Name + Address: Susan Axline EX#229 ①
1742 Rt 12 Gales Ferry

- Atty Heller: meet regs ⇒ must approve
  Public comment is part of process
  No constraint that we could only speak if raising a legal objection
  Suggests our comments can be part of your decision

If allowed,

- I hope all opinions offered at last year's meetings on this topic will be included for consideration in conjunction with this renewed application

- Atty Heller: info coming from Google is a concern
  Many scholarly entities have web sites which provide useful and well researched facts
  My comments are based solely on my education, experience, and information provided to me ~~by Atty Heller~~ (Atty Heller) as an abutter

- Atty Heller: Fear of the unknown
  They've made it pretty clear what they want to do
  Commendable that they listened to us about dust, noise, etc. but disheartening that they ignored the big picture and continue to press ~~for~~ to be allowed to quarry (last year)
  We've made it clear that we don't want them to do this

- Application: "Excavation major" "Industrial Site Regrading"
  Not "regrading"; Not "excavating"; it is quarrying.
  it is mining, which characterization their
  sound expert seems to agree with since he
  labeled his diagram "Gates Ferry Mine" and
  as apparently does the applicant since they
  describe ~~refer to~~ the activities as "rock extraction"
  and "bedrock will be severed from the land"
  both of which conjur up images of
  mining not regrading
  ["Excavation major when greater than 300 cubic yards"]
  ② Atty Heller's 4 million cubic yards estimate
  makes this 13,333 times more than where
  "major excavation" definition begins;
  ① they are talking about removing the mature
  woodland and quarrying Mt. Decatur
  down to river level which is orders of
  magnitude greater than 300 cubic yards ②,
  orders of magnitude beyond "excavation
  major", moving it into a class of its
  own "EXTRACTION", "QUARRYING",
  "MINING"

- Atty Heller: List of encumbrances
  All of these encumbrances were known at the
  time the property was acquired by the
  applicant

- Atty Heller: Applicant relied on regs in place when purchased
  Regs / Laws change, they are not set in stone or intended to be, that is a hallmark of our democracy
  Atty Heller cites recent changes to State legislation as bolstering his client's case

- Atty Heller: Baldwin Hill permit was approved
  Changes are part of the process. If you find something is undesirable, you do not have to continue allowing it.

From the provided Narrative Description:

- pg 2 Applicant's image of the site in 2000 in full operation does not show the fully wooded, granite hill that is Mount Decatur which they intend to remove.

- pg 2 How can removing the woodland and granite not have "visual impacts" to the historic Fort Decatur site?

- pg ¶3+7 If the aggregate does not leave by barge, how many truck trips a day will that add to the 100 cited for "over burden removal"?

- pg 10 In their Character of the Neighborhood section it says A) "consideration of physical characteristics of the

district" must be part of the regs.
⇒ the physical characteristics of this portion of the "district" are mature woodland on a substantial hill (70' from their descriptions) of solid granite. Their plan removes a very large part of that characteristic out crop irrevocably altering its character

B) "particular suitability for particular uses" must be part of the regs. ⇒ it is not suitable for the use they have in mind so they propose altering its physical characteristics (i.e., blast, jack hammer, bull doze, crush, and trundle it away by truck and barge) to make it suitable ⇒ that is not "consideration" it is "destruction"

- Listing the attributes of the property for "extraction use proposed"

pg 11

A) "historic use as a manufacturing facility" - not mining
B) "residential districts developed subsequent to industrial use" - colonial settlements would predate the industrial use by DOW and that industrial use was not mining
C) Atty Heller makes inferences about "legislative intent" in recent regulation changes and reason for "few viable industrial districts" in Ledyard being lack of infrastructure

interpretation
You are not required to accept his ~~take~~ on these things.
Perhaps the town, which is composed not just of the land it occupies but also of the people who choose to make it their home, prefers being a rural/residential town as opposed to an industrial town like Groton.

- "Perception of DOW Chemical as a good ~~neif~~ neighbor comes in large part from physical setting of property"
pg 11
A) Having lived at my address for the past 40 years, my personal perception of them as a good neighbor comes from the fact that 1) DOW maintained the vegetative buffer and appearance of the frontage all along Rt. 12, including the little house at the entrance. About 1/4 of veg. buffer has been removed in past couple years
2) DOW notified us of possibly noisy projects they undertook
3) DOW invited us to tour the plant
4) At no time was my life or routine disrupted by any activities at DOW
B) That "physical setting of the property" will be ~~irrevocably~~ irreversably altered by GFI's mining activities and it will no longer be "remote topographically or in distance" from Rt. 12 when the hill is removed.

And, while the "operating and permanent face of the rock extraction" may be "largely invisible" to the entire town that will not be true for Rt. 12 and its neighbors

- Consistency with Coastal Policies & Goals

pg 13

A) "The entirety of the area for extraction is shorelands", a category of coastal resource per the narrative

B) Coastal Management Act Policies

1) Atty Heller says the proposed activities would be categorized as "general development" within the context of this Act - I find it hard to believe that mining is considered "general development"

2) Ensure that the resources can "support the development without significantly disrupting the natural environment" - the environment will not only be disrupted, it will be removed

3) "To Resolve conflicts between uses on shorelands
- give preference to those that minimize adverse impacts on natural coastal resources" - again, the resources will be removed, I can't think of anything more adverse than total elimination

- "This application contemplates only the regrading of shorelands" - it is not "regrading", it is removal of those shorelands and associated woodland to be replaced with a stabilized crushed rock slab within a granite cubicle of sorts

pg 14

- The rendering provided by the applicant of the planted benches is more akin to an idealized fantasy than reality.
  - A) The trees depicted are mature, full grown specimens - it will take years for the plants they put in to reach that stage as Atty Heller pointed out they will not be planting mature trees
  - B) are not the shallow-rooted, narrow-foot print species - which they say they intend to plant as appropriate for the benches but which will be prone to toppling
  - C) are manicured - which would require landscaping services from an arborist
  - D) and are all alive - which again would require horticultural maintenance as well as irrigation

- Questions to ask experts: impact of removal of hill and woods on their calculations, consideration of height of Pheasant Run, cumulative effects over 10 years

PLEASE deny this application