

**Questions for Ethan Phelps, Regional Director  
Vermont Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation**

1. How do you reconcile the significant gap between the quiet, natural state of Lowell Lake valued by the community and FPR's development plan?
2. How is the development plan for Lowell Lake consistent with ANR's goal to "to protect and improve the health of Vermont's people and ecosystems" when an increase in usage in this small park may significantly tax the ecosystem?
3. Has FPR developed a specific management plan focused on identifying, preserving and mitigating impacts on the flora and fauna located within the park and managing the growing number of visitors over the next 20 years? How does FPR intend to scientifically quantify the carrying capacity of the park? Does FPR have a plan to limit visitors to the park to mitigate overcrowding and exceeding the carrying capacity of the lake and surrounding park?
4. Given that park visits have already exceeded 1999 projections to a significant degree, isn't it possible that FPR is again underestimating the natural growth in visitors over the next twenty years, even without further development?
5. FPR has responded to calls for a comprehensive environmental impact assessment by saying it is premature. Given that the current iteration of the plan is not substantively different than the version from 1999, isn't an environmental assessment overdue on twenty-year old plan?
6. Will the FPR plan include a provision to halt or reverse development if significant negative impacts on the lake's ecosystem are detected?
7. What specific input did FPR receive from Fish and Wildlife and DEC in the creation of the Plan?
8. Will FPR commit to complying with the Town of Londonderry's zoning regulations designed to protect the lake and NOT seek waivers from those regulations?
9. Has FPR read the Londonderry Town Plan section dealing with Lowell Lake and will they commit to abiding by the intent of that plan?
10. Vermont has a stated planning goal "to manage Vermont's forestlands so as to maintain and improve forest blocks and habitat connectors." How does the plan reconcile this goal with the fact that ANR's *Biofinder* application identifies?
  - a. The already over congested approach to the park entrance on Lowell Lake Road as a High Priority Wildlife Crossing (Component Layer)
  - b. Much of the lake and its surrounding land mass is designated as a home to Rare Species (Component Layer)
  - c. The entire perimeter of the lake as Riparian Wildlife Connectivity and Highest Priority Surface Waters and Riparian Areas (Landscape Scale Components)
  - d. Priority Riparian Blocks and Priority Connectivity Blocks within the lake area (Landscape Scale Components)
  - e. The entire lake area as being part of a Representative Physical Landscape.

- i. How does the Plan evidence a “high responsibility for the conservation of these landscapes?” (From *Mapping Vermont’s Natural Heritage*, Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, 2017, p. 47.)
    - ii. How does the Plan support the stated policy that “where possible, maintain or restore natural vegetation and limit development on rare and representative landscapes?” (From *Mapping Vermont’s Natural Heritage*, Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, 2017. P.97.)
  - f. The entire lake area will likely be part of the Town of Londonderry’s efforts to map and protect critical habitats and connectors from segmentation in response to ACT 171. Will FPR support the town’s effort to comply with ACT 171 by modifying development plans to avoid segmenting critical blocks and connectors?
11. Has FPR considered alternatives to overnight camping and other elements of the current plan and has it documented a consideration of those alternatives?
  12. Why has FPR contracted with a vendor to determine the feasibility of the development plan without including environmental impacts as one of the study’s criterion?
  13. Are septic systems still under consideration given language in the contract with SE Group referencing “test borings and soil samples”?
  14. Given that the contract with SE Group state that the project will be ADA compliant how does FPR intend to mitigate storm water runoff into the lake from impervious surfaces, light pollution and impacts on nocturnal specie resulting from required lighting and other impacts on the ecology of the lake and surrounding forests resulting from ADA requirements?
  15. How does FPR intend to address congestion, air pollution and quality of life issues that have already arisen along the community’s roadways due to the organic growth to date, not to mention the increase in usage of the park resulting from the development plan?
  16. Will FPR conduct an air quality assessment on the potential impacts of idling vehicles on roads leading to and from the park?
  17. Is FPR aware that the existing cabins are likely covered with lead paint and will SE Group include the logistics and cost of lead mitigation near the lake in their site plan?
  18. How does FPR intend to address the potential impacts of a round-the-clock increase in traffic on the residents surrounding the park?
  19. In 1999 FPR partnered with a Citizens Advisory Committee. Will you consider directly partnering with the community once again as you move towards a Master Plan?
  20. If FPR makes no substantive changes to the plan to address community concerns how will it manage the conflict with the host community and the broader community that values Lowell Lake as a critical local resource?