

BRUCE L. MCDERMOTT
203.772.7787 DIRECT TELEPHONE
860.240.5723 DIRECT FACSIMILE
BMCDERMOTT@MURTHALAW.COM

August 22, 2023

Melanie A. Bachman, Esq.
Executive Director/Staff Attorney
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 516 – The United Illuminating Company Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Fairfield to Congress Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild Project

Dear Ms. Bachman:

Enclosed for filing with the Connecticut Siting Council (“Council”) are The United Illuminating Company’s (the “Company”) Late Filed Exhibits as requested by the Council during the July 25, 2023 hearing.

An original and fifteen (15) copies of this filing will be hand-delivered to the Council today.

Should the Council have any questions regarding this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,



Bruce L. McDermott

Enclosures

Murtha Cullina LLP
265 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510
T 203.772.7700
F 203.772.7723

Late Filed Exhibit 1

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No.516

Witness: Matthew Parkhurst
Page 1 of 1

Q-LF-1: Cost table based on the relocation of proposed structures (and associated foundations) off the BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. property.

A-LF-1: See Attachment LF-1-1.

Item	Project Component	Total Cost Estimate with Project Component Included (A)*	Proposed Project Cost (B)	Cost Delta (A-B)
1	Relocation of Structure P723S Fully off BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. Property	\$255,000,000	\$255,000,000	\$0
2-1	Relocation of Structure P724S (115kV as Currently Framed as a Deadend Type Structure) Fully off BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. Property	\$255,072,100	\$255,000,000	\$72,100
2-2	Relocation of Structure P724S (115kV Framing Changed to Suspension Type Structure) Fully off BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. Property	\$255,060,000	\$255,000,000	\$60,000
2-3	Relocation of Structure P724S (115kV as Currently Framed as a Deadend Type Structure) to as close to the property corner as possible, but still on BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. Property	\$255,018,000	\$255,000,000	\$18,000
2-4	Relocation of Structure P724S (115kV Framing Changed to Suspension Type Structure) to as close to the property corner as possible, but still on BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. Property	\$255,000,000	\$255,000,000	\$0

*These costs are for the total Project, including the Option described.
Per ISO-NE PP4, Appendix D, these are "Project Initiation" type estimates (-50%/+200% accuracy)
Please see attached Notes and Assumptions documents for further detail

Late Filed Exhibit-2

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No.516

Witness: Leslie Downey
Page 1 of 2

Q-LF-2: Update to response to Council interrogatory 3 to reflect additional contacts with the public.

A-LF-2:

1. On June 26, 2023, the Company called Mr. Mahfouz of 247 Southgate Lane in Southport to follow-up on a call Mr. Mahfouz placed to the Town concerning vegetation clearing on his property. The Company advised that the clearing was not Project-related. Mr. Mahfouz had other concerns about the Project impacts to the neighborhood viewshed, EMFs, and safety and stated that it was a neighborhood with a lot of children. The Company informed Mr. Mahfouz that the Company would not be doing any clearing near his property in the near future and to let him know of the Siting Council process as he stated that he and other neighbors wanted to be involved.
2. On June 26, 2023, Mr. Kalapos of 225 Southgate Lane in Southport called to express concerns about the Project related to the negative affects to his home and neighborhood. He was also concerned about the pole shown in the application that was to be located near his property. The Company advised Mr. Kalapos on how to submit his comments to the Siting Council and provided him the link to the Siting Council website and the docket number.
3. On July 26, 2023, the Company called Mr. Mahfouz of 247 South Gate Lane in Southport to discuss issues raised in his email to the Council on July 25, 2023. Mr. Mahfouz requested verification of rear property line and further details regarding the project and CSC process. The Company arranged field staking of rear property line on August 7, 2023. The Company met with Mr. Mahfouz and Mrs. Canning of 163 South Gate Lane on August 8, 2023 to review details of property line and vegetation concerns. Discussions included the Siting Council process and ability for customers to participate. The Company met with Mr. & Mrs. Mahfouz and Mr. Danylko of 305 South Gate Lane to further review rear property lines in relation to the CDOT/MNR corridor as well as Siting Council process. Mr. & Mrs. Mahfouz and Mr. Danylko reiterated concerns regarding the Project and impacts to their home and property values.
4. On July 27, 2023, Mrs. Canning of 163 Southgate Lane called to express her concerns with the Project. Mrs. Canning explained the view of one of the first poles would be located in the middle of her backyard outside her window. The Company detailed the outreach UI had completed (public information meeting, virtual open house, mailings, etc.) and the Siting Council process including providing Mrs.

Late Filed Exhibit-2

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No.516

Witness: Leslie Downey
Page 2 of 2

Canning the link to the Project website so she could learn more about the Project and stay updated.

5. On August 15, 2023, the Company called Ms. Ozyck of 267 South Gate Lane and spoke to her about her viewshed concerns, easements questions, and monopole locations.
6. On August 20, 2023, Mr. Lissette of 129 Banks Place emailed the Company with a request to underground the lines and concerns about the viewshed and property values. He also stated that he had not received any notifications about the Project. The Company replied with the list of notices mailed from their records and confirmed his address was listed in the abutter list. A pdf with information on transmission lines and comparing overhead and underground lines was attached.

Late Filed Exhibit-3

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No.516

Witness: Correne Auer
Page 1 of 1

Q-LF-3: Clarify wetlands delineations and impacts as they relate to the discussion of floodplain impacts in section 6.3 of Volume 1 of the Application.

A-LF-3: For the field work related to the delineation of state and federally jurisdictional wetlands, watercourses, vernal pools and floodplains on the Project, UI hired BL Companies of Meriden, CT. Work was completed by a wetland scientist(s) and a Certified Professional Soil Scientist. All floodplain areas were field investigated for the presence of poorly drained, very poorly drained, alluvial, or floodplain soils and submerged lands. If any of these soils (or submerged lands) were observed, the area was delineated as a Connecticut wetland based upon Connecticut regulations. Sections of the Project contained areas within the FEMA designated 100-year floodplain that were determined to not be defined as wetlands based on the field investigations indicating the lack of poorly drained, very poorly drained, alluvial, or floodplain soils and submerged land. These areas also failed to meet the federal definition of a wetland, based on the lack of dominant hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and hydrological conditions present.

The methodology to identify existing flood zones within the Project area is described in Section 5.2.3 (page 5-11) of the Application. Section 6.3.3 of the Application presents the proposed impacts to the flood zones (Federal Emergency Management Agency designated 100-year and 500-year flood zones). In this section, 100-year floodplain is common terminology that refers to flood hazard areas that will be inundated by the flood event having a 1-percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. This zone is a calculated area designation based on several criteria including, but not limited to, hydrology, topography, watershed surface characteristics and existing infrastructure which all affect overland surface water flows. The 100-year flood hazard area (aka 100-year floodplain) in this definition is not a basis for determination of federally or state regulated wetlands. The 500-year flood zone also presented in Section 6.3.3 is similar with the exception that the 500-year flood zone refers to flood hazard areas that will be inundated by the flood event having a 0.2 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded each year.

Late Filed Exhibit-4

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No. 508

Witness: Meena Sazanowicz
Page 1 of 1

Q-LF-4 Referencing Figure 2-1 on page 2-2 of Volume 1 of the Application,
include line numbers on this diagram.

A-LF-4 See response to Interrogatory CSC-79.