

TOWN OF GOSHEN –  
PLANNING BOARD  
**FINAL MINUTES**  
PUBLIC HEARING  
OCTOBER 11, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Ed Peckham, Vice Chairman Doug O’Clair, John Wirkkala, George Hebert, Alternate Members Rich Moen (as part of the audience), Alicea Bursey (as part of the audience), Stephen Bursey (as part of the audience), Allen Howe (as part of the audience), and Sue Peacock (Secretary)

OTHERS PRESENT: Shaun Carroll, Sr., Shaun Carroll, Jr., Kathy Carroll, Dick Fraser, Gigi Schendler, Rita Purmort, Christine Smith, Madeline Stevens, Lillian Dennis, Ernest G. Dennis, Sr., Ed Baker, Bruce Nadeau, Ed Andersen, Fred Smith, Don Bailey, Bob Hodgman, Ronald Kempton, Jack Warburton, David Serentino, Keith Hall, Todd Fratzel Town of Newport Planning Board, David Kibbey Town of Newport Planning Board, Jim Grenier, Rick Costello, Howard Caron, Priscilla Caron, Bea Jillette, Mary Wirkkala, Lillyian Wright, and Ray Critch, Lake Sunapee Survey.

AGENDA ITEM # 1: Application Review Newport Sand & Gravel

The purpose of this hearing is to review the application to review the application for Newport Sand & Gravel.

Mr. Wirkkala wanted to first thank Shaun Carroll, Jr. for bringing in the material that Mr. Peckham had submitted to the ZBA, which was the special exception as well as the maps that Mr. Peckham had given to the ZBA. The excavation regulations for the Planning Board state we should be given that material. Mr. Wirkkala again thanked Mr. Carroll for providing the material. The other items that the chairman of the Conservation Commission had requested were the overlay maps of the aquifer superimposed on the project site, which Mr. Wirkkala asked Mr. Carroll if that was something he was also looking into. Mr. Carroll stated yes. Mr. Wirkkala said there was confusion as to what the Planning Board was supposed to have from Jeff Cloutier, who is the head of North American Reserve. Mr. Wirkkala said there was some indication in the application/permit application. Mr. Fraser stated he did have a letter from Jeff Cloutier, which he distributed to the Board.

Mr. Carroll asked if he would like to go over the points to review for completeness, which he was supposed to bring to the hearing tonight. Mr. Peckham agreed that the Board should move forward with these items.

Mr. Carroll stated that before he starts with the items he would like to bring something forward to the Board. Mr. Carroll stated that at the prior meeting there was a discussion about how the Board had voted to not consult with Upper Valley Council, because the Board felt that there was not a change of use that would trigger that. Mr. Carroll said that today he got a call from someone and they said they had received some letters, and last Tuesday (October 2) there was discussion at the Newport Planning Board about this plan. Somewhere along the line someone from the Town Planning Board had sent the Town of Newport a registered letter which was received on September 28. Mr. Peckham stated that he had asked the Secretary Sue Peacock, and she had sent the letter. The secretary stated that she did send it, and it was in her batch of letters to send out certified, and she recalled the Chairman asking her to send the Town of Newport a letter, but it was in error that she sent it certified. Mr. Carroll stated he just wanted to clarify that was what happened. Mr. Carroll said there is a representative from the Newport Planning Board present tonight, Todd Fratzel. Mr. Fratzel said there was some discussion at the Newport Planning Board meeting on whether or not there would be an impact from the traffic or the aquifers, and the discussion was that possibly there would be an impact. Mr. O'Clair stated that Julie Collins contacted him with those two issues, and she wanted to go on record that Newport did have those 2 questions.

Mr. Carroll then went on with the points of interests. As far as the stonewall and the ledger and the 200 ft was wiped off.

Mr. Carroll then stated that the Planning Board wanted a dimension on the haul road, on the plans it actually has in the notes the dimension of the haul road. Mr. Carroll then pointed it to Board members and stated it was on page 2, item 3, which it stated 24 ft wide.

Mr. Carroll then referred to the aquifer overlay map, which is not an actual overlay, but it has enough distinction to it so there won't be any problems as far as being able to read it. Mr. Carroll said that the map that is in the book, which he

explained at the last meeting (9-25) actually shows the coordinates. You can overlay the map on the USGS quad and the coordinates are right on the money, Every bit of description, as far as all the coordinates, is all the same as on the map. Mr. Carroll asked if the Board wanted letterhead from the person who drew up the plans. Mr. Peckham then said that Mr. Fraser qualified as the person who drew up the plans. Mr. Carroll said that Mr. Fraser is the one who drew up the plans and he does have his seal on the plans. Mr. Peckham said that the regulations state that you do need to have the seal.

Mr. Carroll then went on to with the item of the ZBA package. Mr. Carroll said that he did give all materials that were used in making their decision by the ZBA to the Planning Board. Mr. Carroll stated that the maps were all the same. Mr. Wirkkala had found some non-substantial differences of the maps, but agreed that they were basically the same maps. Mr. Wirkkala stated that this could be dealt with after the Board deals with the completeness of the application. Mr. Fraser said that the Zoning and Planning Board have their own regulations; the Planning Board has a number of items that are not on the ZBA regulations. The Plan itself and all its intricate parts are all the same, and the only thing that may be different only because there is a planning board and there is a zoning board is something that is included on the plan sheets. Mr. Fraser said that shouldn't be a real distinction for Mr. Wirkkala to bring up at a planning board hearing. Mr. Wirkkala said he would be glad to talk about his concerns when they get to the facts themselves and during the discussion of the completeness.

Mr. Carroll then said he wanted to point out to the chairman that he didn't want to sit here tonight and he didn't want to scrutinize what that map looks like as to the zoning board map, and that is not what we are here to do tonight. Mr. Carroll said that if there is a problem with the zoning board map, it should have been dealt with back at that stage. Mr. Wirkkala said he did not have a copy of the map. Mr. Carroll said that we are going to be dealing with the maps in front of you, and we are not going to be critiquing the zoning maps and this one, they are all the same, and he said he would just like to move on.

Mr. Carroll said as far as completeness, he would like to know if this application is complete. Mr. O'Clair made a motion to deem this application as complete, Mr. Hebert seconded, and all were in favor.

Mr. Peckham then said he would like to move on for public comment for the process of Newport Sand & Gravel.

Mrs. Wirkkala commented that the public hasn't had a chance to hear about the project. Mr. Fraser then stated he could go through the presentation of the project. Mr. Fraser then went through the booklet that was given to the Planning Board, page by page.

Mr. Fraser stated that on page 1 there is a cover letter that was sent to the Conservation Commission which is required by RSA 155E:3. Pages 2 & 3 are the application to the Planning Board for the excavation permit, page 4 is the list of abutters. Page 5 is the copy of the notice of decision from the ZBA which clearly states that the special exception was granted by unanimous vote of the ZBA on July 26, 2012. There are 6 other driveway entrances as indicated which is currently in force in the entranceway on route 10. A previous driveway permit follows on page 7, and the one that preceded that is on page 8. On page 9 there is a small sketch which shows the haul road location and the driveway entrances within 200 feet of that point, so they are going from south to north and there are 6 entrances as indicated on the sketch. On page 10 there is a copy of the site specific permit, or alteration of terrain permit which was issued by DES on June 8, 2009. On page 11 there is a letter to DES dated June 29, 2012, modifying the plans slightly because they had wetlands delineation conducted on that property this past April 2012 and the plan had to be adjusted a little bit on a minor scale, so we informed DES of that change. Next page 12, there is a memo dated March 5, 2001, from Mary Pinkham-Langer, who is the Sand and Gravel Appraiser with Department of Revenue Administration. Mr. Fraser had asked how many excavation sites were located in residential areas. She wrote "I would estimate that more than ½ of the listed operations are located in residentially zoned areas. Some are rural but a large percentage of them are right in the middle of developed residential housing."

On page 13 through 16 are answers to some of the narrative sections of the application materials, Mr. Fraser said we would go through most of them when we go through the plan sheets. On page 17 is a sketch, which shows the 3 monitoring wells that are located on the property, GP1, GP2 & GP3 and the associated levels of the test pits along with the locations and elevations. On pages 18 & 19 that are specified in the town's checklist are maps of the aquifers, the first one on page 18 is required for all alteration of terrain permit applications to go to the DES One Stop Program, where the GIS map is. On page 19 there is a sketch of the aquifer and this comes from the USGS source

Mr. Fraser said that you will notice if you compare the two maps, the outline of the aquifer doesn't change from one publication to the other. On page 21 & 22 starts to get into Best Management Practices, this page is known as the Stump and Brush Management, and it is important for the Board to know that stumps and brush are not regulated by solid waste here in NH. If you bury stumps on site, the only provision is that a third of the site remains within 75 feet from one map to the other, which is the case of our proposed project, Mr. Fraser states. On page 23 through 27 there is a fact sheet, which are best management practices for fueling and maintenance of excavation and earthmoving equipment. This talks about protections for the aquifer and our drinking water supply. This gives a good a good guideline that our groundwater is protected. On page 28 there is a picture of some of best management practices for fuel storage, Mr. Fraser stated that he thinks Mr. Carroll is putting a small tank down there which is secondary containment and it is roofed, which will meet all state and federal regulations. On page 29 through 30 there is another fact sheet on protecting groundwater. On this fact sheet it talks about other sources of contamination, which Mr. Fraser said he found interesting, as you look at the aquifer here in Goshen and how many operations are ongoing and may impact the groundwater and the aquifer. Mr. Fraser wondered who is watching over some of the items like vehicle and repair shops, and another item is cemeteries and are they employing best management practices so that whatever happens at the cemetery doesn't impact the aquifer. This is what you want to see in town, is all these businesses that may have an impact on the aquifer, to make sure they employ management practices and employing them actively. On pages 31 through 40 are Vegetating New Hampshire Sand and Gravel Pits, which is the bible for reclamation, which simply gives the descriptions for repiling, exhausted and depleted gravel pits. You will notice when you go through these pages that there are 3 prescriptions ranging from cool season grass mix and warm season grass mix.

On page 41 & 42 it pertains to terrace slopes and benching which will be discussed when we go over the plan sheets; this page comes right out of the DES NH storm water manual. Mr. Fraser said this design that we have on this particular excavation site isn't something that we thought of just sitting down contemplating how this design will be, it is something that is recommended by DES, and if it were designed otherwise likely we wouldn't have the alteration of terrain permit. On page 44 there are test pits for locations that are supplied on the plan sheets, and as you will note the content is excellent material to feed through a plant. Then on the very last page are Mr. Fraser's qualifications.

Mr. Fraser said that we could go on to the plan sheets unless the Planning Board has any questions. Mr. O'Clair suggested Mr. Fraser go through the highlights of the plans sheets.

Mr. Fraser explained the plan sheets, which the whole property is 208 acres, and Newport Sand & Gravel have requested a permit to mine an area, which is 15.6 acres. The haul road from Route 10 out to the beginning of the project area is 1200 to 1300 feet. The only area that they are planning to mine is 15.6 acres.

Plan sheet 2 shows a detail of the overall locations with the eskers and contours, which he distributed pictures to Board members showing before and after of how it will be brought down to grade. Mr. Fraser referred to a picture which showed what the finished product looks like, and stated that this land could be utilized for some other use down the road like a commercial site, industrial site, or some residential sites. There was another plan sheet which he was waiting on copies (which Kathy Carroll had left to go get at the office). Mr. Fraser had given a plan sheet to the Board which was scaled at 1 inch that is 120 feet; he understood there was some concern that it did not match the scale of that plan sheet. Mr. Fraser briefly went over plan sheet and the method of benching, the design shows that every 20 feet above an elevation after it has been excavated, there will be a bench. The best management practice recommends a bench no less than 6 feet wide. These benches are meant to slow down any storm water.

Mr. Wirkkala asked about the engineers seal on the first two plan sheets, but there was not a stamp/seal on the reclamation page. Mr. Fraser stated that he could put a condition in the approval that a stamp be put on plan sheet 3.

Mr. Fraser briefly went over plan sheet 4 which relates to the construction entrance where there will be a concrete bridge. So there will be ample opportunity for the fines and small stones to be shaken off the tires before entering onto Route 10. On the left hand side of the sheet it discusses erosion control measures.

Mr. Fraser asked if Bea Jillette had a question about the aquifer, and invited her to come up to the map so he could show her where the aquifers are, and told her that nearly all of commercial quality sand and gravel sites are sitting on top of eskers. Mr. O'Clair asked Mr. Fratzel if he would like a copy of the report from North American Reserve, which is about the aquifer, Mr. Fratzel accepted Mr. O'Clair's Copy.

Recess for the Public Hearing for Craven minor subdivision.

Minor subdivision at 8:00 pm

Ray Critch from Lake Sunapee Survey representing Michael Craven presented a plan for a minor subdivision at 654 Cross Rd, Lot 9, Map 207. Ray stated this is to subdivide the 6 acres into 2 three acre lots. Ray showed the updated map, which showed no issues of concern. Mr. O'Clair made a motion to accept the minor subdivision, Mr. Hebert seconded and all were in favor to accept the minor subdivision.

At approximately 8:15 pm the Public hearing continues for Newport Sand & Gravel

Mr. Fraser continued to go through the high points of the booklet as it relates to Goshen excavation regulations. Mr. Fraser stated that we could dismiss the first item the name of the preparer and the qualifications. Mr. Fraser then said under III.3.A.11 it asks for the name, location and width of all the public highways and rights of way within 200 feet of the property, and the graphic shows that on page 13. III.3.A.14 it clearly states that the excavation site access point located off Route 10 (Class 2 State highway) is illustrated within the plan set. Transportation vehicles will exit the site and proceed northbound on Route 10 to the processing plant in Newport. On rare occasions, a transportation vehicle may deliver material to a location located south of the Lear Hill Road/State Highway 10 intersection. III.3.A.23 An aquifer impact report submitted by Jeff Cloutier (certified geologist/owner of North American Reserve) is made part of this submittal. Mr. Fraser read the important points of the letter. Mr. Wirkkala questioned if there would be baseline readings of the three wells before the project begins. Mr. Fraser stated that there were baseline readings taken back in 1999, 2000, and 2002. Mr. Fraser said that if the Board wishes to monitor that, then this could be done. Mr. Wirkkala said that this is something we should include if we are looking at drawing up a permit, and this should be a condition that we make annual. Mr. Fraser thought this was a reasonable request. Mr. Fraser went on to III.3.A.24, which states that the test pit data is made part of this submittal. Mr. Wirkkala said that he just received this recent report tonight, and the earlier report that was done on this subject by the same individual; he gave readings for two additional test pits that were not included in this report. Mr. Fraser said that if you look at the plan sheet there are spot elevations that were not on this plan sheet, and there may be spot elevations that were not on the last plan sheet. Mr. Fraser said that this is a new application, and the data is very relevant to this project, Mr. Fraser did not go back twelve years ago to come up with this plan sheet. Mr. Wirkkala asked if Mr.

Fraser knew where these two test pits were. Mr. Fraser said that he had done 72 test pits on that property. Mr. Fraser said that he just didn't consider those two test pits. Mr. Fraser presented the pits that were logical and reasonable to the project. III.3.A.25 states that existing vegetation is comprised mostly of mix of mature conifers (pine & hemlock) reaching heights upward to 40.0 plus or minus feet.

III.3.A.26 screening of the excavation site from the remainder of the town. Mr. Fraser indicated that reclamation of the site would occur as they complete the site. Mr. Fraser indicated that there was ample tree cover to the toe of the esker.

III.3.B.1 regarding transportation of materials by public and customers. Mr. Fraser indicated that some customers may be able to load their own materials and that the town would not need to provide any support with that.

III.B.2 regarding statement for estimated volume of materials removed annually and for the life of the project. Mr. Fraser stated that the estimate was based on the economy at the time of the reporting and will be dependent on economic demands. Site will be in operation for approximately 3-5 years depending on demand; Mr. Fraser will follow up with more details on the total load expected. Mr. Fraser estimates that there will be 545,000 yards of material out of the site. That number includes strippings and materials that may not be of quality to use.

III.B.3 regarding proposed routes. Mr. Fraser stated that this was already discussed. The traffic will be limited to 10-wheelers and tri-axles and tractor-trailer trucks. The associated maximum loaded weights are 63K, 73K, and 99K pounds respectively and the number of trucks is expected to vary daily based on demand. The company is requesting a maximum trip count of 110 vehicles per day. Mr. Moen asked about the tractor trailer trucks that and if they would be using the same type of tractor-trailer truck that had been used at the Davis Pit.

III.B.4 regarding best management practices (BMP) to control erosion, sedimentation, dust and other human safety issues during excavation processes. Mr. Fraser indicated that the response would be lengthy and would discuss key items to save time. BMP's would be followed to maintain and manage erosion, wetlands, and storm water. Excavation on this site is to remain above seasonal high water table. Mr. Fraser stated the following items had already been discussed in the previous areas incremental reclamation, seeding, slopes (2:1), grading plan (in regards to Ruger pit), fugitive dust control (water and calcium chloride), pavement of entrance of pit, trucks to be covered before leaving site, entrance to



pit is fenced and locked, fencing on steeper areas and annual MSHAW training class for all employees.

III.B.5 regarding the town requests for storm water treatment plan. Mr. Fraser indicated this was not required as all the storm water is internally drained. If water leaves site, then the storm water permit would be required.

III.B.6 regarding equipment maintenance plans. Mr. Fraser asks the board to refer BMPs on fueling and maintenance of earth moving equipment.

III.B.7 regarding storage of fuel. Mr. Fraser indicates the stored fuel will be in liquid tight storage container.

III.B.8 regarding methods of preventing materials from the site being tracked to public highways. Mr. Fraser indicated that this had already been covered and that the entrance would be paved to abate fines being transported, trucks would also be covered.

III.B.9 regarding specific actions that would be taken to reduce noise, dust, fumes litter, and vibration. Mr. Fraser refers to page 15 (at the top), stating that discretionary back up berms maybe used. Vibration and associated fumes are not expected to be an issue, as there is not expected to be a crushing plant on site. Trucks burn ultra low sulphur unleaded fuel and litter has never been an issue at company sites.

III.B.10 regarding site security. Potential hazards to human safety will be fenced off, MSHAW training to be on site or an escort will be required.

III.B.11 regarding explosives, there will be no explosives on the site.

III.B. 12 regarding the blasting plant, this is not applicable.

III.B.13 regarding processing equipment not expected other than on occasion a screen. Past permits have been requested and granted for this and is requested that these are passed on to this permitting scheme.

III.C.10 regarding narrative comparison between test pit information to our monitoring well bore log data, post contour reclamation data.

III.C.11 regarding location of buried vegetation and debris. Mr. Fraser indicated that this was a given in the industry that the toe of slopes would be covered with material and vegetation.

III.D.1 regarding possible uses of site after excavation. The soils could support industrial, residential or commercial use as well as the land being returned to a natural state.

III.D.2 regarding RSA 155.E. Reclamation will be ongoing thru excavation, unable to give a time frame other than to say that RSA 155.E will be followed and reclamation will be completed within a 12-month period of the pit completion.

III.D.3 regarding reclamation activities. The booklet includes the SCS and the vegetation requirements.

III.D.4 regarding reclamation, Mr. Fraser points the board back to the state requirements in the booklet.

III.D.5 regarding erosion and sediment control plan, there is no SWIFT plan but the erosion and sediment control plan is part of sheet 3 and has already been discussed.

The site manager will be Shaun Carroll Jr.; a list of abutters with contact information is also included in the application.

Mr. Moen and asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Peckham said that the board would address questions from the board first and then would return to Mr. Moen's question.

Mr. O'Clair asked how many individual truck trips may be expected to be hauled from Lempster. The average is approximately 103 trucks. Mr. O'Clair asked how many to be expected in an 8-hour day, Mr. Carroll stated approximately 13-14 per day but would be subject to change based on the economic demands.

Mr. Wirkkala says he believes the planning board's responsibility at this point is to make the excavation fit into the community. Mr. Wirkkala discussed the history of the Davis pit, which is almost 60 years old and said that the new pit could be around for a long time as well and that the board needs to consider this. Mr. Carroll asked for a point of order stating that the plan does not show that reclamation will not occur for a long time. Mr. Wirkkala retorted when this sites

original application was submitted back in 2000, it had been for many additional acres. Mr. Wirkkala was also on the Planning Board then and the board has been trying for many years to resolve the Davis pit. Mr. Carroll asked for another point of order, and Mr. Wirkkala stated that he would like to have his say. Mr. Carroll stated this was a personal opinion and not a part of the application. Mr. Wirkkala continued to state his opinion and said that the board had heard from angry citizens in the past when truck traffic was near 110 trucks per day. Mr. Peckham stated that public comment would occur after Mr. Wirkkala completed his statement. Mr. Wirkkala continued to state that he had a number of areas that he felt needed consideration for the town's best interest.

Mr. Peckham stated the board should vote as to number of trucks. Mr. Wirkkala further stated that the board should also vote on the type of trucks permitted.

Mr. Nadeau stated that the process had been painful and questioned whether this was the town road or a state road. He stated that being a state road that the state regulated it. Mr. Nadeau stated the pit plan was fine and that the planning board should be planning but not reforming.

Mr. Peckham suggested the board vote on the truckload. Mr. O'Clair clarified that although it may be a State road it is the Planning Boards responsibility to oversee traffic that comes through town. Mr. Wirkkala indicated that Judge Jean Burling had ruled that it was reasonable for the town to regulate traffic.

Mr. Wirkkala indicated that there had been an issue where the Goshen planning board had heard from citizens on the number of trucks in the town. Judge Burley said it was reasonable for the town to regulate traffic.

Mr. Peckham stated that this was old Planning Board information, and this was a new application and that a vote should be taken on the truck traffic and if something comes up that we should vote on it when it comes up. Mr. Hebert stated he did not see anything wrong with the amount of traffic in and out of the pit at this time. The roads and equipment are in better shape and the town is use to it, also most citizens are not around during the day and that he had no objections.

Mr. O'Clair motioned to allow 110 trucks, seconded by Mr. Hebert, only Mr. Wirkkala opposed. The motion was accepted. The Newport planning board representative (Todd) suggested that the motion may be opened to public comment. Mr. Peckham then held back the motion and opened it up public comment/review. Don Bailey stated that noise maybe a concern for a lot of people and that the use of the engine compression brake or the Jake brake. Mr. Bailey

stated that he knew that the Carroll's control their own trucks and believes that the Carroll's can prohibit contractors from using these brakes. Mr. Carroll indicated that this was the case. Mr. Carroll also indicated that this brake would not be needed in this pit.

Mr. Peterson (on behalf of the Goshen Fire Dept.) stated that he had not responded to one call in the past 23 years involving Carroll concrete and its trucks. Mr. Peterson indicated that this was a good record.

Mrs. Wirkkala asked what type of trucks had been used in the past. Mr. Carroll stated that the tractor trailer trucks were included in the permit to avoid them being excluded from use in their pit in case they are needed, but he said they are not planned to be used for moving materials.

Mrs. Wright asked about the reclamation and how long before the property would be reclaimed. Mr. Fraser stated that the reclamation would begin as soon as an established area was created.

Mr. Carroll, Sr. stated that there had been no letters indicating that the board was dissatisfied with the reclamation of the Davis pit. Mr. Carroll, Sr. further indicated that citizens could visit the site by organizing an escorted visit through the Carroll office.

Mr. Peckham moved the meeting back to the board to see if there were any other issues to be addressed.

Mr. Wirkkala questioned the need for tractor-trailer trucks on the site; he felt that using it for moving equipment was fine. In regards to the Davis site, he stated that the permit said that the truck size was limited and tractor trailer trucks were prohibited. In regards to the Davis sit, he stated that the permit said that the truck size was limited and tractor-trailers were prohibited. Mr. Wirkkala feels that certain limitations and exclusions should be set regarding truck size at the pit.

Mr. Peckham stated that the continuous referencing to the Davis pit may confuse the audience. Mr. Peckham indicated that there had been no recent complaints of truck related noise to the board.

Mr. Carroll stated that there is no current plan to use tractor-trailers to haul materials.

Mr. Peckham opened up the discussion for public input.

Mr. Wirkkala stated that in regard to the aquifers, the excavation regulations have a section regarding the excavation of materials near aquifers (page 16, regulations). Mr. Wirkkala read the regulations to the board and the public. Mr. Wirkkala would like to see monitoring of the aquifer. Mr. Fraser reviewed data from several reports, which indicated that a negative gravel mining impact on NH municipal water supply is not supported. Mr. Fraser also indicated that there were other activities in town that may affect the aquifer and those activities are not being monitored by the town.

Mr. Wirkkala referred to page 14 in the application stating the terms of the life of the project and reclamation. Mr. Wirkkala stated that this is similar to Davis pit. Mr. Fraser stated this is a new application, which is subject to the terms of RSA 155E. Mr. Carroll, Jr. stated that reclamation would occur as soon as there was room to do so and further stated that the entirety of the project will never be unreclaimed at one time.

Mr. Wirkkala would like to set hours and other parameters on the permit. Mr. Fraser indicated that other such permits they have received included a letter stating that the permit had been granted, hours of operations and other such details.

Mr. Peckham opened the discussion to the public and asked for those who were for the permit to speak. Mr. Peterson reiterated that in 23 years that had been no issues with Carroll trucks. Mr. O'Clair asked for a flashing light at the pit entrance to the road, Mr. Carroll, Sr. stated he was happy to ask the state if that was permissible and would pay for it.

Mr. Peckham asked for comments against, none were received for the truck comments.

Mr. Peckham asked for a motion vote on 110 trucks per day for the pit traffic. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Clair, motion passed (Mr. Wirkkala, was opposed).

Mr. Peckham asked for public comment on the aquifer. Mr. Nadeau stated that there had been a situation in southern NH where a company was allowed to dig into the aquifer and that this is not the same situation in this case as excavation activities will be 20 feet above the aquifer.

Mr. O'Clair asked the public if they would like to have the board request that the conservation commission check/tests the well sites once or twice per year with a member of Carroll Concrete there. Mr. Carroll, Jr. indicated that if this happens they would like to have someone from Carroll Concrete there. Mr. Nadeau stated that any pollution found there may not be from Carroll Concrete. Mr. Carroll, Jr. voiced concerns that there could be an affect on the aquifer from other sources and would like those to be noted.

Mr. Peckham asked for public comments for and there were none and then against for public comments against and there were none. Mr. Wirkkala stated he believed all the components of the permit had been received.

Mr. O'Clair motioned to approve the permit, conditional to the appeal process. Mr. O'Clair stated that if the board approves this permit, the board would not be able to sign a permit until the end of the October. Mr. Hebert seconded the motion; all members approved the permit with no objections. Mr. Peckham stated the application/permit has been approved.

Motion to adjourn Mr. Wirkkala makes motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Hebert, meeting adjourned at 9:55pm.

Minutes prepared by Suzanne Peacock and Alicea Bursey.