

## PLANNING BOARD

Monday, December 12, 2005  
Belmont Corner Meeting House  
Belmont, New Hampshire

Members Present: Vice-Chairman; J. Pike, G. Flack, W. Peterson, C. Patten, J. Marden and R. Caldwell.  
Members Absent: P. Harris.  
Alternates Absent: C. Gilbert and C. Shibles.  
Staff: C. Daigle, R. Ball and E. Murphy.

The vice-chairman opened the meeting at 7 p.m. and welcomed Mr. Pierce Rigrod from DES and members from the Tilton/Northfield Conservation Commission and the Tilton/Northfield Water District. J. Pike wanted to know if the water from the Tilton/Northfield water district comes from Knowles Pond. He was informed that it is only a reserve tank at the pond.

**Joint Meeting of Planning Board, Board of Selectmen and Conservation Commission with NH DES and Tilton and Northfield Conservation Commissions:** Reclassification of the Tilton/Northfield wellhead protection area.

Mr. Pierce Rigrod stated that he is a Principal Planner that works on reclassification for DES Water Source Protection Program. He works across the state to protect water sources. He is involved in technical assistance for communities and oversees the reclassification program.

The reclassification is the State's attempt to have a joint program to manage and protect the area around water sources and to provide authority to local health officers to oversee and inspect for potential contamination sources within the area that has been reclassified. The local inspections require that the inspection officer visit the site every three years to see that the regulations are followed.

Mr. Rigrod stated that he reviewed Belmont's Master Plan and noted that it includes managing water clarity. He stated that the biggest threat to water sources is present and future growth and land use. The primary benefit of reclassification is increased safety of water supply wells by limiting six high risk land uses and inspection of potential contamination sources within the area that has been reclassified. It implements Best Management Practices in the commercial and industrial zones and increases public education.

There are four groundwater classifications; GAA, GA1, GA2 and GB. GAA delineates well head protection areas. It prohibits new and monitors existing high risk uses and authorizes active management on the local level. GA1 consists of groundwater of high value for present or future drinking water. It has no land use prohibitions and authorizes active management on the local level. GA2 is potentially valuable stratified drift aquifers defined by USGS. There are no land use prohibitions and no active management. GB is all

groundwater not assigned to a higher class has no land use prohibitions and no active management. The GAA is the only classification that limits six high risk uses. It also uses active inspections. The GA1 does not have land use restrictions but does have local inspections.

Ms. Denise Naiva wanted to clarify that the GAA has inspections every three years. Mr. Rigrod stated that they are done every three years. He stated that Belmont and Northfield already limit the allowed uses in these areas. Mr. Rigrod stated that if there is an existing high risk use they have to get a groundwater protection permit and have to meet Best Management Practices. Residential development has nothing to do with this program but he wants to see stormwater treated well to make sure pollutants are not going into the ground water. In New Hampshire the well head protection is only with the sanitary radius and you can't do much of anything in that area because of the 150' to 400' direction and land use restriction. The GA2 classification exists if they meet the two hydrologic characteristics.

A representative from the T/N Water District wanted to clarify that the water district encompasses two towns. The aqueduct company's franchise was given to both the towns of Northfield and Tilton. Mr. Rigrod stated he understood.

Mr. Rigrod explained that DES administers the rules, processes the applications, holds public hearings, provides assistance in delineating the well head area, lists potential hazards and authorizes enforcement. The Statute allows for joint authority of DES and health officers to allow the issuance of cease and desist orders and DES can impose fines for violations. DES also notifies landowners in the reclassification area.

The local entity role is to identify the area to be reclassified and do a windshield survey that identifies businesses that are potential threats to the groundwater within the areas. Then formulate a management plan which includes notification to potential contamination sources and periodic inspections. Once that is done they submit the application for reclassification. Once reclassified the town is responsible to maintain and follow a management program. For GAA classification they can use hydro engineering for the well reports and boring and test pumps. The second step is the inventory of the businesses, location, site contact and potential contamination sources. The implementation of the management program includes contacting the businesses, documenting the inspections and education and assistance on related matters.

Mr. Rigrod stated that Best Management Practices are required and gave examples of what they are. He stated that the use of drip pans and funnels when transferring liquids is one. Proper storage and labeling of liquids, having spill kits on site and containers covered and on impervious surface are all Best Management Practices.

Mr. Rigrod stated that reclassification can be influenced through site plan design in the commercial and industrial zones. Belmont and Northfield have zoning restrictions already in place. Reclassification may influence loading areas being on impervious areas/slab with overhangs and berms for drainage. Reclassification is about managing regulated substances appropriately and provides local authority to enforce Best Management Practices. It is useful in water resources areas where significant commercial and industrial uses occur or will occur in the future. Reclassification will require additional staff time to complete inspections, document results and enforce Best Management Practices.

Mr. Rigrod stated that Belmont and Northfield already have restrictions on the six high risk uses and the reclassification would implement the local inspection program. J. Pike wanted to know who is exempt. Mr. Rigrod stated that those that already exist have to come back to DES for a permit. J. Pike wanted to know how they can get the State to enforce these regulations because DOT has a salt shed in the area and they wash their trucks on site. Mr. Rigrod stated that DOT is supposed to be more sensitive to these issues. His department will respond to any request they receive about violations. He stated that salvage yards are the type of business that have major issues and they just need to be educated and advised on a better way to dispose of waste from vehicles that are crushed or destroyed.

J. Marden wanted to know if they choose an area do they have to survey the entire area. Mr. Rigrod stated the area around a well head is delineated when a well comes to DES for approval. They have to submit the boundary when applying for GAA but can utilize the information that already is available.

J. Marden wanted to know if they regulate only the storage of road salt or can they regulate the usage of it on a road and make the area a low salt area. Mr. Rigrod stated that the regulation applies to the storage of salt because there is potential for contamination from runoff.

K. Knowlton wanted to know if the inspections done once every three years is a minimum or a maximum required or can they be done more often. Mr. Rigrod stated that they have to be inspected every three years but can be done more often. Mr. Knowlton wanted to know if the Conservation Commission, if trained, has the authority to do the inspections. Mr. Rigrod stated they can do the inspections but don't have the authority for enforcement.

Mr. Rigrod stated that you have to pick the right tool to match issues that are facing the town. They should revisit the studies that have been done and narrow down the threats that are outlined to determine the best way to handle them. Belmont and Northfield already have restrictions in place.

J. Marden stated that Belmont has a big aquifer. Do they reclassify one section or do they have to reclassify all of it. Mr. Rigrod stated that reclassifying some areas would not make sense if the zone is going to affect the whole area. If it does not affect the rest of the aquifer then they can reclassify only certain sections of it.

C. Daigle stated that when a company goes through site plan approval and has to use Best Management Practices they tend to be forgotten when the company or management changes hands. They should go back every three years as an outreach to remind them of regulations in existence.

J. Marden stated that they are talking about reclassification for the Tilton/Northfield well head area, why are they not talking about reclassification of our own wells. C. Daigle stated that our wells are located in a different area and not in the commercial and industrial zones so there is a different urgency. J. Pike stated that Mr. Rigrod said that residential development is not an issue for reclassification.

Mr. Knowlton stated that he has worked for the State and has experience with junk yard inspections and

the best way to keep the area safe is to ask questions on how potential contaminants are stored and educate the businesses on what needs to be done. C. Daigle stated that part of the site plan regulation includes Best Management Practices but there is nothing set up for follow up visits. Ms Ginger Wells-Kay stated that the only difference in classification is the inspection and education because zoning is already in place. J. Pike stated that mortgagees keep a close eye on properties and don't let contamination happen because it affects property values. They require testing to make sure no contamination happens.

**MOTION:** C. Patten moved to take reclassification of the well head protection area under advisement and to communicate with Northfield/ Tilton on their decision about reclassification.

The motion was seconded by G. Flack and carried. (6-0)

### **BOARD'S ACTION-MINUTES:**

**MOTION:** On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by J. Marden, it was voted to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2005, meeting as submitted. (6-0)

### **STAFF REPORT:**

**A. ROBERT REED TAX LOT 242-002 & 242-003:**

The vice chairman signed the site plan for Robert Reed on Shaker Road.

**B. WINNI BRIDGE PLACE TAX LOT 102-007:**

C. Daigle explained that Winni Bridge Place came in for site plan approval for two separate buildings and they have only built one. They are on a well and have no water for fire suppression. She has talked to the Fire Department about the water system and if a cistern or connection to the water main is needed for the one building or if it is a requirement when the larger building is constructed and both buildings are complete. The Fire Department stated that they are not requiring a cistern for the small building at this time and will not require them to hook into the water main or a cistern for one year. The Board agreed with the Fire Department's recommendation.

**C. 2005 BUDGET:**

C. Daigle stated that she has 29 vacation days remaining for this year. She has talked with Town Administrator, Jeanne Beaudin, because she is also a contract employee and her contract allows her to carry over 20 vacation days per year. J. Pike stated that for this year they could allow C. Daigle to carry over 29 days and starting in 2006 she will be allowed to carry over only 20 vacation days. The Board also gave C. Daigle the option selling back her vacation days for this year if the budget allows.

**MOTION:** J. Pike moved to allow C. Daigle to carry over no more than 30 vacation days for 2005 and starting 2006 she will be allowed to carry over no more than 20 days. She also has the option to receive pay in lieu for this year.

The motion was seconded by W. Peterson and carried (6-0).

**D. IMPACT STUDY:**

C. Daigle wanted to know if the Board is willing to pay \$1000 or more toward the Impact Study by Bruce Mayberry if there is still money in the budget at the end of the year. J. Pike stated the BOS stated that they were willing to fund for the study. It was the consensus of the Board to fund \$1000 or more to the impact study if necessary for the study to continue and funds are available at the end of the year.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:** On a motion by C. Patten, seconded by G. Flack, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 8:37 p.m.  
(6-0)

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elaine M Murphy  
Administrative Assistant