Milford Township

From: Vito DiBiasi [vdibiasi54@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2021 11:02 PM
To: steven.h.culp@gmail.com; jandjspina@yahoo.com; faith@delawareriverkeeper.org; mudpiedave@gmail.com; deli121@ptd.net; airsoilwaterorg@gmail.com; nancepin@aol.com; peterpin@aol.com; mazmitp@gmail.com; delawarevalleyaction@gmail.com; keeper@delawareriverkeeper.org; daviddrichard@gmail.com; mliuart@yahoo.com; pocojoe@gmail.com; mrnkgn@yahoo.com; analiciaculp@gmail.com; liz@lizforrest.com; ravfhendricks@gmail.com; hendricks.dakotaj@gmail.com; dougjmanion@gmail.com; djpco@verizon.net; fkwmalliss@gmail.com; milfordboro.treecommission@gmail.com; plutfy@dvsd.org; revvanb@gmail.com; waterplt@gmail.com; wateropr@gmail.com; waterofc@ptd.net; ssheldon@vancleefengineering.com; editor@pikedispatch.com; copyeditor@riverreporter.com; milfrdtp@ptd.net; secretary@milfordpa.org; sara@delawarehighlands.org; pvranello@yahoo.com; info@pfsc.org; sarah.corcoran@sierraclub.org; tjhaar@gmail.com; cduquette1215@gmail.com; wcollins@simonecollins.com; mmrozinski@pikepa.org; ryan@ryanbalton.com; milfordgarden@gmail.com; sue@pnercd.org; tammy@edapikepa.org; binky23@ptd.net; najarian@remgrp.com; info@pikechamber.com; sean.strub@gmail.com; egragert@gmail.com; PikeExt@psu.edu
Subject: Questions for Milford Twp. and Mr. Shepstone

Friends of the Milford Aquifer

To whom it may concern. I was in the wrong Zoom account, mine instead of my wife's account. The zoom account was started under my wife's name and email and therefore only recognizes her account as the true Zoom account. My account lets me be a listener to the meeting but not with the same privileges as her account. It all looks the same but they could not see me or hear me. I did not figure that out until after the meeting closed. You could imagine my frustration!
I will just have to contact all these people on my own with my comments and reactions. Does anyone know the emails to the planning commission members? I especially liked the comments of the Attorney Farley. Maybe by being forced to write these questions down, it helps expand the conversation. Vito

My question to Milford Twp. and Mr. Shepstone were going to be:

1) Explain to the Public how the words used by Mr. Shepstone to describe this Ordinance like "simplify" and "Business Friendly" are not words of concern for anyone who wants to protect the MIlford Aquifer in the **MOST ROBUST WAY POSSIBLE?** Why does the Ordinance have to be *clean and streamlined?* For whose benefit? Why can it not be *technical* and as *restrictive as possible*?

2) Why water down the ordinance for business? Is that what your constituents want? Do you listen more to business concerns or constituent concerns?

3) By changing the language of this Ordinance to be simplified from the Dingman's version, are you stripping away any of the *technical restrictions* of the Original Ordinance?

4) Is Shepstone proposing **Dingman Twp.** simplifys their Ordinance?

5) The **Tenn. Pipeline** runs through the 44 acre (Latimore property.) Is that being addressed in this Ordinance as Faith Zerbe pointed out?

6) I applaud **Attorney Farley's** efforts at drilling down on 55 gal. definition, and offering a 35-55 gal. separate category.

7) It appears that all the participant's suggestions allowed for the *perfection* of this Ordinance. That was very encouraging. I hope as this Ordinance undergoes further analysis it continues to get better.

8) When I hear land uses like *"used car lots"* and *"golf courses"* my head starts to explode. I hope they do not mean these are *acceptable uses* on **Zone 2 of the Milford Aquifer**. I hope restrictions in this zone are prohibitive for these types of uses by their very nature. Are these more restrictive conditions *codified* in this Ordinance?

9) Is there any way to calculate the *cumulative effects* of Three Developments in a row at the Rt.6 I84 Interchange in Miford Twp.? What effects will it have on the Springs and the Aquifer? What happens when you add all that *"impervious surface"* together, plus add the 93acres of development in Dingman's Twp.? Each piece has one effect but added together is there a different more powerful cumulative effect? The three Developments in Milford Twp. are:

1) **The Latimore 44 acres** by far the **most consequential** because of a) **100% being on the Aquifer,** b) Any retention ponds are not going to be resistant to any type of chemical pollution, even small spills, because of the "Unconfined Aquifer." Unconfined Aquifers are in a separate category of their own because of the lack of barrier between the surface and the aquifer below. Does this Ordinance address this unique "unconfined aquifer?"

2) **The 27 acre Biando property.** This a concern because it contains a piece of Zone 2 and is also very *steeply sloped* to the *"exceptional waters"* **Sawkill Creek** *just* **100 ft.** away at its bottom reach.

3) Just 1350 ft. up the road is the **K & N property** with a **28 acre** development called "Timber Woods.(?)" The concern for this property is similar to the Biando property. It is also very *steeply sloped* and at its bottom reach it is only about 1000 ft. from the *"exceptional waters "* **Sawkill Creek.**

10) Even though it garnered a laugh from the Planning Commission, Mr. Shepstone's strong support for the **Gas Industry** is a red flag for **Friends of the Milford Aquifer.** This bias shows the subservient view of protecting a town's Drinking water supply because of the overwhelming documentation that **fracking** can have a detrimental effect on drinking water supplies. When you couple this comment with his other comments about "simplifying" this Ordinance to make it more "Business Friendly," you can see where we are legitimately concerned that this *attitude* seeps into the language of this Ordinance. By extrapolation, we hope that Milford Twp. does not embrace this type of *causal attitude* towards protecting this Aquifer.

11) As Milford Twp. pursues the perfection of this Ordinance we hope that Milford Twp. will put this much consideration into Friends of the Milford Aquifer's efforts to get as much of Zone 2 land into **conservation easements.**

12) I hope that all these concerns are addressed in some way or another before your next workshop with the Milford Water Authority on June 14th . We are concerned that if the **Milford Water Authority** is only going to rely on the *Ordinance only* approach to protecting the Springs instead of in combination it with Zoning - this Ordinance needs to be as *air tight* as I can be! Not *simplified* or *friendly* for the benefit of the *Business Community* but strengthened with the best possible language for the ***Public Community*** - especially for **2.400** the rate paying customers who

consume this water. We hope that Milford Twp. would supplement the **Ordinance only** approach to protecting the Springs with the appropriate **Zoning restrictions**. This has to be an *"all in"* comprehensive approach to protecting this Aquifer. Anything less is just that - **LESS**.

Vito DiBiasi
Communications Rep.
Friends of the Milford Aquifer
Contact: vdibiasi54@gmail.com or panda1999@verison.net
570-618-3114