

Transcript of PZC Public Hearing April 26, 2022 at 7:18 P.M.

Art Moran - I'll open the Public Hearing at this time. Roll Call Rich Chalifoux ...

Richard Chalifoux - Here

Art Moran - Zach Turner - recused himself

Art Moran - Denise Beale

Denise Beale - Here

Art Moran - Charles Raymond

Charles Raymond - Here

Art Moran - Doreen Rankin - excused

Art Moran - Mike Sinko

Mike Sinko - Here

Art Moran - Nate Koniecko - excused

Art Moran - Fred Eddy

Fred Eddy - Here

Art Moran - Terri Eickel

Terri Eickel - Here

Art Moran - At this time Terri Eickle will be seated for Zach Turner. This is a continuation of a public hearing for Special Exception Application#2021-03, Blue Camp CT, LLC, Applicant and Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation, Owner for property located at 451,455, & 495 Route 2; Comprehensive luxury recreational campground.

Kathy Warzecha - I'd like to enter the following exhibits into the record. Exhibit 72 a letter dated March 22, 2022 from Maragret Gibson, 154 Watson Road concerning Blue Camp CT, LLC. Exhibit 73 letter dated March 22, 2022 from Maryann O'Neil to Kathy Warzecha concerning BlueWater RV Park. Exhibit 74 a letter dated March 23, 2022 from Susan and Tim Hotchkiss to Kathy Warzecha stating testimony from the PZC meeting held on March 22, 2022. Exhibit 75 PFAS Evaluation Report prepared by BGT Environmental, LLC dated March 1, 2022. Exhibit 76 Supplemental Will Server Letter from Preston Plains Water Company dated March 16, 2022. Exhibit 77 Carl Nielsen report, CLM from TRC Companies, Inc to John Moulson and Commission members dated March 11, 2022. Exhibit 78 dated March 30, 2022, from Kathy Warzecha, Town Planner to Harry Heller, comments regarding revised site plan prepared by Benesch dated March 9, 2022, for 451, 455, & 495 Route 2. Exhibit 79 an email dated March 10, 2022 from Sarah Sportman, Connecticut State Archeologist. Exhibit 80 a letter dated March 30, 2022, from Tom Cummings, CLA Engineers, his comments for the revised campground site plan dated March 9, 2022, prepared by Benesch dated March 9, 2022, for 451, 455, & 495 Route 2. Exhibit 81 a letter dated March 22, 2022 from Gary Piszczek, Chairman of Conservation & Agricultural Commission to PZC regarding revised project comments. Exhibit 82 letter dated April 12, 2022, from Heller, Heller, & McCoy, Harry B. Heller to PZC, Kathy B. Warzecha, Town Planner regarding

cover letter for Blue Camp CT, LLC. Exhibit 83 letter dated April 12, 2022, from Heller, Heller, & McCoy, Harry B. Heller to CLA Engineers, Inc, Thomas Cummings regarding comments and cost estimates for Blue Camp CT, LLC. Exhibit 84 a letter dated April 7, 2022 from Benesch, Will Walter, PE to Kathy Warzecha, Town Planner regarding responses to her comments dated March 30, 2022. Exhibit 85 Blue Camp CT, LLC Revised Plan prepared by Benesch dated April 7, 2022. Exhibit 86 a letter dated April 14, 2022, from Harry B. Heller, synopsis of demand on municipal services and the cost to the community. Exhibit 87 a letter dated April 19, 2022 from CLA Engineers, INC, Tom Cummings, P.E. to Kathy Warzecha, Town Planner regarding comments. Exhibit 88 the Planner's comments regarding compliance with the Zoning Regulations with comments by PZC Members. Exhibit 89 a letter dated April 21, 2022, from Gladys Kimmel & John J. O'Dea of 32 Route 164, stating comments. Exhibit 90 a letter dated April 21, 2022, from Harry B. Heller, Heller, Heller, & McCoy responding to the Planner's Supplemental Comment List. Exhibit 91 is a letter dated April 21, 2022, from George T. Logan, REMA regarding Rodent & Insect Control Plan. Exhibit 92 which is a resume for Graham A. Washburn, Project Geologist/ GIS Specialist, BGTEnvironmental, LLC. Exhibit 93 a resume for Zoe Belcher, LG, LEP, and BGTEnvironmental, LLC. Exhibit 94 a letter dated April 26, 2022 from Harry Heller in response to matrix additional review comments dated April 21, 2022, included Benesch's response by Will Walter with an attachment.

AT THIS POINT THE TOWN PROVIDED RECORDING DEVICE CEASED WORKING DUE TO TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES. WHILE A NEW RECORDING DEVICE WAS FOUND THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

Attorney Heller representing Blue Camp CT, LLC, and Mashantucket Tribal Nation introduced the team of people that were with him to assist in providing information to the Commission and the public. He also corrected Mrs. Warzecha that the PFAS report was not prepared by Emily D'Marco.

He then stated the property owners have addressed the many concerns that have been brought up at both the Inland/Wetlands Commission and the previous two Planning and Zoning Commission Public Hearings. The owners have listened to the many comments and concerns of the Preston citizens and have made adjustments to address those concerns.

One concern that was addressed in the flood impact study showed that in the event of a 100-year flood event the campsites would be under six inches of water in the worst-case scenario. This is well below anything that would cause damage to the sites or the RVs on the sites.

To address the concerns of residents on Lynn Drive and surrounding the area over the views seen from their properties, the owners have planned to infill the southern border of Avery Pond with evergreens between and deciduous trees already established there.

Dumpsters have been added to address the concerns of refuse. Also to appease the concerns of the steep slope, a wooden retaining fence will be installed on the western edge of the roadway located on the property.

There is a need for a secondary emergency ingress and egress. To address this, plans include a structurally sound drive covered with grass immediately to the west of the primary access to the property. The embedded structure will easily support any emergency vehicles as well as other vehicles.

The property has been heavily studied by the tribe for its archaeological significance and as a result of their findings, a conservation area has been set aside and the rest of the site has been approved for development.

At this point, Steve Ulman explained the data collected by the traffic study that was done. He explained that according to the state there was not significant enough traffic on Routes 2A and 12 to warrant their inclusion in the study that was done. The traffic studies were done in May 2021, while this may not seem like the ideal time other data was used as well. The data that the State of Connecticut had for 2017, 2018, and 2019 pre-pandemic years were taken into consideration. The 2021 data was expanded by taking the average of 2017-2019, which was then increased by 1% per year to project possible traffic patterns. It needs to be noted that the CT DOT typically collects data in May rather than July. It was also noted that other developments that occur in the area have to take into account what is already in the process of being developed.

Att. Heller then addressed concerns about hazardous materials. He stated that the pool chemicals and oil and gas for lawn mowers would be stored in a maintenance building. And that the building in question has no drain so everything will be contained within the building in the event of spillage. He also stated that there are written protocols to follow in the event of spillage. There are 3-gallon containers to deal with any waste.

Mike Sinko felt that the 3-gallon limit was too small.

The owners are researching smokeless fire pits in hopes to alleviate concerns over excessive campfire smoke.

The driveways to the tent area have been widened to 10 feet making them accessible by ambulance. The fire department will be able to get their trucks within 200 feet of the most remote site.

Attorney Heller then addressed the presence of PFAS on the property. He explained that this is a relatively recent environmental concern. The State of Connecticut has established both stationary and mobility levels. He stated the use of sludge fertilizer in 2005 has left residual amounts of PFAS on the property. He then stated after multiple samples were taken it has been established that direct exposure limits were well below the state's criteria. Therefore, there is no concern for exposure. He then explained that there are studies on mobility which is the leaching of the containment throughout the area. Studies have determined the distance PFAS will move

and it has been determined that the PFAS on the property has moved as much as it will move. He reiterated that none of the levels have exceeded the levels established by the State of Connecticut.

Terri Eickel questioned the validity of the information and stated that PFAS is carcinogenic and that there are no safe levels.

Att. Heller reiterated that the State of Connecticut has regulations that they are using as a guide.

He continued to state that the development will have less phosphorus and nitrogen leaching into Avery Pond than the agricultural use on the property.

AT THIS POINT ANOTHER SOURCE FOR RECORDING WAS ESTABLISHED. THE TRANSCRIPT FOR THAT RECORDING IS AS FOLLOWS:

Terri Eickel - when you look at the Avery Pond do you look at the wetlands and the brook that are adjacent?

Harry Heller - Uhm we have looked at the brook and yeah again this is primarily a wetlands issue. And but we had two ecologists. We hired Carl Neilson specifically to look at the lake ecology which is a science unto itself, and we have Rema Ecological Services evaluating our general impact or lack thereof on inlands, wetlands and watercourses on the site other than the pond. Which would include all the forested wetlands, the wet meadows that are on the southeasterly portion of the site and Indian Town Brook. Remus' report as well as Carl Nielsen's report are in the record. The next question is please provide a general course of community services study for this project. And the comments that have been received by your commission, there have been comments that this project will provide no benefit to the municipality. We disagree with that. You are both an administrative and legislative body and in your legislative capacity you have determined that in the RC zone and the R60 zone if the special expectation criteria are satisfied that a recreational campground is a use allowed in both those districts. That is something you determine as a legislative body. So we have introduced into the record uh our estimated the real property taxes estimates that this project will generate on an annual basis and uh based on our projected construction cost for this project this project will be either the second or third largest ah private uh er the second or third largest tax paying entity in the uh Town of Preston and will be the largest private tax paying entity.

We've also looked at the cost of community services to do that we contacted both your resident state trooper and as well as your fire marshall. And we used as our basis the response calls that have been required to Strawberry Park and Hidden Acres. And ummm the response from both the fire marshall and the state trooper are in the record as well as an analysis that we have prepared of those figures, but ahh succinctly in 2021 14 ah, 9 fire responses and 14 ah police responses, and those represent on the fire responses a little over 1% of the total

responses in your community for the year. And for the police responses uhm and we've excluded motor vehicle responses, the police responses are about 7 or 8 tenths of 1 percent for the year of the responses. So, I submit to you that based on the data we have gleaned from both your resident state trooper and fire marshall that the cost of community services with a project that is going to be a major tax generator is minimal.

I am now going to go to the April 26th, today, response letter to two additional questions that were raised by your planner in the matrix that was prepared as to the applicable to the regulations to this project and the applicant's response. Number one is the insect and rodent plan was indicated as being outstanding. Because of the environmental sensitivity of this area we did not want to go to ah a exterminator in order to prepare a plan for us. Instead we engaged the services of Rema Ecological Services in order to prepare a insect and rodent plan that would be sensitive to the environment, would not use any harmful chemicals, and would to the maximum extent as possible introduce good cultural practices to control insects and rodents. And you have that control plan in the records of this proceedings. And George Logan the author of that plan is here and available to answer any questions the Commission may have on the plan.

Ah there was a request for construction details and specs on glamping tents. Ah we have included both the technical specifications for the glamping sites in the revised plans that have been submitted and we have also submitted to you photographs of actual glamping sites uhm taken from another Blue Water project so you have those in the record.

The spill control plan we talked about, the fuel shed bumper we spoken about and as I indicated as a result of your planner's comments we have after the April 7th response we have provided infill buffering with evergreens along the south easterly side of northwesterly detention basin and the southerly and southeasterly limits of the 100 foot nondisturbance area in order to ensure during winter months ah we do not have gaps in the buffering. So that the project is totally buffered from the adjoining residential neighborhood.

Next was response to traffic concerns regarding traffic concerns due to new casino projects, Steve Omen has addressed that. We have addressed the PFAS issue and the OSTA response to the second emergency access. Ah there was a request that we incorporate speed bumps into the project vernacular for this project. The applicant has declined that invitation because they are a maintenance issue and they create stormwater runoff issues. This is a relatively flat site and in order to address some of the concerns of the Inlands, Wetlands Commission and to create greater separations from the development and the wetland sources we have converted almosts all of the maneuvering areas on the site, other than the main access and area around the the Welcome Center to a compacted gravel base material. There is a posted 5mph speed limit in the park and we have added the signage in the signage plan. So based on Blue Water's historical experience in operating parks of this nature we do not believe that speed bumps are required or would be a good addition to the project.

There was concern about potential conflict between the check-in time for patrons entering the project and school bus traffic generated from the middle school. As a result of that we have modified the operational protocol for the project. On weekdays, during the shoulder months which would be April, May, and part of June and September and October check-in time will be at 3:30 so traditionally Blue Camp uses 3:00 so we've moved it back to avoid conflict with school buses.

We added a note to the plan whether there was a question or not Blue Camp will allow the storage of recreational vehicles on site over the winter. No recreational vehicle patron will be allowed to store a vehicle on site during the off-season. They will have to be taken off site. There will be a number of Blue Camp owned recreational vehicles that will be stored on site over the winter, but patron RVs.

There was a question as to whether or not there will be propane stored and sold on site. There will not. Anyone having to purchase propane will have to go to a local vendor.

There was a question concerning irrigation. There will be irrigation around the maintenance building and the Welcome Center. As you see from the site development plan this project is very heavily planted. The landscape architect has incorporated a tremendous amount of landscaping into this project. Other than the area around the maintenance building it will not be irrigated. There is a protocol for inspection and replacement if trees or shrubs die. And if there are prolonged periods of dry weather it may be required by the part of park owner for watering, but that would be done manually not by an irrigation system.

Uh there was a comment that the scope and scale of this project is too large for the town. This proposal has as currently constituted has 280 sites including both the glamping sites and the recreational vehicles sites. Strawberry Park is about 450 sites, ah so nearly double the size of this project; and Hidden Acres is somewhat smaller. And it brings me back to the moment to the figures that I gave you about community services. We were looking at those numbers based on the raw data so the 14 police responses and the 9 fire responses that I er was the information obtained from your public safety personnel are based on two projects combined that are about 240% the size of this proposed project.

Ah, there was a comment and a concern that this project will lower property values. That is not what the professional evidence indicates. We commissioned Howard Russ from Russ Appraisals a well recognized appraising in the area to perform a ah comparative sales analysis to determine whether or not umm on a broad basis recreational campgrounds have an adverse impact on the market value of single family residences located in close proximity. That report is in the record of this proceedings. And the conclusion of that report is that there is no ascertainable negative impact to property values.

Ah there was concern that this project will have a negative impact on wildlife habitat. We've already spoken about the phytoplankton ah both in Indiantown Brook as well as Avery Pond. And ah there was concern about light and that concern is unfounded based on the

project site lighting plans, but when you look at the habitat value of this property is currently about 80% of is in post agricultural successional growth now. So that area of the site has very little wildlife habitat value. Ah there are only marginal areas that are wooded on the site. And the proceedings before the Wetlands Commission, the Wetlands Commission evaluated whether or not the project would have an adverse impact on aquatic, and a plant and fish life in those water bodies. And the determination of the Commission in its vote deemed there was no adverse negative impact to wildlife or habitats in wetlands or watercourses.

Uhm there was a comment about Public Act 21.29 which among other things needs some very critical revisions to the enabling legislation which enables municipalities to adopt zoning in the State of Connecticut. Because you as a Zoning Commission had no inherent powers under the common law. Your power is derived from Chapter 124 of Connecticut General Statutes which allows the regulation of land use through the zoning process. And up until last year when the legislation was changed you were able to consider the character of the neighborhood in which a project is proposed. That language has been changed and now the enacting regulations you are required ah your regulations must be drafted with reasonable consideration to the physical site characteristics of the district and it's peculiar suitability for particular uses and with the view to encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout the municipality. In evaluating that language we recognize the fact this property is strategically located, it is at the intersection of two arterial state highways within your municipality. It is diagonally down the road from the Mashantucket Pequot Foxwood Casino Project. Uhm you have a hotel that abuts it to the east, you have other Foxwood related ammededies in Ledyard located in close proximity of this property. Those are the physical characteristics in which this site lies. You have recognized that in your legislative capacity by zoning the predominance of this property in the resort commercial zoning district. I represent to you that this is a good development, this will be a benefit to the Town of Preston, it is going to enhance your tax base, it is going to create both construction jobs when the project is being constructed, as well as operational employment opportunities in your municipality. While patrons are encouraged to use the services provided within the vacation resort that includes all the camping facilities and the Welcome Center and avail themselves to the recreational opportunities on the site. Patrons are not held hostage, patrons are going to matriculate to other resources in the area. Certainly the Casino, maybe local restaurants, so there is going to be a derivative impact from this development by bringing people into the Town of Preston who will support other businesses and services within your community.

But most importantly I submit to you that this project complies with the requirements of your regulations, it complies with the specific uclinding requirements of Section 18.11 of your regulations and it satisfies the general evaluation criteria that you are required to consider when you are acting on a special exception application. Through the review process that has occurred ah before your Commission and the municipal Wetlands Commission there have been

many modifications that have been made to this site plan. Those modifications by and in large have been incorporated to lessen perceived impacts on existing residents of the Town of Preston and their properties and to enhance the environmental compatibility of the project. We submit to you that we are in compliance and ask that the Commission approve the Special Exception and Site Plan. If anyone has any questions I'll try to address them.

Denise Beale - Yes Attorney Heller, of the 280 sites how many of the them are going to be used by Blue themselves and how many are used year round?

Harry Heller - Not year round

Denise Beale - So the ones staying on the property.

Harry Heller - There are some that will stay but not many.

Denise Beale - How many?

Harry Heller - 27

Denise Beale - 27

Harry Heller - Yes.

Denise Beale - So these 27, are these going to stay on the property to be rentals to other people?

Harry Heller - Yes.

Denise Beale - Okay.

Harry Heller - All of those will be rentals.

Denise Beale - Okay and in off season there will be people there to maintain the property.

Harry Heller - There will be a skeleton crew there in the off season, yes.

Emily Project Manager - There is usually 2-3 people, it just depends on the property. It's usually 2-3 people at most. So once it's off season usually end of October 31st or November 1st there's usually the general manager and chief engineer and sometimes maybe an assistant general manager. It just depends.

Denise Beale - I have another question just because I don't seem to have a reference. Where this property is in relation to the intersection and the entrance to the property.

Harry Heller - The entrance is approximately 638 feet east of the intersection of Route 2 and 164.

Denise Beale - Do you have any pictures that show where that intersection is in relation to that drive?

Harry Heller - Okay This is the overall site plan, which is Sheet C-2.0 um so this is the intersection of Route 164 and Route 2 and this is a 100 scale plan and this is your site prop. So from centerline intersection to centerline intersection is 638 feet.

Denise Beale - So can you show me in relation to that intersection and the entrance, there are a couple of roads that come off Route 2 can you show them in relation to that entrance?

Unidentified speaker - This is 164, this is our driveway here

Denise Beale - Yup!

Unidentified speaker - is about 130 feet

Denise Beale - Is that the abandoned road?

Unidentified speaker - that's one of them, do we have one better,

Denise Beale - It's not near any roads on the south side

Harry Heller - For the record I think this is the one I think you were talking about that is abandoned.

Denise Beale - So here's the intersection, here's Indiantown Road, and Shoeville, something I guess it's not a road. So there is really none on the other side of the road.

Unidentified speaker - It's called Indiantown Road, but it really looks like driveways.

Denise Beale - yup, yup so here is the intersection so where abouts is this driveway? Right here.

Unidentified speaker - That driveway is here.

Denise Beale - And that's one of two ways to access the property?

Unidentified speaker - This is where we hopefully get this for access, and that is emergency access only.

Denise Beale - Okay.

Unidentified speaker - This is the main access.

Denise Beale - It was looked at as far as traffic.

Unidentified speaker - Yes.

Denise Beale - So there will be big big RV's coming and going at this access.

Art Moran - Can you use the microphone Denise.

Denise Beale - Sorry, so my concern is the size of the vehicles coming and leaving this property, coming down Route 2 and coming down Route 164, turning left and then left again.

Unidentified speaker - It was looked at and the number of cue vehicles is 2-3 vehicles total turning off to the site, which is we have more than enough room to handle two or three, and if they come in all bunched up

Art Moran - Could we quiet down out there.

Unidentified speaker - we can handle two or three vehicles, when they arrive they aren't waiting here to get into the site, when they come in they can park here. We have room here for 17 vehicles to check-in and then go to their site.

Emily Project Manager - We also have check-in processes, this is Emily again - We also have check-in processes and policies where they don't all have to come to the Welcome Center. We have check-n where they don't even have to get out of their vehicle, we have people with ipads that can check them in right away and direct them right to their sights. We have a lot of different policies that we've put in place at our different campgrounds depending on if it's the weekends and things like that. We staff depending on the volume of who's checking in, many of them pre-check in online. We already see who's coming in and what the volume is so we accommodate that. We have staff, we ramp up our staff accordingly to accommodate that and manage the volume.

Denise Beale - I have one other question as far as staffing. What is the process used at other campgrounds like the one you're proposing here? It was spoken to us that it would increase our jobs, more jobs where are you going to get them from?

Emily - We advertise locally.

Denise Beale - You don't bring them in from other places.

Emily - If we have to but we prefer to hire locally. We have an HR team that works with local hiring agencies and word of mouth certainly works through the town. We have a lot of ways to locally find local help.

Denise Beale - Okay I think you've answered all my questions, thank you.

Emily - Okay sure.

Again for the record Harry Heller - that raised the question Steve Bowman will address, there is some restriping that will occur, he talked about cueing the left turns into the site. And as in the cueing that will occur will you speak on that part?

Steven Bowman - As proposed on the plan, as proposed by the OSTA, so from Route 164 west to somewhere here the roadway is 5 lanes wide. Two lanes eastbound, 2 lanes west bound with a center median that is 12 feet wide. What we're proposing is that the left turn into the site to take that center median back about 145 feet and make a left turn lane into the site. And so what will happen is right as you go approach the site you have 2 lanes east bound, 2 lanes west bound, and a left turn lane.

Art Moran - Anything else from the Commission, questions, comments?

Steven Bowman - Thank you very much.

Art Moran - Again when I open it up to the public please state your name and address for the record. Please limit comments so everyone's not repeating yourself or information from someone else. If there's anyone who would like to speak for the application? Against the application? Come on up.

Connie Bernard - My name is Connie Bernard, I live at 34 Route 164, and I've lived there for over 50 years and as you a lot has changed here in 50 years. One of my concerns Attorney Heller is that you said that they put in plantings so that the people on Lynn Drive won't be able to see the campers. I invite any of you or all of you to come to my backyard and see what I see now. It's a club at night, I will see the campers.

Art Moran - Can you speak to us please?

Connie Bernard - Oh I'm sorry, I will be able to see the campground year round. I invite anyone to my backyard to see what I see. Ummm You will notice that on Route 164 that not many people are in their front yards, they are all in their backyards. We enjoy our backyards. If this goes through, that will be completely gone. The noise factor, the noise will reverberate. You can hear when they have movies down at Foxwoods. Ah I was a little concerned about the fires he said smokeless. Let's see if that really happens. I'd like to know who's there to manage all the camp campers, who's in charge to make sure things are the way you say they will be. I have a lot

of concerns, I have concerns about the traffic. We will once again we'll be exposed to construction trucks, steel trucks, cement trucks, you name it all the dust, all the dirt. I have a feeling that your appraising isn't quite right. We need to look. I think that, who would want to buy my house? I don't know with all this going on. I don't know. Umm I have another question. I don't know if you all know our water is provided by the Preston Water Company which is actually Mashantucket. And I presume they'll be providing water to the camps. Can you answer that?

Art Moran - Yes.

Connie Bernard - Okay. How can we be sure of the continuity of our water? How, how can that happen?

Art Moran - Well, I think that was covered by Attorney Heller the last time.

Connie Bernard - I wasn't here I'm sorry. I wasn't there. So I don't know. But I know that everything is moving very fast up and down Route 164 so I assume they are going to be doing something with the water lines. Can anybody tell me the answer to that? Can the Mashantucket? Can you guys say anything?

Art Moran - You want to hang on or do you want to answer that now or later on?

Harry Heller - It's up to you, it will only take two seconds.

Art Moran - Okay, Are you all done madam, asking questions?

Connie Bernard - Ahhh, I guess. Yeah.

Harry Heller - Again for the record Harry Heller. As we indicated last time and you have a letter in the record from the Tribal Utility Company, the Preston Plains Water Company system will not provide the service for this project. It will come directly from the casin, from well the reservation. So then the two systems don't intermingle.

Art Moran - Thank you. Would anyone else like to come up for comment?

Steve Ballirano - Good evening, Steve Ballirano, 107 Cooktown Road, thank you for continuing the hearing tonight allowing the residents an opportunity to respond to updated information submitted to the Commission since the last time. I'd like to start by sharing a few comments regarding town regulations that are used to guide the process. Section 18.4 promote or protect or promotes property values. I had a chance to study the real estate evaluation submitted by the applicant. The conclusions related to the impact on property values by Russell Pleus Services are incomplete. They don't provide a level of detail that will enable sufficient conclusions to be drawn. If you look at it closely the two home value comparisons that were submitted to the Town of Preston were not statistically significant in order to draw a definitive conclusion as the sample sizes were way too small. Additionally, comparisons were made adjacent to Hidden Acres campground, with only 180 campsites, not 200+ as listed in the analysis; it's right on their website. This is a much smaller campground in scope than the project proposed by Blue Camp. If you remember to last meeting I submitted a study by Dr. Lennon, at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, where he stated and he proved park size is positively

related to approximate property values. The Blue Camp proposed project with 65 acres and 280 RVs with some 1,800 people active on the property will have a much larger negative impact on property values than Hidden Acres. Likewise if you consider other towns in the plan compared to. The campground in East Lyme and there were ah 6 of them I sorry and ah the 4 campgrounds in East Lyme and the 6 in Salem were all significantly smaller than the project being proposed on Route 2 in Preston. Incidentally the mil rate in Salem is 32.2, the mil rate in East Lyme is 28.5 significantly higher than Preston which also directly affects home sales and values if you look at the whole supply and demand model. The social economic conditions in each town, local political climates, availability of local jobs, quality school systems, etcetera are all factors that do not allow adequate comparisons of ah between these towns and Preston. Based on the size and the scope of the proposed project is not considered the best use of this location it will have a negative impact on property values among other considerations. Just a few brief comments - site design - the proposed project does not present a better overall neighborhood compatibility; considering by comparison the consistent design of the Hilton Garden Inn with its rustic character of the area, this Preston not Ledyard by the way. Even the barn shaped Dunkin Donuts building blends into the local scenery. The proposed park is the most basic form imaginable, consider the view of 280 RVs parked side by side in close proximity and the imagine of a trailer park immediately comes to mind. This is outdoor sprawl and it will have a negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods. You've heard mention the lights, the noise, the traffic, the pollution, excetera. The project is out of size for this area with 1,800 visitors expected at one time for almost 60% of the year. Based on the description of the development it appears to be nonconformity to the surrounding area. It's not a surprise to me that the developers have never shared any artist's drawings rendering the buildings or topography. I haven't seen one and I have been to all the meetings. Noise pollution submitted by the Commission last week was a list of weekend activities which seem to be kind of vague. It ah, the activities at their other properties seem much more comprehensive, it may be prudent to ask for all the activities planned by day for the season. And not only accept a sample, as you know samples can be changed. Habitat areas - again I won't go deep into this nothing, nothing has been formally by DEEP on the nationally diversity database. And I just want to hold that thought for a minute. I want to come back to the ah ah habitat in a second. Traffic loads, I spent a lot of time on this I think I told you last time my credentials VP of Sales for Stop & Shop. I was on the Retail Site Development Committee for 13+ years for Stop & Shop so I hold a lot of experience in this area when it comes to timing of traffic and so on. um But I want to cite some very very recent examples and one not so recent. Tisdale, Massachusetts almost 2,000 people rural rustice characteristics just like Preston. There was a major RV park proposed January 11, 2022 there's an article in the Berkshire Eagle ah it was denied. What they did was revise the traffic study to reflect the summer traffic pattern. What they found, was that it was a great negative impact on the local neighborhood. It wasn't in harmony, it would completely change

the character of the neighborhood and it does not lessen congestion. I have a copy for the Committee. Santa Fe Beach, Florida July 2021 RV park proposed serious concerns about how increased traffic will compromise safety. Also park guests would use golf carts for personal vehicles to get to and from the facility. The town voted 3 to 1 to reject the proposal. Sussex County, Delaware, a little further back, March 2013, traffic impact study major concerns about the proposed campground creating more traffic on already congested roads. That application was denied. Traffic loads I generally got up to talk about Route 2A, and in brief again, I have a lot, a lot of data on this. The ah the statement about this 2A business about 2A does not warrant a study based industry provided protocol. I submit to you that the mid-May numbers, May 10th, 14th, 17th, understate the traffic. Ah The folks that live on this road are very concerned. I talked to many of them when we did the um we did ah, when they signed a petition. The fact is you have to apply the Memorial Day to October 31st, that's the only way to do it. Think of the people of Tisdale, Massachusetts, if they hadn't done that they would be at risk. The community would be at risk, the traffic, and so on. I'm not a fatalist but I'm telling ya the timing matters in many of these communities where we propose retail development we did go back and if we didn't do these seasonal adjustments or it would have been rejected. Cape Cod, the Rhode Island shorelines, Connecticut shoreline, all the towns if you want to know what's happening in season. It's common sense folks. Think about it, think about it for a minute. Think about this intersection out here. The average RV is 35-40 feet long. You can google it. That's the size of a tractor trailer with the turning radius of a tractor trailer. For every vehicle that passes this intersection, for every RV that's 2 less cars that don't get through. Because 1 car length is equal to one RV. If you don't look at the numbers the devil is in the details. Memorial Day to to October 31st it would be irresponsible, I'm not calling you irresponsible, the decision to approve would be irresponsible to use the traffic study that you have. If DOT doesn't have the information they have time to get it and time to commission a study, whatever you do. The study has to be approved by DOT. They're the experts. Please do not accept the dates that you have, you could be making a fatal error. The road construction that was done to support the casino further down into Ledyard is significant. We don't have that. Route 2A with its improvements is better, but it's not great for the kind of traffic we may be facing. We should know what that is. The project at Foxwoods, the water park, 600,000 people it's public information. That's what they project. I would tell you that the projections exist today for traffic. Otherwise they wouldn't know egress and exiting they wouldn't know how much parking they need to add or not. So they exist. The state hospital we talked about last meeting, it's pie in the sky, there's nothing firm, you don't even know what it's going to be so those projections would be harder to get, but I'm telling ya this roadway out here could be a nightmare. And, and again I'll get off of that, one other thing that I haven't heard is an evacuation plan. I'm not sure if it's part of the statutes or not, but a park this size has no specific study addressing the safety and security of the surrounding residents during an evacuation. A propane explosion, an RV catches

fire, it spreads, creates a wildfire, who knows I don't even know. How are evacuation roads impacted, can the impact be mitigated, can we account for all possible scenarios? We have a moral obligation to proceed with a specific study to determine the magnitude of this problem and the possible mitigation. Have all the proper engineering done. In the end we all want the same thing: safe and private community. More on the community, last week the developer responded to the Commission regarding the cost to community services. They submitted that back in 2021 the two campgrounds had an average of 9 calls to the fire department and 14 calls to the state police only to Strawberry Park; that's the only data the state police officer could get. For the 2021 season. I would submit to you that 2021 if you think back families weren't out as in previous years out on vacation. Those numbers were probably less participation in campgrounds. The only season that would produce fewer calls than last year would have been 2020 when the pandemic was in full swing. So, just a caution there. A few meetings ago we submitted a petition with almost 400 signatures from town residents opposed to this project ah it was given to the Commission, and in only 10 short days in the cold and the rain residents stepped up to sign it. If you had a chance to review the names and addresses that these weren't only Watson Road, Lynn Drive, Overlook Drive, Route 2 residents, but they encompassed almost every corner of our town. This is a sort of mini referendum as I like to say and if you would and, and if we did have a referendum nearly 10% of the town would have said No, rejected. That's 20% of the households in the town of Preston. Please consider the significance of nearly 400 residents who are asking you to deny the application. Since a referendum isn't part of the process, maybe it should be. A local, our local residents have told us time and time again; I know I got a lot of the signatures myself, that we have an expectation of privacy and peace and quiet in our own homes this must be preserved. More on the subject of habitat, and I said to you, and again I'm almost done. I want to talk to you about habitat. First thing, I just want to note I saw just yesterday, I saw my first bald eagle of the season. I was standing in my driveway. It was certainly a magnificent creature; the wing span had to be more than 6 feet wide and it was coming from the Avery Pond direction. I am in awe of these creatures as they are one of the most spectacular species in nature. And to think, most people never get to see a bald eagle in person let alone from their yard. Over the years I've learned a few facts about bald eagles. If you indulge me a one more minutes I want to share a few. They mate for life. Eagles share nest duties with their partners. When one is out hunting the other stands guard. They have a keen ability, they can look out in one direction with their left eye, while looking in the opposite direction with the right eye. Which makes them awesome hunters. They return to the same spot every year to make their nest. Looking at the bald eagle yesterday I couldn't help but wonder if the RV park is approved, disturbing the eagle's habitat will this be the last time the eagle returns, the eagles return to make their nest. I understand there are 3 mating pairs on this property. And what will happen to the rest of the protected species? That decision rests with you folks. To some the wildlife may be a minor point. We have learned that the developer, to

the developer the bald eagle and other wildlife that inhabit this site don't matter. They will ask you to disregard these facts as they, as they have stated more than once publicly, particularly during the Wetlands open hearing. I would ask you to consider the abundance of significant wildlife and ecosystem in and around Avery Pond. Along with all the other important criteria you have to consider for this application. And I ask you once again to deny this project. Thank you. But I give you this handout of the articles, I had to print out the Trisdale article because sometimes it's real squirrely and doesn't open up and I didn't want you to have trouble reading it. Thank you.

Kathy Warzecha - This will be Exhibit 95.

Peter Leibert - That's a tough presentation to follow. My name's Peter Leibert, I live in 39 Krug Road and I've lived there for - close to 55 years. It's peaceful, relaxed, rural town. That's how I describe Preston. We moved here because it was just that. And now, if I were to move here again, and I saw that we have Strawberry Park, Hidden Acres, and Blue Water Campground Resort, that would be a little scary to me. Couple of things I wanna address, uh one certainly is the question of Route 2A and Route 2. The numbers that were presented by supposedly professional, professional evaluators. Doesn't make sense. If you've driven that route, during your time going to work or whatever, you've seen that it just doesn't make any sense. The intersection of 164 and 165 has not been addressed, I don't think. That's a dangerous, it's one of the most dangerous intersections in town and we get all the traffic coming from Massachusetts through that intersection - I live on Krug Road and when I have to come up and get onto Route 164, during shift change, it's a good wait. The other thing I wanna mention or discuss is the smokeless fire pit. The famous smokeless fire pit. If you've got fire, you've got smoke. I just bought smokeless fire pit, paid a good amount for it, stainless steel. It's wonderful. But it smokes when you start, so there's really no such thing as a smokeless fire pit. The whole question of ah fire company, police, fire police - I was a captain as a fire police, as for fire and police and some question of 14 police calls and 9 fire calls to these campgrounds in the past - I don't know if that was in a week or a month or a year - but I have a scanner at home, and I'm sorry it just doesn't jive with with what I'm hearing on that scanner and I think that's about all I have to say and I thank you all for listening and also you folks for presenting - what you've presented was a tough trip for you guys. Thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else would like to comment, come on up.

Susan Rosenberg - My name is Susan Rosenberg and I live at 72 Lakeview Drive, Preston. First of all I'm gonna give a handout for you to look at which coincides with this very unreadable document here. And what it is, is campground activity schedule, April through October. Umm This is taken right off the internet of a campground very near to us in Connecticut and as you can see there's activity schedule for every weekend of every week starting from when the campground opens to when the campground closes. Not only are there activities every single weekend, but I also attached - there's weekly activities on top of that. And these activities

include everything from luaus to birthday weekends to throwback weekend to Christmas in August, wonderland weekend, Hawaiian weekend, and goes on and on. So if the activity at this campground is I believe is going to be a lot more than what has been presented by Blue Camp. Ummm another thing is - could everybody, I've handed out some posters of birds that I've taken, I'm a photographer. This kind of coincides with the fellow that spoke a few moments ago, about the birds that we have in this area that we are about to threaten with all of this activity. We have bald eagles, we have swans, we have ospreys, we have great blue herons, umm we have some juveniles, bald eagles that are around Amos Lake and I know they're over here too because in the past summer, the people who live near Avery Pond saw them. So that's one of my major concerns also and I'll give you all a copy of these pictures so you can have it. And I think they kind of speak for themselves and that's all I have to say, thank you.

Art Moran - Thank you. Anybody else like to comment?

Jennifer Hollstein - Jennifer Hollstein, 12 Lynn Drive. Ahh first I just had a quick question, I umm noticed that at most of the water resorts, they have some sort of fencing dog park like an enclosed park, like a walking area, some of the beach designated as dog friendly beaches. Is that, I haven't seen anything myself, any plans that they have proposed to have.

Kathy Warzecha - That is not shown in the plan at this time.

Jennifer Hollstein - Just from the thought as far as safety is there anything in regards to like licensing, rabies, vaccinations, proof of anything? No? Okay. And just a thought that there may be, if there's possibility that, limits to, so there aren't too many dogs. Okay. I don't believe the aesthetic character of these RV's on top of one another would be in any way are in harmony with the surrounding area as a reference of a special exception application. Looking at all the site plans that come in little boxes representing RV's and buildings, it's difficult to be able to envision what this RV resort would look like once completed and that there are real buildings and 200 real RV's parked on the grounds that I know of that Blue Waters has not presented any pictures of what it would look like. I tried to find a similarly sized design that Blue Water owns that would give a visual of this proposed development. Blue Water's Cape Charles, just open KOA Campground seemed comparable with 316 full service sites, 7 deluxe cabins, and 5 glamping tents. The biggest difference being though that it is located on the Chesapeake Bay and has actual beach frontage. I went online and found an aerial photo of the campground and I've had that photo enlarged for the Commission to see, Tim is walking around with now. In reference to the Cape Charles' KOA being located on Chesapeake Bay and having actual beach frontage access, this type of campground may do very well when it's located near a large accessible body of water such as the ocean or a large bay or a lake where the guests have access or even close proximity to an actual beach. But I believe it has been mentioned previously that Avery Pond is not comparable to those bodies of water that other Blue Waters Resorts are located on. And yet, as Todd Berbage told us, at the June 23rd 2021 meeting that the Poquetanuck Fire Department. Their properties are "centered around water, and the amenities

that that location will provide, such as fishing, beach access, kayaking, and canoe rentals". Attorney Heller even reiterated when discussion came up regarding other locations, that that lake - referring to Avery Pond - is an amenity to this project and as Todd indicated that projects are centered around water. Also when asked if the proposed resort will be bringing in Bands, Todd replied by saying 'no' that Foxwoods has such a great entertainment center that there is no way he could compete with that. He called Foxwoods the Disneyland of the north. So if Avery Pond won't be the amenity Blue Water planned on due to the floating dock and kayaking and canoe rental being removed from the plans, and no longer having the boardwalk down to the pond. What amenities are proposed; that this luxury resort will have that will draw people to stay there? What sets it apart? Tennis and hibachi courts, swimming pools, splash pad? Those amenities being found at most of the campgrounds and even some hotels. I'm not sure how many people want to stay in this proposed resort on cramped sites with no shade, and limited access to water activities on a struggling little pond, solely to visit Foxwoods. But according to Todd Berbage, this RV resort won't be bringing more people to the area. He told us on June 23rd, that part of the reason Blue Water chose this location was due to the fact that Foxwoods realized it had a little bit of an issue. He stated that over the years, as the popularity of the casino grew, that the RV base started to grow, it became an inconvenience to opportunity. I've mentioned at least twice that the RV's were already here. Todd said the Foxwoods patrons are their clientele, and that they're just "taking Foxwoods existing people and putting them here", referring to the proposed Blue Camp RV Resort. I don't believe in any sort of market analysis is required in the planning zoning regulations, but Attorney Heller reminded commissions that they needed to review actual facts, not just one person's opinion. So for development of this magnitude with this much concern from the Preston residents about impact on the environment, in the town of Preston, shouldn't there have been some sort of study done to determine if there really is demand for 280 RV parking spots? I don't know if Foxwoods keeps records of RV lot usage, or if they do, how far they go back. But it seems to me that Blue Water could've requested that information to present as actual facts. I driven past that RV designated parking lot at Foxwoods a number of times and to see usage, I drove by last June on 14th right after that initial meeting with Blue Water, granted things were a little different because COVID was still kind of an issue, but I do have pictures of the lot and at most, during June, there were 8, 8 RV's in the parking lot at one time. I apologize. So I'm not sure where he's getting these numbers that he thinks that there's already people here, this picture showing that they're not. Um So I will present these pictures actually, for what it's worth. The picture showing what was back in June. When the subject of the lack of existing RV's parking at Foxwoods was brought up at the June 23rd meeting at the firehouse, even Attorney Heller commented that he didn't know about Foxwoods and couldn't speak for Foxwoods in regards to the RV traffic there. But he said two parking lots on the right of Mohegan Sun are always full every weekend and that he'd be surprised if Foxwoods was different. But Blue Water isn't developing next to Mohegan

Sun, they're developing in a Mashantucket land. Lastly, Todd Berbage came to Poquetanuck Firehouse on June 23rd last year to "open a conversation between the community". During that conversation, Preston residents expressed numerous concerns that the development possibly have on Avery Pond, the surrounding wetlands, and the town of Preston itself. Todd encouraged any of us to visit one of his campgrounds, specifically Stafford Lake related New Hampshire, to see what Blue Water was all about. Todd said "seeing is believing" and even offered to comp anyone who went. Well it wasn't feasible for me to visit that or any of his campgrounds so I did what I would normally do when planning a trip, I went on TripAdvisor and read reviews from other travelers on his Strafford Lake campground. A 3-star review from August of 2021 states in part "screaming kids running around unsupervised and an endless stream of rented golf carts bumping down the gravel roads, gave the campground a chaotic feel from morning to night". A 1-star review from October of 2020 states "unattended little kids running all over the place, golf carts flying around with kids driving them and kids hanging off the back. Loud parties, broken down laundry room, and terrible dirty dusty roads". Mind you there are good and bad reviews and I'm not just singling out the negative ones, but after reading the ones I did and seeing similar complaints, it made it question how all of Blue Water's RV parks are managed. The question led me to research the rest of Blue Water's RV resorts listed in their portfolio on the handout from the Planning and Zoning Public Hearing on February 23rd. I also used the TripAdvisor website in search for each of Blue Water's resorts. Some campgrounds had more reviews than others, so since the reviews were posted in chronological order from newest to oldest, I only printed the website's page one reviews. In some cases, those reviews went back beyond time Blue Water owned or managed and I say this because some other campgrounds are either jointly owned with another corporation or Blue Water partnered with another company and assumed management of the campground. Again I'm not trying to single out the bad reviews admittedly there are good reviews, I just wanted to bring attention to the fact that even though there are good reviews, there are similar concerns at most of their campgrounds. Two of the main issues being management and the spacing concerns. I selected a few of the reviews, I'm not gonna read all of them, I did take the time though for the commission and Attorney Heller, if you would like it, I printed out each of the page ones of TripAdvisor's reviews of each of Blue Water's resorts that are currently running and operating. Yes that's one and I have one for Attorney Heller if you'd like it.

Kathy Warzecha - That's 98.

Art Moran - Do we have to take it?

Kathy Warzecha - Yes, that's 98 and the pictures will be 99, TripAdvisor 100.

Jennifer Hollstein - So I just pulled out a few I'm not gonna read all of them but some of the management issues made in 2021 review of Yogi Bear's Jellystone Park-Camp resort. Now these are all Blue Water owned campgrounds or managed. "No security, no quiet time enforcement, no dust control. Kids driving around rental carts like NASCAR. Not a friendly park. As a full-time

RV'er, just warning my fellow traveler". A review from September of 2021 of Cherry Stone Family Camper Resort: "Streets were like speedways with out of control golf cart drivers. Music so loud you got to enjoy it halfway down the block from it. Lots of barking, lots of lights from golf carts racing by after dark until midnight". A July 2021 review of Frontier Town: "The golf cart situation is as stated by others, ridiculous. They allow anyone to drive one with no rules, no enforcement of any kind. Although you see park rangers driving around on their golf carts, they don't stop to answer any questions or listen to any concerns". On the issue of shade and spacing concerns, in October of 2020 a review of Sun Outdoors Rehoboth Bay: "Keep in mind we are in a fifth wheel camper, and our bedroom slide out is about 10 feet from their firepit". In October 2020 review of the same: "This park is basically an open field, newly turned into a campsite." Sound familiar? October 2020, review of the same: "The trees are newly planted so it will be a long time before there will be any shade." Sound familiar? September 2020, review of Charles Chesapeake Bay: "BTW no trees so no shade, ouch". May 2020 review of Cape Charles Chesapeake Bay: "just an FYI, you better like your neighbors because those spots are very close together". May 2020 of the same: "The things that are subtle are the fact that there are almost no trees, so the camping spaces are more like a parking lot with no shade". Creating RV's resorts listed in Blue Water's portfolio were just recently purchased so they really had minimal reviews on them. One of them was purchased in June of 2021 and the other two were purchased January of this year, and the other three resorts listed on their portfolio are actually still in development stages, so realistically, that's six of their resorts that you really can't even include as far as looking to see what their conduct is. I would also like to note to the best of my research to date, Blue Water is not actually purchased and developed the campground from the ground up. I knew they purchased the campground and taken over ownership of it or partnered with another company and assumed management of another campground. So we really don't know what their track record is as far as doing it from the ground up. So again I understand some of these issues may not be addressed by Planning and Zoning Regulations, but going back to when this application was first submitted and seeing how many revisions had to have been made due to the lack of due diligence on the part of the applicant and their experts. Isn't it possible they've gotten other things wrong as well? Are we just supposed to take Todd Berbage's word that seeing is believing? What I have seen so far does not instill confidence in me that this this development won't have negative impacts on Avery Pond, the town of Preston, or its residents in the long term. I feel that Blue Camp's application for a luxury RV resort should be denied. Thank you for your time.

Kathy Warzecha - This will be 101

Tim Hotchkiss - Tim Hotchkiss, 20 Lynn Drive. Anybody that's dealt with the beach traffic in the summertime and then combined with casino traffic on Lynn Drive, there are times that we cannot get out here, we have to go all the way up to the other side because the traffic is so backed up and then get in the line to take back roads. There have been times that on my way

back from Rhode Island, or any other part of the state, had to take the back roads because of the backed up traffic. In other words, I just wanted to see a study done during normal times.

Margaret Gibson - My name is Margaret Gibson I live at 154 Watson Road in Preston, good evening to you all. Um I have not so much formal remarks as rather scattered random ones mostly because I'm not trying to repeat some of the things that have already been said, even though I would like to reiterate some of them. Um I do want to address the issue of subsequent compatibility with surrounding development in the neighborhood and having the site design in harmony with the surrounding area. Um In passing, I want to say that - before I address - that the issue of neighborhood compatibility is still very much alive for me and I hope for you. If my letter to you of March 22nd, I cited at least one person: Justin LaFontaine, in a letter to Kathy Warzecha, who did take issue with Attorney Heller's interpretation about 21, 29, and I just referred, hope that you will look into that and resolve it. Um In terms of physical appearance, I think that they're talking about buildings um concerns about designs of the buildings and appearance of buildings on the site and I think that someone else has already said, we have not seen very many drawings Um so we don't know about what they look like with the relationship to the land. But the buildings that will be permanently on site aren't the only buildings that will be there. Um The RV trailers themselves are a kind of building. They're mobile, yes, they're transient, yes, but um when they're parked and on site, they become a kind of temporary building made of metal, aluminum, and plastic and there's no possibility of any kind of governance as to what they'll look like or anything of the sort. Um In terms of what that RV park, may look like, just seeing a picture of one with real life RV campers in it not these rather blue and green, environmentally pretty sketches um that we've referred to when talking to the site. That's not what it's gonna look like. Um by compare, in the neighborhood, it's been pointed out that there's been built in Garden Inn down the road um and of course the casino. By comparison, a field full of RV campers is going to look like, the Hilton Garden Inn is going to be a sort of visual paradise, I think. But as I've pointed out before, the Hilton Garden Inn, the casino, and Dunkin Donuts, do not comprise the entire neighborhood. There is the neighborhood of Lynn Drive, there are houses nearby on Watson Road, Cooktown Road, up and down 164 and actually across the road on Route 2. Surely these are neighborhoods or are part of the whole neighborhood, and I would have to submit that they should be considered. I've noticed that there hasn't been very much said about - there's been things said about lighting. I haven't heard very much talked about except from Preston residents about noise, weekend activity, music, pets, etc. um That's kind of an odd thing really, I mean you're asked to cite what is within regulations when you've got a final product and you can't regulate the human beings who are there. Or if management is not enforcing quiet hours or whatever. You're gonna have considerable activity, noise, etc. Some of which can be regulated or mitigated and a lot of which cannot. Um I don't know what to say about that except I think the final product will not be compatible with the residential neighborhood just across Avery Pond because certainly sound is

amplified as it travels across water. Also I'm a um I don't mean ah I'm glad that the lighting that's being provided is down lighting. Are the army campers and the campers themselves providing down lighting with their campers? They will be a source of lights, certainly. Headlights, all sorts of lights when people are at home, flashlights are not a big deal. But all of that cumulative lighting does affect um environment um the environment. Both for the human neighborhood and for the environment: the wetlands, the breeding birds and other wildlife. I'm just skipping some stuff, sorry. We have heard from remarks in public hearings, both the IWW Commission and Planning and Zoning um about additional tax dollar income for needy Preston and Preston's need to be business friendly. It's been pointed out ah that there's not much business in Preston. I don't know what the state of Preston riverwalk is, but certainly there is a lot of development proposed there and if it comes to fruition there will be plenty of tax dollars. It can't be said that Preston is business friendly, that is incorrect, um assessment of what Preston has done. I do want to make a request to the Commission. I believe that there is a urgent need to revise the regulations under which applications are um waiting. Um And I think it's urgent because of we want to assure the quality life to homeowners, farmers, existing national treasures - like wetlands and woodlands and lakes - and I don't think um I um existing regulations pay enough attention to the quality of life for those who live in Preston. This is not a huge, this is a request for a review, this is not a big criticism. I think that the regulations need to be revised in review to climate change. We're having bigger storms, more rain, tree damage. All of this has to be anticipated for the good of the town, its residents, and the businesses, and new residents. I would ask for this Commission and Inland Wetlands to consider forming a special committee to study and propose revisions to the existing regulations. I would also ask that P&ZC consider saving farm land which farm organically, does not create run off and harm the stuff. Ah Because again, climate change is going to create a need for the ability of places to provide their own food, not just for the town of Preston. The existing farmland should not be ah called resort commercial and just given away or developed over it. It's valuable and I would like to see the town of Preston recognize what value it has. I also, The chairman of the Inland Wetland Commission said, when their vote was finalized and you voted for the application, he said: "I don't like it but it meets regulation". I don't think it's enough to simply meet regulation. I mean, I, regulations are regulations I'm looking a little further down the road. It's crucial to Preston wants business because it enhances the quality of life in Preston, for its residents, farmers, habitat, habitat, lakes, ponds, watershed areas, and other loving creatures in the wetlands wildlife. It is not enough that it meets regulations and becomes ah really helpful to the casino down the road and relieves them of some problems. It should enhance whatever the project is. It should enhance the life and environment of the town of Preston. So as you consider that part the proposal, please continue to consult other sources, both legal, environmental, and so on. Ah please consider for instance, there is a request that there will be further studies of. Please continue to consult other sources, don't be content with studies done by the applicant,

particularly the traffic report which I'm not gonna say what I had to say because I think another resident presented a lot of very good information. Please dig deeper, re-do the traffic study, ah, ah I know you can only measure what is in existence and how. But if the casino down the road says we're gonna have 600,000 people coming a day for the water park and that there are other projects, that's gonna have an impact on traffic. I know you will do this anyway but I'm just gonna it: do what your mind and heart thinks is the best choice for Preston. And take risks if you have to making your decision. I don't I don't envy you, it takes intelligence but it also takes courage. And I know the residents are with you as you do your deliberations and I would also like to say that I have not been prouder of people who've lived in Preston than I have been in the last few months, listening to people who are not professionalism who do their own research, who have intelligence, who maybe don't have the skills of presentation that other professionals do. But I think that because of the commitment of these residents to the life in Preston, we have gotten not just concessions, but there have been studies done and I want to thank the applicant for being responsive to some of them which I think have improved the application. That said, that said I stand with those who ask you not to approve this application, thank you.

Kathy Warzecha - So this is Exhibit 102.

John Wagner - My name is John Wagner, live at 41 Lynn Drive, for 49 years. I'm a member of Preston City Firefighters. How many of you people that have been onto the campground here in town, how many of you have been into the one on Pierce Road, on Strawberry Park? How many of you have ever been over to the one on the Quinebaug River? Any of you? What is it like? It's basically borderline control tapes. I have responded there as an EMT and firefighter, it is a nightmare. Trying to get in there with the emergency vehicles or private vehicles. And I don't see just because this is a high end luxury campground it will be any better. Because with that type of environment you can't get away from the noise, you can't get away from chaos. It's gonna be there 24/7. Number one I wanna mention that's really important is Mr. Heller is wrong about the water system. Two wells on Lynn Drive are connected to the water system over at Foxwoods Resort. Look at the road up there, have you ever seen hydrants there before? That's not only coming from our two wells, it's coming from their water supply. If we have a big storm, the chloroform count goes up into our wells, and you can tell when we're getting water from Foxwoods. When you take a shower, you need a gas mask because the chlorine comes out it's enough to gag you, try to drink it, the smell awful ether. They're connected so he's wrong. The other thing is I'd like to point out, and I think you already got the idea I've mentioned this once before, these people came here and never do due diligence at all on their proposed campground, otherwise why would we have the concessions that we have gotten from them? If we were to listen to them and had not done that, it would have been a total disaster over there for the environment, and all the habitat of wild animals, the eagles, everything that's there. Also Avery Pond. They never even looked at it. What I submitted to you is section 18, special

exceptions, I'd like to try to pick it apart. I'm not gonna read all of them you know what they are. But number one, protect and promote the rights of individuals, property values, and environment, and the area. This project does nothing but infringe on the rights of the individuals located in the quiet neighborhood closest to the proposed project. It will not increase property values, it will cause them to be decreased. Therefore does not meet the requirements of meeting the proper relationship between the taxable values of real property in the area. This project is nothing more than a huge seasonal, transitional mobile home park, which is not aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood, or Preston in that location. Environment, you've heard a lot already on the environment. How did we get to these concessions and stuff? It was us because they had no interest in the environment whatsoever and that's documented if you look into the Inland and Wetland records. This project is nothing but, ah oh sorry, due to the numerous complaints by the local homeowners, it was made evident to the Inlands Wetlands Commission of the total lack of caring of the environment and wildlife, by Blue Water who obviously did not do due diligence and research on Avery Pond, water surrounding lands and water wildlife and fish. Numerous concessions that can be made to the Inland and Wetland Commission due to our opposition. One such concession is that one hundred foot bumper zone that they're talking about that they had to give up because of the wetlands in the front, and the boardwalk they gave up; if they would have done due diligence, we would never have had to do that. During the hearing process, their lawyer had the audacity to lecture the Commission that the environment wasn't their concern, and stressed that it was not addressed in their regulations and not under their per view. That is proof to me that they will not be good neighbors or an asset to Preston. With that attitude, how can you trust them to maintain the park in a special application process? Improve land use, the project does not meet the requirements of improved land use. Squeezing 280 large campers into less than now 65 acres, does not improve the land use. It will over stress it due to the number of people, vehicles, camperfires, activities being held on site, the property still surrounded by wetlands and streams that has native to migrating species, coming up to spawn in Avery Pond and Ames Lake. The Agricultural Commission voiced their opposition to this park and stated that this possible land is considered prime farmland by them and also the state of Connecticut. Their overall neighborhood compatibility, can somebody please explain to me how a seasonal luxury camper park is compatible with waterfront, streams, and local neighborhoods with homes in the six figure range. I don't think so. This eye sore is not compatible with the local neighborhood, the surrounding farmlands, or the rural portrait of Preston. Especially the size and place this in that location next to a busy noisy highway, the main route through Preston. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation, this project will add to increase the ah traffic issues as the current road design does not have the width to allow over sized, very wide, 35-40 foot campers and other vehicles to safely maneuver to make the turn off Route 2. I know what the engineer said, but he doesn't live here and he doesn't have to live and watch this fiasco take place. Campers and tow vehicles

maneuvering to make the turn off Route 2 into the campground without causing a blockage in the road, especially if there was an influx of these campers coming in for the weekend or if they are leaving at the same time. Pedestrian circulation is gonna be a huge safety problem. There are no sidewalks in the area, only narrow shoulders to walk on. Route 2 and 164 are noted for high traffic volume and present a danger to anyone walking or riding bicycles on those shoulders. Accidents waiting to happen. Parking. According to Blue Camp, they state that they will have 5-6 parking spaces available on the site. I don't know where the number 17 came from, I guess that's just a dream, but I can't see that. This is totally undersized to handle the predicted turn over of campers not even going without affecting the traffic on Route 2 and 164. Open space. What open space? 208 campsites and the campgrounds plan for activities there is swimming pool, water park, campgrounds, other buildings, bathhouses, etc. And only open spaces are the wetlands areas and Route 2. Lighting, is a concern and Laurie brought up and almost beat it to death. But again, the point is as Connie mentioned, you're not looking at the elevated parts of the other parts of the neighborhood on 164 and moving up on across the street. That light is gonna go up no matter what they do and we're not taking into the ah into ah the lighting coming from those campers. They're gonna have bright lights and all kinds of stuff there and that's still gonna be added to this light, and it's gonna filter through and into the neighborhoods especially right behind it and it's gonna reflect off of that pond. We already have to deal with lighting from Foxwoods. Architectural treatment and aesthetics. Blue Camp's plans call for support buildings. They will be built for functionality, not for being aesthetically pleasing to look at or to be compatible with the neighborhood. 208 RV and small camper sites, etc. Are now being squeezed into an area less than 65 acres. This is due to a 100 foot bumper zone from the Avery Pond wetlands. This now promotes a very high density campsite roughly around 17 per acre and should be considered maxing on this acreage. Proper relationship between taxable values and real property in this area. This has been touched on but this is something else to think about. Blue Camp states this will only increase on the neighborhood zone better. They did not to my knowledge, had not had real estate assessors come into the homes to accurately assess the property at this current time. If you investigate the tax assessments on record, all those homes are assessed in six figure range. There's no way a noisy, unsightly, glorified, seasonal transitionally mobile home park is going to add any homeowner's property value. Would any of you want this to happen to any of your neighborhood? The commission shall consider and evaluate each application for a special exemption using the minimum criteria. Site design, I'm not gonna read specifically again I'll take main points from it. Appropriateness of location or used. The use shall reserve the integrity and character of the neighborhood. Adjacent uses and current zoning district consideration shall be given to the size, location, use, and height of buildings, nature, extent of landscape location, driveway, parking, building areas, etcetera. This project is zoned resort/commercial, that could allow a campground, however this project will not preserve the integrity and character of the neighborhood. This project does not

consider nature in any way even with the proposed landscape design that has the potential skill to seriously protect the wildlife and fishers of the area around the area. These birds are used to quiet down there, what do you think is gonna happen with that going on 24/7 during the time when they're breeding and everything? You think that's not gonna affect them? What about the osprey right across the road on Route 2? They've been there for years and they're gonna be there when that, I don't think so the location of the driveway, this one they're overlooking and not addressing in my opinion. The location of the driveway like Mr. Heller stated about six hundred and something feet from that intersection. That is a very small area on a very busy road. If you live down there or even go through there, when that light's green, you better be watching where you're going. Because they're not going the speed limit, I'll tell you that. So this is gonna cause a potential, very serious traffic congestion point. The proposed drive in located about like I said 600 feet from the intersection between Route 2 and 164. Campers coming from i-95 and going east on Route 2 will be entering the park with no wide turn lane. They haven't even mentioned anything about a wide turn lane coming east to west. First I heard there was one going west to east. And I'd like to see that because that is not a five lane road. There's two going east and two going west. The little turns on the next 600 foot section. The right turn lane off Route 164, without that turnoff for them to get off that road being blocked by campers turning into the park. This will cause left turning drivers to go into the Route 2 traffic lane, then cut back into the right hand lane to turn onto Route 164. All of this is within very short distance with potential to block Route 2 right lane as the light changes. Campers coming from the west need to go through the intersection to get into the area of the entrance road. Depending on traffic flow going west, campers will have to block the far left east lane of Route 2 to enter, leaving only one lane to go east on the proposing turn lane there. If there is a period of influx into the campground, this could cause a backup into the intersection, blocking access and egress into 164. As we stated, 35 to 40 foot campers, two in a row, trying to get through that light - they're not gonna make it. If they get hung up there, it's gonna block up everything so they're not looking into the traffic plan, they don't impress me at all. What about Watson Road intersection at Dunkin Donuts? Have you ever come down Watson Road to try to get out into Route 2 or onto Watson road? I've been in real bad accidents over there. And nobody's looking at that place. And what about Dunkin Donuts, they got a pretty good business over there. That can be a challenge getting out because it's almost a blind turn looking to the right. Somebody better look at that. Proposed registry parking lot will be small. There is no mention of the entrance road into the park being widened to accommodate these luxury campers coming and going. That's a very narrow road. Loading areas will also cause more congestion coming and going from the park. Depending on Blue Water plans for some type of camp store etc., trucks and delivery vehicles will be delivering supplies which adds to the traffic problem. The use and project shall be, will be compatible with adjacent established uses in the neighborhood. Like in the regulations kind of repeat themselves. This project is not compatible with the adjacent

established uses and neighborhoods. Immediate area has a grass farm across the street, a middle school, family neighborhoods, and open space farmland. This parcel again has been deemed prime agricultural land. The project and its uses shall not degrade or decrease the surrounding properties. Surrounding properties should continue to have the ability to consistently develop to the applicable zoning regulations. This project does not meet this requirement. It will degrade and decrease home property value. If this project is approved, it remains to be seen what long term effects it will have on the home, building, and agricultural use. Adjacent area streets will not have the ability to handle traffic flow and shall not cause traffic hazards. The use and extent of nature and arrangement of property entrances and exits shall not create or further aggravate vehicular or pedestrian traffic safety problems. This project wholly does not meet this requirement. The adjacent industries do not have the ability to handle any more increased traffic flow. And again I challenge you to sit over here for a while and watch what happens on 164 and that intersection. Especially an influx in numbers of large luxury campers coming and going, Blue Camps presented on file in depth traffic studies that totally understated, inaccurate, and totally inadequate. I don't care what the engineer says. What he looked at is bogus. They have not or they have not done due diligence on traffic down there. It is bad, and it is bad at times you can't get out coming out of Lynn Drive and onto 164 and back and forth. It is totally bogus report. Blue Camp admitted in testimony that they looked at traffic cameras, the Route 2 and 164 intersection area in early May and only for several days. This totally missed the beach traffic as we brought up. And that period of time was also as stressed and that needs to be looked at. It is a lot worse in that period of time than they took that first survey. Blue Camp did not consider the effect of campers on Route 12 to Route 395. They tried to say that that doesn't really apply but it does. And, people that live on the two way section know exactly what I'm talking about. That is a very narrow road and if you're trying to tell me that these campers coming over through there are not going to block that, somebody's dreaming. Foxwood Resort and again they're trying to prove this because it hasn't been done yet and it's not someone's responsibility, but somebody better take responsibility for it because when you have a Great Wolf resort, proposing 600,000 people a year, that's another - on average - 1,400 cars per day. So somebody better wake up and take a look at that. Whether it's their responsibility or not, that's gonna be a big mess, if we don't look at it and do something about it now. Under these circumstances, Blue Camp Campground being built in this location, they can put it somewhere else as far as I'm concerned, but it doesn't belong here. With their car arrangements and trailer parking facilities, entrances and exits seriously creating and further aggravating community in particular and pedestrian traffic problems. Can't get around it, it's there. Construction of light or air quality is reviewed as it relates to impact on single use of solar access. This project's current projected size does not meet this regulation. There is nothing scenic about an enormous luxury campground in a rural town surrounded by agricultural land and the neighborhoods. It is impossible that this large campground will not compromise the life

here in the neighborhoods, wetlands, school, and lighting from the campsite, other people have mentioned that - I'm reinforcing it. The use or usage will not create excessive and unreasonable noise that is different from what currently exists within the neighborhood. Consideration shall be given to light levels, smoke, dust, vibration, yada,yada,yada. The proposed project will not adversely affect environmental quality. A project of this magnitude will create excessive and unreasonable noise that is different from what is currently existing in this neighborhood. Campgrounds are notorious again for being noisy, you can't get away from that. The projected 1,700 campers and this is from their report, 6 people per camper, is an average so it's about 1,700 people. Activities and all the entertainment programs are noisy, I've never heard of one that is quiet. So again by nature, they should not - with the noise and everything - they should not be allowed in a well developed, established residential neighborhood of homes worth hundreds of thousands of dollars at this point - when they're done, I don't know what they'll be worth. It is extremely difficult for a campground this large, located extremely close to this residential neighborhood, to regulate light levels, smoke, odors, and gas. Campground of this design between offensive processes to adjacent properties that proposed use detrimentally affect on the environment even with the quality area even with 100 foot buffer zone from the wetlands and Avery Pond. You just can't put all that machinery and stuff like that, it's another accident waiting to happen. Consideration shall be given to protected wildlife, topography, habitat, trees, vegetation, landscape, will be provided. Original design and construction plan were not done with due diligence as I mentioned. If the citizens of Preston had not stepped up and challenged Blue Water and their attorney, this whole project would have destroyed the environment, wildlife and fish area on and around this site. Blue Camp's attorney has consistently spoke down to us citizens who brought up these offenses, outright insulting the inlands and wetlands regulations. Consistently object to our challenges, with total disregard to these important issues. Their attorney continually lectured the commissioners on what their jobs were, and lectured them on their regulations. This was all due to challenges which wholly showed their contempt for the environment wildlife issues. I suspect they're going to do the same thing to you. The way these people presented themselves to all of us was demeaning and enforced that feeling about them being all about money and their business and a disregard for neighbors, the environment, and the town of Preston. The only thing we will get from them is increase taxes. Blue Camp's only offering is their stated 238,602 dollars of taxes paid to us. They are another utopia except one difference - they got money. Remember they have zero experience building a campground from ground up. They are adversity to the environment, the wildlife is on record. If you don't believe me, look at the drawings, wildlife and inlands are not shown, it's very evident. This should be a warning to us. This proposal is all about and only benefits Blue Camp in question. We get nothing, but heaches. The welfare of the effective citizens and the betterment of the town should overwhelmingly trump the amount of taxes to be collected. Please put the concerns of the hundreds of citizens that sign the

petition against Blue Camp's project and all the taxpaying citizens who will have their quiet neighborhoods, quality of life, and property values detrimentally affected by Blue Camp's campground if allowed to be built at this site. Thank you.

Art Moran - If anyone else comes up to speak then please try not to repeat and make it a little shorter, we have to finish our regular meeting here tonight.

Peter Rosenberg - My name is Peter Rosenberg, I live on Lakeview Drive and I've retired from medicine a year and a half ago to come to the quiet part of Connecticut. What a joke. I've had so many wonderful times and I'll tell you what I've learned here, you can take normal Americans and give them a passionate cause and you watch out, because they can accomplish all kinds of things. And the president of Ukraine, ah one of the New York Times writers said when you have a man with courage, you've got a winner. And that's what I'm gonna ask you to do. If you really consider what you've heard tonight, and consider rejecting this plan. With regard to the issue of chemicals in the ground, we're part of the Uncas Health District and we can have regulations which are stronger than the states. And in my previous life, we did that with the Sherman, which is on the New York line, a town that is approximately the same population as here. And guess what? The water remained clean, the property values increased, and my wife took pictures of the birds. We see those birds every day. You know how fortunate we are? They're on the Avery Pond. You think they're gonna stick around if this environmental embarrassment shall we say takes place? I don't think so. And it's a matter of you believe what you hear or you believe you're lying. Common sense works here, just as well as the regulations. So I hope you give serious consideration, and you know I actually studied every one of your faces when Mr. Ballirano was talking, the smoke coming out of your ears, you were thinking about this. So good luck, thank you.

Art Moran - Anyone else like to comment?

Susan Sliker - Hi my name is Susan Sliker, my husband Robert and I just moved to this area in August of last year. I think I've previously mentioned that had we known that this campground was going in - we would not have moved here. Our property is - and I'll try to show you on this map - our home sits right there. Mr. Heller did mention that they are going to put in um trees to buffer some of the sight of the campground. Now when my husband and I first got there and they did the site walk, we could actually talk to people on the site walk - that's how close this project is going to our home. They came out to survey for I guess this runoff pond, here. And again we could talk to the surveyors from our deck. I invite each and every one of you commission members to come to my home and view what we view from our backyard currently and what we will be viewing if this campground is approved. If I could borrow that picture one again - the one that was admitted earlier - I understand that, I'm sorry, the entrance to the campground will be, I guess, this area here.

Unidentified voice - Right.

Susan Sliker - Right, but I understand that that basically will be about the same, comparable, that's what we're going to see in our backyard. We moved to Preston because of the quality of life, the quietness, the country setting. Thank you. Again I can't reiterate the property values - I know our property will definitely decrease, I don't know what the real estate agents, what they are dealing with. I would not again - repeat, not again - bought my property had it been that this was going to go through. I urge you to please reject it, even if it's just for us. It's a simple request, please reject it because what we moved here for was the quiet of the country, Preston. Again I extend the invitation to come to our backyard and you will see what we will see. Thank you.

Andrew Stockton - Good Evening my name is Andrew Stockton, I live in 16 Lynn Drive. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this project. First I like to, is this thing working? There will be a few breaks while I jump over parts. First I wanna comment on what Attorney Heller said about the IWWC's - there's no adverse impacts on wildlife. Um I was at that meeting, what I heard on the night that you voted - you know it was a 3-2 vote - Commissioner Fox, seems to me brought up the issue there needs to be a bond. Commissioner Moulson, in reference to things are better with this being planning review areas known as barriers and they've gone from 14 in some places to 24, out on Avery Pond. And Commissioner Hayes said nothing. That's all I heard, I didn't hear any statements being made about, we found no impact on the wildlife, maybe I missed something, but um I don't think I did. May I see that picture again? And just to say that I have this comment that others have tonight about we've been looking at this project since June and never saw much of a 3 dimensional plan. Now that's kinda shocking to me because you know I've been working for Electric Boat for 30 years, 20 years I was an engineer - 20 years as a principal engineer which is about if you wanna stay on the technical side of things - that's where you're gonna live. About 1994, Electric Boat was doing a lot to go, get into 3D presentation of this design. Like a virtual walk through parts of the boat and have the customer sign off on the different aspects and placement of the design. So, when, I was shocked, 28 years later, all we have are these plan views and nothing that really gives us a good picture of what this all is gonna look like when we drive by. When we spend those 30 seconds, like I do every week, going from 164 all the way past Hilton Gardens, am I just going to be seeing something like this repeated for 30 seconds? Is that what we're gonna have, I mean is that gonna be the billboard for Preston? Is this gonna be Preston's legacy seeing this for about 30 seconds as you drive by. I hope that doesn't happen. I'll turn, turn to other thoughts. I took the time to go through the Plans of Conservation Development basically looking at the last section where you have the goals of the POCD and the page where you cited such goals, forth down and what you see is: "create a diverse business environment that will encourage positive sustainable economy with an objective to encourage businesses that have a higher tax rate to locate in Preston". And that set off a little bell in my head because I recall the planning and zoning meeting that took place on May 1, 2007. Were you - I know Warzecha was there. And that night the tribal were,

they were proposing changes to the commercial/resort zones. There it was going on as they wanted to get more consistency amongst the towns, Ledyard, North Stonington, Preston. But they weren't talking about what they wanted to do with that time. And some of the commissioners got a little antsy and they started almost you know almost like suggesting ideas to commission members. Seeing if they could get a bit of a response. And one of the commission members said "what about campgrounds?". And another the um - I think it may have been chairman of the commission at that time - response was "no you don't want to do that because campgrounds basically have a low assessment value, a lot of stuff that's there is based on consumer construction costs" just, things you don't pick up when you do an assessment on. For example, if you're looking for a cabin here, and I've looked at what they've done, that this is analysis they did for the 270 site, the cost of that was 23,760,000 dollars. And that is supposed to generate at least somewhere around 230,000 dollars in taxes. And if you apply the mil rate of 26.9 you currently have, you come up with an assessed value of 8,558,736, which is about a ratio when you look at the assessed value the construction value, about 36%. Says you know, look at homes,, but I think typically you look at is a market value which is gonna take 70%. You're looking for properties with high assessed values such as commercial properties that have you know homes and other businesses and other things that are assessable, that have assessable value. This in terms of meeting your goal, Goal number 4 this doesn't do it. I'm just pointing out, things that I've seen you know that you are Plan of Conservation Development, it doesn't seem to leave a good match. Goal number 5; Priority areas for economic development in Preston will be those areas located on the state highways that have access, visual exposure, environmental compatibility, and remoteness from residential development. The key words being remoteness from residential development on state highways. Blue Camp is not remote, it's all there on Route 2 near a large residential neighborhood, large community, school, and just down the road, the town hall. Other things that pop out when I read the Plan of Conservation Development, Planning and Zoning Commission should review and appropriately amend zoning regulations and zoning map to reflect the plans that improve the visual appearance along the routes. Especially route 2, says there. But if you look at route 2 today, you've got a bit of light happening there. You can see what looks like houses that are abandoned. And to me I don't see that getting any better by building Blue Camp. I see things going in the other way, something to be aware of and I haven't heard anybody point that out. But I like to look around, see what's happening, you know, and I don't see good things happening here. Excuse me while I jump over my, to jump over what's been said. I think that's what I have to say about, the ah your POCD. I'd like to talk about what many have said about the Russ Assessment of property values analysis and I don't see too much about values that others have said, just a few things that you haven't said. I read through it, about 50 pages and a majority of the content doesn't seem to be related to Preston. It hits on East Lyme and Salem, and Preston. And somehow - I don't know why all of that - why did you cover the other two towns? What point were you trying to make by doing

that? I certainly know that East Lyme and Salem don't resemble Preston, back then I spent a day a week in East Lyme and I was thinking a lot about as I was walking, as I drove through there. I don't know how you can compare the impact of something like Blue Camp in Preston vs. all the camping sites you got, and the ah vacation homes and stuff you got in East Lyme, it's just not the same. But basically when I look at this site, having done a physical analysis, how can you have any statistical significance here? You do the analysis of Preston, you've got two populations: one you've got the ones that have not been impacted, and the other being the impacted case. Well you define the non-impacted, you use two home sales. To define the impacted case, three home sales. That's not statistical significance. Maybe 50 or 100, you might have something, but not two and three, it's just not a study one would think would give much credibility. to I bring that up because it seems to be an important thing, talking about special exemption. Property value - that's one of the issues, the impacted property values and I don't think we should be using this size analysis to show them there's no impact of property values on this site because we have this analysis from Russ Appraisals where they took five sales and made a conclusion that can have a major impact on this town. Traffic study - I don't wanna say too much about this, but I am concerned, no one's really shown - one of the main issues is I think - no one's really shown about how you exit Blue Camp and wanna go east and wanna make that left turn and cross those two lanes where people are doing 55 and then get up the speed. That really concerns me and I think maybe there is a solution to it, but I didn't see that presented. I've been to all the meetings and that to me is an important issue with how you exit there given the four lanes of traffic going usually well over 50 in that part there. I think about what would happen if someone gets a little smart and thinks I'm not gonna risk my life for that, I think the easiest thing to be stay in the right lane, make a right turn and go into Preston Plains Middle School, cut back out there, make a right turn, slip over, and now you can easily make your left turn. That's not what we want people doing. Or you could try Lynn Drive and you just got the two lane road up the end of Lynn Drive. When you do the traffic studies, the one that really matters about all the weird things that happen, like people end up going down Cooktown Road because they missed their turn and stuff. That doesn't come up in these traffic studies and that's what we're going to have to live with. At this analysis of the surfaces of the towns that have to provide, how it's really negligible. We heard that when Blue Camp showed up here, and I (???). Whether you have all these 7,000 people who show up here, and you've got a population of about 4,788 or something, that ah during those seven months, that's like a peak increase of 30%. If you take that increase and just spread it out, over the year, that's a level loading thing, you end up with about a 21% increase. And I'm saying to myself, we increase our population by 21%, Blue Camp gives up about 238,000 dollars, which is about 5.7% of the town budget. How do you suddenly serve - well I'm not saying you're gonna give them all the services, but I would get very nervous when I got one number, that's up 21% increase, and then with my additional income is only 5.7. I'd wanna look really hard at that. Let's start want to

pretend I'm a typical chief financial officer who is adverse to risk. And do a serious analysis on that and look at all your services you're gonna need - and in order to do that you're gonna need, you really have to pin people down. You've gotta get memos, letters from teams, department heads, your firechief, your state police, public works, does there, what does Uncas Health have to say about this? Are there any ongoing legal costs because you have such a large commercial entity? Are you taking on any liabilities and having to pack on the insurances? I mean a lot of this stuff, maybe you won't need these, you need to look at all of these. This is what businesses do to ensure that they make a smart decision and don't end up investing in something and then finding out - oh my gosh, we're losing our shirt on it, it's costing us money. Especially when you're just talking about you know \$230,000. Did I lose it ,did it go dead? I promise not much longer I'll shout. Okay, talking about \$230,000. and with a budget of sixteen million dollars that's gonna make some noise a little - that's 1.4%. And if you think about when you hire a set of people, I think you got people who senior rates. You take on one or two of those, and you end up - we need more of this particular personnel. That 230,000 dollars can go pretty fast. So, and I am concerned that this analysis is being done by the applicant, who obviously has a vested interest - he'd like to present a low number to you, make you think it's negligible. It's in his interest to give you a low number. You shouldn't be turning over that responsibility to the applicant. Those are you know, ah kinda basically what I got here tonight, but I think those are things that others haven't talked or thought about and I hope you give them some consideration. But in terms of housing prices, we need to keep people wanting to move into Preston because people are leaving Preston and I know that well, as some of you know that's happening. We see that data - people coming, people going. If you want to keep the price of housing up, you've got to have an influx of people coming in to match the ones that are leaving or you're going to end up with a surplus of housing and I don't see, I see Blue Camp having a negative impact on that. I know it certainly would have for me in 2005 when I lived at the house I currently own that, you know, I knew Foxwoods was out there, and I felt I could live with that but put Blue Camp so close to me right there by 164 home. No, I wouldn't have bought the house. Like I said you need to keep people, coming from outside, having an interest and purchasing houses in the town because people are leaving. A lot of people see heading south, I've talked to a lot of people who are doing the part-time thing now, half the time down in Florida, down in South Carolina, and eventually moving out. So you gotta protect that, you gotta do something to keep those values up. You certainly don't wanna discourage people from moving to Preston because it will impact all of us, this isn't just a "in my backyard" situation, it will attack housing prices throughout the town. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

Patricia Monhan - I figured I'd get up before you all fall asleep. Patricia Monahan, 50 Lakeview Drive. I'd like to thank the town planner and Planning and Zoning Commissions for that comment on Exhibit 88, with the comments, I mean I was very impressed with that and it shows your character and professionalism so, thank you. I'd like to ask that you consider a few things, I

mean, under Item 46: Caring and Property Values, I'm just gonna make a comment on that. In the end it's not the formula that puts a value. Now I use the term: unknowing buyer and knowing seller. And the knowing seller, have already expressed the sense that they feel that property values are going to devaluate and the unknowing buyer has already expressed that they would not have purchased the property had they known that a project of this size was ah in that location. I ask you to consider a modification requiring the applicant to establish a long term water quality and aquatic habitat monitoring program at Avery Pond and its outlets, to make sure lab permeability testing is done, ensure ENS measures are correctly implemented, inspected, and maintained. And Identify the surrounding wildlife communities and vegetative species. These were all recommendations by Jean Pilo, Joseph is it Gredeau, Karl Neilson, George Knoxin, and Noreen Bowles . Consider a design change, modification to the east of the side of the property, to include a 100 foot buffer to shield light flow, eliminate parking spaces, roadways, and campsites within 100 foot buffer of the protect migration pathway to Long Island Sound. The vegetative buffer will serve a dual purpose of shielding light pollution and filtering storm water run-off from the developed area. Please consider public act 21, 29, section 10: in any municipality that is contiguous to or on a navigable waterway draining to Long Island Sound: A) be made with responsible consideration for the restoration and protection of the ecosystem and habitat of Long Island Sound. B) be designed to reduce pathogens, toxins, contaminants, and floatable debris on Long Island Sound. And C) provide that such municipality, Planning and Zoning Commission consider the environmental impact on Long Island Sound Coastal Resources as defined in Section 22A, 93, of any proposal for development. You are aware the fish migration pathway allows alewives to journey from Long Island Sound to the Thames River, Avery Pond to Ames Lake to spawn and return. The journey includes IndianTown Brook, which encroaches on part of parcel 495. This should be treated as a sensitive area requiring a buffer so as not to be disturbed. If fish can migrate to Long Island Sound from Avery Pond, so can pathogens, toxins, contaminants, and floatable debris. Public Act 21-29 makes it our responsibility to prevent such. I'd like to take a moment to explore responses provided in both Exhibit 84, which is Gladys Kimmel responses to town planner, and Exhibit 90, Attorney Heller's responses to the planner, supplemental comments list. In question 29, the town planner ask, excused the town planner asked: please provide a list of activities will be planned for the park, include types of activities that will occur on weekends, will it be screened movies? If so, what will you do for your neighbors when you plan activities? We were told there would be no outdoor activities that require amplification? The list that was provided, include the following items: tennis court, open play, games, kids club, bingo, karaoke, within the welcome center. If you visit Blue Water Property websites, typical lists include swimming pool parties, 4th of July fireworks, Martis Gras, car shows, wine festivals, beer festivals, food trucks, and jeep jamborees. So I wonder if the applicant could take us outdoors and provide a more inclusive list. I'm going to address questions 35 and 36 together since they have similarities. Question 35: Can you

provide an updated environmental report including the difference between impact farm use vs RV use and the beautification of the pond and its wildlife. The response was: please see the report of Karl Neilsen sent, already submitted into the record. Question 36: There were several lines added to record regarding various environmental impacts, please address, especially the impact on the alewife migration with potential existence of the tidal drainage system. How will it project preparing vegetation, sea corridors for the wetlands of 50 feet, and any artificial lighting? Addressed - Letter from Jean Pillow from Eastern Connecticut Conservation District, and buffer water quality and stormwater maintenance concerns and impact, addressed in a letter from George Knox. It is my opinion that this is primarily the concern of the Inlands and Wetlands Commission. But, there is a provision in their regulation that indicates the use will not ... adversely impact environmental quality. Their response was the, regarding our artificial lighting, the photometrics plan states no light spillage onto the pond; though the extensive site investigation conducted by the applicant's professional consultant states no evidence of light spillage over the terrain of this site. Attorney Heller will submit an answer to me, additional concerns with a second letter. My question is can the applicant please expose which professional consultants performed the investigation of tidal terrains and what methods were used. As explained in Exhibit 62 - this is crucial - into implicating that the use will not adversely impact environmental quality. Many references were made in prior reports while the planner asked for updated information. Many changes had been made since these reports were written. In regards to the alewife migration, the concern that needs to be addressed here is taken directly from Exhibit 62, resource concerns, ECCP would like to assure that any future development along the shore of Avery Pond and its outlets that are draining from the south of the end of the pond will not impede or impact the efforts to restore the historic alewife fish migration to Avery Pond, or the remaining habitat of Avery Pond. And my comments are that alewife migration path needs to be buffered to ensure no disturbance from construction, run-off, or human activity. And again Public Act 21-29 Section 10, makes that our responsibility. Speaking to the environmental quality impact, Exhibit 62 further speaks to that of stormwater management should be managed and minimized, that there should be proper perk tested to ensure the basins can capture and filtrate the first inch of runoff. Again you can refer back to that Exhibit for those details. In the review letter of February 10, 2022 from George Turrel, certified forest and soil scientist, addressed to the Preston's Inlands Wetlands and Watercourse Commission, the concluding paragraph in that correspondence states: "it is in my opinion that due to revisions in this design plan, there will be no significant impact to the wetlands due to construction and operation of the proposed project, provided that the proposed EMS are correctly implemented, inspected and maintained". Although he was speaking to Inlands Wetlands, addressing wetlands, this speaks to environmental quality impact. There are no provisions to monitor the water bodies, then what are the measures to prove EMS measures are correctly inspected and maintained. In Exhibit 61 Dr. Knoxland complete species list of

vegetation in each wetland should be developed so that an analysis of any kind of habitat, quality loss can be made. In Exhibit 63, Ron Bowles Senior Director of Science and Conservation Connecticut Audubon Society, suggests the list on site survey would be important to identify and mitigate potential impacts on wildlife communities, including turtles, snails, mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians. The answer to question #36, the town planner was directed to a report submitted by Karl Neilsen. Mr. Neilsen reported the following design improvements required were: establishment of 100 foot buffer along the pond shoreline with no development and maintenance of naturally occurring native vegetation cover and tree growth. Elimination of parking spaces, roadways, and campsites within 100 foot buffer of the pond eliminated the dock as well as you're aware. And stormwater runoff to the pond in developed areas has been essentially eliminated with the drainage being diverted to properly designed stormwater features that discharge to trip de carries that flow out of the pond. I asked Mr. Neilsen about the diversion of the stormwater that discharge to the tributaries that flow out into the pond. His response was, as the applicant alluded to tonight, he was hired to evaluate only the pond. Mr. Neilsen required certain design changes and states that with all drainage being converted to properly designed storm drain features, that discharge is to tributaries that go out in the pond. And the applicant responds that there is no discharge to the tributaries that flow out of the pond. There should be clarification on this. I think these 5 professionals have summed it up, the only way to know if all of these less than 18 year old regulations still work is through monitoring. Establishing a long term water quality and applied habitat monitoring program at Avery Pond and its outlets. And make sure the lab proper testing is done to ensure the EMS measures are correctly implemented, inspected, and maintained, and identify the surrounding wildlife communities and vegetative species. This project is a huge proposal with which detailed environmental impact studies have not been completed. Wildlife and vegetative communities have not been identified. How can the effects of such a large proposal be judged without this due diligence? I did skip over a few plans here that ah this would be under 46 as well: inconsistencies with the POCD. The POCD is concerned with the impact of traffic on Poquetanuck Village, Route 2A, Poquetanuck Village is listed under the National Registry of Historical Places and is bordered by the Sensitive National and Architectural Resources of Poquetanuck Cove. Poquetanuck Village will continue to be adversely affected by through traffic. Page 130 of Preston's POCD describes that. The POCD raises concerns about land use and activities above the aquifers, posing water quality threats. Accidental spills and leaks are believed to cause contamination whether it is from leaking underground or above ground contaminants. Work on roadways, driveways, excessive, or unnecessary use of fertilizers and pesticides. The application of road salts and de-icing agents all find their way into the groundwater, potentially harming the natural earth. Please review page 60, slide 79 of Preston's Planned Conservation and Development Connecticut Official Protect Aquifers Now Preston, Connecticut. The state's listed threatened species, the bald eagle, is very present at Avery Pond.

The state's listed endangered species, sharp-shinned hawk, is listed as being identified on Avery Pond. Inlands and Wetlands Exhibit 25, submitted December 2, 2021; provided photos of bald eagle, blue herring, osprey posted on social media by Preston residents from Poquetanuck Cove Avery Pond to Amos Lake. Central to Preston's POCD were those around protecting these water bodies and their respective habitats. Under Item 48, consider the modification that no wood will be taken from a property, requiring snags and trees remain intact and no removal of trees. There are plenty of options for purchasing locally, smokeless firepits still emit carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide just in reduced amount. Under item number 49, the lighting plan does not take into consideration 288 RV lights which will be 11 to 13 feet in height. The neighborhood is already challenged with light pollution that traverses for miles. Light pollution causes visibility disruptions and nuisances especially from glares and spill over effects that may lead to human health problems. Light pollution also changes the natural illumination at night with brightly lit skies and leads to a disruption of the ecosystem. How much more light pollution is acceptable in that area? And last I would ask you to consider reducing the number of sites to 180, reducing the number of transient people to 1,080 instead of 1,700 into our small town. One of the differences between the campgrounds that exist now and this one is the ones that exist now are primarily seasonal campground, people are at least staying there for a week at a time, a month at a time, or a season at a time. And the applicant that this campsite will have a three day turnover. So I mean, so anybody can do that math, 280 sites turning over every three days, that's a lot of transient folks coming into town and I believe it's a lot of traffic. The traffic study, after hearing the gentleman speak earlier, sounded pretty hypothetical. And it's a good thing that we have common sense and can do the math and the 280 campers moving around. Ah um the benefit to Preston, what really is the benefit to Preston? I don't see a lot of economic development there. Um I do see that folks are probably going to be at Foxwoods, they're probably going to be taking trips to Mystic. Ah and I'm not sure - well first of all - I'd like to see the data of how we came up with that tax dollar amount. Um because there's not an awful lot there to be taxing, you've got axillary buildings. So I don't see that, however if you look at, recently, top ten taxpayers was listed in New London Day: and if you calculate out the dollars you've got the incinerator at 909,000, you've got the Hilton Gardens at 272,000. I think you have a pretty incorrect figure there at Strawberry Park, I think you only paid for Pierce Road and I don't think they gave you everything the park owns. But if you look around the website and add up Strawberry Park, Strawberry Park comes to 106,000. After that the numbers are 39,000; 36,000; 29,000; 28,000; 24,000; 22,000. I think that says something about Preston, I think that tells you that folks are happy to spend tax dollars to live in a community of such health and um safety and quality of life. Okay respectfully submitted Patricia Monahan 50 Lakeview Drive and thank you very much. There was one other thing, I just wanted to clarify the limnology. The limnologists are scientists who studied the character of freshwater systems, such as lakes, rivers, streams, ponds, and wetlands. So they would have been perfectly acceptable to ask a

limnologist to do a study, and not just do a study on the lake but to do a study of the entire waterbody, wetlands and pond.

Micheal Carey - May I give you an Exhibit

Kathy Warzecha - Yes, absolutely.

Michael Carey - These are copies of the points of and the intervention that was filed with Inlands and Wetlands Commission, we have petitions here too; and this is not intended to be an intervention to this proceedings.

Kathy Warzecha - But you want to....

Michael Carey - I want them included because of the attachments are are mainly supporting some the arguments

Kathy Warzecha - Okay, so this is one, is different?

Michael Carey - There are extra copies for the Commission.

Kathy Warzecha - So these are for the Commission, okay

Michael Carey - My name is Micheal Carey and I'm an attorney with Suisman Shapiro Attorneys -at- Law in New London.

Art Moran - Please use the mike.

Michael Carey - There won't really be much to hear anyway, but ah I'll try to be really brief. I spoke here a couple of months ago. I wasn't quite lucid that night, but I think I remember a lot of what I said. I don't want to repeat it all. But it's been a long time and I can't remember exactly what I said. And wouldn't blame you if you can't remember what I said either. First thing I wanna mention is this will be scatter shot and reaction to what Attorney Heller said. And I'm trying to avoid repeating. Um I would like to repeat one thing that Mr. Gibson said, he stole my thunder. I've been to a lot of these proceedings over the years, not as many as Attorney Heller, probably not as many as you. I have never um seen comments

Unidentified Person - I'm having a hard time hearing.

Michael Carey - and contributions by members of the public at one of these proceedings of the quality um that we've seen here. And that includes not just the articulateness with which the thoughts and information was presented, but the fact that the information was brought up in the first place. I don't know about any of you, I never heard it from so many. I contacted Mr. Gibson. And then Attorney brought in Mr. Neilsen. And there's been quite a bit of information like that that's been passing throughout this thing and I think really pivotal, pivotal, in terms of what you want to consider about this application, I assume will be tonight. I will want to say one thing at the beginning and this is not a review or chastisement of the applicants, just a major observation going throughout this thing, it's the nature of things, which was a lot of information received in the last several days. A lot of information received today. There was one document and we've received - I've received the information because I represent the interveners. Attorney Heller has been good enough to give me updates. One thing is that printed, and it was 91 something pages, it arrived at 2 o'clock in the afternoon so when I do look at it, there are a lot

of small numbers on it, so I didn't have a chance to look at that, probably would've excluded it anyways. There's been a lot of stuff that came in that no one had a chance to look at or review or understand. There's one thing that troubled me from the beginning of this, Attorney Heller was good enough to talk about this issue at the beginning of this talk tonight. The property - the overall property consists of two zones. One is your vacation resort, resort, whatever it's called. The other one is commercial and the hidden resort isn't allowed in the commercial I don't believe, or the other way around. You're vacation resort regulation says flat out that it can include a recreational campground. So I'm assuming that all of the recreational campground's regulations apply to this recreational campground. And here's the thing, that bothers me and I find it's probably odd, these glamp sites, whatever you call them, they're permanent structures, it seems to me and that's one of the - it was in the documents I received today, there were photographs of - representative photographs of these things sites at Blue Camp, Blue Water operates. Those are permanent structures, I mean there was some talk about there being pilings in the ground on which the wooden floors sit. But those things don't come and go, and they can't go, they're not on wheels and your regulations defines - says that recreational campgrounds are for camper use, essentially. Camper unit is defined as something that has to be on wheels right? Even at Strawberry Park, people park their campers for the season and are allowed to put additional things on, you have specific regulations to protect against those additions to the campers because they're permanent, fixed to the site. I don't see anything in your regulations that allow for these glamping sites. I just don't. And I ah I think they have to come out, they're not permitted by your regulations that I can see, there's no explanation of why they wouldn't be. Not that I've heard from this. That was one thing I wanted to mention. There's been some discussion of about whether this project is approved and built if any sort of impact will occur on the economy of Preston. If it's a vacation resort, I don't see how it possible could. The regulations are clear that those resorts tend to be self sufficient, self contained. Not to mention I don't see people getting into one of these huge vehicles and driving down the street for a coffee or whatever else they might wanna do in Preston. I don't - I just don't see any spinoff businesses coming from this particular campground. And the traffic there that was presented tonight, supports that intuition. Mr. Allmen reports as long as no 14 trips or something like that, so nobody's gonna be going anywhere, according to Mr. Allmen's statement and the gentleman that works for Stop & Shop. And I would say that - and I don't wanna beat a dead horse, it's already beaten very well but - I wondered and there's a lot of comparisons here at Strawberry Park, the applicant compared themselves to Strawberry Park for a lot of reasons on a lot of issues. One thing they didn't do is go outside Strawberry Park to do the traffic study last summer or two summers ago. If that is a comparable a comparable situation to this one, for other reasons, I don't know why it wasn't for traffic, maybe there was a good reason for why it wasn't. But that was in operation probably fewer over the last two years but still, it was there and the traffic study could have been taken there. Not to mention the fact that they probably

should have probably been taken in the summertime. I think people still use Route 2 as a way to get to the beach. If - I wanted to say one thing about Blue Camp's offer that the applicants have agreed to create a buffer along the lake. I would ask that if the application is approved and enhanced buffers are approved, this is in terms of the plants and the trees, but provides a buffer even in the winter time. That there be some kind of a planting plan be part of the conditions and that the plan provide for maintenance, inspection certainly, and replanting in the event the plants don't take for whatever reason. We've done this in other places, much more difficult property owners than you will have here to deal with and it's worked out very well. It's important, and if the plants don't take for whatever reason, I would suggest you ask for a bond. This wouldn't go on forever, it would go for long enough that it would ensure you have plantings established. Another thing I haven't really heard mentioned, apparently there's no concerns at all about one of these trailers - one of these campers - being lost on the way in. I drove down Lynn Drive and I don't think one of those campers could get down there and certainly couldn't turn around. So maybe it's not a problem, maybe it's not an issue, if it is I suspect there to be a sign or something. But that was just a thought I had. In terms of the secondary access, I would ask again if project's approved that at a that and the question of where will the secondary access were to be remain up in the air. That there's no building permits issued until it's out of the air. Going to AUSTIN and DOT, I suspect that's something that might not be done responsibly soon. But the emergency access is critical according to your particular regulations. I'm afraid that DOT may come out and wanna have a roundabout down there. They seem to have a pension for that lately. With regards to the limnologist, Mr. Neilsen appeared at the Inlands/Wetlands Commission, I'm not sure if you're here. During the Wetlands hearings, that's the only reason I bring this up; during the Wetlands Hearing he acknowledged that the report he gave, it's 7 pages and has a bunch of tables and charts on it - he corrected me when I called the charts and tables. But the bottom line is, his report focused on phosphorus levels and phosphorus levels in the pond now and when the project is built. He acknowledged that he'd never come here to the site, for purposes of doing a study, might've been here four or five years ago for some other reason. But he didn't come to the pond so he didn't do sample anything. His numbers about phosphorus, look at this report, are all numbers that are assigned to different types of land use, activities. I wouldn't say they're random or arbitrary, but I would say he didn't seem to have a whole lot of relationship to reality here in Preston. And I don't think he took any soil sample or anything else, but saw based on his model, that with this type of use, phosphorus into the pond generated whatever the level was which I couldn't understand any of this. What I did understand is he did not do an actual test, he did not do an actual site survey and his numbers come from a book. The limnologist that my clients engaged, on the other hand, had detailed analysis of what needed to be done to make a proper study. And that's true also of Professor Lumus of Conn College, whose work is attached to the intervention petition. He did a um and he was highly critical of the methods the applicants experts used or didn't use with

regards with making certain determinations on the impact of this project on the farm. Also I on traffic ah I forgot to mention - this project it seems to me is somewhat squeaknearis, it's um I'm not sure if you could go to your models and codes and pick out numbers from trip-tick for this place. I don't know how many campgrounds there are in the country that are as transient as this as opposed to Strawberry Park, which is not, which is another reason why comparisons to Strawberry Park throughout um really don't ah wash. Almost oh um apparently the nearest a firetruck can get to the glampsites, one of the far glampsites is 200 feet away, that seems like quite a difference. I'm not a volunteer firefighter, I've never been to a fire that seemed like it would be rather far, and I don't know if it's been mentioned if there would be water available on site for those purposes or not. But those glamp sites do seem to be made of flammable material. With regard to Public Act 21-29, the applicant argues essentially to modify amends to your regulations to prohibit any reference in them to take into consideration the character of the neighborhood. Just have a couple of points. I guess the main point is I don't think that argument is relevant, ah given the terms of your regulations. I also am not convinced that 21-29 really does read the word character out of regulations the way it does, of course I wouldn't be able to find one. The 21-29 code of guidance to section 8-2 regulations which has been your guiding star always in terms of what you put in regulations. And what it says - this is section D10 of section 8-2, is that zoning regulations shall not be applied to deny any land use application on the basis of a district's character, unless said such character is expressly articulated in such regulations with clear and explicit physical standards for site or structure. What I'm stressing here is that it's a district's character not saying a property's character. And I hate that, I listened to a webinar last summer of 2021, can't remember, but proponents of the bill that became 21-29 and what they were trying to do was prohibit local zoning commissions from writing regulations that would be a bar to certain income levels ah income levels of people of certain ethnic backgrounds coming to municipality because the house you know they would live in would not be the right character, so what they wanted to do was tie the word character to physical characteristics, but I do think by the way they wrote it, the district's character, they may not have accomplished exactly what they intended to accomplish. But probably more important to the matter is that is your regulations don't talk about character, and they don't talk about character, they talk about criteria for evaluating a special exception for a recreational camper, what they talk about is promoting the rights of the individuals, property values, and the environment and the area as a whole. Sound planning and zoning principles, neighborhood compatibility, a better overall neighborhood compatibility. This isn't character, and this isn't an intended to close your town to any group or class of people, residential structures or anything like that. What's it's trying to do is protect properties, or allow you to protect property or allow you to take these things into consideration to protect properties like the ones on Lynn Drive from an incompatible use right next door just across the pond. It required you to look at things like matching and proper relationship between taxable values of real property and character. I

will say I'm mad, I believe the applicant said that they had spent 225 million dollars to construct the project and that therefore translates into 250,000 dollars either in the assess or assessment or something like that. The mil rate, the assessed value of a property for purposes of taxes, does not depend on construction cost, it might be a factor but it's not determining. So I don't acknowledge that the 230,000 dollars - I don't think any of us know here what the tax value of this property will be, if it's built as proposed. And I'm not sure you're even supposed to take that into consideration, when you're making decisions based on your own regulations. So I'm not gonna read the whole of the regulations to you, but I think what I just read to you was key you have the right, and I think you have the obligation, to look at the neighborhood that exists - the neighborhoods that exist. And the other uses in the area and the other properties and see what's been proposed here with all of those sites, 280 of them, ah for those campers - campers of that size and height - whether those are compatible and I suggest that, ah, that it's not and I also suggest that it's not relevant to look at this project as being compatible or not with the hotel or the Dunkin Donuts or anything else on Route 2. That's important, I ah, I suppose, but I think a primary importance is how is this gonna fit with the neighborhoods that are already there and I think you've heard enough and seen enough to know that it doesn't fit. It just doesn't. It'd be one thing if you have you know houses here and you're looking across the pond to some other houses, ah um this doesn't fit, I've lived my entire adult life almost - I've lived in Southeast Connecticut - I really wish that if this properties gonna be used, were gonna be used, when it is gonna be used, it be used for something more than this, different than this. But it's not for me to say. Ah couple other things on this Warzecha chart, it's mentioned, there's some mention towards the end, second to last page. There's some dialogue here between a commission member and Ms. Warzecha I believe, I think this was here. Where there's talk about quiet time or when it starts and then smokeless firepit - never heard of that, take it out - apparently somebody on commission thinks there's such thing as a smokeless firepit. Then something about if they're gonna have a band for a dance, every band uses an amplifier. I'm not sure I've been here every night of this Hearing, but I, I don't recall there ever being any discussion of there being any bands on this property, ah coming into play. And that sent me thinking, you know, you're driving down the street and you're walking down the street and a car goes by blaring music from their own vehicle. That could happen here but I ah maybe I just missed it; it hadn't occurred to me that there would be bands hired here to come in and provide entertainment for the ah transient campers. And I think that's a real problem and I think should not be allowed if this project is approved. Oh one last thing, it is important, this commission has to consider the intervention petition that were filed. And I say has to act on them. And I think that all the evidence as presented both by all the people from the public, and by, actually by the applicant too, demonstrates that there will be an impact on wildlife, wildlife habitats, other natural resources that stay protected by the statute that allow for the petition. While I think you're gonna have to make a finding of feasible improved alternative. And if there's no evidence

of feasible reasonable alternatives whether there are or there aren't, it hasn't come up. How do you find that this is the only feasible improved alternative, the most feasible improved alternative, with no evidence? Maybe in the next twenty minutes, whatever times left, but you need to make that finding, the Wetlands Commission for whatever reason, didn't. By the way I looked at the Wetlands, I have it here, there hadn't seemed to have been any real detailed discussion of impacts or whether there would be impacts or if there were what they would be impacting. Looks like there was a vote, looks like there was some confusion, and three people recused themselves. We'll hear the audio, see what happened I wasn't there. But ah I don't think there was any thorough discussion of the wetlands issue. There was a vote 3-2. Looks like the only real thorough discussion was by one of the members voting against it. And ah even if there had been a perfect discussion, and a motion that dealt with all of the wetlands issue, that does not show you applying your regulations to matters involving the environment. You're regulations talk about the environment. Um I mentioned that earlier I'm not gonna to read you your regulations. So I think there's some real questions about these glamping sites. I don't see how they're permitted by the regulations. I don't see how they're permitted and the regulations that apply to Strawberry Park are very clear, that they have to be on wheels and they can't be fixed on the ground and when you pick it up, it can't disturb anybody. So if you're gonna put pilings in the ground, to support these glamping sites, I don't see how you're gonna take those out without disturbing the ground. Um I think I'll leave it at that, I appreciate all the time you all put into this ah and I don't envy you looking through all the materials that have been submitted, but thank you for listening.

Unidentified person - I'll put this onto the table. I'll put this onto the table. And this is a copy okay?

Kathy Warzecha - That's 105.

Unidentified person - I sent it to you in an email Kathy.

Susan Hotchkiss - My name is Susan Hotchkiss, 20 Lynn Drive, and this is gonna be pretty brief, thank goodness, because they said please don't be repeating, and I'm gonna be skipping over even though you have the paper in front of you. Um I would just say that the town of Preston, its commissions and town representatives serve its citizens. This development is not benefited residents. That's kind of an absolute statement because it certainly benefits residents, but it benefits those who will pay to stay there. It is intended to benefit its developer and the tribe. It is impossible to claim with certainty that the tax income generated by this development as stated by Attorney Heller, will offset other costs to the town due to reduced property values and increased expenses for the town. It is impossible to put a dollar value on the many negative effects it will have on the quality of life for the many residents living nearby, the effects it will have on the school, the impacts on local traffic, and most certainly on the environment and the wildlife in it. And I just wanna digress a little bit because repeatedly, in the wetlands testimonies and presentations, Attorney Heller admonished the Wetlands Commission to not to consider

wildlife in their evaluations of criteria and regulations. So if wildlife is not allowed to be considered in the wetlands evaluation of wetlands environments, then you guys must have to take on that important role of considering the wetlands and the impact um that this development will have on the wildlife there. This development as it is currently designed has too many negatives or potential negative impacts. It is not up to Preston to ensure that Blue Water will be able to achieve its high profit goals. If Preston wants to permit such a thing, an RV park with much smaller impact on the environment, on the surrounding neighborhood and on the resources of Preston, must be considered. As representatives of this town, you have the ability to require that there needs to be alterations to the project in the form of conditions for approval. Blue Water can spend less, they don't need to pack sites in like sardines in a can in order to maximize the number of sites according to the pre-designed formula in your zoning regulations. Important thing is any development must be sensitive to the environment, the water shed, wildlife and their habitats, and the potential for surface and aquifer pollution. I'm gonna skip down because many people have referenced your Plan of Conservation Development. I'm going to skip down to the last one listed on the page - it's page 149 - goal one which is about natural resources, the objective being - ensure that existing and future water supplies are adequately protected. Now under that goal there were four actions listed, but I listed three that were pretty relevant to this discussion. In the interim, Planning and Zoning should continue, should consider adopting groundwater protection regulations for the land over the aquifer that serves the Preston Plains Water Company in the vicinity of Avery Pond. Avery Pond is specifically listed in that action and where is the aquifer that serves Avery Pond? It's right under the development. Action four: Planning and Zoning should consider adopting stream protection measures for Shoeville Brook, which has been identified as a future potential service water supply, end quote. This would mean that Indiantown Brook, which flows out from Avery Pond and continues on to become Shoeville Brook, must be protected. And the big question is, when does it become too late to adopt these protective measures? And so very quickly, I have some take aways listed at the bottom of that second page. The town of Preston answers to and serves its citizens, it is not beholden to Blue Water development, its representatives, or the tribe. The environment, the wildlife, and their habitat, surface waters, and aquifers, must be protected. This ecosystem will suffer if the project continues as currently planned. The nearby neighborhood, including the school, will be negatively impacted by noise, air quality, traffic, etcetera, period. It will be negatively impacted. It is impossible to state with certainty again that the estimated tax benefit will offset the many negative impacts in terms of quality of life and added expenses for the town. It is possible to be mindful of all these things and promote desirable development at the same time. Not all development fits. Thank you.

Art Moran - Anybody else?

Sean Tate - Oh no he says one more. Good evening or it's almost good morning, um I am staring at the clock and I am going to give myself five minutes or less to get the heck out of this

podium. My name is Sean Tate and I live in 18 Overlook Drive, which is right behind here. And my profession, and I'm an international educator, so I worked all over the world for the last thirty years, and I'm still working from my computer dealing with developing nations all over the world. And people say why don't you want retire, I say no I just get tired. And so I'm getting quickly tired right now and I wanna thank the people here. First of all I'm staring at all of you on the commission and I wanna thank you for your stamina tonight, I wanna thank you for all of the paper that you're gonna have to go through here. You're drowning in paper, I sympathize. And I wanna thank you for your opinions and all the thought that you bring to your work. I really appreciate it and I think this group - everybody ought to applaud this Commission. Thank you very much, that's very heartfelt to me. Secondly I'd like to thank Harry Heller. There he is, I'd like to shake his hand. Thank you Harry, you don't know how much you've given us, you've given us so much. Harry is a walking case of lessons learned. We have learned a lot from him, and you really care and I really appreciate it. What I'm gonna do tonight is because everybody has said almost all the things I was going to say, so that just leaves one thing. One of the things I do in my work is to evaluate giant educational projects all over the world. And we do something called 'quality assurance criteria'. So what I am compiling for you to use as a tool is a set of questions that are based on all the things you have heard tonight or at least some of them, except for maybe the last gentleman, that was very important what he said. And so I am going to give each of you a quality assurance criteria tool and it was all taken from your own, and particularly on your own criteria and regulations, the special exception criteria was patented on. And in fact this sheet was given out to everybody, everyone who came in room tonight. There are only a few things that I think I want to re-mention. And the things that really are heartfelt to me are how am I going to feel sitting up on my little modest house, up on Overlook Drive. And how would each one of you feel - and I'm looking at every one of you tired faces, who have tried to cover up yawns in the last hour, that I totally appreciate - but how would you feel if Blue Camp said "we are going to put 280 RVs down here"? You probably wouldn't feel very good and that's not how , that's how I feel too. So the criteria that really comes to me out of the zoning regulations with the special exceptions, is the one that says um "the intensity of the proposed use of the project development use shall be compatible with the adopted POCD and will be compatible with the adjacent use of the family neighborhood", and it talks about harmony with the neighborhood. Um we have had great, many statistics and experts that have been brought in to talk about different aspects of this project. But the whole - in the whole project is really neighborhood compatibility and Margaret Gibson talked about that when she previously talked to this group and the wetlands group. When she said "neighborhood compatibility? This is not going to be compatible." it's just not. There's no other way it fits with your very own regulations, it just doesn't. Um there are a number of other issues that have all been brought up tonight, but the key word for me feelings, keywords for me are the feelings, ah the assurance that we were going to have a quality project, if it ever happens, and so that's why these are called quality

assurance criteria, which I already gave you a tool for you to look at. These questions, which cover most of which has been spoken here by various people, very passionate. And so you can use it, you can throw it in the wastebasket if you want, but I think it will help because it asks you yes or no, have you considered this or that. Have you considered the laws, the pollution and so forth. For me I guess that's the other one issue I wanted to mention, I've got about one minute of my five minutes. The other issue for me is noise pollution and I don't see how you can get out of this one. You can work your way through all of the other things about odors, smokeless fire pits which now Peter Lieber has said check into that, but the noise pollution is really really a difficult one to deal with. If I am going to sit up on my back porch and hear kids of 280 campers yelling and screaming and running around, portable stereos and TVs and radios playing. Am I going to be hearing all kinds of other things that will come from this group of giant RVs? I don't think so. I don't want that. Do you want that? Would you want that? If you lived in my house? I hope not. So in conclusion, I'm gonna give you a tool and I'm gonna let you work with it and give a set of questions. I think will help you, I think so, maybe, I hope. And I wanna thank you again for your patience, your stamina, and for being a very considerate commission, in a very difficult situation. Thank you very much. I think I made it in 5 minutes.

Gary Piszczek - As an act of mercy can I submit my Conservation Commission comments rather than talk.

Art Moran - You mean you don't want to wait?

Jerry Garbarek - I won't take much time. I just want to comment on

Art Moran - State your name and

Jerry Grabarek - Oh, Jerry Grabarek, 17 Hewitt Road, formerly Route 2. I just wanted to comment on the traffic turning left, coming out of that campground onto going to Westerly. I can tell you what will happen, they're gonna get frustrated, very frustrated and because they're not gonna be able to turn left because - probably some of you remember this I said that the utopia is gonna come to town and they're gonna stop traffic for a period of time and I mentioned it was kinda like hotel California, where you can check out any time you want but you can never leave. And this is gonna be the same type of thing. They're gonna get frustrated, they're gonna turn right, they're gonna turn right onto 164 and they're gonna turn around in the parking lot right there, for sure. The next thing I got is the PFAS, as you know I was probably the instigator of that little study. And they did test it, ah Mr. Heller, I, I got in a little disagreement with you because 5 out of 6 sites tested for the solubility part of the PFAS came at a level that was of an area of concern. 5 out of 6. Not like 2 out of 3 like the Meatloaf song, this is 5 out of 6, that's bad. Ah the only thing I can say besides that is I notified the tribe of that PFAS spreading back in 2019 via email and they responded to me by saying that the - I wanted them to test the Preston Plains Water Company, just the water - and they responded to me that it wasn't done. That the slug was never spread there. But then again, and ah the corn grower interestingly enough, the farmer who was growing corn there, was kicked off the site by their

camp. So I really don't have anything else to say except that 5 out of the 6 sites are leveled with the GAPMC that were above the recommended thing, I just think they should do more testing. And I got kicked out of the wetlands meeting basically because I contacted Zoe Belcher, because her phone number was listed in the report, so I called her and Mr. Heller raised ex parte, and so I didn't vote in the wetlands commission. Needless to say nobody has done a study on what those numbers mean and I'm not a biochemist, and nobody know what they have and they were saying about Connecticut, levels of PFAS, well New Jersey's level is 14, Connecticut's level is 70 because that's what the EPA said. Who knows what the level's gonna be. But you said there is no safe level. Alright that's all I got to say, thank you.

Gary Piszczek - This won't take long. How many minor disturbances does it

Kathy Warzecha - Name please.

Gary Piszczek - Oh, Gary Piszczek, 124 Miller Road, how many minor disturbances does it take to make a major one? This is a land use question that in 2022 we no longer have the luxury to ignore. We have for months now discussed and argued over buffers, set backs, upland review areas, concepts that are uniquely drawn and envision land use that are meaningless to the means of the natural world. And the impact on the system that begins with Amos Lake flows through Avery Pond, Indian Brooke, Poquetanuck Cove, and into the Thames River, is our concern. The Conservation Commission has and will continue to advocate for protection of this valuable wildlife corridor and water course. Eliminating or restricting the Blue Camp project intrusion within the 100 foot wetland review area, in our view, is necessary to minimize negative impact on this system. Achieving this goal, limited intrusion, will only be reached by compromise, not regulation. Our Commission which includes agricultural concerns has compromised on the loss of 28 acre farmland. Preserve the wildlife and watercourse corridor. The abutting residents are being asked to compromise their quality of a peaceful neighborhood life. The Conservation and Agricultural Commission is asking for the applicant to also compromise on the scale and scope of this proposal. Any campsites located in the wetland and new area, guarantees the use of pesticides and creates a marginal area. This activity is advised against on page 15 of the applicant's paper, the scientific basis for wetland and watercourse buffer zone which I've included. It has been and will be argued that Preston's Boards and Commissions have no legal basis to propose these restrictions. Our view is that compromise, even with legal authority, an agreement between all, create an ethical use of our limited natural resources and will be upheld by not only the courts but generations yet to come. If the applicant cannot complete this project with respect to compromise, the land requires and still make it financially viable, perhaps they have the wrong location.

Art Moran - Anybody else from the public? Got one minute.

Unidentified person - Just wanted to see your blood pressure go up.

Henry Heller - Again, Henry Heller, I'm going to try to be brief, but there are some points I need to make here. Ah

Art Moran - Can you show a little respect here?

Henry Heller - I just wanna correct some comments that were made, I'm just gonna to hit or miss as I'm just going through the comments. There were comments saying there was no market study performed on this project, and that um Blue Water has partnered with other entities and other projects. Ah this project is a joint venture. If you look at the plan that was presented with the original application and it hasn't changed, the applicants of Blue Water and Sun RV Resorts. Sun RV Resorts and Sun Communities is one of the largest developers of recreational properties in the United States. Ah, they also have a separate home community division, Sun Communities. This is a very substantial joint venture, and they do not do projects without doing their due diligence, without doing their market study, no proven investors are gonna invest 20 to 25 million dollars without doing a market study and having reasonable confidence based on that study that it's gonna be viable and profitable. Um Margaret Gibson indicated that Justin LaFontain took issue with our interpretation of 21-29. That is correct but not in the sense that she alluded to. He took issue with our assertion that you do not have the right to consider impact on property values. And there is conflicting language in 21-29 that we're not going to have the answer to until that's sorted out by the courts or there is a technical amendment made to the legislation. Um he did not take issue with our interpretation of 21-29 as it relates to the explicit deletion of character, community character, from one of the evaluation criteria allowed under 8-2 which is your enabling legislation. Um and as Attorney Carey correctly recited, the act is even more specific, it says that you cannot consider community character, unless that character is specifically stated in the regulations. Read the legislation, it says clear as day. Um. There was a comment that the applicant has or should consider the Lake Drive neighborhood. As we have proceeded down the path with this application, ah the applicant has attempted to address every comment that has been rendered both from the public hearing process and it has been received from staff. Ah, as we indicated, we have incorporated a very significant amount of screening. In order to screen this project from the Lynn Drive neighborhood, um it is along the periphery of the still water retention quality basin, at the westerly end of the site, screening has been added at all infill areas along the periphery of Avery Pond and we have provided in the revised plans the profile views to show evidence of that the screening that has been incorporated, does in fact screen this project visually from the Lynn Drive neighborhood. There was another comment ah rendered I believe by Mr. Leiter about people driving by this property. Disregard the fact that this project was also screened from Route 2. Ah when you look back at our initial presentation from the initial night of the public hearing, you'll see that the applicant, from the inception, has proposed a vegetative burm along Route 2 in order to provide screening of the project from Route 2 and provide the project screening from Route 2 traffic, so it works both ways. Um, with respect to what our opposition calls noise, what we call sound. The park regulations were entered into the record of this proceeding. You'll notice that they have quiet time, ah when the park is required

to be quiet so that it will not have an adverse impact on residential neighbors and we've also indicated um that there will be no amplification provided in this park. There was some comment made about the density being 17 units per acre, the density in fact is a little over 4 units per acre. Your regulation allows 5 units per acre which allows for a total of 325 recreational vehicle sites on this property. Ah, and we're proposing 280 in the revised formulation of the application. Ah there was an allegation that we came up with a low cost of the community services. We didn't dream up what the response has been from your other recreation campgrounds. We went to your resident state trooper and we went to your fire marshal and they provided us with the figures. Um, the figures speak for themselves. There was a question about the discharge to the tributaries out of the pond. And we have 2 tributaries flowing out of Avery Pond. We have the ah drainage ditch which was probably man made at some point during the past, that discharges in the southerly direction under Route 2. And then we have Indiantown Brook on the easterly side of the site. If I could borrow these plans here. No, I want the site drainage plan. I'm not taking them, they're too heavy and I'm too tired. So as I indicated we have the drainage ditch, out of Avery Pond on the west side of the site. You can see we have a large stormwater detention basin here on the west side and you can see also that there is a discharge here. That is discharging stormwater during the storm events into this drainage ditch that flows south under Route 2. However on the east side of the site where we have Indiantown Brook, which has been identified as potentially sensitive because of alewife migration from Thames River through Poquetanuck Cove, up into Avery Pond. You'll notice here, we have a created wetland and we have a stormwater basin on opposite sides of the cul-de-sac stream. And those are interconnected by a cul. You'll notice that there is no discharge from this system. So we are not discharging from this system, that is an emergency overflow. And it's not a stormwater discharge that we have in several of the basins. That's only during significant enough storm events where the water rises up and over tops of the basin where it will discharge, but we're not providing a discharge from the basin to Indiantown Brook. So the plans themselves do not air out the comments. Number one, there is no light pollution because the photometric plans evidence the fact that there is zero light migration. Not only to Indiantown Brook, but into the peripheral wetlands that are adjacent to Indiantown Brook. And secondly, the storm water metho management methodology for the project does not result in a discharge to that tributary. Ah there was a comment that there was a lot of information received in the last few days. That is correct because we have received a lot of comments from staff in the last few days. Now, let's quantify what the last few days are. Um there was a set of staff review comments that were presented to the applicant and um we replied to those in correspondence and supporting documentation on April 7th so I don't consider that in the last few days. Then there was a second review letter that we received on April 21st and I partially responded to that on Friday and then we filed the final response earlier today. So we turned that around in four or five days. Um, there was a comment that the glamping sites that are proposed for this project,

are not authorized by your regulations and cannot be permitted. We disagree with that and quite frankly your regulations do not support that. And I call your attention to two sections. First of all, in your definitional section, you have a definition of a recreation campground. It says recreation campgrounds is an area where privately or publicly owned, used daily, nightly, weekly or longer basis for the accommodation of tents or recreational camping vehicles. And then in Section 18.11, of your regulations, recreation campgrounds as defined in two of these regulations, are intended to be occupied by recreational vehicles or tents for seasonal lodging. The glamping sites are tents. We have the details of those sites in the plan and we have presented pictures of the glamping site tents in our response letter that was submitted to the Commission today. They are tents, they are made of canvas, sitting on a wooden base, and they comply with the requirements of your regulations. Ah one thing I would like to point out is your town engineer has approved the bond issued for this project that was submitted by the applicant in the amount of \$461,000. Your municipal wetlands agency approved a bond amount of \$600,000 for this project without mention of the bond estimate that had been submitted by the applicant. Um I'm just pointing that out, we're not falling with the \$600,000 bond, but we don't wanna bond twice for the same thing. Ah there were comments about the emergency access and it being dependent on OSTA action. That is not the case, we have incorporated into the plan the structural emergency access drive so emergency vehicles can get in and out of this site if there is a blockage on the primary access to the property to respond to an emergency in all instances. So we have provided for the emergency access that is required by the regulation and we have further indicated that in the event that OSTA approves the secondary cut in the non-access line on commercially reasonable terms, the applicant will install that secondary access. There was a comment raised that there have been two environmental intervenors in this process. And there was a claim that the applicant has not presented any feasible improved alternative. First I will call the Commission's attention to the Page versus the Planning and Zoning Commission Case. It says that a municipal land use agency when it receives an intervention petition, an environmental intervention petition, must first make a determination of whether or not the activities proposed are reasonably likely to unreasonably pollute and destroy the natural resources that are within the permitting jurisdiction of the agency. And it is only if you make a determination that the activities proposed in conjunction with the application, are reasonable likely to have that effect on natural resources within your permitting jurisdiction, that you then get to the second step of determining whether or not there is no other feasible improvement alternative. We would submit to the Commission that based on the plan as its been modified by the public hearing process, both before your Commission and your municipal wetlands agency, that it is not reasonably likely that this project is going to unreasonably affect the natural resources of the state of Connecticut for the town of Preston. A lot of the issues that have been dealt with in this proceeding are what have been classified under Connecticut case law, as technically complex issues. And on technically complex issues,

the law charges that expert evidence is required in order to substantiate a claim of impact or no impact. And we will submit to the Commission that the expert evidence that has been presented into the record of this proceeding, evidences the fact that as the plan has been modified, it is not reasonably likely to unreasonably pollute the natural resources within your permitting jurisdiction. In the event that you do determine that it is reasonably likely to unreasonably impair resources within your jurisdiction, then I call to your attention the fact that we've been before the municipal agencies of the town of Preston for the past six months now. And through that process, numerous modifications and iterations of the plan have been presented for consideration. The plan has been still that but first has been incorporated that were not incorporated previously, activity has been removed from probably the most valuable area of the site in the northwest corner peninsula and along the south lake periphery of Avery Pond. And the storm water management for the protocol for the property has been enhanced and there is no reasonable evidence in the record that this project is reasonably likely to unreasonably pollute those resources. And secondly, that the modifications that have been made through the review process evidence the fact that in order for a project to be economically viable, and we have presented that evidence and put to the record of this proceeding, for it to be economically viable, a project has to have certain critical mass. As the testimony has indicated, the construction cost of this project is 20 to 25 million dollars. A significant amount that cost is infrastructure related and that cost has to be incurred whether or not you have a hundred sites or three hundred sites. And if you do not have the critical mass to cover those fixed costs, the project simply is not economically viable. And when considering alternatives, alternatives are essentially a balancing exercise between the harm to the environment, if there is any, and the - ah if you look at the preamble for the wetlands act, in Connecticut, it's a balancing between that and the economic development of the state. And when you look at your Plan of Conservation and Development, as we have cited in our report to the Commission on consistency with the Plan of Conservation and Development, you have designated the substantial portion of this property and the resort commercial zoning district and the resort commercial zoning district designation is a designation that was intended to promote economic development in the town of Preston. There was a comment about noise pollution and again I cite to the fact that there is a difference between noise and sound. I'm not gonna say that if you're out in the yard on Lynn Drive, that you're never going to hear sound from this project, you probably will. But the department of energy and environmental protection has established sound standards. And you have both a daytime sound standard to a residential receptor and you have a nighttime standard to the residential receptor. And this project like any other project is required to comply with those standards. And in summation, I was shocked by some of the comments that I heard this evening, there's no really fundamental of our democracy. There were comments made that it is not enough simply to meet the regulations. And you should reject this application, even if it is just for us. The town of Preston is

beholding to its citizens. I find these comments very troubling. We are a society, that is founded in regulation. Without regulation we have chaos. The Mashantucket Pequot Nation is a property owner in your community. They are entitled to the project of your regulations just as much as every resident sitting out here. When they make an investment based decision to come before you with an application, they do so base upon the language of those regulations, regulations that you have adopted in your legislative capacity. And in administering an application of this nature, ah which is administrative by nature, where you have to apply your regulations, some of which, like the regulation in section 18.11, are very specific, and although of which the general evaluation criteria in section 18.4 are more amorphous. Like if you have to apply those regulation, that is your charge when you accepted appointment as a member of this Commission. And we trust that you will do so fairly and honestly based upon the information that is being presented and into the record, I know that this has been a long and trying endeavor and I thank you very much on behalf of the applicant and the whole development team, for your consideration and for the attention you have given us.

Art Moran - Taking questions from the Commission?

Henry Heller - Sure.

Denise Beale - Yes, I argue what you consider a tent. Ah, a tent to me is something that can be picked up and moved, picked up and moved, picked up and moved, it's not, it's not, it doesn't have a foundation. So I disagree with that comment.

Henry Heller - These are your regulations, that have been adopted by your Commission, you chose not to define tent in your regulations, this is a canvas um a canvas that sits on top of a wooden platform and we believe that it does meet the intent of a tent as it is contained in your regulation and secondly, these things are not novel. These glamping and they're called 'glamping' or 'safari' tent sites, are included in high end campgrounds resorts throughout the United States.

Denise Beale - If I may. Tents, a portable shelter, made of cloth. Supported by one or more poles and stretched tight by cords through loops attached by spikes driven into the ground. We don't have to define tent it's already define.

Henry Heller - Well, ah.

Art Moran - Is that our definition, the Commission's?

Denise Beale - My understanding is we don't have a definition, it's the definition of the word. And that's the definition of the word.

(Man) - just to throw this out there, I know that Hidden Acres, they have a camp tent site area and they actually have some platforms that you could use to put your tent on so I don't know if that kind of qualifies this as the same thing or not I mean this thing here to me just sounds like a big tent. You know with a lot of amenities but ...

(Person) - well that's exactly what it is. It is high-end

Emily - and you can still take it down, in the off-season, it doesn't stay up. Oh this is Emily, we take it down in the off season. We put it up in season, then we take it down in the off season, it's a much sturdier tent that's a little bit bigger than just your pitched tent. You know we call those 'primitive tents' but there's different definitions. There's a primitive tent, there's a safari tent, there's different variations, different types of tents, they've come a long way.

Richard Chalifoux - Look at the pictures we were given, I have a couple questions.

Charles Raymond - Hey, Art, it's tomorrow.

Art Moran - I have just a couple questions

Charles Raymond - The Public Hearing was yesterday.

Art Moran - I have a couple questions. So the questions I have, and I heard talk about the golf carts and stuff, is gonna be an age limit.

Henry Heller - That's an Emily question.

Emily - I believe there is an age limit, I believe, we do need to confirm that, I will confirm it, but I believe there is, and they are electric.

Art Moran - At one point tonight, you said that you couldn't put those speed bumps in because of water drainage. Was that the case?

Henry Heller - They are both maintenance and drainage.

Art Moran - So speed bumps? Can you make models of this?

Woman - There's ways you can do it, to address the drainage.

Henry Heller - We don't - with a five mile an hour speed limit in the park, we don't see the need for it. Obviously, if commission does-

Woman - I understand, the point is that: will people adhere to that speed limit, and I think that's the concern.

Henry Heller - Most people will heed that. I mean nobody brought that up tonight and I - what you said about not being able to put it into the water drainage. I didn't say we couldn't, I said that traditionally, they have both maintenance issues and they can create drainage problems.

Art Moran - One last chance for the commission before I close the Public Hearing.
Many voices all at once.

Mike Sinko - Table

Art Moran - No we have to close the Hearing.

Mike Sinko - Well not unless you get an extension

Kathy Warzecha - No, no more extensions.

Henry Heller - We're out of extensions.

Richard Chalifoux - We received information right?

Art Moran - No, No, we're not gonna vote tonight.

Mike Sinko - Suppose we have questions and we need information.

Kathy Warzecha - Well you can get clarification on certain things, but there might be things we won't be able to get answers to. We don't have-

Henry Heller - I know what you haven't seen what was submitted, but what we submitted today was only in response to comments, nothing substantially changed in the application.

Kathy Warzecha - I think one of the documents that you did submit was a repeat; that you gave me this afternoon.

Henry Heller - I'm, I'm not sure which one?

Kathy Warzecha - I think the PFAS was already in record.

Henry Heller - Oh yes the PFAS was already in the record, yes.

Richard Chalifoux - One question I had is for the resort commercial area they have presented. I didn't see a lot of detail on the buildings, but do the buildings fit the design standard?

Kathy Warzecha -They fit the standard.

Man - I'm sure they

Different Man - The architects are in here.

Richard Chalifoux - I did see like metal roof and vinyl siding.

Kathy Warzecha - Well no it's not vinyl siding, it's concrete-

Henry Heller - Yea it's ugh- No it's ugh, it's particle board.

Kathy Warzecha - Yeah, it's particle board. And it does say cedar shake, but I don't know if that's the case.

Henry Heller - It's this whole series.

Kathy Warzecha - I know, wait a minute. Let me get that.

Richard Chalifoux - I know it

Woman - I think it's metal roofing.

inaudible

Henry Heller - And you can't accept evidence after tonight, you can still interact with staff. And you can also get clarification.

Art Moran - Everybody else good? Thank you. We'll close the Public Hearing at this time.

Henry Heller - Thank you again.