

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 Docket No. 508

5 The United Illuminating Company (UI) application
6 for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
7 and Public Need for the Milvon to West River
8 Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild Project
9 that consists of the relocation and rebuild of its
10 existing 115-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission
11 lines from the railroad catenary structures to new
12 steel monopole structures and related
13 modifications to facilitate interconnection of the
14 rebuilt 115-kV electric transmission lines at UI's
15 existing Milvon, Woodmont, Allings Crossing,
16 Elmwest and West River substations along
17 approximately 9.5 miles of the Connecticut
18 Department of Transportation's Metro-North
19 Railroad corridor traversing the municipalities of
20 Milford, Orange, West Haven and New Haven,
21 Connecticut.

22 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

23
24 Continued Public Hearing held on Tuesday,
25 May 24, 2022, beginning at 2:02 p.m.,
 via remote access.

H e l d B e f o r e :

 JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1 **A p p e a r a n c e s :**

2 **Council Members:**

3 **KENNETH COLLETTE, Designee for Commissioner**
4 **Katie Dykes, Department of Energy and**
 Environmental Protection

5 **QUAT NGUYEN, Designee for Chairman Marissa**
6 **Paslick Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory**
 Authority

7 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
8 **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**
9 **LOUANNE COOLEY**
 MARK QUINLAN

10 **Council Staff:**

11 **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**
 Executive Director and Staff Attorney

12 **MICHAEL PERRONE**
 Siting Analyst

13 **LISA FONTAINE**
14 **Fiscal Administrative Officer**

15 **For the Applicant, The United Illuminating**
16 **Company:**

17 **MURTHA CULLINA LLP**
18 **One Century Tower**
 265 Church Street, 9th Floor
 New Haven, Connecticut 06510-1220
 BY: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ.

19 **For Party, City of Milford:**

20 **HURWITZ, SAGARIN, SLOSSBERG & KNUFF, LLC**
21 **147 North Broad Street**
 New Milford, Connecticut 06460
 BY: JOHN W. KNUFF, ESQ.

22 **Zoom co-host: Aaron Demarest**

23 ****All participants were present via remote access.**

24 *****AUDIO INTERRUPTION - denotes breaks in speech**
25 **due to interruptions in audio or echo.**

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon, ladies
2 and gentlemen. This continued remote evidentiary
3 hearing session is called to order this Tuesday,
4 May 24, 2022, at 2 p.m. My name is John
5 Morissette, member and presiding officer of the
6 Connecticut Siting Council.

7 If you haven't done so already, I ask
8 that everyone please mute their computer audio and
9 telephones now. A copy of the prepared agenda is
10 available on the Council's Docket No. 508 webpage,
11 along with the record of this matter, the public
12 hearing notice, instructions for public access to
13 this remote public hearing, and the Council's
14 Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures.

15 Other members of the Council are, Mr.
16 Silvestri, Mr. Nguyen, Mrs. Cooley, Mr. Quinlan,
17 Mr. Collette, Mr. Lynch, Executive Director
18 Melanie Bachman, Staff Analyst Michael Perrone,
19 and Fiscal Administrative Officer Lisa Fontaine.

20 This evidentiary session is a
21 continuation of the public hearing held on April
22 28, 2022. It is held pursuant to the provisions
23 of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes
24 and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act
25 upon an application from The United Illuminating

1 Company for a Certificate of Environmental
2 Compatibility and Public Need for the Milvon to
3 West River Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV
4 Rebuild Project that consists of the relocation
5 and rebuild of its existing 115-kilovolt electric
6 transmission lines from the railroad catenary
7 structures to new steel monopole structures and
8 related modifications to facilitate
9 interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric
10 transmission lines at UI's existing Milvon,
11 Woodmont, Allings Crossing, Elmwest and West River
12 substations along approximately 9.5 miles of the
13 Connecticut Department of Transportation's
14 Metro-North Railroad corridor traversing the
15 municipalities of Milford, Orange, West Haven and
16 New Haven, Connecticut.

17 A verbatim transcript will be made
18 available of this hearing and deposited with the
19 City Clerk's Office of the Milford, New Haven and
20 West Haven City Halls and the Town Clerk's Office
21 of the Orange Town Hall for the convenience of the
22 public.

23 We will take a 10 to 15 minute break at
24 a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

25 We have a motion on the agenda. The

1 City of Milford submitted a motion for an
2 additional evidentiary hearing on May 20, 2022.
3 UI submitted an objection to the city's motion on
4 May 23, 2022. Attorney Bachman may wish to
5 comment.

6 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
7 Morissette. In its motion the city requests more
8 time to follow up on UI's responses to
9 interrogatories and to obtain additional
10 information. In its objection UI requests an
11 opportunity to present oral argument on its
12 grounds for objecting to the city's motion during
13 this hearing. Considering the hearing program,
14 specifically Roman Numeral No. IV, "Closing or
15 continuation by the Connecticut Siting Council,"
16 staff recommends we pass this motion at this time.
17 And if all party appearances and cross-examination
18 are completed at the conclusion of the hearing,
19 the motion for the additional hearing and the
20 opportunity for any oral argument thereon can be
21 taken up at that time. If all party appearances
22 and cross-examination is not complete at the end
23 of this hearing, the Council will continue the
24 evidentiary hearing which would render the city's
25 motion moot. Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
2 Bachman. So therefore we will pass on taking up
3 the motion at this time and we will consider it at
4 the end of the hearing depending on where we are
5 at that point.

6 Moving on to administrative notices
7 taken by the Council, I wish to call your
8 attention to the item shown on the hearing program
9 marked as Roman Numeral I-C, Item 90, that the
10 Council has administratively noticed. Thank you.

11 (Council's Administrative Notice Item
12 I-C-90: Received in evidence.)

13 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue
14 with the appearance of the applicant. In
15 accordance with the Council's April 29, 2022
16 continued evidentiary hearing memo, we will
17 commence with the appearance of the applicant, The
18 United Illuminating Company, to swear in its
19 additional witnesses and to verify the new
20 exhibits marked as Roman Numeral II, Items B-9
21 through 14 on the hearing program.

22 Attorney Bachman, can you please begin
23 by swearing in the UI additional witness, Mr.
24 George, Mr. Parkhurst and Mr. Roedel, for purposes
25 of taking the oath. Attorney Bachman.

1 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
2 Morissette. Can the witnesses please raise their
3 right hand.

4 D A V I D R. G E O R G E,
5 M A T T H E W P A R K H U R S T,
6 E D W A R D R O E D E L,

7 having been first duly sworn (remotely) by
8 Ms. Bachman, testified on their oaths as
9 follows:

10 C O R R E N E A U E R,
11 T O D D B E R M A N,
12 A Z I Z C H O U H D E R Y,
13 B E N J A M I N C O T T S,
14 S H A W N C R O S B I E,
15 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,
16 S A M A N T H A M A R O N E,
17 A N N E T T E P O T A S Z,
18 M E E N A S A Z A N O W I C Z,

19 having been previously duly sworn (remotely)
20 continued to testify on their oaths as
21 follows:

22 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
24 Bachman.

25 Attorney McDermott, please begin by

1 identifying the new exhibits you have filed in
2 this matter and verifying the exhibits by the
3 appropriate sworn witnesses.

4 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
5 Morissette. I hope our sound is a little bit
6 better. I've repositioned myself to be closer to
7 the microphone.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Unfortunately, you're
9 still a little weak.

10 MR. LYNCH: Very weak.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Very weak. Thank you,
12 Mr. Lynch.

13 MR. McDERMOTT: We're going to try and
14 -- (AUDIO INTERRUPTION)

15 I apologize. How's that, Mr.
16 Morissette?

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Much better. Thank
18 you.

19 DIRECT EXAMINATION

20 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Applicant's
21 Exhibit No. 9 is the revised response to Council's
22 Interrogatory Set One, No. 16, dated May 13, 2022.

23 Applicant's Exhibit No. 10 is the
24 additional witness resumes received May 17, 2022.

25 Number 11 is Applicant's Late-File

1 exhibits, dated May 17, 2022.

2 Applicant's Exhibit 12 is the responses
3 to the City of Milford's interrogatories, Set One,
4 dated May 17, 2022.

5 Exhibit 13 is Applicant's responses to
6 the City's interrogatories, Set Two, dated May 17,
7 2022.

8 Applicant's Exhibit No. 14 is
9 Applicant's revised response to the City's
10 Interrogatory No. 2-6, dated May 18, 2022.

11 Mr. Crosbie, with regards to the
12 Applicant's revised response to Council Set One,
13 No. 16, that would be Exhibit No. 9, Exhibit No.
14 11, Exhibit No. 12, Exhibit No. 13 and Exhibit No.
15 14, did you prepare or oversee the preparation of
16 those exhibits?

17 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, I did.

18 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any
19 changes or revisions thereto?

20 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Not at this
21 time.

22 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt those
23 as exhibits in this proceeding?

24 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, I do.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. George, with

1 regards to Applicant Exhibit No. 10, which
2 includes your resume, are you familiar with that
3 filing made by the company?

4 THE WITNESS (George): Yes, I am.

5 MR. McDERMOTT: Do you have any changes
6 or revisions to it?

7 THE WITNESS (George): No, I don't.

8 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as
9 a full exhibit today?

10 THE WITNESS (George): I do.

11 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr.
12 Parkhurst, with regard to your resume, which is
13 included as part of Applicant's Exhibit Number 10,
14 do you have any changes or revisions to that
15 document?

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): No, I do not.

17 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as
18 a full exhibit here today?

19 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

20 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr.
21 Morissette, with apologies to the Council and to
22 particularly Attorney Bachman and her staff that
23 does a great job preparing the hearing program,
24 this morning as I was preparing for the hearing, I
25 noticed that there was a mistake in the company's

1 response to Interrogatory No. 7 from the City.
2 That would be Set Two of the City's responses --
3 the City's interrogatories, excuse me. And the
4 company filed a revised response to that document
5 just right before the hearing. And I again
6 apologize for the lateness of that, but it did not
7 seem to be a document that I could have had a
8 witness kind of orally correct, so that's why we
9 filed the revised version of that. So if I may
10 add that as Applicant's Exhibit No. 15, and that
11 would be a revised response to the City of
12 Milford's Set Two Interrogatory Number 7, dated
13 May 24, 2022.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, you may. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And Mr.
17 Crosbie, are you familiar with that document that
18 was filed by the Council -- or filed by the
19 company with the Council today?

20 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, I am.

21 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any
22 changes or revisions thereto?

23 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Not at this
24 time, no.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as

1 a full exhibit?

2 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, I do.

3 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr.
4 Morissette, with that, I move that UI Exhibits 9
5 through 15 be admitted into evidence.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
7 Does the City of Milford object to the admission
8 of the applicant's new exhibits, Attorney Knuff?

9 MR. KNUFF: No objection, Mr.
10 Morissette.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Is
12 attorney Sharp with us this afternoon?

13 MR. KNUFF: Unfortunately, she is
14 unable to join us, so just me.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
16 The exhibits are hereby admitted.

17 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-9 through
18 II-B-15: Received in evidence - described in
19 index.)

20 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue
21 with cross-examination of the applicant by the
22 Council starting with Mr. Perrone and followed by
23 Mr. Silvestri.

24 Mr. Perrone.
25

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
3 Morissette.

4 Could UI explain what the ISO New
5 England asset condition list is?

6 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Roedel, I believe
7 that's probably a question for you.

8 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Thank you for
9 the question. My name is -- (AUDIO INTERRUPTION)

10 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, we can't
11 hear you.

12 THE WITNESS (Roedel): The ISO New
13 England asset condition list is a listing of all
14 the projects in the region on the pool
15 transmission facilities of New England that are
16 being rebuilt or modified due to the condition of
17 them as assets, their age or their physical
18 deterioration.

19 MR. PERRONE: And how does that differ
20 from the project list?

21 THE WITNESS (Roedel): The regional
22 system plan, the RSP?

23 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

24 THE WITNESS (Roedel): The RSP would be
25 projects that have a reliability need based on a

1 criteria violation like a thermal overload or a
2 voltage violation.

3 MR. PERRONE: (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) I
4 can repeat that.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Please, Mr. Perrone.
6 We're having difficulties hearing you.

7 MR. PERRONE: Sure. Why was the
8 proposed project listed in the RSP asset condition
9 list?

10 THE WITNESS (Roedel): It was listed in
11 the asset condition list based on the physical
12 deterioration of the structures where the
13 transmission lines were connected.

14 MR. PERRONE: Is the project or any
15 portion of the project proposed to be undertaken
16 by state departments, institutions or agencies or
17 to be funded in whole or in part by the state
18 through any grant or contract?

19 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Not that I'm
20 aware of, no.

21 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to Late-File
22 Exhibit Number 1, page 1, paragraph 4 where it
23 discussed how heights are determined and they were
24 revised downward in 5-foot increments until a
25 violation is reached and then it was bumped up 5

1 feet to clear the violation. My question is,
2 could you clarify what is meant by a clearance
3 violation?

4 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Parkhurst can
5 respond to that question, I believe.

6 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr. Perrone,
7 in regards to the 5-foot increment part of the
8 response on Late-File Exhibit 1, this was talking
9 in general terms of how we developed the heights
10 of the structures. Each pole comes in 5-foot
11 increments, and we said, okay, here's a baseline
12 of, let's say, 105. If there was a clearance
13 violation to something below it, we raised the
14 height of the structures. And we did that until
15 there was no clearance violation to any
16 surrounding objects, and that's how we generated
17 these heights. And we did that iterative times
18 through the design process as we moved poles
19 around.

20 MR. PERRONE: And what would constitute
21 a violation, would it be a violation of NESC or
22 another code?

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): We follow
24 NESC code, and UI has an additional buffer over
25 that code of about 3 foot in the vertical

1 direction, and we also have to follow
2 Metro-North's requirements being 15 feet from the
3 catenary structures.

4 MR. PERRONE: And just to be absolutely
5 clear, 15 feet horizontally or vertically?

6 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): The 15-foot
7 is a radial, so a combination horizontal and
8 vertical.

9 MR. PERRONE: Going back to the NESC,
10 is the current project based on the 2017 NESC?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

12 MR. PERRONE: There's a 2023 NESC with
13 an effective date of August 1, 2022. Are you
14 aware of any material changes in the 2023 version
15 that would affect structure heights or clearances
16 for the project?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): I am not.

18 MR. PERRONE: Turning back to Late-File
19 Exhibit 1, page 2, paragraph one, could you
20 explain what insulator swing and conductor uplift
21 are?

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Conductor
23 uplift is when, let's say I have a pole and what I
24 consider a valley shorter than the others, there
25 would be uplift on the wire connection. So

1 ultimately think of something being pulled out of
2 the ground. A lot of structures are not designed
3 to handle those uplift loads, so that plays into,
4 a big account into structure heights and how we
5 can't go specifically from, directly from a
6 120-foot pole to a 100-foot pole in one span
7 because most likely that lowest, shortest
8 structure would experience a negative uplift which
9 it's not designed to withstand.

10 MR. PERRONE: And insulator swing?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Insulator
12 swing, when you have -- sorry, I'm trying to
13 explain it to the non-engineers on the call. So
14 with wind and with the line angle, so the turning
15 of the route, the conductors will swing, they're
16 not completely straight. So when they swing up,
17 if they swing too much up, too high up, they could
18 either have a clearance violation to the structure
19 itself or sometimes they would bind. We're using
20 a brace post insulator technology. It would bind
21 the insulator which is, it could provide, which we
22 don't want to do, so we account for insulator
23 swing in the design. Again, it's similar to
24 uplift where you want to keep structure heights
25 relatively the same height throughout with some,

1 not a significant decrease from a tall pole to a
2 shorter pole.

3 MR. PERRONE: And also on the Late-File
4 exhibits there is attached sheet 2 of 2 where it
5 mentions if you go from a 300-foot span to a 600,
6 in other words, eliminate an intermediate
7 structure, adjacent structures may increase in
8 height by as much as 25 each. So on the drawing,
9 which is the lower right, in that particular
10 scenario both outer structures would go up 25 feet
11 to keep the span above the clearance; is that
12 correct?

13 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst):
14 approximately, yes. That's in general terms.

15 MR. PERRONE: On page 22 of the
16 evidentiary hearing transcript last time UI
17 testified that the structures are designed for a
18 winter loading with heavy ice. My question is,
19 what is considered heavy ice, is there a certain
20 thickness?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, the
22 lines are designed to withstand 1.5 inches of ice.

23 MR. PERRONE: And is that an NESC or a
24 UI standard, where does the one and a half come
25 from?

1 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): That's an
2 additional UI standard criteria.

3 MR. PERRONE: And on page 24 of the
4 evidentiary hearing transcript I had asked about
5 the footprint of transition stations and what they
6 would contain, and there was testimony that from I
7 believe Mr. Crosbie that you would have terminals
8 that could range up to 20 to 40 feet in height.
9 Could you clarify how many structures would be
10 located within a transition station?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes. Thank
12 you, Mr. Perrone. And I do apologize, this is
13 MeeNa Sazanowicz. There would be two riser
14 structures at the ends of the cable sections, and
15 that's to, you know, connect the overhead wires to
16 the underground cables.

17 MR. PERRONE: And also moving on to
18 page 49 of the transcript where we had asked you
19 about substation upgrades, and you had testified
20 that there would be hardware upgrades at the
21 substations to accommodate the 1590 ACSS
22 conductor. Would these hardware upgrades result
23 in any increase in structure heights?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
25 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz again. No, they would

1 not.

2 MR. PERRONE: And is that true for all
3 the affected substations?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

5 MR. PERRONE: Next I'm going to move on
6 to the cost topic. Late-File Exhibit 4,
7 approximately 24 percent of the regionalized cost
8 would be borne by Connecticut ratepayers. So is
9 it correct to say that the remaining 76 percent of
10 the regionalized cost would be borne by New
11 England ratepayers outside of Connecticut?

12 THE WITNESS (Roedel): This is Edward
13 Roedel. Yes, that is correct, the remaining
14 portion of regionalized costs would be borne by
15 the pool transmission facility so the remainder of
16 New England.

17 MR. PERRONE: Could any portion of the
18 total project cost be borne by Connecticut
19 ratepayers only and under what circumstances?

20 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Yes.
21 Determination of regionalized versus localized
22 costs is done by ISO New England in accordance
23 with the transmission tariff. During this
24 evaluation they look at a number of different
25 factors, but one of them is looking at the least

1 cost alternative that is technically feasible, and
2 any costs above that estimate will be instead of
3 being regionalized would be paid 100 percent by
4 the Connecticut electric ratepayers.

5 MR. PERRONE: So, for example, if there
6 was a modification, perhaps an underground segment
7 or a different alternative and if it came out
8 higher than the least cost alternative, ISO would
9 look at that and potentially that would be borne
10 by Connecticut ratepayers?

11 THE WITNESS (Roedel): That's correct.
12 Your specific example is cited in some ISO New
13 England cost allocation documents, in fact.

14 MR. PERRONE: And also whatever
15 regional costs, the regionalized costs. However,
16 on page 62 of the transcript Mr. Crosbie had noted
17 that some costs would be borne by distribution
18 ratepayers for distribution work. Do you have a
19 dollar amount or percentage of the total project
20 costs associated with distribution work?

21 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): So for
22 distribution work associated with the Milvon to
23 West River Transmission Line Project, it would be
24 about, an estimate of about 400,000 at this time.

25 MR. PERRONE: And the remaining project

1 costs would be all regionalized?

2 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes.

3 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to
4 environmental, I understand the proposed
5 structures would have a galvanized silver color.
6 From a visual and aesthetic standpoint,
7 Mr. Libertine, how would galvanized structures fit
8 in or not fit in with the context of the area?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, can
10 everybody hear me okay?

11 MR. PERRONE: (Nodding head in the
12 affirmative.)

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Great. Thank
14 you. Mr. Perrone, I think that's a -- it's a
15 question that really comes down to, you know,
16 personal taste. There are galvanized structures
17 along the rail line today, so it wouldn't be
18 totally out of context. I guess there could be
19 another argument made that a lot of the, what I'll
20 call the existing catenaries, the older structures
21 have patinaed and weathered, the argument may
22 introduce something that might look closer to
23 that. In general, the steel that can fade to a
24 light gray is typically, from my perspective, a
25 better alternative, but again, a lot of this comes

1 down to your own personal preference from an
2 aesthetic standpoint. But it certainly would not
3 be out of context either of those options.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
5 Libertine. You were breaking up a little bit. I
6 want to make sure Mr. Perrone got it all.

7 Mr. Perrone, did you get everything you
8 needed?

9 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.

11 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to alternative
12 configurations. Is a double circuit line on the
13 southern side of the railroad corridor for the
14 entire route feasible?

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
16 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. We did evaluate that
17 and take a look at impacts to the southern portion
18 of the railroad during the solution study phase.
19 We did determine that there were significantly
20 more impacts to the southern side of the railroad
21 as opposed to the northern side.

22 MR. PERRONE: For an overhead segment
23 shifted to the south in the Milford area, for
24 example, in the map 2 area, where would your
25 transition stations be located relative to the

1 right of way, would they tend to be on the
2 northern side or the southern side?

3 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone
4 you're referring to the transition stations for
5 the underground to overhead option?

6 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, we
8 currently had anticipated in our conceptual review
9 of this option that they would be on the northern
10 side, and that is to align with the proposed route
11 which is the overhead lines which are on the
12 northern side of the railroad corridor.

13 MR. PERRONE: And just before we talk
14 about the potential visual effects of the entire
15 route to the south, could you discuss potential
16 visual impacts of an overhead segment to the south
17 in the Milford area in the map 2 area, including
18 but not limited to impacts to the Milford Green?

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike
20 Libertine. I guess I'll start. I would have to
21 see precisely where those poles are, but certainly
22 shifting those poles to the south side would have
23 more of a visual impact to the green from some
24 locations. That's about all I can say without
25 having any real information on where they would be

1 specifically.

2 One thing I will say about the green.
3 As you are on the green facing the rail line,
4 there are several structures or homes, residences
5 and some businesses as well, so there are fleeting
6 glimpses of the existing infrastructure today. So
7 again, depending upon pole placement, that would
8 really be a critical aspect of how much of an
9 impact it might have.

10 MR. PERRONE: If UI were to modify the
11 project in the Milford area, whether it's an
12 underground alternative or a shift to overhead to
13 the south in the Milford area, in general would
14 such design changes impact portions of the project
15 outside of Milford in other municipalities?

16 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): This is Shawn
17 Crosbie with UI. Depending on the extent of the
18 alterations within Milford, there is potential for
19 it to impact the surrounding municipalities, yes.

20 MR. PERRONE: Could you explain just
21 generally what those impacts might consist of?

22 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Those impacts
23 could consist of ground varying impacts, so you
24 have cultural resources or environmental. It
25 could be additional in terms of structure heights

1 depending on the alignment, ultimate footprint of
2 where we would put transition structures.

3 MR. PERRONE: And since the last
4 evidentiary hearing has UI had any discussions
5 with SHPO?

6 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): This is Shawn
7 Crosbie. Yes, we have.

8 MR. PERRONE: What were the outcome of
9 such discussions?

10 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): This is Shawn
11 Crosbie again. We had discussions where SHPO had
12 requested some additional information on structure
13 heights and the due diligence that we had done. I
14 believe David George could provide some additional
15 detail to those, to that question, Mr. Perrone.

16 MR. PERRONE: Sure.

17 THE WITNESS (George): Mr. Perrone,
18 David George here. We did have ongoing
19 discussions with the SHPO regarding pole heights,
20 placement and potential impacts to cultural
21 resources in the area. And we discussed some of
22 the various options for construction, trying to
23 figure out which would be the best alternative for
24 cultural aside from all other resources.

25 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I

1 have.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
3 Perrone. We'll now continue with
4 cross-examination of the applicant by Mr.
5 Silvestri followed by Mr. Nguyen.

6 Mr. Silvestri.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
8 Morissette. And good afternoon, all.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: I'd like to start my
11 first round of questions concerning Charles
12 Island. And if we could look at Volume 1A, which
13 is the appendices, within that there's Appendix A1
14 and a December 22, 2021 letter from the State
15 Historic Preservation Office.

16 Now, on page 2 of that letter it states
17 in part that both parties agree that the
18 production of a pedestrian survey, mapping and
19 historic research of Charles Island, as well as
20 the production and installation of interpretive
21 signage would successfully mitigate the impact.

22 A couple questions on that. Could you
23 explain what is meant by a "pedestrian survey"?

24 THE WITNESS (George): Mr. Silvestri,
25 this is David George. A pedestrian survey of the

1 island would include a thorough walk-down of the
2 island, the notation of all cultural features on
3 the island, things like stone walls, foundations
4 and a complete photodocumentation of the island as
5 well.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: And then how about the
7 "interpretive signage," what does that mean?

8 THE WITNESS (George): So the
9 interpretive signage would be ultimately a
10 deliverable that would be produced after detailed
11 historical research about the island, its former
12 occupants, its former uses, and then all kind of
13 wrapped into an interpretive statement that would
14 be converted into a sign for placement on Silver
15 Sands.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Then, Mr. George, the
17 last part of that says "would successfully
18 mitigate the impact." What impact would be
19 successfully mitigated?

20 THE WITNESS (George): The SHPO chose
21 this mitigation option in order to offset or
22 mitigate the impacts to the historic resources in
23 Milford along the right of way corridor.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Impacts such as visual?

25 THE WITNESS (George): Visual impacts.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. And
2 one more question, Mr. George. Are you aware of
3 the 2006 publication by a Michael Dooling that's
4 entitled "An Historical Account of Charles
5 Island"?

6 THE WITNESS (George): I have seen
7 reference to that document.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
9 Now, staying on Charles Island, it is designated
10 as a natural area preserve and an important bird
11 area and nesting habitat. The question I have, in
12 the applicant's biological and ecological
13 assessments were there any studies that examined
14 potential bird migration toward the transmission
15 corridor, any possible potential adverse impacts;
16 and if so, any potential mitigation measures?

17 MR. McDERMOTT: Is that you, Todd?

18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Would the UI
19 team like me to take this, or Correne?

20 This is Mike Libertine. I'll start.
21 We worked very closely with UI on the bird issues,
22 specifically with DEEP and some of the Natural
23 Diversity Data Base, but I am familiar with the
24 area in general. And typically, in terms of bird
25 migration, the major flyways, the major flyway

1 certainly is the Atlantic Eastern Seaboard, and so
2 it's conceivable that the island is used as a
3 stopover. However, the only areas that would be
4 probably highly congregational for migratory birds
5 along the right of way would be at any of the
6 river crossings, and that would be if the birds
7 were using some of the smaller rivers, the West
8 River, for example, as a secondary flyway.

9 So from our perspective, I don't think
10 it was specifically, to answer your question, I do
11 not know specifically a study or survey done with
12 respect to the island, but it certainly is -- it's
13 not a surprise that it's an important bird area
14 because, again, it is right in Long Island Sound
15 and along the Eastern Seaboard.

16 I'm not sure, did that help answer your
17 question, Mr. Silvestri?

18 MR. SILVESTRI: To some extent, Mr.
19 Libertine. I do appreciate that. My concern is
20 that if there's any birds, if you will, of special
21 significance would they migrate towards a taller
22 utility transmission structure should the project
23 be approved. And if so, I've seen, for example,
24 crossings of different rivers further east in
25 Connecticut that have these balls that are put on

1 the transmission lines at different areas. I
2 assume that that's to try to keep birds away or at
3 least to warn them that there's a line that's
4 going across. So that's kind of what I'm looking
5 at.

6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Typically
7 those are actually aviation markers as opposed to
8 bird deterrents, if we're talking about the same
9 features on the lines that are crossing large
10 water bodies.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: I always thought they
12 were for birds. Thank you, Mr. Libertine.

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I would
14 imagine the birds associate with those as well
15 because of course the wires, just like guy wires
16 on telecommunication towers, very tall ones, they
17 can be a problem for bird collisions. But those
18 are strictly for aviation.

19 To answer your question, in terms of
20 tall structures, if you were to go along the right
21 of way today, you would see there are a fairly
22 substantial amount of nests on some of the taller
23 monopoles and even on some of the bonnets that
24 exist today that Ospreys typically use. So
25 Ospreys certainly are one of the bird species that

1 UI is very aware of, and we have some management
2 protocols that will be going into place to make
3 sure that those birds are protected and that the
4 work is done in such a way that it will not
5 disturb any breeding pairs that might be active
6 during a construction season.

7 Beyond that, you know, in terms of
8 manmade structures, most birds would prefer to
9 have a natural environment in terms of nesting.
10 They may perch temporarily. Any of the raptors
11 could be seen that are in the Connecticut area
12 could be seen down there at any given time. But I
13 think from a direct impact standpoint really the
14 focus would be on Osprey and Osprey nests.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you,
16 Mr. Libertine. While I have you, I did want to do
17 a follow-up on one of Mr. Perrone's questions
18 about the color of the structure. And if I heard
19 correctly because you were kind of breaking up
20 towards the end there, if I heard correctly, it
21 seemed that it's basically a matter of opinion
22 that if the new structures went in, say, as a dark
23 brown or blackish color to try to blend in with
24 the existing catenary, it's just, it's up to the
25 observer's eye as to whether it would be better or

1 not. Would that be correct?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That
3 certainly is my opinion on that matter because
4 I've talked to so many people over the years, and
5 it's almost split down the middle. Some people
6 prefer the darker colored monopoles and others
7 prefer just to go with the steel and let that
8 weather on its own, so kind of go to a dull matt
9 finish. But yeah, to answer your question, yes, I
10 would say that it is really each observer has
11 their own personal preference when it comes to
12 aesthetics.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
14 again, Mr. Libertine.

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You're
16 welcome.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: I'd like to go back to
18 Mr. Parkhurst, I believe, for a follow-up on Mr.
19 Perrone's question. Good afternoon, sir. This
20 goes back to --

21 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Good
22 afternoon, Mr. Silvestri.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. This goes
24 back to that May 17, 2022 Late-File exhibit. If
25 you look at the very last page, which is sheet 2

1 of 2, that talks about the pole will experience
2 uplift unless it is a deadend structure. And I
3 think you explained that to my satisfaction that
4 with that drawing that's in the upper left, if
5 that were to exist, and if I understand correctly,
6 the tension on the transmission line could
7 actually pull that pole up; is that correct?

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Let me
9 provide some more guidance. So typically there's
10 two types of structures, there's a deadend
11 structure and a tangent structure. The tangent
12 structures are the ones that cannot experience
13 uplift, they're not designed for that. The
14 deadend structures are heavier, they're larger
15 structures, and they can experience uplift with no
16 issues.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: So if you go back to
18 that schematic or that drawing that's on that
19 second page there, sheet 2 of 2 over on the top
20 left, you have one pole there that I guess would
21 experience the uplift. How many shorter poles
22 would be needed to eliminate that uplift?

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): I think that
24 it would be a case-by-case basis. It would depend
25 on how the -- what height differential we're

1 looking at in like a vertical versus horizontal.
2 It would depend on how far down you have to go or
3 how far up you have to go over a certain distance.
4 There's no exact number.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: So there's more to it
6 then that if I came back to that drawing and if I
7 added one more shorter pole, that wouldn't
8 necessarily solve the problem, if I understand
9 correctly, because there's other factors that are
10 involved, correct?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.
13 Okay. I'd like to take some time now to examine
14 the proposed transmission pole locations in
15 Milford basically going from Gulf Street West and
16 also at the same time reviewing some of the data
17 that was just presented in Exhibit 15 today. So
18 the first question I have, is there a pole P917N?

19 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
20 Silvestri, this is Mr. Matthew Parkhurst again.
21 No, there is not. No, there is no pole 917.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: So the proposal, as I
23 see it, was to bridge the cemetery from P918N to
24 P916N and not interfere with any type of cemetery
25 operation; would that be correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
3 Now, just to verify, if I understood the Exhibit
4 15 and some other exhibits correctly, Pole P916N
5 is 135 feet tall; is that correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, that's
7 correct.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Then Pole 915N is 145
9 feet?

10 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: And P914N is 135 feet,
12 also correct?

13 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. Thank you.
15 Then continuing on, there's no pole that's labeled
16 P913N; is that also correct?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): That is also
18 correct.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understand the
20 drawing correctly, P914N will connect with P912N
21 to the bridge at River Street, so far so good?

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. But why is there
24 not a pole in the middle, P913N?

25 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): For a variety

1 of reasons. If you look at the area, there's the
2 road, there is a -- Railroad Avenue is right by
3 the catenary 913. And as you may or may not be
4 aware, there is a proposed mixed use development
5 planned for that parcel to the north on the west
6 side of River Street. And the proposed
7 development will turn that road into a two-way
8 road. So we would, in order to place a pole in
9 between, we would have to locate it in the middle
10 of a driving lane.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: So the way it's
12 configured right now or the proposed configuration
13 is basically planning for the future, correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then pole P912N,
16 if I have the data correctly, it's 130 feet tall,
17 also correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Now,
20 continuing on, there's no pole labeled P911N. And
21 similar question, why is that?

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So if we use
23 our initial design baseline, the catenary 911 is
24 located within the train station, so the nearest
25 piece of land, available land to not impact that

1 train station would be that grass median north of
2 the train station. Placing poles there would
3 require tree clearing within that median. So we
4 decided to also have a longer span to eliminate a
5 need for tree clearing or any easements with the
6 property owner to the north.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: If there were a pole
8 that was placed there, say P911N, would that also
9 take up parking spaces?

10 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): It would
11 either, it would be either, take up parking spaces
12 or be located in that grass median and additional
13 tree clearing would be required.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Then
15 again we're continuing on. We have pole P910N.
16 And if I have data correct on that, that's also
17 140 feet tall, also correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you.
20 Continuing on, west of High Street there's no pole
21 P909N. And again, same type of question, why is
22 there no pole there?

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So when we're
24 designing this transmission line, we have to look
25 at it as a system and not individual structures.

1 So sometimes by, in this case if we were to add --
2 909N doesn't become a significant value without
3 911.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm not sure if I
5 understand you when you say "significant value."

6 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So we're
7 looking at structure heights. With a long span
8 between 910 and 912, that's what governed the
9 height of 910. So by adding 909, it would
10 essentially be the same height as 910 and going
11 down the line. So there would be no, because of
12 uplift and there's other reasons I spoke of
13 before.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I'm going to
15 hold that thought. I do thank you for your
16 answer. And I'll approach that again in a few
17 minutes. Just let me verify at this point, pole
18 P908N is 135 feet, also correct?

19 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, that's
20 correct.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: And in refreshing my
22 memory, the approximate height of the bonnets on
23 the existing catenary structure is probably about
24 60 feet typical, also correct?

25 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Also correct,

1 yes.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Great. Thank
3 you. Now, the last time we met we discussed the
4 height of some poles that they could possibly be
5 reduced with the addition of new poles kind of
6 placed in the middle, if you will. And if you
7 look at the response to A-LF-2 in the Late-Filed
8 exhibits, it kind of touched on downtown Milford,
9 but I'd like to expand upon the response that was
10 there. So a couple questions I want to ask you
11 pertain to that area.

12 The first one, can additional poles be
13 added between P914N and P912N to reduce the
14 overall height? And if that's feasible, how many
15 poles would be needed and how much of the height
16 would be reduced?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So due to the
18 two-way road and the buildings on the east side of
19 River Street, there's no feasible location to put
20 a pole by catenary 913 unless it's moved into the
21 property of the mixed use development. We could,
22 as what was written in Late-Filing response number
23 2, 912 could move to the east, but it would not
24 have a significant impact on pole height.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you.

1 So same question, how about between P912N and
2 P910N, could any other shorter poles be placed in
3 between that would reduce the overall height of
4 those two poles?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, we could
6 place, as I talked about a few minutes ago, that
7 911 in the grassy median north of the train
8 station.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: But if you had that one
10 and you go back to that drawing on sheet 2 of 2,
11 does that cause uplift?

12 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): We would have
13 to design that as the larger deadend structure to
14 not have uplift or what I was -- in my response to
15 Mr. Perrone, insulator swing so far north compared
16 to the other poles.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: And when you say
18 "larger deadend structure," do you mean larger as
19 in girth or larger as in height?

20 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Diameter.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: Diameter, okay. Thank
22 you. All right. And that would be, I guess, the
23 same between P910N and P908N as far as adding
24 something in between to try to reduce the overall
25 height?

1 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Great. Thank
3 you. I'm going to leave that part and ask a
4 general question.

5 THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Silvestri?

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Berman): I just want to
8 amend or make an additional comment pursuant to
9 your questions about the location of P908N and
10 some of the nuance you asked about relating to the
11 positioning on that. And just to advise you that
12 the reason that we know that Railroad Avenue was
13 planned as a two-way street in the future, and the
14 reason that we know of the plan development just
15 to the north of the tracks there is because of
16 meetings that were held with the Town of Milford,
17 and that's the kind of engagement, you know,
18 that's where we learned of those coming land uses
19 and really tried to adapt our design to it.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood, Mr. Berman.
21 I did not know about those, hence my question is
22 asking to you. So thank you.

23 All right. Continuing on, if the
24 transmission lines were to go underground, would
25 the underground route parallel the railroad

1 corridor and still be located within the DOT right
2 of way?

3 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
4 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Is this for
5 the entire project area, Milvon to West River or
6 specifically in Milford?

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Let's consider it as
8 Milford at this point.

9 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So at this
10 time at a conceptual level the team did review a
11 potential for one route which would be parallel to
12 the train tracks. This would be located in the CT
13 DOT corridor, so that would also require approval
14 from the State of Connecticut for us to place
15 those underground facilities within their railroad
16 corridor. The team also did review at a high
17 conceptual level a route that would be outside of
18 the railroad corridor as well.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: When you say "outside
20 the railroad corridor," where would that be?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Within the
22 public streets.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And when
24 you were looking inside the railroad corridor,
25 were you still looking on the north side or were

1 you looking at the south side?

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We were
3 looking at the north side to align with the
4 location of the existing -- not existing, excuse
5 me, the proposed overhead line project.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Copy that. Thank you.
7 If you look at River Street on a hypothetical
8 underground route, how do you cross River Street
9 underground?

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Apologies,
11 give me a moment.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: No, take your time. So
13 if you're underground in the DOT corridor and
14 you're heading west, if you will, I'm curious as
15 to how you cross a road.

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We would
17 have to HDD in that section, which is horizontal
18 directional drilling.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: So you would go
20 underneath the road? Would that be correct that
21 you would actually go from the, say, ballast area
22 at the railroad you would go underneath River
23 Street and then come back up again?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes,
25 correct. And this is also due to needing to reach

1 the riser pole for the other side of the
2 underground cable and the limited area that we
3 would have there in order to -- on the east side
4 of River Street to construct an open trench for
5 the duct bank.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Then is it
7 feasible rather than going underneath, say, River
8 Street, could you connect to the bridge and just
9 go straight across?

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): It is my
11 understanding that projects would have to receive
12 approval from the State of Connecticut to attach
13 to those railroad facilities, and that is not
14 something that is taken lightly.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Could it be a
16 desirable way to go? Or I'll rephrase. Is it
17 more desirable to go underneath, hypothetically,
18 River Street or to connect just going straight
19 across on top of the bridge, on the side of the
20 bridge?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So crossing
22 above grade and attaching to the bridge we'd have
23 to do extra engineering, due diligence based on
24 the size of the cable to be able to determine if
25 we'd be able to make that sweep to connect to the

1 overhead bridge facilities.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. I
3 appreciate your answers and didn't mean to put you
4 too much on the spot. One final question for you.
5 In looking at an underground option through
6 Milford, we had two potential options that you
7 mentioned, one of them staying within the DOT
8 corridor, the other one going into some road. Do
9 you have potential cost estimates for either or
10 both of those two options?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, we have
12 conceptual grade estimates for both those options.
13 So the underground section, which at this point we
14 have determined potential locations of riser poles
15 at location P904 and P915 just due to the built
16 environment and having to rise up for the
17 underground cables. In the railroad corridor we
18 estimated the cost to be around \$66.8 million. I
19 apologize, I believe that was -- hold on.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: That's okay, I'm
21 writing it down. Take you time.

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): \$66.6
23 million. I apologize.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: 66.6, okay. Thank you.

25 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): And then for

1 -- I'm sorry, for the open street conceptual cost
2 was around 74 million.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: And the open street
4 would still kind of start at P904 and somehow end
5 at P915?

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: And it was 74 million
8 you said?

9 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
11 very much.

12 Mr. Morissette, I have reached the end
13 of my questions. Thank you. And thank you, all.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
15 Silvestri. We'll now continue with
16 cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen followed by Mrs.
17 Cooley.

18 Mr. Nguyen.

19 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
20 Good afternoon. I have a few questions related to
21 Late-File No. 1. And then before I get into
22 number 1, Late-File No. 1, I just want to ask the
23 company witness, are there any violations
24 currently existing that need to be rectified as
25 part of this transmission project?

1 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Nguyen, Bruce
2 McDermott. Are you speaking about NESC
3 violations?

4 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, NESC violation, DOT
5 violation, Metro-North.

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): No, there
7 are no current violations.

8 MR. NGUYEN: So for the purpose of
9 Late-File Number 1 that talks about violations, so
10 is it for illustration purposes? That's what I'm,
11 I was a bit confused in terms of violation that's
12 listed on Late-File Number 1.

13 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr. Nguyen,
14 this is Matthew Parkhurst, Mr. Matthew Parkhurst.
15 So I think the violation term, there's no actual
16 violations on the line, clearance violations on
17 the line now in terms of NESC code. The violation
18 term that was used in Late-Filing response 1, we
19 were talking about the design process and how we
20 established new pole heights in terms of ensuring
21 that there are no clearance violations with the
22 new design.

23 MR. NGUYEN: In the distribution area
24 there's a certain vertical clearance, you know,
25 from the lowest of the wire to the ground, there's

1 a vertical clearance. For a transmission area is
2 there a typical vertical requirement for
3 transmission lines, specifically --

4 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): To confirm,
5 Mr. Nguyen, typical vertical clearance to ground?

6 MR. NGUYEN: Yes.

7 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes. So the
8 NESC mandates typical vertical clearance to
9 ground, plus UI along with many utilities in the
10 U.S. have an additional buffer. UI's vertical
11 clearance to ground mandated is 23 feet.

12 MR. NGUYEN: So 23 feet. Let's say you
13 have two poles and there's a wire that goes from
14 one pole to the other. The lowest point of that
15 wire, which is called a sag point, from there to
16 the ground typical is about 23 feet requirement;
17 is that right?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Just looking
19 at clearance to ground, yes.

20 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Now, in this we are
21 talking about poles that are over 100 feet, so
22 this is way exceeding the requirement. So if you
23 could explain, you know, what other reasons behind
24 this in terms of the vertical clearance.

25 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So we have to

1 meet clearances to every object other than ground
2 whether it be a building, whether it be a bridge,
3 whether it be a railroad track, and also the
4 Metro-North catenary structures. That was
5 actually governing the structure height was the
6 Metro-North electrical infrastructure and their
7 catenary structures and their desire to keep 15
8 feet away from -- maintain 15-foot clearance from
9 the 115-kV lines to their facilities.

10 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. I'm looking at
11 the attachment LF-1-1, and I see diagrams of
12 different scenarios. Are you there? Are you at
13 that attachment, Mr. Parkhurst?

14 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, I see
15 that.

16 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Great. Just
17 briefly if you could explain again overall this
18 diagram. And I see that there's different
19 scenarios where the height of the pole can be
20 average or it can be taller. So if you could,
21 again, if you could explain, if you could go over
22 this attachment.

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Okay. Yes, I
24 can go through this.

25 MR. NGUYEN: Or anybody else prepared

1 this attachment.

2 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes,
3 Mr. Nguyen, I can go through this attachment. The
4 first at the top, the top three, starting in the
5 top left, the top three photos talk about
6 structure height in relation to topography. So
7 when we consider pole height, we also have to
8 consider topography. In many locations the ground
9 elevation on the land north of the railroad tracks
10 and where the existing catenaries are positioned
11 are much lower than -- is much lower and so the
12 pole height would have to be taller, would have to
13 be bigger in order to make up for the topography
14 difference. But in these cases, given everything
15 else constant, the top of pole elevation above sea
16 level would be the same.

17 MR. NGUYEN: Okay.

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): The next
19 three talk about horizontal distance away from the
20 Metro-North catenary structure. As I said in
21 response to one of Mr. Silvestri's questions, we
22 have to meet the 15 foot in a radial direction,
23 combination vertical and horizontal. So as we
24 come closer to the catenary structures with the
25 new 115-kV poles, they have to be taller to meet

1 that clearance more in a vertical direction than
2 in a horizontal direction.

3 The bottom two on the right-hand side
4 just gives an example of where we would not place
5 a pole due to constructability issues, concerns
6 with having a pole in the embankment of the
7 railroad ballast. We would rather be on the
8 bottom or the top flat surface. That would also
9 ease accessibility during construction and future
10 maintenance.

11 And the next sheet, sheet 2 of 2, it
12 talks about, the top left figure is a figure that
13 represents what a structure and uplift would look
14 like where it's shorter than the others around it.
15 The two diagrams on the right-hand side give a
16 summary of what would happen with the sag of the
17 wire if we go from a 300-foot approximate span to
18 a 600-foot approximate span in general terms, of
19 course.

20 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you for that
21 explanation. One last question regarding the 24
22 percent that was provided to Mr. Perrone's
23 question. Now, how was that 24 percent
24 determined? First of all, is that going to be the
25 distribution customers would absorb 24 percent of

1 this whole project cost; is that correct? And if
2 it is correct, then if you could explain how is
3 that determined?

4 THE WITNESS (Roedel): This is Edward
5 Roedel from UI. The 24 percent is for a
6 regionalized transmission project, and that's
7 calculated based on the amount of load that the
8 Connecticut retail customers represent against the
9 balance of New England.

10 MR. NGUYEN: And who determines that
11 load, is that the ISO, is that load determined by
12 ISO?

13 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Yes, the
14 transmission owners or distribution providers in
15 New England provide their loading information to
16 ISO New England and they make that calculation.

17 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And currently prior
18 to this project what is the current load right
19 now, is it also 24 percent?

20 THE WITNESS (Roedel): You're speaking
21 of the amount of load in Connecticut?

22 MR. NGUYEN: Right.

23 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Yes, Connecticut
24 represents roughly 24 percent of ISO New England's
25 total load.

1 MR. NGUYEN: I see. Okay. And that's
2 all I have, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

3 Thank you, gentlemen.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
5 We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mrs.
6 Cooley followed by Mr. Quinlan.

7 Mrs. Cooley.

8 MRS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr.
9 Morissette. I just have a few questions, actually
10 might be more of a clarification. To start with,
11 I'm looking at Late-Filed Exhibit 2, question
12 Q-LF-2. And I just would like some clarification
13 on my math here. You've talked a bit about the
14 cost of undergrounding the transmission lines
15 between P905 and P914 or potentially using the
16 catenary structure, but this question talks about
17 how you could add poles to lower the overall pole
18 height. And just adding up what it looks like in
19 the answer to this question, it looks like it
20 would be a total of 12 to 13 more poles at a cost
21 ranging between \$20.4 to \$24.7 million, but it
22 seems like the issue here is that the height
23 decrease would be no more than 25 feet for that
24 option, is that correct, do I have the costs on
25 that correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Ms. Cooley,
2 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. So in Late-File
3 No. 2 answer I believe the total amount of
4 structures that we estimate, if we would be
5 allowed to lower the height of our structures,
6 match the catenary structure at one structure for
7 each catenary would be about 22 structures.

8 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. I'm adding up what
9 it says under each of your sections where it says
10 how many structures for each of those that would
11 need to be added, and I'm only coming up with 12
12 to 13. So where are the extra numbers coming up,
13 or am I just not reading that correctly?

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, it's
15 Bruce McDermott. I think, at least the UI room
16 has seemed to have lost Ms. Cooley.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Ms. Cooley, can you
18 hear me?

19 MRS. COOLEY: I can hear you. Can you
20 hear me?

21 MR. MORISSETTE: I can hear you.
22 Attorney McDermott, can you hear Mrs. Cooley?

23 MR. McDERMOTT: I can hear now, but I
24 do think we lost the last question, so maybe you
25 can repeat the last question.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

2 MRS. COOLEY: Sure. I'm just trying to
3 get some clarification here because I was reading
4 through the answer there, and when I added up what
5 I could see where you were adding poles in each of
6 those sections, I came up with 12 to 13, but it
7 sounds like in the answer it says 22 additional
8 structures. I'm just trying to figure out where
9 the additional 10 came from or where those were
10 added in. Because I'm seeing for downtown Milford
11 it says three structures. Milford Cemetery it
12 says one structure. Indian River, two. City
13 Carting, four. Morgan Lane, one. West River, two
14 to three.

15 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): This is Aziz
16 Chouhdery. You're right, if we use the existing
17 design structure heights and add the additional
18 structures, the total structures required would be
19 14, but if we met all structures with the existing
20 catenary structure, then we need 22 more
21 structures.

22 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. So 22 total or 22
23 in addition to the --

24 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): In addition
25 to the total.

1 MS. COOLEY: Additional to the 13 or
2 14?

3 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): Yes. If we
4 use the current design, structure heights, so you
5 saw that we need in Milford, downtown Milford
6 three and Milford Cemetery one structure between
7 916 and 917. And Indian River we have to
8 introduce two. City Carting, four. Morgan Lane,
9 one. West River, three. So all together these
10 are 14. If we add 14 more, we can reduce some
11 structure heights based on the current design. So
12 these would be in addition, additional 14.

13 MS. COOLEY: Okay. I guess I'm still
14 not sure. Are you getting the 22 by adding the
15 additional, I think you're saying 14 instead of
16 13, to what's there already?

17 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): Based on the
18 current design, we have 158 structures. That's
19 what we are designing the line, what we submitted
20 in the application. If we reduce the structure
21 height, we could have 13 or 14. We have not
22 finalized the design. This is a conceptual
23 estimate. So you add 158 plus 14, 172 structures
24 to design the line. If we redesign the line
25 matching the existing catenary structures with

1 these new structures, we have to add 22 more, so
2 158 plus 22 is 180.

3 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. And even if you
4 added those 22 extra structures, it would really
5 limit, the height decrease could be no more than
6 25 feet?

7 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): Because as
8 Matt Parkhurst discussed, the height limit is
9 determined based on the adjacent MNR wires, so we
10 cannot reduce much.

11 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. That was the
12 question I had about that comment. And then I had
13 only one more kind of a question that may be a
14 little off topic, but it was kind of sparked by
15 something that Mr. Silvestri said about birds.
16 And I wondered if UI is still having issues with
17 monk parakeets in this area and whether or not
18 that has impacted the catenary structures or if
19 you would anticipate there to be any issues with
20 those on this transmission structure.

21 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Ms. Cooley,
22 this is Shawn Crosbie. On the current project
23 footprint we haven't seen any monk parakeet nests
24 on the catenaries. UI inspects where there are
25 known locations for monk parakeet nests which

1 mainly house on distribution poles. UI continues
2 to do inspections on a specific frequency and then
3 provide maintenance to those areas, as necessary,
4 pending operation's evaluation of impact.

5 MRS. COOLEY: So not anticipated to be
6 an issue?

7 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Not
8 anticipated, correct, yes.

9 MRS. COOLEY: Very good. All right.
10 Thank you very much. I think that covers the
11 questions that I still had pending. Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mrs.
13 Cooley. We'll now continue with cross-examination
14 by Mr. Quinlan, followed by Mr. Collette.

15 Mr. Quinlan.

16 MR. QUINLAN: I have no questions at
17 this time. Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
19 Quinlan. We'll now continue with
20 cross-examination by Mr. Collette, followed by Mr.
21 Lynch.

22 Mr. Collette.

23 MR. COLLETTE: Yes. Thank you. Just a
24 couple of questions. One goes to the deadend
25 structure that was discussed. And I believe the

1 answer to Mr. Silvestri's question was that it's
2 larger in girth. And I was just wondering if
3 that's along the entire length of the deadend
4 structure or is that just really closer to the
5 base of the structure?

6 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): The length
7 depends on the -- (AUDIO INTERRUPTION)

8 MR. COLLETTE: If you had to install a
9 deadend structure compared to a regular monopole,
10 it was described as those are larger in girth, the
11 deadend structure is larger in girth.

12 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): Deadend
13 structures --

14 MR. COLLETTE: And I was just wondering
15 if that's --

16 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): Sorry.

17 MR. COLLETTE: I was just wondering if
18 that's along its entire length, you know, or is it
19 just sort of more at the base of the structure
20 itself.

21 THE WITNESS (Chouhdery): It depends on
22 how much adjacent span to achieve the clearance in
23 that area. So if we have a smaller span, we need
24 small length of that pole. But something that
25 Matt mentioned earlier is the diameter depends on

1 how much load we are putting. So deadend
2 structures usually have more diameter, much
3 thicker steel, so they can handle much more load.

4 MR. COLLETTE: Okay. The next question
5 is about the mitigation at Charles Island. And as
6 Mr. Silvestri, again, as he referenced, it's a
7 nature area preserve. And I was wondering, in
8 discussing the plans for this mitigation at
9 Charles Island, was it known to SHPO or to UI or
10 either of the parties that the area is actually
11 closed to access from May 1st to September 9th?

12 THE WITNESS (George): Mr. Collette,
13 this is David George. That is in fact true, the
14 SHPO understands that the mitigation would have to
15 take place off season in terms of any bird
16 migratory incidents there.

17 MR. COLLETTE: Did SHPO express any
18 concern that essentially interpretive exhibits
19 would have limited sort of accessibility or
20 visibility, especially during the time when the
21 island is closed?

22 THE WITNESS (George): No, sir, because
23 the signs will be posted on Silver Sands Beach,
24 which actually sees quite a bit of foot traffic,
25 and in recent days has seen its highest traffic

1 count ever.

2 MR. COLLETTE: And Mr. George, I don't
3 know if you were present at the initial session of
4 the hearing, but has there been discussions with
5 DEEP about placement of interpretive exhibits on
6 this property?

7 THE WITNESS (George): It's my
8 understanding that SHPO has reached out to DEEP,
9 and DEEP is favorable for that as a mitigation
10 option.

11 MR. COLLETTE: All right. I have no
12 further questions. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
14 Collette. We'll now continue with
15 cross-examination by Mr. Lynch.

16 Mr. Lynch.

17 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
18 I just have a few clarifications, thanks to Mr.
19 Silvestri asking most of my questions. As far as
20 socialization on a regional basis, I understand
21 the 24 percent that the ISO uses, but I thought I
22 heard earlier based on Mr. Perrone's questions
23 that the ratepayer is going to bear 100 percent of
24 the costs. What did I miss here?

25 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Lynch, this

1 is Edward Roedel. The 100 percent number that I
2 cited was any costs above the least cost
3 alternative for a project.

4 MR. LYNCH: Okay. A lot of times
5 people were breaking up and I didn't hear that.
6 Thank you very much.

7 Also, I thought I heard earlier that
8 you're going to use no state or federal funds.
9 Now, with the federal infrastructure bill, which
10 was actually designed to help upgrade the grid,
11 are you telling me you didn't apply for it or
12 you're not eligible for it? The state has \$9
13 billion coming to it.

14 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Lynch, this
15 is Shawn Crosbie. If you give us a minute, we can
16 get you an answer back on that one.

17 MR. LYNCH: All right.

18 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Thank you.

19 MR. LYNCH: There's a lot of money out
20 there. This is what it was designed for. That's
21 why I asked the question.

22 As far as another question Mr.
23 Silvestri was asking earlier about undergrounding,
24 and you gave two different costs for the two
25 different plans. My question really is, how is

1 that -- what is that based on, is that cost per
2 mile, cost per -- you know, what's the formula
3 used for getting the cost for those two
4 undergrounds, is it based on per mile?

5 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): MeeNa
6 Sazanowicz. So in order to calculate those
7 conceptual cost estimates, we did populate a
8 template that was based on some recent
9 transmission projects that had the same
10 installation or approximately the same
11 installation as this proposed underground system
12 would have.

13 MR. LYNCH: Okay. And my last question
14 is, again, another follow-up from a few other
15 questions for Mr. Libertine as far as our
16 feathered friends flying around, especially the
17 Osprey and the red-tailed hawk. The Ospreys
18 migrate up here every year; the hawk stays around.
19 Are you saying that they would not look to migrate
20 through this area or nest in this area?

21 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Lynch, I
22 hope you can hear me. I'm having a hard time
23 getting my video to start.

24 MR. LYNCH: I can hear you, Mr.
25 Libertine.

1 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No, I was not
2 suggesting that they would use the corridor, no.
3 What I was saying was that there are certain birds
4 today that will use structures within the right of
5 way, and our expectation would be that in the
6 future they would likely seek out those tall
7 structures, particularly the Ospreys. My
8 reference to other hawks or other birds of prey is
9 that you will often see them in that general area,
10 but they do not necessarily use man-made
11 structures other than buildings in some cases, but
12 we have not had that. We did do a walk-over and a
13 survey of the area, and we have not seen, other
14 than the Ospreys, any other birds really utilizing
15 the areas within the right of way itself.

16 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Libertine.

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): You're
18 welcome.

19 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette, those are
20 all my questions, but I would like to go -- Mr.
21 Crosbie getting me the information on why they
22 haven't applied for any federal or state money.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
24 Mr. Lynch, I've got that noted. We are going to
25 take a ten-minute break and we'll resume at 3:41,

1 and hopefully Mr. Crosbie can have the answer to
2 that question; or if not, by the end of the
3 hearing today. Thank you, Mr. Lynch. We'll
4 resume at 3:41.

5 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
6 3:31 p.m. until 3:41 p.m.)

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Mr. Crosbie,
8 did you get an answer on Mr. Lynch's question?

9 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, Bruce
10 McDermott. If I could take the unusual step of
11 responding to say that I spoke with the general
12 counsel of Avangrid, that the company is in the
13 process of exploring all opportunities that might
14 be available to it under the federal stimulus
15 package. It has not yet made any determinations.
16 The bill obviously came, or the law came after the
17 project was conceived. So the company is
18 currently looking at not just in terms of this
19 project or other transmission line projects, but
20 various monies that might be available. It has
21 not reached any determination as to this project.
22 It was noted to me that some of the money is, you
23 know, there's an application process, for example,
24 some of the money you would have to apply to DEEP
25 or other agencies. Those agencies have not yet

1 established a process for the distribution of the
2 funds that would come to them. So I think the
3 takeaway from my quick call was that they are
4 looking, they are aware of it, but at this point
5 they have not identified whether or not there is
6 money available for a project like this.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
8 Attorney McDermott.

9 Mr. Lynch, does that satisfy you for
10 the time being?

11 MR. LYNCH: Well, I'll put it this way:
12 It's a possible answer, but I think if they
13 investigate, there may be found money there. So
14 Mr. McDermott, I hope you take a look.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
16 Mr. Lynch. I will now continue with
17 cross-examination. I would like to start with
18 Late-File Exhibit 1, just a quick clarification.
19 The response on the second page, second paragraph,
20 page 2 of 2 of Late-File Exhibit 1, it says, "On
21 each iteration, structure heights were reduced as
22 much as possible such that they would not create
23 any clearance violations or result in uplift in
24 any of the conductors or shield wires."

25 So basically that concludes that all of

1 the structures along the line are at the lowest
2 point, lowest design point to achieve clearance
3 requirements for obstacles within the right of way
4 within a 5-foot bandwidth. Does that sum it up
5 correctly?

6 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
7 Morissette, this is Mr. Parkhurst. Yes, that's
8 correct.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. So Mr.
10 Parkhurst, so all the structures are at their
11 lowest possible point?

12 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
14 Okay. I would like to go to Mr. George for a
15 couple minutes here and his cultural resource
16 report associated with the application within
17 Appendix D of the application, the cultural
18 resource report, the phase 1A, page 14. So in the
19 viewshed analysis, I may be be ad-libbing here a
20 little bit, actually it's on page 15, it says the
21 analysis that anything above 125 to 140 feet in
22 height has an adverse -- represents an adverse
23 effect to the viewshed and therefore has an impact
24 on the cultural resources. Does that mean that
25 anything below the 125-foot mark would be

1 acceptable?

2 THE WITNESS (George): No, sir, it does
3 not. It was just using the project constraints as
4 they were given to me at that time.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So from a
6 viewshed perspective, the pole heights of 125 to
7 140 were provided as an input to your analysis.
8 Was there any consideration of what height would
9 be acceptable?

10 THE WITNESS (George): No, sir, not in
11 terms of the minimum heights. We considered the
12 constraints as given to us, and also afterwards
13 we, in cooperation with the UI team, considered
14 the lower structure heights that were in the 120,
15 125-foot range and concluded that those also would
16 probably represent an adverse effect on the
17 viewsheds.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. While I
19 have you, the state resources -- there's a lot of
20 emphasis on the national resources but not the
21 state resources. Can you explain to me why that
22 is?

23 THE WITNESS (George): Yes, sir.
24 Typically the State Historic Preservation Office
25 advocates for us to report those adverse or

1 potential effects on National Register of Historic
2 Places. Some of the State Register of Historic
3 Places in the area are considered part of the
4 national register districts already, so there was
5 not a need to mention them as a separate call-out,
6 but understanding for clarification sake in the
7 interrogatory process we provided additional
8 clarification. And as the project corridor
9 expansion was requested out to 800 feet of the
10 project centerline, or the catenaries, rather, we
11 included additional state registered properties
12 that fell within that area.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you.

14 THE WITNESS (George): Sure.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: The information that
16 was filed today, Q-MIL-2-7, has two state
17 resources, both residences that were demolished.
18 And I just want to make sure I understand which
19 resources those were. And I will go to map sheet
20 3 of 34, which is the 100 scale, if I will. I
21 want to make sure I understand where these two
22 residences are. I'm not sure if Mr. George will
23 answer this or Mr. Crosbie. But on map sheet 3 of
24 34 on the corner of Clark Street and Pearl Hill
25 Street, approximately where the R10 is, is that

1 where those two residences were located?

2 THE WITNESS (George): I believe you're
3 correct, those were on the, I believe the
4 southwest corner of the intersection. The
5 coordinates for those structures were provided by
6 the SHPO in their database, the State Historic
7 Preservation -- State Historic Resources, I mean,
8 and then we plotted those and did a comparison to
9 the Google Earth and modern day aerials, and it
10 appears that those two buildings have been raised.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: What I'm trying to
12 figure out, is it where the R10 is or is it where
13 the property 609 is, if you can confirm that for
14 me.

15 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Chairman
16 Morissette, this is Shawn Crosbie.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Crosbie.

18 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): If you give us
19 a moment, we can confirm that for you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.
21 Okay. I'll continue with my questioning and
22 you'll see where I'm going with this in a moment.
23 Okay. What I want to explore is going
24 underground. Now, structures P901N on map sheet 3
25 of 34 through P904N are in the backyard of several

1 residential properties, and that's very concerning
2 to me having them about residential properties as
3 they are. I understand that you were given a
4 quote of 66 million for going underground in the
5 road; is that correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): In the area
7 of the Milford Train Station, that is correct.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Okay. First let
9 me go there. So the 66.6 million, what's the
10 length of that from P905 to P914?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Apologies.
12 MeeNa Sazanowicz. Mr. Morissette, that's
13 approximately 3,000 linear feet.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: 3,000 linear feet. So
15 in the railroad corridor it's 66.6 and in the road
16 is 74. How many feet does the road consist of?

17 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Apologies,
18 I'm having some technical difficulties here. The
19 road is approximately 3,500 linear feet.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: So 3,500 for \$74
21 million, wow. So if I look at the map, if I look
22 at the map sheets, you've basically got -- and I'm
23 going to start at P900N. So you could put a riser
24 structure there. You go up Clark Street then go
25 down Pearl Hill Street then you cross over to map

1 sheet 4 then you go down Railroad Ave. which is a
2 pretty straight shot right down to structure 914.

3 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
4 Morissette, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The riser
5 structure location would be at approximately
6 structure 905.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I know, I'm
8 expanding it.

9 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Oh, okay.
10 I'm sorry, apologies. I'm sorry.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry. I'm going
12 a little further. To avoid going into the
13 backyards of the residents from 901 to 904, I'm
14 starting at 900, and it looks, it appears to me
15 that you've got a pretty clear shot all the way to
16 914. Now, my question is, are your estimates so
17 high because you have to have an HDD by River
18 Street, is it River Street?

19 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, that is
20 correct. There would be an HDD section there to
21 rise the cables up. Additionally, the circuits,
22 in order to meet the conductor that is being
23 installed on the overhead transmission line, we
24 would have to have two cables per phase.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Understood. So

1 to avoid the HDD, couldn't you do a riser
2 structure at either P912 or put one in, in between
3 912 and 914?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
5 Morissette, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The reason
6 why those other locations were not selected was
7 due to the limited space and needing to take up a
8 large area for the riser structures. The area
9 around Pole 912 is in a small drive access up to
10 the train station.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Well, 912
12 probably wouldn't work, but how about someplace
13 before River Street or even -- yeah, before River
14 Street is there a location where a riser structure
15 could go?

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Just looking
17 at the mapping, Mr. Morissette, it appears on the
18 northern side we're either abutted to the south by
19 the railroad tracks or to the north with a very
20 limited area within the Metro-North corridor in
21 order to place riser structures that would not
22 interfere with parking or drive lanes.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Well, it seems
24 to me that if you got rid of that HDD, first of
25 all, that would bring your price down quite a bit,

1 and you're at 74 million for not even a mile which
2 is way out of whack. Excuse me. Okay. How about
3 putting the riser structure at P900N, any
4 complications there?

5 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Just
6 thinking about the topology in the area, Mr.
7 Morissette, I think we would have to further look
8 at availability of placing the structures there.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We're not going
10 that much further than structure 904. I'm a
11 little confused as to why your price for the
12 public roads is higher than the railroad corridor.
13 I would think they would have been reversed given
14 the constraints of working in the corridor. Can
15 somebody explain why the road is more expensive
16 than the railroad corridor?

17 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Sure. The
18 overall linear footage and cost of materials
19 including, you know, an increase in, you know,
20 cable needed. We're talking a total of 12 cables
21 for both of the circuits. We also took into
22 account additional need for support in terms of
23 police support in the roads as well as either the
24 option of jacking and boring underneath the
25 railroad to get back to the north side or the need

1 to install riser poles on the south side and then
2 cross back over to the north side of the tracks
3 from an underground configuration to match up with
4 the proposed overhead design.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Both scenarios, the
6 underground is on the north side of the track;
7 isn't that right?

8 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): For the
9 proposed underground section that was estimated,
10 it was on the south side of the railroad tracks,
11 and this would --

12 MR. MORISSETTE: That's not what we
13 heard earlier. We heard the north side.

14 (Pause.)

15 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, we're
16 just having a little side bar.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly, that's
18 fine.

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Berman may have a
20 thought as to the directions we're talking about
21 here.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you.

23 THE WITNESS (Berman): Just to help
24 clarify, Mr. Morissette, in the sort of model that
25 you're kind of hypothetically advancing, do you

1 have the underground segment ending at the
2 Wepawaug River or do you have it extending east of
3 that?

4 MR. MORISSETTE: No, I'm trying to come
5 up short of the Wepawaug River so you don't have
6 to do an HDD.

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct,
8 understood. So I think we had previously
9 discussed locations of riser stations, so west of
10 River Street there is no unencumbered area large
11 enough for us to place those.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. What we're
13 talking about, however, is why your estimates are
14 higher in the railroad corridor -- in the public
15 road versus the railroad corridor. And you were
16 testifying that the underground cable would be on
17 the south side of the railroad corridor versus the
18 north side which was testified to earlier.

19 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The north
20 side is for within the Metro-North corridor,
21 correct, and the south side was for in the public
22 streets. The roads that were selected for the
23 public streets we felt were wider and potentially
24 able to accommodate the larger duct bank.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Got you. Okay. So

1 that makes -- all right. So you were basically
2 going to go from structure 904N and go down Broad
3 Street; is that correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct.
5 That is correct.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I didn't
7 understand that. Thank you. Thank you for that
8 clarification. So given that you're going down
9 Broad Street, and that looks like a pretty clear
10 shot as well --

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): These costs
12 for the underground option within the public
13 streets also account for, you know, the additional
14 cost implications for traffic control and support
15 as well as there's other construction needs to
16 facilitate open trench in the public streets.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: That's why it doesn't
18 make sense to me because those costs are going to
19 be a lot smaller than the costs associated with
20 coordinating with the railroad and having to work
21 nights and evenings to do your undergrounding
22 within that corridor. It seems to me that would
23 be more expensive but --

24 So where would your HDDs be located in
25 that scenario? You say you have to go under the

1 railroad.

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, because
3 of the bend radius for the underground lines that
4 would be in the public streets, we do not feel
5 we'd be able to accomplish the tight sweep to
6 continue from Broad Street back up River Street,
7 especially with some of the markings that we had
8 noted on the public roads for other utilities to
9 be able to make the sweep and come back up on the
10 north side. So it was anticipated that at least
11 for this high level conceptual option to come in
12 through the parking lot at Stonebridge, which
13 would require additional land rights, and then
14 cross back over to the tracks -- cross back to the
15 tracks.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: You're going to have
17 to help me out here. Where is Stonebridge?

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Just south
19 of the tracks, south of pole location 914 -- oh,
20 apologies, 6 of 34.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: You said Stonebridge?

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Apologies,
23 it's map page 6 of 34 on the 100 scale.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I don't see
25 Stonebridge though.

1 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So it would
2 be the location on the south side of the tracks
3 directly south of where Pole 914 North is shown on
4 the map.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So that's where
6 your HDD would go through?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: You can't go on -- is
9 River Street a -- River Street is a bridge, is
10 there a railroad bridge?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Railroad
12 tracks, correct, they are raised.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: You can't go
14 underground under the bridge?

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We felt
16 based on the routing and the large bend radius of
17 the cables that coming back up River Street along
18 with the other utilities in that intersection of
19 Railroad Ave. and River Street, that being able to
20 come back up and make the sweep would not be
21 feasible as that would be the HDD section back
22 over to the riser pole and there isn't space to
23 construct the access pit.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: And how much does the
25 HDD cost in your estimates?

1 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Just give me
2 one moment. The total estimated cost for HDD was
3 approximately 1.4 million.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: And there's one or
5 two, do you have to do an HDD at the beginning?

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Two pits,
7 correct, and we assumed two separate bores for
8 each circuit.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: So HDDs are in total
10 2.8 million or 2.8 million times two?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So the total
12 for -- I apologize, the total for within the
13 railroad corridor for that one HDD is 1.4. The
14 total for, we would actually be jacking and boring
15 underneath the railroad tracks in the public
16 street option, and that estimate came out to be
17 around \$600,000.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Just to
19 clarify, there are two HDDs on the railroad
20 corridor, but there's one for each circuit so
21 that's four; is that correct?

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): For the
23 option within Railroad Ave. and the railroad
24 corridor there is one HDD section consisting of
25 two bore holes.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And that's 1.4
2 million?

3 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes,
4 correct.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: But there are two of
6 them, one at the beginning and one at the end?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): One bore pit
8 at the beginning of the jack and bore and one
9 receiving pit at the end of the jack and bore.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Right. But at the
11 beginning of the underground back at P904 you're
12 going under the railroad, correct?

13 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): No, we would
14 be staying within Railroad Ave. to the north of
15 the train tracks.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Well, it's
17 going to be costly to do the jack and bores. So
18 why didn't you look at Pearl Hill Street and
19 Railroad Ave., what were the obstacles there
20 versus going down, what was it, Broad Street?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The
22 obstacles with -- the team did not look at the
23 option of going down Pearl Hill Ave. Within the
24 rail corridor we do not believe it's feasible
25 because of the high slope up to the properties as

1 well as the additional cost for trenching and
2 material costs to extend the underground section
3 back to pole, I believe it's 900.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Very good. All
5 right. Has there been any further discussion with
6 CT DOT as to going onto the catenaries?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We do have
8 our regularly scheduled biweekly meetings with
9 them. At this point we do not, we have not had
10 further discussion.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We also had
13 a conference, a phone call with CT DOT personnel,
14 and we have a meeting scheduled to discuss further
15 with them the catenary options as well as the
16 underground within the corridor option.

17 THE WITNESS (Berman): So could I add a
18 comment on the concept of building off the
19 existing catenaries?

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. Go right
21 ahead.

22 THE WITNESS (Berman): So I'm trying to
23 start my camera. This is Todd Berman from UI.
24 One of the challenges, right, is that resiliency
25 is a very hard thing to measure, right. But one

1 of the underlying philosophies of this endeavor is
2 to take the critical infrastructure off the
3 Metro-North power infrastructure. And
4 specifically I would like -- again, resiliency
5 benefit is hard to quantify, but if you look at
6 DEEP's letter to the Siting Council, the first
7 sentence in the third paragraph really captures it
8 all, you know, "Department staff noted that modern
9 monopoles will likely have a material positive
10 impact on energy system reliability and resiliency
11 over the century-old catenary structures." So we
12 can't lose sight of the critical resiliency
13 element of basically deconstructing the connection
14 between the rail infrastructure and the electric
15 infrastructure.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Berman, you
17 actually hit on my next question. In part of your
18 response to UI's response to MIL-1-1 and MIL-1-2
19 the term "does not meet the core project
20 objectives of enhancing the reliability and
21 resiliency of UI's electric system." Now, I don't
22 understand, if you were to rebuild a catenary
23 structure with the loading criteria that is
24 required for you to put on transmission lines onto
25 the facilities and to meet all the loading

1 requirements, how -- my question is, how does that
2 degrade reliability and resiliency, how does it do
3 that?

4 THE WITNESS (Berman): I can speak to
5 that. Todd Berman again, Mr. Morissette. So
6 there's two parts to the answer to that question,
7 most specifically the second part of your
8 question, how does that degrade, right? So when
9 you have commingled infrastructure, and we're
10 talking about resiliency, for example, you have a
11 sewage treatment plant, you know, that loses its
12 electrical supply, it has a back-up generator so
13 that the two infrastructures are not co, you know,
14 co-linked. If the treatment facility loses its
15 power supply, it's got a backup. Likewise, if the
16 railroad system suffers some kind of issue, then
17 it would not necessarily entangle the electric
18 utility. Likewise, if the electric utility has
19 some kind of difficulty, it doesn't compromise the
20 critical nature of the railroad services. So
21 that's essentially the resiliency benefit, not to
22 mention that it's addressing a significant present
23 resiliency risk.

24 But I think, Mr. Morissette, it's also
25 worthy to comment on the fact that, you know,

1 those catenaries are not owned by UI, we don't
2 have the rights, you know, the -- what is the way
3 to say it -- the regulatory complications of
4 approaching Metro-North and the state DOT about
5 the potential to rebuilding those catenary
6 structures which would potentially cohabitate some
7 subset of our powerlines, it is, I think it's
8 hypothetically kind of, we can kick it around
9 here, but I think as a practical matter it's
10 probably not a feasible solution.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Could you address the
12 reliability aspect of that statement, how does it
13 degrade --

14 THE WITNESS (Berman): So when you say
15 "the reliability aspect" -- could you ask that
16 again, Mr. Morisette, just what reliability are
17 you trying to get at?

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Well, I'm trying to
19 get at the reliability, the statement that is put
20 in the response that "does not meet the core
21 project objectives of enhancing the reliability
22 and resiliency of UI's electric system." So I'm
23 asking you how does it enhance reliability or, if
24 you upgraded all the facilities, how could it
25 degrade reliability?

1 THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, I guess we
2 would answer that by saying that it is a
3 resiliency priority to disconnect the collocation
4 of the Metro-North assets and the UI assets,
5 right. It makes both inherently more resilient.
6 Future maintenance and access relays into that.
7 There are so many layers to the resiliency
8 benefit.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it enhances
10 resiliency, but what about reliability?

11 THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, I think
12 there is reliability as well just with the ability
13 to access our assets without having to encumber or
14 cause Metro-North to have to have outages or track
15 closures, et cetera, and the benefit runs the
16 other way as well is that Metro-North then is less
17 constrained as well.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good.

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, could I
20 just have one second?

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly.

22 (Pause.)

23 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Thank you. I
24 think Mr. Berman's answer stands, Mr. Morissette.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. My
2 intent here was to get on the record what UI meant
3 when they were saying reliability and resiliency
4 as to improvements and detail what that meant. So
5 thank you.

6 That concludes my questioning. What
7 I'd like to do is to start with the
8 cross-examination of the applicant by the City of
9 Milford.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette?

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. I'm sorry.
12 Thanks for reminding me, Mr. Silvestri. Mr.
13 Perrone actually had some follow-up questions as
14 well. Mr. Silvestri, why don't you go ahead.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
16 Morissette. Based on your discussion that you
17 just had, I do have a couple follow-ups.

18 When we were talking earlier about
19 undergrounding within the railroad corridor that
20 would cost \$66.6 million, what would be the
21 reduction for not having to put new poles in that
22 area from 904 to 915? There's got to be some cost
23 savings that would offset the 66.6 million.

24 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Silvestri,
25 this is Shawn Crosbie. We're getting you that

1 answer.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me pose
3 another one while you're getting that answer. If
4 someone could look at the City of Milford
5 interrogatory Set One responses. This is the one
6 that has a number of visualizations, if you will,
7 concept stuff. I'm looking at the very last
8 picture. It's photo 6, view from Daniel Street in
9 Milford, and this is the concept for the
10 underground configuration. If you have that in
11 front of you, let me know, and then I'll pose my
12 question to you.

13 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Libertine, this is
14 probably something for you.

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I am there,
16 Mr. Silvestri.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
18 Libertine.

19 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I had to get
20 off mute.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: No problem. The first
22 question I have, this was taken from Daniel Street
23 kind of looking at the northeast. There's a
24 bridge that's over on the right-hand side. What
25 bridge is that or what road is underneath that

1 bridge or what's underneath that bridge?

2 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'm orienting
3 myself here. Mr. Silvestri, what number are we
4 looking at? I'm sorry.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Number 6, last one in
6 the package.

7 MR. KNUFF: I don't want to interject
8 myself where I'm not wanted, but as someone who's
9 been in the area, I'd be happy to respond. This
10 is Attorney Knuff.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
12 Knuff. We'll let the applicant respond.

13 MR. KNUFF: Okay.

14 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr.
15 Silvestri, I don't have that handy without having
16 to cross-reference with the Google Earth. So if
17 Mr. Knuff would be so kind to let us know, it
18 might move things along a little quicker. I
19 certainly can go and verify it, but it might take
20 me a minute to load that.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: I've got to leave that
22 to Mr. Morissette.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney Knuff, if you
24 don't mind.

25 MR. KNUFF: Only because it's very

1 common knowledge. It's the river.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So that's the
3 Wepawaug River.

4 MR. KNUFF: Yes.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Copy that. Thank you.
6 So back to UI, the riser that's there seems to be
7 coming up between the catenary structure and
8 P914N; is that correct?

9 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is
10 correct.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. So that the
12 riser structure would take the place then of 914N
13 and then the pole that we see to the far right is
14 actually P15N on the opposite side of the river.
15 Do I have that correct?

16 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is
17 correct. And I apologize, I do not have those
18 structure numbers in front of me, but that is my
19 recollection from working on this, but yes, that
20 is on the other side of the river.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: That's great. I was
22 just trying to get orientation on that part. And
23 then when we go back to the other riser structure
24 that's at South Broad Street in Milford, that's
25 coming up in the vicinity of 904. I'm trying to

1 get the exact spot where that's coming in. Is
2 that on the opposite side of Beardsley Avenue, on
3 the west side of Beardsley Avenue?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
5 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The riser
6 pole would be located on the east side of
7 Beardsley Avenue around pole location 905N.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: Would it take the place
9 of 905N?

10 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, I'm
11 sorry, we lost you for a second. Could you repeat
12 that?

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Would that riser
14 structure take the place of pole 905N?

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Excellent. Okay.
17 Thank you.

18 Mr. Morissette, that's all I had, but I
19 would like to follow up on how much money would be
20 reduced by not being on the railroad for that
21 span.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
23 Silvestri. Go ahead.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: I was going to say I'd
25 also like to know based on what you inquired about

1 running from 900 back to 915 what the additional
2 cost might be on that as well. I think that's a
3 great idea to not have an overhead by all those
4 apartments and homes that are there.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
6 Silvestri. So therefore I'm going to ask for a
7 Late-File be provided with some detail to it as to
8 going underground starting at P900N as a riser
9 structure through either P914N as a riser
10 structure or on the other side of River Street to
11 add a riser structure. I'd like a cost analysis.
12 And please if you could describe the route so that
13 we're clear that we are going to be south of the
14 railroad right of way, and describe the HDDs and
15 the jack and bores required and the costs
16 associated with them. And to the extent that we
17 can go onto River Street and eliminate a jack and
18 bore or HDD to eliminate some of the costs, I
19 think that would be extremely helpful.

20 With that, I understand, Mr. Perrone,
21 did you have -- Attorney McDermott, did you get
22 all that? Attorney McDermott?

23 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sorry, yes, we have
24 that. Thank you.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Okay. Mr.

1 Perrone, I understand you have some follow-up
2 questions as well. Mr. Perrone, please continue.

3 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. I understand
4 you're looking into the cost delta on the
5 reduction from the 66 million to get to the cost
6 delta. That was one of my questions. My other
7 two were, do you have a cost delta for an all
8 southern route overhead but just everything on the
9 southern side of the railroad right of way?

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
11 we do not have an estimate on the south side.

12 MR. PERRONE: And also --

13 MR. McDERMOTT: Would you like us to
14 add that to the homework or --

15 MR. PERRONE: Please, yes. And would
16 you have a cost delta for a southern overhead
17 route between P905 and 914?

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
19 we do not currently have a cost estimate for that
20 integration.

21 MR. PERRONE: Could that be added to
22 the Late-File list as well?

23 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

24 MR. PERRONE: That's all I have. Thank
25 you.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
2 Perrone. So we have four Late-Files, cost
3 reduction relating to the reduction of poles, the
4 underground route from 900, 900N to 914, delta for
5 the south side costs overhead, and the delta for
6 the south side costs for 905 to 914.

7 Okay. Considering the hour, we are
8 going to close the hearing for today, and this
9 will give the City of Milford an opportunity to
10 look at their information and cross-examine when
11 we reconvene. So with that --

12 MR. KNUFF: Mr. Morissette, could I
13 just interject one question for a moment, please?

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly.

15 MR. KNUFF: So long as they're
16 computing the cost deltas, can we also include the
17 catenary? There's a conceptual estimate of 39
18 million, but again, I think it would be helpful to
19 know what the savings are with regard to as
20 compared to the elimination of the poles. In the
21 interest of time, I'm also happy to submit -- I
22 had extensive questions to ask this afternoon. I
23 appreciate the Council's diligent review of the
24 application. So in the interest of time, I'd be
25 happy to submit additional interrogatories so that

1 we can get some of this out of the way rather than
2 doing it through cross-examination, if that's the
3 Council's preference.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: I will ask Attorney
5 Bachman to comment on that request and whether
6 it's from a procedural point of view additional
7 interrogatories are something that we can do
8 considering that the deadline for interrogatories
9 has passed. Attorney Bachman, do you wish to
10 comment?

11 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
12 Morissette. The continued evidentiary hearing
13 date is Tuesday, June 14th. Certainly, Attorney
14 Knuff, if you can issue interrogatories within a
15 week, the deadline for those interrogatories would
16 be a week before the hearing so that would be June
17 7th, Attorney McDermott, for the responses.
18 Certainly, if UI needs an extension to respond
19 based on any of the questions that are actually
20 asked, we can take that up at the hearing because
21 the extension would only be about three days, and
22 we could only go to the next hearing anyway.

23 So if Attorney McDermott has no
24 objections to having an additional accelerated set
25 of interrogatories to minimize the amount of

1 cross-examination Attorney Knuff has at the next
2 hearing, I think we should proceed. But Attorney
3 McDermott, I look to you.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
5 Bachman.

6 Attorney McDermott, what do you think?

7 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. I have no
8 objection with additional interrogatories,
9 although -- it's fine. I hope it does speed
10 things up. I would hope that the same right to
11 issue interrogatories would be extended to the
12 company for the city's witnesses that they've
13 identified and to which prefile testimony has been
14 submitted. I don't know at this time that we have
15 any, but kind of on the theme of it will speed
16 things up a little, to the extent we have
17 questions, I think we could probably dispense with
18 a few of them through the issuance of some
19 interrogatories on the city's identified witnesses
20 as well.

21 MR. KNUFF: We certainly would have no
22 objection to that.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. We will
24 proceed with the City of Milford issuing
25 interrogatories by June 7th in preparation for our

1 June 14th hearing.

2 MS. BACHMAN: Excuse me, Mr.
3 Morissette, June 7th would be the day that the
4 interrogatory responses are due.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

6 MS. BACHMAN: If they could submit
7 those interrogatories by May 31st, which is the
8 day after Memorial Day, that would be appreciated.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Attorney
10 Knuff --

11 MS. BACHMAN: The schedule will apply
12 to all parties and intervenors. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
14 Attorney Knuff, is that acceptable?

15 MR. KNUFF: I will do my best
16 understanding that, you know, if there are the
17 certain things I cannot get into those
18 interrogatories, I will have the opportunity for
19 cross-examination. I'm just trying to be
20 cooperative.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
22 We appreciate that. And you can include in your
23 interrogatory your question about the reduction in
24 poles associated with the catenaries as well.

25 MR. KNUFF: Terrific. Thank you very

1 much.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. So
3 therefore, the Council announces that it will
4 continue the evidentiary session of this public
5 hearing on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2 p.m., via
6 Zoom remote conferencing. A copy of the agenda
7 for the continued remote evidentiary hearing
8 session will be available on the Council's Docket
9 No. 508 webpage, along with the record of this
10 matter, the public hearing notice, instructions
11 for public access to the remote evidentiary
12 session, and the Council's Citizens Guide to
13 Siting Council Procedures.

14 Returning to the city's motion for an
15 additional evidentiary hearing, since party
16 appearances and cross-examination in accordance
17 with the Council's hearing program remain
18 unfinished at this time and the Council has
19 scheduled a continued evidentiary hearing session
20 for June 14, 2022, the motion is moot.

21 MR. KNUFF: Thank you.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Please note that
23 anyone who has not become a party or intervenor
24 but who desires to make his or her views known to
25 the Council may file written statements with the

1 Council until the record closes.

2 Copies of the transcript of this
3 hearing will be filed with the City Clerk's Office
4 of the Milford, New Haven and West Haven City
5 Halls and the Town Clerk's Office of the Orange
6 Town Hall.

7 I hereby declare this hearing
8 adjourned. Thank you for your participation, and
9 we'll see everybody June 14th. Thank you,
10 everyone. Have a good evening.

11 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
12 and the hearing adjourned at 4:38 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 100 pages
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
6 before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL of the
7 CONTINUED REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: Docket No.
8 508, The United Illuminating Company (UI)
9 application for a Certificate of Environmental
10 Compatibility and Public Need for the Milvon to
11 West River Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV
12 Rebuild Project that consists of the relocation
13 and rebuild of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV)
14 electric transmission lines from the railroad
15 catenary structures to new steel monopole
16 structures and related modifications to facilitate
17 interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric
18 transmission lines at UI's existing Milvon,
19 Woodmont, Allings Crossing, Elmwest and West River
20 substations along approximately 9.5 miles of the
21 Connecticut Department of Transportation's
22 Metro-North Railroad corridor traversing the
23 municipalities of Milford, Orange, West Haven and
24 New Haven, Connecticut, which was held before JOHN
25 MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on May 24, 2022.

26
27 

28 -----
29 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
30 Court Reporter
31 Notary Public
32 My commission expires:
33 May 31, 2023

I N D E X

****COUNCIL'S ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE ITEM
I-C-90: RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE ON PAGE 148.**

WITNESSES: (Previously sworn)

**CORRENE AUER
TODD BERMAN
AZIZ CHOUHDERY
BENJAMIN COTTS
SHAWN CROSBIE
MICHAEL LIBERTINE
SAMANTHA MARONE
ANNETTE POTASZ
MEENA SAZANOWICZ
DAVID R. GEORGE (Sworn on page 149)
MATTHEW PARKHURST (Sworn on page 149)
EDWARD ROEDEL (Sworn on page 149)**

EXAMINERS:	PAGE
Mr. McDermott (Direct)	150
Mr. Perrone (Start of cross)	155-236
Mr. Silvestri	169-230
Mr. Nguyen	189
Mrs. Cooley	196
Mr. Collette	201
Mr. Lynch	204
Mr. Morissette	209

1 I n d e x: (Cont'd)

2 APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS
3 (Received in evidence)

4 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
5 II-B-9	Applicant's Revised Response to Council Set One Interrogatory No. 16, 6 dated May 13, 2022	154
7 II-B-10	Applicant's additional witness resumes, received May 17, 2022	154
8 II-B-11	Applicant's Late-Filed Exhibits, 9 dated May 17, 2022	154
10 II-B-12	Applicant's Responses to City of Milford's Interrogatories, Set One, 11 dated May 17, 2022	154
12 II-B-13	Applicant's Responses to City of Milford's Interrogatories, Set Two, 13 dated May 17, 2022	154
14 II-B-14	Applicant's revised response to City of Milford's Set Two Interrogatory No. 6, dated May 18, 2022	154
15 II-B-15	Applicant's revised response to 16 City of Milford's Set Two Interrogatory No. 7, dated May 24, 2022	154