

EX#168
Received 11/21/24

September 26, 2024

Laurel Eddings
16 Old Quarry Road
Gales Ferry, CT 06335

Ledyard Planning and Zoning Commissioners
Liz Burdick, Ledyard Director Land Use and Planning
Ledyard, CT

Dear Commissioner and Ms. Burdick.

I am speaking tonight to address the concerns that I have about the possibility of approval for this 5-10 year project by Cashman which I strongly oppose as a resident and tax payer of Gales Ferry/Ledyard..

My first concerns have to do with **11.3.4.C,D, and E (odors, fumes, dust, noise, vibrations, appearance, or other similar reasons, property values or historic features of the immediate neighborhood, existing historic/natural assets/features) and 9.2.C1 (No dust, dirt, fly ash or smoke shall be emitted into the air so as to endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare, or to decrease the value or enjoyment of other property or to constitute an objectionable source of air pollution.)**

From all the information that has been presented in previous presentations about the dangers of silica dust being released by the quarry operations, and in spite of being told that the amount of silica in the rock is minimal, I remain unconvinced that this danger has been mitigated. This danger is not just to those of us who live close by but also to our three schools that are within a mile radius. This is our children's future health that could very easily be impacted. The concern I have is that these problems will not necessarily show up right away, and by the time that they do, Cashman could no longer even own the property in question. And as

happens in many places, companies just drag out any legal proceedings to make it too expensive for the injured party to afford or reach settlements that "are just the price of business".

Another criteria that would preclude this quarry from happening is

8.16.D. The purpose of these regulations is to insure the following:

- **the landscape is not needlessly marred during and after operations,**
- **the work will not be a source of dust, pollution, and/or siltation,**
- **the site will not be generally characterized by unsightliness as evidenced by open pits, rubble, or other indications of completed digging operations which would have a deteriorating influence on nearby property values.**

It has been mentioned that the area being quarried is not visible from any of the houses in the area. That may be true but it is most definitely visible from Route 12. It will change a gently wooded hillside into a bare cliff. That is something that can not be undone and will never return to its natural state. There will also continue to be runoff from this into the river and we have no way of knowing how much this will weaken Mount Decatur which could lead to future rock falls and destruction of the historical site even though they are trying to avoid that.

My next concern has to do with **9.2.C.3, (With the exception of time signals and emergency signals and noise necessarily involved in the construction or demolition of buildings or other structures, no noise which is unreasonable in volume, intermittence, frequency, or shrillness shall be transmitted beyond the boundaries of the lot on which it originates.)**

Noise pollution will occur. I can frequently hear the Base colors and the trains from across the river. When Dow was operating I would easily hear the alarms that sometimes went off. There is no way that blasting and crushing rock will not generate noise that will travel throughout the area making it change from a quiet neighborhood into a very noisy industrial zone. The exceptions in this talk about construction or demolition of buildings or other structures were never meant to mean the destruction of a

mountain. Cashman's experts claim that the noise level will not transmit beyond the property lines and gave us the average noise levels already present. I focus on the concept of average. This does not mean that noise greater than the average is present, in fact it must be to arrive at the average. The higher levels of noise will be transmitted beyond the property lines and that is what will disrupt the mostly quiet neighborhoods that surround the property. This will greatly reduce the ability to enjoy the quiet peacefulness of the neighborhood.

My other concern relates to **8.16.N.4 Upon completion of operations, no bank shall exceed a slope of one (1) foot vertical rise in three (3) feet of horizontal distance. The disturbed area shall be covered with a minimum of four (4) inches of topsoil and graded. On completion of grading, the area will be limed, fertilized, and seeded in accordance with the approved Plan. The site shall be maintained until the area is stabilized.**

8.16.N.7 All topsoil and subsoil shall be stripped from the operation area and stockpiled for use in site restoration..

Cashman has addressed this by creating tiers in the cliff that will be landscaped, however, during the majority of the project this will be steep and bare rock. And what happens in 5-6 years if Cashman is not making the profit off the land that they want so they cut their losses and just leave it. It has been said there will be a bond, but will that bond be enough to make not fulfilling the whole plan enough of a deterrent.

I have also heard many references to the fact that the town already approved the quarry at Baldwin hill. If we approved one, why not this one? I have already heard about the impact of noise and vibrations from that quarry. It has not been a pleasant experience for many in that neighborhood. Seems to me the town should learn from that decision and not repeat it.

I have heard nothing of Cashmans plans to clean up the land area that is already there for future use, nor plans to meet these regulations at the completion of this project. I have seen the signs that there is contamination, but nothing about how that will be managed. Cashman had

to have known of these issues before they purchased the land or if they somehow did not then that speaks to a lack of due diligence on their part. At this point I believe that Cashman is just trying to get whatever profit out of the land that they can with no real vision of what will happen at the end of that 5-10 years. At that point they will be left with a property that has little value due to the contamination of the majority of the property and the cost of reusing and cleaning the land up. At that point they could just abandon the property and the town would be left with very little to show for allowing this.

Cashman has repeatedly assured us that they will do everything they can to reduce the environmental impact, but will that monitoring really be enough? How are the residents and town going to make sure that all of these methods that they will use will actually produce the results that they claim. Cashman wants the town to push the "I believe everything you have to say" button. The problem with this is that if this is approved, then by the time their claims and reassurances are proven to not be the reality, it will be too late.

I do understand that Cashman is trying to make some profit out of this property, but they need to find something else to fill that need. Because of these concerns I strongly oppose this and highly recommend that this project not be approved, and will continue to oppose this no matter how many times it is resubmitted.

Thank you for your time!
Laurel Eddings