

Presentation to Select Board 12/20/21 – Agenda Item: Brief staff update on Mayflower Wind proposed electric cable installation in Falmouth
Dave Buzanoski, FHMNA President

With respect to tonight's Select Board meeting concerning the above subject, I last appeared before you on 5 Oct 2020, at which time this project was in its early stages. ConCom had already cleared Mayflower's request for test boring at 2 locations. The Town Counsel had okayed the use of town property which I believe was subject to the Select Board's approval.

At the time, FHMNA had requested the Select Board to delay the decision to allow this test drilling until such time that the full extent of this project was brought to the attention of the public, and until many of our questions concerning the impact on our community and potential health and safety concerns were answered.

The Select Board then in Nov 2020 voted to approve Mayflower's request. The Town then also retained an independent consultant, Exponent Corporation.

Test bores were completed and the Surf Drive site was eliminated, leaving the preferred location as Worcester Ave. Later, Mayflower also added a second site in the Heights at Central Park Ave.

To date, many of our questions and health and safety concerns remain unanswered and we would hope and expect the town to be able to share the information they have learned from their independent consultant on this matter. In the meantime, the approval process, and the project race on.

Up until now, FHMNA has been careful not to have taken a position on this matter and we merely sought answers to our questions and concerns without canvassing our membership. However, we have recently surveyed our membership with regards to whether or not they support or oppose the onboarding of Mayflower's transmission cables under our community's beach and neighborhood. The results are as follows:

86 % of the respondents to our survey OPPOSED the cables, and
14 % of the respondents APPROVED

To be clear, we are not opposing the Clean Energy initiative or wind generation, **we are specifically opposed to the cables transiting our beach, one of the oldest, most densely populated communities in our town.**

Question: when approached by Mayflower did the town suggest any alternative locations to Mayflower?

Further in this regard, Mayflower's initial description of this project mentions the Heights Beach and Worcester Ave. This has now been described in Mayflower's recently submitted documents

more specifically to describe the site as Worcester Ave. Park. In the park! Between the North and South bound lanes, with justification for same being that it would create less traffic congestion during construction, avoid conflict with other utilities, and although not stated, "easier and cheaper".

Question: Has the town given any consideration to the deed conditions and rights of abutters?

The second site at Central Park Ave. would also go under the Heights Beach and then up Central Park Ave. between the ball field and the Shipwrecked Restaurant, and eventually over to Falmouth Heights Road, clearly impacting another densely populated area, bordering a major park where our children and grandchildren play daily, as well as a number of commercial entities.

With regard to Mayflower's initial project submission as to the number of cables, I recall the initial description being three (3) cables, but I've subsequently seen it described as four (4) cables. This perhaps was also mentioned as being three (3) power cables and one (1) communication cable. And... even in their latest legal notice for "Federal Consistency Review" it is mentioned "up to five (5) cables in Falmouth ECC".

With Mayflower being selected on 17 Dec 21 to provide another 400MW to the state of Massachusetts, does this mean the number of cables will be expanded further? Where does such expansion end?

Zoning rules are put in place to protect individuals as well as the town.

Mayflower is seeking comprehensive zoning exemptions to allow such cabling through our town as well as at the terminal substation. Is this in our town's best interest?

With regard to the unanswered Health and Safety concerns... Science / Experts and History have run into some conflicts over the years, and the long terms exposure to high voltage and EMFs remain a long-term question for all of us. We need some answers.

You may recall the likes of:

The Tobacco industry telling us smoking was safe.

We were told Asbestos was safe to use in homes and ships.

Lead paint wasn't questioned until it was too late.

Same for Lead pipes in Flint, MI.

Diethylstilbestrol (DES) was said to be safe to use in the 1940's.

Oxycodone was not supposed to be addictive.

Let's not make a mistake here. Our lives, and the lives of those who follow us for generations to come, could be at risk too.