

Attachment 12

Additional Items to Consider

1. Other Permits required for this project include the following:

- NHDES Site Specific, (Alteration of Terrain) Permit
- Army Corp Section 404 Individual Wetlands Permit
- Section 401 Water Quality Permit
- NHDES - Groundwater Discharge Permit (leachfields)
- NHDES - Community Water Supply Well (Large Groundwater Withdrawal Permit)
- EPA - Construction Stormwater
- DOT - Highway Access / Traffic Analysis
- Historical / Archaeological assessment
- NHDES - Dam Safety (possibly)
- Tamworth Hazardous Waste Generator License
- Tamworth Race Track Ordinance Permit
- Tamworth Subdivision Approval (Davis Lot)
- Tamworth Wetlands Special Use permit

2. The Application does not adequately describe planned facility operations and thus their impacts cannot be determined.

- The anticipated number of people, cars, trucks and trailers that are expected during “larger events” is not defined (Application pg. 25).
- The number of SCCA or similar events is not defined (p. 26).
- The RTO allows racing from 12 – 6 p.m. (not eight-hours) on Sundays (RTO pg. 6).
- The definition of “majority” used to describe street-legal automobiles or motorcycles is not defined (Application pg. 29).
- The number of vehicle trips per day of street-legal vehicles is not defined (Application pg. 30).
- The location, capacity and size of “additional satellite parking” are not defined (Application pg. 30), so potential impacts to wetlands cannot be assessed.
- The use of campers and recreation vehicles in the satellite parking areas (e.g overnight use, similar to New Hampshire International Speedway in Loudon) is not defined.

- The Application (pg. 93) states that the race track will not be plowed, to allow its use for winter driving instruction. The Application then inconsistently excludes the road course under the list of project components active in the winter in the following paragraph.
- Snow and debris disposal areas (Application pg. 93) should be clearly identified. De-icing chemicals should be identified, and their planned storage area (s) and projected quantities provided.

3. The Application understates likely scope and impacts to the public.

- The economic benefits mentioned in the Application are not backed up by facts. Studies by economists of other tracks, and research by UNH Professor Richard England, show that unless the owners are local, the economic benefit would not occur in Tamworth. The project would cost the Town, with no offsetting benefit.
- The \$350,000 annual property tax payment is inaccurate. The figure Professor England calculated is \$76,245. Taxes paid by the owner would be offset by abatements to other property owners whose property values fall (est. 25 to 40%). See Dr. England's "An Estimate of the Annual Tamworth Property Tax Revenue From Phase I of the CMI Race Track Project" and other similar articles, Attachment 13.
- The regional economic benefit suggested in the Application is not substantiated. Since the project would have a large negative impact on the ecologically sustainable tourism that the area depends on, a net benefit is not certain. Any gains would come with a loss of the way of life for many existing residents and visitors.