

CONNECTICUT  
Land Conservation Council

Sent via email: [peter.hearn@ct.gov](mailto:peter.hearn@ct.gov)

Date: April 13, 2018

To: CT Council on Environmental Quality

From: Connecticut Land Conservation Council by Amy Blaymore Paterson, its Executive Director

Re: Tilcon Study

On behalf of the Connecticut Land Conservation Council, please accept the following comments regarding the *Environmental Study Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land/Proposed Quarry Expansion and Future Water Storage Reservoir*. ("Tilcon Study") This study was required by the legislature in 2016 as a precondition to the City of New Britain's proposal to allow the Tilcon mining company to undertake total rock excavation in approximately 70 acres of drinking-water reservoir land owned by the city, almost all of which is comprised of highly protected Class I and II watershed lands.

As the state's umbrella organization for the land conservation community, including its 137+/- land trusts, the Connecticut Land Conservation Council (CLCC) advocates for land conservation, stewardship and funding, and works to ensure the long-term strength and viability of the land conservation community in Connecticut. Consistent with our mission, ensuring the highest degree of protection for lands valuable for conservation purposes, including Class I and II watershed lands, is a priority for our organization.

On March 6, 2016, CLCC submitted testimony to the Public Health Committee in opposition to **Senate Bill 300, An Act Concerning New Britain Water Company Land**, citing our concerns that allowing the project would set a dangerous precedent for the protection of drinking water watershed lands. Still relevant today, our testimony is further underscored by the recently released draft of Connecticut's first State Water Plan, which lists as one of its top ten consensus-based policy priorities the protection of Class I and Class II lands.

Pursuant to state water policy and law, Class I and II lands are protected and preserved to safeguard the quality of our state's water resources. Accordingly, transactions involving Class I lands are severely restricted and those involving Class II lands are limited. The law furthermore provides that because these are lands located closest to water supply sources they require a state Department of Public Health permit to transfer or change their use. Such approval traditionally is only granted to small activities related to good management of the public's water resources.

The city of New Britain seeks to lease approximately 70 acres of the city's water department's Class I and II (and a small percentage of Class III) land in Plainville to Tilcon for rock mining. The mining, adjacent to an existing quarry, is expected to continue for up to 40 years. At the end of that term, the project proponents have proposed that the excavated area be transformed into a storage reservoir and that Tilcon would be required to grant minimum acreage areas of open space to the city of New Britain and the towns of Southington and Plainville.



Permitting the project to move forward will serve to undercut the strict protections on Class I and II lands currently accorded under state law, not only posing a risk of adverse impacts to highly valuable water supplies, but also setting a dangerous precedent for further erosion of such laws and for requests for similar activities from others in the future.

We respectfully contend that basing a development decision today on proposed outcomes over 40 years is not prudent planning, particularly when it significantly risks adverse impacts to lands statutorily protected for safeguarding the state's water resources.

In conclusion, in addition to scrutinizing the specific adverse impacts that the proposed project will have on the critical natural resources on the site and in the region, we urge the Council to strongly consider the precedent setting nature of allowing this project to move forward contrary to existing law and policy.

Thank-you for the opportunity to submit these comments. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.



April 11, 2016.

Dear Karl Wagener,

We are deeply concerned about the proposal to expand the Tilcon mine in New Britain, CT.

1. While Connecticut is currently 58% forest cover, little of this land, only 19%, contains large blocks of core forests, forests over 1,250 acres (ctwoodlands.org). The central corridor where the town of New Britain is found has few of these large parcels of forest remaining (ctwoodlands.org). Expansion of the mine will remove 131 acres of forest from a 1000-acre parcel. This will have a disproportionate impact on the remaining 869 acres as tree cutting eliminates habitat for interior forest species and degrades the remaining habitat. With forest fragmentation, edge species such as parasitic Brown-headed Cowbirds and invasive plants can move in and take a toll on intolerant interior forest species. Lenard Engineering does not address the impact that the mine will have on the three *most important* state listed species of Greatest Conservation Need found at the site: the interior forest-dwelling Wood Thrush, Scarlet Tanager and Worm-eating Warbler. Scarlet Tanagers and Worm-eating Warblers are particularly vulnerable to the effects of forest fragmentation, including nest parasitism by Brown-headed Cowbirds, which can also have deleterious effects on Wood Thrush reproduction (Birds of North America Species accounts). Additional forest-interior species of birds, including those among the 14 other species of Greatest Conservation Need found at the site in the breeding season, will experience similar negative impacts from habitat loss and degradation. Breeding in this forest is the only chance for long-distance migrants to replenish their numbers from deaths suffered on migration and over the winter. This forest is also an important migratory stopover point in spring and fall seasons not included in the census period, for birds on their way to and from breeding areas north of Connecticut. According to the Lenard Engineering study, the terrestrial Eastern Box Turtle is also found within the proposed mine expansion's footprint. As individuals in this species have small home ranges, they cannot simply move to another part of their home range if part is destroyed. In their proposal Lenard suggests transplanting individual Box Turtles as mitigation, but does not provide any proof that relocations have been successful in the past. In fact, Eastern Box Turtles have demonstrated some homing tendencies to return to their former locations when moved to unfamiliar areas (Lemkau, 1970). Although Tilcon has proposed a land swap for this land for 291 acres of open land to Plainville, New Britain and Southington, Lenard Engineering has not provided any information on the ecological quality of this parcel(s). As three locations are proposed, one can assume that these are small areas of isolated and fragmented forest (the largest appears to be 132 acres). A continuous parcel of forested land in the center of Connecticut is a precious ecological commodity that should not be destroyed, nor chipped away at.



2. The proposed expansion is anticipated to impact all vernal pools on the site and eliminate breeding habitat for two wetland species, the Jefferson Salamander and the Spotted Turtle. This will be especially deleterious for the Jefferson Salamander, as this species is highly sensitive to habitat destruction (CT DEEP, 2016), and vernal pool #3 with the highest abundance of salamander egg masses found by Lenard will be destroyed by the proposed mine expansion. The environmental study conducted by Lenard Engineering falls short on examining how the loss of these vernal pools might bring these two species of special concern closer to extinction within the state.
3. Removing the forest cover of 131 acres of Class 1 watershed land would lead to erosion into the current reservoirs, degrading water quality, increasing the cost of water treatment, and thwarting the purpose of having protected forested land surrounding reservoirs. Not only would the reservoirs at this site be degraded, but this would set a terrible precedent that would continue to threaten reservoirs and water quality throughout Connecticut.
4. Although Lenard Engineering states that the water that accumulates in the new mine pit (proposed for use as an additional drinking water reservoir) will not be contaminated, we are not assured that a study has been done to determine that the exposed rocks would not be leaching toxic chemicals into the water in the mine pit.

Sincerely,

*Barbara Nicholson and Sylvia Halkin*

Professors, Biology Department  
Central Connecticut State University  
1615 Stanley St.  
New Britain, CT 06050

#### References

Birds of North America Species Accounts for Wood Thrush, Scarlet Tanager, and Worm-eating Warbler. A.F. Poole and F.B. Gill, Editors. Cornell Lab of Ornithology, Ithaca, NY.

Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. Jefferson salamander Factsheet, 2016. <http://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=2723&q=568058>

Hurd, J., J. Parent, D. Clvco, M. Tyrrell, and B. Butler. Forest Fragmentation in Connecticut:

BIOLOGY

CCSU



---

Central Connecticut State University

What Do We Know and Where Are We Headed?

[https://www.ctwoodlands.org/sites/default/files/CFPA%20Research%20Note%206%20Forest%20Frag%20Oct%2006\\_0.pdf](https://www.ctwoodlands.org/sites/default/files/CFPA%20Research%20Note%206%20Forest%20Frag%20Oct%2006_0.pdf)

Lemkau, P. 1970. Movements of the box turtle, *Terrapene c. carolina* (Linnaeus) in unfamiliar territory. *Copeia* 4: 781-783/

**From:** bsetlow@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Barbara Setlow  
<bsetlow@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:53 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water  
Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.


Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Barbara Setlow  
2 Orchard Rd Farmington, CT 06032-2519  
bsetlow@uchc.edu



---

**From:** Douglas Meyer <dwmeyer8215@att.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 3:11 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon/New Britain

Just what does PROTECTED, in protected watershed area mean? Is it just a mild suggestion? Something that can be ignored when profit is involved?  
Clean, potable water is threatened from many sides and must be contentiously husbanded. Gravel is Important but clean water is absolutely vital.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** abcfish@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Donald Danila  
<abcfish@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 2:03 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Please note that as a retired professional fisheries biologist, a member of the Fisheries Advisory Council to CT DEEP, and an appointed member of both the East Lyme Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources and the Niantic River Watershed Committee, I am familiar with watershed protection and environmental and ecological processes. This change in land usage should not be allowed to go forward. Our drinking water supplies are too valuable to be degraded by a project that would benefit the few over the many.

Thanks for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,  
Mr. Donald Danila  
24 Pattagansett Dr East Lyme, CT 06333-1120  
abcfish@atlanticbb.net



2 April 2018

To: Karl Wagener at [Karl.Wagener@ct.gov](mailto:Karl.Wagener@ct.gov)  
CT Council on Environmental Quality  
Hartford, CT

From: Dr. Justine C. Beach  
5 Osgood Ave.  
New Britain, CT 06053

Re: the Environmental Study Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land; Proposed Quarry Expansion and Future Water Storage Reservoir (February 2018), by Lenard Engineering, Inc.

Dear Dr. Wagener:

I would like to comment on the Lenard study cited above. Chapter 7 reports results from the wetland and biological inventory and assessment, Chapter 11 lists the anticipated permitting needs for the project, and Chapter 13 summarizes the project benefits and environmental impacts; I will focus my comments on these chapters of the report and on Lenard's revised proposal #2 (7 Feb 2017) for the study. I firmly believe that the study does not meet key requirements of Public Act 16-61 and the study grievously understates the environmental impacts of the project.

In the revised study proposal, Lenard states, under task #8, that they have reviewed the federal Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) web-site and determined that one endangered species, the Northern Long Eared Bat, was present in the study area. However, no field surveys were conducted for bats, a serious omission that was pointed out as a fundamental flaw of the proposal during the CEQ meeting of 19 Oct 2016 prior to the Feb 2017 finalization of the proposal. In light of the fact that no follow-up field studies were conducted, the concluding statement in Chapter 13 that, "no federally listed endangered species were detected during the study..." is misleading, at best, since no attempt was made to find the one federally listed species that Lenard knew, prior to beginning the study, might be on-site.

Lenard also agreed, in task #8 of revised proposal #2, to initiate a consultation or coordinate with the US Fish & Wildlife Service with regard to the Northern Long Eared Bat. The study report does not mention any consultation with either federal or state authorities with regard to this, or any other bat species. The required consultations involving the species of special concern that were detected are listed on page 28 of Chapter 7 (along with one for tribal resources), but these were erroneously not included in Chapter 11's list of Anticipated Permitting Requirements. Due to this oversight, Lenard understates the obligations of the City of New Britain and Tilcon, and misdirects the attention of citizens and decision makers. As we are all aware, ignorance is not an excuse for breaking the law. Field surveys and consultations will have to be conducted, at additional expense, by the concerned parties and should have been itemized in Chapter 11.

Public Act 16-61 lists items that were required in the study, including "procedures and steps that are available to minimize environmental impacts for such change of use...". The study report does not mention or discuss any procedures or steps that might minimize environmental impacts, especially the loss of forest cover and extirpation of species, and so fails to meet the requirements of the Act.

To paraphrase some of the results of the study as reported in Chapter 7, the proposed mining of Bradley Mountain to create a quarry will affect the birds, amphibians and reptiles that breed on the site through either direct mortality, loss of habitat, or by degradation of habitat critical to their survival; some of these species will be impacted significantly.

Direct loss of vernal breeding pools, loss of 72 acres of wooded habitat, and lowered reproduction resulting from diminished depth and duration of standing water in the remaining vernal pools will result in negative consequences for all of the amphibians and reptiles detected during field surveys. Six amphibian and reptile species found on-site are listed as those of Greatest Conservation Need in the state. The Jefferson Salamander, restricted to trap rock ridges, will be **extirpated** from the site. Spotted Turtles will also be **extirpated** from the area if just a few adults are lost to direct mortality. Not to mention that a large portion of the habitat for Eastern Box Turtles will be lost and much of their habitat degraded. At least four vernal pools will be lost directly through excavation and another three will suffer **significant** hydrologic changes due to loss of their drainage basins. These are substantial outcomes that are not fully stated in the summary of environmental impacts in Chapter 13.

Again, to paraphrase the results reported in Chapter 7, nearly 40% of the breeding bird species detected during surveys in May and June are of Greatest Conservation Need in the state. Over a third of the bird species detected are dependent on forested habitat and they will be affected by the direct loss of 72 acres of habitat— additionally, if forest clearing is done during the breeding season, it will result in the direct mortality of adults and nestlings. Also, the proposed quarry site is interior or “core” forest, which increases the ecological significance of the site and its value to wildlife, particularly to forest-interior species. The secondary impacts of fragmenting the forest block and creating new edge effects extend beyond the actual quarry footprint and well into the 1,000 acres of core forest that this site is part of, causing further mortality due to additional exposure to predators and to nest parasites. Results of the biological surveys describe the permanent negative effects that the project will have upon the environment. These should be detailed in Chapter 13.

Of the 43 breeding birds detected, 25 (58%) are migrants and are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Act. No mention of the need for consultation about these species (in particular, the Wood Thrush, that is also listed on the federal IPaC site as a Bird of Conservation Concern) is made in Chapter 11, and no mention is made about potential mitigation measures since such measures were not discussed at all in the report.

More bird species would likely have been detected in the fall and winter months had surveys been conducted during those periods of time. Bradley Mountain is one of the favorite hawk migration observation points in the fall as hawks and eagles often follow ridges southward during their migration. No surveys were attempted in the winter when it is easier to detect certain species of owls and when eagles often reside in our area near open bodies of water like the reservoir. Additionally, with the methods the biologists were asked to employ, the number of each avian species on-site could not be estimated with any confidence. Because quantifying the number of birds that are on-site during the year is a pre-requisite for consulting with authorities about steps that might be taken to lessen the environmental impact of the project, further surveys are likely to be necessary. This should also have been mentioned in the report, Chapter 11, in the context of permitting requirements. Again, as pointed out before the study began, a fundamental flaw of Lenard’s revised proposal was not including 4-season surveys of birds using standard, repeated-survey methodology.

Despite failing to meet the requirements for a legally comprehensive environmental study, this report does outline some of the negative effects the project will have on the environment. The fact that the report fails to weigh the environmental costs of mining Class I watershed against the benefits of the quarry suggests that those costs might be more than Tilcon wishes to confront. The extensive changes that the quarry would make to the water supply for New Britain, Plainville, Southington and Berlin should be weighed against the benefits of alternative quarry sites that do not have such pronounced environmental costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the study report.

Sincerely,  
Justine C. Beach (PhD, Ecology & Conservation)

**From:** Rivers Alliance of CT <rivers@riversalliance.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 11, 2018 9:22 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Cc:** Rivers Alliance  
**Subject:** Comments on New Britain/ Tilcon study

Environmental Study Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land  
Proposed Quarry Expansion and Future Water Storage Reservoir

Rivers Alliance finds the study inadequate and flawed relative to the requirements of PA 16-61.

We have submitted comments and testimony in the past (including comments on the 2008 version of this project), which I will not repeat at length here. I also accept and refer you to the expert comments and testimony of Paul Zagorsky, Esq., Dr. Richard Judd, and others in New Britain's Protect Our Watersheds group. I have been able to verify their statements in all of the many instances in which I checked for validity.

The Lenard report was supposed to be an independent study but the longstanding financial relationships between and among the consultant, Lenard, the Tilcon company, and the City of New Britain belie any claim to independence. In 2008, the legislature designated DPH to do a similar, *independent* study. (DPH declined for reason of inadequate resources.) No one at that time thought that New Britain could use its own engineering consultant to do an independent. Yet throughout this report, Lenard is the source of the information, often recycled information from the past.

We are supposed to have been given field notes and similar primary data, but it has not been forthcoming. Such information should be made publicly available with the study.

The environmental study of the site does not cover all seasons in adequate detail. It skimps on the much needed inventory of wildlife (animals and plants) on site. Considering that all species on site will be destroyed, a full inventory is necessary to evaluate the extent of the environmental loss.

In the summary of environmental impacts, there is no mention that the already stressed Coppermine Brook will be further impaired by a skimming protocol that will almost continually divert water. Lenard claims that that the brook will meet pending minimum flow standards. But New Britain and/or Bristol pump water out of the stream via adjacent wells. The recent results have included period of little flow and no flow at all. Zero flow doesn't meet any standard. A separate analysis is needed to assess the extent of harm to the brook when it is subject to both skimming and pumping.

The study glosses over the impacts to both supply and the environment during the 40 to 50 years that the watershed is being stripped of all life, soil, and valuable rock. It gives a misleading calculation of the quantity of available clean water that will be lost. It values only the runoff, or discharge, from the headwaters (wetlands) of two streams, which it estimates to be 70,000 gpd. But that is a small fraction of the quantity of water stored in 70 plus acres of watershed. This is clean, high-quality water. Even if one's only concern is supply, this water in the ground (probably in the millions of gallons) is there, is secure (unless this project goes forward), and is available for use in an emergency. Nature's water storage is a gift to the residents of New Britain. The report should quantify the amount of water now in storage.

The report basically acknowledges that there is no evidence that demand will increase significantly. So it relies on assertions that demand *might* increase because we live in an uncertain world.

To sum up. The study is not independent. It is incomplete. And its conclusions are not always supported by the evidence it offers.

Margaret Miner  
Rivers Alliance of Connecticut  
7 West Street, POB 1797  
Litchfield, CT 06759  
Tel: 860-361-9349  
Cell: 203-788-5161  
<http://www.riversalliance.org>

*Serving all the waters of Connecticut*

**Roland C. Baikal**  
**35 Ridgewood Lane**  
**Berlin, CT 06037**

April 11, 2018

Mr. Karl J. Wagener, Executive Director  
Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality  
79 Elm Street  
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: Tilcon/New Britain Public Act 61-61

Dear Mr. Wagener:

I have been following the proposal of Tilcon Inc. to strip mine the land of New Britain. I am opposed to this proposal because of the adverse impact it will have on the Shuttle Meadow Reservoir and the surrounding area.

This action will only benefit Tilcon, Inc. and negatively affect the environment, adjacent homeowners and the Reservoir.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,



Roland C. Baikal  
35 Ridgewood Lane  
Berlin, CT 06037



**Connecticut Fund  
for the Environment**

**Save the Sound®**

**Testimony of Connecticut Fund for the Environment  
For the Council on Environmental Quality**

***PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land***

Submitted by Karen Burnaska  
Water Projects Coordinator  
April 9, 2018

*Connecticut Fund for the Environment is a non-profit environmental organization with thousands of members statewide. The mission of CFE, and its bi-state program Save the Sound, is to protect and improve the land, air, and water of Connecticut and Long Island Sound. We use legal and scientific expertise and bring people together to achieve results that benefit our environment for current and future generations.*

Connecticut Fund for the Environment and its bi-state program Save the Sound (CFE/Save the Sound) writes to strongly oppose the proposal to change the use of New Britain Water Company Land to accommodate significant mining activities.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. For decades it has been recognized that conservation of Class I and II watershed land is necessary to protect the drinking water supply, and the public's health. This proposal, should it move forward – which would decimate, not protect these critical lands - sets a dangerous precedent that puts all of our drinking water in Connecticut at risk. If we are willing to trade off the forested land that purifies our drinking water supply to expand something as substantially incompatible as mining operations, what hope is there for protecting these types of lands from other development or even less invasive activities?

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitats for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water. These are not mild or even modest environmental impacts. The expectation is not that there will be an impact zone that can be restored, or that can recover in the following year. This report instead outlines a complete taking of the existing landscape: removal of swaths of forests, fragmenting critical habitats, and the loss of filtering capabilities for the local reservoir. This type of action, without mitigation would rarely be allowed, much less on these types of protected lands.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

CFE urges you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by Connecticut General Statutes and recommends that this proposal be rejected.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

## Wagener, Karl

---

**From:** john sokolowski <johnesokolowski@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 27, 2018 8:45 PM  
**To:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** New Britain Watershed Environmental Study

Executive Director Wagener,

First, thank you and the Council for being Connecticut's watch dog, especially in this politically and environmentally alarming time. I'm thankful to see the CEQ in action and away from the State budget's chopping block.

As time passes and we learn more, concern regarding the Tilcon expansion project only grows. Thankfully, I expect the Council will read the study studiously, from front to back, and unlike me, not only during their lunch breaks. The horrid environmental impacts are too many for sufficient comment, and almost as alarming is a more subtle detail. This 'independent third party study' is written as a persuasive piece, evidenced in Chapter 2, Executive Summary. Like Sparknotes for Moby Dick, we can assume the summary will be the most read part of the study.

Throughout the Chapter 2, several pleasant figures appear in **bold** print, including: alleged acres of land preserved, donated land, supposed increases in New Britain's water storage capacity, system safe yield increase, and daily water supply increase. However, any figures detrimental to quarry expansion are in regular font or, disturbingly, not mentioned in the summary whatsoever. In regular font we can read the number of acres of Class I and II water company land on New Britain's parcel (2-1, sec 4), estimated time of quarrying, and acres of wetland lost. Missing from Chapter 2 entirely are the following: **Class I and II Watershed destroyed, Vernal Pools destroyed, expected extirpation of state listed species of concern.**

Although the facts are found later in the report, they are absent from the summary. The summary reads as a quarry feasibility report.

Thank you for your time in reading,

~ John Sokolowski



## COMMENTARY TO THE C.E.Q. ON TILCON ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY GRAVE CONCERN WITH LOSS OF HABITAT AND LOSS OF CLASS I AND II WATERSHEDS

---

Save Our Water CT is a non-partisan, state-wide, citizen-led group working to protect Connecticut's waters through increased citizen engagement. Our core belief is that:

***WATER IS A PUBLIC RESOURCE, BELONGING TO THE PEOPLE OF CT AND HELD IN TRUST BY THE STATE TO BE MANAGED SUSTAINABLY FOR THE BENEFIT OF GENERATIONS TO COME.***

Members of Save Our Water CT have previously spoken at Water Planning Council hearings on their opposition to the proposed Tilcon expansion in New Britain, which would allow strip mining on protected watershed lands owned by the New Britain Water Company in return for an undisclosed sum of money and the potential for a new water reservoir 40 years in the future. As the C.E.Q. is undoubtedly aware, the recently released draft of Connecticut's first state water plan lists as one of its top ten consensus-based policy priorities the protection of Class I and Class II lands. Allowing this "swap" to proceed would set a dangerous precedent for future loss of high priority watershed land and would potentially imperil the state's dedication to preserving the highest quality drinking water in the nation.

The environmental study recently completed by Lenard Engineering- as a prerequisite to proceeding with Tilcon's expansion- is also of cause for grave concern. It appears that multiple vernal pools will be lost or impacted, endangering several amphibian and reptile species; that breeding bird species of "Greatest Conservation Need" will lose critical habitat; that a portion of the Metacomet trail will be destroyed; that significant forested lands will be eliminated; and that inadequacies in the study led to failure to investigate certain wildlife during particularly important periods. Essentially, the entire habitat will be lost at the new quarry site and degraded along its adjacent limits. Additionally, the billions of gallons of filtered water currently provided by the 131 acres will be lost during the 40 years of strip mining.

We would hope that the drinking water needs of New Britain can be critically evaluated and if necessary addressed in a far less destructive manner.

Save Our Water CT **strongly opposes** the approval of the Tilcon New Britain expansion and thanks the Council on Environmental Quality for considering our views.

Valerie Rossetti for the Save Our Water CT Steering Committee

[www.saveourwaterct.org](http://www.saveourwaterct.org)

[info@saveourwaterct.org](mailto:info@saveourwaterct.org)



Comments on the Plan for Tilcon's New Quarry

April 12, 2018

To Mr. Peter Hearn  
Council on Environmental Quality

Thank you for considering public input on Tilcon's proposal to develop a new quarry on 131 acres of land owned by New Britain and its Water Department which includes 125 acres of protected watershed land (Class I and Class II).

The report of Davison Environmental in Chapter 7 of the Lenard Engineering report indicates that the area proposed for development is very important and rich habitat for a substantial number of species whose existence is threatened in Connecticut. If the New Britain/Tilcon proposal moves forward, these species would suffer further diminishment.

- Individuals would be killed directly, for example ground-dwelling salamanders and turtles would die when the soil is scraped from the site.
- The numbers of some threatened species would decline further because their breeding is further restricted, like certain amphibian species that would no longer be able to reproduce because the vernal pools in which they must breed are completely destroyed or reduced in quality.
- Interior forest birds breeding in the area are already in trouble in Connecticut. They would lose a significant breeding area because of the forest fragmentation and the loss of core forest habitat that would be caused by the proposed extensive destruction of their existing nesting area.

Additionally, it would be a very bad precedent to allow a totally destructive use of Class I and Class II watershed protection land. These lands are protected by Connecticut state statutes and are a very important reason that we can rely on excellent quality drinking water in this state. All lands so classified need to be kept intact to function for their intended purpose.

Unfortunately, there is a repeated effort in Connecticut to utilize Class I and Class II watershed land for other purposes, thereby reducing their protective value. One such example was the recent Kinder-Morgan pipeline proposal for Connecticut. No land that Tilcon owns in other towns and has offered to trade can afford protection to the existing drinking water sources that would be affected by the proposed quarry. Protecting land and water is protecting people.

Please do not support a precedent-setting change in how Class I and Class II lands are valued and do not support the destruction of very important habitat.

Sincerely,

Sally Rieger  
9 Stodmor Rd.  
Simsbury, CT 06070

Paul E. Zagorsky  
New Britain, CT 06052

April 12, 2018

Council on Environmental Quality  
Attn: Peter Hearn ([peter.hearn@ct.gov](mailto:peter.hearn@ct.gov))

Re: Public Act 16-61 "An Act Concerning An Environmental Study  
On A Change In Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear Mr. Hearn:

The recently released Lenard Engineering study on the environmental impact on a change of use of protected watershed, while limited in scope (what was studied), time (not four seasons), and questionable methodology (no use of standard repeated survey methodology re: birds) is clear. This protected watershed (95% of which is Class I and II) is a significant environmental site, and the impact of the proposed change (strip mining) in use will result in the annihilation of everything that lives, breeds, exists, and grows there, along with a significant and permanent loss of clean, naturally filtered water into Shuttle Meadow Reservoir and Crescent Lake.

Some of my comments have incorporated and/or are taken from those submitted by Dr. Justine Beach, whose credentials, background and detailed analysis are far greater than I am capable of. Copies of documents I have cited and/or referred to are available upon request.

The report notes direct mortality for all species, total habitat loss, and habitat degradation to areas adjacent to the quarry limits. As to the impact to the numerous State listed special concern species – the loss of this terrestrial habitat could result in "extirpation" (the wiping out) of certain populations atop the whole of Bradley Mountain (not just the proposed quarry site). Many of these species are cited in the CEQ's Environmental Quality in Connecticut annual report through 2016 (bats, eastern box turtle, spotted turtle, wood thrush).

Nearly 40% of the breeding bird species detected are of Greatest Conservation Need in CT. Over a third of the species detected are dependent on forested habitat and they will be affected by the direct loss of their habitat. If forest clearing is done during the breeding season (April to August), it will result in the direct mortality of adults and young. No bird surveys were conducted in the fall or winter although Bradley Mountain is one of the favored hawk migration observation points as hawks and eagles often follow ridges southward during their migration. No surveys were attempted during periods when federally listed sensitive species of owls or eagles might be in the area, so no detections could be reported.

At least 4 vernal pools on the site will be lost. Another 3 that will suffer significant hydrologic changes (reduced groundwater flow and increased drying) due to close proximity to the proposed quarry.

The report states no federally listed endangered species were detected during the study. Lenard knew at the outset (see their study proposal and 10/19/16 CEQ minutes) that the Northern long eared bat is in the protected watershed and is a federally threatened species but did not study them. You aren't likely to detect what you aren't looking for.

The study indicates the proposed quarry will destroy a portion of the Metacomet Trail and trail areas adjoining the proposed impact zone would also need to be re-routed due to safety concerns. The quarry would also move significantly closer to Southington's Crescent Lake (a popular passive recreation area) and Shuttle Meadow Reservoir.

There are issues with respect to Lenard's actual and potential safe yield analysis. Their current Safe Yield Analysis refers to and relies on the 2002 Water Supply Plan Lenard did and the statements in that report that the City owned Patton Brook Well was not included as part of the evaluation as at the time it was leased to Southington. That Lease expired on July 1, 2014 and was not renewed. Patton Brook has/had a registered diversion of 1.207 million gallons per day permitted withdrawal capacity. The 10/4/17 minutes of the New Britain Board of Water Commissioner's meeting indicate the Well was tested and produced approximately one million gallons per day for several weeks. Patton Brook should have been included in Lenard's 2018 safe yield analysis.

As to potential safe yield, New Britain owns land in Burlington (33 parcels purchased in 1900) for the development of the Lamson Corner-Burlington Brook Reservoir which, according to Lenard's 2009 New Britain Water Supply Plan says "would increase system safe yield by 2.6 MGD". Lenard also noted in 2009 that NBWD's water supply and distribution system is more than adequate to meet the needs of its current customers and the projected needs of the population in its service area through the 50-year planning period and that the City "will not need to develop any new sources of water through 2050".

The Connecticut Department of Public Health noted (6/4/15 memo) that this future Burlington potential source of public drinking water is designated as a "High Quality Source", and that the NBWC owns nearly all of land tributary to this potential drinking water supply and has been protecting this land for 100 years. This Reservoir was not mentioned in analyzing potential future safe yield.

Lenard's study falls short of the parameters spelled out in Public Act 16-61 "An Act Concerning An Environmental Study On A Change In Use of New Britain Water Company Land". The Water Planning Council told Lenard on 8/12/16 (after the CEQ rescinded their study approval on July 27, 2016) that "I'd like to emphasize that this is an environmental study, not a mining study, not a water supply study. And if there was a scope of study that was too narrow or was inadequate, frankly that would just be a waste of the city's money and a waste of time for everybody involved in this process. Because if we get to the point where we're having to weigh in on whether or not, like, the report is adequate and it's adequate based on, like a limited scope of study, that's a place where you do not want to be". That's where we are at.

This is a significant site in terms of environment, and the impact on the proposed change in use (while totally understated and glossed over by Lenard) is catastrophic – direct loss and mortality to everything.

Sincerely,  
Paul E. Zagorsky  
New Britain

To: Council on Environmental Quality

From: GROTON CONSERVATION ADVOCATES

76 Riverview Ave.

Noank, CT 06340

Email: [groconadv2017@gmail.com](mailto:groconadv2017@gmail.com)

Website: [www.GrotonConservationAdvocates.org](http://www.GrotonConservationAdvocates.org)

April 18, 2018

To the CEQ:

Groton Conservation Advocates (GCA), an environmental advocacy organization formed in fall 2017, focuses on advocacy in Groton but on occasion will engage in State-level issues with the potential to impact the Groton area. At issue is the controversial plan to allow the Tilcon mining company to rock 100 acres of protected reservoir lands (Class I and II lands) owned by New Britain and its Water Department.

We have many concerns:

- Swapping a portion of New Britain's key Class I and II watershed lands for temporary corporate profits or municipal gain sets a dangerous precedent for Groton and all of the state. Watershed lands buffer our water from environmental contaminants and filter it for our aquifers. The recent State Water Plan draft lists protection of watershed land as one of its top ten priorities and re-states Connecticut's dedication to preserving the highest quality drinking water in the nation.
- If a critical reappraisal of New Britain's drinking water needs demonstrates a real need (other than financial or political gain) for more water capacity, a less destructive way can certainly be found.
- The environmental study recently completed by Lenard Engineering as a prerequisite to proceeding with Tilcon's expansion is also of cause for grave concern.
  - a. multiple vernal pools will be lost or impacted, endangering several amphibian and reptile species
  - b. breeding bird species of "Greatest Conservation Need" will lose critical habitat
  - c. a portion of the Metacomet trail will be destroyed
  - d. significant forested lands will be eliminated
  - e. study failed to investigate certain wildlife during particularly important periods.

The entire habitat will be lost at the new quarry site and degraded along its adjacent limits and billions of gallons of filtered water currently provided by the 131 acres will be lost during the 40 years of strip mining.

David Vallee from NOAA/ National Weather Service recently spoke at a conference about climate trends in Connecticut and called the "instant onset of dry and wet the new regime" in our state, one of seven areas in the country experiencing dramatic swings in weather that result in flash flooding and drought. Apparently, the NY/New England area is a "hot spot on the planet."

Please, given this sobering reality, now is certainly not the time not to stall in our collective efforts to protect our natural resources—above all our watershed lands. We must redouble them because at stake here is the long-term welfare of the people of Connecticut whose wellbeing is inextricably connected to the conservation of land, water and wildlife.

Thank you,

Eugenia Villagra and Liz Raisbeck, Co-Chairs, Groton Conservation Advocates

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:08 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Watershed Land Swap

---


**From:** Connie Reder [cmrblue@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 4, 2018 9:58 AM  
**To:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Re: Tilcon Watershed Land Swap

Dear Mr. Wagener:

Please strongly advise a NO vote to Tilcon Mining on Watershed Lands!

Thank you!

Don and Connie Reder  
24 Deepwood Lane  
West Hartford, CT



---

**From:** dolceguar1@aol.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:02 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon expansion

I strongly oppose the expansion of Tilcon into CT's water supply.

Dolores Guarino  
12 Marvel Rd  
New Haven, CT 06515  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** dianablair309@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Diana Blair <dianablair309@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 2:51 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
ms Diana Blair  
30 Bokum Rd Apt 309 Essex, CT 06426-1542  
dianablair309@gmail.com



**From:** detlefjoerss@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Detlef Joerss  
<detlefjoerss@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 2:47 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Mr. Detlef Joerss  
821 Soundview Dr Mamaroneck, NY 10543-4224  
detlefjoerss@msn.com

**From:** freespiritfarm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Debra Bologna  
<freespiritfarm@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 8:53 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.


Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Mrs Debra Bologna  
933 Stone Rd Windsor, CT 06095-1038  
freespiritfarm@sbcglobal.net



---

**From:** deborahe.crosset@gmail.com on behalf of Debbie Crosset <debbie.crosset@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 6:13 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

I am writing to tell you I am opposed to Tilcon extending their quarry into a protected water supply area. It is protected for a reason. If it is dug up and otherwise tampered with and destroyed, it will lead to destruction of habitat for plants and animals living there. That will lead to negative impacts on Connecticut's water supply and access to clean water.

Sincerely,  
Deborah Crosset

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Protect our Watersheds/ Reject the Tilcon proposal

---


**From:** Deanna Deshpande [deannadesh@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 4, 2018 11:12 AM  
**To:** CT Water Planning Council; Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Protect our Watersheds/ Reject the Tilcon proposal

I urge the Water Planning Council to reject the Tilcon proposal which would put our public water at great risk. Municipal gain and corporate profit should not be placed above the health and well-being of citizens.

Thank you for doing the right thing and carefully examining the detrimental effects that the Tilcon proposal would have on our environment.

Sincerely,  
Deanna Deshpande  
West Hartford, CT

cc Karl Wagener



---

**From:** Dawn Henry <dawn@henrystrategy.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 8:16 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Hi Peter. I just wanted to let you know that I'm very concerned about the Tilcon mining project and its impact on our water supply and the surrounding areas. Please can you oppose this project, thank you.

-Dawn

***Dawn Henry, Principal***  
**HENRY STRATEGY PARTNERS, LLC**  
205 Bayberry Lane - Westport, CT 06880  
Office (203) 349-2642 - Cell (203) 293-5753  
[dawn@henrystrategy.com](mailto:dawn@henrystrategy.com)

**From:** David Michel <davidmichel74@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:37 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter; CT Water Planning Council; Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** TILCON MINING / Connecticut

To whom this may be of concern, and to Mr Peter Hearn

I am not only a constituent in CT, but I am also running for state legislation. Had I been a legislator at the present time, I would make sure anyone working in departments supposed to look out for us the constituents, would do their job properly and not be subject to back room deals or special interests.

Should I become a legislator, I will fight this kind of activity in order to protect our land, water, wildlife, and health. As a matter of fact there should be no fight, when it comes to common sense.

The impacts of strip mining rock from the property are clear and obvious- total habitat loss with mortality of all species, and habitat degradation to adjacent areas of the proposed quarry limits.

As Tilcon wants to expand its New Britain quarry into protected water supply land, this would set a terrible precedent, chipping away at established protections for **everyone's** water supply in CT.

Kindly take this email into consideration, I am blind copying many people who are active in our state for Social Justice and Common Sense.

## **David Michel**

***It's Time To Clean Things Up***

**(+1-914-843-7545**


<https://secure.anedot.com/davidmichel/donate>

**"David Michel 2018" for CT State Rep D-146**

**Paid for by David Michel 2018 supporters, Jason Kyek, Treasurer, Approved by David Michel**

**Think Green before printing! Pensez a Dame Nature avant d'imprimer ! ♻️**

This electronic message contains information that may be legally confidential and/or privileged. The information is intended solely for the individual or entity named above and access by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic message in error, please reply immediately to the sender that you have received the message in error, and delete it.



---


**From:** David Leighton <davidsleighton@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 9:29 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Hello Mr. Hearn,

I would like to submit my public comment to CEQ in opposition to the expansion of the Tilcon quarry in New Britain. I am concerned about habitat loss, degradation of adjacent landscapes, and loss of natural wilderness space.

Thank you,

David Leighton  
Guilford, CT



---

**From:** cannell.dm@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of David Cannell  
<cannell.dm@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 07, 2018 10:18 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Mr. David Cannell  
JOHNSON Rd Columbia, CT 06237  
cannell.dm@gmail.com



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Watershed destruction.

---

**From:** David Busha [davidbusha1@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 4, 2018 10:28 AM  
**To:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Watershed destruction.

Hi. Please protect watershed areas. Reject the Tilcon proposal. Thank you. David L. Busha, Canton, Ct.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Protect Our Watersheds and Reject the Tilcon Proposal

---

From: David Macbride [macbrided@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 11:07 AM  
To: CT Water Planning Council  
Cc: Wagener, Karl; info@saveourwaterct.org  
Subject: Protect Our Watersheds and Reject the Tilcon Proposal

Water Planning Council and Director of the Council on Environmental Quality:

Tilcon is seeking to expand its gravel mining to 131 acres of land which includes Class I and Class II watersheds. In exchange, they'll give \$\$ to New Britain, acreage elsewhere, and a potential new reservoir- in 40 years. Now the environmental study is out: major habitat destruction and significant species loss in the contested area. There will be more blasting, dust, and the loss of billions of gallons of filtered water from the mined area.

The recent State Water Plan draft lists protection of watershed land as one of its top ten priorities and re-states CT's dedication to preserving the highest quality drinking water in the nation.

Protect Our Watersheds and Reject the Tilcon Proposal!

David Macbride  
Professor of Composition and Music Theory  
Hartt School, University of Hartford  
W. Hartford, CT 06117  
[www.davidmacbride.com](http://www.davidmacbride.com)<<http://www.davidmacbride.com>>

**From:** cyril.may@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cyril May  
<cyril.may@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:43 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

I would like to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.


At this time in CT's history the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands does not benefit CT residents as a whole and may yield long term economic and environmental problems for the sake of short term and limited economic gain.

Our priority should be to protect habitat and drinking water by preserving what open space and wildlands remain in our small state.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Mr. Cyril May  
128 Nicoll St New Haven, CT 06511-2622  
cyril.may@aya.yale.edu

  
**From:** cmatthews@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Claire Matthews  
<cmatthews@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:38 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water  
Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Ms Claire Matthews  
3 S Cove Ln Essex, CT 06426-1422  
cmatthews@comcast.net

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 5:59 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Reject the Tilcon Proposal

---

**From:** Cindy Moeckel [clmoeckel@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 4, 2018 4:42 PM  
**To:** CT Water Planning Council  
**Cc:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Reject the Tilcon Proposal

Water, and access to potable water is a basic human right. The need for water is immediate ... always.

Do not swap this precious, irreplaceable resource for the promise of a new reservoir ... some place, some time, decades from now.

Such short-sighted, ill-considered, disastrous deals must be stopped.

For once, for all, and for good.

Cindy Moeckel  
79 Amidon Rd.  
Ashford, CT 06278

**From:** christined.hare@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Christine Njuki  
<christined.hare@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:38 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.


Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Ms. Christine Njuki  
15 Crest Rd Mansfield Center, CT 06250-1206  
christined.hare@gmail.com


  
**From:** christina catalano <christina.catalano1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 2:59 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon/Expansion of the New Britain Quarry

Mr Hearn,

I am writing you to express my concern and opposition to letting Tilcon expand its New Britain quarry into protected water supply land. This would set a terrible precedent, chipping away at established protections for **everyone's** water supply in CT!

Please protect the citizens of CT, our natural resources and our water supply by preventing this senseless violation of our treasured natural resources.

Thank you,  
Christina Catalano  
23 Moshier Street  
Greenwich, CT 06831



---


**From:** Cecil Phillips-Ritchey <cecil@cprdesignco.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 5:36 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Don't chip away at our state's protected water supply. Say "no" to Tilcon! Leave New Britain's quarry land alone.

Leave our treasured natural resources alone.

Cecil Phillips-Ritchey  
CPRdesignco  
Marketing and Design for Nonprofits  
203-605-3068 cell  
[cecil@cprdesignco.com](mailto:cecil@cprdesignco.com) // [www.cprdesignco.com](http://www.cprdesignco.com)





---

**From:** cealwhalen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Cecelia Whalen  
<cealwhalen@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 7:00 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Ms. Cecelia Whalen  
252 Old Canterbury Tpke Lot 18 Norwich, CT 06360-1363  
cealwhalen@gmail.com

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Protect our watershed

---

**From:** Carolyn Gabel-Brett [cgfeminist@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 4, 2018 11:44 AM  
**To:** CT Water Planning Council  
**Cc:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Protect our watershed

I am writing to urge you to reject the Tilcon proposal. It is critical that we protect our watershed and do not allow corporate or municipal gain in exchange for our important resource. The State Water Plan (draft) acknowledges that protecting our drinking water is one of Connecticut's top priorities as it should be.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn Gabel-Brett  
11 Cobbs Rd.  
West Hartford  
CT. 06107

Sent from my iPhone

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:03 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: (Quarry)

---

From: Carole Osborn [longing4desertskies@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 1:31 PM  
To: CT Water Planning Council; Wagener, Karl  
Subject:

Hello,

As a concerned CT citizen, I am writing to you today to voice my opposition to allowing Tilcon to expand its gravel mining to 131 acres of land which includes Class I and Class II watersheds.

Class I and II watersheds buffer our water from environmental contaminants and filter it for our aquifers. The recent environmental study shows major habitat destruction and significant species loss in the contested area if permission is granted to Tillson. There will be more blasting, dust, and the loss of billions of gallons of filtered water from the mined area. If allowed, this move would be devastating to our water supply and environment.

The recent State Water Plan draft lists protection of watershed land as one of its top ten priorities and re-states CT's dedication to preserving the highest quality drinking water in the nation. To that end, I implore you to carefully read the environmental study, while keeping the safety and health of your citizens in mind.

If a critical appraisal of New Britain's drinking water needs demonstrates a real need for more water capacity, let's solve it in a less destructive and healthier way!

Sincerely,

Carole Osborn

11 Brook Street

Winsted, CT

06098

[REDACTED]

---


**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 08, 2018 6:30 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: tilcon proposal

---

From: Carolann Purcell [01cnan@gmail.com]  
Sent: Saturday, April 7, 2018 10:23 PM  
To: Wagener, Karl  
Subject: tilcon proposal

Please consider, but vote AGAINST their proosal.. It will be BAD for our future (which they won't be around to suffer).  
Carolann Purcell

--  
CBP




---

**From:** Carmela Garofalo <carmelagarofalo26@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 9:45 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon study

I write to voice my opposition to Tilcon expansion into New Britain quarry. This would set a dangerous precedent and would affect everyone's water supply.

Thank you.  
Carmela Garofalo  
10 Westbrook Rd.  
Bloomfield, CT 06002



---

**From:** Bruce <bletcherdmd@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 7:52 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Our water resources are precious as are the adjacent watershed lands so I oppose (strip) mining those watershed acres. I think Tilcon should find another site. Let this 100 acres stay natural and protected to best protect our New Britain reservoir/water natural resources assets. Thank you

Dr Bruce T Fletcher DMD  
62 Dover Rd  
New Britain, CT 06052-1916

Bruce T Fletcher  
(860) 212-0684

**From:** Garrett Boisvert <gadboisvert@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 12:12 PM  
**To:** CT Water Planning Council; Wagener, Karl; Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Regarding Tilcon Quarry Expansion

Karl, Peter, and the Water Planning Council,

I grew up in Central Connecticut and spent many days of my youth hiking up and down the Metacomet trails and around Crescent Lake. It's my understanding that the state is preparing to designate that land for systematic destruction for the profit of Tilcon.

Now, I have nothing against Tilcon. I was in a car accident on I-84 and the dispatchers and drivers helped save my life by preventing other cars from hitting me and contacting 911 on my behalf. I owe them a great deal. Even so, Tilcon is a temporary institution. One day it will go out of business, but the marks they are leaving on the landscape are permanent.

I'm also concerned that the environmental and species assessments have been mere formalities. For example they have ignored the presence of the long eared bat, which is a federally protected species.

Too much land in Southington and surrounding towns have been given up to development projects in the last decade. Please don't add one of the last pockets of natural retreat be irrevocably pillaged. I would like to share these places and experiences with my kids one day, and not merely give them the intangible idea that where that hole is, a mountain used to be.

With concern for our shared environment,  
Garrett Boisvert

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 05, 2018 6:04 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Til con land swap

---

From: Bonnie [mcnairb@comcast.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 12:06 PM  
To: Wagener, Karl  
Subject: Til con land swap

Mr. Wagner,

Giving up natural watersheds is akin to filling in wetlands for human development. Not a good idea.

Mother Nature doesn't judge us but she will definitely react to whatever we do to this world - as in behavior has consequences.


I suggest you give very careful thought to letting one company control the future of something that once changed (damaged?) cannot be reversed.

I fear for the future of such an environmental impact, not just on New Britain but also on the entire area. Safe drinking water? That should be your top priority.

Sincerely,  
Bonnie Mc Nair  
Berlin

Sent from my iPhone





---

**From:** billchapinpt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Bill Chapin  
<billchapinpt@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:41 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Mr Bill Chapin  
92 Limewood Ave Branford, CT 06405-5340  
billchapinpt@icloud.com

**From:** Bendicoot@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Ben Martin  
<Bendicoot@everyactioncustom.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2018 12:41 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

Dear CEQ Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the New Britain/Tilcon environmental study.

I strongly oppose the Tilcon mining proposal to destroy over 100 acres of drinking watershed lands.

Under state law, the land proposed for the quarry operation is intended to be preserved in perpetuity. Class I and II watershed lands need to be protected and this proposal sets a dangerous precedent that puts all our drinking water in Connecticut at risk.

The environmental study states the expansion of the quarry will destroy critical watershed lands, eradicate habitat for reptiles and amphibians, drastically affect migrating and resident birds, and result in the loss of billions of gallons of clean naturally filtered water.

The precedent-setting destruction of Class I and II watershed lands, extensive damage to the environment, and lack of evidence substantiating the need for future reservoir capacity in the region are just a few of the many reasons this mining proposal should not go forward.

I urge you to uphold the strong protections of Class I and II watershed land as required by the Connecticut General Statutes.

Sincerely,  
Mr. Ben Martin  
329 Ward St Wallingford, CT 06492-4535  
Bendicoot@yahoo.com