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THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council, today Tuesday October 6, 2015, 11 a.m.

A VOICE: Excuse me. Could it be louder, please? I can't hear at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: FOr some reason this brilliant new arrangement, they put you between mics instead of at the mics.

COMM. CARON: Mr. Chairman, if
I could?
The mics are designed with a 30-degree angle on both sides. You don't have to move them back and forth. It should pick you up and the mics will adjust to anybody who is soft talker or a loud talker. It might take a second, but the mics will adjust and the acoustics in the room should work pretty well.

And as you can see, I'm speaking very normally. It's picking me up so I don't have to play with the microphone. So --

SEN. MURPHY: So the pamphlet
says.
THE CHAIRMAN: And here is our engineer who designed this. So --

COMM. CARON: I have a flair for interior decorating.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess at my age I should learn how to talk so people can hear me.

Okay. This hearing is a continuation of a hearing held on September 1, 2015, at the Greenwich Library in Greenwich, Connecticut. It was 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 substation located at 290 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich, 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 substation 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. And we'll now proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available on the table near the door.

I'll begin with the appearance of the applicant, Eversource Energy, to verify new exhibits marked as Roman numeral two, items B 20 through 29 on the hearing program.

And I don't know if there are any more witnesses that have to be sworn in.

MS. DUBUQUE: Yes, thank you.
Mr. Chairman, I'm Marianne Barbino Dubuque. I'm an attorney with Carmody, Torrance, Sandak \& Hennessey, and I represent CL\&P doing business as Eversource Energy.

First, I thought I would just reintroduce our witness panel. Each was already sworn in on September 1st. We have

Mr. Ken Bowes to my left, far left, Vice President of Engineering. To my near left, Mr. Ray Gagnon, Director of Transmission Projects. To my right Ms. Jacqui Gardell, Project Manager, and to her right Mike Libertine of All-Points.

And at this point I
respectfully request that we swear in two additional witnesses, Mr. John Case and Ms. Lisa Cooper.
 RAYMOND GAGNON,
 MICHAELILIBERTINE, GABORMEXEI, recalled as witnesses, having been previously sworn, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

JOHN C. CASE,
LISA COOPER,
called as witnesses, being first duly sworn by the Executive Director, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may I begin with their resumes, because they were listed -- Mr. Case's resume is listed as item 10-D for Eversource's exhibits. That was previously submitted.

And Ms. Cooper's resume is
listed as item 10-K. That is part of a supplemental prefiled testimony that we will also be authenticating in a minute, but $I$ thought I would begin with their resumes first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you. So
beginning with Exhibit 10-D the resume of Mr. John Case, I'd like to ask Mr. Case if his resume is true and accurate and if there are any changes?

THE WITNESS (Case): It is
true and accurate and there are no changes.

MS. DUBUQUE: And do you adopt your resume today as an exhibit?

THE WITNESS (Case): Yes, I do.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you,
Mr. Case.
Ms. Cooper, as to Exhibit
$10-\mathrm{K}$, is your resume true and accurate and are there any changes?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): Yes, my resumes true and accurate. And no, there are no changes.

MS. DUBUQUE: And do you adopt your resume today as an exhibit?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): I do.
MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you. Now turning to exhibits 20 through 29 and -- but we're going to exclude 26 , because that's Dr. Gabor Mezei, and he will do that separately.

So I'm going to ask Mr. Bowes, Mr. Gagnon and Ms. Gardell as to Exhibits 20, Eversource responses to Council interrogatories set two, dated September 25, 2015; and Exhibit 21, Eversource responses to

Bella Nonna Restaurant and Pizzeria, interrogatories dated September 29, 2015; exhibit 22, Eversource responses to Greenwich Chiropractic and Nutrition interrogatories dated September 29, 2015; Exhibit 23, Eversource's responses to Field Point Estate Townhouses interrogatories, dated September 29, 2015; Exhibit 24, Eversource response to Office of Consumer Counsel Interrogatories set two, dated September 29, 2015; Exhibit 25, Eversource supplemental direct testimony of Kenneth Bowes, Raymond Gagnon and Jaqueline Gardell with attachments dated September 29th, 2015; Exhibit 27, Eversource responses to Pet Pantry Super Discount Stores, LLC, interrogatories, 1 to 30,33 to 37,39 to 43,45 to 46,48 to 49 , 51, 53, 56 to 57, 59, 61, dated September 29, 2015; Exhibit 28, Eversource response to Office of Consumer Counsel interrogatories set two, revise number 25, dated September 30, 2015; and Exhibit 29, Eversource responses to Pet Pantry Super Discount Stores, LLC, interrogatories 31, 32, 38, 44, $47,50,54$ to $55,58,60,62,63$, and revised

25, dated September 30, 2015.
So once again, referring to exhibits 20 to 25, 27 to 29, I'll ask Mr. Bowes, Mr. Gagnon and Ms. Gardell, did you prepare or oversee preparation of these exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I
did.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, I did.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I did.

MS. DUBUQUE: Are there any corrections or clarifications or additions? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There are none.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): No, there are none.

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 adopt the written testimony in Exhibits 20 to 25, 27 to 29 as your sworn testimony and you adopt these documents as exhibits?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I
do.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, I
do.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I
do.
MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you. Now turning to Exhibit 26,

Eversource direct testimony of Dr. Gabor Mezei, dated September 29, 2015, and Dr. Mezei was also sworn in on September 1st.

Dr. Mezei, did you prepare or
oversee the preparation of Exhibit 26?
THE WITNESS (Mezei): Yes, I
did.
MS. DUBUQUE: Are there any
corrections, clarifications or additions?
THE WITNESS (Mezei): No.

MS. DUBUQUE: To the best of your knowledge, is the information in Exhibit 26 true and accurate?

THE WITNESS (Mezei): Yes, it
is.
MS. DUBUQUE: Do you adopt the written testimony in Exhibit 26 as your sworn testimony?

THE WITNESS (Mezei): Yes, I do.

MS. DUBUQUE: Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the Council admit into evidence Exhibits 20 to 29 as full exhibits, subject to the Council's September 1 protective order, as well as Exhibits $10-\mathrm{K}$ and $10-\mathrm{D}$, the resumes of Ms. Cooper and Mr. Case, and Exhibit A, Eversource's request for administrative notice items 1 to 32 on pages 6 to 8 of the hearing program, which I believe I did not properly request on the record on September 1st.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Does any party or intervener
object to the admission of the applicant's
new exhibits?
(No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none, the exhibits are admitted.

We'll now resume with the cross-examination by our staff, Mr. Mercier.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
Most of my questions were
answered in the Council interrogatory responses set two, but $I$ do have a couple of follow-ups based on that document. The first question has to do with the cofferdams. There was a very detailed response in question number one.

I was wondering what, if anybody knows, what is the maximum length that a cofferdam could be installed?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I don't
know, but we had one that went across the Naugatuck River as part of the Yankee Gas project that was probably close to 200, 250 feet.

MR. MERCIER: Have you ever seen one up to 800 feet? Is that possible?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I think
the technique is -- is able to go as far as, I would assume. It's just the amount of water that's moving back and forth that has to go around the cofferdams. If it's a stiller area it's a lot easier to install, pump out the water and to work in that area, than in something that is moving.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So if it was possible I guess my question was, instead of doing a horizontal directional drill through the blue and orange route through Bruce Park, you cofferdam dam that, if that was even examined. I'm not sure.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It wasn't looked at as part of the application.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. With the orange open trench route through the small wood lot in Bruce Park, I understand you have to clear the trees and to create the trench opening. And once you're done it will be reseeded and allowed to revegetate naturally.

Would Eversource have to maintain that open trench area as a grassland or shrubby area to prevent trees from growing up above the underground cables?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, we would want to make sure that we maintain the area above the trench itself to make sure that we can anticipate -- yes, so we would manage that area, that's specifically right above that trench area.

MR. MERCIER: In Bruce Park.
So that would be Eversource's responsibility to maintain that particular area?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

MR. MERCIER: And just flipping to interrogatory response letter 11, that was the photo simulation I asked. Did you try to mimic the existing Pet Pantry building?

I see the brick veneer on the north side of the structure that appears to be concrete facing the Field Point Roadside. Is it possible to install brick veneer on the side facing Field Point Road?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it is.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. I noticed looking at this photograph that there appears
to be some kind of bump out as you go to the south end of the building, a slight bump out. Is it also possible to design the building so it's a clean straight line? I'm not sure what the purpose of the bump out is.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): The purpose of the bump out is so that we could move the access door from the high visible side of the intersection to the back of the building. And that allows for truck entry and to be able to get over to the crane to lift the equipment. So that's why that is some hardset lines.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

And looking further south of the building I see a concrete wall. I'm assuming is that the firewall, the proposed firewall for the transformer?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it
is. The one that you're looking at is approximately 8 feet high.

MR. MERCIER: Does that
firewall structure also have a roof? I can't tell from this picture.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, it would be an open, just an open wall.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is it
constructed of concrete?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
It's concrete or like a cinderblock, like a concrete block.

MR. MERCIER: And for that face that faces Field Point Road, is it possible to install a brink veneer on that side of the firewall?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it would be.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

I read in the application
there will be low-level lighting installed within the substation area. Could you please explain what the term "low-level lighting" means?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): The low-level lighting is for access. It would be near the door entryways, just for the low-level would not go beyond that area.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is the
intent to illuminate the entire substation at night, or just those specific access ways? THE WITNESS (Gardell): No, the low-level lighting would just be for those access ways. We would have other lighting if we had to do work at night at the substation to fix any equipment.

MR. MERCIER: For the lights that may be needed during nighttime work hours, are those mounted on independent masts? Or are they mounted on the building, or other available structures?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We really haven't designed exactly the locations, but we have in the past put them on A-frame structures, some of the structures that are up high so you have a lot of visibility of the work yard.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you.

On page $L-3$ of the application it essentially states the site could be at risk for vehicle impact. So I wasn't sure if there was any particular construction method you're going to use for the -- this pertains
to the GIS building, for the GIS building, whether there's extra framing installed or bollards within the concrete or anything of that nature?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): The building will be designed for vehicle impact to protect the equipment inside.

MR. MERCIER: And how is that accomplished? Is there extra concrete or something?

THE WITNESS (Gardell):
It's -- it's designed to withstand a certain amount of crash protection, and it would be concrete.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
And staying with the safety
issues, regarding potential fires or emergency response issues at the substation, mechanical failures, as such, what type of detection system is in place to detect fires, or other types of malfunctioning equipment?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): For right now we have, specifically for fires itself, we have smoke detection, detection in the GIS building in the switchgear. We do
have alarms that go back to the local control center to take -- so that, you know, if something does happen we can notify our personnel to get out to the site.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): I'll
add. I'd like to add to that our substations are built intrinsically safer for spacing for fire, so that there will be no issues outside of the fenced area.

MR. MERCIER: Now you mentioned personnel would have to be dispatched. Is it specific emergency response personnel from Eversource, or just in-general technician?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Usually
our electricians who are nearby get
dispatched, are the first to the site.
MR. MERCIER: You say, nearby.
Is there a certain location, or yard they're based at, or some building?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be Glenbrook Road in Stamford.

MR. MERCIER: And what will
their role be when they're dispatched? To assess the situation?

THE WITNESS (Bowes) : First would be to make safe. And if in case of a fire, it would be to, under the direction of the system operator, deenergize the necessary equipment to allow the firefighters to extinguish the fire.

In the case of in the release of the -- the transformer oil it would be a containment, a spill response, a contractor or group that was brought in to complete the cleanup.

MR. MERCIER: Now in regards to the municipal emergency responders that may go to the site if there was some type of issue requiring their assistance, are they specifically trained in responding to transformer fires, say, or other substation fires or issues?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): They are specifically trained to wait for Eversource employees to make the scene safe, and that goes whether it's a pole-top transformer on the side of the road, or whether it's a substation transformer.

Remember there have been
substations in Greenwich, several of them for more than a hundred years. It's not a new situation to have a new additional substation in the town of Greenwich.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. So they can't act as the municipal emergency responder until they get direction from Eversource personnel that's dispatched? THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct. They stand by and ensure public safety, but will not enter a substation until directed by Eversource personnel.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
I just had one other question actually in regards to the Cos Cob substation. Does Metro-North own and maintain their own equipment within that substation?

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Metro-North? Well, there are two substations on the Cos Cob facility. One of them adjacent to the Eversource substation is owned by Metro-North and there's a second Metro-North substation closer to the tracks. Eversource operates and maintains under
contract the one adjacent to the Eversource substation and we provide services for that operation and maintenance.

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll now continue with questions by members of the Council starting with Mr. Ashton.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
I apologize for not attending
the September 1st hearing. I had other problems to address. I have read the transcript however, and so a few of my questions are going to come out of that.

In the transcript it was mentioned that there was a fire at Cos Cob substation. Can someone tell me what that nature of that fire was?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I can. The middle phase service station transformer 11-S1, it's a 27-kV overhead transformer that feeds the station service, apparently was damaged previously.

It caught fire and tripped the necessary circuits and buses inside the substation. And it did burn for a period of time until Eversource arrived, escorted the local fire department in, made the scene safe and the fire was extinguished.

MR. ASHTON: And Eversource's nearest facility is out of Stamford. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is today. That's not where the person was dispatched from. We went through the normal protocol and there were no -- no responders from the Stamford work center. So we went to a supervisor that I think actually dispatched from the town of Milford.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. And that
transformer is a distribution type
transformer, a pole-top type transformer? THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was, yes.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. What are
the transformer ratings of the Cos Cob transformers, and tell me how that rating is determined?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): You're talking now about the substation power transformer?

MR. ASHTON: Yes, the
substation load transformers. There's three of them and what are they rated at? And under what circumstance?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There are three transformers rated at 27 -- 27.6 kV on the low side.

MR. ASHTON: NO, I'm thinking of the MVA transformer capacity?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
The three 27 kV are rated at 47 MVA for the 2 X transformer, 47 MVA for the $3 X$
transformer, and 25 MVA for the 5X
transformer.
MR. ASHTON: Are those FOA ratings? Forced oil and air or what?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Forced air ratings.

MR. ASHTON: They're not forced oil. Does it have FOA capability? THE WITNESS (Bowes): It does not.

MR. ASHTON: So none of the
three have that capability?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): I stand corrected -- Mr. Gagnon. The top rating does have forced air and forced oil.

MR. ASHTON: On the 47 MVA, is FOA in ratings?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it
is.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's
correct.
MR. ASHTON: And how about the
smaller one?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We've got 27, 37.3 and 48.7.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And I apologize for that. I gave you the rating for the 5 X transformer, which is the 13.2 kV . The rating of the 1 x transformer is 50.4 MVA .

MR. ASHTON: 50.4 ?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): And that is a forced oil, forced air.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Now back
in the bad old I seem to recall that they were doubled rating. You had a self-cooled
rating, an FOA rating and then another FOA rating were everything came on. Which rating are we using here?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The
highest rating.
MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): The
highest rating, for example --
MR. ASHTON: It's all pumps and fans are on?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): For the example, the 11R 1X rating is 30.2/40.3/50.4 MVA.

MR. ASHTON: Wonderful. Okay. that helps me considerably. And that rating is continuous rating or short-term, or long-term emergency?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's continuous rating.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Good. So that a transformer could take an even higher loading on a short-term basis. Is that not fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it can. And we do use contingency ratings on
all equipment.
MR. ASHTON: As I recall, the docket before us you used a rating of 135 , 1 think, combined for the three transformers. And that is based on an FOA, FOA rating continuous. Ya vol?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's based on, yes, continuous, but it also includes that the largest transformer is out of service for that first contingency. So you have two of the smaller units active.

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So for example, if you took the two smaller units at 47 MVA each, that obviously does not equate to 135 MVA.

MR. ASHTON: Right. That's a long-term emergency rating then, the 135 ?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

MR. ASHTON: And long-term
emergency is defined as what?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Up to 24 hours.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. One cycle?

Multiple cycles?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): One cycle with a cooldown period between.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Let me tell you where I'm going here. As I recall, the numbers this project cost is \$140 million, which if my memory is correct using some rough numbers, equates to about \$30 million a year in carrying charges. Is that a fair guess for an order of magnitude? Anybody want to pick on me?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: That's a
reasonable working number?
THE WITNESS (Cooper): Yeah.
MR. ASHTON: That's $\$ 10$ for every man woman and child in Connecticut per year, which I find frankly shocking. I grew up in a era where a breaker cost a hundred thousand bucks a mile of transmission. A 115 cost a hundred thousand -- 300,00 for 345. So to see these numbers like 140 million it stretches my imagination to no end.

You have -- you could replace the transformers at Cos Cob, could you not,
and increase the load carrying capability?
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Our distribution engineering folks have said they have had that the largest transformers that they could fit in the location due to the tight workspace.

MR. ASHTON: The tight workspace?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: Couldn't we revamp the substation and slip a transformer in? I mean, when I hear someone say, it can't be done, I start wondering.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So if transformer capacity were the sole issue we would certainly look at other alternatives.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. But that is an issue, in fact, that's before the House right now. Is it not?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's one of the issues we have.

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We also
have overloads on the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ feeders between
Cos Cob and Prospect.

MR. ASHTON: One of the things that has happened in the past, has it not, is that where a load growth is anticipated a facility was put in that operated at a lower voltage where it's capable then of being converted to a higher voltage when the need arose? Is that not correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: For example, I think we did this between Norwalk and Glenbrook. Am I correct in that? THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's a capability for additional expansion between Norwalk and -- and Glenbrook.

MR. ASHTON: And if my memory of history is correct, I think some of the 115-kV lines in Eastern Connecticut were built for 345 and were initially operated at 115. So that kind of a transition is not out of the question. Is it not?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't believe it's applicable in this case, but -MR. ASHTON: Well, let me give you a specific. I recognize that Greenwich is the end of the line. I recognize that
it's a difficult area to serve. I recognize that the load there has grown over the years. Nonetheless there are questions, fair ones as to how much more it's going to grow. And it's a hell of a big question, in my opinion, as to the ability and desirability of hitting the rate base with 140-million-dollar charge. Forget the cost sharing. That works both ways. It's a two-edged knife. Insofar as there was a strong case for additional load growth, I want to explore that a little bit later. Would it not be possible to build a 115-kV cable that goes to Prospect Street in that area and operate it at 27 kV for an additional feeder? The answer has got to be yes.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, not without a complete rebuild of the Prospect substation.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. But is
that going to be you're going to spend 140 million to complete rebuild. What I'm looking for is what are the alternatives that you looked at here to avoid $\$ 140$ million? THE WITNESS (Bowes): So in
the application we listed several alternatives, including one distribution alternative which would be to have a substation at a different location.

MR. ASHTON: Yeah, but that's the same thing. That's moving the deck chairs around.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The OCC asked us to look at a $27-k V$ solution from Stamford into Greenwich.

MR. ASHTON: But Stamford is all 13, too, isn't it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct. We would have to build a new, and in essence, a new bulk substation.

MR. ASHTON: So you have to build a new substation in Stamford to provide 276 that reaches into Greenwich. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That was the alternative that was asked.

MR. ASHTON: And can you
transfer any load from Cos Cob to Waterside?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Very
minimal at this point.

MR. ASHTON: What is minimal?
What's that defined as?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think
there are no circuits today that -- that bridge that, those geographic locations. So we would have to build additional -additional distribution circuits.

MR. ASHTON: Did anybody look at the cost of that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So that would serve more load from Cos Cob.

MR. ASHTON: Yeah, transfer some of the load off of Cos Cob. You're saying you've got to do something drastic because Cos Cob gets to 135.8 MVA and you're worried about it. And I want to know what you did to try and figure out a way around it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So as the Siting Council is well aware, we built Tomac several years ago to try to offload some of the load in Greenwich and serve it. It has constrained space as well and we don't have the room to expand Tomac --

MR. ASHTON: I know Tomac is a
very small site. I do know that.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): -- which
is between Waterside and Cos Cob geographically. To build distribution circuits for, you know, several miles from Waterside into Greenwich we did not believe was a viable alternative.

MR. ASHTON: Did anybody look at it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we did.

MR. ASHTON: And what was the cost of that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): To have the same equivalency it was nine distribution circuits.

MR. ASHTON: Well, you're not going to get the same equivalency because nobody in their right mind would build ten circuits from Waterside into Greenwich. The question is, can you avoid or delay rebuilding the system between Cos Cob and Greenwich by transferring some of it to Waterside, slash, Tomac Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't
believe it's a practical alternative.
MR. ASHTON: That doesn't answer my questions, and I'm sorry. What kind of costs and load transfer capabilities are there?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, a new circuit would be approximately 20 MVA.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Twenty MVA
is a sixth of almost -- almost a sixth of your 135.8 MVA. It does mean that you can delay spending 140 million dollars at 30 million bucks a year. Isn't that true?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): If that were the only need, the capacity need at Cos Cob, the answer would be yes.

MR. ASHTON: And what else could you do at Cos Cob to help the problem? And I don't buy there's no room at Cos Cob. I know the station.

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Additional transformation could be added.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. And what kind of costs are we talking about?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Again,
there would probably be some acquisition of property.

MR. ASHTON: Can I make a suggestion that you come back with an answer a little later?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): I have the answer.

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): I have the answer. For the site at Cos Cob it would be approximately $\$ 190$ million.

MR. ASHTON: For doing what?
THE WITNESS (Gardell): To -we would have to expand into a property and buy a commercial building that's next to Cos Cob. We would also have to run two new 13-2 duct banks from Cos Cob all the way out to the Prospect substation location. That approximate cost is about $\$ 84$ million.

So that would be more
expensive than the transmission 115-cable costs, which right now are at $\$ 72$ million. So we did look at this and we think the most efficient way to serve the area is with the transmission solution.

MR. ASHTON: Are the gas
turbines still operating at Cos Cob?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): They are operational, yes.

MR. ASHTON: And how old are

```
those gas turbines?
```

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): At Cos
Cob, 1969, I think the first --
MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry. I
can't hear you.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I think
1969 the first set was installed, there was three. And then in 20082 additional units were installed.

MR. ASHTON: An additional unit or units?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Units, two.

MR. ASHTON: So there's five units at Cos Cob?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, there are.

MR. ASHTON: And the first three are roughly 20 megawatts apiece. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The first three are roughly -- yeah. All five are roughly 20.

MR. ASHTON: They're all five?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Roughly
20.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. I don't want to quibble on that. So you've got five gas turbines and that would support the Cos Cob substation on a single circuit. Wouldn't it? If you lost a circuit the five gas turbines and one $115-k v$ circuit would carry your peak load. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, one circuit today would cover the peak load, one overhead transmission circuit.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. You're not too fat with extra capacity, though, are you?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, I
believe for feeding out of Cos Cob is 160 MVA, and we're -- that's a hundred with the five.

THE WITNESS (Bowes) : And
those are not must-run units under any
situation.

MR. ASHTON: NO, I understand. They're reserve units, but the 59 units are getting a little bit long in the whiskers.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And again, they solve a capacity deficiency on the transmission system. They do not solve a capacity deficiency or a reliability issue with the distribution.

MR. ASHTON: I fully
understand that. What I'm troubled by when I hear a 190 million-dollar capacity expansion, that one, I'd really like to know more about that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And again, that was to look at a like-for-like alternative of the same capability.

MR. ASHTON: The same capability at Cos Cob or into Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The same capability to serve the $13.2-\mathrm{kV}$ load in Greenwich.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. What I'm trying to get at is, is there an increment that you can do that allows the postponement of the 140 million dollars, i.e., 30 million
bucks a year that will work for five years and so we can sort this out?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): In 2010 we initiated a series of projects that did just that. They're listed in the application. They were incremental distribution investments of about $\$ 35$ million that got us to the point we are today. There's always something you can do more. MR. ASHTON: Well, I know that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): But at what cost and at what benefit and at what longevity of solution?

MR. ASHTON: Been there, done that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we're at a point now where we've exhausted all the viable distribution alternatives to serve the 13.2-kV load.

MR. ASHTON: Let me go on with a few other things. I'm looking at some of the Pet Pantry Discount Store questions and answers. One of them relates to the permissions for construction or laying lines
by the I-90 Highway. And you say, no, it hasn't.

Has the company ever -- this was question number 01 , $I$ guess it would be. Has Eversource, $C L \& P$, whatever the current name is, ever approached the State to see whether they can run longitudinal on highway properties?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, we have.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: And what was the reason that the State said you can't? I assume that's the answer you got.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): They are planning to expand $1-95$ in that area.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. So they would only tolerate a transverse crossing and not a longitudinal parallel. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): For a divided interstate highway, that is correct.

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We build
distribution and transmission facilities
along normal state roads on a routine basis.
MR. ASHTON: Okay. On the same page I made a note that the cost of 140 million was based upon what assumptions of the ground that you were going to go through. And let me elaborate on that question a bit.

Did the company do any borings or look at any geological studies of the area?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes. Yes, the company did. They did 40 borings along the -- the route and they definitely looked at the geographic -- topology of the area.

MS. BAIN: Excuse me. Could we ask the witness to pull that microphone toward him? We can't hear him.

MR. ASHTON: Supposedly it's not going to help, but if he raises his voice it will help I'm sure.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'll try to raise my voice.

MR. ASHTON: I'm a great believer in the voice before the electronics.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Maybe I'll sit up.

MR. ASHTON: Would it be reasonable to say that it's fairly well known Greenwich is an awfully bony area, a lot of ledge?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): A lot of ledge that is exposed. That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: Did that fact come into the assumption of cost?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it did.

MR. ASHTON: Bear with me a minute. On question 06, in the sentence, the middle -- the second sentence says, the company has completed some investigation in that area to help quantify those factors and adjust estimated construction duration.

What investigations broadly did you look into? It's a three-line answer.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Can you ask your question again. $I$ just want to make sure $I$ got it.

MR. ASHTON: Well, it uses the
term, "the company has completed some
investigations," and I'm just inquiring as to what those investigations were and how competent they were. And competent in the sense of thorough.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah,
there were site surveys performed -- site surveys performed and the borings that we took.

MR. ASHTON: You did take
borings?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah.
There were 40 borings.
MR. ASHTON: Okay. I knew you did 40, but I didn't catch the "boring" term.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Oh, sorry.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. So that should give you a fair indication of the subsurface conditions. Is that reasonable?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It gives us a good start.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. In the next one it says you've taken 40 soil and water samples. Is that the reference to borings?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes,
that is.
MR. ASHTON: Now which is it?
Borings, which I find defined as drilling a hole down to find out what the heck is there? Or water and soil samples, which ain't borings in my book?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, we took the borings themselves and in the borings you can identify where the water table is.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. And you answer in the question 45, it talks about the area of the substation and the magnitude of the floods that are going to be experienced across the street and so forth. Apparently the preferred site is above the 500-year storm. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: Nonetheless, a 500-year storm has been exceeded this last weekend in South Carolina. And having had some personal experience with floods, magnitudes, does the company use in its
design a maximum probable flood or something of that like so that your connections, your protective schemes and so forth are well above anything you're likely to get in the way of floods?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): "Likely"
is the keyword in that question.
MR. ASHTON: I know it is, and that's what I'm waiting to hear with bated breath.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we use a base flood elevation which is dictated by the 500-year flood for a category three storm surge. And then add a design basis on top of that of one foot plus one foot.

MR. ASHTON: One foot plus
what?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Plus one
foot.
MR. ASHTON: So two feet?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So an
equivalency of two feet above the 500-year flood mark.

MR. ASHTON: And isn't it fair to say that the incremental cost of doing
that does not break the bank at all? It's where you put your connections, where you put your junction boxes and so forth? THE WITNESS (Bowes): For a new substation that is very accurate. MR. ASHTON: Right. Now we're talking a new substation? THE WITNESS (Bowes): To retrofit an existing fleet of substations, it is --

MR. ASHTON: It's a horse of another color?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is
very different, yes.
MR. ASHTON: Yeah, I
understand that. Okay. The next question in order, 46 talked about the outages that occurred in Storm Sandy where Greenwich Road got hit badly, 80 percent -- 87 percent in Storm Sandy and then 99 and a half percent of another storm.

That was primarily
distribution. Was it not, where the trees came down and cleaned out the house?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): For

Storm Sandy it was almost entirely distribution. For the second event that occurred in August it was a transmission loss of service, loss of supply.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. A loss of
transmission line?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
MR. ASHTON: Okay. So the substation before us per se would have no bearing on those numbers. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would have no bearing on the loss of transmission supply.

MR. ASHTON: Right.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): It
probably would have some bearing on the loss of distribution supply from Storm Sandy.

MR. ASHTON: Well, if you
still have overhead lines how is it going to work? You're not ready to put everything underground. Are you?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Two-part
answer. During storm Sandy our distribution automation saved approximately 100,000
customers. They were automatically restored with an alternate feed. That would be our intention, is to bring that technology to Greenwich once we have a second source. So we could use the Cos Cob substation and the Greenwich substation and place automation in between them.

So the hundred thousand customers was on a base of about 500,000 customers that were -- lost service during that event.

MR. ASHTON: I'd love to have a nice chat with you about overhead versus underground, but $I$ don't think that the Chairman is going to let me get away with that, so I'll pass on it.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the second part of your question --

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually you may, but $I$ think we have another member that's going to dive into that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The second part of your question around undergrounding, we have been active with the Town of Greenwich on looking at
undergrounding distribution facilities in the town. And there is a project proposed now in one of the low-lying areas that was directly impacted during super Storm Sandy.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. We talked a bit about the peak load at Cos Cob. I assume that's all weather normalized. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it
is.
MR. ASHTON: And what are the conditions on when you, quote, weather normalize?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't know specifically. I know we use a multiyear average, in this case a three-year average.

MR. ASHTON: Something like
90 -- 90 degrees or something of that nature?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's
a similar process to what ISO New England does with a 90/10 forecast.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. In
question 57 there's a little editorial in the answer. It says -- the question was

Eversource claims the project increased
reliability. And the answer to that was, as set forth this project will greatly improve reliability of electric service.

How would you like to talk to me a little bit about why it's greatly improved?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure.
Probably the nearest example I can give is during July of 2015. We had 27-kV circuit outages from Cos Cob to Prospect and went into emergency ratings on three occasions. MR. ASHTON: Caused by what?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The cable faults themselves, is what was the -MR. ASHTON: Okay. This was cable failure?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Cable
failures on the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ system between Cos Cob and Prospect --

MR. ASHTON: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Bowes):
-- forced the remaining
three feeders into their emergency ratings for, in one case, more than 24 hours.

MR. ASHTON: How old are those
cables?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): They vary in age. There are sections that are very old and there are sections that are brand-new.

MR. ASHTON: They've been in there for 50-odd years. Haven't they?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Prospect substation is now 81 years old.

MR. ASHTON: Having a birthday?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So some of the cabling components could be several decades old, yes.

MR. ASHTON: I can seem to remember working on and it ain't quite 81 years ago, but it's a long time ago.

All of these cables, whether regardless of the voltage, have a finite life. And so you do do various preventative maintenance things on them to try and measure what that life is. You do things, bigger than, or what have you, power factor testing and so forth?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Based
upon the technology of the cable system design we do a variety of operations and maintenance.

For example, if it's a
high-pressure fluid filled cable we maintain a cathodic protection system for the steel pipe. We take samples of the oil to look for a dissolved gas or other insulation breakdown. We do do electrical testing for transmission typically only upon repair, but we also have baseline of information from the original installations.

MR. ASHTON: And testing the oil you look for things like acetylene in the oil or something like that which might indicate a minimal of arcing?

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Yeah, acetylene typically --
is typically a more advanced gas indicating, you know, a partial discharge and fault, high temperature. We look for a change in other gases that are more predictors of degradation of the cable insulation. Acetylene usually is a go/no-go type of test.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. One thing
that caught me by surprise here, and I want to explore it a bit, was the fact that you were proposing to use an HPFF cable here as opposed to a solid dielectric. Help me out as to why you made that choice?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Two
reasons. I think one was the ease of construction. It's a much smaller trench, much smaller profile that would have to be excavated, and that leads to the second thing, which is, you know, a vastly reduced cost.

MR. ASHTON: The solid
dielectric insulation, insulated cable is a much higher cost cable?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be based upon the duct bank configuration, yes.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Gagnon has got something he wants to throw in to say. THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, I was just twiddling through some numbers here. And you know, we talked about the HDD excavating approximately 10,000 cubic yards as part of the entire line project. Going
with an XLPE you're increasing the depth, the trench base. And so that you'll be excavating around 14,000 cubic yards. So that's 40 percent more volume that has been taken out.

MR. ASHTON: A hundred bucks a yard?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): For concrete and for flow-able fill, probably, yeah.

MR. ASHTON: Why is that so different? What makes the trench so much bigger?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the insulating oil.

MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the
insulating fluid, so it's allowed to circulate, in this case, in a passive system so that cools the cables. In the future it could become an active system either by force fluid or by force cooling, which would increase the capacity of those cables and allow for, you know, a potential third interconnection into that substation.

MR. ASHTON: Eversource has had a lot of experience with oil-filled cables. Have they not?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we do.

MR. ASHTON: Have you had any
failures or dig-ins?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We've had a single dig-in actually in Stamford on the lines from --

MR. ASHTON: That was the
Cedar Heights cable?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): From Glenbrook to Cedar Heights, yes.

MR. ASHTON: And that was where a contractor dug where he shouldn't dig?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct, with an auger.

MR. ASHTON: Otherwise the record is perfect?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Otherwise the records that we
found that I'm -- that I'm aware of is perfect for CL\&P, that's correct.

MR. ASHTON: FOX a
high-voltage cable? Forget the low voltage. THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct. MR. ASHTON: Anything 69 and below.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So some of the things we've done since the Cedar Heights experience is -- it's now in a concrete encased fluidized backfill. So there's some physical protection to the pipes.

The individual circuit routes for transmission cables are now a separate call-before-you-dig utility, so it's not lumped in with the remaining Eversource distribution facilities. So we get a separate block out for that as well. And we also now put a tape along the linear route of the transmission cables to, again hopefully give some indication as people dig. They'll see the tape and stop digging before they excavate into the duct bank.

MR. ASHTON: And even CBYD,
call before you dig doesn't necessarily save
you. We have experience, have we not, that contractors on occasion are prone to dig the ground without calling CBYD?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
MR. ASHTON: They may be
beginning to learn, but there's still a way to go.

I want to ask you a couple of questions on the nature of construction for the cables. We talk in the application in absolute terms, but I'm looking for a relative term. Can you think of any construction that compares one way or another with the kind of construction that you're proposing here?

For example, would a water
line or a storm sewer line over something like that be roughly similar?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We did do a project in Stamford that is probably the closest.

MR. ASHTON: I know, but that's another cable job. I'm not interested in that. There are comments from people in the letters that I read where people are
expressing a lot of concern about what this is going to do. And what I'm looking for you to tell me is whether or not there are other non-Eversource projects that have a comparable, if not similar impact? THE WITNESS (Bowes): I can think of several, and one, the first I'll use is actually an Eversource project, but it's not electric. Our gas expansion project in the state of Connecticut is putting hundreds of miles of new gas pipeline in the ground to serve customers. So that's an example of another infrastructure project that is --

MR. ASHTON: Now Eversource does not serve gas in Greenwich. If my memory is correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: What kind of work in Greenwich -- in Greenwich would be analogous to what you're doing here?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the Town of Greenwich has done a lot of work with their sewer mains and recently had a project in the same proximately to Cos Cob substation
under Metro-North railroad tracks where they replaced some -- some sewer main.

MR. ASHTON: So would it be fair to say then that municipal projects, either water, sewer, or storm drains have similar if not identical impacts to the kind of thing that's going here?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, they do. Another example would be, you know, the large MDC project here in the -- in the central region, probably 10 to 20 times the size of the project we're proposing, much larger in scope and scale.

MR. ASHTON: Well, let me turn now to the questions of load growth, which I must admit in my heart of hearts I'm still puzzled by. I don't know where the State is going. The Governor has put forth a program of seeking to expand the use of various types of on-site generation, solar of one kind or another, expand the use of natural gas and what have you.

Has the applicant looked at the impact or projected the impact of that program?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: And what does it say vis-a-vis Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So one of the programs that has been advocated by the State of Connecticut is Solarize Connecticut where the Green Bank is the financing entity, and Eversource look at towns that have future capacity needs and identify them so they become a target per se for the Green Bank to promote solar in that town.

In 2013 the town of Greenwich was selected. The response was, I would say, acceptable, but was not robust as compared with other towns where the Green Bank has done a solarize campaign.

MR. ASHTON: Acceptable by the customers themselves?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, about 90 people, I think, selected residential solar in this case. We have pending applications for solar right now in Greenwich. There are 28 of them which accounts for about 400 kW of peak load and
that peak load occurs, or peak generation capacity occurs between ten and eleven in the morning for solar.

MR. ASHTON: So that's less than half of 1 percent of your projected peak load on the Cos Cob substation?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct. And it's also not the right time of day. It's between eleven and, you know, ten and eleven in the morning, not when the peak load occurs in Greenwich, between four and six.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Is it fair to say that the -- let's talk about peak first. The peak tends to be on a very hot windless day in summer, a calm day in summer?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It
typically tends to be the third or fourth consecutive day.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. But it's a day where there's darn little wind and a lot of sun, and a lot of temperature.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's a pre-loading on the first day. The load doesn't come down as much at the beginning of the morning. It continues to inch its way up
to the third or fourth day where you have very high loads.

MR. ASHTON: It pumps up as people take the air conditioners out of the attic and stick them in the window?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And they're less tolerant of public appeals for curtailment.

MR. ASHTON: And that peak load, that the load rises pretty sharply to about ten in the morning and then it's fairly flat, allowing for a little dip there maybe, and then the absolute peak is late in the afternoon, but it's a fairly flat load during that summer peak. Isn't it? It's not a spike like you get in the winter?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's becoming more acute because of, you know, on a systemwide basis because of the adoption of solar. So solar is curtailing the peak in the early afternoon hours, but drops off dramatically into the midafternoon hours where almost no solar generation, you know, a very small percentage of nameplate is available at three to four in the afternoon.

MR. ASHTON: So solar, really, is it fair to say solar really provides energy and not capacity?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's probably a good way to say it, yes.

MR. ASHTON: Or if it does provide capacity it's a relatively small amount that's nameplate?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): At the time of need, yes. It's probably in the less than 40 percent of nameplate when the hours of need are greatest.

You asked a more general question about load projections.

MR. ASHTON: Yeah?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): ISO New England has projected a 1.1 percent load growth that is above what Eversource --

MR. ASHTON: That's across the system?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct. That's above what Eversource has done. In fact, in this case even the area of the state with the most robust economy, in this case, Fairfield County, we are only projecting a

1 percent increase in usage.
This year to date we've seen a
1.5 percent increase in usage. So it's not out of the realm of possibility that the one percent is a good design basis.

MR. ASHTON: Eversource does not serve gas in Greenwich. Does it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We do not. It is served by CNG.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Does
Eversource have any opinion as to the relative cost of gas applications versus electric in the area of hot water heating and drying, specifically?

Let me be very blunt. Is gas cheaper for hot water heating than for drying, clothes drying and cooking?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I think the original question was around, do we have an opinion on whether it's more efficient or more --

MR. ASHTON: You can answer it that way. We'll come back later.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): You
asked one question. The second was a little
different. That's why.
MR. ASHTON: Yes, it is.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the
first question $I$ would say for the consumer that natural gas is probably a better alternative for -- for hot water, for heating and for --

MR. ASHTON: For drying?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): And For drying.

MR. ASHTON: If that is the case does Eversource feel any obligation to alert the consumer that that is the case so they avoid using electric applications?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we promote the national gas expansion in the state.

MR. ASHTON: That didn't answer my question.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So as part of our conservation programs we look at electric alternatives and we'll obviously try to recommend what's best for the customer regardless --

MR. ASHTON: Do you in a
declarative sentence say, Mr. Ashton, you have electricity to your house, you have gas to your house. It is in your best interest to use gas for heating, hot water and drying, period?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We never make that definitive statement, as far as I know.

MR. ASHTON: Would a campaign which does that chew into your peak load growth?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not on those summer hot days.

MR. ASHTON: Why?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Again, because we're not looking at heating, we're probably not looking at cooking. We're probably not looking at clothes drying.

MR. ASHTON: People do eat in the summer, I think.

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Residential gas for cooking is
a very small percentage of the electrical --
MR. ASHTON: And a 60-watt
lightbulb replaced by 11 -watt lightbulb is a
small increment for improvement, but nonetheless you take it. Don't you?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So part of our 1-percent load forecast assumes a certain amount of distributed generation and assumes a certain amount of energy efficiency.

MR. ASHTON: And assumes a certain amount of what?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Energy efficiency, which would electric conservation measures. We have been active in the town of Greenwich with our campaigns for residential programs.

MR. ASHTON: Does it include switching to gas?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do not know.

MR. ASHTON: Does anybody
know?
No. I'm sorry. It's a public hearing, but we need sworn witnesses. Nobody on the panel knows?

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman,
mr. Ashton, Mr. Swift will be here this
afternoon.
MR. ASHTON: Okay.
MS. DUBUQUE: And Mr. Swift
will likely be able to answer that question.
MR. ASHTON: That's fine. I'm getting to the end. And as the panel well knows my background is both electric and gas and $I$ was raised in an era where we did what we thought would be best for the customer and we broke our backs trying to knock costs down. So that's what some of my pointed questions are.

Your route goes across Indian Harbor, the proposed route. Is that an open cut or a directional drill crossing? I couldn't quite figure it out from the map. It looks like it's open cut.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): There's actually two. There's the preferred route. There's one that goes directional drill across, and then there's the preferred route open trench option that actually uses the cofferdam.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. And use of
a cofferdam is a fairly standard construction
technique for crossing bodies of water, streams of one kind or another. They use it on gas transmission lines. Yankee used it and so forth. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes,
that is.
MR. ASHTON: Well accepted and well proven. Okay. Bear with me while I will go through this thing.

On the bottom of -- this is Exhibit 1, page ES-7. At the very bottom the line reads, neither alternative is as desirable as the preferred route due to physical constraints and increased community and environmental impacts. That's a nonquantitative type of thing that $I$ have to ask a question about.

It's right opposite the route map which is an aerial photo. Mr. Libertine might like to chime in. Did you find it?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): The southern route, there's no room left in Sound Shore Drive, the alternative for the southern route. So we would have to be in private property.

MR. ASHTON: When you say no room, explain?

THE WITNESS (Gardell):
There's no room left for
utilities to be built in Sound Shore Drive.
MR. ASHTON: The drive is full Of existing utilities?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, it is.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. That helps explain it. No room doesn't mean much. So are they all active utilities or are they inactive, or what?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We've talked with the Town of Greenwich. They have some issues with their sewer mains. They have a new main in there. They also have their old main in that area. In the situation, they have so much stress on their system that they want to keep all their mains there because they have issues going forward with that.

MR. ASHTON: All right. I'll going to pass on that. I'm not going to fall on that. Just bear with me a little bit
more.
You gave me the size of the Cos Cob transformer. Do you consider a 1 percent overload, which is -- the 2017 figure is about six tenths of a percent of an overload, as I recall? And it's shown on page $\mathrm{E}-5$ of your application.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm sorry. What was the question?

MR. ASHTON: Well, you show that the peak total MVA load on the substation is 135.8. So you have capacity of 135. What I'm trying to get at is how serious of an overload that is. And I know that's an overload, but life is full of overloads and life is a crapshoot and we do take chances. What I'm trying to get at is how serious is that eight tenths of an MVA overload?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I wouldn't consider it a serious overload.

MR. ASHTON: Do you ever use water cooling on transformers, turning a garden hose on them?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

MR. ASHTON: I'm not recommending, but do you ever use it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we have.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. That is an FOA, FOA H2OA. Isn't it.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So what that does is it mitigates the temperature of the oil, but it does not prohibit the windings from being overloaded. So it's a very stopgap type measure with the idea that you're willing to accept premature aging and failure of that piece of equipment to carry you through, as you say, a very short-term peak.

MR. ASHTON: What is the power factor with that 135.8? Let me give do a follow-on question first.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We could easily find out and read it into the record.

MR. ASHTON: Well, okay. But the follow-on question is, has the addition of capacitors to correct power factor at Cos Cob been looked at?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it
has.
MR. ASHTON: And to knock that
loading down a little bit?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. So
when we look at the -- the bulk distribution substations and distribution substations every year for VAR needs, or capacitor needs. In the case of Greenwich, there are station capacitors and there are a host of line capacitors.

MR. ASHTON: Sure, they're out on the distribution circuit.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): On the distribution circuit to try to --

MR. ASHTON: And that's
voltage driven in part. Isn't it?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, voltage driven primarily, but also the necessary VARs to maintain a . 99 power factor as the desired, you know, at peak.

MR. ASHTON: Do you think the 135.8 is at the .99 percent power factor? THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think it's probably very close to that, but I will verify.

MR. ASHTON: I would like to hear what the number is.

Is there anything in Greenwich in the way of government philosophy, if you will, that says the load will not grow? In other words, are there any prohibitions extent in Greenwich that say you can't build new housing, you can't go put in additional loaded buildings or what have you?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, quite the opposite. Right now there's -there are several requests for new service and service upgrades. We're seeing a very robust economy. There are presently 92 applications in our design phase for either upgraded services or new services in Greenwich.

MR. ASHTON: So Greenwich
isn't going away?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): No. In
fact, we're seeing a lot of the older homes being -- being torn down and new homes being constructed.

MR. ASHTON: That's
interesting. I heard of a house -- not in
Greenwich, but in that general area -- it was
built in '98. A 5,000 square-foot house. It
was built in '98 and is has now been torn
down and is being replaced.
In the section -- on page
E-6-E, and it's section E-4.1.2, this -- you
talk about reliability and outages and so
forth. I want to be sure that we're focusing
on a substation and not on feeders where they
may be superannuated, may need some
replacement. Whether or not you do a
substation or not, is there still work on
feeders that has to be done notwithstanding a
new station?
you're going to tap into an existing feeder,
built a new Greenwich substation the existing
load on the $27-k V$ feeders would be reduced by
about the capacity of the -- it into the station and serve it
would have clearly $N$ minus two type contingency for those 27-kV feeders going forward.

So whether we made additional investments in them, or looked to ultimately retire them, that's probably a decision that is certainly beyond our planning horizon now, probably beyond the ten years. But I could see that taking place in the 10 to 20-year timeframe of serving Greenwich at 13.2 kV rather than the 27 kV as we have today.

MR. ASHTON: Has any thought
been to use the 23 kV as the distribution voltage?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Probably not in this case, introduce, you know, another voltage into the town of Greenwich. We will probably serve at 13.2.

MR. ASHTON: And that's because there's a lot of $13-8 \mathrm{kV}$ in the area? Is that fair to say.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, there's a lot of 13-2.

MR. ASHTON: 13-2. 13-2 is an old Helco voltage. Isn't it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
MR. ASHTON: And 13-8 was the old CL\&P voltage and never the twain shall meet. But anyway, it's a higher distribution voltage. Is that fair to say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MR. ASHTON: Is there any
thought of converting any of the distribution system to high voltage to get rid of some of the loading on the 27-6 feeders coming out of the station?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, in essence this plan replaces some of the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ system with 115-kV system.

MR. ASHTON: Yes, I understand that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So to go above 27 kV or to expand the 27 kV is not something we're looking at. In fact, quite the opposite of removing, you know, 50, a 60-year-old $27-\mathrm{kV}$ system uni-grounded that has other operating complications.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that winds me up for a while.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll let you unwind. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Ashton.

Senator Murphy.
SEN. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity at the last time. I will defer to other members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens. DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My questions are going to be somewhat on a different tack and they're going to focus on three areas. One is the need. One focuses on sort of a soft version of environmental justice issues, and then lastly on the routing.

And the first question I have is, there seems to be a lot of discussion whether or not you've actually -- and I saw this in the Town, the planner has said this. There's been back and forth, whether or not you've actually demonstrated that there is a need for this. And who actually has concluded beyond Eversource that there's a need for this?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I guess
I would say that I'm the decision maker on
the need looking at the load projections, looking at the reliability of the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ system, looking at the future capabilities, say, a system where we could transfer load between Cos Cob and Greenwich, looking at the aging assets of both the $27-k V$ system as well as the Prospect Street substation. So those in totality, $I$ would say are the main drivers for the need in -- in Greenwich.

DR. KLEMENS: How about ISO
New England? What do they have to say? THE WITNESS (Bowes): ISO New England has approved the technical aspects of this project, but it's really not a needs analysis. It's a no adverse impact. So they have said that by extending the transmission system to the new Greenwich substation it won't impact the bulk system, the bulk power system.

DR. KLEMENS: So I've read all the public -- well, $I$ mean not all -- but the public comments. I think there was one single letter that spoke from a gentleman in Riverside that spoke in favor of construction of this. Piles and piles of letters that
don't want this.
You have gone on record in saying that the only beneficiaries of this electricity coming from here in is the town of Greenwich. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

DR. KLEMENS: Not going to
Stamford Hospital?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is,
it is not going to Stamford Hospital?
DR. KLEMENS: Not going to
Rye?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

DR. KLEMENS: Not to Port
Chester?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not to
Port Chester.
DR. KLEMENS: All right. So it's an interesting conundrum. You have here a station that you ostensibly wish to build to benefit the citizens of Greenwich, or the residents, and yet no one wants it.

So I ask why are you doing it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's an easy question and an easy answer.

DR. KLEMENS: Really? I don't
think it's that easy.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Because we have an obligation to serve all the customers.

DR. KLEMENS: What if the customers don't wish to be served? What if the customers would rather be in the dark, have unreliable service as opposed to having that station put there?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So there is no customer in Greenwich that has come to us and said we don't want to be served by CL\&P any longer. So we have no one saying, we don't want electricity anymore.

DR. KLEMENS: Reliable
electricity, we're talking about?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): What
we -- what we're talking about is the obligation of a public service company to serve the load that is there, and also to anticipate the future needs of the town and clearly the reliability needs of the town.

So that is an obligation that we have.
DR. KLEMENS: What if they
don't wish you to have that obligation?
Don't they have a right not to have it? I mean, you've heard testimony that from the town planner they don't feel you've made the case that Greenwich is growing, that they dispute a lot of this in their statements. So if they don't want it why are we doing this?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So you asked a legal question before, which I'm not capable of answering. So -- but why are we doing it? I'm doing it because I believe it's the right thing to do for all the customers of Greenwich.

DR. KLEMENS: Even though they don't wish this to happen?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Even
though there's a percentage that do not want it, yes.

DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Do you
have any data on electrical consumption per town? I would like to know, are communities, more affluent communities such as Greenwich
using more or less per capita electricity?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we do have that data. In fact, we have at least filed partial data in that regard. Greenwich is the third-largest user of electricity in the Eversource service territory, and with 28,000 customers it is a far smaller number of customers that are served by the two largest towns, Hartford and Stamford.

For example, Stamford has approximately twice as many customers served at number two.

DR. KLEMENS: So we're looking at spending $\$ 140$ million which is going to be amortized over ratepayers across the state to service this cluster of people here at this very southwestern corner of the state. Is that the best way to spend all the ratepayers' money?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe it satisfies the needs of that community.

DR. KLEMENS: How about the rest of the state?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We
invest dollars in every town in the state of Connecticut every year. So in this case there happens to be a large investment in Greenwich, but there have been large investments in Haddam, in Killingly, in Hartford, in Stamford.

So to single out a particular
town for one project $I$ think is a very
limited view of the obligation to serve and I believe that we distribute the resources of the company in an appropriate way to satisfy the needs of our customers.

Not one customer better service than another, but all customers with a base level of service that means the lights don't go out on a hot day, the lights don't go out in the middle of the winter.

DR. KLEMENS: I understand
that. What I'm getting at is if in fact you have an area that seems to be using a lot more electricity, maybe than other parts of the state, what are you doing to encourage conservation there as opposed to building more capacity and more transmission?

Because it seems to me, and I
heard this in the earlier one -- and I drive around these communities. I see the landscape lighting. I see the incredible waste of electricity in some of these more affluent communities. What are you doing to try to -- to bring that in, I mean, instead of just building more? As long as you make more they will use more.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So there may be a multipart response to that.

DR. KLEMENS: Please?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Our
energy efficiency programs are provided for all residents in the state of Connecticut. We put more focus on certain areas than others and we identify for multiple years areas in the state where we could defer capacity investments. Greenwich has been one of those. So we've been very active with electric conservation measures in Greenwich.

That said, all of those programs rely upon a customer acceptance. We cannot force people to conserve. We cannot force people to put in more efficient appliances or lighting. We have an
obligation to serve as well, so if they want to use those appliances and that lighting that is their right to do that. It's not for the electric utility to say, you cannot turn on certain things at certain times.

DR. KLEMENS: So if the people in certain communities had the ability and the income level not to want to conserve, or conserve less than maybe because -- why do we end up paying? All the other ratepayers end up paying for these improvements?

I mean, this is the social justice issue I'm trying to hammer at. I feel as a ratepayer, I'm sort of -- and I'm very concerned about how I use my electricity. I have all kinds of energy savings. I feel I am subsidizing wasteful behavior in other parts of the state. And I feel that you are actually aiding and abetting it by just producing more and more capacity and transmission. That's my personal concern.

Where does this end? We used to talk about energy conservation. Now we just talk about putting more energy into the
hands of people. It seems conservation has really taken a backseat.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I
would say to start with, I disagree with your premise.

DR. KLEMENS: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Eversource is one of the
country's leaders in conservation programs. We've been active in conservation for decades. In fact, this last week we filed our three-year plan with DEEP, and ultimately it will go to PURA. A 700 million-dollar investment in energy conservation over three years.

We're active with the Green
Bank and Solarize Connecticut programs. More than a billion dollars over ten years is going to the solar and distributed generation industry in the form of incentives and renewable energy credits. So we are very active in trying to conserve and make Connecticut a greener infrastructure for their energy needs. We're active with the gas expansion in Connecticut.

So because we come forward with a project that is needed based upon capacity, based upon reliability, and it's a percentage of our overall spending program over the next decade, many of those budgets have come before the Siting Council, Bethel-Norwalk, Middletown-Norwalk, Glenbrook cables, Stamford cables, south end substation, Glenbrook substation, Cos Cob substation, with infrastructure improvements. We've invested over $\$ 2$ billion into that part of Connecticut, not at the -- at the expense of others.

We've also invested into, you
know, the Greater Springfield Reliability Project which brings a source of transmission into Connecticut. Now we're active in the building of the interstate reliability project. So we're building out infrastructure that's needed, some of it for economic reasons, but most of it purely for reliability reasons.

DR. KLEMENS: Okay. So we assume that this is needed. I'll go with that assumption now, despite everything that

I read, piles of paper that say you haven't made the case, but let's go forward with the fact.

Is there a reason why you haven't considered putting -- I mean, I have a problem with the parkland, going through a park. But $I$ also understand that the other route is crazy to go up and around and through. It's a very inefficient and expensive route.

Can't you consider putting it overhead parallel to the highway at the very, very northern end of Bruce Park and not have to dig, and all of this digging? Which to me, as $I$ see it is almost like fracking. Can't you just use electric wires across Bruce Park parallel to Interstate 95?

There seems to be an area below 95 that may be half in the park, half on 95 , where you can put high-tension wires, at least for that segment. And avoid all that disruption to the park to the residences and of all that.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well,
yes, we did look at overhead solutions as
part of the selection. We looked at actually four different possible overhead routes. And what we did is we actually end up dissipating them due to a bunch of reasons. And I'll let Jacqui dive into those because she did most of that work, but we did look at four options.

DR. KLEMENS: Were they presented to the Council as alternatives or anything?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): No, because when we looked at -- first we did look, we did sit with some CDOT --

MR. ASHTON: Use the mic, please?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We did look with -- at the utility -- the highway corridor. We did sit with CDOT. There is -there's not a lot of room in their corridor. They also have an expansion that's also part of our application, their letter back to us.

We did look at also going
south of Interstate 95. And if we were in that situation the amount of houses we would have to acquire in that area is rather large
and the cost of the project based on the value of the property is $\$ 290$ million.

DR. KLEMENS: Maybe I'm not being clear what I was talking about. I wasn't talking about the whole thing being overhead. I'm talking about basically you go to your preferred route map segment, sheet 6 of 9 .

I'm asking why you can't have this go -- and it may not be -- it may be off the 95 right-of-way. It could even be in the very, very northern part of Bruce Park. Why can't this area from the DPW shoot across and be high-tension wires at least getting over to Davis Avenue and maybe beyond?

I'm not saying the whole thing needs to be, but why not in this area that is so problematic in terms of the wetlands, and that why can't it go there?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We also looked at the impacts, all the tree removal that would have to happen for -- it would be somewhere between a 70 to 90 -foot right-of-way and you would have to remove all the trees in that area. And that also would
have huge impacts to Bruce Park going forward.

DR. KLEMENS: I don't see where the trees would be removed. You have on the orange you've got the open trench. That area there where you have to remove trees. It seems fairly open to me on the north end of Bruce Park there. You cross Indian Harbor. You cross another field that's essentially open.

Why can't you put the wires --
why can't you span Bruce Park with wires parallel to the highway, either on the highway right-of-way, or at the very, very northern end of Bruce -- edge of Bruce Park?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, if you follow the orange route, that, you know, that is a little small forested area I think of, $I$ don't know if it's five acres or so. The trick is, is with overhead, overhead line you also have to have a right-of-way clearing to make sure there the trees are substantially far enough away that they won't fall into the transmission line.

The minimum right-of-way
clearance is usually about 70 feet. So that that would take a pretty wide swath of everything along that, that corridor.

DR. KLEMENS: Weren't you talking about having the trench, just to do the trench it was going to be 50 feet wide already in previous testimony? We're going to take 50 feet to do the trench.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I believe it was 25.

DR. KLEMENS: Was it 25 or was it 50?

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, can
I help Dr. Klemens out here, Dr. Klemens? He asked a question that was not answered and that is, why not go overhead along the railroad where from Elia Avenue all the way to Cos Cob you're overhead along the railroad.

That's -- Eversource owns -- I can't remember who owns the rights for Elia Avenue back east, but they go all the way to New Haven along the tracks.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We
looked at that for the Stamford project also,
as building along the railroad tracks. Some of the difficulty is -- is the easement area itself. We do have -- the transmission line does have a cable swings, or what we call blowout. I want to make sure the term -MR. ASHTON: But there are ways of preventing that. Are there not? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, a lot more structures. You have a tighter and tighter pack.

MR. ASHTON: Yeah, you don't let a tangent string hang on. You have a standoff insulator, and you've got that along existing rights?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, one of the biggest issues that we have is working with the railroad schedule, working with the railroad availability to be able to take their tracks out of service. You know, it's an active railroad, very busy.

And when we looked at the Stamford project it was only allowing us to work -- and I'd have to look at the record, but if I recall it was close to two and half hours, three hours at the most, and that
included their track time turning and switching things off per day. So the amount of time for setup every day and breaking down the equipment, it would just become unfeasible to build along the railroad.

MR. ASHTON: Now careful. UI is doing it today.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): And we did look at the northern part, to go north of the tracks and there is room when you start off, but it quickly gets into folks. There's the backyards of the houses in that area and we also have acquisitions of homes, which we thought the impacts would be too great for this project.

MR. ASHTON: So you're saying to us that it is technically not possible to build along the railroad in this section where it has been possible to build along a railroad from New Haven all the way to Cos Cob. Is that right?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): Only because of how close the backyards and houses are to this area.

MR. ASHTON: And these are the
most? This is the most constricted section in the state?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): On the south side of the railroad between the highway and the railroad is only 36 feet. And on the north side it is -- I'd have to look it up.

MR. ASHTON: Well, you're building along the north side now. You've built along the north side. Is that not true? You're in the north side of Norwalk. THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Is the question, have we built or are we building? MR. ASHTON: No, it's a statement. You have built already on the north side. It's in congested areas with buildings right smack up against the railroad right of way. Is that not correct? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The
last project I recall was the Pequonnock Elia Avenue project that we built along the railroad.

MR. ASHTON: And that's a fair number of miles. Is it not?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It was
a fair number of miles. I don't remember the exact amount.

MR. ASHTON: And in this
section it can't be done?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Technically it can be done but there's an expense to it and that's where --

MR. ASHTON: We all can agree that building anything on a railroad ain't cheap?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Right.
And that's true. When you're comparing that cost of going through an open, you know, trenching, an open trench through a field, the open trench through the field is much cheaper, less expensive.

MR. ASHTON: Right. Did you run cost estimates on that overhead?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, we did.

MR. ASHTON: What do they
show?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, one of the most -- I think the cost estimate that we looked at in detail was 200 and --

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We -the number I quoted before was the south route. We chose to do one to the north and one to the south to get those numbers. But I have here the amount of properties in the area were 64 properties impacted. 60 easements and 4 to 10 acquisitions for the north.

MR. ASHTON: And what kind of impact are we talking about? Blowout problems where the conductor swings out over somebody's property?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): It would be in some locations we're very tight also. We also have our distribution line in that area. That would also have to be moved up onto the transmission structures.

MR. ASHTON: That's not

```
unusual. Is it?
```

THE WITNESS (Gardell): No, it is not.

MR. ASHTON: And so did the design include restrained conductors so it wouldn't blowout?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): It
would just mean you would have to have more structures in a smaller space.

MR. ASHTON: Maybe. But isn't that true along the railroad? Railroad construction ain't new. Is it?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): No, but we do not go in the catenaries anymore.

MR. ASHTON: I understand that you don't. You go on separate structures and that's been true for a long time. So is there a particular problem here that I'm missing somewhere?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): And if you were to continue the whole way north if you look on in Google maps -- I'm not sure if you could see it in our maps here -- but as you go to the west of Indian Harbor the backyards are right up against and there's absolutely no room as you move closer towards Greenwich Ave to put lines to the north of the railroad in that area without acquiring many properties.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The
bottom line it's just the cost of being able to do that versus the cost of the open
trench. The cost was $\$ 291$ million.
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Well, we did not estimate the north because of the huge amounts of impacts to go north all the way down to Railroad Ave.

MR. ASHTON: Well, Dr. Klemens has been asking what $I$ thought was a fair question and I should have thought of it myself. And that was, how hard did you squeeze that overhead route?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): When we looked at it we ended up only going as far as Indian Harbor. And then we did not think that we could build it further to the north and we would have to go across the highway and into Bruce Park and we would have to remove lots of vegetation.

And that would also put a tower at the pinnacle of height by the Bruce Park Museum and we thought the impact was too huge to the town of Greenwich to do that.

MR. ASHTON: If you went
overhead for part of the distance to make a transmission to underground, it's not a particularly formidable problem. Is it?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): With the cheaper HPFF it's harder to do.

MR. ASHTON: Yeah, you need a
little terminal station?
THE WITNESS (Gardell): Right, which requires more cost and more land and more --

MR. ASHTON: Wow. You know, you've got 140 million bucks. You're spending a hell of a lot, no question about it. Again, I think both of us are trying to get at the issue of how hard did you squeeze that solution?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We -we looked at ten options that we looked at for different routes and we had a multi-disciplinary team in our -- and our project team and then we brought others in to try to get the right fit for the town of Greenwich.

MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry,
Dr. Klemens. I didn't mean to take away your thunder, but I thought your points were well -- were good and well advised.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,

Mr. Ashton. I'd like to just sort of try to finish this up, because whether or not the whole length can go overhead, that's something that I'm not best able to judge.

But what I'm trying to figure out is what we can do about this very complex crossing, or options to Bruce Park. And when I was asking -- and I'm sure Mr. Libertine can opine on the value of the forest as you get closer and closer to 95 as to being a fragment and not having a great deal of ecological value. I would like to know why we can't take the project overhead basically around near the DPW on map 6 of 9, parallel basically the property line of Bruce Park.
I understand that the area
outside the white is probably -- to the north of it is probably the I-95 right-of-way. But push that right up against that property line, have it sail over Indian Harbor. Maybe, hit that peninsula. Put a pylon there and then land over on the other side. And maybe even continue overhead further west.

But I'm trying to avoid
everything that is being done or proposed to
be done in Bruce Park with the underground drilling and sort of quasi fracking type of drilling and trying to get it overhead.

Now whether or not you can put more overhead on a longer route, that that's an issue that Mr. Ashton touched on. But I don't know why we can't do something right here on that one and it goes, frankly, could even go further overhead. And don't see why you couldn't do it overhead for quite some distance going toward the museum.

And I don't know whether the impact of having all this underground work versus having a pylon by the Bruce Museum is bad. I mean, it was never presented to anyone to really opine on that.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Dr.
Klemens, I'm going to chime in a little bit and at least give you my perspective when we looked at this from a number of avenues.

Cost aside, just I would agree that in terms of the, what we'll call, the transition area that you're proposing to go from underground to aboveground at the DPW yard, that forest probably does not hold a
high amount of value in terms of wildlife habitat, or really -- it had some storm damage over the years and because the soils that are shallow out there it does not have a robust forest.

I had concerns that we started moving west. We did a take a look, not necessarily as a transition just through Bruce Park, but looking at options for overhead. As you move westward the forest is actually creating a pretty good buffer from the highway. My concern once I was told what the criteria would be for the necessary right-of-way with overhead lines, that 70-foot swath takes down a good amount of that if not pretty much all of that if we were to stay -- all that forest, if we were to stay on the northern limits adjacent to the highway.

And so my thought was from a
long-term aesthetic standpoint we had a visual and noise issue that doesn't exist today that would, you know, certainly impact people using the park as well as probably some of the neighbors along Kinsman Lane.

I felt if the techniques were done property once the construction was done people wouldn't even know this was here. So from a longterm standpoint that was my -- my feeling was that there was a benefit to exploring the underground options all the way along.

And with respect to even
moving a little bit further to the west and towards the museum itself, again, we tried just to transition it back into the road so that we would have as much minimal disturbance to existing vegetation, trees and that type of thing. And -- and I hear what you're saying.

One of the challenges $I$ think
from this transition to underground to overhead and then overhead back to underground, again because of the technology being used, and again, someone else can jump in here because this is a little bit beyond me, but I do understand that we would have to have other components that haven't been necessarily planned for at this point, which means more room.

I don't know if it means acquisitions or not. It could, but the impacts overall to the Park, we're talking 80, 90-foot structures, multiple structures with the overhead lines. That gave me some pause in terms of where we could come down and where really the visibility associated with these long-term would be.

DR. KLEMENS: But Mr.
Libertine, I understand what you're saying and it sounds seductively wonderful. We'll just bury it underground and you'll never know that it's there again.

My first question is, if it's running parallel with the highway as a backdrop and the train lines, $I$ mean, that northern part of Bruce Park already is quite visually impacted by its proximity. There's a highway. There's the train line. So it's hard to tell exactly how -- you would probably have to do some simulations to show exactly what that would look like standing in Bruce Park looking toward it, how visually jarring transmission lines would be given that the backdrop is Interstate 95 and train
lines.
We've heard a lot of concern about the wetlands and what happens with these, going under them. And so in a way you're right. Once it's hidden, it's hidden, but I'm concerned of how you get there in terms of impact. That that's really what I'm trying to -- I'm trying to avoid it and go overhead.

I don't know. Maybe if this is continued -- I don't know how this works in terms of getting a simulation, but $I$ would like to see how offensive, visually offensive it would be standing here down on the southern part of Bruce Park looking up to the high-tension wires that would be roughly paralleling visually the interstate.

Whether or not that would be such an intrusive visual thing versus the risks and the people's discomfort about going underground. There's people that are uncomfortable with the type of materials that are being used.

There's a question, which I'm going to throw out, whether or not you even
can even Kinsman Drive or Kinsman Lane. Supposedly that's a private road and one of the submissions said that their deeds extend right into the middle of the road. And so what permission do you have to actually do it there?

So there's lots of issues with this underground route that $I$ think could be solved by doing this, but that's just my opinion. You can respond to any or none of it.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.
It's -- you bring up some fair points. I think obviously this type of technology has been used. I think that's something that has to be balanced.

I think at the end of the day the feeling was when we started looking at a balance of cost, environmental impacts and social benefits and the downsides to some of these, it appeared as though an all-underground route in some configuration on -- on balance seemed to make the most sense to the entire project team, which I tend to agree with. But I -- also I
certainly understand what the concerns are. Nothing is perfect in terms of construction. DR. KLEMENS: And I guess my very final question will be, have you received permission or an agreement with the Town of Greenwich to actually go through their park to do this? I mean, this is all theoretical.

We've had -- the town planner came and had a lot of concerns about this. I understand the wetlands commission agency didn't have as many concerns, but do you actually have permission to go through this town park? Is this real?

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, if I might answer that question? As you know, the Siting Council has the ultimate authority to decide the routing or the location of the substation. So at this point there have been ongoing discussions with town officials, however there are no pending applications before the Town because we would need to know the precise routing before we would pursue the property rights acquisition phase of the project, but there have been discussions.

DR. KLEMENS: So Attorney
Dubuque, if we were to approve this route they would still have to get permissions? Or would we be basically taking the Town's parkland by our approval?

MS. DUBUQUE: No, you would not be taking the Town's parkland by your approval. Eversource would continue to discuss with the Town the appropriate rights and there are statutory provisions, as you probably are aware, that if the electric company or any public service company cannot obtain the rights through negotiation there are also court -- there is a court process.

DR. KLEMENS: So if we were to approve this routing through the park that would give you the leverage to potentially take the park by eminent domain?

MS. DUBUQUE: No, I don't think that's exactly what I said, Dr. Klemens.

DR. KLEMENS: Well, it's sort of what I heard.

MS. DUBUQUE: Well, no. What
I'm saying is that there, Eversource and
certainly CL\&P before it has a history, a very long history of working collaboratively with towns, with private property owners once projects are approved.

So to the extent that there
would need to be any further discussions or further process, yes. Ultimately are there other legal avenues available? Yes, there are. That would be part of the public utilities act.

DR. KLEMENS: But as we sit here right now the Town has not acceded to allowing Eversource to take a part of Bruce Park for this?

MS. DUBUQUE: We have not applied for any permits or approvals or grants of rights at this time. And I would like to just mention one thing, and we will submit if we may after the hearing, but your comment about Kinsman Lane. We do have documentation from --

MS. BIDRA: Excuse me. This is Lauren Bidra from the OCC. I'm going to have to object at this point. Attorney Dubuque is not a sworn witness in this case.

And this has gone on for a little bit too long, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to -it's a legal question, so she is allowed to answer the legal question.

So continue.
MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, we would like to submit following this hearing documentation about the issue that Dr. Klemens raised about whether Kinsman Lane is a public or private road. That's was the only point $I$ was trying to make.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. I
have no further questions for now,
Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to break for lunch. So 45 minutes and we'll be back here at approximately quarter to 2.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken
from 12:54 p.m. to 1:49 p.m.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good
afternoon. We'll have our discussion of football and whatever else -- and save that for 5:00 p.m.

Thank you. I'd like to resume our meeting. And I believe Mr. Hannon is -MR. HANNON: Thank You,

Mr. Chairman. Yes, I do have some questions.
I know with the horizontal
drills that are being proposed I don't believe that the company had finalized what type of material they might be using for the drills. But I'm just wondering whether or not it's bentonite or some other material is being proposed in conjunction with the horizontal drilling?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Bentonite is the common drill mud that they typically use.

MR. HANNON: Yeah, but I also know what the cost is per linear foot as far as the bond, and there are other materials that appear to be a little more environmentally preferable. So that's kind of why I'm raising the issue as to whether or not any determination has been made on the material that would be used? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, it has not.

MR. HANNON: Okay. In the application that came in, I've got a question about this low-strength concrete slurry. I have an idea of what $I$ think it might be. But my understanding is where all the open trenches are, this system would be used where you would be putting the low-strength concrete slurry.

Now is that something that is relatively porous? Because I've got to assume that it hardens, but sort of what is the porosity? Or --

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It is a concrete. It just has a different PSI rating. Normal concrete is 5,000, 7,000. This is like a three, it's a lot lower. So it allows you go back in and excavate later.

MR. HANNON: Okay. But it's pretty stable once it's in?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And the reason that I'm asking is because with some of the areas where the open trenches are proposed -- and you're also talking about a
cap by a protective layer of high-strength concrete. I'm assuming that there's very little subsidence in the trenches where they go in.

So that if you go in and you backfill a little bit, plant grass or whatever the natural environment is in an area, you're not going to see any subsiding like if you dig a trench in the roadway, you could backfill it or compress it as much as you want, but odds are it's still going to give. And you're going to start to seeing those depressions in the road.

So I'm just trying to get an idea if this is more -- you're not going to see it?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It's more stable. We've used this on a lot of projects down Route 1 where, you know, it has to meet DOT regulations and it, it does provide that stability.

MR. HANNON: And what type of -- or amount of soil, for example, would go over it as far as backfill if you had to re-grass an area? Because I don't believe I
saw that anywhere in the documents, so I'm just kind of curious on that.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Approximately a foot to
18 inches we have the opportunity to put on top.

MR. HANNON: Okay.
MR. ASHTON: Mr. Libertine, I couldn't hear that one.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'm sorry. About a foot to a foot and a half.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you. You have such a good voice $I$ would like to hear it.

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
Thank you, sir.
MR. HANNON: I believe there were two numbers that were given previously. One was about 10,000 cubic yards of material removed. The other one was 14,000 cubic yards of material being removed, depending upon what type of system and the wires that were being used.

What is being proposed to do with the material that is removed from the
trenches? Because if you're going in and putting in the concrete slurry, you're not going to have much of a use for what you're taking out of that trench. So what is the proposed use there?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We're actually going to be removing it off-site and disposing of the soil according -- according to regulation, you know, the standards.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Now my understanding is that Eversource and DEEP have reached an agreement. It took a while to get to in how to deal with these kinds of materials. I'm assuming that you folks are planning on adhering to that agreement?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Going back to sort of the diagram that gives the various options here, and it was discussed a little bit earlier about possibly putting overhead lines in by the highway. I'm just trying to get an idea, because $I$ guess what may be the highway right-of-way just north of Bruce Park, I think you've got three lanes in each
direction, a breakdown lane.
The center median is maybe a hundred, 120 feet. Does that sound about right? I mean, I'm not looking for the exact footage, but about a hundred to a hundred and $20 ?$

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I
would -- I would agree.
MR. HANNON: Okay. So if you were looking at possibly putting in overhead lines, say, north of Bruce Park what kind of right-of-way do you need and what would be the width of trying to keep that clear from trees? I'm just trying to get an idea because I'm curious as to whether there would be any buffer left between the highway and the park.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah.
This will be a -- built as a double circuit where we are building two lines down -- down that transmission route. So you would probably have a hundred -- typically what we use is a hundred feet of clearing for that right-of-way.

And then the two ends where
we're coming out of the ground we have to build a couple little mini substations to do the conversion for the overhead.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Gagnon, if you say you normally use a hundred feet that's not always true in a confined area. You could get through with about 50 feet. Can't you?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Seventy-five is, I would say,
is our typical.
MR. ASHTON: Phase to phase is
how much?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): About
20 feet phase to phase.
MR. ASHTON: Okay. And 15
feet on either side of it. So you got
50 feet by my calculation.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): You
would need more than 15 feet for blowouts. With a 40-foot -- we did take a quick look at this over the break. We would probably get by with 70-foot on that right-of-way here.

MR. ASHTON: You're worried
about blowouts.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We're worried about blowouts.

MR. ASHTON: And I'm arguing that by using dead-end construction or we screen you can cut that blowout down to essentially zero?

THE WITNESS (Case): Not zero.
No, with a 400-foot span you would still have -- 400-foot is a pretty short span.

MR. ASHTON: And what spans do you have along the railroad now?

THE WITNESS (Case): They're around 350.

MR. ASHTON: Let's talk about what you got now that you don't get that kind of blowout with a restrained conductor.

THE WITNESS (Case): No, but it would be a lot structures within Bruce Park, though.

MR. HANNON: Then one of the other questions that was raised at the public hearing had to do with the oils that would possibly be used. Can you tell me what's in the oils?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We're
planning to use a dielectric fluid called polybutene. And polybutene is a colorless, tasteless, odorless substance. It's not designated as an environmental hazard. It's not classified as a waste carcinogen. It's nontoxic, nonhazardous, non-sensitizing, non-teratogenic and non-mutagenic.

MR. HANNON: Have you provided any information on that to the Council?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The MDS sheets were provided.

MR. HANNON: Okay. I didn't see it, so thank you. Because I know part of the question was that, is there a possibility that these lines could leak. So that's kind of why I was asking earlier whether or not the concrete slurry is porous or not. Because if there was sort of a leak, then where does the oil go? You know, so it was the kind of questions like that kind of where I was going.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Let me provide some information regarding the pipe and the insulation itself. You know, the pipe that we put in the ground is steel. It
has an epoxy coating on it. We do weld the pieces together. The pieces are then $x$-rayed to verify that the weld is -- meets the requirements that we need, you know, a very excellent weld.

Then there is extra additional coating put over that mostly for cathodic protection. And then it's, you know, put in the thermal backfill on top of that. So there's -- it's a well-confined pipeline.

MR. HANNON: And just again, because this was an issue that was raised by the public at the public hearing. I just wanted to address it a little bit more. And I guess, for example, if there was a small leak somewhere for whatever reason, is there any type of leak detection that's set up on the pipes? Or would it just be that on a routine inspection somebody might realize the amount of fluids were lost? I mean, I'm just curious.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, we actually use three types of leak detection that we have. We have fluid level alarms in the system. We also look at frequency of the
pump operations, how fast they start up. And we also look at low-pressure alarms that we have on the pipe.

MR. HANNON: With one of the responses you gave a little earlier it does raise a new question which is nowhere in this document. I'm assuming that for testing the weld seals you're using x-ray equipment?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It's a
form of x-ray. It's not --
MR. HANNON: Is it something
that will require an ionizing radiation
license from our agency? Or do you bring in outside contractors that use equipment that's already been authorized by the agency?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'll
verify that. I don't know.
MR. HANNON: Thank you. No, because again, I'm assuming most welds that I'm aware of, they're usually done by $x$-ray machines and that often requires some type of ionizing radiation license. I mean, it's just a registration.

So I'm curious as to whether or not that's something that the company
would have and they may have a license for it that's portable, or you bring in an outside contractor just to make sure that that equipment is licensed?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I would assume it's the outside contractor that brings in that license as part of their contract responsibility.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. I do not -- well, wait a minute. I do have one other question. There was some dialogue about possibly doing some other things at some point in the near future and delaying the Greenwich substation. I guess part of my question is that, what are sort of the inflation rates associated with it?

If you move this out, say, five years, because you were able to do some other modifications and the substation was delayed for, say, five years, what are we looking at for inflationary rates and how would that then, when you combine the cost of the other things that you might do within the next five years, how would that relate when you take that cost and then add it in to the
additional cost of the substation?
I'm kind of curious if you have any numbers like that.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'll try my best to answer. I think the inflation rates are fairly nominal. I think we look at a five-year look when we do budgeting. I think the inflation rates are 1 to 1 and half percent. So it's fairly nominal in that regard.

As far as the -- if we were to delay five years what would we have to do and the cost of that, it would probably be the use of emergency generation so there would be either purchase or rental, it would be operation of that. So it could be in the, you know, 10 to 20 million dollars per year range.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then I'm also assuming that labor, materials and everything else would go up. You know, so I guess kind of what I'm getting at is if you have 30 or 40 million dollars that you need to spend between now and, say, five years to do some of these other upgrades, is it going
to cost more than that by the time you go back in to do the substation because of all the other factors that may come into play just in terms of overall cost?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is
likely that it would cost more than the 140 million-dollar estimate today. It's hard to say. I think the bulk of this project will ultimately be the civil construction costs and that's probably more dependent upon the availability of contractors and the market pressures that they're seeing for other work.

I wouldn't expect to see large variations in that, but if there are other large infrastructure projects that constrain that market the prices will probably go up a little more.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. I have no other questions at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens.
DR. KLEMENS: Very quick follow-up question to Mr . Hannon's questions about the buffer along -- separating Bruce Park from Interstate 95. And this is a
question for Mr . Libertine, I think.
If you were to use the orange
route that's on the preferred route map segment, map sheet 6 of 9, we follow that orange route. And let's, for argument's sake, we go 35 feet on each, you know, each side of it. If those trees were removed 35 feet on each side of that orange line, in your professional opinion are we still well buffered, still a buffer between Bruce Park and the interstate tree buffer?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): If we follow the orange option line as it's depicted here then I think we're taking advantage of some open field areas on the property. So it appears that a 35-foot offset on either side would not impact a lot of the areas in that northern portion of the park.

## We still have the

consideration of where on that particular figure of map sheet 6 of 9 in the back of the application, where it's shown as BPV-2 open trench. Obviously there's going to have to be significant clearing in there.

When we talked about this a little bit earlier I felt as though we were talking about pushing it even further to the north and so that, that I had some serious concerns about opening of those areas, I guess I'll call it the north of the dashed line.

But two things for
consideration, Dr. Klemens, that I've had some concerns with about overhead transition here is at either end we do have to have a transition station of some kind. I don't know the exact dimensions of those, but I do have concerns about the -- the space and what kind of clearing requirements we might have with those. So that's just another consideration.

But to answer your question, I think if we're to follow that line, as your suggesting, then certainly it minimizes the amount of tree clearing that would have to be done.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner

Caron.
COMM. CARON: I'm all set,
Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch.
MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, I
wasn't here this morning and I'm sure Mr. Ashton asked all my questions while I was gone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some you probably had never even dreamed of asking.

MR. LYNCH: So that having been said, and I've had a little minor accident coming here, I'm just waiting for the drugs to kick in so $I$ can go through the rest of the day. I'm going to pass for now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. LYNCH: I have faith in you, Phil.

MR. ASHTON: Just so that I'm clear in the discussion we had on the preferred route, are we looking at the drawing figure G-8, $B$ as in beta? Is that the one everybody is referring to?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, sir.

MR. ASHTON: Let's make sure the applicant says yes, too. I hate to see a grown man cry.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): G-8
is.
MR. ASHTON: G-8, B as in
Betty. Okay. We're all on the same page?
THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.
It's the same, same figure as what
Dr. Klemens had referenced.
MR. ASHTON: Mr. Bowes, you mentioned that in that the event the station was delayed that you felt there would have to be an emergency generator installed. You didn't say where, when and how big and how fueled and so forth. And so I'd like to hear a little bit more about that. Is this going to be, have to be in the Greenwich area, not Cos Cob?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.
It would be probably at the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ substations for $27-\mathrm{kV}$ customer locations. A tractor-trailer mounted unit is in the 2-megawatt range. So probably a dozen or more of those at locations around --

MR. ASHTON: And if it was a couple of megawatts would that not load off the diagram -- off the table you had earlier -- and I forget what page it is, but it's up front of the application, anyway.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Do you
have a diagram?
MR. ASHTON: I don't have the page reference in hand, but there's a table up early in Exhibit 1 that lists the load on the Cos Cob substation. That's the one.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): On page
E-5 there's the summer load, summer peak loads and then a projection out to --

MR. ASHTON: How much would a couple of megawatts buy in terms of time, assuming you replace or do something when you hit 100.0 percent, which $I$ find a little amusing?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): By adding more each year you could delay it probably five years or so.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. Thank you.
I have nothing further.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have a
few questions. Since there have been a number of questions raised about an option of overhead lines, and obviously you had previously done your homework, although apparently you chose not to give us. I'd like to have a little bit of analysis that you could present at the next meeting, a diagram, maybe a visibility, a cross-section. Some information so we have that as an option we can understand a little better.

We know where you're coming from, but it's been sort of piecemeal because of the questions. So that would help if you could put that all in the package. And I think you pretty much know based on Dr. Klemens, and what we're talking about. We're obviously not talking about the whole distance, but particularly to avoid, or to mitigate the impacts on the park.

MR. ASHTON: I'd like to see a cross-section on the overhead route near that area you felt was very congested. I'd like to see what could be done. And I'm not interested in a hundred foot right-of-way, so don't give me that. It won't fly.

THE CHAIRMAN: So hopefully
that's understood. I'm not totally clear on one of the issues, which I assume is reliability and I thought I heard one of the answers was, how did you determine that? And I think Mr. Bowes said, I determined it. And that's okay.

But forgetting that, I mean, is there at some point where maybe that you would have -- you would be in violations of either some state or federal agency and therefore be subject to something? Or I mean, how do you measure the reliability other than saying, of course we want redundancy and everything else?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I can maybe provide a more detailed description. I was kind of are abrupt when I said that. So back in the summer of 2011 we had a series of issues on the $27-k V$ system that led us to a conclusion that we needed to finally build a new bulk substation in Greenwich.

We got into a situation where we had to shed customer load over a series of days where then 5,000 customers were
interrupted. We did not think that was acceptable. We think the obligation to serve requires us to serve all customers at all times, except under extreme conditions. So we went forward and made a public announcement around a new substation. It was a very open process. There was a press conference, actually, where I made that announcement.

We then embarked on a series of meetings with the Town of Greenwich to talk about where we could site the substation. That didn't stop us from doing the other regulatory requirements that we have. We listed it with your ten-year forecast of loads and resources, 2012. We went through the ISO New England process to make sure we studied the area completely and looked at whether it was a two-line solution or a three-line solution.

And we accommodated in our
final design a two-line solution, but plans for the future of a three-line solution, both at the substation with a six-position ring in the GIS building, and also with the
fluid-filled system that we can circulate or cool the fluid in to expand the capacity if it were to interconnect with a bulk power system at some time in the future.

We completed the ISO process with no adverse impact. Last year we went through the distribution rate case for Eversource Connecticut, listed that as part of our capital program for five years. So it's been a very open and transparent process we have used to go through about announcing the fact that we needed a substation and how we got there.

So it's more than just me deciding. It's been me identifying the need, the urgency of the need and then starting on a five-year plan to try to get -- try to get us there. In the interim we did multiple distribution system improvements, more than $\$ 35$ million worth of improvements that got us to we are today.

But even last month we had three contingencies -- not last month, but the month of July we had three contingencies on the $27-k V$ system that put us narrowly
close to again interrupting customers in the town of Greenwich. To me, that's not an acceptable way to run an electric system. So that's why we're here today, again trying to articulate the need that we do need to have a bulk substation in Greenwich.

It also opens up future
capabilities that we don't talk about yet in the application, the ability to switch between Cos Cob and the new Greenwich substation, to provide customers with automatic backup where they do not have that today. There's nowhere to move the load. If we get into the 24 -hour contingencies we talked about this morning with Mr. Ashton, that anticipates you can move the load to some other substation within that 24-hour period. There's nowhere else to move it here. We can't move it Waterside. We can't move it to Stamford. We can't move it to New York. So we are stuck with having to deal with an issue at the end of the line. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That was, I think, a more useful response than the prior one.

On the issue of future demand or the increase in demand you mentioned Energize Connecticut, various efficiency, and Solarize, those, but I'm wondering -- and this question, it's probably better asked to the Town, but the Town has chosen not to be a party, so I'll ask you.

Has Greenwich embarked on any
other types of -- what did you call it?
Reduction in demand activities such as microgrids? Such as, do they have an energy district? I mean, has the Town? Because we've sort of asked what you've done and you've talked about how proactive you are.

But has the Town been
proactive in dealing with -- and obviously they've known about this since you've had this transparent process for a number of years.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I can respond to the microgrid specifically, and then maybe open up to a more general response. We've gone through two solicitations in the state of Connecticut for microgrids. We have not received any
responses from the Town of Greenwich.
We're about to go out with our third in, probably in October to, again try to solicit input in proposals for microgrids. Again, microgrids are a part of the solution as is Solarize Connecticut, as is energy efficiency, but it will tend to slow the rate of demand versus replace the reliability need that we have today.

I'm personally not aware of any other actions that the Town has taken for trying to satisfy their -- their consumption or their demand issues.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And
I just wanted to mention everybody received this document that was provided by Consumer Counsel about a case in New York. Queens, and Brooklyn, which when I first looked at it I said, is this being provided to replace a sleep medicine I use?

But after rereading I found it actually very interesting about how in that particular case -- and obviously it's another jurisdiction, another state -- they really went, you know, a combined process of looking
at every aspect of alternative.
And I thought it was
interesting and would think particularly if the issue was raised by the Town and others then maybe, you know, being a little bit more proactive might have delayed where we are today. That apparently is not the case, but that certainly maybe should be required reading of the number of the -- I guess that's a comment as opposed to a question.

I just, I guess, one other thing. The structure that you're proposing for the new substation, is that -- this was probably asked and answered before. Is that normal? Do you normally, when you build a substation, put it inside of a building?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We do not. We have one other bulk substation that is contained or partly contained within a building. It came before you as part of the Bethel Norwalk and Middletown Norwalk projects, where the $345-\mathrm{kV}$ GIS at Norwalk substation is contained within the middle building.

We don't have any other
distribution substations or new distribution substations that are inside buildings. Some of the open-air $4-\mathrm{kV}$ systems we have, or substations we have we're actually in the process of retiring and removing those indoor substations.

What makes this unique is the need for two things. One is we are planning for the future with a sixth-breaker ring. That dictates us going to a GIS technology. And the reason six-breaker ring, is for the third transmission line that might ultimately come here.

Future plans, nothing on the drawing board today, but again, thinking 30 or 40 years out it's a viable thing to plan for. Putting it inside the building, it's an urban area. What we're seeing and hearing a lot from the residents of Greenwich, that they would prefer to have this substation in the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: But apparently not in the building you've designed. And I raise this, somewhat elicit smiles from some people, but also because -- and I've seen
some of the proposals by, I think, we'll have them, at least in one case an intervener.

But the more you dress up the building, it does add to the cost and that cost is something that we're all going to be paying for. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think
some of the -- the additions that we've been asked from the Council and from the Town have provided a positive aesthetic benefit and the costs have been relatively nominal at this point. So $I$ don't think it's been overly burdensome at this point to change the design or outlook of the facade of the facility.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's helpful. Mr. Hannon.

MR. HANNON: Thank You,
Mr. Chair.
Just to follow up on one of your comments about the future expansion of this proposed site with going with a third unit. The pole site, which is, I guess, located just a little bit up the road, would that site be large enough to also accommodate the third unit?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it's an alternate location that has the same equipment, whether it's at the preferred or the proposed or the alternate. It both fits onto the site. There are some other issues with the alternate site, which have been identified in the application.

MR. HANNON: I'm just curious because you're saying you're trying to plan out for the future. I was just curious if the pole site would also be able to accommodate the tree units?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it would.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens.
DR. KLEMENS: I just have one more question, and I tried to get at this earlier. I understand your desire to provide reliable electric service as a corporate decision and a duty. What $I$ was trying to elicit, and maybe I wasn't very successful at getting that, if you fail repeatedly to provide reliable electric service to parts of your service area are there fines or
penalties that can accrue to your utility for not providing reliable service?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Over the
years we've had a series of reliability dockets with PURA. And in some cases there have been, I guess you could call it penalties, either disallowances of storm costs, return on equity penalties. For a specific town it's usually been a required improvement project and then reporting on that.

So for example, if we were to not serve the town of Greenwich and we might be ordered to build the facilities that we're here today seeking approval for.

DR. KLEMENS: Or if you were penalized in some way on a larger scale ultimately any kind of costs and penalties that are placed on Eversource ultimately find their way back to the ratepayers?

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Typically not the penalties.
DR. KLEMENS: Well, whatever you want to call them, but I mean, what I'm trying to get at is there's a larger societal
interest in having this grid beyond Greenwich, or not. THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think

I understand. And yes, there's -- there's obviously benefit to having reliable service, not only for the customers in Greenwich but for all the, you know, the economic development of that area as well as the people that are frequency -- frequenting those establishments in Greenwich.

DR. KLEMENS: That's maybe why there's a Siting Council with some of these decisions, because when a community may not want something there may be a larger regional need or common good, and that's what we're charged with doing, would you say?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think
you have to weigh the positives and the negatives of any project, try to minimize those, try to make it cost effective and reliable. But you have to balance those needs.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: So we need to do some chair shifting. We'll now go to the
questions from --
MR. ASHTON: Before you do I've got one more. In terms of what you're going to be supplying us $I$ would like a careful look at that right-of-way near Bruce Park Road, whatever it is. I won't accept a 100-foot right-of-way requirement. That's clearly out of the question.

But there may be options such as putting poles on both sides of the railroad right-of-way with the arms hanging into the right-of-way that allow you to go overhead there. And I'd like a careful look at that option. So that please don't put a hundred foot right-of-way in there. I'm not going to swallow that.

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, would you like to have the answers to the two questions that were asked this morning? We do have answers. One was about the power factor for 1-35.

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess if we have an answer.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The
power factor at the peak load day was 0.998
or effectively --
MR. ASHTON: Unity power
factor?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Unity
power factor.
MR. ASHTON: So that means there's no advantage of putting in capacitors at Cos Cob to go to unity. You don't reduce the loading of the transformers?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
MS. DUBUQUE: And Mr.
Chairman, the second question was about what we tell customers, what Eversource tells the customers in terms of electric and gas options. And I mentioned that Mr. Swift would be here this afternoon and he can answer that question if you would like him to do so now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

```
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    recalled as a witness, having been
    previously sworn, was examined and
    testified on his oaths as follows:
    MS. DUBUQUE: And I just want to say for the record Mr. Swift was sworn in on September 1st.

THE WITNESS (Swift): Good afternoon. I believe that the question had to do with energy efficiency, and correct me if I'm wrong, and then if energy efficiency pays incentives to customers to change from one fuel to another fuel, in this case it was natural gas.

And energy efficiency doesn't promote fuel switching, whether it's from oil to gas or electricity to gas. However the energy efficiency programs do encourage customers to be energy-efficient. So if a customer is converting from one fuel to natural gas we encourage those customers to participate in our programs and weatherize their homes as an example or add insulation.

And in addition we offer
incentives for high-efficiency equipment. So if a customer is putting in a boiler we will pay an incentive to cover the incremental cost of installing a high-efficiency boiler versus a -- versus a baseline boiler.

MR. ASHTON: Just one question. You do not then tell a customer you can take advantage of gas to your economic and energy efficiency benefit?

THE WITNESS (Swift): Energy efficiency doesn't do that. As I'm sure you know have do a sales group that, you know, consistent with the State of Connecticut comprehensive energy strategy, you know, to encourage customers to --

MR. ASHTON: I'm looking for a yes or a no.

THE WITNESS (Swift): Energy efficiency does not do that. We encourage high efficiency assuming the customer has made the decision to change fuels.

MR. ASHTON: It's up to the customer to figure it out?

THE WITNESS (Swift): It's up to the -- exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right.
Thank you. So we'll now continue cross-examination. Office of Consumer Counsel.

And will you three vacate your
positions so they can come here please? We do find that Eversource like to monopolize all the seating. Sorry, you have to share. So whenever you're ready to begin your cross-examination.

MS. BIDRA: Good afternoon,
Mr. Chairman, Council members, and Eversource. My name is Lauren Bidra.

MR. LYNCH: Speak up, please.
COMM. CARON: It will adjust.
THE CHAIRMAN: Keep talking and we'll adjust by some magic wand. But Commissioner Caron apparently --

MS. BIDRA: Apparently it wasn't on.

COMM. CARON: You know what your problem is then.

MS. BIDRA: My name is Lauren Bidra. I'm a staff attorney with the Office of Consumer Counsel.

MS. BAIN: Good afternoon councilmembers, Attorney Bachman, Council staff and panel. I'm Margaret Bain from the Office of Consumer Counsel.

I'd like to start off with
looking at need and look at the forecast. We have in the application on page $E-5$ you have a table that goes out to the future. And in the response to OCC-22 we have a revision to part of that table, so if we could get those two together.

So the table in $E-5$ has a
total of MVA for 2014 of 131.8 and that was revised to the actual in OCC-22, of 107.7. So 2015 in $\mathrm{E}-5$ is 133.1. And in OCC-22 it's 114.8. So significantly less.

So would you talk about the
future from starting off from the point of the estimate in 2015 of 114.8. And even before you do that, is that estimate close to the actual for August? Do you know?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I
believe the 114.8 is a July number.
MR. ASHTON: Normalized?
MS. BAIN: Okay. Was your
peak in July or do you know what the August results are at this point?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I
believe the peak was in July and it's -- it is normalized. It was approximately, I
think, 89 percent of the normal system, or the absolute system.

MS. BAIN: So you're
comfortable with the 114.8?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I
am.
MS. BAIN: Okay. So if we could look at, for instance, are you starting with the 114.8 and using your 1 percent increase per year from there?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): For
what?
MS. BAIN: For the future, for
2016 we'll start with.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm not
sure I understand that.
MS. BAIN: You're saying
there's 1 percent growth per year approximately?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The
1 percent was in the original application.
MS . BAIN: Right.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Table
E-1.
MS. BAIN: Right. Correct.

Page E-5?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So that was derived from a group of substations in the Norwalk Stamford subarea and it was the average of three years. So it was 2010, '11 and '12.

## A VOICE: Louder please.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was 2011 -- 2010, '11 and '12 and it was the average load increase of those transformers per year over a three-year period. That's what we used to project the 1 percent going forward from 2013.

MS. BAIN: Uh-huh. And now we're starting from a different point.

Right? We're starting from a lower level. We're starting from 114.8. Right? If we -let's take the response to OCC-22. Okay?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm not sure $I$ understand what you mean by starting from.

MS. BAIN: Starting to look at the future from a lower level. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, there certainly have been two years of, you
know, 2013 and 2014 -- or I should say, 2014 and 2015 that were lower than the 2013 number, but we have not reset it to 114.8 as a starting point.

MS. BAIN: Are you still sticking with 134.5 for 2016?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we're saying that the underlying kilowatt hour usage has really remained unchanged even though the peak demand has come down. So the basis for the customer load is still there.

You understand what I'm saying?
MS. BAIN: I do.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the
kilowatt hours are still all being used. So the customers haven't all of the sudden changed their equipment. The number of customers is essentially unchanged while the number of customers, new customers taking advantage of Solarize Connecticut or energy efficiency has remained unchanged. What has changed is the weather.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Just to clarify we're looking at the summer peak load levels tables?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MS. BAIN: Okay.
MR. ASHTON: Is that weather normalized? Is the 114 weather normalized?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the absolute loads taken. So no, it would not be. If we had seen the same peak in New England that we saw in 2013 we would see --

MR. ASHTON: I want to make sure we haven't got Russians numbers here. I asked you earlier about the 135.5 peak on Cos Cob in 2017. You answered that was weather, a weather normalized peak. Remember?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Because it's forecasted, yes.

MR. ASHTON: NOW I understand, but it's a weather normalized figure. What $I$ want to know is the 114.8 and the 107.7 and the year proceeding weather normalized?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, they're actual values.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. So that could be, I'll pick a ridiculous figure, 65 degrees, not 95 degrees. I don't know what it was, but the point is, it ain't
weather normalized, so we're not comparing apples and apples.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The past
is the actual data. The future is the forecasted data.

MR. ASHTON: Right, but again, the past is not weather normalized?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So what that means, I think, if I could expand on that, is that if the same weather were to occur as occurred in 2013 we would see the peaks that have been forecasted.

SEN. MURPHY: So let me see if
I can understand it. I think you're really talking about two starting points. She's talking about starting points as the real thing, and you're talking about a starting point that's annualized, and there are two different things.

MR. ASHTON: Normalized.
SEN. MURPHY: Normalized, two different things. And she's asking you
questions and you're thinking in a different term than I think she, is the problem that you're having. She's talking about your real numbers and you're talking about the normalized numbers. And you forecast off the normalized numbers, not off the real numbers as I understand it.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct. And we also look at not just a single substation or a single transformer.

SEN. MURPHY: Right.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We look at a group of them. That's probably representative of what's going on in the economy.

SEN. MURPHY: But I can see the cross-examination coming about the growth, but you're really starting at two different points to talk about the growth, is the point I'm trying to make. And I think it hasn't been clear. At least it wasn't to me until you resolved it. Sorry for the interruption, Mr. Chairman.

MS. BAIN: So are you looking
at making any changes to this table $E-1$ for

2016 forward?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We have not redone the planning or the load forecast for the summer of 2015. So there it's possible there could be adjustments based upon, you know, the data that is still being compiled. But at this point we have not made any changes.

MS. BAIN: Now what else goes into the peak usage forecast? Would it be subject to energy efficiencies in addition to weather?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, energy efficiency, distributed generation and also an eye towards what ISO New England is also looking at for the regional system as far as the growth rates that they are looking at it, to make sure that we're not totally disparate from what they are projecting as well.

MS. BAIN: Okay. So if we do look at OCC-22, which has actuals. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MS. BAIN: The actuals went
down from 2013 to 2014 -- I calculated it
down 17 and a half percent, which you cite that number as well. And then in the next year it went up 6.5. Okay.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I
believe that's -- I calculated the same numbers, yes.

MS. BAIN: Okay. And then
between 2012 and 2013 it went up 1.8?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So this, this points out some of the difficulty of looking at a particular year and a particular substation in trying to come up with an overall estimate of the load increasing or the load decreasing.

MS. BAIN: Along the same
lines, if we look at the response to OCC-24.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I
have it.
MS. BAIN: We have the 25
largest customers and their maximum demand. Between 2014 and 2015 I counted 11 customers increased and 14 decreased in their usage.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): This is actually the peak demand, but I think that's right.

MS. BAIN: And their usage during the peak, yes. And so have you noticed that customers have had an impact from energy efficiency? Or why do you think those customers decreased who decreased, the 14 that went down?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do not
know.
MS. BAIN: You don't know?
You haven't looked into that?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): I have
not.
MR. ASHTON: Mr. Bowes, where
the times of the peaks the same? Could one group be on -- one entity be on vacation in the summer at one time and then not another? It's potluck. Isn't it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's probably many reasons why the demand changes. It could be the ones that increased, you know, may have added an additional shift. They may have added a new production line. Other customers may have done energy efficiency measures that have now, you know, mitigated the peak demand. I just have not
studied the 25 in any detail.
MS. BAIN: Okay. Starting with the response to OCC-19. Now in the attachment it lists the customers who will be sharing the category A load. Is United Illuminating going to be contributing to that?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): United
Illuminating is an extended 21 category customer. They are not connected to CL\&P system and non PTF.

MS. BAIN: So no, United Illuminating will not. No?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): No.
MS. BAIN: And what percentage
will Public Service of New Hampshire be contributing approximately?

THE WITNESS (Cooper):
Twenty-one percent.
MS. BAIN: And Western
Massachusetts Electric?
THE WITNESS (Cooper):
Nine percent.
MS. BAIN: And is the only
reason that they're contributing is because
they are sister affiliated companies? They are part of Northeast Utilities companies that work together.

THE WITNESS (Cooper): The rate design for schedule 21 category $A$ is for all customers connected at non-PTF and PSNH and WMECO are connected at non-PTF for this rate design.

MS. BAIN: Okay. So this is?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So that
would be, again non-PTF facilities in New Hampshire or in Massachusetts.

MS. BAIN: NOn-PTF?
THE WITNESS (Cooper): It's connected at non-PTF which are the PSNH retail customers and also WMECO. So, yes.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Is this project though -- okay. This project, though, what we're talking about is the LNS costs and those are non pooled. Right?

THE WITNESS (Cooper): Right.
Local network service costs are costs that not out in the -- in the region.

MS. BAIN: They're non pooled?
THE WITNESS (Cooper): No, the
rate design is that they're primarily non pooled, but there's also rate -- rate design differentials between regional and local rates, so it covers that also, the timing of it.

So primarily non-PTF, yes.
MS. BAIN: Non-PTF. And then section $B$ dealt with the pooled transmission facility costs. And now why would this response be confidential as to whether or not you filed that with ISO? That's usually public knowledge. Right?

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, I think Ms. Bain is asking a question about the protective order and these responses were filed pursuant to the protective order. So the content of those should not be discussed in open forum.

MS. BAIN: No, I was just asking why you thought it was confidential, whether or not they filed with ISO, that aspect of it.

MS. DUBUQUE: I believe that the response indicates that it's proprietary and confidential because it has not been
submitted to ISO New England. It states that in the response. So $I$ would just be careful about going too far down afield when we have filed subject to protective order.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Actually the response doesn't indicate that you filed. It just says it's proprietary.

MS. DUBUQUE: No actually at the bottom it says, Eversource has not yet submitted the associated transmission cost allocation application to ISO New England under B. It's in our response.

MS. BAIN: I'm not looking at the confidential piece.

MS. DUBUQUE: I stand corrected then. But it is in the confidential piece for which you have access.

MS. BAIN: Right. But I'm just wondering again why would that be confidential, that particular element of it.

MS. DUBUQUE: I think we've answered the question based on it not being filed yet with ISO.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they've answered the best they can, whether you're
satisfied or not. I think we should go on now.

MS. BAIN: Usually it's, you
know, a matter of public knowledge as to whether or not you file, but that's okay.

MR. ASHTON: Just to be sure I understand, you're saying that it's confidential because it has not been filed. Is there anything in the nature of the filing that would warrant it being confidential? I'm a little bit in their camp and I find this thing all bizarre that everything is so secret, not only in this application, but in others and it's super confidential. And I don't understand it.

MS. DUBUQUE: Well, Mr. Ashton
that information was in the motion for protective order and it was based on the fact that it's proprietary because it would undermine the competitive bid process.

MR. ASHTON: Okay. I'm not
sure I was there, but if I did I voted against it, $I$ assure you. But $I$ just fail to see why it's top secret. I just can't believe it.

THE CHAIRMAN: But we did take action, so let's go on.

MR. ASHTON: Let's go on.
MS. BAIN: Okay. Now OCC-2,
the question was, provide a narrative concerning the basis for provisions that the company has made for contingencies. Basically what I'm looking for here is why you chose 10 percent, why you chose that number for contingencies. How you arrived at that, $I$ don't have any detail in this response.

Can you provide a response that has more detail? Some of the contingencies, for instance, sound kind of like they could be very expensive. For instance, the possibility of blasting and chipping, the jack and bore under the railroad, the horizontal directional drilling issues, weather issues, traffic issues.

So I'm not understanding why
you're choosing 10 percent. If you can explain that in more detail that would be good.

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman,
again $I$ would like to point out that OCC-2 was responded to under the protective order. This, it had very specific information. MS. BAIN: This is OCC-20 and I asked the same question. MS. DUBUQUE: I'm sorry, I thought you said OCC-2.

MS. BAIN: Yeah, I asked the same question about a narrative in OCC 2. MS. DUBUQUE: But we did not provide that narrative in OCC-2 because the numbers were all spelled out in the information that was filed subject to the protective order.

MS. BAIN: No, this is just concerning the 10 percent contingency. That's it. Not anything about the numbers. Nothing about anything confidential.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): All
right. We'll try to provide a generic response to this. And what we did is, you know, one of the parts that we do, when we do an estimate we look at the expected risk of the project. And just, you -- you pointed it out there's several items that is in that
contingency amount.
You know, the project itself is in a very dense urban environment that provides a lot of complications in digging around the subsurface areas. And because you have a lot of utilities, communications, sewer, water, gas, that's going to affect where the pipe cable is and how far down you have to go.

We -- we looked at soil
disposal, the testing where we have to remove the soil, traffic restrictions on -- of the construction itself. There's limited workspace, workhours. Traffic control, putting up barriers, police protection. And then there's the dewatering on this.

This is close to the
shoreline. We expect water as we do some work, so disposal charges, frac tanks for holding. So there's a lot of construction risk in -- in the cost.

MS. BAIN: So how did you settle on ten? Would it be higher? Do you think it could be higher than that?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We have
done many, many projects. A lot of this, a lot of this work, you know, underground work we have, our estimating group looks at past projects. Stamford is one that isn't too far away, very similar conditions.

We have done other underground work in part of Middletown, Norwalk. And so we looked at past projects to come up with an historical costing in our estimate process. And so that's what it's based on.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Gagnon, would another way of looking at it be to try and recognize the unknowns where costs are going to be incurred two or three years down the road?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm not sure -- I apologize. I'm not sure I follow that.

MR. ASHTON: You're allowing
10 percent for contingency. Is that
10 percent one way of measuring unknown costs because they're two to three years down the road?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.
Yes, that is correct.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Regarding the response to $O C C-25$. Can you give us the percentage of customers who are participating in the energize CT programs? Do you have the total customers, in other words, for residential and then commercial and industrial? And then we can develop the percentages.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, we don't have the percentages for that.

MS. BAIN: Can you get us
that.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Sure.
SEN. MURPHY: Do you have the total number of residential and commercial?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We can.
We can put that together.
MR. ASHTON: Did you tell us 28,000?

THE CHAIRMAN: That's the total -- it's an assignment for you, so let's go on. You need to provide that information. MS. BAIN: Okay. Regarding the response to OCC-26, when you state that you had direct mail. 10,400 Greenwich
residents received an energy efficiency mailing in August. What was that mailing? Was it a bill insert?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was not a bill insert. It was a separate mailing.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Can you file
a copy of that on the record?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MS. BAIN: Regarding the last paragraph there, where it says account executives have individually contacted 66 commercial industrial customers within the last two years. Do you offer customized applications for these customers? Or is it the standard energize programs?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Clearly
the standardized programs, but also one of the -- one of the programs for commercial industrial customers is just that. It's a -it's a more flexible solution that meets their particular needs that's part of one of the program designs.

MS. BAIN: Would it be something like, United Illuminating has an
energy efficient blueprint program?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, and I think the programs are in close alignment with United Illuminating through Energize Connecticut.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Do you keep statistics on how many of these customers have initiated measures?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we do.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Can we get the statistics on that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.
MS. BAIN: Okay. So now in the response to OCC-28 this one asks about various measures that you might have looked into to reduce demand. Now it says here that you haven't really studied the volt/VAR controls in detail. An analysis of battery storage has not been conducted.

Are these things that you think you could do to be part of a program that would help to reduce demand? And I'm thinking about the Brooklyn Queens demand management program where they instituted a
number of different measures, not relying on just one measure to solve this problem, but a number of different measures with energy efficiency, a different standard, standard, you know, distribution measures all combined. So have you looked at any of these things in combination, in a mix that would help you to come down from this 140 million-dollar project, and yet satisfy demand?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I'll try to pick up the questions one at a time. I think there were about five there. The first around conservation voltage reduction. Connecticut has benefited from a program, although relatively simplistic, for more than 30 years of lowering the overall voltage at the substations and maintaining it out to the last customer on the line.
By reducing that voltage by
about 2 percent we have saved energy consumption by about 1 percent. That was the initial study that was done. And although load mix has changed a little bit, I think 1 percent is still very conservative.

We also have the ISO New
England emergency actions under operating procedure 13, where they need to reduce the voltage by 5 percent and achieve -- achieve a 1.5 percent reduction in demand. So we have to be careful how much benefit we will see as we've already have reduced 2 percent to start with. Another 5 percent has to be available for emergency actions.

And then doing an optimization at the individual circuit level, there's still some benefit there, but it's going to be, I think, minimal. And in the case of Greenwich it may be difficult to achieve those compounding benefits.

Going onto battery storage, we have started to look at some applications for battery storage. They have been mainly dealing with trying to firm up the variability of distributed generation, specifically solar. So trying to take something that is highly variable that, you know, based on weather conditions, cloud cover or cloud movement and trying to make that firm. So taking a 1-megawatt solar and
truly making it appear like 1 megawatt throughout the daytime hours, or at least the operating hours.

We haven't really looked at energy storage as a means shift the peak. So in this case you would store the energy in an off-peak time and then release it on an on-peak time for a couple of reasons. I think it has promise in the -- in the future, but today there really isn't the packaged unit at the utility scale to do that. There are many demonstration pilots going on.

In fact, the State of
Connecticut just launched an open meeting yesterday to talk about some of those things that are contained within the new legislation. So I think there's some pilot work to do here. To say that it will definitely work and definitely satisfy this need, I think time will tell.

The last item on this was around energy efficiency. We've talked a little bit about that, but additional energy efficiency, especially targeted an area may be with some increased incentives, which is,

I believe that you mentioned the Con Ed package.

They're taking one of their demand response programs and targeting it specifically to this area, and I think about $\$ 25$ million of energy efficiency funding for this. I think that's something to look at. It's not within the mechanisms we have today in Connecticut for how the energy efficiency programs are funded and then managed, but I think it has something, some opportunity.

Looking at the -- I think you also mentioned cost effective in your discussion, and I know you, you asked for administrative notice of a document that was from -- actually case 14-E 0302. And that has some -- some very interesting numbers in it around the cost effectiveness of their programs.

The Con Ed proposals, and I'll
refer you to -- if have it there -- I'll refer you to page 7 in the second paragraph. This was in the utility commission findings.

The 41 megawatts of customer
side nontraditional solutions will be
approximately $\$ 150$ million or about $\$ 3.7$ million per megawatt. And if you go on to the next sentence, the 11 megawatts of utility side nontraditional solutions of the 11-megawatt range are estimated at $\$ 50$ million, or about $\$ 4.5$ million per megawatt.

So although they are proposing
some innovative solutions the cost effectiveness versus the project we're proposing which is just over $\$ 1$ million per megawatt, $I$ don't think it passes the cost-effectiveness test. So -- and those obviously are the two solutions there.

One is for 41 megawatts and one is for 11. So for 52 megawatts you're proposing to spend 200 million. Although certainly our cost estimate is something that -- that stops people. I understand for 140 million that's for 134 megawatts. So it's a factor of three to four times more cost effective than the Con Ed solutions they're proposing in Brooklyn.

MS. BAIN: I think, you know,
looking at just that one little piece, you
know, that doesn't give you the full flavor. You know, if I could just mention there's a whole big decision here with various different measures being taken.

Now is the company taking any proactive steps like Con Ed did? For instance, Con Ed brought this to the public service commission and they were trying to solve that problem of a too-expensive substation, in their case, like, a billion dollars. And you know, apparently they're going forward with it and really trying to save this money. But has the company taken any proactive steps like that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I think, yes, but not to the integrated approach that Con Ed has. And just to be clear, they deferring the need for that substation by five years and spending $\$ 200$ million to do that. The original project has not gone away. It's only been deferred.

So I think Eversource has looked at, you know, our energy efficiency programs in this area. The fact we worked
with the Green Bank for our Solarize Connecticut program for this town. The fact that we've been active in the micro-grid solicitations with DEEP.

You know, round one and round two did not bring forth any micro-grid solutions from the town of Greenwich. We are active with other technologies out there, including battery storage now with the recent legislation in Connecticut. So I think we are not as integrated and maybe not as far along as New York is, but we're also, I think, taking a more pragmatic and much more cost-effective approach than they are.

MS. BAIN: On your micro-grid solution did you specifically propose Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's an open solicitation. The market needs to respond to it, so that's the way that this, the proposal in Connecticut is working. For rounds one and round two we received no proposals from anyone in the town of Greenwich.

MS. BAIN: Okay. Did you go
talk to Greenwich?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We talked to all the towns about soliciting or responding to the RFP. So in essence, yes, but Greenwich was treated no different than anyone else in that regard.

MS. BAIN: But did you
specifically talk to Greenwich about possibly this micro-grid specific application?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, if -- if you look inside our application, although a micro-grid might prolong or delay the need, it really is not a viable solution. MS. BAIN: So does that mean, no, you didn't talk to Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, we talked to them. Be we see it as not a viable solution to this project. We saw it as a resiliency, a very good resiliency project, could be done there.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Bowes, could you define a micro-grid just for the record so we're all clear on what it is?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure.
In fact, you know, DEEP has given a

```
definition as well. In essence it's a --
it's either a single customer or a group of
customers that have generation and can
operate independent of the electric grid when
needed to or when it's desirable to do so.
    So they can in effect isolate
themselves from the grid, operate
independently with all of the load and
balancing requirements of that and then
return to the grid when it is either reliable
to do so or economic to do so.
    MS. BAIN: So does that sound
like something that might help with the peak
load?
                                    THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes,
for -- on a small-scale basis and that might
defer, as I said, might defer the need for a
period of time. But it's really not an
alternative to the capacity of a new
Greenwich substation.
    MR. ASHTON: Is this in your
answer also driven by the by the fact that
the customer must install generation? If
it's just a bunch of customers connecting
together that doesn't affect your peak load.
```

THE WITNESS (Bowes) :
Obviously there would be generation involved in this.

MR. ASHTON: Right. That's what I'm saying. It has to happen. To make it reduce peak load it has to have a generation component.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And we
looked at a series of generation alternatives in the application as well. And if you're looking for a green solution it would probably be driven more towards fuel cells which have a baseload capability, a thermal capability that customers could take advantage of to make it more economic. But it also has to be sized at a sufficient capacity to really satisfy the need.

MS. BAIN: And if we're talking about breaking down the need, and not saying this one micro-grid is going to solve this whole problem, rather a combination of things, as Brooklyn and Queens had. They have a micro-grid. They have battery storage. They have the volt/VAR optimization. They have a whole panoply of
things that will help to solve their problem. They're not relying on one thing.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): And I think that they have proposed all of those things. I'm not sure any are operational today.

MS. BAIN: So you've proposed
a micro-grid?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, you just gave a list of things that someone was doing as it had already been done. I believe those are all still in the future and may or may not be effective.

MS. BAIN: They are, but they are proposing them and they've been accepted by the public service.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): But
there's also another very interesting part of that Con Ed decision. It's on page 6, and $I$ think that's another critical part here.

The first paragraph, the
company will develop backup plans which will include additional utility side solutions or advancement of the deferred traditional
utility structure -- infrastructure to meet
its needs in the event that the above customer side nontraditional solution checkpoints are not met.

So there's 17 megawatts of
traditional utility investment that Con Ed is planning to make, is 80 megawatts of load transfers they're planning to make in addition to that. Eighty megawatts would solve the problem in Greenwich for many years to come. I just have no -- no place to transfer that load to. That's what the Greenwich substation will allow us to do, is transfer about that amount of load from Cos Cob to Greenwich.

So Con Ed has many more options available to them than we do in Greenwich, and they're also going to pay a premium in this case for the nontraditional investments of about four times the cost of this project per megawatt hour, or per megawatt.

MS. BAIN: Right, in order to save money on putting in a new substation, a 1 billion-dollar substation.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Defer,
not solve. It only differs it five years. MS. BAIN: Right. And you know, the forecast as we have seen in the actual versus the forecast can be very different and it can be lower. And who knows in the future if more energy efficiency, et cetera, who knows hypothetically if there will be no need for, you know, the extra piece that they're missing.

They may find -- get out there and say, oh, wait a minute. It doesn't look like we're going to need this because people have lowered demand. The system, right? Is changing. Right? As you say.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is very true, but on the flipside I don't think it would be prudent to go forward and avoid all of the studies that are out there that say temperatures are warming and that the climate in Connecticut will continue to change.

In fact, there are some state laws now that we have to factor in changing climate in Connecticut. That does not mean the temperatures are going to get cooler. It
means the temperatures will get hotter and that should also be balanced in our planning assumptions as well.

MS. BAIN: And how perhaps --
I don't know if Mr. Swift would be better able to answer this, but what are the programs that Energize Connecticut has to reduce air conditioner usage? Let's start with the residential side.

THE WITNESS (Swift): So we'll start on the residential. Our flagship program, the home energy solutions program offers weatherization services to all of our customers including air sealing, insulation as well as duct sealing, which is an important component of reducing air-conditioning load.

Through that program there are rebates for high-efficiency air-conditioning units, including very efficient ductless heat pump units that customers can leverage to, to ensure that their air-conditioning systems are running efficiently and they're minimizing their impact on peak load.

Similarly on -- for the
commercial and industrial programs, as Mr. Bowes mentioned, there's packaged rebates available for, you know, for high-efficiency cooling units, whether they be, you know, small commercial units or large chillers. In addition there are also comprehensive packages that are off -- often put together for larger commercial industrial -- larger commercial industrial customers that would include measures against -- such as cooling, but even large compressor projects and lighting is good. People don't associate lighting with peak, but it's coincident with peak, so there's also another good opportunity to reduce summer peak load through essentially all of our energy efficiency programs.

MS. BAIN: So for instance,
what would be your incentive for the residential air-conditioning system? And that would be a whole house air-conditioning. THE WITNESS (Swift): A central air-conditioning system, yes. MS. BAIN: Versus the window air conditioner?

THE WITNESS (Swift): Subject to check, I believe it's $\$ 250$ for a high-efficiency central air-conditioning system.

MS. BAIN: And then the
chillers would be different?
THE WITNESS (Swift): They
vary. Those are typically custom projects, so the incentive would not be a flat amount.

MS. BAIN: Okay. So basically
250 wouldn't be a big incentive for that.
THE WITNESS (Swift): It's not
a big incentive, but again the incentive is designed to get people that are going to be installing central air-conditioning, or replacing central air-conditioning to go that extra step and put in the high-efficiency system.

MS. BAIN: Thank you. And regarding your response to OCC-3, now the numbers in here, the $\$ 2$ million, the 9.7 does this include the circuits through this, or is this just the drilling?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It's
talking about the directional drilling.

MS. BAIN: Just drilling?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's
true. It includes the cost of the cable itself. It's like the component piece of that section of line, not only the construction, but the materials for the cable.

MS. BAIN: Does it include the
actual circuit line?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, the cable itself. Yes, it would have one section.

MS. BAIN: It includes the drilling and the circuit?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.
We just did it by, like, a per-foot calculation.

MS. BAIN: Plus the line, going through it. Okay.

Response to OCC-11. Now this says that about 76 percent of the $26.7-\mathrm{kV}$ load is serving the Western Greenwich area, and that's the area that it has the capacity concerns. Is that correct, Western

Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's where the majority of the load is, yes, or the load density area.

MS. BAIN: So did the company analyze moving the 24 percent that's not in Western Greenwich to another substation?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, but there's no other substation, except Cos Cob. So it all comes back to that source, whether it's the 13 kV fed out of Cos Cob or the 27 kV fed out of Cos Cob.

MS. BAIN: There's no other substation that has 27 kV you're saying?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's correct.

MR. ASHTON: The nearest one would be to Norwalk?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, you are correct and it's -- that would not be a viable alternative of that length of distribution service.

MS. BAIN: And what is the normal substation, you're saying, that most substations are not 27.6. What would be the most common substation?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): The most common new substation today is at 23 kV with a high side of 115 kV . We still also have 13.8 kV and $13.2-\mathrm{kV}$ legacies from the old Hartford Electric Light Company and the old Connecticut Light \& Power.

But given the alternatives or the preference, we would propose 23 kV in the future if that area was served at that voltage for this discussion we had this morning about a higher distribution voltage lowers the current, and thus the losses.

MS. BAIN: Regarding the response to OCC-17, has the company made any contact with Connecticut Natural Gas regarding promoting combined heat and power?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not that I am aware of, no.

MR. ASHTON: May I inquire as to exactly what that meant, combined light and power?

MS. BAIN: Combined heat and power.

MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?
MS. BAIN: Combined heat and
power.
MR. ASHTON: Oh, heat. So this would be a small generator on somebody's front porch that would provide --

MS. BAIN: Yeah.
MR. ASHTON: I can see there's
a red hot market.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, the more typical or traditional market is the hospitals where there would be generation at a hospital like Greenwich Hospital. And they would use the waste heat for their own, you know, internal heat and hot water needs or other process needs. Most hospitals in the state of Connecticut have some form of generation as part of their energy mix.

MS. BAIN: Now looking at some of the environmental issues. With the line HPFF, high pressure fluid filled line, through the body of water in Bruce Park, what are the potential consequences from drilling in there and doing horizontal drilling? What are the potential consequences to the ecosystem of that body of water, which I believe has fish and other living beings in
there?
For instance you can talk about the drilling, mudding and the slurry. THE WITNESS (Libertine): This is Mike Libertine. I'm not an expert certainly on this particular technique, but I think with any construction project of this size and using some of the -- the options that are on the table, there has to be great care taken to ensure that things are done properly and that you have contingencies in place in case you do run into some technical difficulties.

Certainly with the slurry, which is going to be some type of a bentonite material, that does have the potential to release to the water bodies in the event of some unforeseen circumstance. I know there have been projects that the company has been involved in and they've had good luck with this particular type of operation doing the directional drilling, but certainly there are those risks involved with any large-scale construction project.

I think from a standpoint of
the impact on the environment if there were to be some type of release of the bentonite, which is probably the most -- the largest concern in terms of a release during construction with the horizontal drilling technique, that tends to be more of a nuisance in the sense that it's unsightly.

It can be messy and take some time to clean up, but in terms of long-term effects, I don't believe there are substantial impacts. And I'm going to qualify that as long as we don't have some type of a major blowout.

We do have some responses in the interrogatory set two from the council, specifically numbers 9 and 10 that speak to that in more detail. And again, I'm not an expert on this.

With respect to once it's constructed we obviously have underground lines that do contain fluids. It's -- it's an oil. So whenever you have oil involved there is the potential for leaks and releases. As Mr. Gagnon had mentioned this morning, there are protective measures in
place. It's all encased in a steel pipe. There are alarm systems. There are seams because you have to weld the pieces together. So those have to be done in a way, a proper way so that you don't have the potential for a leak. There will be a cathodic protection system as well so we know that we're in a saline environment which can enhance rusting. So obviously that's something that has to be taken into consideration.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Libertine, there are many, many pipelines that cross saltwater. Aren't there?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, there are, sir.

MR. ASHTON: So it's both cathodic protection and the nature of the coating on the pipe that offers protection.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
stand corrected. You're right.
MR. ASHTON: And the epoxy is
a pretty good coating. You would agree?
THE WITNESS (Libertine): It
certainly is. Again, I'm not an expert with
this particular technology, but certainly, as I say, any construction or operation that involves underground lines there's always that potential. But I think in terms of its design, these are -- these are done fairly commonly throughout the country, so it's not a unique methodology that -- that we're proposing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens I think had a comment.

DR. KLEMENS: I just have a comment or clarification for Mr. Libertine, because words matter. You start off saying that there's a risk associated, but we've had very good luck. I don't think it's really a matter of luck. Is it? Isn't it a matter of diligence and your preparation?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
apologize if $I$ used the word "luck."
DR. KLEMENS: You did and I
think you need to clarify that.
THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.
Thank you for catching that. No, absolutely.
The fact is that once -- once
a route is selected, really that's when
the -- the true engineering is going be performed here. We're going on the idea that we have a proposed pathway that we know needs to cross two bodies of water. We've taken a look at a couple of different options as to how to get -- get across those bodies of water. And as Dr. Klemens is suggesting we will need additional information just to understand exactly the depths of the water table.

We know it's shallow. That's pretty evident just from looking at the lay of land out there, so we know we're going to be dealing with that environment. But it's going to be encased in a concrete slurry that will further protect it. So yeah, the design elements are going to be key in making sure that we have those protective measures in place.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, to add to Mike. You know, as we bring out a contractor to do that, we bring a contractor that is specialized, and then so they have the skill set. The contractor is required to have an incident mitigation plan in place.

There's three parts to that medication plan.
One is they have to provide documents to ensure the quality of work practice, and part of that is they have records of equipment and equipment maintenance. They have quality materials that the use. There's specifications that are required. There's details of record permits needed. And there's also records of the personnel training.

Part of that plan is they have to provide plans for proper setup and operation, where they're going to exit and enter. The proper space for consumable staging materials, how they're going to set up a spoils area. The poling plan, the tensions as they pull on the cable. And the mud slurry leak -- leak detection, they require to have systems that are set up for that.

And lastly, they provide a plan for evidence of response in case there is an issue. They have standby equipment on site, materials such as the vac trucks, holding tanks, straw -- straw hay bales and
they have cleanup procedures already in place.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): The only thing $I$ would add as well is that other than really the bentonite slurry -- bentonite slurry this is a standard construction operation. There's nothing beyond that in terms of any other -- introducing any other type of fluids or liquids that you would see on any other construction site.

MS. BAIN: Regarding the ongoing operation can you talk about how you would handle the possibility of burn through due to a cable electrical fault?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Most -most faults would be internal to the cable itself. You know, it would be -- the cable would short against probably the casing, which, you know, would be, you know, would ground out against that. And the system would automatically detect a fault and be taken out of service.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's a
physical construction of the duct bank and fluidized backfill that becomes almost like a
concrete. That's going to prevent construction next to it for other utilities as well in the future. They're not going to be able to co-locate in proximity to the steel pipe because of that concrete barrier and as well as, you know, the call before you dig provisions that are out there.

MS. BAIN: And if you do have a problem in ongoing operation, how long would it take to repair this type of thing? And you would have to -- it would be shut down, you're saying. Right? For instance of burn through?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, I'm aware of a pipe that was in the Boston area that had recently been punctured and immediately they -- they relieved pressure from the pipe itself. They excavated the area. They had taken some of the material away because then you want to clean the area up. Looked at the pipe itself. They have to determine is -- was the cable damaged itself or was it just the external pipe?

They were able to cap that pipe, particularly, cap that pipe with some
weld and put it back. So it was probably in service back within a week, week and a half. MS. BAIN: Week and a half. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens has a follow-up.

DR. KLEMENS: What happens if this happens underwater? You mentioned that there was earth removed and they opened it up and excavated it to remove, I guess, earth that was polluted in some way. What happens if this happens underwater in Indian Harbor?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The
fault in this case, it was a puncture from a contractor. That's -- of all the faults that we're aware of most of them are a puncture through a manmade event that occurred. A natural leak from corrosion I am unaware of one happening on our system to date.

So for underwater, if the
cable itself -- if the cable faulted it would fault within the pipe itself and it would be self contained in that pipe. It's not going to go outside of that, that casing. It would be -- the fault would be held within that pipe.

DR. KLEMENS: But you would have to dig up the hole. If it was submerged you would have to take everything out of the --

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We should -- we should be able to extract the cables itself. Just pull the cable out.

DR. KLEMENS: So you could pull the cable out and put it back in again without having to tear up the pond again?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct.
DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.
MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, I'm not speaking too well. Just another follow-up to Dr. Klemens' question.

So are you saying that erosion of any type could not disrupt the cable? I know they have a couple of situations out west that that was the case. So I just figured I would ask the question.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): What we do is we put an extensive corrosion cathodic protection in place. It starts with the initial construction of the pipe itself, making sure that that, the protective coating
on the outside of the epoxy coating is sealed.

The weld pipe itself is then sealed again. And then we put a cathodic protection on it. Usually there's a rectifier that's installed and it puts a -embeds a current on the pipe and that keeps -- it's a way of protecting the pipe. And they -- they do periodic tests on this protection to verify that the pipe is holding up to the corrosion. As long as the coating on the pipe is good they're going to be -- they're going to be able to see that in the test results of the cathodic protection.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
MS. BAIN: Did you do an analysis of using XLPE pipe instead of the HPFF?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): As we said earlier, we did look at XLPE. And for us it's the size of the trench and the cost of the XLPE. Going with XLPE, it was more expensive, $\$ 16 \mathrm{million}$. MS. BAIN: Did you include the
costs of the cofferdams, all of the things that are associated with this particular application?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, we did.

MS. BAIN: You did? And it still came out to be more expensive? And the cost of maintenance going forward, a higher cost of maintenance on the HPFF going forward. Did you include all that when you looked at it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the construction technique, either HDD or open trench with a cofferdam would be the same or very similar whether it was XLPE or HPFF. So those costs would be, and difficulties would be about the same.

MS. BAIN: But you wouldn't need the pressurizing stations. Right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So there would be some difference in equipment at the Greenwich substation for the pumphouse or pressurization house. The lifecycle costs are, I think, as part of the administrative notice of this docket as well, so there's
very good detail in the Siting Council's lifecycle costs around HPFF versus XLPE. And I think that they are comparable, if my memory serves me?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah,
if you go back between different years, there's a little -- they're very comparable. Different years -- I think there was actually different conclusions about which ones cost more. And a lot of it has to do with the construction of the trench itself. That's where the cost concern is. How -- how much material are you excavating? And it has to do with the capacity of the cable predicts the design of the trench.

MS. BAIN: Regarding the geologic features of Bruce Park you mentioned that you might have to use blasting in the area. And tell us what would be the impact of blasting on the park ecosystem and on the Kinsman Lane residences?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I think we've always put out there blasting would be the last resort. We're going try to use pneumatic cameras. We'll try to do maybe
even the expanding grout option. But if it comes to it, we would do some blasting.

And that they would do a -there's a lot of new blasting techniques out there that allow it to be less intrusive and it's the way they design the explosive charges in certain patterns. They can control it. They have ways to control that. I'm not the expert in that,
but we do hire blasting contractors that have that capability.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Just to back up to the previous question. The lifecycle costs are included on table ES-3. And they show the 115-kV XLPE has a total lifecycle cost, again single circuit, of 31,835,000. And the 115-kV HPF has a total lifecycle cost of $25,444,000$. So a sizable difference in lifecycle costs as well.

MS. BAIN: So back to the
blasting. Would you ever have to use blasting in the body of water in Bruce Park? Possibly, is that a possibility that you might have to?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We're
not anticipating. When we did the soil borings there were silt, layers of silt that -- I'm recalling the application, there's two layers of a type of silt and were able to use -- it was the depth, the depth of the silt, it was large enough or deep enough for us to do the work and we didn't have to go further.

MS. BAIN: So you feel it would be within that silt level it should be operating?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): If
we were going with the open trench option.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Correct, open trench option.
MS. BAIN: Has the company
received any communications from DOT regarding it's position on the proposed route?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): They
have not. They have not provided any preference of any of the routes through the Bruce Park route, other than just telling us they didn't want us to be on their -- next to their -- longitudinally built next to their
highway, the railroad.
MS. BAIN: Could you file a copy of any letter you got from them regarding that?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It's in the application.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's in the application.

MS. BAIN: It's in the application. What's the date of the letter?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
January 23, 2015, and that's appendix E .

MS. BAIN: Thank you. Okay. The application on page E-3 mentions the 2014 integrated resources plan. And I believe it's also in the administrative notice section, but the plan classifies the Greenwich, the planned Greenwich project as a category $C$ project. And under category $C$ it means that under certain circumstances requests for proposals, RFPs may be applicable for soliciting non-transmission alternatives.

Did CL\&P issue RFPs to solicit
non-transmission alternatives for the Greenwich Cos Cob project?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We did not issue an RFP, and I believe that's a leftover from the Connecticut energy advisory board process. I'm not sure it's still in effect.

MS. BAIN: It's in the 2014
integrated resources plan.
Now we talked a little bit about this before, but just to clarify completely, did the company consider using a mix of alternatives to solve the capacity issue or solve a portion of it with each measure in the mix contributing a piece to the total solution? Did you actually write up a plan like that or did you give that serious consideration in some way?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say for the last four plus years we've looked at various alternatives including the distribution improvements we've made in more than, I guess, more than a dozen now. We looked at the Solarize Connecticut program. We looked at energy efficiency, but we did
not issue a comprehensive RFP to satisfy this need.

MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, Mr.
Bowes. After I do what Mr. Caron says about volume levels, I can't hear what you're saying.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm sorry. I will speak up.

MR. LYNCH: Please.
MS. BAIN: Okay. So did you write up a plan that has this, you know, alternative would save us 5 percent, this one would get us 10? You know, using a mix of solutions, did you ever do that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Other
than what's the non-transmission alternatives in the application, we did not.

MS. BAIN: No? Okay. And has
the company ever considered having a major promotional campaign for energy efficiency and demand reduction measures with the Town of Greenwich participating?

THE WITNESS (Swift): I think
there, there was one of the OCC responses that illustrates, you know, a lot of the
outreach efforts that we -- we've made to Greenwich.

But in addition to that, Greenwich has signed the clean energy communities pledge which essentially gives the Town a couple things. It's a pledge for the Town to conserve a certain amount of energy, but it also typically mobilizes local taskforces to encourage both residential and commercial customers to participate in energy efficiency.

So I think, you know, through our traditional channels plus layer on top of the fact that Greenwich is a member of the clean energy communities, I think we've -- we certainly haven't ignored Greenwich and I think we're very active and proactive in terms of promoting energy efficiency to all the customers in Greenwich.

MS. BAIN: Did you ever really, though, contact them and say, listen. It looks like people in your town are not thrilled about this plan and let's have a big push on energy efficiency?

THE WITNESS (Swift): There
certainly have been messages about promoting energy efficiency. I can't speak to whether those messages have been linked specifically to the proposed project.

MS. BAIN: Then thank you.
Regarding the Docket Number 435 which is the Stamford project, this was administratively noticed and I have copies of this. I'm just going to read a little piece. If anybody wants to read and follow along, it's just a couple of sentences $I$ wanted to read. I have copies if anybody wants it -- or I'll just read.

Now this -- and I just want to look at the second paragraph and it's item number one. It says -- the first sentence, it says the cost of the proposed project is extremely high, approximately $\$ 5800$ per foot. Then the second paragraph of item number one says, to our mind 5800 per foot is extremely disturbing. Although it can pass judgment on project need and environmental effect, the Siting Council has negligible authority to evaluate and regulate project costs. The applicant made a case
under inquiry that this is a realistic cost figure.

That may be, but we are concerned that what is needed is a thorough and intense review by this applicant, parens, and any other in a comparable position, end parens, as to how to drive down these costs. Then the last sentence of that paragraph says, out-of-the-box thinking is critical for cost management. Subsequent projects must, all caps, pay greater attention to capital and operating costs if electrical energy costs are to be held in check. In short, do a better job for less. Can you tell us how you did out-of-the-box thinking? Give us -- on this project in order to keep in mind the high cost and keep it down.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): First of all, that was the Stamford reliability cable project. And it actually came in \$10 million less than what we had originally budgeted for.

A VOICE: Louder please.
MS. BAIN: I'm sorry. Can't
hear you.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That was the Stamford reliability project. That project actually came in $\$ 10$ million less than what we had put in the application as the cost estimate.

So -- and we looked at that project and we looked at the results of it and that was the forefront of our minds as we begin to design this project. And therefore, we spent a lot of time looking at the alternative types of designs to go with this, the Greenwich project.

We looked at an XIPE, trying to put that into the ground and trying to move that forward. And the cost of that was just prohibitive. So we ended up going with the HPFF cable design saving $\$ 12$ million in the design itself. Even though the project is $\$ 140 \mathrm{million}$ we feel that we've squeezed out quite a bit and learned quite a bit from the stamford project in coming up with this design.

MS. BAIN: So I mean, can you give me one example, to say, and not to use

XLPE?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We
used -- correct. We went with the HPFF cable. That's -- that's one example that we did.

Stamford was a little bit different. It was a line that we were -- it was a reliability project for the transmission itself. So that was just a small upgrade to the terminal structures at both ends of the substations. And so the majority of the cost itself was the cable.

In this project a big portion of the -- the cost is the length of the cable in the ground, the substation itself at Greenwich, and there's a piece at Cos Cob. And we did look at the designs on both those locations and we tried to minimize the cost. We went in with a very narrow or light construction building at the -- the Greenwich substation.

> Consultation with the Town.

We were trying to -- trying to give them what they were looking for in terms of the aesthetics. We wanted to do it in a
cost-conscious way, so we started using concrete panels trying to keep that cost down.

So we did look at the different components and as part of that we did design the systems trying to be the most cost effective as we can.

A VOICE: Louder please.
MS. BAIN: That's it for us.
MS. BIDRA: Thank you.
MR. ASHTON: I must say the author of that opinion was quite articulate, but I think the logic also applies in this docket.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mercier has a follow-up.

MR. MERCIER: Another quick question regarding the possibility of blasting along the route maybe in front of someone's home. Is it typical that pre-blast surveys are done in this type of work, pre-blast surveys of someone's foundation or a residence?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, we do. And we typically will put seismic
equipment out there to measure, to verify that we're -- we're under a certain impact blast propagation. So they -- they do -- the blasters do that as part of their plan, yes.

MR. MERCIER: Is there a
mechanism in place so if a resident has a claim that damage was done due to blasting does Eversource have a mechanism in place? Or does that go through the subcontractor level?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It
would -- well, they definitely would contact the project -- we'll have a project contact person available for this project that the homeowner could contact, homeowner or business owners could contact. That would be first approach, contacting them.

If we felt that the contractor did something beyond what was beyond their plan, their initial plan, and it was -- it was their issue, then we would probably ask the contractor to look at that, but we would be the first point of contact of where to go to.

MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
you.
THE CHAIRMAN: The next for cross-examination Parker Stacy.

MR. STACY: Mr. Stein, Ms. Bachman, members of the Siting Council, this is a first for me in terms of the fairly daunting theater here. So please bear with me and help me along if I'm not within the confines of your protocols, whatever they may be.

On September 21st I filed a letter to the Siting Council and copied everyone on the list that they gave me at the time. And my question for Eversource is, has there been any response or any consideration given to the points that I made in my letter?

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

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, one moment.
(Whereupon, a recess was taken
from 3:51 p.m. to 3:55 p.m.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm ready, ready for your response.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'll
take -- I think Mr. Stacy brought up the question of the park and more or less the surface and subsurface water conditions. And he brings of a very interesting point as to my perspective in that this is an historically developed park and during some of the excavations that were done on his property for a septic system installation they found some old drains there, which is probably not surprising if you live anywhere in New England.

So the short answer is I'm not sure we know everything, or know -- or will we know everything about what's going on underneath the areas we're going to excavate until we do a little more work. We have done some substantial test boring work up to this point, so we know the underlying soils there. It's mostly sand and gravel.

Mr. Stacy did provide some photographs after the most recent large rain event we had back in September. There was standing water, which again, should not surprise any of us. There's fairly shallow groundwater out there. We don't have -- we
have surface water throughout the park. So we fully anticipate that we're going to be dealing with water both during construction and once the line is installed if we go through the park. So the questions that he raised are, both in terms of could we create a problem that could create additional surface water inundation out there with the installation of this trench and then the concrete casing that will hold the lines? And I think one of the things from my perspective as we look at this, is that we're going to have the line insulation, but around that is going to be material that's backfilled that's very similar to what is out there today. We're going to have some form of sand and gravel.

So in terms of altering the
flow that -- the flows that are happening today on the park property, the gradient is such it's fairly level out there, but the groundwater is likely to flow towards Indian Harbor, which then ebbs and flows with the tides.

So $I$ think if anything in
terms of the groundwater at the site once we're installed there's a potential we could be creating somewhat of a preferential pathway along our route just in the sense that once water infiltrates into that trench it's probably going to follow along that trench line and will be allowed flow essentially like it does today, with the exception there will be a, for the lack of a better term, a "rectangular box" there that will be in some way, shape or form influencing groundwater and how it moves relative to how it does today.

The other point that he did bring up was he had some concerns about the statements that were made about affecting the flood storage capacity at the park. And our answer was talking more or less about just that flood storage capacity. And the fact is that because we're not having above-ground structures we're not going to be altering that in any way.

And I believe, and again what
we're installing is not going to have a
substantive effect of conditions as they really occur today. Certainly it's not going to be an effect where we're going to be impacting residential properties or anything along those -- along those lines. Where we are in that part of the park it's fairly -we know it's fairly shallow bedrock in some portions.

And then once we get into the, what I'll call the park proper out by the ball field and get in closer to lakes we know, that it starts to transition more into a alluvial soil type.

So I think at that point we really don't have significant concerns. But again, we need to do a little bit of additional work to really understand how water is flowing out there along the -- the pathway that we're ultimately going to be building on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
MR. STACY: And my actual
question, Mr. Libertine, was, has anybody addressed the points that $I$ made in my letter to now? Has anybody given consideration to
the points that I made and submitted some kind of a response? Or is what you just said, is that your response right now?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That's certainly my response.

I'm not sure if there's been anything formal.
I have not seen anything formal come back based on what you had -- had submitted.

MR. STACY: So in Mr. Ashton's words, a yes or no, and that would be no.

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may I just interrupt? There were no interrogatories addressed to us, so there was nothing for us to respond to.

MR. STACY: Right. And I'm only asking whether any consideration was given to the points that $I$ made in my letter up until now, and you have answered them here and now and that's it. Right?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, sir.

MR. STACY: So until now the answer is no. Right now it's from you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, they do the answer. You do the questioning. You can
interpret it anyway you want, but you've gotten your answer at this point.

MR. STACY: I'd like to expand on the point that you were interpreting, Mr. Libertine. The main contention that $I$ have, and with respect to my septic system, is that after the septic system was installed, and unknowingly it interdicted some existing water flow patterns. But that was not known at the time because all the testing that they did -- and they did some testing -- didn't show anything of the kind.

And it took some several years for the actual new pattern of flow to create and manifest itself. However that happened, I'm not an expert in this stuff. And my real question to Eversource is, how can you determine the unknown, and in my view so far, my experience, unknowable changes in patterns that might occur based on these ancient drains and patterns, and as you say, all over New England, but I'm only concerned with Bruce Park?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): All
I can offer today is similar to your
situation. If in fact this line were installed and there were some unforeseen events after the fact, in terms of what seemed to be a pretty good fix at your property in terms of putting the curtain drains and that, that's essentially what's going to be surrounding this particular installation. We don't call it that, but it's essentially the same type of material. So it's impossible for us to predict, obviously, but I know we, obviously Eversource would be committed to fixing a problem if it were to arise. I don't foresee that. I think there's, between what we have today and the information that would have to be obtained prior to construction and then even during construction, and what we're seeing, that could certainly be mitigated, or at least minimized. Maybe not fully mitigated until, like as you say, if something pops up two or three years later. I think that's going to be something that we would just have to -- we have to deal with. THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens I think has a follow up.

DR. KLEMENS: Are you saying that these trenches, when you trench it they're going to act sort of like French drains and the trenching itself is going to be a water collector that's going to actually move along that trench, those trenches?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It certainly is conceivable in some areas just because of the depth of the groundwater being so shallow. I've only seen some of the borings and we certainly don't have extensive borings along the entire line that goes through the park. We have every 60 or 70 feet. So we have some ideas as where it transactions from bedrock into a more appropriate soil type.

So yeah, essentially the way they're constructed there's a good chance that we're going to be intercepting some groundwater, certainly during high groundwater periods.

DR. KLEMENS: And is that a bad or a good thing? Or an indifferent thing?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'm
not necessarily sure it's a bad thing. Groundwater ultimately is flowing towards the bay. And so again, I mentioned earlier that we may create a situation where there's a bit of a preferential pathway that maybe accelerates that certain times of the year or certain events. I don't see it necessarily as a bad thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon.
MR. HANNON: And to follow up on Dr. Klemens, I'm assuming that when -well, if this goes forward I'm assuming that the design is going to take slopes into consideration so that you are not creating problems elsewhere, and that the water will continue to flow down towards Indian Harbor?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That would be the goal, absolutely.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.
MR. STACY: I guess from my perspective, and included in my letter, is the unknowable element of this is such that all of your planning, all of our planning on my little piece of land there could not foresee what would happen several years later
and that a project of this size and of this nature could have unforeseeable consequences down the line timewise and for the park itself and other residents that might not even show up at your line, along your line. And so from that point of view I believe that I have indicated that unless these things can become knowable, that in my view the line should not be located at Bruce Park.

## THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me

 just say a couple of things just on process. First of all, at this stage we don't even know -- there are a lot of ifs. One, if something is going to be approved, and as I'm sure you're aware, there are a number of options as to how or where a line -- and we've even added another option in discussion today. So we don't even have those facts yet.If and when -- and again, I'm stressing the word "if" -- this project is approved with an approved location of whatever it is of where the line is going to go, at that point the applicant -- again, I'm
using the word "if" -- will be required to provide, we call it $a \operatorname{D}$ and $M$ plan, a much more detailed plan with presumably many more soil borings and other, whatever it's called, geologic, and other kinds of investigation and that also has to go through the Council. So the short answer to your question is, yes, there are a lot of unforeseen, but there will be presumably a lot fewer, a lot fewer once all these determinations are made if they're made.

MR. STACY: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens.
DR. KLEMENS: In this
discussion something occurred to me also in talking. You earlier asked the applicant to prepare some analysis of potential of an overhead powerline going through Bruce Park. And in this discussion it occurred to me that that might also -- something else you may want to look at and include in the analysis is, I believe that some of those footings are going to be in a flood layer or a floodplain.

So I think that needs to also
be part of the picture. When we look at it
we should look at that, too. I mean, we should be cognizant of that.

MR. STACY: The only other point I want to make, which Mr. Libertine has more or less made for me, is that I took the two photographs that you have -- you all have, I believe -- the day after the day it rained. This followed a 30-day dry spell, one of the driest periods that I've ever experienced in that area.

And so that groundwater, and I believe you said, we know there's groundwater and there's standing water in Bruce Park. For there to be standing water in Bruce Park under those conditions with the porus soil that you've talked about seems to me that there's a lot of undiscovered water conditions there.

And I would urge that the
Siting Council would make sure that you all have done your homework upside and down so that we don't end up ten years from now with a big mess on our hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Representatives of Pet Pantry, please.

MR. MARCUS: Edward Marcus and Mark Bergamo of the Marcus Law Firm on behalf of Pet Pantry. I'm ready any time.

Now we can agree that the use of 290 Railroad Avenue is an integral part of the original plan that was submitted. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the proposed substation site, yes.

MR. MARCUS: Right. And can we also agree that that property has been occupied by Pet Pantry for 40-some odd years?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I
believe that's correct.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. And if your proposal that includes 290 Railroad Avenue were to be approved Pet Pantry would be evicted, or asked to leave. Is that correct?

MS. DUBUQUE: I'm going to object to that question because that's the relationship between private parties that are not -- that's not an issue before the Siting

Council right now. And the use of the word "eviction," I don't --

MR. MARCUS: Well, required to
leave. I'll correct it.
THE CHAIRMAN: I think there's
a way you can answer that, because it is pretty obvious what the answer is without using those terms.

So will the building be able to hold both Pet Pantry and your facility?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, it will not.

MR. MARCUS: Now does
Eversource own 290 Railroad Avenue?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): We do not.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. Is there any guarantee that you will ever own 290 Railroad Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): If it becomes a substation, then the answer would be yes.

MR. MARCUS: Well, can you elaborate on that answer? Because looking at the leases $I$ have $I$ don't see where there's a
guarantee. You have an option to negotiate. No guarantee that you'll arrive at a price. Is there?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I have not seen the lease.

MR. MARCUS: You have not seen the lease.

MR. LYNCH: Again, Mr. Bowes, could you please speak up. I know I'm going deaf anyhow, but --

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I have not seen the lease.

MR. MARCUS: But isn't this crucial to your initial proposal? You've submitted a proposal to the Siting Council. Thousands upon thousands of dollars have been expended by your firm, or rather the Eversource, by legal firms involved in this matter. A great deal of time has been spent and you could not in good conscience today tell the Siting Council that you have any guarantee of owning that property. Is that correct?

MS. DUBUQUE: I'm going to object to the characterization about the good
conscience and what the lease says and what it doesn't say.

MR. MARCUS: I'll delete the word "good conscience." I'll delete the words.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure this is even before the Siting Council.

MS. DUBUQUE: It's irrelevant to the Siting Council's decision.

MR. MARCUS: Of course it's relevant. If you don't own the property then how can you come in with this proposal. And if you don't have any showing of a right to own it, how can you come in with a proposal?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask our staff attorney to respond.

MS. BACHMAN: Under
Connecticut general statutes 16-50P subsection G, it states that the Council may not take into account whether or not they actually own a property or have rights to the property, because it's really outside of our charge to balance the need for the project with the environmental impact.

Any ownership rights, lease
rights or any other property rights are between the actual property owner and the applicant who may become a certificate holder or may not. So hence, that's why we don't take that into consideration.

MR. MARCUS: Well, just may I inquire of Counsel, what you're really saying is that someone could come before the Siting Council with an application and have absolutely no right to the property that they allege they're going to be utilizing?

MS. BACHMAN: That's correct.
It happens all the time particularly with our cell tower applications.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. All right. The point has been made. I'll move on. Okay. I propose to go through the Pet Pantry interrogatories, not through all of them, but starting with page 1 just to make sure that we're all, so to speak, on the same page.

And the question was, just to be certain that we're starting off in the right direction, are there any studies as to the impact of lack of parking due to the trenching and laying of lines in the
Greenwich area? Is that what everyone has
before them?

$$
\text { THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it }
$$

is.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. And your response was that you just haven't conducted a study. And my question would be, what good is a study after the fact? And you're saying a parking plan will be conducted if the Siting Council approves the project. THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, right now we -- we put a couple alternative routes into -- as part of our application. We don't know the exact route, so we're trying to -- we're going to wait for exact route to understand where we're going to be looking.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. So at this point let's say that's the first question where there's no study, and I think we'll find about eight more as we go forward. If you now look at the next question and that was, has Eversource received any permission or authorization from either the federal or state government for
the construction or laying of lines, or by I-95 Highway in Greenwich. The answer is no as it relates to this project.

So the question would be when do you intend to seek such authorization? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Once a route is -MR. MARCUS: And can we get an answer without counsel indicating to you what it might be?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sir, they're allowed to talk amongst themselves. Obviously I'm hopeful that we're not going to have to answer all 51 questions this way, so let's keep moving.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We
haven't determined a route yet, or it hasn't been determined.

MR. ASHTON: Keep your voice up, Mr. Gagnon.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MARCUS: I'm not certain
that I understand it. You submitted a plan.
Correct?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.
MR. MARCUS: And you submitted an alternative plan. Am I right?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We submit -- we submitted three alternative routes and a couple variations to some of those routes.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But --
THE WITNESS (Bowes): So maybe I could help.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. Sure.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Until a, you know, a specific location for road crossing, rial crossing is established through the Siting Council process we can't ask the state or federal government for a permit that doesn't specify the exact locations.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. So at this point we don't know whether or not such a permit would be granted. Is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We -we have had conversations with CDOT. They've seen all of our plans and we've taken into
account some of their concerns already on the alternatives, all the alternatives that are presented in our application.

MR. MARCUS: But you don't know as a matter of fact that it would be granted. Correct? Is that right?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's correct.

THE WITNESS (Gardell): We do not have permission as of yet.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. If you
look at question number three, the matter of the width of the trenches. And when I look at your response and I do the arithmetic it comes to about 75 feet in width. It's almost the size of a city block. Is that a correct interpretation?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Of the trench? No.

MR. MARCUS: Well, you're showing area -- you're showing a trench of 4.5.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's the width.

MR. MARCUS: Right. Area
affected, 25 feet wide.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's the area of meeting the vehicles, trucks to do the trenching work.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. Total width of work zone is about 20 feet. And then the area required for construction is 30 feet. Is my addition incorrect?

THE WITNESS (Libertine):
That's not a cumulative
number. I think that may be part of the confusion. The 75 feet that you've referenced is for a safety zone for construction. And that 20 feet is the actual work zone.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. During the course of construction it would actually be 75 feet. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): For protection for temporary construction, yes.

MR. MARCUS: Right. So my addition isn't wrong. It's only during the construction period. Right?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'm sorry. I thought you were adding those.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Each -each question has an independent answer, not a connected answer.

MR. MARCUS: Right. But if you add them up?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): You don't add them.

MR. MARCUS: You ultimately add them up for construction.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): You do not add them up. Each is a separate response.

MR. MARCUS: Do you add them up for construction purposes?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. What would the width be during the term of construction?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Depends on which part of the construction process you're asking. And we've gone through each step A through E. Do you want to know just about the trench width itself?

MR. MARCUS: Well, what's the
largest width that would exist during the construction period?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think 30 feet would be the largest width based upon response to question $E$.

MR. MARCUS: How do you get to 30 feet looking at your response? Just explain it to me.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I think
what there -- it's trying to explain is you've got this -- if can picture a trench width of five feet. Let's use five feet. And then there's a working zone next to that trench where you're going to have the vehicles, so that's an extra amount.

MR. MARCUS: Right. How much is the extra amount?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well,
in here we talked about a work area construction of 25 feet. Then you have a safety zone that you want to protect the crews. This is a -- you're in traffic.

MR. MARCUS: No, I understand.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): So you have this area encompassing all of that that is a safety zone. So it's a little bit beyond where the vehicles are and it's a
little bit on the other side of the trench where there's -- no vehicles are. There will be cones set up.

MR. MARCUS: I understand.
Just tell me the total width during construction.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, we've used approximately 30 feet.

MR. MARCUS: Total?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Total.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. And if you have 30 feet width and you're working on a road, how would vehicles get by?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I have to know the size of the road, but we do have -- we do set up a -- we do set up traffic plans with the town. We get together and understand how to move traffic around a work zone. And we want to make sure it's done in a way that protects the crews on the site.

MR. MARCUS: Have you done that as of yet?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, the detailed traffic plans aren't done yet.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. And we had asked a question about decibel levels of construction sites, sounds caused by construction and the like. Your answer were that no studies were performed for the potential construction site. When would that study be taken?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, sound studies of the actual construction we would probably not be doing, as it is exempt.

MR. MARCUS: Would not be doing?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Because it's exempt.

MR. MARCUS: Well, aren't there ordinances that relate to decibel levels?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's for operation of the equipment, operation of the facilities.

MR. MARCUS: Operation of the facility and also any blasting construction work that you do?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): During the construction period, my understanding is
it's exempt.
MR. MARCUS: I'm sorry. I
didn't understand?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): During construction, the construction noise, my understanding, is exempt.

MR. MARCUS: Have you checked with the Town as to that?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): The only -- Mr. Gagnon is correct in the sense that the decibel levels are exempt during construction. There are time constraints as to when you can do the construction, but this is like any other construction along that road for a new building.

MR. MARCUS: Now you've testified today, I believe, that you have yet to engage any contractors for this project. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, other than engineering contractors.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But have you predicted how long it will take to complete the project?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): There
is a schedule in the application.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. And what does that say?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That says 19 months for the entire project.

MR. MARCUS: And what do you base that on?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Past experience on other projects that we had done.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. So you don't have studies where one would normally expect them. In the case of the term of the project you're just basing it on previous experience?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So what studies were you referring to that we have not previously done?

MR. MARCUS: Well, it was the impact of parking due to trenching, the construction noise. I don't believe you've done a terrific study. Have you?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, we have not.

DR. KLEMENS: Would you please
all speak up a bit. It's getting softer and softer. I was having trouble hearing.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We have done other projects that that was done in Stamford. It's the same process in which we went through.

MR. MARCUS: Well, you mean, each traffic study is the same?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No.
MR. MARCUS: No?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): The
process.
MR. MARCUS: The process is the same. When do you do a traffic study?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Once we know the route we'll start doing traffic studies.

MR. MARCUS: Now have you, in question number six, have you performed any studies relative to subsurface conditions, such as rock, water, other utilities?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We put in the application and we've discussed today that we've done soil borings at 40 different locations. And so we do have some
preliminary information around the preferred routes that we have identified.

MR. MARCUS: Now what do you mean by a preliminary?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Preliminary means we would
like to do more testing, more soil borings once we define the route to get a better profile for our engineering.

MR. MARCUS: If you look at your response to question number seven where we asked whether or not full studies have been undertaken to assess the full impact of construction, $I$ don't quite understand your answer. You say if you get approval from the Siting Council you'll take additional samples.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, sir I don't understand. It seems to be rather a comprehensive answer. The question has been raised throughout this hearing, the difference between preliminary and final. They don't have a defined route, so I'm just -- other than you're continually repeating, and are you going to do this for
all 51 or more questions?
MR. MARCUS: Well, it depends what the question has in it, but I'd submit to you that I've sat very patiently on behalf of Pet Pantry.

THE CHAIRMAN: So have we, sir.

MR. MARCUS: I know. That's your job as the Siting Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's your job, too.

MR. MARCUS: And that's mine as an attorney, but $I$ would like to go through this as thoroughly as possible while I have the ability to do so, so if there is a record as to the questions that are asked and answered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's just not ask the same question where we've already gotten a response.

MR. MARCUS: Well, I'm certainly not trying to, and I believe they are different in nature.

But coming back to number
seven, when you say you're going to take
additional samples to refine the analysis, tell me what you mean by that?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): What
that means is we would like to go in once we know the preferred route to do more soil borings in the area. We -- we need to profile exactly where the bedrock is to understand where we're going to be putting -putting in the pipe. We want to make sure that -- that we have all that engineering pre-done prior to getting into construction. It's just that -- it's just the moving into detailed engineering. That's what it allows us to do. We -- we can plan with the preliminary data that we got and then what we have to do once we know the route we go in and get more detailed information and then do more detailed engineering.

MR. MARCUS: Right. But really what you're telling us, or telling me is that it's only after you have approval, after you have a defined route that you do your studies. And you don't really know today what those studies may reveal or what
problems may be related to a given route if you get approval. Is that basically it?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Basically that's it.
MR. MARCUS: Okay.
THE WITNESS (Gardell):
Because there's several routes
you can't do engineering. It wouldn't be prudent to do detailed engineering and soil borings on each of the routes, especially in the application.

MR. MARCUS: And it is certainly conceivable that you could obtain approval from the Siting Council for a route and then later determine that it's not feasible, that it doesn't work, because you're then taking additional engineering studies which indicate you can't do it?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I
wouldn't -- I don't believe so. I think with the preliminary information that we have it gives us a good assessment of what we need to do. It's just the final details of a -- to develop the drawings and the engineering specifications, is -- the other information
is required.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. If you
look at the answer to question eight, you're talking about covering on excavations. That was the question and you said, message boards, barrels and traffic roll-up signs will be used to help ensure the protection and safety.

You didn't mean that that would protect the excavation. You mean you would just use that to tell the public that the excavation was taking place. Is that right?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, at night what we would do is we would put the steel plates down so traffic could resume. And the idea of message signs, boards, barrels and traffic signs are really just traffic safety management.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. Now we had asked you whether or not you had conducted any terrific studies. And the answer was no?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct.
MR. MARCUS: Okay. Is that
what you normally do, conduct a study after
you obtain approval?
MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, I think we're getting a little repetitive here. I think we've said several times that the studies come once you have the route and more details.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's what I believe the members of the Council have also heard, and asked and answered more than one time.

MR. MARCUS: Now have you done a study of the impact of the construction, excavation, demolition on each of the potential site? And if so, why haven't the studies been disclosed? And your answer was further detail will be developed as engineering continues.

MS. DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, that's already been sworn testimony, so that's the answer we gave.

MR. MARCUS: Well, does that mean I'm not allowed to cross-examine on sworn testimony?

THE CHAIRMAN: It means do not be repetitive. And if it's already -- I
don't know if it's already here in the document, unless you're eliciting additional or new information that's not here. I'm not quite sure $I$ understand what your point is.

MR. MARCUS: Well, I'm questioning the answer. You know, the answers to all these questions are all general in nature and this one is just typical of them, further detail will be developed as engineering continues and after a general contractor is on board. They're asking the Siting

Council to give them approval for one of the routes and $I$ submit you don't have the information that you need. I mean, there are at least nine studies that haven't been performed and I'm trying to inquire as to what additional detail is required, what else has to be submitted.

MS . DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman,
the record shows we have 29 exhibits at this point. So there is a great deal of information in the application in the exhibits. I do not think it's fair to characterize this application as not having
any information about these particular studies. So if there is a question -MR. MARCUS: I posed a question.

MS. DUBUQUE: We will answer the question, but I don't think that we should opt to keep going over what's in the application again and what's already been sworn to.

MR. MARCUS: I posed a question, and if Counsel hadn't interrupted I assume $I$ would have gotten an answer.

MS. DUBUQUE: What was your
questions, sir?
MR. MARCUS: The question was, what further detail is required to be developed? It's an easy question.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah,
we're trying. We need to figure out what route we're going to be going. Once we're on the route we have to determine are we on the left side of the street? The right side of the street? The exact details of where things are going to be constructed.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): We'll
survey the other utilities in the road to make sure we have minimized the interferences. We may have to relocate some of those facilities, or relocate through a change in our depth or route the transmission line. Those are some examples of what we would do in a further analysis and further information for the development and management plan.

MR. MARCUS: If you look at question number 13 , we asked whether a study has been conducted -- shows the impact of how Greenwich town services will be impacted should there be emergencies such as a fire at the potential substation. And your response is, Eversource has not conducted such a study. Wouldn't that be a study that would be necessary and appropriate to submit? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): There's two potential locations that the substation could be on at this point and that's subject to this proceeding.

MR. MARCUS: Well, wouldn't
the emergency procedures be the same regardless of which location might be
accepted?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure.
If you -- if you turn to page $\mathrm{E}-15$-- I'll give you time to get there.

MR. MARCUS: No, I don't have it in front of me. All I'm asking for is that --

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, on page E-15 it lists all of the substations in the town of Greenwich. I spoke this morning that, for example, Prospect has been there for 81 years. The Town understands the requirements around emergency response for a substation event, as they have lived with them for decades.

So there will be some unique things around the new Greenwich substation, which we'll review with the Town if and when the project is approved. But to characterize the fact that we don't have a study where we've had equipment operating in that town for a hundred years I think is a little disingenuous.

MR. MARCUS: Well, that's your opinion, sir, which you're entitled to.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So again that was page $E-15$, if you're interested. THE CHAIRMAN: It would have helped if you had referred to that in your response. That one I'll give the questioner some credit.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. If you
look at question number 14, out of any of the potential substations as submitted by you in your original proposal and the alternatives, which line is the largest?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't think I have anything to add to that.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. And tell me this, which site would do the least damage by way of disturbing existing property owners?

MS. DUBUQUE: Perhaps you can clarify what you mean by damage.

MR. MARCUS: Well, interference with their ability to use their property, traffic issues and the like. Things that might be negative relating to existing property owners.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So in
the application we go through a list of criteria we use for selecting a substation location. That's a little bit of a variation on the criteria we use.

I believe that on two of the sites there are existing buildings, which would maybe factor into what you're asking. In two of the sites there are nonexisting buildings. Impacts are usually more pronounced on the neighbors to the substation than the actual use of the existing property. Not always the case, but --

MR. MARCUS: If your initial application which utilizes 290 Railroad Avenue were to be granted, would the site that you currently use at 330 Railroad Avenue continue to be utilized?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it would.

MR. MARCUS: And why would
that be?
THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's actually in one of your questions, and we responded to it.

MR. MARCUS: I'm asking you.

You're a live witness. I'm asking you for a live answer.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, it's -- most of the facilities would be removed from that site, the Prospect Street substation, in this case the transformers and switchgear. We would still maintain the $27-\mathrm{kV}$ switching equipment there that supplies the downtown Greenwich network. So there will be much less equipment on site, but we would still use that for a switching location.

MR. MARCUS: Now we asked question 16, what the amount of proposed impervious surface is in relationship to open space for each potential substation location. And your answer was a percentage calculation of impervious surfaces has not been completed.

So once again, no study. When would that be done. When would you complete it?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Once the proposed site was selected.

MR. MARCUS: So once again you
don't really know what you might be heading into relative to the surface until after the fact as far as this Council is concerned? THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would certainly be part of the development and management plan, so that's kind of the second phase of this process.

MR. MARCUS: Now throughout your answers to our questions you indicate that if there is a new substation the additional service that you would be able to perform would be limited to Greenwich. Am I correct in understanding the answers that way?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think just the way you worded it, it's a little different than what I'm used to. The intended and sole use of the substation is for Greenwich.

MR. ASHTON: Keep your voice up, please, Mr. Bowes.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. How do you actually enforce that? If there were a need on any given Sunday, so to speak, in Stamford or in Rye, New York, or any other area you
service and you needed that power, would you not give it to them?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I'll answer two part. There are no interconnecting wires to New York, so that's a very easy answer. There's no mechanism to do that.

In Stamford for the flow of
electricity to flow from Greenwich to
Stamford, I'm not aware of a situation where that could occur on the distribution system. So I don't think it's possible today with the existing facilities we have.

MR. MARCUS: And would it be possible if you were to add equipment to service Stamford, for example?

THE WITNESS (Bowes):
Technically it's possible.
It's really not feasible, otherwise we would be adding equipment in Stamford to serve Greenwich today.

MR. MARCUS: It might be feasible tomorrow?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's
possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: A follow-up question. Would some terrible thing happen if somehow you added that equipment and some entity or individual in Stamford were served? Would that somehow destroy some balance between, I don't know what?

MR. ASHTON: The laws of
nature?
THE CHAIRMAN: The laws of nature. Okay. I was just wondering if there was some something that I'm missing, some extreme.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't see there would be any detriment to Greenwich or Stamford if that were to occur.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But the representation throughout the answers of our interrogatories are that it's limited to Greenwich?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yeah, and I understand it. That may have been a reaction to many of the claims that were made at the public meeting, that this was for another state, or for another town or something else.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. So it's kind of an overreaction.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): I wouldn't characterize it that way. It was a reaction to it.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. And why couldn't the substation at 330 Railroad be brought current to address the potential need of customers? It's there. Why can't you can't you add to that?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): 330
Railroad we call our Prospect substation site. There there's some difficulties with this site as it exists today. You're probably aware that there's a culvert 16 feet wide, 200 feet long built in 1934 that exists through the middle of this site. That that makes it extremely difficult for us to use that site, having an active culvert underneath it. It would have to be rebuilt or located somewhere else.

There's also a 15-inch sewer pipe that runs down the east side of the culvert. This would also have to be removed.

This site is in a flood -- 500-year
floodplain. We would make sure that all the equipment would have to be raised up. The existing substation, as we said before, parts of it are going to exist. We're not removing all of it.

MR. MARCUS: What is a
500-year floodplain? Can you explain that?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): A
chance for a flood in 500 years.
MR. MARCUS: So if means that you're talking about one flood in 500 years? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It doesn't exclusively mean that, no.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But what's
the difference between a 100-year floodplain and 500 years, except one is five times more than the other? You're talking about one flood in a hundred years potentially.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Theoretically.
MR. MARCUS: Theoretically.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It's
doesn't mean -- it's just like -- it's just
like any probability. If you roll the dice.
There's a one in seven chance. It doesn't
mean one will come up again and again.
MR. MARCUS: So a 500-year
floodplain, can we agree, is not significant? THE WITNESS (Libertine): I
would not characterize it as that. There are certain base elevations that are developed based on probabilities. And so the -- the difference is usually a foot or more. So we're talking about a site that has a lower elevation that we're proposing.

So in the event of a surge or some type of a catastrophic event, which we typically have a lot less than 500 years apart, there could be some potential damage to equipment. So it just means that it's a technical and cost issue for having to deal with it. It doesn't mean you can't build in it, but you certainly are vulnerable.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But it's a limited amount of vulnerability. Can we agree as to that?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): Until it occurs.

MR. MARCUS: Well, that's true of any event.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Klemens has a question.

DR. KLEMENS: I have a question for Mr. Libertine. Has it been generally the increasing practice with climate change in the concept of resiliency that more and more people are using the 500-year flood benchmark as we used to use the hundred-year flood mark. Isn't that sort of becoming increasingly accepted practice? And I think some of that has happened at this Council.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is true. It is being used more and more as the, we'll use the base level from which to work with. And certainly yes, the Council has addressed that on several dockets. And I think Mr. Ashton made a good point this morning that they had such an event, if not worse, just this past weekend in South Carolina. So it can happen.

MR. MARCUS: If you turn to question number 20. We ask why the market study for evaluating potential sites for substations -- it should be studies -- were
not submitted as evidence for the record. Your answer was, you did not conduct a market study. And my question would be, why not? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): What we did is we had a real estate company, $C B$, Ellis, Richard, work with us. They, aided by our local or internal real estate folks, conducted a site survey or survey for -- for properties.

They looked what was on the market, what was company owned, what was company leased. They used a lot of the internet information out there on sites for looking at it. And they also contacted local brokers and appraisers that they went to, to get additional information.

MR. MARCUS: Now we asked in question 23 whether you conducted any studies as to how the market value of real estate -contiguous real estate, real estate in the area that would be effected during the construction period. And your response was, no.

So once again, you did not
conduct any study as to what effect your
construction would have on other property owners.

MS. DUBUQUE: I think that was asked and answered, sir.

MR. MARCUS: I don't think we had asked that question before.

MS. DUBUQUE: It's the question you've just read and answered.

MR. MARCUS: But in any event the answer is, no. Right?

Now we had asked in question 24 what injurious impacts substations can have on public health. Once again, have you submitted any studies? Your answer was that there will be no injurious impact. How can you be so sure about it and so definitive?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We have substations all throughout Connecticut, Western Massachusetts, Eastern Massachusetts, New Hampshire. I am unaware of any.

MR. MARCUS: So you're basing it on existing substations?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon):
Experience.
MR. MARCUS: Experience?

Okay. But in fact, you don't know whether or not this new substation, if in fact built, would have any effect, any injurious effect? THE WITNESS (Gagnon): From past experience, no.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. If you look at question 25 , if this project is guestimated to come in at 140 million -- is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's the project cost estimate.

MR. MARCUS: Right. It's an estimate. And that estimate could be wrong or it could be correct. And generally on construction jobs, at least in my experience over the years doing construction law, most jobs have overruns. Now I don't know whether that's your experience at Eversource or not, but my guess is it probably is.

In any event, if -- let's
start with 140 million. If it cost 140 million what affect will it have on the ratepayer?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's
in a response to another question from the

OCC, so it's very prescriptive.
MR. MARCUS: Right. But I have another follow-up question to it. So just tell me your response?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, it's in answer 44.

MR. MARCUS: Can't you just testify to it? You must know what it is. Isn't that a major part of this, the cost to the ratepayer?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's not as simple as one cost. It depends on which ratepayer.

MR. MARCUS: Well, residential ratepayer?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Okay. We show that the transmission rate would be -- hang in with me with the zeroes -. 000458 dollars per kilowatt hour.

Distribution retail rate would be .000160-kilowatt hours.

MR. MARCUS: So what does that mean to me as the owner of a residence? How much more a month is it going to cost me?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So it's
really based on what your usage is. We could easily calculate it.

MR. MARCUS: As a guess.
THE WITNESS (Bowes): Or
provide the usage.
MR. MARCUS: Well, $I$ can't provide the usages. My wife pays all the bills, so I don't know.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So you're asking us a detailed question but you don't know the basis for it?

MR. MARCUS: In general -- in General you know what it's going to cost the average residential consumer of electricity. How much?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the average is about a 700-kilowatt hour per month customer.

MR. MARCUS: I'm sorry. How much will it cost?

THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the math would be simply 700 times the distribution and the transmission.

MR. MARCUS: Which is what? You must have some number. You must know it.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, we do. It's about $\$ 5$ a year.

MR. MARCUS: Five dollars?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): A year
for CL\&P. Let's narrow it down to CL\&P. I can't tell who the other customers would be. Different revenue requirements.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. And what is the job actually cost you 200 million? As I understand the way it works, that would result in the ratepayer paying roughly, what? 50 to 60 million of it, because there was testimony earlier that 140 equated down to 30 million.

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yeah, and I think we were -- we were talking about that at lunch. And it's -- it was actually probably 25 first -- first year costs.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. But if you have an overrun what would it be roughly? If it cost you 200 million, not 140.

THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be a ratio at about the same amount. So if you're increased by, in this case, \$60 million, it would go up by about, you
know, 40 percent.
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): And if you went by what we did in Stamford we actually came in under budget by 20 -\$10 million. So --

MR. MARCUS: You must have had a great contractor. We had asked the question, question 26 whether you had done any studies on the use of chemicals to break rocks. Your answer were, no studies have been submitted. Is that another one of these studies that will be done assuming you obtain approval?

MR. ASHTON: I have a question. Is there any -- is there an assumption that you're going to use chemicals to break rock?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, there we did talk in the interrogatories that there's the possibility that we could use expanding grout. So I assume that's where he's going.

MR. ASHTON: And I suppose if
you blasted you'd consider that a chemical?
THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct.

MR. ASHTON: Can we move on?
MR. MARCUS: I'm just running through my notes, and if you give me a minute we'll see where we are.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to give you three minutes and then we're going to terminate today's hearing.

MR. MARCUS: If you move to question 36 , and we'll remove the characterization of monolithic structure from the question, but assuming you obtain approvals, how would the building of the substation impact the evaluation of properties that are in close proximity to the structure?

Will values go up? Will it go down? Based on your experience when you put a substation in does that adversely affect the value of contingent real estate?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I
haven't done a -- you would have to ask the assessor in this particular case. In the other case I'm not aware. I don't do those studies. So --

MR. MARCUS: Well, you've been
involved in the construction of a number of substations. Am I right?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I
have.
MR. MARCUS: And what normally
happens to the value of the properties that are contiguous to the substation?

THE CHAIRMAN: He just
testified live that he doesn't know. So I don't think there's any --

MR. MARCUS: I didn't hear him actually say, no, he did not.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you said you didn't know?

MR. MARCUS: Did you say you do not know?

THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I did not know.

MR. MARCUS: Okay. If the -I still have some more questions, so if you want to adjourn for the day we'll pick up at the next hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'd just
like to announce that we'll continue the evidentiary portion of the hearing again
here, 10 Franklin Square, on Tuesday, December 1st, at $11 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m}$, in one of these two hearing rooms, preferably the other one. Please note that anyone who
has not become a party or intervener but 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.

And I hereby declare this hearing adjourned. Thank you.
(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused and the above proceedings were concluded at 5:00 p.m.)
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| \$291 (1) | accommodated (1) | added (5) | 0:21,10 | $\underset{0.3}{\text { alignment (1) }}$ |
| 0.1 03.7 | accomplished (1) | 0:22,21,22,18,3 <br> adding (3) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { aesthetics (1) } \\ 0: 25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 3 \\ \text { allege (1) } \end{gathered}$ |
| \$3.7 (1) $0: 2$ | accomplished (1) 0:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adding (3) } \\ & 0: 21,25,20 \end{aligned}$ | affect (4) | $0: 11$ |
| \$30 (1) | accordance (1) | addition (8) | 0:7,25,22,18 | allocation (1) |
| 0:9 | 0:8 | 0:22,20,11,8,6,3,8, | affected (1) | 0:11 |
| \$35 (2) | according (2) | 22 | 0:1 | allow (5) |
| 0:7,20 | 0:8,8 | additional (27) | affecting (1) | 0:5,24,12,12,5 |
| \$4.5 (1) | account (3) | 0:9,3,13,11,15,6,7, |  | allowed (6) |
| 0:6 | $0: 11,20,1$ accounts (1) | 21,13,15,8,4,6,1,21, | affiliated (1) | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 21,18,4,8,12,22 \\ & \text { allowing (4) } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\$ 5(1)$ $0: 2$ | accounts (1) $0: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23,23,8,8,17,16,1,17 } \\ & 2,18,11,16 \end{aligned}$ | $0: 1$ affluent (2) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \operatorname{allowing~(4)} \\ 0: 12,22,13,19 \end{array}$ |
| \$50 (1) | accrue (1) | additions (3) | 0:25,5 | allows (4) |
| 0:6 | 0:1 | 0:14,24,8 | afield (1) | 0:10,24,17,14 |
| \$5800 (1) | accurate (7) | address (3) | 0:3 | All-Points (1) |
| 0:18 | 0:22,25,8,11,22,3,5 | 0:14,14,8 | A-frame (1) | 0:6 |
| \$60 (1) | acetylene (3) | addressed (3) | 0:16 | all-underground (1) |
| 0:25 | 0:14,18,23 | 0:24,13,17 | afternoon (9) | 0:22 |
| \$72 (1) | achieve (3) | adhering (1) | 0:14,21,25, $1,23,18$, | alluvial (1) |
| 0:22 | 0:4,4,14 |  | 5,6,21 | $0: 13$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \$ 84(1) \\ 0: 19 \end{array}$ | acoustics (1) $0: 19$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { adjacent (3) } \\ 0: 22,1,18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \operatorname{again}(\mathbf{4 6 )} \\ 0: 2,25,5,15,22,20, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \operatorname{almost}(7) \\ 0: 9,9,1,23,15,25,15 \end{array}$ |
| 0.1 | acquire (1) | adjourn (1) | 15,11,10,19,20,13,11, | along (34) |
| A | 0:25 | 0:21 | 19,1,4,3,5,15,6,11,19, | 0:1,13,19,3,16,18, |
|  | $\underset{0.21}{\operatorname{acquiring}}$ (1) | adjourned (1) | $1,13,17,25,9,10,4,16 \text {, }$ | $23,1,13,5,18,19,9,10$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { abetting (1) } \\ 0: 20 \end{gathered}$ | acquisition (2) | adjust (5) | $1,20,25,1,1,24,13,25$ | $10,19,8,5,7,5,5,18,6$ |
| ability (5) | 0:1,24 | 0:16,19,18,10,12 | against (7) | 12,5,14 |
| $0: 6,7,9,15,21$ | acquisitions (3) | adjustments (1) | 0:17,18, 19, 23, 11, | altering (2) |
| able (16) | 0:13,7,2 | 0:5 | 18,20 | $0: 19,22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0: 1,11,4,18,24,4,18 \\ & 11,6,4,24,6,13,5,9,11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { acres (1) } \\ 0: 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { Administrative (5) } \\ 0: 15,19,15,24,17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|} \text { age (2) } \\ 0: 7,3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { alternate (4) } \\ 0: 2,2,4,6 \end{gathered}$ |
| above (11) | across (10) | administratively (1) | agency (4) | alternative (16) |
| 0:25,3,6,17,4,22,18, | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 19,16,19,13,21, \\ & 15.16 .13 .15 .6 \end{aligned}$ | $0: 7$ | $0: 11,13,15,11$ | $0: 3,21,7,1,16,6,12$ |
| $22,18,1,14$ | 15,16,13,15,6 <br> Act (4) | $\left.\right\|_{0: 25} ^{\operatorname{admission}(1)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { agenda (1) } \\ 0: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $23,1,19,20,12,12,12,3$, <br> 5 |


| alternatives (16) | appear (2) |  | 23,3,8,17,21,9,18,22, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16,23,2,19,22,9,9, | 0:19, | 4,24,16,10, | ,8,6,22,3,8,21,1,6,8, | 16,21, |
| 7,24,1,13,21,16,2,2,10 | appearance (1) | 15,5,17,14,23,13,18,1, | 12,4,12,16,24,3,10,14, | authenticating (1) |
| although (7) | $0 \cdot 11$ | 20,20,18,25,13,17,25, | 7,19,1,6,11,1,8,15,23, | 0:15 |
| $0: 4,16,23,8$, | ap | 6,18,2,12,24,6,16,21, | ,6,12,1,11, | author (1) |
| 21 | , | 16,23,8,25,6,18,22,18, | 17,19,3,9,16,22,6,10, | 0:12 |
| always |  | 18,25,8,24,5,25,22,23, | 23,13,6,16,21,3,11,19, | (1) |
| 0:9,6,3,23 | 0:18,25,1 | 3,9,16,16,19,20,19,10, | 18,21,21,4,16,19,24,2, | 0:17,24 |
| amongst (1) |  | ,21,25,3,7,17,23,6, | ,12,17,22,11,19,20,7, | authorizat |
| 0:12 |  | , | 18,14,2 | 0:24,5 |
| amortized | apples (2) | areas (12) | Ashton's (1) | authorized |
| 0:15 | 0.2,2 | 0:3,11, 15, 17, 16, 2 | 0:9 | 0:15 |
| amount | appliances | $15,18,5,5,15,9$ | aside (1) | automatic |
| 0:2,13,8,5,6,9,24,2 | 0:25,2 | arguing (1) | 0:21 | 0:12 |
| $2,5,1,15,23,20,21,1$ | applicable | $0: 3$ | aspect (2) | automatic |
| 13,9,7,13,15,14,20,23 | 0:22,23 | argume | 0:1,22 | 0:1,21 |
| amounts (1) | ap | $0 \cdot 5$ | aspect | automation |
| 0:4 | 12,23,2,25,5,2 | arise | 0:13 | 0:25,6 |
| amusin | 16,3 | 0:13 | assess (2) | availability ( |
| 0:19 | applica | arithm | 0:25,13 | $0: 18,11$ |
| analogo | 0:25 | 0:14 | assessme | available (8) |
| 0:21 | app | arms | :22 | 0:9,12,25,8, |
| analysis | 0:16,2,15,16,21,1,6 | : 11 | assessor | 14 |
| 0:15,6,19 | 10,7,21,2,23,5,9,7,2 | arose | 0:22 | Ave (2) |
| 1,7 | 21,11,13,9,11,10,3,3, | :7 | assets | 0:20,5 |
| analyze | 6,8,10,15,17,5,9,13,3, | around | 0:6 | Avenue (12) |
| 0:5 | 1,23,11,23,25,8,1,14 | :4,7,17,23,3,19,2 | assignm | 0:21,24,15,17,2 |
| ancient | applications (8) | 8,14,13,25,6,5,14,22, | 0:21 | 21,7,19,14,19,15 |
| 0:20 | 0:23,12,14,15,21 | 18,2,14,18,1,13,17 | assistance | avenues (2) |
| angle (1) | 15,17,1 | arrangement (1) | :15 | 0:20,8 |
| 0:14 | applied | 0:9 | associat | average (6) |
| announc |  | arrive | 13 | 0:16,16,5,10,14 |
| 0:24 | applies | 0:2 | associated | avoid (8) |
| announcement | $0: 13$ | arrived | $0: 7,16,10,14,$ | $0: 24,21,14,21,24,$ |
| $0: 6,9$ | apprais | $0: 4,1$ | assume (9) | $18,17$ |
| announc | 5 | articulat | :2,14,7,24,11,6, | aware (12) |
| 0:11 | ap | 0:5,12 | 12,21 | $0: 20,24,11,20,10$ |
| annuali | 0:17,14,17 | Ashton (277) | assumes | $18,15,15,16,10,15,23$ |
| 0:21 | approached | 0:9,10,7, | 0:4,6,8 | away (7) |
| answere | $0: 6$ | 18,22,1,6,12,20,23,6, | assuming (12) | $0: 15,19,23,22,5,21,$ |
| 0:9,15,14,12, 22,25, | appropriate <br> 0:11,916 | 9,14,20,2,12,17,21,25, | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 18,2,14,7,19,2 \\ & 1715111211 \end{aligned}$ | $20$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 18,17 \\ \text { anticips } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4,13,16,7,10,17,22,1, \\ & 9,15,23,20,5,11,16,22 \end{aligned}$ | ,15,11,12,1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { awfully (1) } \\ 0: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| 0:4,24,2 | 8,15,15 | $1,8,12,25,8,12,17,2,8$ | 0,25 |  |
| anticipated (1) | 1,13,13 | 16,23,3,8,12,1,5,9,15, | assumptions | B |
| 0:3 | approvals | 19,23, 4,7,17,1,9,1 | 0:4,3 |  |
| anticip | 6, | 22,10,15,21,12,17,23, | assure | achman (4) |
| 0:16 | approve | 2,19,24,3,9,13,24,9 | 0:23 | 22,5,17,12 |
| anticip | 0:2,16 | $13,17,22,3,12,21,8,16 \text {, }$ | attachment | back (29) |
| 0:1 | approved (7) | 20,24,6,11,15,5,8,15, | , | $0: 15,3,9,1,23 \text {, }$ |
| anymore | 0:13,4,15, | 19,12,5,11,17,22,12, | attachm | 19,21,22,11,18,18,17, |
| 0:17,7 | 19 | 15,20,25,6,10,15,13 | $0: 13$ | 18,2,22,19,20,9,1,2,9, |
| apart (1) | approves | 25,13,19,6,11,16,1,6, | attending | 6,13,20,22,7,24 |
| 0:14 | $0: 10$ | 11,15,20,1,5,24,5,22, | $0: 12$ | backdrop (2) |
| apiece | approxi | 14,19,3,14,2,18,4,12, | attention | 0:16,25 |
| 0:24 | 0:19 | 19,3,9,1,6,15,19,6,10, | 0:12 | backfill (6) |
| apologize (4) | approxima | 22,2,8,11,18,25,1,9 | attic | 0:10,6,10,24,9,25 |
| 0:12,17,17,19 | 0:23,22,7,11,25,24 | 14,19,24, $8,15,19,25,2$, | 0:5 | backfilled (1) |
| apparently (8) | $11,18,4,25,19,17,1,18$ | 5,24,7,1,6,10,23,10, | attorney (7) | $0: 16$ |
| $0: 25,16,5,7,22,13$ | $8$ | $22,1,5,16,21,2,11,15$ | $0: 20,1,24,19,22,$ | background (1) |
| 14,11 | arcin | 21,1,18,24,19,24,12, | 13 | 0:7 |
| appeals (1) | 0:16 | 19,24,2,7,15,23,2,14, | auger (1) | backs (1) |
| 0:7 | area (73) | 13,6,11,6,16,25,8,14, | 0:19 | 0:10 |


| backseat (1) | 0:22,1,14,19,5,11,6, | Betty (1) | boiler (3) | 3,23,4,15,21,3,17,24, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:2 | 16,11 | $0 \cdot 7$ | 0.22,24 | 3,20,3,22,10,24,11 |
| backup (2) | bated | beyond (11) | bollards | 25,4,9,16,21,22 |
| 0:12,22 | 0:9 | 0:24,7,8,22,15,21, | 0:3 | box (1) |
| backyards (3) | battery | 7,19,19,25 | bond (1) | 0:11 |
| 0:12,23,18 | $0: 19,16,18,9,2$ | bid (1) | 0:18 | boxes (1) |
| bad (5) | bay (1) | 0:20 | bony (1) | 0:3 |
| 0:24,15, | 0.3 | BIDRA | 0:5 | BPV-2 (1) |
| badly (1) | Bear | $0: 11,22,23,6,8,14$ | book | 0:23 |
| 0:19 | 13,8,25, | 18,19,10 | 0:7 | brand-new (1) |
| BAIN (107) | bearing (3) | big (8) | bore (1) | 0:5 |
| 0:12,16,21,23,20,3 | 0:10, 13, 17 | 0:5,15,3,11,13,23 | 0:18 | Branford (2) |
| $7,13,17,22,25,14,22,5$ | become (6) | 13,23 | boring | 0:20,21 |
| 13,23,2,24,9,21,24,7, | 0:21,10,4,8,3,5 | bigger (2) | 0:14,17 | break (5) |
| 15,19,1,9,2,12,15,20, | becomes (2) | 0:22,13 | borings (18) | 0:1,17,22,9,17 |
| 24,9,13,17,24,7,14,19, | 0:25,21 | biggest | 0:8,12,7,10,1 | breakdown (2) |
| 5,13,18,3,4,4,8,15,22, | becoming | 0:16 | 7,9,10,2,11,12,4,24,7, | 0:9,1 |
| 1,11,23,7,10,24,6,11, | 0:18,10 | bill (2) | 6,10 | breaker (1) |
| 14,24,15,25,7,14,12, | bedrock (3) | 0:3,5 | Boston | 0:19 |
| 18,7,14,22,2,4,18,24, | 0:7,15,7 | billion | 0:15 | breaking (2) |
| 5,10,19, $1,8,13,18,4$, | begin (5) | 0:18,11 | both (15) | 0:3,19 |
| 12,22,13,22,25,5,17, | 0:11,8,16,5,1 | billion-dollar | 0:14,8,7,6,11,23, | breath (1) |
| 11,8,3,17,25,6,18,16, | beginnin | 24 | 10,17,9,11,17,3,7,10 | 0:10 |
| 20,9,16,2,9,14,8,10, | 0:20,6, | bills (1) | bottom (4) | brick (2) |
| 18,20,5,25,24,9 | behalf (2) | 0:8 | 0:10,11,24 | 0:17,20 |
| balance (5) |  | birthda | Bowes (319) | bridge (1) |
| 0:19,23,21,23, | behavio | 0:11 | 0:1,21,12,4,11,16 | 0:5 |
| balanced (2) | 18 | bit (33) | 23,12,21,1,19,9,19,21, | brilliant (1) |
| 0:16,2 | beings | 0:12,3,7,6,5,2,25 | 10,20,1,8,13,20,24,3, | 0:9 |
| balancing | 0:25 | 18,9,21,1,6,21,14,2, | 8,16,21,4,7,11,18,24, | bring (10) |
| 0:9 | believe | 17,6,5,23,11,24,23,10, | 13,19,23,2,14,20,23,8, | 0:3,21,6,13 |
| bales (1) | 0:25 | 21,21,6,16,4,24,1,1,3 | 12,21,17,25,8,13,20, | 21,22,16 |
| 0:25 | Bella (1) | bizarre (1) | 24,3,10,19,2,10,14,25, | brings (3) |
| ball (1) | 0:1 | 0:12 | 6,13,20,25,3,14,23,4, | 0:16,7,4 |
| 0:11 | below | blast (1) | 14,19,3,12,17,11,21, | brink (1) |
| bank (9) | 0:6,1 | 0:3 | 24,6,11,18,21,4,8,13, | 0:10 |
| 0:1,17,2 | bench | blasted | 25,7,12,16,23,17,22,9, | broadly (1) |
| 17,1,24 | 0:8 | 0:24 | 14,19,7,13,17,21,2,8, | 0:19 |
| banks (1) | benefic | blaster | 12,25,17,6,16,14,17,4, | broke (1) |
| 0:17 | 0:3 | 0:4 | 8,13,7,4,6,17,22,8,1,4, | 0:10 |
| Barbino | benefit | blasting (12) | 20,7,16,22,6,17,4,9, | brokers (1) |
| 0:19 | $0: 13,23,5,10,5$, | :17,18,20,23,2,4, | 16,21,8,18,24,3,9,15, | 0:15 |
| barrels (2) | 12 | 10,21,22,19,7,22 | 20,6,12,15,21,3,10,17, | Brooklyn (4) |
| 0:6,18 | benefited | block (3) | 5,8,20,25,3,7,19,25,4, | 0:18,24,23,22 |
| barrier (1) |  | 0:7,18 | 13,17,23,10,20,15,23, | brought (5) |
| 0:5 | benefits (2) | blowout (6) | 25,15,22,1,6,12,17,24, | 0:10,18,7,1,8 |
| barriers | 0:20,15 | 0:5,10,24,5,16,13 | 12,6,10,14,18,1,5,13, | Bruce (37) |
| 0:15 | bentonite (6) | blowouts (3) | 20,11,19,2,20,25,9,12, | $0: 12,18,7,13,17,12$, |
| base (8) | 0:10,14,15,2,5,5 | 0:20,25,2 | 3,7,4,5,11,20,6,12,20, | 1,8,12,15,15,16,19,7, |
| 0:7,12,9,2,15,7,6,15 | BERGAMO (2) |  | 6,16,20,17,7,1,13,3, | 15,1,14,9,17,23,15,13, |
| based (22) | 0:23, |  | 21,3,17,24,4,10,17,23, | 24,11,18,24,10,5,20, |
| 0:11,20,5,8,4,25,17, | best (9) | blueprint (1) | 5,11,15,20,23,2,8,19, | 17,22,23,23,9,18,13, |
| 2,3,1,15,5,22,18,10, | 0:20, | 0:1 | 24,7,14,1,5,14,20,3,8, | 14 |
| 23,8,20,2,7,1,17 | 5,25 | blunt ( | 11,8,12,2,13,23,4,9, | bucks (5) |
| baseline (2) | beta (1) |  | 17,23,7,11,13,18,10,4, | 0:20,12,1,6,9 |
| 0:11,25 | 0:22 | board ( | 9,17,2,9,13,11,15,18, | budget (1) |
| baseload (1) | Beth | 0:15,6,1 | 2,10,16,21,24,15,1,8, | 0:4 |
| 0:13 | 0:21 | boards (2) | 3,9,17,25,15,2,1,7,14, | budgeted (1) |
| basically (8) | Bethel-Norwalk (1) | 0:6,17 | 18,1,17,8,23,12,20,12, | 0:23 |
| 0:6,13,15,4,8,10,2,4 | 0:7 | bodies (4) | 3,19,4,7,15,10,15,11, | budgeting (1) |
| basing (2) | better (8) | 0:1,17, | 15,20,4,8,11,3,9,12,7, | 0:7 |
| 0:14,21 | 0:5,13, 10,5,5,14,11 | body (3) | 1,6,10,15,18,1,16,23, | budgets (1) |
| basis (9) | 8 | 0:20,24,22 | 25,2,8,1,12,25,18,22, | 0:5 |


| buffer (5) | call (13) | careful (5) | certainly (27) | checkpoints (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:11,16,24,10,11 | 0:2,25,4,22,6,9,6, | 0:6,5,13,2,6 | 0:16,7,23, 1, 1,20,8, | 0:3 |
| buffered (1) | 24,6,10,8,2,12 | CARMODY (2) | 25,18,6,14,22,25,1,16, | chemical (1) |
| 0:10 | call-before-you-dig (1) | 0:4,20 | 1,2,5,18,8,11,20,22, | 0:24 |
| build (18) | 0:15 | Carolina (2) | 13,5,18,16 | chemicals (2) |
| 0:13,14,17,6,4,19, | called (3) | 0:23,21 | certificate (2) | 0:9,16 |
| 24,7,22,5,18,19,14,2, | 0:3,1,4 | CARON (8) | 0:17,3 | Chester (2) |
| 21,15,14,17 | calling (1) | 0:11,4,1,2,10,13,16, | cetera (1) | 0:17,19 |
| building (34) | 0:3 | 4 | 0:7 | chew (1) |
| 0:16,2,3,10,17,11,1, | calm (1) | carry (2) | Chair (2) | 0:10 |
| 1,6,25,20,15,23,7,18, | 0:15 | 0:12,13 | 0:18,25 | child (1) |
| 19,1,9,13,9,20,25,16, | came (9) | carrying (2) | CHAIRMAN (94) | 0:17 |
| 20,24,17,21,23,4,20, | 0:2,24,10,2,20,7,21, | 0:9,1 | 0:1,8,11,2,6,19, 7 , | chillers (2) |
| 20,9,15,12 | 4,4 | Case (51) | 18,12,23,3,7,11,15,19, | 0:5,6 |
| buildings (5) | cameras (1) | 0:9,1,21,21,24,3,6, | 24,23,25,4,7,9,13,15, | chime (2) |
| 0:9,17,2,6,9 | 0:25 | 17,2,7,22,11,16,24,19, | 3,7,15,16,22,4,21,24, | 0:20,18 |
| built (15) | camp (1) | 22,23,24,12,13,8,16,7, | 25,3,4,5,9,16,25,1,23, | chipping (1) |
| 0:7,18,20,5,2,3,16, | 0:11 | 2,2,25,7,12,17,7,17, | 14,22,15,16,24,17,22, | 0:18 |
| 10,13, 15,21,19,25,16, | campaign (3) | 23,7,2,9,13,6,16,10, | 14,21,21,7,11,23,13, | Chiropractic (1) |
| 2 | 0:17,9,20 | 18,12,22,13,19,25,13, | 24,1,25,20,9,4,15,2, | 0:4 |
| bulk (10) | campaigns (1) | 12,6,24,22,23 | 17,19,23,21,11,24,24, | choice (1) |
| 0:20,15,5,18, 18,8, | 0:13 | cases (1) | 9,11,13,24,5,6,15,11, | 0:5 |
| 22,3,6,18 | can (95) | 0:5 | 18,6,10,18,2,7,18,24, | choosing (1) |
| bump (4) | 0:21,7,4,3,19,22,25, | Case's (1) | 20,3,1,9,1,5,8,13,23 | 0:22 |
| 0:1,2,5,7 | 22,21,10,3,24,2,9,7, | 0:9 | chairs (1) | chose (4) |
| bunch (2) | 21,10,8,15,12,6,22,20, | casing (3) | 0:7 | 0:3,5,9,9 |
| 0:4,24 | 13,6,8,3,6,9,4,20,1,10, | 0:18,23,11 | challenges (1) | chosen (1) |
| burdensome (1) | 5,23,14,10,16, 1, 16,20, | catastrophic (1) | 0:16 | 0:6 |
| 0:13 | 1,18,3,1,17,16,25,13, | 0:12 | chance (3) | cinderblock (1) |
| burn (3) | 22,2,7,11,16,17,7,11, | catch (1) | 0:18,9,25 | 0:7 |
| 0:3,13,13 | 3,6,4,5,21,6,2,8,9,12, | 0:14 | chances (1) | circuit (15) |
| bury (1) | 7,22,15,24,7,18,25,17, | catching (1) | 0:17 | 0:7,10,11,12,15,16, |
| 0:12 | 25,8,6,12,6,23, 12,14, | 0:23 | change (7) | 9,13,12,14,19,11,9,14, |
| bus (1) | 8,9,13,14,18,7,3,20, | category (6) | 0:21,13,8,16,21,5,6 | 16 |
| 0:22 | 21,12,15,1 | 0:13,5,9,5,20,20 | changed (3) | circuits (8) |
| buses (1) | cap (3) | catenaries (1) | 0:17,22,24 | $0: 22,2,4,7,5,16,20$, |
| 0:2 | 0:1,24,25 | 0:7 | changes (8) | 22 |
| business (2) | capabilities (3) | cathodic (7) | 0:23,25,9,12,25,8, | circulate (2) |
| 0:22,16 | 0:4,3,8 | 0:6,7,7,18,22,4,14 | 19,19 | 0:19,1 |
| busy (1) | capability (10) | caught (2) | changing (2) | circumstance (2) |
| 0:20 | 0:23,2,1, 13, 16, 18, | 0:1,1 | 0:14,23 | 0:7,18 |
| buy (3) | 20,13,14,11 | Caused (2) | channels (1) | circumstances (1) |
| 0:18,15,16 | capable (2) | 0:12,3 | 0:13 | 0:21 |
|  | 0:5,13 | CB (1) | characterization (2) | cite (1) |
| C | capacitor (1) | 0:5 | 0:25,10 | 0:1 |
|  | 0:7 | CBYD (2) | characterize (4) | citizens (1) |
| cable (34) | capacitors (4) | $0: 24,3$ CDOT | $0: 25,19,4,5$ charge (2) | $0: 23$ city (1) |
| 23,3,14,15,12,2,23,4, | capacity (26) | 0:13,18,24 | 0:7,23 | 0:16 |
| 8,3,7,11,17,14,16,17, | 0:12,15,14,18,5,7, | Cedar (3) | charged (1) | civil (1) |
| 22,20,20,7,9,17,14,21, | 11,23,9,2,3,7,12,18, | 0:12,14,8 | 0:16 | 0:9 |
| 18,4,12,14 | 24,18,21,3,2,19,17,23, | cell (1) | charges (3) | CL\&P (10) |
| cables (12) | 14,13,18,20 | 0:14 | 0:9,19,7 | 0:21,5,25,3,16, 1, 10, |
| 0:25,1,18,20,23,3, | capita (1) | cells (1) | chat (1) | 25,5,5 |
| 14,20,10,8,8,7 | 0:1 | 0:12 | 0:13 | claim (1) |
| cabling (1) | capital (2) | center (3) | cheap (1) | 0:7 |
| 0:13 | 0:9,12 | 0:2,14,2 | 0:10 | claims (2) |
| calculate (1) | caps (1) | central (5) | cheaper (3) | 0:25,22 |
| 0:2 | 0:11 | 0:11,23,3,15,16 | 0:16,16,2 | clarification (1) |
| calculated (2) | carcinogen (1) | certain (18) | check (2) | 0:12 |
| 0:25,5 | 0:5 | 0:13,19,5,6,9,15,5, | 0:2,14 | clarifications (2) |
| calculation (3) | care (1) | 5,7,7,21,7,2,6,7,22,23, | checked (1) | 0:14,24 |
| 0:18,17,17 | 0:10 | 6 | 0:7 | clarify (4) |


| 0:24,21,11,19 | co-locate (1) | 20 | conductor (2) | 0:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| classified (1) | - | co | , 1 | onstraints (2) |
|  | r |  | conductors (1) | 0:14,12 |
| classifies | :12 | co | 0:23 | onstricted (1) |
| 8 | colorl | 0:10,18,22,2 | nes | 0:1 |
| clean | :2 | completed (4) | 0:3 | constructed (5) |
| 0:4,9,20,4,15 | 7,21 | 0:16,25,5,1 | conferenc | 0:4,23,20,18,24 |
| cleaned (1) | 0:7,21 | completely ( 2 | 0:8 | construction (66) |
| 24 | co | 0:18,12 | confidential (10) | 0:18,24,25,18,8, |
| cleanup |  | complex | $0: 10,20,25,14,1$ | 3,14,25,24,5,2,2,4,9, |
| 0:11, | combine | 0:6 | 0,8,10,14,18 | 13,20,6,7,24,5,2,6,10, |
| clear (8) | 0:4,25,5,16,20 | complic | configuration (2) | 24,2,24,13,11,20,3,16, |
| 0:19,4,13,20,2,2 | 25 | 0:22,4 | 0:17,22 | 17,1,7,14,17,20,23,9, |
| 18,23 | co | componen | confined | 14,17,19,25,18,6,3,4, |
| clearanc |  | 0:7,16,4 | 0:6 | ,9,22,25,5,5,12,13, |
| 0:1 | comin | components | confines | 14,21,14,11,12,22,1, |
| clearin | :10,4,1,13 | 0:13,23,5 | 0:9 | 15,16,1 |
| 0:22,23,25,15,21 | 22,24 | compounding ( | confusio | Consultation (1) |
| clearly (4) | COMM | 0:15 | 0:12 | 0:22 |
| ,25,8 | 2, | co | congest | consumabl |
| clerk's (2) | comment (4) | 0:9,7,1,20 | 0:16,22 | 0:14 |
| 0:5,10 | :20,10,10,12 | compres | conjunctio | CONSUMER (10) |
| climate (3) | comments (3) | 0:10 | 0:11 | 0:10,9,20,4,13,16, |
| 0:20,24,6 | :24,22,20 | compre | connect | 23,20,24,14 |
| close (9) | comm | 12 | 0:10,6,7,15 | consumption (3) |
| 0:21,24,24,23,1,15, | 0:15,6,15,13,19 | Con (9) | Connecticut (41) | 0:23,12,22 |
| 17,3,14 | 8,9,10 | 0:1,2 | 7,21,3,12,14,2 | contact (7) |
| closer (5) | commission | 15 | 7,17,10,6,7,2,14,17, | $0: 15,21,12$ |
| 0:24,19,10 | 0:11,23,8 | conceiva | , 25,12,17,8,3,24,6, | 16,23 |
| closes (1) | Commissi | :8,13 | ,14,9,2,10, | contacted |
| 0:8 | 0:25,13 | concep | 1,20,24,7,6,15,15,5, | 0:12,14 |
| closest | committe | :6 | 24,18,18 | contacting |
| 0:21 | 0:12 | concer | connecting (1) | 0:17 |
| clothes | comm | 1,2 | 0:24 | contain (1) |
| 0:17,18 | 0:14,15,25 | concerned | connectio | 0:21 |
| cloud (2) | commonly (1) | :15,6,4,22 | 0:2,2 | contained (5) |
| 0:23,2 | 0:6 | concerning (2) | conscience | 0:19,19,23,16,22 |
| cluster | communi | :6,16 | 0:20,1,4 | containment (1) |
| 0:16 | 0:6,17 | concerns | consecutive (1) | 0:9 |
| CNG (1) | communitie | 6,1,10,12,5,10,14 | $0: 18$ | content |
| 0:9 | 0:24,25,2,5,7,5, | 4,16,15,1 | consequen | 0:17 |
| coatin | community (3) | concluded | 21 | contenti |
| 0:1,7,19,23,25,1,12 | 0:14,22,1 | 0:22,15 | conservation (10) | 0:5 |
| Cob (48) | companies (2) | conclusio | :21,11,23,20,24,1, | contiguous (2) |
| $0: 24,15$ | 0:1,2 | 0.21 | 9,10,14,14 | 0:20,7 |
| 25,25,23,11,13,15,3, | company (26) | conclu | conservative ( | contingencies (7) |
| 22,15,17,18,10,16,17, | 0:3,8,12,16, | 0:9 | 0:25 | $0: 23,24,15,7,10,15,$ |
| 2,8,20,10,20,18,5, | $4.5,14$ | concr | conserve (5) |  |
| $18,21,19,11,10,8,12 \text {, }$ | $19,5,11,12$ | ,9,10,3,8,14, 15,2,2, | consider | 0:25,10,2,16,1,20 |
| 14,8,10,11,2,16 | comparable (4) | 17,15,1,5,2,11 | 0:3,21,11,12, | contingent (1) |
| cofferdam (5) | 0:5,3,7,6 | conditioner (2) | considerably (1) | 0:19 |
| 0:17,12,23,25,14 | compared (1) | 0:8,25 | 0:15 | continually (1) |
| cofferdams | $0: 15$ | conditio | consideration (10) | $0: 24$ |
| $0: 12,4,1$ | compar | 0:4 | 0:21,9,17,11,18,1 | continuation (1) |
| cognizant | 0:13 | conditions (10) | 25,16,14,5 | 0:10 |
| 0:2 | compari | 19,12, | considered | continue (10) |
| coincide | 0:12,1 | 15,18,20 | 0:5,19 | $0: 8,14,23,8,6,22,20$, |
| 0:14 | compati | conduct (3) | consistent | $16,17,24$ |
| collaboratively (1) | 0:17 | 0:25,2,25 | 0:8 | continued (1) |
| 0:2 | competent (2) | conducted (8) | constrain (1) | 0:11 |
| collector (1) | $0: 3,3$ | $0: 20,6,9,21,12,16,8$ | $0: 16$ | continues (3) |
| 0:5 | competitive (1) |  | constrained (1) | 0:25,17,10 |


| ntinuous (4) | Cos (48) | 0:4 | 24,16,22,2,15,18,11, | decade (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:16,19,6,8 | 0:24, 15,21,18,23, | covers (1) | $10,19,24,2,23,2,18$ customers (53) | $0: 5$ |
| contract (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 25,25,23,11,13,15,3, \\ & 22,14,17,18,10,15,17 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 4 \\ \text { crane } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { customers (53) } \\ & 0: 1,9,10,12,19,7,9, \end{aligned}$ | decades (3) <br> 0:14,11,15 |
| contractor (12) | 2,7,20,9,20,18,5,6,10, | 0:11 | 10,16,7,8,11, 12, 14,25, | December (1) |
| 0:9,16,3,6,22,22,24, | 18,25,6,3,23,5,9,18, | crapshoot (1) | 3,1,11,6,15,16,8,15, | 0:2 |
| 14,18,22,11, 7 | 20,19, 11, 10, 8, 11, 13,8, | 0:16 | 17,10,16,18,19,19,20, | decibel (3) |
| contractors (6) | 10,11,2,16 | crash (1) | 21,3,5,23,4,6,16,3,5, | 0:2,16,11 |
| 0:2,14,11,10,18,21 | cost (73) | 0:13 | 13,15,20,7,3,24,14,14, | decide (1) |
| contributing (4) | 0:6,19,21,8,9,13,19, | crazy (1) | 21,10,10, 19,9,6 | 0:18 |
| 0:6,17,25,15 | 13,3,10,25,12,15,12,1, | 0:8 | customized (1) | deciding (1) |
| ntrol (4) | 13,18,24,24,25,1,6,21, | create (5) | 0:14 | 0:15 |
| 0:1,14,8,8 | 19,17,22,25,1,13,1,4, | 0:19,7,8,14,4 | cut (3) | decision (7) |
| controls (1) | 6,4,5,20,24,10,21,13, | creating (3) | 0:15,17,5 | 0:6,25,21,16,3,19,9 |
| 0:19 | 18,9,18,22,19,3,22,8, | 0:11,4,14 | cycle (2) | decisions (1) |
| conundrum (1) | 9,9,12,16,18,17,1,10, | credit (1) | 0:25,3 | 0:13 |
| 0:21 | 18,6,16,12,14,18,2,7, | 0:6 | cycles (1) | deck (1) |
| convenience (1) | 16,11,21,9,12,24,13, | credits (1) | 0:1 | 0:6 |
| 0:6 | 20,9,21 cost-conscious (1) | $\begin{gathered} 0: 21 \\ \text { crews (2) } \end{gathered}$ | D | $\underset{0: 1}{\text { declarative (1) }}$ |
| $0: 24$ | $0: 1$ | $0: 20,20$ | D | declare (1) |
| conversion (1) | cost-effective (1) | criteria (3) | dam (1) | 0:11 |
| 0:3 | 0:14 | 0:13,2,4 | 0:12 | decorating |
| converted (1) | cost-effectiveness (1) | critical (2) | damage (5) | 0:5 |
| 0:6 | 0:13 | 0:20,10 | 0:3,7,15,19,14 | decreased (3) |
| converting (2) | costing (1) | cross (4) | damaged (2) | 0:22,5,5 |
| 0:8,16 | 0:9 | 0:8,9,13,4 | 0:25,22 | decreasing (1) |
| cooking (3) | costs (25) | cross-examination (5) | dark (1) | 0:14 |
| 0:17,17,22 | 0:4,24,22,10,10,11, | 0:6,23,5,17,3 | 0:10 | deeds (1) |
| cool (1) | 8,18,20,22,22,9,13,21, | cross-examine (1) | darn (1) | 0:3 |
| 0:2 | 1,16,23,2,14,19,25,7, | 0:22 | 0:20 | deenergize (1) |
| cooldown (1) | 12,13,18 | crossing (6) | dashed | 0:4 |
| $\stackrel{0: 3}{\text { cooler (1) }}$ | Council (39) | 0:18,15,1,7,14,1 | 0:6 | DEEP (5) |
| cooler (1) | 0:4,3,23,13,9,9,20, | cross-section (2) | data (7) | 0:12,11,4,25,6 |
| 0:25 | 6,9,17,9,9,12,7,22,15, | 0:8,21 | 0:23,3,4,4,5,6,15 | defer (5) |
| cooling (4) | 23,5,12,6,20, 1, 15,21, | crucial (1) | date (3) | 0:6,17,17,17,25 |
| 0:22,23,4,11 | 7,19,9,10,15,16,9,14, | 0:14 | 0:2,18,10 | deferred (2) |
| cools (1) $0: 20$ | 8,13,3,12,16,7,8 | cry (1) | dated (10) | 0:22,24 |
| $0: 20$ Cooper (16) | councilmembers (1) | 0:3 | $0: 24,2,5,7,10,14,18$, | deferring (1) |
| Cooper (16) | 0:22 | CT (1) | 21,1,17 | 0:18 |
| $0: 10,2,7,10,15,17$, | Council's (3) | 0:4 | daunting (1) | deficiency (2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12,15,8 \\ & 21,25 \end{aligned}$ | COUNSEL (10) | $0: 24,3,19,20$ | Davis (1) | define (2) |
| Cooper's (1) | $0: 10,9,20,17,24,20$, | culvert (3) | 0:15 | 0:22,8 |
| 0:12 | 24,7,9,11 | 0:15,19,24 | day (16) | defined (5) |
| copied (1) | counted (1) | cumulative (1) | 0:8,15,15,18,20,23, | 0:22,2,4,23,23 |
| 0:12 | 0:21 | 0:10 | 1,16,2,3,17,15,25,7,7, | definitely (4) |
| ${ }_{\text {copies ( }}^{\text {(4) }}$ | country (1) | curious (7) | 21 | 0:13,19, 19,12 |
| $\underset{\text { 0:8,8,12,8 }}{\text { copy (2) }}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0: 6}$ | 0:2,15,21,24,2,8,10 | days (2) | definition (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { copy (2) } \\ 0: 8,3 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{0: 9}{\text { country's (1) }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { current (4) } \\ 0: 5,12,7,8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 13,25 \\ \text { daytime (1) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 1 \\ \text { definitive (2) } \end{gathered}$ |
| corner (1) | County (1) | currently (1) | 0:2 | 0:7,16 |
| 0:17 | 0:25 | 0:16 | dead-end ( | degradation (1) |
| corporate (1) | couple (13) | curtailing (1) | 0:4 | 0:22 |
| 0:20 | $0: 10,8,2,2,16,8,5$, | 0:20 | deaf (1) | degrees (3) |
| corrected (3) | 18,6,11,12,12,6 | curtailment (1) | 0:10 | 0:18,24,24 |
| 0:4,16,21 | course (3) | 0:8 | deal (7) | delay (5) |
| corrections (2) <br> 0:14,24 | $0: 14,10,17$ | $\underset{0: 5}{\operatorname{curtain}(1)}$ | $0: 11,13,22,23,19 \text {, }$ | $0: 21,11,12,21,12$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 0: 14,24 \\ \text { corridor (3) } \end{gathered}$ | court (2) $0: 14,14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0:5 } \\ & \text { custom (1) } \end{aligned}$ | dealing (4) | delayed (3) $0: 20,13,6$ |
| 0:18,19,3 | cover (3) | 0:8 | 0:16,19,14,3 | delaying (1) |
| corrosion (3) | 0:15,23,24 | customer (20) | dealt (1) | 0:13 |
| 0:17,22,11 | covering (1) | 0:23,9,14,13,22,22, | 0:8 | delete (2) |


| 0:3,4 | 0:25,1,11,14,23,19, | dig-in (1) | distance (3) | dozen (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| demand (18) | 17,1,16,9,18,16 | 0:9 | 0:23,11,18 | 0:24,23 |
| 0:1,2,10,8,13,10,20, | detailed (9) | dig-ins (1) | distribute (1) | DPW (3) |
| 24,19,25,17,23,24,10, | 0:13,17,3,25,13,17, | 0:7 | 0:10 | 0:13,14,24 |
| 5,4,13,21 | 18,9,10 | diligence (1) | distributed (4) | Dr (76) |
| demolition (1) | details (4) | 0:17 | 0:5,19,14,20 | 0:19,16,18,19,7,8, |
| 0:13 | 0:8,23,6,23 | dimensions (1) | distribution (35) | 10,20,8,12,16,20,3,8, |
| demonstrated (1) | detect (2) | :13 | 0:18,3,2,7,4,15,8,7, | 18,2,17,22,13,23,18, |
| 0:20 | 0:20,21 | dip (1) | 9,25,23,2,18,24,1,17, | 11,6,6,23,8,3,3,4,11, |
| demonstration (1) | detection (6) | 0:12 | 5,6,12,14,13,4,8,15,7, | 14,14,6,22,25,17,9,3, |
| 0:12 | 0:20,24,24,17,23,18 | direct (3) | 19,1,1,5,21, 11,22,11, | $1,15,21,22,11,10,13$ |
| dense (1) | determination (1) | 0:12,16,25 | 20,23 | 21,22,9,23,10,16,16, |
| 0:3 | 0:22 | directed (1) | district (1) | 17,16,23,11,23,9,11, |
| density (1) | determinations (1) | 0:11 | 0:12 | 20,7,4,6,1,8,12,15,24, |
| 0:3 | 0:11 | direction (4) | disturbance (1) | 1,22,11,13,14,25,1,3 |
| department (1) | determine (5) | 0:3,7,1,23 | 0:13 | drains (5) |
| 0:5 | 0:5,22,18,15,21 | directional (6) | disturbing (2) | 0:5,9,21,6,4 |
| dependent (1) | determined (4) | 0:10,15,20,19,25,22 | 0:21,16 | dramatically (1) |
| 0:10 | 0:25,6,17,18 | directly (2) | dive (2) | 0:22 |
| depending (1) | detriment (1) | 0:3,22 | $0: 21,5$ | drastic (1) |
| $0: 21$ | 0:14 | Director (2) | divided (1) | $0: 14$ |
| Depends (3) | develop (3) | 0:3,4 | 0:22 | drawing (2) |
| 0:18,2,12 | 0:7,22,24 | disagree (1) | docket | 0:22,15 |
| depicted (1) | developed (5) | 0:4 | 0:3,25,6,1 | drawings (1) |
| 0:14 | 0:6,16,10,17,6 | disallowances (1) | dockets (2) | 0:24 |
| deposited (1) | development (3) | 0:7 | 0:5,17 | dreamed (1) |
| 0:5 | 0:8,8,5 | discharge (1) | document (5) | 0:10 |
| depressions (1) | dewatering (1) | 0:20 | 0:11,7,16,15,2 | dress (1) |
| 0:13 | 0:16 | disclosed (1) | documentation (2) | 0:3 |
| depth (5) | diagram | 0:15 | 0:21,9 | driest (1) |
| 0:1,5,5,9,5 | 0:19,3,7,8 | discomfort (1) | documents (3) | 0:9 |
| depths (1) | dialogue (1) | 0:20 | 0:7,1,3 | drill (4) |
| 0:9 | 0:11 | DISCOUNT (4) | dollars (10) | 0:10,15,20,14 |
| derived (1) | dice (1) | 0:17,16,23,23 | 0:11,25,1,18,17,23 | drilling (14) |
| 0:3 | 0:24 | discuss (1) | 11,16,19,3 | 0:4,2,3,12,19,23,25, |
| description (1) | dictated (1) | $0: 9$ 0:9 | domain (1) | 1,14,21,22,3,22,5 |
| 0:17 | 0:12 | discusse | 0:18 | drills (2) |
| design (23) | dictates | .20,17,23 | done (47) | 0:6,9 |
| 0:3,1,14,2,5,15,23, $22,13,5,8,1,2,16,15$ | 0:10 | discussion (8) | 0:20,13,15,8,23,17, | Drive (6) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22,13,5,8,1,2,5,16,15 \\ & 6,10,18,19,23,6,13 \end{aligned}$ | dielectric ( | $0: 16,23,20,14,10$ $18,15,19$ | 22,13,4,6,25,1,2,2,20, | $0: 23,5,6,1,1,7$ |
| designated (1) | difference (5) | discussions (3) | $20,11,10,5,5,21,7,7,$ | 0:16,18,22,12 |
| 0:4 | 0:21,19,22,15,8 | 0:20,25,6 | 16,21,20,22,25,10,18, | drivers (1) |
| designed (7) | different (30) | disingenuous (1) | 22,4,4,24,11,21,8,12, | 0:8 |
| $0: 13,3,14,6,12,23,$ | 0:4,14,12,1,10,2,16, | $0: 23$ | $21$ | drops (1) |
| $14$ | 14,15,22,25,1,19, 1,3, | disparate (1) | door (3) | $0: 21$ |
| designs (3) | 4,4,5,5,6,5,6,8,9,7,5, | 0:19 | 0:10,8,2 | drugs (1) |
| 0:23,12,17 | 24,23,17,7 | dispatched (6) | DOT (2) | 0:14 |
| desirability (1) | differentials (1) | 0:12,17,24,8,12,15 | 0:20,17 | dry (1) |
| 0:6 | 0:3 | disposal (2) | double (1) | 0:8 |
| desirable (2) | differs (1) | 0:11,19 | 0:19 | drying (7) |
| 0:13,5 | 0:1 | disposing (1) | doubled (1) | $0: 14,17,17,8,10$, |
| desire (1) | difficult (3) | 0:8 | 0:25 | 18 |
| 0:19 | 0:1,14,18 | dispute (1) | down (38) | DUBUQUE (52) |
| desired (1) | difficulties (3) | 0:8 | 0:5,24,24,11,3,22,4, | 0:8,18, 19, $7,19,1,5$, |
| 0:20 | 0:13,16,13 | disrupt | 3,5,15,6,14,19,20,20, | 13,16,13,20,4,14,23,1, |
| desires (1) | difficulty (2) | 0:17 | 5,10,25,1,6,3,8,14,22, | 6,11,24,3,15,2,6,19, |
| 0:6 | 0:2,10 | disruption (1) | 8,19,12,7,18,3,16,3, | 24,15,25,7,17,13,1,13, |
| despite (1) | dig (8) | 0:22 | 21,16,23,5,13,17 | 23,8,15,21,16,25,6,10, |
| 0:25 | 0:17,21,25,2,14,9,7, | dissipating (1) | downsides (1) | 17,11,22,24,8,2,18,20, |
| destroy (1) | 2 | 0:3 | 20 | 5,13,18,3,7 |
| 0:5 | digging (3) | dissolved (1) | downtown (1) | duct (5) |
| detail (12) | 0:22,14,4 | 0:8 | 0:9 | 0:17,17,23,15,24 |


| ductless (1) | 0:24,14,15 | elevation (2) | engineer (1) | 0:24,10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:20 | ecosystem (2) | 0:12,10 | 0:3 | ESQ (4) |
| due (7) | 0:24,20 | elevations (1) | Engineering (14) | 0:8,11,22,23 |
| 0:5,13,4,14,7,24,20 | Ed (9) | 0:6 | 0:2,3,1,21,9,10,13, | essence (4) |
| dug (1) | 0:1,20,22,6,7,17,19, | eleven (3) | 19,8,9,17,24,17,10 | 0:14,13,4,1 |
| 0:16 | 5,15 | 0:2,9,10 | England (12) | essentially (10) |
| duly (1) | edge (1) | Elia (3) | 0:20,17,11,13,17,8, | 0:22,10,6,18,16,5,9, |
| 0:3 | 0:15 | 0:17,21,20 | 15,1,11,2,11,22 | 6,9,17 |
| duration (1) | editorial (1) | elicit (2) | enhance (1) | established (1) |
| 0:18 | 0:23 | 0:24,22 | 0:9 | 0:14 |
| during (21) | EDWARD (2) | eliciting (1) | enough (4) | establishments (1) |
| $0: 9,24,10,4,9,14,2$ | 0:22,3 | 0:2 | 0:23,24,6,6 | $0: 10$ |
| $4,6,3,17,20,16,22,17$ | effect (8) | Ellis (1) | ensure (5) | Estate (7) |
| $24,5,24,4,11,21$ | 0:6,7,23,1,3,25,3,3 | 0:6 | 0:10,22, 10, 3, 7 | 0:6,5,7,19,20,20,19 |
| duty (1) | effected (1) | else (12) | enter (2) | estimate (13) |
| 0:21 | 0:21 | 0:16,20,24,21,15, | 0:11,14 | 0:24,3,7,14,15,13, |
| E | $\begin{aligned} & \text { effective (5) } \\ & 0: 20,13,22,13,7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18,9,6,20,18,25,21 } \\ & \text { elsewhere (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entire (5) } \\ & 0: 1,25,24,12,5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 23,9,18,6,11,13,13 \\ \text { estimated (2) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | effectively (1) | 0:15 | entirely (1) | 0:18,5 |
| E-1 (2) | 0:1 | embarked (2) | 0:1 | estimates (1) |
| 0:24,25 | effectiveness (2) | 0:10,8 | entitled (1) | 0:18 |
| E-15 (3) | 0:18,10 | embeds (1) | 0:25 | estimating (1) |
| 0:3,9,2 | effects (1) | 0:7 | entity (3) | 0:3 |
| E-3 (1) | 0:10 | emergencies (1) | 0:8,15,4 | et (1) |
| 0:15 | efficiencies (1) | 0:14 | entry (1) | 0:6 |
| E-4.1.2 (1) | $0: 11$ | emergency (15) | 0:10 | evaluate (1) |
| 0:6 | efficiency (32) | 0:18,12, 13,6,17,18, | entryways (1) | $0: 24$ |
| E-5 (6) | 0:7,11,13,3,7,6,7, | 22,11,23,14,14,2,9,24, | 0:23 | evaluating (1) |
| 0:7,13,2,7,10,1 | 11,14,4,6,14,15,21,14, | 13 | environment (5) | 0:24 |
| E-6-E (1) | 4,24,1,4,22,24,6,9,24, | eminent (1) | 0:7,3,1,9,14 | evaluation (1) |
| $0: 6$ | $6,17,25,20,11,18,24,2$ | $0: 18$ | environmental (8) | $0: 13$ |
| earlier (12) | efficient (5) | employees (1) | $0: 17,15,13,19,4,18$ | even (27) |
| 0:1,21,16,5,2,4,19, | 0:24,21,24,1,20 | 0:21 | 23,24 | $0: 13,21,24,23,17$, |
| 11,21,3,16,13 | efficiently (1) | encased (3) | environmentally (1) | 19,11,23,9,3,8,25,1,3, |
| early (2) | $0: 23$ | 0:10,1,15 | $0: 20$ | $10,22,14,9,11,1,19,17 \text {, }$ |
| $0: 21,10$ | efforts (1) | encompassing (1) | epoxy (3) | 5,13,18,19,7 |
| earth (2) | 0:1 | $0: 23$ | $0: 1,22,1$ | event (14) |
| 0:8,9 | eight (3) | encourage (6) | equate (1) | 0:2,11,12,1,17,16, |
| ease (1) | 0:18,21,3 | 0:22,14,17,10,14,9 | 0:15 | 22,14,11,12,25,19,9, |
| 0:7 | Eighty (1) | end (17) | equated (1) | 20 |
| easement (1) | $0: 8$ | $0: 2,23,25,6,10,10,$ | 0:13 | events (2) |
| $0: 2$ | either (14) | 23,8,13,3,8,15,17,11, | equates (1) | 0:3,7 |
| easements (1) | 0:21,5,15,13,17,15, | 22,6,22 | 0:8 | EVERSOURCE (58) |
| 0:7 | 17,11,11,7,2,10,13,25 | ended (2) | equipment (29) | 0:3,16,12,22,23,25, |
| easier (1) | elaborate (2) | 0:12,17 | 0:12,7,7,21,5,17,1, | $3,8,11,15,19,22,16,22$ |
| 0:5 |  | ends (2) | 13,4,8,14,4,3,21,17,5, | 13,20,8,12,22,25,1,4, |
| easily (2) | electric (18) | 0:25,11 | 5,23,21,1,19,21,8,10, | 5,25,1,16,8,14,8,18, |
| 0:20,2 | $0: 3,9,13,14,22,11,7$, | Energize (5) | 15,20,3,2,15 | 22,6,11,12,22,6,8,20, |
| east (2) | 20,4,16,11,3,20,24,16, | 0:3,4,16,4,7 | equity (1) | 8,25,13,11,8,19,15,2, |
| 0:22,23 | 21,4,5 | ENERGY (55) | 0:8 | 8,9,23,8,14,17,12,14, |
| Eastern (2) | electrical (5) | 0:3,16,12,22,3,6,10, | equivalency (3) | 18,23,16,18 |
| 0:17,19 | 0:9,23,23,14,13 | 13,16,24,25,14,21,24, | 0:15,18,22 | Eversource's (5) |
| easy (5) | electricians (1) | 11,6,6,7,11,14,4,5,9, | era (2) | 0:10,6,18,8,7 |
| 0:2,2,4,17,6 | 0:16 | 13,20,11,14,4,23,1,1, | 0:19,8 | everybody (2) |
| eat (1) | electricity (12) | 3,21,5,6,22,23,6,9,24, | erosion (1) | 0:23,15 |
| 0:19 | 0:2,4,17,19, 1,5,21, | 6,12,17,16,5,25,20,4, | 0:16 | everyone (2) |
| ebbs (1) | 4,16,13,9,14 | 8,10,15,18,24,2,13 | ES-3 (1) | 0:13,1 |
| 0:24 | electronics (1) | energy-efficient (1) | 0:14 | evicted (1) |
| ecological (1) | 0:25 | 0:15 | ES-7 (1) | 0:20 |
| 0:12 | element (2) | enforce (1) | 0:11 | eviction (1) |
| economic (5) | 0:20,22 | 0:23 | escorted (1) | 0:2 |
| 0:21,7,4,11,15 | elements (1) | engage (1) | 0:4 | evidence (3) |
| economy (3) | 0:17 | 0:18 | especially (2) | 0:13,22,1 |


| evident (1) | 0:24,15,9,7,16,20, | extract (1) | 0:18 | 0:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:12 | 14,13,8,16,24,6,11,13, | 0:6 | fault (6) | filled (2) |
| evidentiary (1) | 3,22 | extreme (2) | 20,14,21,13,21,24 | 0:5,19 |
| 0:25 | exists | 0:4,12 | faulted (1) | final (4) |
| exact (7) | 0:14,1 | extremely (3) | 0:20 | 0:4,22,22,23 |
| 0:2,4,13, 14, 15, 17, | exit (1) | 0:18,21,18 | faults (3) | finalized (1) |
| 23 | 0:13 | eye (1) | 0:14,16,1 | 0:7 |
| exactly (8) | expand | 0:15 | favor (1) | finally (1) |
| 0:14,20,22,20,20, | $0: 24,14,16,19,21$ |  | 0:24 | 0:21 |
| 20,9,7 | ,2,12,3 | F | feasible (3) | financing (1) |
| exa | pandin |  | 0:16,19,2 | 0:8 |
| 0:17,5,13,24 | 0:1,21 | fa | features (1) | find (11) |
| example (18) | expansion (7) |  | ):17 | 0:18,4,5,20,20,18, |
| 0:8,12,14,9,8,4,16, | $0: 13,11,9,16,25,20$, | face (1) | fed (2) | 19,2,11,10,21 |
| 12,9,10,23,15,12,19, | 20 | 0:9 | :10,1 | findings (1) |
| 25,4,11,16 | expect (3) | faces (1) | federal (3) | 0:23 |
| examples (1) | 0:14,18,13 | 0:9 | 0:11,25,16 | fine (1) |
| 0:6 | expected (1) | facilities (9) | feed (1) | 0:5 |
| excavate (3) | 0:23 | 0:25, 1, 17, 14, 11, 20 | 0:2 | fines (1) |
| 0:23,17,15 | expended | 4,4,13 | feeder (2) | 0:25 |
| excavated (3) | 0:17 | facility (7) | 0:15,20 | finish (1) |
| 0:10,18,9 | expense | 0:21,8,4,14,9,10,22 | feeders (7) | 0:2 |
| excavating ( | 0:12,7 | facing (2) | 0:24,23,9,13,17,2 | finite (1) |
| 0:24,3,13 | expensive | 0:19,21 | 10 | 0:19 |
| excavation (3) | 0:21,10, 16, 16,24,7 | fact (29) | feeding | fire (9) |
| 0:10,12,13 | experience (13) | 0:18,9,2,23,21,19,3, | 0:20 | 0:8,3,6,18,20, 1,5,6, |
| excavations (2) | 0:24,2,9,1,19,9,15, | 19,11,3,12,18,13,25,2, | feeds (1) | 14 |
| 0:7,4 | 24,25,5,15,18,17 | 25,22,22,24,14,20,1,3, | 0:24 | firefighters (1) |
| exceeded (1) | experienced (2) | 8,5,20,3,1,2 | feel (7) | 0:5 |
| 0:22 | 0:15,10 | factor (12) | $0: 12,6,14,17,19,9$ | fires (5) |
| excellent (1) | expert (5) | $0: 23,17,23,19,22$ | 20 | 0:17,20,23,17,18 |
| 0:5 | 0:5,18,25,9 | 21,25,3,5,21,23, | feeling | firewall (4) |
| except (3) | explain (7) | factors (2) | 0:5,18 | $0: 18,19,24,11$ |
| 0:4,8,16 | 0:19,2,11,23,6,8,7 | 0:17,3 | feet (36) | FIRM (5) |
| exception | explore (2) | facts (1) | 0:22,24,22,20,22, | 0:19,19,25,4,17 |
| 0:10 | 0:12,2 | 0:19 | 6,8,5,3,23,5,7,15,17, | firms (1) |
| exclude | explorin | fail (2) | 18,20,6,8,14,15,1,6,8, | 0:18 |
| 0:18 | 0:6 | 0:23,2 | 12,14,18,2,5,10,10,18, | First (31) |
| exclusively | explosiv | failure (2) | 8,12,15,16 | 0:23,3,17, 11, 17, 1 |
| 0:13 | 0:6 | 0:16,13 | felt (5) | 10,8,12,23,2,7,14,23, |
| Excuse (5) | exposed | failures (3) | 0:1,2,13,22,1 | 4,18,15,12,14,18,14, |
| 0:6,16,22, | 0:8 | 0:19,18,7 | fenced (1) | 21,16,19,17,23,6,13, |
| excused (1) | express | fair (23) | 0:9 | 19,18,18 |
| 0:14 | 0:1 | 0:23,10,3,19, 13, 19 | few (3) | fish (1) |
| Executive (1) | extend | 18,18,24, 10, $8,4,12,2$, | 0:15,22 | 0:25 |
| 0:4 | 0:3 | 4,21,5,23, 1,7,13,21,24 | fewer (2) | fit (2) |
| executives (1) | extended | Fairfield (1) | 0:10,10 | 0:5,19 |
| $0: 12$ | 0:9 | 0:25 | Field (9) | fits (1) |
| exempt (5) | extending (2) | fairly (13) | 0:6,19,21,9,9,14,15, | 0:4 |
| 0:10,14,1,6 | 0:22,16 | 0:4,11,14,25,7,6, | 15,11 | five (22) |
| exhausted (1) | extensive (2) | 5,6,24,22,6, | figure (12) | 0:19,2,4,8,11,22,1, |
| 0:18 | 0:22,12 | faith (1) | 0:17,16,5,5,22,22,9, | 19,18,20,24,12,24,22, |
| Exhibit (19) | extent (2) | 0:17 | 18,17,23,2,19 | 9,13,19,1,10,10,16,3 |
| 0:20,2,7,14,25,3,5, | 0:7,5 | fall (2) | figured (1) | five-year (2) |
| 8,11,14,19,22,15,20,3, | external | 0:24,2 | 0:20 | 0:7,17 |
| 7,18,11,10 | 0:23 | fans (1) | file (4) | fix (2) |
| exhibits (16) | extinguish (1) | 0:10 | 0:5,7,2,7 | 0:7,4 |
| 0:13,10,17,22,3,6, | 0:6 | far (16) | filed (12) | fixing (1) |
| 22,5,7,14,14,16,1,4, | extinguished (1) | 0:1,1,7,7,23,12,17, | $0: 4,11,11,16,21,4,6$, | 0:12 |
| 21,24 | 0:6 | 24,11, 17,3,8,4,11,18,3 | 23,8,13,11,9 | flagship (1) |
| exist (3) | extra (8) | fast (1) | filing (1) | 0:11 |
| 0:22,24,4 | 0:2,9,18, $6,8,17,13$, | 0:1 | 0:9 | flair (1) |
| existing (16) | 15 | fat (1) | fill (1) | 0:4 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { flat (3) } \\ & 0: 12,14,9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 11 \\ \text { foot (13) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Franklin (1) } \\ 0: 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19,22,4,17,23,4,5,16 \\ & 1,4,15,2,18,25,20,3,17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 1,20,21,5,5,24,11 \\ & 15,22,13,15,4,6,21,24 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| flavor (1) | 0:15,15,16,19,17,4, | frankly (2) | Gardell (45) | 19,12,15,20,23,15,12, |
| 0:1 | 11,11,24,15,18,21,8 | 0:18,8 | 0:4,22,13,4,9,18,2, | 1,4,18,23,20,25,4,7, |
| fleet (1) | footage (1) | French (1) | 10,6,21,3,5,11,5,2,9,6, | 22,18 |
| 0:9 | 0:5 | 0:3 | 9,13,9,15,21,3,8,14, | Google (1) |
| flexible (1) | football | frequency (2) | 11,16,20,8,22,3,1,13, | 0:15 |
| 0:21 | 0:24 | 0:25,9 | 20,25,6,13,2,11,1,5, | government (3) |
| flipping | footings | frequenting (1) | 14,23,9,6 | 0:4,25,16 |
| 0:13 | 0:22 | 0:9 | garden (1) | Governor (1) |
| flipside | force (4) | front (4) | 0:24 | 0:18 |
| 0:16 | 0:21,22,23,24 | 0:5,4,19, | Gas (31) | gradient (1) |
| flood (13) | Forced (8) | fuel (5) | 0:20,1,6,9,11,8,19, | 0:21 |
| $0: 1,12,13,23,18,20$, | 0:19,20,23,5,5,22, | 0:9,9,12,16,12 | 9,11,15,21,7,12,15,5, | granted (3) |
| 23,25,9,11,18,8,9 | 22,22 | fueled (1) | 16,2,4,22,16,7,3,25, | 0:21,6,15 |
| floodplain (5) | forecast | 0:16 | 16,10,13,13,17,3,7,15 | grants (1) |
| 0:23, 1,7,15,3 | 0:21,4,16,1,5,3,10, | fuels (1) | gases (1) | 0:17 |
| floods (3) | 3,4 | 0:16 | 0:22 | grass (1) |
| 0:15,24,5 | forecasted (3) | full (6) | gave (7) | 0:6 |
| flow (8) | 0:15,5,15 | $0: 14,6,15,1,12,13$ | 0:17,2,5,5,10,13,20 | grassland (1) |
| 0:20,23,8,9,14,16,8, | forefront (1) | fully (3) | General (9) | 0:23 |
| 9 | 0:9 | 0:9,2, | $0: 14,13,1,22,18,8$ | gravel (2) |
| flow-able (1) | foresee (2) | funded | 11,12,13 | 0:19,18 |
| 0:9 | 0:13,25 | 0:10 | generally (2) | great (7) |
| flowing ( | forest (5) | fundin | 0:5,14 | 0:24,14,11,9,19,22, |
| 0:18,2 | 0:9,25,5,10,17 | 0:6 | generation (15) | 7 |
| flows (2) | forested (1) | further | 0:20,1,23,5,19,14, | Greater (2) |
| 0:20,24 | 0:18 | 0:16,14,23,9,9,6, | 14,20,3,23,3,7,9,10,16 | 0:15,11 |
| fluid (7) | Forget | 14,3,24,16,8,16,9,16, | generator (2) | greatest (1) |
| 0:5,18,22,1,24,2,19 | 0:8,2,4 | 7,7 | 0:14,3 | 0:12 |
| fluid-filled (1) | forgetting | future | generic | greatly (2) |
| 0:1 | 0:8 | 0:20,9,3,24,13, 23,4, | 0:20 | 0:2,5 |
| fluidized | form (5) | 7,1,9,14,20,10,3,13, | gentleman (1) | Green (6) |
| 0:10,25 | 0:20,10,15,17,12 | 13,23,4,9,12,6,9,3 | 0:23 | 0:7,11,16,16,1,11 |
| fluids (3) | formal (2) | G | gentlemen | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { greener (1) } \\ 0: 23 \end{array}$ |
| fly (1) |  |  |  |  |
| 0:25 | 0:25 |  | 0:5, | 0:11,12,21,25,6,3,1, |
| FOA (9) | forth | 0:22,4,6 | geographically (1) | ,24,10,18,22,6,20,23, |
| 0:18,23, $7,1,1,5,5,6$ | 0:15,3,16,3,3,2,2 | Gabor (2) | 0:4 | 18,21,5,18,4,6,25,15, |
| 6 | 18,4,8,19, 16,6 | 0:19,16 | geologic (2) | 20,20,23,3,13,24,11,7, |
| focus | forum (1) | Gagnon (181) | 0:17,5 | 13,15,8,3,7,17,18,1, |
| 0:11,15 | 0:18 | 0:3,22,13,4,7,15,25 | geological (1) | 16,10,17,5,9,17,5,23, |
| focuses (1) | forward | 8,18,25,14, 1, 10,22,20, | 0:9 | 14,7,16,25,4,4,18,20, |
| 0:12 | 0:21,3,1,2,2,5,13,1, | 1,5,12,13,22,15,4,10, | gets (2) | 20,21,20,6,14,18,22, |
| focusing | 12,17,8,10,16,12,21 | 14,7,7,11,17,21,1,5, | 0:15,11 | 11,2,6,10,8,1,19,13,2, |
| 0:8 | found (3) | 19,11,22,1,7,11,21,5, | GIS (6) | 6,10,25,14,7,17,24,1, |
| folks (4) | 0:24,21,9 | 11,15,20, 1,8,19,19,21, | 0:1,1,25,25,22,10 | 5,8,15,20,9,12,14,17, |
| 0:3,11,14,7 | foundation (1) | 8,18,22,3,19,18,24,16, | given (9) | 22,25,6,11,22,19,19,2, |
| follow (10) | 0:22 | 9,24,8,15,12,19,25,5, | 0:24,18,25,7,16,25, | 22,2,4,14,16,19,13,16, |
| 0:17,4,13,19,19,17, | four (7) | 11,19,23,23,13,24,13, | 17,1,24 | 20,1,2,13,10,17,9,12, |
| 10,7,25,10 | 0:11,25,2,6,21,19, | 20,17,6,16,7,18,4,9, | gives (4) | 19,9,21,14,19,10 |
| followed (1) | 20 | 14,19,1,25,10,22,22,9, | 0:21,19,5,2 | grew (1) |
| 0:8 | fourth (2) | 16,5,19,25,11,16,24,9, | Glenbrook (6) | 0:18 |
| following | 0:17,1 | 13,16,24,2,10,15,24, | 0:22,11,14,14,7,9 | grid (4) |
| 0:8 | frac (1) | 20,15,14,12,5,11,21, | go/no-go (1) | 0:1,4,7,10 |
| follow-on (2) | 0:19 | 20,4,5,22,25,14,20,5, | 0:24 | ground (8) |
| 0:18,22 | fracking | 19,2,2,24,11,11,6,16, | goal (1) | 0:5,3,11,1,25,20,15, |
| follows (3) | 0:15,2 | 20,21,1,4,18,23,2,7, | 0:18 | 15 |
| 0:18,6,25 | fragment (1) | 16,22,7,10,14,24,8,13, | goes (9) | groundwater (10) |
| follow-up (6) | 0:11 | 18,24,4,10,20,25,4,8, | 0:22,14,13,20,8,3,9, | 0:25,23,2,13,10,20, |
| 0:23,5,14,16,1,3 | framing (1) | 3,9,11,15,22,5,3,3,19, | 13,12 | 21,2,11,12 |
| follow-ups (1) | 0:2 | 14,23,18,19, 11,8,12, | Good (32) | group (7) |


| $0: 10,7,3,13,15,3,2$ | Harbor (8) | 0:16 | hopeful (1) | 0:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| grout (2) | 0:14,9,17,13,20,11, | helps (2) | 0:13 | identical (1) |
| 0:1,21 | 24,16 | 0:15,10 | hopefully (2) | 0:6 |
| grow (2) | hard (4) | hence (1) | 0:20,1 | identified (2) |
| 0:4,5 | 0:9,12,20,7 | 0:4 | horizon (1) | 0:7,2 |
| growing (2) | hardens (1) | HENNESSEY (2) | 0:7 | identify (3) |
| 0:24,7 | 0:11 | 0:5,21 | horizontal (6) | 0:10,10,16 |
| grown (2) | harder (1) | hereby (1) | 0:10,5,12,19,22,5 | identifying (1) |
| 0:2,3 | 0:2 | 0:11 | horse (1) | 0:15 |
| growth (9) | hardset (1) | hidden (2) | 0:11 | ie (1) |
| 0:3,11,15,18,11,18, | 0:13 | 0:5,5 | hose (1) | 0:25 |
| 18,19,17 | Hartford (3) | high (13) | 0:24 | ifs (1) |
| guarantee (4) | 0:9,6,5 | 0:8,22,17,20,2,9,1, | Hospital (4) | 0:14 |
| 0:18,1,2,22 | hate (1) | 15,3,19,18,17,20 | 0:9,11,11,11 | ignored (1) |
| guess (21) | 0:2 | high-efficiency (6) | hospitals (2) | 0:16 |
| 0:6,9,10,4,24,3,23, | Haven (2) | 0:21,24,19,3,3,17 | 0:10,14 | illuminate (1) |
| 15,14,22,6,9,11,22,6, | 0:23,20 | higher (8) | host (1) | 0:1 |
| 22,9,23,20,19,3 | hay (1) | 0:21,6,15,4,23,24, | 0:9 | Illuminating (5) |
| guestimated (1) | 0:25 | 11,8 | hot (9) | 0:6,9,13,25,4 |
| 0:8 | hazard (1) | highest (2) | 0:14,13,16,6,4,13, | illustrates (1) |
| H | $0: 4$ HDD | 0:5,8 | 16,7,13 | 0:25 |
|  | 0:23,13 | 0:22 | 0:1 | 0:23 |
| H2OA (1) | heading (1) | high-pressure (1) | hour (4) | immediately (1) |
| 0:6 | 0:1 | 0:5 | 0:8,20,19,17 | 0:17 |
| habitat (1) | health (1) | high-strength (1) | hours (12) | impact (27) |
| $0: 2$ | 0:13 | 0:1 | 0:10,24,24,21,22, | 0:23,6,5,24,24,15, |
| Haddam (1) | hear (15) | high-tension (3) | 11,25,25,15,2,3,21 | 18,10,20,13,23,7,17,6, |
| 0:5 | 0:7,8,12,10,11,18,9, | 0:20,14,16 | House (8) | 3,24,1,19,2,24,24,20, |
| half (10) | 2,14,9,13,16,5,1,11 | high-voltage (1) | 0:18,24, 2, 3, 25, 2, 21, | $13,12,12,15,13$ |
| 0:20,5,19,19,24,11, | heard (7) | $0: 2$ | $23$ | impacted (4) |
| $9,1,2,3$ | $0: 25,5,1,2,23,4,9$ | Highway (18) | houses (3) | $0: 4,6,18,13$ |
| Hall (1) | hearing (21) | 0:1,7,22,12,17,13, | 0:24,12,23 | impacting (1) |
| 0:6 | 0:9,10,4,14,20,3,13, | 14,5,15,12,19,15,19, | housing (1) | 0:4 |
| hammer (1) | 22,19,8,22,13,18,2,21, | 22,24,16,1,2 | 0:8 | impacts (12) |
| 0:13 | 7,22,25,3,9,12 | hire (1) | HPF (1) | $0: 6,15,21,1,14,4,3$, |
| Hampshire (3) | heart (1) | 0:10 | 0:17 | 19,19,11,9,12 |
| 0:16,12,20 | 0:16 | historical (1) | HPFF (9) | impervious (2) |
| hand (1) | hearts (1) | $0: 9$ |  | $0: 15,18$ |
| 0:9 | 0:16 | historically (1) | $18,3$ | important (1) |
| handle (1) | heat (7) | 0:6 | huge (3) | 0:16 |
| 0:13 | 0:20,16,22,25,2,12, | history (3) | 0:1,4,21 | impossible (1) |
| hands (2) | 13 | 0:16,1,2 | hundred (16) | 0:10 |
| 0:1,23 | heating (5) | hit (3) | $0: 2,19,21,21,8,6,3$ | improve (1) |
| hang (2) | 0:13,16,6,4,16 | 0:19,21,18 | $5,5,22,23,5,24,15,22$ | $0: 2$ |
| 0:12,18 | heck (1) | hitting (1) | 18 | improved (1) |
| hanging (1) | 0:5 | 0:6 | hundreds (1) | 0:6 |
| 0:11 | height (1) | hold (3) | $0: 10$ | improvement (2) |
| Hannon (29) | $0: 19$ | 0:25,11,10 | hundred-year (1) | $0: 1,10$ |
| $0: 2,3,16,1,18,22,22 \text {, }$ | Heights (3) | holder (1) | $0: 9$ | improvements (6) |
| 7,17,10,18,9,20,8,12, | 0:12,14,9 | 0:3 | hypothetically (1) | 0:1,11,10,19,20,22 |
| 11,4,11,18,9,19,19,16, | Helco (1) | holding (3) | 0:7 | inactive (1) |
| $\underset{\text { 17,8, } 15,9,10,19}{ }$ | $0: 25$ held (4) | 0:20,25,11 |  | $0: 13$ incentive (6) |
| Hannon's (1) | held (4) | hole (2) | I | incentive (6) |
| 0:23 | 0:10,12,24,13 | 0:5,2 |  | 0:23,19,9,11,13,13 |
| happen (7) | hell (2) | home (2) |  | incentives (4) |
| $0: 3,18,22,5,25,2,21$ happened (3) | $\begin{array}{r} 0: 5,10 \\ \text { help (14) } \end{array}$ | $0: 12,20$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 1 \\ \mathbf{I}-95(3) \end{gathered}$ | $0: 20,8,21,25$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { happened (3) } \\ 0: 2,15,11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { help (14) } \\ 0: 17,20,21,17,4,14, \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { homeowner (2) } \\ 0: 15,15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-95 (3) } \\ & 0: 16,18,2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { inch (1) } \\ 0: 25 \end{gathered}$ |
| happening (2) | 13,23,8,13, 1,8,10,7 | homes (4) | idea (7) | inches (1) |
| 0:18,20 | helped (1) | 0:21,22,13,19 | 0:11,4,15,23,14,2, | 0:5 |
| happens (8) | 0:4 | homework (2) | 17 | incident (1) |
| 0:3,3,6,7,10,11,13,6 | helpful (1) | 0:4,21 | ideas (1) | 0:25 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { include }(\mathbf{9}) \\ & 0: 15,23,23,10,22,8 \\ & 25,10,21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0: 16,5,8 \\ \text { inflationary (1) } \\ 0: 21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insulator (1) } \\ & 0: 13 \\ & \text { integral (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 23 \\ & \text { intersection (1) } \\ & 0: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 10,13,21,15,20 \\ & \text { items (3) } \\ & 0: 14,19,25 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| included (3) | influencing (1) | 0:7 | interstate (8) |  |
| 0:1,14,21 | 0:13 | integrated (4) | 0:22,18,17,23,25, | J |
| includes (4) | information (23) | 0:16,11,16,9 | 17,25,11 |  |
| 0:9,3,13,18 | 0:21,2,11,9,23,9,17, | intend (1) | intervener (3) | jack (1) |
| including (5) | 3,13,22,8,15,1,18,21, | 0:5 | 0:24,2,5 | 0:18 |
| 0:2,9,14,20,21 | 25,3,15,23,1,8,13,16 | intended (1) | Intervenor (1) | Jacqui (2) |
| income (1) | infrastructure (6) | 0:18 | 0:14 | 0:4,5 |
| 0:8 | 0:13,23,10,20,16,25 | intense (1) | into (53) | January (1) |
| incorrect (1) | in-general (1) | 0:5 | $0: 13,10,18,6,20,14$, | 0:12 |
| 0:8 | 0:14 | intent (1) | 18,10,20,21,11,23,25, | Jaqueline (1) |
| increase (7) | initial (5) | 0:1 | 23,22,10,20,20,21,17, | 0:13 |
| 0:1,23,1,3,2,10,10 | 0:23,24,20,14,13 | intention (1) | 25,11,14,17,5,24,11, | jarring (1) |
| increased (6) | initially (1) | 0:3 | 16,11,4,3,23,14,12,10, | 0:24 |
| 0:25,14,22,20,25,24 | 0:18 | intercepting (1) | 10,17,12,11,15,6,9,12, | job (5) |
| increasing (3) | initiated (2) | 0:19 | 15,13,20,5,13,25,11, | 0:23,14,9,11,9 |
| 0:1,13,5 | 0:4,8 | interconnect (1) | 13,7,2 | jobs (2) |
| increasingly (1) | injurious (3) | 0:3 | intrinsically (1) | 0:15,17 |
| 0:10 | 0:12,15,3 | interconnecting (1) | 0:7 | John (3) |
| incredible (1) | innovative (1) | 0:5 | introduce (1) | 0:9,1,21 |
| 0:3 | 0:9 | interconnection (1) | 0:16 | judge (1) |
| increment (2) | input (1) | 0:25 | introducing (1) | 0:4 |
| . 0:23,1 | 0:4 | interdicted (1) | $0: 8$ | judgment (1) |
| incremental (3) | inquire (3) | 0:8 | intrusive (2) | 0:22 |
| 0:6,25,23 | 0:19,7,17 | interest (2) | 0:19,5 | July (5) |
| incurred (1) | inquiring (1) | 0:3,1 | inundation (1) | 0:9,24,18,21,24 |
| 0:14 | 0:1 | interested (3) | 0:9 | jump (1) |
| independent (3) | inquiry (1) | 0:23,24,2 | invest (1) | 0:20 |
| 0:10,4,2 | 0:1 | interesting (7) | 0:1 | junction (1) |
| independently (1) | insert (2) | 0:25,21,22,3,17,18, | invested (2) | 0:3 |
| 0:8 | 0:3,5 | 4 | 0:11,14 | June (1) |
| Indian (8) | inside (6) | interference (1) | investigation (2) | $0: 3$ |
| 0:13,9, 17, 13, 20, 11, | 0:7,2,16,2,17,11 | 0:21 | 0:16,5 | jurisdiction (1) |
| 23,16 | Insofar (1) | interferences (1) | investigations (3) | $0: 24$ |
| indicate (4) | 0:10 | $0: 3$ interim | 0:19,1,2 | justice (2) |
| 0:16,6,18,9 | inspection (1) | interim | investment (3) | 0:13,13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { indicated (1) } \\ & 0: 7 \end{aligned}$ | install (4) | interior (1) | $0: 3,14,5$ investments (5) | K |
| indicates (1) | 0:5,20,10,23 | 0:5 | . 0:7,5,5,18,19 |  |
| 0:24 | installation (3) | internal (3) | involved (6) | keep (11) |
| indicating (2) | 0:8,10,8 | 0:13,16,7 | 0:3,20,23,22,18,1 | 0:20,13,11,6,17,18, |
| 0:19,9 | installations (1) | internet (1) | involves (1) | 2,15,19,7,20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { indication (2) } \\ 0: 18.21 \end{gathered}$ | 0:12 | 0:13 | 0:3 | keeps (1) |
| $0: 18,21$ indifferent | installed (11) | interpret (1) | ionizing (2) | 0:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { indifferent (1) } \\ & 0: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 17,17,2,12,14,14 \\ & 6,4,3,7,2 \end{aligned}$ | interpretation (1) | 0:12,22 <br> irrelevant | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ken (1) } \\ 0: 1 \end{gathered}$ |
| individual (3) | installing (3) | 0:17 | 0:8 | Kenneth (1) |
| 0:13,11,4 | 0:24,15,25 | interpreting (1) | ISO (13) | 0:12 |
| individually (1) | instance (7) | 0:4 | 0:20,16,10,12,17,5, | key (1) |
| $0: 12$ | 0:8,15,17,7,18,2,12 | interrogatories (12) | , 15,11,21,1,11,23,1 | 0:17 |
| indoor (1) | instead (4) | 0:24,2,4,7,10,16,20, | isolate (1) | keyword (1) |
| 0:5 | 0:10,9,6,18 | 24,13,18,18,19 | 0:6 | 0:7 |
| industrial (6) | instituted (1) | interrogatory (3) | issue (22) | kick (1) |
| 0:7,13,20,1,9,9 | 0:25 | 0:9,13,15 | 0:15,15,18,7,13,12, | 0:14 |
| industry (1) | insulated (1) | interrupt (1) | 6,22,9,21,12,22,1,4, | Killingly (1) |
| 0:20 | 0:14 | 0:12 | 23,25,4,14,1,21,25,16 | 0:5 |
| inefficient (1) | insulating (2) | interrupted (2) | issues (19) | kilowatt (3) |
| 0:9 | 0:15,18 | 0:1,11 | 0:17,18,8,18,21,16, | 0:8,15,19 |
| infiltrates (1) | insulation (7) | interrupting (1) | 21,13,16,7,3,20,13,5, | kind (28) |
| 0:6 | $0: 8,23,14,24,19,14$ | $0: 1$ | 20,20,20,18,22 | $0: 1,19,4,24,14,19,6$ |
| inflation (3) | $14$ | interruption (1) | item (5) | $20,2,9,20,2,11,15,15$ |


| 20,20,2,22,12,15,18, | 0:13,17,25,14,8,9 | 0:1,1,2,22,4,16,22 | 0:4,25,6,25,17,17, | 0:1,5,22,3,8,7,14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,15,2,12,6,2 | large-scale (1) | leftover (1) | 12,9,21,24,3,15,24,15, | located (4) |
| kinds (3) | 0:23 | 0:5 | 20,19,8,13, 7, 19, 22,12, | 0:20,23,9,21 |
| 0:16,13,5 | largest (8) | legacies (1) | 22,19,5,9,18,18,19,7, | location (12) |
| Kinsman (6) | 0:9,4,9,20,3,24,2,11 | 0:4 | 4,14,8,1,12,3,5,5,9,17, | 0:19,5,4,18,18,2,23, |
| 0:25,1,1,20,10,21 | last (14) | legal (5) | 24,6,11 | 13,25,3,12,16 |
| Klemens (71) | 0:22,5,11,20,6,22, | 0:12,8,4,5,18 | linear (2) | locations (9) |
| 0:7,8,10,20,8,12,16, | 23,10,14,19,21,24,20, | legislation (2) | 0:19,17 | 0:15,5,14,22,25,18, |
| 20,3,8,18,2,17,22,13, | 8 | 0:17,10 | lines (24) | 18,25,20 |
| 23,18,11,6,6,23,8,3,3, | lastly (2) | length (4) | 0:13,17,25,20,10,3, | $\operatorname{logic}(1)$ |
| 4,11,14,14,6,22,25,18, | 0:14,21 | 0:16,3,20,14 | 20,14,5,16,24,1,22,11, | 0:13 |
| 9,3,1,15,21,22,11,10, | late (1) | less (16) | 20,15,3,16,21,3,11,5, | long (11) |
| 13,21,22,9,23,10,16, | 0:13 | 0:4,7,10,1,9,16,11, | 25,1 | 0:3,17,7,10, 2, 2, 12, |
| 16,17,16,23,11,23,9, | later (7) | 5,14,22,4,2,19,5,10,13 | linked (1) | 9,11,23,16 |
| 11,20,7,4,6,1,8,12,24, | 0:12,5,23, 17, 21,25, | letter (10) | 0:3 | longer (2) |
| 1,22,11,13,14,25,1,3 | 15 | 0:13,23, 21, 3, 10, 12, | liquids (1) | 0:16,5 |
| Klemens' (1) | launched (1) | 16,24,17,21 | 0:9 | longevity (1) |
| 0:15 | 0:14 | letters (2) | Lisa (2) | 0:14 |
| knew (1) | LAUREN (4) | 0:25,25 | 0:10,2 | longitudinal (2) |
| 0:13 | 0:11,23,8,18 | level (10) | list (3) | 0:7,19 |
| knife (1) | LAW (3) | $0: 15,8,24,16,23,11$, | 0:10,13,1 | longitudinally (1) |
| 0:9 | 0:19,4,16 | 10,10,22,15 | listed (7) | 0:25 |
| knock (2) | laws (3) | levels (5) | 0:9,9,13, 1,5,15,8 | longterm (1) |
| 0:10,2 | 0:23,7,9 | 0:25,5,2,17,1 | listen (1) | 0:4 |
| knowable (1) | lay (1) | leverage (2) | 0:21 | long-term (6) |
| 0:8 | 0:12 | 0:17,21 | lists (3) | 0:17,18,21,21,8,9 |
| knowledge (4) | layer (3) | Libertine (45) | 0:10,4,9 | look (62) |
| 0:21,2,12,4 | 0:1,13,23 | 0:6,19,8,17,10,12,3, | little (49) | 0:16,9,8,8,23,15,9, |
| known (4) | layers (2) | $8,10,15,1,12,24,4,8,4$, | 0:12,5,3,23,5,20,12, | 20,7,14,21,8,21,5,25, |
| 0:4,17,9,6 | 0:2,4 | 5,12,15,20,24,12,18, | 25,25,3,18,4,18,9,21, | 6,13,17,22,23,9,7,15, |
| knows (5) | laying (3) | 22,3,12,7,11,25,23,4, | 1,19,3,6,20,2,14,5,18, | 7,22,21,25,2,6,7,5,13, |
| 0:16,23,7,5,7 | 0:25,25,1 | 20,5,24,7,25,17,4,9, | 2,12,17,18,6,10,5,23, | 1,8,22,9,12,22,16,23, |
| kV (17) | leaders (1) | 19,24,9,4,4,13 | 11,24,23,25,7,10,9,6, | 17,7,11,11,5,21,15,17, |
| 0:9,14,18,15,10,11, | 0:9 | Library (1) | 16,16,24,24,1,3,22,3, | 4,22,13,21,25,1,22,12, |
| 13,20,18,18,10,11,13, | leads (1) | 0:11 | 16 | 13,10,3,10,8,7 |
| 2,3,4,8 | 0:10 | license (4) | live (4) | looked (35) |
| kW (1) | leak (9) | 0:13,22,1,7 | 0:10,1,2,9 | 0:15,24,14,23,24,5, |
| 0:25 | 0:15,18,16,17,23,6, | licensed (1) | lived (1) | 1,12,21,25,21,25,12, |
|  | 18,18,1 | 0:4 | 0:14 | 15,15,20,19,18,10,10, |
| L | leaks (1) | life (4) | living (1) | 8,16,6,4,24,9,21,11, |
|  | 0:23 | 0:20,22,15,16 | 0:25 | 20,24,25,7,8,14,10 |
| L-3 (1) | learn (2) | lifecycle (6) | LLC (3) | looking (47) |
| 0:21 | 0:7,6 | 0:23,2,14,16,18,19 | 0:18,16,24 | 0:25,16,21,23,22, |
| labor (1) | learned (1) | lift (1) | LLP (1) | 25,11,2,16,17,18,19,1, |
| 0:20 | 0:21 | 0:12 | 0:5 | 2,3,5,13, 9, 23, 15,18,4, |
| lack (2) | lease (5) | Light (4) | LNS (1) | 10,21,21,25,11,1,24, |
| 0:10,24 | 0:5,7,12,1,25 | 0:5,6,20,19 | 0:19 | 24,16,17,11,13,8,12, |
| ladies (1) | leased (1) | lightbulb (2) | load (62) | 12,25,11,17,12,11,24, |
| 0:2 | 0:12 | 0:25,25 | 0:5,1,3,2,11,23,11, | 24,17,5,14 |
| lakes (1) | leases (1) | lighting (10) | 13,22,4,13,15,20,20,6, | looks (3) |
| 0:11 | 0:25 | 0:17,19,22,4,6,3,25, | 15,25, , ,6,10,23,10,10, | 0:17,3,22 |
| land (4) | least (11) | 2,12,13 | 14,14,17,10,4,11,5,17, | loss (5) |
| 0:6,22,13,24 | 0:3,21,14,19,2,21,2, | lights (3) | 1,4,23,2,10,13,24,13, | 0:3,4,5,13,17 |
| landscape (1) | 19,16,15,15 | 0:8,15,16 | 17,25,10,11,24,3,13, | losses (1) |
| 0:3 | leave (2) | like-for-like (1) | 14,5,24,8,14,25,6,6, | 0:12 |
| Lane (6) | 0:20,4 | 0:15 | 11,13,17,24,16,22,2,3 | lost (3) |
| 0:25,1,20,10,1,21 | Leavenworth (1) | likely (5) | loaded (1) | 0:11,10,20 |
| lanes (1) | 0:6 | 0:4,6,4,6,23 | 0:9 | $\boldsymbol{l o t}(42)$ |
| 0:25 | led (1) | limited (5) | loading (4) | 0:5,18,17,5,7,2,1, |
| large (11) | 0:20 | 0:9,13,12,18,20 | 0:22,3,10,9 | 23,20,21,21,20,23,16, |
| $0: 10,3,4,25,14,16$, | ledge (2) | limits (1) | loads (4) | 8,20,19,9,10,2,10,16, |
| 24,5,11,6,21 | 0:6,8 | 0:18 | 0:2,14,16,6 | 18,18,17,19,4,6,20,1, |
| larger (6) | left (7) | line (43) | local (7) | 2,10,4,25,11, 14, 8,10 , |


| 10,17,13,12 | maintenance (7) | 11,19 | medicine (1) | mics (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lots (2) | 0:19,3,21,3,6,8,9 | Massachusetts (4) | 0:20 | 0:10,10,13,16,18 |
| 0:17,7 | major (3) | 0:21,12,19,19 | meet (3) | midafternoon (1) |
| loud (1) | 0:13,19,9 | masts (1) | 0:4,20,25 | 0:22 |
| 0:17 | majority (2) | 0:11 | meeting (6) | middle (6) |
| louder (4) | 0:2,12 | material (11) | 0:3,2,7,14,3,2 | 0:22,15,17,4,23,17 |
| 0:7,7,24,8 | maker (1) | 0:8,10,23,19,21,25, | meetings (1) | Middletown (2) |
| love (1) | 0:25 | 16,19,13,15,9 | 0:11 | 0:21,7 |
| 0:12 | makes (3) | materials (8) | meets (2) | Middletown-Norwalk (1) |
| low (2) | 0:12,7,18 | 0:22,18, 14, 20,6,6, | 0:3,21 | 0:7 |
| 0:10,2 | making (4) | 15,24 | megawatt (6) | might (27) |
| lower (7) | 0:25,1,17,25 | math (1) | 0:1,2,7,12,20,21 | 0:18,15,20, 16,8,4 |
| 0:4,16,16,23,2,5,9 | malfunctioning (1) | 0:22 | megawatts (11) | 19,23,15,6,12,13,16 |
| lowered (1) | 0:21 | matter (7) | 0:24,2,16,24,3,15 | 12,13,16,17,18,24,20, |
| 0:13 | $\boldsymbol{m a n}(2)$ | 0:4,13,16,16,19,5 | 16,20,4,6,8 | 4,20,10,25,23,1,22 |
| lowering (1) | 0:17,3 | 12 | member (2) | Mike (3) |
| 0:17 | manage (1) | maximum (3) | 0:20,14 | 0:5,5,21 |
| lowers (1) | 0:5 | 0:16,1,20 | members (5) | mile (1) |
| 0:12 | managed (1) | may (43) | 0:8,6,7,5,8 | 0:20 |
| low-level (5) | 0:10 | 0:8,9,14,20,5,10,10, | memory (4) | miles (5) |
| 0:17,19,22,24,4 | management (5) | 10,19,10,10,19, 23, 1,3, | 0:7,15,16,4 | 0:23,5,11,24,1 |
| low-lying (1) | 0:25,10,19,9,6 | 13,14,9,21,22,23,14, | mention (3) | Milford (1) |
| 0:3 | Manager (1) | 24,12,13,10,19,22,3,9, | 0:18,15,2 | 0:16 |
| low-pressure (1) | 0:5 | 12,4,20,19,3,4,6,11, | mentioned (12) | million (45) |
| 0:2 | manifest | 25,1,3,21,7 | 0:11,18,12,2,17, | 0:7,9,22,22,24,11, |
| low-strength (2) | 0:15 | Maybe (26) | 13,2,24,7,17,3 | 12,11,19,22, 25, 25,7,4, |
| 0:3,7 | manmade (1) | 0:1,12,21,9,3,15,3, | mentions (1) | 14,2,1,9,17,23,20,6,1, |
| luck (4) | 0:16 | 21,23,10,2,8,9,17,22, | 0:15 | 2,6,6,11,17,20,20,21, |
| 0:20,15,16,19 | many (15) | 5,8,22,11,11,25,19,19, | Mercier (29) | 24,22,4,18,20,8,21,22, |
| lumped (1) | 0:11,5,22,12,19,1,1, | 5,9,7 | 0:6,7,23,8,16,7,12, | 9,12,14,21,25,5 |
| 0:16 | 7,12,9,15,13,13,3,22 | MDC (1) | 24,14,23,3,8,14,25,8, | million-dollar (4) |
| lunch (2) | $\boldsymbol{m a p}(7)$ | 0:10 | 19,8,15,10,18,23,12,5, | 0:11,13,7,9 |
| 0:17,17 | 0:16,19,7,14,3,4,22 | MDS (1) | 13,4,15,17,5,25 | mimic (1) |
| Lynch (10) | maps (2) | 0:10 | mess (1) | 0:15 |
| 0:4,5,11,17,9,13,16, | 0:15,16 | mean (38) | 0:23 | mind (3) |
| 3,9,8 | MARCUS (132) | 0:12,10,11,21,5,6, | message (2) | 0:19,20,17 |
|  | 0:19,22,3,3,4,12,17, | 12,5,1,22,15,16,7,4, | 0:5,17 | minds (1) |
| M | 3,13,17,23,6,13,3,10, | 20,22,8,13,12,24,20, | messages (2) | 0:9 |
|  | 6,15,5,18,8,23,2,8,11, | 14,24,24,1,7,4,2,9,10, | 0:1,3 | mine (1) |
| machines (1) | 19,4,11,20,25,5,16,21, | 22,15,19,13,23,1,17, | messy (1) | 0:12 |
| 0:21 | 4,8,13,16,23,4,14,21, | 23 | 0:8 | mini (1) |
| magic (1) | 4,9,11,22,1,11,15,21, | means (14) | met (1) | 0:2 |
| 0:12 | 2,7,16,22,2,6,11,19,7, | 0:20,15,25,1,6,12,5, | 0:3 | minimal (5) |
| magnitude (2) | 10,13,18,3,10,2,8,12, | 1,21,6,4,24,10,15 | method | 0:25,1,16,12,13 |
| 0:10,14 | 21,20,5,12,2,20,24,11, | meant (1) | 0:24 | minimize (2) |
| magnitudes (1) | 21,5,3,10,15,10,23,5, | 0:20 | methodology (1) | 0:19,18 |
| 0:25 | 24,7,14,20,13,20,25, | measure (6) | 0:7 | minimized (2) |
| mail (1) | 13,25,8,22,14,22,16,1, | 0:21,11,13,2,15,1 | Metro-North (5) | 0:19,2 |
| 0:25 | 6,6,10,14,21,2,19,24, | measures (13) | 0:16,20,23,24,1 | minimizes (1) |
| mailing (3) | 22,17,5,9,21,25,6,12, | 0:12,20,24,8,16,1,3, | Mezei (8) | 0:20 |
| 0:2,2,6 | 2,7,14,22,3,6,12,19, | 5,4,10,25,18,21 | 0:19,17,18,19,21 | minimizing (1) |
| main (5) | 24,3,8,19,6,2,8,25,5, | measuring (1) | 25,4,9 | 0:24 |
| 0:2,17,18,8,5 | 11,15,19 | 0:21 | mic (1) | minimum (1) |
| mainly (1) | MARGARET (2) | mechanical (1) | 0:14 | 0:25 |
| 0:18 | 0:12,23 | 0:19 | microgrid (1) | minor (1) |
| mains (3) | MARIANNE (2) | mechanism (3) | 0:21 | 0:12 |
| 0:24,16,20 | 0:8,19 | 0:6,8,6 | micro-grid (9) | minus (1) |
| maintain (7) | MARK (4) | mechanisms (1) | 0:3,6,15,9,12,22,20, | 0:1 |
| 0:23,2,9,17,5,19,7 | 0:23,23,4,9 | 0:8 | 23,8 | minute (5) |
| maintaining (1) | marked (1) | median (1) | microgrids (4) | 0:15,14,10,11,3 |
| 0:18 | 0:13 | 0:2 | 0:11,25,4,5 | minutes (2) |
| maintains (1) | market (9) | medication (1) | microphone (2) | 0:17,6 |
| 0:25 | 0:12,17,19, $7,9,23,2$, | 0:1 | 0:23,17 | missing (3) |


| 0:12,9,11 | 0:13 | near (7) | 0:19,22 | 0:24,3,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mitigate | mo | 2,23,14,13,21 | noise | otify (1) |
| $0 \cdot 19$ | 0:3,7,6,7,9,5,1 | nearby (2) | 0:22,5,21 | 0:3 |
| mitigated (3) | much (28) | 0:16,18 | nominal (3) | notwithstanding (1) |
| 0:25,18,20 | 0:4,8,9,15,12,12,24, | nearest (3) | 0:6,9,11 | 0:13 |
| mitigates (1) | 11,19,2,15,16,12,10,3, | 0:8,8,16 | non (4) | nowhere (3) |
| 0:8 | 13,15,15,6,13, 12,2,25, | necessarily (5) | 0:11,20,2 | 0:6,13,18 |
| mitigat | 14,10,24,15,20 | 0:25,8,24,1, | none (5) | uisance |
| 0:25 | mud (2) | necessary (5) | 0:17,19,4,1,10 | 0:7 |
| mix (6) | 15,1 | 0:4,2,19,13,18 | Nonetheless (3) | number (37) |
| 0:7,24, 16, 13, 15, 13 | mudding | need (52) | 0:3,21,2 | 0:21,14,14,4,2,7 |
| mobilizes (1) | 0:3 | $0: 18,6,14,14,10,12$ | non-Eversource (1) | 4,1,2,20,2,18,9,18,3, |
| 0:8 | multi-disciplinary (1) | 2,10,12,21,23,1,9,3, | 0:4 | 7,19,2,10,15,1,3,6, |
| modific | 0:17 | 22,6,12,20,4,23,15,16, | nonexisting | 16,20,16,12,11,19,11, |
| 0:19 | multipa | 5,5,8,8,15,24,1,22,3, | 0:8 | 24,11,8,23,25,1 |
| moment | 0:10 | 20,18,13, 17,17,19,8, | nonhazardous (1) | numbers (19) |
| 0:18,20 | Multiple | 12,21,8,19,2,22,16,23, | 0:6 | 0:6,8,22,10,22,4,18, |
| money (3) | 0:1,16 | 6,22,15,19,23,8 | non-mutagenic | , 10,4,5,6,6,6,12,17, |
| 0:19,13,23 | multiyear (1) | needed (10) | 0:7 | 17,21,16 |
| monolithic | 0:15 | 0:9,2,20,24,21,12,5, | Nonna | numeral (1) |
| 0:10 | munici | 9,4,1 | 0:1 | 0:13 |
| monopoliz | 0:13,6,4 | needs (18) | non-PTF (7) | Nutrition (1) |
| $0: 2$ | MURPHY | 0:9,7,7,14,24,25,2 | 0:6,7,11,13,15,6 | $0: 4$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { month (5) } \\ & 0: 22,23,24,24,18 \end{aligned}$ | $0: 25,3,4,16,24,11$, 16,14 | $12,24,17,22,22,19,1$, $13,14,3,24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nonquantitative (1) } \\ & 0: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { months }(\mathbf{1}) \\ 0: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Museum (4) } \\ 0: 20,11,14,1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { negative (1) } \\ 0: 23 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-sensitizing (1) } \\ & 0: 6 \end{aligned}$ | oaths (3) |
| more (104) | must (8) | negatives (1) | non-teratogenic (1) | $0: 18,5,25$ |
| $0: 17,2,4,11,20,12,9$ | 0:16,23, 11, 11,8,25 | 0:19 | 0:7 | object (4) |
| 24,19,22,4,18,13,20, | 25,6 | negligib | nontoxi | 0:25,24,23,25 |
| 21,1,25,1,21,24,24,4, | must-ru | 0:24 | 0:6 | obligation (8) |
| 7,8,8,15,24,20,20,25, | 0:24 | negotia | nontraditional | 0:12,6,22,1,3,9,1,2 |
| 17,9,1,6,6,7,5,25,19, | MVA (17) | 0:1 | 0:25,4,2,18 | obtain (5) |
| 15,18,20,14,1,6,10,18, | 0:12,14, | negotia | non-transmission (3) | 0:13,13,1,12,11 |
| 17,25,21,17,14,19,24, | 13,15,16,15,7,8,10,21, | 0:13 | :23,1,16 | obtained (1) |
| 22,5,3,18,3,14,23,21, | 11,18,8 | neighbors | normal (6) | 0:16 |
| 16,21,13,13,12,15,15, | myself (1) | 0:25,10 | $0: 12,1,15,15,1,2$ | obvious (1) |
| 6,9,6,17,23,7,10,22, | 0:9 | neither (1) | normalize (1) | 0:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23,2,16,19,12,15,3,3 \\ & 5,21,7,7,1,5,17,18,5,9 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | networ | n | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { obviously } \\ 0: 15,22 \end{array}$ |
| 9,16,8,7,7,14,14,24,20 |  | - $0: 22$, | 0:7,19,25,4,4,13,17, | $6,23,5,14,2,20,10,11,$ |
| morning (12) | name | new (63) | 19,1,7,23,24,5,6 | 11,13 |
| 0:1,3,10,25,11,6,15, | 0:6,8,18 | $0: 9,13 \text {, }$ | normally (6) | OCC (5) |
| 19,11,25,10,19 | nameplate (3) | 17,7,16,5,7,20,11,16, | 0:22,5,15,12,25 | 0:8,23, 9,24 |
| Most (23) | 0:24,8,11 | 17,8,12,16,22,14,16, | North (21) | OCC-11 (1) |
| 0:8,23,24,21,5,25,1, | narrative (3) | 11,12,17,23,20,5,6,22, | 0:21,18,8,9,6,9,1 | 0:20 |
| $1,24,23,19,23,25,1,14$ | 0:5,9,11 | 6,17,10,21,17,13,1,19, | 11,16,3,8,14,20,3,4, | OCC-17 (1) |
| $3,15,16,15,6,21,4,16$ | narrow (2) | 7,15,22,16,11,1,11,1, | 14,17,24,11,4,6 | 0:14 |
| mostly (2) | 0:19,5 | 16,12,19,23,2,4,11,14, | Northeast (1) | OCC-19 (1) |
| 0:7,19 | narrowl | 22,15,3,17,10,25,5,20, | 0:2 | 0:3 |
| motion (1) | 0:25 | 2 | northern (7) | OCC-2 (4) |
| 0:17 | national | next (15) | 0:13,12,15,9,18,17, | 0:4,1,7,11 |
| mounted (3) | 0:16 | 0:15,23,16,5,24,7,2, | 18 | OCC-20 (1) |
| 0:10,11,23 | natural (7) | 3,2,24,25,2,22,11,22 | Norwalk (9) | 0:4 |
| move (17) | 0:21,5,7,10,17 | nice (1) | 0:10,14,11,21,21, | OCC-22 (5) |
| $0: 15,8,19,10,17,13$, | 17 | 0:13 | 22,4,7,17 | 0:4,9,10,18,22 |
| 17,19,19,20,20,16,6, | naturally | night (3) | note (2) | OCC-24 (1) |
| 16,18,1,8 | 0:21 | 0:2,6,15 | 0:3,4 | 0:16 |
| moved (1) | nature (11) | nighttime (1) | notes (1) | OCC-25 (1) |
| $0: 16$ | $0: 4,20,18,9,9,18,2 \text {, }$ | $0: 9$ | $0: 3$ | $0: 2$ |
| movement (1) | $23,8,8,10$ | nine (3) | notice (4) | OCC-26 (1) |
| 0:24 | Naugatuck (1) | 0:15,23,16 | 0:19,15,25,17 | 0:24 |
| moves (1) | 0:20 | nobody (2) | noticed (3) | OCC-28 (1) |


| 15 | 10,6,15,8,4,16,5,20 | operator (1) | 23, | pamphlet (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OCC-3 | 20,23,25,24,13 |  | 22 | 0:25 |
| 0:20 | one (124) | opine (2) | over (23) | panel (4) |
| occasion | 0:14,19,24, | 0:9,1 | 0:11,2,17,15,14,18 | 0:24,23,6,23 |
|  | ,13,25,2,20,1, | opinion (8) | ,11,14,11,20,22,3,24, | panels (1) |
| occasions (1) | 12,15,16,12,24,23,15, | 0:5,11,20,10,2,9,1 | 22,7,24,3,11,11,21,7, | 0:2 |
| 0:11 | 15,16,18,3,24,25,7,13, | 25 | 16 | anoply |
| occupied (1) | 7,20,4,5,25,20,2,11, | opportunity (4) | overall (5) | 0:25 |
| 0:14 | 12,22,24,16,8,13,1,18, | 0:5,5,11,15 | 0:4,3,4,13,17 | PANTRY |
| occur | 8,16,24,3,4,8,16,2,18, | opposed (4) | overhead (36) | 0:17,15,23,15, |
| 0:14,2,20,11 | 9,19,20,20,4,11,23,11, | 0:4,11,23,1 | 0:23,16,20,13,12 | 5,14,19,10,17,5 |
| occurred | ,4,25,11,18,8,2,19 | opposite (3) | 20,20,16,18,18, | paper (1) |
| $0: 18,3,14,16,15,1$ | 17,3,20,9,16,1,14,15, | 0:18,11,20 | 10,23,3,13,23,3,5,9, | 0:1 |
| occurs (4) | 16,22,4,21,18,19,22, | opt (1) | , $10,14,18,18,5,9,21$, | aragraph |
| 0:1,2,11,2 | 15,2,12,3,15,16,25,5, | 0:7 | 10,3,10,3,21,13,18 | 0:11,22,21,15 |
| October (2) | 22,20,2,11,16,2,18,12, | optimizatio | overload (6) | parallel (6) |
| 0:4,3 | 24,16,20,25,4,19,12, | 0:10,25 | 0:4,6,14,15,19,21 | 0:19,12,17,13,14, |
| odd (1) | , $9,12,9,8,13,5,23$, | op | overloaded (1) | paralleling (1) |
| 0:14 | 11,16,17,25,1,12,11,2, | 0:22,13,2,9,14,1,1 | 0:10 | 0:17 |
| odds (1) | 3 |  | overloa | arens |
| 0:11 | ones (3) | options (12) | 0:24,16 | 0:5,7 |
| odorles | 0:3,20, | :7,15,7,9, | overly | Park (58) |
| 0:3 | ongoing | 17,16,8,5, | 0:12 | 0:12,18,7,7,13,17 |
| off (16) | 0:20,12,9 | orange (8) | overreactio | 19,22,12,1,8,12,15,16, |
| 0:13,21,22,10,2,11, | only (24) | $0: 11,17,5,17,2,5$, | 0:2 | 20,7,15,1,9,24,3,17, |
| 2,3,25,13,5,6,7,13,18, | 0:14,18,10,25,3,22 | 13 | overrun | 23,15,7,14,16,18,14, |
| 22 | 22,5,12,12,6,24,13,21 | order | 20 | 5,11,17,19,25,10,19, |
| offensive | 1,5,4,16,22,10,3,22, | 0:3,16,10,17,15,16 | overrun | 9,6,20,17,20,22,23,2, |
| 0:13,13 | 10,22 | 4,18,2,14,22,17 | 0:17 | ,1,5,21,18,6,10,23, |
| offer | on-peak | ordered | oversee (2) | 13,3,10,18,13,14 |
| 0:20,14 | 0:8 | 0:14 | 0:5,20 | PARKER (2) |
| offers | on-site | ordinanc | own (8) | 0:14,3 |
| 0:13,19 | 0:20 | 0:16 | 0:16,17,12,14,18 | parking (3) |
| OFFICE | ont | origin | 11,14,21 | 0:24,9,20 |
| 0:10,5,9,20 | 17,5 | :12,19,21,20,8,1 | owned | parkland (3) |
| 24,10 | open (28) | originally ( | 0:23,1 | 0:6,5,7 |
| officials | $0 \cdot 17$ | 22 | owner (2) | art (47) |
| 0:20 | 22,5,7,10,13, 14,15,25, | ostensibly | 0:2,23 | 0:13,20,15,18,23, |
| offload | ,24,15,23,7,10,22,18, | 0:22 | owners (5) | 25,21,3,16,11,1,20,12, |
| 0:21 | 14,19,13,13,15,15 | others (5) | $0: 3,16,17,24,$ | 9,23,17,15,9,13,13,7, |
| off-peak | open-air (1) | $0: 16,13,18,4$ | ownership (1) | 14,8,5,20,5,2,7,22,22, |
| 0:7 |  | Otherwise (3) | . 25 | 8,20,16,4,11,24,5,4, |
| offset ( | opened | 0:20,23,19 | owning (1) | 6,25,7,13,11,19,5,4,9 |
| 0:17 | 0:8 | out (79) | 0:22 | partial (2) |
| off-site | opening | $0: 6,1,2,5,7,4,16,8,9$, | owns (2) | 0:20,4 |
| 0:7 | 0:20,5 | 19,17,17,20,2,5,24,4, | 0:20,21 | participate (2) |
| often (2) | opens | 5,18,4,4,16,20,11,10, |  | 0:18,10 |
| 0:21,7 | 0:7 | 7,16,17,19,14,19,11,6, | P | participating (2) |
| oil (14) | operat | 4,25,4,1,17,14,2,16, |  | 0:3,22 |
| 0:8 | - | 10,8,18,3,10,23,1,12, | p | particular (17) |
| 15,15,9,19,12,22,22 | operated | 25,18,8,10,18,10,11, | 迷 | $0: 9,24,7,11,21,23$ |
| oil-filled (1) | 0:4,18 | 13,21,20,22,7,3,7,9, | package | 1,11,20,22,6,21,1, |
| 0:2 | operates | 18,7,23,4,21,1,25,9, | 0:14, | 7,1,22 |
| oils (2) | 25 | 16,22,10,18,19,8,13 | packaged | particularly (5) |
| 0:22,2 | operating (7) | outages (3) | 0:10,2 | 0:25,18,3,25,13 |
| old (12) | 0:2,22,2,3,11,1 | 0:17,10,7 | packages | parties (1) |
| 0:24,5,25,4,9,14,18, | operation (12) | outlook (1) | 0:7 | 0:24 |
| 25,3,4,5,9 | $0: 19,3,16,21,2,13,7$ | 0:14 | page (19) | partly (1) |
| older (1) | 12,9,19,19,21 | out-of-the | 0:21,3,11,7, | 0:19 |
| 0:21 | operational (2) | 0:9,16 | 12,2,1,22,19,15,19,2 | parts (6) |
| once (2 | 0:4,5 | outreach (1) | 3,9,2 | 0:21,18,24,22,1,3 |
| $0: 2,20,4,12,2,5,$ | operations (2) | 0. | pages (1) | arty (3) |
| 19,19,24,24,4,2,6,9, | 0:2,1 | outside (8) | 0:19 | 0:24,7,5 |


| pass (4) | 17 | 0:25,25,9 | pm (6) | $0: 4,14,17,13,23,18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:16,24,15,22 | percentages (2) | piece (10) | 0:21,21,25,22,22,15 | 20 |
| passes (1) | 0:8,10 | 0:13,14,17,25,9,4 | pneumatic (1) | possible (15) |
| 0:12 | perfect | 15,9,16,24 | 0:25 | 0:24,9,20,3,10,13,2, |
| passive (1) | 0:21,25, | piecemeal (1) | point (42) | 17,19,5,14,12,15,18, |
| 19 | per-foot | 0:12 | 0:7,6,19,21,9,25,8 | 25 |
| past (9) | 0:16 | pieces (3) | , $24,19,24,12,13,9$, | possibly (6) |
| 0:15,2,3, 7,3,8,8, | perform (1) | 0:2,2, | , 13,13,22,15,4,25, | 0:21,10,23,12,8,23 |
| 5 | 0:12 | Piles (3) | 21,20,7,1,23,4,18,15, | postponement (1) |
| pathway (4) | perform | 0:25,25 | 4,2,4,6,25,4,16,19, | 0:24 |
| 0:3,5,19,5 | :6,7,2,5,19,1 | pilot (1) | 0,4,22,21,18 | potential (19) |
| patiently (1) | perhaps (2) | 0:17 | pointed (2) | $0: 17,24,21,23,16$ |
| 0:4 | 0:4,18 | pilots (1) | 0:11,2 | 3,6,4,3,17,6,14,15, |
| pattern (1) | period (10) | 0:12 | points (10) | 20,9,16,8,14,24 |
| 0:14 | 0:3,3,5,18,11,18,23 | pinnacle | 0:23,13,18,19,1 | potentially (2) |
| patterns (4) | 5,25,22 | 0:19 | 10,16,24,1,17 | 0:17,18 |
| 0:7,9,19,21 | periodic (1) | pipe (26) | pole (2) | potluck (1) |
| pause (1) | 0:9 | 0:7,23,25,3,8,1,19 | 0:22,1 | 0:17 |
| 0:6 | periods (2) | ,15,18,21,23,25,25, | poles (1) | power (18) |
| pay (3) | 0:21,9 | 1,22,25,24,3,7,8,11, | 0:10 | 0:2,23,16,23,19,22, |
| 0:23,17, | permission (5) | 12,18,9,23 | pole-top | 8,3,20,25,2,5,6,16, |
| paying (4) | 0:5,5,13,24,10 | pipeline (2) | 0:22,19 | 21,23,1,1 |
| 0:10,11,6,11 | permissions (2) | 0:11,10 | police (1) | powerline (1) |
| pays (2) | 0:25,3 | pipelines | 0:15 | 0:18 |
| 0:8,7 | permit (2) | :13 | poling | practical (1) |
| peak (3) | 17,2 | pi | 0:16 | 0:1 |
| $0: 13,15,6,25,1,1,5$, | permits (2) | 0:12,18 | polluted ( | practice (3) |
| 10,13,14,9,13,15,20, | 0:16,9 | Pizzeria (1) | 0:10 | 0:4,5,10 |
| 10,11,15,20, 13,25,21, | person (2) | 0:1 | polybutene (2) | pragmatic (1) |
| 24,10,24,7,11,13,10, | 0:11,14 | place (13) | 0:2,2 | 0:13 |
| 24,2,25,5,13,25,6,24, | personal | 20,6,9,10,12,1,19 | pond (1) | pre-blast (2) |
| 13,14,16 | 0:24,22 | 5,2,23,6,8,12 | 0:10 | 0:20,22 |
| peaks (2) | personall | placed | pooled | precise (1) |
| 0:15,14 | 0:10 | 0:19 | 0:20,24,2, | 0:23 |
| penalized | personnel | plan (28) | pops (1) | predict (1) |
| 0:17 | 0:4,11,13,8,12,10 | $0: 13,12,17,16,9,25,$ | 0:21 | 0:11 |
| penalties (5) | perspective (4) | 1,11,16,22,16,18,9,17, | porch | predicted (1) |
| 0:1,7,8,18,22 | 0:19,5,13,21 | 11,23,4,20,20,2,3,8,9, | 0:4 | 0:23 |
| pending (2) | pertains (1) | 24,3,14,9,6 | porosity | predictors (1) |
| 0:23,21 | 0:25 | planned (2) | 0:12 | 0:22 |
| peninsula (1) | PET (12) | 0:24,19 | porous (2) | predicts (1) |
| 0:21 | :17,15,23,15,23,1, | planner (3) | 0:10,17 | 0:14 |
| people (23) | 5,14,19,10,17,5 | 0:18,6,9 | Port (2) | pre-done |
| 0:7,21,24,25,21,4, | phase (8) | planning (11) | 0:16,19 | 0:11 |
| $19,16,23,24,6,1,24,3$ | 0:22,15,24,12,12, | 0:16,7,15,1,8,3,6,7 | portable (1) | prefer (1) |
| $21,25,9,19,12,13,14$ | $15,15,7$ | $2,23,23$ | 0:2 | 0:20 |
| 22,7 | Phil (1) | plans (7) | portion (4) | preferable (1) |
| people's (1) | $0 \cdot 18$ | 0:22,14,22,12,25 | 0:18,14,13,25 | 0:20 |
| 0:20 | philosop | 17,25 | portions (1) | preferably (1) |
| Pequonnock (1) | 0:4 | plant (1) | 0:8 | $0: 3$ |
| 0:20 | photo (2) |  | porus | preferenc |
| per (20) | 0:14,19 | plates | 0:15 | 0:8,22 |
| 0:17,9,10,23,1,2,17, | photograp | 0:16 | posed (2) | preferential (2) |
| 17,10,18,11,2,6,11,20, | 0:25 | play (2) | 0:3,10 | 0:4,5 |
| 20,18,20,19,17 | photogra | 0:23,3 | position ( | preferred (10) |
| percent (39) | 0:21,6 | please | 0:18,6 | 0:17,19,21,13,7,3, |
| 0:19,19,20,4,5,11, | physical | 0:7,18,11,15,14,21, | positions | 21,3,1,5 |
| $17,1,3,5,4,5,22,9,18,1$, $9,18,21,12,1,19,23,9$, | 0:11,14,24 | 1,9,7,9,24,8,7,2,9,25, | 0:1 | prefiled (1) |
| 22,16,20,21,21,22,25, | 0:16,11,23,12,21 | pledge (2) | 00:10 | preliminar |
| 4,5,7,8,21,5,12,1 | picking (1) | 0:5,6 | positive | 0:1,4,6,22,15,21 |
| percentage (7) | 0:22 | plus (6) | 0:18 | pre-loading (1) |
| 0:24,23,20,4,15,3, | picture (3) | 0:15,16,18,18,20,13 | possibility (7) | 0:23 |
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| protection (14) | 0:5,7 |
| 0:14,6,11,8,15,7,18, | purposes (1) |
| 19,23,5,10,15,20,7 | 0:14 |
| protective (12) | pursuant (2) |
| 0:15,3,1,15,16,4,18, | 0:13,16 |
| 2,14,25,18,25 | pursue (1) |
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| protocol (1) | 0:19,24 |
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| provide (22) | 20,18,21,4,5,25,7,8, |
| 0:2,17,7,21,23,17, | 14,25,16,14,17,8,17,1, |
| 11,19,24,5,13,11,20, | 9,22,4,23,5,15,25,12, |
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| providing (1) | 8,9 |
| 0:2 | puzzled (1) |
| provisions (4) | 0:17 |
| 0:13,10,6,7 | pylon (2) |
| proximately (1) | 0:21,14 |
| $\begin{gathered} 0: 25 \\ \text { proximity (3) } \end{gathered}$ | Q |
| 00:18,4,14 |  |
| prudent (2) | qualify (1) |
| 0:17,9 | 0:12 |
| PSI (1) | quality (2) |
| 0:14 | 0:3,6 |
| PSNH (2) | quantify (1) |
| 0:6,15 | 0:17 |
| PTF (1) | quarter (1) |
| 0:11 | 0:18 |
| public (23) | quasi (1) |
| 0:18,7,10,7,21,21, | 0:2 |
| 22,22,12,9,11,21,13, | Queens (3) |
| 13,5,16,12,4,7,16,11, | 0:17,24,22 |
| 23,13 | questioner (1) |
| pull (4) | 0:5 |
| 0:17,17,7,9 | quibble (1) |
| pump (3) | 0:8 |
| 0:6,1,21 | quick (3) |
| pumphouse (1) | 0:21,22,17 |
| 0:22 | quickly (1) |
| pumps (2) | 0:11 |
| 0:9,3 | quite (11) |
| puncture (2) | $0: 16,16,11,19,10$, |
| 0:13,15 | 17,21,21,12,14,4 |
| punctured (1) | quote (1) |
| 0:16 | 0:12 |
| PURA (2) | quoted (1) |
| 0:13,5 | 0:2 |
| $0: 15$ | $\mathbf{R}$ |
| purely (1) |  |


| radiation (2) | 0:12 | red (1) | relative (5) | represent (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:12,22 | ready (5) | 0:7 | 0:12,12,14,20,2 | 0:21 |
| Railroad (32) | 0:21,4,24,24,5 | redone (1) | relatively (4) | representation (1) |
| 0:20,1,17,19,1,17, | real (11) | 0:3 | 0:7,10,11,16 | 0:17 |
| 18,20,5,18,20,4,5,17, | 0:14,19,3,6,16,5,7, | reduce (7) | release (5) | representative (1) |
| 22,9,4,4,21,5,11,11, | 19,20,20,19 | 0:8,17,23,3,6,8,15 | 0:7,7,17,2,4 | 0:14 |
| 19,1,7,18, 14, 19, 14, 16, | realistic (1) | reduced (3) | releases (1) | Representatives (1) |
| 7,12 | 0:1 | 0:11,17,7 | 0:24 | 0:1 |
| rain (1) | realize (1) | reducing (2) | relevant (1) | request (4) |
| 0:21 | 0:19 | 0:20,16 | 0:11 | 0:8,13,18,21 |
| rained (1) | really (37) | Reduction (4) | reliability (17) | requests (2) |
| 0:8 | 0:14,12,1,2,14,3,2, | 0:10,14,5,21 | 0:7,1,3,7,2,25,3,15, | 0:12,22 |
| raise (3) | 16,2,7,7,24,9,17,18, | redundancy (1) | 18,22,4,13,8,4,20,3,8 | require (2) |
| 0:23,6,24 | 18,4,10,12,13,18,17, | 0:15 | Reliable (7) | 0:12,19 |
| raised (9) | 15,25,5,21,2,15,17,22, | refer (2) | 0:18,20,24,2,5,21, | required (10) |
| $0: 8,10,21,12,2,4,7$, | 7,21,24,18,1,19,1 | 0:21,22 | 10 | $0: 8,9,24,8,1,3,7,1$ |
| 21,2 | realm (1) | reference (2) | relieved (1) | $18,16$ |
| raises (1) | 0:4 | 0:24,9 | 0:17 | requirement (1) |
| 0:20 | reason (7) | referenced (2) | relocate (2) | 0:7 |
| raising (1) | 0:8, 13, 4, 23, 16, 11, | 0:10,13 | 0:3,4 | requirements (6) |
| 0:21 | 25 | referred (1) | rely (1) | 0:4,15,14,9,13,7 |
| range (3) | reasonable (3) | 0:4 | 0:22 | requires (3) |
| 0:18,24,5 | 0:14,4,19 | referring (3) | relying (2) | 0:6,21,3 |
| rate (10) | reasons (6) | 0:2,23,17 | 0:1,2 | requiring (1) |
| 0:7,7,7,5,8,1,2,2,17, | 0:7,21,22,4,19,8 | refine (1) | remained (2) | $0: 15$ |
| 20 | rebates (2) | 0:1 | $0: 9,21$ | rereading (1) |
| rated (3) | 0:19,2 | regard (3) | remaining (2) | 0:21 |
| 0:6,9,14 | rebuild (2) | 0:4,10,6 | 0:22,16 | reseeded (1) |
| ratepayer (6) | 0:18,22 | regarding (14) | Remember (5) | 0:21 |
| 0:14,23,10,13,15,11 | rebuilding (1) | 0:17,23,1,23,10,20, | 0:25,16,21,1,13 | reserve (1) |
| ratepayers (3) | 0:22 | 13,16,11,16,18,4,6,18 | removal (1) | 0:2 |
| 0:15,10,20 | rebuilt (1) | regardless (3) | 0:22 | reset (1) |
| ratepayers' (1) | 0:20 | 0:19,24,25 | remove (6) | 0:3 |
| 0:19 | recall (6) | regards (2) | 0:24,6,17,11,9,9 | residence (2) |
| rates (6) | 0:24,2,5,6,24,20 | 0:12,15 | removed (8) | 0:23,23 |
| 0:16,21,6,8,17,4 | recalled (2) | region (2) | 0:4,20,21,25,7,8,5, | residences (2) |
| rather (6) | 0:16,23 | 0:11,23 | 24 | 0:22,21 |
| 0:11,10,25,21,17,19 | recalling (1) | regional (3) | removing (4) | resident (1) |
| rating (19) | 0:3 | 0:14,16,3 | 0:20,7,5,4 | 0:6 |
| 0:24,4,17,19,25,1,1, | received (8) | registration (1) | renewable (1) | residential (12) |
| 2,2,5,8,12,15,16,19,3, | 0:2,5,25,15,1,22,17, | 0:23 | 0:21 | $0: 22,22,13,6,15,9$ |
| 5,18,15 | 24 | re-grass (1) | rental (1) | 11,20,9,4,14,14 |
| ratings (7) | recent (2) | 0:25 | 0:15 | residents (5) |
| 0:23,19,21,7,25,11, | 0:9,21 | regulate (1) | repair (2) | 0:24,14, 19, 1,4 |
| 23 | recently (2) | 0:24 | 0:10,10 | resiliency (3) |
| ratio (1) | 0:24,16 | regulation (1) | repeatedly (1) | 0:19,19,6 |
| 0:23 | recess (2) | 0:9 | 0:23 | resolved (1) |
| Ray (1) | 0:20,21 | regulations (1) | repeating (1) | 0:22 |
| 0:3 | recognize (4) | 0:20 | 0:25 | resort (1) |
| Raymond (1) | 0:24,25,1,13 | regulatory (1) | repetitive (2) | 0:24 |
| 0:12 | recommend (1) | 0:14 | 0:3,25 | resources (4) |
| reached (1) | 0:23 | reintroduce (1) | replace (4) | 0:10,16,16,9 |
| 0:12 | recommending (1) | 0:24 | 0:24,17,8,19 | respect (3) |
| reaches (1) | 0:2 | relate (2) | replaced (3) | 0:8,19,6 |
| 0:18 | record (14) | 0:24,16 | 0:2,25,4 | respectfully (2) |
| reaction (2) | 0:22,21, 20, 2, 23, 2,8, | related (2) | replacement (1) | 0:8,12 |
| 0:22,5 | 22,8,18,16,21,1,8 | 0:1,1 | 0:11 | respond (5) |
| read (11) | records (3) | relates (2) | replaces (1) | 0:10,21,20,14,16 |
| 0:16,14,25,20,20,1, | 0:23,5,9 | 0:24,3 | 0:13 | responded (2) |
| 9,10,11,13,8 | rectangular (1) | relating (1) | replacing (1) | 0:2,24 |
| reading (1) | 0:11 | 0:23 | 0:16 | responder (1) |
| 0:9 | rectifier (1) | relationship (2) | reporting (1) | 0:7 |
| reads (1) | 0:6 | 0:24,15 | 0:10 | responders (2) |


| 0:13,13 | RFPs (2) | Roman (1) | saltwater (1) | 0:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| responding (2) | 0:22,25 | 0:13 | 0:14 | second (14) |
| 0:16,4 | rial (1) | roof (1) | same (29) | 0:18,23, 15,2,4,18, |
| response (50) | 0:14 | 0:24 | 0:6,15,18,16,17,19, | 23,10,25,14,22,15,19, |
| 0:9,19,2,13, 13,18, | Richard (1) | room (11) | 3,25,7,9,9,2,7,13,5,15, | 6 |
| 13,9,14,10,24,23,4,18, | 0:6 | 0:19,24,18,22,2,4 | 14,5,9,14,17,9,20,5,8, | secret (2) |
| 16,3,10,24,2,6,12,12, | rid (1) | 11,19,10,19,25 | 14,19,24,23 | 0:13,24 |
| 13,21,2,24,15,4,20,20, | 0:9 | rooms (1) | samples (5) | section (9) |
| 14,22,15,24,2,3,5,6, | ridiculous (1) | 0:3 | 0:24,6,7,17,1 | 0:5,6,18, 1,4,8,5,12, |
| 14,12,3,5,11,20,15,13, | 0:23 | rough (1) | sand (2) | 18 |
| 5,22,25,4 | right (82) | 0:8 | 0:19,18 | sections (2) |
| responses (12) | 0:4,5,5,23,17,19,19, | roughly (8) | SANDAK (2) | 0:3,4 |
| 0:23,25,3,6,15,23, | 22,6,15,23,8,18,23,11, | 0:24,2,3,5,18,16,11, | 0:4,21 | seductively (1) |
| 10,5,1,15,14,24 | 19,20,4,15,3,21,17,18, | 20 | Sandy (6) | 0:11 |
| responsibility (2) | 11,17,18,5,19,19,7,5, | round (3) | 0:18,20, 1, 18, 24,4 | seeing (7) |
| 0:8,8 | 4,12,4,21,22,25,16,17, | 0:5,5,22 | sat (1) | 0:4,13,21,12,12,18, |
| rest (2) | 23,6,11,22,25,20,21, | rounds (1) | 0:4 | 18 |
| 0:24,15 | 12,18,20,4,22,2,13,14, | 0:22 | satisfied (1) | seek (1) |
| Restaurant (1) | 21,12,19,3,15,19,23, | route (50) | 0:1 | 0:5 |
| 0:1 | 12,1,13,10,15,23,12,3, | 0:11,17,13,19,13, | satisfies (1) | seeking (2) |
| restored (1) | 6,25,21,23,4,14,20,13, | 14,19,21,13,18,22,24, | 0:21 | 0:19,15 |
| 0:1 | 22,10,12,2,2 | 8,10,7,17,3,10,5,8,22, | satisfy (6) | seem (2) |
| restrained (2) | right-of-way (17) | 2,19,21,3,3,5,21,21, | 0:11,12,9,19,17,1 | 0:24,15 |
| 0:23,16 | 0:11,24,14,21,25, | 25,19,23,19,5,14,16,7, | save (5) | seemed (2) |
| restrictions (1) | 18,14,24,12,24,23,24, | 17,16,8,23,5,17,23,1, | 0:25,24,13,23,12 | 0:23,4 |
| $0: 12$ | 5,7,11,12,15 | 14,5,20,21,5 | saved (2) | seems (8) |
| result (1) | rights (10) | routes (11) | 0:25,21 | 0:16,20,25,1,18,7, |
| 0:11 | 0:21,14,24,9,13,17, | 0:13,2,16,22,13,6,7, | saving (1) | 16,19 |
| results (3) | 21,25,1,1 | 2,7,10,14 | 0:18 | segment (3) |
| 0:22,14,8 | ring (3) | routine (2) | savings (1) | 0:21,7,4 |
| resume (10) | 0:24,9,11 | 0:1,19 | 0:17 | seismic (1) |
| 0:9,12,20,22,2,8,14, | rises (1) | routing (4) | saw (4) | 0:25 |
| 5,1,16 | 0:10 | 0:14,18,23,16 | 0:17,1,8,18 | selected (4) |
| resumes (4) | risk (4) | run (5) | saying (25) | 0:14,21,25,24 |
| 0:8,16,11,17 | 0:23,23,21,14 | 0:16,7,18,3,12 | 0:14,3,16,16,16,15, | selecting (1) |
| retail (2) | risks (2) | running (3) | 10,25,14,9,17,8,12,7, | 0:2 |
| 0:16,20 | 0:20,23 | 0:15,23,2 | 5,20,13,23,13,12,16,6, | selection (1) |
| retire (1) | River (1) | runs (1) | 1,7,8 | 0:1 |
| 0:6 | 0:20 | 0:23 | scale (3) | Self (2) |
| retiring (1) | Riverside (1) | Russians (1) | 0:13,17,11 | 0:15,22 |
| $0: 5$ | 0:24 | 0:10 | scene (2) | self-cooled (1) |
| retrofit (1) | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { R o a d }}(20)$ | rusting (1) | 0:21,5 | 0:25 |
| 0:9 | 0:20,21,9,22,23,18, | $0: 9$ | schedule (3) | SEN (7) |
| return (2) | 11,2,4,11,13,23,6,15, | Rye (2) | 0:17,5,1 | 0:25,4,16,24,11,16, |
| 0:8,10 | 23,13, 13,15,15,1 | 0:13,25 | schemes (1) | 14 |
| $\underset{0: 11}{\operatorname{revamp}}(\mathbf{1})$ | roads (1) | S | 0:3 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Senator (1) } \\ 0: 3 \end{array}$ |
| reveal (1) | Roadside (1) |  | 0:1 | sense (5) |
| 0:25 | 0:19 | safe (3) | scope (1) | 0:4,24,7,5,10 |
| revegetate (1) | roadway (1) | 0:2,21,5 | 0:13 | sentence (6) |
| 0:21 | 0:9 | safer (1) | screen (1) | $0: 14,15,1,3,16,8$ |
| revenue (1) | robust (4) | 0:7 | 0:5 | sentences (1) |
| 0:7 | 0:15,24,14,5 | safety (7) | se (2) | 0:11 |
| review (2) | rock (2) | 0:16,10, 13, 19, 24,8, | 0:9,10 | separate (5) |
| 0:5,18 | 0:21,17 | 19 | sealed (2) | 0:14,18,9,5,11 |
| revise (1) | rocks (1) | sail (1) | 0:2,4 | separately (1) |
| 0:21 | 0:10 | 0:20 | sealing (2) | 0:20 |
| revised (2) | role (1) | sake (1) | 0:14,15 | separating (1) |
| 0:25,9 | 0:24 | 0:6 | seals (1) | 0:24 |
| revision (1) | roll (1) | sales (1) | 0:8 | September (19) |
| 0:4 | 0:24 | 0:7 | seams (1) | $0: 11,25,24,2,5,8,10$ |
| RFP (3) | roll-up (1) | saline (1) | 0:3 | 14,18,21,1,17,18,15, |
| 0:4,4,1 | 0:6 | 0:8 | seating (1) | 22,13,3,11,22 |


| septic (3) | shocking (1) | 0:2,13,18,11 | 0:24 | 0:2,12,14, 1,2,22,11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:8,6,7 | 0:18 | site (35) | socia | 19,18,15,12,13,3,9 |
| series (6) | shoot (1) | 0:22,4,17,14, 1, 10,6 | 0:12,20 | Sound (6) |
| 0:4,19,24, 10,4,9 | 0:13 | 6,17,12,21,22,24,5,6, | societal (1) | 0:22,5,3,15,12,9 |
| serious (5) | Shore (2) | ,24,10,2,11,21,6,14, | 0:25 | sounds (2) |
| 0:14,18,21,4,18 | 0:23,5 | 15,15,5,10,24,13,14, | soft (2) | 0:11,3 |
| serve (19) | shoreline (1) | 17,19,25,9,8 | 0:17,1 | source (3) |
| 0:1,11,22,24,20,19 | 0:18 | sites (5) | softer (2) | 0:4,16,9 |
| 12,15,7,21,18,6,23,9, | short (5) | 0:3,6,8,24,1 | 0:1,2 | south (9) |
| 1,2,3,13,20 | 0:9,18,14,12, | Siting (22) | soil (15) | 0:2,16,23,8,23,4,2, |
| served (7) | short-term (3) | 0:3,20,6,17,12,1,23, | 0:23,6,23,8,10, 12,1, | 4,20 |
| 0:9,9,15,8 | 0:16,22,14 | 5,12,20,25,15,21,7,9, | 13,16,4,15,24,7,5,9 | southern (3) |
| serves (1) | show (7) | 8,10,15,16,9,14,12 | soils (2) | 0:22,23,1 |
| 0:4 | 0:10,22,21,15,12,5, | situation (9) | 0:3,18 | southwestern (1) |
| service (31) | 17 | 0:25,3,25,19,24,23, | solar (13) | 0:17 |
| 0:22,24,10,4,10,3, | showing | 1,4,10 | 0:20,11,22,23,3,20, | space (5) |
| 12,13,11,22,6,16,14, | 0:13,21, | situations | 20,23,1,2,19,21,25 | 0:23,2,14,14,16 |
| 15,19,12,20,24,25,2,5, | shown (2) | :18 | Solarize (8) | spacing (1) |
| 16,22,8,16,21,22,2,11, | 0:6,23 | $\boldsymbol{s i x}(3)$ | 0:6,17,17,4,6,20,1, | 0:7 |
| 1,16 | shows (2) | (11,5,1 | 24 | span (3) |
| services (5) | 0:21,12 | six-breaker (1) | sole (2) | 0:12,8,9 |
| 0:2,16,16,13,13 | shrubby (1) | 0:11 | 0:15,1 | spans (1) |
| serving (2) | 24 | six-positi | solicit (2) | 0:10 |
| 0:10,22 | shut (1) | 0:24 | 0:4,25 | Speak (8) |
| set (15) | 0:11 | sixth (2) | solicitation (1) | 0:9,16,8,2,9,20,1,24 |
| 0:24,10,21,10,12,2, | side (27) | 0:9,9 | 0:19 | speaking (2) |
| 17,2,15,24, 15, 19,3,16, | 0:18,21,9,11,23,10, | sixth-breaker (1) | solicitations (2) | 0:22,14 |
| 16 | 4,6,9,10,11,16,22,17, | 0:9 | 0:24,4 | specialized |
| settle (1) | 7,8,17,25,4,23,2,9,3,1, | sizable | soliciting (2) | 0:23 |
| 0:23 | 22,22,23 | 0:18 | 0:3,23 | specific (7) |
| setup (2) | sides (2) | size (7) | solid (2) | 0:2,12,24,9,3,9,13 |
| 0:3,12 | 0:14,10 | 0:12,2,8,22,1,16,15 | 0:4,13 | specifically (13) |
| seven (3) | signed (1) | sized (1) | solution (16) | 0:5,23,16,20,15,14, |
| 0:11,25,25 | 0:4 | 0:16 | 0:9,25,14,13,19,20 | 21,21,5,16,8,16,3 |
| Seventy-five | significant | skill (1) | 22,23,5,21,16,13,18, | specifications (2) |
| 0:10 | 0:25,15,3 | 0:24 | 11,2,16 | 0:7,25 |
| several (13) | significantly (1) | slash (1) | solutions (10) | specify (1) |
| 0:1,1,21,5,13,7,12, | 0:11 | 0:24 | 0:25,25,4,9,14,22, | 0:17 |
| 25,13,25,7,4,17 | signs (3) | sleep (1) | $23,12,14$ | spell (1) |
| sewer (7) | 0:6,17,18 | 0:20 | solve (10) | 0:8 |
| 0:17,24,2,5,16,7,22 | silt (5) | slight (1) | 0:5,6,2,9,20, 1,9, | spelled (1) |
| shall (1) | 0:2,2,4 | 0:2 | 13,14 | 0:12 |
| 0:3 | similar | slip (1) | solved (1) | spend (4) |
| shallow (5) | 0:20,18,5,6,5,15,16, | 0:11 | 0:9 | 0:21,18,24,17 |
| 0:4,11,24,7,10 | 25 | slopes | somebody (1) | spending (5) |
| shape (1) | Similar | 0:13 | 0:19 | 0:11,14,4,10,19 |
| 0:12 | 0:25 | slow ( | somebody's (2) | spent (2) |
| share (1) | simple | 0:7 | 0:12,3 | 0:11,19 |
| 0:3 | 0:12 | slurry (10) | somehow (2) | spike (1) |
| sharing (2) | simplis | 0:3,8,2,17,3,14,1 | 0:3,5 | 0:16 |
| 0:8,5 | 0:16 | 18,5,6 | someone (5) | spill (1) |
| sharply (1) | simply | smack | 0:19,12,20,10 | 0:9 |
| 0:10 | 0:22 | 0:17 | someone's (2) | spoils (1) |
| shed (1) | simulation | small (11) | 0:20,22 | 0:16 |
| 0:24 | 0:14,12 | 0:17,1,24,7,23,1,18 | somewhat (3) | spoke (3) |
| sheet (3) | simulatio | 15,5,3,10 | 0:10,24,4 | 0:23,24,10 |
| 0:7,4,22 | 0:21 | smaller (7) | somewhere (4) | Springfield (1) |
| sheets (1) | single (8) | 0:13,11,14,8,9,7, | 0:23,12,16,2 | 0:15 |
| 0:11 | $0: 10,9,23,7,10,10,2$, | small-scale (1) | sorry (20) | Square (1) |
| shift (2) | 16 | 0:16 | $0: 6,3,9,16,16,21,9$ | 0:1 |
| 0:21,5 | sister | smiles (1) | 21,11,3,22,6,24,8,25, | square-foot (1) |
| shifting (1) | 0:1 | 0:24 | 22,25,2,18,19 | 0:2 |
| 0:25 | sit (4) | smoke (1) | sort (14) | squeeze (2) |
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| 6,5,10,3,25,3,16,17, | 0:15 | 0:16,16 | topology (1) | transfers (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11,18,19,20,3,4,19,19, | term | three (30) | 0:14 | 0:7 |
| 25,19,16,4,11,17,9,16 | 0:19,25,14,12,5,2 | 0:5,9,14, 2, 4, 13, 2 | torn | transformation (1) |
| alks (1) | 11,17,13 | 13,11,23,25,11,14, | 0:22, | 0:21 |
| 0:13 | termina | ,16,25,23,23,24,25, | TORRANCE (2) | transformer (24) |
| tangent | 0:4,10 | 5,14,22,21,1,21,5,12,6 | 0:4,20 | $0: 19,8,17,22,24,23$, |
| 0:12 | terminate | three-line (3) | total (12) | 4,18,19,19,23,3,12, |
| tanks | 0:7 | 20,20,23 | 0:11,8,5,15,21,1 | 5,16,17,18,19,21,9, |
| 0:19,25 | terms | three-year (3) | 17,16,5,5,9,10 | 11,15,3,10 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a p }}$ (1) | 0:11,18,22,1,6,7,12, | 0:16,12,11 | totality (1) | transformers (10) |
| 0:20 | 2,4,16,3,16,4,9,4,8,18, | thrilled (1) | 0:8 | 0:24,5,9,4,25,4,23 |
| tape (2) | 24,6,7,19,2,3,5,8 | 0:23 | totally | 9,10,6 |
| 0:19,2 | terribl | throughout (7) | ,2, | transition (8) |
| target (1) | 0:2 | 0:2,6,1,21,8,17,1 | touched | $0: 19,23,8,11,17$, |
| 0:10 | terrifi | - | 0:6 | 12,12 |
| targeted | 0:22,22 | 0:20,25 | toward | transmission (32) |
| 0:24 | te | thunde | 0:18,11, | 0:22,3,20,21,25,16, |
| targetin | 0:6 | 0:23 | towards | 6,25,3,6,13,10,14,20, |
| 0:4 | test (4) | thus (1) | $0: 19,10,15,12,23$, | 3,16,24,21,16,24,3,17, |
| taskfor | 24 | :12 | 16 | 24,24,21,12,8,10,9,5, |
| 0:9 | testifi | tides (1) | tower (2) | 17,23 |
| tasteless | 0:18, | 0:25 | 0:19,1 | transparent (2) |
| 0:3 | testify | tight (3) | town (58) | 0:10,18 |
| team (3) | 0:8 | 0:6,7,1 | 0:5,6,4,16,25,2,2 | transverse (1) |
| 0:17,18 | testim | tighter (2) | 2,13,12,15,17,18,4, | 0:18 |
| tear (1) | :14,12,5,6,1 | 0:9,10 | 24,25,6,24,1,8,21,19, | treated (1) |
| 0:10 | 5,7,19,23,13 | timefr | 6,9,14,20,22,9,12,11, | 0:5 |
| technica | testing | 0:10 | 6,6,12,15,1,11,4,9,9, | tree (4) |
| 0:13,12,16 | 0:23,9,13,7 | times | 3,2,7,23,21,6,7,22, | 0:21,11,21,12 |
| technically (3) | 11,7 | 11,5,4,14,21,19, | 22,17,8,13,10,12,18, | trees (10) |
| 0:17,6,18 | tests | 4,16,22 | 21,24,10 | 0:19,24,23,25,4, |
| technici | 0:10 | timewis | Townho | 22,13,14,7 |
| 0: | theate | 0:3 | 0:7 | trench (36) |
| techniq | 0:7 | tim | to | 0:17,19, 23, 3, 6, 8, |
| 0:1,1,6,6,13 | theore |  | 0:9,16,9,3, | 12,22,5,5,6,8,14,15,1, |
| techniques (2) | 0:8 | Title (1) | Town's (2) | 9,4,24,22,14,11,15,13, |
| 0:1,4 | Theor | 0:13 | 0:4,7 | 15,10,6,8,2,6,19,21, |
| technol | 0.20 | today | track | 22,9,12, |
| 0:8 | theref | 4,2,14,11,4,15,8 | 0:1 | trenches (7) |
| techno | $0 \cdot 1$ | 23,7,21,4,13,9,7, | tracks | 0:6,24,3,1,2,6, |
| 0:3,1,19,14,10, | thermal | 15,15,10,8,6,2,17,21, | 0:24,1,23,1,19,1 | trenching (5) |
| telling (3) | 0:9,13 | 9,14,2,25,15,19,20,17, | tractor-trailer (1) | 0:14,4,25,4,20 |
| $0: 23,21,2$ | thinking | 23,25,12,21,14 | 0:23 | trick (1) |
| tells (1) | 0:11,15,1,24,9, | today's (1) | traditional (4) | 0:20 |
|  | third (7) | . 7 | 0:24,5,9,13 | tried (3) |
| temperature | 0:24,1 | together (8) | traffic (15) | 0:10,18,18 |
| 0:21,21,8 | 25 | 0:2,6,3,17,25,8,4,17 | 20,12,14,20,17 | tripped (1) |
| temperatur | third-l | told (1) | ,25,8,14,16,6,16,18, | 0:1 |
| 0:19,25,1 | 0:5 | :12 | 19,22 | trouble |
| temporary (1) | thorou | toleran | train | 0:2 |
| 0:20 | 0.4,4 | 7 | 0:16,19,2 | troubled (1) |
| ten (9) | thoroug | tolerate | trained (2) | 0:10 |
| 0:19,2,9,11,8,18, 1 | 0:14 | 0:18 | 0:16,20 | truck (1) |
| 23,22 | though | Tomac (4) | training ( | 0:10 |
| tend (2) | 0:18,17,20,21,1, | 0:21,24,25,2 | 0:10 | trucks (2) |
| 0:25,7 | 10,18,19,21,19 | tomorro | transact | 0:24,3 |
| tends (3) | though | :23 | 0:15 | true (17) |
| 0:14,17,6 | 0:23,16,9,12,8,14,7, | too-exp | transcript | $0: 22,25,8,11,22,$ |
| tensions (1) | 8,20,23,20, 4, 2, 20, 7 , | 0:9 | 0:4,15,17 | $12,11,12,4,10,6,16,3$ |
| 0:17 | 25,13 | took (6) | transfer (6) | 1,24,14 |
| tenths (2) | thousand (3) | $0: 14,8,9,12,13,5$ | 0:23, 12, 4, 4, 11, 13 | truly (1) |
| $0: 5,18$ | 0:20,2 | top (6) | transferring (1) | 0:1 |
| ten-year (1) | Thousands (2) | 0:4,15,6,9,24,13 | $0: 23$ | try (21) |


| 0:15,17,21,23,21, | ultimately (10) | 0:13 | 0:24,22 | 0:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22,14,6,19, 1,4,17,17, | 0:5,12,7,9,12,18,19, | unless (2) | using (18) | verify (6) |
| 3,19,20,20,12,12,24, | 19,2,8 | 0:7,2 | 0:3,8,14,1,20,24,8, | 0:13,25,3,17,10,1 |
| 25 | unaware (2) | unreliable (1) | 4,8,9,8,18,12,13,1,1,8, | version (1) |
| trying (40) | 0:17,20 | 0:11 | 7 | 0:12 |
| 0:23,10,13,17,13, | unchanged (3) | unsightly (1) | Usually (10) | versus (12) |
| 22,11,5,24,3,8,8,12, | 0:9,18,21 | 0:7 | 0:15,23,1,20,9,11,3, | 0:13,12,25,14,19,8, |
| 14,22,13,14,4,12,9,21, | uncomfortable (1) | unusual (1) | 5,9,8 | 25,25,10,4,24,2 |
| 25,20,12,19,21,24,8, | 0:22 | 0:19 | utilities (9) | viable (6) |
| 12,14,15,23,23,2,6,15, | under (18) | unwind (1) | 0:5,7,12,10,2,6,2, | 0:7,19,16,13,17,20 |
| 8,22,17,19 | 0:3,25,7,24,1,4,4, | 0:1 | 21,1 | Vice (1) |
| Tuesday (2) | 12,18,2,2,20,21, , 2, | up (84) | utility (10) | 0:1 |
| 0:4,1 | 15,17,4 | 0:16,22,24,25,17, | 0:15,4,17, 1, 11, 23, 4 , | view (4) |
| turbines (4) | underground (18) | 23,19,2,25,3,24,10,11, | 23,25,5 | 0:9,18,6,9 |
| 0:2,6,9,12 | 0:22,25,22,14,24,1, | 8,3,7,17,17,18,12,2, | utilized (1) | views (1) |
| turn (4) | 13,24,6,17,19, 12,21,8, | 19,15,13, 17, 1, 21,17,5, | 0:17 | 0:6 |
| 0:14,4,3,22 | 2,6,20,3 | 10,7,22,3,19,23,17,19, | utilizes (1) | violations (1) |
| turning (4) | undergrounding (2) | 9,3,8,12,15,8,12,19,9, | 0:14 | 0:10 |
| 0:17,15,23,1 | 0:24,1 | 16,19,21,8,2,10,11,13, | utilizing (1) | vis-a-vis (1) |
| twain (1) | underlying (2) | 17,8,11,17,22,1,17,16, | 0:11 | 0:3 |
| 0:3 | 0:8,18 | 18,21,25,10,5,22,9,20, |  | visibility (3) |
| Twenty (1) | undermine (1) | 5,9,11,14,3,16,16,1, | V | 0:18,7,8 |
| 0:8 | 0:20 | 21,2,1,25,16,21 |  | visible (1) |
| Twenty-one (1) | underneath (2) | upgrade (1) | vac (1) | 0:8 |
| 0:19 | 0:15,20 | 0:10 | 0:24 | visual (2) |
| twice (1) | understands (1) | upgraded (1) | vacate (1) | 0:22,19 |
| 0:11 | 0:12 | 0:16 | 0:25 | visually (4) |
| twiddling (1) | understood (1) | upgrades (2) | vacation (1) | 0:18,23,13,17 |
| 0:22 | 0:2 | 0:13,25 | 0:15 | VOICE (10) |
| two (49) | undertaken (1) | upon (13) | value (7) | 0:6,20,23,25,13,7, |
| $0: 21,14,8,24,10,21,$ | $0: 13$ | $0: 15,4,1,10,17,22,2$ | $0: 2,9,12,1,19,19,6$ | 24,8,19,20 |
| $10,21,11,14,16,18,20$ | underwater (3) | $3,22,10,6,16,2$ | values (2) | $\operatorname{vol}(1)$ |
| 22,6,19,1,8,12,24,18, | 0:7,11,19 | upside (1) | 0:21,16 | 0:6 |
| 20,25,8,23,8,18,6,25, | undiscovered (1) | 0:21 | VAR (1) | volt/VAR (2) |
| 18,21,24,18,14,22,14, | 0:17 | urban (2) | 0:7 | 0:18,24 |
| 14,6,22,15,4,4,21,6, | unfeasible (1) | 0:18,3 | variability (1) | voltage (18) |
| 20,5,8,4,2 | 0:5 | urge (1) | 0:20 | 0:5,6,19,2,16,18,14, |
| two-edged (1) | unforeseeable (1) | 0:19 | variable (1) | 17,25,3,5,9,14,17,20, |
| 0:9 | 0:2 | urgency (1) | 0:22 | 4,10,11 |
| two-line (2) | unforeseen (3) | 0:16 | variation (1) | volume (2) |
| 0:19,22 | 0:18,2,9 | usage (9) | 0:3 | 0:4,5 |
| Two-part (1) | Uniform (1) | $0: 1,3,9,10,22,1,8,1$, | variations (2) | voted (1) |
| 0:23 | 0:15 | 5 | 0:15,6 | 0:22 |
| type (30) | uni-grounded (1) | usages (1) | variety (1) | vulnerability (1) |
| $0: 19,14,18,19,24$, | 0:21 | 0:7 | 0:2 | $0: 20$ |
| 16,11,1,2,14,22,14,8, | unique (3) | use (56) | various (7) | vulnerable (1) |
| 22,22,17,21,15,21,2, | 0:7,7,16 | 0:25,25,25,12,5,15, | $0: 20,19,19,3,16,3,$ | 0:18 |
| 13,9,10,17,4,21,13,9, | unit (5) $0 \cdot 16,23,22,25,11$ | 3,7,19,21,4,24,2,22,2, | $\stackrel{21}{\text { VARs (1) }}$ | W |
| $16,12$ | $0: 16,23,22,25,11$ United (5) | 13,8,2,15,16,14,15,3, | $\underset{0.19}{\text { VARs (1) }}$ | W |
| 0:21,19,23,9,12 | 0:5,8,12,25,4 | $20,12,7,18,24,21,5,25$ | vary (2) |  |
| typical (4) | units (14) | 6,1,10,11,21,2,4,11, | 0:3,8 | $0: 20,10,11,15$ |
| 0:11,9,20,9 | 0:11,14,13,16,17, | 16,11,18,18,8,15,9,16, | vastly (1) | waiting (2) |
| typically (11) | 20,24,2,2,12,20,21,4,5 | 20 | 0:11 | 0:9,13 |
| 0:10,18,19,17,15, | Unity (3) | used (22) | vegetation (2) | wall (2) |
| 22,22,8,8,25,13 | 0:2,4,8 | 0:3,3,23,20,23,15, | 0:17,13 | 0:17,2 |
| $\mathbf{U}$ | unknowable (2) $0: 19,22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,6,18,23,23,11,12, \\ & 19,19,8,17.14 .12 \end{aligned}$ | vehicle (2) $0: 23,6$ | wand (1) |
|  | unknowingly (1) | useful (1) | vehicles (5) | wants (4) |
| UI (1) | 0:8 | 0:24 | 0:3,13,25,2,13 | 0:20,24,10,12 |
| 0:6 | unknown (2) | user (1) | veneer (3) | warming (1) |
| ultimate (1) | 0:21,18 | 0:5 | $0: 17,20,10$ | 0:19 |
| 0:17 | unknowns (1) | uses (2) | verbatim (1) | warrant (1) |


| 0:10 | 0:17 | 6,17,22,8,1,4,20,7,16, | 0:18 | years (47) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| waste (3) | whole | 22,6,17,4,9,16,21,8, | word (5) | 0:2,2,21,1,7,9,17,8, |
| 0:4,5,12 | 0:5,16,14,3,17,3,21, | 18,24,3,9,15,20,6,12, | 0:19,22,1,1, | 6,15,18,3,18,20,24, |
| wasteful (1) | 25,21 | 15,21,3,10,17,18,5,21, | worded (1) | 12,24,22,9,19,16,4,5, |
| 0:17 | wide (4) | 3,8,14,8,20,25,3,7,19, | 0:16 | 5,14,22,14,17,19,9,1, |
| water ( | 0:2,6,1,1 | 25,4,13,17,23,10,20, | words (5) | 6,8,20,13,21,25,22,14, |
| 0:3,6,24,6,10,16,5 | width (12) | 15,23,25,15,22,1,6,12, | 0:6,5,13,10,5 | 12,22,9,11,16,18,13, |
| 13,16,6,4,1,23,7,18, | 0:13,13,15,24,6,17, | 17,24,12,6,10,14,18,1, | work (37) | 16 |
| 13,20,24,17,4,7,9,22, | 22,24,2,10,5,12 | 5,13,20,11,19,2,20,25, | 0:20,6,6,9,18,14,1, | yesterday (1) |
| 3,23,1,3,9,6,18,9,5,15, | wife (1) | 9,12,3,7,24,11,16,20, | 21,19,23,12,6,23,13, | 0:15 |
| 13,14,17,21 | 0:7 | 16,9,24, $8,15,8,22,3$, | 13,3,19,2,2,7,18,19,3, | York (5) |
| Waterbury (1) | wildlife | 12,19,25,5,11,19,23,1, | 7,21,16,17,17,4,6,15, | 0:21,17,12,25,5 |
| 0:7 | 0:1 | 13,20,25,6,13,23,2,11, | 17,19,23,16,16,6 |  |
| Waterside (6) | willing | 1,5,14,17,12,25,13,24, | worked (1) | $\mathbf{Z}$ |
| 0:23,3,6,20,24,19 | 0:12 | 13,20,17,3,10,15,6,16, | 0:25 |  |
| way (44) | wind (1) | 7,18,9,14,19,1,7,12, | workhours (1) | zero (2) |
| 0:17,17,24,5,6,13 | 0:20 | 17,25,10,22,22,9,16,5, | 0:14 | 0:6,7 |
| 25,5,23,4,18,11,17,22, | winding | 4,5,12,24,4,8,20,6,12, | working | zeroes (1) |
| 20,18,14,5,6,4,3,17, | 0:10 | 20,16,20,17,7,1,13,3, | 0:14,16,17,17,2,21, | 0:18 |
| 20,12,21,20,5,5,10,8, | windless | 21,3,17,24,4,10,23,4, | 11,12 | zone (7) |
| 6,18,1,12,23,17,6,14, | 0:15 | 5,13,19,17,23,5,11,15, | works (3) | 0:6,13,15,11,19,24, |
| 20,16,14,16,4,10 | window | 20,23,2,8,19,24,7,14, | 0:8,11,10 | 19 |
| ways (5) | 0:5,24 | 1,5,14,20,3,8,11,8,12, | workspace (3) | 0 |
| weather | $0: 24$ | 2,13,23, 11,18,8, | corried (3) | 0 |
| 0:7,12,22,3,4,12,13, | winter (2) | 14,21,25,19,25,16,24, | 0:16,24,2 | 0.998 (1) |
| 17,19, 1, 7, 13, 12, 20, 23 | 0:16,17 | 9,13,16,4,9,17,2,9,13, | worse (1) | 0:25 |
| weatherization (1) | wires (8) | 11,15,18,2,10,16,24, | 0:20 | 000160-kilowatt (1) |
| 0:13 | 0:16,20,14,11,12 | 15,1,8,3,9,17,25,15, | worth (1) | 0:21 |
| weatherize (1) | 16,22,5 | 10,22,1,7,12,24,2,10, | 0:20 | 000458 (1) |
| 0:18 | wish (4) | 15,1,7,14,18,1,17,8,4, | Wow (1) | 0:19 |
| week (4) | 0:22,9,3,18 | 15,20,24,18,22,20,3, | 0:8 | 01 (1) |
| 0:11,2,2,3 | within (16) | 15,23,14,12,5,11,21, | write (2) | 0:4 |
| weekend (2) | 0:18,3,17,18,23,17 | 20,4,12,20,5,22,12,25, | 0:16,11 | 0302 (1) |
| 0:23,20 | 19,23, 13, 16, $, 2,2,21,24$, | 12,14,20,5,7,11,3,19, | written (3) | 0:16 |
| weigh (1) | 10,8 | 7,15,23,25,19,2,2,24, | 0:5,7,7 | 06 (1) |
| 0:18 | without (6) | 11,25,4,20,24,7,25,17, | wrong (3) | 0:14 |
| weld (7) | 0:18,3,21,10,7, | 10,15,11,15,20,4,11,3, | 0:7,22,13 | 06471 (1) |
| 0:1,3,5,8, | withstand (1) | 11,6,16,21, 1,4,9,12, |  | 0:21 |
| welds (1) | 0:13 | 23,7,9,18, 23, 2,9,19, | X | 06702 (1) |
| 0:19 | witness (587) | 24,1,6,10,15,18,1,7, |  | 0:7 |
| well-confined (1) | 0:24,24,3,10,15,7,9, $11,15,16,18,23,25,2,8$, | 16,22,7,10,14,24,8,13, 18,24,4,9,20,25,4,8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { XLPE (10) } \\ & 0: 1,18,21,23,23,15, \end{aligned}$ | 1 |
| Weren't (1) | 10,12,21,25,4,9,18,25, | 16,23,3,9,11,15,22,5, | 2,15,14,1 |  |
| 0:4 | 14,1,10,22,6,20,1,5, | 3,3,6,19,14,23,18,25, | x-ray (3) | 1 (21) |
| west (5) | 12,21,3,13,5,11,22,5, | 19,2,8,1,12,25,18,22, | 0:8,10,20 | 0:11,16,15,19,5,1, |
| 0:17,23,7,9,19 | 15,21,1,19,9,19,21,10, | 1,3,23,4,15,3,17,24, | x-rayed (1) | 11,4,19,8,8,10,9,18, |
| Western (5) | 20,1,8,13,20,24,3,8, | 13,20,3,11,8,12,19,22, | 0:2 | 21,12,22,25,1,24,19 |
| 0:20,22,24,6,19 | 10,14,16,21,4,7,11,18, | 4,22,13,4,17,23,4,10, |  | 1.1 (1) |
| westward (1) | 24,7,13,19,23,2,12,15, | 24,5,11,16,25,4,9,16, | Y | 0:17 |
| 0:10 | 2,9,14,20,23,8,12,21, | 21,1,4,15,22,2,18,25, |  | 1.5 (2) |
| wetlands (3) | 17,25,8,13,20,24,3,10, | 20,3,17 | Ya (1) | 0:3,5 |
| 0:18,3,11 | 19,2,10,14,25,6,13,20, | witnesses (6) | 0:6 | 1.8 (1) |
| What's (12) | 25,6,9,13,3,7,11,17, | 0:17,9,16,3,22,13 | Yankee (2) | 0:8 |
| $0: 2,23,23,14,10,16$ | 21,1,5,14,19,23,4,14, | WMECO (2) | 0:20,3 | 1:49 (1) |
| 14,6,23,7,8,14 | 19,3,12,17,9,11,15,21, | 0:7,16 | yard (4) | 0:21 |
| whenever (2) | 24,11,17,22,1,7,11,21, | woman (1) | 0:18,19,7, | 10 (12) |
| 0:4,22 | 5,11,15,20,1,8,19,6, | 0:17 | yards (4) | $0: 11,9,7,17,9,22,16$ |
| Whereupon (3) | 11,18,21,4,8,13,25,7, | Wonderful (2) | 0:24,3,19,21 | $20,21,16,13,1$ |
| $0: 20,21,13$ | 12,16,23,17,22,9,14, | 0:14,11 | year (20) | 10,000 (2) |
| whiskers (1) | 19,7,13,17,21,2,8,12, | wondering (6) | $0: 9,18,12,1,2,7,2$ | 0:24,19 |
| 0:3 | 25,17,6,16,21,8,14,17, | 0:15,13,9,4,19,10 | 17,21,6,10,18,11,19,3, | 10,400 (1) |
| white (1) | 4,8,13,18,22,3,7,4,19, | wood (1) | 11,6,2,4,18 | 0:25 |


| 100,000 (1) | 1-35 (1) | 0:13 | 0:7,19 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0:25 | 0:21 | 2010 (3) | 29 (13) | 4 |
| 100.0 (1) | 135.5 (1) | 0:3,5,9 | 0:14,17,2,5,8,10,18, |  |
| 0:18 | 0:11 | 2011 (2) | 22,3,6,17,14,21 | 4 (1) |
| 100-foot (1) | 135.8 (5) | 0:19,9 | 290 (6) | 0:7 |
| 0:7 | 0:15,10,12,17,22 | 2012 (2) | 0:20,7,18, 14, 18, 14 | 4.5 (1) |
| 100-year (1) | 13-8 (2) | 0:16,8 | 29th (1) | 0:22 |
| 0:15 | 0:20,2 | 2013 (8) | 0:14 | 40 (10) |
| $107.7(2)$ 0.9 .18 | $14 \text { (3) }$ | 0:13, $13,1,2,8,14,25$, | 2-megawatt (1) | $0: 12,12,14,23,4,11,$ |
| 0:9,18 | 0:22,6,8 | 8 | $0: 24$ | $23,16,24,1$ |
| 10-D (3) | 14,000 (2) | 2014 (7) | 2X (1) | 400 (1) |
| 0:10,20,16 | 0:3,20 | 0:8,1,1,25,21,15,8 | 0:15 | 0:25 |
| 10-K (3) | 140 (14) | 2015 (20) |  | 400-foot (2) |
| 0:13,8,16 | 0:22,22,11,25,4,9,7, | 0:4,11,3,25,2,5,8, | 3 | 0:8,9 |
| 11 (8) | 9,20,8,21,22,13,21 | 11,14,19,22, 1,17,9,10, |  | 40-foot (1) |
| $0: 5,13,5,9,21,3,16,2$ | 140-million-dollar (1) | 14,2,4,21,12 | 3:51 (1) | 0:21 |
| 114 (1) | 0:7 | 2016 (3) | 0:22 | 40-some (1) |
| 0:4 | 14-E (1) | 0:14,6,1 | 3:55 (1) | 0:14 |
| 114.8 (8) | 0:16 | 2017 (2) | 0:22 | $41(2)$ |
| $0: 11,14,18,4,9,17,3$, | 15 (2) | 0:4,12 | 30 (14) | $0: 24,15$ |
| 18 | 0:16,20 | 20-year (1) | 0:17,22, 1, 12,25,23, | 43 (1) |
| 115 (4) | 15-inch (1) | 0:9 | 15,17,8,2,5,8,12,14 | 0:17 |
| 0:20,19,22,3 | 0:22 | 21 (3) | 30.2/40.3/50.4 (1) | 435 (1) |
| 115-cable (1) | 16 (3) | 0:25,9,5 | 0:12 | 0:6 |
| 0:21 | 0:13,14,15 | 21st (1) | 300,00 (1) | 44 (2) |
| 115-kilovolt (2) | 160 (1) | 0:11 | 0:21 | 0:24,6 |
| 0:19,21 | 0:20 | 22 (1) | 30-day (1) | $45(3)$ |
| 115-kV (6) | 16-50P (1) | 0:3 | 0:8 | $0: 17,13,17$ |
| 0:17,13,12,14,15,17 | 0:18 | 23 (6) | 30-degree (1) | 46 (2) |
| 11-megawatt (1) | $17(2)$ $0 \cdot 1,4$ | 0:5,13,2,8,12,18 | 0:14 | 0:17,17 |
| 0:5 11R (1) | 0:1,4 | 24 (5) | 31 (1) | 47 (5) |
| 11R (1) $0: 12$ | 18 (1) | 0:8,23,24,5,12 | 0:24 | 0:25,14,15,6,15 |
| $\begin{gathered} 0: 12 \\ \text { 11-S1 (1) } \end{gathered}$ | 0:5 | 24-hour (2) | 31,835,000 (1) | 48 (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 11-S1 (1) } \\ 0: 23 \end{gathered}$ | $19(1)$ $0: 5$ | $0: 14,18$ $\mathbf{2 5}(\mathbf{1 5})$ | $0: 17$ $32(2)$ | 0:17 |
| 11-watt (1) | 190 (1) | 0:24, 11, 21, 1,3,5,16, | 0:24,19 | $48.7(1)$ 0.15 |
| 0:25 | 0:11 | 10,11,19, 1,1,18,7,18 | 33 (1) | 49 (1) |
| 12 (2) | 1934 (1) | 25,444,000 (1) | 0:17 | 0:17 |
| 0:6,9 | 0:16 | 0:18 | 330 (3) | 4-kV (1) |
| 12:54 (1) | 1969 (2) | $250(2)$ $0: 22,11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 16,7,11 \\ & \mathbf{3 4 5}(\mathbf{2}) \end{aligned}$ | 0:3 |
| 120 (1) | 1-megawatt (1) | $26(7)$ | 0:21,18 | 5 |
| 0:3 | 0:25 | 0:3,18,15,20,3,7,8 | 345-kV (1) |  |
| 13 (4) | 1-percent (1) | 26.7-kV (1) | 0:22 | 5 (3) |
| 0:12,3,10,11 | 0:4 | 0:21 | 35 (2) | 0:4,8,12 |
| 13.2 (3) | 1st (6) | 27 (12) | 0:6,7 | 5,000 (3) |
| 0:18,10,18 | 0:25,18,22, 13,3,2 | 0:14,3,5,9,14,15,15, | 350 (1) | 0:2,15,25 |
| 13.2-kV (3) $0 \cdot 20,20,4$ | 1X (2) $0 \cdot 19$ | 11,18,18,10,13 | 0:13 | 5:00 (2) |
| 0:20,20,4 | 0:19,12 | 27.6 (2) | 35-foot (1) | 0:25,15 |
| $\begin{gathered} 13.8(\mathbf{1}) \\ 0: 4 \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 0:9,24 $\mathbf{2 7 5}$ (1) | $0: 16$ $\mathbf{3 6}(2)$ | $50(9)$ $0: 6,25,20,6,8,12,7$ |
| 131.8 (1) |  | 0:20 | 0:5,9 | $18,12$ |
| 0:8 | 2 (5) | 276 (1) | 37 (1) | $50.4 \text { (2) }$ |
| 13-2 (4) | 0:13,19,9,21,7 | 0:18 | 0:17 | 0:19,20 |
| 0:16,23,24,24 | 2.3 (1) | 27-6 (1) | 37.3 (1) | 500 (4) |
| 133.1 (1) | 0:23 | 0:10 | 0:15 | 500 0:9,11,16,13 |
| 0:10 | $20 \text { (18) }$ | 27-kV (16) | 38 (1) | $500,000(1)$ |
| 134 (1) | 0:14,17,22,3,5,14,7, | $0: 23,24,9,9,18,17,2$, | 0:24 | $0: 9$ |
| 0:20 | 24,3,6,11,6,15,17,6, | 13,21,2,6,21,22,20,25, | 39 (1) | 500-year (8) |
| 134.5 (1) | 14,23,4 | ${ }^{8}$ | 0:17 | $0: 17,22,13,22,25,7,$ |
| 0:6 | 200 (6) | 28 (2) | 3X (1) | $2,8$ |
| $135(4)$ $0: 3,16,18,13$ | 0:21,25,17,16,9,21 | 0:19,24 | 0:15 | 50-odd (1) |
| 0:3,16,18,13 | 2008 (1) | 28,000 (2) |  | 0:7 |



