

**Written Testimony
Donald H. Crockett
Resident of New Britain
Monday, March 6, 2016**

S.B. No. 300, AN ACT CONCERNING NEW BRITAIN WATER COMPANY LAND

I think a high bar should be met to permit development of New Britain's watershed land in S.B. 300. There should be strong evidence that New Britain's drinking water system will benefit and not suffer long-term. Municipal revenue and commercial interests shouldn't be the primary motivators or it will set a precedent that will jeopardize Connecticut residents' safe drinking water in the future.

Is there a demonstrated need for the reservoir?

The New Britain Water Department said this proposal was resurrected because Shuttle Meadow Reservoir experienced a "reoccurring interval of going in and out of water supply droughts" last year as in 2007. Two years ago the Water Department, justifying the sale of the Patton Brook Well in Southington, said the City has a more than ample water supply that meets the 100-year drought criteria. Is there a formal plan documenting the potential need for additional water in 40 years?

Where are more detailed plans for the reservoir?

The only depiction of the reservoir presented so far is its surface area on one side of a much larger quarry. Where are the details of how this reservoir will be constructed? Will Tilcon's mining be planned to specifically construct a reservoir and watershed, or is Tilcon just extracting all the available traprock? If the reservoir is the primary justification of the quarrying, more detailed plans about the proposed reservoir should be made available, and incorporated in the contract so Tilcon can be held accountable for their delivery.

What are the costs in turning a potential reservoir into an actual reservoir?

The phrase "potential reservoir" has been used a number of times in presenting the proposed reservoir. The proposed sale of the Patton Brook Well was justified in part because repair costs would exceed \$1 million to bring it back to full capability. What are the associated costs that New Britain versus Tilcon will be responsible for in turning the Tilcon quarry into a viable reservoir? Will those costs be justifiable given alternatives?

What protection will there be for the reservoir from Tilcon's remaining quarry?

Tilcon will retain ownership of the quarry that isn't deeded to New Britain for reservoir development. What will keep water from that surface area entering the proposed reservoir? What does Tilcon plan to do with this property after the 40 year lease expires? Reservoir plans would clarify how much of a concern this is. What contract arrangements need to be made if it is a concern? Promising that water won't leave the site until it has been tested is not enough.

When will New Britain residents be shown the 40 year mining plan?

Tilcon's presentation to New Britain residents claimed there will be a "long term shift in mining location away from neighbors." The presentation showed the mining plans for the first five years where the blasting activity will be on the other side of the quarry from New Britain. However, the

proposed reservoir necessitates blasting to return to New Britain's side to remove traprock to a depth of ~150 feet along the 1000+ foot buffer. Tilcon claims the blasting buffer will be more than tripled from 300 feet to 1000 feet. Looking at a current satellite map of the quarry I don't see any New Britain residence that is closer than 1000 feet of recent blasting. Neighboring residents deserve transparency on the mining plans through the entire 40 year lease. When will these plans be made available?

Donald H. Crockett
195 Hartford Rd., New Britain, CT
doncrockett63@gmail.com