

SANFORD PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MEETING May 15, 2013 – 7:00 P.M.
Town Hall Annex Third Floor Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT Robert Hardison, Chair
 John McAdam, Vice Chair
 Richard Bergeron
 Joshua Howe
 Lela Harrison
 Matthew Treadwell
 Kelly Tarbox, Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Charles Andreson, P.E., AICP, City Engineer
 Michael Casserly, P.E., Assistant Engineer

STAFF ABSENT: James Q. Gulnac, AICP, Planning & Development Director
 (w/notice)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hardison called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M. Chair Hardison then outlined the meeting format for tonight.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. File #18-12-R: R. Pepin & Sons, Inc., c/o Carl Beal, 15 Deborah Ave, Sanford, Maine.**

Chair Hardison said the complete project description would be given during the work session review.

Chair Hardison asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of this project; there were none.

Chair Hardison asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition of this project; there were none.

Chair Hardison closed the public hearing.

III. NEW BUSINESS

There were no new business items.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

The Board reconvened after the work session discussion at 8:40 PM to take action on this item.

- 1. File #18-12-R: R. Pepin & Sons, Inc., c/o Carl Beal, 15 Deborah Ave, Sanford, Maine.**

Chair Hardison asked if the Board had any other questions, discussion items, etc. before taking action on this item. No one did.

Chair Hardison asked Carl Beal, applicant's agent if he had anything to add; he did not.

Chair Hardison said that the Board was going to work through the conditions to make sure all concerns are addressed.

Board member Tarbox read through the items that were discussed during work session to work out wording and to see if the Board wanted to keep these items as conditions. The items discussed were:

- Amending monitoring process
- Size of approved open pit acreage
- 5/15/13 engineering memo resolved to satisfaction of staff
- Water district access added to plan
- Amendment to operations manual regarding over-excavating
- Fire department's requirement of knox box
- Add enforcement to approval
- Waivers to be accepted by Board

Chair Hardison also felt that the SPRC review comments and engineering memo, both with today's date, should be added to the conditions of approval. The engineering memo dated May 13, 2013 should also be added.

Chair Hardison called for a motion. There was a short discussion on finalizing the conditions of approval before a motion was made.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board accept the Finding of Facts itemized in the project status report (see attached) and find that application File #18-12-R, Pepin Mineral Extraction, requesting approval for a major site plan for mineral extraction has been prepared in accordance with Article II, Section 272-2-25, Site Plan Review, Mineral Extraction Standards of the Code of the City of Sanford and Article I, Site Plan Review and subject to the conditions listed below grant a five year operation permit and grant waivers for stormwater extended to the Perham and DeLuca properties, and the waivers granted for tree inventory and plan scale as in the previous approval:

- a) The Operations Manual is made part of this approval with an understanding that activities not described in the manual may be considered as 'not permitted';
- b) The applicant agrees as per Section 272-2-39 Noise control to comply with Chapter 178, Noise of the city code;
- c) The applicant will provide five (5) complete sets of the approved plans to the Planning Department for certification (distribution of the certified plans: Planning, Engineering, CEO, and applicant);
- d) A performance bond/letter of credit in an amount approved by the city engineer for a five (5) year period is provided (the instrument may be for a one year period, but must be renewable);
- e) That a reclamation plan will be in effect and at a minimum the applicant will provide an activity report on April 30th and October 30th each year to the city engineer who will conduct an inspection to verify the report. The applicant will be responsible for maintaining an adequate inspection escrow with the engineering department;
- f) The Department of Environmental Protection Permit is made part of this approval;
- g) No permit to operate this facility shall be issued until all the conditions of the approval have been satisfied;
- h) Any changes to the approved plan will require review and approval by the Planning Board;
- i) The monitoring program as outlined and added on from the site plan review committee meeting of 5/15/13 shall be included and reads as such: 'amend the proposed groundwater monitoring program to clarify the detection limits for analysis. The lower limits may vary slightly depending on the season and sample condition but will be in the range of 100 micrograms per liter, perform semi-annual

- sampling and analysis, and report the analytical results to the city as soon as they are available?;
- j) Permission is granted for a 15-acre operation. This will be open-working area and approval is subject to the granting of a DEP variance and additional performance bond. The 15 acres is to include both the haul road and the storage areas;
 - k) All items in both engineer memos of 5/13 and 5/15, along with the Site Plan Review Committee letter of 5/15, must be resolved to the satisfaction of staff;
 - l) A note shall be placed on the plan granting water district access for three (3) years after the closing of the pit;
 - m) The operations manual be amended with respect to over-excavating to the satisfaction of the city engineer;
 - n) The applicant must comply with the requirements of the fire department with respect to the knox box;
 - o) Enforcement practices:
 - a. Site will be subjected to periodic inspections by the city's engineering staff. If non-compliance is identified the operator will be verbally notified to the need of corrective action. This action is to be completed within 72 hours or have a plan acceptable to the city engineering department for rectifying the situation.
 - b. If compliance is not achieved, written notice will be given. The operator will be given two working days for compliance or to deliver a plan with the objective of achieving compliance otherwise engineering will advise codes to initiate action which may result in the requirement to cease all operations.

Chair Hardison asked Mr. Beal if these conditions were understood; Mr. Beal said it was.

Board member Tarbox added to the condition of granting water district access to the site for three (3) years – the condition should also include a letter from the property owners granting this access.

Chair Hardison added the condition of the timeline submitted by the applicant will be revised based on tonight's discussion and included as an appendix to the operations manual.

Chair Hardison asked Mr. Beal if he had anything to add. Mr. Beal said he did have a change to make to one of the conditions, which was changing the date of providing an activity report from April 30th and October 30th each year to June and December and explained the reason for the change. Mr. Beal had made the change in the operations manual but it wasn't changed in the planning director's report.

Chair Hardison asked if anyone else would like to add anything as a proposed condition; no one did.

Board member McAdam seconded the motion.

Chair Hardison informed everyone that the Board would be granting final approval based on the conditions tonight and explained why.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 3, 2012; October 17, 2012; and November 14, 2012

Board member Tarbox made a motion to approve the minutes of October 3, 2012 and November 14, 2012 as written. She was not at the October 17, 2012 meeting so she thought someone that attended should make a motion on this set of minutes.

Vice Chair McAdam made a motion to approve the minutes of October 3, 2012 and November 14, 2012.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 5-0 (Board members Bergeron and Howe were not on the Board at this time).

Board member Harrison made a motion to approve the minutes of October 17, 2012 as written.

Vice Chair McAdam seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 4-0 (Board members Bergeron and Howe were not on the Board at this time and Board member Tarbox was absent from meeting).

VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There was no planning director's report.

VII. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM to go into a work session meeting. The meeting adjourned at 9:01 PM.

***Non-Agenda Item: Election of new secretary:** Board member Tarbox volunteered to be secretary to the Planning Board. Board member Harrison seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

Attachment to May 15, 2013 Minutes

The Finding of Facts for Public Hearing Item #1 is under Old Business

There are no New Business Items

*Finding of Facts for Old Business Item #1
File #18-12-R: Pepin Mineral Extraction Expansion*

- The applicant has provided proof of ownership of the properties in question and has standing to make the application.
- The application was reviewed by the planner and classified as a conditional use major site plan. [Section 280-91-Mineral Extraction & Article XIV] Amendments to the approval of mineral extraction permits require review by the Planning Board subject to comments from the Site Plan Review Committee.
- The applicant met with the Planning Board on March 6, 2013. After some additional discussion about the application the Board, with the agreement of the applicant, decided the following initial course of action:
 1. The application would be considered an amendment to the existing approved mineral extraction operation approved as File #11-09-R.
 2. That there would be no extension of time considered in the amended application.
 3. It was decided that the continuation of the permit for the one year would allow the applicant to demonstrate their compliance with the approved operations manual.
 4. That the operations manual would be amended/revised/edited rather than have addendums added to it.

5. That the applicant would prepare and submit a complete application packet (set of envelopes is already on file), (3) full paper sets, and one (1) disc copy with individual pdfs of each of the items in the application.
6. The planner would duplicate the disc and distribute to Planning Board and others rather than posting on the website.
7. Chair Hardison stressed that if it was not included in the operations manual it was not approved.
8. Should a situation arise which might require an activity not covered by the manual the applicant should contact the planning director prior to taking that action.
9. The planner would decide on the appropriate course of action to be followed on the request.
10. A site visit was held at 7:30 AM on Friday May 10, 2013. Mr. Pepin and engineer Beal led members of the Planning Board, staff, and interested public on a tour of the site so that they could see firsthand the conditions in the pit and have a better understanding of the scope of the proposed expansion of the operations onto the lands owned by DeLuca and Perham. Slope stability was discussed in certain areas and a reclamation plan outlined. Details would be provided at the Site Plan Review Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday May 15, 2013.
11. A Site Plan Review Committee meeting was held on Wednesday May 15, 2013.
12. On May 15th the Planning Board held a public hearing on the application. No one from the public spoke.
13. The application was then discussed by the Board in a work session. During this session Mr. Andresen presented the findings and recommendations from the Site Plan Review Committee [the report memo dated May 15, 2013 is attached and made part of this Finding of Facts]. Mr. Casserly presented an updated engineer's report [engineer's memo dated May 15, 2013 from Mr. Casserly is attached and made part of these Findings of Facts].
14. The following items were discussed by the Board, staff and applicant:
 - a) The timeline of reclamation as presented by the applicant [schedule of reclamation areas prepared by the applicant is attached and made part of the Finding of Facts].
 - b) A discussion on the amount of open acreage to be considered 10 or 15 to include storage and processing as well as active mining; the Board also reviewed the time limit of the requested permit and decided that should any permit be granted it should be for the full five (5) year period.
 - c) The ground water monitoring program discussed with detection limits of 100 micrograms per liter.
 - d) A specific plan for the enforcement of the operations of the pit as approved and specified in the operations manual were discussed and the following was agreed upon: (1) There would be periodic inspections conducted by the city engineer; (2) The engineer would notify the owner of any conditions needing attention; (3) If correction action was required the owner would have 3 working days to either take such action or present a plan to do so; (4) If these conditions were not met then the engineer would notify the owner in writing and require the owner to respond within two (2) working days; (5) If no response by the owner, the engineer would notify the code enforcement office who would then shut down the operation until such time as it was brought back into compliance. This enforcement procedure in no way replaces the CEO's review of the operation under the conditions of the DEP permit or any other city code issues.
 - e) If the owner wishes to make any changes to the approved manual of operations he should, prior to making any changes, contact the planning director who will review the request with the appropriate staff and consider whether or not further review by the Planning Board is required. Should there be a disagreement between the staff and the owner that question would be brought to the Planning Board at their next available meeting for their review and consideration.
15. The Board decided that based upon the information presented and the comments from staff that it could take action on the matter that evening and consider for approval a new five (5) year mining extraction permit for Mr. Pepin which would include the addition of the new parcels [Deluca & Perham] conditioned upon the staff approving new and updated plans,

operation manuals and other attachments and submittals including required Maine DEP documents prepared by the applicant, and the posting of an updated performance guarantee and appropriate review escrow.

16. The Board closed the work session and went back into session to consider the application.

City of Sanford, Maine
Department of Public Works
156 School Street, Sanford, Maine 04073
Tel. (207) 324-9135 Fax. (207) 324-9142

Charles J. Andreson, P.E., AICP
City Engineer / Director of Public Works

Memo To: Planning Board
James Gulnac, Director of Planning

From: Charles Andreson
City Engineer / Director of Public Works

Date: May 15, 2013

RE: Site Plan Review Committee Report
File No. 18-12-R
Major Site Plan – R. Pepin & Sons Mineral Extraction Expansion



The Site Plan Review Committee met at 9:00 AM on Wednesday, May 15, 2013. I chaired the meeting at Jim Gulnac's request, as he was away on other City business. Dave Pepin, Carl Beal, P.E., and Cynthia Thayer, C.G. attended the meeting on behalf of R. Pepin & Sons.

Carl Beal, P.E. and Cynthia Thayer, C.G. presented the plans for the proposed expansion of the borrow pit. Other staff people in attendance were David Parent (SWD Supt.), Tom Connolly (Chief of Police), Jamie Cole (Code Enforcement), John McAdam (Planning Board), Dick Wilkins (City Council), Mike Casserly (Asst. City Engineer). After hearing the presentation on behalf of the applicant, staff comments, and reviewing the issues the Site Plan Review Committee voted to advise the Planning Board that the plans have been prepared in conformance with the City's ordinances, and that the following items be accomplished by the Applicant and resolved with the Planning Board:

1. Amend the proposed Groundwater Monitoring Program to clarify the detection limits for analysis (the lower limits may vary slightly depending on season and sample condition but will be in the range of 100 micro grams per liter), perform semi-annual sampling and analysis and report the analytical results to the City as soon as they are available.
2. That a note be placed on the plan granting the Sanford Water District access to the monitoring wells for groundwater sampling as the Water District may require for a period of three years following the cessation of mining operations. A letter from the property owners granting this access to the Water District is also required.
3. Clarify whether the processing and storage areas will be considered part of the 10 Acre limit on working pit area.
4. Amend the Operations Manual to require backfilling of "over excavated" areas within two months of the time that the excavation reaches the excavation limit as indicated on the plans.
5. The Fire Marshal was unable to attend the meeting, but did request a Knox Box at the gate for emergency access. The Applicant is hopeful that it will not be required to

Site Plan Review Committee Report 5-15-13 .doc

City of Sanford, Maine
Department of Public Works
156 School Street, Sanford, Maine 04073
Tel. (207) 324-9135 Fax. (207) 324-9142

Charles J. Andreson, P.E., AICP
City Engineer / Director of Public Works

keep the gate locked, so this item may be resolved with the Fire Marshal, depending on the determination made by the Planning Board.

6. Add a provision to the Operations Manual expressing cooperation between the Applicant and the City to resolve problems, if groundwater monitoring indicates that contaminants are present at any levels of concern.
7. Consider the term of the permit for this mineral extraction (the current permit will expire in 2014), it may be practical to extend the permit for another 5 years with an effective enforcement mechanism.
8. The Applicant's Engineer will respond to the concern about embankment stability at the "bend in the river" during a 100 year flood event. *and Penha*
9. A storm water waiver is recommended for the DeLuca parcel.
10. The Operations Manual and Plans shall be modified to incorporate the resolution of items from the engineering review memo and from the Planning Board's decisions on required changes or conditions.

The meeting focused on some very detailed aspects of the Plans and Operations Manual, and I would commend both the Applicant and staff for their patience in dealing with these items, and for the cooperative spirit in completing that review process. I will try to answer any questions that you may have concerning the discussions at the Site Plan Review Committee.

City of Sanford, Maine
Engineering Department
156 School Street, Sanford, Maine

Charles J. Andreson, P.E., AICP
Public Works Director / City Engineer
Tel. (207) 324-9135
Fax. (207) 324-9133

Michael Casserly P.E.
Assistant City Engineer
Tel. (207) 324-9108
Fax. (207) 324-9133

Memo To: Sanford Planning Board

From: Michael J. Casserly, P.E.
Assistant City Engineer

Date: May 15, 2013

RE: **Pepin Mineral Extraction Amendment, RR Zone**
File 18-12-R For May 15, 2013 Planning Board Meeting

Michael J. Casserly



I have been working with the Applicant's consultants to resolve most of the items on my May 13 2013 review memo. Both the Applicant and staff are seeking guidance from the Planning Board on the following:

1. In its review of the new "timeline" plan introduced the past few days, the Applicant may ask the Planning Board to consider additional storage and processing area. A main feature of this idea is for the Applicant to fill many of the 2.5 to 1 slopes with on-site silt or clay prior to loam and seed.
2. If the Board grants the request for additional storage area, we would not argue against that, as long as the additional open area was covered by the Reclamation Guarantee (which has been \$4,000 per acre). Also Maine DEP's limit for a pit without a variance is 10 acres. The City follows that standard.
3. I had asked the Applicant for some alternative to leaving the near-vertical gravel faces for long periods of time. After some discussion today, I believe the Applicant may propose distance and / or time limits on these over-excavation areas prior to their filling and reclaiming.
4. We feel we are on track to resolving groundwater monitoring and sampling questions. The Applicant's professionals have offered an explanation as to why they are using a test laboratory that uses a higher detection limits than what staff and the Water District asked for. The Board should weigh in on this.
5. The Applicant will respond with a P.E. stamped letter addressing my question on the proposed extraction earthwork near a "hairpin turn" in the Great Works River, and what effect a 100 year storm might have.
6. The Applicant proposes in the Operations Manual to import a clay-topsoil mix, I believe from the Applicant's other facilities. The Planning Board should decide on this. We do not have an issue with this, especially with the groundwater monitoring plan in place.
7. The pit hours are proposed to remain at 6 AM through 5 PM. The previous intent of the Planning Board was to allow some early trucks to leave the pit starting at 6 AM, while more full-scale pit activity would commence at 7 AM. The Board should indicate if they are OK with this.

8. Informational: No pit-related truck travel on any road other than Old Mill Road (and Main Street) is proposed. Also, previously; the Operations Manual restricted truck travel on Old Mill Road between March 21 and April 30. The Applicant is seeking a slightly different arrangement. This should be decided by the Planning Board.
9. The Inspection Fee Escrow will need to be replenished to the 2009 amount. The Autocad file will need to be submitted as described before.
10. Mr. Beal has worked hard with me to eliminate smaller issues such as the contents of the Operations Manual and some plan features. Discussions were had to make the Manual as clear as possible. Some of the revisions yet to be made will depend on some Planning Board decisions during this Meeting. We expect the final submittal, including the Final Plans, Final Operations Manual and Groundwater Monitoring Plan to be clear and complete so the Planning Board's expectations and what is being approved is clear.

CITY OF SANFORD
 PLANNING BOARD FINDING OF FACTS
 REVIEW CHECKLIST FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS



Approval Criteria and Standards

The following criteria shall be used by the Site Plan Review Committee and the Planning Board in reviewing applications for site plan review and shall serve as minimum requirements for approval of the application. The application shall be approved unless the Site Plan Review Committee or the Planning Board determines that the applicant has failed to meet one or more of these standards. In all instances, the burden of proof shall be on the applicant and such burden of proof shall include the production of evidence sufficient to warrant a finding that all applicable criteria have been met.

A	Utilization of the site. The plan for the development will reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support development. Buildings, lots, and support facilities will be clustered in those portions of the site that have the most suitable conditions for development. Environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains and unique natural features will be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent. Natural drainage areas will be preserved to the maximum extent.	OK FOR GRAVEL PIT
B	Access to the site. Vehicular access to the site will be on roads which have adequate capacity to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the development. For developments which generate 100 or more peak-hour trips based on the latest edition of the Trip Generation Manual of the Institute of Traffic Engineers, intersections on major access routes to the site within one mile of any entrance road which are functioning at a Level of Service of C or better prior to the development will function at a minimum at Level of Service C after development. If any intersection is functioning at a Level of Service D or lower prior to the development, the project will not reduce the current level of service. The Planning Board or Site Plan Review Committee may approve a development not meeting this requirement if the applicant demonstrates that:	OLD MILL RD - ADEQUATE
(1)	A public agency has committed funds to construct the improvements necessary to bring the level of access to this standard; or	
(2)	The applicant will assume financial responsibility for the improvements necessary to bring the level of service to this standard and will assure the completion of the improvements with a financial guarantee acceptable to the Town.	
C	Access into the site. Vehicular access into the development will provide for safe and convenient access.	SAME ACCESS DRIVE AS 2009
(1)	Any exit driveway or proposed street will be so designed as to provide the minimum sight distance to meet the Maine Department of Transportation standards.	
(2)	Points of access will be located to avoid hazardous conflicts with existing turning movements and traffic flows.	
(3)	The grade of any proposed drive or street will be not more than 3% for a minimum of two car lengths or 40 feet from the intersection.	OK
(4)	The intersection of any access drive or proposed street will function at a Level of Service of C following development if the project will generate 1,000 or more vehicle trips per twenty-four-hour period or at a level which will allow safe access into and out of the project if fewer than 1,000 trips are generated.	< 1000 TRIPS/DAY
D	Internal vehicular circulation. The layout of the site will provide for the safe movement of passenger, service and emergency vehicles through the site.	ADEQUATE
(1)	Nonresidential projects will provide a clear route for delivery vehicles with appropriate geometric design to allow turning and backing for a minimum of WB-50 vehicles.	✓
(2)	Clear routes of access will be provided and maintained for emergency vehicles to and around all buildings and will be posted with appropriate signage ("fire lane - no parking").	✓
(3)	The layout and design of parking areas will provide for safe and convenient circulation of vehicles throughout the lot and will prohibit	✓

	vehicles from backing out onto a street.	
(4)	All roadways will be designed to harmonize with the topographic and natural features of the site. The road network will provide for vehicular and pedestrian safety, all-season emergency access, snow storage, and delivery and collection services.	✓
E	Pedestrian circulation. The development plan will provide for pedestrian circulation within the development. If the project is located in an area where sidewalks exist or are located within 1,000 feet of the site, provisions shall be made for connection to the existing sidewalk system	N/A, NOT FOR PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
F	Stormwater management. Adequate provisions will be made for the disposal of all stormwater collected from proposed streets, parking areas, roofs and other surfaces through a stormwater drainage system and maintenance plan which will not have adverse impacts on abutting or downstream properties:	WAIVER RECOMMENDED FOR EXPANSION
(1)	To the extent possible, the plan will detain stormwater on the land at the site of development and do so through the use of the natural features of the site.	
(2)	For major developments, stormwater runoff systems will detain or retain water falling from the site such that the rate of flow from the site does not exceed the predevelopment rate.	
(3)	The applicant will demonstrate that downstream channel or system capacity is sufficient to carry the flow without adverse effects or will be responsible for the improvements to provide the required increase in capacity.	
(4)	All natural drainageways will be preserved at their natural gradients and will not be filled or converted to a closed system except as approved by the Site Plan Review Committee or Planning Board and appropriate state agencies if required.	
(5)	The design of stormwater drainage systems shall provide for the disposal of stormwater without damage to streets, adjacent properties, or downstream properties.	
(6)	The design of the storm drainage systems will be fully cognizant of upstream runoff which must pass over or through the site to be developed.	
(7)	The biological and chemical properties of the receiving waters will not be degraded by the stormwater runoff from the development site. The use of oil and grease traps in manholes, the use of on-site vegetated waterways, and the reduction in use of deicing salts and fertilizers may be required, especially where the development stormwater discharges into a gravel aquifer area or other water supply source.	
G	Erosion control.	
(1)	For all projects, building and site designs and roadway layouts will fit and utilize existing topography and desirable natural surroundings to the fullest extent possible. Filling, excavation and earthmoving activity will be kept to a minimum. Parking lots on sloped areas will be terraced to avoid undue cuts and fills and the need for retaining walls. Natural vegetation will be preserved and protected wherever possible.	EROSION CONTROL COMMITTED TO BE ADEQUATE (MINOR AREAS)
(2)	During construction of major developments, soil erosion and sedimentation of watercourses and water bodies will be minimized by an active program meeting the requirements of the York County Soil and Water Conservation District's Best Management Practices.	
H	Water supply.	N/A
(1)	The development will be provided with a system of water supply that provides each use with an adequate supply of drinking water.	
(2)	If the project will be served by the Sanford Water District, the applicant has secured, in writing, a statement from the Water District that the proposed water supply system conforms to its design and construction standards, will not result in an undue burden on the source or distribution system, and will be installed in a manner adequate to serve domestic water and fire protection needs.	✓
I	Sewage disposal.	N/A
(1)	A sanitary sewer system will be installed at the expense of the developer if the project is located within a sewer service area as defined by the Sanford Sewerage District. The Site Plan Review Committee or Planning Board may allow individual subsurface waste disposal systems to be	↓

	used where service is not available.	N/A (CONT)
(a)	Upstream sewage flows will be accommodated by an adequately sized system through the proposed development for existing conditions and potential development in the upstream area or areas tributary to the proposed development.	S
(b)	All components of sanitary sewerage facilities that connect to the Sewerage District's system must be designed by a professional engineer registered in the State of Maine and will be tested in full compliance with the design specifications and construction practices as established by the District. The construction of sewer lines will include the construction of laterals to the property line of each lot where individual lots are created.	
(c)	All individual and community on-site systems will be designed in full compliance with the Maine State Plumbing Code (May 1, 1995 Edition), as amended. Upon the recommendation of the Local Plumbing Inspector, the Site Plan Review Committee or Planning Board may require the location of reserve areas for replacement systems.	
(2)	If the project will be served by the Sanford Sewerage District, the applicant shall secure, in writing, a statement from the Sewerage District that the proposed sewerage system conforms to its design specifications and construction practices and that the project will not result in an undue burden on the system.	
J	Utilities. The development will be provided with electrical and telephone service adequate to meet the anticipated use of the project.	N/A
K	Natural features. The landscape will be preserved in its natural state insofar as practical by minimizing tree removal, disturbance and compaction of soil, and by retaining existing vegetation insofar as practical during construction. Extensive grading and filling will be avoided as far as possible.	OK FOR GRAVEL PIT SOME TREES TO BE PLANTED
L	Groundwater protection. The proposed site development and use will not adversely impact either the quality or quantity of groundwater available to abutting properties or public water supply systems.	GW MONITORING PLAN IN-PLACE
M	Exterior lighting. The proposed development will provide for adequate exterior lighting to provide for the safe use of the development in nighttime hours. All exterior lighting will be designed and shielded to avoid undue adverse impact on neighboring properties and rights-of-way.	N/A
N	Waste disposal. The proposed development will provide for adequate disposal of solid wastes and hazardous wastes.	TRASH TO BE HAULED OUT
(1)	All solid waste will be disposed of at a licensed disposal facility having adequate capacity to accept the project's wastes.	
(2)	All hazardous wastes will be disposed of at a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility and evidence of a contractual arrangement with the facility shall be submitted.	
O	Landscaping. The development plan will provide for landscaping to define street edges, break up parking areas, soften the appearance of the development and protect abutting properties from adverse impacts of the development.	OK - ORDINANCE-MANDATED BUFFERS ON PLANS
P	Shoreland relationship. The development will not adversely affect the water quality or shoreline of any adjacent water body. The development plan will provide for access to abutting navigable water bodies for the use of occupants of the development.	PER CEO - OK.
Q	Technical and financial capacity. The applicant has demonstrated that he has the financial and technical capacity to carry out the project in accordance with this Code and the approved plan.	HAS DEMONSTRATED.
R	Buffering. The development will provide for the buffering of adjacent uses where there is a transition from one type of use to another use and to screen service and storage areas. The buffer areas required by the zoning regulations will be provided and maintained.	OK
S	Airport encroachment. The development will not encroach above the imaginary surface of the Sanford Regional Airport as specified in Section 77.13 of Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations unless such encroachment will not have a detrimental impact on the instrument landing approach minimums currently in use or likely to be in use in the future.	N/A

Schedule of Reclamation Areas
Expansion of Existing Mineral Extraction Operations
Old Mill Road & Twombly Road
Sanford, Maine

R. Pepin and Sons, Inc.
PO Box 729
Sanford, Maine 04073

May 17, 2013

The following individual areas within the existing facility, as depicted on the approved drawings, are anticipated to be completed as follows:

1. The area on the west side of the driveway, as you enter the pit, will be backfilled with clay material from Area 2 and then reclaimed. This work will be completed by **July 1, 2013**.
2. The area of clay material, to remain open for excavation of reclamation soils.
3. The west side of the pit, north of the former Agway store. Gravel soil in this area will be excavated for a length of approximately 400 feet, from the reclamation area, back to the limit of the current pit. As the excavation proceeds northerly, Pepin will backfill the side slopes using on-site clay and silt materials within 4 months of initiating the embankment excavation, within 2 months of excavating to the setback limit, and when the length of the excavated embankment reaches 200 feet. Approximately half of this area will be reclaimed by **December 2013** and the remaining half by **May 2014**.
4. The area between the internal road and the wetland setback will be excavated for processing crushed gravel. When the area reaches the final elevations, it will be reclaimed with loam and seeded. This work should be completed by **June 2014**.
5. Area on the East side of the existing pit and continuing onto the DeLuca parcel will be mined for sand. This will occur from the present time into the spring of **2015**.
6. The loam stockpile area on the right side of the entrance driveway. This material will be used to reclaim all of the prior areas. When the loam is removed the area will be seeded and mulched.
7. Phase 2 (on the Sebago plans) will not be excavated north of the current pit for the foreseeable future. All disturbed areas will be backfilled, seeded and mulched in conjunction with Area 3.
8. Major excavation onto the Perham parcel is not expected to begin until late 2014.
9. Work on the DeLuca parcel, east of Genest, is not expected to begin until 2015.

Changes to this schedule will be submitted to the City in the semiannual reports and to the Staff prior to initiating excavation activity.