

April 27, 2015

Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Docket 192B

Intervenor's Brief

Dear Chairman Stein and Council Members:

Despite the open hearings and opportunities to submit testimony afforded me by the Siting Council, I feel like an unrepresented party in relation to Docket 192B. That is because Oxford, the host town, has provided little, or no chance for me and my neighbors to be heard.

In 1999, when Oxford was a sleepy farm town of approximately 9820 people, the right to acquire property for a potential power plant was approved by a mere 67 votes on a referendum that was the third question attached to the highly popular appeal for an Oxford High School. In the intervening years, Oxford's population has swelled to 12,683 (2010 census), and the town's character has changed to a bedroom community where families have moved to enjoy its quiet rural charm. My community of Oxford Greens (a 55+ community of 360 current homes, with approval for another 540) did not exist in 1999.

The Town of Oxford has apparently endeavored to conceal the plans for the power plant as the population grew; at the least, it did nothing to reveal those plans. There is no mention in the town's Plan of Conservation and Development, where anyone researching the community's plans would logically look. The town's Municipal Development Plan also does not mention a proposed power plant. The October, 2014, Planning and Zoning meeting, which produced a letter endorsing the project, while possibly legal, was certainly clandestine.

There is little support for the power plant in Oxford, with the exception of a few public officials who have their own agenda. The voice of the people has never been solicited by town officials as it should have been for a project of this magnitude and dispute. I submit as evidence of the town's opposition the many letters and postcards you have received.

I ask the Connecticut Siting Council to recognize the host town's opposition to Docket 192B, and to carry out its responsibility to "...protect the environment and ecology of the state and to minimize damage to the scenic, historic, and recreational values" and thus deny this application.

If your deliberations cannot produce a denial, I subsequently request two conditions, in addition to any conditions that the Siting Council applies:

1. Construction be precluded from starting until E-Commerce Road is completed (Draft Fact #208), so that truck traffic will not destroy our country roads, and be able follow the proposed route (Draft Fact #207).
2. The applicant be required to immediately install ambient air quality sensors in surrounding areas so that changes in air quality can be measured. This would allow a comparison of air quality pre and post construction and operation. My intent would be to request an injunction to cease operation if the air quality decreases to an unsafe level. I should note that if you are unable to require monitoring, my community is prepared to install its own sensors, and continuously report air quality conditions.

I recognize the difficulty that the Connecticut Siting Council faces in deciding this matter, and thank you for your service.

Sincerely,

Wayne McCormack

593 Putting Green Lane
Oxford, CT 06478

203-888-3399
wayne@waynemccormack.com