

Town of Goshen  
Zoning Board of Adjustments  
Meeting Minutes  
April 14, 2009

**Present:** Peta Brennan, Robert Johnson, Hannah Lockwood, Chairperson Thomas Lawton, Cyndi Phillips and Secretary Jessica Dennis. Planning Board Members: James Carrick, Chairperson Allen Howe, Rich Moen, Jonathan Purick, and John Wirkkala and Bernie Waugh of Gardner, Fulton & Waugh, attorney for the Town of Goshen

**Additional Attendance:** Shaun Carroll Jr, of Carroll Concrete, Stephan Pernaw of Pernaw & Co, Tim Britain of Cleveland, Waters & Bass, Jeff Cloutier of North American Reserve, Robert O'Neal of Epsilon Associates, Inc. Residents: Beatrice Jillette, Lilyan Wright, Frances Hadley, Keith Hall, Jean and Paul Barrett, Virginia Schendler, Ellie and Fred Trommsdorff, David and Patricia Stephan, Fred and Cynthia O'Clair, Linda Janicke, Alan Greenhalgh

- 1. Meeting Overview:** Allen Howe called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m., some board members need to leave at 9:30 p.m. so there is a time constraint. The corrected notes and corrected pages from Mr. Rauseo's, of Rauseo & Associates, should be available to the boards. Mr. Rauseo was not available for tonight's meeting. Other experts are here and available to answer questions. Attorney Brittan thanked the secretary and provided Chairman Lawton with a couple technical corrections that Newport sand and Gravel, Inc would like to point out for corrections.
- 2. Aquifers:** Mr. Cloutier of North American Reserve is available to answer questions. Allen Howe has a question about page two next to last paragraph, there is a statement "limited extent of excavation..." Is this a general statement or a specific statement about this project? Mr. Cloutier explains the statement could be, or is, both, the excavation will be above the aquifer. Some of the material being excavated at this location will be above the aquifer, but the total extent of aquifer, which extends outside of Goshen municipal lines. Mr. Cloutier believes the extent of excavation will be minimal in comparison to the total size of aquifer. North American Reserve did not drill or excavate to bedrock to determine the extent of the aquifer. Ossipee Aggregates do research worldwide and review the impact of excavating within aquifer, and no impacts were noted. In the Midwest it is common to proactively excavate below the water table, and there is no evidence of the impact on aquifers. There are specific studies of gravel pits and more recently, with respect to crushed stone quarries, but the type of excavation is not being performed at this location. Allen Howe points out that on page two, the last paragraph "In fact the opening of the excavation will actually increase..." is this a theoretical statement or actual models after excavation. Mr. Cloutier states this is not actually modeled to this site, generally under the topsoil there is sand and gravel. Once that top soil is removed that water is still absorbed into the aquifer. Allen Howe then points out on page three, "subjects season stream is perched..." he wants to know how they know the impermeable streambed is 25 feet and not 26 feet from the stream and could not be damaged. Mr. Cloutier explains that generally you need a bowl shape and the banks of the stream hold the water in. The water flow would be visible. Allen Howe wants to know how they know that 25 feet is enough without hitting the aquifer. Mr. Cloutier

explains that based on observation and test pits, they have not actually dug into the 25 foot set back. Allen wants to know about the test pits as opposed to wells in regard to observations. Mr. Cloutier explains that there are different characteristics of a well or a pit. Wells will give you a better measure of the water table. Peta Brennan asks the Planning Board about their regulations for a 150 foot set back, the application is for 25 feet, Is there a reason for the 150 foot regulation? Allen Howe states that the regulation was put into place before he was on the board so he does not have actual knowledge of the history behind that regulation. Tom Lawton is wondering about the possibility of contaminants. After topsoil disturbed or after the topsoil is removed, what is the likely hood of and oil leak leaching into aquifer? Mr. Cloutier responded that NSG equipment uses diesel fuel and generally diesel fuel and hydraulic fluids will bond to sand and gravel before it will leach into aquifer and allow the operator to deal with a leak. Gas will leach faster. Diesel fuel can be easily captured before it leaches. Jim Carrick asks them to justify the affects on the season stream, and who oversees the aquifers after the harvesting of material, does the state regular those affects or someone from outside state agency? Typically the regulator is the Town, NHDES will come out upon request. As mentioned at a previous meeting best management practices are used at all Newport Sand and Gravel excavation sites. Shaun Carroll states that silt fences and best management practices will keep them away from the season stream and the Planning Board or ZBA can come do a look around if they wish. Spill kits are also available if something were to happen. Jim Carrick is concerned because neither Board has done an on site look and it's not in either Board's forte, so will DES come and do a periodic look with out someone making a call. Because the Board does not have the expertise they would not know what is normal. Mr. Cloutier explains that DES would not come and do regular inspections unless a request was made. Allen Howe wanted to know what would happen if the 25 foot exception is not granted. Shaun Carroll states that the work would just start further back, but they would rather not be further back, and 25 feet was acceptable several years ago. If not within 25 feet of the stream it would be gradual increase towards to boundary, if they were restricted to 50 feet or something like that, it would be the same slope, which would result in a smaller footprint. In regard to the streambed, if the excavation was restricted the esker goes 50 feet, they would have to go in another 150 feet and it would be harder to maintain that peak. This would result in leaving too little humps and would look funny after work is complete.

3. **Noise Levels:** Robert O'Neal of Epsilon Associates, Inc is at the meeting again tonight to address and answer further questions the Board has. Allen Howe has questions about the sound measurement on June 18, when they were working in the Davis Pit. Page one of the report states that both sites would not be operating at both time. Are these sound data appropriate for establishing base line acoustical conditions at the present time for the proposed excavation at the Anderson site. Mr. O'Neal says yes, what drove the sound levels that were measured was the traffic along Route 10, the Davis pit could not be heard to North it could only be heard when the traffic level was low. Allen Howe addresses figure number three on page ten, location 1 is the Fournier property, location two is the Goshen Town Hall, and location three is Bevilacqua residence. Mr. O'Neal shows the locations on a map. Allen Howe questions why the noise levels did not change after the Davis Pit was done for the day? If noise levels did not materially change what can be

concluded? Mr. O'Neal explains that the conclusion is that the graphs in his report show that there are constant changes in sound levels, as there are trucks and other traffic all day even without Davis pit activity, minute by minute the noise levels change, Fournier is the only location that the Davis traffic passes. Allen Howe states that if the typical traffic pattern of the Davis pit is to travel to Newport, then the Fournier location is the only one that will pick up the sound levels. If no change is heard after the pit is closed how can it be concluded that if you take the Davis pit traffic out of the situation that there will be no detectable-recorded data difference. Allen has created a few graphs by location, based on tables two thru four. Allen explains his graphs and passes them around. The meters were not the place the same distance from Route 10 at each location, the Town Hall meter was 30 feet away, the Bevilacqua meter was 100 feet and the Fournier meter was 300-325 feet. The distance in feet from Route 10 the closer the meter is to Route 10 the higher the L-max values. While the recorders at Bevilacqua and Fournier are a larger distance from Route 10, can the sounds at the three levels be compared since they were not the same difference from Route 10. Mr. O'Neal says no, because they are different distances, that is OK that was the intention. They were placed based on the different property locations and their distances from Route 10. The meters were placed based on the general characteristics of the houses/building near that site location. The setbacks were done deliberately. Mr. O'Neal discussed the results on pages 14, 15 and 16, the same three sites you will notice the L90 is plotted and it can be seen generally that the L90 for the Town Hall, Bevilacqua, and the Fournier property it is from high 30s to low 40s, which is an indication of steady state of background sound levels. L-max 80 to 85 dBA's at the Town Hall. Allen Howe has created one more LEQ graph which is plotted by the distance from Route 10 as on page four. Mr. O'Neal explains you can pick any figure, for example figure number four, on the bottom of graph. The LEQ is one point in time even down to the minute, these were set to record every minute and also every hour. Take the area under the curve in the course of one hour; taking area under the curve, what would that one number be over the course of an hour. One hour LEQ is a one number "average." Mr. Howe explained the LEQ at Fournier was greater than at Bevilacqua despite fact that Fournier is 200-225 feet further away from Route 10, doesn't that indicate there are louder noises at the Fournier property. Mr. O'Neal says there may be small impact from the Davis pit which is another 1,000 feet to west of Route 10. The Bevilacqua property has a lot more trees and the noise from the traffic headed north is blocked by the trees. The Fournier property is in the direct line of sight of the road. Allen states there are several properties closer to Route 10 located near the Fournier property. Would results have been different if they selected a location closer to Route 10? Mr. O'Neal feels the results would be within a one or two dBA level difference, which would not be much. Allen Howe points out that on page 20 the model dBA is in the mid 50's, which is less than the model of 22 Lear Hill Road. Both numbers are LEQs. Mr. O'Neal points out section 6.2 on page 20. Allen Howe wants to know how far the access road from 22 Lear Hill Road is. What is the exact distance? How far was the meter that was used on October 21, 2000. Mr. O'Neal state the distance is 25 to 30 feet. Allen Howe states that on page 17, the haul trucks are stated to produce 69 dBA at 50 ft. Mr. O'Neal will have to look at his field notes at that was several years ago and he does not recall. Allen Howe states that a reference point relative to Route 10 would be helpful, because the closer the meter to Route 10 the more affect the traffic on Route 10 will have on that

noise value. Mr. O'Neal points out that the noise level would also include noise from the Sugar River. Allen Howe asks if any haul trucks were at the Davis Pit when these measurements were done? Mr. O'Neal states he will have to refer to his field notes, as that was nearly nine years ago. Peta Brennan wants to know about the measurements on Lear Hill Road, predicted future noise levels at 22 Lear Hill Road has a total future amount 65-dBA and no future ambient noise, she does not understand Mr. O'Neal explains that 85-dBA noise level. Page 22, table five shows the predicted sound level from project is 25-dBA. The predicted future dBA is 25 at 22 Lear Hill Road which is calculated from the current noise level of 40-dBA the existing background noise, plus the Project of 25 dBA. Section four shows the existing L90 of 40, 40 and 38 for the three locations. The existing 40-dBA plus 25-dBA still equals 40-dBA. The L-max at the Town Hall was measured at 30 feet this is a worst case. Allen Howe states that 69-dBA equals to a truck at 50 feet away these tables don't address if the noise level is different if the truck is fully loaded. So what you want is predicted project level plus the truck that just left the pit. Peta Brennan thought existing background would be the noise of trucks going by. Mr. O'Neal states that the background as we are defining it is the L90. Page 15, figure five, the Town Hall L-max for each hour, 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. was 80 to 90-dBA. L90 40 to 41-dBA statically it's louder. Peta Brennan feels this should be factored that there is a truck every 3 minutes. Allen Howe if the Davis Pit is the background noise, what would be the background noise is if the Davis pit were not there. Is that an appropriate question? Mr. O'Neal says yes, you have 3,000 vehicles a day on Route 10; the Davis pit is about 110 vehicles of that number. In terms of sound level, even if you removed the sound levels from the Davis Pit, the noise levels would be about the same. Allen Howe clarifies that other vehicles that pass create comparable sounds, so if noise from the Davis Pit were removed the sound levels would still be there. 220 trucks a day, very similar sounds level. Cyndi Phillips if 3,000 vehicles passed by is 2 hours in the middle of the day during working hours or during the commuting hours. Mr. O'Neal explains it was a 24-hour period, which would include both the mid-day traffic and commuting traffic. Cyndi asks if the ambient sounds of traffic going to be reduced. Are the Davis pit hours of operation the highest point of traffic or during the commuting hours? In the day time how is the general traffic level at 10 am, most of traffic on Route 10 is 4 to 7: 30 if on Route 10 traffic at 10:00 a.m., is the pit noise the dominate noise or just typical traffic noise. Mr. O'Neal says to look at page 15, figure five, it illustrates the whole days worth of sound levels of traffic you can see hour by hour the traffic. You still have traffic going through Town. Not comprehensive. Logging trucks, UPS, FedEx, other gravel pit trucks not only from the Davis pit, utility company vehicles, school buses SUV's ect. Steve Pernaw states the highest two hours at the Town line are 7:00 to 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at night. 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. 220 cars an hour next 189, next 165, 169, 170, 203, 207, 235, 251, 285, 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. An average of 200 cars an hour all day long. John Wirkkala asks about page 8, the studies were done in preparation for the 2004 project. This project is a somewhat different location, where the meters were originally set up for resident noise level studies, now the project has moved, if doing the project now would you pick different locations. Mr. O'Neal states that locations one and two, the Town Hall and the Fournier site would be the same. The only site he might change today would be the Bevilacqua; he might have chosen a site closer to Keith Hall's residence. Ambient sound levels a little south,

since no project today these are still reasonable sound levels for today. John Wirkkala states that on page 24, the sound levels in the last column, nearest the property to the East and to the North East. In regard to increased ordinance should not be more than 10-dBA to ambient. There are a couple close figures like nine and ten, which are projecting to other locations as a basis for the chart. Mr. O'Neal states that the software package applies it differently to different parts of the area. To far eastern side, figure seven of the report shows the worst combinations there. John Wirkkala addresses page seventeen this is a 25-ton haul truck, the LEQ was 69-dBA which was taken on April 20, 2004 would you still have used a 25-ton haul truck as a reference. Is this an appropriate sized truck for this project or would a larger truck, such as a 99,000 pound vehicle, change the dBA that is being discussed. Shaun Carroll states that 99,000 trucks not being used. John Wirkkala states that they are included in application. Shaun Carroll states no the application is for the legal limits, one truck last year weighted at 80,000. Mr. O'Neal states that the same size engine is used in both trucks. Peta Brennan asks if the size of the trucks is 26,000 lbs, with a gross weight of 80,000 pounds, would one extra axle haul extra poundage. John Wirkkala asks Mr. O'Neal to look at page 20 and check his field notes to see what the sound levels at 22 Lear Hill is. He feels these sounds like high, the dBA must include the Sugar River, but what other traffic might be involved. He was noticing the chart above the paragraph reads, "22 Lear Hill Road is 1610 feet from the project location." If that figure was used for a basis for the scenarios on page 24, why is the worst case actually the lowest of all sound levels? Mr. O'Neal directs the Boards to table six, which is operational, sound; there is a lot of topography between the noises and the road. Figured into software so the numbers were calculated base on the topography of the area. John Wirkkala states that if 22 Lear Hill Road had a haul road across from the driveway the worst case of 25-dBA would be irrelevant to the ambient sound. The entrance is very close to 22 Lear Hill Road, page 20, the truck traffic noise indicates that at 22 Lear Hill Road, "the sound level at 55-dBA from project" addresses the question. Mr. O'Neal explains that at the end of the access road the trucks will stop and drive down Lear Hill Road to Route 10, which are the modeled project trucks used. A mathematical 55-dBA from truck traffic only was established. The existing was 61-dBA, he will need to verify the distance from the road. Depending what was going on that day, buses, logging trucks, ect., it might not be surprising if the noise level was high that day? Tom Lawton wonders if the field notes would tell the distance, and if the only time you heard noise from the Davis Pit was in lulls in traffic. Mr. O'Neal will look-up the field notes for the study in 2003. Shaun Carroll believes they were up near the top of the hill near the pond. Tom Lawton is looking for a rough estimate of the distance of the monitoring site was from the Fournier property. Bernie Waugh is trying to get clarification of the question; page 20 the sound levels at 22 Lear Hill Road was 55-dBA from the project, lower than 61-dBA ambient. 61-dBA included noise from the Davis Pit. Mr. O'Neal states that the Davis Pit was open, and yes if trucks did pass by, they would be included. Bernie Waugh wants to know if some numbers of background noise included the trucks. Mr. O'Neal explains that 61-dBA was not background noise; it was just the noise from activity that day. It is asked if the truck manifest could be requested from the Town for activity during the day in question. The Boards should know how many trucks there were traveling to and from the pit that day. Allen Howe says that it not the number of trucks, but a question of 69-dBA for truck that was 50 feet away. It seems that additional

information is needed about the distance from the project the meters were set. Mr. O'Neal explains that it is sort of a science, what is in operation was a relatively slow moving truck; the trucks can't go 60 mph in the pit. So 69-dBA is a good number for numbers in the pit. Allen Howe asks if the truck was going faster would it make more noise. Shaun Carroll explains that the trucks can't do more than 15 mph in the pit, and by the time they turn and the bottom of Lear Hill they still won't get much speed. Allen Howe feels that 69-dBA at 50 feet away with a haul truck going by the meters must have been more than 50 feet away. Allen Howe suggests they let Mr. O'Neal review his notes while the Boards speak to another speaker. Jim Carrick feels the worst-case is that the noise will change from residence to residence depending on their location in Town. Worst-case sound levels were looked at. Mr. O'Neal verifies this comment. Jim Carrick asks if besides the local government agency is there a state agency that Newport Sand and Gravel must answer to in regard to sound levels. The response is no, so Jim Carrick clarifies that the regulators are the Town. To people at a higher location the sounds diminish. Mr. O'Neal explains that's why the Fournier property was selected. Jim Carrick states you can hear the noise sounds below that elevation, so the neighbors in-between do not hear the noise. Mr. O'Neal noises diminish, you may still hear the activity, but the question is will it be within the Town's regulation. Jim Carrick asks would there be something in place to regulate the noise. Linda Janicke asks from the audience if the board still has the information from the Grouse property, noise levels were taken there which included the noise from the trucks down shifting. Allen Howe states not here at this time. There must be copies of it in the file. Linda Janicke clarifies that the noise levels are not from trucks in the pit. Cyndi Phillips asks if the charts include the Newport Sand and Gravel trucks and cars coming down Lear Hill and shifting, is everything in the graph. Mr. O'Neal, Yes.

4. **Traffic:** Allen Howe is trying to understand the calculations in figure 3, the 2010 traffic projections, following page 6. Trying to understand the Route 10 running north to south numbers. What does 222 refer too? What the volume refers too. Total traffic at the three peak hours. Jim Carrick asks what are the three peak hours? And are they carried thru all three. Mr. Pernaw, yes. Jim Carrick, figure 7, refers to page nine. Mr. Pernaw explains the day counted was from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., it could be 7:15 to 8:15 a.m., it could be a little different from day to day. 27 was the highest that's why it was used to be conservative, 22 is pretty consistent. The count is never going to be exactly that number every day, traffic is dynamic it will change. Allen Howe states that the 2010 numbers are predicted, how was it predicted? Mr. Pernaw explains it is raw data from January, they know it is not a peak month, so the numbers were increased to accommodate for traffic. 2% increase per year. A review of historical data shows that is high, but the adjustments were to make the numbers high. Specific numbers to figure two. Allen Howe notices there is a 14% season impact then a 2% growth per year. He could not come up with the same number; it looks more like 1.3% not 2%. Mr. Pernaw explains the numbers are not calculated on a calculator across the board, they are done individually and then 2% is added. Allen Howe addresses appendix E, the average traffic data by State of NH traffic data. There are a couple pages in NH 10 at Lempster town line, different from 18 to 19 ranges? Where did number come from Allen Howe e-mailed DOT and they give a number of only 1900? Mr. Pernaw states the info from DOT is published on traffic

forms. He has collected data since 1985, and DOT only does short term counts. Appendix B shows illustrations done in the month of August and created an average daily volume based on that. Mr. Pernaw has data going back forever, the DOT does not keep that far back. Allen contacted a person by the name of David Szczublewski at NHDOT. Why is there such a significant difference other years 18 to 1900 range. Mr. Pernaw explains this is six days of data not 365, and we don't know what was going on that day, could be an active day. 2900 to 1800 is significant, and would indicate a negative growth rate. Allen Howe clarifies because the 1991 counts were so large. Mr. Pernaw states this was closer to the site, through out Lempster 1.3% was the increase, so the average is 1.5%. Allen Howe wants to know if the average was 1.5% why was 2% growth used. Mr. Pernaw states they wanted go to the higher side of the estimate. Allen Howe points out that 1.9% should be OK, because 1991 was an anomaly, if that number was not used in the calculations all the other numbers were really low. What months would be best for data collection. Mr. Pernaw suggests not to get hung up on figures from one location, and he is sure as DOT data collection would be different. Allen Howe went to DOT and downloaded their sheets from July, August, September and October, and they did match. Those were occurring during summer months when the Davis was in operation, likely the counts would include all trucks going thru. Mr. Pernaw again mentions that this seems to be hung on just the one location. Allen Howe says it appears the 2010 projected data would include haul trucks. Is using the 2% really a fair number if it would already include the trucks in the growth rate. Mr. Pernaw feels the traffic in Goshen will increase by approximately 2% regardless of if the truck information is included in the current numbers. Allen Howe made some of his own graphs, and some of them are not close to Mr. Pernaw's report. Mr. Pernaw agrees there is regression using the logs. Allen Howe has the report given to the Planning Board from Newport Sand and Gravel and there was no excavation in 2007. So the truck traffic point is low. Mr. Pernaw states that when doing a study with DOT, 2% is standard default growth rate, in the city 1% is used. Which is why the 2% was used, the average was probably more like 1%, but the intent is not to low-ball numbers. This area has been studied, and even if 3% is used the conclusion would be the same. Allen Howe wants to know what would the difference need to be to make a difference in the conclusion? Mr. Pernaw has concluded it did not make a difference because the numbers are so low you will never need a left turn lane at the bottom of Lear Hill Road. Figure 5 is an illustration. Shaun Carroll asks Mr. Pernaw if he needed to put a number on the growth rate, what would it be? Mr. Pernaw explains there isn't a number, and directs the Boards to page 16, table five to help answer that question. In the morning peak there would need to be over 200 left turns, we have 8: midday-194, we have 16: PM peak-172 left we have 12. Table 6, Page 17 addresses right turns. At AM peak, we have 10, there would need to be over 111 vehicles per hour to require a right turn lane. Peta Brennan states there are 220 permitted round trips coming from the Davis Pit. Mr. Pernaw explains again, that both pits will not be running concurrently and the trips to and from the new excavation site will not create more gravel trucks. Jim Carrick is curious about the previous question about the safety of the bridge over the Sugar River. Was information found about the longevity of the bridge? Will it need to be replaced sooner rather than later due to the truck traffic over it. Mr. Pernaw explains he is not a bridge engineer, but he can research. Jim Carrick wonders if widening of road from the pit to the bottom of Lear Hill, if the suggestion of a turn shelf

out of pit onto Lear Hill is in additional of tree removal for a site line of view. Mr. Pernaw explains this is already done in the report, the vegetation needs to be trimmed to the road, and an approach shelf. Jim Carrick wants to know if it is still necessary for an approach shelf if the vegetation is cut back. Mr. Pernaw says yes, they want the truck when exiting to be on pavement. They want the intersection to be designed so the trucks can turn right down Lear Hill and not cross the center line. Jim Carrick wants to know if that will change due to the water coming down the hill, will any redesign be needed. Mr. Pernaw says yes the intersection would need additional drainage. Shaun Carroll explains the road exiting the pit will be pitched backwards so the water will not be coming down into Lear Hill Road.

5. **Property Assessment/Sales:** Allen Howe has some questions about the new documents submitted from Mr. Rauseo but he is not here. Mr. Britain feels there should be enough information for the ZBA to determine if these is a different application than the previous submitted. John Wirkkala feels it would still be beneficial if both boards were able to hear the questions and responses. He has still found some discrepancies with reports submitted. Mr. Britain states the numbers may appear incorrect, but conclusions are the same. John Wirkkala says the comparative analysis chart of recent comparable sales C3 in Charlestown. The original information submit stated \$76,500, the new states \$80,500 which better fits with the text, however, page 43 of the original that needed correcting, figure that was incorrect of \$76,500 still appears in corrected version. C3 adjusted sale price appears. Turns the info around, when the value is submitted so the selling price of the site is \$80,500 higher than a none gravel property. It appears Mr. Rauseo has left the analysis with the former figure in place and it is now going in the wrong direction, which seems to presents a problem. Mr. Britain states if \$80,500 then the sale is appropriate to gravel than it sold at a high price than if it was not. Some are sold higher and some are lower. John Wirkkala feels the conclusion sale is high, but what is written is the 4% which is going in the wrong direction. 4% less is how it is presented, but now it is showing it sold at 4% greater than the sale price. Allen Howe states that while there appear to be errors in the report, the conclusions would not change. We should move along and if the ZBA needs clarification than can request it.
6. **Sound Levels:** Mr. O'Neal has answers to the follow-up questions that he was asked. The two measurements near the future access are 10 feet from the edge of the road. As far as the L-max values, the Davis Pit was in operation that day. Max sound levels were 75 and 79-dBA which is consistent with the data. The LEQ's were 59 to 61dBA at the two locations along Lear Hill Road. At 61dBA, seven trucks from Davis Pit were included for the 59dBA three Davis pit trucks were included.
7. **Continuation:** Rich Moen made a motion, which was seconded by John Wirkkala, the motion passed, for the Planning Board to adjourn. Chairperson Lawton points out the ZBA has had no public comments yet, so it seems we need another hearing. Bernie Waugh suggested the Board not process a final vote until there is something written-up. Mr. Britain state the ZBA is voting on whether there is a significant change, and there is no point to continue if the ZBA decides there is not a significant change. There needs to be another ZBA meeting hearing. Second Tuesday in May, May 12<sup>th</sup>, NESHA is already on the agenda. A motion was made by



Cyndi Phillips, which was seconded by Bob Johnson to continue the meeting on Thursday April 30th at 6:30 pm, the public meeting to begin at 7:00 p.m. Motion passed. Peta Brennan made a motion, which was seconded by Tom Lawton, motion passed, meeting adjourned at 9:47 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jessica K. Dennis  
Secretary for the Zoning Board of Adjustments