

Present: Vice-Chairman John (Jack) Karcz, Members John (Jack) Downing, Leon Holmes Sr., Andrew Kohlhofer, Roger Barham, Building Official Bob Meade, Senior Planner Jenn Rowden, and Land Use AA/Recording Secretary Casey Wolfe.

Also in attendance: Rene LaBranche, Doug Brown, Laurie Pitkin, Mark Pitkin, Felicia Augevich, Renne King, Mary-Ann Blaikie, Nancy Fiske, Erin Holt, Gene Cordes, Robert Kennedy, Brad Lake, Doug Andrew, Arleigh Green, James Watkins, Kevin Baum, Cindy Grasso, Randy Grasso, Travis Baum, Kelly Baum, Tom O'Brien, Ellen Douglas, Jessica Gurer, Tarik Gurer, and Dennis Quintal.

Mr. Karcz opened the meeting at 7:17 PM.

## **I. CONTINUED BUSINESS**

### **Public Hearing continuation – Galloway / Seacoast Farms Site at parcel 05-035 located on Shirkin Road**

Mr. Karcz explained that tonight the Planning Board may have the opportunity to either deny, accept, or extend the application. He also announced that Rene LaBranche from Stantec is here in place of Dan Tatem tonight.

Mr. Quintal started his presentation. He explained that he is representing John Galloway and that he is designing the plans for a concrete and asphalt recycling facility. The Planning Board has already done a site walk on Mr. Galloway's property in Plaistow where they have already evaluated the noise, dust, and other byproducts. Since then, some design work has been done.

Mr. Quintal summarized what he has accomplished since the last meeting in June. A traffic study has been completed and submitted to the Town. A survey of Shirkin Road has been done. Mr. Quintal has submitted a Dredge and Fill permit to the State. The plan is to widen the road to 22 feet, but this permit will also allow the Town to widen the road to 30 feet if it chooses to do so in the future. In addition, an Alteration of Terrain permit has been submitted to the state. The NH Fish and Game Department has also been in contact with Mr. Quintal. They want an existing culvert to be replaced so that it can serve as a critter path. Also, any netting material used for slope stabilization has to be biodegradable so that animals do not get caught in it. Mr. Quintal is also waiting on a review from the NH Division of Historical Resources.

There has been a response from Stantec (this letter will be included in the minutes). Mr. Quintal felt that most of the issues that Stantec brought up in its letter could be easily resolved. Mr. Quintal quickly went through and addressed some of the numbered items in Stantec's letter:

#16: Stantec requested a full-perimeter survey. The Board already addressed this in another meeting and this was determined unnecessary. The pit is well within the property's boarder.

#21 & #22: Mr. Quintal believes that excavation requirements were already addressed.

#24, 25, & 29: Concerns sampling, inspecting, and testing. Mr. Quintal felt that some of this was already discussed.

#30: Here Stantec requested a drainage analysis. Mr. Quintal is waiting on the finalizing of the Alteration of Terrain permit. Then he will submit a copy of the drainage analysis to the Town.

#32 & #33: These suggestions have to do with the traffic analysis. This is something that should be discussed at the next meeting so that the Board has time to look through this.

#34: This was a comment from Stantec about widening Shirkin Road. It was Mr. Quintal's understanding that 22 feet of gravel is what was agreed upon. The Dredge and Fill permit will allow for 30 feet of gravel in the future. He did provide cross-sections of this road for road-widening.

#35: Here Stantec is requesting that Mr. Galloway provides trucking reports semi-annually to the Town. This is something that Mr. Galloway needs to agree to (although he said he would).

#36-51: To this date, Mr. Quintal has not been involved with Seacoast Farms and is not sure to what extent the business will affect design plans.

#52: Concerning the Alteration of Terrain permit – Mr. Quintal had a conversation with DES about this. Any predevelopment calculations for storm water runoff need to start from 10 years ago.

#53-63: These pertain to design and drafting requirements – will have to be addressed later.

#64: Stantec would like a sign at the end of Shirkin Road warning about truck traffic. Mr. Quintal felt that this wouldn't be a problem.

#65: Concerning damage to Beede Hill Road. The project will be about 1% of daily traffic on Beede Hill Road. Galloway would pay for 1% of the funding if the Town resurfaced Beede Hill Road.

Mr. Quintal explained that at this point he will need to incorporate any design changes that need to be made. As far as the DES applications, it could take another two or three months to get those finalized.

Mr. Meade didn't think that 22 feet was what the Board agreed upon for the width of Shirkin Road. Mr. Karcz agreed and felt that 24 feet was what was talked about. Ms. Rowden confirmed that in the March meeting minutes 24 feet was commented on – not 22 feet. Mr. Karcz was also expecting pavement. Mr. Barham agreed that 24 feet was what was considered practical. The road needs to be widened and improved. It was left to the applicant to come up with a recommendation to satisfy the Board. It was not decided whether or not the road needs to be paved. Mr. Quintal felt that the entrance to the road could be paved. He doesn't think that Mr. Galloway would agree to pave the whole road. There was some discussion about road impact fees.

Ms. Rowden had some comments in terms of what the Board should do at this point. This application was originally filed in November and the Board still has not been able to take jurisdiction. The Board could either continue the application or deny the application and allow Mr. Galloway to reapply. Ms. Rowden suggested taking the latter option because it would allow the applicant and the abutters to go through this process in just one or two more meetings instead of these incremental updates. Mr. Quintal added that the application could always get continued with the requirement that the abutters get notified again. Mr. Barham asked Mr. Quintal if he has been in contact with Mr. Tatem during this process. He felt that if they were having a dialogue going there would be less delays. Mr. Quintal said that at this point there has not been much dialogue because Stantec is not obligated to work on design – just on review. Mr. LaBranche invited Mr. Quintal to come over to his office next week.

Mr. Meade brought up that there should be at least some kind of apron at the entrance to Shirkin Road. He also added that Bob Kelly (Seacoast Farms) should have contacted Mr. Quintal. Mr. Karcz felt that the storm water management plan should reflect both operations on the site. Mr. Barham felt that it would be best to continue the application to two months from now (October 5<sup>th</sup>). Mr. Karcz added in notifying the abutters about this meeting. Ms. Rowden reminded Mr. Quintal about the two week deadline. Mr. Quintal wanted an answer about whether the road need to be 22 or 24 feet of gravel. Mr. Karcz answered 24 feet and that there needs to be pavement at the beginning. Mr. Quintal suggested that perhaps Mr. Galloway would be willing to do crushed asphalt instead of gravel – this would be a better surface.

Ms. Rowden announced that the Board did receive a letter from Kevin Baum on behalf of Hard Rock Development with concerns and recommendations regarding the application. Mr. Barham made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Holmes seconded that motion with all in favor.

Mr. Baum urged the Board to strongly consider denying the application. It's been nine months since this application started. It's been five months since March. They'll need two more meetings to get through the initial comments but then design issues will need to be addressed after Mr. Quintal receives permitting from the state. Some issues haven't even been addressed since March. The abutters should not need to be dragged back every month to get a little more information. The Planning Board should deny the application tonight and allow the applicant to resubmit. It seems pretty clear that he has not been working with Stantec.

Mr. Randy Grasso reminded the Board that at the last meeting they said this would be the last time they would be allowed to continue the application. Ms. Ellen Douglas wanted to ask a question about the materials that would be brought into the site. Mr. Barham informed Ms. Douglas that this is a question she can ask once jurisdiction is being taken on the application. Mr. Meade suggested to Ms. Douglas to look back at previous minutes.

Ms. Renee King felt that the Board made it clear last time that if the materials were not ready at this time, then the application would be denied. Mr. Barham explained that one of the reasons that there has been so many meetings is that there were several waivers that were denied in March and that providing all of these materials has been significant work. Ms. King wanted to know if all of these materials have been provided at this point. Mr. Barham felt that was not an easy question to answer.

Ms. Cindy Grasso felt that continuing the application to October 5<sup>th</sup> would not make a lot of sense because it does not seem like the state permitting will be done at that point. Once the permitting is done, Mr. Quintal is going to have to do some redesign work. If we have a meeting in October, it seems that Mr. Quintal is just going to ask for another extension. Ms. Rowden commented that it is possible that Board could take jurisdiction of the application on the condition that they applicant receives the state permits. Ms. Grasso also addressed the entrance to Shirkin Road. She believes that there should be at least some paving at the entrance of the road to limit dust picking up on Beede Hill Road. Finally, Ms. Grasso brought up how there seems to be a lack of information on how Seacoast Farms will be included in this plan. Mr. Barham informed her that Seacoast Farms would only be included in terms of drainage and storm water

management. Mr. Meade added that Mr. Kelly was supposedly going to get together with Mr. Quintal to talk about what was going to happen on those drawings.

Mr. Barham made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Kohlhofer seconded that motion with all in favor. Mr. Barham made a motion to continue the public hearing to date certain October 5<sup>th</sup> at the school with the condition that if materials aren't provided so that jurisdiction can be taken then the Board will deny the application as incomplete. Mr. Meade suggested the library instead of the school. Ms. Rowden explained that Mr. Barham cannot say what the motion is going to be at a future meeting. The application can simply be continued. Mr. Downing seconded that motion to continue the application to October 5<sup>th</sup> at the library (understanding that they cannot decide the jurisdiction now). Mr. Holmes asked Mr. Quintal a question about how many rods Shirkin Road is. Mr. Quintal answered that it's 49.5 rods. He also commented on how the telephone poles can be kept in the same spot and still have the road widened in the town right-of-way. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Karcz were also in favor of the motion. Mr. Kohlhofer was not in favor. Mr. Karcz concluded that the application has been extended to October 5<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Barham made a motion to have a five minute recess so that the abutters could clear out. Mr. Downing seconded that with all in favor.

## **II. NEW BUSINESS - none**

## **III. MINUTES**

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to approve the minutes of July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016. Mr. Downing seconded that motion with all in favor.

## **IV. BUILDING INSPECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Meade wanted to state on camera (since the last Planning Board meeting was not filmed) that Mr. Galloway was more than aware of his financial responsibility to pay for the town engineer review work and that Stantec had been mailing its detailed invoices to the Galloway's this whole time.

Mr. Meade informed the Planning Board that Mr. Suprenant never actually got rid of his fuel tank – it's been sitting in his garage. Mr. Suprenant suggested the he could put the fuel tank on the body of the truck. Mr. Meade felt that this opens up a whole new can of worms since then there would be the question of whether this truck counts has one of Sprenant's two allowed trucks. Also, we need to keep in mind that this property is in the aquifer. Ms. Rowden felt the Board would be well in its right to issue a Cease and Desist Order.

Mr. Meade brought up the new wider "welcome to Fremont" sign on Danville Road that the Garden Club suggested. The Board was okay with this going in. Mr. Meade also stated that other signs had gone up and come down (on telephone poles and two advertising business out of town).

Mr. Ferwerda may be building too close to a wetland area. Mr. Ferwerda supposedly will have a soil scientist come in and take a look at this. Mr. Meade asked that someone else such as the Conservation Committee look at this.

Mr. Meade has talked to Mr. Merrill about giving him 30 days to do his blasting. He told him it would be best to get as much done as he can right away to minimize complaints.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **1. 2017 Planning & Zoning Budget Review**

There was some discussion about the 2017 Planning and Zoning budget that Heidi had proposed. Mr. Barham will sit down with Ms. Wolfe to make some changes. Mr. Kohlhofer thought the \$7,000 difference from last year was a bit much. Mr. Karcz thinks there should be more in the budget for trainings.

### **2. And any other business which may come before the Board.**

## **VI. INCOMING CORRESPONDANCE**

Letter from NHDES to Jacob's Cove Subdivision concerning requested records of long-term storm water I&M activities – this is a copy of the letter for the Planning Board

Mr. Kohlhofer made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 PM. Mr. Downing seconded that motion with all in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Casey Wolfe  
Recording Secretary

### **Action Items:**

- Mr. Barham will meet with Ms. Wolfe to go over the 2017 budget.



July 29, 2016  
File: 195112445

Mr. Brett Hunter, Chairman  
Fremont Planning Board  
PO Box 120  
295 Main Street  
Fremont, NH 03044

Dear Mr. Hunter:

**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

We have reviewed the following information, submitted by Civil Construction Management, Inc. (CCM) for the subject project, received on July 21, 2016:

- Amended Site Plan, Sheets 1 through 4, prepared by CCM, dated October 2, 2015, most recently revised on July 20, 2016
- Existing and Proposed HydroCAD reports, prepared by CCM, undated
- Existing and Proposed Watershed Plans, Sheets 1 & 2, prepared by CCM, dated July, 2016
- Traffic Impact Memorandum, prepared by TEPP, LLC, dated June 1, 2016

This submittal was reviewed in response to a request by the Town of Fremont and was reviewed for conformance with the applicable sections of the Town of Fremont Site Plan Regulations as well as other relevant local and state regulations and accepted engineering practice. The original comments from our January 26, 2016 review letter are in italics, new or supplemental comments are in bold and comments that were addressed have been removed. We have the following comments:

**Project Description**

According to the plans submitted by CCM, the applicant proposes to add a concrete and asphalt crushing/processing operation to the existing site plan, which currently includes an on-going excavation operation and the Seacoast Farms Compost Products composting operation. An additional office trailer is proposed, as well as the expansion of the northern excavation area.

**Waiver Requests**

1. *We take no exception to the waiver request to not perform test pits, because no road or septic construction is proposed. However, if a drainage design is required by the Board, test pits may have to be performed to verify the estimated seasonal high water table and infiltration rates of the insitu soils.* **The Board denied this waiver request and several test pits were performed. The test pit logs should be provided to Stantec for review of the proposed grades, in relation to the requirement that all excavation activities be no closer than 4' to the estimated seasonal high water table.**



**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

## **General Comments**

7. *It should be noted that a crushing/processing operation generates significant noise. The board should consider the proximity of the residential abutters when discussing the application. Considering this, specific attention should be given to the request to operate on Saturdays. **This comment was discussed; however the Board has not made a formal determination on the allowable operation hours.***
9. *We recommend that an erosion and sediment control plan be submitted, demonstrating how the applicant intends to treat the large volume of stormwater that are directed into the adjacent wetland complex. Currently, there does not appear to be any erosion control/ treatment measures in place. **The plan showing the proposed erosion control measures only addresses the proposed expansion of use. The Board should consider the entire site, as it is one parcel and owned by the same company.***
10. *During previous, annual site walks for the excavation activities and during our recent site walk on January 19, 2016, we noted that the active composting work area has encroached into the 100' wetland setback in many locations. As part of this approval, we recommend that the plans be revised to show these areas to be regraded and reclaimed. In addition, we recommend that permanent markers be placed every 50' delineating the setback, in an effort to eliminate future encroachment. **Comment not addressed.***
11. *Considering the active work area far exceeds the 100,000 square foot limit, specified by NHDES Alteration of Terrain Program (AoT), we recommend that the applicant apply for an NHDES AoT permit. **Stantec did not receive any documentation confirming that the plans have been provided to AoT for review. The Site Plan should have a note added; confirming that the AoT permit has been issued.***
12. *We recommend that the applicant provide documentation demonstrating how the composting facility is complying with the maximum allowable 25 tons per day (trucked in compost) noted on the 2001 NHDES composting Permit By Notification (PBN) and how this correlates with the maximum 16 trucks per day allowed by the site plan, approved in 2013. **Comment not addressed.***
13. *The 2001 NHDES composting PBN identifies a minimum separation of 150' from any wetlands; however, the site plan shows that, at several locations, the active work area is located considerably less than 150' to the wetlands. We recommend that the Applicant address this inconsistency with the NHDES Waste Management Division and provide documentation that this issue is appropriately addressed. **Comment not addressed.***
14. *We recommend that Item #4, of the previous conditions of approval, be clarified regarding the allowable 6,000 cubic yards of compost produced, so it is clear if this is a weekly, monthly, or annual, allowable total. **Comment not addressed.***



July 29, 2016  
Mr. Hunter, Chairman  
Page 3 of 8

**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

15. *We recommend that the Town require surety, as noted in Item #5, of the previous conditions of approval, for the cost of disposal of the tailings that are currently located at the subject site. **Comment not addressed.***

#### **Plan Comments**

16. *Typical notes must be added, addressing the missing items required in Section 1.13.S, items 1 through 19 of the Fremont Site Plan Regulations. **Comment partially addressed. Several items must still be added to the plans including the registry book and page numbers, proposed monumentation at all lot corners, bearing and distances on all lot lines, etc.***

#### **Excavation Comments**

21. *The Board should review the current reclamation surety to confirm that it is adequate to cover the total cost of reclaiming all existing and proposed excavation areas. **This was addressed at the last Board meeting; however no documentation was provided.***
22. *We recommend that item #9, of the previous conditions of approval, dated January 22, 2013 be revised to omit the words “as available on-site”, as it appears that there is not enough loam to adequately reclaim the current and proposed excavation area. **Comment not addressed.***

#### **Environmental Comments (Proposed Crushing/Processing Operations)**

24. *Notes should be added to the plans requiring that the facility operator shall hire a third party, environmental management consultant, who shall sample and test each and every source of the concrete and construction material debris delivered to the facility, certifying that the material being imported has been analyzed, and the imported material contains no contamination and complies with all Local, State and Federal requirements and is suitable for reuse on a site other than the site the material was generated from. **Comment not addressed. The note that was added only requires that reports be provided to the Town. Specific sampling and reporting notes must still be added to the plans.***
25. *Notes should be added to the plans requiring that a third party, environmental management consultant shall perform monthly inspections of the crushing facility and operation and shall collect samples of the materials being imported which shall be tested for the presents of contaminants. **Comment not addressed.***
29. *Considering the high pH levels associated with crushed concrete, the applicant should provide a plan, demonstrating how the potential wind-blown crushed concrete dust will be controlled, reducing or eliminating the potential contamination of the adjacent wetlands. In addition, the plan should show how the stormwater runoff with potentially elevated pH levels, from the crushed concrete stock piles will be controlled and treated, prior to entering the adjacent wetlands. **Comment not addressed.***





**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

### **Drainage Analysis**

30. *Considering the large percentage (approximately 9-10 acres) of the parcel that has been cleared and developed over the past years, we recommend that the applicant provide a drainage analysis, complying with the Town's regulations and the requirements of the NHDES AoT Program, demonstrating how the sequential expansions of the active work area are to be mitigated, so the current increase in flow is reduced to pre-development conditions. **Comment partially addressed. The Designer provided pre and post HydroCAD reports; however no report or supporting calculations or documents were provided (see additional related comments on pages 6-8 of this letter).***

### **Traffic Analysis**

32. *As noted by the Road Agent, we concur that the intersection of Beede Hill Road and Shirkin Road does not appear to be adequate to handle the proposed, increased trucking. We recommend that a plan be provided showing the existing configuration of the intersection and the proposed improvements necessary to provide adequate sight distance, turning radii, etc. **A truck-turning plan was provided; however, the turning movement from the site, to the south, shows the tire path outside of the proposed edge of pavement, indicating that the radii must be increased. In addition, the proposed turning movement into the site from the north must be added to the plan to evaluate the proposed northern radius of Shirkin Road. Also, the plans specify that Shirkin Road remain as a gravel road. At the last meeting the Board voted to require that the road be upgraded to meet the typical Town standards for roadway construction including pavement. This information must be added to the plans and a pavement section added to the Detail Sheet. Finally, the sight distance was not addressed with the revised information provided for review.***
33. *The condition of Beede Hill Road between Shirkin Road and Route 101 appears poor. The additional, proposed heavy trucking will accelerate the deterioration of this roadway. We recommend that the Applicant provide an evaluation of Beede Hill Road to assist the Board in determining if off-site improvements are warranted and if so, the extent of the improvements necessary. **Comment not adequately addressed. A truck distribution analysis was provided for review; however, the analysis considers a reduced average daily trip count due to an assumed shut down in the winter. We recommend that the Board consider the additional trucking during full operation, when considering any potential off-site improvements. With the 90% / 10% assumed distribution, to the north and south on Beede Hill Road, the traffic memorandum indicates that there will be an additional 72 truck trips travelling on Beede Hill Road between Shirkin Road and Route 101.***
34. *The gravel portion of Shirkin Road is shown to be 15' wide. Although the Applicant's existing business is the only facility on the dead-end road, 15' is not an adequate road*



**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

*width. The proposed increase in trucking on this road will potentially result in traffic delays on Beede Hill Road, for example, if trucks are waiting at the entrance of Shirkin Road due to another truck exiting the site. Furthermore, the additional trucking will result in additional maintenance/repairs to the gravel road, causing the Town to incur additional costs. We recommend that the gravel road be upgraded to meet the Town's typical roadway design requirements, specifically regarding the roadway width and the gravel/pavement section dimensions. **Comment partially addressed. A general plan was provided showing the proposed widening of Shirkin Road. However, prior to approval of the road widening, full design plans, including detailed plan and profile plans must be provided for review. The proposed plans must include details such as, but not limited to: horizontal and vertical curves, tangents, existing and proposed drainage infrastructure, limits of the existing ROW, grading easements, if necessary, underdrain locations and outlets, etc.***

35. *The Applicant is requesting that the current daily truck limit of 16 be increased to 40. The Applicant should provide a procedure to confirm with the Town, how the current limit of 16 trips and the proposed limit of 40 trucks will be documented by the applicant. As part of this proposed procedure, we recommend that reports be provided semi-annually to the Town. **Comment not addressed.***

**New Comments on New Information Provided:**

**Amended Site Plan & Alteration of Terrain Site Plan**

36. **The plan includes an AoT Limit of Work; however the piles of tailings, which include a significant amount of plastics and trash, remain within the wetland setback. These piles should be removed from the site and replaced with a continuous erosion control measure, such as stump grindings.**
37. **As noted above, the test pit data should be provided to Stantec, for review of the proposed grades in relation to the estimated seasonal high water table.**
38. **The proposed fill material, that is to be used to raise the grade of the crushing operation area, should be specified on the plans.**
39. **There is a note that specifies a stone and wood chip berm; however the detail sheet does not include a detail for this erosion control measure. The note should be revised or a detail added.**
40. **The large pile of material that is noted as a “vegetated barrier berm” should be removed from the wetland buffer. If this is not a “vegetated barrier berm”, the hatching pattern should be changed and added to the legend.**
41. **The area of the proposed detention basin encroaches into the crushing operation area. This area likely does not have the same infiltration characteristics. The pond must be relocated outside of the crushing**



**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

**operation area, or the infiltration component removed from the drainage calculations.**

- 42. The proposed grading will create an area that puddles in the southwestern corner of the crushing operation area and must be revised to provide positive drainage towards the proposed infiltration basin.**
- 43. An erosion control measure, such as a mulch berm or silt fence must be added on the down slope side of all areas of proposed site disturbance.**

**Amended Site Plan Detail Sheet:**

- 44. A detail of the “PVC Caution Fence” should be added to this sheet.**
- 45. Information should be added to the plans specifying the proposed construction materials for the crushing operation area.**

**Wetland Fill & Erosion Control Notes:**

- 46. Several of the notes are too general and should be revised to be specific to the proposed construction. For example, Note #4 should be revised to specify actual NHDOT gravels, and the proctor that is noted should be revised to a modified proctor (ASTM 1557).**
- 47. Note #5 should be revised to reference the roadway section that is to be added to the Detail Sheet. In addition, the specific section of the Town’s regulations should be listed as part of this note.**
- 48. Note #6 must be revised to specify screened loam.**
- 49. Notes must be added for all AoT requirements, specifically stabilization and winter construction requirements.**
- 50. A site specific construction sequence should be added to the notes.**

**Drainage Analysis**

- 51. A complete drainage report must be provided, meeting all the requirements of the AoT regulations.**
- 52. We understand that no drainage studies have been completed for this site in the past. Per a discussion with Ridge Mauck of the AoT Program, NHDES will require that the existing conditions in 1981 (when NHDES AoT jurisdiction was established, per RSA 485-A:17) shall be used to compare pre and post stormwater peak rates of flow from the site. Considering this, the Designer should provide documentation of the site conditions in 1981 and revise the existing conditions HydroCAD calculations to match those site conditions.**
- 53. The revised report must include the 25-year storm event calculations, per the Site Plan Regulations.**



**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

54. **The drainage plans should have north arrows and scale bars added.**
55. **Calculations must be provided demonstration compliance with all Town and AoT drainage requirements. Such as water quality, volume, pre and post peak rates of flow, etc.**
56. **The pre and post HydroCAD reports indicate a significant amount of compacted gravel surfaces. Per AoT, the curve number for this cover type must be 96, regardless of the underlying soil types.**
57. **The proposed conditions do not appear to account for the entire, proposed tree clearing. The site plans show over an acre of tree clearing; however, the HydroCAD reports only show 0.312 acres of tree clearing. The cover types must be corrected in the calculations to match the proposed plans.**
58. **The infiltration rate for the infiltration basin (10 inches/hour) is significantly higher than allowed by AoT and must be corrected. In addition, as noted previously, a large portion of the infiltration area is located within the crushing operation. This area will be compacted gravel or concrete and will have little to no infiltration capability. The calculations must be revised to meet the proposed conditions and the allowable rate of infiltration, as specified in the AoT stormwater manuals.**
59. **Considering that the stormwater basin is proposed to infiltrate the stormwater, specific construction details must be added to the plans for the basin design and construction, ensuring that the basin will actually infiltrate stormwater, as included in the drainage calculations.**
60. **We recommend that a plan be provided; showing the proposed grading of the infiltration basin, the treatment swales, and the overflow weir, at a larger scale, so the grading can be adequately reviewed. In addition, spot grades should be added for the overflow weir.**
61. **The four, final drainage analysis points are located on opposite sides of the proposed site expansion and appear to flow onto several different abutting properties. Each area must be evaluated individually and any increases in the peak rate of stormwater flow must be mitigated so all peak rates of flow will be the same or less at the various property lines. Currently, the calculations show increases in flow at analysis points 2 and 4, which must be mitigated on the subject site.**
62. **Supporting information must be included showing how the rainfall amounts were determined for each storm event.**
63. **It does not appear that the HydroCAD calculations consider the proposed widening of Shirkin Road. Proposed off-site improvements should be added to the revised drainage calculations.**



July 29, 2016  
Mr. Hunter, Chairman  
Page 8 of 8

**Reference: Fremont, NH - Galloway – Amended Excavation Site Plan  
Tax Map 5 Lot 35  
2nd Review**

**Traffic Concerns:**

- 64. Considering the proposed increase in truck traffic from the site, “TRUCKS TURNING AND ENTERING” signs should be provided on Beede Hill Road.**
- 65. Some pavement rutting is apparent on Beede Hill Road from Shirkin Hill Road towards Route 101. With the proposed significant amount of added truck traffic on Beede Hill Road, further damage to the road should be anticipated. A contribution by the Developer to compensate the Town for future added costs to correct the anticipated damage should be discussed by the Board.**

Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

**STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES INC.**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dan Tatem", written over the printed name.

J. Daniel Tatem  
Project Manager  
Tel: (603) 669-8672  
Fax: (603) 669-7636  
[dan.tatem@stantec.com](mailto:dan.tatem@stantec.com)

c: Heidi Carlson, Town Administrator  
Bob Meade, Building Inspector  
John Galloway, Owner  
Dennis Quintal, CCM (email)  
Ridge Mauck, NHDES AoT (email)  
Rene LaBranche, Stantec