In The Matter Of:

Petition from Chatfield Solar Fund, LLC

PUBLIC HEARING February 21, 2019

BCT Reporting LLC 55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A Plainville, CT 06062 860.302.1876

1	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
3	
4	Docket No. 1354
5	Petition from Chatfield Solar Fund, LLC, For a
6	Declaratory Ruling for the Proposed Construction,
7	Maintenance and Operation of a 1.98-megawatt Ac Solar
8	Photovoltaic Electric Generating Facility On
9	Approximately 25 Acres Located Generally South of Route
10	80 (North Branford Road) and East of Chestnut Hill Road
11	In Killingworth, Connecticut, and Associated Electrical
12	Interconnection to Eversource Energy'S Green Hill
13	Substation Located At 775 Green Hill Road, Madison,
14	Connecticut
15	
16	Public Hearing held at the Killingworth Fire
17	Station, Meeting Room, Number 333, Route 81,
18	Killingworth, Connecticut, Thursday, February 21, 2019,
19	beginning at 6:30 p.m.
20	
21	Held Before:
22	JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., THE VICE CHAIRMAN
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	
4	ROBERT HANNON,
5	DEEP Designee
6	
7	LARRY LEVESQUE, ESQ.
8	PURA Designee
9	
10	ROBERT SILVESTRI
11	MICHAEL HARDER
12	EDWARD EDELSON
13	DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMONS
14	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
15	
16	Council Staff:
17	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
18	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
19	
20	ROBERT MERCIER,
21	Siting Analyst
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:(cont'd)
2	For Chatfield Solar Fund, LLC:
3	MURTHA CULLINA
4	One Century Tower
5	265 Church Street, 9th Floor
6	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
7	By: BRUCE L. MCDERMOTT, ESQ.
8	BMcDermott@murthalaw.com
9	203.772.7787
10	
11	and: SAMUEL R. VOLET, ESQ.
12	SVolet@murthalaw.com
13	203.772.7713
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and 2 gentlemen, could we have your attention, please? I'm James J. Murphy Jr. I'm the acting chairman 3 of the Siting council. 4 And I'm really going to break with 5 protocol for -- normally we would start right off 6 7 and do this, but tonight in view of the fact that 8 we lost during the past few days one of the great men that I have met in my time who served for a 9 number of years on this Council. 10 11 He was a veteran of World War II and a 12 Purple Heart recipient -- who was Eddie Wilensky 13 who also served as the mayor of his hometown for 14 ten years. 15 So let's just open this meeting and respectfully ask that everyone observe the passing 16 17 of this wonderful gentleman with a moment of 18 silence. 19 (Pause.) 20 21 22 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I thank you very 23 much. To the business at hand, I call this 24

meeting to order this evening February the 21st,

25

2019, at approximately 6:30.

As I have indicated to you, I am James J. Murphy, Jr., the Acting Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council who are here this evening is Robert Hannon who's the designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes, the Commissioner of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Larry Levesque, the designee for the Acting Chairman John W. Betkoski, III, of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri; Dr. Michael Klemens; Edward Edelson.

And members of our staff are Melanie
Bachman, our Executive Director and Staff
Attorney; and Robert Mercier, our siting analyst.

This is a continuation of a public hearing which began at 3 p.m. this afternoon. Copies of the hearing program and Council's citizens guide to Siting Council procedures are available up here to my left and to your right.

This meeting will be held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and the Uniform Procedures Act upon a petition from Chatfield Solar Fund, LLC, for the declaratory ruling for the proposed

construction, maintenance and operation of a

1.98-megawatt solar photovoltaic electric

generating facility located generally south of

North Branford Road and east of Chestnut Hill Road

in Killingworth, and associated electrical

interconnection to Eversource Energy's Green Hill

subdivision station located at 755 Green Hill Road

in Madison, Connecticut.

This petition was received by the Council on October 23, 2018. The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this hearing was published in the Middletown press on January 23, 2019. Upon the Council's request the petitioner erected a sign at the proposed site so as to inform the public of the name of the petitioner, the type of facility, the hearing date and location, and contact information for this Council.

This afternoon members of the Council, staff and public personally conducted a field review of the proposed site in order to observe first-hand the potential effects of this proposal. In addition, the petitioner has submitted a video to the Council that shows existing site conditions. The video is available on the

Council's website for anyone who cares to view the same.

This hearing session this evening has been reserved for the public to make short statements into the record. These public statements are not subject to questions from the petitioner, the parties or the Council. And members of the public making statements may not ask questions of the petitioners, the parties or the Council. These statements will become part of the record for Council consideration. A sign-up sheet is available over to the left, as was previously indicated.

As a reminder to all, off-the-record communications with members of the Council or a member of the Council's staff upon the merits of this petition is prohibited by law.

I wish to note that the petitioner including the parties and their representatives and witnesses are not allowed to participate in the session this evening.

I wish to also note for those of you that are here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for this public comment session, that you or they may send

written statements to this Council within 30 days of the date hereof and such written comments will become part of our record as if spoken this evening at the hearing.

We ask persons making public statements in this proceeding to confine his or her statements to the subject matter before the Council and to avoid unreasonable repetition so that we may hear all of the concerns you and your neighbors may have. Please be advised that the Council cannot answer questions from the public about this proposal.

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited at the Killingworth and Madison Town Clerks' offices for consideration of the public.

Before I call upon the first speaker who has a signed up -- and we have one sheet here and there are more over there if other people want to sign up. Before calling on the first person to speak, I'd like to ask a representative of the petitioner to make a short presentation indicating what it is they are proposing, and speaking briefly as to what plans they have for the project.

BRANDON STEPHENS: Good evening everyone. My name is Brandon Stephens. I'm a project manager for Standard Solar, the company who will be contracting to build this, build this project.

We're looking to build a 1.92 megawatt AC system on this site that you guys know on Route 80. It will consist of roughly 6500 solar panels. Our goal would be, with Siting Council approval, to begin construction in the June timeframe with the goal of operating the system by the end of the year.

What we're proposing is to build this facility with the least impact that we can to the property and the surrounding community and to, you know, produce clean renewable energy for the next 20 to 25 years.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I just want to indicate for the information -- I see there's quite a crowd and that's wonderful.

I have eight people to speak now, and I don't know how many others there are, but the practice -- and to advise people that are here that in the vicinity of nine o'clock we will close

this hearing and there will be a further time for people to participate in the public session, but that unfortunately is held in New Britain at another time.

If we're approaching nine o'clock and we're almost out of speakers we'll probably stay longer to accommodate, but I just wanted to indicate that there is kind of a time limitation as to how long the public program will go on tonight.

The first speaker I have on the list is

Peter Stockman -- oh, excuse me. Sorry. Written

in above -- and I apologize -- is the First

Selectman Cathy Iino.

Sorry about that.

CATHY IINO: Hi. I'm Cathy Iino. I'm the First Selectwoman. I'd like to thank you for coming to hold proceedings in Killingworth today. You were able to see a little bit of our beautiful town and you can understand why protecting our environment and our landscape is so important to us.

I was able to attend some of the hearing this afternoon and I appreciate the seriousness with which you interrogated representatives from

Chatfield Solar, particularly about the environmental protections that will be needed to protect the site.

When I expressed my support for the project I did so contingent on the project meeting stringent environmental standards. I might not have stated that strongly enough, and I urge you along with the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to approve this project only if it will meet those standards during construction, and as long as it operates.

We are particularly concerned with how the project would be monitored in the long run, and I ask the commission to tell us what the longterm protocols would be -- not tonight, I understand -- to make sure that the system is operated and maintained as proposed and approved.

I also urge the Council to require
additional plantings to visually screen the
installation from Route 80 year round as a
condition of approval. Although this portion of
Route 80 is not officially a scenic road
Killingworth's glory is its natural landscape
throughout the town.

I have a couple of further things I

wanted to say. First in response to some questions that have been raised -- this is more for the crowd here. Killingworth's tax ordinances do not preclude taxing this system. A tax exemption was created for businesses that install net metered solar installation systems such as Killingworth True Value. It doesn't apply to this system.

Our town assessor looked at other taxable solar installations like this one in the state, and he estimates -- I should say guesstimates -- he'd probably be mad at me for even saying this -- that the proposed system would generate over \$80,000 in taxes annually.

Second, I appreciate the Council's concern expressed this afternoon for the fact that Killingworth has a volunteer fire company, which has generously let us use this space today. The KVFC has been exemplary in the level of training that its members get. So I want to allay any concerns about their capabilities as compared to professional departments.

I'm certain that they would appreciate any special training that could be offered concerning solar arrays such as this one -- but

they're fantastic. Thank you very much.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, First Selectman lino.

Peter Stockman, I guess you're on now. Sorry about that.

PETER STOCKMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. My name is Peter Stockman. My wife

Terry Stockman is sitting there. Our address is

138 Chestnut Hill Road, probably a mile, a mile

and a half from the facility. And we have owned

our house in Killingworth since 1997.

energy and the environment. I am trained as a financial economist. We're both career management consultants. My work has been in financial analysis for energy companies and financial firms investing in, among other things, large-scale alternative production of merchant power. Terry has worked on energy economics as well as corporate credit risk management.

We need to keep in mind how very small the benefits of the CHF project are when compared to the negative environmental impact of the project. CHF estimates that the net improvement in carbon reduction for the project will be 193

tons of CO2 equivalent per year.

The average U.S. household emits approximately 8 tons of CO2 equivalent per year. This means that the impact of the CHF project is equivalent to 240 households reducing their carbon footprint by only 10 percent. The project has the same benefits as a small number of households making only small conservation efforts.

In fact, the net carbon removal benefit of 193 tons of CO2 equivalent per year is a misleading figure. The CHF project will remove a CO2 equivalent for a project life of, say, 20 to 30 years. Core forests removes carbon indefinitely.

There are too many gaps and inaccuracies in the petitioner's filing to cover in a brief a statement. The petitioner cannot even accurately state the current zoning of the property upon which it's building, although it did correct the record today at the evidentiary hearing. For this reason we will restrict our comments to consideration which is missing from the analysis of the environmental impact of the project, and that consideration that's missing from the analysis is project abandonment,

abandonment of the facility.

Number one, the petition provides no evidence that the project will be an economic success. That is it provides no evidence that the project will make money for its investors. On the contrary, the petition and the petitioner's responses to the Council's interrogatories and facts submitted by others provide evidence that the project will not make money, or at the very least CHF does not have sufficient competence to make the project a success.

I think one of the things we heard today was how cost -- how sensitive the economics of this project are to the underlying cost of the project. It is very much marginal. I think that came through loud and clear.

CHF does not know the lease payments.

These are the sources of uncertainty about its economic viability. CHF does not know the lease payments it will need to make to the landowner yet. CHF does not have a power purchase agreement in place, so it does not know how much money it will make from the sale of some merchant power it produces. It does have a contract for demand coming through the -- I think they call it the

Z-REC program, but they actually only qualify for the L-REC program.

It does a contract for demand, but that price floats. That's a competitive bid process and there's no guarantee over 15-year intervals as to what price they'll get for their power. So while it might be viewable for the first 15 years, if Z-REC tariffs go down in the 15th year or the 16th year when they need to renew, who knows what the revenue they'll be getting from power is?

CHF has underestimated the cost of building fire suppression capability on this industrial site, and that came through in the fire marshal's report. CHF does not -- sorry.

Just on the REC thing, prices for RECs have fallen 40 to 50 percent since the first year of this, the L-REC program, and they're volatile. CHF has botched the sizing of the decommissioning bond that it has taken out. CHF simply multiplies a per acre factor times 25 acres.

The standard calculation for decommissioning costs, and therefore the size of the decommissioning bond builds up the cost of decommissioning from factors and rates, i.e., salvaged value rates which actually drive

decommissioning costs, not some arbitrary, unsupported factor times the acreage of the property.

If the project is not a financial success it will be in the interests of CHF to abandon the project. We have seen, I think -- and in the evidentiary hearing today how many ongoing maintenance costs there are to a project like this. The basins have to be cleaned out. The panels need to be cleaned. It is an ongoing investment and cost into this project over time. Abandonment would mean none of those things get done.

Upon abandonment what we'd be left with is an industrial site located in a rural residential district containing toxic metals deteriorating into wetlands upstream from lakes and streams used for recreational purposes. And the contention today at the evidentiary hearing that the amount of toxic materials is minuscule relative to the mass of the panes is correct, but irrelevant. Glass is heavy. Cadmium is light. Cadmium in small quantities is extremely toxic.

So I would ask the Council to pay no attention to those assurances that it received

today on the toxicity of these panels.

We ask the Council to accept our argument the abandonment of the site will exacerbate environmental damage and the lack of economic viability will lead to abandonment. It's a novel argument. In this regard we ask the Council to take the following actions to inform a more complete evaluation of the environmental impact.

One, require CHF to provide the Council with the financial model that is used to determine the economic viability of the project so the assumptions underlying this model can be examined and stress tested.

Two, require CHF to provide the Council with financial statements and SSI, Standard Solar, to provide the Council with the financial statements with which to assess the capacity of these two nested limited liability corporations to complete the project, or to operate the project should additional construction or decommissioning costs arise.

Three, require CHF to provide a detailed decommissioning plan. The estimate contained in the petition is not supported by any facts.

Four, require CHF to provide the Council with a copy of the decommissioning bond it has posted. There are any number of ways a surety can get out from underneath a bond. Essentially it's an insurance contract and it's adjusted upon a claim.

A surety bond is simply an invitation to litigate. The Council needs to understand whether a decommissioning bond will actually result in adequate site restoration and responsible disposal of the electronics.

Finally five, require that the structure of the decommissioning bond include an annual installment funding of the full cost of decommissioning with annual updates to the cost and salvage values behind that estimate.

The bond should fully be funded in 15, by the 15th operating year so as to coincide with the repricing of the power that they get from the REC program. And then it should be topped up or released as necessary for the remaining life of the project. That will ensure that the cost of the decommissioning are covered, unlocked.

In summary, abandonment of PV facilities creates serous environmental risks. The Council

should take into account these risks as it
evaluates the environmental impact of the CHF
project and how these risks compare with a small
benefit of the project.

The Town of Killingworth should understand that an abandoned industrial site will be its problem, not the problem of the landowner and not the problem of the State of Connecticut.

I thank the Council for the opportunity to make this statement.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next speaker is Tom Paul to be followed by Matt Link.

TOM PAUL: Yeah. I just wanted to point out to the Council that on the west side, on the border between Killingworth and Madison on Route 80 was -- I was on the committee. We petitioned the Selectman and then the State, and it was approved to be a scenic highway.

And we had hoped that from the Killingworth line, you know, possibly to the circle, that would be a continuation of the scenic highway.

And then I look at the plans. I see that the panels are pretty close and low where

the dip is, pretty close to the road and probably wouldn't add to the scenic highway.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: You want to identify yourself for the record.

TOM PAUL: Yeah, it's Tom Paul.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Paul.

Matt Link to be followed by Lee J.

deLisle.

MATT LINK: Good evening, everyone. And Good evening, Siting Council. I want to second what Cathy Iino said about the due diligence that the Siting Council put in this afternoon. I was here for the three o'clock meeting that you had.

And it's obvious that you've read through all the paperwork in the report, and I appreciate the time and the questioning that you had. And on behalf of my wife and the neighbors we appreciate that work.

I live on 497, Route 80. And if anybody has driven by the site or did the walk-through today, I'm the little brown house that you can clearly see diagonally. It will be, you know, northwest of the proposed site. And my wife and I 13 years ago knew that when we moved in. We would have Route 80 going through our front yard, and

that was -- we knew that. The road had certainly been there a lot longer than we have.

But what we liked about that area is the amount of core forest that was there. We enjoyed that it was zoned as a residential area, and we enjoy having the fellowship of our neighbors in there. So we're not opposed to having neighbors or houses.

It just seems from what I've heard and living there and understanding the area, between the slope, between the wetlands, between the core forest that's there, it seems that there has to be a better area for a solar farm to be put in, in an area such as where we live here in Killingworth.

The amount of questions about the runoff and just the technicality -- and a lot it was over my head, but I can see that there's obviously concerns on just would a solar -- just because there is a parcel of land available, I don't see it necessary that a solar farm, or appropriate for a solar farm to be put in that particular parcel of land.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Lee deLisle followed by Rhonda Larson.

LEE J. deLISLE: Good Evening and thanks for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. My name is Lee deLisle. I live on 2 North Chestnut Hill Road in Killingworth. We moved to Killingworth two years ago from the town of Prospect because we really loved the rural nature of Killingworth.

I have a few observations and a few concerns that I'd like to communicate to the Council tonight. My first being the management capacity of the potential landlord which is Rajvilla. They're out of New Haven. This is a single employee concern.

They have less than \$50,000 in annual revenue, and I don't know how a one-person operation would be able to oversee the project particularly over a long period of time. So I think that's a questionable part of this project.

Secondly, the project is depicted as being consistent -- and these are words directly from the report -- being consistent with local, state and federal land-use plans. Over the past two years I've had the opportunity to act as a consultant to the DEEP to develop their five-year state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan which

was submitted to and approved by the National Park Service. So I got a really good education on all the wonderful properties that are overseen by the DEEP in the State.

And from that education I'm quite sure that clearing 16 acres, clear cut of forest and disturbing critical wetlands is not consistent with the conservation guidelines of the State, nor quite frankly, has the Town of Killingworth or a representative of the solar company been able to cite the claim that this is also consistent with the 2018 conservation and development plan of Killingworth.

I asked the question at the last meeting and neither the Town nor the solar company could -- I don't think they knew it was even in the report quite honestly.

It also concerns me that there's very little written evidence that town officials have discussed it at any length in either committees or commission meetings since it was presented to the Town last fall.

I know that Connecticut has a long and admirable history of protecting coastal and inland wetlands. If the Siting Council does consider

this, approving this project I hope that they would restrict the panels that are in the south and west portion of the property -- I'm sure you've looked at the maps enough times -- where they're proposing to put bridges across wetlands to perhaps have another two or three dozen panels. That from any perspective doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

They would also have to -- some sort of travel path to go over these, what were described as very small bridges to bring fire suppressing vehicles into that sensitive wetland area.

Again, if the Council decides to go forward I would also suggest -- strongly suggest that the number of panels on the north side of the project which runs along Route 80 be reduced considerably to eliminate the destruction of the natural vistas on this portion of the roadway so that it's more consistent with the characterization of the 500 plus acres of Hammonasset Reservoir to the west and Chatfield Hollow State Park to the east.

It is a beautiful stretch of roadway.

It is a scenic. It really helps to define what

Hammonasset is, or what Killingworth is.

I also point out if tolls arrive for all vehicles in the State of Connecticut on 95, there's certainly going to be a lot more traffic on Route 80 that runs parallel to 95. And again, so we've got other threats coming to our pristine natural setting.

So in conclusion, to have this clear-cut industrial site line between these two pristine properties I think would be a grave error in judgment, and an action that would be contradictory to the character of our town.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Rhonda Larson to be followed by Janine Stoner.

RHONDA LARSON: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Rhonda Larson and I live at 2 North Chestnut Hill Road with my husband Lee. I'm not used to speaking without a flute in my hands because I am privileged that that is my profession, as a professional flute player. So nature is an integral part of my daily life and that's where I'm coming from here.

I'm a big fan of solar energy and all sustainable energy interventions. It shows an attention to our present need for it and it

inspires a hope for a cleaner sustainable future.

My problem with the current proposal is strictly

about the location, the effect it will surely have

on what I consider Killingworth's highest asset,

the surrounding natural world.

The location for this project is sandwiched in between Chatfield Hollow and Hammonasset Reservoir. Since the property is zoned for residential this indicates the property might be able to sustain one house without disrupting an ecosystem, but this out-of-state company got a deal from a landowner where they can lease it far cheaper than any commercially zoned place, and they have no interest in where it is located or what it will disrupt as long as the price is right.

And isn't it interesting to you -- it's interesting to me that it's a limited liability company on top of it. Further, this company has no prior knowledge or ties to Killingworth, or what it's special values are, nor will this matter to them because they will never be part of the community. And for them nature is something that is currently in their way here and will be greedily disposed of.

Does anyone realize what clear cutting

16 acres of woodland wetlands will do. It will do

just what it's designed to do, let in full hot

sun, thereby drying up everything around it that

sustains this ecosystem of plants and animals.

And let's not pretend that you have a grass -- that you can have a grass road that will be used to transport every panel without affecting or disrupting the vernal pools, and eventually the lower wetlands.

What is sustainable energy if it makes an ecosystem disappear, especially when there are so many places around here where these panels could go and not destroy an ecosystem? To me it is an important crossroads for Killingworth to decide something -- and the State, whether its pristine land is worth destroying in the name of some modest amount of money gained, or whether Killingworth values the uniqueness it contains which cannot be bought or sold.

The pristine natural world that endows us here every day, the woods, air, water, wildlife, silence, and beauty to the soul of all of us, Killingworth should fight to keep this.

Since we've all become aware that fossil

fuels are destroying the natural world around us, including ourselves, solar energy is no more an asset if it's first and lasting act is to destroy a pristine ecosystem.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Janine Stoner followed by Tom Hagerty.

JANINE STONER: Hi. I'm Janine Stoner.

My husband Art and I live right next door, the

abutting property. I'll be brief. The only thing

I really want to say is our biggest concern is

changing the residential zoning to a commercial

zone to have a commercial business in that area.

It doesn't make any sense to us, and our concern is also for the long-term effect of that. Once you've allowed that to happen you've now set a precedent. And we would worry that that would continue to be a commercially zoned area. And right now it should be left as it is, residential, which is why we all live there, and we would just like to make that known.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Tom Hagerty to be followed by Ben Stillman.

THOMAS HAGERTY: Good evening. Chairman

Murphy, thank you for coming out all this way to Killingworth today to hear everyone's comments. We really appreciate the effort.

I'd like to say straight up, right in front I am a huge renewable energy fan, whether it be wind or solar or whatever. I would like to simply echo the points made by First Selectwoman Iino, provided that the factors that she stated are in fact listened to and adhered to. I think that solar is clean, it's safe and it's quiet.

My sense is that I happen to be overwhelmingly in favor of this project, and my sense is that while you may hear a lot of negative comments tonight in opposition to the project, I think that's just simply the nature of this type of hearing. That's what -- that's what you hear. That's what comes out.

You may not hear many positive comments, but from the conversations I've had with friends and residents around town I think there's a tremendous support for this project. You may just not hear about it tonight.

And again, I think that's just the nature of the beast. Thanks for your time.

A VOICE: Can you indicate where you

1 live?

THOMAS HAGERTY: Twenty-five Madison
Hollow.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Bill Stamm.

WILLIAM STAMM: I'd like to thank you guys for coming down way out here to Killingworth, which is kind of the point of this. A lot of people have made some good technical points already, so I won't reiterate them.

I will say a lot of us have been thrown into this type of understanding of legal documents, petitions. The petition and its inaccuracies are overwhelming. It's really -- I could go on for about an hour about it. The commercial zone affidavit you received from the lawyer was extremely disturbing to say the least.

So with that in mind I'm going to speak on behalf of -- I do not live on Chestnut Hill. I live on Alders Bridge, miles away, but it could be my yard.

So I drove down Chestnut Hill the other day and they have a beautiful view out in the back yard that will be gone. Just because they can't see a panel per se -- and I don't even know that they will be able to see the panels or not -- the

vista will be gone. You're ripping out,

destroying, gutting 16 acres of our town. We are
in the woods because that's where we want to be.

So I think you need to remember that we have these
resources for us first.

And I hate to say this, but I know Cathy Iino wrote a letter which she said it was on her behalf only -- on Killingworth Town letterhead as a Selectwoman. She does not represent most of the people -- I'm sorry -- that I talked to in this town that do not want this, but do want solar and renewable energy somewhere else in a more suitable area.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next speaker comes from the second list and it's Chris Little.

And while Chris Little is coming up, a reminder. If you want to be heard this evening you have to sign up on the sign-up sheet. There are more sheets over there. I'm sorry for the interruption, but go ahead. He will be followed by Alyson Somerville.

CHRISTOPHER LITTLE: I am one of the neighbors that live across the street and looks

out my window every day to these woods. I'm not going to waste everybody's time. They've said already what I have to say.

I just think it's -- it could be so put somewhere else. There's so much more property in the Town of Killingworth. Killingworth owns hundreds of acres, plenty of places where it could be put. Around schools, behind schools, wooded areas near schools that aren't part of vernal pools that feed into our town beach, which this does.

The other thing I'm afraid of is abandonment like everybody else talked about. Abandonment is the biggest thing. It's not a viable place. They're not going to make money off of it, and if it gets abandoned it's a huger eyesore for us, the neighbors. And if you'll find people are for it they don't live around it. Keep that in mind.

Thank you.

ALYSON SOMERVILLE: Hi, and thank you for coming. My name is Alyson Somerville and I live at 44 Chestnut Hill Road. And I have a very, very large parcel of land that's very close to this proposed site. There's only one piece of

property between me and the site and I back up to Mrs. Stoner's property there.

I've lived there my entire life. My brother co-owns it with me. He lives in Montana and I'm also speaking on Alfred's behalf tonight, Alfred Somerville also.

This is more emotional than anything. I do not want to see those beautiful pristine woods destroyed. And it will have an environmental effect on my property as well, so that's basically all I really want to say.

I'm, you know, I'm just very emotionally attached to that land and I don't want to see the environment of it destroyed, the wetlands and everything. I have wetlands on my property that might be affected by this.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Next is Maryanne Little to be followed by Linda Anderson.

MARYANNE LITTLE: Hi. Good evening.

Thank you for all -- the Chairman of the

Connecticut Siting Council -- for coming, to

listen to what we have to say today.

I too will not be repetitive in what already residents have said. I, my husband Chris

Little and I live across the street. We have a working farm. I have a child.

I will tell you that I would be putting up probably some cameras of any sort to record the noise levels and any other destructive levels that would come into cause -- for me and/or my daughter to become injured while working with our horses, or any other negative effects that we put on our farm such as water pollution, damage to our wells, damage to our cement foundation and anything else.

I was a biology major. My heart is in forestry and I appreciate everything that nature has to offer. I agree that I am not against a solar farm, however that area is not, in my opinion, an area where a solar farm should take place.

There are ecosystems that have developed over there that took hundreds of years. There are certain types of soils, plants, algae, microbials that we, to the naked eye cannot see. And I feel that putting solar panels and everything else up -- and again, all the inconsistencies that are going on with the answers from the Chatfield Solar Fund is very concerning to me at this point in the game. And the fact that they have a vested

interest in this -- if it does succeed I will try 1 2 to find a way to appeal it. Thank you. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: 3 Thank you. Linda Anderson followed by Jessie 4 5 Larsen. LINDA ANDERSON: Hi. I'm Linda 6 Anderson. I live on Chestnut Hill and I agree 7 with what's been said about the beauty, the 8 9 decommissioning, all the prior comments. The only comment that I feel wasn't 10 addressed is I have a concern. When I come out of 11 Chestnut Hill onto Route 80 it's hard to see 12 traffic coming, heading eastward. 13 Now where this is being built, it's a 14 little bit further down on Route 80. And if I'm 15 at the crest or the top of the hill and coming out 16 17 of Chestnut Hill and have poor vision, the person 18 coming over the hill will also have poor vision of an exit or entrance road on Route 80. 19 20 I just think it's very poorly designed 21 for the ecosystem, for the transportation and the destruction of the beautiful land is unbearable. 22 23 Thank you. THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 24 I think the last one is 25 Jessie Larsen.

Alec -- I'm not sure -- last name is Martin.

JESSIE LARSEN: Hi. I'm Jessie Larsen.

I don't have anything really prepared as everybody else does, but they reiterate all my feelings. I don't live in the area, but I do live in

Killingworth and I came here because of the beauty of the forest and the trees, and the hiking and whatnot. And my biggest concern, even though I am for solar is location.

You know, you're putting this in a residential area with a scenic highway and beautiful vistas and the environment, and that's all going to be taken away by this small little output of the solar farm. And I think that abandonment is a big issue. The inconsistencies that the company, when I tried to look up to see what their assets were, you know, I can't find anything that gives me any type of, you know, confidence that this is going to be taken care of should something go wrong.

We've had storms that cause all kinds of damage with trees falling down. In a year you know those solar panels could be damaged. Are they going to say, well, the cost is now too much for me to repair it, and just let it go after one

year? How does that risk cost benefit, you know, help in this situation?

So when I look at a situation I look, does the benefit outweigh the risk? And in this case I truly, with everything said tonight, don't believe that it does. So I'm totally against it.

Like I said, where it's located is the issue. It's not so much that it's a solar farm. I've seen solar farms work, you know, in North Carolina with big open fields and, you know, true farmland. And they can be very, very helpful to us. So I would just put that in your thoughts.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Alec Martin.

ALEC MARTIN: Hi. My name is Alec Martin. Now I live on 81, so I'm way away from where this is actually taking place. To the commission, thank you.

The big question in this is, if? And right now in America we are calling for renewable energy. There is a vast need for renewable energy. I am for solar energy and I know everybody has their specific why not, but I think if anything of all these why-nots, certainly they have to be addressed.

But I think at least talk of 1 2 decommissioning, abandonment and I think all of these things can be held in bonds contracts, I 3 mean really severe contracts that state 4 specifically what takes place. And they -- there 5 should be bonds on this held by the Town. 6 The company that is going to be doing 7 this, their feet should be held to the fire if 8 again -- the big if, if the siting committee says 9 this is what we should do, and the Town doesn't 10 have a real say in this. 11 12 I think the gist of the whole thing should be handled in really, really severe 13 contracts holding this company, their feet to the 14 15 fire, really holding their feet to the fire. Thank you. 16 17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're now on the last list that we have 18 so far. Don Venett. 19 20 DON VENUTI: There's an "I" on the end 21 of that, Venuti, V-e-n-u-t-i. 22 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Well, there's a dot, 23 but no -- my apologies. In any event, Mr. Venuti, 24 be our guest. 25 DONALD VENUTI: Don Venuti, 126 Burr

Hill Road, Killingworth, Connecticut. I'm one of the largest landowners in this town, me and my brothers. I've built several of these solar fields, quite a bit larger than this project. And I've looked at the plans. I could build this with my eyes closed.

Now I'm a hundred percent in favor of this thing. I know there's a lot of tension with the neighbors that are surrounding it and, you know, all that stuff goes around. But what I would like to say is I'm kind of in this spot myself.

But a few years -- well, it was probably 10 years ago I had a piece of land in Madison, 13 acres. And I wanted to dig a little pond, take the gravel out and build a house. I had a bigger squad than this come down and shut me down. Can't do this. Can't do that. Boom, Boom, Boom. So, you know, whatever.

So I went back to the drawing board and in about three months I went in for affordable housing, and I got ten houses on the 13 acres.

All those people came down. The zoning board got up there right in front of everybody. He goes I cannot deny this. They meet every requirement

that there is. So they would have been better off with the pond and one house instead of ten houses on the 13 acres. But what I'm saying is --

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: You're one of the few people that understood affordable housing really doesn't mean it either.

DON VENUTI: Right. But what I'm trying to say is this person owns the land. And they're all hating the idea they're going to clear cut the 23 acres, this and that. So down the road if this gets denied, this person could still -- you cannot deny a person the right to his land. So he could still do something that they have no say over and still cut them 23 acres of trees.

So what you've got to look at is, what is the best thing for the property? You know, I was in a meeting the other night and their answer was, we're going to fight them then. So whatever this guy does they're still going to fight him, but I'm saying you cannot deny the man the use of his land. That's the most important thing.

But I'm a hundred percent in favor of this project.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
Mr. Venuti. George Brencher. And Megon Dudley

after Mr. Brencher.

GEORGE BRENCHER: Good evening. My name is George Brencher. I live at 17 Chestnut Hill Road. We've lived there for more than 20 years. We're on the west side of the road so we can't see this eyesore, but obviously I oppose the proposal.

I agree with Mr. Venuti. People can do what they want with their property within zoning, within environmental, and that's the world we live in. We don't just get to do anything we want with our property.

I know the Council has a large factual record before it, and I want to bring some big picture context that may not be apparent from the details of the record. Killingworth is not a highly affluent community like New Canaan or other towns in Fairfield County for example. It's a small rural town of typical means, yet despite that it has some of the strictest zoning and wetlands rules in the state.

We have these rules because we made a choice to preserve the rural character of our community and to protect our environment, especially our groundwater and wetlands. In short there's a reason that Killingworth looks different

from many of our neighboring towns. It's because people here have sacrificed for decades to preserve and protect what we have here.

This project flies right in the face of all that. We all discussed how this is in a residential zone. It's two miles from Killingworth's extremely compact commercial zone. It's right between the state scenic road that sees every use all year round. Hikers, cyclists, horseback riders. It's on lists of where you should go to do these things. People come from all over the state.

It's right next to a very popular state park. I went down there and leafletted for 20 minutes last Saturday. I met 50 people. Not one of them was from Killingworth. This area is used by residents from all over the region. Obviously there's issues with the drainage down into Deer Lake and Hammonasset River. There's issues with the vernal pools and wetlands.

This area has an environmental benefit to communities in Killingworth and outside Killingworth because of its scenic beauty and because of its positive impact on species diversity and water quality.

The DEEP did a great report tearing apart these guys' petition. I'm sure you guys have been all over it. I don't need to reiterate for you the value of core forests. It's a top DEEP priority. We're now going to deforest 25 acres along the edge of it. That makes no sense.

All right. They're going to cut within a few feet of vernal pools and wetlands. You can't do that in this town. Why should they be able to do that? They're going to destroy habitat right next to an NDDB area that they have admitted contains habitats that's suitable for these various different NDDB species.

The fact that they weren't able to find a green orchid or a whippoorwill in late November in Killingworth, not a real shocker. Okay? How about they do it in the spring. I guarantee they will find one.

I've been listening to whippoorwills in that neighborhood for the 20 years that I've been there. When my wife moved into our house right before our wedding in June, we had one in our yard. Nobody could sleep in the house with all these guests -- because we got married in our

yard. We had a whippoorwill right there. There's not going to be any whippoorwills after they clear cut. Okay? It's going to drive the vernal pools out. It's going to change the habitat.

The benefit to the Town is going to be negligible. If it's \$80,000, which I highly doubt because three days ago nobody could give us an estimate. You know, if I want to build an apartment building on my house and give you a couple hundred thousand dollars, I don't think you'd take it. So why are you going to take \$80,000 to do this?

Once they cut this forest down, I don't care if they abandon it and they have a bond, you're not going to grow the forest back. It's done. The damage is done. If you approve this project you might as well approve any project that comes before you. Don't waste people's time with the hearing. Put it on Guilford Green. I mean, this is ridiculous. It's hard. I know you have to go through a process, but it's absurd. In sum please reject the proposal.

MEGON DUDLEY: So my name is Megon

Dudley. I am a resident of Chestnut Hill. And I

have to be honest, I did not plan on meeting my

neighbors until I was exploiting all of you by peddling Girl Scout cookies in a couple of years. So this has been very nice.

One of the things that I think I'm just compelled to say is having moved onto Chestnut Hill two days before Sandy when we closed on our house, we were without power for a couple of weeks. The ice storm last year, we were without power for a week and a half. So everyone on Chestnut Hill pretty much has generators. That's the way it goes.

But one of the things that happened during last year's ice storm is trees took down the transformers, and it lit a fire at the top of Chestnut Hill in Madison that scorched the entire road. Firetrucks couldn't get down there because too many trees came down. That is a regular occurrence with every ice storm, every huge thunderstorm that happens on Chestnut Hill.

God forbid in the future there is another significant storm that takes out access to this farm's Route 80. How are they going to access the solar farm to put out fires, fire prevention? What happens if that fire spreads to the houses on Chestnut Hill, the remaining forest

that exists?

When firetrucks can't get to it it's going to take it all out. So without an alternate access road to this that's not Chestnut Hill you're not going to be able to go through River Road. How is it going to happen?

And just another thing. You know, to pretend that this wasn't already in the works or this is all happenstance, Eversource has been doing a lot of tree work on Green Hill Road and they're staging heavy equipment at the substation on Green Hill and putting in materials to move this forward. So I -- I think I'm just a little concerned that decisions are made without the appropriate consultation maybe of the folks that have to live with it literally in their backyard.

And again, thank you for the opportunity -- everyone said, thank you for coming down. Thank you for coming down. Thank you for letting me say what I had to say. Thank you all for the Girl Scout cookies you will be buying in a couple of years. I appreciate it. Thanks.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: That is the last person who has signed up to speak. Is there anyone else who wishes to express their concerns

or what have you? Yes. Go ahead.

Would you give me your name?

SCOTT ROWLAND: No problem. My name is Scott Rowland. I live at 55 Chestnut Hill. I'm not in support of it. I think all the residents did a great job voicing their opinion. I don't need to repeat it.

However, I think it's important that I voice something that I've talked with my kids about in my household. Living on Chestnut Hill you see the signs now, no solar farm.

My eight-year-old daughter. What's going on, Daddy?

We explain what's going on, cutting down forests near the wetlands. Renewable energy is great though, honey. She went up on her laptop the other night and wrote a whole letter of why they shouldn't occur. And I'm not going to read the whole letter.

Kathy -- I think my wife sent it to you.

But I want to read one paragraph that's very tough

for me to explain to my daughter, so take this

into consideration. And this is her words.

Another reason that you need -- another reason that this is not a good idea is that you

need to cut down trees, and some animals need trees like birds. Also, you need to clear lakes off, but also animals need water to live.

For example, they will be threatening their habitat and destroying it -- she bolds it.

So the poor animals will have no water, no habitat. Imagine if that was you. How would you feel if that was your water and your habitat. She ends her letter, PS, I gave my reasons. By the way I'm only eight years old. Please no solar farm.

I thought it was important for you to hear a perspective from a child living on Chestnut Hill who's going to see forests taken down near the wetlands for renewable energy. It sounds like an oxymoron to me. So maybe if you approve this you can help me try to explain that to my daughter.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Do we have anyone else? Yes.

ROBERT YOUNG: Hello. My name is Bob
Young. I live on Champlin Road, which is off of
Chestnut Hill and my house is at the very end
which is between Foster's Pond and Deer Lake.

Last I knew, water runs downhill. So

all that runoff from this 16 or 25 acres, however much is cleared, will end up whether it's prior to abandonment or 10, 20 years after abandonment. This water will run off into Foster's Pond. It will eventually run off into Deer lake where there's a Boy Scout camp there. There's summer camps there. Kids swim in that water. I think this is a big mistake.

Furthermore, beyond Deer Lake -- I'm not positive, but I believe that water eventually runs down into River Road and further on down into Green Hill. So there's a number -- it's not just the Chestnut Hill, the Champlin Hill properties that are affected, not that end of town. I think there's going to be an impact on the other side of town, down near Green Hill Road. So I would like you to please take that into consideration.

Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I'll ask again. Is there anyone else?
Yeah.

FREDERICK BOVA: Hi. My name is Fred Bova. I live on 3 North Chestnut Hill Road. I just moved here October. I find this like heaven on earth. I love this area and coming here and

seeing all my neighbors -- is pulling me away, because I see so much concern. I was here this afternoon and I watched. I sat right there and I watched you actually ask all the questions. And I was amazed, because you actually did your homework. I was expecting just something to get tossed off, but a lot of things came up this afternoon.

One thing that came up was, as far as fire retardant, if there's a problem and there's a fire if they're not allowed to have water in the area, a certain amount of water you have to use foam. But then someone said, but in order to use foam you have to have water to activate the foam.

There's just so many things that when you ask these people who are supposed to be in charge of this product they didn't have a clue. They had no answers at all. It would be like, we're going to get back to you. We're working on that. They're not working on it. They're just not going to do any of that homework unless you force them to do the homework.

You asked some fantastic questions and you put their feet to the fire on some very important issues, and I thank you for that. I

really do.

And I hope that, you know, they do their homework and realize that the things that they would have to do to actually do this safely, they're not going to have a net gain. They're not going to get money out of this in the long run. And you know what? That's what it's really all about for them. It's all about money.

And as far as damage to the solar panels and in case of a fire, solar panels do have cadmium. Cadmium is a very, very dangerous element. You need a very small amount of that in your water, in your environment to create a huge problem. When you have 25 acres of that inside those panels with a big storm and damage, we're asking for a lot of trouble.

With that, I want to thank you again for everybody here for showing up. I love the fact that these are my neighbors now, and I thank you so much again because I came today, and I was actually renewed to the fact that people do their homework. And you really put in a phenomenal amount of time I can tell, because the questions that you put to them were very, very valid.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

(No response.)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: If not, then we're going to close this public session of the Siting Council on this particular petition, and close this meeting.

And before doing so I'd like to announce that the evidentiary hearing which started this afternoon will be continued and heard in New Britain on Tuesday, March the 26th at 1 p.m.

Please note, as I have mentioned before, that anyone who has not become a party or intervener, but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council and were not able to do so tonight may file written statements with the Council until the public record closes which will be, like, 30 days after the hearing in March.

Copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed at both the Killingworth and Madison Town Clerk's office. I hereby declare this meeting adjourned. I thank you for your participation and I really thank you tonight.

For seeing such a large crowd I really have to compliment you on not the number of people who didn't come forward and say the same thing that we heard over and over again. And it's really appreciated because we go to a lot of places and we've had some great experiences, but we enjoy doing it. In any event, drive home carefully and have a good night. Thank you. (Whereupon, the above proceedings were concluded at 7:40 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I hereby certify that the foregoing 54 3 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken 4 of the Public Hearing in Re: Petition No. 1354, PETITION FROM CHATFIELD SOLAR FUND, LLC, FOR A DECLARATORY RULING FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, 5 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A 1.98-MEGAWATT AC 6 SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITY ON APPROXIMATELY 25 ACRES LOCATED GENERALLY SOUTH OF 7 ROUTE 80 (NORTH BRANFORD ROAD) AND EAST OF CHESTNUT HILL ROAD IN KILLINGWORTH, CONNECTICUT, 8 AND ASSOCIATED ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTION TO EVERSOURCE ENERGY'S GREEN HILL SUBSTATION LOCATED 9 AT 775 GREEN HILL ROAD, MADISON, CONNECTICUT, which was held before JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., THE VICE CHAIRMAN, at the Killingworth Fire Station, 10 Meeting Room, Number 333, Route 81, Killingworth, 11 Connecticut, Thursday, February 21, 2019. 12 13 14 15 Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857 Notary Public 16 BCT Reporting Service 55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A 17 Plainville, CT 06062 My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25