

October 8, 2025

To: Steven Graham

Cc: Alna Select Board

From: Amy Preston

RE: Draft of Mining Ordinance presented August 14, 2025

It was mentioned at an earlier SB meeting you would like feedback on this draft. The draft has a lot information to review(not including cross review of the state articles included), but I have noted items questionable and curious items in this correspondence. It was an interesting intro with emphasis on reflections of the Mining Committee (which choose to NOT have a Mining Ordinance and is no longer in existence.) Would you be able to clarify your “less risky” approach? By what definition or who’s definition is your draft “less risky”?

Has this draft been discussed or presented to the Planning Board, CEO, or town council for review?

Article 1 / Section 2. Purpose

- Why has the Sheepscot River and its tributaries been limited to “lower Sheepscot River wetlands area”? Can this area be defined?
- Why has protection of (1) quality of life and homes of residents, (2) scenic beauty and (3) businesses all been omitted, under Purpose, when these values were included in the Blasting Ordinance and all other previous drafts and proposed mining ordinances?

Article V1

*2 plus pages for existing mining and quarrying operations is register or offer assumption of Burden of Proof is confusing.

*Barring expansion, why is there no time limitation for existing operations to fall into compliance with new ordinance? (maintaining a whole additional state ordinance for CEO and Planning Board to work with is time consuming and cumbersome.)

-a new permit has a 5 year limitation and then must be renewed (Article IX/Section 1/D)

* Article VI /Section 1 /A. item 7 : does “footprint” include depth of mining?

* Section VI B “any time after the expiration of one hundred and eighty days following the enactment of this ordinance”. Does this mean a mining operation can present Burden of Proof indefinitely into the future?

It is my understanding there is only 1 Quarry and a handful of mining operations in this small town at this time. Why not have them all follow Section 1 A. and Register as existing within a specified number of days?

* B/5 This item appears incomplete "ends with comply with the followingof the state performance standards: (and nothing is listed)

There appears to be no limitations on length of operation timewise (ie. 5 years, 10 years, etc.). However new Operations are required to offer "expected" life or longevity of an operation. Perhaps there should be a timeframe for existing operations too.

There also does not appear to be any production limits by size or time frame in this draft. These limits would also limit increases in noise, dust, traffic, etc throughout the life of a mining operation.

What is the process going forward with this draft? Review with Planning Board and Council? Town information meeting open to public questions and comments?

Thank you for your time.