



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

March 4, 2024

Bridgette A. Woodall
51 Blue Ridge Drive
Manchester, CT 06040
woodallspace@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 Bridgette Woodall:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) is in receipt of your Request for a Public Hearing, dated March 3, 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

MAB/RDM/dll

c: Service List dated January 26, 2024
Council Members

From: B Woodall <woodallspace@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2024 8:02 PM
To: CSC-DL Siting Council <Siting.Council@ct.gov>
Subject: Petition 1609

Dear Ms. Bachman:

Please find attached my letter of opposition to Petition 1609.

Bridgette A. Woodall
51 Blue Ridge Drive
Manchester, CT 06040

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square,
New Britain, CT 06051

March 03, 2024

Dear Ms. Bachman:

I am writing in opposition to Petition 1609.

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.

No one wants a utility station in their backyard and no neighborhood should ever have one forced upon it. No one wants to see a vibrant ecosystem decimated or witness the senseless cutting of life-sustaining trees. But that is exactly what is happening at 250 Carter Street in Manchester, Connecticut.

Willful destruction of an inhabited and thriving ecosystem by means of deforestation, disruption of wetlands, and the upending of wildlife as well as the reckless endangerment of people and the devaluing of their community and homes, all in the name of “going green” and bolstering the Governor’s 2040 carbon zero energy agenda, defies logic, sound judgement, rational thinking, and general common sense. Going solar to save the planet by destroying the planet and defiling perfectly good neighborhoods in the process makes no sense.

If the solar industry falls under the purview of the Connecticut Siting Council, then one can reasonably conclude that the solar industry has been deemed a public utility by the State. As such, TRITEC Americas, LLC, should be held to standard. A public utility facility belongs in an already commercially/ industrially zoned site, not on land zoned as residential and rural. In reading the solar industry’s basic literature, it likewise confirms that a solar facility does not belong in or near a residential neighborhood or an established environmental ecosystem such as inhabited woodlands and wetlands. A responsibly managed solar facility is situated on open dry flat land and/or on high ground and away from water sources, wooded areas, wildlife habitats, gas and electrical lines, parkland, usable agricultural land, residential neighborhoods, and even historical sites. Also, it is highly recommended that the proximity of a solar facility to human domiciles and wildlife habitats be at least a half mile to two miles away - to limit exposure from the emitting electromagnetic energy, noise pollution, and other potential hazards. Kindly tell me how 250 Carter Street meets the criteria?

According to industry standards, if a solar facility is to be of any merit, a 1.0-megawatt or higher facility is required. Additionally, a 1.0-megawatt facility requires a minimum of 10 acres to adequately support its solar panels. So why is TRITEC Americas petitioning to only construct a 0.999-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic facility on 7.8 acres of a 41+ acre lot? What becomes of the remaining thirty-some acres of unused land? How long before TRITEC Americas petitions to re-zone the site as commercial/ industrial, once it has its solar facility in place and then a solar radiation storage unit appears and more land is taken and re-zoned? Likewise, if a 1.0-megawatt solar facility roughly generates enough energy to power approximately 150 to 200 residential houses, what's the point of a 0.999-megawatt facility and why does a perfectly good forest have to pay the price for a nothing producing facility? Who actually owns 250 Carter Street and who exactly is it being sold to (TRITEC Americas, Eversource, some anonymous corporate giant?) What is the real agenda?

How exactly does this whole solar facility thing work? Who exactly will be doing the daily monitoring, running, and operating of the site? Who is actually accountable and responsible to the surrounding neighborhood? Just how feasibly sustainable is all this solar energy? What happens in twenty years when this facility becomes defunct (that is four or five years into the Governor's 2040 carbon zero agenda) and we are left with a toxic dump and wasteland? What good is the land then? Who is really going to be there for the clean-up – TRITEC Americas or the taxpayer? LLCs are just **limited liability** companies, which come and go and have very little responsibility. TRITEC Americas is itself a subsidiary of the larger California based TRITEC Group AG, established solely for project development, securing financing options, and the managing of its own assets. What about the assets of the surrounding neighborhood (homeowners and nature alike)?

Who really benefits from this virtual nothing 0.999-megawatts of solar energy that requires destruction of 7.8 acres of land to accommodate it? No one is offering to lower my electric bill or provide me with a discount. No one is offering to re-seed the trees, restore the wetlands, or relocate wildlife and/or rebuild their habitats. No one is offering a tax break to the neighborhood property owners who will be directly affected by this misplaced eyesore. We all know that the facility will be tied into the electrical grid. So, is this just another Eversource project (in disguise) designed to raise our electric rates and not really an initiative to promote beneficial solar energy and meet this preposterous 2040 carbon zero agenda?

In its petition to desecrate the property at 250 Carter Street, TRITEC Americas, openly bills itself as part of the commercial and industrial solar market. So, how does it not know the industry standards and "best practices?" Does being a leading solar company, with over thirty years (est. 1987) of experience in the field, equate to being an expert in loopholes and underhandedness? If this were a company with any integrity, it would do the job right and set up a proper facility in a properly zoned location with all the appropriate permits and adherence to public utility regulations – not slide under the radar and underhandedly seek an exemption waiver. Likewise, it would be open and forthright and not operate in secrecy and avoid the public. Surely this Council can do better in vetting the solar companies that are right for doing business in Connecticut and in protecting its residents and nature. Who in their right mind would locate a solar facility in the middle of a heavily wooded residential neighborhood? The potential for sparking a wild fire alone is enough to tell any sensible person not to do it (or even chance it).

There are plenty of commercially/ industrially zoned unused, abandoned, and derelict sites in and around Manchester that more suitably conform with solar facility standards than 250 Carter Street. Many of these sites would greatly benefit from revitalization, while in the process of providing responsible “clean energy.” Thus, voiding the senseless destruction of a much needed woodlands. If not for this oversight of an exemption waiver on the part of the State, one could easily construe this petition for 250 Carter Street as spot zoning.

Just because the Governor has jumped on the band wagon of “carbon zero emissions,” that does not mean the this Council needs to be welcoming and accommodating to every unscrupulous opportunistic company coming out of the woodwork for a piece of the pie. We the taxpaying homeowners who have wetlands on our properties are not permitted to disturb them in any way yet, its OK for corporate America to do so, Hence, ravaging our communities and green spaces just to make a quick buck.

There are many unanswered questions, concerns over the poorly planned designs, and so much secrecy surrounding this project at 250 Carter Street that it has upset a peaceful neighborhood and has made the public uneasy. In a free and democratic society, the public has a right to be heard. It has a right to voice concerns and receive honest answers. It has a right to be a part of the decision-making process that affects its community. In the best interest of the people, our community, and the voice that nature is denied, I like my neighbors, am making a request for a public hearing and Council acknowledgement.

It does not require a rocket scientist to know that it is a bad idea and a raw deal. Simply put, this petition is absurd. Open your eyes to see the forest for the trees.

Bridgette A. Woodall
51 Blue Ridge Drive
Manchester, CT 06040