

**From:** [Gary Goeschel](#)  
**To:** [Jennifer Lindo](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: To the Inland Wetland Agency and Chairman Gary Upton  
**Date:** Monday, July 13, 2020 3:18:44 PM

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Carol Russell <carolfrussell@sbcglobal.net>  
**Date:** July 13, 2020 at 2:55:21 PM EDT  
**To:** Gary Goeschel <ggoeschel@eltonhall.com>  
**Subject:** To the Inland Wetland Agency and Chairman Gary Upton

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the proposal under consideration by the Inland Wetland Agency to extend the agency's upland review area from 100 ft to up to 500 ft surrounding any water body. My understanding is that such an extension would not automatically keep a developer or homeowner from building activity in the revised review area, but would require application for (and approval of) a permit from the Agency prior to going forward with a proposed project.

I am a long time resident of a neighborhood served by the East Lyme public water system. And while I am submitting this opinion in my individual capacity, I also happen to be a member of the East Lyme Water & Sewer Commission. Needless to say, the protection of the drinking water sources (for both public and private wells) within our town is a very important topic to me.

An expanded Inland Wetlands Agency review area would require more (perhaps many more) proposed projects to go through an additional permitting process, and that may be considered onerous by some. However, if an expanded Agency review area is necessary to better protect the Town's drinking water supply, such expansion has my full support. First and foremost, this makes sense from a public health standpoint. However, it also makes sense economically as well. Water quality issues can lead to costly filtration and/or other remediation efforts. Reduced drinking water quality can negatively impact property values as well as the desirability or feasibility of future development projects. Severe drinking water quality issues can devolve into emergency crisis situations.

That being said, what is the right land buffer around the Town's various water bodies to comprise the upland review area? Is 500 ft too high? Still not high enough? Is 100 ft too low? My response to these questions is one key question. What does the science say? I urge the Town to follow the science. When other towns opted for the 500 ft standard, what was the scientific basis for their decision? Is their relevant guidance from the State DEEP? from the US EPA? Is their applicable guidance from our State and local public health professionals? The Town should be taking the appropriate steps to follow best practices when it comes to protecting the sources for our drinking water. Protecting the public health is vital to protecting the long term economic health of our town.

Thank you for considering my comments on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Carol F. Russell  
4 Bramble Bush Drive  
Niantic, CT