

Appendix A
Detailed Community Survey Results

Table A1
Richmond Community Survey

Responses to statements on a scale of 1 to 7 where
1 means strong disagreement with the statement and 7 means strong agreement.

	Strong disagreement -----Strong agreement													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7							
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#							
1. The Town should encourage new business to locate in Richmond to provide jobs for our young people. (n = 274)	14	5.1	9	3.3	7	2.6	31	11.3	40	14.6	30	10.9	143	52.2
2. An area near the I-95 interchange should be set aside exclusively for industrial development. (n = 269)	36	13.4	17	6.3	20	7.4	37	13.8	33	12.3	39	14.5	87	32.3
3. The Town should acquire land and develop it as an industrial park. (n = 268)	79	29.5	25	9.3	29	10.8	51	19.0	18	6.7	16	6.0	50	18.7
4. New business should be discouraged since it will create a demand for more residential development. (n = 249)	134	50.0	33	12.3	33	12.3	23	8.6	12	4.5	14	5.2	19	7.1
5. If someone wanted to build a shopping center on Route 197 just outside of the Village District, the Town should permit it. (n = 275)	59	21.5	15	5.5	16	5.8	27	9.8	27	9.8	36	13.1	95	34.5
6. The Town should encourage new commercial development such as motels, truck stops and restaurants near the interstate exit. (n = 271)	54	19.9	12	4.4	14	5.2	38	14.0	36	13.3	36	13.3	81	29.9
7. Owners of forest land should be required to practice sound wood lot management to minimize over cutting. (n = 274)	27	9.9	8	2.9	7	2.6	24	8.8	36	13.1	20	7.3	152	55.5
8. The development of commercial marina facilities in the river should be encouraged. (n = 268)	48	17.9	12	4.5	11	4.1	49	18.3	36	13.4	27	10.1	85	31.7
9. Antique stores, craft and gift shops and art galleries should be attracted to locate in the Village. (n = 272)	18	6.6	11	4.0	14	5.1	42	15.4	38	14.0	41	15.1	108	39.7

Table A1 (cont'd)

Responses to statements on a scale of 1 to 7 where
1 means strong disagreement with the statement and 7 means strong agreement.

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
10. Fast food franchises should be prohibited from locating in the Village District. (n = 269)	64	23.8	26	9.7	22	8.2	27	10.0	11	4.1	26	9.7	93	34.6
11. The Town should encourage professional offices and services to be developed in the Village. (n = 274)	13	4.7	10	3.6	8	2.9	30	10.9	35	12.8	35	12.8	143	52.2
12. New manufacturing and industrial uses should not be allowed to locate in the historic district. (n = 273)	38	13.9	11	4.0	13	4.8	36	13.2	24	8.8	29	10.6	122	44.7
13. The Town should actively work to preserve the historic character of the Village. (n = 272)	20	7.4	3	1.1	12	4.4	39	14.3	31	11.4	22	8.1	145	53.3
14. Property owners in the historic district should be required to conform to architectural standards when making changes to historic buildings. (n = 270)	36	13.3	8	3.0	26	9.6	37	13.7	35	13.0	28	10.4	100	37.0
15. The Town should actively enforce regulations on junk cars and property maintenance. (n = 276)	16	5.8	5	1.8	8	2.9	22	8.0	19	6.9	37	13.4	169	61.2
16. A plan should be developed for the future use of the railroad right-of-way for recreation purposes. (n = 267)	28	10.5	4	1.5	10	3.7	45	16.9	36	13.5	33	12.4	111	41.6

Table A2 (cont'd)

Mean responses to statements on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means strong disagreement with the statement and 7 means strong agreement

	Number of Years Resided in Richmond					Age of Head of Household					Child. in HH			
	All Respond.	2 or Less	3 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	More than 20	<25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	>65	No	Yes
10. Fast food franchises should be prohibited from locating in the Village District.	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.28	4.57	4.09	4.45	3.81	4.56	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.26	4.41
11. The Town should encourage professional offices and services to be developed in the Village.	5.70	5.78	6.03	5.92	5.65	5.50	5.27	5.92	5.91	5.40	5.35	5.65	5.70	5.70
12. New manufacturing and industrial uses should not be allowed to locate in the historic district.	5.10	5.27	5.58	5.56	5.16	4.70	4.64	5.29	5.30	4.54	5.35	5.06	5.07	5.20
13. The Town should actively work to preserve the historic character of the Village.	5.59	6.07	6.08	5.80	5.53	5.09	6.27	5.76	5.90	5.00	5.21	5.55	5.60	5.58
14. Property owners in the historic district should be required to conform to architectural standards when making changes to historic buildings.	4.89	5.27	5.43	5.12	4.86	4.45	5.45	4.84	5.12	4.41	4.35	5.33	4.97	4.86
15. The Town should actively enforce regulations on junk cars and property maintenance.	5.93	6.23	5.89	6.28	5.47	5.90	6.09	6.04	5.90	5.72	5.68	6.25	5.98	5.83
16. A plan should be developed for the future use of the railroad right-of-way for recreation purposes.	5.25	6.04	5.17	5.44	5.41	4.71	5.91	5.77	5.84	4.38	4.33	4.85	5.15	5.51

Table B1

Richmond Community Survey

Willingness to use local tax money for various activities
on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is very unwilling and 7 is very willing.

	1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
17. Improving and constructing sidewalks in the Village. (n = 273)	19	7.0	6	2.2	11	4.0	41	15.0	49	17.9	28	10.3	119	43.6
18. Developing the Town forest for recreational use. (n = 271)	67	24.7	16	5.9	19	7.0	56	20.7	38	14.0	17	6.3	58	21.4
19. Constructing off-street parking near Main Street. (n = 271)	41	15.1	15	5.5	14	5.2	61	22.5	40	14.8	31	11.4	69	25.5
20. Acquiring land along the riverfront outside of the Village for recreational use. (n = 271)	57	21.0	15	5.5	22	8.1	46	17.0	36	13.3	35	12.9	60	22.1
21. Spending money to keep open space from being developed. (n = 266)	83	31.2	19	7.1	31	11.7	51	19.2	23	8.6	18	6.8	41	15.4
22. Purchasing land which is important wildlife habitat. (n = 269)	56	20.8	13	4.8	23	8.6	46	17.1	25	9.3	27	10.0	79	29.4
23. Expanding the Richmond Utilities District sewer system to encourage additional development on the fringes of the current Village. (n = 268)	59	22.0	17	6.3	23	8.6	46	17.2	45	16.8	29	10.8	49	18.3
24. Assisting in restoring historic buildings in Town. (n = 268)	70	26.1	25	9.3	21	7.8	54	20.1	30	11.2	22	8.2	46	17.2
25. Providing tax breaks to farmers to keep their land in agricultural production. (n = 273)	49	17.9	16	5.9	19	7.0	42	15.4	34	12.5	36	13.2	77	28.2
26. Upgrading the school curriculum and program to make the Town more attractive for families with children. (n = 274)	44	16.1	14	5.1	22	8.0	31	11.3	27	9.9	24	8.8	112	40.9
27. Providing tax breaks to owners of forest land who keep it undeveloped and open it to the public for hunting and similar uses. (n = 273)	71	26.0	24	8.8	14	5.1	46	16.8	22	8.1	26	9.5	70	25.6

Table B2
Richmond Community Survey

Mean responses to willingness to use local tax money for various activities on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is very unwilling and 7 is very willing.

	Number of Years Resided in Richmond				Age of Head of Household						Child. in HH			
	All Respond.	More than			<25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	>65	No	Yes		
		Less than 5	5 to 10	11 to 20										
17. Improving and constructing sidewalks in the Village.	5.40	5.59	5.50	5.12	5.44	6.55	5.37	5.09	5.32	5.59	5.65	5.52	5.18	
18. Developing the Town forest for recreational use.	3.98	4.96	3.92	4.28	3.44	5.09	4.50	3.99	3.54	3.34	3.94	3.96	4.19	
19. Constructing off-street parking near Main Street.	4.52	4.58	4.06	4.80	4.39	4.67	5.09	4.33	4.54	3.82	4.58	4.60	4.46	
20. Acquiring land along the riverfront outside of the Village for recreational use.	4.23	5.34	4.03	4.76	4.02	3.69	5.73	4.78	4.38	3.82	3.31	3.90	4.18	4.47
21. Spending money to keep open space from being developed.	3.49	4.29	3.26	3.76	3.46	3.05	3.91	3.60	3.72	3.00	2.91	3.60	3.49	3.55
22. Purchasing land which is important wildlife habitat.	4.37	5.07	4.44	5.12	4.44	3.78	5.73	4.70	4.71	3.85	3.76	3.94	4.33	4.60
23. Expanding the Richmond Utilities District sewer system to encourage additional development on the fringes of the current Village.	4.06	4.38	3.83	3.60	3.78	4.18	5.18	4.03	3.78	3.72	4.15	4.44	4.10	3.92
24. Assisting in restoring historic buildings in Town.	3.74	4.61	4.26	3.12	4.10	3.10	4.73	3.90	3.92	3.05	3.38	3.83	3.86	3.63
25. Providing tax breaks to farmers to keep their land in agricultural production.	4.51	4.98	5.17	4.92	4.25	4.02	5.27	4.79	4.61	3.60	4.30	4.74	4.60	4.51
26. Upgrading the school curriculum and program to make the Town more attractive for families with children.	4.84	6.03	5.39	4.92	4.62	4.10	5.73	5.73	5.10	4.35	4.03	4.12	4.63	5.34
27. Providing tax breaks to owners of forest land who keep it undeveloped and open it to the public for hunting and similar uses.	4.03	4.49	4.53	4.12	4.49	3.35	5.82	4.33	4.32	2.92	3.94	3.76	4.03	4.15

Table C

Richmond Community Survey
Residents' attitudes toward growth and land use regulation

	Number of Years Resided in Richmond										Age of Head of Household					Child, in HH	
	All Respond.	2 or Less		3 to 5	6 to 10	11 to 20	More Than 20	<25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	>65	No	Yes		
28. Richmond's rate of growth over the past ten years has been:																	
(1) much too slow	9.2%	13.2%	11.1%	12.0%	7.8%	6.8%	9.1%	16.1%	7.9%	10.3%	5.9%	5.7%	8.6%	11.1%			
(2) too slow	21.0	30.2	25.0	32.0	13.7	16.5	9.1	35.7	21.1	15.4	20.6	11.3	21.1	22.2			
(3) about right	52.4	43.4	52.8	44.0	54.9	56.3	72.7	39.3	48.7	53.8	52.9	66.0	52.0	51.1			
(4) somewhat too fast	12.5	11.3	11.1	4.0	19.6	12.6	9.1	8.9	18.4	10.3	14.7	9.4	11.4	14.4			
(5) much too fast	4.8	1.9	0.0	8.0	3.9	7.8	0.0	0.0	3.9	10.3	5.9	7.5	6.9	1.1			
29. Thinking about the next ten years, do you think Richmond's growth will be:																	
(1) much faster than the past ten years	32.5	45.6	38.9	33.3	34.0	22.8	50.0	35.7	38.5	41.0	23.5	15.4	31.6	35.2			
(2) somewhat faster than the past ten years	45.8	45.6	41.7	37.5	46.0	48.5	50.0	44.6	48.7	38.5	44.1	48.1	44.8	47.3			
(3) about the same as the last ten years	18.8	8.8	13.9	16.7	18.0	26.7	0.0	17.9	10.3	17.9	23.5	34.6	20.1	15.4			
(4) somewhat slower than the past ten years	1.8	0.0	2.8	12.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.8	2.6	0.0	2.9	1.9	2.3	1.1			
(5) much slower than the past ten years	1.1	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	5.9	0.0	1.1	1.1			
30. Thinking about the Town's zoning and land use regulations, do you think that:																	
(1) they are too restrictive in telling a person what they can do.	24.4	15.4	11.8	17.4	20.8	36.4	27.3	19.6	21.4	31.4	33.3	22.4	27.4	18.1			
(2) they are about balanced between the need for regulation and the property owner's desires.	47.6	48.7	52.9	47.8	50.0	43.4	54.5	60.9	38.6	40.0	45.5	51.0	46.5	48.2			
(3) they are too lenient and do not provide enough protection for the public.	28.0	35.9	35.3	34.8	29.2	20.2	18.2	19.6	40.0	28.6	21.2	26.5	26.1	33.7			

Table D (cont'd)

	Number of Years Resided in Richmond							Age of Head of Household				Child. in HH			
	All Respond.	2 or Less		3 to 5		6 to 10		11 to 20		More Than 20		Age		Child.	
			%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
(1) If fifty new homes were built in Richmond, I'd prefer to see them in one large subdivision.	4.8%	6.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	9.1%	8.5%	3.9%	0.0%	6.5%	3.8%	3.5%	6.6%
OR															
(2) If fifty new homes were built in Richmond, I'd prefer to see them built in a number of smaller subdivisions scattered around the Town.	20.1	20.3	24.2	48.0	25.0	9.9	9.1	25.4	25.0	23.7	9.7	11.5	19.8	22.0	
OR															
(3) If fifty new homes were built in Richmond, I'd prefer to see them scattered throughout the Town along the existing roads.	75.1	72.9	72.7	52.0	75.0	82.2	81.8	66.1	71.1	76.3	83.9	84.6	76.7	71.4	
(1) The Town should preserve the active farmland in Richmond even if it means providing financial assistance to farmers.	29.6	39.3	31.4	41.7	26.5	23.3	40.0	47.4	24.4	15.8	36.4	23.1	31.4	28.3	
OR															
(2) The Town should preserve the active farmland in Richmond even if it means severely restricting the farmer's rights to develop the property.	5.6	8.9	2.9	4.2	8.2	3.9	30.0	3.5	6.4	5.3	0.0	5.8	5.2	6.5	
OR															
(3) The Town should encourage the retention of active farmland but shouldn't be actively involved in preserving it.	64.8	51.8	65.7	54.2	65.3	72.8	30.0	49.1	69.2	78.9	63.6	71.2	63.4	65.2	

Table E1

Richmond Community Survey

Residents' level of satisfaction with Town services on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is very satisfied and 7 is very dissatisfied

	Very satisfied			4			5			6			Very dissatisfied							
	#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%						
36. Maintenance and repair of the Town's roads (n = 271)	24	8.9		44	16.2		40	14.8		60	22.1		39	14.4		20	7.4		44	16.2
37. Police protection (n = 270)	18	6.7		40	14.8		52	19.3		63	23.2		24	8.9		25	9.3		48	17.8
38. Fire protection (n = 266)	78	29.3		55	20.7		55	20.7		47	17.7		7	2.6		12	4.5		12	4.5
39. The Town's regulations governing land use and development (n = 242)	7	2.9		19	7.9		48	19.8		76	31.4		36	14.9		24	9.9		32	13.2
40. The operation of the Town government and boards (n = 259)	7	2.7		23	8.9		44	17.0		74	28.6		35	13.5		29	11.2		47	18.1

Table E2
Richmond Community Survey

Residents' mean level of satisfaction with Town services
on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 is very satisfied and 7 is very dissatisfied

	Number of Years Resided in Richmond					Age of Head of Household					Child. in HH			
	All Respond.	Less than 5	5 to 10	6 to 11	More than 11	<25	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	>65	No	Yes	
36. Maintenance and repair of the Town's roads	4.04	4.27	4.20	4.32	3.98	3.85	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.30	3.76	3.56	4.13	3.97
37. Police protection	4.12	4.29	4.49	3.92	3.86	4.06	4.11	4.25	4.38	4.45	3.69	3.98	3.98	4.36
38. Fire protection	2.75	3.07	3.37	2.79	2.71	2.37	2.09	3.34	2.91	2.75	2.34	2.28	2.60	3.07
39. The Town's regulations governing land use and development	4.30	4.68	4.15	4.27	4.39	4.14	5.00	4.12	4.51	4.89	3.94	3.75	4.33	4.18
40. The operation of the Town government and boards	4.47	4.57	4.44	4.57	4.53	4.38	4.67	4.38	4.78	4.93	4.33	3.79	4.46	4.50

File: RichTab.E

Appendix B
Soils Information

Soils Associations

A Soils Association is a landscape that consists of one or more major types and at least one minor type of soil. Sagadahoc county is made up of five soils associations. The following descriptions taken from the SCS Soil Survey for Androscoggin and Sagadahoc County discuss the four associations within the Town.

1. The Charlton-Sutton-Paxton association is composed of generally deep, medium textured and moderately coarse textured soils; well drained and moderately well drained; found on level to moderately steep slopes on hills and ridges. The majority of the watershed of Pleasant Pond is made up of soils within this association.

This association consists of 300 to 900 foot high hills and ridges that have rounded tops and long slopes. The ends of the slopes are generally wetlands and steep stony gullies. The pattern of natural drainage is poorly defined. The majority of the association is woodland, typically on the tops of the ridges and in the wetlands at the base. Trees are predominantly hardwoods, with some white pines and fir. Farms found within the association are usually dairy operations or orchards. The cleared slopes are mostly free of surface stones.

2. The Hollis-Sutton-Buxton association varies from shallow to deep and medium textured to moderately coarse texture; these soils are generally well drained to moderately well drained and found from nearly level to steep slopes, generally on the tops of hills and ridges. The majority of this association is found along Route 24 north of the Village, on the ridge that separates the Kennebec River and Mill Brook/Wilmot Brook watersheds.

This association is characterized by irregular topography and many small depressions with restricted drainage. Nearly all of this association is wooded with mixed hardwoods and some softwoods.

3. The Scantic-Leicester-Scarboro association consists of deep, medium textured to moderately coarse textured soils; poorly drained and very poorly drained found on level areas and gently sloping hills. This series coincides with most of the watersheds of the Abagadasset River and Denham Brook.

Most of the association is wooded, consisting of pine, fir, and northern hardwoods. The farms that have been developed on these soils are generally dairy or poultry farms. Much of the land is suitable for development of nesting and feeding areas for migratory waterfowl.

4. The Buxton-Hartland-Belgrade association contains deep, medium textured, moderately well drained and well drained soils, found on land that varies from level to moderately steep. It is the most predominant soils association in Richmond, characteristic of the Mill Creek watershed.

This association is characterized by short, irregular, complex slopes. Farming can be limited by the small size of the level areas and the irregular, steep slopes. White pine, maple, birch, beech, and ash are the predominant species in the woodlands.

Soil Units

The following description of the various types of soils found within the Town is taken from the USDA's Soil Survey for Androscoggin and Sagadahoc County. The various mapping units are divided into the following categories, based upon their ability to support subsurface wastewater disposal systems:

- Generally Suitable for Subsurface Wastewater Disposal
- Usually Suitable for Subsurface Wastewater Disposal, with some Unsuitable
- Hydric Soils: No On-site Sanitary Discharge Allowed
- Non-Hydric Floodplain Soils: No On-site Sanitary Discharge Allowed

GENERALLY SUITABLE FOR SUBSURFACE WASTEWATER DISPOSAL

The Adams series consists of excessively drained, nearly level to steep, strongly acid, sandy soils that formed in deep deposits of water-laid sand. These loamy sand soils typically occur on terraces or on the sides or tops of esker-like ridges along streams and rivers. The soil has low natural fertility. Adams soils are only found in a few isolated locations in the northerly sections of Richmond. Limitations for on-site disposal are moderate, although there is some danger of groundwater contamination due to the rapid permeability of the soil. The State Plumbing Code requires a small disposal system. Minimum lot size: 40,000 square feet. Soil Profile/Condition: 6B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Adams soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
AaB	Low	Very High	Very High	Medium
AaC	Very Low	High	High	Medium

The Charlton series consists of deep, well drained soils that were formed in glacial till. These soils are typically found on the sides and tops of ridges throughout Sagadahoc County. Most of the major watersheds in Richmond have pockets of Charlton soils on the higher elevations. The largest concentration is on the south side of the Beedle Road, east of the New Road. Surface runoff tends to be slow, while infiltration is rapid. Permeability is described as moderate to rapid. These soils are well suited to a variety of farm crops: potatoes, beans, corn, grass, alfalfa, and other legumes. Small areas of slopes in the C (8 to 15%) and D (15 to 25%) ranges are found throughout the Town. Erosion may be a problem on these steeper areas, as noted by the '2' suffix in the soils classification. On Charlton fine sandy loam (CfB) limitations for on-site disposal are slight. On slopes in the 8 to 15% range the limits are described as moderate, due to seepage; areas having greater slopes have severe limitations. On the very stony sandy loams (ChB, ChC, and ChD) the limitations are compounded by the presence of stones.

The State Plumbing Code requires a medium large disposal system. Minimum lot size: 25,000 square feet. Soil Profile/Condition: 2B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Charlton soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
CfB	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High
CfC2	High	High	High	High
CfD2	Very Low	Medium	Medium	Low
ChB	High	High	High	High
ChC	High	High	Medium	High
ChD	Very Low	Medium	Medium	Low

The Hartland series are deep, well drained soils that formed in stratified lacustrine and marine sediments of very fine sandy loam and silt loam texture. Because of its fine texture, erosion can be a severe hazard to land use activities. Slopes in the 2 to 8% range are well suited for vegetables. These soils have severe limits for on-site septic systems due to moderately slow permeability in the subsoil. The State Plumbing Code requires large leach fields in these soils. Minimum lot size: 30,000 square feet. Hartland soils are found infrequently in Richmond. The largest mapped areas are on either side of the New Road, south of the Pitts Center Road. Soil Profile/Condition: 8B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Hartland soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
HfB	High	Very High	High	High
HfC2	Medium	High	Medium	Medium

The Hinckley series consists of deep, excessively drained, gravelly soils that formed in coarse textured glacial outwash. These soils typically occur on terraces and outwash plains. The underlying material, found at depths of 20 inches, is sand and gravel. In the 3 to 15% slope ranges Hinckley soils have moderate limitations for on-site septic systems, due to the potential for groundwater contamination. The State Plumbing Code requires a small sized disposal system. Minimum lot size: 40,000 square feet. Hinckley soils are found very infrequently in Richmond, and usually in conjunction with the Charlton series. Soil Profile/Condition: 6B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Hinckley soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
HkB	Low	Very High	Very High	Medium

The Melrose series are deep, well drained soils that formed in moderately coarse textured material over moderately fine and fine textured material. This soil is well suited for grassland and most cultivated crops. The soil has severe limitations for on-site disposal due to slow permeability in the substratum. The State Plumbing Code requires a medium

large disposal system. Minimum lot size: 35,000 square feet. Melrose soils are found very infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 8B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Melrose soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
MeB	High	High	Medium	High
MeC	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

The Ninigret series consists of deep, moderately well drained, nearly level or gently sloping soils. They are found on outwash terraces and sand plains. A seasonal high water table of 15 inches is commonly present, posing a limitation to land development. Groundwater contamination may pose a severe problem for on-site disposal. The State Plumbing Code requires leach fields in this soils to be of medium size. Minimum lot size: 80,000 square feet. Ninigret soils are found very infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 5C. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Ninigret soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
NgB	Very Low	High	High	Medium

The Paxton series consists of deep, well drained loamy soils that were formed on firm, compact glacial till. Paxton loam and Paxton very stony loam are found within the Town, the latter having a stone content of up to 3%. With proper management this series is well suited for crops and orchards. Its suitability for on-site disposal is rated as severe, due to its slow permeability in the underlying strata. The State Plumbing Code requires a medium large disposal system. Minimum lot size: 30,000 square feet. Paxton soils make up a small but significant percentage of the Pleasant Pond and Baker Brook watersheds. Soil Profile/Condition: 3B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Paxton soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
PbB	High	High	High	High
PbC	High	Medium	Medium	Medium

The Suffield series consist of deep, well drained soils that formed in thick deposits of marine and lacustrine silt and clay. This soils are found on dissected terraces. The soil is very susceptible to erosion if disturbed or if the vegetation is removed. Most of this series is found on slopes in the 8 to 30% range. Limitations to on-site disposal is severe because of the slow permeability in the substratum. The State Plumbing Code requires an extra large disposal system. Minimum lot size: 35,000 square feet. Suffield soils are found most frequently in the Mill Brook watershed, and to a lesser degree in the Baker Brook watershed. Soil Profile/Condition: 9B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Suffield soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
SuC2	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
SuD2	Very Low	Medium	Low	Very Low

USUALLY SUITABLE FOR SUBSURFACE WASTEWATER DISPOSAL, WITH SOME UNSUITABLE

The Buxton series consists of deep, moderately well drained soils that formed in marine or lacustrine deposits of silt and clay over bedrock, glacial till, or sand and gravel. These soils are typically found in areas of rolling topography intermixed with small knolls. Surface layer of topsoil is generally up to eight inches in depth, well suited for grass, legumes, and most short season vegetables. Included in the series are small pockets of poorly drained soils and occasional rock outcrops. Where the slopes are in the 'C' range (8 to 15% or greater) some severe erosion may be present on the steeper areas. On-site disposal has severe limitations due to the slow permeability in the subsoil. The State Plumbing Code requires extra large disposal fields in these soils. Minimum lot size: 35,000 square feet. Buxton soils are commonly found in the Abagadasset, Mill Brook, and Denham Brook watersheds. Soil Profile/Condition: 9C/D. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Buxton soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
BuB2	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
BuC2	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

The Hollis series are well drained, shallow soils that were formed in glacial till. Two types of this series are found within the Town: Hollis fine sandy loam, and Hollis very rocky fine sandy loam. In both series the slopes range from moderate to very steep (up to 45%). Bedrock is generally found at very shallow depths, with outcrops common. In the very rocky series the outcrops can occur over 25% of the acreage. The severe limits to on-site disposal are primarily caused by the presence of bedrock so close to the surface. The State Plumbing Code requires medium large disposal fields in this series. Minimum lot size: 30,000 square feet. Hollis soils are one of the predominant types found throughout the Town. Soil Profile/Condition: 2AII/B or 2AIII/B. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Hollis soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
HrB	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
HrC	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
HrD	Very Low	Very Low	Low	Very Low
HsB	Very Low	Very Low	Medium	Very Low
HsC	Very Low	Very Low	Medium	Very Low
HsD	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low

The Sutton series are glacial till soils described as deep, moderately well drained. This series is found on the lower part of long slopes and in slight depressions on hills and ridges. Sutton loam and Sutton very stony loam is found within Richmond. Stoniness is the main limitation on use, with stones typically found in over 3% of the land. Its suitability for on-site disposal is rated as severe, due to its slow permeability in the underlying strata. The State Plumbing Code requires leach fields in this soils to be of medium large size. Minimum lot size: 30,000 square feet. Sutton soils are found primarily in the Pleasant Pond watershed and on the east side of Route 201. Soil Profile/Condition: 3C/D. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Sutton soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
SxB	High	High	High	High
SxC	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
SyB	High	High	High	High
SyC	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

The Woodbridge series consists of deep, moderately well drained, slightly depressional to gently sloping soils. A firm hardpan, at depths of 16 to 30 inches, restricts the downward movement of water and root systems. With proper management practices the soil can be well suited for hay production and vegetable crops. Its suitability for on-site disposal is rated as severe, due to its slow permeability in the substratum. The State Plumbing Code requires large disposal systems in this soil. Minimum lot size: 35,000 square feet. The largest concentration of Woodbridge soil is found on the west side of the Alexander Road, in the upper reaches of the Baker Brook watershed. Soil Profile/Condition: 3C/D. The following chart gives the Soil Potential rating for the Woodbridge soils:

SOIL	SEPTIC	DWELLINGS	ROADS	DEVELOPMENT
WrB	High	High	High	High
WsB	High	High	High	High

HYDRIC SOILS: NO ON-SITE SANITARY DISCHARGE ALLOWED

The Biddeford series are very poorly drained, nearly level loamy soils that formed where marine and lacustrine deposits of silt and clay filled in depressions. Biddeford silt loam, the type found in Richmond, is considered a hydric soil, typical of wetland environments. It receives a great deal of water from surrounding areas and is usually ponded for over half the year. Most of the soils are found on slopes of 1% or less. The soil profile will typically include a thick (up to 18 inches) layer of organic material on the surface. New on-site disposal systems are prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Most of the Biddeford soils are found along the Abagadasset River, the upper reaches of Mill Brook, along Denham Brook on the west side of the Interstate. The undulating section of I-95 near the Beedle Road was constructed on this series. Soil

Profile/Condition: 9E. The Soil Potential rating for Biddeford soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Leicester series consists of deep, poorly drained soils that formed in sandy loam glacial till. This series is scattered infrequently along upland drainageways and in the bottom of depressions throughout much of the community. Most of the occurrences have been identified as wetlands. The water table of this hydric soil is found within 12 inches of the surface about half the year. Stoniness and high water table limit most of the soils to forest land and wildlife habitat. New on-site disposal systems are prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Soil Profile/Condition: 2E. The Soil Potential rating for Leicester soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

Peat and Muck are organic soils found in depressions. The surface layer of this hydric soil is made up of partly decomposed woody vegetation, ferns, cattails, reeds, and sphagnum moss. The organic mat can range from one to ten feet in thickness, but typically is 5 to 6 feet deep. Soils are saturated throughout the year, with the water table at 12 to 15 inches below the surface in the driest years. On-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Peat and Muck conditions are found in only a very limited number of places in Richmond, and are always associated with wetlands. A good example of its occurrence is the large wetland below the State Highway garage on Route 201. Soil Profile/Condition: 5D. The Soil Potential rating for Peat and Muck is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Scantic series consists of deep, poorly drained, level or nearly level soils that formed in silt and clay deposited by ponded water. These hydric soils are often found in slight depressions with no surface drainage. With proper management these soils may be suitable for pasture and feed crops. New on-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Scantic soils are a common occurrence in the Baker Brook, Denham Brook, and Abagadasset River watershed, and are usually associated with wetlands. Soil Profile/Condition: 9E. The Soil Potential rating for Scantic soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Scarboro series consists of deep, very poorly drained, level soils that formed in outwash sand and gravel. These soils are found in shallow depressions on outwash plains. The soil usually has little or no surface drainage and the water is ponded on the surface for half the year. The water table in this hydric soil is permanently near the surface. On-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Scarboro soils are found very infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 5E. The Soil Potential rating for Scarboro soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Swanton series consists of poorly drained soils that formed in moderately coarse textured outwash material underlain by marine or lacustrine clayey material at a depth of 18 to 40 inches. This hydric soil is typically found at the headwaters of small streams and is wet throughout most of the spring and fall. On-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Swanton soils are found very

infrequently in Richmond.. Soil Profile/Condition: 8E/D. The Soil Potential rating for Swanton soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Walpole series consists of deep, poorly drained level or nearly level soils, found in narrow bands and small pockets on glacial terraces. The water table is at or near the surface for half the year. On-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Walpole soils are found in a very limited number of places in Richmond, and are always associated with wetlands. A good example of its occurrence is the wetland on the northwest corner of the Langdon Road and the Plumer Road. Soil Profile/Condition: 5E/D. The Soil Potential rating for Walpole soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

NON-HYDRIC FLOODPLAIN SOILS: NO ON-SITE SANITARY DISCHARGE ALLOWED

The Winooski series consists of deep, moderately well drained, nearly level to slightly depressional soils. These bottomland soils are flooded in winter and early spring, but very seldom during the growing season. The seasonal high water table of 15 to 20 inches can be a limiting factor to development. The soils have a severe limitation for septic systems due to the seasonal high water table, occasional flooding, and the potential to contaminate streams. New on-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table and seasonal flooding. Winooski soils are found very infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 11C. The Soil Potential rating for Winooski soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 8E/D. The Soil Potential rating for Swanton soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

The Walpole series consists of deep, poorly drained level or nearly level soils, found in narrow bands and small pockets on glacial terraces. The water table is at or near the surface for half the year. On-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table. Walpole soils are found in a very limited number of places in Richmond, and are always associated with wetlands. A good example of its occurrence is the wetland on the northwest corner of the Langdon Road and the Plumer Road. Soil Profile/Condition: 5E/D. The Soil Potential rating for Walpole soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.

NON-HYDRIC FLOODPLAIN SOILS: NO ON-SITE SANITARY DISCHARGE ALLOWED

The Winooski series consists of deep, moderately well drained, nearly level to slightly depressional soils. These bottomland soils are flooded in winter and early spring, but very seldom during the growing season. The seasonal high water table of 15 to 20 inches can be a limiting factor to development. The soils have a severe limitation for septic systems due to the seasonal high water table, occasional flooding, and the potential to contaminate streams. New on-site disposal is prohibited by the State Plumbing Code due to the high water table and seasonal flooding. Winooski soils are found very infrequently in Richmond. Soil Profile/Condition: 11C. The Soil Potential rating for Winooski soils is Very Poor throughout all categories.