

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 Continued Public Hearing held on Tuesday,
24 June 14, 2022, beginning at 2 p.m.,
25 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**
5 **Environmental Protection**

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

9 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
10 **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**
11 **LOUANNE COOLEY**

12 **Council Staff:**

13 **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**
14 **Executive Director and Staff Attorney**

15 **MICHAEL PERRONE**
16 **Siting Analyst**

17 **LISA FONTAINE**
18 **Fiscal Administrative Officer**

19 **For the Applicant, The United Illuminating**
20 **Company:**

21 **MURTHA CULLINA LLP**
22 **One Century Tower**
23 **265 Church Street, 9th Floor**
24 **New Haven, Connecticut 06510-1220**
25 **BY: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ.**

For Party, City of Milford:

HURWITZ, SAGARIN, SLOSSBERG & KNUFF, LLC
147 North Broad Street
New Milford, Connecticut 06460
BY: JOHN W. KNUFF, ESQ.
SARA A. SHARP, ESQ.

Zoom co-host: Aaron Demarest

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

1 MR. MORISSETTE: This continued remote
2 evidentiary hearing session is called to order
3 this Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2 p.m. My name is
4 John Morissette, member and presiding officer of
5 the Connecticut Siting Council.

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

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

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

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

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

22 The Council will take a 10 to 15 minute
23 break at a convenient juncture around 3:30 p.m.

24 We'll now continue with the appearance
25 of the applicant. In accordance with the

1 Council's May 25, 2022 continued evidentiary
2 hearing memo, we will commence with the appearance
3 of the applicant, The United Illuminating Company,
4 to verify the new exhibits marked as Roman Numeral
5 II, Items B-16 through 19 on the hearing program.

6 Attorney McDermott, please begin by
7 identifying the new exhibits you have filed in
8 this matter and verifying the exhibits by the
9 appropriate sworn witnesses.

10 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
11 Morissette. Bruce McDermott on behalf of the
12 United Illuminating Company. I hope everyone can
13 hear me.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can hear you
15 fine. Thank you.

16 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. As you
17 indicated, Mr. Morissette, the company has four
18 new exhibits, 16 through 19. I will note just for
19 the record that the witness panel remains the same
20 as the last hearing, and all those indicated on
21 the hearing agenda are present for today's
22 hearing.

23 D A V I D R. G E O R G E,
24 M A T T H E W P A R K H U R S T,
25 E D W A R D R O E D E L,

1 C O R R E N E A U E R,
2 T O D D B E R M A N,
3 A Z I Z C H O U H D E R Y,
4 B E N J A M I N C O T T S,
5 S H A W N C R O S B I E,
6 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,
7 S A M A N T H A M A R O N E,
8 A N N E T T E P O T A S Z,
9 M E E N A S A Z A N O W I C Z,

10 having been previously duly sworn (remotely)
11 continued to testify on their oaths as
12 follows:

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Crosbie, through
15 you, regarding Applicant's Exhibit Number 16,
16 which is the company's responses to the City of
17 Milford's interrogatories, Set Three, dated June
18 8, 2022, are you familiar with that document?

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

20 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any
21 changes or revisions to that document?

22 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No, I don't.

23 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as
24 an exhibit here today?

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

1 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding
2 Applicant's Exhibit Number 17, which is the
3 Late-Filed exhibits dated June 8, 2022, are you
4 familiar with that document?

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

6 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any
7 changes or revisions thereto?

8 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No, I don't.

9 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as
10 an exhibit here today?

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

12 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding
13 Applicant's Exhibit 18, which is the letter from
14 the State Historic Preservation office dated June
15 8, 2022, are you familiar with that document?

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

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

19 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No, I don't.

20 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that
21 as an exhibit here today?

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

23 MR. McDERMOTT: And finally regarding
24 Applicant's Exhibit 19, which is the supplemental
25 response to the City of Milford, Set Three,

1 Interrogatory Number 7A, dated June 9, 2022, are
2 you familiar with that document?

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

4 MR. McDERMOTT: And any changes to it?

5 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No.

6 MR. McDERMOTT: And if you can just
7 raise your voice slightly, Mr. Crosbie. And do
8 you adopt that as an exhibit here today?

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

10 MR. McDERMOTT: And with that, Mr.
11 Morissette, the company would move that Exhibits
12 16 through 19 be admitted as exhibits in this
13 proceeding.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
15 McDermott.

16 Does the City of Milford object to the
17 admission of the applicant's new exhibits,
18 Attorney Knuff?

19 MR. KNUFF: No objection, Mr.
20 Morissette.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Attorney
22 Knuff, is Attorney Sharp with you this afternoon?

23 MR. KNUFF: She is with me just to my
24 left, yes.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Very good.

1 The exhibits are hereby admitted.

2 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-16 through
3 II-B-19: Received in evidence - described index.)

4 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
5 Morissette. Before we go any farther, I just want
6 to, if I could, through Ms. Sazanowicz ask her to
7 address a couple changes that, for reasons that
8 I'll describe in a second, it will be a little
9 tough to identify, but there are necessary changes
10 to previously filed interrogatory and Late-Filed
11 responses. If I could have a moment to ask her a
12 few questions on that, I think we could then begin
13 with the cross-examination of the company.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
15 Attorney McDermott. Please continue.

16 MR. McDERMOTT: Ms. Sazanowicz, do you
17 have any changes or additions to any of the
18 interrogatory responses or the Late-File exhibits
19 that have been previously filed in this
20 proceeding?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes,
22 Mr. McDermott, as part of the detailed design we
23 have eliminated structure 915 as part of our
24 recently completed galloping study.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: And I think for the

1 benefit of pretty much everyone in the hearing, if
2 you could please describe what a galloping study
3 is and why that led to the elimination of
4 structure 915. I think that would be helpful for
5 the record.

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes. A
7 galloping study specifically looks at conductor
8 motion. And galloping is defined as a high
9 amplitude low frequency motion of conductors under
10 certain icing and wind conditions. As part of the
11 preliminary design that was put forward, Pole 915
12 was installed in order to eliminate any galloping
13 concerns such as phase-to-phase conductor
14 violations. As part of the galloping study, it
15 was determined that we are able to remove Pole
16 915, which is the tallest structure in Milford,
17 and we would be installing anti-galloping devices
18 in lieu of Pole 915.

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And how
20 tall is Pole 915? You said it was the tallest
21 structure in Milford.

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): 145 feet.

23 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And then,
24 Ms. Sazanowicz, following the May 24th hearing,
25 did you have an opportunity to further refine the

1 height of the structures in the downtown Milford
2 area such that there should be other changes or
3 modifications to various interrogatories or
4 Late-File exhibits that have previously been filed
5 in the proceeding?

6 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes,
7 Attorney McDermott, we have further refined the
8 design and specifically in the downtown Milford
9 area. The initial design was conservative, but
10 upon further information received from
11 manufacturers and along with review and refinement
12 of standard pole configurations of this section,
13 we were able to decrease pole heights. In the
14 area between poles 904 and 916 the design changes
15 are as follows:

16 Pole 904 was 105 feet. The new height
17 can be adjusted to 100 feet.

18 Pole 905 was 115 feet. It can now be
19 adjusted to 100 feet.

20 Pole 906 was 120 feet. It can now be
21 adjusted to 100 feet.

22 Pole 907 is an additional pole which
23 would be at 105 feet.

24 Pole 908 was 135 feet and will be
25 adjusted to 110 feet.

1 Pole 909 is a new pole which will be at
2 110 feet.

3 Pole 910 was 140 feet and can be
4 adjusted to 125 feet.

5 Pole 912 will remain the same at 130
6 feet.

7 Pole 914 was 135 feet and can be
8 decreased to 130 feet.

9 Pole 915, which was 145 feet, will be
10 removed.

11 And pole 916 was 135 feet and will be
12 able to be decreased to 130 feet.

13 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And Mr.
14 Morissette, I realize that was kind of a quick
15 rundown of the changes. The company recognizes
16 that, and I'd be happy to file, you know, put that
17 in writing as an exhibit following the proceeding.
18 But I think the takeaway was we've eliminated one,
19 the company has eliminated one structure, added
20 two, and that most of the heights of the
21 structures have either remained the same or have
22 been further reduced, and that's obviously from
23 Pole 904 through 916 in the downtown Milford area.

24 So with that, Mr. Morissette, I believe
25 the company is ready for cross-examination unless

1 you have any questions on the revisions that we
2 have just introduced.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
4 McDermott. We'll continue with the
5 cross-examination based on the information that
6 you've verbally read into the record this
7 afternoon. I would like to have that submitted in
8 writing so we have a clear record of the exact
9 heights that are being proposed.

10 So with that -- yes.

11 MR. McDERMOTT: I was going to say,
12 perhaps I'll identify it, picking up on the
13 Council's Late-File exhibit, I think the options
14 that were identified in the Late-Files, this will
15 be Option J. Just to kind of continue the
16 nomenclature that the Council has adopted, we'll
17 refer to it as Option J.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
19 We will continue. And we'll consider this as
20 Option J. And we'll continue with
21 cross-examination of the applicant by the City of
22 Milford.

23 Attorney Knuff and Attorney Sharp,
24 please continue.

25 MR. KNUFF: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

1 I think our cross-examination will be rather brief
2 this afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I have two
3 questions.

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 MR. KNUFF: The first is for Ms.
6 Sazanowicz. With reference to the city's first
7 set of interrogatories, Question No. 11, and I'm
8 sure you don't know it there, so let me reread
9 that. I'm just going to ask you one question
10 about that. The question was, "Utilizing the
11 various resources available to UI, provide a good
12 faith analysis of an alternative to the proposed
13 option that balances costs with the city's
14 preference to minimize adverse impacts to both
15 historic resources and the heart of downtown
16 Milford."

17 Would you characterize Option J, as
18 Attorney McDermott has described it, as a revised
19 answer or response to that interrogatory?

20 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
21 Knuff.

22 MR. KNUFF: Thank you. And my second
23 question is to any member of the UI panel. Does
24 UI commit to including representatives of the City
25 of Milford in meetings or consultations with SHPO

1 in formulating mitigation measures to adverse
2 impacts to historic resources?

3 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Attorney Knuff,
4 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. UI would be happy
5 to collaborate with the City of Milford in
6 consultation with SHPO in determining mitigation.

7 MR. KNUFF: Thank you. That's all I
8 have, Mr. Morissette.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
10 Knuff. Okay. We will now continue with
11 cross-examination of the applicant on the new
12 exhibits, including Option J, starting with
13 Mr. Perrone and followed by Mr. Silvestri.

14 Mr. Perrone.

15 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
16 Morissette. Beginning with the Late-File
17 exhibit -- I'm sorry, beginning with the Late-File
18 exhibit cost table, could UI explain why Option F
19 is about 2 linear miles longer than Option E?

20 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
21 Perrone. This is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Option E
22 followed a more linear straightforward path
23 between Milvon substation to West River. And
24 option -- within the proposed, within the railroad
25 corridor Option F was really routed through public

1 roadways which made the route of the underground
2 longer between Milvon to West River.

3 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to Option C
4 identified as the Milford alternative, this is a
5 visibility related question. Could you explain
6 how these shorter structures would impact
7 historical resources proximate to this segment as
8 well as nearby residences as compared to the
9 proposed project?

10 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
11 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. So Option C, in
12 reducing the heights, would potentially add
13 additional structures within the downtown Milford
14 segment. That would be obviously different than
15 the proposed alignment that we currently have
16 which is referred to as Option A. They would be
17 the additional two structures having additional
18 impacts. And then where the two additional
19 structures would be, there could be the potential
20 of cultural resources there, but additional due
21 diligence would need to be performed so it
22 couldn't be defined exactly at this time.

23 MR. PERRONE: I understand that was in
24 the context of historical resources. As far as
25 the additional structures, how would those impact

1 residences?

2 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): The additional
3 structures would be aligned within the existing CT
4 DOT right-of-way with the other existing -- or
5 other proposed structures, excuse me. We have not
6 done a visual sims on the two additional
7 structures that would be proposed in this
8 alignment.

9 MR. PERRONE: Referencing the City of
10 Milford Interrogatory, Set Three, so this is MIL
11 3-7, part D, on May 5th UI and Mr. George from
12 Heritage met with SHPO. My question is, has UI
13 held any additional meetings with SHPO subsequent
14 to the May 5th meeting; and if so, what was the
15 outcome?

16 THE WITNESS (George): David George
17 here. We have not had any face-to-face meetings
18 with SHPO since that time. We've only had
19 correspondence through letters. And the outcome
20 of that letter was an agreement with our initial
21 survey results and the need for a mitigation to
22 indirect visual impacts.

23 MR. PERRONE: Referencing the May 25th
24 letter from Heritage to SHPO, there is an attached
25 table with pole heights, and for the River Park

1 Historic District there's three monopoles
2 identified. The third one I just see an "e"
3 there. Do you have a pole number for the third
4 one?

5 THE WITNESS (George): I have to double
6 check on that.

7 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And referencing
8 page 2 of the June 8th SHPO letter, first
9 paragraph, SHPO notes that "...this office would
10 recommend the proposal for taller, but fewer, pole
11 structures." Could you identify the design and
12 cost specifics associated with that alternative?

13 THE WITNESS (George): In terms of the
14 cultural resources, I can speak to that only.
15 They preferred the alternative that was discussed
16 last time we had a meeting. Another team member
17 would have to jump in on costs.

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): This is
19 MeeNa Sazanowicz. So the taller structures that
20 would have been in the proposed design are Option
21 A that's on the cost chart.

22 MR. PERRONE: So in terms of cost and
23 configuration, all Option A?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

25 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Subsequent to the

1 June 8th SHPO letter, has UI had any further
2 discussions with the City of Milford regarding
3 alternatives?

4 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
5 this is Shawn Crosbie. Yes, we have.

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay. What was the
7 outcome of that?

8 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
9 this is Shawn Crosbie again. The outcome was a
10 discussion we had with Milford on clarifying some
11 questions they had related to mitigation within
12 the SHPO letters and the current alignment with
13 the transmission line.

14 MR. PERRONE: Okay. I'd like to move
15 on to the DOT comments letter.

16 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
17 can I just add one item to that, please?

18 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

19 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Thank you.
20 Which also led to the discussion around Option J,
21 which was referred to earlier, in reducing the
22 heights between 904 and 916 and eliminating 915.

23 MR. PERRONE: I understand J will be in
24 addition to the table, but offhand do you have a
25 cost delta handy for J?

1 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
2 Perrone. It would be an increase of approximately
3 \$400,000.

4 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Moving on to the
5 DOT comments, DOT notes that part of this effort
6 requires increasing train speeds and that would
7 require upgrades such as adding catenary
8 structures, track siding, additional bridge spans,
9 and wayside equipment to support their high-speed
10 rail initiative. Would the proposed project
11 facilitate these upgrades by having UI, having
12 their transmission off the catenaries?

13 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
14 this is Shawn Crosbie. Yes, the proposed project
15 would support development with CT DOT and
16 Metro-North.

17 MR. PERRONE: Also in the DOT comments,
18 paragraph five of page 1, DOT notes that it
19 recommends UI look into moving the transmission
20 lines to the maximum extent possible to the
21 railroad right-of-way line. Has UI sought to do
22 that?

23 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
24 this is Shawn Crosbie. Yes, UI has.

25 MR. PERRONE: Is configuration A as

1 close to the line as feasible?

2 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
3 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. Yes, it is.

4 MR. PERRONE: And also on the DOT
5 comments, paragraph six of page 1, DOT notes that
6 no longitudinal underground utilities are
7 permitted in the right-of-way. By "longitudinal,"
8 does that mean parallel to the tracks?

9 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): This is Shawn
10 Crosbie with UI. Yes, it does.

11 MR. PERRONE: The DOT also notes that
12 due to the age of the railroad and CBYD not being
13 applicable for underground excavation, they
14 require hand digging to at least 4 feet at every
15 excavation point. In UI's analysis of underground
16 alternatives, did UI take into account digging to
17 4 feet manually and then using mechanized
18 equipment beyond that?

19 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
20 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. In Option E, which is
21 in the Metro-North corridor, the cost estimate did
22 not take into account the soft digging up to 4
23 feet.

24 MR. PERRONE: Would you expect a
25 material difference in the underground

1 alternatives to take that into account?

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, the
3 construction for trenching would be much slower
4 and more possibly.

5 MR. PERRONE: Would you have any
6 ballpark estimates on those?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Not offhand,
8 but I can certainly provide something.

9 MR. PERRONE: I'll move on. On page 2
10 of the DOT comments under a section called Route
11 Characteristics, DOT mentions reinstallation of a
12 fourth track and relocation of a station in
13 Milford. Has UI considered this in its project
14 plans?

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
16 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Yes, through my many
17 discussions with Metro-North and CT DOT, we have
18 coordinated all of our overhead projects along the
19 railroad with their projects that are to be built
20 in the future.

21 MR. PERRONE: The next topic from the
22 DOT comments is on blasting. DOT had mentioned
23 that means of mechanical rock removal shall be
24 explored first before considering blasting, and
25 should blasting be necessary, to consult with DOT

1 and Metro-North Railroad prior to securing
2 approvals. Would UI comply with DOT's
3 recommendations regarding blasting?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, we
5 would.

6 MR. PERRONE: I just have a couple more
7 from the DOT comments. On page 2 there's a
8 section Facilities to be Modified, paragraph two,
9 DOT notes that "Under no circumstances are the
10 railroad's traction power feeders to be left
11 without protection from the static wire during the
12 UI rebuild." Would UI comply with this?

13 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, we
14 would.

15 MR. PERRONE: And lastly, under
16 Facilities to be Modified, second to last
17 paragraph, DOT had a general comment that no
18 transmission structure is to be located within an
19 existing drainage swale containing stormwater
20 runoff from the railbed. Has UI looked into that,
21 and what is the result?

22 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
23 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. Yes, UI has looked
24 into that and we have placed our structures at
25 appropriate locations.

1 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
2 have.

3 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
4 this is Shawn Crosbie. I'd like to follow up on a
5 question you had we were not able to answer at the
6 time right now, if that's okay.

7 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

8 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): It's in regards
9 to the May 25, 2022 letter to SHPO from Heritage
10 Consultants and the table. It is in the row
11 related to the River Park Historic District. And
12 where we have in the cell under UI proposed
13 monopole we have an "e," that "e" should be P916N.
14 We apologize about the error there.

15 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
17 Perrone. We'll now continue with
18 cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri followed by Mr.
19 Nguyen.

20 Mr. Silvestri.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
22 Morissette. And good afternoon, everyone.

23 I do have some confusion about what we
24 just designated as Option J. But I'm going to
25 start with the questions that I had prepared for

1 this hearing, and we'll see what kind of overlap
2 we come to, and maybe I have to break that off and
3 focus specifically on Option J.

4 So, first I'd like to be referencing
5 the June 8, 2022 Late-Filed exhibit, that's
6 Exhibit 17. And for the underground options that
7 are there, there's a note under cost estimate that
8 says "does not include taxes." Could you explain
9 what taxes are or what taxes would need to be
10 paid?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
12 Silvestri, yes, that would be sales tax on
13 materials, also on contracts that UI would have to
14 furnish and install.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: I didn't see that
16 listed for the overhead options. Are those taxes
17 already included in the estimates that we
18 received?

19 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, for the
20 overhead estimates the sales tax is included.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you.
22 Now, if we could turn to Option C, that's the
23 overhead option on the north side that has
24 quote/unquote "reduced structure heights from
25 P905N to P914N." If you turn to page 13 and it's

1 under the assumptions part, it states in part that
2 "no underground subsurface utility survey has been
3 performed on the south side of the railroad
4 tracks," yet for that option I did not see any
5 south side structure planned. Could you explain
6 that?

7 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
8 Silvestri. Good afternoon.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon.

10 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): This is
11 Matthew Parkhurst. I believe the assumptions that
12 are listed on page 13 correlate to Option D and
13 the assumptions that are on page 17 correlate to
14 Option C.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: So that might have been
16 misplaced in the file then?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Because the
19 follow-up I had on that also under the
20 assumptions, it stated that "two additional track
21 crossings will be required." Again, under Option
22 C, I didn't see that, but if this page is
23 misplaced, I do see that for Option D.

24 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, that's
25 correct.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. I'll move
2 on.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Excuse me, Mr.
4 Silvestri. If we could get a point of
5 clarification from Mr. Parkhurst. So page 13 is
6 related to which options again?

7 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Page 13
8 correlates to Option D and page 17 correlates to
9 Option C.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
11 Sorry to interrupt, Mr. Silvestri. Please
12 continue.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Not a problem, Mr.
14 Morissette. Although, if we go back to page 17
15 with the confusion that I do have, it has "Both
16 115 kV lines can be out of service at the same
17 time for three to four weeks" as an assumption.
18 Is that an assumption for Option D or Option C?
19 That's page 17.

20 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): I apologize,
21 if I can revert back and correct what I had
22 previously said. The last bullet on page 13
23 should be on page 17.

24 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, if I
25 could just jump in. I'm now confused.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Please, Attorney
2 McDermott.

3 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Parkhurst, just
4 take a second, if you could, and just kind of walk
5 us through what the correction is that you seem to
6 be making here. So that Mr. Silvestri's question
7 about no geotechnical investigation has been
8 performed on the south side was his initial
9 question, and you pointed out there was no
10 construction on the south side in this option. So
11 with that in mind, would you like to take some
12 time to figure out what the correction is, yes?

13 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Mr. Silvestri,
15 I'm afraid we'll kind of continue to not get it
16 exactly right. Why don't we work on that as you
17 continue with your cross-examination and we can
18 come back, if that works. I'm not sure how that
19 impacts the rest of your cross-examination.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm not sure how that
21 will affect it either, but I do need
22 clarification. I think everybody needs
23 clarification on that one. But let me continue
24 and hopefully we can circle back on that.

25 Again, going with Option C, I'm trying

1 to figure out how much, when you say you have
2 reduced structure heights, I'm still trying to
3 figure out what the reduced structure heights
4 would be. So let me go first and go to the
5 assumptions again on page 13 if this is accurate
6 for Option C. And it says that five additional
7 steel poles and foundations will be needed, but
8 when I look at Option C, I only count three
9 additional poles, those being 907, 909 and 911.
10 So the first question I have is, did I miss
11 something on the poles?

12 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Let me take a
13 few minutes.

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Sorry, Mr. Parkhurst,
15 Mr. Silvestri stumped you.

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): It all
17 correlates to the -- I'm figuring this out.

18 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Should we be
19 doing that now or do you need time is the
20 question?

21 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): I need a few
22 minutes, yes.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Attorney
24 McDermott, maybe I could pose an easier question
25 while that's being worked on. Again, when it's

1 listed as reduced structure heights, I'm kind of
2 looking at a comparison from what was proposed
3 originally to what the heights might be in Option
4 C. So, for example, Pole 904 was originally at
5 105. Do we know what the Option C height would
6 be?

7 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Silvestri,
8 this is Shawn Crosbie. Just give us a moment on
9 that question so we can pull up that document.

10 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
11 Silvestri, this is Matthew Parkhurst. For Option
12 C, the lower pole heights would be similar to what
13 is laid out in what was discussed earlier today in
14 terms of Poles 904 through 909. In addition,
15 Option C adds a pole in the grass median north of
16 the train station, that would be 911, that would
17 be approximately 110 feet. And 910 would also go
18 down to 125 feet and 912 would stay at 130 feet.

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Sorry. What, Mr.
20 Parkhurst, what was the last -- I didn't hear
21 the number at the end.

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Pole 912
23 would stay at 130 feet.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Got that. 909 was
25 originally listed, 909 originally had no pole.

1 Option J, I heard 110. Would that be the same for
2 Option C?

3 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, it
4 would, Mr. Silvestri.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Let me pose
6 a broad-based question. What's difference then
7 between Option C and the newly designated Option
8 J?

9 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Option J, in
10 Option J there would be no Pole 911, and we would
11 reduce base spacing on Pole 912 to limit pole
12 heights on both 910 and 914.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Otherwise, the pole
14 heights would be roughly the same for the others?

15 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I think I got
17 it. Then Pole 911 would connect, if you will, to
18 Pole 910, and that's going to span over buildings.
19 Are all of those buildings part of the railroad
20 station?

21 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, that's
22 correct.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. I want to
24 turn to Option D, if you will. And again, going
25 back to the statement that's on page 17, again, if

1 this does indeed pertain to Option D. Can both of
2 the lines, the 115 lines be taken out of service
3 for three to four weeks or, related to that,
4 what's the mechanism or contingency, if you will,
5 to keep the power flowing in the area?

6 MR. McDERMOTT: Ms. Sazanowicz, is that
7 for you or Mr. Parkhurst?

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Ms.
9 Sazanowicz.

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So Mr.
11 Silvestri, that was an assumption for the project.
12 Taking both 115 kV lines out of service for that
13 long a duration is likely not possible.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: I didn't hear the last
15 part. I'm sorry.

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Taking both
17 115 kV lines out at the same time for that
18 duration between Milvon to West River is likely
19 not possible.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: That's not possible?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: So with the crossing
23 that's proposed for Option D, is it still feasible
24 to do without taking both lines out at the same
25 time?

1 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
2 Silvestri, this is Matthew Parkhurst. If both 115
3 kV lines could not be taken out at the same time
4 for that period of time, you would have to look at
5 doing some temporary work if this were to proceed.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: And whatever temporary
7 work might happen would add to the cost, correct?

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Let me stay with
10 the double crossing, if you will. From an
11 electrical standpoint, is there a potential
12 reliability issue or perhaps a potential
13 maintenance issue with the double crossing of the
14 railroad tracks?

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
16 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The current
17 configuration of the railroad alignment into the
18 substations has the double circuit crossing, so no
19 issues.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: And getting back to
21 what DOT was talking about, expansion or upgrading
22 the lines, would a double crossing interfere with
23 anything that they have proposed?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Based on our
25 current alignment, Mr. Silvestri, we do not

1 anticipate it to have any adverse impacts to their
2 proposed projects.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Let me move
4 on, if you will, to Option H. And if you look at
5 the concept plan, sheet 2 of 3, it has the
6 proposed underground route exiting the railroad
7 corridor proper, then it goes onto Railroad Avenue
8 and it returns to the corridor after the train
9 station. Now, in light of DOT's June 10th
10 memorandum, is undergrounding within the
11 right-of-way still an option?

12 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
13 Silvestri, no, it is not an option.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: So for the route that's
15 outlined in Option H, that would be moot at this
16 point, there would have to be some other type of
17 route?

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Correct.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I do have two
20 other questions on that. The assumptions on page
21 39 that hopefully pertain to Option H, it states
22 that "does not include removals." And the
23 question I have, removals of what?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Apologies,
25 Mr. Silvestri. This is MeeNa Sazanowicz.

1 Removals would pertain to removal of the bonnets
2 attached to the catenaries. However, that
3 assumption should be struck. There are removal
4 costs in the chart for removals for all the
5 underground options.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: In your estimate does
7 the number go up or does the number go down?

8 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The
9 estimates that are presented include removal
10 costs, so they don't change.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. One other
12 question I have under assumptions it also states
13 "does not include remote substation work." Can
14 you explain what the remote substation work would
15 be?

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes. Mr.
17 Silvestri, that would include any additional or
18 changes to P&C that would pertain to an
19 underground configuration versus an overhead.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
21 I kind of reached the end of my questions that I
22 had. I'm still not sure where page 13 and page 17
23 fall in line. I don't know if there's any further
24 clarification that you could offer at this point.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, let me

1 just have a side bar.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Please continue.

3 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
4 Morissette. I think Mr. Parkhurst can address Mr.
5 Silvestri's line of questioning at this point.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. If it
7 could be very clear on the changes that need to be
8 made to page 13 and the changes that need to be
9 made to 17 so we are all clear on what they are.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
12 Morissette. I just said the exact same thing
13 during the side bar, so I appreciate the
14 reinforcement.

15 Mr. Parkhurst.

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
17 Silvestri. I apologize about that. So all of the
18 assumptions on page 13 correlate to Option D. On
19 page 17, bullets 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 correlate to
20 Option C. Bullets 3, 7 and 8 correlate to Option
21 D.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Mr. Morissette,
23 I'm going to need a couple minutes to digest that.
24 So the rest of my questions I'm all set with that,
25 and perhaps I'll come back to that after the other

1 Council members have a chance, but thank you.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
3 Mr. Silvestri. We'll come back to you at the end
4 to see if there's any need for further
5 cross-examination. We'll now continue with
6 cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen followed by Mrs.
7 Cooley.

8 Mr. Nguyen.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
10 Good afternoon, everyone. Just a couple of
11 clarifying questions. We talk about Option J, and
12 it's my understanding that Option J essentially is
13 adding two more poles but eliminates a pole; is
14 that right?

15 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, Mr. Morissette.
16 I apologize for interrupting. I've got to step
17 away for about ten minutes.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good, Mr. Lynch.
19 Thank you.

20 MR. LYNCH: And again, I apologize for
21 interrupting.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Please
23 continue, Mr. Nguyen.

24 MR. NGUYEN: Yes. I don't know if
25 anyone heard my question.

1 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes,
2 Mr. Nguyen. This is Shawn Crosbie. That's
3 correct, Option J would add two structures but
4 would eliminate one structure.

5 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. And I'm
6 looking at the SHPO letter dated June 8 to the
7 Council, and on the last page of that letter it
8 indicates that the SHPO office would recommend the
9 proposal for taller, but fewer, pole structures.
10 Now, is that in alignment, if you will, with
11 Option J in this case?

12 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): The reference
13 that SHPO is making would not be the same as
14 Option J. It's more aligned with what Option A is
15 in our Late-File table, Mr. Nguyen. But Option J
16 does minimize any of the visual impact caused by
17 the taller structure heights.

18 MR. NGUYEN: And with respect to the
19 cost table on the Late-File exhibit, and I see
20 that there's cost data -- delta, rather, for each
21 option. So Mr. Crosbie, in general, who would pay
22 for the cost delta, whatever option is chosen, and
23 specifically how would the costs be allocated to
24 Connecticut specific ratepayers?

25 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Nguyen,

1 this is Shawn Crosbie. Give us one minute.

2 MR. NGUYEN: Sure.

3 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Shawn, this is
4 Ed. If you'd like me to answer that question, I
5 can.

6 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, sir.
7 Thank you, Ed.

8 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Nguyen, this
9 is Edward Roedel with UI. Any incremental cost
10 increases over the least cost alternative
11 identified by ISO New England would be paid for by
12 Connecticut ratepayers.

13 MR. NGUYEN: And how is that allocated,
14 is that 24 percent, is that --

15 THE WITNESS (Roedel): No, 100 percent
16 of the incremental cost increases would be
17 allocated to Connecticut. Anything that is part
18 of the least cost alternative would be spread
19 throughout the region given the 24 percent that
20 you cited.

21 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very
22 much. And that's all I have, Mr. Morissette.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
24 We will now continue with cross-examination by
25 Mrs. Cooley followed by Mr. Collette.

1 Mrs. Cooley.

2 MRS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr.
3 Morissette. I just have a few kind of clarifying
4 questions. We're just hearing about Option J
5 today. So just to clarify, Option J was never
6 presented to SHPO so they did not weigh in on that
7 specifically?

8 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mrs. Cooley,
9 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. Yes, we've never
10 presented Option J to SHPO. We feel it is a good
11 alternative to what we attempted in Option C,
12 which, to address a little bit of Mr. Silvestri's
13 question, Option C had the majority of those
14 structures being reduced, as the reference for
15 Option C is down to 120 feet for the majority of
16 them and add them to the heights for what we were
17 referring to as Option J. So we felt addressing
18 some discussion with Milford, along with reducing
19 the impacts, we felt the Option J was a good
20 alternative to present. And we will discuss with
21 SHPO in terms of what and if the next steps will
22 be for UI on the project.

23 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. So you had said
24 that you thought that J reduces the impact. Do
25 you anticipate that SHPO would be amenable to that

1 given that they had initially suggested that fewer
2 but taller poles would be better from their
3 standpoint?

4 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): I can't speak
5 directly for SHPO. I know that's not your
6 question. I think that we would have to have
7 further discussion with them to see where they
8 would stand. I think some of their discussion was
9 they did like our Option A on the cost table as a
10 primary as it reduces the number of structures and
11 longer spans. Option J does give us more
12 structures, but there's also a balance there, and
13 they're not as tall, reducing that height from
14 different vantage points depending on where
15 someone may be.

16 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. I just wanted to
17 make sure because that seems like those are the
18 two things that SHPO doesn't want. They want
19 taller poles, not shorter, and they want fewer
20 poles, not more. But I think you're trying to
21 balance with the wishes of the town as well, so I
22 think I understand where you're going with that.

23 Okay. My only other question, I just
24 wanted to clarify too that the cost delta for
25 Option J, I think I heard 400K more, is that

1 correct; and if so, where is that coming from? Is
2 there any breakdown on that?

3 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mrs.
4 Cooley. This is Matthew Parkhurst. That 400,000
5 is primarily based off of adding the additional
6 poles and the additional material cost for the
7 steel, for foundations.

8 MRS. COOLEY: Okay. Thank you. I
9 think those are all my questions. Thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mrs.
11 Cooley. Let us continue with cross-examination by
12 Mr. Collette followed by Mr. Lynch.

13 Mr. Collette.

14 MR. COLLETTE: I have no questions. I
15 appreciate the clarifying questions asked by my
16 fellow Council members. Thank you.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
18 Collette.

19 Mr. Lynch, are you back with us this
20 afternoon? We'll circle back with Mr. Lynch. I
21 have some questions, if I may.

22 My first question has to do with the
23 Charles Island mitigation. What is the cost
24 associated with the proposed mitigation at this
25 point?

1 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Morissette,
2 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. At this time the
3 exact costs are not known, but the estimated cost
4 is approximately 30,000.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: 30,000. Thank you, Mr.
6 Crosbie. In that proposed mitigation that is
7 proposed to mitigate for the National Historic
8 registered properties only, not the state; is that
9 correct?

10 THE WITNESS (George): This is David
11 George from Heritage Consultants. No, sir, that
12 will accommodate impacts, indirect visual impacts
13 to the resources in general, not just the National
14 Register.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you for
16 that clarification.

17 THE WITNESS (George): Sure.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. George, while I
19 have you, the town has talked about in their
20 filings about other possible mitigation
21 strategies. Has anything further come out of that
22 information, has UI thought about other potential
23 opportunities within Milford's area of concern?

24 THE WITNESS (George): At this point
25 only the options we discussed with SHPO in the

1 table of mitigation options we proposed earlier.
2 We did also have discussions whether or not
3 additional documentation of the National Register
4 Districts themselves was suitable, and the SHPO
5 indicated to us that the National Register
6 nominations, as they stand, are current, up to
7 date and probably not in need of updating. So
8 that potential option was dismissed by them.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Okay. I'm
10 going to switch gears now to the Late-File cost
11 table exhibit. I just have some clarifying
12 questions. For Option B on the south side of the
13 railroad can someone just in general terms
14 identify some of the obstacles or conflicts that
15 may be encountered if that option was to go
16 forward?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
18 Morisette. This is Matthew Parkhurst. On the
19 south side there's a lot of buildings quite close
20 to the railroad, many more buildings than on the
21 north side, so that would have been a big design
22 constraint. The elevation differences between the
23 tracks and the adjacent line below and where
24 private property is, is also a potential large
25 design constraint. Overall, lack of space within

1 the CT DOT corridor appears to be much narrower on
2 the south side than on the north side. There are
3 locations where, there are two locations in
4 particular where we don't believe we can place
5 poles within 1,000 feet of each other. So we have
6 at least two spans over the course of the project
7 of over 1,000 feet. At that length we get into
8 designs a lot more complex. Perhaps we'll have to
9 use a special conductor type and significantly
10 taller poles.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you
12 for that clarification. I'm going to jump to
13 Option I. I'm a little confused about the mapping
14 on Option I, the last page. It's not clear to me
15 which -- so once you get off of Pearl Hill Street
16 are you following -- then you are following Option
17 G; is that correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
19 Morissette, the cost for Option I was going to be
20 turning onto the railroad corridor and following
21 on the north side parallel to the rail corridor.
22 There were the two lines just to indicate that we
23 could either tie into the option that continued on
24 the public streets or, alternatively, we'd be able
25 to tie into the railroad on the north side option.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So if I
2 understand that correctly, but the cost data is
3 based on Option G plus Option I?

4 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): It would be
5 Option H plus Option I.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. H
7 plus I. Okay. So I is the delta, basically it's
8 the delta on Pearl Street -- Pearl Hill Street.
9 How long is the length of Pearl Hill Street that
10 will be underground?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): I believe it
12 was an additional approximately 2,000 or 2,500
13 feet.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.
15 Okay. One other item that I'd like to have
16 addressed is I saw a couple of times it was
17 mentioned that this option poses a higher
18 likelihood of impacting archeological resources.
19 Why do you think that's the case that it's
20 possible, is that in that particular area or any
21 time you underground?

22 THE WITNESS (George): Mr. Morissette,
23 David George, Heritage Consultants here. I'm
24 sorry, could you repeat that question? I missed
25 it.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: One of the
2 assumptions, especially on Option I, not
3 assumption but one of the notes says "This option
4 poses a higher likelihood of impacting
5 archeological resources."

6 THE WITNESS (George): Yes, sir. The
7 greater amount of buried cable in that corridor,
8 the increased likelihood that it will impact an
9 archeological site. We know from other towns and
10 areas along the coastline that the former railroad
11 corridor or the railroad corridor is built on top
12 of former archeological sites and has not in all
13 places been completely disturbed, so the potential
14 therefore increases if we went underground with
15 the cable.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Very good.
17 Thank you. Okay. That pretty much concludes my
18 questioning for this afternoon. We're going to go
19 back to Mr. Silvestri. But before we do, I have
20 two open items on our to-do list here, and one has
21 to do with the Heritage pole height and the other
22 is the cost estimate increase to hand dig the 4
23 feet. Do we have answers to those two questions?

24 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Morissette,
25 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. Can I just ask for

1 you to clarify? When you say "the Heritage pole
2 height," is that in the letter to SHPO on May 25,
3 2022 in the table to Question Number 2, is that
4 the one?

5 MR. MORISSETTE: This is a question
6 that was asked by Mr. Perrone. Let me ask Mr.
7 Perrone whether he's satisfied with the
8 information he got so far and whether that has
9 been clarified already for him.

10 Mr. Perrone.

11 MR. PERRONE: I'm all set with that.
12 We have the structure number. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Okay.
14 Thank you. Okay. So that just leaves the cost
15 estimate for the increase in hand digging 4 feet.

16 Mr. Crosbie, do you have a response to
17 that?

18 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): So at this time
19 we need a few more moments to gather the
20 information on the cost information that you asked
21 for. Maybe it would be appropriate, I don't know,
22 at the break the team can collaborate to get that
23 together and have that answer for you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. That will
25 be fine. Okay. We're going to go back to Mr.

1 Silvestri and see if he has any additional
2 questions or line of questioning based on the
3 information he's heard so far.

4 Mr. Silvestri.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
6 Morissette. Just to verify from what we talked
7 about with pages 13 and 17, if I understood
8 correctly, page 13 is strictly Option D; is that
9 correct?

10 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): That's
11 correct.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. When we go
13 to 17, there's a mix of items that could pertain
14 to C or could pertain to D, but the one I want to
15 question begins with "6 poles of 160 with lowered
16 pole heights in comparison to the proposed
17 project." That would come under which scenario?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Option C.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: C, okay. Thank you.

20 Mr. Morissette, the only other thing I
21 have, we requested or you requested some
22 information on Option J that would kind of spell
23 things out as a filing, if you will. Could we get
24 corrected pages 13 and 17 as how they pertain to
25 the two options as well?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Silvestri, I
2 think that's appropriate.

3 Attorney McDermott, if we could have
4 revised sheets 13 and 17 revised accordingly to
5 reflect Option C and Option D. And maybe adding
6 to the header both Option C and D, as appropriate.

7 MR. McDERMOTT: Certainly. We'll get
8 that filed as soon as possible.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Okay.
10 We're going to go back to Mr. -- actually, before
11 we do that, we'll go through the rest of the
12 Council to see if there's any follow-up.

13 Mr. Nguyen, any follow-up questions?

14 MR. NGUYEN: No. Thank you very much.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mrs.
16 Cooley?

17 MRS. COOLEY: (Pause) Sorry. No, thank
18 you. I'm all set.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
20 Collette, any follow-up?

21 MR. COLLETTE: No, thank you, Mr.
22 Morissette.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,
24 are you with us?

25 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette, I just have

1 two things. The first one is, going through all
2 your different options and costs, I see -- it's
3 been a long time since I've dealt with the ISO.
4 So there's part of the, I guess you would call
5 part of the legend where the ISO has a percentage
6 or a formula that I'm assuming is for the
7 socialization of the project. Can someone explain
8 that to me?

9 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Lynch, this
10 is Edward Roedel from UI. The cost allocation
11 that is performed by ISO New England is based on
12 each state's share of the total New England load.
13 So Connecticut's share represents 24 percent of
14 the entirety of New England.

15 MR. LYNCH: Say that again. 24 percent
16 is Connecticut?

17 THE WITNESS (Roedel): That's correct.
18 And that cost allocation is done for construction
19 of pool transmission facilities that are
20 determined to be just and reasonable.

21 MR. LYNCH: And who would have a larger
22 percentage, the commonwealth of Massachusetts?

23 THE WITNESS (Roedel): It's based on
24 their total load. I know that Connecticut is 24
25 percent. I don't know if Massachusetts with a

1 large load center in Boston is the majority or if
2 it's spread equally maybe between Massachusetts
3 and the remaining New England states.

4 MR. LYNCH: And my last inquiry goes
5 back to our previous hearing where I asked about
6 if this project would be eligible for the build
7 back America project, the first part of it, and I
8 can't justify it so I'm just asking you if you've
9 looked into that to get funding from the federal
10 government for this utility project.

11 THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Lynch, UI
12 and their other Avangrid operating companies are
13 involved in reviewing our project portfolio,
14 including this project and others, to see where
15 they may apply. Based on the language of the
16 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, I think
17 that this project would; however, there are a lot
18 of considerations that go into that. So I can't
19 say that this project for sure would be something
20 that we would apply for a grant, but some of the
21 money in that act does apply to the rebuild of
22 transmission facilities.

23 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. That's all, Mr.
24 Morissette.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

1 Attorney McDermott, I would like to ask
2 for another filing. If we could have an update of
3 the cost table to include Option J, as described
4 here today, just for the completeness of the
5 record. Very good. Thank you.

6 Okay. We'll now move on to the
7 appearance by the City of Milford.

8 MR. KNUFF: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
9 For the record, John Knuff. We have five members
10 who make up the city's panel this afternoon. We
11 have Marguerite Carnell who is from Archaeological
12 and Historical Services, Inc., Bill Silver who is
13 the chairman of the Milford Historic Preservation
14 Commission, David Sulkis is the city planner in
15 the City of Milford, Christopher Saley, the
16 director of public works in the City of Milford,
17 and MaryRose Palumbo who's the inland wetlands
18 officer of the City of Milford. That's our panel,
19 Mr. Morissette, and they're ready to be sworn by
20 Attorney Bachman.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
22 Knuff.

23 Attorney Bachman, will you please
24 administer the oath.

25 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.

1 Morissette.

2 M A R G U E R I T E C A R N E L L ,

3 B I L L S I L V E R ,

4 D A V I D S U L K I S ,

5 C H R I S T O P H E R S A L E Y ,

6 M A R Y R O S E P A L U M B O ,

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

10 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
12 Attorney Knuff, please begin by verifying all
13 exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses.

14 MR. KNUFF: Thank you, Mr. Morissette,
15 and thank you, Attorney Bachman.

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 MR. KNUFF: Ms. Carnell, did you
18 prepare what is identified as City Exhibit Number
19 2?

20 THE WITNESS (Carnell): Yes, I did.

21 MR. KNUFF: Do you have any changes or
22 revisions to what was filed on May 17, 2022?

23 THE WITNESS (Carnell): No, I do not.

24 MR. KNUFF: Do you adopt that as a full
25 exhibit?

1 THE WITNESS (Carnell): Yes, I do.

2 MR. KNUFF: Thank you. Mr. Silver, did
3 you prepare what's identified as City Exhibit
4 Number 3?

5 THE WITNESS (Silver): Yes, I did.

6 MR. KNUFF: And do you have any changes
7 to that document?

8 THE WITNESS (Silver): There are no
9 changes.

10 MR. KNUFF: And do you adopt that as an
11 exhibit?

12 THE WITNESS (Silver): Yes, I do.

13 MR. KNUFF: Okay. Mr. Sulkis, with
14 reference to City Exhibit Number 4, are you
15 familiar with that document?

16 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): Yes.

17 MR. KNUFF: And did you prepare or
18 assist in the preparation of that document?

19 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): Yes.

20 MR. KNUFF: And do you have any changes
21 or revisions to that document?

22 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): No.

23 MR. KNUFF: And for your purposes, do
24 you adopt that as an exhibit?

25 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): Yes.

1 MR. KNUFF: Okay. Next is Mr. Saley.
2 Mr. Saley, are you familiar with what has been
3 identified as City Exhibit Number 4?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KNUFF: Let me see if I can find
6 you. Are you unmuted, Chris?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KNUFF: Let's move on to MaryRose
9 Palumbo. Ms. Palumbo, are you familiar with
10 what's been identified as City Exhibit Number 4?

11 THE WITNESS (Palumbo): Yes.

12 MR. KNUFF: And did you assist or
13 prepare that exhibit?

14 THE WITNESS (Palumbo): Yes.

15 MR. KNUFF: And do you have any changes
16 or revisions to that exhibit?

17 THE WITNESS (Palumbo): No.

18 MR. KNUFF: And do you adopt that as an
19 exhibit?

20 THE WITNESS (Palumbo): Yes.

21 MR. KNUFF: Thank you. I apologize,
22 but it appears that we lost Mr. Saley. But this
23 is the joint testimony of Mr. Sulkis, Ms. Palumbo
24 and Mr. Saley. And I would move that all the
25 exhibits, including Exhibit Number 4, be admitted

1 as full exhibits.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
3 Knuff.

4 Attorney McDermott, do you take
5 objection to the City of Milford's exhibits,
6 including the testimony of Mr. Saley?

7 MR. McDERMOTT: No objection from the
8 company. Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
10 The exhibits are hereby admitted.

11 (City of Milford Exhibits III-B-I
12 through III-B-4 - received in evidence described
13 in index.)

14 MR. MORISSETTE: We will now begin with
15 cross-examination of the City of Milford by the
16 Council starting with Mr. Perrone.

17 Mr. Perrone.

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION

19 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
20 Morissette.

21 Ms. Carnell, beginning with your
22 prefile testimony, on page 4 there's a mention of
23 impacts to the Metro-North Railroad alignment, and
24 on the June 8th SHPO letter SHPO had indicated
25 that the proposed project would avoid a direct

1 impact to that resource. Do you agree or
2 disagree?

3 THE WITNESS (Carnell): I would need
4 additional information as to what the proposed
5 changes to the catenary structures would be, but
6 in principle, I generally do concur with SHPO's
7 evaluations.

8 MR. PERRONE: And then I have a
9 question for Mr. Silver. On page 5 of the prefile
10 testimony it states that the underground
11 installation of transmission would preserve the
12 historic character of the town green. My question
13 is, would the transition stations, to accommodate
14 an underground segment, would those affect the
15 town green from a visibility standpoint?

16 THE WITNESS (Silver): To the best of
17 my knowledge, no, they would not because the
18 transition stations are not in the vicinity of the
19 downtown area.

20 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Given the latest
21 SHPO letters and the DOT comments, what is the
22 city's preferred option for this project?

23 THE WITNESS (Silver): So the city
24 is -- do you mean from David Sulkis and city
25 employees or from the volunteer Historic

1 Preservation Commission?

2 MR. KNUFF: Mr. Morissette, perhaps you
3 can give us a moment because obviously Mr.
4 Perrone's question is a valid one, but to ask what
5 is the city's preference, I want to make sure that
6 the proper witness is testifying, so if you can
7 just give us a moment.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. Thank you.

9 MR. KNUFF: Thank you.

10 MR. PERRONE: From the historic
11 commission's standpoint.

12 THE WITNESS (Silver): From a historic
13 commission standpoint, we look at the decades, if
14 not century long impact, that this action will
15 take, that if the catenaries existed since the
16 early 1900s, hopefully it would also serve that
17 the new monopoles would also last 100 years and
18 therefore affect the image and character of all
19 the properties that are on either side of the
20 proposed improvements and that our preference, I
21 think that gets to your core question, goes to the
22 resiliency issue. And resiliency, while it is
23 some of the points made within the application,
24 resiliency is proven to also mean underground,
25 especially in low earthquake zone areas like New

1 England is. And my feedback, the commission's
2 feedback is such that it relates not to cost
3 necessarily but it relates to the long-term
4 historic impact. And so therefore it is narrow,
5 perhaps, but it also is long-sighted.

6 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
7 have.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Perrone, we still
9 have a question open from the City of Milford as
10 to what their position is.

11 MR. KNUFF: Mr. Perrone, if you can
12 direct that question to Mr. Sulkis.

13 MR. PERRONE: Sure. Given the latest
14 SHPO letters and DOT comments, what is the city's
15 preferred option for this project?

16 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): The preferred
17 option always, when we talk about powerlines
18 coming through Milford, would be underground,
19 especially in the downtown area. And I raised
20 that with UI at our earlier meetings, especially
21 in light of one of the earlier plans they showed
22 us which had the poles going in front of a
23 property that is in the process -- was in the
24 process of being reviewed for development,
25 redevelopment and has since been approved. So

1 it's a four-story then \$20 million plus building
2 that's going to have one of these huge monopoles
3 in front of it, and I was concerned about that.

4 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Mr.
6 Perrone, anything else?

7 MR. PERRONE: I'm all set. Thank you.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you,
9 Mr. Perrone. We'll now continue with
10 cross-examination of the City of Milford by Mr.
11 Silvestri followed by Mr. Nguyen.

12 Mr. Silvestri:

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
14 Morissette. I'd like to dovetail a little bit on
15 Mr. Perrone's line of questioning about preferred
16 options, if you will. But we've seen and heard
17 about a lot of options today, including the new
18 Option J. Mr. Sulkis, I'm not sure if my question
19 will be directed to you, but I would appreciate
20 your input, and possibly others as well. But
21 first of all, do you have any comments or concerns
22 with Option D that has the overhead transmission
23 structures on the south side of the railroad
24 tracks through the downtown Milford area?

25 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): I haven't seen

1 any of the latest options or alternative options
2 probably at this point in several years since we
3 had our initial discussions with UI. I
4 understand, you know, from the earlier discussion
5 that, you know, that side of the track has more
6 structures which may or may not be true depending
7 on what section you're looking at, but whether
8 it's on the north side of the tracks or the south
9 side of the tracks, it's going right through the
10 heart of downtown.

11 And obviously putting cost aside, the
12 best option would be underground. And I pointed
13 out at the time that at least on the north side,
14 if there was any contemplation of putting the
15 lines underground between High Street and River
16 Street, there is really no underground
17 infrastructure along Railroad Avenue which is
18 where one of the train station platforms is
19 located. And it's also part of the DOT
20 right-of-way going through there. I had checked
21 at the time with the city engineer, and, you know,
22 we had no infrastructure of any kind, and there
23 was no infrastructure that anyone was aware of at
24 the time in that area. So I offered that up as
25 just some information at the time.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your
2 response. The follow-up question I have for you,
3 Mr. Sulkis, if I read DOT's memorandum correctly,
4 I'm under the impression that the train station
5 might be expanded. Are there plans for expansion
6 of the train station?

7 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): If there are
8 plans for the train station to expand, and when
9 you say train station in Milford, we're really
10 talking about a couple of platforms, there's a
11 north platform and a south platform. The old
12 train station building is actually an arts center
13 now, performance space. The state has done some
14 work over the last few years on the, I guess it's
15 the north side, the New York bound side to expand
16 that platform in length a bit. I have not heard
17 or no one has contacted me about expanding those
18 platforms any more than they've already been
19 expanded.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
21 for your response.

22 Mr. Morissette, I am all set at this
23 point. Thank you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
25 Silvestri. We'll now continue with

1 cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen followed by Mrs.
2 Cooley.

3 Mr. Nguyen.

4 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
5 I do not have any questions. Thank you.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
7 We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mrs.
8 Cooley followed by Mr. Collette.

9 Mrs. Cooley.

10 MRS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr.
11 Morissette. I have no further questions.

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

15 Mr. Collette.

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

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

21 Mr. Lynch.

22 MR. LYNCH: Just a clarification from
23 Mr. Silvestri's question. I didn't hear -- it was
24 a little garbled. Is there or is there not going
25 to be expansion of the train station?

1 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): To my knowledge,
2 at this point there's not going to be another
3 expansion of the train station.

4 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Sulkis. I
5 just wanted a clarification. It got kind of
6 garbled so I didn't hear it.

7 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): That's okay.

8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

10 I have a couple of questions.

11 Ms. Carnell, my first question relates to the
12 mitigation of Charles Island which in your
13 prefiled, if I remember correctly, you stated that
14 you didn't agree with it. And I'm kind of
15 paraphrasing here now is that there are other
16 opportunities in the City of Milford that may be
17 more appropriate. What are your thoughts on what
18 you would like to see for, specifically what you'd
19 like to see for mitigation if an overhead
20 provision was to go forward?

21 THE WITNESS (Carnell): Thank you, Mr.
22 Morissette. So as I stated in my prefile
23 testimony, I would prefer to see additional
24 mitigation measures that are more closely related
25 to the historic resources that would have an

1 adverse visual impact, perhaps the Taylor Memorial
2 Library or the Milford Railroad Station that is
3 now occupied by the Arts Council. In particular,
4 the Taylor Memorial Library, that building has
5 been vacated in the past couple of years by the
6 Chamber of Council and now stands vacant. I'm not
7 aware at this time what reuse plans for that
8 building might be. When I was at the site a
9 couple of weeks ago, I did note that there are
10 some developing issues with the building, and it
11 seems to me that a preservation plan, adaptive
12 reuse plan for that building is something that the
13 city might wish to consider as a mitigation
14 option.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms.
16 Carnell.

17 Let's see, Mr. Silver -- or no,
18 Mr. Saley, do you have any thoughts on that?

19 MR. KNUFF: I believe, Mr. Morissette,
20 you want to direct your question to Mr. Sulkis. I
21 think we lost Mr. Saley who is the public works
22 director.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Let's try Mr.
24 Sulkis. Do you have any thoughts on Ms. Carnell's
25 proposed, her thoughts on mitigation, potential

1 mitigation?

2 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): Yeah, I mean,
3 obviously if we can't get the lines underground,
4 which would be my preference, then the shorter the
5 poles the better. And my understanding is that
6 Option J at the moment gets us the shortest height
7 in terms of the poles.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. What I'd
9 like to do is go back to Ms. Carnell. If you
10 could talk about, there was discussion of other
11 eligible properties within the area. Maybe you
12 could help the Council and explain a little bit as
13 to these identified possibly eligible properties
14 and what that means and what the process is or the
15 stages are to have it become eligible and where
16 that might stand with those properties. It's a
17 pretty broad question, I know, but if you could
18 kind of help us out with that, I would appreciate
19 it.

20 THE WITNESS (Carnell): Yeah, I think
21 that question might be better directed to Mr.
22 Silver of the Milford Historic Commission who
23 knows in detail the resources in the project area
24 perhaps more than I do, but I can speak in general
25 to the process whereby an architectural historian

1 with certain qualifications would be engaged to do
2 a preliminary survey and inventory of buildings in
3 the area and through that process would further
4 identify buildings, properties that could be
5 national register or state register eligible, and
6 from that process those buildings or properties or
7 districts in coordination with SHPO would be
8 nominated. But I'd like to ask Bill to talk
9 further about his thoughts on which properties
10 might be eligible for further study.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you,
12 Ms. Carnell.

13 Mr. Silver, if you could expand on what
14 has been said so far, please do.

15 THE WITNESS (Silver): Since it was
16 founded in 1639 and well built in the early 1700s,
17 there are literally dozens, if not hundreds, of
18 structures that are eligible for state or national
19 register status. We recently had one that was
20 granted national register status in one of our
21 neighboring boroughs over on the west side, and so
22 it is a continuing process where property owners
23 continue to explore options. One of them is more
24 on the coast, which is Villa Rosa, and then within
25 the downtown area there are numerous properties

1 that are well over 75 years old that all could be
2 listed on the national -- excuse me, state or
3 national register. We don't have an inventory of
4 those. We currently manage about 220 properties,
5 most of them within the town center area, but they
6 stretch all the way from the Washington Bridge,
7 which is Route 1, and within sight of the
8 Metro-North at the west end all the way to the
9 east end and the synagogue in Woodmont. So there
10 are many properties that currently exist but many,
11 many more that could be eligible for registration.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you
13 for that summary. Okay. At this point the
14 Council has completed its cross-examination.
15 We're going to take a 14-minute break and we'll
16 come back with the cross-examination of City of
17 Milford by Attorney McDermott. So we will see
18 everyone back here at 3:45. Thank you.

19 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
20 3:32 p.m. until 3:45 p.m.)

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We will now
22 continue with cross-examination by the applicant,
23 cross-examination of the City of Milford by the
24 applicant. Attorney McDermott, please continue.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.

1 Morissette.

2 I have a question for Mr. Sulkis,
3 please. Mr. Sulkis, putting aside the underground
4 option which -- the underground options which, as
5 set forth in the June 8, 2022 Late-File exhibit,
6 are as much as \$1.1 billion in cost, which would
7 be about three times the cost of the proposed
8 project, am I correct that your testimony is that
9 the city's preferred option is Option J as
10 discussed at the onset of the hearing today?

11 THE WITNESS (Sulkis): That would be
12 correct.

13 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
14 Morissette. That's all I have.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
16 McDermott. That concludes our hearing for today.

17 The Council announces that the
18 evidentiary record in this matter will remain open
19 for the applicant's submission of the Late-File
20 exhibits requested by the Council during the
21 hearing session this afternoon.

22 Attorney McDermott, we had one open
23 item associated with the increased cost of hand
24 digging. Do you have a response to clean that up?

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Yes, Mr. Morissette.

1 Thank you. We did use the break time
2 productively, and Ms. Sazanowicz can provide some,
3 I think, I'd call rough but hopefully accurate
4 information, in response to the questions about
5 the hand digging and costs associated therewith.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Hello,
8 Chairman Morissette. So the additional costs that
9 will be associated with the 4 feet deep
10 excavation. Vacuum excavation or soft digging in
11 the railroad corridor will be approximately four
12 times more expensive than the proposed traditional
13 excavation methods. Also, we estimate typical
14 excavation time, we're putting together a
15 preliminary schedule for about 40 feet a day.
16 With this additional vacuum excavation down 4 feet
17 and not using your traditional methods, we
18 anticipate the excavation time would be much
19 longer and could be as low as 15 feet a day.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you
21 for that response. That cleans everything up.

22 Just for clarity, the Council announces
23 that the evidentiary record in this matter will
24 remain open for the applicant's submission of the
25 Late-File exhibits requested by the Council during

1 this hearing session this afternoon. A copy of
2 the Late-File exhibits shall be submitted to the
3 service list and will be available on the
4 Council's Docket No. 508 webpage. If neither the
5 Council nor the city request cross-examination of
6 the applicant's Late-File exhibits after a
7 reasonable review period, the Council will place
8 the close of the evidentiary record on a future
9 regular meeting agenda.

10 Please note that anyone who has not
11 become a party or intervenor but who desires to
12 make his or her views known to the Council may
13 file written statements with the Council until the
14 public comment record closes.

15 Copies of the transcript of this
16 hearing will be deposited with the City Clerk's
17 Office of the Milford, West Haven and New Haven
18 City Halls and the Town Clerk's Office in the
19 Orange Town Hall for the convenience of the
20 public.

21 I hereby declare this hearing
22 adjourned. Thank you, everyone, for your
23 participation this afternoon and thank you, once
24 again. Have a good evening and enjoy the nice
25 weather.

1 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
2 and the hearing adjourned at 3:49 p.m.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
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 73 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 June 14, 2022.



Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
Court Reporter
Notary Public
My commission expires:
May 31, 2023

I N D E X

WITNESSES: (Previously sworn)

CORRENE AUER
TODD BERMAN
AZIZ CHOUHDERY
BENJAMIN COTTS
SHAWN CROSBIE
MICHAEL LIBERTINE
SAMANTHA MARONE
ANNETTE POTASZ
MEENA SAZANOWICZ
DAVID R. GEORGE
MATTHEW PARKHURST
EDWARD ROEDEL

EXAMINERS:

PAGE

Mr. McDermott (Direct)	251
Mr. Knuff (Start of cross)	259
Mr. Perrone	260
Mr. Silvestri	269-294
Mr. Nguyen	282
Mrs. Cooley	285
Mr. Morissette	287
Mr. Lynch	295

WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 299)

MARGUERITE CARNELL
BILL SILVER
DAVID SULKIS
MARYROSE PALUMBO

EXAMINERS:

Mr. Knuff (Direct)	299
Mr. Perrone (Start of cross)	302
Mr. Silvestri	306
Mr. Lynch	309
Mr. Morissette	310
Mr. McDermott	314

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

2
3 APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS
4 (Received in evidence)

5 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
6 II-B-16	Applicant's responses to City of Milford's interrogatories, Set Three, 7 dated June 8, 2022	254
8 II-B-17	Applicant's Late-Filed exhibit, dated June 8, 2022	254
9 II-B-18	Applicant's letter from SHPO, dated June 8, 2022	254
10 II-B-19	Applicant's supplemental response 11 to City of Milford's Set Three Interrogatory No. 7(a) received 12 June 9, 2022	254

13
14 CITY OF MILFORD EXHIBITS
15 (Received in evidence)

16 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
17 III-B-1	City's Notice of Intent to be a party, dated March 31, 2022	302
18 III-B-2	City's prefiled testimony of Marguerite Carnell, dated May 17, 2022	302
19 III-B-3	City's prefiled testimony of Bill Silver, dated May 17, 2022	302
20 III-B-4	City's prefiled testimony of 21 David Sulkis, Christopher Saley and MaryRose Palumbo, dated June 7, 2022	302

22
23
24
25