

**Tamworth Conservation Commission Committee Reviewing
Valley Motorsports Dredge and Fill (Wetlands) Application**

NOTES of MEETING March 29, 2004 7:30 - 10:00 p.m.

Tamworth Cook Memorial Library

Draft notes to be approved at next meeting. Meeting audiotaped and videotaped by Sam Martin, Motorsports Holdings, LLC (MSH)

Present

Committee Members: John Mersfelder, TCC Chair; Ned Beecher; Chris Conrod; Don Johnson; and Lori Lenart

Other: Irene Garvey, Abenaki Environmental Services

Procedural

Meeting started at 7:50 p.m. due to change in venue (which was posted on the Town Office door)

Agenda items:, schedule update, public hearing responsibilities, summary of site specific application by Chris C., list of topics by Ned B.

Correspondence

John began by summarizing correspondence he's had with various people:

Site Specific Permit Application - Letter from NHDES, dated March 17, stated deadline for local comments is March 31; letter also stated that NHDES is not required to consider local zoning issues. The deadline of March 31 may not be that significant to us, given that comments made may be relevant also to wetland permit; Irene concerned that stormwater issues need to be commented on, given that it is related to wetland issues and could be submitted at a later date. Chris wondered if we've ever commented on site specific applications as a town; probably not, some said, but this is the largest such single project perhaps ever. John asked whether the letter had been sent to the Planning Board; a representative member (Herb Cooper) of the Planning Board reviewed the letter and said that the Planning Board did not discuss the letter although it was copied to them; they just may not have had time to get the letter out of their box before their last meeting. Irene said that wetlands and site specific applications normally do not overlap, but now they do and are being reviewed by NHDES together; she said there's info in the site specific application that is not in the wetland application. Concern was voiced about not being able to make comments on the stormwater treatment if we miss the March 31 deadline. Consensus was that comments be sent by March 31. A key concern is regarding the lack of discussion of total volume of runoff leaving the site post-development. Possible impacts on aquifer recharge is also an issue.; Ned and John agreed to contact DES to clarify (will call Craig Rennie) and send a short comment by the 31st.

Conference call with Susan Duprev. representing MSH, March 24: Ned and John reviewed the discussion of this call at which it was clarified that MSH had sent a letter to the Planning Board dated March 4 that indicated they would not be submitting an application for a Special Use Permit under the Tamworth Wetlands Ordinance until sometime in the future. TCC had

not been copied on this letter. Ms. Duprey said she wanted to address things one step at a time; she said our ordinance was "broader" than DES and ACOE standards. On this phone call, Ned, John, and Susan discussed site visit arrangements; April 9 is the final date but continued to reference the weather conditions needing to be agreeable. There was discussion about the possibility that, if conditions were not great April 9th, we would do the visit anyway with a potential additional visit as necessary. The TCC Committee's schedule was another topic of discussion on the phone call. Additional details of the phone call appear in notes, reviewed by Ned, John, and Susan Duprey, from that call, attached.

TCC Information Meeting and Public Hearing: John offered Susan this afternoon that we will write a letter to request ESS to appear and the timing of the TCC meeting and public hearing, its goals, expectations, topics to be covered and the general format of the meeting; whoever runs the meeting will establish the rules for the meeting and that we will keep it focused on the topics at hand. Our goal is to get the best information as quickly as possible; therefore, comments should be on substantive issues; we will ask for brevity, lack of repetition, etc.;

Mitigation: Ned, John, and Susan discussed this briefly in their phone call—see attached notes. John and Ned expressed TCC's appreciation that MSH and Susan are open to the considering local mitigation sites and then mentioned that they wanted to postpone further discussion for now. John noted that the TCC has received a copy of a letter from Sandwich Conservation Commission (SCC), sent to DES, regarding the mitigation properties in Sandwich and requesting a copy of the wetlands permit application and to be included in all correspondence as an interested party. John agreed to contact Chip Kimball, Chair of the SCC.

Local Oversight of Construction and Operations: Ned raised this on the call with Susan Duprey, suggesting that there should be some form of local independent oversight during construction and, possibly, operations—not an uncommon thing to have happen. This is to ensure that the permit requirements are met. For more details, see the notes from the call of March 24, 2004 between Susan Duprey, Ned Beecher, and John Mersfelder, attached.

Site Specific Permit Application

Chris Conrod, as requested, provided an excellent summary of the site specific permit application. He pointed out on the plans and maps developed by ESS the constructed detention basins (1 to 10) and the natural detention areas that are to be utilized for stormwater control. The reason for the site specific application is because more than 100,000 sq feet of ground will be disturbed. The stated goals include: to limit peak flow to pre-development rates during a typical large storm event. He discussed the four main subwatersheds detailed on the plans (A, B, C, and D). Anything labeled C goes onto the abutters' land to the east. A small 2 acres on the site drain high and to the east. Another goal of the stormwater plan is to balance watershed runoff so it stays in the same watersheds as before development. Another goal of this permit application is to address water quality treatment, erosion control, and sediment transport. Chris noted that there is not much discussion of total volume—the precipitation falling on the watershed will remain the same, but the impervious cover reduces amount being absorbed to the aquifer; detention ponds regulate how much is let out at what rate, but the total volume will be significantly greater—exactly how much and what that means is, as yet, unclear. This is an engineering issue; a simplistic estimate is that infiltration will go down 40%. It was noted

that the CAD models used should be reviewed by technical experts at NHDES, etc. Chris noted that there were 2 different modeling methods used for pre- and post-development and that the graphs of flows use different time-scales for pre- and post-development. All calculations are based on 10 yr storm, which equals 4.5 inches in 24 hours. There was discussion that the flatland areas north of Route 25 have flooded conditions many years—will increased runoff volume from the site add to this? What will effects be on Virginia Thomas abutting property? One Committee members would appreciate a clearer schematic showing where water is supposed to flow—the one in the application doesn't show where the water ends up (e.g. offsite).

Chris continued describing the water conveyance and storage systems; some water goes from one water basin to another in underground pipes. Increased volumes running through existing wetlands, if it occurs, could affect nutrients and plants in wetlands. And are any retained natural wetlands going to have diminished flows through them due to re-routing of water", Most of the detention ponds will be 2 stage, with one higher than the other so that there's settling and then water will flow out. Basins will be cleaned in spring—it was noted that this should possibly be changed to the fall, to prepare for winter/spring runoff.

The conveyances are design for a 25 year storm. (Chris noted that he assumed the design uses inputs that are required by NH-DES and USEPA.). The question was raised whether actual site precipitation is consist with the average, due to changes in elevation and location on the mountainside that could create a rain shadow or just the opposite. Irene noted that the wetland application talks about some widely scoured stream sites that obviously carry high volumes of water at some times. The site visit and discussions with ESS scientist should help clarify these matters.

Initial stormwater treatment from track is a "verge"—grass filter strip along the road—which which is like a shoulder but continues on at the same pitch as road. Some of these will be quite steep (requiring rip-rap, as on town roads often?) where the road has camber and is going across contour. Off the verge, water goes into stormwater conveyance channel ("ditch"), vegetated or stoned, depending on flow. Next are catch basins or deep sump catch basins; some will trap oil and grit (designed to hold 2 yr storm for 24 hr period--first flush). At least some detention ponds have valves at outlets to contain water if there's a spill. The most advanced treatment is around the staging area and paddock—that water goes directly into advanced stormwater treatment (stormceptors) that removes sediment, oil, and grease. Is MTBE contained by these? Ned said they're state of the art, but need to be maintained.

Operations in the winter? Access roads, main paddock, and hotel road will maintained and salted. Snow not dumped in detention ponds, but didn't go through specifics; "maintenance plan will be developed." Spill prevention plan provided is a sample—is this sufficient for now?

Chris' thoughts and observations: wetland function and total volume were the 2 main issues; odd things he noticed: subwatershed delineation appears to follow an existing woods road and does not go down-slope. In the post-development plan, the watershed seems to be returned more toward normal downslope flow by the construction. One road cut at the top of the track appears to be 45'. Some track area are 6-12' above wetlands. What will happen with water that will flow off the higher areas above wetlands?

Fuel and other potential contaminant storage and use - 2000 gal max onsite fueling station in above ground tank supplied by fuel supplier; no underground storage tanks. Details of this system are not known. Will it be refilled on site or off site? Some on-site repair and then service areas with used oil; there will be no floor drains in service buildings. Ned suggested there should be no drains in any buildings, in case there is inadvertent storage of hazardous liquids anywhere. The site specific permit application addresses contaminants in stormwater, accidental spills, 60 second response rate (what are the details?). There is no berm info on the site specific plan—are the berms for noise no longer part of the plan?

Compiling a List of Questions, Comments, Suggestions

Ned passed out the compiled list: it a brainstormed list so far; is organized by the 20 questions. Includes, at the end, more procedural questions; other comments also included. The last few pages of the document include additional quotes from wetlands law from DES. Still needs to have added anything from notes of the previous two meetings. Ned did consolidate and eliminate repetitions, but did not leave anything out, no matter how basic. Most of the items on the compiled list deal with water quality and quantity. Next step is to cull and eliminate and prioritize items. How to cull it down? Many of the questions have easy answers or can be easily dealt with; Chris saw at least 6 questions that can be answered by site specific application and he will do so. It was agreed that the TCC comment document could include both questions and comments. Questions will be compiled for ESS sooner in preparation for the meeting with them on April 12". There may be more questions and comments to add after the site walk.

Timing: TCC comments should be submitted by the 23rd of April at the very latest. according to a verbal statement that we can submit by the time of the DES public hearing. There was discussion about the 40 day intervention period and the deadline.

For next meeting

Come back next week with comments on the compiled list and be ready to cull and prioritize it. We will also make final plans for the site and finalize a list of questions, information needed for ESS for pre-hearing meeting—a bulleted list

Adjourned at 10:02 p.m.