In The Matter Of:

Application of DWW Solar II, LLC for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibili

Public Comment Hearing September 12, 2017

BCT Reporting LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, CT 06010
860.302.1876

Original File 17-09-12 - Part 04.txt

Min-U-Script®

1	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
3	
4	Docket No. 1313
5	Application of DWW Solar II, LLC for a
6	declaratory ruling that no Certificate of
7	Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is
8	required for the proposed construction,
9	maintenance and operation of a 26.4 megawatt AC
10	solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on
11	approximately 289 acres comprised of 5 separate
12	and abutting privately-owned parcels located
13	generally west of Hopmeadow Street, north and
14	south of Hoskins Road, and north and east of
15	County Road, and associated electrical
16	interconnection to Eversource Energy's North
17	Simsbury Substation west of Hopmeadow Street in
18	Simsbury, Connecticut.
19	
20	Public Comment Hearing held at Eno Memorial
21	Hall Auditorium, 754 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury,
22	Connecticut on September 12, 2017, beginning at
23	6:30 p.m.
24	Held Before:
25	ROBERT STEIN, Chairman

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,
4	Vice Chairman
5	MICHAEL HARDER
6	ROBERT HANNON
7	LARRY P. LEVESQUE, ESQ.
8	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
9	ROBERT SILVESTRI
LO	Council Staff:
L1	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.
L2	Executive Director and
L3	Staff Attorney
L 4	
L5	ROBERT MERCIER
L6	Siting Analyst
L7	
L8	For the Applicant:
L9	PULLMAN & COMLEY, LLC
20	90 State House Square
21	Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3702
22	BY: LEE D. HOFFMAN, ESQ.
23	
24	Also present: AILEEN KENNEY, Deepwater Wind, LLC
25	

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies
and gentlemen. I don't know how good the
acoustics are here. I assume they're great
because I see people sitting in the back. I'm
assuming you can hear everything. If not, there

are seats in the front. It's your choice.

So I'd like to call to order the public hearing, today, Tuesday, September 12, 2017, at approximately 6:30. My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council present are Senator Murphy, our vice chairman. Mr. Hannon, our designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. Mr. Levesque, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority.

Members of the staff present are

Attorney Melanie Bachman, our executive director,

Mr. Mercier, our siting analyst, and Ms. Fontaine,

our fiscal administrative officer.

Mr. Harder, Mr. Lynch, and Mr. Silvestri.

This is a continuation of a hearing that began at 3 p.m. this afternoon. Copies of the hearing program and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures are available for members of the public in the back there.

This hearing is held pursuant to the 1 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General 2 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative 3 Procedure Act upon a petition from DWW Solar II, 4 LLC for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate 5 of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is 6 7 required for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 26.4 megawatt AC 8 9 solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on 10 approximately 289 acres comprised of five separate and abutting privately-owned parcels located 11 12 generally west of Hopmeadow Street, north and 13 south of Hoskins Road, and north and east of County Road, and associated electrical 14 15 interconnections to Eversource Energy's North 16 Simsbury Substation west of Hopmeadow Street in 17 Simsbury, Connecticut. This petition was received 18 by the Council on June 29, 2017.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this hearing was published in the Hartford Courant on July 28, 2017. Upon this Council's request, the petitioner erected signs at conspicuous locations around the properties where the proposed facility is to be located so as to inform the public of the name of the petitioner,

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the type of facility, the hearing date and
location, and contact information for the Council.

This afternoon members of the Council, staff and the public personally conducted a field review of the proposed site in order to observe firsthand the potential effects of the proposal.

reserved first for the public to make short statements into the record. These public statements are not subject to questions from the parties or the Council, and members of the public making statements may not ask questions of the parties or the Council. These statements will become part of the record for Council consideration. A sign-up sheet is available for those who would like to participate. It's in the back. And we would prefer that you limit your comments to three minutes to give everybody a chance.

As a reminder to all, off the record communication with a member 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 the parties and intervenors, including their representatives and

witnesses, are not allowed to participate in this public comment session.

I also wish to note for whose who are here, and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who may be unable to join us, that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing.

We ask each person making a public statement 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 the concerns you or your neighbors may have. Again, please be advised that the Council cannot answer questions from the public about the proposal. We're here to listen.

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the Simsbury/Granby Town Clerk's Offices for the convenience of the public.

Before I call upon members of the public to make statements, I request the petitioner to make a brief presentation to describe the facility.

AILEEN KENNEY: Thank you, Chairman

Stein. My name is Aileen Kenney, and I am vice

president of permitting and environmental affairs

at Deepwater Wind.

The project we have proposed that we're going to discuss tonight is called the Tobacco Valley Solar Project. It's located generally west of Hopmeadow Street here in Simsbury. The project is 26.4 megawatts in size. That's enough power for 5,000 homes. It's located on five different parcels. Two of the parcels are zoned industrial, and three are zoned residential.

So to orient you, if you're along
Hoskins Road at the V with County Road, there's
one parcel located south of Hoskins Road, another
north of Hoskins Road, and then a second cluster
of panels that are located north of Litchfield
Drive, Berkshire Way, west of Knollwood Circle,
and east of Munnisunk Drive.

So this project is crossed by the

Eversource 115-kilovolt transmission line, and it
will connect into the electric grid at the
existing North Simsbury Substation, which is
located at Dorset Crossing, at Dorset Crossing and
Casterbridge Crossing Development.

This blue area on the map are the solar panels. All five parcels are 289 acres. We're proposing project facilities on 156 acres, and the remaining 133 acres will remain open space or forested. The panels will be approximately 10 feet high, and all of the project cable will be buried.

So in terms of access points, we're proposing for construction to have access off of Hoskins Road and via the existing agricultural access point that goes behind Litchfield Drive.

And during operations we would use the same access point on Litchfield Drive, as well as the existing access point off of Hoskins Road.

There are two barns on Hoskins Road that we have proposed to keep. Those have been -- based off feedback from the town, we have proposed to keep both of those barns.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Now we'll start with the First Selectwoman, Lisa Heavner.

LISA HEAVNER: Good evening, everyone.

Welcome to the Siting Council, members of the

public. My name is Lisa Heavner. I'm the first

selectwoman of the Town of Simsbury. We are very pleased to have you visit our quaint town.

For members of the public who are not familiar with this type of proceeding, my formal statement on behalf of the town is in the record as prefiled testimony, which I will present as part of the town's presentation later. But there are copies in the back, if you would like to see that.

Simsbury has been recognized as a CNN/Money Magazine "Top 10 Best Place to Live in America." This honor is not accidental. It is not a matter of luck. Simsbury's recognition as one of the best places to live in the country is the direct result of our intentional planning and our commitment to developing a high quality of life for our residents and our careful stewardship of Simsbury's natural resources.

Simsbury's quality of life is now rightfully in your hands. And as you deliberate, we ask that you do your utmost to preserve those characteristics that make Simsbury the wonderful community that it is. As you drove in, you had the opportunity to see our charming and historic town steeped in history. We are the birthplace of

- 1 Gifford Pinchot. Dr. Martin Luther King spent two
- 2 summers here working in the tobacco fields in the
- 3 very area where the solar project is proposed.
- 4 What you might not have seen on entering the town
- 5 are the many open spaces preserved in farms. A
- 6 third of our land is preserved as open space. We
- 7 take great pride and stewardship of our natural
- 8 resources for generations to come.
- 9 We are committed environmentalists. It
- 10 is not without irony that we note we tried to get
- 11 Community Solar on 16 acres at a closed landfill
- 12 in this town, an ideal site for solar, but that
- 13 project was not favorably reviewed by the
- 14 Department of Energy and Environmental Protection.
- 15 This town is not against solar by any means.
- 16 While we support renewable energy, our
- 17 quality of life, the result of intentional
- 18 planning and years of hard work by countless
- 19 volunteers, is in jeopardy, and we cannot support
- 20 this project as presented. We are deeply
- 21 concerned about environmental and safety issues
- 22 that have not been properly addressed. We are
- 23 particularly concerned about the parcel located on
- 24 the southern side of Hoskins and urge its
- 25 elimination from the project. We are counting on

the Council to do whatever is necessary to preserve those things that make Simsbury a wonderful place, to protect our residents, and to ensure a safe environment, even if that means rejecting the project. If environmental safety, historic preservation and aesthetic issues can be addressed and the Siting Council moves forward with this project, Simsbury remains willing to work with Deepwater Wind to fashion a project that preserves the town's character, counts the concerns of our residents, and leaves the town in

a better place at the project's conclusion.

- I first of all want to thank all of you for your public service. We know that what you do is a hard job, and we are grateful to you for your willingness to serve. And we thank you for your hard consideration of the many difficult issues faced in this case. Thank you.
- THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next,
 Representative John Hampton.

- JOHN HAMPTON: Good evening,
 distinguished members of the Siting Council. And
 welcome to Simsbury. For the record, my name is
 John Hampton, 9 Knoll Lane, Weatogue, Connecticut.
- 25 I'm state representative for the 16th District,

the Town of Simsbury in its entirety. Thank you
for the opportunity to provide this testimony,
which I believe you have a record of, and for
holding this hearing today.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

After extensive review of the Deepwater Wind Solar II, LLC Petition No. 1313 submitted to the State Siting Council for a declaratory ruling, I am asking that the application be denied. believe that the motion for a declaratory ruling should be denied on the grounds that the petition does not meet the procedural requirements of 16-50(a) of the general statutes, as amended by Public Act 17-218. As a state legislator, this is a law I voted in support of which was signed into law by the Governor with the effective date of July 1, 2017. Because Public Act 17-218 was passed, I believe -- excuse me -- because it was passed with the support of legislative, executive and administrative agencies and many municipalities, I believe the company and the Siting Council should honor the intent of this law as it represents a clearly stated public policy towards sustainable solar energy while still being able to preserve open space and farmland. in agreement with the Department of Agriculture

and the Town of Simsbury that DWW be required to
file and obtain a Certificate of Environmental
Compatibility and Public Need. The effective date
of the legislation was July 21, 2017, and all
decisions made by the Siting Council after this
date.

Given the size and scope of the project, which should be one of the largest of its kind in the region, the equivalent of approximately 220 football fields, I believe the impact to the farmland, historic value, neighboring residential property and the nearby school would be substantial. These factors should weigh strongly against a favorable ruling. Once we start going down that road of developing what little farmland our state has left, there's no going back. Going forward, we must make sure that all residents' concerns and questions about the project's agricultural, environmental, historical and quality of life impacts are answered and addressed.

In closing, Simsbury has long been a champion of promoting the rural nature of our community and preserving open space, farmland, forests and sustainable clean energy through our

- 1 100 percent Connecticut policy. Because of these
 2 efforts, groups like the Simsbury Land Trust and
 3 the Save the Woods Community Group, nearly 30
 4 percent of our land has been protected as open
 5 space.
 - I truly believe that we can continue towards sustainable solar energy while still being able to preserve open space and farmland. These are two environmental interests that do not need to compete against each other, and I strongly encourage that any and all alternatives be considered that don't involve building on our precious farmland.
- Thank you so much for your consideration.
- 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
 - One thing I forgot. When you come up, could you please spell your last name so we can make sure -- we've got you. We know your last name. We can check on that. But for the public.
- 21 And I also apologize in advance if I
 22 mispronounce your name.
- William Estell.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

24 WILLIAM ESTELL: Good evening. My name 25 is William Estell. I live at 11 Laurel Lane. Last name is E-S-T-E-L-L.

years. And I must admit that for most of that time I've been a critic of the land use and the regulatory boards of our town for their lack of foresight and willingness to develop and promote economic diversity in our town, with the strange exception of the preoccupation the town now has for multi-tenant development. So I find it really ironic that when an opportunity to come with a dynamic, creative environmentally friendly development process is presented to the town, the town again works against it.

I personally am in favor and hope that you as the Siting Council approve this petition by Deepwater to develop the solar field. It's a temporary project, 20 years. It will return to farmland in 20 years. It will dramatically improve the property value of the land that it is on. It will dramatically improve the grandness for our town and reduce your tax burden, something that we are beginning to feel now.

And finally, based on the proposals from Deepwater, I disagree with the aesthetic impact to the town. The fencing, the set aside

- 1 from the roadways, the fact that they are 10 feet
- 2 high, and the fencing covers most of that
- 3 viewpoint, there is very little aesthetic impact
- 4 to the town.
- 5 So, once again, I hope you find in
- 6 favor of the proposal. Thank you.
- 7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- 8 April Pozzato.
- 9 APRIL POZZATO: First, I would like to
- 10 thank the Connecticut Siting Council for coming to
- 11 Simsbury and giving us this opportunity to speak
- 12 with you about how we feel about the proposed
- 13 Deepwater Wind industrial size solar plant
- 14 invading our town.
- 15 My name is April Pozzato,
- 16 P-O-Z-Z-A-T-O. I live at 16 County Road with my
- 17 husband, Joe. Our son Joe Pozzato, the third,
- 18 lives at 14 County Road; and our son, John, lives
- 19 at 20 County Road. We're all abutters to the
- 20 proposed solar fields, and will be greatly and
- 21 negatively impacted by their placement on County
- 22 Road.
- 23 My husband and his family came to
- 24 Simsbury in 1949, and like many other Simsbury
- 25 residents, we were attracted to this town by the

acres and acres of farmland, open spaces and
quaint and historic neighborhoods. I came to
Simsbury in 1980, and we bought our home on County
Road in 1987. I was very happy we moved there
because we were always surrounded by the farmland
that is now slated to be a solar farm.

The town, like any other town, has grown over the years, and farmland has been converted time and time again to development. I believe our town has tried through the years to maintain our rural character and appeal by developing regulations to avoid the misuse of land and the destruction of our neighborhoods.

This Deepwater Solar Project, if it is allowed to come, avoids and overrides all the safeguards that have been put in place. They do not have the town's or residents' best interests in mind as they try to consume the last, most historic, the richest agricultural farmland left in Simsbury. It makes us very upset that they can play by a totally new and different set of rules disregarding state and town zoning regulations and state and town farmland and agricultural recommendations.

We are not opposed to green energy or

solar, but are extremely opposed to the parcels they selected on residential land within the residential neighborhoods and abutting our homes so closely that when the foliage falls from the trees, all we'll see is an electronic jungle through prison-style chain link fencing. There is absolutely no trees and stuff between their property that they're proposing to build on County

Road and ours.

It's definitely going to have a negative impact on our future and the future of Simsbury and all their residents. Simsbury will no longer be that desirable and quaint little town with the huge black seas of solar panels scarring it. It will have a negative impact on our property values. I don't believe that the property values will increase from this at all. It's going to be very negative. It will negatively impact our neighborhood.

It's also going to negatively impact
the wildlife who currently have free and natural
movement over these 290 acres. A huge fence
around the panels and deforesting 35 acres of land
will surely disrupt the wildlife, the bears, the
deer, coyotes, bobcats, fox, wild turkeys,

migratory birds, et cetera. They will be forced into our neighborhoods, around our homes, children, pets, school yards, and into the roads.

As abutters, the proposed solar plant -- as abutters to the proposed solar plant, we will also be negatively impacted by water runoff from the thousands of panels. Some of us have wells, not city water. Our home at 16 County, my son's at 14 County, and our neighbor at 10 County road, we all have wells. It has not been proven to us we'll have no harmful runoff.

We've been told by Deepwater that the solar panels have a shelf life, and the solar fields will convert back to farmland in 20 to 25 years. That will never happen. Deepwater will own the land, and they are not farmers.

In the end, there is absolutely nothing beneficial, in my opinion, to the Town of Simsbury, nothing beneficial to us residents, and nothing beneficial to the State of Connecticut.

As you know, the power is going to Massachusetts, and the big utilities will benefit from our losses. Therefore, I ask the Siting Council to really think about this and please say no to the industrial sized solar plant in our residential

1 neighborhoods. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I realize it's an exercise in futility, but the time you spend on applauding takes away from other speakers.

Joe Pozzato.

JOSEPH POZZATO: Hello. My name is Joe Pozzato. My wife, April, just spoke.

I came to this town in 1949. I've seen a lot happen. It was all farmland when I came. We watched it grow. It's a beautiful town in a really beautiful state. Now there's one tract of land left that's farmland, a big tract, a lot of acres. And a solar farm wants to go in there.

A VOICE: Talk into the microphone.

JOSEPH POZZATO: Here's the thing.

Deepwater, from my understanding, says the solar

farm is going to disappear and go away in 25

years. The gentleman just said they're going away
in 25 years. He's dreaming. Once the solar farm,
once Deepwater buys that property, once the deal
is final and they buy that property, they are not
going no where. The 25 years, 25 years, are going
to keep coming, and keep coming, and keep coming.
They're not going to invest all this money.

They're not going to get that money back that

they're investing in 25 years. You got to be hit

-- to believe that. No.

As you can see, I'm not educated that much. I come from the other side of the track. But anyway, all right. It's disappearing. We all know that. But we all know, as much as we like to go to the light switch for power, we've also got to go to the refrigerator for food, so we've got to keep the farms going. They're disappearing.

Another thing, the great Dr. Martin
Luther King worked there. He worked on that field
exactly where the solar farm is proposed. He
worked there. We all know that. History said we
believe he made a decision to bring peace to this
country by coming to this end of the country where
people were nice. Why can't the state scrap this
Deepwater thing, build a nice -- let the farming
go there, and just put a nice little piece up that
he came there, like a little appreciation of what
he did. I've been there. I know what he worked
for.

Anyway, that's all I've got to say.

Thank you very much. I'm not here to kick the can or blow my horn, but that's it. Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

2 Kris Barnett.

KRIS BARNETT: Hi. My name is Kris
Barnett, B-A-R-N-E-T-T. And I live at 15 Ox Yoke
Drive in Simsbury. Thank you for the opportunity
to speak this evening.

I'm speaking in opposition to Petition 1313 filed by Deepwater Wind to install a solar facility on 290 acres in my neighborhood. I am not an abutter. I do, however, live within walking distance to the properties. I've been a resident on and off in Simsbury since I was 12. I will not tell you how many years that's been, but it's been a while.

My opposition to this project has nothing to do with it being in my backyard. It has everything to do with the inappropriate siting of the project. I implore you, members of the Siting Council, to put a lot of weight into the following findings and concerns brought forth by the town as a result of the countless hours of due diligence by our local boards and commissions, as well as several State of Connecticut departments. There's a reason that Deepwater Wind does not want this project to be brought to you as a Certificate

of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need and had brought it to you as a declaratory ruling instead.

This project should be subject to the highest level of review in the passage of Public Act 17-218. This project, as determined by our local zoning and planning commissions, is not compatible with our Simsbury zoning regulations and the plan of conservation and development. This project is not a public utility, as defined by the Simsbury zoning regulations. And if subjected to the approval process that every project in Simsbury has been subjected to, it would not be allowed to be located on parcels zoned as residential neighborhoods.

The State Department of Agriculture and the State Department of Energy and Environmental Protection both rejected this project. And it was chosen by Massachusetts who will receive the renewable energy tax credits.

Deepwater Wind has provided insufficient documentation regarding the protection of the wildlife in the area, and has used inaccurate and outdated information regarding the bird population, as determined by the

Connecticut Council of Environmental Quality, and provided insufficient data as to migratory patterns. And there's insufficient information provided about what happens to the wildlife, and where does it go when the panels are installed and the fencing is up.

As Deepwater Wind has stated on several occasions in public meetings, they would like to be partners with the Town of Simsbury for the proposed project. And if that's honestly the case, why would they not want the petition to be subjected to the highest standards with applying through the certificate process.

Simsbury will be celebrating our 350th anniversary in two years, and it's been historically an innovative and forward-thinking town throughout our history while being able to protect our natural resources and grow the community in a thoughtful manner that is consistent with the zoning regulations and the plan of conservation and development that generations of its citizens have written and implemented. We didn't recently get ranked one of the best places to live by chance. Rather, it was by intention. I implore you to not allow the

- landscape and character of Simsbury to be
 permanently altered by inadequate evaluation of
 the project through the declaratory process.
- 4 Thank you.

7

8

9

10

- 5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- 6 I believe it's Ed Carroll.
 - EDWARD CARROLL: Hi. Thanks for the opportunity to speak to you folks. My name is Ed Carroll, C-A-R-R-O-L-L, 28 Gordon street, the north end of the project.
- There are four streets up there, mine,
- 12 Gordon, Willard, Centerwood and Knollwood Circle.
- 13 All the houses on that whole complex are on wells.
- 14 Many of our homes have filters in it put in by the
- 15 DEEP several years back to protect us against
- 16 tribromopropane, ethylene dibromide and
- 17 dibromopropane. These are pesticides. They were
- 18 used for tobacco growth. And it has not
- 19 decomposed over time underground. The stuff on
- 20 the surface where they're growing vegetables right
- 21 now is fine.
- Now, if they're going to install these panels, then they have to dig tens of thousands of holes to anchor them. These things are going to
- 25 | have to go below the frost line, which is going to

- be about 3 and a half to 4 feet. Then they're 1 going to have to dig who knows how many miles of 2 ditches to lay all the conduit. When they do 3 that, I've got a good idea they're probably going 4 to disturb those three chemicals and make all our 5 wells in the neighborhood useless. When that 6 7 happens, who's going to pay for the installation 8 of city water, and how long is that going to take?
- 9 And in the meantime, the whole area will become an issue. I urge you to vote against this. Thank
 11 you very much.
- 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- 13 Chris Kilbourne Jones.
- 14 CHRISTINE KILBOURNE JONES: Hi. My
 15 name is Christine Kilbourne Jones,
- 16 K-I-L-B-O-U-R-N-E; Jones, J-O-N-E-S. I live at 85
 17 Hoskins Road.
- 18 My property is completely engulfed by this solar proposal. This happens to be a 19 20 historical house. The original part, I believe, started in, oh, probably 1730, 1740, which is a 21 salt box. It's now an old colonial farmhouse 22 23 which was the original Hoskins home. I grew up in 24 Simsbury, born and raised in Simsbury, a charming, 25 lovely town, great education system.

The problem being is that I don't

believe that anyone is against renewable energy.

I think it's the proposal because this is coming

into a residential area, and the magnitude of

this. And I must say Deepwater does not have the

experience in building such a unit at all.

I believe we're all very upset by this.

We as a town gain nothing from this. We as a

We as a town gain nothing from this. We as a Simsbury taxpayer gets nothing from it. We don't get a tax break or a lower electrical rate. This is being really, really shoved down our throats. And it's being pushed so rapidly, it makes me very suspect of what the whole thing is really all about. But in all that, as you could gather, I'm strictly against this proposal, and I hope the Siting Council agrees with me. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Steven Angeloff.

STEVEN ANGELOFF: Good evening,

Council. My name is Steven Angeloff. That's

A-N-G-E-L-O-F-F. I live at 42 Berkshire Way. I'm
an abutter, so I'm on a cul-de-sac.

I'm probably the opposite. I'm a fairly new resident to Connecticut and Simsbury.

I retired from the Air Force almost three years ago. I spent 25 years as an Air Force officer, traveled all over the country. My wife's family is from Westfield, Mass. So since she's been a good military spouse, you know what, I decided, "Where do you want to go when I'm done? Let's pick an area." I picked Connecticut. And we picked Simsbury because of the quaintness, the ruralness of it. Living around the country, places like Alaska, Japan, different places, it just had a New England charm.

I've never been involved in any kind of local politics because everywhere I've gone I rent, so I never really bothered to deal with it. But now I really understand the significant impact of what our town is going to have with this solar field. Now, it's a dichotomy. I'm up here complaining; however, I do agree with renewable energy. I just think that we really need to look at where is the right location for this. Why can't -- as a state, why can't we offer some other areas, a similar area as far as acreage, somewhere else in the state that could be off the beaten path, maybe along some of our interstates, our state highways where it's not going to affect a

residential community.

I find it a bit troubling that we have the proposal, and I'm sure they're lovely people, so the company itself, I don't have anything personally against them. It's just why is a consortium of Massachusetts and Rhode Island and everyone making the decision for our State of Connecticut to put solar panels here, and we really will not benefit from it? Yes, maybe a slight mill rate decrease will help us a little bit, but overall I don't really see the benefit.

So with that, I really hope that the Council really reviews this, scrutinizes every line, and realize that this isn't anything other than I think there's a lot better optional areas that we could use in this state that would be better choices than in the back of a residential area on critical farmland.

And as an operator, someone who has flown for many years, large solar panels, large fields, and where I live exactly on Berkshire, it is over one of the major thoroughfares routes that there is also the opportunity and consideration for the operators with glare. So you have to look at that as well, please.

So thank you again. Again, I'm proud
to be in Connecticut. We looking forward to a
future here. And thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Joe Treacy.

JOSEPH TREACY: Yes, sir. Treacy,
T-R-E-A-C-Y. I live at 3 Berkshire Way, right
next to Steve -- Steve, thank you for your
service -- in Simsbury. I've been a resident in
Simsbury for over 40 years. And thank you for
spending the day with us to see and learn all that
Simsbury offers. I'm sorry that you did not have
the time to look at the impact on individual
neighborhoods on your drive-by tour this
afternoon.

I am a supporter of alternative energy sources, but not at the expense of 298, approximately, 290 acres of prime agricultural open farmland. This project is located between five residential neighborhoods bordering our town's second largest aquifer, and within 1,000 feet of an elementary school, which I don't think you got to see today on the tour.

The Tobacco Valley Solar Project will forever change the character of Simsbury with the destruction of land designated by the Connecticut

Department of Agriculture as either prime agricultural forestland, or having been designated by the state having a state importance as --designated as having state importance as agriculture and farmland. At a minimum, you should require the applicant to submit to a more thorough review of the environmental impacts, and require them to meet the standards of both a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need process. This project will bring no increase in electricity to the State of

Connecticut or the Town of Simsbury.

As you have already heard, power is going to be sold to the State of Massachusetts. There will be minimal tax benefit to the Town of Simsbury, approximately less than one-half of one percent of a mill rate on \$100 million, so it's really negligible impact on the town.

As a utility size project with over 110,000 solar panels with hundreds of thousands of steel support beams will be pounded into the ground by pile drivers in the middle of these five residential neighborhoods, including Saturdays that we found out this afternoon. In addition, construction activities and miles of chain link

fence, security fence, will be very disruptive to the bear, deer and reptile population on the site.

Directly to the east of the proposed utility size solar farm located at the intersection of Hoskins and County Road is the second largest aquifer in Simsbury designed as A145 by the State Bureau of Water Protection. At today's hearing I did not hear how this would be protected from storm runoff from the thousands of solar panels directly uphill from that location.

I am particularly concerned with their lack of preparation for the deluge rainstorm, which we seem to have a lot of lately. How would the aquifer be protected from the residue of the farm herbicides and pesticides that will be disturbed as they pound hundreds of thousands of pilings into the ground.

I'm also concerned about some of the applicant's responses to your interrogatories, specifically Question 5, Are any portions of the project enrolled within the State Department of Agriculture, Public Act 490. The answer, Based on a review of town records, Deepwater can find no evidence that any portion of the site is enrolled on the Public Act 490. Hum. A brief discussion

with the town tax assessor found that the current landowner is receiving a lower agricultural tax rate under Public Act 490. Who knew?

Question No. 9, Where are the nearest off-site residences located in two potential construction access points and from the solar field? And there was a lot of discussion about the numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 Litchfield Drive this afternoon. All of you had questions about that. They're all within 100 feet, approximately 100 feet of the proposed access road which runs directly behind Litchfield Drive. The access road is only 10 to 12 feet wide at this point.

There's also no mention of the homes at the end of Berkshire Way, nor the homes at the end of Saxton Brook. In addition, the Kilbourne property, as Christine has indicated, Number 85, will be surrounded by solar panels. The entire south side of Hoskins Road should be off limits to the solar farm and not at the expense of other residential neighborhoods. The impact on home values is unknown because the utility size solar farm is currently not built near residential neighborhoods.

1 You have the opportunity to make a historic decision that will set precedence for the 2 future development of Connecticut agriculture and 3 forestland. The Connecticut Department of 4 5 Agriculture and the Council of Environmental Quality and the town oppose this proposal. 6 7 project would not be permitted in either Massachusetts or Rhode Island. You have the 8 9 opportunity to implement the wishes of the 10 Connecticut Legislature and the people of Connecticut by upholding the legislative intent 11 and spirit of SB 943. The law should be based on 12 13 the date the project is reviewed by you and not submitted only days before the law was put into 14 15 effect. A utility size field should be built on brownfields, industrial sites, state land, public 16 right-of-ways, not on prime agricultural 17 18 forestland in the middle of five residential neighborhoods. Thank you for your time. 19 20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Raymond Hanley. 21 22 RAYMOND HANLEY: Hello. Hanley, H-A-N-L-E-Y. I live on Wescott across from where 23 24 the substation is.

I am for this project for the reason

25

that I think it has the least negative impact on 1 this town. I've been for all of the conservation 2 3 measures we've gone through in this town, all the land protection. I'm for all of that. 4 The town 5 doesn't own this land. The town is not going to buy this land. The conservation organization 6 7 isn't going to buy this land. I wish it could. I 8 would be for that. This town is private property. It's not agricultural land. The farmers don't own 9 10 this land. It's not going to stay farmland. These are going to become houses. These solar 11 12 panels do not have children, they don't go to 13 school, they don't need garbage trucks, they don't need snowplows, they don't need lawn mowers, they 14 don't need leaf blowers, they don't need fire 15 I think there's going to be the least 16 17 negative impact, as I said, for the town. 18 As far as the construction goes, people are concerned about the construction of these 19 I understand construction of the houses 20 panels. they will put in there will be louder, noisier, 21 22 and longer than it's going to take to do this. The agricultural chemicals are the pollutants 23 24 Agriculture polluted the place. The way we here.

do agriculture is kind of strange.

25

all this disruption is going to occur to the land when the houses that will be built there are built. I was against major construction of the multi-use thing that's over there, you know, the thing over there. I'm against most of the multi-development. I wish we could conserve it as open space. The fact is it's not going to stay that way, and I think that this will have the least impact.

Also, it is a 20/25 year project. It's not a permanent thing. Now, I understand there's skepticism about that, but it may not be -- it's not the worst thing in the world. I wish the way this was implemented was -- people are upset. It's rammed down our throats as far as how the Siting Council -- the state overrides the town. That's wrong to a lot of people. I understand that. But taking it all into consideration for this project, I'm not an abutter to the property but I am nearby. I can see the substation and the -- whatever they're calling that thing.

Now, there's other housing developments going in on all the other tobacco property around there, down the road, all of those are going in.

- 1 There's also one going in between Sunrise and, you
- 2 know, Wesley's place, there's that other place
- 3 going in. I'm against all of those. But I
- 4 think that -- and I'm really sorry to oppose
- 5 people. I get it. I'm sorry about that, but I
- 6 think this is the best thing that we can get out
- 7 of this.
- 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- Jason Polayes.
- JASON POLAYES: Jason Polayes,
- 11 P-O-L-A-Y-E-S. I live at 14 Saxton Brook Drive.
- 12 I'm an abutter.
- I believe if this project is done, it
- 14 should be done right. And I believe, as it stands
- 15 now, the proposal is not to the benefit of the
- 16 residents around there. I understand the
- 17 complexity -- or I don't understand the complexity
- 18 of a wind farm on Block Island. This is a solar
- 19 farm in a residential area, and I imagine it poses
- 20 other challenges. And I don't know if I've seen
- 21 those in the proposal.
- 22 Many of the items have already been
- 23 discussed, so there's three items that I worry
- 24 about. I don't think you can underestimate the
- 25 water quality issue. If it goes bad, then there's

a lot that goes bad. And I think the fact that we haven't done the research, we don't have enough data and study behind it to understand exactly what's going to happen when we start digging in that soil. I think it would be prudent for us to really take the time and make sure we understand that.

The animal migration patterns, which might not seem like a big deal, but I think are a big deal to fence off a major part of this part of town. I think the residents of this town during this time period every day will see large animals walking by. They're going to walk somewhere else, and I don't know if that's been taken into consideration.

And then the final point. I know

Deepwater came back with a second proposal. They
had proposal one. Proposal two came back, and I
believe it was actually less area, and I thank
them for doing that, but I think they produced the
same amount of power. I'm curious how less area
produced the same amount of power. If it means
they can use better solar panels, can they use
better solar panels still and use even less area
than they're proposing? I understand the working

area around it, they need to keep their property safe, but I do wonder how small they can actually get, and what type of solar panels they could be using that would make the acreage even smaller than it is. And the other evidence we already discussed. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Next is Stephan or Steven Sutton?

STEPHEN SUTTON: Thank you, folks, for taking the time. My name is Stephen Sutton,

S-u-t-t-o-n. I live at 45 Berkshire Way. I am an abutter.

I don't want to waste your time any further than it needs to. I think my residents -my neighbors have really spoken a lot to some of
the details of this project, and I think we need
to slow down this process and realize that maybe
this project is just a little bit too large for
the area in which they're looking to put it. It
is a good use for the land. It's just a matter of
how it's going to negatively impact the area,
agriculture with aquifers, and also aesthetically
as far as taking our town -- and due diligence
that's gone on for years and years, and just
throwing that out and putting in a utility that

- maybe is more of a vanity project to the utilities
 to say we are green and we are looking for
 alternative energies, versus the mowing down of
 the trees and all the other effects that may
 negatively impact in order just to get some green
- I am a good proponent. I appreciate
 green energy. I just want it to be done in a
 responsible fashion. And I think that based on
 all of the legislation that has gone through, I
 think we just need to pause this process and
 really do a little bit more due diligence. Thank
 you for your time.
- 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- Howard Beal.

energy in the area.

6

20

21

22

23

24

- HOWARD BEAL: Good evening. Howard
 Beal, B, like in "boy," E-A-L. I reside at 288
 Firetown Road, which is in the vicinity of the
 proposed project.
 - When I came here actually I was kind of neutral. I came here to learn actually. And I very quickly, based on all the comments I heard so far, I've very quickly become rather negative on this project.

25 A couple of my questions have already

been answered, but I do have some other points to go over here. We've seen the weather disasters in Texas and Florida recently. What would be the impact if we had a category 3 storm come through It does happen. And we're very much overdue, you know, like 50 years. If we had a wind storm, what happens if all these glass panels are broken up and scattered all over the landscape? What kind of materials are in there that would get into the soil and affect the

environment because of all the breakage? So that

would be one concern.

Another concern. It's noted that the equipment seemed to have a shelf life of about 20, 25 years. And then they're supposedly going to come and take it away, and that would be the end of it. Others have cited that, well, will this really happen, and how come the solar panels don't last forever? Do they deteriorate over time so they are less and less powerful? Why do they take them down after 20 years? It's kind of strange. Power plants last a lot longer than 20 years because they are constantly refurbished and maintained.

And the last point, well, another point

- 1 is somebody mentioned everything is going to be
- 2 fenced over. You know, this fencing which you
- 3 mentioned keeps animals either inside or outside.
- 4 They can't go through the area, and they have to
- 5 find other routes. You might as well build an
- 6 interstate highway around these project areas.
- 7 Because, you know, it has pretty much the same
- 8 effect. It really disrupts everything.
- 9 And the last point would be it's kind
- 10 of disturbing that if this were built, we're
- 11 allowing all this equipment to be built on the
- 12 land of Simsbury, and Simsbury doesn't even get
- 13 the power. It goes somewhere else. Nothing goes
- 14 to Simsbury or its essential services at all, and
- 15 I find that rather disturbing. Thank you.
- 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- 17 Ruth Beal.
- 18 RUTH BEAL: Hi, my name is Ruth Beal.
- 19 I thank you for the opportunity to speak before
- 20 you all. I am against this -- oh, I'm sorry. My
- 21 last name is spelled B, as in "boy," E-A-L. My
- 22 husband just spoke. And I also live at 288
- 23 Firetown Road in Simsbury. Our property does not
- 24 abut the areas of concern, but my concern is how
- 25 this is all going to impact the area.

I am against this particular project.

- 2 I believe there are better alternatives.
- 3 Temporary projects are still temporary. They are
- 4 often put in place hoping that, since they are
- 5 only temporary, we don't have to put up with them
- 6 forever. But then people get complacent and get
- 7 used to seeing things there and say, well, it's
- 8 been there, and so they get less and less
- 9 resistant to having something there.

Simsbury is one of those all too few typical New England towns which are not really so typical. Simsbury is a very special place to live. It's got a lot of open space, which is very unusual in towns these days. There's a lot of raising of the land. It's very disturbing to see so much forestation eliminated. And when things like this do happen, many times when the land is used for whatever, it's never put back the way it was. It's ground leveling, along with the trees being taken down, and when whenever was there is removed, you have chunks of concrete and whatnot from whatever was built there.

A concern which was previously mentioned is the fact that all this is being put in our town for the benefit of somebody else north

of us. And my biggest concern is the proximity to the game preserve that is in the area where this project is sited to be put, and also all the open and rural lands that we have in that area. We have a lot of wildlife, birds. We have in the McLean Game Refuge special bluebird boxes in the hope of encouraging more bluebirds in the area. And something I'm sure a lot of you people have noticed is that there are all too few butterflies flitting around. I'm concerned with how this project will disrupt any migration and typical everyday movements of animals and birds.

I know out west where they have I believe this project they're putting in is basically similar to what's going to be on rooftops of houses and things, as opposed to out west where they have towers where they project the energy up to, but out there they have some really horrific problems with birds who are literally being burned in the air, dropping out of the air. And they're not just talking about a couple hundred, but thousands of them. And also butterflies that are attracted by the lights of the panels, and they get singed and burned, and the birds also see these bugs down there and it

looks like a nice tasty little thing.

1

25

One thing that I wonder about is when I 2 was over in Scotland a few years back, they have 3 what I thought was a very interesting unusual, to 4 my way of thinking, way of generating electricity. 5 And I wonder why we don't take more advantage of 6 7 it. I've never heard of it over in this country. But they use waves of the ocean to generate 8 electricity. And it seems to me that that is a 9 10 good option where you have something, the ocean, just using the motions of the waves, moving to 11 generate electricity. This is something that's 12 13 obviously going on all the time. It's not something that needs to have the sun out every day 14 15 continuing and only works part of the day when the sun is out. The moon and the sun are always 16 17 actively pulling on the water. So even when you 18 don't have the wind, you still have the sun and moon pulling on the water, and it's always 19 20 working. So I think that might perhaps be something we should be looking at more than this 21 22 project. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: 23 Thank you. 24 Dianne Treacy.

DIANE TREACY:

Diane Treacy, 40

Berkshire Way. T-R-E-A-C-Y.

I've lived here for 40 years. And I want to thank you for taking the time to hear residents' thoughts and concerns in what I consider a massive solar utility farm. The limited lime allotted to research to become knowledgeable about this project has been quite an undertaking for concerned residents and town staff. The initial DWW meeting on May 11th invited abutters who received a letter the week before alerting them to a utility solar farm to be built on the 289 acres. 221 are zoned R40, and 68 are zoned light industrial. My first thought was what is the point of town zoning and planning if it can be ignored to meet a private company's commercial wishes.

The Town held a meeting on June 7 to provide a platform for residents, but since the proposal had not yet been filed, answers to many questions were speculative. The hall was standing room only. A second DWW meeting was held June 22nd with close to 300 people in attendance. The overwhelming opinion was not positive.

I have many concerns. One, according to DWW, the energy generated from these solar

panels will be sold to a Massachusetts power

company. The State of Connecticut and the Town of

Simsbury seem to be left out of the equation.

Number two, those who live near or directly abutting the solar farm are mostly young families who have valid concerns about aesthetics, maintenance and security, as well as property values. Five Simsbury neighborhoods are impacted.

Number three, I'm uneasy about the final product from a Rhode Island company who has never built even a small solar farm. At the initial meeting they alluded to two small solar projects. Neither have been built. I still wonder where the field trip they suggested they could arrange for us, or were they taking us?

Number 4, I'm concerned that when asked at the June 22nd meeting how many panels would be installed, they did not know, eight days before submitting a formal proposal. Now we know, 110,000 panels.

Number 6, according to the U.S.

Department of Energy, solar panels may contain hazardous materials. When asked about the disposal of these panels, it was indicated that the industry does not have a viable plan for

disposal, but surely there would be a plan in 20 years. Nuclear power still struggles with this issue after 60 years.

Number 7, Connecticut recently passed a bill to protect residential land, farmland, and forested areas from being used for solar farms. Hopefully this will be considered. The two other states in the consortium, Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have policies that direct solar farms to be built on brownfields, landfills and public rights-of-way.

value of its early towns, beautiful forests and farms we work hard to protect. Simsbury is one of these historic towns settled in 1670. Must we surrender for an entire generation some of the last buildable residential land? Will this town be forced to repeat the epilogues seen in so many towns flatlined with homes 50 years and older? Is it truly necessary to give up on light industrial when it brings jobs to our community?

I am optimistic in reading the
Council's charge to balance the need for adequate
and reliable public utility services at the lowest
reasonable cost to consumers with the need to

protect the environment and ecology of this state, and to minimize damage to scenic historic and recreational values.

I respectfully implore the Council to consider how this decision impacts the next generation of Simsbury. The door will be closed for new housing, and we will shut the door on yet another farmer. In fact, the farmer who has leased this land and farmed there for many many years did attempt to buy this property. This may be a wonderful green addition to Massachusetts energy needs, but what about Simsbury? What about Connecticut? Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Linda Schofield.

LINDA SCHOFIELD: Hi, I'm here to speak in support of this initiative. My name is Linda Schofield, S-c-h-o-f-i-e-l-d. I live at 3 Ryan Circle.

I'm not a neighbor, and I don't live in the immediate vicinity. And I'd like to say I hope you realize that most of the people speaking against this are neighbors, and they do live in the immediate vicinity. And at the last hearing we had I spoke in favor of the proposal, and tons of people who don't live in the immediate vicinity

have come up to me and said, Well, I really agree with what you're saying, but they're nervous about speaking in a forum like this. So I think that's unfortunate.

That said, I really -- you know, I want to support the people who do have concerns, and I hope that Deepwater Wind would do whatever they can to allay their concerns and fix sight lines, and things like that. I think there's room for compromise here. But I do support moving forward with this kind of a proposal because I support green energy solutions. We need to protect the environment, combat climate change, and assure energy independence.

We're a town with a history of neighbors opposed to the various development projects, as someone noted earlier. This phenomenon is common everywhere. Opponents to the bike trail, for example, years ago testified that the trail would bring crime, lower property values, and other negatives. And, of course, none of this actually happened. And indeed the property abutting the bike trail actually went up in value.

I believe that solar panels similarly,

once installed, would potentially increase
property values. Home buyers will love the

3 notion, if they're like me, that their neighbors

4 are totally quiet. There's no barking dogs.

5 There's no blaring music from teenage parties, no

6 kids screaming as they jump into pools, et cetera.

7 Potential home buyers might also be happy that

8 there's no traffic for these solar panels, and

that they don't create pollution unlike we've

10 heard a lot about the agricultural pollution

11 created by the farmers.

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The argument I think that these panels depress home values is not critical to me. The biggest cause of declining home values in our town is our rising mill rate. And on that score, these panels will be of help. The town estimates that the project would produce \$621,000 per year in new revenue to the town, while demanding virtually no town services in return. Others have talked about that before me.

I have heard a concern that the panels are causing existing soil contamination to enter the aquifer below. I'm confused by some of the comments that people have made because they go from talking about the pollution that the

agricultural users have created to talking about
wanting to keep agriculture. It's the

3 agricultural uses that have created that

4 pollution. And I don't understand why, if the

5 topsoil is fine, why there'd be pollution three

6 feet below, I mean, that's what people are

7 concerned about, or why you want to grow food in a

place that's so toxic that you can't put solar

9 panels there.

Also, the idea of runoff being increased somehow by solar panels is specious. The same amount of rain is going to fall on these acres no matter whether solar panels are there or not. So there shouldn't be anymore runoff just because there are solar panels on the land.

Some in town have suggested that any decision to place a solar facility should be approved by the town. I think this was a huge mistake. And I think it's appropriate that we have the state siting commission, as yours is, tasked to do this job. If every town were to decide where power plants of any type were to be located, we would all be living with no electricity because everyone wants such things to exist but to be located elsewhere.

So thank you for taking on this
difficult task. I know that everywhere you go you
probably get opposition to just about every
proposed new facility that you hear about. But
they have to go somewhere. We all want
electricity. So thank you for your efforts. And

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I hope you'll support this.

I think this is Holly Beum. I'm not sure of the last name.

HOLLY BEUM: Hello. My name is Holly
Beum, B-E-U-M. It's short but strange. I live on
11 Longview Drive in Simsbury. I am also a member
of the planning commission, although I am not here
on their behalf. The planning commission has
already officially weighed in on this. I'm here
as a private citizen, and I have a point of view
that I have not heard expressed fully yet that I'd
like to advance in support of this project.

It's called the Tobacco Valley Solar
Project, because these were tobacco fields. And
as many people have mentioned already, the most
famous person who worked this field was Martin
Luther King. Now, as our town finally did the
research to verify that Martin Luther King really

did work these fields, up until a few years ago it was more of an urban legend. And then a lot of work was done by the Simsbury Free Library and the high school, a number of high school students, and the historical society to verify that. This was at a time during a recession. We had no chance to do anything to save this property.

This property is zoned for residential and light industrial, most commonly warehouses, industrial warehouses, and residential. My fear is if we do not protect this, it will be lost forever. Once this is developed, the wildlife will still not be allowed to be walking through everybody's yards, we'll still have the same amount of runoff, but we will never have these fields again. And make no mistake, the current owner of these fields is the Griffin Development Corporation. They are not a farm organization. They are a developer corporation. If we do not have solar panels, we will have houses and light industrial warehouses.

And I can tell you as a member of the board of planning, we have zero jurisdiction if an applicant comes with an application to do residential housing or warehouses and they're

following all the rules and regulations of our
town ordinances. We have to allow it. This is
law. So the concept that if we don't put solar
panels, we'll continue to farm it, already the
Griffin Corporation has announced that the
farmland is not sufficiently valuable to do that.

Now, if we have a 20-year lease, a 25-year lease, we have the time to raise the money and get the ground roots organization to protect these fields forever. And I have witnessed firsthand the work that organizations such as Simsbury Land Trust can accomplish when they're organized. And during this time, and even during the recession, there have been major tracts of land that the Simsbury Land Trust has been able to preserve for the rest of our existence here for perpetuity.

preservation angle. This gives us the time to get the funding. I agree with the people who say that Deepwater is not a farm organization, but they're in business. And if they're given enough money for the land -- and this is not just a parcel of local interest. Martin Luther King is a figure of national and international importance. I feel

confident that with enough grassroots efforts we
will be able to get that funding to save it. And
that's my particular point of view on this that I
wanted to give to the Council.

Thank you for your public service. I know what it's like to sit on the other side of that table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Carl Dunham.

CARL DUNHAM: Good evening. My name is Carl Dunhan, D-U-N-H-A-M. I live at 195
Candlewood Mountain Road, New Milford, so obviously I can't be accused of living here.

I've been involved with what's been going on with solar for quite a while. I was particularly struck at a time when I went to a workshop that DEEP had in January with respect to the location of these solar farms. And what was happening before that, there was no criteria whatsoever, and people started to realize that there are a lot of competing interests in Connecticut policy wise. We have the desire to have renewable energy, and then we have the desire to protect and maintain agriculture, and lastly we have a very big focus on the natural resources

through all the efforts of the DEEP.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What this amounts to is it has to become a balancing act. And there was a void. And this was taken up by the State of Connecticut through their legislators, and they came up with a whole new criteria. That criteria manifests in the statute that's been referred to. That is the policy in the State of Connecticut. That was more or less in the past. And I know your focus is energy, but what really caught my attention in the beginning was the massiveness of these kinds of projects. There's a project in New Milford, which I was concerned with. And when I came to Hartford I saw this is another one. So there are essentially these two situations which really are demanding your attention and put you in a very interesting place.

I respect you all. I have always been impressed by the public duties -- but I just think this proposal, much like the one in New Milford, is massive. People do not understand how big it is. Here you're talking about a better understanding because you can drive around, but there's nothing like this in Connecticut, and I don't think this is the place to start it.

It just troubles me that these are 1 being pushed forward without the full 2 consideration. And, as a matter fact, I think you 3 have to do that. I think that's what the statute 4 requires. So I encourage you to do it that way, 5 to look at it. There are lots of opportunities 6 7 for renewable energy. There are plenty of brownfields. There are plenty of rooftops. 8 have been studies made that we can satisfy energy 9 10 needs alternatively. 11 But very interestingly, the other day I 12 picked up a national nature conservancy magazine and there in the fall issue -- and I refer you to 13 that -- there's an article on solar energy. 14 15 is an issue that's not really national, it's 16 international. There are all sorts of competing 17 issues, which I know they're hard to always watch, 18 but I think they all should be considered. 19 So I appreciate all the efforts you put 20 into it. I do think that this proposal is not 21 appropriate. Thank you. 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mark Scully. 23 MARK SCULLY: My name is Mark Scully, 24 S-C-U-L-L-Y. I live at 29 Notch Road in West

Simsbury. I'm speaking as a private citizen and

25

not -- my views do not necessarily represent those
of the Clean Energy Task Force of which I'm a
member.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I understand that after deliberations you will approve the petition, deny it, or approve with modifications. I urge you to approve it with modifications. There's not enough time to go through all of those modifications, and we've heard many of those tonight. I can see by the height of your binders you've read some of them as I think there are very serious legitimate concerns that our citizens raised, and I would encourage you to make modifications that will allow this solar farm to be built in a way that is in keeping with the character of this community. So make the modifications you see fit, but in the end please approve this site. My reasoning is simple. We all need to do our part to address climate change. We as individuals need to do our part, and we in Simsbury need to do our part. cannot ask other towns across the state to bear the entire burden.

I am involved in some nonprofit work where we've actually tried to analyze could we move ourselves to a sustainable renewable economy,

1 and we literally went through the town rooftop by rooftop and parking lot by parking lot, and we 2 3 looked at could we generate enough energy in town to, you know, the needs, and then we looked at it 4 a bit more broadly at the region. And while we 5 all like to say I support solar as much as the 6 7 next guy but not in residential neighborhoods, not here, the simple fact that rooftops and 8 9 brownfields will not get us there.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In Simsbury we have about 1.7 megawatts of installed capacity. That's residential and commercial. It's about 150 installations. that will increase, looking at it, and maybe a couple more megawatts installed, but we're not going to get close to meeting the needs that we expect when we turn the lights on. And we need to do our part. We can't expect these solar farms to be placed in other communities. It's going to require a difficult decision, and the best decision that you will have to make, but as a citizen of Simsbury I'm willing to accept the sacrifice of putting a solar farm on this site. I think, looking back, this will not materially influence the residential character of the town. I think we have many beautiful farms.

much beautiful open space, and that will still be here.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I encourage you to approve this project with serious modifications. Those should include things like ensuring sufficient decommissioning funds and, in general, listening to some of the very legitimate concerns we've In the end, though, I think future generations will thank us for this project. They'll thank us for promoting the environment that's favorable to business. They'll thank us for parking a piece of land for 20 years or more, preserving its agricultural quality and preventing it from being developed in a more permanent fashion. They'll thank us for improving the image of our town as a leader in clean energy and a place where our children would like to live. And they'll thank us for doing our part to address climate change. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Phillip Prestigomo.

PHILLIP PRESTIGOMO: Thanks for having me. I live at 43 Windham Drive. The last name is Prestigomo, P-r-e-s-t-i-g-o-m-o. I've been a resident here for ten years, almost 11 now.

I live in close in proximity to the new proposed farms. To say that it doesn't ruin property values or the aesthetics of the community is almost laughable. My home prices have been flat. My home has been flat, and I'm losing money year over year. To say that this is going to help it is laughable. It's kind of one of those things that, if you don't live here, and you don't live in that area, that's fine. I'm sure there will be some people that will gladly sell you their homes if this goes through, so you can move right next to the solar farm and not hear the kids jump in the pool. That will be great. That's much better.

One thing I will ask the Commission to consider is where are these solar panels manufactured? They will be more than likely -- I work for an electrical manufacturer. I've been doing consumer electronics for over 30 years as an industrial designer, and I know a lot about these things. These are manufactured in plants in China that produce five times as much greenhouse gases as one panel will save over its lifetime. If you think this is -- the theoretical output of this is going to be on score or exceeded, not even close.

It's going to be below power when it's built, and it's going to get worse over time because these solar panels degrade. Not only do they require tons of toxic chemicals and heavy metals to be produced, those heavy metals start to break down and start to break down in the field because of storms, because of vandalism, because of anything settling in the ground. And you think the pollutants in the ground are bad now with the current farmlands? Wait until there's heavy metals and volatile chemicals and we'll all have cancer. It's going to be awesome. I can't wait for that day.

This proposal is ill thought out. It's by a company that has no experience building these. And we're just going to give them carte blanche? And the thing that should make everybody's hair stand up on the back of their neck is ruling that no certificate of environmental compatibility and public need is required for post-construction maintenance and operation. That is a joke. That statement, I can't even believe you guys actually -- I can't believe they wrote it down. It's amazing. I mean, that's a lot of hutzpah. I really can't

- 1 understand how after all these years we can't even
- get a Big Y in this town, that it took five, ten
- years to get a Big Y, and now all of a sudden
- 4 they're going to ram this down our throats with no
- 5 say by the local community or the state community.
- 6 I think it's laughable.
- 7 I'm all for renewable energy, but solar
- 8 is not -- and these panels last ten years, maybe
- 9 15, at best, and we're going to be stuck with the
- 10 bill for a super fund site 300 acres in Simsbury
- and nobody is going to want to build a house on
- 12 this land. Trust me.
- Thank you for your time.
- 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Bob Beinstein.
- 15 ROBERT BEINSTEIN: So my name is Bob
- 16 Beinstein. It's B, like "boy," E-I-N-S-T-E-I-N.
- 17 I live on 26 Fairview Street in Simsbury.
- 18 I serve on Simsbury's Clean Energy Task
- 19 Force, just full disclosure here, and I work on
- 20 infrastructure sustainability challenges, and
- 21 tonight I speak to you as a resident of Simsbury
- 22 only.
- 23 So the first point. I simply don't buy
- 24 the apocalyptic message that I'm hearing from
- 25 people tonight. I think are there challenges

here? Of course, there are challenges here. With all due respect to my fellow residents who have spoken here tonight, I think that a lot of it's based on somewhat irrational fears and somewhat just really generally poor data, and I think most of you know, a little bit more in the technical

level of detail of what's going on.

I want to say for the record up front that I fully support this project, although there are significant details yet to be worked out. The point that I really want to make going forward -- and you're going to hear a lot in favor and a lot opposed -- I'm in favor. What I want to see happen from here forward is collaboration. I recognize the point that if each town does make a decision about utility infrastructure, we all sit in the dark. I'd agree with that.

That said, I would urge you to have some sensitivity to this town. I want to see this project built. There is a lot of detail to work out. One of the concerns that I have personally is with the process, and the process certainly isn't Deepwind's fault, it's probably not your fault. There's some legislative work to be done.

When I go through the interrogatories

and I see -- I look for detail, I look for how you're going to solve the challenges the town has raised and some of the abutters have raised. And I see that will be in the D&M plan. And the D&M plan won't exist until the project is approved.

It seems a little bit backwards to me.

Part of what I do for work is look at best practices around sustainability of infrastructure. In the research that we've conducted, one of the most important things that happens is early often collaboration between proposed designers, builders, owners, regulators and site people, people that live near where the facility is to be sited.

Through certainly no fault of Deepwater Wind, that's not how this process has worked. It would have been possible to come here to have a collaborative approach from day one, from when we're considering an RFP, we're considering to put it different places, to have discussion. What the objective is, is when we get to this point where a regulatory body is sitting in judgment of a project, we've had this discussion already, we've had collaboration, and each party, in grand tradition of America, which maybe not so much

these days, has given a little bit, has moved in their positions to the point where not everybody is like, yeah, this is great, but everybody had this discussion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So to the extent that that's something you get to weigh in on, I urge you to put whatever conditions you are able to impose for the details that have to be worked out, the things that are going to be in the D&M plan, the individual plan phase, the fence, is it a berm, is it a fence, is it a thing. At some of the public meetings there was a big outcry about it not being fenced. Deepwater Wind came by and drew a fence in, they made it up. Right. Now we don't like the fence. Okay. That's fine. What are we going to put How do we collaborate there? How do we do that? to make this thing work for the people that live near the project, for the people that live in town.

So I just urge you to take a look at this, consider the character of the town, build the project. But let's come to some agreements on how that project fits in the town, how it benefits the town, and how the people that are most impacted can live with it.

1 Thanks for your attention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Robert Newman.

hearing.

ROBERT NEWMAN: Good evening. I'm

Robert Newman, N-E-W-M-A-N. I live at 18 Joshua

Drive in West Simsbury.

I'm looking at this map, and this is a pretty large project. And it's proposed by

Deepwater Wind. And I think that this company has a very unfortunate name. It's part of the same outfit. Engineering built an oil well in the gulf several years ago that resulted in a large oil spill of all time. And so I just have a concern about expressing the question. How comfortable are we in relying on the construction capabilities of this outfit whose engineering construction failure resulted in one of the most infamous environmental disasters of all time? That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Council

The Council announces that it will continue the evidentiary portion of the hearing that was held this afternoon in New Britain on Tuesday, October 10th of this year, beginning at

will now close the public comment session of the

11 a.m.

Please note that anyone who has not become a party or intervenor, but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council, may file written statements with the Council until the record closes.

Again, copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed with the Simsbury and Granby Town Clerk's Offices. And I hereby declare this public hearing adjourned. Thank you all for your participation, and drive home safely.

(Whereupon, the above proceedings concluded at 8:03 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

2	I hereby certify that the foregoing 69 pages
3	are a complete and accurate computer-aided
4	transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
5	of the Siting Council Hearing in Re: PETITION NO.
6	1313, DWW SOLAR II, LLC PETITION FOR A DECLARATORY
7	RULING THAT NO CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
8	COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED IS REQUIRED FOR THE
9	PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION
10	OF A 26.4 MEGAWATT AC SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC ELECTRIC
11	GENERATING FACILITY ON APPROXIMATELY 289 ACRES
12	COMPRISED OF 5 SEPARATE AND ABUTTING
13	PRIVATELY-OWNED PARCELS LOCATED GENERALLY WEST OF
14	HOPMEADOW STREET, NORTH AND SOUTH OF HOSKINS ROAD,
15	AND NORTH AND EAST OF COUNTY ROAD, AND ASSOCIATED
16	ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTION TO EVERSOURCE ENERGY'S
17	NORTH SIMSBURY SUBSTATION WEST OF HOPMEADOW STREET
18	IN SIMSBURY, CONNECTICUT, which was held before
19	ROBERT STEIN, Chairman, at Eno Memorial Hall
20	Auditorium, 754 Hopmeadow Street, Simsbury,
21	Connecticut, on September 12, 2017.

Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R., 061

Court Reporter

	170
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	