

TILTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION

July 16, 2018

MINUTES

Members present: Chuck Mitchell, Chair; Bob Hardy; Jim Cropsey; Jan Landry; Paul Rushlow; Jon Scanlon; Ben Wadleigh; and Kathi Mitchell

Guests: Naomi Praul; Katherine Dawson

Meeting was called to order by the Chair at 7:00 p.m.

1. M&B Tractor – Ms. Praul explained that the applicant is asking the Planning Board for relief from the 100-foot buffer requirement around Ice House Pond. The TCC wondered how that measurement would be determined. Is it from the open water or the edge of the wetlands? The map was not clear.

She stated that Tom Sokoloski, wetland scientist, had proposed 15 trees and 200 shrubs be placed around the pond as part of the remediation for the clear-cutting in the wetland buffer. He suggested 5 red oak, 5 white oak, and 5 sugar maples. The Commissioners felt the suggested trees were not appropriate for wet areas, and they suggested that swamp white oaks, red maples, larch, and hemlocks be used. There is also a question about the size of the trees to be planted and whether they will be balled or in burlap. More information is requested about the shrubs to be used. It is expected that there will be a two-year guarantee for all the plantings. The landscape plan will not be a grid, but the Commissioners felt it needs to be much more detailed to show what areas will have plantings and how far apart they will be. The Commission would like to see the final landscape plan.

The applicant will only use the area for storage and no customers will be visiting the building.

There will be no dumpsters on the property.

There was some confusion since it was stated that the area is not part of the flood plain, but a map stated otherwise. Floodplain compensatory area?

The setbacks of 50 feet on the side and 20 feet in the rear may affect how much excavation can occur and where.

The Commissioners continue to believe that snow storage will be an issue given that the applicant may want to sell equipment during the winter months.

The Commissioners had concerns about water sheeting off the building and the asphalt over the proposed retaining wall and into the pond, given the slopes and elevations listed. There is also a concern about whether the 13.5 foot drop off the retaining wall would be sufficient to prevent such sheeting. Will there need to be a safety fence, guard rails, and no dumping of snow signs?

The culvert at the end of Bittern Lane may need to be extended. There is a narrow turning area at that point that may create issues for large equipment.

The fifteen to twenty foot soil berm raised some questions as to the top elevation and purpose.

2. **Approval of June minutes:** Bob made the motion to approve, Jim seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

3. **Old Business:**

- a) There was a discussion about the Wal-Mart easement, a fence that has been erected, and the issue of encroaching brush.
- b) **Country Meadows:** Massive clear cutting has taken place. They have uncovered a number of large boulders. There has also been a good deal of dust blowing in the area.
- c) **Salmon Run:** There was a discussion about the best time to have the conservation area mowed. Bob made a motion to hold off mowing until after Labor Day, and Kathi seconded the motion, which was approved on a 7-1 vote.

5. **New Business:**

- a) **Pike Quarry project in Belmont:** Because of the project's proximity to the aquifer which supplies water to three towns, Belmont has designated this as having regional impact. After extensive discussion, the TCC requests that a letter be sent to the Belmont Planning Board with the following list of comments:
 - 1) There are concerns that the fracturing of bedrock from blasting could lead to contamination of the aquifer.
 - 2) The 2007 Aquifer Protection document supported by all three communities was supposed to be the guide for "maintaining the viability of common drinking water resources into the future." If Belmont is going to grant exemptions to every business that requests them, the document becomes a sick joke and the aquifer becomes a pawn. Also, if Belmont grants one exception, how will they be able to deny future requests for exceptions?
 - 3) There were questions about what kind of restoration plan will be in effect when the project has exhausted the supply? Will there simply be a 100-foot hole in the ground?
 - 4) Will there be any regular monitoring by the town and by the state?
 - 5) If any serious environmental problems or issues occur, will there be a cease-and-desist plan or notification and inspection procedure?
 - 6) Why is Belmont willing to play Russian roulette with their water supply? What happened to the concept expressed in the Aquifer Protection document of "the towns' strong support for the project and their level of commitment to working collaboratively to protect the shared aquifer resource"?
 - 7) On page 2 of the document referenced above is this quote from a Belmont selectman- "The Town of Belmont is very fortunate ...to be located on a large aquifer area. However, along with the benefits of this comes a great responsibility to assure that we preserve quality and conserve quantity for future generations." This proposed project tests whether Belmont's word is any good.
- b) **Milford Trust project on Route 132:** Materials received from the Planning Board were reviewed. The TCC has many questions and concerns about the proposed plans.

6. Correspondence: There was none.

7. Other: There was a discussion of various town issues.

Bob made a motion to adjourn at 8:53 pm; Paul seconded the motion; all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathi Mitchell, Secretary