

Nov 3, 2025

TO: Planning Board & Select Board

FROM: Amy Preston

RE: Current version(#2 draft) of a Mining Ordinance for Alna

Still amazed at the lack of concern for our town, it's habitats (and equal tax payers) the natural beauty, the rural tranquility, and the protection against potential water issues. The idea of a Mining Ordinance came about to protect the town's resources: land, water and air quality (we are limited to what is on our land, there is no plan b), our residents, our historic buildings and our rural way of life. The town plan 20 years ago did not see any need for corporate business and prided itself in the rural peace and beauty of Alna.

Today this proposed ordinance appears to be a defense on the behalf of a major corporation (with NO vested interest in Alna itself) and a handful of gravel pit owners. At times there appears to be an oligarchy trying to run the direction of this ordinance. It appears that the solo quarry operating at this time will not have to change or adapt to the standards of a new ordinance.

Specific concerns:

*There should be annual limits of what is taken out for the earth, remember that every cubic yard is that much more processing with dust, noise, trucks, wear and tear of roads.

*Quarry Permits should be limited to nor more than 1 operating in the town.

*Time Limits should be established (like the 5 years noted for new operations).

Allowing for never ending projects gives very little opportunity for future generations to slow down and /or halt certain mining activities (like neighboring towns have restricted and kept mining operations to a smaller scale to preserve their communities and avoid potential problems.)

Instead of jumping to "let's avoid the risk" is there any consideration to put together options that truly reflect the entire town's views and then let town counsel advise what risks might come into play.

See next page for some questions-

Questions:

Section 2. Purpose

The purpose does not include the findings which note mining activities can create....."that can adversely affect neighbors' and other residents' peaceful enjoyment of their property" aka Quality of Life. I'm not sure "general welfare" is the same thing.

Question : who defines general welfare and/or peaceful enjoyment?

The purpose also omits inclusion of preserving the rural character of Alna (which has been unique.)

ARTIVLE III Section 2 A 9. (pg6)

"...existing operations may continue to operate under the terms of their pre-existing permits as modified.... Unless the Existing Quarry or Mining Operator files and applications to expand the footprint of their operation...."

QUESTION: How is *footprint* defined? It this a lateral space spreading out in different directions? Does is also include vertical expansion (going down deeper in the bedrock or below the water table restrictions? Would this include any "Application for a variance"? if not what standards would be applied for any "Application of a variance" for an existing operation?

ARTICLE VII Section 2 Standards for New Bedrock Quarrying and Mining Operations

This section completely omits and limits on extraction quantities/limits. (It has been suggested to limit quarry operations to 70,000 cubic yards extracted annually.)

Shouldn't some of (if not most) of these standards be applicable *at some point* to existing operations?

Section 2 Item E

Who is responsible to be measuring Noise on day to day time frame when different processes are taking place?

The follow up processing after a blast in the quarry creates longer lasting noise in the different steps before the dumping crashes into trucks and the back up beepers.

Section 2 Item Q

Could Federal or State listed rare or endangered forms of animal or plant life reports be reviewed every 5 years at least for a site in event there are changes.