



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

February 22, 2024

Marie Urbanetti
213 Blue Ridge Drive
Manchester, CT 06040
marieurbanetti@gmail.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1609** – TRITEC Americas, LLC notice of election to waive exclusion from Connecticut Siting Council jurisdiction, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §16-50k(e), and petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 0.999-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility located at 250 Carter Street, Manchester, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection.

Dear Marie Urbanetti:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) is in receipt of your Request for a Public Hearing, dated February 22, 2024, for the above-referenced petition.

The Request for a Public Hearing will be placed on the next Council meeting agenda, a copy of which will be sent to you. You will be notified of the Council's determination immediately thereafter.

Please contact our office at 860-827-2935 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

MB/RDM/dll

c: Service List dated January 26, 2024
Council Members

February 22, 2024

Ms. Melanie Bachman, Executive Director

Connecticut Siting Council

[Petition NO. 1609](#) : 0.999-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility at 250 Carter Street, Manchester CT 06040

Dear **Ms. Bachman**,

It is futile to have a clean environment with unhappy residents. Residents in the neighborhood adjacent and close to 250 Carter Street are very unhappy with the proposed 0.999-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility in our residential community.

This letter is to request a public hearing on this matter, and denial of the exception to the full process. It also expresses my opposition to Petition NO, 1609 and why:

1. **Habitat Degradation:** The proposed site is a wildlife habitat for many species, including the endangered box turtle. DEEP's own report Appendix C, mentions States Special Concern for the box turtle and its habitat at the proposed site and lays out the complex protection measures they recommend. The land also serves as a corridor for animals including deer, turkeys, fox, and coyote to pass between larger wooded areas and not be forced to pass through our yards where our children and pets play.
2. **Environmental Concerns:** The proposed site is already very wet. We can often hear water running through the storm drains on our street, Blue Ridge Drive long after the last rain storm. Clear cutting land increases runoff and even with the proposed mitigation there is concern it is not sufficient to handle the potential load and contamination that could occur if the system is overloaded or fails.
3. **Health:** According to various research and a 2023 Environmental Impact Report in California indicate that the distance is approximately **5 miles to 1.2 miles** from a solar farm, however, long term research (over 20 years) has not been conducted on the impact to property values or environmental or personal health. Jan 5, 2024
We did not purchase our homes in this neighborhood to become Green Energy Guinea Pigs.
4. **Safety issues:** Including but not limited to
 - Nearby Natural Gas Pipeline - could a stray electrical arc cause a fire or explosion with potentially life threatening consequences?
 - Glare to overheat aircraft
 - Noise
 - Danger to wildlife
 - Creating a lot of heat / WildFires

- Adverse effects on native vegetation and wildlife (habitat and migration)
- Interference with rainfall and drainage
- Direct contact causing injury or death

5. **Property Values:** Our very desirable neighborhood will be much less so with an electric generating facility so close by. Property values will surely decrease if Petition NO, 1609 goes forward. Some neighbors may be forced into financial distress because of it. "...the journal [Energy Policy](#), found that home prices decreased 1.5% on average for properties within 0.5 miles of a utility-scale solar project compared to properties located 2 to 4 miles away from the solar farm. The average decline is around 2.3% for homes closer to the solar farm, within a 0.25-mile radius."

Thank you for your thorough consideration of this proposal and its negative impact on the local community.

Sincerely,

Marie Urbanetti

Marie Urbanetti
213 Blue Ridge Drive
Manchester, CT 06040