

Paul P. Parisi, Chm.; Cos Giuffrida, Sec'y.; Walter J. Dreaher; Seb J. Passanesi; Alternates: George L. Augustine; Robert F. Chamberlain

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Eric G. Lowry, Vice-Chm.; Stephen T. Gionfridda; Ralph H. Shaw, II; Mayor Michael Cubeta; Alternates: Anthony G. Gaunichaux; Joseph E. Milardo, Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT

Comm. Augustine acted for absent Vice-Chm. Lowry and Comm. Chamberlain acted for absent Comm. Shaw.

ACTING MEMBERS

George A. Reif, Dir.; Catherine V. Raczka, Assn't Dir.; Althea Rinaldi, Recording Sec'y.

STAFF

Philip G. Bauer, Engr., Public Works Dept.; Jeff Kotkin, reporter, Middletown Press; 20 members of the audience.

OTHERS

CHM. PARISI:

We will call the meeting to order. Serving to-night for absent Comm. Lowry will be Comm. Augustine and for Comm. Shaw will be Comm. Chamberlain. There are four items on the official public hearing. We will take one at a time. I'll have the Secretary read the Legal Notice and the proponent will be given the opportunity to present their proposal and if there is anyone who wishes to speak in favor will be given the opportunity to speak. Following that, anyone who wishes to speak in opposition will be given the opportunity to speak. Then we will go on to item two, three and four. So I will ask the Secretary to read the call.

INTRODUCTION BY CHM. PARISI

SEC'Y. GIUFFRIDA:

THE MIDDLETOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING MAY 14, 1980, STARTING AT 7:00 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, MUNICIPAL BUILDING, DEKOVEN DRIVE, MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT, to consider the following:

ITEM 1. ON PUBLIC HEARING

1. Proposed amendment to (a): The Plan of Development land-use element and (b): The Zoning Map; to show the location of major aquifers (underground drinking water sources) in Middletown. And further a proposal to adopt, in the text of the Zoning Code, regulations to protect the identified aquifers from contamination.

AMENDMENT TO PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT, ZONING CODE, MAP TO SHOW LOCATION OFF AQUIFERS

CHM. PARISI:

This notice appeared in the Middletown Press on Saturday May 3rd and on Saturday May 10th, 1980. The proposal was put forth by the Midstate Planning Agency and Geoffrey Colegrove, Director. Jeff is there anyone else presenting anything besides you?

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

No, (inaudible) will stay on for the remainder of the meeting to answer questions after the hearing on the proposal. I will make this presentation brief. The basis of this proposal comes from a report that was done back in August as a preliminary draft and became final in February, 1979, from the Area Wide Waste Planning Board which is commonly known as a two-way planning board in the State of Conn. and the office their introduction to a TASK Force but just give you a brief run down on some of the people that is an interagency type of Task Force for people like Dan Meed, DEP; Barry Cavanna, Bob Melvick, Geological Survey; and Dick Woodhill, Dept. of (inaudible)

NOTE: THIS TRANSCRIPT WAS TAKEN FROM A DEFECTIVE TAPE AND WAS TRANSFERRED TO CASSETTE RECORDER

Fred Banak, D.E.P.; Paul Maronay, Water Compliance, and a group of other town planners and other types of people served on the Task Force, to help develop model Aquifer Detention Regulations for the State of Conn. They took their impetus from a previous study which looked at various sources of contaminations throughout the State which was conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey and a previous Grant Program and identified a number of problem areas. The Parks Program developed a model program from which your regulations derived and they identified the presence of land fills, salt storage piles as--the example, two kinds of items which are occurring in our certified potential ground area and causing contamination. There are several/other listed as well. The draft regulation has the essence of that research and investigation has suggested certain uses are prohibited from the aquifer testing zone. The next part identifies which aquifer could test. The information came primarily from the U.S. Geological Survey and the Natural Resource Davis Center at the D.E.P. They identified (inaudible) known or inferred stratified drip and classified basic areas, areas which are---which have greater than/10 ft. of saturated thickness. Areas less than 10 ft. of stratified drift and thickness saturated an immediate recharge areas around surface water will enter and end up traveling through that aquifer. The maps up here show three aquifer areas identified in Middletown. These three areas are areas which have been considered have greater existing or proposed future water supply uses. There are other aquifers in the City of Middletown which are not identified for proposed protection for various reasons. But the three I'm talking about, Millbrook area, the area that you now have developed and have plan to add/additional on River Road and the third site is/Pratt and Whitney/which is the largest identified aquifer.

As I said the information was taken from secondary sources and compiled pretty much thru the research efforts of the Geological Survey and Natural Resource Center, at the DEP.

Not shown on the map are three zones I talked about, the Aquifer, Primary Recharge Area, and the Secondary Recharge Area which you have is the the entire recharge area including the secondary in which the drainage basin in which any rain fall would enter the aquifer itself.

Based on our readings and applications before you I can say that the information on these (inaudible) sources go back to the early 1963 Gary Miller studies and estimated approximately essential 7 to 8 million gallons output from the River Road aquifer. Up to a million in the Millbrook area and estimated someplace in the vicinity of the Pratt and Whitney aquifer. Along this portion estimated 18 to 20 million gallons. On the planning efforts of the Water/Sewer Dept. they recognized need to find additional source of water (inaudible) to have sufficient water until the year 1990 at that point your wells would be exploit here to the point of capacity. Laurel Brook/turns about point 7-8 gallons would be used at its ultimate capacity. I think the Mt. Higby/1.4 million gallons per day. So between these three sources you have sufficient water supply past 1990. Past that point you have to look for other sources and the number of difference sources explored. I think some of the reports revived consider the Pratt and Whitney aquifer probably the most stable for its largest quantity and its/availability to the boundaries of the City of Middletown. Other sources include Cromwell and etc. This would be in the City's future needs as a resource for water supply. I don't know what the traction rate is at the site. Early reports indicate about 3 million gallons a day. Use was zoned by the Federal Government. I have no idea what some of the figures are and if they are accurate now. I think if you look to the very low range the City would

need approximately 6 to 9 million gallons of additional yield per day. That is from source DEP (inaudible). Draft regulations for the most part are fairly minimal. I think, I should say they prohibit. You permanently have a section on Hazardous Waste in your community already adopted in your regulations and it goes on to limit as your proposed regulations states, septic systems, on site septic systems, street salt storage & loading, solid waste disposal sites, also underground storage of fuel or fuel transmission pipes and new enlarged fertilizer storage facilities and then you have a note that waste is prohibited in your community which is another section and the burning industrial commercial uses which would occupy the identified certified area shown on this map. You require certain additional submission requirements to indicate the handling of the solid waste, the hazardous waste would be transported or disposed off. I want to say the State Legislature recently passed a bill which specifically amends 8-3 of the General Statutes which is the Section in the Zoning which allows communities to adopt regulations to protect ground water aquifers purposes of water supply. It further amends the section on the Plan of Development 8-25 which allows the Planning Commission to amend the Plan of Development to take into consideration ground water supplies in future (inaudible) needs from Pratt & Whitney resources. There was some question in the past whether the legal basis was there. I had an opinion from an attorney that it was there. Public health, safety and welfare legislatures have/clarified clearly that it is (inaudible) commission's jurisdiction to make (inaudible) to adopt regulations. I don't have the bill number but I will make copies of it to-morrow. I will be glad to respond to any questions.

CHM. PARISI:

Is there any questions from Commission members. I guess I said that any of those who wanted to speak in favor and those who wanted to speak in opposition maybe that's a poor chose of words for this kind of a proposal but is there any one from the public who wishes to comment on this proposal. Or any one have questions that Jeff would be willing to answer. Yes Jack. Jack excuse me, would you come up and speak into the microphone because this is on tape.

JACK McCORMACK, Chm. of Inland Wetlands:

I'm Jack McCormack, Chm. of the Inland Wetlands. Jeff we have been led to believe that there is an aquifer in Westfield. Why would that not be as suitably protected as these other three?

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

As I said before when the Ground Water Task Force started^{to}/formulate^{OR} which aquifer they would identify and protect said it was a series of criteria and there was four basic types. Three basic types. The first one was source which is now being used for water supply purpose such as River Rd. site. Secondly, for those areas which would^{identify}/as having a water supply plan of some sort either regional or local as being proposed for use in some point in the future. An those would be the two that I mentioned earlier, the area off the Pratt & Whitney and Millbrook basin. The third area of consideration was those of which were unique in some way identified with the Natural Resource Center. The example^{that}/would be the Eight Mile aquifer in East Haddam which is not the closest water supply purposes but is particularly unique from water falling point of view and a (inaudible) factors. The combination^{might be}/used for public water supply I forgot what category it was. The original map which is located a certified drift deposits in Middletown has included areas for instance along the Mattabasett River. There are areas in there and there are small deposits

some identified in the Coginchaug River/area and those were the two that I remember. I don't remember any others in the Westfield other than the ones along the Mattabassett and the one along the Coginchaug. The reason that they weren't identified because they were not one of the four categories /three categories with light puposes, future water supply or identified by Natural Resource Center, DEP resource somewhat. That's the only reason. It's not say that there aren't other aquifers in town. There are in Middletown, the City of Middletown. Just going on criteria that we were using and I was using from the Task Forces recommendations that's why only three of those....

JACK McCORMACK:

These that are chosen ^{that} three by your particular standards are the standards set forth/~~you~~ are using.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

Right. The legislation past says (inaudible) public light purposes (inaudible) statutes to allow three protection areas in the public water supply purposes. There are others obviously which support--- help support civic and domestic density for (inaudible) provide limited oriented sensitive industrial water supply on site. (Inaudible) public water supply purposes in Middletown case, which 3 areas were selected. In talking with the people in the Water Dept. this one, I asked them if they wanted to include even this one. (inaudible) go ahead and analize the study by /Geraghty/ Miller back in the /80's. They said that until they cover the roster for needs they preferred to play on (inaudible) proposal until such time they had to secure arrangements for their water supply at least past year 1990. Also we are dealing with---in many cases secondary data. Some of these aquifers have been (inaudible) this one has in/^{terms of} cross sections a series of wells. You have series of wells already on River Rd. and have plans to install another 4 or so in that area. You have already a water supply serving Pratt & Whitney in the northern end of this aquifer, which in that area potentially (inaudible) 20 million gallons a day. So everything on this particular map is partially for development.

JACK McCORMACK:

My next question would be how accurate the detailed/^{are} the outlines of the aquifer would they plus or minus-a half a mile or...

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

I don't think they are/^{quiet} that gross. The mapping work is done scale is 1" equals 2,000 ft. 124 thousandth. It is not what you call engineering accuracy. They are using for the most part topographic information of the U.S. Geological information so the accuracy is not-is not engineering accuracy.

JACK McCORMACK:

My next question would be with the Sumner Brook aquifer. It's been our experience that extends quiet distance north from Randolph Rd. as well as south.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

Well, the information that I would use-was the /Geraghty/ Miller report which identified locations in here as being the primary. It does go below possibly the areas identified. The well locations are in here and southward.

JACK McCORMACK:

As you well know up in CVH which might be hooked up with Sumner Brook

again it might even swing back/around in to the prime/ of Maromas. There's quiet an area in there that also could be considered.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

The reason this particular aquifer was not looked as a ...yields about 800 thousand to 2 million gallons a day say yield can't say you can't get more than that certain times of the year. I would say without question that these two constitutes to large...have been drilling activities testing out into the meadows and they found the materials were much finer as a result of a certified drift area saturated. The materials looked much finer and would not transmitt. the water. The kind (inaudible) you could use in municipal water supplies. So this area even thought it's certified drift and is fairly deep it's of very fine grain and not considered a good potential for a municipal water supply. You must remember the municipal service vs. what might be way more than that (inaudible) localized to a residential area for that type use. So it is not a comprehensive plan to protect all the water resources subsurfaces water resources of the town of Middletown. It is designed to get at those areas which are expolitable that we know about or deferred, and which service is needed in the community. I think that/Kind of/other survey service would cost...

JACK McCORMACK:

This would be our primary need but if a need arose some more further distance-in years to come there would be other areas within the City that might be able to collectively serve the City-you know in the same capacity. Maybe not all within one area but in different areas in the City we might be able to get the same amount of water from different sources.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

Providing you meet water quality standards in terms of the drinking water standards which (inaudible) treatment plant in fact, probably discussing with the Water Dept. they went to the area south along the Connecticut River for further sources of water supply. We talked about what (Inaudible due to coughing into mike) treatment plant whether or not try to pipe it back to the existing plant or construct a new one etc. Cromwell has a major supply right on the river, located almost to the Rocky Hill Town Line, which could serve Middletown, the northern end of Middletown. Next the railroad track at the town line it's not that far away. This is to the Cromwell site probably not much further than it is to the lower end of the Connecticut River. So of all the sources around, Cromwell is the closest of magnitude.

JACK McCORMACK:

Thank you very much Jeff. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

GHM. PARISI:

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor, wishes to comment or speak in opposition on this.

ROBERT WISE:

My name is Robert Wise, and I am an attorney for Pratt & whitney Aircraft. Mr. Chairman, really I'm here for item 4 but in light of what's going on number 1 I received the guide/agency has but out and reviewed it. I would like to make a few comments relative to it. Jeff, If I could, I would like to start with a couple of questions. Would

you identify as the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft aquifer as I understand is, from secondary sources.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

Well there are several different sources. One is the Geraghty/Miller Study that was done back in 1963 or 64, commissioned by the State of Conn. I can furnish you the exact reference if you like tomorrow if I can get your telephone number and I'll call it in. The second thing that was one of the sources the the people at the Natural Resources Davis Center in Hartford obviously used to compile their original map and that does hold some primary information because the site was developed partically and zoned by Canel and the National G.S. labratory.

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

Well to say, to show what there is now is not a public water site is it?

GEOFFREY COLEGROVE:

No, what we are talking about is a very extensive area as far as I know the actual data areas include space it could just be well site on Pratt & Whitney property.

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

That's a private a....

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

A private water supply.

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

Are you familiar with the Geraghty/Miller Report that was done in 1971 relative to the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft wells?

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

I heard about that report unfortunately I don't have a copy in my possession. I only heard about it only late last week.

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

I'd be very happy to give you a copy Jeff.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

(inaudible) series of test poles up and down along the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft property a series of test poles and analized the (inaudible) of the materials.

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

Yes that would be considered primed area I suppose. Mr. Chairman, In the item #4 we will put in evidence the Geraghty/Miller Report. It was done back in 1971 at the time ECM site, the disposal site that is now operative on the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft facility was being constructed they did a series of borings and tests relative to the aquifer. Conclusion of this report shows that the aquifer actually ends at the pier. Some of you who are familiar with that area knows that there is a pier there. It would be far north, yes somewhere in there Jeff there is a pier. According to the Geraghty/Miller Report in 1971, there would be no aquifer south of that it would be identified north of that it...

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

I understand the material I wouldn't call it aquifer, it wouldn't be

an aquifer because the size of the materials (inaudible). It would not be exploitable in terms of saturated material. I think....

ROBERT WISE, ATTORNEY:

I would prefer Geraghty/Miller to discuss that. But the other two comments I would like to make though are obviously this when it deals with private water supply and an industrial facility that's fully developed it could have a very dramatic impact on the facility when talking about restricting and prohibiting certain uses of that facility. There are jet fuel lines going thru there; There are storage tanks. There is this disposal site that we are going to discuss tonight. So this regulation if proposed and accepted could have a very dramatic impact up there. I think it's noteworthy that the report does state that zoning regulations such as this/^{would} be effective in areas that are presently undeveloped. That is stated on page 13 of the agency's report. So if I believe with the proper to say would not be proper to have such regulations in the area that's fully developed. What I would like to request is that the matter relative to the Pratt & Whitney aquifer's as identified be deferred until we can submit this report that the agency's done to Geraghty/Miller. We would like very much like to have Geraghty/Miller review this report and respond back relative to the prime data that they have, ^{to} the location of the aquifer and ^{to} what they see would be the impact on Pratt & Whitney Aircraft operations of the proposal being made.

GEOFFRY COLEGROVE:

I would say I/^{certainly} have no objections to the/^{only} aquifer in the first place. It's/^{only} that kind of thing. I think the data was...if I knew about the report we would have the people who defined the recharge areas use the material. I only found out today that Paul Maron/^{who} served on (inaudible) test was also the gentleman who's reviewing your application for the (inaudible) water compliance session. And also (inaudible) the report, but somehow couldn't actually communicate that to the people doing the aquifer mapping which is rather strange to me. We all stand to update information based on especially on site they have...and I say if I known it ^{was} available at the time the people who actually define recharge areas. I would have had them take a look at the report. To my knowledge Mr.... that was not to be. I recognize that Mr. Maron indicated/^{today} that he didn't feel that it had an impact. The only question that I would raise which is item #4 whether or not even though its a private piece of property assuming there is good will between the industry and the community to satisfy their mutual needs at some point it is not reasonably expected some kind of cooperation to meet the needs there. That the site be/^{to} considered in light of what would potentially be an increase maybe 3 fold/^{to} pump it from that aquifer which has a definite fact on the (inaudible) conedepression.

ROBERT WISS, ATTORNEY:

We have brought some/^{certified} consultants with us tonight to discuss that and are prepared to respond to it.

CHM. PARISI:

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment on item 1 the aquifer proposal? O.K. if not we will close....

C.V. RACZKA, ASSN'T. PLANNER:

I have a letter from the Midstate Regional Planning Agency, Subject: Proposed Aquifer Area Protection Regulations

Dear Mr. Parisi:

As required by Section 8-3 (b) of the General Statutes, the Middstate Regional Planning Agency reviewed the proposed regulation at its May 6, 1980, meeting and voted to recommend that the Commission adopt the regulation as presented. The Agency feels that this proposal will play an important role in the preservation of water quality in the City of Middletown and the Midstate Region.

Very truly yours,
James F. Dunn, Regional Planner

CHM. PARISI:

I might add too for the people that are here especially for the items that are on the public hearing it is not the practice of the Commission to vote on any items that is heard at the public hearing the night of the public hearing. We do take time to review the transcript and look at the proposals. So if anyone is expecting an answer on items 1, 2, 3 and 4 tonight it's not going to come simply because ^{one} no/has asked for answer tonight on the public hearing items to begins with so the earliest that we would be voting on any particular item would be at our next meeting which would be the 28th, the fourth Wednesday of the month. So with that in mind and before I close item 1 does anyone want to comment on item 1. O.K. Item 2.

App'd meeting of June 25, 1980

SEC'Y. GIUFFRIDO:

Proposed amendment to the Zoning Code to adopt Site Tailored Stormwater Detention requirements assuring that parcels of land, when developed with buildings and paved areas, will produce no more stormwater run-off than before development took place.

ITEM #2
SITE TAILORED
STORMWATER
DETENTION-AMEND-
MENT TO ZONING
CODE

CHM. PARISI:

This is a proposal from the Planning Department and so Cathy will make the presentation.

MS. RACZKA, ASSN'T. PLANNING DIR.

Storm water detention proposal---one of series controls regulating land uses in Environmental Sensitive Areas. The need for them is brought about because of public purposes. They prevent destruction of natural resources areas. There is an immediate need and effect for the long life of the community. They prevent hazards such as flooding and prevents destroying public water supplies and water quality.

The first Environmental Sensitive regulations were adopted by the Planning and Zoning Commission in the 70's and these were the Flood Plain regulations. Since then the Commission has adopted the Streambelt Regulations. Another agency has adopted the Inland Wetlands Regulations. Tonight we heard the proposal for the Aquifer Protection which is another type of Environmental Sensitive Regulation. However, all of this Environmentally Sensitive control are all linked by the drainage systems throughout the community. The Stormwater Detention proposal is intended to preserve that drainage system. Here is our map of the watersheds throughout the City of Middletown. There are 23 of them shown on the map. We compared this with the aquifer protection area was relatively limited and covered only 7.4% of the area in Middletown. However, there are watersheds throught the community so this proposal is essentially of each part of Middletown. Another point I would like to make about the map it shows-the level of details that it shows-There were more/mapping details of various neighborhoods throughout the community. Problems that we have in certain neighborhoods now such as Nejako Drive could have been eliminated or at least minimized. They wouldn't have caused the problems to the land-owners there and it wouldn't have caused potential problems to the rest of the community in assigning a stormwater drainage system. Last year the Planning Commission adopted a formal drainage policy. It is in the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations. The policy is non-site specific regulations. It requires that all land developed that increases runoff to provide for the removal of any pollutants in the water and further more to provide ponding so that the flow into lakes is not more than the flow before development. The Common Council enacted an ordinance to permitt City to take over drainage structures to take over their maintenance and control. Much as the way the City takes over roads in a subdivision after a developer has installed them. So what we have now are regulations requiring developers to install drainage systems and regulations that pick up after they install the maintenance and operations of them. What we are looking for right now is something that comes between the specific standards for the design of stormwater detention facilities. Essentially the heart of the regulations have to do with methods to determine runoff and the requirement as stated in the proposal is that the facilites must have the capacity to reduce peak flows range frequency between 2-100 years.

The issue here is maximum capacity design and the basic choice is between designing drains for a storm which has previously fallen once in every 50 years, one which has previously fallen once every 100 years. (Referring to the chart) These are two charts which appears in a book that's put out by the Soil and Conservation Service, Urban Hydrology Small Watershed and it shows on the map a frequency of happening every 50 years. We see on the chart that the amount of rain which falls is 6 inches, and the periods of amount of rain that falls at a 24 hr. period and storm which has a likelihood of happening every 100 years. That would give us a rainfall of 7 inches. So the difference in 1500 years is only 1 inch in defining storm drain, so it appears reasonable to set a standard of designing drains for a storm which would fall once in every 100 years. Another point that I would like to make if the requirements for flood plain regulations so that two sets of rules would be compatible between them. In order to determine the flood flows for the maximum capacity there are a variety of formulas that can be used, and they are all detailed in geometric highway design. Basically there are 5 types of formulas. They are called the Rational method, Bitgood Thomas method, Weiss method, Regional Analysis method and SCS Curve number for runoff estimation. Now the regulations would accept anyone of these methods in designing this system. However, it strongly recommends the SCS method. Another publication put out by ASPD recommends the SCS method also. ASPD says, "With this methodology it's possible to estimate the runoff from any specific site under natural conditions. Using this info the local agencies can estimate performance standards for any specific area subject to development." The method in the SCS---method in geometric highway design is also highly recommended and is considered good because it is a quick and a reliable system and can be used to determine runoff from future urbanization/channel improvement that is undertaken. The method on soil properties and surface conditions combined with rainfall and basin characteristics.

Which is also interesting is responsible for the actual detail of the program are---here are several charts with the outline. Stormwater Detention Regulations and I'll go through them just briefly. The objectives under the proposal it is (inaudible) the amount of storm water runoff (inaudible) in the Subdivision and Zoning Code Regulations. Another important aspect is the applicability of the regulations. Basically a storm water detention proposal. A proposal requires a land commercial and industrial developments and intensive residential area. Using the Knox subdivision as an example which is a proposal of 80 lots on 68 acres. They would have to conform with a storm water detention plan from the Planning Commission. This does not mean that every individual single family home has to provide a storm water design. It doesn't mean that we are going to have a pond beside each single family dwelling home. One section covers the general requirements facility, and again being addressed itself to the general public perfectly (inaudible) to minimize the danger of the life of the property. The facilities must be designed by qualified engineer in addition for a rebate or credit to the developer who actually reduces current flooding level. Site tailored detention facilities covers basically on five topics, design formula, type of method renown, techniques, access and aesthetics. They're requirements for buffering for this facility and the town, and can require restricted access to that area. This is necessary because there is a potential danger of a pond and types of trees from the neighborhood. So Middletown can limit access to other individuals. Finally, the plan detail, how one goes about submitting a plan to the Planning Commission. The requirements are in Section 55 of the Zoning Code, the fee schedule and also a performance bond is required, equal bonds of 100% of the estimated cost of the stormwater detention facilities.

So in conclusion then, I think that the regulations do have agreement in principle in such a way that they are comprehensible to a variety of developers. To those, Pratt & Whitney, to Aetna, to large developers that are coming into the community as well as individual home owners who would like to be able to come

into an office and look at our map and decide whether or not they have to comply with the regulations. So---

CHM. PARISI:

Do you have a set of proposed regulations? I didn't get one so---It didn't come in a package--Let me say that.

MS. RACZKA:

We have the consultants from Purcell Associates who are available to answer any questions also.

CHM. PARISI:

Purcell wishes to comment at this point?

MR. SUDHIR A. SHAH: DIR. OF ENGINEER, PURCELL ASSOC.

No, we don't have any comments but we're available to answer any questions that the Commission has heard on the public hearing. My name is Sudhir Shah, Dir. of Engineering and next to me is Frank Badino is the ^{District} Manager in charge of this project. We would both be glad to answer any questions.

CHM. PARISI:

Any questions from the members of the Commission? Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak or comment on proposal two. Jack. Inland-Wetlands is speaking tonight.

JACK McCORMACK, CHM. INLAND - WETLAND AGENCY:

I want to thank you for your invitation first of all. My first confusion and I do have some confusions you asked if there were any regulations and before me I have a Draft Ordinance. Are these regulations or is it an ordinance.

CHM. PARISI:

It would be regulations.

JACK McCORMACK:

I had a problem with that as I was reading thru. I am concerned if there may be some conflict between this Commission and the Inland-Wetlands. As you go thru the reading of it-in certain places I have inserted retrominute notations, that's all they are, are notations and comments they might preclude this type of confusion. On your 10.10.01 Objectives, this is item b. "Minimize adverse environmental impacts in both the project area and on downstream users." I would change the period to a comma when not subject to Inland-Wetlands regulations. The next paragraph is "Final determination of the adequacy of the applicants proposed measure(s) shall be made by the Commission or its designated agent." My first inclusion would be after Commission I would have and/or Inland-Wetland Agency and then after you have-or its designated agent I raised the question who would the agent be?

CHM. PARISI:

In our case it would be the Planner.

JACK McCORMACK:

So it might be good to include Inland-Wetlands in that paragnaph also. We have had some discussions in the past as to the 50 and 100 year measures of rainfall. We have always been dealing with the 50 years up to this point. If we do switch to 100 year which I am not against it would be well thatwe all knew about it and we make ourselves uniform throughout the City.

On page 3 and 4 I'm talking now about maintenance roads and easements shall be provided for all permanent facilities. The road shall be 12 feet wide having 12 inches of rolled gravel formed in two equal lifts and surface treated. The gradient shall not exceed 15%. Is that a minimum? Is this considered to be a

CHM. PARISI:

Maximum, no more than 15%.

JACK McCORMACK:

Some developers goes in there and black top, put a road in and black top, where would it be then?

CHM. PARISI:

A road. What is the grade on a road 12? Maximum for a road is 10%

JACK McCORMACK:

Well my only comment be after a period on what would be a maintenance roads and easements will be provided with drainage compatable to the intent of detention facility.

The next paragraph deals with visual aesthetics and we say methods to be considered include, we list some but after the colon I would say methods to be considered include but not limited to. Why box ourselves in. When it comes to fee schedules I always have a problem. I really do not know how to go about putting a fee for people to come before any commission or board in the City. I believe Inland-Wetlands has a \$5.00 per acre fee and if you could see 0-10 acres we could charge \$50.00 and the fee here is \$250.00 and I'm sure that's negotiable with everybody. I always have a problem with it but the outset would seem a little too high. Thank you.

CHM. PARISI:

Thank you Jack.

DIR. REIF:

Have we read the item from Midstate?

CHM. PARISI:

Not on this one yet. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment on item 2. O.K. why don't you read it.

ASSN'T. DIR. RACZKA:

From the Midstate Regional Planning Agency:
May 14, 1980

Re: Site Tailored Stormwater Detention Proposal

Dear Mr. Parisi:

The Midstate Regional Planning Agency has reviewed the proposed regulation at its May 6, 1980, meeting as required by Section 8-3 (b) of the General Statutes. The Agency strongly supports the concept of controlling runoff from new developments as a method to preserve and protect water quality in the Region.

Very truly yours,

James F. Dunn, Regional Planner

CHM. PARISI:

Thank you. If there is no one else to speak on item 2 we will move onto item 3.

SECRETARY GIUFFRIDA:

Request for a Special Exception to permit a drive-up photo facility in the Middletown Shopping Plaza off Washington Street. Applicant Pete Fogarty for the Fotomat Corp.

ITEM 3
FOTOMAT
DRIVE-UP
MIDDLETOWN
SHOPPING PLAZA
WASHINGTON STREET

PETE FOGARTY:

Mr. Chairman, I'm Pete Fogarty of 64 Danbury Road, Wilton, Conn. for the Fotomat Corporation we are requesting permission to place one of

DIR. REIF:

Can I take a crack at that Mr. Chairman. The kiosk would be in the parking area well away from any of the entrances or exists from the shopping center.

PETE FOGARTY:

This is the closest entrance here then on the far side. In no way is it going to interfere with the flow of traffic serving any of these and as I said in my times looking at this site the minimum at different times. I have been there as a matter of fact this evening I drove by there at 6:30 The only cars that were in this general area were over here. There were none here. There were some here at Friendly's. The area basically is sitting vacant.

COMM. CHAMBERLAIN:

Does this building have water and sewer?

PETE FOGARTY:

No sir.

COMM. CHAMBERLAIN:

Does this building have bathroom facilities?

PETE FOGARTY:

No sir.

COMM. CHAMBERLAIN:

What is it? Just one building with one person in it?

PETE FOGARTY:

Yes sir and when we apply for the building permit we submit a letter to the building official a restroom agreement with a business right on the site. In this case this particular case is Friendly's would be the closest proximity.

COMM. DREAHER:

It's just a shell then.

PETE FOGARTY:

It's more than a shell. About five years ago we had a polystyrene core in the building and because of the discussion on toxic fumes from from polystyrene we went searching for another core material and we went to the University of Cincinnati Engineering Department and we spent a quarter of a million dollars to come up with a core material which is Tectum that would stand all the stress that the engineering dept. put on it. It will withstand wind loads, snow loads. I have the research reports here for all of them. It is not a flimsy building by any stretch of the imagination. It's steel and aluminium, Tectum chlorium sheeting.

COMM. PASSANESI:

to
Their prescribed driveway approaches / that kiosk or does it go across all the parking stalls. Can they approach it from any angle.

PETE FOGARTY:

No sir.

DIR. REIF:

They can approach it only from two directions.

PETE FOGARTY:

We will indicate that with arrows on the site.

COMM. PASSANESI:

15
Their prescribed driveway/^{that} leads to the kiosk is there a lane or lanes designed to lead us to the kiosk?

PETE FOGARTY:

Yes.

DIR. REIF:

Yes, under this arrangement at one time they had a different arrangement but their wasn't any, but now there is. You can drive up either side.

PETE FOGARTY:

and the plan if I can....

COMM. PASSANESI:

It is laid out in such a manner that there will be no parking within those approach lanes.

DIR. REIF:

Correct, no parking. The original layout didn't have it that way, that was the change that was made that was referred to.

CHM. PARISI:

I think what you would have Seb is that if assuming that all of the parking spaces were filled people would go down lanes within the parking lot. Obviously if there are no cars there they could do all kinds of criss crossing. I don't know how you're going to prevent that in any shopping center. You know that just happens.

PETE FOGARTY:

We'd put a planter at either end of it. I have a diagram here. Of course the type plants that go in there...whatever the City would like.

COMM. PASSANESI:

Are we violating the number of parking space stalls in the shopping center?

DIR. REIF:

No.

CHM. PARISI:

Any other questions from the Commission. Is there anyone from the public to speak in favor of the Fotomat proposal. Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition. Anyone wishes to comment. O.K. Item #4.

SEC'Y. GIUFFRIDA:

ITEM 4

4. Request for a Special Exception to permit Solid Waste Disposal on the property of United Technologies Corp./ Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Group Mfg. Div. located off Aircraft Road. Applicant Arthur E. Wegner. (Applicant proposed to expand its existing landfill for the disposal of metal hydroxide sludge and filter cake. The waste material is generated by manufacturing facilities owned and operated by Pratt & Whitney Aircraft.)

ITEM # 4
SOLID WASTE
DISPOSAL--PRATT &
WHITNEY AIRCRAFT,
AIRCRAFT ROAD

ATTORNEY ROBERT WISE:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission I'm an attorney for Pratt & Whitney Aircraft. I have brought with me Julio Loureiro, all the way on my right who is a consultant for Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, with Loureiro Engineering. He has designed the facility. Immediately on my right is Dr. Clarence Weltie, who has done the hydrologic studies at the facility and they are both here to respond to any questions you might have. Julio will under take to explain generally what is planned for the area. In the interim since the application was filed, the State of Connecticut is acted we have to under the State statues apply for a permit from the Dept. of Environmental Protection. We have received Commissioner Pac's permit. There is a another permit involved relative to water discharge that we are awaiting. I have brought with me six copies of the permit Commissioner Pac that I would like to file. Also, as I had stated earlier the site that is being expanded was developed in 1971. It was developed as a result of a study done by Geraghty and Miller and I have brought with me the six copies of the 1971 study by Geraghty and Miller. That is all I had to say-now I'll turn it over to Julio Loureiro.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Thank you Bob. I think the best way to intro this situation regard to the site which...I'll give you an idea of the perspective in relation to what you saw under item #1 of the public hearing. Both existing and land disposal site and the new proposed new expansion of this site is located at/southern end what has been termed the P & W aquifer is in fact located at a point at the southern extremity approximately half a mile below the area of that aquifer that Geraghty and Miller once studied and identified as the southerly limit of the Pratt & Whitney aquifer. With that I would like to explain what we have in regard to the site itself. At the present time there is an existing permitted metal hydroxide land fill that was designed to dispose of metal hydroxide sludges & filter cake from the electo chemical machine operations at the Pratt & Whitney facilities. This facility was designed and put into place prior to current requirements in terms of solid waste disposal however it was designed in accordance with the accepted practice at the time. This facility has been in operation for approximately seven years I believe at this point and has been operation a good many years with a continuous monitoring program in that period. The facilitiesI have proposed are (inaudible) of the existing disposal area and are designed to be west of the designated wet lands in that area. We are not impeaching on the wetland area it self. The proposed area has been designed to be constructed in a stage approach thru the disposal of the metal hydroxide sludge. It is basically intended to be developed over a five stage period. We are anticipating a twenty year life for disposal of metal hydroxide sludges and filter cake on this particular site. At the present time Pratt & Whitney have approximately

17

seven thousand yards, cubic yards of stock pile metal hydroxide sludge and filter cake that will initially be disposed along this site and at the present time the treatment activities at the various plants for treatment of metal wastes estimated to produce about four thousand cubic yards per year of sludge and filter cake to be disposed of at the site. The material that is to be disposed of is supposedly to be disposed of is the solid residue after the chemical treatment reduction, oxidation, precipitation, coagulation, filtration and etc. It is staple, it is relatively innocuous and in fact in submitting to the State of Connecticut the State asked that we take test be run on the filter cake to ascertain the leachet characteristics of the material and leachate test have been run at ph's as low as ph's 4 which is an extremely/((inaudible)) and we have found negligible leachate production from the sludge as a result of these tests. The sludge and filter cake as delivered to the site has been dewatered to the point where it is above 30 to 40% solid material resembles a moist material that is very/((inaudible someone coughing into mike)) with normal earth moving equipment. The range of heavy metal and filter cake can generally be expected to fall between the range of 400th of 1% to 3% by dry weight depending on the particular type and nature of the treatment process from which the filter cake originates. The design of the site has been developed on the basis of a geohydrological analysis prepared by Clarence Weltie and Associates for this area and it was designed effectively to allow a control release of any leaching may occur as a result of either surface run off or rainfall falling on the site. A control release into the Connecticut River watershed and a ground water movement from the area of the disposal area to the Connecticut River. Under these conditions we estimate that the quality of the groundwater would reflect Middletown's concentrations of less than one-half/billion in the area that would be effected by the filter cake disposal. This in fact is below drinking water quality standards at those concentrations. The operation as I indicated would be staged with five successive stages. Each stage would be independently prepared. The filter cake will be mixed with off site material on the one to one basis and the filter cake will be deposited in layers vary from 6 to 18 inches. That will be covered with off site material and brought up stage basis. Each particular stage will be handled independently. Surface water will be diverted so that we do not get extensive run off running through the filter cake disposal area itself to minimize the possibility of leaching. We have estimated over the entire 20 year period that whole development if a maximum production rate of/about 21 hundred gallons per day all the leachate could occur from rainfall falling directly on the site taking into account the handling of the surface run off in the area of the site. As each stage is completed/particular stage itself will be kept with an 18 in. layer of material will be regraded to avoid run off on to/that material and then the second stage or the next stage will be developed. The grading will be handled to avoid run off onto the next stage and will be developed in a simple manner. In addition to this we also/proposing and have incorporated a surface runoff sedimentation pond to pick up all the diverted runoffs to insure that we do not get siltation either reaching the area or coming out directly to the Connecticut River. We anticipate this site will result in the very staple condition after its complete and during the development of each of the stages one of the most basic parts of the proposal however is that we are in conjunction with the State Department of Environmental Protection are planning to develop an extensive on site monitoring system through the/monitoring wells both at the new facilities proposed standard facilities and incorporated in conjunction with the existing facilities/a continuous monitoring of the conditions that exist in our developing at the site over the entire period of development of the facility

so at any given time we will have, a very good handle on what the conditions are at the stand point of surface conditions in the area as well ground water conditions and flow and metallic concentration should they exist in the area of this disposal. I believe that sums up what we have basically contemplated for the site. We have ^{provided} detailed drawings that show quite extensively the self development and grading and handling of site that we have in our proposal. I'll be glad to answer any questions at this point.

COMM. PASSANESI:

I don't understand the size or the size of the area that you are talking about. What's the scale on that?

JULIO LOUREIRO:

This is an inch and an eighth.

COMM. PASSANESI:

How big of an area are you talking about.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Let's see...

COMM. PASSANESI:

What is it two acres, three acres, four acres...

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Three and half on each....

INAUDIBLE...TO MANY TALKING AT ONE TIME---Difficult to identify voices & statements

GEORGE REIF:

You're talking about the area in here. Here's the access...

INAUDIBLE...TO MANY TALKING AT ONE TIME---Difficult to identify voices & statements

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Yes we are clear of the wetlands.

INAUDIBLE...TO MANY TALKING AT ONE TIME--HARD TO DETECT WHO IS SAYING WHAT

COMM. PASSANESI:

I don't understand the relationship with that to the full grown master plant. How close is it to the building.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

This is building 10 and Pratt & Whitney Aircraft is here. The building that you see right here.

INAUDIBLE...Everyone talking at the same time.

PHIL BAUER:

Let's turn this around. (MEANING SITE PLAN)

GEORGE REIF:

So the north is not at the top.

PHIL BAUER:

North is to the corner.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Here's the north arrow going out here.

COMM. PASSANESI:

Your present area how big is it?

JULIO LOUREIRO:

The present area would be...estimated in excess of 4 acres.

COMM. PASSANESI:

All going to be built when...

JULIO LOUREIRO:

This area has a design life at the time we designed and put it into operation about 7 years ago. It had a design for 40 to 50 years. We are anticipating that period is still valid. The design life...this facility right here is estimated about 20 years.

COMM. DREAHER:

You say you have 30 to 40 % moist?

JULIO LOUREIRO:

30 to 40% solid contents. 60 to 70%....

COMM. DREAHER:

If that was to stand in a bin for six months wouldn't the sludge go ^{right} to the bottom and the oil would be right on top?

JULIO LOUREIRO:

No, I should explain what this is again. This is the residue after ^{process} treatment of the metallic waste...

COMM. DREAHER:

I'm familiar with the EDM's and ECM's.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

O.K. The filter cake-sludge and filter cake is the end product. This is a very staple material. It is approximately in concentration it is in excess of 95% of the chemicals, alm, lime, that go into the actual treatment/^{process} itself. It is very staple. There are effectively no pre-oils in the sludge or filter cake at all. The metallic hydroxide in the filter cake is totally bound up in the solid material filter cake. The moisture that is associated with the filter cake is ruffly 60 to 70% moisture represents the treated affluent that is in fact permitted by the State of Connecticut and allowed to be discharged directly into the water course. The concentrations of metallics in the liquid portion of the filter cake is in fact within the EPD's permit limitations and is simply bound up with the solid material and cake itself.

GEORGE REIF:

(Inaudible) two words that you started this presentation led me to believe that there is some reason to think that our aquifers/^{perhaps} maybe inaccurate.

JULIO LOUREIRO:

Yes, I think the point to recognize this is as you have seen it in the presentation for your aquifer. Your aquifer was shown to extend all the way down here and in fact well south of Building #10 on Pratt & Whitney Aircraft. The Geraghty/Miller study to which Mr. Wise referred to the fact the aquifer limit as Geraghty/Miller encountered it actually occurring up

the (this is not a good map) but it occurred out at the pier and essentially occurred in the area of the most southerly (inaudible) of private wells/^{that} they have developed. You notice the magnitude for example, your talking capabilities of (inaudible) of two thousand gallons per minute north of that cut off down in the area in which we are concerned at this point. You are talking in magnitudes of the maximum of-for example two hundred gallons per minute. So that the material is much finer and much less desirable in terms of aquifer development. In fact it is one of the reasons why the disposal areas and the private wells have been developed as they have been.

COMM. AUGUSTINE:

You said four thousand sq. yds. a year?

JULIO LOREIRO:

Four thousand cu. yards.

COMM. AUGUSTINE:

Four thousand cu. yds. I'm sorry. How much of this on site? On site operation.

Unidentified speaker in audience---statement inaudible.

COMM. AUGUSTINE:

(Inaudible) truck waste hauled to the facility safe? Where does most of it come from? East Hartford?

JULIO LOREIRO:

Well, East Hartford is so far the largest facility, but...

COMM. PASSANESI:

After the modifications....(Inaudible)

JULIO LOREIRO:

That's a good point

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE:

Probably around 75%....

JULIO LOREIRO:

This site here, the existing permanent site. The predominate hydroxide waste that is disposed at that site is produced right in the Middletown facility.

COMM. PASSANESI:

But trucked then from the outside. But the outside truck is coming in from this site.

JULIO LOREIRO:

This site would have from 20 to 30% from the Middletown facility with the rest being trucked in daily.

CHM. PARISI:

Any other questions from the Commission. Dr. Weltie did you plan on speaking?

DR. WELTIE:

No, unless someone asked me.

CHM. PARISI:

Atty. Wise?

ATTY. WISE:

No. That's all.

CHM. PARISI:

Is there anyone from the public who wishes to comment? Speak in favor? Yes ma'am, will you please come up and identify yourself for the record please.

PAMELA DUNN:

My name is Pamela Dunn, President, Greater Middletown League of Women Voters. My address is 171 Mount Vernon Street. I would like to ask that their should be some delay in considering this proposal and that their should be a public hearing at some future date because there are many complex matters to be considered in this. Now with public participation being recommended it is not required in (inaudible) of this kind. I think it's proper that more time be given for such consideration. There are many things that need to be considered. The main one of course is the future of Middletown's water supply. In view of the conflicting statements and evidence we have had tonight about the sizes of these aquifers it seems to be very reasonable that we should have more time to try to consider all aspects of this. I would also like to hear the reasons for proposing to truck in from outside Middletown to a site which is over a prime aquifer. I know this has to go somewhere and I know we have to find places to dispose of the sludge. I do realize that this is not one of the ^{most} (inaudible) sludges. But nevertheless it seems to me this is such a favorable site for a water supply which we may need as Middletown expands its need for water expands. I think that we should be very slow and very careful in making decisions which may in the future turn out to be unwise. I would also like to have more details about the...for instance one item is what kind of liner is proposed for this pit. That is just one small one. It is as major considerations about future water supplies for the town. It seems to me it might be possible to find another site near by which would be still reasonably convenient for use which will not (inaudible) prime aquifer.

CHM. PARISI:

Thank you Mrs. Dunn. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor or opposition or comment on this proposal.

ROBERT WISE, ATTY.:

Well Mr. Chairman I would just like to point out and welcome responses and comments of....

DR. WELTIE:

I think the first comment I have is there was a public hearing as you know at the State Office building and I believe people were notified and I think the Middletown Health Director was there and I think everyone else were there including experts were invited to that meeting. Rather than going into to that I think one of the things about this site is not that we are compromising in the site, this site was considered as what the ECM site by the DEP people as having quality essentially desirable for this sort of fill because ^{of the} minimal impact that it has. I think that this not anything we have gone into quickly. I think that this study were down there now with Geraghty/Miller doing further studies, in fact we have put in nearly 100 new wells to monitor this thing. We have this thing is pocketed with wells. If you saw this thing you would see dots everywhere. The interesting thing of this is that there are very few sites like this. I've been doing a lot work for Browning Ferris people, you are probably aware of this, all over the country trying to find sites similar to this. They identify this as one of the ^{more} desirable sites, and I hate to say this to Planning Board in Middletown, They are looking for dump sites but the characteristics of the site are certainly ideal if there is such a thing as ideal for this kind of material

because of the nature of what's here. There is no more than 10 ft. of course material underneath that - this site for the major portion from the pier down there is a very fine sand and silt. So the water flows through the court whatever comes in. It's minimal whatever does flow in finds its way through the course materials in the surface into the Connecticut River. The DEP, even in land fill has considered this arrangement an ideal situation. If there are other places like this I would like to know about. I don't think there are. There is no ledge/^{and}proximity except for the south so/^{that}there is plenty of overburden, there is no way that any conceivable danger could occur to a rock well. There is no danger that could occur to an aquifer. Whatever does come in the very minimal amount is diluted into parts of one of many trillion I assume. I would just like to say I don't think that we just put a finger on site here and then try to make a case for the site. The site was reviewed by everyone and I think Pratt & Whitney is aware of this. This site was picked because it did have those unique qualities. So I don't think we are trying to pick this site and come in here and defend this. In no way. We are saying this is the site they looked at and in answer to the question why did it come here from East Hartford. Why did it come here. I think this site whether its Middletown, whether it's Hartford, I think you look to site where there is minimal impact. I think the State can't be separated it into towns. I think this has the minimal impact. I think that impact as been accepted by the DEP. Geraghty/Miller have accepted it. I don't know how many experts/^{that}has to be to be to accept it, that's all I'm saying. Thank you.

GEORGE REIF:

Could I add one thing. The DEP did have it's public hearing on April 18th, and they have extended the time period in which they will take written comments or other opinions.

CHM. PARISI:

They approved it.

GEORGE REIF:

True, but there is still part of it going on obviously. The one part... so people have a few more days until May the 19th. So it isn't as if they....

DR. WELTIE:

I wanted to mention that. The public has a chance to comment. Experts also have a chance to comment.

CHM. PARISI:

George I have a question and I'm just looking at the DEP approval. Do we have the reports and drawings sighting items 2,3, and 4.

GEORGE REIF:

Yes we do have files and material. You probably have copies of them here tonight. Incidentally we do have to meet the requirements of the Commission. We do have a statement from our Dept. of Health. "They are in the process of reviewing this application and they either have not time or all the material they need to complete their reviews."

CHM. PARISI:

Is there anyone else who wishes to comment on item 4. Director of Health, Leon Vinci.

LEON VINCI:

Good evening. I'm Leon Vinci, Director of Health of the City of Middletown. Mr. Weltie mentioned that I attended the Public Hearing so I thought maybe

some questions were raised about the public hearing so I thought I would expand on it. Unfortunately for DEP and for Pratt & Whitney I guess the Run-off Protection Agency did not properly advertise for the public hearing. The key sentence was left out of the newspaper in that the discharge was going to be located in Middletown, Connecticut. At the public hearing this was one of the issues raised by myself on behalf of the City and the Commissioner of Environmental Protection saw it fit to extend the-I guess-the period for written testimonial or whatever until I believe until the current day is May 19th, at such time the hearing officer will review the testimonial that was submitted and then make a decision accordingly. There was reference to a permit and now if I'm correct the DEP issued a Solid Waste permit but there is a Water Quality permit and that's what I was talking about earlier that is being reviewed and the time period extended. Mr. Reif mentioned something about our comments and at the public hearing we brought forth some basic questions that the representatives from the Environmental Protection had answered but we requested that they follow that up in writing with a-just a written answer as to a verbal and we have not^{yet} received that information. That is basically-that's what we are waiting for, just so we can wrap that up at our end.

CHM. PARISI:

Any questions from Leon while we have him here. O.K. Leon. Thank you. We will now close the public hearing. 8:20 P.M.



Althea Rinaldi
Recording Secretary

Paul P. Parisi, Chairman
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

APPROVED AT THE MEETING OF

June 25, 1980