

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 DOCKET NO. 516

5 An Application from The United Illuminating
6 Company (UI) for a Certificate of Environmental
7 Compatibility and Public Need for the Fairfield to
8 Congress Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild
9 Project that consists of the relocation and
10 rebuild of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) electric
11 transmission lines from the railroad catenary
12 structures to new steel monopole structures and
13 related modifications along approximately 7.3
14 miles of the Connecticut Department of
15 Transportation's Metro-North Railroad corridor
16 between Structure B648S located east of Sasco
17 Creek in Fairfield and UI's Congress Street
18 Substation in Bridgeport, and the rebuild of two
19 existing 115-kV transmission lines along 0.23 mile
20 of existing UI right-of-way to facilitate
21 interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric
22 transmission lines at UI's existing Ash Creek,
23 Resco, Pequonnock and Congress Street Substations
24 traversing the municipalities of Bridgeport and
25 Fairfield, Connecticut

 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

 Public Hearing held on Tuesday, July 25, 2023,
 beginning at 2 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 **BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI, Designee for**
4 **Commissioner Katie Dykes, Department of**
 Energy and Environmental Protection

5 **QUAT NGUYEN, Designee for**
6 **Commissioner Katie Dykes, Department**
 of Energy and Environmental Protection

7 **ROBERT HANNON**
8 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

9 **Council Staff:**

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

12 **MICHAEL PERRONE**
 Siting Analyst

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

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

MURTHA CULLINA LLP
 265 Church Street
17 **New Haven, Connecticut 06510**
 Phone: 203.772.7787
18 **BY: BRUCE L. McDERMOTT, ESQ.**
 bmcdermott@murthalaw.com

20 **For Party BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc:**

21 **CRAMER & ANDERSON LLP**
 30 Main Street, Suite 204
22 **Danbury, Connecticut 06810**
 Phone: 203.744.1234
23 **BY: JOSEPH P. MORTELLITI, ESQ.**
 jmortelliti@crameranderson.com

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

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

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Ladies and gentlemen,
2 this public hearing is called to order this
3 Tuesday, July 25, 2023, at 2 p.m. My name is John
4 Morissette, member and presiding officer of the
5 Connecticut Siting Council.

6 Other members of the Council are Brian
7 Golembiewski, designee for Commissioner Katie
8 Dykes of the Department of Energy and
9 Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee
10 for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public
11 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Hannon,
12 Robert Silvestri and Dan Lynch.

13 Members of the staff are Melanie
14 Bachman, executive director and staff attorney;
15 Michael Perrone, siting analyst; and Lisa
16 Fontaine, fiscal administrative officer. If you
17 haven't done so already, I ask that everyone
18 please mute their phones and computer audio now.

19 This hearing is held pursuant to the
20 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General
21 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
22 Procedure Act upon an application from The United
23 Illuminating Company for a Certificate of
24 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for
25 the Fairfield to Congress Railroad Transmission

1 Line 115-kV Rebuild Project that consists of the
2 relocation and rebuild of its existing
3 115-kilovolt electric transmission lines from the
4 railroad catenary structures to new steel monopole
5 structures and related modifications along
6 approximately 7.3 miles of the Connecticut
7 Department of Transportation's Metro-North
8 Railroad corridor between Structure B648S located
9 east of Sasco Creek in Fairfield and UI's Congress
10 Street Substation in Bridgeport, and the rebuild
11 of two existing 115-kV transmission lines along
12 0.23 mile of existing UI right-of-way to
13 facilitate interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV
14 electric transmission lines at UI's existing Ash
15 Creek, Resco, Pequonnock and Congress Street
16 Substations traversing the municipalities of
17 Bridgeport and Fairfield, Connecticut. This
18 application was received by the Council on March
19 17, 2023.

20 The Council's legal notice of the date
21 and time of this remote public hearing was
22 published in The Connecticut Post on April 15,
23 2023. Upon this Council's request, the applicant
24 erected signs at conspicuous locations along the
25 route so as to inform the public of the name of

1 the applicant, the type of facility, the remote
2 hearing date, and contact information for the
3 Council, including the website and phone number.

4 Those locations are as follows: The
5 train station located at 525 Water Street in
6 Bridgeport; the train station located at 195
7 Unquowa Road, Fairfield; the train station located
8 at 61 Constant Comment Way in Fairfield; the Ash
9 Creek Conservation Area located at Kenard Street,
10 Fairfield; the Pequonnock Substation located at 1
11 Kiefer Street in Bridgeport; and the train station
12 located at 96 Station Street in Southport.

13 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
14 communications with a member of the Council or a
15 member of the Council staff upon the merits of
16 this application is prohibited by law.

17 The parties and intervenors of the
18 proceeding are as follows: The applicant, The
19 United Illuminating Company, represented by Bruce
20 McDermott, Esq. of Murtha Cullina, LLP. And the
21 parties in the docket are BJ's Wholesale Club,
22 Inc., represented by Daniel E. Casagrande, Esq.
23 and Joseph P. Mortelliti, Esq. of Cramer &
24 Anderson LLP.

25 We will proceed in accordance with the

1 prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on
2 the Council's Docket No. 516 webpage, along with
3 the record of this matter, the public hearing
4 notice, instructions for public access to this
5 remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens
6 Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested
7 persons may join any session of this public
8 hearing to listen, but no public comment will be
9 received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session.
10 At the end of the evidentiary session, we will
11 recess until 6:30 p.m. for a public comment
12 session. Please be advised that any person may be
13 removed from the remote evidentiary session or
14 public comment session at the discretion of the
15 Council.

16 The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is
17 reserved for members of the public who signed up
18 in advance to make brief statements into the
19 record. I wish to note that the applicant,
20 parties and intervenors, including their
21 representatives, witnesses and members, are not
22 allowed to participate in the public comment
23 session.

24 I also wish to note for those who are
25 listening and for the benefit of your friends and

1 neighbors who are unable to join us for the remote
2 public comment session that you or they may send
3 written statements to the Council within 30 days
4 of the date hereof, either by mail or by email,
5 and such written statements will be given the same
6 weight as if spoken during the remote public
7 comment session.

8 A verbatim transcript of the remote
9 public hearing will be posted on the Council's
10 Docket 516 webpage and deposited in the City
11 Clerk's Office in Bridgeport and the Town Clerk's
12 Office in Fairfield for the convenience of the
13 public.

14 Please be advised that the Council's
15 project evaluation criteria under the statute does
16 not include consideration of property ownership or
17 values.

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

20 I'll move on to administrative notice
21 taken by the Council. I wish to call your
22 attention to the items shown in the hearing
23 program marked as Roman Numerals I-B, Items 1
24 through 87. Does any party or intervenor have an
25 objection to the items that the Council has

1 administratively noticed?

2 Good afternoon, Attorney McDermott. Do
3 you have any concerns with the administrative
4 notices?

5 MR. McDERMOTT: Good afternoon, Mr.
6 Morissette. (AUDIO ECHO INTERRUPTION) Sorry.

7 Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. Bruce
8 McDermott from Murtha Cullina on behalf of the
9 company. No objections to the administrative
10 notice list. And I apologize for my audiovisual
11 problems there, but I think we've taken care of
12 it.

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

15 Attorney Casagrande or Attorney
16 Mortelliti.

17 MR. MORTELLITI: Good afternoon, Mr.
18 Morissette. Joe Mortelliti with Cramer & Anderson
19 on behalf of BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. We have no
20 objections either to the notice.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.
22 Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively
23 notices these existing documents.

24 (Administrative Notice Items I-B-1
25 through I-B-87: Received in evidence.)

1 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now move on to
2 the appearance by the applicant. Will the
3 applicant present its witness panel for purposes
4 of taking the oath, and we will have Attorney
5 Bachman administer the oath when you're ready.
6 Attorney McDermott.

7 MR. McDERMOTT: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
8 Morissette. Good afternoon. Good afternoon,
9 Council members, Attorney Bachman, Mr. Perrone and
10 Attorney Mortelliti. Again, Bruce McDermott on
11 behalf of the company. The witness panel today
12 will consist of the following witnesses: Correne
13 Auer, who is the manager of environmental programs
14 and projects at UI; Todd Berman, senior manager,
15 environmental programs and compliance at UI; Aziz
16 Chouhdery, lead engineer of the project unit for
17 high-voltage lines at UI; Shawn Crosbie, manager
18 of project unit transmission lines in Connecticut
19 at UI; Dr. Benjamin Cotts from Exponent is a
20 principal engineer at Exponent; Leslie Downey,
21 outreach specialist for public outreach projects
22 at UI; Brian Gaudet, project manager at All-Points
23 Technology Corporation; David George, principal
24 investigator at Heritage Consultants; Zachary
25 Logan, who's the manager of project development,

1 integrated system planning at Central Maine Power;
2 Brian Ragozzine, project manager at UI; Matthew
3 Parkhurst, transmission engineering supervisor at
4 Westwood Professional Services; Annette Potasz,
5 real estate projects at UI; and MeeNa Sazanowicz,
6 transmission line standards at UI.

7 And those individuals are all present
8 and can be sworn by Attorney Bachman, Mr.
9 Morissette.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
11 McDermott.

12 Attorney Bachman, please swear in the
13 witnesses.

14 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
15 Morissette. Could the witnesses, please, raise
16 your right hand.

17 C O R R E N E A U E R,
18 T O D D B E R M A N,
19 A Z I Z C H O U H D E R Y,
20 S H A W N C R O S B I E,
21 B E N J A M I N C O T T S,
22 L E S L I E D O W N E Y,
23 B R I A N G A U D E T,
24 D A V I D R. G E O R G E,
25 Z A C H A R Y L O G A N,

1 B R I A N R A G O Z Z I N E,
2 M A T T H E W P A R K H U R S T,
3 A N N E T T E P O T A S Z,
4 M E E N A S A Z A N O W I C Z,

5 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
6 by Attorney Bachman, testified on their oaths
7 as follows:

8 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
10 Bachman.

11 Attorney McDermott, please begin by
12 verifying all the exhibits by the appropriate
13 sworn witnesses.

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
15 Morissette. I believe I can accomplish most of
16 this through Mr. Crosbie.

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Crosbie, regarding
19 UI Exhibit Number 1, which is the application that
20 was submitted in March 2023 and the various bulk
21 filing exhibits that accompanied it, are you
22 familiar with that document?

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

24 MR. McDERMOTT: And did you prepare or
25 oversee the preparation of that document?

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

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

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

5 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And
6 regarding Applicant's Exhibit Number 2, which is
7 the corrected public notice submission, are you
8 familiar with that document?

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

10 MR. McDERMOTT: And did you prepare or
11 oversee the preparation of it?

12 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes I did.

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

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

16 MR. McDERMOTT: Regarding Applicant
17 Exhibit Number 3, which is the responses to the
18 Council's interrogatories, Set One, dated May 31,
19 2023, did you prepare or oversee the preparation
20 of those responses?

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

22 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any
23 changes or revisions to those responses?

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

25 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding Applicant

1 Exhibit Number 4 -- I'm sorry, let's skip over
2 number 4. I'll do that with Mr. Ragozzine.

3 Regarding Applicant Exhibit Number 5,
4 which is the virtual tour of the project received
5 on January 29th, are you familiar with that I
6 guess I'd say virtual tour?

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

8 MR. McDERMOTT: And any changes or
9 revisions to that document?

10 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No.

11 MR. McDERMOTT: Regarding Applicant
12 Exhibit Number 6, which is the letter to SHPO
13 concerning the supplemental information to the
14 Phase 1A Cultural Resources Assessment Survey, did
15 you prepare or oversee the preparation of that
16 document?

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

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

20 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): No, I do not.

21 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding Applicant
22 Exhibit Number 7, which are responses to the
23 Council's second set of interrogatories, dated
24 July 18, 2023, did you prepare or oversee the
25 preparation of those responses?

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

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

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

5 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding Applicant
6 Exhibit Number 8, which are the responses to BJ's
7 Wholesale Club interrogatories, dated July 18,
8 2023, did you prepare or oversee the preparation
9 of that document?

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

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

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

14 MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding -- I
15 guess that's it. I'll do the rest through other
16 witnesses. But I guess then regarding Applicant's
17 Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8, do you adopt
18 those documents as UI's exhibits?

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

20 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr.
21 Ragozzine, regarding your prefile testimony which
22 is Applicant's Exhibit Number 4, dated July -- I'm
23 sorry, June 29, 2023, are you familiar with that
24 document?

25 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Yes, I am.

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

3 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): I do not.

4 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And
5 regarding Applicant's Exhibit Number 9, which is
6 the affidavit regarding the posting of the sign,
7 dated July 18th, are you familiar with that
8 document?

9 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Yes, I am.

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

12 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): I do not.

13 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt
14 Applicant's Exhibits 4 and 9 as full exhibits in
15 this proceeding?

16 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Yes.

17 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. I guess,
18 Mr. Gaudet, beginning with you, Applicant's
19 Exhibit Number 10 in part contains your resume.
20 Are you familiar with that document?

21 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes, I am.

22 MR. McDERMOTT: And any changes or
23 revisions to your resume?

24 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): No.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that

1 as a full exhibit here today?

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

3 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you.

4 Mr. George -- actually, I'll go to Mr.
5 Parkhurst since you're in the room with me.

6 Applicant Exhibit Number 10 also contains your
7 resume. Are you familiar with that document?

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, I am.

9 MR. McDERMOTT: And any changes or
10 revisions to that document?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): No.

12 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr. George?

13 THE WITNESS (George): Yes.

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Applicant
15 Exhibit Number 10 also contains your resume. Any
16 changes or revisions to your resume?

17 THE WITNESS (George): No.

18 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that
19 as an exhibit here today?

20 THE WITNESS (George): I do.

21 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And
22 finally, Dr. Cotts. Applicant Exhibit Number 10
23 also contains your CV. Are you familiar with that
24 document?

25 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes, I am. Is my

1 audio not working?

2 MR. McDERMOTT: We can hear you.
3 You're a little soft, but we can hear you. Any
4 changes or revisions to that document?

5 THE WITNESS (Cotts): No.

6 MR. McDERMOTT: That was a no?

7 THE WITNESS (Cotts): No, that is
8 correct.

9 MR. McDERMOTT: Do you adopt that as an
10 exhibit here today?

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

12 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And with
13 that, Mr. Morissette, I believe that Applicant's
14 exhibits -- I'd ask that Applicant's Exhibits 1
15 through 10 be admitted as full exhibits in this
16 proceeding.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
18 McDermott.

19 Does any party or intervenor object to
20 the admission of the Applicant's exhibits?

21 Attorney Mortelliti?

22 MR. MORTELLITI: Mr. Morissette, no
23 objection to these exhibits. Thank you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. The
25 exhibits are hereby admitted. Thank you,

1 everyone.

2 (Applicant's Exhibits II-B-1 through
3 II-B-10: Received in evidence - described in
4 index.)

5 MR. MORISSETTE: We will now begin with
6 cross-examination of the Applicant by the Council
7 starting with Mr. Perrone, followed by Mr. Nguyen.

8 Mr. Perrone.

9 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
10 Morissette.

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 MR. PERRONE: Beginning with the
13 response to Council Interrogatory Number 2, UI
14 resent its notice to two abutters from whom the
15 certified mail receipts were not received. When
16 were these notices resent via first class mail?

17 MR. McDERMOTT: We'll have to take a
18 Read-In on that. Why don't we just proceed
19 instead of holding you up, Mr. Perrone, and we'll
20 get you that answer.

21 MR. PERRONE: Sure. On page 8-5 of
22 Volume 1, did UI receive any questions or comments
23 from the public at the virtual open house or the
24 two Zoom sessions?

25 THE WITNESS (Downey): Thank you, Mr.

1 Perrone. We did not receive any questions from
2 the virtual open house. From the in-person open
3 houses we had six or seven people from both
4 Fairfield and Bridgeport attend their individual
5 meetings, and they had a variety of questions that
6 we went over at the meeting. They're documented
7 in the application. I can look those up and
8 respond back to you, if you'd like to hear them.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Excuse me, if I may
10 interrupt for a moment. We do have a large
11 witness panel here, so we need to have the
12 witnesses announce their name prior to responding
13 so the record can clearly reflect who's
14 responding. Thank you.

15 THE WITNESS (Downey): I'm sorry.
16 Leslie Downey, public outreach. My camera does
17 not work on my computer, so I'll have to speak to
18 you here.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

20 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to project
21 related questions regarding construction. On page
22 3-10 of Volume 1, for drilled pier foundation
23 installations, how does the vibratory casing
24 process work?

25 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hello, Mr.

1 Perrone. This is Matthew Parkhurst. So
2 typically, once the hole is excavated for a
3 drilled pier foundation, to hold it open before
4 concrete is poured in and while concrete is poured
5 in, the construction contractor would install a
6 temporary vibratory casing.

7 MR. PERRONE: With regard to the
8 response to Council Interrogatory 43, how would
9 the anti-galloping devices work?

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
11 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The anti-galloping
12 devices will be installed on the conductors, and
13 they affect the wind motion across the conductors
14 thereby mitigating the galloping.

15 MR. PERRONE: Referencing the response
16 to Council Interrogatory 14, which is the cost
17 table, do you have an approximate linear length
18 for the hybrid alternatives?

19 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
20 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. I will have to look
21 that up and get back to you.

22 MR. PERRONE: Sure. Referencing Volume
23 2, Sheet 4 of 7 in the 400 scale, there's three
24 double-circuit lattice structures leading up to
25 Ash Creek Substation. And the proposed

1 replacements are pairs of single-circuit
2 monopoles. My question is why were pairs of
3 single-circuit monopoles selected in lieu of
4 double-circuit monopoles?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr. Perrone,
6 this is Matthew Parkhurst again. So when we're
7 looking at the design in this area, we were
8 conflicted with outages where we could only take
9 one of the lines out at one time to construct. So
10 that was a limiting factor in what we could do in
11 this area, along with we had to keep an existing
12 fiber intact that was supported by the existing
13 lattice towers. So when looking at those outage
14 restrictions and also constructability, we felt
15 that the best design approach would be to separate
16 those two lines on -- two single-circuit lines
17 between the railroad and Ash Creek Substation.

18 MR. PERRONE: Referencing page ES-5 of
19 Volume 1, total permanent easements to be obtained
20 are approximately 19.25 acres. Of that 19.25, do
21 you know approximately how many acres would be
22 associated with the BJ's Wholesale Club property?

23 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
24 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. Can we get back to
25 you on that answer while we calculate that square

1 footage of what the easement would be there?

2 MR. PERRONE: Sure.

3 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Thank you.

4 MR. PERRONE: Referencing Sheet 17 of
5 29 of Volume 2 on the 100-foot scale looking at
6 the BJ's property, could Structure 724S be located
7 completely off of the BJ's property, in other
8 words, onto the railroad right-of-way?

9 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr. Perrone,
10 this is Matthew Parkhurst again. Yes, P724S, as
11 positioned currently, is off the railroad
12 right-of-way.

13 MR. PERRONE: In other words, looking
14 at the 724S, it looks a little bit outside the
15 yellow lines of the right-of-way. So is it still
16 at least as proposed partially on the BJ's
17 property?

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

20 MR. PERRONE: But it could be shifted
21 fully onto the railroad right-of-way?

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): In order to
23 do that, we would have to support the Metro-North
24 signal wires at that location, whereas now we are
25 maintaining complete separation between

1 Metro-North and UI infrastructure at that
2 location.

3 MR. PERRONE: Would you know the
4 approximate cost to shift that structure?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): I would have
6 to get back to you on that.

7 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

8 MR. McDERMOTT: Would you like us to
9 take that as a homework assignment, Mr. Perrone?

10 MR. PERRONE: Yes. And also on the
11 same location the response to BJ's interrogatory
12 Number 4, what would be the cost delta to shift
13 Structure 723 south closer to the tracks such that
14 it's entirely, including the foundation, off the
15 BJ's property?

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): That would be
17 negligible if we did that. We can accomplish
18 that. We have a little bit of space to move that
19 structure north.

20 MR. PERRONE: All right. Has UI
21 considered any other alternative design
22 configurations between Structures 721S and 725S?

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): No, we have
24 not.

25 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Moving on to the

1 response to Council Interrogatory 24, in what
2 general locations are the underground
3 streetlighting cables and sprinkler systems that
4 would have to be relocated?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): That would be
6 around proposed Structure P756S. Although, we've
7 not been able to verify with any underground
8 surveys, we do believe that there are new
9 underground sprinkler systems and streetlight
10 services for new streetlights associated with an
11 apartment building and the surrounding parking lot
12 that has recently been built in Bridgeport.

13 MR. PERRONE: And the Resco Substation,
14 does that serve any distribution load or is it
15 only dedicated to the waste-to-energy plant?

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Hi, Mr.
17 Perrone. This is MeeNa Sazanowicz. That does not
18 serve any distribution load.

19 MR. PERRONE: And turning to responses
20 to Council Interrogatories 8 and 9, which is
21 related to supporting clean energy, are there any
22 generation projects in the ISO queue for that
23 target area?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
25 I am not aware of any generation projects within

1 the project area to interconnect.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Referencing the
3 response to Council Interrogatory Number 10, land
4 rights costs are approximately 32.2 million. Is
5 that 32.2 million for acquiring the about 19.3
6 acres of permanent easement?

7 MR. McDERMOTT: Ms. Potasz, is that a
8 question for you?

9 THE WITNESS (Potasz): Yes, I can
10 answer that. This is, of course, based on
11 high-level estimates on the current design
12 criteria. We have not gone beyond that point. So
13 yes, we take the total number of acreage and we
14 use a high-level estimate per acre. Annette
15 Potasz, sorry.

16 MR. PERRONE: And while we're on the
17 cost topic, what is the accuracy band for the
18 postponed 255 million project cost?

19 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
20 this is Shawn Crosbie. It's plus or minus 25
21 percent at this point.

22 MR. PERRONE: Would the proposed
23 project be considered the least cost alternative
24 from ISO's perspective in terms of cost
25 allocation?

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

4 MR. PERRONE: If there are any
5 incremental cost or cost deltas beyond that least
6 cost alternative identified by ISO, who would bear
7 the additional costs?

8 THE WITNESS (Logan): Hi, Mr. Perrone.
9 This is Zach Logan of Avangrid's integrated system
10 planning. Depending on the driver for that
11 incremental cost, it would either be a
12 regionalized cost or a local Connecticut borne
13 cost.

14 MR. PERRONE: Referencing the response
15 to Council Interrogatory Number 4, the project is
16 listed on the ISO New England RSP Asset Condition
17 list. Generally, what types of projects are
18 eligible for the asset condition list?

19 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Perrone, this
20 is Zach Logan again. I'll be answering this
21 question. The asset condition list are projects
22 that are determined by the transmission owners to
23 continue prudent operation of the electric
24 infrastructure. So it could be transmission lines
25 or substation assets that are pool transmission

1 facilities to support the New England region.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Which asset
3 condition entries on ISO's June 2023 asset
4 condition list are associated with the project?

5 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Perrone, are
6 you asking for the asset condition IDs from the
7 list?

8 MR. PERRONE: Yes.

9 THE WITNESS (Logan): Yes. Let me pull
10 that up right now. You can take your next
11 question, and I'll have that to you in a few
12 minutes.

13 MR. PERRONE: Okay. My next question
14 when we have that will be, is there a cost delta
15 between the proposed project cost and some of the
16 costs in the asset condition.

17 But moving on, with response to Council
18 Interrogatory 12, is Eversource about 19 percent
19 of the total?

20 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Perrone, this
21 is Zach Logan again. I'm pulling up that table
22 from the interrogatories. Excuse me for a second,
23 my computer is moving very slowly. Can you repeat
24 your question, please? I now have the
25 interrogatory response pulled up.

1 MR. PERRONE: Okay. For Interrogatory
2 12, from that table is Eversource about 19 percent
3 of the total?

4 THE WITNESS (Logan): That's correct,
5 Mr. Perrone.

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

7 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Logan, do you have
8 the June asset condition list in front of you?

9 THE WITNESS (Logan): I was grabbing it
10 when I was answering those questions. I don't. I
11 will in a minute though.

12 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. I apologize. I
13 thought you were ready. Okay.

14 THE WITNESS (Logan): No. Sorry.

15 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
16 this is Shawn Crosbie. If you don't mind, we can
17 go back to a question that you asked earlier in
18 the hearing on the square footage on BJ's
19 property. Are you okay with us answering that
20 right now?

21 MR. PERRONE: Sure.

22 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Okay. So UI
23 estimates that for our construction easement we
24 would need somewhere around a half acre to
25 three-quarters of an acre on the property.

1 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone,
3 I can also respond to the hybrid length question
4 that was asked as well. The linear length for
5 that project would also be 9 miles.

6 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney McDermott, if
8 we could move on and we'll come back to the asset
9 ID list.

10 Go ahead, Mr. Perrone.

11 MR. PERRONE: Referencing page 2-13 of
12 Volume 1, proposed conductors are 1590 kcmil and
13 some 2156 kcmil ACSS. What are the existing
14 conductors for the project?

15 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hello, Mr.
16 Perrone. This is Matthew Parkhurst. The existing
17 conductors on a few of the lines on the south side
18 of the railroad are 1590 ACSR, and the north side
19 of the railroad is 1590 ACSS.

20 MR. PERRONE: Referencing page 6-39 of
21 Volume 1, which is a noise related section, would
22 operation of the project comply with DEEP noise
23 control standards?

24 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Perrone,
25 this is Shawn Crosbie. Yes, it would.

1 MR. PERRONE: Referencing page 6-2 of
2 Volume 1. Should blasting be required, would UI
3 consult with DOT and Metro-North prior to securing
4 approval of a blasting plan?

5 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): This is Shawn
6 Crosbie again. Yes, we would. However, UI does
7 not anticipate blasting to be done on this
8 project.

9 MR. PERRONE: Referencing Volume 1A,
10 tab 8.4, which is the FAA section, we have three
11 FAA no hazard determinations. Certain
12 determinations require notice to the FAA within
13 five days after construction reaches its greatest
14 height. Would UI comply with such requirements?

15 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Mr. Perrone,
16 this is Brian Ragozzine, the PM. For UI, yes, we
17 would.

18 MR. PERRONE: Can you explain why a
19 vertical configuration was selected for the
20 conductors versus a delta or horizontal?

21 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
22 Perrone. This is Matthew Parkhurst. We choose a
23 vertical configuration to minimize the amount of
24 right-of-way needed outside of the railroad
25 corridor. A delta configuration would almost

1 double that.

2 MR. PERRONE: And is it correct to say
3 horizontal would be even more than delta?

4 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes.

5 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Moving on to the
6 response to Council Interrogatory 69, it's an EMF
7 related question. Exhibit 3 of the response to
8 Interrogatory 69, it's dated May 30, 2023, on page
9 25 of that section, Option 1 for the Windward
10 Apartment building increases the minimum conductor
11 height by 5 feet. My question is, would the phase
12 spacing remain the same?

13 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Just a moment,
14 Mr. Perrone, if you'll allow me to find that spot.
15 Yes, that is correct, it would remain the same.

16 MR. PERRONE: Okay. My question is,
17 did you look at a closer phase spacing for that
18 option; and if so, would that provide additional
19 magnetic field reduction?

20 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I'll start the
21 answer and say we didn't evaluate that, and I'll
22 turn it over to Matt Parkhurst for the extra
23 explanation.

24 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
25 Perrone. This is Matthew Parkhurst. So we did

1 not look at the phase spacing reduction at the
2 Windward Apartments, mainly because if we were to
3 decrease the phase spacing we would have to
4 install -- we would have -- the phases would have
5 a galloping in between them, and we would have to
6 install -- do a galloping study and install
7 anti-galloping devices in front of that apartment
8 building.

9 MR. PERRONE: That's all I have on EMF.

10 Moving on to scenic, historic and
11 visibility related topics. Referencing the
12 responses to Council Interrogatories 53 and 54,
13 does the FCC NPA agreement for cell towers apply
14 at all to transmission lines?

15 THE WITNESS (George): Good afternoon,
16 Mr. Perrone. The FCC Programmatic Agreement does
17 not specifically apply to transmission lines. It
18 was selected by SHPO because the tower heights on
19 this project were going to be of a similar height
20 to cellular towers.

21 MR. PERRONE: Referencing application
22 Appendix F, which is the Formal Requirements and
23 Council Application Guide, does the Siting Council
24 Application Guide for electric transmission line
25 facilities require a specific study area radius

1 for visibility?

2 THE WITNESS (George): Again, David
3 George here, Mr. Perrone. I don't know the
4 specific answer to that, but to my knowledge that
5 is not the case.

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And has SHPO
7 provided any feedback regarding the June 29, 2023
8 supplemental information to the Phase 1A?

9 THE WITNESS (George): Yes, sir, we
10 received a letter this morning, as a matter of
11 fact, from the SHPO, and Attorney McDermott can
12 provide this as well. The letter indicates that
13 the SHPO agrees that there will be an adverse
14 effect on viewsheds and that additional
15 consultation between UI and the SHPO should occur
16 prior to the development of the project.

17 MR. PERRONE: Looking at that
18 supplemental information related to the Phase 1A,
19 dated June 29, 2023, Photosimulation 21, the
20 proposed one, which double-circuit structure do we
21 see on the left side of that photosim? So it's
22 Photosim 21 proposed, left side.

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Hi, Mr. Perrone.
24 It's Brian Gaudet with All-Points. I believe that
25 is Structure P765AS. You can see that in the

1 upper right-hand corner.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. On page 2 of the
3 supplemental information to the Phase 1A survey,
4 could you please define visual clutter?

5 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Brian Gaudet
6 with All-Points again. Visual clutter here, I
7 think the easiest way to describe it to you would
8 be to point you to a photo. It really was a term
9 that we sort of deemed necessary with all the
10 infrastructure associated with the catenary
11 structures and bonnets that currently exist over
12 the rail lines. So if you look at Photo 20 of the
13 initial visibility analysis -- give me one second
14 and I'll tell you what -- that would be Appendix
15 C, Photo 20. Do you have that in front of you?

16 MR. PERRONE: Yes. Yes, got it.

17 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): So if you look
18 between the existing and proposed conditions
19 there, you can see, you know, it's a pretty thick
20 visual impact for the existing conditions from the
21 catenary structure and bonnets there across the
22 center of the photo. When you go to the proposed,
23 the reduction of the overall number of structures,
24 so across the entire project we're currently at
25 200 structures that are being removed and replaced

1 for 103. So there's a balancing act here in terms
2 of the quantity versus the height difference. But
3 I think Photo 20 and the simulation associated
4 with it provide a good example of the removal of
5 some of that visual clutter, as we call it.

6 THE WITNESS (George): Mr. Perrone, if
7 I could add to that. David George again. Brian
8 is exactly right, the visual clutter is also tied
9 to the number of lines that are in the photos as
10 well. So as the poles are lengthened and change
11 the configuration, some of the electrical lines
12 will disappear, guy wire anchors, things like
13 that.

14 MR. PERRONE: Referencing the video
15 tour of the project, it's mentioned on page 3 of
16 the prefile testimony of Brian Ragozzine, which
17 street level views and simulations in that video
18 tour coincide with street level views and
19 simulations in the June 29th supplemental info to
20 the Phase 1A?

21 THE WITNESS (Downey): Leslie Downey,
22 public outreach. I can answer that partially. We
23 used the exact simulations that have been included
24 in the application. There were about seven or
25 eight of them, so it was eight roughly out of 12.

1 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I just have a
2 few left. Moving on to page 5-45 of Volume 1, 71
3 of 122 soil borings have been completed. My
4 question is, what is the status of the remaining
5 51 soil borings?

6 THE WITNESS (Auer): Good afternoon,
7 Mr. Perrone. This Correne Auer. We are still
8 planning to continue these borings prior to
9 construction, but we're waiting on access so
10 ongoing.

11 MR. PERRONE: And next question related
12 to wildlife. I understand the latest IPaC,
13 I-P-a-C, review was dated December 8, 2022. Has
14 UI had any further consultation with the U.S. Fish
15 and Wildlife Service regarding the northern
16 long-eared bat in light of the change from
17 threatened to endangered?

18 THE WITNESS (Auer): So we have not
19 done another IPaC species listing at this time.
20 We're planning to do that soon in conjunction with
21 permit applications. I have run a data version of
22 the northern long-eared bat determination key, and
23 at this point it's looking like a no effect or
24 impacts to the northern long-eared bat along the
25 project corridor.

1 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

2 THE WITNESS (Auer): But no official
3 correspondence with U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

4 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I
5 have for UI.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
7 Perrone.

8 Attorney McDermott, you have four open
9 items from Mr. Perrone's questioning. Would you
10 like to knock them off now or wait until the end?
11 Do you need more time?

12 MR. McDERMOTT: Well, Mr. Crosbie is
13 whispering in my ear that we can at least answer
14 one. And I know Ms. Downey can answer the very
15 first question Mr. Perrone had for us regarding
16 Interrogatory Number 2 and the two abutting
17 notices that were returned.

18 Ms. Downey, when were the letters to
19 the two abutting property owners sent?

20 THE WITNESS (Downey): We received the
21 receipts returned on May 12th, and the postmark on
22 the newly mailed ones were May 24th.

23 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

24 MR. McDERMOTT: And then, Mr. Logan, I
25 believe you have an assignment for Mr. Perrone.

1 Do you have a response at this point?

2 THE WITNESS (Logan): This is Mr.
3 Logan, that's correct, I do. Mr. Perrone, the
4 asset condition list IDs associated with this
5 project are 91, 151, 152, 153 and 154. Those
6 associated IDs on the asset condition list total
7 179 million plus 50 percent minus 25 percent is
8 the accuracy of that number. As advertised in
9 this, it's 250 million. We are still within that
10 threshold of the plus 50 percent, so we don't --
11 are not required to provide any further update to
12 ISO New England, but knowing that we have a cost
13 increase within that threshold, we will be working
14 on an update to the ISO as well on that list.

15 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
17 everybody, for those responses. So Attorney
18 McDermott, you have one more left, the cost of the
19 shift of the BJ's structure on the property, and
20 we can come back to that later.

21 MR. McDERMOTT: Yes, please, that will
22 be great. I think we still need to effort that a
23 little bit. Thank you.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
25 One other item before we move on to Mr.

1 Nguyen. The July 25th SHPO letter that was
2 received today, are you going to be filing that at
3 the end of the hearing to be part of evidence?

4 MR. McDERMOTT: We will file that later
5 today or first thing tomorrow. And just to be
6 clear, Mr. Morissette, the letter is dated July
7 24th, and it was received by Mr. George today, but
8 it is actually dated yesterday, but we will file
9 that as soon as the hearing adjourns for the day.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

11 Mr. George, just one follow-up question
12 before we move on. The SHPO is requesting for
13 additional consultation concerning the visual
14 impact. In your opinion, is there an adverse
15 visual impact?

16 THE WITNESS (George): There will
17 certainly be some adverse visual impacts to
18 historic properties along the edge of the
19 corridor. The further we get out, the less the
20 impacts are so that in some cases, say as far as
21 Seaside Park, they may be only considered peekaboo
22 views of the project depending on where you're
23 standing. The major impacts will be closer to the
24 line, especially in the City of Bridgeport and
25 then down near the Southport Historic District.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Just one follow-up
2 before we move on. Now, my understanding is that
3 the transmission structures have been specifically
4 lowered to mitigate some of that visual impact.
5 Is my understanding correct, so SHPO wants
6 additional consultation, and the screening isn't
7 quite adequate?

8 THE WITNESS (George): That is correct,
9 sir. I don't think they're asking about
10 additional consultation regarding the project
11 design. I think they're asking for additional
12 consultation regarding what would the offset or
13 the mitigation package look like for the project
14 in terms of offsetting impacts to local resources.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
16 That was helpful.

17 THE WITNESS (George): Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We will move on
19 to Mr. Nguyen, and then we will follow with Mr.
20 Silvestri.

21 Mr. Nguyen.

22 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
23 And good afternoon, everyone. My questions are
24 directed to the witness panel. If information
25 pertains to your area, please feel free to jump

1 in. I have a few general questions and a few
2 questions on the interrogatory responses.

3 So let's start with general. The
4 proposed transmission facility, throughout the
5 application it's indicated that these lines will
6 withstand weather conditions of a Category 3,
7 hurricane Category 3; is that right?

8 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Nguyen,
9 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. That is correct.

10 MR. NGUYEN: Now, by comparison, what
11 hurricane category level can the current
12 infrastructure withstand?

13 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Nguyen,
14 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz again. These structures
15 were designed and installed sometime ago. I can't
16 specifically speak to what the specifics of the
17 design at that time was. But I do not believe
18 they had the additional hurricane wind load
19 criteria.

20 MR. NGUYEN: Understanding that the
21 construction activities will be done by segments,
22 would there be any expected outages or
23 interruption of service during the construction?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Nguyen,
25 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz again. There are going

1 to be transmission outages that we need to make in
2 order to install and construct the facilities.
3 However, there will not be any distribution
4 because of the transmission outages to our
5 customers.

6 MR. NGUYEN: Referencing the Council on
7 Environmental Quality, CEQ, there was a letter
8 dated May 25th, and one of the recommendations
9 indicates that you will perform an inspection at a
10 minimum of weekly or within 24 hours by the end of
11 a storm that generates a discharge that equals or
12 exceeds half inch of rain. The question, does the
13 general public have a similar requirement?

14 THE WITNESS (Auer): Hi, Mr. Nguyen.
15 This is Correne Auer. Those requirements are from
16 the Connecticut DEEP's construction stormwater
17 general permit, and those permits apply to
18 construction projects of an acre or larger.

19 MR. NGUYEN: In terms of inspection and
20 monitoring for the operation of the transmission
21 lines and facilities, does UI monitor this
22 remotely or do they send physical personnel?

23 THE WITNESS (Auer): Are you talking
24 about erosion and sediment control inspections or
25 a different type of inspections?

1 MR. NGUYEN: I'm sorry, I did not hear.

2 THE WITNESS (Auer): I'm sorry, this is
3 Correne Auer again. When you say "inspections,"
4 are you talking about erosion and sediment control
5 inspections like that previous question referred
6 to, or are you talking about inspections to the
7 lines themselves?

8 MR. NGUYEN: Moving on to the response
9 to interrogatories, referencing CSC-3.

10 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Nguyen, I'm sorry
11 to interrupt. I think Ms. Auer actually had a
12 question for you. She wasn't understanding your
13 previous question. So I don't know if you want to
14 repeat the question.

15 MR. NGUYEN: The previous question, I
16 had thought the answer was yes, regarding whether
17 or not UI monitoring the transmission lines, you
18 know, for service interruption remotely or do they
19 send out, they have a physical inspection?

20 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr. Berman
21 indicates that he can answer that question for
22 you. Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.

23 THE WITNESS (Berman): Hello, Mr.
24 Nguyen. This is Todd Berman from Avangrid.
25 There's sort of two parts to that answer. With

1 respect to sediment controls and during
2 construction, those inspections are done by human
3 beings, boots on the ground. Now, once the lines
4 are operational, there is a whole infrastructure
5 of telemetric data that is constantly reporting as
6 to the condition and performance of the
7 transmission line, and that's all done
8 telemetrically.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you for that.
10 Okay. Moving on to Interrogatory CSC-3, the
11 response indicates that there were four comments
12 received by UI, is that right, upon the
13 post-application?

14 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Nguyen,
15 this is Shawn Crosbie. Could you just reask the
16 question again, please?

17 MR. NGUYEN: Sure. CSC-3 indicates
18 that there were four comments received by outreach
19 post-application.

20 THE WITNESS (Downey): Mr. Nguyen, this
21 is Leslie Downey, public outreach. Yes, we
22 received four comments.

23 MR. NGUYEN: And the question is, has
24 UI received any additional comments since they
25 filed the application?

1 THE WITNESS (Downey): Yes, we have.
2 Let me pull up my information.

3 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Nguyen, Bruce
4 McDermott. I'm sorry to jump in on your line of
5 questioning. I want to exclude from the answer,
6 if I could, the conversations that the company has
7 been having with BJ's Wholesale, and they are an
8 intervenor. And we have been having discussions
9 with them. But I think I'm going to ask Ms.
10 Downey to kind of extract from her answer that
11 particular line of kind of comments and just
12 address any other comments we've been having, if
13 that's okay.

14 THE WITNESS (Downey): Sure. Thank
15 you. Leslie Downey, public outreach. We received
16 an email from a Brian Robinson on Washburn Street
17 in Bridgeport. He's the owner of a billboard in
18 that location that abuts the northern parcel of
19 the railroad tracks. He had concerns about his
20 billboard. I mentioned it to the project team as
21 well as energy land management, and they are aware
22 of the billboard.

23 We received a notice via the Town of
24 Fairfield, a request from Elicit Brewery who are
25 going to put a brew pub on the southern portion of

1 the railroad tracks on Black Rock Turnpike in
2 Fairfield. We've been working with the town on
3 that. Elicit Brewery is stilling working with the
4 DOT on where they are going to locate their
5 pathway between the brewery and the railroad
6 tracks.

7 We received questions from South Gate
8 Lane residents, one was Karim Mahfouz, concerning
9 what was happening on South Gate Lane, veg
10 management questions, what type of clearing there
11 would be.

12 MR. NGUYEN: You've got a few
13 additional. Are those already in the record?

14 MR. McDERMOTT: Those were in response
15 to the Council's Interrogatory Number 3, Mr.
16 Nguyen, I believe.

17 Ms. Downey, is that correct?

18 THE WITNESS (Downey): Yes. Although,
19 I believe the one from June on South Gate Lane was
20 not in that.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney McDermott, I
22 want to make sure I'm clear here. So
23 Interrogatory Number 3 included everything that
24 was just testified to except for the June 23
25 correspondence?

1 THE WITNESS (Downey): No, that went up
2 to April 5th. Since April 5th, we had the Brian
3 Robinson, the billboard owner, we had Elicit
4 Brewery, and we had Karim Mahfouz from South Gate
5 Lane.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. With that, it
7 sounds to me that it's appropriate to amend the
8 response to CSC-3 to include the interactions that
9 were just testified to. We'll address that at the
10 end. If we do have a continuation, I will look
11 for a Late-File for that, otherwise we'll go back
12 to the testimony at hand. Very good. Thank you.

13 Please continue, Mr. Nguyen.

14 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
15 Referencing CSC-8, the response
16 indicates that there are several recent federal
17 initiatives to support the build-out of
18 transmission. Regarding federal loans or grant
19 programs, the question is are those applicable to
20 UI, and has UI reviewed or considered applying and
21 taking advantage of those programs?

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Hi, Mr.
23 Nguyen. This is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Yes, the
24 project will be applicable in the event that
25 additional clean energy can be brought to the

1 transmission grid allowing for additional capacity
2 with this project. However, this project was not
3 identified by the Avangrid team as a project that
4 will be eligible for funding through the federal
5 programs based on those that were applied for by
6 Avangrid.

7 MR. NGUYEN: Is it fair to assume that
8 UI will continue to monitor and take advantage of
9 those programs if it's applicable to them?

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Nguyen,
11 yes, we do have a group dedicated here at Avangrid
12 that is monitoring any federal programs that
13 become available and determining which projects
14 across the operating companies would be available
15 to receive funding.

16 MR. NGUYEN: With respect to the
17 alternative from reading the response to CSC-14,
18 and I just want to clarify what's before the
19 Council here, is that the Alternative Number 5
20 which is the hybrid option that UI is proposing,
21 is that right?

22 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
23 Nguyen, there was a hybrid option that was
24 reviewed by the study team when the engineering
25 study took place.

1 MR. NGUYEN: And if you look at CSC-14,
2 attachment 1, and I see the hybrid option, which
3 is identified as Alternative 5; is that correct?

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

6 MR. NGUYEN: And the price tag for that
7 is approximately 278 million; is that right?

8 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
9 Nguyen, that is correct.

10 MR. NGUYEN: Now, when I look at the
11 application on 2-17 to be exact, it mentioned
12 about 255 million for the project. So are we
13 talking apples to apples here or there's some
14 discrepancy of 23 million? So if you could
15 explain the difference between the two numbers.

16 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr.
17 Nguyen. This is MeeNa Sazanowicz. So the hybrid,
18 the preferred alternative is not shown in this
19 table. The hybrid alternative is building
20 single-circuit structures between the Sasco Creek
21 demarcation point with Eversource all the way up
22 to Pequonnock Substation and then from Pequonnock
23 Substation doing double-circuit monopoles between
24 Pequonnock and Congress. The preferred
25 alternative is single-circuit monopoles up to

1 transmission Structure 737 in Bridgeport and then
2 from 737 onward to Pequonnock, and then from
3 Pequonnock to Congress would be double-circuit
4 structures.

5 MR. NGUYEN: So essentially there's
6 about \$23 million additional from the --

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes,
8 correct, to do the hybrid option.

9 MR. NGUYEN: And one last question
10 regarding CSC-12. And I know Mr. Perrone already
11 asked this question, but essentially there's 5
12 percent allocation to UI retail customers and 19
13 percent to Eversource Connecticut retail
14 customers; is that correct?

15 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Nguyen, this
16 is Zach Logan from Avangrid. Yes, that is
17 correct.

18 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you. The question
19 is how the cost allocation is established, is it
20 based on the load or is it based on ISO factors?

21 THE WITNESS (Logan): The allocation --
22 Mr. Nguyen, this is Zach Logan again. The
23 allocation is based on load share and ISO New
24 England. So ISO directs the allocation based on
25 load share.

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

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

6 Mr. Silvestri.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
8 Morissette. And good afternoon, everyone. I'd
9 like to stay on the question that Mr. Nguyen posed
10 regarding CSC-14-1 attachment. And if I heard
11 correctly, what's listed as Alternative Number 5,
12 the overhead transmission line hybrid option, is
13 not the preferred option; is that correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
15 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Correct.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. I
17 just wanted to clarify that part.

18 Okay. In your conversations with
19 Connecticut DOT and various railroad entities,
20 obviously, are you aware of any expansion plans
21 for the railroad that would cause concern or
22 potential relocation of your proposed transmission
23 structures?

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
25 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. Yes, we do

1 have ongoing biweekly meetings with Metro-North
2 and Connecticut DOT to coordinate both our
3 projects as well as any other additional projects
4 that the DOT may have in the future.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
6 for your response. And what is the timing for
7 this project in relation to the in-service date
8 for the new Pequonnock Substation?

9 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
10 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The
11 in-service date for Pequonnock Substation I
12 believe is at the end of 2024. Construction
13 kickoff for this project is fourth quarter of 2024
14 extending through 2028.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: So essentially the new
16 Pequonnock would be up and running before this
17 project is tied in and completed?

18 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
19 Silvestri, yes, that is correct.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Great. Thank you.
21 Okay. Now we're going to bounce back with the
22 different volumes, and I'd like to start with
23 Volume Number 2 of the submittal. For example, if
24 you could look at Sheet 2 of 21 of the
25 cross-section diagrams. And the question I have

1 for you, if I compare the existing structures for
2 the 1130 line to the structures for the proposed
3 1430 line, I have two questions: First, the 1430
4 line structures have a different configuration,
5 particularly with the insulators; and second, the
6 1430 line structures are considerably taller. So
7 could you comment on both of those questions?

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi. Good
9 afternoon, Mr. Silvestri. This is Matthew
10 Parkhurst. While I can't comment on the previous
11 design criteria of the 1130 line, I can comment on
12 the current design criteria of the 1430 line. So
13 regarding the braced post configuration, we went
14 with a braced post configuration to minimize
15 conductor swing, and that would minimize conductor
16 blowout under hurricane wind conditions which
17 would minimize the amount of right-of-way we would
18 need. A suspension insulator, like the one you
19 see on the left of the cross-section diagram, is
20 able to swing more with the wind so there is a
21 possibility that we would need additional or added
22 more right-of-way than with the braced post
23 configuration.

24 Regarding the structure heights, in the
25 past few years we've had conversations with

1 Metro-North and CT DOT, and they required a
2 15-foot radial clearance between their
3 infrastructure and our 115 kV conductors. So that
4 is the limiting factor in most cases on the
5 structure height.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: I appreciate your
7 response, but let me ask a follow-up here. Would
8 the existing 1130 line structures require some
9 type of modifications in the future to comply with
10 what I'll deem as a new standard for sway and
11 clearance and that type of thing?

12 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
13 Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. In regards
14 to the NESC structures that were installed I
15 believe in the early nineties, because of the
16 grandfather clause, would not need to have any
17 alterations, you know, to be able to, you know,
18 maintain any additional clearances that were
19 governed by the NESC.

20 In terms of separation by Metro-North,
21 our current practice, you know, with the
22 conductors being, you know, closer together than
23 what we are currently designing, we do work
24 together and take outages, as necessary, either on
25 UI's facility to, you know, allow Metro-North to

1 maintain their facilities below us or vice versa.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
3 for that response as well. Let me shift gears to
4 Volume 1A. These are the photosimulations that
5 are in Appendix C. And I'd like to start with
6 Photosimulation 22. And if you have that, let me
7 know and I'll pose the question to you.

8 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Good afternoon,
9 Mr. Silvestri. It's Brian Gaudet with All-Points.
10 If you're looking to speak with me, I am ready.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
12 The lattice structure would be removed which, at
13 least in my opinion, is a plus, I will say that.
14 But I'm trying to decipher where the wires,
15 particularly the upper most wire, which I believe
16 is the shield, connects from P775AS. It appears
17 to travel past the, I'll call it the building with
18 the time and temperature sign. It also has the
19 CVS Pharmacy truck in front of it, but I'm not
20 sure where it connects. Does it connect behind
21 that building or somewhere over to the right-hand
22 side?

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): There's another
24 structure off the right of this photo. Give me
25 one second to see if I can pull that up. So if

1 you look at Photo 21, simulation, I should say,
2 for 21, you can see the structure in the
3 background, the proposed structure in the
4 background sort of dead center in the
5 photosimulation, that is Structure P779S.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: P779S, correct?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): I think
8 that's 783.

9 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Hold on, let me
10 just double check that.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): It's 779S.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
14 While I have you, Mr. Gaudet, I'd like to go back
15 to what Mr. Perrone had questioned about visual
16 clutter.

17 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Yes.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: And if you could look
19 at Photos 7 and 8 in that appendix. I'm just
20 curious of your opinion between the proposed --
21 let's see if I got the pictures right. Hang on
22 one second.

23 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): Photo 7 is at
24 the Fairfield Train Station.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, the Fairfield

1 Train Station in 7 and the proposed also in 7,
2 what's your opinion or your comments about visual
3 clutter between those two photos?

4 THE WITNESS (Gaudet): I think between
5 the existing and proposed conditions here you can
6 see that in the existing you've got a number of
7 structures, smaller structures on the south side
8 of the tracks there that will be removed, in place
9 in this view, for two larger poles with longer
10 spans. It's a balancing act I think here. On one
11 hand, you are installing new monopoles that are
12 more in kind with the 1130 line structures on the
13 north side of the tracks, so they fit in a little
14 bit better there as opposed to the older weathered
15 catenary structure and bonnet attachments that
16 currently exist. And you do limit the number of
17 structures that you see, although they are taller.
18 So I guess vertically you might be increasing the
19 clutter here in the sense that you have two taller
20 structures than what exist today, but
21 horizontally, as you go down the tracks, it would
22 be lessened, in my opinion.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for opining
24 on that. Okay. I'd like to shift gears again to
25 go to Volume 2, attachment V2.3. These are the

1 scale maps. And the location of Structure P648S
2 is depicted on sheet 1 of 7. Could you tell me
3 where will the transmission lines actually connect
4 to the Eversource system?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
6 Silvestri. This is Matthew Parkhurst. So we
7 would take the existing conductors currently
8 attached to the existing bonnet structure to the
9 north of the proposed pole and we would relocate
10 those existing structure conductors and terminate
11 them on the new pole P648S.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: And then where does it
13 tie into going across Sasco Creek?

14 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): It would
15 follow the path of the existing alignment back to
16 Eversource's first catenary structure which is
17 647S about 300 feet to the west of Pole 648S.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understand
19 correctly, it would go back to the catenary
20 structures but in Eversource territory?

21 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
23 Okay. Now, in attachment V2.4, the structures on
24 Sheet 1 of 29, and they range from P648S to P651S,
25 they appear closer together when compared to

1 Structures P657S through P661S on Sheet 3 of 29.
2 So what I'm trying to figure out, for Sheet 1 does
3 the comparative closer spacing of the structures
4 result in reduced height of the structures; or
5 conversely, are the structures on Sheet 3 taller
6 than the ones on Sheet 1? And I hope you
7 understood that.

8 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
9 Silvestri. Yes, I believe I did understand that.
10 Yes, typically where we have shorter spans the
11 poles will be shorter, and where we have the
12 longer spans the poles will typically be taller.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Now,
14 staying with those two sheets, what's the driver,
15 if you will, behind having shorter structures and
16 closer spacing on Sheet 1 versus the taller
17 structures and wider spacing on Sheet 3?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So our
19 baseline approach, and where we have available
20 land, we currently go with 300-foot spans with the
21 new poles adjacent to the catenary, the existing
22 catenary structures. However, in a lot of
23 locations along this route, we weren't able to
24 achieve that because of the existing built
25 environment. And the driver of this location in

1 between 657 and 661 that you had referenced on
2 Sheet 3 of 29, the driver of increasing our span
3 lengths here was limiting any impacts to the
4 Southport Train Station and the associated parking
5 lot. We also are aware of a food delivery
6 location for a restaurant at the location of the
7 Southport Train Station about halfway between Pole
8 659S and Pole P661S which was the driver to
9 eliminate or create a longer span in that section.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: I believe I understand.
11 Thank you. One additional question I have, would
12 there be any advantage, possibly cost savings, by
13 reducing the number of structures on Sheet 1
14 through wider spacing and slightly taller
15 structures?

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Well, yes,
17 typically taller poles and less poles would
18 produce a cost savings, but in this location the
19 driver here was the existing width of the CT DOT
20 corridor and the residential properties adjacent
21 to it. We wanted to place our poles in the
22 north-south direction and along with the span
23 lengths as we get, so that a blowout would stay
24 within the existing CT DOT corridor here. As your
25 span length increases, your conductor blowout

1 increases and the need for an additional more
2 easement to account for that blowout would be
3 required.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
5 for that response as well. If I could change
6 gears and talk about Ash Creek.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Silvestri, if I
8 could interrupt, please.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes, Mr. Morissette.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: I'd like to take a
11 ten-minute break here, unfortunately, and
12 interrupt you, and we'll come back here at 20 of 4
13 for you to continue, if I may.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: I don't have a problem
15 with that, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
17 And sorry to interrupt.

18 We will take a ten-minute break and we
19 will return at 3:40. Thank you, everyone. We'll
20 see you at 3:40.

21 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
22 3:30 p.m. until 3:40 p.m.)

23 MR. MORISSETTE: All right. Mr.
24 Silvestri, sorry for the interruption, but please
25 continue.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Not a problem, Mr.
2 Morissette, and I thank you.

3 Again, I'd like to talk about Ash Creek
4 for a few moments. Both lattice structures would
5 be removed and replaced with 5 single-circuit
6 transmission line structures, and I believe we
7 kind of commented on that before. My question,
8 would Kenwood Avenue be used to access the western
9 lattice structure and the installation of P713ES-1
10 and P714WS-1?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Would you
12 repeat the question? Mr. Silvestri, would you
13 mind repeating that question, please?

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Sure. Would Kenwood
15 Avenue be used to access the western lattice
16 structure and the installation of P713ES-1 and
17 P714WS-1?

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
19 Silvestri --

20 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Are you going
21 to answer?

22 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Yes, that is
23 correct.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
25 Now, the eastern lattice tower essentially is

1 surrounded by intertidal flats, and from my kayak
2 experience I believe access by barge would be
3 prohibited due to insufficient water depth, so
4 access to that lattice structure would be probably
5 through the substation. But how would you then
6 traverse the flats to that lattice tower?

7 THE WITNESS (Auer): Hi, Mr. Silvestri.
8 This is Correne Auer talking. We're currently
9 looking into and evaluating various options for
10 access out to that lattice structure. Yes, it
11 would primarily be from the substation to some
12 extent either with use of matting or installation
13 of riprap to access the island. We're also
14 looking at other alternatives, but a barge is not
15 one of them for this location.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Would a helicopter be a
17 potential alternative?

18 THE WITNESS (Auer): Yes.

19 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And how
20 would the installation of the transmission lines
21 across Ash Creek be conducted as well as the
22 removal of the existing transmission lines?

23 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): One moment,
24 Mr. Silvestri.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Sure.

1 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): This is Brian
2 Ragozzine again. Can you clarify that question?

3 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm curious how you
4 would install new transmission lines across Ash
5 Creek as well as removing the existing
6 transmission lines across Ash Creek.

7 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Silvestri,
8 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. So the question
9 that you're asking is relative to a means and
10 methods by our contractors who would execute the
11 job. Right now we don't have that. What we could
12 do are some options that we see in the past. We
13 could attach some sort of splice to a dead-end
14 point where it interconnects with the existing
15 corridor in the Metro-North CT DOT line and
16 develop a work pad there and pull from that point,
17 have an exiting pull pad in the substation and
18 pull that over from that perspective. But we
19 would need to define that better to answer
20 specifically your question on the means and
21 methods with our contractor. We're not at that
22 stage right now.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. I
24 appreciate that. But sequentially what would
25 actually occur first? And I think you touched on

1 part of this in response to a question by Mr.
2 Perrone. But I would take it that a new structure
3 would have to go up first and then maybe the
4 structure that it's going to replace comes down.
5 Sequentially how would you handle the two lattice
6 tower structures at Ash Creek?

7 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
8 Silvestri. This is Matthew Parkhurst. I can
9 explain that. If we turn to Sheet 15, this
10 section, this area there will be a lot of go back
11 and forth in terms of sequencing in order to do
12 this work properly to keep at least one line in
13 service and to make sure there is no crisscross of
14 exiting conductors and new conductors, et cetera.

15 So step one, we would work on what I
16 would call the east side of the substation. So we
17 would install Structure P714WS-1 and we would
18 install Structure PS714WS-2, and on those
19 structures we would terminate the existing
20 conductors currently attached to that tower
21 associated with that line. I believe the number
22 is 91001-2. And then at those structures or the
23 side of the structure opposite the tower we would
24 install new conductors. So between 714WS-2 we
25 would install new conductors to the substation

1 termination structure. At Structure P714WS-1 we
2 would install new conductors to P714WS closer to
3 the railroad, and that would be in what we can
4 term a temporary configuration for a while.

5 And then we would place that line in
6 service. We would take out the 1430 line, and
7 that would allow us to install P713ES-2. That
8 would allow us to remove the existing lattice
9 tower closest to Kenwood Avenue, and that would
10 also allow us to install P713ES-1 and all the new
11 conductors associated with that 1430 line, along
12 with removing the existing.

13 We would then later on go back to the
14 line on the eastern side of the substation and be
15 able to take that line out again so we could
16 remove the conductors attached to the tower on the
17 island, remove the tower on the island, and
18 install new conductors between 7146WS-1 and
19 714WS-2. So it's basically a three-phased
20 approach.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. And again,
22 the objective is to always keep one of those
23 transmission lines in service, correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): That's
25 correct.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
2 One last question I have on Ash Creek, kind of
3 referring, if you will, to the response to
4 Interrogatory 67, is UI amenable to adding a pole
5 and platform somewhere in that area for osprey?

6 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Silvestri,
7 this is Correne Auer. Yes, we are amenable to
8 adding the replacement platform in the vicinity of
9 that area, yes.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
11 Now, there's a few existing structures, for
12 example, TP718S and TP735S that would be
13 reconducted. So we have existing structures
14 that you're going to reconductor. Could you
15 explain the reconductoring of the structures and
16 what it would entail?

17 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
18 Silvestri, this is Matthew Parkhurst again. So
19 there is a few structures on the line that are
20 existing poles -- two of them you just referenced
21 in your question -- where we would remove the
22 existing conductors and the attaching hardware,
23 the 115-kV conductors, and the existing shield
24 wire would be removed, and we would replace those
25 with new hardware to support a new OPGW fiber and

1 new 115-kV conductors.

2 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. And I
3 thank you. So there would be no height change for
4 those existing structures, correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): No.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.
7 General question, did UI consider things like
8 anti-galloping devices or strut insulators and
9 higher design tensions that could possibly reduce
10 a number of structures possibly reducing midspan
11 structures along any portion of the proposed
12 route?

13 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): One second,
14 Mr. Morissette -- or Mr. Silvestri.

15 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi,
16 Mr. Silvestri. This is Matthew Parkhurst.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes.

18 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): In certain
19 cases we did. However, we have tension limits we
20 have to be under for NESC code, so we couldn't go
21 that high. In addition, when you increase
22 tensions you're also increasing the loadings on
23 the poles making the -- potentially making the
24 foundations larger as they have to carry more
25 weight, more tension. In addition, with regards

1 to anti-galloping devices, although, yes, they can
2 be installed on new lines, it's sound engineering
3 practice to try to stay away from those for new
4 lines or rebuilding existing lines unless we
5 really have to.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understand
7 correctly, there's an overall design tension that
8 cannot be exceeded, would that be correct?

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

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.
12 Okay. If we could refer now to the response to
13 Interrogatory Number 35. And it states that
14 "Galvanized steel poles have a longer life cycle
15 than weathering steel. Galvanized steel is about
16 5 to 10 percent less expensive than weathering
17 steel." The question I have for you, what are the
18 life cycles of galvanized steel versus weather
19 steeled poles?

20 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Mr.
21 Silvestri, let me direct that to one of our
22 engineers.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Sure.

24 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
25 Silvestri, are you asking what are the maintenance

1 and O&M costs relative to weathering steel and
2 galvanized steel, the differences?

3 MR. SILVESTRI: No. Actually, what I'm
4 looking at, you have "Galvanized steel poles have
5 a longer life cycle than weathering steel." So
6 how long do they last?

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): As part of
8 the project, Mr. Silvestri, we anticipate a
9 minimum life cycle for the assets we install of 40
10 years.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: 40 years for
12 galvanized?

13 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: So that weathered steel
15 would have somewhat of a less life span, if you
16 will, but that might be undefined at this point?

17 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): That is
18 correct. We also anticipate additional
19 maintenance costs as well that are associated with
20 a weathering steel product as opposed to
21 galvanized steel.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: What would be the
23 additional maintenance that you'd have to do on
24 weathered steel?

25 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Additional

1 potential for corrosion would be an example versus
2 a galvanized steel which is more protected.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. And I
4 thank you. Then turning to the response to
5 Interrogatory Number 66, it notes that "The
6 permittee shall maintain a rain gauge on site to
7 document rainfall amounts." This is for routine
8 inspections. And then it goes on to talk about
9 "At least once a week and within 24 hours of the
10 end of a storm that generates a discharge, a
11 qualified inspector shall inspect at a minimum the
12 following," and then it continues in the middle of
13 the page there.

14 The question I have is for storms that
15 generate a discharge, how would you measure that
16 or where would you measure that?

17 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Silvestri,
18 this is Correne Auer. The general rule of thumb
19 for generating a discharge that DEEP recognizes is
20 about a tenth of an inch. That's the way to kind
21 of monitor the weather on using the nearest
22 weather station on any of the various weather
23 monitoring online sites, that or the rain gauge
24 itself to determine if a discharge actually
25 occurred. And if you can't, you know, another way

1 would be to actually observe a discharge like
2 flowing from your site, like a concentrated flow
3 of stormwater.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: But you wouldn't
5 necessarily set up rain gauges in various spots of
6 the proposed route, you'd rely more on, say, a
7 weather channel or something like that, would that
8 be correct?

9 THE WITNESS (Auer): Correct.

10 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Then
11 turning to the response to Interrogatory Number 3,
12 and this concerns the BJ's loading dock and
13 easement, did EMF calculations, were they
14 performed for that particular area; and if so, do
15 you have any type of comparative numbers?

16 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine):

17 Mr. Silvestri, this is Brian Ragozzine. We're
18 going to redirect that to our SME who did all the
19 EMF studies.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Sure.

21 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Ben, would
22 you mind taking that? Benjamin?

23 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I apologize. Can
24 you hear me now?

25 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Yes, we can.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: I can hear you now.

2 Thank you.

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Thank you. This
4 is Ben Cotts. An EMF analysis was done at the
5 BJ's facility. This is covered in the original
6 report that was submitted to the Council. This is
7 in Volume 1A. I think the best place to look at
8 it is probably PDF page 83. That's Table B-1, and
9 this is cross section 11. Qualitatively speaking,
10 the field levels will decrease at the edge of the
11 right-of-way a small amount relative to the
12 existing levels in that location.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. I
14 appreciate your reference to that which I will
15 look up in a few minutes as well but also your
16 narrative. So I thank you.

17 All right. My last question, I think,
18 for now turns back to Volume 2, and this is
19 attachment V2.4. And the question concerns
20 structure P745S. So the proposal is to shift a
21 double circuit from the south side of the railroad
22 from P745S to P745N and then continue west on the
23 north side of the tracks to P737N. Now, the
24 transmission lines would then switch to single
25 circuits on the north and south sides of the

1 railroad. So my question, why the switch to the
2 north side as opposed to just staying on the south
3 side of the tracks? And you could probably see
4 this better on Sheets 20 and 21 of 29.

5 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
6 Silvestri. This is Matthew Parkhurst. So
7 starting at Structure 738 on Sheet 20, we are on
8 the north side of the railroad tracks as that is
9 in currently a vacant lot. As you get closer to
10 Howard Avenue, going to the southwestern corner of
11 Railroad Avenue and Howard Avenue, you get to a
12 multi-story building. I don't know the land use,
13 type of building offhand. But we did -- that was
14 one of the items we looked at to try to stay away
15 from that building, but we did not have conductors
16 over, directly over that building.

17 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I couldn't pick
18 that up from the drawings that you have because
19 obviously they're kind of one dimensional looking
20 down, but it's more related to existing
21 structures, clearances, that type of thing,
22 correct?

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Correct. We
24 took a lot of -- we looked at the built
25 environment a lot, and that's why within this

1 congested area we do go from the north side, the
2 south side and then back, kind of a combination
3 north and south side, mainly due to clearances and
4 the existing buildings in the residential areas,
5 et cetera.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you
7 again for that response.

8 Mr. Morissette, I think that's all I
9 have, at least right now. Thank you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
11 Silvestri. We'll now continue with
12 cross-examination by Mr. Golembiewski followed by
13 Mr. Hannon.

14 Mr. Golembiewski.

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you, Mr.
16 Morissette. And good afternoon everyone. I just
17 have a few questions.

18 My first is what is the quantification
19 of any temporary or permanent impacts to inland
20 wetlands, tidal wetlands or watercourses? I
21 couldn't find a table that had any of that, and
22 maybe that's me but --

23 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Golembiewski,
24 this is Correne Auer. If you reference page 6-8
25 of the application and 6-10, the first table 6-1

1 lists the estimated project impacts to inland and
2 tidal watercourses, and 6-2 is the summary of
3 estimated project impacts to wetlands, both inland
4 and tidal.

5 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: You said 6-8?

6 THE WITNESS (Auer): 6-8 and 6-10.

7 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: All right. And does
8 that include any tree clearing?

9 THE WITNESS (Auer): So the acres of
10 tree clearing, that's in section 3. It does
11 include tree clearing in wetlands. The table on
12 6-10 includes any vegetation clearing in wetlands,
13 but the acres of tree clearing is actually on
14 6-15, so that is in the same section.

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.

16 THE WITNESS (Auer): That breaks it
17 down by temporary clearing which is areas that
18 would be allowed to revegetate fully and then
19 permanent tree removal acres of clearing.

20 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Great. Thank
21 you. I had one question also in the 100 scale
22 plans, the areas of tree clearing primarily along
23 the southern part of the road, it's all purple.
24 Is that just tree clearing and not stumping and
25 grading, and then I guess it also leads into my

1 questions, how will those cleared easement areas
2 be left?

3 THE WITNESS (Auer): So the areas where
4 stumping and grubbing would be required is where
5 there would be permanent roads installed or where
6 a foundation is being installed, otherwise the
7 areas would not necessarily be stumped. They
8 would just be cut flush with the ground. And in
9 the areas that are permanent tree removal, those
10 areas would have to remain with lower species
11 only.

12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.

13 THE WITNESS (Auer): In the vegetation
14 management clearance zone that we need.

15 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So in those
16 areas it would just be maintained as some type of
17 low shrub habitat or meadow habitat?

18 THE WITNESS (Auer): Correct.

19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Because I
20 know I saw a letter from the Town of Fairfield
21 where their sole request was that, you know, if
22 vegetation is going to be cleared, you know, to
23 kind of offset or mitigate that impact. So what
24 you're telling me, in most areas where trees will
25 be cleared there still will be some, whatever

1 vegetation, I don't want to say native because
2 there's not maybe a lot of native vegetation
3 there, but there will be either shrub areas
4 maintained in those areas primarily?

5 THE WITNESS (Auer): Correct. There's
6 a table that was also submitted as part of an
7 interrogatory that lists the type of species that
8 are allowed to be maintained within clearance
9 zones.

10 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. That's all my
11 questions. Thank you.

12 Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

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

17 Mr. Hannon.

18 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
19 I did have a number of questions. I'd like to
20 start on page ES-8, and then there's also a
21 comment on ES-9. So, for example, at the bottom
22 of page ES-8, UI is stating, For example, no new
23 monopoles will be installed in either wetlands or
24 watercourses. You go up to the second paragraph
25 on page ES-9, A total of 26 monopoles will be

1 located in the 100-year floodplain.

2 So my question is, what are you using
3 for the definition of wetlands?

4 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Hannon, this
5 is Correne Auer. Wetlands are defined and
6 delineated in a wetland survey that was done by a
7 wetlands contractor, and they were defined per the
8 Army Corps of Engineers' definitions. Those
9 wetlands are shown on our mapping, and those are
10 described in Section 5 and 6. And those are, some
11 wetlands are located within floodplains, but
12 essentially those are two separate --

13 MR. HANNON: Well, my issue is that the
14 wetland definition in Connecticut is poorly
15 drained, very poorly drained floodplain and
16 alluvial soils. And I've been dealing with this
17 for 20 years, so I'm just, I'm kind of at a loss
18 as to how you can say that no new monopoles will
19 be located in either wetlands or watercourses and
20 then in a paragraph or two later you're saying 26
21 monopoles will be located within the 100-year
22 floodplain. I mean, that's the wetlands by
23 definition in Connecticut. So you're not using
24 Connecticut's definition for wetlands?

25 THE WITNESS (Auer): We're using what

1 the wetlands delineation report says for a
2 definition for wetlands. It's actually, where
3 we're installing the monopoles is what's
4 considered uplands in terms of their delineation.

5 MR. HANNON: I've just got an issue
6 with that, again, having worked with wetlands for
7 I can't tell you how many years now.

8 But staying on page ES-9, you talk
9 about, However, there are portions of three
10 temporary work pads that will be situated in
11 wetlands, affecting approximately 0.1 acres of
12 wetland. So I'm assuming based on your previous
13 response that this does not include anything
14 that's located within a floodplain, that these are
15 just field delineated wetlands that the soil
16 scientist came up with.

17 THE WITNESS (Auer): The impacts from
18 the work pads, those work pads are, there's
19 matting that's going to be placed within the
20 wetlands, and that could also be considered in
21 floodplains, but the poles themselves would be
22 outside of the wetland.

23 MR. HANNON: I'll come back to this to
24 a degree with a couple of other questions that I
25 have. But just for clarification, on page 4-1,

1 it's like the middle of the page, In total, 157
2 catenary structures are located along the
3 Connecticut DOT corridor in this project area.
4 Will all of those structures be replaced or will
5 some remain? And I know that you talked about 102
6 monopoles going in. So I'm just curious as to how
7 many of the catenary structures will remain.

8 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): One second,
9 please. This is Brian Ragozzine.

10 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Hannon,
11 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. We will not be removing
12 any of the catenary structures from the corridor.

13 MR. HANNON: Okay. All right. Thank
14 you. On page 2-12 there is a comment that UI
15 anticipates that construction may involve the use
16 of a barge in the river. Can you give me an idea
17 of what the scope of activities might be by the
18 barge?

19 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Hannon, this
20 is Correne Auer. I may be answering this in
21 conjunction with that purpose, but possible
22 equipment that will be used on the barge would be
23 cranes, man lifts, bucket trucks, and they would
24 be used for the removal of some of the assets
25 along the southern edge of the corridor along the

1 Pequonnock River.

2 MR. HANNON: Thank you. Moving on to
3 page 3-1, the bottom of the first paragraph states
4 that this agreement specifies certain non-standard
5 construction methods and schedules, including the
6 performance of certain project tasks, to avoid or
7 minimize conflicts with rail operations. What are
8 considered "non-standard construction methods"?

9 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Hannon,
10 this is Shawn Crosbie. Could you please repeat
11 the question?

12 MR. HANNON: Sure. The first paragraph
13 on page 3-1 at the very bottom in the introduction
14 and overview it states that the agreement
15 specifies certain non-standard construction
16 methods and schedules, including the performance
17 of certain project tasks, to avoid or minimize
18 conflicts with rail operations. I'm just asking
19 what are examples of non-standard construction
20 methods?

21 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Thank you,
22 Mr. Hannon. This is Brian Ragozzine. We may have
23 to get back to you on that, Mr. Hannon.

24 MR. HANNON: Okay. I was just curious.
25 I mean, the language is there, so I thought I'd

1 follow up and ask about it.

2 Going on to page 3-8, it talks about,
3 this is sort of the middle of the page, temporary
4 access will be required in a tidal wetland to
5 removal a lattice steel tower situated on a small
6 island in Ash Creek near Ash Creek Substation.

7 My question is, has any analysis been
8 done on the lattice structure to determine whether
9 or not there are any hazardous materials on it
10 such as paint, things of that nature; and if so,
11 are there any special precautions that would be
12 taken to remove that lattice structure?

13 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Hannon, this
14 is Correne Auer. Yes, we did do analysis on the
15 tower, and I believe we just had, there was levels
16 of metals in the coatings, but I'd like to check
17 that and get back to you.

18 MR. HANNON: That's fine. On page 3-9,
19 the second paragraph talks about the size of each
20 work pad will vary based on location and space
21 available. In general, a typical work pad for
22 installing a new monopole would be approximately
23 40 feet by 100 feet. So I guess my question on
24 that is, going back to the wetland issue I was
25 raising earlier, if there are 26 new monopoles

1 being located within the 100-year floodplain and
2 in general each work area is about 4,000 square
3 feet, we're talking about roughly 2 and a half
4 acres of land being utilized. It's a wetland
5 designated land, at least as far as Connecticut
6 statutes go. But yet the numbers I'm seeing on
7 some of the tables you mentioned earlier to Mr.
8 Golembiewski appear to indicate that any type of
9 wetland use is significantly lower than that. So
10 I'm wondering if you can explain the difference
11 between the two.

12 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Hannon, this
13 is Correne Auer again. Are you referencing the
14 area of impact from the work pads in terms of the
15 table on page 6-10?

16 MR. HANNON: Which page is that again?

17 THE WITNESS (Auer): 6-10 has a table
18 of estimated project impacts to wetlands. That's
19 where we have work pads, temporary construction.

20 MR. HANNON: I understand that, but my
21 issue is that floodplain in Connecticut, by
22 definition, is wetlands. And if you just take
23 what you're saying on page 3-9 that the typical
24 work pad location for a new monopole is 40 feet by
25 100 feet, at least if my numbers are correct,

1 that's 4,000 square feet times 26 pads, it works
2 out to 2 point not quite 4 acres of land that
3 would be designated as wetland. And that's why to
4 me that's a whole lot different than the total of
5 0.12 acres of wetlands. So I'm just having a hard
6 time balancing the two numbers.

7 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Hannon,
8 this is Shawn Crosbie with UI. If I could
9 elaborate on one of the prior questions that you
10 asked related to wetland definitions and how we
11 assess the project. We did assess it to both
12 federal and state criteria. We did look at
13 floodplains. I would ask that we table a response
14 to be more pointed in a potential Late-File. I
15 think we should speak to our wetland scientist to
16 confirm the questions that you're asking. We can
17 record these questions and respond to them all
18 appropriately.

19 MR. HANNON: That's fine. And just for
20 the record, I'm not referring to the 500-year
21 floodplain. I'm sort of tapping it at the
22 100-year floodplain which is what the typical
23 wetland commission in Connecticut would be looking
24 at. So I'm not talking about a lot further than
25 the 100-year floodplain.

1 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): That's
2 understood. Thank you.

3 MR. HANNON: So hopefully that helps
4 you as well. And that's fine with the Late-File
5 as far as I'm concerned.

6 On page 3-10 the typical foundations
7 are expected to average 15 to 40 feet in depth and
8 some may go as deep as 90 feet deep. What I
9 didn't see is -- I mean, there's a reference
10 that's made to a project Materials Management Plan
11 dealing with spoils and groundwater, but I didn't
12 really see any detail on that. When would
13 something like that be provided?

14 THE WITNESS (Auer): Mr. Hannon, this
15 is Correne Auer. We're in the process of
16 generating the Materials Management Plan used by
17 the contractors during the project. I'm not sure
18 if that's something that typically would be
19 submitted in the D&M plan or a form of it would be
20 addressed in the D&M plan.

21 MR. HANNON: Okay, because let me
22 explain why I'm sort of raising the question on it
23 is, again, this is skipping ahead a little bit in
24 Section 5.2.4, page 5-13, you talk about results
25 that the testing depth of the groundwater in the

1 project area is estimated to range from 5 to 25
2 feet or more below grade. So if the expected
3 depth of the foundations is 15 to 40 feet, most of
4 the holes will in fact have water. Based on some
5 of the information that is in the report, it talks
6 about some of the potential contaminants that were
7 being tested for. So one, I was wondering whether
8 or not you had any of those results because
9 apparently on page 5-47 it stated 67 of the 71
10 test borings encountered groundwater. So I'm
11 assuming that's anywhere from 5 to 20 feet in
12 depth.

13 So you're having all of these borings
14 that are being done. In order to do the work for
15 the foundations, I'm assuming there would have to
16 be some type of dewatering. So I'm curious as to
17 what would happen with the dewatering because of
18 the potential contaminants that are being looked
19 at as well as the soils, because if you're
20 drilling and you're pulling out a lot of the
21 soils, they may be extremely saturated. So how is
22 that actually being handled? Is there going to be
23 dewatering on site? Will that go into water
24 approved trucks? That's kind of where I'm going
25 with this. Those are the things that I'm kind of

1 looking for just to make sure that we're not
2 creating problems elsewhere. And once we're
3 pulling something out of a hole, you don't want to
4 have contamination in the water or the soils that
5 are being maybe spread on land. So that's kind of
6 where I'm going with it.

7 THE WITNESS (Auer): Thank you. This
8 is Correne Auer again. Yes, you're correct, we
9 have been doing these borings and this due
10 diligence work trying to do this currently. And
11 we are taking soil samples and groundwater samples
12 where we do encounter groundwater. The purpose is
13 to precharacterize both the soil and the
14 groundwater. We have results, and the results are
15 summarized in what we're putting into our
16 Materials Management Plan for the contractor to
17 use so that they know how to manage the soil and
18 groundwater appropriately.

19 This will also be addressed in the D&M
20 plan. And there is recommended needs for soil
21 management and the drawing out, if you will, of
22 the soil prior to moving it off site. And there's
23 various options for groundwater removal from the
24 site versus treatment, and they're all things that
25 are more of a contractor means and methods, how

1 they will determine how they will manage the soil
2 and groundwater, but at the direction of UI and
3 our consultant's expertise in the area to give
4 them guidelines and recommendations but per state
5 and federal requirements. But that will be, the
6 options will be laid out within the D&M plan and
7 the Materials Management Plan that we will provide
8 to the contractor and then they will ultimately
9 choose the method that they --

10 MR. HANNON: Thank you. I just want to
11 make sure that these are addressed because these
12 can be critical issues for all the parties
13 involved. The last thing I think UI wants to do
14 is create additional erosion or environmental
15 problems by putting contaminated soil on the
16 ground because, again, was it in page 6-4 you're
17 talking about there could be soils stored on site,
18 things of that -- so I'm just trying to make sure
19 that that is going to be something that is
20 specifically covered so that everybody is
21 satisfied without having other potential problems
22 of contamination occurring because of the borings
23 and all the soils taken out. So thank you on
24 that.

25 I guess I have another question going

1 to a section in 6, 6-13. I tried to work out some
2 of the numbers, and I just can't do it, so I'm
3 hoping you can help me. You've got the Table 6-3
4 where you're talking about the monopole
5 foundations, the estimated impact on volume. And
6 I'm assuming that what you're referring to there
7 is the displacement of flood storage capacity. Is
8 that correct?

9 THE WITNESS (Auer): This is Correne
10 Auer. Yes, that's correct.

11 MR. HANNON: Okay. So I'm looking at
12 the second paragraph on page 6-13 and it talks
13 about, Based on these structure foundation
14 dimensions, the potential to impact floodplains
15 per monopole foundation will range from
16 approximately 8 to 400 cubic feet, and I'm having
17 a very difficult time figuring out how you can be
18 down as low as 8 cubic feet when, based on the
19 numbers, you're talking about -- and again, these
20 numbers are on page 6-14 -- the top of the
21 foundation will be located at least one foot above
22 the FEMA 100-year flood elevation, plus the
23 20-inch sea level rise projection. So you've got
24 a 32-inch cap there. So I'm just trying to figure
25 out how, when you've got in that respect almost 3

1 feet in height of displaced water, how you come up
2 with numbers as low as 8 or 9 cubic feet. That's
3 got to be a very small portion of that foundation
4 for the monopoles. That's why I'm just kind of
5 wondering where the numbers came from or how you
6 arrived at them.

7 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Thank you for
8 that, Mr. Hannon. This is Brian Ragozzine.

9 THE WITNESS (Auer): This is Correne
10 Auer. Those volume estimates were just the
11 portion that was within the 100-year floodplain.

12 MR. HANNON: Okay. And again, the only
13 reason I'm raising the question on it is because
14 in one part of the document you talk about there
15 are 28 monopoles that will be installed in the
16 floodplain. And I'm assuming those that are
17 highlighted in blue on table 6-3 are the 26
18 monopoles that will be installed in the wetlands.
19 So, are you saying that not all of the monopoles
20 are completely within the wetlands, that it may
21 just be a small corner of the foundation? So I'd
22 just like some clarity on that. Because, again,
23 the way that it was originally stated early on in
24 the document you're saying 26 new monopoles being
25 installed in the floodplain.

1 THE WITNESS (Auer): This is Correne
2 Auer again. Each monopole depending on its volume
3 or its diameter and depth that it's taking up
4 within a floodplain ranges from that 8 to 400
5 cubic feet. And then when you look at the amounts
6 within -- so out of the 26 monopoles in the
7 100-year floodplain, 4,100 cubic feet is the total
8 from those 26 within the portion of the 100-year
9 floodplain.

10 MR. HANNON: All right. I've just got
11 a couple of general questions left. One word I
12 did not see anywhere in the document relates to
13 alluvial soils which is part of the Connecticut
14 definition of a wetland. So if you're going to be
15 talking to the wetland scientist on that, that may
16 be something you also want to have them address.
17 That would be appreciated.

18 Another general question deals with the
19 foundations because it talks about in the report
20 that the foundations are going to be filled with
21 concrete. So I'm just wondering that due to the
22 high groundwater level is there a specific type of
23 concrete mixture where chemicals may be added
24 that's needed to be able to solidify the concrete
25 and have it cure where it may actually be in

1 water?

2 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Mr. Hannon,
3 this is Brian Ragozzine again. I'll pass it off
4 to my engineering team.

5 MR. HANNON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear
6 the response.

7 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): One moment,
8 please.

9 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Hannon,
10 this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. As part of our
11 construction specifications that we do provide,
12 there are sections in there that would apply for
13 pouring or application of concrete in wet
14 locations. As part of the construction, we will
15 have the contractor submit to us particular
16 concrete mixes that we will review and approve
17 before they are applied in the foundation.

18 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. So
19 there may be some special concrete mixtures that
20 are needed in certain spots?

21 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Potentially,
22 yes.

23 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. And the
24 last question I have is dealing with, on the
25 questions submitted by the Siting Council to UI,

1 the response to Question Number 47, I just want to
2 make sure that we're on the same page on that.
3 This is dealing with flood mitigation measures,
4 but it talks about, this is the answer, "However,
5 the proposed monopole structures associated with
6 subdivision tie-ins at Congress Street, Resco and
7 Ash Creek Substations are located in floodplains
8 and will be designed to rise one foot above the
9 100-year flood elevation and will also account for
10 sea level rise." So that is in fact the 32 inches
11 that was addressed on page 6-14? I just want to
12 make sure there's consistency with the response.

13 THE WITNESS (Auer): Yes. This is
14 Correne Auer. Yeah, where we're accounting for
15 that sea level rise in Question 47, that was the
16 same pages that we talked about in the --

17 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. I have
18 nothing further. But I guess, Attorney McDermott,
19 I guess there's the one question they're going to
20 deal with and get back, maybe a Late-File, on the
21 wetlands issue. Is that your understanding as
22 well?

23 MR. McDERMOTT: That was my
24 understanding, although I thought Mr. Crosbie had
25 indicated he might have an answer.

1 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Hannon,
2 this is Shawn Crosbie. We have a follow-up
3 response to you on your question related to
4 non-standard work activities in 3-1. What we're
5 referring to there is night work which is not
6 typical that we perform on maintenance or
7 construction activities within the project
8 corridor or on the Metro-North and CT DOT
9 right-of-way.

10 MR. HANNON: Okay, that's fine. I was
11 just curious. I saw the language and I wasn't
12 sure exactly what it referenced. So thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney McDermott, I
14 actually have three items that are open from Mr.
15 Hannon's line of questioning. One has to do,
16 relating to the analysis of the lattice structure
17 and tidal wetlands and the environmental impacts
18 associated with it.

19 The second one would be concerning the
20 100-year floodplain and its analysis of it not
21 being included as a wetland impact.

22 And then the alluvial soils and how and
23 if that has been handled in the soil analysis.

24 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr.
25 Morissette. I believe we can answer at least the

1 first one.

2 Is that true, Ms. Auer?

3 THE WITNESS (Auer): Yes. So one of
4 the towers had elevated levels of lead in the
5 coating, so we would ensure that the tower itself
6 would be sent for proper off-site recycling or
7 disposal. And during any deconstruction
8 activities workers would have to protect
9 themselves per OSHA standards.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

11 MR. McDERMOTT: I think we'll have to
12 take the other two as a little bit of further
13 homework assignment, Mr. Morissette.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

15 Mr. Hannon, are you all set with the
16 response?

17 MR. HANNON: I am. Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
19 We will now continue with cross-examination by
20 Mr. Lynch followed by myself. I am going to try
21 to squeeze questioning by the Council in today,
22 and hopefully we can conclude the questioning and
23 cross-examination by the Council.

24 So with that, Mr. Lynch.

25 MR. LYNCH: Can you hear me, Mr.

1 Morissette? I'm losing my voice.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I hear you fine.
3 Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

4 MR. LYNCH: First off, I want to state
5 that I'm a little -- I feel uncomfortable asking
6 technical questions with regards to the line. I'm
7 going to leave those to my more informed
8 colleagues. But I do have some overall questions
9 about the project. And I'll start off with, you
10 talk, the poles are going to be a lot higher than
11 the catenaries were, and you reference in I think
12 both the application and one of the
13 interrogatories a Category 3 hurricane and you
14 also referenced the Halloween snowstorm we had a
15 while back.

16 Now, my questions with those are, what
17 is the wind load or capability for these towers to
18 withstand heavy winds, and what would be the ice
19 load on these towers?

20 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Thank you,
21 Mr. Lynch. This is Brian Ragozzine. I'm going to
22 refer that to our engineering crew.

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
24 Lynch. This is Matthew Parkhurst. We design the
25 monopoles to be able to carry a

1 one-and-a-half-inch radial ice load.

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): And Mr.
3 Lynch, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. I will also add
4 to Mr. Parkhurst's response. The Category 3
5 hurricane or the structures the line is designed
6 to withstand the maximum wind loading of 130 miles
7 per hour.

8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Would the
9 towers be more vulnerable to coming down or
10 failing if they were in a heavy ice load?

11 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Thank you,
12 Mr. Lynch. Brian Ragozzine.

13 MR. LYNCH: I know it's a loaded
14 question.

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Lynch,
16 are you asking if they are more prone to have an
17 issue with ice compared to wind or -- I just want
18 to understand the question.

19 MR. LYNCH: What is the -- I'm trying
20 to refresh my own memory. In a Category 3
21 hurricane the wind I think would be 140 miles per
22 hour?

23 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Sustained
24 winds, I believe, are from 111 to 129 miles per
25 hour.

1 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.

2 Let me move along to something that you
3 were talking to Mr. Hannon about. You talked
4 about, he mentioned the 100-year floodplain, and
5 this just occurred to me while he was talking
6 about it. In the recent rain that we've had in
7 the last couple of weeks, month, whatever, have
8 you examined the 100-year floodplain as far as
9 flooding and would that impact your project? Has
10 it flooded, I guess, is the question.

11 THE WITNESS (Auer): This is Correne
12 Auer. We have not done any further flood analysis
13 or analysis on the 100-year flood elevation at
14 this point.

15 MR. LYNCH: Moving along here, I just
16 want to get a clarification. I don't think I read
17 it right or I got confused when you're talking
18 about your work schedule. I understood the day
19 part of it pretty well, but I couldn't understand
20 the workload at night with the trains and without
21 the trains. Can you go over that again for me?

22 THE WITNESS (Ragozzine): Thank you,
23 Mr. Lynch. That's going to be dependent on both
24 CT DOT and MNR and their schedules and how they
25 interpret our work schedule and what they will be

1 willing to authorize.

2 MR. LYNCH: I guess where I was
3 concerned is -- not concerned, but I couldn't
4 understand, would the trains be running when
5 you're working at night?

6 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr. Lynch, this
7 is Shawn Crosbie with UI. To answer that
8 question, yes, we work around the ongoing
9 schedules. Some of our night work that was
10 referred to as Mr. Hannon's question on
11 non-standard hours is when we interconnect with
12 our transmission lines on the corridor with some
13 of our substations. So if we're working on the
14 north side of the right-of-way and our substation
15 is located on the south side of the right-of-way,
16 we do what we have to do. It's called a
17 four-track crossing. Metro-North recommends that
18 that four-track crossing occur at night when
19 traffic with the trains is less frequent versus
20 commuter hours are during the day. So that is
21 what the reference to the non-standard activity is
22 just to kind of give you an outline of what it
23 might be. Hopefully that helps.

24 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. And my last
25 overall question concerns, I forget where it in in

1 the interrogatory, 11 or 12 or 13, when you're
2 talking about socializing the project -- or
3 regionalizing the project. I guess, regionally 75
4 percent of the project is going to be picked up by
5 New England, other states in New England. Is that
6 how I'm interpreting the socialization?

7 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Lynch, this
8 is Zach Logan from Avangrid. You are correct in
9 your understanding.

10 MR. LYNCH: Offhand, would you happen
11 to know what percentage, I guess I would say, of
12 the project would go to break down to the
13 individual New England states, you know, the
14 Commonwealth, New Hampshire, Maine or Rhode
15 Island?

16 THE WITNESS (Logan): Right offhand --
17 this is Zach Logan again, Mr. Lynch -- I do not
18 have the other New England state breakdown. I can
19 get that for you, if you would like.

20 MR. LYNCH: No.

21 THE WITNESS (Logan): I do have the
22 Connecticut percentage.

23 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, that's all I need.
24 It's only a curiosity question. I was just
25 wondering. And my last part of that is, is there

1 any federal money being involved here?

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Lynch,
3 this is MeeNA Sazanowicz. No, there will not be
4 any federal funding involved in this project.

5 MR. LYNCH: I guess I lied. I have one
6 last question. The determination on the
7 socialization or regionalization, is that done by
8 the ISO or by NEPOOL?

9 THE WITNESS (Logan): Mr. Lynch, this
10 is Zach Logan. That is done by the reliability
11 committee. That would be NEPOOL.

12 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you very much.
13 Mr. Morissette, I'm all done.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
15 I will now commence with my cross-examination.
16 I'd like to go to Volume 1, specifically Figure
17 1-5 and Figure 2-1. Now, my question is 1-5
18 provides a schematic or one-line of the existing
19 115, and 2-1 provides a one-line of the proposed.
20 Now, it does indicate on 2-1 what is new
21 single-circuit and new double-circuit, but I'm
22 having a difficult time determining what lines are
23 what because the configuration is different.
24 Specifically, I think it's the 1130 line goes down
25 and crosses to the, I think it's south, and then

1 goes on to the Pequonnock Substation. So could
2 somebody kind of walk me through this and explain
3 what's going on here?

4 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
5 Morissette. This is Matthew Parkhurst.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon. First
7 of all, let me ask, would line numbers on this be
8 more helpful?

9 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, let me
10 ask you. It seems you're suggesting it would be,
11 so would you like us to do that for you?

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Yeah, that would be
13 helpful, if you could. I don't want you going to
14 too much trouble, but I'm having difficulty with
15 this. So if Mr. Parkhurst could walk me through
16 this as it is now and provide a Late-File
17 including line numbers, I'd appreciate it.

18 MR. McDERMOTT: You're up,
19 Mr. Parkhurst.

20 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Certainly.
21 So, Mr. Morissette, so I'm going to go over Figure
22 2-1 and start with the easy stuff. First, on the
23 south side of the railroad corridor you have a
24 structure marked Eversource existing structure
25 B647S. That is the first Eversource structure

1 existing that we'll be tying back into.

2 On the west side of Sasco Creek that is
3 line 1430, and that line extends from that point
4 further west to Eversource's Sasco Creek
5 Substation not on this sheet; further east to UI's
6 Ash Creek Substation that is marked P713ES and
7 then south away from the tracks to the substation.

8 Coming out of the substation is line
9 91001-2. That extends east. And that line on
10 Pole 737S will cross the tracks to the north side
11 to meet line 1130, and those both will continue
12 east towards Pole P745N. West of Pole 737N is the
13 continuation of UI's 1130 line. Feel free to
14 interject if you have any questions as we go.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Well, I guess, if you
16 don't mind just giving me a real high-level
17 analysis of what you've got going on here. And
18 once I get the one-line with line numbers on it, I
19 think that would help me figure it out. But just
20 on a high level, it seems like you're crossing the
21 railroad to go to double circuits and then coming
22 back --

23 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): We are.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: -- versus going
25 straight through. And why is that?

1 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): So if you
2 take a look, what you can't see on this print is
3 the aerial and the existing built environment. So
4 we tried to stay away from highly, the higher
5 congested residential areas in Bridgeport and
6 north of the corridor and east of 740 between Pole
7 745 and Pole 752. That is why we cross south with
8 both circuits as that area is residential in
9 nature and quite, I would classify it as urban in
10 nature up in Bridgeport. Between 737 and 745 the
11 land was more, there was more available land on
12 the north side of the railroad corridor. In
13 addition, there was a multi-story building that we
14 wanted to avoid on the south side of the corridor
15 just west of Pole 745S and existing UI Pole RT5.
16 Crossing south where we did at 745 also allowed us
17 to connect into the existing Resco tap line that
18 did not have to be rebuilt leading to the Resco
19 Substation.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Just let me ask
21 a question about the Pequonnock Substation.
22 You're entering and exiting the Pequonnock
23 Substation on the south side, and you've
24 eliminated the -- I wouldn't say eliminated, but
25 you've reduced the structures to the north. Is

1 there a reason for that?

2 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
3 Morissette, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The main
4 driver for that is coordination with the
5 Pequonnock rebuild project. And as part of that
6 project and in our discussions with Connecticut
7 Department of Transportation, as well as
8 Metro-North, it was decided best to have the
9 majority of the structures, you know, into and out
10 of Pequonnock in that area of the tight curve to
11 be on the south side of the tracks.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So it's really
13 a constructability issue, would I say?

14 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): And future
15 plans as well for the DOT as well as Metro-North.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Good. Well,
17 thank you both for answering these high-level
18 questions. I'll probably have more once I get the
19 line numbers, but your responses make sense as to
20 why you did what you did. I just wasn't quite
21 getting it just looking at the one-line. Thank
22 you.

23 Let's see, I want to jump to Mr. Cotts
24 -- Dr. Cotts, excuse me, having to do with EMF.
25 And I am looking at CSC-69-1, which is the direct

1 testimony of Dr. Cotts. Now, on page 4 -- let me
2 know when you're there and we can continue.

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Thank you, just
4 about there.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS (Cotts): And while I'm
7 looking, I wanted to potentially correct myself.
8 Earlier in my response to Mr. Silvestri, I think I
9 may have miscited the document. I think I said
10 Volume 1, and I should have said Volume 1,
11 Appendix E in my citations to that table for his
12 review.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you for
14 that.

15 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I am now on page
16 3 of the direct testimony.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. On line 12 this
18 has to do with raising the top conductor by 4 feet
19 and keeping the lower conductor as originally
20 proposed, basically increasing the spacing and
21 therefore increasing the magnetic fields. First
22 of all, just theoretically, when you decrease the
23 spacing -- let me make sure I get this straight
24 now. When you increase the height, you reduce EMF
25 at the ground level, correct?

1 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: And then when you
3 decrease the spacing, you increase the EMF level?

4 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I think that may
5 have been flipped around. When you decrease the
6 spacing between conductors, generally speaking,
7 there is a better mutual cancellation of the
8 fields. And so at ground you would generally
9 expect a decreased phase spacing to result in
10 decreased magnetic field levels.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So in this
12 particular situation we're increasing the top or
13 the top conductor therefore increasing the spacing
14 and therefore increasing the EMF levels?

15 THE WITNESS (Cotts): That's correct --

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

17 THE WITNESS (Cotts): If I may clarify,
18 this is in regard to a correction that was made.
19 This was not an updated change. This is related
20 to the existing configuration where the top
21 conductor was, after the initial modeling,
22 identified to be modeled in the incorrect
23 location. And so it was corrected to be at the
24 correct location which is higher than the original
25 model used.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So that's based
2 on the existing conductor?

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): That is correct.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So in that new
5 location, the new conductor, although below
6 standard levels, will be in the same
7 configuration?

8 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I apologize.
9 Could you rephrase the question or --

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. We got, a
11 storm is coming in over here, it's getting awfully
12 dark outside. So in that location the new
13 conductor will basically be in the same
14 configuration or higher?

15 THE WITNESS (Cotts): The new
16 conductors will be in a different configuration
17 entirely in that location. And perhaps a visual
18 representation might be helpful here.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Now, before we
20 get to the visual, let's jump to Exhibit 2, the
21 table that you provided. I found that very
22 helpful, by the way. Thank you. I think it kind
23 of walks you through what the changes are. And
24 maybe what we could do is just walk through each
25 one of them and you could in layman's terms

1 explain it to us all starting with the apartment
2 building in Fairfield.

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes. Beginning
4 with the apartment building in Fairfield -- and
5 just for the record, this is in the interrogatory
6 responses. I believe it's page 1 of Exhibit 2.
7 It's PDF page 94 that I'm looking at.

8 So the first one for the apartment
9 building in Fairfield, I believe this is what we
10 were just discussing. The existing conductor, the
11 top existing conductor was modeled at 48 feet, and
12 that was increased to be corrected to 52 feet.
13 And this is what we were discussing. This
14 increased the phase spacing between the conductors
15 for the existing configuration. Therefore, with
16 the existing configuration having an increased
17 phase spacing, this also increased the magnetic
18 field levels at the apartment building for the
19 existing configuration.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Let me stop you
21 there. Now, this is on, I'm looking at the
22 100-scale map, sheet 9 of 29. I'm still a little
23 confused where that apartment building is. If
24 someone could identify that for me. Is it
25 SAS-1746?

1 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi,
2 Mr. Morissette.

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Go ahead, Matt.

4 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
5 Morissette. This is Matthew Parkhurst. That
6 apartment building, the new multi-story apartment
7 building is located at SAS1754 to the east of
8 proposed Pole E689S.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I had the wrong
10 one. Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. So 1754,
11 okay. We'll go back to Mr. Cotts -- Dr. Cotts.
12 So these are the existing levels. How do I
13 interpret what the revised -- do you have a table
14 that has the revised levels?

15 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I do.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Maybe you can point me
17 to that and we can clarify some of this.

18 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Perhaps before we
19 leave this apartment building in Fairfield, there
20 was one adjustment that was made to the existing
21 models. There was an estimate that was made to
22 the proposed models. And the second adjustment
23 was to revise the proposed values to be from the
24 top conductor -- sorry, from the minimum conductor
25 height to be from 79 feet 4 inches to 75 feet 3

1 inches which increased the proposed magnetic field
2 levels at the apartment building.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

4 THE WITNESS (Cotts): So at the
5 apartment building in Fairfield, the net effect is
6 that both existing and I should say corrected
7 proposed magnetic field levels increased relative
8 to what was originally in the report.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. But the
10 increased proposed magnetic field levels are the
11 proposed levels after construction?

12 THE WITNESS (Cotts): That is correct.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: So actually we can use
14 this table. So you have the adjustment for the
15 existing and then you'd have the proposed. Okay.
16 All right. Maybe we can move on to the apartment
17 complex on 24 and 25.

18 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Those are
19 sheets --

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Sheet 24 and 25.

21 THE WITNESS (Cotts): 100-scale map
22 Sheets 24 and 25?

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Could you tell
24 me where the apartment complex is, is that MX1 or
25 is that RPS1926?

1 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
2 Morissette, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The second
3 one is correct, RPS1926.

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Great. Thank
5 you. All right. So in this location the magnetic
6 fields, the proposed magnetic field levels
7 increased but slightly.

8 Okay. And the next one is the
9 playground. Is that playground on 24, is that
10 what you're referring to?

11 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Mr.
12 Morissette, this is Matthew Parkhurst. That
13 playground is on the same parcel as the apartment
14 building RPS1926.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So as part of
16 that complex there?

17 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette,
18 this is Ben Cotts. To clarify, the playground is
19 best seen on Sheet 24 of 29, whereas the apartment
20 building is best seen on Sheet 25 of 29.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So where it
22 says park and recreation, that's the one you're
23 referring to. Okay. And again, in this area the
24 magnetic fields are decreased.

25 THE WITNESS (Cotts): That is correct.

1 The vertical spacing of the proposed conductors
2 was corrected from 14 to 12 feet. So with a
3 smaller conductor spacing that decreased the
4 magnetic field levels. The minimum conductor
5 height of the proposed line also, I should say, on
6 the north side of the tracks was corrected from 91
7 to 99 feet 11 inches. So the greater conductor
8 height reduced the field levels. And the vertical
9 spacing of the conductors on the proposed line on
10 the south side of the tracks, this is the one that
11 is nearest the playground, decreased from 14 feet
12 to 13 feet. The reduced conductor spacing also
13 resulted in decreased magnetic field levels at the
14 playground.

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Okay.

16 Moving on to the last one, the residential area
17 north of Connecticut CT DOT, where do I see that,
18 XS-17, what sheet would that be reflected on, if
19 someone could help me?

20 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette,
21 this is Ben Cotts. The best sheet for this also
22 Sheet 25 of 29.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS (Cotts): But instead of
25 looking on the south side of the CT DOT corridor,

1 we're looking on the north side of the CT DOT
2 corridor. So this is most representative of the
3 area approximately near RPN2043, RPN2042, RPN2040
4 and RPN2041.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Good. Thank
6 you for walking me through that. That was very
7 helpful. I was struggling with that.

8 What I'd like to do is just quickly
9 walk through attachment CSC-14-1, which is the
10 cost table that was provided. And thank you for
11 providing that. I also found that very helpful.
12 Okay. What I'm trying to figure out here is
13 alternative or Option 1 is the 255 million, but
14 there was an analysis of an alternative, and I
15 believe it's in page 25, that goes around the
16 residential area on a single circuit versus -- no,
17 I think the alternative was either going around it
18 in a single circuit or going around it in a double
19 circuit. Could you tell me which one of the
20 alternatives reflect doing either of those?
21 Hopefully, I'm clear.

22 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette,
23 to clarify, are you asking about the EMF analysis
24 and the alternatives that were contemplated there
25 or are you asking about the overall alternatives

1 for the whole project?

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Well, I'm asking what
3 the cost associated with doing either of those
4 alternatives in that location. I believe the
5 alternative was a single circuit down South
6 Frontage Road.

7 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr.
8 Morissette, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Did you understand
10 what I was asking?

11 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, I
12 believe so.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. I'm
14 not sure I did.

15 THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The cost
16 alternatives for the double-circuit variation --
17 this is in regard to the EMF alternatives -- is
18 not covered in the table that you mentioned for
19 alternatives; however, it is covered in the EMF
20 report that was submitted as part of the
21 interrogatories. Let me just see what number it
22 is. I think it's the last one.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Did I get that
24 right? So one alternative was to do a double
25 circuit down South Frontage Road and then another

1 alternative was to do a single down South Frontage
2 Road and then keep the single on the south side of
3 the track.

4 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette,
5 this is Ben Cotts. I think I can help walk you
6 through this a little bit.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

8 THE WITNESS (Cotts): This is Exhibit 3
9 to attachment CSC-69. And this begins on PDF page
10 110, which is a little bit different than the
11 analysis we were just looking at on attachment
12 number -- sorry, Exhibit Number 2 to attachment
13 CSC-69.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Let me try to get to
15 where you are. So it's not Exhibit 2?

16 THE WITNESS (Cotts): It's Exhibit 3.
17 I think the best place to look is going to be
18 Roman Numeral page 5, which I have as PDF page 116
19 of the interrogatory responses.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Unfortunately, I don't
21 have PDF --

22 THE WITNESS (Cotts): This is Exhibit
23 3.

24 MR. MORISSETTE: Exhibit 3.

25 THE WITNESS (Cotts): CSC-69.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Attachment E, is it in
2 there?

3 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Exhibit 3. Would
4 it be helpful to share my screen?

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Unfortunately, we
6 can't do that. Is this the one dated May 30,
7 2023?

8 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes, that is
9 correct.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Mine is
11 actually labeled Exhibit 1. Anyway, so continue.

12 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Okay. So what I
13 have is Roman Numeral page number V. There's a
14 table that's called summary of magnetic-field
15 reduction at apartment buildings.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

17 THE WITNESS (Cotts): To clarify a
18 little bit more, the discussion we were just
19 having with regard to Exhibit 2 relates to
20 corrections that were made in the original
21 modeling. Exhibit Number 3 also includes those
22 corrections but looks at design alternatives that
23 UI evaluated at these two apartment building
24 locations.

25 If I can focus in just on this would

1 now be a redesign option. One redesign option was
2 made for the apartment building in Fairfield.
3 That is on the first line of this table. And the
4 redesign option there was to increase the minimum
5 conductor height from 75 feet 2 inches to 84 feet
6 5 inches, roughly not quite a 10-foot increase in
7 conductor height. And in conjunction with that, a
8 decrease in the phase spacing from 14 feet to 12
9 feet. So both of those redesign factors will tend
10 to reduce the magnetic field levels.

11 And what the table shows is that the
12 reduction at ground level is different than the
13 reduction in the roof at the roof just because the
14 roof is much closer to the conductors than the
15 ground is. So you have a greater percentage
16 reduction at the roof than you would at the
17 ground. But the table shows that that design
18 option reduces ground level magnetic field levels
19 by about 30 percent and at the roof by about 47
20 percent. And the UI estimated cost for that
21 reduction or for that redesign is approximately
22 \$36,000.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS (Cotts): At the Windward
25 Apartment Building complex in Bridgeport there

1 were three different alternatives evaluated. The
2 first, as shown on this option one line, was an
3 increase in the minimum conductor height from 75
4 feet 2 inches to 80 feet 2 inches, an increase of
5 that minimum conductor height by about 5 feet.
6 And that results in a ground level reduction of
7 about 9 percent and a reduction at the roof of
8 about 27 percent in the magnetic field level with
9 an associated cost of about \$31,000.

10 I think getting back to your original
11 question regarding the double-circuit structure,
12 that is what is envisioned in Option Number 2.
13 That would remove the transmission lines from the
14 southern side of the tracks and reroute both
15 transmission lines in a double-circuit structure
16 north of the tracks along South Frontage Road.
17 And in that case, essentially removing the
18 transmission line from the front of the apartment
19 building has a substantial reduction in both
20 ground level and roof level magnetic fields 88 to
21 97 percent respectively at a cost of about \$7.5
22 million.

23 And then the last option that was
24 evaluated is similar to Option 2, but instead of
25 rebuilding both transmission lines on a

1 double-circuit overhead structure, that would look
2 at rebuilding both transmission lines in an
3 underground duct bank on the north side of the CT
4 DOT corridor. It would have similar reduction
5 levels as the double-circuit structure but would
6 be at a cost of approximately \$42 million.

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you
8 for that. That was very helpful. Okay. I'm
9 going to switch gears and I'm going to go to
10 historic resources. Now, in several areas the
11 heights of the structures were lowered to provide
12 visual reductions for historical resource
13 purposes, but by doing that you increase the
14 impacts of the EMF levels. So my question is, and
15 it's very broad, I'm hoping you can provide some
16 insight is, are there any specific areas in which
17 there is a conflict between lowering the
18 structures for historic purposes, historic
19 resource purposes and increasing EMF levels?

20 THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette,
21 this is Ben Cotts.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you.

23 THE WITNESS (Cotts): I think I will
24 respond briefly regarding the magnetic field
25 levels and then maybe allow someone from UI to

1 discuss the structure height. I think in broad
2 terms, the magnetic field levels that we calculate
3 at the edge of the right-of-way and beyond and in
4 fact even directly underneath the conductors EMF
5 levels are all well below international standards
6 for potential EMF exposure. So to the extent that
7 a lower structure would be required, I think that
8 overall broad conclusion would remain the same
9 that the field levels would remain below those
10 standards, albeit with a lower structure height
11 and lower conductors the EMF levels may increase
12 relative to what they would be without or with a
13 taller structure.

14 MR. MORISSETTE: Anybody else wish to
15 comment?

16 THE WITNESS (Parkhurst): Hi, Mr.
17 Morissette. This is Matthew Parkhurst. If I
18 could add to what Dr. Cotts just said. So when we
19 provide inputs for the EMF study for a multi-mile
20 project like this one, we don't initially look at
21 every location because the clearance to ground,
22 which is what we're talking about here, changes
23 significantly throughout the course of the
24 project. So as an initial input to the EMF study
25 we look at worst case possible, so closest to the

1 ground, and Exponent would run their EMF study off
2 that value. So even our shortest pole heights
3 would be above, it would place the conductor above
4 that level, that elevation.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you
6 for that clarification. Thank you all for your
7 patience. Sorry we're running a little late here,
8 but I did want to wrap up our cross-examination
9 for this afternoon. And thank you, everyone, for
10 providing your responses. It was very helpful.

11 One thing I did want to say before I
12 end my cross-examination is I thought the
13 application was very thorough and very clear and
14 provided adequate information to do a thorough
15 analysis on what UI is proposing here, and I
16 thought it came out very well.

17 So with that, we have five Late-Files,
18 I believe, Attorney McDermott?

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Subject to the team
20 here telling me no, I think you're right.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Let's walk
22 through them real quickly and we'll everybody to
23 dinner. The first one is the cost to shift the
24 BJ's structure on the property.

25 Late-File 2 would be update of CSC-3 to

1 add the additional contacts that have been made to
2 interested parties.

3 Late-File 3 concerning the 100-year
4 floodplain versus wetland impacts, I'll call it.
5 You can include in that the alluvial soils.

6 And number 4, include in the table or
7 the schematic on 2-1 the line numbers.

8 Okay. Are we good?

9 MR. McDERMOTT: We're good.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you,
11 everyone. That concludes our hearing for this
12 afternoon. And the Council will recess until 6:30
13 p.m., at which time we will commence with the
14 public comment session of this remote public
15 hearing.

16 And Attorney Mortelliti, I'm sorry we
17 didn't get to you this afternoon, but at our next
18 hearing you will have the opportunity to
19 cross-examine the applicant.

20 MR. MORTELLITI: No problem, Mr.
21 Morissette. Thank you very much.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Thank you,
23 everyone. We'll see you at 6:30.

24 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at
25 5:18 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2
3
4 I hereby certify that the foregoing 124 pages
5 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
6 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
7 before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL of the
8 REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: DOCKET NO. 516, An
9 Application from The United Illuminating Company
10 (UI) for a Certificate of Environmental
11 Compatibility and Public Need for the Fairfield to
12 Congress Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild
13 Project that consists of the relocation and
14 rebuild of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) electric
15 transmission lines from the railroad catenary
16 structures to new steel monopole structures and
17 related modifications along approximately 7.3
18 miles of the Connecticut Department of
19 Transportation's Metro-North Railroad corridor
20 between Structure B648S located east of Sasco
21 Creek in Fairfield and UI's Congress Street
22 Substation in Bridgeport, and the rebuild of two
23 existing 115-kV transmission lines along 0.23 mile
24 of existing UI right-of-way to facilitate
25 interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric
transmission lines at UI's existing Ash Creek,
Resco, Pequonnock and Congress Street Substations
traversing the municipalities of Bridgeport and
Fairfield, Connecticut, which was held before JOHN
MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on July 25, 2023.

22 

23 -----
24 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
25 Court Reporter

I N D E X

COUNCIL'S ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE ITEMS I-B-1
through I-B-87: RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE ON PAGE 8.

APPLICANT'S WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 10)

CORRENE AUER
TODD BERMAN
AZIZ CHOUHDERY
SHAWN CROSBIE
BENJAMIN COTTS
LESLIE DOWNEY
BRIAN GAUDET
DAVID R. GEORGE
ZACHARY LOGAN
BRIAN RAGOZZINE
MATTHEW PARKHURST
ANNETTE POTASZ
MEENA SAZANOWICZ

EXAMINERS:	PAGE
Mr. McDermott (Direct)	11
Mr. Perrone (Start of Cross)	18
Mr. Nguyen	40
Mr. Silvestri	51
Mr. Golembiewski	75
Mr. Hannon	78
Mr. Lynch	97
Mr. Morissette	39,102

APPLICANTS' EXHIBITS
(Received in evidence)

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
II-B-1	Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need filed by The United Illuminating Company, received March 17, 2023, and attachments and bulk file exhibits including: Bulk file exhibits: a. City of Bridgeport zoning code b. City of Bridgeport zoning map c. City of Bridgeport Plan of Conservation and Development	18

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

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
d.	City of Bridgeport Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations	
e.	City of Bridgeport Inland Wetlands soil map	
f.	Town of Fairfield zoning regulations	
g.	Town of Fairfield zoning map	
h.	Town of Fairfield Plan of Conservation and Development	
i.	Town of Fairfield Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations	
j.	Town of Fairfield Inland Wetland soil map	
k.	Municipal consultation filing: Volume 1, description of proposed project Volume 1A, Appendix A, Agency correspondence Volume 1A, Appendix B, Ecological Assessment Report Volume 1A, Appendix C, visual assessment and photosimulations Volume 1A, Appendix D, Cultural Resources Report Volume 2, project mapping and drawings Outreach log Frequently asked questions Railroad powerline upgrades Presentation to Bridgeport Presentation to Westport Fairfield Public information meeting presentation Bridgeport public information meeting presentation Virtual open house postcard UI's Project page	

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

2 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
3 II-B-2	Applicant's corrected public notice 4 submission, dated March 21, 2023	18
5 II-B-3	Applicant's responses to Council 6 interrogatories, Set One, dated May 31, 2023	18
7 II-B-4	Applicant's prefiled testimony of 8 Brian Ragozzine, dated June 29, 2023	18
9 II-B-5	Applicant's virtual tour of project, received June 29, 2023	18
10 II-B-6	Applicant's letter to SHPO concerning 11 supplemental information to the Phase 1A 12 Cultural Resources Assessment Survey, dated June 30, 2023	18
13 II-B-7	Applicant's responses to Council interrogatories, Set Two, dated 14 July 18, 2023	18
15 II-B-8	Applicant's responses to BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc. interrogatories, 16 dated July 18, 2023	18
17 II-B-9	Applicant's sign posting affidavit, dated July 18, 2023	18
18 II-B-10	Applicant's witness resumes, 19 received July 18, 2023	18