

Richos, Sarah

From: Vanessa Cardillo <secretarydaltonconcom@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2021 12:09 PM
To: Rennie, Craig
Subject: Illegal DCC Members and Letter

EXTERNAL: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Good morning Craig,

I am writing to you in regards to any letters that you may receive from the “new Dalton Conservation Commission.” I know that the logistics in the removal and appointment of the Commission’s members do not apply to your business. Though I wanted to reach out to you to let you know that Jon Swan has fully taken over the little Town of Dalton and it’s quite sad. It infuriated him to no end that he had no control over the Commission to force us to write an acceptable letter to deny the Landfill project. As you may know his wife is also Vice Chair for the Dalton Select Board as well as the Commission’s liaison. They abused their power with the town and forced 3 members off of the Commission before term was up, and didn’t properly take the steps that are the rules and procedures in the appointment of Commission members. Yet they went behind everyone’s backs and appointed friends of his and whom are all members of the Save Forest Lake organization and were extremely biased in their decision making and writing of the letter to send to you. I hope that you’re actions would be not to accept any letters they send to be allowed on the file whatsoever, if not for the illegal way of their appointment, but for being extremely past the deadline you and or your department set forth for this project. It is unfair. They are grasping at loose strings trying to weasel their way into forcing people to join their group and force their agenda upon others. I appreciate your time in this matter. I apologize for bothering you with our town politics and such, I just wanted to open your and your departments eyes to the corrupt actions that are taking place in order to sabotage and attack this one project at hand to their full extent/power as possible. I am not trying to persuade you in any way shape or form, yet to merely follow the deadlines and make a decision based on that which is fairness. What they are doing is wrong! Once I figure out how to download the DCC’s last meeting in regards to this letter making you can hear for yourself how biased they are.

Thank you again so much for your time and help on this matter. Have a wonderful weekend!!

Vanessa Cardillo

Richos, Sarah

From: Jim Dannis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2021 2:50 PM
To: Rennie, Craig
Cc: Sandy Dannis
Subject: We are Dalton residents who don't support the landfill but nonetheless oppose HB 177. Plus an alternative legislative approach.

EXTERNAL: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Dear Mr. Rennie --

We wanted to pass this along some lighter reading in your stack of stuff on the Dalton landfill proposal!

As we note in our comment to the legislators, we believe a solid majority of Dalton voters are in support of the landfill. We also believe a solid majority respects DES's professionalism and expertise.

We are saddened to see a small but very vocal group launching attacks on your organization and some of your professionals. Please be assured that in our experience this is not representative of our town as a whole or the North Country as a whole.

Thank you for your efforts, and all the best,

Jim and Sandy

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jim Dannis <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Mar 29, 2021 at 2:34 PM
Subject: We are Dalton residents who don't support the landfill but nonetheless oppose HB 177. Plus an alternative legislative approach.
To: <HouseWaysAndMeansCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseTransportationCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseState-FederalRelationsandVeteransAffairs@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseScienceTechnologyandEnergy@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseResourcesRecreationandDevelopment@leg.state.nh.us>, <HousePublicWorksandHighways@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseMunicipalandCountyGovt@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseLegislativeAdministration@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseJudiciaryCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseLaborIndustrialandRehabilitativeServices@leg.state.nh.us>, <HHSEA@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseFishandGameCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseFinanceCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseExecutiveDepartmentsandAdministration@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseEnvironmentandAgricultureCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseElectionLawCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseEducationCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseCriminalJusticeandPublicSafety@leg.state.nh.us>, <HouseCommerceCommittee@leg.state.nh.us>
Cc: Sandy Dannis [REDACTED]

Dear Legislators:

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of our state!

As conservation-minded people who are the largest landowners in Dalton, we are not supporters of the proposed Dalton landfill. So you'd expect us to be in favor of HB 177. But we're not. We take good legislative principles seriously and we think HB 177 fails on many counts.

Here's what we believe is wrong with the bill.

(1) HB 177 is dishonest. The bill pretends to protect state parks. But with all the exceptions and holes in the bill's swiss cheese language, it's obvious HB 177 zeroes in on only one target. And that's the landfill proposed in Dalton. State parks are just a convenient pretext. Please cut through the camouflage and assess this bill for what it really is.

(2) This is special interest legislation. This bill doesn't look to set general policy for all landfills or even to balance the competing interests associated with the Dalton proposal. Instead, it's one-sided, special interest, NIMBY legislation pushed mostly by a small group of wealthy, politically-connected Littleton, Bethlehem and Forest Lake property owners. They don't want any commercial or industrial development in Dalton (a poor town whose tax base needs a lot of improvement) if they might catch a glimpse of it from their homes on the lake or up on the ridges. You hear their voices in HB 177 but not the voices of Dalton families.

(3) The bill is an end-run around DES's good process. DES's landfill siting and approval process already takes into account the interests of all "affected persons". This includes the landfill opponents on the lake and the ridges. They've inundated DES with literally hundreds of comments. DES's process is working. Like everyone else, these landfill opponents should rely on DES's sound process and expert judgment. There is no reason to grab this single landfill proposal out of DES's capable hands and make it the target of special "kill" legislation.

(4) HB 177 drags the legislature into the no-go zone of giving one-off approvals to individual landfills. In substance, HB 177 asks the legislature to take an up-and-down vote on a single project, the Dalton landfill. That's not what the legislature is meant to do. In New Hampshire, we trust our legislature to set general rules and not to spot zone out individual projects. This is a dangerous precedent. What happens next time, when a landfill is proposed in another town? Will you see a new bill asking for another legislative spot zoning "no"? A bill saying "no landfill shall be sited within 2 miles of X"? With X being a new invented pretext, like a river, or mountain, or town forest, or conserved land? Will the legislature be asked to act on every future landfill proposal via special bills? This kind of legislation can seriously damage our state's well-earned reputation for being open, fair and business-friendly.

(5) The bill takes away local control and silences the voices of Dalton voters. DES will make its professional and expert siting/approval decision. If the project makes it through DES, it will then be up to Dalton voters and elected officials to decide whether to accept the landfill sponsor's proposal to the town. The current proposal -- with the landfill paying 100% of all property taxes -- could transform the lives of many Dalton families who struggle financially. But HB 177 would tell Dalton families that their needs, their opinions and their voices mean nothing. Dalton would have no say at all. Although we would not be among them, we believe a solid majority of Dalton residents would support the landfill proposal. One-sided, special interest legislation like HB 177 that caters to a small, elite group should not silence the voices of Dalton's families.

For these reasons (which are 100% non-partisan!), we urge you to vote down HB 177.

We want to point out that there is another and more appropriate route HB 177 could have taken.

If there are valid concerns about property impacts, DES's landfill approval process could be revised by legislation to make it even more clear that affected property owners' input will be fully considered in all landfill applications.

For example, requirements could be added for DES to hold public hearings in surrounding towns, not just the host town. DES could be asked to make specific findings regarding the impacts on affected landowners. DES could be directed to fold these impacts into the public interest determination. The legislature could provide guidance on how different factors, including impacts on property owners, are to be weighed in DES's public interest test.

These types of general process improvements -- applicable on a fair and equal basis to all projects -- would be sensible and responsible.

Unfortunately, rather than working in this direction, HB 177 takes what we believe is the harmful and irresponsible path of seeking a legislative "kill" on a single project. This is not the New Hampshire way.

Thank you for considering our views! And thank you again for what you do for New Hampshire.

Sandy and Jim Dannis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Giallongo, Stefanie

From: Jeanne Beaudin <townadministrator@belmontnh.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 11:38 AM
To: DES: Wetlands Application Public Comments
Subject: Belmont Letter of Support File #2020-02239
Attachments: Belmont LOS File 2020-02239.pdf

EXTERNAL: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Good Morning – please find attached our letter of support for the application before the Wetlands Bureau relative to Casella Waste. Thank you.

K. Jeanne Beaudin, ICMA-CM
Town Administrator
Town of Belmont
143 Main Street
Belmont, NH 03220
603-267-8300 Ext. 124

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE:

The information in this email message and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only and may be privileged and confidential. If you have received this email message and attachments, if any, in error, please notify me immediately by email at the above address and return and destroy the original and all copies. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.



Office of Board of Selectmen

143 Main Street, P.O. Box 310, Belmont, New Hampshire 03220-0310
Telephone: (603) 267-8300 Fax: (603) 267-8327

July 7, 2021

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services
Wetlands Bureau
29 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire
Via email: WetlandsApplicationPublicComments@des.nh.gov

Re: Public Comment - Granite State Landfill Wetlands Application - NHDES File# 2020-02239

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is offered in support of the Granite State Landfill Project, and the Wetlands Application pending before the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.

As the regulatory review of the Granite State Landfill moves forward, it is important to recognize the diminishing disposal capacity in New Hampshire. For example, the North Country Landfill in Bethlehem is soon to close. This facility provides disposal capacity for 150 New Hampshire cities and towns throughout the state – this is equal to about 50,000 households and 5,500 businesses. These customers will be forced to incur additional disposal and transportation costs if this capacity is not replaced. The Granite State Landfill provides New Hampshire with the opportunity to replace that capacity in a timely manner. The Granite State Landfill is also intended to be a part of Casella's integrated waste management system that will include a state-of-the-art Materials Recovery Facility in New Hampshire that will allow for recyclables to be processed in state, which would also reduce costs, and at the same time, improve recycling rates.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

K. Jeanne Beaudin
Town Administrator

Thank you for letting me participate in this hearing, and welcome to the North Country.

I am here to support the wetlands permit. I feel the new project would be a huge benefit to Dalton which is a starving town.

Unfortunately, there are people who are telling half-truths, distorting the actual project plan and are just plain lying to the residents of Dalton.

Therefore, I would like to bring to light some of those inaccuracies and clarify them.

1. The actual foot print of the landfill is not 180, 189, 200, 500 or 1900 acres, the actual footprint is 137 acres, within a 1900-acre parcel of land.
2. As some say, the landfill will keep expanding. This is another distorted view. In reality the permit is for the entire 137 acres. There will be a 3-phase plan of development, but this is all contained in the 137 acres within the 1900 acres.
3. While the wetlands are very important, so is responsible growth in Dalton. I believe Casella is responsible and they have the rules of the permitting process to go by. 17 acres of wetland will be taken, but Casella will have to lessen the severity of that take with a much greater, larger area of wetlands. There was an offer of 244 acres of highly valued wetlands offered to the Dalton Conservation Commission for the taking of 17 acres of wetland, yet they turned it down, why? 244 acres in return for 17 acres seems like a very generous offer. Not to mention the community assistance Casella is willing to provide to Dalton.
4. The property that the landfill would be sited on already includes industrial uses, and, has been logged for generations. I'm curious as to how the opposition feels about the 150 acres being logged by the

State at Forest Lake. Certainly, there are lots of wetland there and yet no comment by them, personally I feel very comfortable with the rules and regulations that the State mandates for protection.

5. In-state waste disposal is going up. Due to the increase of people moving to this State, the rising cost of fuel, and diminishing landfills.
6. This new landfill would be state of the art. Their responsibility is to put as little as possible into the ground. Recycling, repurposing and creating fuels out of materials produced by the waste breakdown process are some of the ways they will accomplish this huge task.
7. Until the opposition makes the packaging manufacturers change their ways, where will you put your garbage? The opposition does have one good point however, recycling is important, not an overnight process for sure, but you know, Casella has the same thought.
8. My last comment, we all know that there was a leachate spill, unfortunately it was made out to have contaminated rivers, ponds, etc. The truth is it did not! A landfill has multiple backup plans to ensure that if there is a leak it will be detected and contained before it really goes anywhere. So please stop with the scare tactics. This is why this project has the expertise and the opposition does not. I'd like to hear from the Casella experts to get the truth about what really happened during that spill and what reports said.

Again, thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Pam Kathan

Submitted Public hearing on 7/14 PGM

Thank you for letting me participate in this hearing, and welcome to the North Country. I apologize for the disrespect ^{being} shown to ~~us~~ ^{you}

I am here to support the wetlands permit. I feel the new project would be a huge benefit to Dalton which is a starving town.

Unfortunately, ^{there has been much whining and drama} there are people who are telling half-truths, distorting the actual project plan and are just plain lying to the residents of Dalton.

~~Therefore, I would like to bring to light some of those inaccuracies and clarify them.~~

~~I am not a pedigreed, privileged~~ ^{second home owner} ~~second home owner~~ ^{I am a Dalton resident who works hard to}

1. The actual foot print of the landfill is not 180, 189, 200, 500 or 1900 acres, the actual footprint is 137 acres, within a 1900-acre parcel of land.

The permit is for the 137 acres

2. As some say, the landfill will keep expanding. This is another distorted view. In reality the permit is for the entire 137 acres. There will be a 3-phase plan of development, but this is all contained in the 137 acres within the 1900 acres.

3. While the wetlands are very important, so is responsible growth in Dalton. I believe Casella is responsible and they have the rules of the permitting process to go by. 17 acres of wetland will be taken, but Casella ~~will have~~ ^{has} to lessen the severity of that take with a much greater, larger area of wetlands. There was an offer of 244 acres of highly valued wetlands offered to the Dalton Conservation Commission for the taking of 17 acres of wetland, yet they turned it down, why? 244 acres in return for 17 acres seems like a very generous offer. Not to mention the community assistance Casella is willing to provide to Dalton. ~~There will be a tremendous loss~~

That's just part of the permitting process

4. The property that the landfill would be sited on already includes industrial uses, and, has been logged for generations. I'm curious as to how the opposition feels about the 150 acres being logged by the

4/1

Thank you for letting me have the opportunity to speak and welcome to the North Country, I apologize for the disrespect shown to you, This is not ~~the~~ North Country hospitality, I'm not a pedigreed, privileged, second home owner activist, I am a hard working Dalton resident trying to survive, I'm here to support the approval of this wetlands permit, I feel the new project would be a huge benefit to Dalton residents and local garbage haulers, It will keep their jobs

State at Forest Lake. Certainly, there are lots of wetland there and yet no comment ~~by them~~ ^{on that}, personally I feel very comfortable with the rules and regulations that ~~the State~~ ^{DES} mandates for protection.

Contrary to popular belief

5. In-state waste disposal is going up. Due to the increase of people moving to this State, the rising cost of fuel, and diminishing landfills. *Independent local garbage haulers will be hurt by denying the permit*

6. This new landfill would be state of the art. Their responsibility is to put as little as possible into the ground. Recycling, repurposing and creating fuels out of materials produced by the waste breakdown process are some of the ways they will accomplish this huge task.

7. ~~Until the opposition makes~~ ^{The opposition needs to concentrate} ~~the packaging manufacturers~~ ^{change} their ways, where will you put your garbage? The opposition does have one good point however, recycling is important, not an overnight process for sure, but you know, Casella has the same thought.

8. ~~My last comment~~, we all know that there was a leachate spill, unfortunately it was made out to have contaminated rivers, ponds, etc. The truth is it did not! A landfill has multiple backup plans to ensure that if there is a leak it will be detected and contained before it really goes anywhere. So please stop with the scare tactics. ~~This is why this project has the expertise and the opposition does not. I'd like to hear from the Casella experts to get the truth about what really happened during that spill and what reports said.~~ *In reality*

~~It is~~ *It is unfortunate that our SB, PB + CC are all on one*

Again, thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Pam Kathan

~~This is not~~

has national activist members - not representative of the true Dalton residents

Thank you for letting me speak at this hearing and welcome to the North Country I apologize for the disrespect that you have been shown.

This is NOT the North Country's way.

I am not a pedigreed, privileged, second home owner, actual
I am here to support the approval of the

I am a
hard working
Dalton
resident
trying to
survive

wetlands permit. I feel the new project would be a huge benefit to Dalton residents and local garbage haulers.

① The permit is for a footprint of ~~137 acres~~ ^{137 acres} of 1900 acres
to be built in 3 phases - not an expansion

137 acres of 1900 acres

3 phase development in 137 acres

**OUR VIEWS
ON
THE DALTON LANDFILL PROJECT**

*Submitted to the
public hearing on
7/14/21
DGM*

But first, we wish to express our appreciation to DES for giving us the opportunity to express our views

Our names are Don & Nancy Mooney. We have lived permanently in Dalton at our present address for over 40 years.

Our Grand Parents & Parents lived the majority of their lives in Dalton and were strong supporters of the Dalton community as we are.

We hope that the above statement will indicate how strongly we feel about the welfare of our town.

We are here in support of Casella's plan to develop a landfill in Dalton. We support the project and urge the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services to approve the pending wetland permit for the site. We have toured the proposed Landfill site and find(in our opinion) that considering the large amount of space between the landfill and the nearest neighbors and the uses as an active gravel mining quarry and logging site, a better place would be very hard to come by. Casella will build a modern landfill and their technical expertise will protect the environment and benefit Dalton as they do the essential work of managing waste.

Many of the ideas about the Landfill that are being promoted by one person are in error and present a very different view than ours.

Examples:

1. That Casella has not been receptive to having a discussion with the Select Board.

FACT - Representatives of Casella have tried a number of times to establish a constructive discussion with the Board and have been refused.

2. That the Landfill is a Dangerous Project and will cause damage and loss of property value.

FACT – The state mandated regulations that the Project must follow will prevent this Project from being a danger. The DES hearings are an example of how thorough and tough the state review process is. As far as causing a loss in Property Values, there is a landfill in Bethlehem and \$1 million homes nearby. Coventry, VT where Casella has a landfill is a very popular place to live.

3. The Project will have a negative impact on the quality of life and local tourism.

FACT – The quality of life will not be impacted in a negative way, actually, depending on what kind of an agreement that is settled on between Casella and the Town, the lives of many citizens will be improved. Example: Many Citizens can not pay their taxes and the revenue the town would get from the landfill project would lower taxes a lot. Emergency & Road Departments could have the latest equipment. Educational help could be offered. Much, Much more will be possible if only a positive discussion can be established between the Town and Casella.

FACT – There is a landfill in Bethlehem and there are other landfills in the North Country and they have not affected tourism. People still enjoy visiting and fishing, hunting, snowmobiling, skiing, going to

restaurants and everything else. Our local snowmobile club is thriving and we know many folks that come to the area to visit.

Over the years we have seen many problems in and for the Town arise. These problems were handled without the division and animosity that now exists. This present situation can be attributed to the actions of one person and his ability to use false and misleading information. To his credit, he is a very smooth talker and is very willing to work hard in order to gain his objectives. However, his back ground indicates an individual that is very destructive and can not be trusted.

We plan to submit public comments to the NHDES in support of Casella's wetlands permit and hope that others will too.

Views of a Caring Couple,
Don & Nancy Mooney



The State of New Hampshire
Department of Environmental Services



Robert R. Scott, Commissioner

Water Division, Land Resources Management, Wetlands Bureau

PUBLIC HEARING WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

The purpose of this public hearing is to receive public comments on NHDES application 2020-02239, submitted by Granite State Landfill, LLC, proposing to impact approximately 17 acres of wetlands for the construction of a new landfill.

Please drop this comment card in the box provided on the table at the entrance to the auditorium.
 A written comment is treated exactly the same as an oral comment.

NAME: <i>Victor St Cyr</i>	TOWN: <i>DALTON NH</i>
AFFILIATION: <i>Local Resident 65 years</i>	DATE: <i>7/14/21</i>
COMMENT: <i>Hello. My HOME HAS BEEN IN DALTON FOR 65 YEARS I WAS A selectman FOR 19 YEARS Planning Board FOR 2 YEARS MY two sons and their family both live in Dalton With MY 5 Grand Children. I AM the 9th Generation IN Dalton. I HAVE BEEN INVOLVED WITH the Proposed Site FOR many years and see NO Reason that the Landfill Should NOT Be Built IN Dalton. I trust DES To Govern and work with Casella to Ob the wet land permits. Thank you!</i>	

[Signature] Dalton NH 03598

Giallongo, Stefanie

From: Newton,Chaz <cnewton@manchesternh.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 9:15 AM
To: DES: Wetlands Application Public Comments
Subject: RE: Public Comment - Granite State Landfill Wetlands Application - NHDES File# 2020-02239
Attachments: Public Comment – Granite State Landfill Wetlands Application.docx

EXTERNAL: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

To Whom it May Concern:

Please accept this attached letter in support of the Granite State Landfill Project, and the Wetlands Application pending before the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.

Regards,

Chaz Newton
Solid Waste & Environmental Programs Manager

City of Manchester
Department of Public Works
475 Valley Street
Manchester, NH 03103
(603) 792-5306

The Right-To-Know Law (RSA 91-A) provides that most e-mail communications, to or from City employees and City volunteers regarding the business of the City of Manchester, are government records available to the public upon request. Therefore, this email communication may be subject to public disclosure.

New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services
Wetlands Bureau
29 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire

Re: Public Comment – Granite State Landfill Wetlands Application – NHDES File# 2020-02239

To Whom it May Concern:

Please accept this letter in support of the Granite State Landfill Project, and the Wetlands Application pending before the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.

The awareness and thorough processes in how we landfill waste has developed over the years in a way that prioritizes the residents' health and safety as well as preserving our environment. The Granite State Landfill project is no exception of a project that has developed a comprehensive process and ensures these priorities. This process is vigilant of the surroundings while providing a service needed for the community.

The Granite State Landfill would provide an option for municipalities during the ongoing difficult market. With limited options for municipalities for waste disposal, this can put City governments in a unique position of cost in respect to supply-and-demand. The NCES Landfill in Bethlehem currently provides an option for waste disposal to 150+ cities and towns throughout the state, and is moving toward final closure. The difficult market due to limited options, combined with disposal and transportation costs could put many of these 150+ municipalities in a challenging financial position moving forward for many years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.



The State of New Hampshire
Department of Environmental Services



Robert R. Scott, Commissioner

Water Division, Land Resources Management, Wetlands Bureau

PUBLIC HEARING WRITTEN COMMENT FORM

The purpose of this public hearing is to receive public comments on NHDES application 2020-02239, submitted by Granite State Landfill, LLC, proposing to impact approximately 17 acres of wetlands for the construction of a new landfill.

**Please drop this comment card in the box provided on the table at the entrance to the auditorium.
A written comment is treated exactly the same as an oral comment.**

NAME: George Bell	TOWN: Dutton NH
AFFILIATION: Resident	DATE: 7/14/21
COMMENT: Build the landfill IN Dutton. OK the WET Land Permits.	
<i>George Bell Dutton NH</i>	

www.des.nh.gov