

**Hearner**

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:58 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon and the protection of our water supply

**From:** Suzanne Piazza [mailto:amendment28now@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:30 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon and the protection of our water supply

Dear Mr. Hearn,  
Please do not allow Tilcon 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! I am a citizen of Connecticut and I think protection of our water supply should be a top priority.  
Suzanne Piazza  
Bethlehem, CT

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:59 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Oppose Tilcon Expansion

-----Original Message-----

**From:** mjhmeyer [mailto:mjhmeyer@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 11:41 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>; CT Water Planning Council <WPC@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Oppose Tilcon Expansion

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!

I am writing to oppose this senseless violation of our treasured natural resources.

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.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:58 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon study

**From:** info@plymouthlandtrust.org [mailto:info@plymouthlandtrust.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 9:44 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon study

I am opposed to the proposal to quarry in Class 1 and 2 watershed lands. The purpose of these lands is to protect drinking water, not mining. We can not take our drinking water for granted. Many other places have had serious water quality issues, such as in West Virginia (mining pollution) and Milwaukee (agricultural waste), because they did not safeguard their drinking water and protect their watersheds.  
Jerry Milne

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:56 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Mining Plan

**From:** Mark Melechinsky [mailto:mmelechinsky@snet.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 5:47 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Tilcon Mining Plan

Dear Mr. Hearn.

I'll be brief. I am adamantly opposed to any plan that would allow Tilcon-Tomasso to mine trap rock in the protected watershed. I have hiked the area in question extensively over the past four years and can attest first hand to its beauty and the abundance of wildlife and cannot think of one good (i.e. - common sense) reason to allow a company to conduct mining operations under any conditions upon its lands. For the sake of all leave things as they are. Thank you.

Mark Melechinsky  
69 Black Rock Avenue  
New Britain, Ct 06052

860-225-4210

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon

**From:** Barbara Sadowski [mailto:bsadowski9595@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:24 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon

Dear Mr Hearn,

Strip mining is equal to the total destruction of the immediate area and the poisoning of miles of the adjacent environment. Please do not approve Tilcon's proposal.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Sadowski

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** Karen Schnitzer [mailto:kschnitzer1@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:18 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Dear Mr. Hearn,

I just want you to know that I am adamantly opposed to allowing Tilcon to expand its New Britain quarry into protected water supply land. The land is protected to keep this kind of thing from happening.

I find it appalling that this is even being considered.

Allowing the strip mining of rock from the property would lead to total habitat loss with mortality of all species, and habitat degradation to adjacent areas of the proposed quarry limits.

Please do not allow it.

Thank you.

Karen Schnitzer  
Cheshire, CT  
203250-3351

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bruce [mailto:bfletcherdmd@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 7:52 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**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:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:56 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** deborahe.crosset@gmail.com [mailto:deborahe.crosset@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Debbie Crosset  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 6:13 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**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



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:56 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]ir  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** j.bass [mailto:jb.dron@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 5:47 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>; CT Water Planning Council <WPC@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

I am concerned about clean water and protecting public water supply. Natural resources in Connecticut should be treasured and protected from profit margins!

I oppose allowing Tilcon to expand the New Britan Quarry and mine in a protected reservoir.

Please, stop this!

"

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 way.

Thank you for listening, please protect the public good, which depends on preserving watershed areas.

Jenny Bass  
Windham Connecticut

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 10:56 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** Cecil Phillips-Ritchey [mailto:[cecil@cprdesignco.com](mailto:cecil@cprdesignco.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 12, 2018 5:36 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <[Peter.Hearn@ct.gov](mailto:Peter.Hearn@ct.gov)>  
**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:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:01 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** Janina Wolfin [mailto:janinawoelfin@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:37 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

I want to protest strongly against the plan to expand the New Britain quarry into a protected water supply area. The rock stripping will kill all living creatures in the habitat, and this will set a very bad precedent for the treatment of CT's sensitive water supplies. I live next to a wetland and have a private well, and I've seen water quality in my well deteriorate over the 24 years I've lived here. There was also a scare of possible uranium contamination in local wells not long ago. Please do not go ahead with this plan.

Thank you for reading this, Yours sincerely, Yann (Jan) van Heurck

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:01 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

-----Original Message-----

**From:** John Ostaszewski [mailto:ostaszej@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:44 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

I am writing in opposition to the potential expansion of the Tilcon's New Britain quarry into our state's watershed. Clean water is a right to be protected for all of the residents of CT. Please vote for the people of CT and not for big business.

Thank you.

rgds,  
John Ostaszewski  
50 Blanket Meadow Rd  
Monroe, CT 06468

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:06 AM  
**To:** ~~Reini Knorr~~  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** Reini Knorr [mailto:rknorr@optonline.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 12:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Dear Peter,

Please note my strong opposition to Tilcon's proposed plan to expand its New Britain quarry into protected water supply land. 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. This proposal contradicts all tenets of sound watershed practices in that - if approved - the consequences will include increased flooding and soil erosion from fast run-off, reduction of ground water to maintain ecological productivity and loss of natural habitats for wildlife. I oppose this senseless violation of our treasured natural resources.

Sincerely,

Reini Knorr  
83 Alberta Street  
Fairfield, CT 06825  
203/331-0922

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:07 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Val Guarino [mailto:bths62@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 1:49 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

I urge you not to allow an exception to mining on protected watershed. This would set a dangerous precedent endangering other watershed areas. Our water sources must be protected at all costs over the profiting by commercial operations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Val Guarino  
Southington

Sent from my iPhone

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:07 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on Tilcon expansion

**From:** katjajen@gmail.com [mailto:katjajen@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Jennifer Kleindienst  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 3:24 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>; CT Water Planning Council <WPC@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Tilcon expansion

Dear CEQ and CT Water Planning Council,

Tilcon should not be permitted 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!

I oppose this violation of our treasured natural resources. 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.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Jennifer Kleindienst  
241 West St.  
Middletown, CT 06457

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:01 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon

**From:** Patricia Johnson [mailto:pj15000610@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:51 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon

DO NOT ALLOW TILCON TO EXPAND IN NEW BRITAIN!



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:11 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED] air  
**Subject:** FW: New Britain/Tilcon Watershed Plan

**From:** Adam D. Ligas [mailto:aligas@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 14, 2018 1:49 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** New Britain/Tilcon Watershed Plan

Hello Peter,

I have been following this issue and wanted to take a few moments to comment.

A single report produced by the requesting party should not be used as the main data point in considering any change like this. Independent verification is a must-have when considering changes to something that impacts every resident, and residents in surrounding towns.

The report makes assertions on various projections - water usage, water storage, future needs, impact on flooding skimming other water sources, etc. However, without another study for verification, we do not know how accurate these data points are. In places the report seems to almost contradict itself. It will rely on data from the mid-1900s to make a point about something being in a good position, and then later reference the future projections look more dim in light of the changing environment. If the future is going to be worse, we can't use our past as an accurate predictor. These results may simply be the best this report can do - perhaps it was the only data available to use - but it should be a clear signal that more data is required to make an informed decision.

Some of the results in the report rely on man-made interventions (i.e. pump from here to there). Have those changes been made in other Connecticut communities? How did they work out? We need to talk to others who have walked down this path and find out their experiences. We should also try to talk to others that have rejected this path, why they did so, and what the experience from their decision has been.

Our drinking water is our most precious resource. We are blessed to have a very good source and system in place here. Water can have a massive impact on the both residents and businesses in a community. Some communities have had nature turn against them (drought) others have made mistakes by their own hands (Flint). We are very lucky that neither have happened here.

We have established these rules to protect ourselves and did so with scientific data, deep thought, and reservation. We are now being asked to remove these protections. The bar to do so should be incredibly high and it should only be for something of the utmost importance. The timeline on this entire project is in the decades, and many of us may not even be here to deal with the outcome of this decision. The result of this will fall squarely on our children and their children. We need to be good stewards of their future and the future of our communities.

The cost of getting this wrong is potentially catastrophic.

Thank you for your time,

- Adam

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:10 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon study - water conservation

**From:** bruce2sail [mailto:bruce2sail@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 14, 2018 9:30 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon study - water conservation

Dear Mr Hearn,  
Kindly provide legislation and enforce current rules to prevent Tilcon from mining trap rock from drinking water lands serving New Britain and surrounding areas.

Removal of forests, topsoil and drainage areas from the land, as well as disturbance of bed rock and the creation of significant dust from ongoing operations will all negatively affect drinking water quality and public health. That would be inviting disaster.

Water supplies in CT are under too much pressure from development, mining, pollution and other factors, so we cannot afford to allow any ingress into class B or class A buffer lands.

These areas were set up early in the 20th century by visionaries who created a fantastic water supply and land use plan in our tiny state to protect public health, so we cannot take any further liberties with the plan by ignoring state laws by looking the other way to allow improper development.

Please stop Tilcon from moving ahead with this terrible plan. There are plenty of other areas they can mine that will have a much lower impact on CT's water resources.

Thank you

Sincerely

Bruce Ross  
(203) 224-8842  
Skype: bruce.c.ross  
Stratford CT  
Sent from my mobile.

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:09 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Mining Expansion, New Britain, Plainville, Southington

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Katherine Wadsworth. [mailto:katdelano@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:49 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Mining Expansion, New Britain, Plainville, Southington

I hope you are receiving much correspondence from people greatly concerned about the prospect of the over 100 acre proposal to mine trap rock in strip mine fashion within the watershed of their water source. I think of future outcome of this dangerous endeavor as a terrible mistake we won't know the ramifications of until many decades have gone by, until Tilcon and its current hierarchy have made their company's millions & millions and have moved on, until it is finally realized what kind of damage has been done to people living in these 3 towns and then their further suffering because their water supply is no longer fit to drink, and shut down. There is good reason why these protective boundaries to public water supply systems & landscapes were implemented in the first place in the State of Connecticut and elsewhere... and those reasons have not changed. Hydrology in trap rock has not changed. Studies, contracted by the 2 most interested parties, showing no negative impact but some short term financial benefit to the economically challenged City of New Britain cannot be considered unbiased. Clean air and clean water are essential to a healthy life, we all know that. These resources should not be put at risk, ever

I certainly hope & pray that the voices of environmental groups and individual advocates speaking to keep protections in place, not only in New Britain but through-out our State, will be heard and this kind of threat will be erased from our futures.

Thank you for your continued work to that end.

Katherine Wadsworth  
Farmington, CT

Sent from my iPad

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:09 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: PA 16-61 – AAC An Environmental Study on a Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land

-----Original Message-----

**From:** ksherman@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:ksherman@everyactioncustom.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:29 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**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 Kimberly Sherman  
TALCOTT FOREST Rd Farmington, CT 06032  
ksherman@ymail.com

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:25 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon impacts

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Wagener, Karl  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 5:36 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon impacts

---

**From:** Paula Coughlin [paulacoughlin@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 4:05 PM  
**To:** Wagener, Karl  
**Subject:** Tilcon impacts

Dear Mr. Wagener,

We are Connecticut residents who are deeply concerned about the long term health of our state water supply. Water is a public trust resource, an irreplaceable requirement for all humans and wildlife.

We're sure you are aware of the recent environmental study which stated that the expansion of the Tilcon gravel mining operation would cause major habitat destruction and significant species loss in Class I and Class II watersheds. There will be more blasting, dust, and the loss of billions of gallons of filtered water from the mined area.

This would set a precedent for swapping our key watershed lands for corporate profits or municipal gain. Class I and II watersheds 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 CT's dedication to preserving the highest quality drinking water in the nation.

Negative impact on Class I and II water does not represent a best practice for addressing New Britain's drinking water needs.

Sincerely,  
Paula and Daniel Coughlin  
Woodstock Valley, CT

**From:** [REDACTED] <welchdonna@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 7:18 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Tilcon vs life

My husband and I wish to express our disbelief in anyone of solid mind believing that the tilcon expansion is a good deal for everyone. A reservoir to replace wetlands in 40-50 years? In the meantime where is what's left of the wildlife going to live? The threatened plants or plants of special concern, are they going to migrate along with the wildlife very slowly—in maybe 40 years—to their new home? Let's be real. It's all about money and more money for a company based in Ireland. We don't want to drink water that will have pollutants in it that may be released while tilcon destroys a beautiful natural area. And those residents who live near to the area of proposed expansion? Does an owner or primary stock holder of tilcon live there? Probably not. Let's stop this totally wrong move.

Sent from my iPhone

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:10 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon Study

**From:** ann Trapasso [mailto:anntrapasso@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 14, 2018 6:06 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study

Dear Peter Hearn,

I am writing to protest Tilcon's move to expand its New Britain quarry into what is now protected water supply land. The damage to the environment would, of course, be irreparable. I implore you to do all that you can to protect the water supply and its surrounding land. The citizens of Connecticut (or any part of the nation) deserve no less. Act before it is too late.

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter,  
Ann Trapasso  
10 Cherry Hill Road  
Branford, CT 06405

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:24 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Lenard Engineering environmental analysis

**From:** Joan Packer [mailto:jpacker33@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 4:00 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Lenard Engineering environmental analysis

I think the report is useful in that it points out (Davison Environmental) that the site is "part of a larger ecological unit...lies within a large block of contiguous and unfragmented forest approximately 1,000 acres in size." Their detail on trees, plants and wildlife may be incomplete, but I think it would be unfortunate to destroy this 72 acre landscape for a quarry, in one of the most densely populated states in the US.

I think the report indicates (at least to me) that losing the tree cover, other vegetation and wetlands could affect groundwater recharge, rainfall and possibly other aspects of our climate.

Thank you.

Joan Packer  
Farmington



**From:** Katherine Wadsworth. <katdelano@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 10:49 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Mining Expansion, New Britain, Plainville, Southington

I hope you are receiving much correspondence from people greatly concerned about the prospect of the over 100 acre proposal to mine trap rock in strip mine fashion within the watershed of their water source. I think of future outcome of this dangerous endeavor as a terrible mistake we won't know the ramifications of until many decades have gone by, until Tilcon and its current hierarchy have made their company's millions & millions and have moved on, until it is finally realized what kind of damage has been done to people living in these 3 towns and then their further suffering because their water supply is no longer fit to drink, and shut down. There is good reason why these protective boundaries to public water supply systems & landscapes were implemented in the first place in the State of Connecticut and elsewhere... and those reasons have not changed. Hydrology in trap rock has not changed. Studies, contracted by the 2 most interested parties, showing no negative impact but some short term financial benefit to the economically challenged City of New Britain cannot be considered unbiased. Clean air and clean water are essential to a healthy life, we all know that. These resources should not be put at risk, ever

I certainly hope & pray that the voices of environmental groups and individual advocates speaking to keep protections in place, not only in New Britain but through-out our State, will be heard and this kind of threat will be erased from our futures.

Thank you for your continued work to that end.

Katherine Wadsworth  
Farmington, CT

Sent from my iPad

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

**From:** Tim Mack [mailto:tmack125@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 4:45 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** roberta mack <heyroberta@hotmail.com>  
**Date:** April 15, 2018 at 1:29:38 PM EDT  
**To:** "karl.wagener@ct.gov" <karl.wagener@ct.gov>  
**Cc:** "tmack125@comcast.net" <tmack125@comcast.net>  
**Subject:** Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Dear Director Wagener,

We are writing to you on behalf of our concern about the declining Eastern Box Turtle populations in Connecticut. We have become aware of an application by Tilcon to expand their traprock quarrying operation in New Britain and the subsequent Lenard Engineering, Inc. environmental report. Regarding Chapter 7, prepared by Davison Environmental, Box Turtles are considered a significant biological resource in this area. With 10 records submitted to the CT DEEP Natural Diversity database, the Bradley Mountain box turtle population is of significant size. The approval of this application would threaten this dense population of box turtles located on a 100 acre habitat in western New Britain, within the negative impact area from quarry expansion.

Although Chapter 7 contains solid turtle data, it lacks an analysis of the effects on the larger surrounding population and no environmental mitigation follow up plans if the 72 acres are quarried and converted to a reservoir. The after effects of quarrying would result in the destruction of CT DEEP traprock ridge Critical Habitats on this site: open summit habitat, cliff habitat, dry forest habitat and talus habitat, and certainly contaminate and diminish the surrounding wetland habitats and watershed downslope. These preservation of the environmental quality of these habitats are critical to the survival of the Eastern Box Turtle species as well as other plant and animal wild life, like Long Eared Bats, Bald Eagles and Jefferson Salamanders

In Hamden, where we live, there was a similar situation that threatened the box turtle population in the nearby forest. The box turtles that were once plentiful in this area, have become more sparse over the last several decades because of residential development. At 64 Rocky Top

**From:** Jack Bliss <jackblissdesigns@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 12:12 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter

Dear Mr. Hearn,

Please do not allow Tilcon to strip mine a watershed area, they are protected for a reason. Obviously you know that, being half of the Environmental Quality Council, but I'm sure you'll need backup from CT citizens to convince Tilcon.

I wish you the best of luck protecting this watershed and others from those who do not care about our ecosystem (or anything other than their own profits).

Jack Bliss  
Concerned Citizen

**From:** Rebecca Karabin-Ahern <rebeccakarabin@acmemonaco.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 17, 2018 10:14 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Acme Monaco

Good morning Mr. Hearn,

I was advised by Paul Zagorsky and Nancy Najarian that I should reach out to you regarding what the public act allowing Tilcon to expand onto watershed property would mean to Acme Monaco.

We are a local manufacturer of catheter guidewires, orthodontic wires, springs and stampings here in New Britain. We have been here 70 years and currently employ 140 people. Our property borders Tilcon with the Tennessee gas line running in between.

When Tilcon blasts they are required to call us, as well as folks on the Plainville side. At Acme we need to shut off all sensitive equipment before they blast because the blast can knock certain equipment out of calibration. If machinery is knocked out of calibration then we have to pay to fly someone in from the Midwest to fix our equipment. As you can imagine being a manufacturer we cannot afford any down time.

When Tilcon blasts is rattles this building to an extent that can be hard to fathom. One blast last year caused a 4 inch three ring binder to fall from a shelf and narrowly miss our sales managers head. We have documented photos of dust clouds after a blast from our security cameras thus having us to change our Hepa filters more often that the normal routine maintenance.

At Acme we have 103 documented cracks in our building. We also had a beautiful retaining wall collapse. The mason said it was from the blasting. When I approached Tilcon to split the bill with Acme they refused. The invoice would have only cost them \$1,500. You see Mr. Hearn they have not been good neighbors. They do not care about the folks that surround them.

On View Street in Plainville (which is well water) there are over 16 cases of cancer. It makes you wonder what is in the blasting material? I believe Paul Zagorsky already sent you the material safety data sheet on the blasting powder.

If you ever would like to feel a blast please feel free to come sit in my office or conference room. I think you will be surprised at what we feel.

You will see my contact information below. Please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Best regards,

**Rebecca Karabin-Ahern**  
Co-President



**ACME MONACO CORPORATION**  
75 Winchell Road New Britain, CT 06052 U.S.A.  
Phone (860)224-1349 Fax (860)827-9982  
<http://www.acmemonaco.com>

Connect with us:

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:24 AM  
**To:** Frantz, Blair  
**Subject:** FW: Lenard Engineering environmental analysis

**From:** Joan Packer [mailto:jpacker33@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 4:00 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Lenard Engineering environmental analysis

I think the report is useful in that it points out (Davison Environmental) that the site is "part of a larger ecological unit...lies within a large block of contiguous and unfragmented forest approximately 1,000 acres in size." Their detail on trees, plants and wildlife may be incomplete, but I think it would be unfortunate to destroy this 72 acre landscape for a quarry, in one of the most densely populated states in the US.

I think the report indicates (at least to me) that losing the tree cover, other vegetation and wetlands could affect groundwater recharge, rainfall and possibly other aspects of our climate.

Thank you.

Joan Packer  
Farmington

Linda Pagani  
Bloomfield, CT  
April 13, 2018

Comments submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality on the report titled  
*Environmental Study Change in Use of New Britain Water Company Land:  
Proposed Quarry Expansion and Future Water Storage Reservoir.*

My brief comments are confined solely to the report, as the CEQ has requested.

In chapter 7, the "Wildlife Impacts" section states that the proposed quarry expansion totals 72 acres, and will result in multifaceted wildlife impacts and losses including:

Habitat loss: direct loss of a species habitat due to quarry expansion which results in direct mortality. *This includes fragmentation and loss of core forest.* (Italics mine)  
(chapter 7, "Wetland and Biological Inventory and Assessment, Proposed Quarry Expansion and Storage Reservoir;" page 19, section 5.0, first bullet)

This is severe. Equally as important, in my opinion, is the loss of 72 acres of mature forest and the trees therein that help clean our environment. Nowhere in the report is mention made of the beneficial and critical roles trees in forests play in keeping our air clean, in modifying air temperature, and helping to increase precipitation. In short, playing an active role to help maintain a livable climate in our state.

Regarding water, the report seems to make some big assumptions about future water demand projections on New Britain's available supply, in an attempt to come out with a positive recommendation to allow Tilcon to expand its mining operations into the watershed and create what is termed a "storage reservoir."

On page 2-6 of the executive summary, item 36 refers the reader to chapter 13 for a detailed discussion on a benefits versus the environmental costs of the project. However, one finds that the impacts in that section have been given short shrift compared to the benefits.

Chapter 13, "Project Benefits and Environmental Impacts," states that

"... the overall project benefits need to be compared and contrasted with the likely environmental impacts, so that an informed decision can be made on moving forward. This chapter highlights contents from the previous twelve chapters, and provides a comparison of these two items."  
(chapter 13, page 13-1)

The chapter goes on to note that future water demand projections are expected to increase only slightly between 2018 and 2060, then lists a host of unsubstantiated, potential "what ifs" as reasons the project would be beneficial. They all seem to be, at this point, merely conjectural, including: DEEP water diversion policy changes, reductions with the Metropolitan District Commission water purchase contract, water demands from a "yet to be identified future Town or large user;" or a catastrophe that takes out a major source of supply. (page 13-2)

The summary of environmental impacts on page 13-3, on the other hand, seems to be minimized. Only five categories are cited, with limited to no explanation of what the impacts to the environment would actually be. For that, one has to delve into the details of chapter 7 to find the irreversible and vast environmental damage resulting from the project.

To conclude, I think the lack of examining the effect the loss of 72 acres of forest will have on the environment, including air quality, as well as the misleading, implied conclusion(s) of chapter 13, are some of the shortcomings of the report.

Thank you for your consideration.

**From:** Karen Maher <grizbogie@live.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 16, 2018 12:07 AM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon

This email is my going on record as being against the proposal to allow Tilcon to strip mine protected watershed area. This will forever ruin the landscape and more importantly risk destroying an invaluable resource.

Karen Maher. Plainville

**From:** Justin Ligas <jligas@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 9:57 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter  
**Subject:** Tilcon Study Comments

Mr. Hearn,

First, I apologize for the late reply. The Courant Article didn't come out until April 14th, and I didn't have a moment to write until now. I was reading the study (some of it, admittedly) and I wanted to share some quick thoughts.

I have some significant concerns about the viability of the new reservoir and the disturbance to wildlife in the area. I just don't understand how with that level of heavy equipment, working for as long as they will be over the life of the lease, will not result in levels of pollution in excess of what the study forecasts by looking at existing surface water. Additionally, I believe the impacts to the natural environment around the facility will be impacted dramatically more than previously forecast.

I just think that we can always revisit this later if we believe that we are wrong in blocking it, but with the levels of pollution possible, the disturbance to local wildlife, and the possibility of contaminating surrounding areas, I don't feel it is worthwhile, nor viable.

I'll keep it short in an effort to let you go about your day, but while I realize the solution to pollution is dilution, I'd rather not have to test the theory.

Thank you,  
Justin Ligas  
Berlin, CT



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:11 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: New Britain/Tilcon Watershed Plan

**From:** Adam D. Ligas [mailto:aligas@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 14, 2018 1:49 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** New Britain/Tilcon Watershed Plan

Hello Peter,

I have been following this issue and wanted to take a few moments to comment.

A single report produced by the requesting party should not be used as the main data point in considering any change like this. Independent verification is a must-have when considering changes to something that impacts every resident, and residents in surrounding towns.

The report makes assertions on various projections - water usage, water storage, future needs, impact on flooding, skimming other water sources, etc. However, without another study for verification, we do not know how accurate these data points are. In places the report seems to almost contradict itself. It will rely on data from the mid-1900s to make a point about something being in a good position, and then later reference the future projections look more dim in light of the changing environment. If the future is going to be worse, we can't use our past as an accurate predictor. These results may simply be the best this report can do - perhaps it was the only data available to use - but it should be a clear signal that more data is required to make an informed decision.

Some of the results in the report rely on man-made interventions (i.e. pump from here to there). Have those changes been made in other Connecticut communities? How did they work out? We need to talk to others who have walked down this path and find out their experiences. We should also try to talk to others that have rejected this path, why they did so, and what the experience from their decision has been.

Our drinking water is our most precious resource. We are blessed to have a very good source and system in place here. Water can have a massive impact on the both residents and businesses in a community. Some communities have had nature turn against them (drought) others have made mistakes by their own hands (Flint). We are very lucky that neither have happened here.

We have established these rules to protect ourselves and did so with scientific data, deep thought, and reservation. We are now being asked to remove these protections. The bar to do so should be incredibly high and it should only be for something of the utmost importance. The timeline on this entire project is in the decades, and many of us may not even be here to deal with the outcome of this decision. The result of this will fall squarely on our children and their children. We need to be good stewards of their future and the future of our communities.

The cost of getting this wrong is potentially catastrophic.

Thank you for your time,

- Adam

Mr. Karl Wagner

April 23, 2018

Executive Director

Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

79 Elm Street

Hartford, CT. 06106

RE: Public Act 16-61

The stated purpose of Public Act 16-61 is to assess the impact of permitting the mining of 131.4 acres of Shuttle Meadow watershed. In response, Lenard Engineering's (LEI) environmental study proffers promise of a future 2.3 billion gallon quarry reservoir that will increase storage capacity 45% providing 10.5 MGD for 85,149 residents of New Britain in 2060. Increased storage capacity is gained by "flood skimming" or diverting surface runoff from Coppermine Brook and its tributary, Pokeville Brook at White Bridge Surface Supply station (WBSS). Here runoff is diverted via intakes of a common channel fed into an adjacent a small 2.5 MG pond. The registered diversion for WBSS is 15 million gallons a day (MGD). According to the study, the facility can be operated in conjunction with city owned wells at Upper and Lower White Bridge that are adjacent the pond and share the same watershed.

Historically, concern about the city's water supply has motivated expansion of its water system as industrial and residential demand grew. In 1966, a New Britain Water Dept. report states that the water supply was serving 96,000 customers with a demand of 11.2 MGD or 118 gallons per capita while anticipating service to 112,000 residents by 2000. LEI's 2009 water supply plan for New Britain reports that usage peaked about 1970 with an average daily demand of 12.3 million gallons per day compared with 9.91 MGD in 2006. Both provide a measure of the city's supply and demand.

An assumption of the report states Patton Brook Well (documented water diversion of 1.2 MGD) is omitted from study because it "is was" leased to Southington, CT. Originally, leased in 1980, Southington declined its renewal in 2014. The registered diversion under lease was 1.34 MGD with a reported use of as much as 361,729,000 (1988). Southington's 2014 federal grant proposal stated that the well pumps 750 gallons a minute. In September, 2016, LEI accepted the city's request to revise the water plan to ensure a safe yield and complete necessary state forms after the Common Council voted to sell Patton Brook Well to Southington for a million dollars. The vote was later rescinded because of the drought. In its 202 water supply plan, LEI recommended reactivation of the well (then under lease) because it would increase safe yield by 1.2 MGD. Exclusion of Patton Brook Well impairs the accuracy of LEI's calculations of the city's present water supply and safe yield

Furthermore, LEI explains that mining Shuttle Meadow's watershed would result in loss of 160,000 gallons a day (a reduction in safe yield from 17.64 MGD to 17.48 MGD, ) mitigated by eventuality of a quarry reservoir. The loss is less than the 200,000 MGD that the firm first reported to the New Britain water department in 2007. The study fails to address annual loss of 58,400,000 gallons during the 40 year span of mining Shuttle Meadow watershed.

Rationale for flood skimming is a gain in supply for storage. Reported data about peak flows fails to answer the basic question about gain in supply obtained from surface runoff. At WBSS an increase in supply from runoff is limited by the size of channel intakes, capacity of the channel and adjacent small pond, capacity of the motors and pumps to suction and pump, as well as the diameter of the outlet pipe. The report notes that with all pumps working, WBSS can deliver a theoretical 991 billion gallons for storage in 28 months. Pumping at that (theoretical) rate reportedly reduces time needed to fill the proposed reservoir from 10 years to 2.3 years, while confirming need to maximize suctioning and pumping to gain surface runoff. Given longitudinal data about the frequency, intensity and duration of precipitation, it is perplexing that the study does not contain estimates of surface runoff diverted within designated time frames.

Furthermore, the study qualifies use of flood skimming by stating that water from WBSS will be used to fill the proposed quarry reservoir when the capacity of the city reservoirs is equal to or greater than 90% full and when stream flows are adequate to meet minimum DEEP standards

Since WBSS is adjacent to Upper and Lower White Bridge, share the same watershed and may be operated together, what environmental stresses are introduced by rapid or regular suctioning and pumping at WBSS on the water table, the aquifers, or neighboring wells using the same watershed? In 2016, the New Britain Water Dept submitted a grant proposal to the state to replace the motor control system as WBSS Pond. It included a request to purchase six 200 HP variable frequency drives, 6 new high efficiency pumps and motors, a new SCADA control system and a self cleaning screen. Their installation would create a high efficiency pumping station and heighten concern.

The disquiet is illustrated in an exchange of letters between the former head of the city water department and the state Commissioner, Dept. of Health. In December, 2015, the former advised the state that the first trigger level of the city's Water Supply Alert plan had been reached, adding that the city had been continuously pumping from its auxiliary sources since September.

In his January, 2016, response, the commissioner acknowledged the first stage of the alert and adequate registration of use. He advised that continuous pumping may have an adverse impact the on the nearby watercourse. Furthermore, he advised that the water dept. carefully monitor groundwater levels to ensure the aquifer had capacity to meet the needs of the city. In time, the city purchased water from the MDC.

The study charts peak flows from Coppermine Brook into the Pequabuck River. Storage of flood skimmed surface water raises questions about potential contamination. In 2016, The Hartford Courant, published an article about concerted effort of the Farmington River Watershed Association (FRWA), the Connecticut River Watershed Association (CRWA) and Trout Unlimited (TU) to rehabilitate a stretch of the river. The executive director, FRWA, voiced concern that heavy rainfall washes trash, petroleum leakage and other pollutants including coliform bacteria into it. Environmental concern about flood skimmed surface water received no mention.

The referenced Milone and MacBroom's evaluation of Coppermine Brook watershed proposed creation of 3 "reservoir" or "reach" storage areas to delay and reduce potential flooding. One of the proposed

sites is land owned by the New Britain Water Company upstream from Whigville Reservoir. The area in Burlington is known as Lamson Corner. Historically, the city began purchasing this watershed in the early twentieth century. A 1966 water dept. report recommended construction of a reservoir here. New Britain Water Dept. ownership of the land is confirmed by a 2008 letter to the state health committee when the storage reservoir was first proposed. In exploring improvements to the city's water system in 2002, LEI noted that the Lamson Corner Reservoir (35 feet deep and 160 acres) if activated could be supplied by a diversion from Burlington Brook at Covey Rd. and store a billion gallons of water. A former head of the New Britain Water Dept. provided similar description of this site for a reservoir. Thus Lamson Corner offers an alternative site for a large surface reservoir that would increase safe yield and eliminate need for mining Shuttle Meadow watershed.

In sum, Public Act 16-61 focuses attention on the environmental impact of mining Shuttle Meadow watershed. Reading LEI's study of the proposed storage reservoir raises environmental concerns about the impact this may have White Bridge Surface Supply station and the watershed that serves Upper and Lower White Bridge as well. It reminds me of efforts to untangle a knot in monofilament line whereby pulling on one loop impacts other strands.

Respectfully,

William Ostapchuk

New Britain, CT.

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on Tilcon Quarry Expansion Study

**From:** Stewart W Jaeger [mailto:stewartjaeger@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 8:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>; CT Water Planning Council <WPC@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Tilcon Quarry Expansion Study

Greetings,

I make the following comments because too many important decisions are made by political views and belief and not the practical fact. My background is that I have lived in the area for many years and walk the area from Wassel Reservoir to the Tilcon Quarry regularly. From 1960 to 1980 I resided in New Britain in the area of the N.B. Water Filtration Plant. From 1995 to the present I have resided in Plainville in the area that joins the Tilcon Quarry.

I found the environmental report consistent with my observations in the area over the years. I found nothing surprising. I've read that some people find the report lacking, but then again maybe the negative impact of this project is minimal to the environment.

I have lived for over twenty years next to the Tilcon operation, in fact their land starts where mine ends. I have never had a negative experience with Tilcon.

I've listened to the comments made at various meetings and have come to some basic conclusions:

1. New Britain Water Company has not objected to the project.
2. The city and towns of New Britain, Plainville and Southington have not objected.
3. The Plainville Water Company and Algonquin Gas Company have not objected.

Here are some facts:

1. Ten years ago the area was so overpopulated with deer the damage to landscaping was costly. Today even with harvesting, the deer population is still robust.
2. About every 10 years N.B. cuts hundreds of acres of timber from the watershed property. Recently Southington cut timber on adjacent land.
3. Over the years N.B. has removed miles of the Metacomet Trail.
4. A gas line crosses much of the watershed property. Heavy construction equipment has been brought onto the watershed in the last ten years to repair or inspect the gas line.
5. A stolen car was recovered from the watershed property years after it was abandoned and burned.
6. Camping sites litter the entire watershed property.
7. There are remains (foundation) of a homestead and a junk yard in the watershed.

Even with high human foot and motor traffic on the watershed and reservoirs there has never been an alarm on the water quality. The only alarm has been water shortage. In 1962 N.B ran out of water, the Wassel Reservoir and Harts

Ponds were added to the Shuttle Meadow Reservoir reserve. In 2016 N.B ran low on water again. Future planning dictates an additional water source for N.B and Tilcon's plan could be a good answer.

I will speculate that the process of purifying water has improved over the years and some techniques are new to when watershed protection laws were formulated.

I know water used to be filtered in sand beds and then chemicals are added. With that process, N.B won awards for great drinking water!

Politically to stifle a project because it could happen "elsewhere" is a poor reason in my book. Some say, but not me "not in my backyard" but this is in my backyard!

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.



**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Wagener, Karl  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 7:08 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

---

**From:** roberta mack [heyroberta@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 1:29 PM  
**To:** Wagener, Karl  
**Cc:** tmack125@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Dear Director Wagener,

We are writing to you on behalf of our concern about the declining Eastern Box Turtle populations in Connecticut. We have become aware of an application by Tilcon to expand their traprock quarrying operation in New Britain and the subsequent Lenard Engineering, Inc. environmental report. Regarding Chapter 7, prepared by Davison Environmental, Box Turtles are considered a significant biological resource in this area. With 10 records submitted to the CT DEEP Natural Diversity database, the Bradley Mountain box turtle population is of significant size. The approval of this application would threaten this dense population of box turtles located on a 100 acre habitat in western New Britain, within the negative impact area from quarry expansion.

Although Chapter 7 contains solid turtle data, it lacks an analysis of the effects on the larger surrounding population and no environmental mitigation follow up plans if the 72 acres are quarried and converted to a reservoir. The after effects of quarrying would result in the destruction of CT DEEP traprock ridge Critical Habitats on this site: open summit habitat, cliff habitat, dry forest habitat and talus habitat, and certainly contaminate and diminish the surrounding wetland habitats and watershed downslope. These preservation of the environmental quality of these habitats are critical to the survival of the Eastern Box Turtle species as well as other plant and animal wild life, like Long Eared Bats, Bald Eagles and Jefferson Salamanders

In Hamden, where we live, there was a similar situation that threatened the box turtle population in the nearby forest. The box turtles that were once plentiful in this area, have become more sparse over the last several decades because of residential development. At 64 Rocky Top Road in Hamden, CT, a development application proposed quarrying the trap rock ridge on a large portion of a 18 acre parcel in order to make it suitable for a 288 unit apartment complex. In 2017, we submitted 3 box turtle records into the CT DEEP database, and are estimated to have a small to moderate population. A large scale development such as this, which included destruction of the ridge, would have completely wiped out the box turtle population.

During the spring of 2017, four traprock critical habitat areas were identified by Sigrun Gadwa, of the Connecticut Botanical Society, along a portion of the "Quinnipiac Blue Trail" that runs through the property across the top of the ridge. Sigrun also provided us with guidance and training regarding the box turtle habitat, along with conservation practices that we could implement and hopefully increase the box turtle population.

Rocky Top ridge is surrounded by deciduous forest with leaf litter and rich humus, and pristine wetlands downslope. Rock dust and truck traffic would have contaminated water and altered the hydrology of these pristine wetlands. These habitats are vital to the survival of wild life and animals like the Eastern Box Turtle. Fortunately, after an environmental outcry from the surrounding residents, the developer withdrew the application, and donated the property to the Hamden Land Conservation Trust. The land and wildlife are now protected.

We ask you and the CEQ to give special consideration to the environmental quality of the habitat areas, and the large Eastern Box Turtle population living in the forested watershed in and around the Tilcon quarry expansion area. The contamination that sickens and weakens natural wildlife will eventually sicken and weaken residents of Connecticut. Thank you for your time and attention to protecting Connecticut's natural resources and wildlife!

Sincerely,  
Tim and Roberta Mack  
24 Rainbow Court  
Hamden, CT 06514  
tmack125@comcast.net  
heyroberta@hotmail.com

Sent from my iPad

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

**From:** Tim Mack [mailto:tmack125@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 4:45 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** roberta mack <heyroberta@hotmail.com>  
**Date:** April 15, 2018 at 1:29:38 PM EDT  
**To:** "karl.wagener@ct.gov" <karl.wagener@ct.gov>  
**Cc:** "tmack125@comcast.net" <tmack125@comcast.net>  
**Subject:** Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality

Dear Director Wagener,

We are writing to you on behalf of our concern about the declining Eastern Box Turtle populations in Connecticut. We have become aware of an application by Tilcon to expand their traprock quarrying operation in New Britain and the subsequent Lenard Engineering, Inc. environmental report. Regarding Chapter 7, prepared by Davison Environmental, Box Turtles are considered a significant biological resource in this area. With 10 records submitted to the CT DEEP Natural Diversity database, the Bradley Mountain box turtle population is of significant size. The approval of this application would threaten this dense population of box turtles located on a 100 acre habitat in western New Britain, within the negative impact area from quarry expansion.

Although Chapter 7 contains solid turtle data, it lacks an analysis of the effects on the larger surrounding population and no environmental mitigation follow up plans if the 72 acres are quarried and converted to a reservoir. The after effects of quarrying would result in the destruction of CT DEEP traprock ridge Critical Habitats on this site: open summit habitat, cliff habitat, dry forest habitat and talus habitat, and certainly contaminate and diminish the surrounding wetland habitats and watershed downslope. These preservation of the environmental quality of these habitats are critical to the survival of the Eastern Box Turtle species as well as other plant and animal wild life, like Long Eared Bats, Bald Eagles and Jefferson Salamanders

In Hamden, where we live, there was a similar situation that threatened the box turtle population in the nearby forest. The box turtles that were once plentiful in this area, have become more sparse over the last several decades because of residential development. At 64 Rocky Top

Road in Hamden, CT, a development application proposed quarrying the trap rock ridge on a large portion of a 18 acre parcel in order to make it suitable for a 288 unit apartment complex. In 2017, we submitted 3 box turtle records into the CT DEEP database, and are estimated to have a small to moderate population. A large scale development such as this, which included destruction of the ridge, would have completely wiped out the box turtle population.

During the spring of 2017, four traprock critical habitat areas were identified by Sigrun Gadwa, of the Connecticut Botanical Society, along a portion of the "Quinnipiac Blue Trail" that runs through the property across the top of the ridge. Sigrun also provided us with guidance and training regarding the box turtle habitat, along with conservation practices that we could implement and hopefully increase the box turtle population.

Rocky Top ridge is surrounded by deciduous forest with leaf litter and rich humus, and pristine wetlands downslope. Rock dust and truck traffic would have contaminated water and altered the hydrology of these pristine wetlands. These habitats are vital to the survival of wild life and animals like the Eastern Box Turtle. Fortunately, after an environmental outcry from the surrounding residents, the developer withdrew the application, and donated the property to the Hamden Land Conservation Trust. The land and wildlife are now protected.

We ask you and the CEQ to give special consideration to the environmental quality of the habitat areas, and the large Eastern Box Turtle population living in the forested watershed in and around the Tilcon quarry expansion area. The contamination that sickens and weakens natural wildlife will eventually sicken and weaken residents of Connecticut. Thank you for your time and attention to protecting Connecticut's natural resources and wildlife!

Sincerely,  
Tim and Roberta Mack  
24 Rainbow Court  
Hamden, CT 06514  
[tmack125@comcast.net](mailto:tmack125@comcast.net)  
[heyroberta@hotmail.com](mailto:heyroberta@hotmail.com)

Sent from my iPad

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on Tilcon Quarry Expansion Study

**From:** Stewart W Jaeger [mailto:stewartjaeger@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 15, 2018 8:05 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>; CT Water Planning Council <WPC@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Tilcon Quarry Expansion Study

Greetings,

I make the following comments because too many important decisions are made by political views and belief and not the practical fact. My background is that I have lived in the area for many years and walk the area from Wassel Reservoir to the Tilcon Quarry regularly. From 1960 to 1980 I resided in New Britain in the area of the N.B. Water Filtration Plant. From 1995 to the present I have resided in Plainville in the area that joins the Tilcon Quarry.

I found the environmental report consistent with my observations in the area over the years. I found nothing surprising. I've read that some people find the report lacking, but then again maybe the negative impact of this project is minimal to the environment.

I have lived for over twenty years next to the Tilcon operation, in fact their land starts where mine ends. I have never had a negative experience with Tilcon.

I've listened to the comments made at various meetings and have come to some basic conclusions:

1. New Britain Water Company has not objected to the project.
2. The city and towns of New Britain, Plainville and Southington have not objected.
3. The Plainville Water Company and Algonquin Gas Company have not objected.

Here are some facts:

1. Ten years ago the area was so overpopulated with deer the damage to landscaping was costly. Today even with harvesting, the deer population is still robust.
2. About every 10 years N.B. cuts hundreds of acres of timber from the watershed property. Recently Southington cut timber on adjacent land.
3. Over the years N.B. has removed miles of the Metacomet Trail.
4. A gas line crosses much of the watershed property. Heavy construction equipment has been brought onto the watershed in the last ten years to repair or inspect the gas line.
5. A stolen car was recovered from the watershed property years after it was abandoned and burned.
6. Camping sites litter the entire watershed property.
7. There are remains (foundation) of a homestead and a junk yard in the watershed.

Even with high human foot and motor traffic on the watershed and reservoirs there has never been an alarm on the water quality. The only alarm has been water shortage. In 1962 N.B ran out of water, the Wassel Reservoir and Harts

Ponds were added to the Shuttle Meadow Reservoir reserve. In 2016 N.B ran low on water again. Future planning dictates an additional water source for N.B and Tilcon's plan could be a good answer.

I will speculate that the process of purifying water has improved over the years and some techniques are new to when watershed protection laws were formulated.

I know water used to be filtered in sand beds and then chemicals are added. With that process, N.B won awards for great drinking water!

Politically to stifle a project because it could happen "elsewhere" is a poor reason in my book. Some say, but not me "not in my backyard" but this is in my backyard!

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2018 11:08 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: Tilcon-City of New Britain

**From:** Joseph [mailto:perkins952@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 5:24 PM  
**To:** Hearn, Peter <Peter.Hearn@ct.gov>  
**Subject:** Tilcon-City of New Britain

April 10, 2018

Peter Hearn  
State of Connecticut

Subject: Proposed Tilcon/City of New Britain Watershed Plan

Dear Mr. Hearn:

I am taking the time to share my feelings on the the proposal currently up for hearing. I am not in the habit of writing or speaking about matters such as this but this time I feel I must because the ridiculousness of this is so extreme.

I know you know all about the plan but just let me summarize it briefly from what I know. the city wants permission to allow Tilcon to mine a large acreage of protected watershed property in exchange for them, in 35 or 40 years, to give the city water rights to said property which is to be used for another city water supply. I'm not sure but I think there is some money involved also.

let me explain why I feel this plan is so insane. a couple years ago the state was in the midst of an intense drought and the water level at our main city reservoir, shuttle meadow, was at historically low levels, supposedly maybe with not enough water to get us through the winter. our all wise mayor and other town leaders knew all summer that the water lever was going rapidly down but never declared a water emergency or put into place any water rationing procedures that I am aware of.

in november or so they finally declared a water emergency and told city residents that they situation was critical and they were being forced to purchase water from the MDC. of course the purchase price and purification/distribution cost would be passed on to city residents in the form of higher fees/supplemental charges.

now here's the totally crazy part of this whole situation. the city has to my knowledge at least THREE back up water supply reservoirs. Wasel reservoir, and both upper and lower Hart's Ponds. (I know this for certain as I grew up fishing at the Harts Ponds and am no longer able to as it's posted as a city water supply) there could actually be more such reservoirs that I'm not aware of. anyway this is what I would really like someone to explain to me. we have 3 lakes whose very existence is to supply the city with water when water levels are extremely low at the main reservoir as happened a couple years ago. so WHY IN THE HELL are we buying water from hartford and why am I being billed for it, when we already have millions of gallons of free water to use???? in my mind the answer is simple. the city saw it as just another source of income for them. they bought water for a set price then billed the residents excessively and made money off the whole process. again, that's just my opinion though an investigation into all the finances involved would reveal the truth.

it's the only thing that makes sense to me. what other reason could there possibly be to buy water when we already had tons of it????

how does all that relate to the Tilcon matter we're talking about here? just this. the city of new britain already has 3 backup reservoirs (and doesn't make any use of them!!) so why in the world would we need yet another backup reservoir that we don't need, especially in 40 years from now!! this whole thing is all about a city government and big business coming to a mutually beneficial deal for each other. Tilcon is safe from running out of gravel for another 40 years and city politicians and others involved will be vacationing in Hawaii and receiving other little "thank you" gifts from them. at least that's how I see it in my mind.

the truth actually is that Tilcon is running out of land to mine. if this deal goes through it will insure they will stay in business for another 40 years, won't cost them millions upon millions to relocate though I even doubt that they could as who would want such of noisy and polluting business in their town.(if the gravel was even available there) this is a last gasp by a dying business and they trying to make a deal with the city by giving them something that is absolutely useless to them. I believe the city has already spent thousands of dollars on a study of some sort. not a penny more should be wasted on this fiasco especially when those funds could have gone to much better use.

lastly, you need to consider the hundreds if not thousands of people who live in the area of the proposal. they should not be forced to suffer through a lifetime of noise, air, and water pollution just for the benefit of some greedy, slick talking big businessmen.

and one last note. I believe the study pointed out that after 40 years the water that the city will possibly be getting will be heavily polluted by industrial waste and cost the city additional money and equipment to purify enough to drink. and that would be in the event we would even need to use it as a water supply——which is extremely doubtful as we already have plenty of backups.

reject this whole idea. anyone with half a brain can see the only people that benefit from it is the rich fat cats at Tilcon and I as a taxpayer and someone who cares about the environment do not wanted to be screwed by Tilcon. the city of new britain is already great at doing just that.

Joseph Piorkowski Jr.