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THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council today, Tuesday, February 23, 2016, approximately 11 a.m. My name is Robin Stein. I'm Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council, and we're here for Docket Number 461.

This hearing is a continuation of hearings held on September 1, 2015, in Greenwich; and on November 6, 2015; December 1, 2015; January 12, 2016, here in New Britain.

It is held pursuant to provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from Eversource Energy for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the construction, maintenance and operation of a 115-kilovolt bulk station located, or to be located at 290 Railroad Avenue in Greenwich, Connecticut, and two 115-kilovolt underground transmission circuits extending approximately 2.3 miles between the proposed substation and the existing Cos Cob substation in Greenwich, Connecticut, and related substations improvements.

This application was received by the Council on June 26, 2015. A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the town clerk's office in the Greenwich Town Hall for the convenience of the public.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available by the door. And the first intervener that we'd would like to call would be Parker Stacy.

Not that I can do anything for
Mr. Stacy, but I think we have notified all the parties and intervenors that this may be the last -- or this is the last opportunity to appear.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: The second
intervener is Mr. Granoff.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Then we'll go to the grouped intervenors, the Bella Nonna Restaurant and Pizzeria, Greenwich Chiropractic Nutrition, Joel Paul Berger and Meg Glass. Is there anybody representing the grouped intervenors.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Then we have the
next intervener, Cecilia Morgan.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Although we don't have any of those parties or intervenors, what I would like to ask those who are present whether there's any objection to allowing the documents that these parties and intervenors have submitted to be made part of the record?

MS. DUBUQUE: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman. Marianne Barbino Dubuque for Connecticut Light \& Power Company doing business as Eversource Energy.

And I do object to Parker Stacy's submission for the reason that some of the information in his filing would require technical expertise. And there is no foundation that he possesses that technical expertise, specifically the statements about undiscovered groundwater and surface water conditions in the park. If they're undiscovered I'm not sure how they would be likely to be seriously and adversely affected, and those are statements directly from his filing.

So I would object to consideration of those statements that require technical expertise. I have no objection to that being
considered as his personal opinion, but certainly not as any expert testimony.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are there any more? Any other objections?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: I think what I'll do is I'll accept all the testimony for what it's worth and the Council will take note of your concerns.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now I do believe we do have the Town of Greenwich present. So those representing the Town, if you would come up and sit at the table to our left please?

Are you ready?
MS. KOHLER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Council. My name is Julie Kohler. I'm representing Cohen \& Wolf, representing the Town of Greenwich. Also with me is David Ball. I'd like to present our witness panel.

On my left is Amy Siebert, P.E.,
Commissioner of Public Works. To her right is Katie DeLuca, AICP, Director of Planning and

Zoning; Denise Savageau, Conservation Director. And to my right, Bruce Spaman, Parks and Recreation Director.

If they could stand and be sworn?
AMY SIEBERT,
DENISESSAVAGEAU,
K ATHARINEDDeLUCA,
BRUCESSPAMAN, called as witnesses, being first duly sworn by the Executive Director, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. KOHLER: The Town offers eight exhibits for identification purposes and they are listed in the hearing program as Roman numeral 11B-1 through 8. At this point I'd ask the witnesses be allowed to verify the exhibits?

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.
MS. KOHLER: Ms. Deluca, did you prepare or supervise the preparation of Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you have any clarifications, additions or deletions to make of those exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.

MS. KOHLER: And are they true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you adopt them here today as your testimony?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: Ms. Sievert, did you prepare, supervise or modify the preparation of Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah. It was part of number six, and number seven and eight. Six, seven and eight.

MS. KOHLER: Just six, seven and eight?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah.
MS. KOHLER: And do you have any additions, clarifications or modifications to make to those exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): No.
MS. KOHLER: And are they true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you adopt them here today as your testimony?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yes.

MS. KOHLER: Ms. Savageau, did you prepare or supervise the preparation of Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you have any additions or clarifications to make to those exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): No.
MS. KOHLER: And are they true and accurate to they best of your knowledge?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you adopt them here today as your testimony?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: Mr. Spaman, did you supervise or prepare Exhibit 6, 7 and 8?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: And do you have any additions or clarifications to make to those exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): No.
MS. KOHLER: And do you adopt them here today as your testimony?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Yes.
MS. KOHLER: With that

```
exhibits?
```

accurate to they best of your knowledge?
verification, I'd ask that these exhibits be made full exhibits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any party intervener object to the admission of the Town of Greenwich exhibits?

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of Eversource $I$ object to the Exhibit Number 3, comments from the Town of Greenwich, First Selectman -- I'm sorry, number four, comments from Greenwich Planning and Zoning dated November 23, 2015.

The resumes of the witness panel do not disclose any expert qualifications on issues that require technical expertise, need issues, alternatives, Cos Cob Transformers, and those type of issues. And I refer you to the Town's response to Siting Council interrogatory question 19 where the Town has admitted it does not have the engineering expertise. So as to those issues I don't feel there's any foundation.

And I also refer you to page 25 of 26 of the $11 / 23$ comments. And specifically at the bottom of the page, the second paragraph after the conclusion reads, that the town staff in trying to understand this proposal has obtained input from
industry professionals who have considerable knowledge and experience in the design, construction, maintenance and overhead of underground transmission facilities throughout the Northeast along with transmission voltage substations.

They're equally familiar with pipe
tied cable feeders and solid dielectric circuits. They are thoroughly conversant in construction costs and methodologies and industry practices relative to both design and implementation. They have done extensive work throughout the Northeast. If these industry professionals are not here then this document contains hearsay. And to the extent that any of the sworn exhibits that Eversource has filed are being challenged by this document, and those are based on qualified witnesses, we object to admission for that purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a response to that, Attorney Kohler?

MS. KOHLER: I do. I believe that the November 23rd letter stands on its own and that the Town does not claim to be an expert. They don't claim to be an expert in the

November 23rd letter. And in fact, the November 23rd letter was seeking for the Council and for Eversource to pursue other alternatives that were raised in the November 23 rd letter.

It indicated that they believe there were other alternatives. The Town did its own research and requested that Eversource and the Council pursue these other alternatives. I don't believe that they pretended to be an expert and put that evidence into the record. And we'd ask that the Council accept this evidence for what it's worth, and for what the Town intended for it to mean.

MR. ASHTON: So any claim of expertise we should ignore?

MS. KOHLER: The Town has made it very clear that it is not an expert.

MR. ASHTON: Yes or no would work.
MS. KOHLER: Yes, the Town is not an engineering expert.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, I have one more.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes?
MS. DUBUQUE: As to Exhibit 6, the
drawings attached to question 1 , on their face they appear to be prepared by Toshiba \& WEG, W-e-g Representatives. And if their drafters are not here then there really is no witness that can attest to their authenticity. So I do not believe that those drawings can be sworn to as evidence. And also there's just no witness who can explain what these drawings are being offered for because they just depict apparently transformers, but they don't show any relationship to any of the information in this particular docket.

MS. KOHLER: I believe they can be verified by Ms. DeLuca in the fact that she contacted these transformer manufacturers. She provided them information as to the parameters of Eversource's substation design, and they provided her responsive information. And the Council can certainly question Ms. DeLuca as to that information and gain further elaboration.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a lot of technical information that has been provided by the Town. I think we would have hoped that you would have provided maybe some technical experts. I think we're relying on, for the
cross-examination, to really probe a little deeper because you raise some critical issues. But unless your witnesses are prepared to testify, you know, with expertise on these it's going to make it a challenge.

So in that respect I'm sympathetic to the objection, however as we generally do, we will accept the material. You've agreed to the caveat or the -- it was suggested that apparently none of you are expert in this area. So I'm going to let the testimony in for what it's worth.

But I do caution you that, you know, your case would have perhaps been a lot more helpful if you did provide more than just some drawings, but anyway. Anything else?

MS. DUBUQUE: No that's fine.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections by any of the other parties intervenors?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: If not, we'll then admit the exhibits. And we'll now go to cross-examination starting with Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

I'm just going to flip through some of the questions, the responses that were provided to the questions to the Council interrogatories. I'll just begin with question four. In the third paragraph of the response, $I$ just want to make sure the value that you provided, the 124.9 is correct. If you could just look at the previous two values, 114.8 plus 11.1?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm having difficulty hearing you.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, in the third paragraph, the value of 124.9 MVA was given. I just want to make sure that value is correct based on the information on the 114.8 MVA. And $I$ assume you're adding 11.1 MVA to that?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think it would be 125.9 , would be the correction there. Thank you.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: I just have a follow-up on that. Then are you using as the base of 200 -- the 2015 number, is that what you're -THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, of 114.8 MVA.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll reserve
my questions because I have some real difficulty with that, but I'll wait for my turn. Go ahead. MR. MERCIER: Actually I'm just going to turn to interrogatory number one. Those were the diagrams that were just discussed. One of the diagrams, I'm hoping to show just the dimensions of the proposed equipment by one of the manufacturers that you have listed.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Can you repeat the question?

MR. MERCIER: Question number one, responses to the two diagrams, Exhibit A -- two Exhibit As, actually. What are these diagrams attempting to demonstrate?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, sorry.
What I had -- what I had done is I had contacted the transformer manufacturers and showed them the OCC-62 floorplan, if you will, of the Cos Cob substation and had asked whether or not these -these transformers could fit into that substation.

And when you look at the dimension of the transformers that are shown on the floor plan, I think when you compare that to the dimensions shown here -- so on a very simplistic basis it appears that they would fit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, can I follow up? In your communication with the companies, did you include the testimony from Mr . Bowes so that they could have at least heard why Eversource has stated in their third supplement testimony why this is not possible? It certainly would have been particularly helpful if your sources had had this material. Did you provide that?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, it was a very generic question.

I would read you the e-mail that I sent to them, but unfortunately I can't seem to access the Internet. So I -- it was a short paragraph requesting, you know, just based on size alone. It did not provide any additional information other than the transformer.

MS. KOHLER: We can certainly provide that as a late file, if you like.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know if we -- based on what I've heard so far, I don't know whether that would be particularly useful, since obviously this was Mr . Bowes' testimony.

I mean, this is a critical issue
that was first raised by OCC and I certainly would have hoped that you would have provided, for want
of a better term, "more meat on the bone" than just -- than you would have. And you had this other information, but let's go ahead. Continue.

Mr. Hannon. I'm sorry. We have another follow-up question.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.
Again, it's on the same line. I guess the question is talking about sort of a floorplan, if you will. Does that take into consideration part of the existing equipment that may be below ground? Or was this just something where here's a flat map and you can pop it in place, not taking into consideration what may or may not be below ground?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): That's right. It was just a flat map. So it was, again it was generic question. Here's the flat map of the substation with the dimensions shown. Could you fit 80-MVA transformers in this location? The response, as you see, was these plans.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.
MR. MERCIER: Yes, regarding your discussion with the manufacturers did it also include any additional equipment or changes that might be necessary inside the substation to hook
this equipment up?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MR. MERCIER: Now assuming larger
transformers at Cos Cob could be part of the solution for additional power supply to Greenwich -- it's assuming that, and assuming that Eversource needed to expand their substation beyond its property line to accommodate the larger transformers, and assuming that, would the Town be willing to offer some of its land south of the substation to support any expansion?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): You know, I think what we're looking at here, taking a quick look at this, since we don't have any real information here on the quantity or anything, $I$ think Eversource is aware it's a capped site. It's a brownfield site.

So we don't really have enough information from your question to know what, you know, what the impacts of something like that might be. That site has been remediated.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is the site that's been remediated a town park now?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Correct.
MR. MERCIER: Okay. So if they
could work around remediation issues and wanted to expand the substation south towards the some of the parkland. Would that be amenable to the Town? THE WITNESS (Siebert): Well, it looks like on this map that they still have some room between there on what I'm looking at here on this, on this little map.

MR. MERCIER: Right. I'm just asking you if they needed to go beyond their property, would the Town be willing to offer some land up?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yeah, there's a couple things. There's the Town acquired this land as part of a piece of legislation. It was owned by the State of Connecticut and transferred to the Town as a piece of legislation. And it says specifically what we can and can't do there. So you would have to go back and change that legislation with the State of Connecticut to do that. So it's not just the Town being able to do that.

The other part of that is that
because it's a brownfield site, and we went through the voluntary remediation program with the Department of Environmental Protection and EPA,
they would also have a say on what we could or couldn't do with the park land because of the remediation site. So even though it's now park land and being used that way, because the site is capped, it was part of a brownfield remediation and part of that voluntary remediation program we would have to go through that.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, this is not a new topic. Has there been any discussion in the planning department or in the Town about a possibility of transferring land to Eversource, or whichever name they want to go by, so that what you're trying to do can be accomplished? Has there been any discussion of intelligent competence to test this out?

I mean, you're saying you don't
know. Well, we know that. This is characteristic of every municipal transfer I've ever been associated with, but we've got a specific problem here that deserves specific significant attention. THE WITNESS (Deluca): As you know, we've had a long position lasting over many years now with Eversource and the Town. And we've been trying to have a collaborative process with them through this whole process starting many years
ago. And that question has never been asked of us.

> We've asked about solutions over
time as to how we could go about solving the problem. One of which was the Metro-North solution, as an example. We were told at that time that's off the table. It wasn't until these new questions of this Council that that even became an option.

So we've been trying to have a conversation with Eversource for many years about solutions and we've been told effectively that this is -- this is the only proposal that they are willing to put forth. So we are -- our hands are tied unless we are asked the question ourselves whether or not we would be -- whether that's an option, but that has not been presented to us.

MR. ASHTON: Or if you choose to press the point in front of the Siting Council, which Ms. Kohler I know is very familiar with? THE WITNESS (Deluca): Which is exactly what we've been trying to do, is raise -raise the questions, because we've -- we've raised them with Eversource to date and we've not gotten very far. So it's not until we're -- we're here,
frankly, that we've been able to have a decent conversation about some of these solutions.

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Mercier?
MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'm going to move on to question number eleven, response to number eleven.

Now I understand the environmental and cultural values that were listed in this response. That being said, how would any of the three possible or potential horizontal directional drilling routes through the park affect these values?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?

MR. MERCIER: In your response you present many environmental attributes to the park such as waterfowl use or songbird use, or things of that nature, but Eversource has proposed three variations of horizontal directional drilling that goes pretty much under the park and under the tidal basin.

So I'm just trying to understand what the Town's view is regarding horizontal directional drilling that would avoid
environmental impact?
THE WITNESS (Savageau): So for a couple things that we are looking at, and some of the proposed routes have been -- was looking at taking down some of the urban forest and the trees, what we need to do there. So we were concerned about that.

In terms of the horizontal drilling, once we found out that they were going to be -- or looking at doing the high-pressure fluid filled lines, we were very concerned about that. There have been spills. There was a recent spill within the past several years under Long Island Sound.

And we're looking at -- because this is an area of a -- where we're looking to have salt marsh migration, where we're looking at, you know, maintaining this as a very urban park in a coastal environment, we're very concerned about making sure that whatever happens there is something that could handle that environment. It's not a freshwater environment. It's a coastal environment and I think that there's, you know, challenges there.

In Western Long Island Sound we
have a lot of water quality challenges in Western Long Island Sound. We also have one of the most productive shellfish areas in the whole state of Connecticut. And so any kind of leakage or whatever with a spill like that would be devastating to, not only the town of Greenwich, but the shellfish industry within the state of Connecticut.

We think that if there's a proven feasible alternative to going through the park it's certainly something we would want to explore. And the high-pressure fluid filled is something we're very concerned about.

The other -- the other part of that is all of the staging areas that are involved. And we're not really sure exactly how large that would be, but this is a big, big project and the more we learned about it the more we got concerned about the size of the staging areas and the impact, certainly in terms of birds, and using them.

You know, a lot of times we look at sites in terms of, well, what's the long term? So after the site is closed off and look at the long term, and that's where we're more concerned about
the fluid filled. But during constructions also has a lot of impact and that impacts the wildlife, and you know, just the noise, the drilling and whatever. This is a critical area, so we're really looking at that as well.

MR. MERCIER: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Spaman): Bruce
Spaman, Superintendent of Parks. Also I believe one of the three schemes was an open trench that ran down the length of Kinsman Lane and Bruce Park Drive and actually trenched through the ponds. So there were two sections, two ponds that they were going to trench through. We feel that was not a good option for the Town.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, and in regards to the drilling you mentioned several points. I guess I'll start with the staging areas.

I mean, would you agree they are kind of localized areas in one specific portion of the park for an install point, and then another localized area in the receive point for the drill? Do you agree it's a localized area?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): It did.
We're not really sure how large that would be. I wouldn't say it was just a localized area. I
would be looking at, as a staging area, not only the immediate drilling area, but where they would be having equipment. Do they need to be, you know, if they are going to be, you know, sucking out any of the dredge material that's underneath, or whatever, how are they going to? Where is it going to be using trucks? Where's the staging area going to be? There's a lot more involved than just the immediate area where they're going to be drilling down.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. For instance,
I guess, one of the routes begins at the Kinsman Lane as the preferred drill section -- excuse me, I take that back.

It appears two of the drill
segments for the install point would be adjacent to the ballfield. So would you agree that it would just be localized in the area of the ballfield? A localized area, yes, so there would be trucks according to the description of the application, and the staging area for the drilling equipment, but that would just be affecting that portion of the ballfield.

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Unless I
saw detailed drawings with an erosion sediment
control plan and how they want to be handling everything on site $I$ wouldn't be able to say that.

A lot of times, you know, whenever you're doing this type of thing the staging area isn't just a matter of, like, oh, here's where the vault is going to be. We would need to look at more detailed plans. And that's one of the things I've learned working land use, is that a lot of times the staging areas get -- become a lot larger than anybody expects.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Your concern with the staging area is excessive tree clearing or damage to the ballfield? What exactly would the issue be?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): All of the above. Definitely looking at the recreation areas, but as well as the impact to the whole area. It's very flat there, so we'd be looking at, like, okay. What exactly -- how is it going to impact everything else?

We found the trees that might need to come down, so it depends on where the staging area is. There's three routes, and three staging areas could be in different places. So --

MR. MERCIER: Have you looked at
the drill maps that were provided in the application, the exact location?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MR. MERCIER: Now in regards to
tree clearing, again it looks like the ballfield location might not have any tree clearing. So that would be something more acceptable than, say, another area where there were trees? Would you prefer an open area?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): From an environmental perspective it's not as much impact with the ballfield, but that's with the exception of the Town uses that as a, you know, as a recreation area. So we were looking at trying to avoid that use of a recreation area. There's a limited amount of ballfields in town and this is a very active ballfield that is utilized.

And so that the Town was very concerned about the use of the ballfield, how long the ballfield would be down, and whether we'd, you know, be able to put the ballfield back.

MR. MERCIER: I believe in the record it stated that you do that activity in the winter months when the ballfields aren't used. Would that be acceptable to the Town?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): The Town was still very concerned. I know that our parks and rec director was very concerned about making sure that we would be able to, you know, utilize that ballfield.

That said, that doesn't address some of the other issues of drilling under the pond and whatever.

MR. MERCIER: As for this spills, you mentioned spills. Are you stating that you're concerned that once the pipe is installed under the pond in the park it could leak?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MR. MERCIER: Okay. And you
mentioned some leak in Long Island Sound?
THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.
MR. MERCIER: Do you know what that
Long Island Sound leak was caused by?
THE WITNESS (Savageau): I -- I
don't know exactly what the cause is. I just know that they had a problem with the high-pressure fluid filled lines and that material that leaked in the well -- that leaked into Long Island Sound is not a good thing, so we're looking into that.

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Also I might
say that the scheme that has the trench, or the drilling set up in the ballfield is going to clear a 25-foot swath from Kinsman Lane to the -- to that site to go over land and over the hill there.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, I think you're referring to the orange route that's the variation two, but there's also another route that kind of goes through an open area.

THE WITNESS (Spaman): There's one that goes around.

MR. MERCIER: The blue route, the variation of one that avoids many of the tree clearing that you're talking about. So I think in the application there were some areas that would require clearing depending on the route, and some areas that wouldn't.

So I guess what I'm hearing is, just to confirm, that the Town would prefer less clearing it the park of trees to maintain the forest canopy?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think our official statement on that is we don't want anything through the park, particularly when there's a seemingly viable alternative down Metro-North, and we feel very strongly about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the word "vehement" was used several times.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It's a good word.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not objecting to it.
MR. MERCIER: Now Ms. Deluca, in response to your comment just now I just want to confirm that, you know, you mentioned one of the routes in your response. I don't have it in front of me, unfortunately.

I just want to confirm that the route that you were favoring is the single pole overhead route that is south of the Metro-North Railroad and north of Interstate 95. It's the single pole, not the double-pole route.

MR. BALL: Excuse me, you're asking about LFE-3?

MR. MERCIER: Yes. Thank you for clarifying that for me. I think that was in your response to question 18.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I see.
I think that there's pros and cons to -- to the variations in the overhead and underground route through Metro-North. So I think there's -there's pros and cons. I don't think we've gone
as far as to say which ones are more desirable over another one, other than the Metro-North route in general is much favored over anything in Bruce Park.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. I guess my question was for the overhead route, there's two proposals. One has poles on either side of the railroad and one that has it only on the south side of the railroad. So I'm just trying to confirm which one the Town prefers?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Again, I
think there's a lot of question about -- because there are pros and cons with -- with that variation. So I don't think we favor one over the other.

There's obviously the issue with the sewer line on the southern side. There's the issue of the vegetative buffer on the northern side. So there's the height of the poles -- is in question, whether they use the horizontal pole or the vertical bulk, whether they could go on the catenary structures.

So there, there's a lot of
questions about the logistics of that route, but $I$ think the general statement is that that route,
whichever variation in Metro-North is chosen, is more desirable than anything through the park.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now according to the plans that Eversource submitted in their last exhibit, you know, obviously the resultant tall structures, whether it's the two poles on either side of the railroad or a single pole, and you know, these structures will be visible from areas of town including Bruce Park and residential areas.

So I just want to know, you know, how does the Town respond to the visibility of these pole structures when compared to no visibility of it at all in an underground route?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I think when you -- when you weigh out all of the things that are at issue here, the reliability, the cost and the environmental impacts, I mean, obviously as you know, their question number one, the need.

So if we moved past that and I think then you start looking at some of the cost issues and some of the environmental impacts. And when you again compare these, when you compare these routes either through Bruce Park or through

Metro-North and you look at the potential problems with going through Bruce Park that we've outlined in our comments, I think that the benefit of going down Metro-North far outweighs any negative of going through Bruce, Bruce Park when you consider the environmental issues that we believe are very significant for going through the park.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you. And I have no other questions at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll now have questions from the councilmembers. Senator Murphy.

SEN. MURPHY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Just to follow up, Ms. DeLuca, so basically speaking, and I gather from what you just said and from reading the material, presented on behalf of the Town, that as far as the environmental concerns as the Town views them, using the Metro-North regardless of the height of the pole and what have you, those environmental concerns are less than doing anything in Bruce Park?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
SEN. MURPHY: That's the bottom
line. In other words, $A$, you don't believe they've provided further need?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Correct.
SEN. MURPHY: After that, assuming that they have, which is up for grabs at this point, the main thrust is anything but Bruce Park?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): That's correct and I would just like to --

SEN. MURPHY: Go ahead.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Sorry, just to add to that.

SEN. MURPHY: Don't feel sorry.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): I appreciate that. We understand that there's the $D$ and $M$ process that would follow, should there be an approval. And obviously we would like to be very, very involved in that if it gets to that stage, because things about the height of the poles and the vegetative buffer replacement, things along those lines we would like to be very involved in all of that, and with the infrastructure.

SEN. MURPHY: That I can certainly appreciate, but the backup or follow-up of that is, why didn't you people come in earlier?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, we --
we've been, as I mentioned earlier, we've been working for many years on -- on this and we've -we've thought that we have been participating, frankly.

We've found this to -- thought this was a collaborative process and we've been working along -- along those lines. If you recall at the September meeting I stood up at that meeting and read something, read my comments into the record at that time.

SEN. MURPHY: A very good thorough job, I might add.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Thank you. I appreciate that. And at that time, you know, I expressed what -- the journey we've been on thus far and that we've -- we were working together.

And frankly, the other thing that I commented on is that this is a complicated subject matter. Obviously you've seen the evolution from comments back then to the comments going forward.

SEN. MURPHY: You don't have to
tell us.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): So along
those lines, again we thought we were working collaboratively when we -- when we read the
testimony and heard the testimony that's come out through the Siting Council process. Frankly, we were a bit taken aback.

As I mentioned, we've been working, you know, with Eversource in the first selectman's office, been asking questions. Thought we were getting, you know, answers to those questions that were, I don't want to say not truthful because that's certainly not the case, but when we asked, is it possible to go down Metro-North? Is it possible to do these various things?

And we were told, no, it's not possible. The planning and zoning commission through the municipal consultation filing phase asked many questions about need. And we, basically the gist of the response was, thank you for your questions and we'll deal with it when we get to the Council.

So here we are now and we realized you're right, late in the game here that we better -- we better make sure that we're really protected here. So that's, you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's not really the answer.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It's been a
learning process.
THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the answer -the question from us, since we were not involved in the last umpteen years is why, as most communities that we've, you know, on complex issues, you didn't file for intervener party status from day one. But let's -- it is what it is. It doesn't make any sense to us why you waited this long, but thank you for at least --

SEN. MURPHY: I think things would have been a lot different if you had been in day one.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I hope the same positive outcome will come on this, but I mean, frankly, I mean I'm not sure that, like I said, it's been a learning process. Had -- had we known now -- if we had known then what we know now I suppose it would have been different.

However I mean, we've -- our main goal in all of this was to ask the question. Again, we're not energy experts. We've never purported to be. Starting from day one we've stated that we're just here to ask the questions. And we thank you very much, by the way, for asking it, and to get where we are now.

But had we known that we should have hired attorneys and filed intervener status before, we would have. But frankly we're, you know, we are where we are at this stage.

SEN. MURPHY: But as a municipality there's more to just asking questions. There's really a role to be played, too. And that's why we were surprised you were -- I'm not speaking of you individually or as individuals. I'm talking about as the community of Greenwich.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): And just all I can do is add to Katie's comments that we believed we were negotiating and discussing and collaborating in good faith with the utility. That was our understanding.

SEN. MURPHY: I think I've wasted enough time with that and I think we'll move on. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashton.
MR. ASHTON: Good morning -- I think it's still morning. I also share a positive reaction to the written comments that were filed by the town planner. I thought they were well done and deserving of deep, of good consideration.

Now there's a couple of things that

I do have problems with. I came away from the table almost with the understanding that the town planner does not believe that the load in Greenwich will reach a point requiring a new substation. Is that fair to say or not?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think that is fair to say.

MR. ASHTON: It's fair to say?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Based on the figures that have been presented in their application.

MR. ASHTON: And what basis do you have for making that conclusion which requires a lot of understanding of electrical loads and electrical systems and the like?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I -- I've come at it from a different tact, if you will -tack. The area that is shown in the figure in the application, the red area, if you will. I think it's $\mathrm{E}-10$, if I recall correctly. That is the downtown area of Greenwich. That is a developed area.

It is not an area where there's a lot of vacant land. There's not a lot of growth potential in that area in terms of the residential
areas. I'm talking about eviron. That's a built out area. When you go to the downtown area of Greenwich, Greenwich Avenue specifically, again I -- that's an area that is developed. It's an historic area. There is development potential, certainly, but not of a great amount.

So when I think about what the needs are for the Town in that, and how we -- how we plan to grow, you saw the plan of conservation and development document that I put onto the record with the November 23rd. And it talks about how Greenwich is about conservation first and about development second. So we are not trying to grow in any great way, such as some of the other areas in Fairfield County are at this time.

So with that backdrop, then when I
look at -- when I looked through the application and looked at the load and the peak loads for the 2013 -- I don't need to hash through all of that again, but all of the numbers with the 2013 for -as that being the peak and then the forecasting out through 2023, it didn't seem that it added up to me.
So that why I was -- it was more
asking the question than $I$ was stating, stating
that there was a definite issue. It just -- it just seems to me from a layman's standpoint that something is not adding up when you look at that growth potential in town and when you look at the fact, well, what seems to be the 2013 was this anomaly.

MR. ASHTON: And isn't it fair to say that in many instances plans of conservation and development are, I'll use my term, "wish lists?" They don't come to pass necessarily. They are sort of an objective. If we could do that it will work out fine. If we can't, so be it and move on to the next one.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I view it as the framework for the Town, so almost like the umbrella. So this is -- this is what we've decided as a community how we want to grow, and then you use your zoning regulations to make that plan come to fruition.

MR. ASHTON: And don't zoning regulations and planning regulations get changed from time to time depending on what kind of a red-hot idea a developer brings in?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes. Yes, this is true, but one of the -- one of the things
that the planning and zoning commission has to do when they make an amendment to their zoning regulation is it has to be in compliance with the plan of conservation and development.

MR. ASHTON: And there's at least two members of, former members of the planning commission -- or zoning commissions here?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: So we're fairly
familiar with that, but there's no clear-cut guaranteed way of ensuring of what the plan of $C$ and $D$ says is necessarily going to pass. Is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think that's a fair, you know, general statement.

MR. ASHTON: Would you allow that there has been substantial growth in Greenwich over the past 40 or 50 years?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): What do you mean by growth?

MR. ASHTON: Electrical growth.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh well, I would leave that up to Eversource to answer that question.

MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I would
leave that up to Eversource to answer that question.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. I'm sure Eversource will come back with a handy-dandy answer. They may even mention the name of an engineer who worked on some of that.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): But I will say just in terms of land-use growth, I mean, we -- one of the things that the plan of conservation and development does talk about is maintaining traditional development patterns. So when you look at the areas within that so-called red area, those have been basically the same for the last 40 years.

MR. ASHTON: Oh, I'm certain that's the case and $I$ know it's the case in a number of respected well identified towns in the center of the state. Every one $I$ won't go that far, but a number of them.

Who is on the hot seat if load occurs and facilities are not available to serve the load?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I
would assume that's the utility, but -- and I
guess that's -- that's why we're asking the questions that we're asking.

MR. ASHTON: That's fair enough.
You can ask the question.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
Because what it seems like when you look at those, when you look at the loads that have -- that have been presented and you look at the forecast, just using the basic math of what we have in 2013 and what the difference would be in 2023 with the 9 megavolt, and when you look back and you think, okay, well how are -- perhaps it's not that simple. It does seem that simple, though.

And if you look at how do you get that, that 9 megavolts and you look, well, could you do something at Cos Cob? Could you do something with the switching on all, all of the things that are in the record? It seems that there's other --

MR. ASHTON: Is there any reason you can think of that Eversource, or CL\&P, or Northeast Utilities, or whoever it may be would put forth a plan that would be "improper," I'll use the word, from any standpoint you can think of?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I would -- I would put it this way. If I wanted to get from A to B.

MR. ASHTON: Get from what?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): If I wanted to get from $A$ to $B$ and someone said, here's a Honda. And another person said, here's a Ferrari, I suppose I would offer the Ferrari. But do I think they're acting improperly? No, I have no reason to believe that.

MR. ASHTON: That's a fair posit, however let's look at the way the thing might be constructed. I've got a Ferrari right next to me, right here. I've got a Honda -- and by the way the Ferrari is one that's pretty well beaten up. It could be placed satisfactorily. I've got a Honda which is a mile and a half down the road and it's brand-new.

Doesn't that situation throw a little different curve on the picture as to how to go about fixing things? Isn't it human nature almost? Almost -- $I$ didn't say it is -- almost to put forth the most efficient system possible when you get into a planning in the town hall, and Aquarion or what have you? You do what you can
afford. Isn't that true?
THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah. I think, again you know, you've heard us mention this before. Again, we're asking the question.

You know, when planning these are difficult issues. As engineers we often like to be very conservative in our -- our plans. I can understand that. I deal a great deal with wastewater, which has certain parallels. Treatment plants have certain capacities.

MR. ASHTON: I haven't seen any overhead of wastewater lines.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): That's right. That's right.

MR. ASHTON: I hope I don't.
THE WITNESS (Siebert): Thank goodness you haven't -- well, there are some overhead lines here and there.

But in terms of capacity and wanting to make sure that there's room for demand, there's room for peaks, there are ways to handle those things. You know, utilities like to build. You know, oftentimes they find themselves looking at, do we need a new plant? Do we need a bigger plant? Or do we need to just rightsize or change
equipment?
So again, we're just trying to ask the question. We're looking at the loads. I think with the information and the research that Katie had done we looked at this and said, hmm, we can't understand wanting new facilities.

You know, it's almost kind of like a value engineering process that $I$ think it's my understanding the Siting Council, you know, helps ask you guys ask all those questions to make sure that they've looked at all those options and that it's been looked at very thoroughly. So those are questions, again that we've been bringing up over time.

MR. ASHTON: Have you attended all the hearings on this docket for the last six months?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): I have not.
MR. ASHTON: Or somebody from the agency?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I -- I've been at three of them, I believe. And I've read the transcripts from all of them.

MR. ASHTON: Did you feel that the agency has made an inquiry to find the most
efficient way to solve the problem considering environmental aspects?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I find that this process has been very, very, very --

MR. ASHTON: Nerve-racking. You can say it.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think you have asked many, many questions that are some of the -- yes, I think you have asked the good questions. And I've been actually very pleased with how the process has gone in the sense, again just reverting back to when the Town asked the same questions and we didn't get very far.

It was -- it's been actually rather rewarding to have you ask the questions and to get further than we have. So I do feel that you've asked questions that have addressed this issue.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. One last question. Do you believe the question or proposition of an alternate route along the railroad, which is underground for part of the way and possibly -- possibly overhead for the balance of the way, helps your case or solves your problems?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, our
first issue is the issue of need. And I do have a difficulty getting over that based on --

MR. ASHTON: So we're stuck on
need. Is that fair?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah, so assuming we get past that, $I$ do think that that route, whatever variation that is within the railroad, solves the environmental issues that we were greatly concerned with.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Now you can let Mr. Hannon have a whack at need.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon.
Thank you, Mr. Ashton.
MR. HANNON: Thank you. I do have a few questions.

On the interrogatories question to page 1 of 1 , your response was to say the Town -it's the first paragraph -- the Town made it clear they would need to see backup data at some point. Can you please explain what you mean by backup data?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm sorry. Where are you?

MR. HANNON: It's your response,
the Town's response to question two.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, question two.

MR. HANNON: The end of the first paragraph. You said, the Town made it clear they would need to see backup data. I'm just curious as what you mean by backup data?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Well, throughout meetings with Eversource over time while they were discussing this, again we took it on faith as we noted in here that, you know, that the need was very well established.

You know, one of the individuals, the first Selectman himself said many a time we definitely want to see -- we want to see numbers. We did not see any numbers. We were never provided any actual use values, load values.

During the process we were just talking to them about -- they were talking to us about the need that they were forecasting, but we, throughout those many meetings, we didn't have any numbers.

So that's all that means, that we were looking forward to seeing those numbers, which I think Katie has explained have been coming
out through this process.
MR. HANNON: On question six,
page -- oh, I take that back. I'm sorry.
Question 7 on page 2 of 3, can you please describe what the root is for the Old Greenwich common force main that you state goes through Bruce Park to Davis Avenue that has to be, I guess, rebuilt or at least portions of it reconstructed?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yes. So the Old Greenwich common force main is a large force main in Greenwich that serves multiple pump stations. It comes -- I'll take you from -- it Comes all the way from Old Greenwich, but when you come to Indian Field Road in Cos Cob -- actually, if we go -- if we back up, we go along Sound Shore Drive in the vicinity of the Cos Cob pump station.

We come along Sound Shore Drive to get to Indian Field road. We go underneath Indian Field Road. We proceed west between I-95 and the railroad through an easement through there, all the way along to Indian Harbor. It goes under the water there. It heads west.

It comes up on a grassed area near the Bruce Park pump station on Davis Avenue. It comes up and goes underneath -- well, it comes up.

It's up from under the water. It's still buried, obviously. And it's buried, goes through west to Davis Avenue where it goes underneath the railroad tracks and it finally discharges by gravity at the intersection of Bruce Park Avenue and Davis Avenue.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So that portion, that goes through Bruce Park?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): There's a very -- there's a small section that's in the very western -- the western part of the park. It's not in the bulk of the park that we've been talking about.

MR. HANNON: Is that an area that needs to be dug up, trenched, things of that nature? I mean, again part of the reason I'm asking is because here you've got a force main where you need to do repair work on that.

And part of the response on question 17 is you're saying that with what Eversource was proposing, any such construction would have a devastating environmental impact to the park.

So you're replacing a force main. They're proposing to put in something different,
but you know, is it impossible to equate the two? So if one is creating environmental problems, isn't the other one also?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Well, I can say, you know, that $I$ don't view them as the same thing. I look at that force main, that force main is over on a western portion that is really -well, I guess this section of it is technically still in a little bit of the park. It's a very small section.

It's serving an existing need.
It's much smaller. It's a 24-inch line, so it's smaller than, you know, when we do have to replace it, which you're right. We do have to replace force mains on occasion. You know, the impact of taking that out and putting that back in, we can handle in that area, because we're not in an area that's full of trees and full of some of the, you know, other concerns that we -- that Denise has outlined for the park.

You know, I think again the point that we've tried to make is that by looking at the three routes, you know, up in the railroad area it really takes the Bruce Park thing out of the picture. You know, I don't -- I don't think
they're equivalent there. I'm not sure if that answered your question.

MR. HANNON: How deep is the force main?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): I'm not sure how deep it is at that location. It varies along its route.

MR. HANNON: Rough idea? I'm not going to hold you to it.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): It's probably at least 3 feet deep. It's probably, you know, it could be four, five, six. It depends on what part you're at in the route.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Because part of the reason I'm asking is because the force main also goes under some water bodies. And if I remember correctly, and again my memory isn't always the best, but $I$ thought that the horizontal drilling that was being proposed by Eversource was about 30 feet below the bottom of the ponds. It may be a little bit closer.

So if there was a leak there I'm just wondering what do you think would create more of an environmental problem if there was a leak with the lines that Eversource would be proposing,
or if there was a problem with the force main?
THE WITNESS (Siebert): I think
that's a very interesting question. You know, honestly what's in a wastewater force main, albeit not pleasant to most people when it leaks, is material that has -- may have a short-term impact, but does not have a long-term environmental impact because it can be easily digested by all the bugs and creatures out there, as occurs in the wastewater treatment plant when it finally lands there.

So it's organic in nature. You know, while again we don't want to be consuming it, it is not a toxic substance. So -- and one of the things we do with our force main is we, you know, we do replace it typically before it will -it will break.

You know, one of the concerns I think that we had with some of the material, that when we learned a little bit more about it on these HPFF cables, is that it is material that is rather noxious in nature. It's certainly not something that you would like leaking out over time.

You know, in my experience I know

I'm not a knowledgeable engineer, but dealing with pipes underground, things do -- do have a service life. Things can leak. Things can go in directions which can be unforeseen depending on the subsurface conditions, which we don't know a lot about.

So I think all those things cause us to raise concerns and be much more in favor of seeing something up overhead on the upper, you know, up along the railroad line and so forth. Because again, I can't tell you what kind of conditions it may be even if you're 30 feet below the surface.

What happens when you need to repair that line? How are you going to do that? Or is material going to just continue to be pumped in and dispersed? That could probably be kind of tricky, too.

MR. HANNON: And with the
horizontal drilling that is on the table for this project, is your concern more once the drilling has been completed and the lines are in place, or is it the drilling itself, or is it both?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): I think
we're concerned about all of the above.

MR. HANNON: Would it make a difference if bentonite wasn't used as far as the horizontal drilling?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): I'm sorry. If the what?

MR. HANNON: The bentonite. It's the material that they use. It's like a mud material that they use for drilling.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): NO, I think the, you know, horizontal directional drilling no matter how you slice it is going to have a large impact on the park. I think there are clear concerns that, you know, Denise and Katie have stated about clearing, about impacts, and again about long term having that kind of infrastructure underground. I think all of those concerns are there.

But again, I think we keep trying to point out that we're glad you all asked questions about, what about going -- if need is established, what about going overhead up in an area where then we wouldn't have to worry about those issues? We wouldn't have to worry about that in the future. What are we leaving for somebody, you know, in the future?

MR. HANNON: I don't have anything else at this time.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Can I just point out also that there is no sewer line that goes through the park. It's a bit confusing. So that there's a tiny, tiny little portion is -- just to make sure there's no confusion. There's not a sewer line that goes through that area.

MR. HANNON: Again, just to follow up on that $I$ was going by what you had responded in your answer.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): It's hard to explain, yeah.

MR. HANNON: And it's that there is a line that goes through the park.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): In a very, very small section that is right -- well to the west. So that's what $I$ wanted to clarify because it is a bit confusing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mercier?
MR. MERCIER: You mentioned there was a pump house and I think I see it on this overhead map. Is that related to the sewage main? Or is that something else?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): It's a separate. So if you were looking at --

MR. MERCIER: Yes, I see the
location.
THE WITNESS (Siebert): Seven of -are you on seven of nine?

MS. KOHLER: Is that Late-Filed
Exhibit 3?
MR. MERCIER: I'm on six of nine, but I know where the station is. I just want to know, is that a water supply?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah, that's the same image. So again, in all this information, you know, Eversource has our force main drawings. But we have a force main that comes, as I said, on the south side of the tracks along here, and it goes underneath and comes up there.

There is a gravity line, a small portion of gravity line up here on Bruce Park Avenue that goes down, and that feeds into that small pump house there. And they both have lines which then go out into Davis Avenue into the roadway and go on and up underneath Davis Avenue.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Levesque?
MR. LEVESQUE: I don't have any additional questions, other than the ones that were already stated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I have a few. I'm not asking anything about Bruce Park. I read that word "vehement" several times, so obviously others can ask that, but $I$ do have a few questions.

In your, I guess, it was your request to become an intervener dated January 11 th of this year and I think I'm quoting correctly. It says, Greenwich has been afflicted by severe and lengthy power outages resulting from weather events in the past. And then I'll get to that issue of weather events a little bit later.

But then also in your response to question five, $I$ guess, it's in the February 16th, from the Siting Council, you state that -- and again, I'm quoting, the project does not address the fact that older overhead distribution lines remain susceptible to storm damage.

Is it your position that the main issue of system reliability is related to overhead distribution lines?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Is it our what?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that your position that that is the main issue? I see some nodding yes and I see some --

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right. Then as on page 18 of 26 , in the November 23rd, that's where we talk about some of the storm hardening. And yeah, we -- when we think about reliability we have an issue with what happens during storms. So it's right. It is the 13-kilovolt lines that are of most concern to us reliability-wise.

I've been at cocktail parties as of late and people would say, what's going on with this Eversource business? We -- we need, you know, we need the reliability, and my mother doesn't have her generator, $X, Y$ and $Z$. And so every time you talk to somebody in town the reliability issue is always about what happens during storms.

We've gone through the series of bad storms in 2011, 2012 with Sandy, and those are the kinds of things that the first selectman has been working on very hard with Eversource. And they've come to the table to try to figure out a
way so that our -- our needs can be addressed. So when we have, coming into this project, that backdrop of this big push to work with Eversource to deal with the reliability issues that happen during storm events.

So that's why $I$ bring it up, that when Eversource comes to the Council and they say, we have this reliability project and it's going to cost 140 million.

We say, oh, you know, we're
concerned about reliability as it relates to these storm events. We would like to see some of that addressed and -- with the distribution side of things.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you, one, aware that that does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Siting Council, distribution lines?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
THE CHAIRMAN: And two, the
solution is in your hands? All you have to do is pay for it. And Greenwich, probably more than almost any community in the state of Connecticut, is probably able to do that. I mean, you could sign an agreement with Eversource, have a cost-sharing agreement, or just pay for it and
start tomorrow undergrounding all your lines. THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah well, as I've said, we've been talking about this for many years. It's not a new topic and we've -we've been working with Eversource to help with the distribution system.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just gave you a solution.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Thank you and I appreciate that.

And the reason why it's relevant to this conversation, though, is that a transmission line is being proposed and when you look at -look at some of their late files and they talk about how the switching, if the switching happens and the redundancies in the systems in the distribution system, and you look at that, the North Greenwich, one of the late files talked about how there was a lot of switching that happens so that they could do some maintenance in the North Greenwich area. That was in 2014 and 2015.

It starts, you know, it starts to beg the question, well, if all that switching can happen in some of the solutions they're looking at
here with the automatic -- with the automatic switching, knowing that some of it will still be manual, it is related to the distribution system, is my point.

So if they can -- if they can make some of these upgrades to the distribution system maybe there wouldn't be the need for the transmission line system. So that was the connection there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Let's see. In response to, I guess, it's the first question from the Siting Council on page 2 of 2 , you question -- and I think several others, OCC and several others had questioned the applicant's reliance on the 2013 system peak load, rather than, as you said, updated peak load from 2014, 2015.

I think you make a similar point in question four and I think -- and unlike where I was sympathetic to your term of "vehement," I was very unsympathetic to your statement that the weather-related incident which created the peak load in 2013 was an anomaly.

And this obviously, I guess, there's still disagreement on this issue of
whether there is such a thing called climate change, extreme events. But don't you think that it would be incumbent on all of us, but particularly our utility, that they should prepare for that, and that 2013 is not an anomaly? The anomaly was probably this past year when we had a record-breaking heat, but it happened in December.

But that didn't affect -- probably in a positive way it affected the electricity usage for that during that, that December heatwave, but that could have happened in August of 2015. It's the hottest year on record -- if you believe the scientists, and maybe you guys don't. I don't know.

But I'm just really -- I really take issue with saying 2013 is an anomaly. It's never going to happen again, just like the hundred-year storm may have happened three years ago and the last two years we didn't have a storm of that category. So let's just forget it. I mean, you want to try to answer that?

Because it really disturbs me that you're making that -- what seems to be the point that, you know, it happened in 2013. We're not going to have any extreme weather events, or if
they happen they're going to happen in the winter and we don't have to worry about them.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, I very much believe in climate change.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, then don't use the word "anomaly."

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, what happened in 2013 is that you're talking about those five days and that's their representation, that even though 2015 was hotter, 2013 had those five hot days in a row, which is why it went up. But the point I'm trying to make is that we know that there's 135-MVA capacity that is in -- that comes out of those transformers in Cos Cob. And that's -- that's the power available from the smallest two of the three units there, and we know that because we have to presume that the largest of the three is inoperable at any one time. That's how they have to operate.

So for the electrical system in
Greenwich to be in any sort of Jeopardy the largest transformer has to be out of service and it has to be blisteringly hot for a period of time. We know that it's not just -- it's not just over a long period of time. It has to be a
sustained period of time, as they've represented. So the likelihood of that happening is whatever it is. So if you're willing to grant them the commission to spend 140 million to mitigate an occurrence that has -- I don't -- I'm not an expert in game theory, but I mean I don't know what that number is. But it has to -- let's say, one in a million chance of that ever happening.

So by contrast the utility's original method of preventing that one-in-a-million happenstance was to construct the pipe type cable feeder to feed a new substation. So it has to be quantified that the likelihood of a pipe type cable feeder failure, which historically spews petroleum-based dielectric fluid all about, is an occurrence that is far less than this potential of those two things happening, which is that both -- that one transformer is out and that you have those -- that those five hot days in a row. So that was the point.

Here you are talking about a potential of this failure, which who knows what the likelihood of that is? Where we know the likelihood of there being -- there being an issue
with, based on statistics, of the pipe type failure. I mean, it's -- I would rather put my eggs in the basket of let's just do the transformer upgrade in Cos Cob because that would seem to solve the problem.

And to speak to your point, yes, I do believe there's climate change. Yes, of course there could be five hot days in a row, but the likelihood of there being a transformer out during that time period also seems small to me.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): And I think we wanted to add to that, again we're just asking the question of -- we saw 2013 data. We're trying to ask the question of, is it -- I guess that would be more of a question for you all with your expertise -- is it typical to design for one point? Or is it better to incorporate the data from '14 and '15, which we know now was not incorporated? Is that a reasonable thing to look at, because 2015 was pretty dang hot even -- even in August, that $I$ seem to recall?

Again, $I$ can -- you know, we're just trying to ask that question. I'll take that wastewater analogy again. You can have a terrible storm. You can have Hurricane Sandy and have your
plant running at a peak flow for a certain period of time. And yes, that likelihood of that occurring again, it will happen again, but does it mean I'm going to build a whole other treatment plant? Or does it mean I'm going to look at changing my equipment size? So we're just trying to ask the question and say, should that be looked at?

THE CHAIRMAN: If there was not this issue, which at least one of you seem to agree, of climate change your point would be well taken. But somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 plus countries in Paris seem to agree that it was an issue and it's going to get more significant, not less significant. So coming up with these -Let me finish please, please. I
know you can't wait, but --
So coming up with these averages, I don't think that's how in Europe -- I don't that's how they figure, for example, whatever the hundred-year flood or ten-year flood or whatever is determined. But $I$ don't think that's what Charleston, South Carolina did.

Well, we didn't have any flooding for two or three years, so let's just lower the
standards. And then they got, I think it was maybe over -- I don't remember, over a 500-year flood.

So I just think in light of climate change -- which as I say, it's not universally accepted. But it is -- by those who accept it, at least one of you seem to say that you did, that we're going to get more significant events and they could happen in the summer and not just in December, but I think we've exhausted that.

When $I$ hear taking an average I get -- I think for forecasting in general it makes sense, but it's a much bigger challenge in this day and age.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah, and I don't think I'm -- I'm not trying to say we're taking an average and I'm not trying to suggest you -- I'm just asking if it's -- I think we were just asking the question about if it's routine to plan for a peak based on one point.

You know, presumably there were -there was a mass of data in there. And again, if we're looking at forecasting increases I would hope that absolutely those increased forecasts that we talked about in one of our questions in
here are based on taking into account some of this kind of weather that we expect to see.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Even if you did go -- if you accept the 2013 to 2023 forecast there's only a difference of 9.2 MVA, and they're proposing 134 MVA to cover that. So even though there's less than 7 percent more capacity than what presently exists they're proposing a hundred percent to offset that. So even using the forecast it still is a question to me as to why 134 is needed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's the value of you being able -- finally deciding to sit at the table because you can ask those questions. In your previous stance of just sitting in the back and sending us very well thought out and comprehensive reports, you didn't have that.

So there is value and I hope you now appreciate that and it also gives us a chance to ask whether you consider them useful and not questions -- or intelligent questions, or not. Anyway.

I did have, $I$ guess, one more, one more point. In response to your second and third question you make the point that the Town has not
experienced significant population growth and, you know, there's an area where you don't have to, you know, bring in an engineer from the West Coast. I think it's pretty clear that that's correct.

And although as Mr. Ashton stated, there are several of us who have a little bit of experience in planning and zoning, my guess is that Greenwich is probably one of the relatively few municipalities in Connecticut that will probably stick pretty closely to their conservation development plan probably when, you know, when some of your grandchildren are around. But there are more issues, though, than just population growth, and over time other things evolve. I mean, homes -- I didn't see any statistics, but at least we've heard -- and maybe this is just hearsay -- that homes in Greenwich tend to be fairly large.

And no matter how good and how efficient they are that, you know, larger does -as the building is torn down or replaced by something larger, it may have higher electrical demand or other things. But that's just an introduction.

Within your conservation and
development plan, do you have a -- I saw a couple of citations to conservation energy, but do you have a whole section, or do you have a sustainability plan that deals with the conservation side and reducing your electric load? THE WITNESS (Savageau): We don't have a comprehensive plan per se. The conservation commission is charged with looking at the energy conservation and we have looked at that in two perspectives. One is working with our community, on our community outreach and we've participated in several of the programs there. And then the other thing is looking at what the Town is doing internally.

And the Town has been doing a lot of different energy conservation work, some of it using some alternative energies, but for the most part looking at being more energy efficient and particularly our school system has been doing most of that.

There's, as you know, the clean energy community program. The Town is participating in that. We have done the benchmarking. We kind of got a little bit hung up on that because there was a transition in staff
when we were working with the Connecticut State University Institute there to do all of our benchmarking for us. And we now have that on track so that we have all of that information. And as staff had changed there it kind of got behind the eight ball a little bit, but we -- so we do have a program where we're looking at that and we've really looked at, particularly with our largest buildings which are our schools, seeing how energy efficient they could be.

And we're working, and we have a capital plan that's moving those along to say, okay. How do we really make sure that everything is working there? So I think we do have a really good program in terms of energy efficiency.

The other thing is we have, I think, probably one of the most robust building departments in the State. And as you know, the state building codes I think, more importantly than all the clean energy programs which are really educating homeowners on how to be more energy efficient, but the most energy efficiency is going to be happening because of the changes in state statute, and the statute requiring the
building codes, you know, be updated.
So for example, we're looking at, in 2016, them adopting the new IECC compliance guide standards for home building for 2012. And these, you know, have to do with the $R$ factors in your home and the energy efficiencies in the home. And I think Connecticut has been on the forefront. We already have the 2009 standards. There's 2012 standards that are going to be going into effect statewide.

And in a community like Greenwich where we do have some older housing stock, but we also have a lot of upgrades, the new building codes are basically saying, any time you enclose a port or any time you're doing some type of energy efficiency work you have to comply with the standards. So as a community that has -- what number of building permits a year?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): About 2,000.

THE WITNESS (Savageau): So we have a lot of upgrades that are happening. So most of our homes are probably meeting a lot of these criterias, which isn't happening in other places with energy stock. So we're working hard to
educate the community, but one of the things that we have found and we found this, like, when we were working with -- on the solarize programs and whatever, there's a lot of our customer -- I'm saying customers. Our residents are already doing a lot of work because of anything they've done in their home and because of the new -- the new energy codes.

And I think it's interesting because IECC has now come out with 215's -- 2015 standards which bring it even to a higher level. And as Connecticut updates its building codes -I'm not sure if it's every two or three years or however many years they do it, they'll be adopting those. And I think that's where you're going to see the real energy efficiencies with where we've seen them with the water supply side.

And I know I serve on the water planning council advisory group and one of the things we're hearing from the water utilities is that they're actually not selling enough water, and there's a real challenge with them taking in enough dollars because they're not selling enough water because of a lot of the energy efficient -excuse me, the water efficiencies put in from
plumbing codes and whatever. And I think you're going to see those same types of energy efficiencies happening with the new building codes.

So I think that it's something you need to be -- we need to be paying attention to as we're talking about demand and where we're going -- and needs.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): To your comment, $I$ want to say I absolutely agree with you that as far as communities go, Greenwich has a history of sticking to their plan of conservation and development and not -- not going off course. So I agree on that point.

And I would, also with the population you've seen a lot of testimony that the population has not increased and it's not projected to increase. But I understand also that from Eversource's comments that it's not necessarily about the number of people, but about the load generated by that number of people and I understand that point.

And in the December hearing particularly there was a lot of talk about this so-called teardown rebuild and how a lot of that
happens in the back country of Greenwich, which is not in the red area that was -- that's on the map on $\mathrm{E}-10$. And $I$ would just note that the -- the significance of that comment is that the Northwest Greenwich substation is handling that area. There's a lot of extra capacity in Northwest Greenwich as has been testified to here. So that teardown rebuild business $I$ don't think is really at issue as it relates to their -- their capacity issues coming out of Cos Cob.

And so again, when you look at it in that area that seems to be this area of concern for them. It's an area that's already developed. And in fact, townwide there's only 175 vacant parcels and I don't -- I don't know how many of those are actually buildable. So it may just be someone split off some land. It doesn't necessarily mean that it's viable for -- for development.

So the point again is that
there's -- it's not like there's a lot of great development potential in that sense as it relates to this load issue, particularly in the area where they have identified the need.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, a quick
question. Has Greenwich established an energy district which allows you to have, you know, create your own microgrid in a populated area?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): So we have not established the microgrid. We did look at that when it came out and we were looking to see, like, okay. Would this, you know, make sense for us? I did look at what they were looking at in terms of the award.

So for example, in the round one that came out in July, July of 2013, there were nine awards made. Most of -- four of them were for big public facilities that were like universities, UConn, Wesleyan, University of Hartford and then the sub base. The rest of them were all for towns for their public works facilities or the town hall public works facilities complex.

And actually the Town of Greenwich already has -- it's not quite a microgrid, but we just put in a new public safety complex and we already made sure during that, that building construction project, that we had the redundancy for that system. So we have actually -- it's double redundant in terms of that.

So when we were looking at what the first needs were and what they were looking to fund during that microgrid program we were already covered because we had just put in this new facility. And we have a combination at, not only the public works facility, but at town hall and a few of our other facilities that, just like what other people were putting in, was either diesel or natural gas generators and whatever. We already had those in place.

Because I think people get confused about the microgrid. That doesn't solve your energy problems. It only keeps you online during emergency situations and we already had that in place. We haven't had a major one in the downtown area. With that area being out, it is our backcountry area with the trees and the powerlines. So that's where we had that distribution problem.

So that said, there were a couple of places that we would look at. So as we move forward if they decide to continue the program we know there are some challenges with funding up at the State. We wouldn't be looking at, is there -do we have an appropriate place to put a microgrid
in the town of Greenwich in the downtown area? And one of the things we probably would look at would be possibly our library and some of those places we use for emergency shelters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll proceed with cross-examination by Eversource.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
I'd like to begin by asking Katie, at the Siting Council's hearing on January 12, 2016, you informed the Council that because the Town was a party that you didn't speak for the Town. And I just wanted to be absolutely clear that today you do speak for the Town? Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): All of us together here. The first selectman is here also.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you. Have you ever worked for an electric utility company in a planning or forecasting role?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: Have you ever held a
position in an organization responsible for providing reliable electric service?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: I'd like to ask a few questions about the November 23rd report. And beginning on page 2 of 26 , you indicate at the top of the page that part of what the Town would do is assist the Council by imparting your knowledge about the type and how much inconvenience that the town residents would be willing to endure in order to achieve the utility's goal.

So is it your position that reliable electric service is the utility's goal and not a goal for all utility customers in the town?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Since it's the utility's application, that was -- that was the angle that $I$ was -- that $I$ was going at. So I should have said, to achieve the utility's goal as outlined in their application.

MS. DUBUQUE: And is it the Town's position that residents of Greenwich should not have to experience any inconvenience if it results from conditions that compromise reliable service?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, that is
not the position. Again, $I$ think we were talking about the issues that occur when any sort of project occurs in town. I think what we were trying to do is -- is make sure that we've outlined some of our concerns. And again, stating that we would want to be a part of the $D$ and $M$ process so that we can work with -- with Eversource to make sure that it's minimized. MS. DUBUQUE: Moving on to page 3 of 26, you indicate that you are quite surprised by Eversource's forecast of such vigorous load growth, and that load growth being 1 percent per year. In light of the evidence in this docket that the ISO New England's forecast is 1.2 percent per year can you explain the basis for your conclusion that 1 percent would be vigorous?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes. The -again, $I$ was coming at this from more of a planning standpoint. So looking at the way the town has already developed and how much development potential there would be in the town, so it was more from a land-use standpoint as it -than it was from an electrical forecasting standpoint. And --

MS. DUBUQUE: Moving on to page --
oh, I'm sorry. Did you want to say something else?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. Next on page 4 of 26 you indicate that you believe that much of the forecasting for potential electric consumption in Greenwich has been influenced by what has taken place in Stamford and other places, rather than a careful analysis of what has taken place in Greenwich.

So could you explain the basis for your belief that Eversource is basing its project on and its forecasting on events, particularly in Stamford?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, my -my thought behind that was, as you've just described, that the ISO is the 1.2. So that, that's a regional type of way of looking at something. And again, when you're talking about the 1 percent, you explained in the record where you came up with that 1 percent.

So my purpose of this, this line of questioning was if -- if again, bringing it back to the land use and what's happening in

Greenwich per se, what kind of population growth,
what kind of expansion are we expecting? Does this mirror what Eversource is outlining in their application?

And you look at -- you look at a City like Stamford where they have a different plan of conservation and development, obviously with different goals than the Town of Greenwich. So that was -- that was the angle that $I$ was coming from there, that it seemed that when you have that kind of growth potential, that it made more sense for a city than it would for the Town of Greenwich.

MS. DUBUQUE: And when --
THE WITNESS (Deluca): And --
sorry. And again, just bringing it back to the rationale of where the 1 percent came from in the first place, it's coming from more of a regional angle.

MS. DUBUQUE: And wouldn't Stamford and Greenwich share same the same concerns about reliable electric service for the region?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, absolutely.

MS. DUBUQUE: And what other places were you referring to in your comment? You
indicate Stamford and other places. Could you tell us what other places you were referring to? THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think just in the, you know, frankly just in the Fairfield County area. I mean that there's going to be a reason why 1 percent was chosen. So if it's not for Greenwich specifically, the microcosm of Greenwich, then it has to be for a regional area. So it's the region of where we -- where we live. MS. DUBUQUE: Also on page 4 of 26 you discuss the 135 MVA and you referred to the OA/FA/FA-2 ratings. And can you explain the differences between these ratings and the sources for this information?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes. The OA -- well, do you want me to -- I mean, I explained it on page 4. I can -- I'm happy to read it into the record if you think that's agreeable, because $I$ explain what it is on page 4. Do you want me to read it into the record?

MS. DUBUQUE: No. No, it's already in the record. No, I'm just asking you --

THE WITNESS (Deluca): So that's what OA/FA -- and OA represents oil air. FA refers to forced air, and FA-2 is a more vigorous
version of FA.
And the point here, and I think this has been answered through the various interrogatories at this point as to -- as to what the capacity is of the transformers and, you know, the relevance of why $I$ was asking the question.

MS. DUBUQUE: My question was really about how you relate those readings to the 135 MVA?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I see. Okay. So the question $I$ was trying to get at is, if they are OA, representing the oil air, they couldn't -- they'd be retrofitted to be more of an FA-2, meaning that there their capacity would increase.

So if we're talking about capacity
issues at Cos Cob the thought was if you've got transformers that could be retrofitted to hold -to have more capacity, then wouldn't that potentially solve the problem as opposed to having to construct a whole new substation and transmission line?

MS. DUBUQUE: On page 5 of 26 you mentioned the ANSI standard 57.1200-1010 setting -- well, actually ten-ten I guess it would
be correctly -- stating it's setting requirements for the transformers at Cos Cob substation. Can you explain what that standard requires at Cos Cob substation?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): So they have to be able to -- the actual construction of the transformers has to be such that they can handle 133 percent of the load indicated on the nameplates for each value, whether it's OA, FA, or FA-2 .

> So should a transformer whose nameplate indicates an FA-2 rating to be a hundred MVA to be subject to a load of 120 MVA -- does not suddenly become a risk for failure? The sole ramification of consistently operating this hypothetical transformer at 133 MVA, which is 133 percent of the nameplate rating, is that its designed life expectancy is reduced from 30 years to 25 years. So the point that I was raising --

MS. DUBUQUE: I'm sorry. Were you reading? Can $I$ just interrupt for a moment?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: You were reading from this particular standard?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I was
reading page 5 of $26-B$. So what $I$ was -- what $I$ was trying to get at there is that if there are these instances where you have to go over the nameplate rating that it doesn't all of the sudden make the transformer blow up.

So if you're in a car and the speed limit is 65 miles an hour and you have to go 80 miles to overtake someone, does that mean that because that you're going, you know, beyond what car should be going at, that is, you know, is that a problem?

So if you're overtaking someone in the lane, that's one thing. But if you're driving from Greenwich to Maine at 80 miles an hour maybe that -- maybe that will have more of an impact on the car. So that was -- that was what I was trying to get at here.

MS. DUBUQUE: But isn't that particular standard the standard that defines the specs for oil-immersed transformer manufacturers in building transformers?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Isn't it -can you repeat the question?

MS. DUBUQUE: Isn't that particular standard the standard that defines the
specifications for oil-immersed transformer manufacturers in building the transformers? THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I see.

I'd have to -- I'd have to go back and refer back to that section to find out.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. We'll just move on. On page 8 of 26 you indicate that it may well be that load projections offered in the application by the utility are not entirely accurate. Have you performed any studies or evaluations of load projections that you believe are more accurate?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Can you refer on the page, where you are on page 8 ?

MS. DUBUQUE: Page 8 of 26.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, yes.
Thank you.
So again, that that spoke to the question, which I think has now been answered through the interrogatories after I wrote this in November, that the question was if you, or the issue is that if you have something, you know, a peak load in 2013 and then we find out that it's -- it's so much hotter in 2015, why is it that 2015 had such a lower peak load in the end?

And I think that that has been addressed by the 2013 having a 5-day period, as opposed to perhaps not that long of a time in 2015. So that was where $I$ was coming from there.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. So my question was, have you performed any studies or evaluations of the load projections that you think are more accurate? Because your statement is that the information is -- might not be accurate. So I'm just asking whether you have performed any studies.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I have not performed any studies.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you.
On page 9 of 26 you indicate that it's possible that power could end up in Stamford. And I'm wondering why this would be an issue for Greenwich when some Greenwich customers are served from Stamford?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): But you're on number 5 on page 9?

MS. DUBUQUE: Page 9 of 26 , yes.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): So this, this came -- what I was asking there, or what I was commenting on there was power is coming in
from Stamford to Cos Cob. So the question was, if that's the case does that also mean that power goes from Cos Cob to Stamford? And if that's the case, perhaps there was some switching that occurred due to some something that happened here in that area that would have made the 2013 peak load higher.

So it was really just asking if power comes one way, presumably it could go back the other way. And if that's the case, perhaps there's something in Stamford that happened during 2013 to have that, to have that peak load such the way that it was.

MS. DUBUQUE: So it's not the Town's position that Stamford customers couldn't be served, or other customers couldn't be served, and that only Greenwich substation should only serve Greenwich customers?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Certainly not.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you.
Page 14 of 26 . I'm going to start
first with, did you have a chance to review Eversource Energy's response to OCC-64 that included the 2014 usage among the various towns?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't have it in front of me.

MS. DUBUQUE: Could you possibly
look at it?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah.
MS. DUBUQUE: All set?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: So based on this
information that has been sworn to, you can see the total kilowatt hours for Stamford and you can see them for Greenwich.

Now on page 14 of 26 you state that it should not be ignored that at present the electrical consumption of Stamford is more than three times that of Greenwich. Now is that consistent with the OCC-64 response based on this chart?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It doesn't. It doesn't appear so. This, this data became available in December.

MS. DUBUQUE: So could you possibly tell us what was the basis is for your opinion that Stamford's consumption was more than three times of Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I would have
to go back and look and see where I -- where that was. I'm not sure if it was based on the population. I'd have to go back and look and see why -- where that came from. I don't have the answer. I can find out for you.

MS. DUBUQUE: No, that's okay. And would you agree that it appears to be about 60 percent higher based on these numbers, assuming my math is correct?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm not very good at math. So I'm going to go with what you said. That's about right.

MS. DUBUQUE: Subject to check it's about 60 percent higher. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm better with a calculator.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you.
On page 25 of 26 , we're moving to the end of this document, you state that the Town's role is to ensure that when a construction project is completed that the site is left equal to, or if not superior in every way than it was prior to commencement of any work.

And are you suggesting that this superior standard be adhered to for this project
if it's approved by the Council?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, what I'm suggesting here is that we in the Town very much want to work with Eversource and we want to make sure that this, this project is done in such a way that it works for Eversource and it works for the Town.

And what I mean by that is that we collaborate together to ensure that the impacts are minimized during construction and that post construction the -- whatever the route is, that it's in a way that is done in respect -- in a respectful way to the town.

MS. DUBUQUE: But my question was, what would be the standard? Is your standard that the site be left equal to or superior since you've stated both in this letter?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, if I
have a choice I would go with superior.
MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): But I
suppose $I$ would -- we would accept equal to.
MS. DUBUQUE: And on page 25 of 26 , you may recall earlier when I objected to this particular exhibit, $I$ read the quotation about the
town staff obtaining input from industry professionals on all of the issues that were reflected in your letter. But you have not identified any of those industry professionals.

Correct?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): That's correct.

MS. DUBUQUE: And do you have a written agreement with any of these industry professionals to provide services in this docket?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: And were these industry professionals provided with full copies of Eversource's application at the time of your letter?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No. It was -- if I may? It was in the September meeting, I believe it was. I submitted at that time some references to the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. I think they're referred to. So that that's some written documentation that $I$ used to get some of this information.

MS. DUBUQUE: So it wasn't necessarily talking to qualified experts. You were reading articles. Is that what you're
saying?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): All of the above, yes. Talking, I spent some time speaking with Ms. Bachmann. Spent some time, yeah, as I stated here, with industry professionals with considerable knowledge and experience. I've looked at articles, like you said. I've looked at publications, used the internet, the Energy.gov, which is where I found the transformer manufacturers.

MS. DUBUQUE: And did those professionals help you prepare today?
the witness (Deluca): Not specifically, no.

MS. DUBUQUE: And have you consulted them on an ongoing basis throughout the docket?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: On page 26 of 26 you also state that what is available to us at present seems superficial in its depth of investigation. Is it still your position that Eversource's application, 44 exhibits, including about 284 interrogatories and late files, including some with multiple parts, are superficial?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): At this
stage we're thrilled that the questions have been asked and we appreciate that they've been answered. So I don't believe that -- there's a big difference between where this application was at the end of the municipal consultation filing and where it is today.

MS. DUBUQUE: So the depth of the investigation is no longer superficial?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It's -- no.
MS. DUBUQUE: Now attached to the November 23rd report was the Bruce Park overhead simulations that you submitted to the Council. And did you submit those with Eversource's permission, or All-Points' permission?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, once a document is submitted to the Town of Greenwich it's subject to the Freedom of Information. So I wasn't aware that there was any need to do that considering that it's public record.

MS. DUBUQUE: I just asked the question if you had their permission?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Did I ask them specifically whether that could be done? No, but just by virtue of the Freedom of Information
laws, yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: And would you say that one of the important responsibilities of the Greenwich Planning and Zoning Commission is to prepare a long-range plan for future development?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: And is reliable electric service essential for future development?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: Is reliable electric service critical to the day-to-day operation of businesses in towns, and the comfort and safety of your residents?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: And are you generally familiar with the Town's annual report for fiscal year 2013/2014, specifically the building and inspection division?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm more familiar with the planning and zoning division, not so much the building inspection division.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. Would it surprise you if I told you that there was 2,286 building permits listed in the Town's report, representing an 8 percent increase over fiscal
year '12, 2012/2013?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: And are you aware
that there's a significant number of residential add and alter permits, that there's actually a separate category for that?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: And that the new residential permits exceeded a hundred for the first time since fiscal year 2007/2008?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah, when we're looking at -- you're looking at which annual report?

MS. DUBUQUE: Annual report fiscal year 2013/2014.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): And which page are you on? Do you have it in front of you? MS. DUBUQUE: I do have it in front of me. And it would be on page 113 and 114. And I only have one other fact. Are you aware of the construction value reported in that section of the annual report, about 409 million, a 49 percent increase over fiscal year 2012/2013 which is the highest since fiscal year 2007/2008?

MS. KOHLER: Are you referring to
something that's in the record.
MS. DUBUQUE: Yes, the annual report is in there. There was administrative notice taken of it, yes.

Just are you generally aware of this building department construction activity? THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yes. Yes, I can speak to that because what's easy to speak to that is that in any given year when we're dealing with certain revenues, if we have a school that has undergone a large reconstruction we can often see a bump in our permit revenue from that. We see what Denise spoke to, which is a lot of the teardown rebuild which we're talking about. So that while we have a lot of -when someone might look at it and say, oh, these are new building permits, it doesn't mean that it's a newly developed lot from zero. It's, frequently what it's related to is that somebody demolished a home and then built a new structure on the parcel.

MS. DUBUQUE: But you don't have any actual data. That's your understanding of what these figures mean?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): That is --
that is what those figures mean. The building inspection division is part of the department of public works.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. Thank you. Do you know who prepared the Toshiba drawing?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes. Well, I mean, other than Toshiba? What do you mean by that.

MS. DUBUQUE: Who? The person, please.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm going to have to get onto the Internet.

MS. DUBUQUE: That's fine. I'll
move on -- or the WEG drawing for that matter. Are either of those folks here today?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, no.
They're not here today.
MS. DUBUQUE: And did you tell both Toshiba and WEG that their drawings were being introduced as evidence in this docket?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, but again, they submitted it as -- to a town entity. They knew that $I$ worked for the Town of Greenwich.

MS. DUBUQUE: No, I just ask you if they knew. Okay. Can you explain the notation on
the WEG drawing that says, WEG's property, forbidden reproduction without previous authorization?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It's a notation on the drawing.

MS. DUBUQUE: So would it seem to suggest that you would need their permission to file it?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, again it's filed in a municipal environment, and in the State of Connecticut environment. So then they -when $I$ asked, requested the information from them I stated that I am from the zoning department of a municipality, and could I please have a drawing?

MS. DUBUQUE: Right. But my question was, wouldn't that notation seem to be inconsistent with filing something without their permission.

MR. BALL: I'm going to just object to the line of questioning. I appreciate Attorney Dubuque's effort to protect Toshiba, but obviously that when they submitted a document to the Town of Greenwich at that point the issue is one under FOIA. It becomes public record, as Ms. DeLuca stated, rather than surmising as to what that
notation is going to be.
THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to both sustain the objection, and I'm also going to say we're going to break for lunch. And we will resume at 1:45.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 1:01 p.m. to 1:48 p.m.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll now resume the cross-examination with the Town by Eversource.

MS. DUBUQUE: Good afternoon. I'd like to just go back for just a few more questions about the transformer drawings, just quickly. Do you know if they included the tap changer that Mr. Bowes mentioned was necessary in his prefiled testimony?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I did not request a tap changer, so $I$ don't believe that they did.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. So if they don't have a tap changer, do you know how Eversource would be able to control voltage?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, but I would -- I think part of the -- no, I don't.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. And I think
you stated that these drawings were just furnished to you by the manufacturers. So there was no sense of compatibility with Eversource's equipment or the requirements of ISO New England's operating procedures, or any of the clearances in the national electrical safety code?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I had sent them the floorplan for the station. And so I assumed based on the fact that they're a manufacturer that they would look at the plan and see whether or not an 80-MVA transformer could fit there. So I did not specifically ask them about those specifics.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. And do you know if they would require foundations?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I didn't ask them that specific question.

MS. DUBUQUE: Now in the
interrogatory responses, question 1 at the bottom you referred to 80-MVA transformers, two 80-MVA transformers as being sufficient. If one of those transformers was out of service such as for maintenance do you know how Eversource would be able to serve the load of that transformer that goes out?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I think -- no. I had assumed that there would be three transformers there, but only two of them would be, you know, based on how these things work. So only two would -- assuming that the third was out of service, that that would be two at any time.

So that's where you get the 160
MVA, which exceeds the 134. So the assumption was that there was three, but one of them would be inoperable.

MS. DUBUQUE: Okay. And assuming for the sake of argument that these larger transformers could fit at Cos Cob and they would provide more capacity, how with the Town propose to solve the problems that the project addresses with respect to the overloads on the feeders between Cos Cob and Prospect?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I would just say we're not suggesting that we -- to have a solution. We're just asking the question. So it seems starting back with the transformers that the question is -- that the issue is that there is a need issue.

So the question is, couldn't that,
that need issue be addressed with the transformer upgrade? I understand that there's these others with the -- with the line going from Cos Cob to Prospect and then the transformer at Prospect. So that's why I asked, asked the question yet again, couldn't there be a 27-K line upgrade?

So you had testified at one point, Eversource had, that there was some fixes to the lines that were needed over the years recently. So the question was, couldn't -- couldn't that line just be upgraded?

And conversely couldn't the Prospect transformers be upgraded? And/or couldn't there be some switching that occurred along the whole distribution network that would negate the need for that transmission line? So it was questions as opposed to problem solving.

MS. DUBUQUE: And I believe you said that you, the Town's position is that the re-closers could help solve the problem and improve reliability in Greenwich. And are you aware that if you added re-closers you would have to increase the height of poles in Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, that was the -- that was the issue with the reliability
with the distribution line.
MS. DUBUQUE: Right, but that's what you would have to do.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
Right.
MS. DUBUQUE: You would have to add higher poles and also you would need more tree trimming?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
MS. DUBUQUE: And is it the Town's position that more tree trimming would be advantageous?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): More advantageous in -- I don't -- what do you mean by your question? I'm not sure I'm fully following your question.

MS. DUBUQUE: Well, in terms of your solution that if you were asking the question about additional re-closers, that tree trimming would be necessary in order to implement that solution. So if --

THE WITNESS (Siebert): So if what you're talking about is tree trimming in specific locations to address specific pieces of infrastructure, I think that's something that the

Town has always been happy to work with Eversource on.

The Town saw the changeover of poles along, for example, the length of North Street. Much taller poles going in, and they supported that project. We helped make sure traffic could flow while that was going on in order to help the health, so to speak, of the distribution network.

MS. DUBUQUE: And you've indicated that the Town would still be vulnerable to storm outages, but Mr . Bowes has testified on October 6th that -- and in response to OCC-80, automation between Cos Cob substation and the new Greenwich substation could automatically restore power. So --

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, he said, in essentially all of the town, because he did -- he did also state in October that there was a significant -- that there were areas of town that would still be subject to the manual switching.

MS. DUBUQUE: Correct. But again, you've indicated that this project does not help with the storm outage situation. And in light of
this testimony have you reevaluated that position, that some of Greenwich would be improved with the new Greenwich substation, in effect, as part of the addressing storm outages? THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I think if there's -- I mean, obviously there's redundancy built into the distribution system already with switching. And so if there's any increase in that switching for it to be automatic, I think that that's valuable. Presumably that can happen on the distribution system without a transmission system being employed.

So again, with Mr. Bowes' testimony he was -- he was acknowledging that a portion of the town would still be manual. So I think any move towards automatic is positive, but obviously there's a balance in there.

MS. DUBUQUE: And you also mentioned the $4-\mathrm{kV}$ conductors, undergrounding $4-\mathrm{kV}$ conductors, $13.2-\mathrm{kV}$ conductors. And would the Town be willing to pay for the service conversions because each customer would need to be converted?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I think that's a much bigger question. I mean, we'd obviously have to understand more about -- about
specifically about what you're referring to there. MS. DUBUQUE: Well, in your filings you've indicated that you think that part of the reliability of the system could be improved by varying these conductors, but there are costs associated with these conductors. And I'm trying to get at who you think would be paying those costs?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I would just say that we're -- we would like to continue to work with Eversource to upgrade the distribution system.

MS. DUBUQUE: And are you aware that PURA actually requires the replacement of overhead distribution facilities with undergrounding to be at the Town's expense, not at Eversource's expense?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I
don't -- I mean, are we talking about the transmission line application, or are we talking about redoing the distribution system throughout town?

MS. DUBUQUE: Well, we're talking about the Town's position in these comments, that this project is not needed because you could be
doing these other things to the distribution system.

So I'm trying to get at if you're going to do the things that you suggest, including the additional re-closers and the undergrounding. And you have stated that this would strengthen the reliability of service in town and there wouldn't be a need for this project. Then I'm trying to get at where -- what is this position based on and who would be paying for it?

MS. KOHLER: I'm sorry. Are you addressing a particular interrogatory response? That might be helpful.

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes, I referred to, I think in the very beginning it was question six that cites these -- it's question five, which indicates that the project does not address storm hardening, and you have these options. So could you tell me more about these options in terms of who would pay for these options for the changes to the distribution system?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I see.
Okay. No, not at -- I don't think we could at this time because we don't -- we don't have a proposal in front of us that addresses those
things.
MS. DUBUQUE: And for the storm and non-storm events are you aware of what the leading cause of electrical outages is?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): For --
sorry. For storm and?
MS. DUBUQUE: Storm and non-storm outages, what is the leading cause for electrical outages? I'm just checking if you know.

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Trees.
MS. DUBUQUE: Can you repeat?
THE WITNESS (Spaman): Trees.
MS. DUBUQUE: And would you say that the Town would be more supportive of enhanced tree trimming to improve the distribution system?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I think that all we can say is we'd like to work with Eversource to increase the reliability of the distribution system with a plan, you know, and a discussion and a collaboration.

MS. DUBUQUE: You've mentioned that you think there should be some additional undergrounding for the hybrid route. Is that correct?

MR. BALL: Are you talking about

LFE-3, the proposed route along the Metro-North Railroad?

MS . DUBUQUE: Yes.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't
think -- actually, the answer to Mr. Mercier earlier today, our position is that we favor the overhead/underground hybrid route over Bruce Park, but the variation within that Metro-North line we have not taken a position on.

Can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MS. DUBUQUE: I asked about the additional undergrounding on the hybrid route.

MR. BALL: Is there a particular interrogatory that you were referring to?

MS. DUBUQUE: I'll go back to that question. I know we're pressed for time.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): If you're referring to the last, the easternmost pole?

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes. Yes, we would prefer that to be either underground in that area or either shifted, shifter further -no, I'm sorry. No, it would be the western most pole and we would want it to be shifted to the
east further and/or underground from the penultimate pole.

The reason being that that
intersection there with Greenwich Avenue,
Steamboat Road, Railroad Avenue and Bruce Park Avenue is a very common intersession of our downtown. And so to have that large pole there we questioned whether it was possible to increase the section of underground in that area and/or offset the pole so it's not such a prominent part of the intersection.

MS. DUBUQUE: So that would be an aesthetic concern, largely?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: Would you like us to stop now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I guess we have to. We have an anomaly in our process for reasons which I won't go into. We have to briefly open another docket. We will resume 461 very shortly.
(Whereupon a recess was taken from
2:01 p.m. to 2:21 p.m.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now resume
Docket 461, cross-examination of the Town by
Eversource.

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, thank you, but I have no further questions.

Thank you, panel.
THE CHAIRMAN: So now, next will be cross-examination, if there is any, by the Office of Consumer Counsel.

MR. ROSENTHAL: We have no cross for this panel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Cross-examination by Parker Stacy? (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The attorney for Pet Pantry?

MR. BERGAMO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the panel.

Pardon me if my voice doesn't come out clearly. I've got a little bronchitis.

Mark Bergamo. Good afternoon.
Referencing the Town of Greenwich letter to the Siting Council, dated November 23rd, 2015, was there any response to your letter from the applicant?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now you stated in your letter that need had not been demonstrated
by the applicant. Is there any specific reason the need has not been demonstrated?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think it's more of a question. And the issue is that if -if we accept the growth projection out to 2023, they -- there, there's a need stated of 144.2 MVA , and at present we're told that there's a capacity of 135 MVA. So that would mean that we're in need of an additional 9.2 MVA by 2023.

And so to make up for this projected less than 7 percent, more capacity than what presently exists, they're seeking to build a new substation that would increase the present capacity by a hundred percent at the cost of 140 million.

So our question is, is that the right way to go about things? And couldn't some of that capacity be achieved by, for an example, again the transformer upgrade at Cos Cob? And I understand that there's a question about whether or not the transformers fit. I think there's still a question.

We've, you know, contacted the manufacturers, and just on a very general level, asked them whether the transformers could fit.

They provided drawings that show just from a purely spatial standpoint they could fit. So I think that there's still a question as to whether or not that the $80-$ MVA transformers could fit there, because if they could that clearly would provide the 160 MVA that would be offsetting the 144 that is projected by 2023.

MR. BERGAMO: That was one of the alternates that you were given from the applicant?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): One of the alternates?

MR. BERGAMO: Yeah, was there any alternates given, rather than install these new transformers? Was there any alternates given by the applicant to the Town?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Not that I'm aware of, other than obviously the application.

MR. BERGAMO: Right. Now did you get any other independent information from any other source that denotes that there's not a need for this particular project?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Can you repeat the question, please?

MR. BERGAMO: Did you consult with anybody independent other than within your
internal capacity for consultation as to whether or not this project was necessary on the Town's behalf?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): We have no expert on record.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now have you looked at the answer to QLF-20 that was submitted to the Connecticut Siting Council by CL\&P dated January 14, 2016, which shows the Connecticut electric annual calendar sales from Eversource?

MS. KOHLER: Hold on a second.
It's Eversource's response to 20?
MR. BERGAMO: Yes, it is.
MS. KOHLER: And I'm sorry. The date is January 14th?

MR. BERGAMO: January 14, QLF-20. Do you see what I'm referring to?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Not yet. I'm sorry.

MS. KOHLER: Hold on one second.
Okay.
MR. BERGAMO: As you have the chart before you, is that consistent with your prior testimony that there is practically no growth in the town of Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I would say yes, in that the year 2010 the residential Connecticut electrical annual calendar sales for Eversource was at $10,196,000$, approximately. And in 2015 it was at $10,094,000$. So there seems to be a decrease on the residential side and similarly on a commercial side, and also industrial.

MR. BERGAMO: And up to 2015 has that increased or gone down?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): There's been a decrease from 2010 to 2015.

MR. BERGAMO: Is this consistent with your prior testimony that there has been no growth in the town of Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah, I
think that's consistent with our comments that there has been change and that we've had building permits and there's been energy conservation. And so I think that that is consistent, yes.

MR. BERGAMO: So it's slowly going down rather than increasing?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
MR. BERGAMO: Has your commercial or industrial basis increased at all? Are there
any new businesses that have been coming in?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, yes.
We -- we always have turnover and there has been approvals for change within the Town.

MR. BERGAMO: And what type of changeover is that? Is that highly industrial?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, I would say it's along the order of additions to commercial areas and -- and change of uses of commercial areas. That's generally what we would review in planning and zoning.

MR. BERGAMO: And could you explain what type of changes in uses? Do they affect the system, electrical system at all? Are there increases as far as your observation of electrical usage?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, we have had some, some buildings that have been LEED certified, but you know, beyond that I couldn't -I couldn't speak to the exact energy consumption of those premises.

MR. BERGAMO: Would you like the chart to speak for itself?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, thank you.

MR. BERGAMO: NOw with regards to alternates, have any alternates been discussed with the Town, between the Town and the applicant as far as the proposed substation?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, I mean, not since the application process started. We inquired of the applicant prior to that, but nothing since the application has been filed.

MR. BERGAMO: Any information that's been given would have been given through this hearing process?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right. I mean, we -- there was, you know, discussions of routes but not one -- and we asked, inquired of Eversource, you know, about the Metro-North line, for an example.

I mean, as you saw filed in similar responses here there were questions about what it might look like that was -- the photo simulations that have been discussed with the first selectman's office and Eversource.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. So there's no additional information that you received?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Correct.
MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now with
regards with the lines going through Bruce Park, is the Town in favor of this, this line going through Bruce Park, the proposed?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we've heard for umpteen times the answer to that, so I don't think it's necessary to repeat.

MR. BERGAMO: Oh, that's right.
You just reminded me, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: If you didn't hear anything else at this hearing, I think that's it.

MR. BERGAMO: Thank you.
Okay. Now to the best of your knowledge, are there any improvements that the city is going to work with the applicant for the distribution system through Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Can you repeat the question, please?

MR. BERGAMO: In other words, are there any plans that are forthcoming that the applicant has with the Town to upgrade the distribution system, to the overheads? THE WITNESS (Siebert): Not that I'm aware of. THE WITNESS (Deluca): I would say that we try to work collaboratively with

Eversource and that's an ongoing discussion. But is there something on the table right at this moment? Not that we're aware of.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Would a new substation on the Railroad Avenue property or anywhere else for that matter improve, in your opinion, the restoration of electricity in a storm event or an emergency event that might bring down power lines?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I
don't see how because if the -- unless there was a storm event that, I mean --

THE WITNESS (Siebert): I think we asked the question. We've been trying to understand the answer to that question ourselves to an extent.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're not required. I mean, if you don't know you can also say that.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well I mean, it's sort of a loaded question because it's, you know, it's difficult to answer, frankly. I mean, is the new substation going to dramatically increase the reliability of the distribution lines? I mean there, there's issues with switching and there's so many moving parts to
that.
It's, you know, I don't think that it's been proposed to deal with the reliability issues of the distribution system per se. I think it's a capacity issue from what $I$ understand from their application.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. What type of -- I don't think we've heard from the Town as far as the city's own efforts to improve the electrical systems. Is there any plan in place currently to improve the electrical systems, for example, the poles, the replacement poles, overhead wires and things of that nature? I believe it was mentioned earlier.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): That infrastructure belongs to the utility, so the utility company is responsible for maintaining its electrical infrastructure.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. And is it true that you're maintaining that really the new plant is just going to be superfluous as far as the amount of electrical supply?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, just based on the simple math if you agree with their forecast that 9.2 MVA is needed in 2023 and
they're proposing 134 MVA, based on that simple math it appears so.

MR. BERGAMO: So would it exceed the design?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right, or the need, the stated need.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. I see.
Now during this past summer were there any electrical outages experienced by the city that the Town was aware of?

THE WItNESS (Deluca): We don't have that information handy at the moment.

MR. BERGAMO: Now the applicant has provided that 2013 experienced some problems with regards to, I believe it was the five-day output, the heat. Was there anything similar to that experienced in 2014 or 2015 to the Town's knowledge?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't know the answer to that question at this time.

MR. BERGAMO: That's fine. Now with regards to the population of Greenwich, has it grown or has it decreased? Do you have any knowledge as far as what has been the current growth or decrease, and what if anything is it?

THE CHAIRMAN: The record has been provided on that, sir.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah, we provided the SERC report on that.

MR. BERGAMO: Is it the Town's expectation that growth will increase or decrease?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): We imagine that it will stay effectively the same. The SERC report has indicated there will be a decrease.

MR. BERGAMO: And with regards to energy-saving programs, to what extent is the Town of Greenwich participating?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): The Town of Greenwich is participating in the clean energy community program. Part of that is working and doing our benchmarking and also outreach to the community.

We participate -- we're a CPACE committee, which means we offer the opportunity for commercial entities to get into the CPACE program. We've participated in the solarize program, so that's primarily where we are. We also purchase, as part of the clean energy community program, we purchase RECs with our renewable energy credits as part of that
alternative energy.
The other piece of that is we are looking at installing, wherever we can, alternative energy. So for example, we put on a 90-kilowatt photovoltaic system on the Glenville School. We've also used some photovoltaic in a couple of our other smaller buildings, and we use them there where we can.

As we put in some new -- another new school we put in some other alternative energies, some heat pumps in terms of for thermal, geothermal type heating. So we've been looking at wherever we can.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): And we've got lighting upgrades and rightsized equipment at our wastewater treatment plant. So every time we do it, when we start our own town projects we're certainly also looking at energy conservation. And we've taken advantage of some of the rebate programs and so on to fund that.

MR. BERGAMO: So is the Town reducing their dependency or their usage?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): We're working towards that goal. Yeah, we've got the benchmarking. We are just solidifying our
benchmarking so that we can actually document, you know, that exact use. But we've been working on all aspects, the street lighting, our fleet. We now have a fleet of hybrids, so we've been participating in that program. So we're working towards that goal.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. And on a private side, I'm hearing what the Town has been doing as far as a municipality. What is the town doing as far as working with the public at large?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): Well, that's what I'm saying. The two -- the two big programs, what was solarize, and we slowly participated in the solarize program. And that was really obviously, not to just get more solar installed, but to bring, you know, get people more familiar in looking at that.

And actually, the solar
installations, prior to holding the solarize program and post holding the solarize program, has increased. So where, you know, we work with folks we now have an application process I think that is fairly easy. Our building department, because of the solarize program, understands solar a little bit more and we're able to get through that, that
building process, which is part of it. So working on that.

And then, again the CPACE program is looking at commercial. We also, I think, encourage LEED buildings. And you know, so anything we're working, we're working with new development coming in. We encouraging, you know, folks to look at LEED certification and whatever with buildings.

MR. BERGAMO: Getting back, getting to your report that's the November 23, 2015, on page 5, is it not true that when you did that report you didn't find any major difference in the temperatures between the years 2013 and 2014?

MS. KOHLER: Can you give us a page number that you're referring to?

MR. BERGAMO: It was page 5.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, right.
The 2015 seemed to be dramatically warmer than the other users, but there we didn't seem to see a major difference in temperature between 2013 and 2014.

MR. BERGAMO: And yet the usage was down in 2015?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): And in 2014.

MR. BERGAMO: In 2014, okay.
Okay. On page 9 of your report, number 6, you discuss the routing of the 8 feeders, but the capacity of the individual circuits and loads that have been carried in the past have not been made available. Was that information given -- later provided to you?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think it was one of the OCC requests.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. And on page 10 of the report it brings up the same issue. As the consumer counselor, namely, can you size up the three transforming units, or add a fourth?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I don't think we suggested adding a fourth. I mean, that kind of speaks to that reliability question that you were asking because -- and I think Mr. Hannon had addressed it at one of the meetings specifically.

Because from what $I$ understood it's not -- it's not a reliability issue as it relates to the transmission line but more as it relates to the transformer, because the transmission line obviously could go between Stamford and Cos Cob and then it's out. And so it's -- it really
becomes a question about the transformer, if I understood that correctly.

And in which case, if that's where this line of questioning was going, is if that's the case then can't you -- can't you upgrade the transformers at Cos Cob, or potentially at Prospect?

MR. BERGAMO: Number 8 on page 11 of the report. Now you went into the analysis of potential under capacity problems. You request a listing of capacity of all the feeders, V-feeders less capacity and loads fed.

Now there was some documentation that's been provided by Eversource. Did that meet your informational needs?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I apologize.
What page was this?
MR. BERGAMO: That's number 8 on page 11.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, okay. And can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Pertaining to the analysis of potential under capacity problems that the Town requested that they get a listing of the capacity of all the feeders, and V-feeders and
list capacity and the load feed be provided. Was that ever provided to you?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Not to us specifically, but $I$ think -- I think it is now part of the record, if $I$ understand correctly.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now are you satisfied with that information? Does that meet your request needs?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I think -- I think there's still -- I think there is still a question, actually.

MR. BERGAMO: Why is that?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): And I think that -- why, or when?

MR. BERGAMO: Why? Why is that?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh. Well, I think that, again it speaks to some of the -- some of the alternative options here, is to the transmission line and what options there are on the distribution side. So I think I understand that's not before the Council, but it is in relation to the transmission line.

So I think that has been -- I think they've answered a lot of the questions in a very generic way, but obviously they've -- they've not
done that full-blown analysis of it, that I've seen at least as part of the record.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now you also mentioned on the last paragraph of page 11 in the report about taking additional capacity at the North Greenwich substation where you feed through the system. Was that a proposed alternate?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): It was a question that was -- that we were asking. That the -- there's been the upgrade to Northwest Greenwich and I think that's been discussed here, that there is an upgrade to Northwest Greenwich. And now there's excess capacity there.

So knowing that there's excess capacity, what could be done on the distribution side to shift that capacity to where the need is in the lower part of town?

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. So you're disagreeing that, in essence, that this so-called load increase that's proposed by the applicant of 1 percent a year is not accurate?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I'm putting it into question. I don't -- I think that's the way to answer that is, I think there's a question as to how that relates to what actually is
happening on the land-use growth side in Greenwich.

MR. BERGAMO: So in other words, are you disagreeing? Or -- I don't know where you're going with that.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't - it's hard for me to reconcile that number. I don't think it's supported when I look at the land use growth. But again, I'm not an electrical engineer, so $I$ don't -- I can't speak to that side of it at all. All $I$ can say is that -- exactly. That's why we're asking the question.

MR. BERGAMO: And it's also in taking in consideration what has been provided by the applicant in QLF-20. It's with regards to the usages for the Town?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right. And to that end I would also note that our plan of conservation and development and zoning regulations have not changed in any way that would -- that $I$ could see any major growth taking place that would change that, that projection going forward.

MR. BERGAMO: Has there been any
large business that has moved in recently within
the last year or so?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
MR. BERGAMO: Okay. No factories?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): No
factories, no large office buildings.
MR. BERGAMO: I'm almost at the end of my questions.

Is there anything specific in nature, okay? That you do disagree with the applicant's application for? I mean, is there anything specific? I mean, I know you've spoken in your report on some generalities. Is there anything more specific that you can speak of?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I'm still failing to understand why if one does agree with the forecasting, why one would want to spend \$140 million on a new transmission line and a new substation to provide 134 MVAs, but only 9.2 has -- is stated as the need by 2023. I'm failing to understand that.

Also I would like to see Eversource document why the transformer upgrades at the Cos Cob substation doesn't work other than just it doesn't fit. I think there that's been put into question in my mind, and it's still a question for
me.
And I also -- I forget how you phrased your question, but $I$ think it's -- just to state it again. I apologize, but I do think that if the Council feels that there is a need for this project that I think that there's a viable alternative down Metro-North, and then Bruce Park should be off the table.

MR. BERGAMO: Now does the Town have any plans to upgrade or enlarge any infrastructure to support any type of growth whatsoever?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): We do have a new school plan. It's an existing school, New Lebanon School and we're proposing to rebuild that school.

MR. BERGAMO: But there's no major growth?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): No.
THE WITNESS (Siebert): No, not on that.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. You made a point in your report and would you please clarify that? It was on the top of page 16 , that a major portion of all the residential customers of

Greenwich would receive no further benefit from a new bulk substation, but to what extent, I mean, to what extent do you have the basis to say that? THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, that that's from the applicant's application where they describe which portions of the town come out of Cos Cob and which are on the North Greenwich and Mianus substations along with the Greenwich network.

So the point was that once built, if it is built, only 52 percent of all the energy projected to be delivered to the town would come from the new substation. So that, that means that the 48 percent that's still remaining would have their electricity delivered by the distribution feeders.

MR. BERGAMO: Now the new substation wouldn't protect the feeders at the Cos Cob for recurrence of lightning strikes?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't see that the new substation would protect it? No, from lightning strikes, I don't see how.

MR. BERGAMO: And can we agree that for all the customers fed from the North Greenwich substation the proposed new substation really will
not do anything for them in that area?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): The new substation?

MR. BERGAMO: In other words, is North Greenwich going to benefit from this new substation, the customers?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, they, I mean, they have indicated on the record that there are some improvements being made to the switching. So from that standpoint, yes, but I mean, there's the switching capabilities is viable on -- you don't need high power transmission lines for that. You can have switching capability on lower voltage lines, too.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. So the $\$ 140$ million, it is your belief it is not going to improve reliability?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I again, I think it speaks to the transformer versus transmission line reliability that $I$ was just speaking of. So if the line from Stamford to Cos Cob goes down, the line goes down. I mean, this project won't address the reliability there.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. So you're not, the Town of Greenwich is not in favor of the
proposed new substation?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): I don't think the need has been demonstrated for it. I still have a question personally on that.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. How would the construction of a new substation impact the downtown area?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): In the form that it is?

MR. BERGAMO: That it is proposed?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, in
terms of the disruption during construction?
MR. BERGAMO: Yes.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, that's obviously a very busy area of town.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): It's certainly going to affect -- It's certainly going to affect traffic. It would affect traffic pretty -- I mean, that's a big one down there.

MR. BERGAMO: Are there any safety concerns with regards to, I believe there's a natural gas facility near that's proposed at the substation?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah. I
mean, there's major safety concerns and I think
we've put those in the record. I mean, for an example, this is a heavily populated area. There's residential nearby. There's a -- there's a low bridge that the fire trucks can't come under. There's a propane filling station nextdoor.

> The substation itself, I know
they're proposing firewalls around the transformers, but again it's, you know, if a transformer catches fire, if you just YouTube transformer fires. I mean, those don't get put out with a fire extinguisher. I mean, that that's, you know, and they've testified about that these stations are not manned, and therefore we have to wait for someone to come and get into the station.

And they gave this testimony from when this happened in Cos Cob. The person that was supposed to be nearby wasn't. It took a long time for the person to come. I mean, so there's -- yeah, there's major safety concerns once the substation is there just based on the location of it. I mean, this is true of any substation in town, of course. I mean, this substation is no different other than that it's
where it's located in a residential area and that it's new. So we're talking about something new. And you know, just back to the disruption area. I mean, it's just such a heavily populated area. So it's the traffic issues, rerouting of all the people that come into the downtown that shop in the downtown. But you know, as we've said, if there is to be -- if there is to be any disruption, obviously we wanted to work, work with Eversource and with the Council through the $D$ and $M$ process and make sure it's done in the best way possible and we're ready and able to help.

But we're, you know, having said that, there's still a question about need. So assuming we can get over that and the line is there we will do everything we can to help with that, with that disruption. But we see it as a major, major undertaking and I don't think that's in dispute here.

MR. BERGAMO: Now, what's the primary road that goes into Greenwich? Is it the Prospect Railroad?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): That's a major, major area of town, Railroad Avenue.

MR. BERGAMO: And that has access to both city hall and it has access to the various points?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, it's within the downtown area. It's where the Greenwich Train Station is located. It's where access is to I-95. It's right around the corner from town hall or the downtown business district. Greenwich Avenue is -- is in that vicinity. There's a lot of converging activity.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Now you pointed out on page 22 of your report that there were a number of items that the application was silent on. Is it your position that you wish no action be undertaken until further information is communicated to the Town?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well I mean, we're in the Council's process now. I mean, ideally if there could be an examination of a transformer upgrade at Cos Cob, if that could be examined and if that seems fruitful, then perhaps that could be done as an interim.

And in the meantime we could -- we could work with Eversource to come up with, you know, transmission solutions down Metro-North and
if it's -- if once the transformers are in and, you know, which I understand would take about 18 months to 2 years. So once they're in if there's -- if it's documented that there's still a need at that time we would have a plan in place. They would have a plan in place to come back to the Council and get that approved. I mean, that would be an ideal situation from our standpoint.

MR. BERGAMO: Okay. Thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next,

Field Point Estate Townhouses.
Christine Edwards.
MS. EDWARDS: Good afternoon.
Thank you for providing us this opportunity to make questions. Some of the questions I had intended to ask have just been asked, but I do want to go into a few things.

You did say that in the process of looking to become more efficient with the resources of the Town spending and such, that you've looked to do some solar photovoltaic energy cells and in different places, and that you've looked at it for schools. Is this something that, with the

New Lebanon School creation that, you're going to
plan for larger use of alternative energy of some kind? Has that been a discussion?

THE WITNESS (Savageau): I can't speak for the building committee, but certainly we'll be looking at energy efficiency as part of the new building codes and under the Connecticut clean Green Bank programs.

Any school receiving funding from the State has to be an energy-efficient school and have what they call -- there's a special term for it. I can't think. Anyway -- but the school, schools have to reach a certain threshold or they wouldn't be in. So we'll be looking at that and how best to go.

THE WITNESS (Spaman): I've said in some building committee meetings, and they are shooting for gold standard LEED, you know, criteria. So --

MS. EDWARDS: With the idea that this will cost the Town less and use less energy off the grid, if you will?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Yeah.
MS. EDWARDS: So that's the commitment of the Town, is to lower energy costs, not to increase them, even if there is building
going on.
In the same way -- and this is probably directed mostly to Katie -- are you finding that more and more of the permits that are coming in for building, just generally older home rip down, new building going up, are you seeing greater use of solar, of the geothermal with more permits in that vein?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, we are seeing, for an example, actually the 330 Railroad location which is the Prospect home.

The -- Mr. Granoff, who is the owner now of that building, his proposal through the planning and zoning commission, there's a lot of energy conservation on that particular building. I just mentioned that example because we're all familiar with that site. So there is solar there and improvements to the windows and to the energy efficiency of the building.

But yes, I would say that that is -- that is true. I mean, even on just the town level the buildings that we've made improvements to, there are -- solar is a big part of that. Green roofs are -- also seem to be quite, quite popular at the moment.

We don't require it per se in our zoning regulations, however people on their own initiative have been going down that direction. Greenwich Academy school, for an example thier rebuild from five or six years ago now included a major, major green roof. And our own high school auditorium building has a green roof there, too.

MS. EDWARDS: And I believe Country
Day?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, I
think -- I think you're right.
MS. EDWARDS: So you're seeing, even though we have the building that's going on, you would see -- or you would say, I guess, and I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but would you say that there's a lowering of usage that's not only being seen at the Cos Cob station, and being documented there, but that this is an increasing phenomenon?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, I
would just point to the, $I$ think it was OCC-20 that we were just looking at. I obviously don't have those numbers. That's Eversource's department, and I think the numbers that they provided in OCC-20 do show that.

I can speak to the -- to the trend that I see in the plans that come through, that come through my office. And yes, certainly there, there's a big -- a big proportion of those development projects that include some of these conservation measures as it relates to energy.

MS. EDWARDS: So as you've said, if the transformer can be increased and that can be really looked at it might completely obviate any need to have a separate substation built given the lack of increased usage of the electricity on a year-by-year basis going forward?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): My question along those lines really had to do with numbers, and numbers only. So based on this, this 9.2 MVA projected in 2023, I mean, if you put in the 80-MVA transformers in Cos Cob it seems that that, you know, that that would cover it. So just based on pure numbers.

MS. EDWARDS: So really what you're looking at here is in terms of need. You would say there's a lack of need across the board from new building construction for residential, for commercial, et cetera, as people are implementing new fuel technology, if you will.

It's not increasing need, even though we're increasing -- we're not having big buildings going in. We're not like Stamford that as a big, big hospital to go in and a huge Harbor Point construction which is drawing more and more on the grid. We're having basically replacement housing?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah. Yes,
I see what you're saying.
MS. EDWARDS: And even though they're bigger houses, their usage is going down because of alternate fuel usages that you are describing. Would you say that would be the case?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, I
haven't looked at a house by house comparison from a teardown rebuild, what the energy load is in that. But isn't OCC-20 -- I think that that chart speaks for itself.

You know, $I$ can say that if you're going from a 10,000 square-foot house to a 15,000, most likely, or even a 5,000 to a 15,000, I mean, it's still the same four people that live there. I mean, you're not looking at 16 people that live there. So the number of people are not incrementally changing.

MS. EDWARDS: So the same with the water usage. Would it be the same? A lot of the electricity will be the same people who only use the rooms they're in, which is more and more of a trend with smart technology.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Right.
MS. EDWARDS: So that really
answers a big block of questions that $I$ have. So even though we are seeing perhaps some increases of size of houses, usage has not changed.

Population is not expanding to an extend that you're having more draw. And in fact the need -THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a question? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, this is the question. So her comment is -- the final question is, you don't perceive that there's this great a need as has been presented in all the meetings that we've had so far, that from a town point of view of new construction, of town construction, et cetera, it's going down, not going up?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I think that the plan of conservation and development and the zoning regulations speak to a development environment that is measured. It is not meant -it is, again like the POCD states, the plan of
conservation and development states it's about conservation first, and then development.

We've not seen any major growth. I think that there's -- we've stuck to what our plan of conservation and development has stated. And the reason why is that we have a zoning schema that is in keeping with that plan of conservation and development. We have a very horizontal form of government, so we have a lot of checks and balances.

We, through the first selectman's office, have a plan implementation committee that reviews how we're doing with the plan of conservation and development on a regular basis that is, again there's lots of checks and balances there.

Our members of the planning and zoning commission are on that, the plan implementation committee, as are members of the RTM, so that it's multilayered. And it's not something that can be changed easily. It has to go back before the RTM, the representative town meeting which is -- how many do we have on the RTM?

THE WITNESS (Siebert): 236.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): 236 members. So again, it's a very horizontal form of government.

MS. EDWARDS: Okay. In addition to that, you're with planning and zoning. What was the zoning like when these initial, way back 50 years ago or so, that area that we're speaking about for a second substation, what was that like at that time?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well, there was a period of time in the late sixties and seventies where there was a lot of office buildings that had -- that had gone up in the Post Road corridor.

MS. EDWARDS: And prior to that, along that Railroad Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, in the Railroad Avenue?

MS. EDWARDS: Yeah.
THE WITNESS (Deluca): No, very, very quiet $I$ would say in that area.

MS. EDWARDS: And now what is the kind of zoning, if you will, that's moved forward there?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Well,
we've -- there's been no zone change per se, however we have seen redevelopment in that area that is in keeping with those zoning regulations. And there's, you know, new businesses that are going into existing spaces and that there's some redevelopment of property, such as along Old Track Road, which is in close proximity to that area. There's a residential building.

The plan of conservation and development talks a lot about residential and how we are a residential community. So I only mention that because there's a lot of people that means that will be -- that will be traversing that area.

MS. EDWARDS: And that means also that instead of being a more commercial, it's going into mixed-use and residential?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MS. EDWARDS: And those condominiums are, say, a million in value as you go up?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, I don't know there.

MS. EDWARDS: Field Point and such?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Oh, yes. I
would say yes that the -- I'm not a, you know,
don't have the figures in front of me but $I$ would say that yes, as you progress further.

MS. EDWARDS: So it's a change.
What about the fact that as one goes down Old Field Point Road there that you have a narrowed area and then you go under a bridge? Have there been trucks that have turned and hit utility poles due to realizing they can't go under the bridge? Because I believe that I had read that, but $I$ wanted to confirm if you had seen that there had been accidents in that area.

THE CHAIRMAN: ExCuse me. I'm getting a little lost about the relevance of these questions.

MS. EDWARDS: It's very important because if we're putting in the facility that's almost at the sidewalk level and you have commercial trucks who can't go underneath a railroad bridge, right at the corner of Field Point Road and Railroad Avenue it's a very small turning circumference.

And I believe I have read that there have been accidents with large major trucks at that utility pole area. So that has a great relevance in terms of you as a Siting Council for
appropriate placement.
THE CHAIRMAN: Can we get a quick answer?

MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, that should be a quick answer.

THE WITNESS (Siebert): Yeah, I think the answer is that it is an area of very low clearance. You can't get fire trucks through there. So there probably has been cases where somebody has not read the clearance sign. We've had issues.

MS. EDWARDS: Okay. Thank you. I just had one other question. Oh, yes. In terms of what you're seeing with planning and zoning at this time for permits, have you received any permits for Bloom boxes for either commercial or residential use? This is an alternate technology for producing electricity.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): The only one that I'm aware of is the fuel cells at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. I don't know if that is a Bloom box, but that's the one that comes to mind.

MS. EDWARDS: Yeah, that would be a fuel cell.

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yeah, that's
the one that comes to mind.
MS. EDWARDS: And more and more
Silicon Valley is seeing that, so we're starting to see that in Greenwich as well. And that would basically be for the Siting Council less usage, again off the grid and a drop in the percentage of growth, electrical pull.

THE CHAIRMAN: We know all about it.

MS. EDWARDS: Okay. Well, I wasn't sure. So my apologies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your job is to ask questions. You're making enough statements. And you said that was your last question.

MS. EDWARDS: I said I think that was my last question, and I think I'm satisfied with your answers. And I thank you very much for the opportunity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Granoff.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: The grouped
intervenors, Bella Nonna Restaurant, Chiropractic, Mr. Berger and Ms. Glass. Is there anybody representing these people?
(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan.
(No response.)
MS. KOHLER: Mr. Chairman, we just have a couple of cleanup questions for the panel. It won't take but five minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just hold on.
Okay. We'll now have
cross-examination by the applicant. There are no -- I don't know what cleanup questions are, or statements. But there are no statements at this point. MS. KOHLER: Okay. I also just wanted to note for the record I think we just needed to administrative notice something that we had on the hearing agenda. I don't believe we did it earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is the State of Connecticut integrated water quality report final, dated October 1, 2014. Is that what you're talking about? MS . KOHLER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to administratively noticing that.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: No objections, so it
is noticed. So yes, it's your turn to go sit in the audience, and it's Eversource's turn to be on the panel.

MR. BALL: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. Will we have the oppurtunity? There were just one or two questions we wanted to clean up with the panel. If you'd allow us?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is going to be short?

MS. KOHLER: It's literally one or two questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some of your people which are various -- and you have a very good team there and I give them a lot of credit, but occasionally their answers tend to be long. So if the questions and the answers can be short I'll allow it. Go ahead.

MS. KOHLER: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your grace.
Mr. Spaman, Attorney Dubuque asked the witness panel about tree trimming to protect the distribution systems in storm and non-storm events. Can you describe what affirmative action Greenwich has taken regarding tree trimming to protect the existing distribution system?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Yeah, we have a policy that, you know, we feel that all Greenwich residents deserve safe and reliable electricity into their homes. And to that end we do have a policy on the tree trimming and we don't deny them any access to the trimming activities. We give them the clearances they want with the exception of ground to sky trimming of trees, which means, you know, cutting all the branches off on one side of a tree.

We feel it's, you know, well, we give them, you know, the use of the electrical power and be able to get reliable power. We don't do that at the expense of good arboriculture, so that we do expect tree work. And any tree that's removed is to be posted. And posted trees, people can object and then, you know, there will be a public hearing on those, on those particular trees.

So we've got a pretty good program and I feel we do work well with, you know, with the utility company. And we'll give permits for certain circuits -- for every circuit that they do and we just try to keep it up, and then we supervise the work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Hannon has a follow-up
question.
MR. HANNON: When you said, give them the clearance they want, who is them?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): The electrical utilities, Eversource.

MR. HANNON: I wasn't sure if you were talking about the power company or the residents. Thank you.

MS. KOHLER: Do have a specific program, though, that's a multimillion-dollar program that's geared toward tree trimming?

THE WITNESS (Spaman): Yeah, we instituted a capital project that we did over three years from 2011 to 2013. That was $\$ 1.4$ million to go through town and find any trees that were defective, hazardous to the public and, not just to the utility lines, but also to the traveling public itself. And we feel that we've had some very good results from hitting those trees and doing that program.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR. BALL: Thank you. If I may?
Ms. DeLuca, there was a question from Attorney

Dubuque about the Town's position. If the Siting Council finds there's a need for the project and it's sited along the Metro-North Railroad corridor, it's going to go up and down underground briefly at certain points. And there was a question about the Town's position as to extended undergrounding, and if I could just clarify that? In LFE-3 you see that segment 4 has an alternative 4B where it would go underground.

Do you see that in LFE-3, Ms. DeLuca?
THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MR. BALL: Okay. And in the most recently filed exhibits by Eversource, which was Late-Filed 25, there were a number of photographs. And one of the photographs is page 3 of 17 which shows a particular intersection. Can you describe what is this intersection?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): That is the intersection where Greenwich Avenue is coming down, traveling south. Bruce Park Avenue is the road over there. Railroad Avenue is the road to the right, and the Steamboat Road would be the one traveling south.

MR. BALL: Okay. In terms of the Town's position, first of all, is this the point
where it would go from overhead to underground to your understanding?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MR. BALL: Okay. And what is the Town's position in terms of extending the underground? Can you describe?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, we were hoping that the underground could extend from the substation. It would go east along Railroad Avenue and it would connect to this pole that is shown on page 3 of 17 .

And we were hoping that instead of that pole there the undergrounding could be extended to the other pole, which is described here as STR2-103, so that the reason being that it wouldn't be in that prominent intersection.

MR. BALL: Okay. And when you said, prominent intersection, this is one of the most heavily traveled intersections in Greenwich, I take it?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes, this is the bottom of the main business district in town.

MR. BALL: Okay. And the pole where it would go from overhead to underground is 119 feet high?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): Yes.
MR. BALI: How far are you asking for, for the extension of the underground?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): I believe it's 300 feet, or less.

MR. BALL: Right. And even if it was moved a hundred feet would that help?

THE WITNESS (Deluca): That would be fine, too. Yes, just so it's offset from that intersection. I think it's 300 feet to the other pole approximately, but if, you know, even if it was just offset a little bit, you know, 150 feet just so it's out of that main intersection there, that would be desirable.

MR. BALI: Thank you. I have nothing further.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll take about a three minute break while we rearrange.
(Whereupon a recess was taken from 3:19 p.m. to 3:25 p.m.)

THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to start with the cross-examination by the Office of Consumer Counsel. Just a word, this is additional information, and that means it's the last, your last opportunity. So $I$ don't want to rehash old
news. There's plenty of that.
Okay. So that was my preamble.
Now I understand you have two new exhibits, or something like that.

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. We will just do this quickly. Our panel has previously been sworn in. We have Ken Bowes, Ray Gagnon, Jacqui Gardell, Mike Libertine. K E N N E T H B. B O W E S RAYMOND $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{N}$
 MICHAEL LIBERTINE, recalled as witnesses, having been previously sworn, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. DUBUQUE: We have two new exhibits since the last hearing. Exhibit 43, Eversource Energy responses to OCC interogatory set 6, dated February 16, 2016; and Exhibit 44, Eversource Energy Late-Filed Exhibits 15 to 25, also dated February 16, 2016.

And I'd like to ask Mr. Bowes and Mr. Gagnon and Ms. Gardell, did you prepare or oversee the preparation of these exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I did.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I did.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, I did.
MS. DUBUQUE: And do you have any clarifications, corrections or additions?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do not.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I do not.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): I do not.
MS. DUBUQUE: To the best of your knowledge, is the information in these exhibits true and accurate?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it is.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, it is.
MS. DUBUQUE: And do you adopt
these documents as exhibits?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I do.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: And also quickly, as to the heights on the photo simulations in Exhibit 44, Late-Filed 25, I'd like to ask Mr. Libertine if he -- did you prepare the photo simulations with the structure heights added, or oversee their preparation?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I
did.
MS. DUBUQUE: And are they true and accurate?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
MS. DUBUQUE: Do you have any
corrections, clarifications or additions?
THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.
MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I respectfully request that the Council admit into evidence Exhibits 43 and 44 as full exhibits. And if I could continue, I also have two administrative notice items.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MS. DUBUQUE: And the first is that on December 1st the Council granted Eversource's request to take administrative notice of the draft 2014/2015 forecast of loads and resources report. The report is now final, so we would like administrative notice of the final report.

And also the town panel witnesses mentioned the Long Island Sound cable leak issue. And we would like administrative notice of Document 224 of the Siting Council, and that is the Long Island replacement cable proceeding.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections to the admission of these reports and documents?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Not from OCC.
THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? No?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none, these exhibits are admitted. And we'll continue with the cross-examination by OCC.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
I'd like to start with OCC-79, please. And in the OCC-79 response Eversource offered the sales totals excluding Metro-North in a confidential attachment. And our question is whether Eversource might be willing to provide the list of towns in order of usage without the actual usage figures in the manner that is in OCC-64?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I could answer it in a general term. The reason it's confidential is it's, you know, specific to a single customer, so we don't release customer specific information without their consent.

In this case it would change the order of those towns there were previously, and Greenwich would become number four and Waterbury
would become number three.
Is that sufficient?
MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, that is sufficient. Thank you.

MS. BAIN: Margaret Bain for the Office of Consumer Counsel. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to start with Late-File 12.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I have it.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Here the response tells us that the load demand for North Greenwich is not solely due to usage by North Greenwich customers. Is that correct? In other words, there was switching.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There was a brief period of time, yes, where a load was transferred to North Greenwich problematically as part of an electrical outage.

MS. BAIN: And it says that actually, the 33 percent increase in demand at the North Greenwich substation between 2010 and 2015 was a result of switching operations which were implemented in response to a fault that occurred on a circuit not normally fed by North Greenwich substation. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.
MS. BAIN: So what was the load that was switched to North Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was load normally fed from the Prospect Street substation.

MS. BAIN: Was it from a few customers, or was it just a certain transformer? Or what was it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be a block of customers. I don't have the specifics, but in general it's about 500 customers per a load block, and probably up to maybe 2 to 3 MVA.

MS. BAIN: So what we've discussed so far about North Greenwich, people have mentioned the tear downs, the older homes being demolished and newer ones put in their place with an increase in size and demand.

If we look at the transcript from 12/1, page 47 , page 48 , we're talking about the larger dwellings causing that load. So actually this load is only partly due to that. Part of the reason is the switching. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is
correct.
MS. BAIN: And I think we even
talked about that today with the larger homes being responsible for that increased demand, however part of that apparently is due to the switching.

Now let's see. Now regarding the ISO forecast, the use of ISO forecast is to verify the Greenwich forecast. Right? To help you come up with your Greenwich forecast. I believe you put an excerpt from the 2013 CELT report?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe we did, subject to check, yes.

MS. BAIN: Yeah, OCC-38, page 3.
the witness (Bowes): Yes, we have it.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Now that CELT report comes out every year. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it does.
MS. BAIN: Okay. So I have here a copy of the 2015, an excerpt from the 2015 CELT report. We'd like to show that to you.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes, we'd like to provide also to the Council and to the parties a copy of 2015 CELT data, and 2013 CELT data. It is highlighted in certain spots to assist with our cross-examination.

May $I$ bring you a few copies, Attorney Bachman?

MS. BACHMAN: Sure.
Excuse me, Attorney Rosenthal?
MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.
MS. BACHMAN: Did you want to request administrative notice of the 2013 CELT report. We only have the 2015?

MR. ROSENTHAL: You have the '13. Right?

MS. BAIN: Yeah, we have the '13 excerpt.

MR. ROSENTHAL: The '13 I think is in the record. The '15 is not, so yes, I think we would need to respectfully request that administrative notice be taken of the 2015 CELT data.

MS. BAIN: And the 2013 that's in the record in $O C C-30$, is excerpted off the page that we have here from the actual report. It's the same numbers that we're highlighting, but we just wanted to compare the two pages.

MS. BACHMAN: We have the 2015 CELT report on our administrative notices, so they're both on hand.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay. All right. And these obviously have some highlighting, but it's to assist with our cross, as mentioned.

MS. BAIN: If we look at these two reports in 2013, the forecast for 2015 under summer 50/50 peak net $P D R$ and summer $90 / 10$ peak net PDR is 2368 for the 50/50, 2593 for the $90 / 10$.

Now in the 2015 report it's 50/50 for the gross -- they have a gross PV PDR in 2015 and a gross PVR PDT for 90/10. Okay? So the 50/50 in 2015 is 2269, so a decline from the 2368 in the 2013 report. And the 90/10 is 2489, again a decline from the 2593 in the 2013.

MS. DUBUQUE: May I ask if there's a question?

MS. BAIN: Do you see that? Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.
MS. BAIN: Now in 2022 do the two reports also have -- show declines for 2015 from the 2013?

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to ask a question at some point?

MR. ROSENTHAL: That's a question.
MS. BAIN: Yeah, do the two reports
show a decline between 2013 and 2015?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, they do. MS. BAIN: And I think the company has said that the compounded annual growth rate, I think -- did you say you had it as 1.2, but you chose to use 1 in yours, a 1 percent increase for the compounded annual growth rate?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yeah, the two weren't necessarily correlated or related, but we did look to the ISO forecast as part of the analysis we did.

Under OCC-30 there's a -- there's a data table that lists each one of the substations in Southwest Connecticut and we averaged those to come up with the 1 percent for the distribution and planning forecast, and then compared that with the ISO forecast of 1.2 percent, the ISO forecast being weather normalized where the Eversource distribution one was not.

MS. BAIN: And has the compounded annual changed in 2015 from 2013?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): For the ISO
New England forecast? Yes, it has.
MS. BAIN: It's gone down to
. 8 percent?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it has.
MS. BAIN: Okay. That was all for Southwestern Connecticut. And in Norwalk the compounded annual growth report has gone down. Is that right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm sorry.
What was that again?
MS. BAIN: For Norwalk.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): For the Norwalk area?

MS. BAIN: The compounded annual growth rate?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it has.
MS. BAIN: So that's gone down to what? To . 1 percent. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it has.
MS. BAIN: From in 2013, 1.1?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

MS. BAIN: And also Norwalk was a little bit increased for 2015. Right? Between 2013 and 2015?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, the 2015
forecasts were higher than the 2013.
MS. BAIN: Then did it decline in

2022 between the two?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it did.
MS. BAIN: Okay. And then as we noted, the compounded annual growth report went down.

So I know in the transcript I believe Eversource had mentioned it might consider revising its forecast. Have you considered any revisions to the forecast?

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may we go off the record for a moment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
(Off the record discussion.)
MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, we're ready to go back on the record. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I've been shown a different document from ISO New England that was used for a comparison to update our results.

It does not seem to be in the record at this point, but it's the -- it's the 2015 gross net of the PV forecast which shows Southwest Connecticut still at 1.2 percent adjusted annual growth, and the Norwalk area at
0.5 percent annual growth. So it's a different table within -- it's actually page 14 with that data table where you're showing us, you know, one of the different pages.

MS. BAIN: Actually if we look at the one for 2015 that we have here, the first column says the CELT gross.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And that's
1.2 percent. So it does agree with ours, yes.

MS. BAIN: And then there's the gross minus PV, which is probably -- that's 1.2 it looks like. Is that right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct. So we're using the 1.2 percent, not the 0.8 percent.

MS. BAIN: So this is PV and PDR, the passive demand response?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
MS. BAIN: That's what we're
looking at here to get the . 8 ?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, so we're looking at the gross.

MS. BAIN: So you did not take into account any energy efficiency things, you're saying?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, they're
already in the measured values we use, as we include all of them. So our measured values from the substations include all the energy efficiency and all the solar at the time of peak. So, much more.

MS. BAIN: So you do not take into account any increase in energy efficiency for future use?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct, because we use measured data at peak.

MS. BAIN: Right. And I know there's other things that they -- and ISO apparently has taken into account under PDR. One of the things was, I believe, the federal appliance improved standards for that. Are you familiar with that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say vaguely familiar, not at a level to properly answer any questions.

MS. BAIN: Okay. So that's not something that you would have used either to look at in your forecast?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Because we used the measured values, because we include all of the actual energy efficiency in them.

MS. BAIN: And so you're talking about past energy. You're not talking about going forward?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, it's a history as well, so it's the annual increase with those factors included. I know you have some other interrogatories that you have asked about, you know, the penetration rates, or the participation rates for energy efficiency, and although I don't think you asked for solar as well, in this, specifically in the town of Greenwich.

MS. BAIN: So can you tell us what you included for energy efficiency going forward? Can you quantify that for us?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The same rate we used just in the past. So no increase in it and no decrease in it. The same annual amount.

MS. BAIN: So what was the percentage that you had?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So it's just the measured values. So we look at the measured values each year, so it's included in that. We don't forecast specifically for energy efficiency or for solar.

MS. BAIN: So you don't forecast specifically for energy efficiency?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's why we use the gross number.

MS. BAIN: All right. And is that because you don't think energy efficiency will increase, or why would that be?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We think the rate of future increase will be around the past participation rates. And again, it's by the nature of how we do it. It trues up. It trues itself up each year.

MS. BAIN: Looking at the
transcript from $12 / 1$ on pages 60 and 62?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I have them.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Now we're talking about basis. And I think that, Mr. Bowes, in lines 22 through 25 you said there's been no curtailment of actual uses by customers in Greenwich. So the baseload or base usage is still there. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the
kilowatt hour sales is what $I$ think the reference was to, yes.

MS. BAIN: And then on 62 you mentioned we've seen a baseload increase over the years. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MS. BAIN: I did up a little chart based on OCC-22 and Late-File 20 with the baseload for the 27.6 Cos Cob transformer.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay. So this is a table compiling data already in the record from the OCC-22 response, and the Late-File 20 response. And I have copies to share.

MS. BAIN: 2009, '10 are blanked out because apparently there was some problem with the meters. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There was ongoing work at those substations, so the metering was out of service for a period of time.

MS. BAIN: So those were low, you know, outsized low. So we're not including those in this calculation. Now if we look at the averages, ten year, five year and three year, do you see that section?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do.
MS. BAIN: Are those going down?
MS. DUBUQUE: Can I just ask a
question, Mr. Chairman? Are these averages already calculated in our responses?

MS. BAIN: No, it's based on those responses.

MS. DUBUQUE: You calculated that. So basically this is new information that you're giving us now?

MS. BAIN: Well, subject to check. It's right at that total column minus nine and ten.

MS. DUBUQUE: Right. But we haven't -- we don't have the opportunity right now to take out our calculators and check all these figures. I mean, if it had been provided ahead of time we could have.

MR. ROSENTHAL: We'd be asking you to accept those averages subject to check, then.

MS. DUBUQUE: I do object to numbers being thrown at us at the hearing when the memorandum for the Council clearly stated that all filings were to be made by February 16th. And for this panel to have a fair opportunity to assess these numbers, I think this information should have been provided in advance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there other
things where you have compiled, because I have to tell you we're moving at a certain pace and I'm looking outside? And I'm also thinking that a few people have to go a long way in rush-hour.

And knowing that we're not going to finish today, even if we go to seven, I know some people like to ask questions. I'm thinking that -- I assume you have a lot more. Am I correct?

MR. ROSENTHAL: One second, please. Are you suggesting another hearing date potentially, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: With a great deal of pain, yes, sir. But I'm also trying to figure out how much longer. I mean, you must have a sense of your questions.

MR. ROSENTHAL: We do, but we also have at least one other data compilation, so that issue could be worked out with counsel for Eversource.

MR. ASHTON: I think what he wants you to do is get those out of the way today so they can look at them before we come back again.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Well, yes. We can certainly distribute them today, and then they
would have the opportunity that they're seeking to, to confirm the data.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it's really necessary that you can't ask the questions in any other way? I mean, because you know they're going to have to check the information.

I see a dramatic change between
2014 and 2015. Maybe why -- I mean, just doing this at this late date really just drags this out, and I'm not sure what the purpose is.

MS. BAIN: Yeah. You know, in my experience usually the people accept it subject to check, but this is the first time I've had, you know, and then if there's a problem with it when they check it, which is simple, but --

THE CHAIRMAN: But of course once we close the hearing it's a little bit difficult to get the check checked. You're doing it at the, you know, eleventh hour. We had intended -- well, I guess it was just a dream that we close the hearing today.

MS. BAIN: But I mean, whatever, you know, whatever way you think would be quickest or whatever would be fine with us.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid I can't
even think of how to define quickest in these proceedings.

MS. BAIN: You know the best, most efficient. Let me put it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask
Attorney Bachman to opine on the process.
MS. BACHMAN: Perhaps how we could approach this so that it's fair for everyone, is that these items be submitted ahead of time, distributed. If you could distribute them today that would be fantastic.

You're also going to have to distribute them to all the other parties and intervenors who aren't here. So you're going to have to do an electronic distribution. That way everybody will have an opportunity to review the material, check it and we'll come back one final afternoon on March 10th and close the hearing.

If that's acceptable to everyone in the room, please let me know.

THE CHAIRMAN: We may not have any Council members here, but we would be glad to have you guys all about, and particularly looking at the gentleman there in corner.

MR. BERGAMO: Do what you need to
do.
MS. BACHMAN: Attorneys Kohler and Ball, that's okay?

MR. BALL: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: We're not permitting new information. This is just a compilation of existing information. Is that clear?

MR. ROSENTHAL: If we could have one more minute we might be able to make things easier. If I may just confer for one moment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.
MR. ROSENTHAL: So we will, if it's okay with counsel, some of this we may be able to do on brief. So we will -- it's a very small number of items at this point.

We will confer with counsel for Eversource about any additional items that we'd like to have added to the record before the March 10th hearing, and we should be able to wrap up whatever we need to do at the March 10th hearing quickly as seems desired, if that's okay.

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes, that's fine.
Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any of the other parties intervenors want to opine on this?

Hopefully not.
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Council
announces that we will continue the evidentiary portion of the hearing at its offices, meeting here at 10 Franklin Square in New Britain on Thursday, March 10, 2016. I'm told if we do it at one we're going to get through it in hearing room two. It's the other hearing room.

MS. BAIN: Mr. Chairman, I have two more I could do today. Do you want me to do those now? These are simple ones. No exhibits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just two more questions and you're done?

MS. BAIN: That I can do today and then, you know, the other ones that have chart I'll leave.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're going to come back anyway. Right?

MS. BAIN: Okay. I'll do these two then. These are just quick ones. Okay. That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hopefully all of them will be quick. Dream on, right?

MS. BAIN: We'll just do them all

March 10th, then. That sounds good.
THE CHAIRMAN: Please note that it's only because -- what is this? This is the fifth hearing. So I have been noted generally, with the exception perhaps of my wife, for being a rather patient man. Five hearings is a lot.

Okay. Please note anyone who has not become a party intervener but who desires to make his or her views known to the Council may file written statements with the Council until the record closes. Copies of the transcript of this hearing will be filed at the Greenwich Town Clerk's office.

I hereby declare this portion of the hearing closed. And thank you. And in this case, really drive home safely.
(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the above proceedings were concluded at 3:58 p.m.)
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| public (16) | 27:1;161:18 | reach (2) | received (3) | references (1) |
| 5:17;6:6;8:24; | quantified (1) | 43:4;149:12 | 6:1;126:23;159:15 | 100:19 |
| 83:13,16,17,21;84:6; | 71:14 | reaction (1) | receiving (1) | Referencing (1) |
| 100:19;102:20;106:3; | quantify (1) | 42:22 | 149:8 | 120:19 |
| 107:24;133:10; | 182:15 | read (12) | recent (1) | referred (4) |
| 163:18;164:18,20 | quantity (1) | 19:11;39:9,9,25; | 26:12 | 90:11;100:20; |
| publications (1) 101:8 | $21: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 22 ; 64: 7 ; 90: 18,20 \\ & 99: 25 ; 158: 9,22 ; \end{aligned}$ | recently (3) <br> 111:9;139:25; | 109:20;116:14 |
| pull (1) | quick (6) | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 25 ; 158: 9,22 ; \\ & 159: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 9 ; 139: 2 \\ & 165 \cdot 13 \end{aligned}$ | referring (9) |
| 160:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 15 ; 82: 20 \\ & ; 190: 21,24 \end{aligned}$ | reading (5) | recess (3) | 104:25;115:1;118:15, |
| pump (5) | quickest (2) | 37:17;92:21,23; | 108:6;119:21 | 19;123:17;134:16 |
| 55:11,16,24;62:23; | 187:23;188:1 | 93:1;100:25 | 167:19 | refers (1) |
| 63:22 | quickly (4) | readings (1) | re-closers (4) | 90:25 |
| pumped (1) | 108:13;168:6; | 91:8 | 111:20,22;112:19; | reflected (1) |
| 60:16 | 169:19;189:21 | reads (1) | 116 | 100:3 |
| pumps (1) | quiet (1) | 12:24 | reconcile (1) | regarding (4) |
| 132:11 PURA (1) | $156: 21$ | ready (3) | 139:7 | 20:22;25:24; |
| PURA (1) | quite (4) | 8:16;146:12;179:15 | reconstructed (1) | 162:24;174:5 |
| 115:14 |  | real (4) | 55:8 | regardless (1) |
| purchase (2) | $150: 24,24$ | 18:1;21:14;80:16, | reconstruction (1) | 37:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:23,24 } \\ & \text { pure }(\mathbf{1}) \end{aligned}$ | quotation (1) | 22 realiz | 105:11 record (30) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { regards (9) } \\ 28: 15 ; 31: \end{array}$ |
| 152:19 | quoting (2) | 40:19 | 7:8;14:10;31:23 | 127:1;130:15,22; |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { purely (1) } \\ 122: 2 \end{gathered}$ | 64:12,20 | $\underset{158 \cdot 8}{\operatorname{realizing}(1)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 9 ; 44: 11 ; 48: 18 \\ & 69: 12 ; 88: 20 ; 90: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131: 10 ; 139: 15 ; \\ & 144: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| purported (1) | R | really (32) | 20,22;102:20;105:1; | Regency (1) |
| 41:22 |  | 15:4;16:1;21:18; | 107:24;123:5;131:1; | 159:21 |
| purpose (3) | Railroad (24) | 27:16;28:5,24;40:21, | 137:5;138:2;143:8; | region (2) |
| 13:19;88:22;187:10 |  | $23 ; 42: 7 ; 57: 7,24$ | $145: 1 ; 161: 13 ; 175: 14,$ | 89:21;90:9 |
| $\underset{9}{\text { purposes (1) }}$ | 36:7;52:21;53:8; | 69:15,15,22;78:8,14, | $\begin{aligned} & 19 ; 179: 11,13,15,22 ; \\ & 184: 9: 189: 18: 191: 11 \end{aligned}$ | regional (3) |
| 9:13 | $55: 20 ; 56: 3 ; 57: 23$ | 15,22;82:8;91:8;96:8; | 184:9;189:18;191:11 | 88:18;89:17;90:8 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { pursuant (1) } \\ 5: 12 \end{gathered}$ | 60:10;118:2;119:5; | $129: 20 ; 133: 15 ;$ $135 \cdot 25 \cdot 142 \cdot 25 \cdot 152 \cdot 9$ | record-breaking (1) | $\underset{155: 14}{\operatorname{regular}}$ |
| pursue (2) | $\begin{aligned} & ; 146: 23,25 \\ & 0 ; 156: 16,1 \end{aligned}$ | $14,20 ; 154: 7 ; 187: 3,9$ | Recreation (4) | regulation (1) |
| 14:3,8 | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 19,20 ; 165: 3,21 ; \\ & \text { 150:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 191:16 | 9:3;30:16;31:14,15 | 46:3 |
| push (1) | 166:9 | rearrange (1) | RECs (1) | regulations (7) |
| 66:3 | raise (4) | 167:18 | 131:24 | 45:18,21,21; |
| put (24) | 16:2;24:22,23;60:8 | reason (13) | recurrence (1) | 139:20;151:2;154:23; |
| 14:10;24:14;31:21; | raised (3) | $7: 14 ; 48: 20 ; 49: 10 ;$ $56 \cdot 16 \cdot 58 \cdot 15 \cdot 67 \cdot 11$ | 142:19 | 157:3 |
| 44:10;48:23;49:2,23; $56: 25 \cdot 72 \cdot 2 \cdot 80: 25$. | 14:4;19:24;24:23 | 56:16;58:15;67:11; | red (3) <br> $43 \cdot 19 \cdot 47 \cdot 14 \cdot 82 \cdot 2$ | rehash (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 56: 25 ; 72: 2 ; 80: 25 ; \\ & 83: 21 ; 84: 4,25 ; 132: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { raising (1) } \\ 92: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 155:6;166:15;171:19; | redevelopment (2) | $\begin{array}{r} 167: 25 \\ \text { relate (1) } \end{array}$ |
| 9,10;140:24;145:1, | ramificatio | 173:22 | 157:2,6 | 91:8 |
| 11;151:15;152:16; | $92: 15$ | reasonable (1) | red-hot (1) | related (6) |
| 173:16;174:9;188:4 | ran (1) | 72:19 | 45:23 | 5:24;62:24;64:24; |
| putting (4) | 28:10 | reasons (1 | redoing (1) | 68:3;105:19;177:9 |
| 57:16;84:8;138:22; $158: 16$ | rate (5) | $119: 18$ rebate (1) | 115:21 | relates (7) |
| 158:16 | 177:4,7;178:12 | rebate (1) | reduced (1) | 66:11;82:9,22; |
| PV (4) | 182:16;183:9 | $132: 19$ rebuild (6) | 92:18 | 135:21,22;138:25; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 176: 9 ; 179: 23 ; \\ & 180: 11,15 \end{aligned}$ | rates (3) | rebuild (6) | reducing (2) | 152:6 |
| PVR (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 182: 8,9 ; 183: 1 \\ & \text { rather (9) } \end{aligned}$ | 141:15;151:5;153:16 | redundancies (1) | 137:22 |
| 176:10 | 52:14;59:22;68:16; |  | 67:16 | relationship (1) |


| 15:10 | 134:11,13;135:2,11; | resources (2) | revenues (1) | 154:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| relative (1) | 136:9;138:5;140:12; | 148:20;170:17 | 105:10 | root (1) |
| 13:11 | 141:23;147:12; | respect (3) | reverting (1) | 55:5 |
| relatively (1) | 161:18;170:17,18,19; | 16:6;99:12;110:17 | 52:12 | ROSENTHAL (19) |
| 76:8 | 174:9,16,20;175:8,20, | respected (1) | review (3) | 4:13;120:7;171:3,9; |
| release (1) | 24;176:8,12;178:4; | 47:18 | 96:23;125:11; | 172:3;174:21;175:4, |
| 171:21 | 179:4 | respectful | 188:16 | 5,9,13;176:1,24; |
| relevance (3) | reported (1) | 99:13 | reviews (1) | 184:8;185:16;186:10, |
| 91:6;158:13,25 | 104:21 | respectfully (2) | 155:13 | 17,24;189:8,12 |
| relevant (1) | reports (5) | 170:9;175:15 | revising (1) | Rough (1) |
| 67:11 | 75:17;171:2;176:5 | respond (1) | 179:8 | 58:8 |
| reliability (20) | 20,25 | 36:12 | revisions (1) | round (1) |
| 36:17;64:24;65:9 | representation (1) | responded (1) | 179:9 | 83:10 |
| 16,19;66:4,8,11; | 70:9 | 62:11 | rewarding (1) | route (22) |
| 111:21,25;115:4; | representative (1) | response (44) | 52:15 | 33:6,7,11,15;34:12, |
| 116:7;117:18;128:23; | 155:22 | 6:15,18,24;7:2;8:5 | right (53) | 13,15,23;35:2,6,24, |
| 129:3;135:16,21; | Representatives (1) | 12:16;13:21;16:21; | 8:24;9:2;20:16; | 25;36:14;52:20;53:7; |
| 143:17,20,23 | 15:3 | 17:5;20:20;25:6,10, | 22:8;37:24;40:20; | 58:7,13;99:11; |
| reliability-wise (1) | represented (1) | 16;34:7,9,20;40:16; | 48:5;49:13,14;50:14, | 117:23;118:1,7,13 |
| 65:12 | 71:1 | 53:18,25;54:1;56:19; | 14;57:14;62:18;65:6, | routes (8) |
| reliable (8) | representing (7) | 64:17;68:11;75:24; | 11;66:18;98:12; | 25:12;26:4;29:12; |
| 86:2,13,24;89:21; | 6:23;8:14,19,20; | 85:7;96:24;97:16; | 107:15;112:2,4,5,9; | 30:23;34:9;36:25; |
| 103:7,10;163:3,13 | 91:12;103:25;160:24 | 113:13;116:12; | 121:17;122:18; | 57:23;126:14 |
| reliance (1) | represents (1) | 120:11,21;123:12; | 124:23;126:12;127:7; | routine (1) |
| 68:15 | 90:24 | 160:20,25;161:2,24; | 128:2;130:5;134:18; | 74:19 |
| relying (1) | reproduction (1) | 171:5,12;172:10,23; | 139:17;147:7;151:11; | routing (1) |
| 15:25 | 107:2 | 180:16;184:10,11; | 154:6;158:19;165:22; | 135:3 |
| remain (1) | request (8) | 190:2 | 167:6;174:7;175:10; | row (3) |
| 64:22 | 64:11;108:18 | responses (7) | 176:1;178:5,15,21; | 70:11;71:21;72:8 |
| remaining (1) | 136:10;137:8;170:9, | 17:2;18:12;109:19; | 180:12;181:11;183:5, | RTM (3) |
| 142:14 | 16;175:7,15 | 126:18;168:18;185:2, | 22;184:3;185:9,11, | $155: 20,22,24$ |
| remediated (2) | requested (3) | 4 | 12;190:19,24 | running (1) |
| 21:21,23 | 14:7;107:12;136:24 | responsibilities (1) | rightsize (1) | $73: 1$ |
| remediation (5) | requesting (1) | 103:3 | 50:25 | rush-hour (1) |
| 22:1,24;23:3,5,6 | 19:14 | responsible (3) | rightsized (1) | 186:4 |
| remember (2) | requests (1) | 86:1;129:17;174:2 | 132:15 |  |
| 58:17;74:2 | 135:9 | responsive (1) | $\boldsymbol{r i p}(1)$ | S |
| reminded (1) | require (6) | 15:18 | 150:6 |  |
| 127:8 | 7:15,24;12:14; | rest (1) | risk (1) | safe (1) |
| removed (1) | 33:15;109:15;151:1 | 83:15 | 92:14 | $163: 3$ |
| 163:16 | required (1) | Restaurant (2) | Road (14) | safely (1) |
| renewable (1) | 128:17 | 6:20;160:22 | 4:5;49:17;55:14,18, | 191:16 |
| 131:25 | requirements (2) | restoration (1) | 19;119:5;146:22; | safety (6) |
| repair (2) | 92:1;109:4 | 128:7 | 156:14;157:7;158:5, | 83:21;103:12; |
| 56:18;60:1 | requires (3) | restore (1) | 20;165:21,21,22 | 109:6;144:20,25; |
| repeat (9) | 43:13;92:3;115:1 | 113:15 | roadway (1) | 145:21 |
| 18:10;25:15;93:23 | requiring (2) | result (1) | 63:24 | sake (1) |
| 117:11;118:10; | 43:4;78:25 | 172:22 | Robin (1) | 110:13 |
| 122:23;127:6,17; | rerouting (1) | resultant | 5:5 | sales (4) |
| 136:21 | 146:6 | 36:5 | robust (1) | 123:10;124:3; |
| replace (3) | research (2) | resulting (1) | 78:18 | 171:13;183:24 |
| 57:13,14;59:16 | 14:7;51:4 | 64:14 | role (3) | salt (1) |
| replaced (1) | reserve (1) | results (3) | 42:7;85:23;98:20 | 26:17 |
| 76:21 | 17:25 | 86:23;164:2 | Roman (1) | same (19) |
| replacement (5) | residential (15) | 179:20 | 9:14 | 20:7;41:14;47:14; |
| 38:19;115:14; | 36:9;43:25;104:4,9 | resume (4) | $\operatorname{roof}(2)$ | 52:13;57:5;63:13; |
| 129:12;153:6;170:24 | 124:2,6;141:25; | 108:5,9;119:20,23 | 151:6,7 | 81:2;89:20,20;131:8; |
| replacing (1) | 145:3;146:1;152:23; | resumes (1) | roofs (1) | 135:11;150:2;153:22; |
| 56:24 | 157:8,10,10,16; | 12:12 | 150:24 | 154:1,2,3;175:21; |
| report (33) | 159:17 | retrofitted (2) | room (6) | 182:16,18 |
| 86:5;102:12 | residents (6) | 91:13,18 | $22: 6 ; 50: 20,21$ | Sandy (2) |
| 103:16,24;104:13,14, | 80:5;86:10,22; | revenue (1) | 188:20;190:8,9 | 65:22;72:25 |
| 22;105:3;131:4,9; | 103:13;163:3;164:10 | 105:12 | rooms (1) | satisfactorily (1) |


| 49:16 | 134:20;150:24; | 57:11 | 10;163:10 | 160:5;165:1;170:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| satisfied (2) | 179:21 | set (3) | sidewalk (1) | sitting (1) |
| 137:7;160:16 | seemed (2) | 33:2;97:6;168:19 | 158:17 | 75:15 |
| Savageau (24) | 89:9;134:19 | setting (2) | Siebert (44) | situation (3) |
| 9:1;11:1,4,8,11,14; | seemingly (1) | 91:25;92:1 | 8:23;10:10,15,19, | 49:19;113:25;148:8 |
| 22:12;26:2;28:23; | 33:24 | seven (6) | 22,25;21:12,24;22:4; | situations (1) |
| 29:24;30:15;31:3,10; | seems (13) | 10:11,12,13;63:5,6; | 42:11;50:2,13,16; | 84:14 |
| 32:1,13,16,19;77:6; | 45:2,5;48:6,18; | 186:6 | 51:18;54:8;55:9;56:9; | six (9) |
| 79:21;83:4;131:13; | 69:23;72:10;82:12; | seventies (1) | 57:4;58:5,10;59:2; | 10:11,12,13;51:16; |
| 132:23;133:11;149:3 | 101:21;110:22;124:5; | 156:12 | 60:24;61:4,9;62:13; | 55:2;58:12;63:9; |
| saw (6) | 147:21;152:17; | several (8) | 63:1,5,12;72:11; | 116:15;151:5 |
| 29:25;44:9;72:13; | 189:21 | 26:13;28:16;34:2 | 74:15;79:19;104:11; | sixties (1) |
| 77:1;113:3;126:17 | segment (1) | 64:7;68:14,14;76:6; | 105:7,25;112:13,22; | 156:11 |
| saying (9) | 165:8 | 77:12 | 127:22;128:13; | size (6) |
| 23:16;56:20;69:16; | segments (1) | severe (1) | 129:15;132:14; | 19:14;27:19;73:6; |
| 79:14;80:5;101:1; | 29:16 | 64:13 | 141:20;144:16; | 135:12;154:10; |
| 133:12;153:9;180:24 | Selectman (4) | sewage (1) | 155:25;159:6 | 173:17 |
| schema (1) | 12:9;54:14;65:23; | 62:24 | Sievert (1) | sky (1) |
| 155:6 | 85:20 | sewer (3) | 10:7 | 163:8 |
| scheme (1) | selectman's (3) | 35:17;62:5,8 | $\operatorname{sign}(2)$ | slice (1) |
| 33:1 | 40:5;126:21;155:11 | share (3) | 66:24;159:10 | 61:11 |
| schemes (1) | selling (2) | 42:21;89:20;184:11 | significance (1) | slowly (2) |
| 28:9 | 80:21,23 | shellfish (2) | $82: 4$ | 124:21;133:13 |
| school (14) | SEN (11) | 27:3,7 | significant (8) | small (8) |
| 77:19;105:10; | 37:13,25;38:4,9,12, | shelters (1) | 23:20;37:7;73:14, | 56:10;57:10;62:18; |
| 132:6,10;141:14,14, | 22;39:11,21;41:10; | 85:4 | 15;74:8;76:1;104:4; | 63:19,22;72:10; |
| 15,16;148:25;149:8,9, | 42:5,16 | shift (1) | 113:20 | 158:20;189:14 |
| 11;151:4,6 | Senator (1) | 138:16 | silent (1) | smaller (3) |
| schools (3) | 37:12 | shifted (2) | 147:14 | 57:12,13;132:7 |
| 78:10;148:23; | sending (1) | 118:23,25 | Silicon (1) | smallest (1) |
| 149:12 | 75:16 | shifter (1) | 160:3 | 70:16 |
| scientists (1) | sense (8) | 118:23 | similar (3) | smart (1) |
| 69:13 | 41:8;52:11;74:13; | shooting (1) | 68:18;126:17; | 154:5 |
| scont'd (1) | 82:22;83:7;89:11; | 149:17 | 130:16 | so-called (3) |
| $4: 1$ | 109:3;186:15 | shop (1) | similarly (1) | 47:13;81:25;138:19 |
| se (5) | sent (2) | 146:7 | 124:7 | solar (10) |
| 77:7;88:25;129:4; | 19:12;109:8 | Shore (2) | simple (6) | 133:15,18,24; |
| 151:1;157:1 | separate (3) | 55:15,17 | 48:13,13;129:24; | 148:21;150:7,18,23; |
| seat (1) | 63:2;104:6;152:10 | short (3) | 130:1;187:15;190:12 | 181:4;182:10,25 |
| 47:21 | September (3) | 19:13;162:9,16 | simplistic (1) | solarize (7) |
| second (8) | 5:9;39:8;100:17 | shortly (1) | 18:24 | 80:3;131:21; |
| 6:16;12:23;44:13; | SERC (2) | 119:20 | simulations (4) | 133:13,14,19,20,24 |
| 75:24;123:11,20; | 131:4,8 | short-term (1) | 102:13;126:19; | sole (1) |
| 156:8;186:10 | series (1) | 59:6 | 169:20,22 | 92:14 |
| section (10) | 65:21 | show (7) | single (4) | solely (1) |
| $29: 13 ; 56: 10 ; 57: 8$ | seriously (1) | $15: 10 ; 18: 6 ; 122:$ | 34:12,15;36:7; | 172:12 |
| 10;62:18;77:3;94:5; | $7: 21$ | $151: 25 ; 174: 20$ | $171: 21$ | solid (1) |
| 104:21;119:9;184:22 | serve (4) | 176:20;177:1 | sit (3) | 13:8 |
| sections (1) | 47:22;80:18;96:18; | showed (1) | 8:15;75:13;162:1 | solidifying (1) |
| 28:12 | 109:24 | 18:17 | site (13) | 132:25 |
| sediment (1) | served (3) | showing (1) | 21:16,17,21,22; | solution (7) |
| 29:25 | 95:18;96:16,16 | 180:3 | 22:23;23:3,4;27:24; | 21:5;24:6;66:20; |
| seeing (10) | serves (1) | shown (6) | 30:2;33:4;98:21; | 67:8;110:21;112:18, |
| $54: 24 ; 60: 9 ; 78: 10$ <br> $150 \cdot 6 \cdot 10 \cdot 151 \cdot 12$. | $55: 11$ | $18: 22,24 ; 20: 18$ <br> $43 \cdot 18 \cdot 166 \cdot 11 \cdot 179 \cdot 18$ | $99: 16 ; 150: 17$ | $21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 150: 6,10 ; 151: 12 ; \\ & 154: 9 ; 159: 14 ; 160: 3 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { service (14) } \\ 60: 2 ; 70: 22 ; 86: 2, \end{array}$ | 43:18;166:11;179:18 <br> shows (3) | $\begin{array}{\|r} \hline \text { sited (1) } \\ 165: 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { solutions (5) } \\ 24: 3,12 ; 25: 2 ; 67: 25 ; \end{array}$ |
| 171:6 | 24;89:21;100:19; | 123:9;165:16 | sites (1) | 147:25 |
| seeking (3) | 103:8,11;109:22; | 179:23 | 27:23 | solve (6) |
| 14:2;121:12;187:1 | 110:6;114:21;116:7; | side (17) | Siting (16) ${ }_{5}$ | $52: 1 ; 72: 5 ; 84: 12$ |
| seem (13) | 184:17 | 35:7,9,17,19;36:7; | 5:3,6;12:17;24:19; | $91: 20 ; 110: 16 ; 111: 20$ |
| 19:12;44:22;48:13; | services (1) | 63:16;66:13;77:5; | 40:2;51:9;64:19; | solves (2) |
| 72:5,21;73:10,13; | 100:10 | $80: 17 ; 124: 6,7 ; 133: 8$ | 66:17;68:12;85:13; | 52:23;53:8 |
| 74:7;107:6,16; | serving (1) | 137:20;138:16;139:1, | $120: 20 ; 123: 8 ; 158: 25$ | solving (2) |


| 24:4;111:17 | 143:19;153:18 | $11,15 ; 97: 10,14$ | 16;147:6;151:17 | sub (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| somebody (5) | special (1) | 135:24;143:21;153:3 | stations (2) | 83:15 |
| 51:19;61:25;65:18; | 149:10 | Stamford's (1) | 55:12;145:14 | ubject (9) |
| 5:19;159:10 | speci | 7:2 | stati | 39:18;92:13;98:13; |
| someone (6) | 23:19,20;28:19; | stance (1) | 72:1;76:1 | 102:18;113:21; |
| 49:6;82:17;93:8,12 | 109:17;112:23,24 | 75:15 | status (2) | 174:11;185:8,17; |
| 105:16;145:15 | 121:1;140:8,11,13 | stand (1) | 41:7;42: | 187:12 |
| somewhere (1) | 164:11;171:20,22 | 9:4 | statute (2) | submission (1) |
| 73:12 | speci | standar | 8:25,25 | 7:14 |
| songbird (1) | 7:17;12:22;22:17; | 91:24;92:3,24 | Statutes (1) | submit (1) |
| 25:18 | 44:3;90:7;101:14 | 93:19,19,25,25;98:25; | 5:13 | 102:14 |
| sorry (22) | 102:24;103:17; | 99:15,15;149:17 | stay (1) | submitted (9) |
| 12:9;18:15;20:4; | 109:12;115:1;135:19; | standards (7) | $131: 8$ | 7:7;36:4;100:18; |
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