

A. Roll Call

Present: Brendan Magnan, Daniel Bedeker, Ranjit Bhawe, Dave DeFlumeri, Lisa Tryon and Julie Valvo.

Absent: Jim Connors, Matthew Connors, Heather Donaldson-Gladue and Steve Munson.

Also Present: Joe Griffith, MaryRose Palumbo and Lisa Streit.

Magnan called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and deemed there was a quorum.

Magnan reviewed: As we continue to host remote meetings, she wanted to take the opportunity to highlight a few guidelines to ensure business runs efficiently and that all statutory and administrative rules are followed:

1. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and Governor Lamont's executive orders, this meeting is being recorded and will be made available on the City of Milford website.
2. During this meeting, if members of the Inland Wetlands Commission would like to speak, please utilize the "raise your hand" feature via Zoom. All participants will be muted during the meeting unless recognized by the Chair.
3. After being recognized to speak, please state your name and address prior to making a statement.

B. Pledge

All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. Public Comments

None.

D. Old Business

Magnan reviewed the rules of a Public Hearing:

- Thank you everyone for coming and having an interest in the process.
- Please note that this Formal proceeding, I ask that everyone please be respectful of the process.
- Everyone has been muted on entry and we ask that you stay muted to avoid background noise unless you are recognized by the Chair to speak.
- The applicant and their consultants will give their presentations and then the public will be asked to speak in order of:
 - those for,
 - those against, and
 - those neither for nor against who have questions on the application.
- Reminder that comments are limited to 5 minutes.
- This is not a back and forth discussion. The applicant and their consultants will address the public's questions during rebuttal.
- Reminder that the Inland Wetland Agency is made up of citizen volunteers. Commissioners have taken CT DEEP inland Wetland Commissioner Training and attended training by the CT Association of Conservation and Inland Wetland Commission and the CT Bar Association on the CT Inland Wetlands Statutes.
- Please respect the process.

MaryRose:

As a reminder to the public, the commission operates under the State Statutes and the MIWA regulations. Section 10 of the regulations calls out the criteria for decisions. In reaching its decision on any application after a public hearing, the agency shall base its decision on the record of that hearing. *Documentary evidence or other material not in the hearing record shall not be considered by the agency in its decision.*

Section 10 Considerations for decision

10.1 Evidence

The agency may consider the following in making its decision on an application:

- A. The application and its supporting documentation, including the applicant's comments and testimony,
- B. Public comments, evidence and testimony,
- C. Reports from other agencies and commissions including but not limited to the city of Milford.
- D. The agency may also consider comments on any application from the New Haven county soil and water conservation district, the South Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency or other regional organizations (e.g., council of elected officials); agencies in adjacent municipalities which may be affected by the proposed activity, or other technical agencies or organizations which may undertake additional studies or investigations.
- E. Nonreceipt of comments from agencies and commissions shall neither delay nor prejudice the decision of the agency.

10.2 Standards and criteria for decision

In carrying out the purposes and policies of sections 22a-36 to 22a-45, inclusive, of the Connecticut general statutes, including matters relating to regulating, licensing, and enforcing of the provisions thereof, the agency shall take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances, including but not limited to:

The environmental impact of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands or watercourses.

The applicant's purpose for, and any feasible and prudent alternatives to, the proposed regulated activity which alternatives would cause less or no environmental impact to wetlands or watercourses.

The relationship between the short term and long-term impacts of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands or watercourses and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of such wetlands or watercourses.

Irreversible and irretrievable loss of wetland or watercourse resources which would be caused by the proposed regulated activity, including the extent to which such activity would foreclose a future ability to protect, enhance or restore such resources, and any mitigation measures which may be considered as a condition of issuing a permit for such activity including, but not limited to, measures to (1) prevent or minimize pollution or other environmental damage, (2) maintain or enhance existing environmental quality, or (3) in the following order of priority: restore, enhance and create productive wetland or watercourse resources.

The character and degree of injury to, or interference with, safety, health or the reasonable use of property which is caused or threatened by the proposed regulated activity.

Impacts of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands or watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed and future activities associated with or reasonably related to, the proposed regulated activity which are made inevitable by the proposed regulated activity and which may have an impact on wetlands or watercourses.

10.3 Existence of feasible and prudent alternative

In the case of an application which received a public hearing pursuant to a finding by the agency that the proposed activity may have a significant impact on wetlands or watercourses, a permit shall not be issued unless the agency finds on the basis of the record that a feasible and prudent alternative does not exist. In making this finding the agency shall consider the facts and circumstances set forth in subsection 10.2 of this section. The finding and the reasons therefore shall be stated on the record in writing.

10.4 Alternatives with less impact

In the case of an application which is denied on the basis of a finding that there may be feasible and prudent alternatives to the proposed regulated activity which have less adverse impact on wetlands or watercourses, the agency shall propose on the record in writing the types of alternatives which the applicant may investigate provided this subsection shall not be construed to shift the burden from the applicant to prove that he is entitled to the permit or to present alternatives to the proposed regulated activity.

10.5 Based on information in the record

In reaching its decision on any application after a public hearing, the agency shall base its decision on the record of that hearing. Documentary evidence or other material not in the hearing record shall not be considered by the agency in its decision. However, the agency is not precluded from seeking advice from its own experts on information already in the record of the public hearing. A conclusion that a feasible and prudent alternative does not exist does not create a presumption that a permit should be issued. The applicant has the burden of demonstrating that his application is consistent with the purposes and policies of these regulations and sections 22a-36 to 22a-45, inclusive, of the Connecticut general statutes.

From Section 2 Definitions:

“Feasible” means able to be constructed or implemented consistent with sound engineering principles

“Prudent” means economically and otherwise reasonable in light of the social benefits to be derived from the proposed regulated activity provided cost may be considered in deciding what is prudent and further provided a mere showing of expense will not necessarily mean an alternative is imprudent.

A motion was made by DeFlumeri, seconded by Valvo to hear items IW-23-028, IW-23-0029 and IW-23-0030 together. The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

1. **IW-23-0030: 0 Sub Way, Robert Scinto** – Proposed construction of a 160,000 square foot warehouse and office facility with associated parking, drainage, and grading in and within 150’ of a wetland and watercourse in the Beaver Brook Watershed.
2. **IW-23-0029: 305 Sub Way, Robert Scinto** – Proposed construction of a 160,000 square foot warehouse and office facility with associated parking, drainage, and grading in and within 150’ of a wetland and watercourse in the Beaver Brook Watershed.

3. **IW-23-0028: 325 Sub Way, Robert Scinto** – Proposed construction of a 160,000 square foot warehouse and office facility with associated parking, drainage, and grading in and within 150' of a wetland and watercourse in the Beaver Brook Watershed.

MaryRose reported that the questions from the last meeting were:

- Information for Alternative 3, recommended by William Kenny
- information for Alternative Plan 2 as shown by William Kenny
- Information on the impacts of Alternative Plans 1,2 & 3 on functions and values of the onsite and adjacent wetland.
- Cross section of proposed grading and erosion and sedimentation controls immediately adjacent to the wetlands and open space areas.
- Proposed stormwater and water quality system maintenance plan
- Spill prevention and clean-up plan
- Are any chemicals being sold from the warehouse, if so what type of chemical and what size containers?
- To save wetlands impacts and removal of mature trees, has the applicant requested a waiver from P&Z for the minimum number of parking spaces required for their approval?

Magnan called for the Applicant's presentation.

Attorney Kevin Curseaden, Curseaden & Moore, LLC, 3 Lafayette Street, Milford, CT representing R.D. Scinto, introduced the consulting team and stated that they met with the City Engineer and revised their plans. The City Engineer's report was issued and stated that he needs more time to review the information. They also met with the Economic Development Agency and discussed IWA information and Manny Silva submitted a summary of this to be added to the record. This was uploaded to City Squared and staff has uploaded the following items to the agenda the revised stormwater drainage report and Mr. Kenney's alternatives and responses to some of the questions. There are no chemicals to be stored or sold on the property.

Regarding the zoning waiver for parking. They can pursue this and have to present a zoning compliant plan to Zoning. They could ask Zoning for a waiver or they can submit a zone text amendment application based on the end users required parking and what zoning feels that they can agree to based on their information. There is no guarantee that they can reduce the parking, but the applicant is willing to look at that and make an effort to do that before Zoning.

Manny Silva, Rose-Tiso & Co., LLC, 35 Brentwood Avenue, Fairfield, CT, speaking to the 6/30/23 letter to City Engineer reviewing his comments and addressed each item while sharing his screen. Speaking to Sheet SP-3 discussed the City Engineers' requirements to reinforce the silt fencing in the northern area. The City Engineer reserved the right to have additional comments. City Engineer required that the stormwater analysis include the undisturbed areas in the offsite areas in the analysis. Mr. Silva reviewed his 7/03/23 Letter to City of Milford Economic Development Office.

William Kenny, William Kenny Associates, 195 Tunxis Hill Cutoff South, Fairfield, CT, reviewed the plan and two alternative plans discussed at the last meeting and he has summarized and focused on quantifiable factors, qualitative review of wetland functions as they relate to wetlands. Starting with the initial site plan in Northwest corner of property to remove a wetland and create new wetlands in the forested area. Alternative 1 had the plan for offsite improvements in the mondo pond area.

Alternative 2 preserved the existing wetland minus 1800 sq ft to be removed for an access driveway to the building. They propose moving parking in an upland area. Expanded the mitigation area by creating new wetlands to make up for the proposed filling. Stopped the mowing that is occurring in that area which has no shrubs. Proposing planting about 70 trees in the wetland and area immediately adjacent to it and creating more of a natural habitat area improving its stormwater management function and native flora and wetland fauna. Parking area to the north there were questions on how that might affect wetland to the east. Primarily it would affect water management (plants infiltrate and slowly enter the wetland after being naturally cleaned and cooled). The parking lot would change that, but the stormwater management system would allow the water to be treated, cleaned and cooled then discharged below grade infiltrating through the soil to the ground water and then the wetland as it does today. Another factor would be additional sunlight impacting the wetlands where now it is forested. Proposing to plan a full row of evergreen trees along the edges of the parking lot to limit the amount of light getting to the wetlands through the lower levels of the forest. This protects the areas along the sides of the cleared area from sunlight. He gave a qualitative summary of the three plans speaking to table entitled wetland and associated upland conditions initial and alternatives 1 and 2 plans:

**305-325 Sub Way
Milford, Connecticut**

***Wetland and Associated Upland Conditions for
Initial and Alternate 1 and 2 Plans***

	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Initial Plan</u>	<u>Alternative 1 Plan</u>	<u>Alternative 2 Plan</u>
Existing Wetlands	ac	1.05	1.05	1.05
Wetland Disturbance/Loss	ac	0.22	0.22	0.04
Wetland Creation	ac	0.23	0.00	0.05
Proposed Total Wetlands	Ac	1.06	0.83	1.06
Wetland Enhancement	ac	0.00	<0.02	0.18
Upland Woodland Loss	ac	0.23	0.00	0.39
Upland Woodland Creation or Enhancement	ac	0.00	2.3	0.13
Public Hiking Trail Improvement	lf	0.00	3,650	0.00
Upland Woodland Temporary Disturbance	ac	0.15	0.00	0.08

Note: The noted upland woodland loss only includes areas associated with the wetland activities.

Kenny proceeded to review the Wetlands Functions for Stormwater Detention Basins:

305-325 Sub Way
Milford, Connecticut

Functions of Western Woodland Wetland (Stormwater Detention Basin)

<u>Wetland Functions</u>	<u>Relative Capacity to Perform Function</u>			
	<u>Existing Plan</u>	<u>Initial Plan</u>	<u>ALT 1 Plan</u>	<u>ALT 2 Plan</u>
Modification of Groundwater Discharge	Low	Low	Low	Low
Modification of Groundwater Recharge	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate+
Storm and Flood Water Storage	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate+
Modification of Water Quality	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate+
Export of Detritus	Low	None	None	Low+
Contribution to Abundance and Diversity of Wetland Flora	Low	None	None	Moderate+
Contribution to Abundance and Diversity of Wetland Fauna	Low	None	None	Moderate+

Kenny stated that alternative 2 is his recommended plan as it has less impact and higher function.

Atty Curseaden stated that their review with the City Engineer does not stop with the IWA, the City Engineer will continue to review the project in front of other City boards.

Mr. Scinto thanked everyone for their time and thanked the team as he feels it was a very thorough presentation with 3 options and he would appreciate action taken.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak in favor / proponents

- This is not a back and forth discussion. The Applicant and their consultants will address the public's questions during rebuttal.
- All discussion is through the Chair
- Please keep questions and concerns focused on matters within the Inland Wetland Agency's Jurisdiction: wetlands, brook, river, flooding, and wetland soils. Zoning Issues such as density, and traffic are not under IWA review.
- Reminder that comments are limited to 5 minutes.

Compliance Officer noted that 3 items were submitted for the record against the proposal and have been added to the document links.

Diane Prior, 5 Audubon Close, Milford, CT

Stated that this seems to be an awful lot of mitigation for one spot and she still has concerns with the impact on the wetland with a 160,000 sq. ft. WAREHOUSE and 20 trucking bays. She understands and respects timelines but would like more time to review.

The applicant said that in the past there were up to 500 cars which is very different than 20 tractor trailer trucks coming in and out of the property. The applicant said there would only be 12 trucks being loaded at one time and doesn't address the trucks that are unloading the items and doesn't explain why there are 20 if only 12 are needed, that's a lot. They continue to have concerns with diesel fuel particles in the air and landing in the water. Cars likely didn't release diesel. The diesel likely would be idling for a longer time. Asked for a study to be done on the impact of trucks putting fumes in the air. There was a discussion of what happens if there is a spill and a 24 hour call for this. Who will be monitoring this and how will it be reported and to whom. She also asked about garbage inside and outside of the warehouse and who will be monitoring and where will they be. Will the sanitation companies be made aware of these concerns. She had a question about the trees (maple forest). Mr. Kenny was talking about removing the forest as one of the alternatives and their roots would be removed as well. The roots are what keeps the wetlands together. The proposal doesn't replace the root system which loosens the ground and the wetlands go away. The shade is also very important as the rain gets absorbed into the trees and roots systems. Over the weekend the entire state suffered from torrential rains. Her concern is what plans are being made to protect the wetland if the area is saturated with a deluge to keep loose ground from pouring into the wetlands.

Robin Moran is concerned with the 20 truck bays if only 12 are needed. What happens if this tenant leaves or the deal falls through, what happens to this building if a tenant leaves and a new tenant goes in what happens then because it is past the approval process.

Regine had a question about the table, there was an item on the export of detritus and what did that mean. In terms of the parking lot, she understands that was being planned in an area close to the entrance to the mondo trail system?

Jane Platt, 132 Platt Lane, stated that she has heard nothing on the impact on animals in the area.

Alan Kohler – Unit 29 Audubon Close, stated that this is a beautiful property and feels this eco system is delicate and one bad accident could mean no more birds, turtles, or fish. Why approve the gradual degradation of this ecosystem.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak in favor / proponents

Julie Nash, Economic Development Director read a letter from EDC (attached) The letter outlined the success of the FDC Euro and the commitment to sustainability and this is a significant milestone growth of a company in the Milford Community with a strong market position and economic benefit to Milford and CT. Reviewed the water quality treatment plan that is proposed will protect mondo ponds and have positive impacts to the community. Discussion of proposed growth of 300-500 jobs over the next decade.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak unclassified (neither for nor against)

None.

Chairman Magnan called for the Applicant's Rebuttal

Bob Scinto – Explained that there will be 12 trucks verses 20 docks. Trucks will go all over the east coast. They don't leave the docks until they are full; they will sit there, no cab, until they are full and then it leaves. There are 550 cars now that leak grease and oil with no treatment. This project will improve the quality of water. It doesn't matter who the tenant is, the measures of protection are taken.

Manny Silva - clarifying that all 20 docks will be occupied with a trailer but only 12 will move out per day. There is no benefit to idling a truck in place burning diesel needlessly. There will be a reduction in intensification of use; Subway had training sessions, sales meetings, etc. Cars were not just parked. Spill response is a 24 hour DEP program with a response time within 1 hour; it does not take 24 hours, it means someone takes calls 24 hours a day. Regarding garbage; garbage is mostly cardboard and a compactor would be used, no leakage. Regarding soil erosion and sedimentation controls – the plan is to control runoff during construction until the site is stable. DEP has a whole manual on how to operate the site during construction with a logbook to the DEP.

Bill Kenny – regarding the table about detritus. In this context it has to do with the food chain from plants or animals and movement. Magnan asked that he explain about the tree roots and mitigation. Kenny addressed the stormwater management and that roots are critical in stabilizing soil. Once an area is converted into a parking lot, we rely on the stormwater plan to control the water movement as well as S & E controls. Magnan questioned if the application is approved and the development falls through what would happen. Scinto stated that this is a very good growth company and they need this facility and will occupy two buildings across the street as well. It is ideal for them and a very good use of the property. If the development does fall through, then any changes would have to come back for approval.

Curseaden stated that if the project is approved, there is a 5 year permit. If the project falls through or the tenant leaves, they would have to seek a new tenant or a new project. Typically required by the IWA are weekly logs and the DEP also requires monitoring to ensure that the features stay in place during the critical construction time. They are redeveloping an existing site adjacent to Mondo Ponds; it is not any closer to the entrance. They believe it is a strong application and a balance of economic development and the protection of resources.

Magnan addressed the issue of animals on site and referenced Section 10 of the IWA regulations, by state law. There is no testimony for this project regarding endangered species or vernal pools.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak against/opponents

Alan Kohler, unit 29 Audubon close They said that there is no benefit to idling, nice to say but will there be requirements for that.

Diane Prior, 5 Audubon Close, stated that she is still confused about the way the trees are going to be addressed with the root system and about 12 trucks vs 20 docks. She understands that there is an economic boost to all of this but is concerned with the environmental impact. She further questioned that

it was stated there used to be 500 cars dumping grease and oil onto the parking lot and questioned where that information came from.

Robin Moran questioned the growth of the company and its intent to continue to grow and stay in Milford. Everyone thought BIC and Subway would stay as well. She is concerned as to how all these changes will impact us.

Tom De Matteo, 5 Audubon Close referenced the issue of economic development and that jobs and taxes are obviously important. But we cannot ignore the value to the town this unique property like Mondo Ponds has. Regarding 500 cars versus 175 cars; if the business grows and there will be more employees and in 10 years it will be back to 500 cars with trucks as well. The next step is to go to Planning and Zoning and he questioned what a text amendment was.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak in favor / proponents

Julie Nash, Economic Development Council – stated that the holistic view is to live, work and play and she would not speak here if this project did not support this. When talking about economic growth, this means across the company and country, not necessarily Milford. They are looking to move to additional type of car parts and their headquarters to be located in Milford.

Chairman Magnan called for those to speak unclassified (neither for nor against)

None

Curseaden addressed the question regarding a text amendment. This is a regulation change, not a zone change based on a number of different factors. Regarding the parking; there were not 500 employees in Milford, no additional parking spaces are being requested, there are no changes to Mondo Ponds. One plan has enhancements to the trails and invasive species removal and professional opinions of equal or improved quality of habitat. Regarding truck idling, he does not see why there can't be no idling as a condition; trucks don't stay, the trailers stay. There would be 12 movements per day not 20 trucks per day. 20 trailers could be at the loading docks. BIC Drive is a major route down to an industrial route. Subway was here for quite some time and this option is to keep another Milford business in Milford. The plan calls for an increase in treatment to the runoff that is not happening now and using the IWA Regulations currently versus what was required back then. There will be a cleaner product entering the system with this plan versus what is happening now.

Chairman Magnan called for Agency members questions

Magan reviewed the training and experience of the Commission and that they are volunteer commissioners that have been trained and are doing this because they care, there are no preconceived opinions.

Tryon stated that she has three questions for clarification.

- 1) Did the City Engineer recently get the items for review and needs more time. MaryRose stated that there has been communication since May and some information has just been received on Friday.
- 2) Talk about the parking. The number of parking spaces is predicated on the size of the building and not the number of employees. Curseaden stated it is based on the size of the building and the use. Each town has a parking table and then there is a new requirement for electric charging vehicles over 30 spaces and then other parking requirements so that is what drives it and the use will drive it i.e., if

the user has multiple shifts or it is a shared use. In this situation they are not in a position to reduce the size of the building so have a unique situation where the end user has specific requirements so we can ask the zoning board to reduce the parking.

- 3) Question about the lighting – there is lighting on the demarcation line, will they be on 24-7, what is the schedule, she is concerned about the nocturnal fauna. Silva stated that they will be using lighting that is dark sky compliant and low to the ground; they are 20' high and there is shielding in the fixture so they will not be lighting up areas in the woods or wetlands. The lights will be on for security. Curseaden stated that there is a lighting plan with specs. Silva stated that they will be good stewards and use Best Management Practices to improve the site to today's standards. 1970 aerial photos show Mondo Ponds but in 1950 it was not there. It was man made from the construction of 1-95.

Valvo questioned the number of parking spaces and if there is a reduction, would the lot be made smaller and less trees removed. Magnan stated that the decision has to be based on what is presented and they would have to come back with a modification if need be. Valvo questioned where the number of 12 trucks came from. Scinto stated that it comes from the tenant, that the most they have is 12 per day.

DeFlumeri questioned if the building is sprinklered and if this is included in the calculations. Silva stated that yes, the building code requires sprinklers and the calculations are based on a 100 year storm. Even in a 7" rainstorm, the water falling inside the building would go into the floor drains and into the sanitary sewer. That volume of water could be contained in the treatment system.

Julie Nash stated that the company produces videos for customer service as well as parts distribution. Half of the business is video production on how to fix parts, etc.

MaryRose asked if the latest Cornell numbers for the 100 year rainstorm were used. Silva stated that the bulletin from the CT DEP and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) was used and the numbers have gone up in the last couple of years.

MaryRose reviewed the initial plan calls for filling of wetlands, improvements, and creation of wetlands. Alternate 1 calls for filling of wetlands and offsite improvements. Alternate 2 leaves the wetlands as they are, 1800 sq ft of fill, additional wetlands and replanting to increase function and an additional parking area with grading within 5' of the wetland that is heavily treed.

Bedecker stated that he is very familiar with the area and he is against removing trees so he is leaning towards improvements on the Mondo Pond property which is Alternate 1.

Tryon stated that she favors Alternate 2 and would like to see fully engineered plans for that. Magnan agrees and feels that it has been a very compelling testimony and this protects and enhances the wetlands as well as trees as a buffer for the wetlands and sound as well. He believes, based on the testimony that this plan has a net benefit and the number of trucks that come and go is not the criteria it is rather the functions and value of the wetlands in the application that guides the IWA.

MaryRose stated that the original plan has stormwater management, grading and is complete. Alternate 2 has rough drawings, not fully engineered, no soil erosion and sedimentation controls and no stormwater detention design.

Bhave stated that he is in favor of Alternate 2. Valvo stated that she is in favor of Alternate 1 with the enhancing of the trails and maintaining the forest up front and enhancing the wetlands. DeFlumeri stated that he would like all of the plans for Alternate 2.

Valvo questioned if improving the drainage by Mondo Ponds was still part of the plan. Curseaden stated that the large drainage pipe would be repaired or unclogged and he would defer to his team regarding lowering the water level. Kenny stated that the pipe is quite old and has been clogged for many years and has allowed the ponds to adjust to the new levels. His concern is if cleaning the pipe will drop the water level in the pond and may dry up the wetlands around the pond. He thought they would leave it and replace the subsurface pipe and provide a control flow condition. Scinto stated that they would be happy to put a new pipe in.

Magnan emphasized the importance of the function and values and feels there are net benefits in Alternates 1 and 2. The functions table was reviewed and the consensus was to consider Alternate 1 and 2 and not the initial plan.

This evening the Agency can:

Ask questions.

Request additional review.

Motion to request additional information.

Motion to Continue the hearing to a specific time and date. (7/19/23 at 7:30 pm)

Hearing can be continued for specific information only (i.e., a grading plan or report,
Engineered plans for alternative 2

OR

Hearing can be continued if waiting for overall plan revisions.

Motion to Close the hearing (*If the Agency has sufficient information to make a decision, only information in the record can be used for the decision*)

Agency can deliberate

Agency can wait to deliberate at next meeting (no discussion or information may be received outside the meeting room)

The following motion was made by Bedecker and seconded by DeFlumeri:

I move that the public hearing for IW-23-0030, 0 Sub Way; IW-23-0029, 305 Sub Way; IW-23-0028: 325 Sub Way be continued to 7/19/21 at 7:30 pm for the following information:

- The engineering for the parking and stormwater treatment, in soil erosion and sedimentation controls and cross section, lighting plan for Alternative 2
- How many established trees in that area would need to be removed.

The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

E. Minutes

No action taken.

H. Staff Report

MIWA Clerk Taft Clark has created a reference page for you all to access. The link is [HERE](#) . The page contains:

- MIWA meeting dates (first and third Wednesday at 7:30 pm)
- MIWA Regulations
- MIWA Bylaws
- Milford Ethics Commission Guide
- Past memos from the City Attorney's office on Inland Wetland legal questions and cases
- Training opportunities with CT DEEP and UConn for land use commissioners.
- MIWA webpage
- Milford YouTube page (MIWA meeting videos are available here)
- MIWA meeting Zoom link

The office has been working on a number of inquiries, complaints, minor reviews, and other reports.
Site Status:

Project Site	Status	Monitoring Reports	
		Last Received	Final Due By
1553 Boston Post Road	Asbuilt received		
30 Bridgeport Ave	Ongoing		
0 Cherry St/Jefferson Park	Ongoing		
67-69 Cooper Ave	Ongoing		
94 Edgewater Place	Ongoing		
201 Kings Highway	Ongoing		
104 Lavery Lane	Plantings in, seeded, not yet established.		
32 Alexander Drive	Ongoing		
16 Marsh Street	Asbuilt received		
114,122,124,128 Merwin Ave	Ongoing		
40 Morehouse Rd	Permit taken out		
690 New Haven Ave	Ongoing, plantings in, waiting on monitoring reports	6/23	6/26
33 Pearl Street	Revised asbuilt required		
8 Pepe's Farm Road	Ongoing monitoring.	June 2023	Nov 2023
0 Quarry Road	Ongoing, lot 1 & 2 completed, lot 3 under construction		
0 Terrace Road	Waiting on final review.	Spring 2022	Complete
161 W Rutland Rd	Ongoing-several lots have been sold off and individual owners are coming in with minor modifications to the proposed sites. In all	Waiting on reports	

	cases no work has been proposed in the conservation wetland areas. Issue with stormwater association to be worked out with developer/lot owners before bond release.		
Wheelers Farms Rd	Waiting on final review		
523 Wheelers Farms Rd	Ongoing.		

Please remember to call or email if you are unable to attend a meeting.

H. Chair Report

The next meeting will be the continuation of the Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on July 19, 2023 via Zoom.

Please let the office know if you cannot attend and get any questions you have on the applications to MaryRose so that she can forward them to the applicants.

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Bedecker seconded by DeFlumeri to adjourn at 10:10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Streit

These minutes have not been accepted or approved.