

In The Matter Of:

*Eversource Energy Application for a Certificate of
Environmental Compatibility and Public Need*

*Continued Public Hearing
September 5, 2017*

*BCT Reporting LLC
PO Box 1774
Bristol, CT 06010
860.302.1876*

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 Docket No. 461A

5 Eversource Energy Application for a Certificate of
6 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for
7 the construction, maintenance, and operation of a
8 115-kilovolt bulk substation located at 290
9 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut, and two
10 115-kilovolt transmission circuits extending
11 approximately 2.3 miles between the proposed
12 substation and the existing Cos Cob Substation,
13 Greenwich, Connecticut, and Related substation
14 improvements.

15
16
17 Continued Public Hearing held at the
18 Connecticut Siting Council, Ten Franklin Square,
19 New Britain, Connecticut, Tuesday, September 5,
20 2017, beginning at 1:04 p.m.

21
22
23 H e l d B e f o r e :

24 ROBERT STEIN, Chairman
25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s :

2

3

 Council Members:

4

 SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,

5

 Vice Chairman

6

 ROBERT HANNON

7

 MICHAEL HARDER

8

 LARRY P. LEVESQUE, ESQ.

9

 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

10

 ROBERT SILVESTRI

11

12

 Council Staff:

13

 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.

14

 Executive Director and

15

 Staff Attorney

16

17

 ROBERT MERCIER

18

 Siting Analyst

19

20

 For EVERSOURCE ENERGY:

21

 CARMODY TORRANCE SANDAK & HENNESSEY, LLP

22

 195 Church Street

23

 New Haven, Connecticut 06509

24

 BY: ANTHONY M. FITZGERALD, ESQ.

25

 MARIANNE BARBINO DUBUQUE, ESQ.

1 A p p e a r a n c e s : (Cont'd)

2

3 For THE TOWN OF GREENWICH:

4 COHEN AND WOLF, P.C.

5 P.O. Box 1821

6 Bridgeport, Connecticut 06601

7 BY: DAVID A. BALL, ESQ.

8 DAVID E. DOBIN, ESQ.

9

10 Intervenor:

11 DWIGHT UEDA

12 Field Point Estate Townhouses, Inc.

13 172 Field Point Road, #10

14 Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

15

16 Intervenor:

17 CECILIA H. MORGAN

18 3 Kinsman Lane

19 Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies
2 and gentlemen. I'd like to call to order a
3 meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council on
4 Docket 461A today, Tuesday, September 5, 2017, at
5 approximately 1 p.m.

6 My name is Robin Stein. I'm chairman
7 of the Connecticut Siting Council. This
8 evidentiary session is a continuation of hearings
9 held on July 13th, July 25th, and July 29th of
10 this year. It is held pursuant to the provisions
11 of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes
12 and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act
13 upon an application from Eversource Energy for a
14 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and
15 Public Need for the construction, maintenance and
16 operation of a 115-kilovolt substation located at
17 290 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut, and
18 two 115-kV transmission circuits extending
19 approximately 2.3 miles between the proposed
20 substation and the existing Cos Cob Substation,
21 Greenwich, Connecticut, and related substation
22 improvements.

23 On May 25, 2017, the Council, pursuant
24 to a request filed by Eversource Energy and the
25 provisions of the Connecticut General Statutes

1 4-181a(b), reopened the May 12, 2016 final
2 decision rendered in this matter.

3 A verbatim transcript will be made of
4 the hearing deposited with the Town Clerk's Office
5 in the Greenwich Town Hall for the convenience of
6 the public.

7 We will proceed in accordance with the
8 prepared agenda, copies of which are available.

9 And we'll start with the appearance of
10 the intervenor, Parker Stacy.

11 Would you please rise and take the
12 oath?

13 P A R K E R S T A C Y,

14 called as a witness, being first duly sworn
15 by Ms. Bachman, was examined and testified on
16 his oath as follows:

17 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go through a
19 series of questions just to verify the material.
20 You can stay seated.

21 DIRECT EXAMINATION

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stacy, you've
23 offered administrative notice items marked as
24 Roman numeral IV, Items A1 and 2.

25 Does any party or intervenor object to

1 the items which Mr. Stacy has requested for
2 administrative notice?

3 (No response.)

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none.

5 (Stacy Administrative Notice Items
6 IV-A-1 and IV-A-2 received in evidence.)

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stacy, you have
8 offered the exhibit listed under the hearing
9 program as Roman numeral IV-B-1. Did you prepare
10 or assist in the preparation of Exhibit IV-B-1?

11 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I don't know
12 which one that is.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: It's your prefile
14 testimony.

15 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I prepared and
16 filed --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Dated July 10, 2017.

18 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I prepared and
19 filed that prefile testimony.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

21 Do you have any additions,
22 clarifications, or deletions, modifications to
23 that exhibit?

24 THE WITNESS (Stacy): No.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is the exhibit

1 true and accurate to the best of your knowledge?

2 THE WITNESS (Stacy): Yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer this
4 exhibit as your testimony today?

5 THE WITNESS (Stacy): Yes.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Does any party or
7 intervenor object to the admission of the exhibit?

8 (No response.)

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none.
10 (Stacy Exhibit IV-B-1: Received in
11 evidence - described in index.)

12 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll start with
13 cross-examination first by staff.

14 Mr. Mercier?

15 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Council members.

17 Mr. Harder is sitting there, so I don't
18 overlook you.

19 MR. HARDER: No questions.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri?

21 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,

22 Mr. Chairman.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon.

25 THE WITNESS (Stacy): Good afternoon.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: How would you envision
2 that a battery system such as Tesla's would be
3 installed and be used in the Town of Greenwich?

4 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I'm not sure how
5 I would envision it. I know how it has been
6 envisioned in other jurisdictions by Tesla and
7 other power companies. And the way that my
8 understanding is, and I'm hoping to get more
9 clarification from Eversource today, is that as
10 the Powerwalls are installed, that they take power
11 during the slack period of the demand overnight
12 and charge themselves up, and then during the more
13 peak demand periods they are discharged by
14 Eversource, or by the utility, in order to balance
15 those demand periods out. They also serve as a
16 battery back-up in case of power outages. And I
17 hope to talk about all of those things today.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: My understanding is
19 that there's a backlog of orders from Tesla. Do
20 you know of any backlog, or how long the wait
21 period would be to get these batteries?

22 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I don't.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: Do you know the life
24 span of the batteries?

25 THE WITNESS (Stacy): My understanding

1 is that, according to the Vermont utility, that
2 they are installing them for a period of ten
3 years, and then they would be taken out, which is
4 what I believe Tesla has called them, their useful
5 life, and then they would be replaced.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Now, judging from the
7 information that you had submitted, everything
8 that I see that's going to charge or power the
9 batteries is solar related. Is that correct in
10 what you've seen for the Tesla batteries?

11 THE WITNESS (Stacy): No, no. They are
12 stand-alone. However, they can be hooked into a
13 solar power system, but they are sold stand-alone
14 as well.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: That's all I have,
16 Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

18 MR. HANNON: I have no questions.
19 Thank you.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

21 MR. LYNCH: Just one quick follow-up to
22 Mr. Silvestri's question. You said the battery
23 life, or the life of the system, would be ten
24 years. Now, Tesla and a lot of other companies
25 are still working on storage batteries. What is

1 the inevitability that as this progresses in two
2 years, five years, there's a more powerful system,
3 would that be used as a replacement, would you be
4 asking the utilities to replace the system?

5 THE WITNESS (Stacy): I can't speak to
6 that because I'm not affiliated in any way with
7 Tesla. The information that I have gotten has
8 been through their web site and a brief phone call
9 with one of their representatives, and a couple of
10 emails that they have sent me. So I don't know
11 the answer to that question.

12 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14 We'll now go to cross-examination by
15 the applicant.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: No questions.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll just see who -- is
18 there anybody from the Office of Consumer Counsel?

19 (No response.)

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Field Point Estate
21 Townhouses?

22 (No response.)

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?

24 (No response.)

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Richard Granoff?

1 (No response.)

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Grouped intervenors,
3 Bella Nonna Restaurant, Greenwich Chiropractic,
4 Joel Paul Berger, and Meg Glass?

5 (No response.)

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

7 MS. MORGAN: I have no questions.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Town of Greenwich?

9 MR. BALL: We have no questions.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Morningside Circle
11 Association?

12 (No response.)

13 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll now go to your
14 turn, Mr. Stacy, to cross-examine the applicant.

15 MR. STACY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 R O N A L D J. A R A U J O,

17 F A R A H S. O M O K A R O,

18 K E N N E T H B O W E S,

19 J A S O N C A B R A L,

20 J O H N C. C A S E,

21 C H R I S T O P H E R P. S O D E R M A N,

22 M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,

23 called as witnesses, being previously duly
24 sworn, testified further on their oaths as
25 follows:

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 MR. STACY: I'd like to begin with my
3 July 14, 2017 question. It's under Stacy 001. It
4 was the only question I had at that point.

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

6 MR. STACY: In Eversource's response to
7 my question, it included the Town of Greenwich
8 nontransmission alternative analysis of 12/12 of
9 '16. And then in your response, the first line of
10 the second paragraph says, "Eversource has worked
11 with the Town of Greenwich during the past year on
12 several energy efficiency initiatives and has
13 identified a potential roadmap..."

14 And then if I go to the town, their
15 supplemental prefile testimony of August 22nd of
16 '17, I'll just read you the one little part, which
17 was also repeated in response to a question by
18 you, I believe, Attorney Fitzgerald. "The town
19 does not agree with the conclusions reached by
20 this analysis," referring back to your
21 nontransmission alternative analysis.

22 My question is this: Has Eversource
23 taken any steps since then to update this analysis
24 and bring it into a place where the town can agree
25 with it?

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Concerning the
2 nontransmission alternatives outside of energy
3 efficiency, I would say we have not. Energy
4 efficiency discussions continue.

5 MR. STACY: And so the town therefore
6 continues to disagree with the report?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe that
8 was their testimony last week, yes.

9 MR. STACY: Thank you.

10 On page 7 -- and I believe this was
11 already referred to indirectly in the question to
12 me -- you have estimated equipment -- sorry. On
13 page 7 you have estimated equipment costs of 15
14 million, including site development costs. Where
15 do these cost figures come from?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So as part of
17 enabling legislation that was passed by the
18 Connecticut Legislature in 2015 --

19 MR. STACY: 2015 you said?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In 2015. The
21 legislature enabled both electric distribution
22 companies, UIL and Eversource, to put forward a
23 proposal for energy storage to DEEP. And they had
24 a docket opened 15-5, which part of it dealt with
25 energy storage. So in preparation for that

1 docket, Eversource went out to 19 manufacturers
2 and got information back from many of them, which
3 included indicative pricing. So while it's not a
4 firm commitment for pricing, it's certainly
5 directional in nature for the cost for a system of
6 this size.

7 MR. STACY: So this was as a result of
8 the IEP that you referred to later on?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was a request
10 for information I think is how we termed it, yes.

11 MR. STACY: Right. And the graph that
12 is on page 7, can you tell me what exactly it is
13 intended to depict? I mean, I tried to respond to
14 a question from the panel, but I suspect that you
15 are in a much better position to explain what that
16 means.

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I can. So
18 along the horizontal scale are the hours of the
19 day, starting at midnight, and going to midnight,
20 then on the vertical scale is the output in
21 megawatts.

22 MR. STACY: Okay.

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): And then there
24 are two lines. There's the original line, which
25 is in red, which would be what the system load

1 would be. Again, this is just a hypothetical or a
2 typical example. And then using the energy
3 storage is the line in blue. So for offpeak hours
4 the system is charging and taking energy from the
5 grid, and then during peak hours it's providing
6 energy to the grid. So therefore, the red line
7 lowers during hours of peak operation, or peak
8 demand, and it goes up a little during hours while
9 the battery system is charging

10 MR. STACY: I'd just ask, is that a
11 better answer to the question you asked me?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: That's really not --
13 you're cross-examining the applicant, not the
14 Council.

15 MR. STACY: Okay. That's fine.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I understand though
17 but --

18 MR. STACY: Moving onto my
19 interrogatory of August 14 of '17, Stacy 001. And
20 in that you refer in your response to the DEEP
21 docket request demonstrating projections, and
22 you've listed a number of 19 vendors. Is this the
23 same request that you were referring to just a
24 moment ago?

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

1 MR. STACY: And so this request took
2 place when again?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be the
4 second quarter of 2016.

5 MR. STACY: And then I just would like
6 to reread my question because apparently at that
7 time requests were made to Tesla employees, two
8 people here, and additionally, a request was sent
9 to the email mailbox. "I have previously
10 submitted information about Tesla's products for
11 battery storage systems and contact information
12 for their representative, Mr. Hawari."

13 And I go on, "Please advise if anyone
14 has contacted Mr. Hawari to see what Tesla might
15 offer Eversource and the Town of Greenwich, who
16 made the contact and when, and what were the
17 results of that contact."

18 So I just repeat my question since your
19 response didn't really answer the specifics of
20 that question.

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): As a public
22 utility in the State of Connecticut, we use a
23 procurement process approved by PURA that doesn't
24 solicit input from a single vendor, but from
25 multiple vendors. In this case, we'd already

1 requested information from Tesla, including three
2 different tries or attempts to get information
3 from them. They did not respond to it. We
4 typically do not reach out to a single employee at
5 a single company for information purposes.

6 MR. STACY: So the answer is that no
7 one has tried to contact him?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

9 MR. STACY: Okay. Moving onto my 8/14
10 of '17, Stacy 002. I asked to project the number
11 of Powerpack and Powerwall Systems needed to
12 achieve 5 megawatt of energy storage, which was
13 incorporated in your report.

14 And your response was, 2,667 units, and
15 at a total cost of 18 to \$22 million, not
16 including replacement of the batteries at the end
17 of their useful life, which would require a
18 similar investment, you say, every 10 years.

19 I just would like to pass these out.
20 I've already given copies to the Siting Council.
21 These come right off the web site that I put in my
22 information on last Thursday, I think it was.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. So what is
24 the question?

25 MR. STACY: I'm waiting for them to get

1 copies.

2 If you look at the first of these,
3 which is the picture of a house --

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): This "Reliable
5 Power Day and Night"?

6 MR. STACY: "Reliable Power Day and
7 Night."

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

9 MR. STACY: Is this -- and if you look
10 at the second page, it says, "Order your
11 Powerwall," and talks about do you have a 1
12 bedroom, 2 bedroom, 6 bedroom home. And it lists
13 prices, 5,500, 700, 6,200, et cetera.

14 Is this where you found the information
15 that you included in the response to me?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe we just
17 used the information that you originally provided
18 in the attachments. I'm not sure if this was
19 the -- it looks like to be the same information,
20 but it was either an email or an attachment to one
21 of the previous correspondence.

22 MR. STACY: I did not send you these
23 web pages. Let me just read your answer. It
24 says, "Per Tesla's web site, the cost for each
25 unit is..., " "700 for the supporting hardware and

1 installation cost," et cetera, and you build that
2 up into a number of 18 to 22 million.

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Okay.

4 MR. STACY: So is this the source of
5 your response to me?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe it's
7 something either you provided or we got from the
8 web site. This response says it's from the web
9 site.

10 MR. STACY: So it was not something I
11 provided, so it would be a response from the web
12 site?

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe that's
14 what the interrogatory statement says, so I would
15 agree with that.

16 MR. STACY: Okay. And would you say --
17 would you agree that, if you go on the web site,
18 that this page of information about the Powerwall
19 is, in fact, aimed at an individual consumer, and
20 if you look at the second page, it says, inquire
21 about the Powerwall for your home? That's the
22 second handout.

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say I
24 would generally agree with that, yes.

25 MR. STACY: And if you look at the

1 dropdowns at the top, you'll see that they say
2 "Solar Panels, Powerwall, Solar Roof, Commercial,"
3 and then the last one says "Utilities." And in
4 the Utilities section is the last handout. There
5 are four pages to it.

6 The first says "Distributed Energy
7 Products," and above that is "Request a call."

8 Second, "Learn about Powerpack."

9 The third, "Inquire about our utility
10 products and services."

11 And the last says, "Request a call"
12 also.

13 Did anyone from Eversource request one
14 of those calls?

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not to my
16 knowledge, no.

17 MR. STACY: Okay. So moving onto my
18 Stacy 003 of 8/14 of '17. In the attachment that
19 I sent you all, entitled "Green Mountain Power web
20 site," the first half of the -- the top half is
21 their home page. And if you click on the picture
22 of that house, the information on the bottom half
23 comes up. And one of the pieces of information
24 that comes up in that web site is that the
25 battery, or batteries, will provide 8 to 12 hours

1 of whole house back-up power.

2 Are you there?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I am not there.
4 I'm sorry.

5 MR. STACY: It was an attachment to an
6 8/31 submission.

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Okay. I didn't
8 have this submission. Sorry. I see it, yes.

9 MR. STACY: And in your previous
10 testimony Eversource has referenced outages in
11 Greenwich, and I made note of three of them --
12 there may have been others -- August 12th a tree
13 fell on the transmission lines. Most customers
14 were back online in six hours. April 16, a
15 transformer went, and that took nine hours. And
16 then the most recent one this summer you've talked
17 about on July 20th, several hundred customers were
18 out of service for two hours.

19 And is it not true that anyone with 8
20 to 12 hours of whole house back-up power would
21 have avoided interruption and had power throughout
22 these and the majority, if I heard you correctly,
23 of recent power failures in Greenwich?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

25 MR. STACY: Thank you. And then they

1 go on to say that they will partner with
2 customers -- I'm just above there. I'll just read
3 the short line. "Partner with customers to
4 utilize the batteries during peak energy times to
5 directly lower costs for customers by reducing
6 transmission and capacity cost."

7 And I'm understanding that this is the
8 same idea that you depict in your graph on page 7,
9 the same that was asked from the panel in your
10 analysis as well. Is that correct, the idea of
11 partnering with customers to utilize batteries
12 during peak energy times to directly lower costs
13 for customers?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Actually, no.
15 The graph that I talked about before was for a
16 grid side or utility battery storage system.

17 MR. STACY: Okay. And would it be
18 correct to say that this would accomplish
19 something similar to that?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It could be used
21 to accomplish something similar. There would have
22 to be other enabling software and hardware control
23 system to do that.

24 MR. STACY: In other words, Eversource
25 would need to control the draw of the power when

1 it was needed and placement of the power when it's
2 not. Is that correct?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

4 MR. STACY: I'm referring now to the
5 New York Times Business Day article of July 29th.
6 I excerpted parts of that, and also included that
7 in an attachment entitled, "New York Times
8 Business Day, July 29, 2017 excerpts." Do you all
9 have that?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's a
11 single-page document?

12 MR. STACY: It was a single page
13 attachment. And in the body of the submission I
14 also included the link to the article itself.

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I have the single
16 page attachment.

17 MR. STACY: Okay. Good. So in the
18 article -- or I should say as a consequence of the
19 article -- I may be a little out of bounds here --
20 but I did speak briefly with a representative of
21 the utility, Green Mountain Power, and they said
22 that "As a result of the article, many utilities
23 have contacted us" -- this is a quote -- "in
24 response to the newspaper article."

25 My question is, is Eversource one of

1 those utilities?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is. I'm
3 not sure if it was in response to this article. I
4 think it was before this article.

5 MR. STACY: And going on in that
6 submission, it says in the article and also in
7 other submissions that I made that they will offer
8 the battery to as many as 2,000 customers,
9 Powerwall, for a one-time payment of \$1,500.

10 And my question is this: How does that
11 compare with the 22 to 24 million for Eversource?
12 I mean, is it just because this is commercial
13 versus -- how do you look at these two items
14 together? What do you make of it?

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I could speculate
16 and respond that I believe Green Mountain Power is
17 aggregating the energy savings and monetizing that
18 so they are able to buy down the initial costs of
19 the Powerwall units and the installation costs for
20 their customers. Eversource is not allowed to do
21 that in the State of Connecticut.

22 MR. STACY: Okay. So we don't really
23 know how they make them available at that cost.
24 Is that correct?

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do not know.

1 MR. STACY: Right. And yet, isn't it
2 fair to say that that concept fits with one of the
3 Council's wishes -- I'm not sure who said it --
4 that those that benefit carry the cost versus
5 increasing rates on all ratepayers statewide?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't know
7 that. I don't know how Green Mountain Power is
8 charging or absorbing the costs for the program.
9 I know what they're charging the end use customer
10 based on this newspaper article. I don't know how
11 the remaining customers pay for that.

12 MR. STACY: Is it true that even the
13 \$1,500 fits pretty well per customer -- would fit
14 pretty well in the concept that those who benefit
15 carry the costs?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't know
17 what -- based on the costs of being, in our
18 estimate, 5,500 plus the installation, so it would
19 be quite a bit higher than that, so they're
20 getting a subsidy from the utility to install the
21 Powerwall units.

22 MR. STACY: Okay. So you don't know?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): All I know is
24 what the list price is, and what, according to the
25 article, what the cost to the Green Mountain Power

1 customer is. It looks like it's about 25 percent
2 of the actual cost of the unit.

3 MR. STACY: \$1,500?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

5 MR. STACY: And if that were available
6 at those types of costs, would that not be of
7 interest to Eversource?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, in this
9 case it would appear that hypothetically the
10 utility is giving a 75 percent subsidy for
11 customers that sign up for this program. So that
12 means the customers that sign up for it get the
13 benefit of a reduced cost. They get the benefit
14 of some period of uninterruptible power during
15 emergencies. But the rest of the customers would
16 be paying their 75 percent share. So I think it's
17 a cost shifting. So it's not the person that's
18 receiving the benefit is paying the entire cost.
19 They're getting subsidized at about 75 percent.

20 MR. STACY: I appreciate the answer.
21 I'm gathering that that is just a hypothetical
22 answer, though, that whoever has been in contact
23 with Green Mountain Power doesn't know exactly how
24 the thing works, how they interface with Tesla,
25 how the money comes in, how it goes out, and what

1 the customer result is, all those factors are
2 really not known to Eversource. Is that correct?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say
4 that's accurate.

5 MR. STACY: Elsewhere in the article --
6 I won't belabor the thing -- it points out the
7 fact that Green Mountain Power is a B Corporation.
8 Are you familiar with a B Corporation?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I am not.

10 MR. STACY: In the newspaper article it
11 says, "In 2014 the utility became a B Corporation.
12 That is a voluntary designation requiring
13 executives to take into account not just how
14 decisions will affect profit of the shareholders,
15 but also how they will affect the public,
16 generally defined as society or the environment."

17 And if I may, if we look on the B
18 Corporation web site very briefly, "B Corps are
19 for-profit companies certified by the nonprofit B
20 Lab to meet rigorous standards of social and
21 environmental performance, accountability, and
22 transparency."

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a question,
24 because I think the answer I heard was that they
25 are not familiar with that, so --

1 MR. STACY: My question was, is
2 Eversource a B Corporation, or is planning to
3 become one?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't believe
5 that we are, and I don't know what our future
6 plans are in that regard.

7 MR. STACY: Okay. Thank you.

8 So reading through the entire New York
9 Times article, which I referenced last Thursday,
10 isn't it true that all reported initiatives
11 reported in that article come from the utility,
12 and there's no mention of any initiative on the
13 part of any municipality or jurisdiction?

14 THE CHAIRMAN: And what's the relevance
15 of the question?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't see a
17 reference to any other utilities in this.

18 MR. STACY: That there has been a wish
19 stated that the Town of Greenwich would do more,
20 and this article would imply that to do more in
21 Vermont is Green Mountain Power. That's the
22 relevance.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. In Vermont it's
24 relevant. But let's go on because we're not in
25 Vermont.

1 MR. STACY: Okay. As you said last
2 time.

3 In the article the executive says, "The
4 opportunity for us is to lead the transformation
5 of an electric system that depends on power sent
6 along big transmission lines to a community home
7 and business based energy system."

8 And when I go back to the quote that I
9 originally referenced from your chairman --
10 president, rather, Mr. Judge, that Eversource is
11 going to be the leading -- I'm sorry, I don't have
12 it. I have to dig it out.

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's Stacy
14 Question 003?

15 MR. STACY: Yes. It's buried in a sea
16 of paper here. That Eversource would be "the
17 catalyst for change and opportunity in New
18 England." And given what we see here, the stated
19 intention to lead the transformation from big
20 transmission lines to a community home and
21 business based service, promoting a distributed
22 energy storage system, becoming a B Corporation,
23 isn't it fair to say that Eversource is up against
24 serious competition for that designation in New
25 England?

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I can talk
2 about what Eversource does in this regard.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I'd actually prefer if
4 you just answer yes or no.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: The question asked for
6 a comparison between Eversource --

7 THE CHAIRMAN: If you can do it briefly
8 because --

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we spend \$500
10 million a year in energy efficiency in New
11 England. We have partnered with a supplier for
12 renewable energy for 1,090 megawatts coming from
13 Hydro-Quebec in Canada. We're preparing a bid
14 right now for 800 megawatts of offshore wind in
15 the State of Massachusetts. We're participating
16 with the State of Massachusetts for the
17 600-megawatt energy storage proposal. In each one
18 of these cases there has to be enabling
19 legislation for a regulated utility to respond to
20 that.

21 In 2015 we worked with the Connecticut
22 Legislature to propose legislation that would
23 allow utilities to own and operate energy storage.
24 That translated into a DEEP proposal in Docket
25 15-5 where we, as well as United Illuminating,

1 submitted proposals for energy storage in the
2 State of Connecticut. Both of those proposals
3 were rejected by the state because we could not
4 show a cost benefit for them. And furthermore,
5 they challenged us to use traditional alternatives
6 that were lower cost than energy storage. We are
7 trying to rework our proposal now to lower the
8 cost of energy storage and resubmit to that.

9 So I believe that we're very active in
10 the states we're allowed to, and in the states
11 where we're not allowed to yet, we seek
12 legislation. For example, the Governor recently
13 signed a bill for fuel cells that, again, would
14 allow utilities to own and operate fuel cells in
15 the State of Connecticut. We endorse that. We
16 worked with the Legislature to write that bill.
17 It was ultimately approved and signed by the
18 Governor.

19 So where we're able to, we clearly
20 strive to fulfill the requirements Mr. Judge has
21 laid out.

22 MR. STACY: So to be the catalyst for
23 change and opportunity in New England, what I hear
24 you say is that you are doing the best you can
25 under the circumstances that confront you, and

1 that if another utility in the State of Vermont is
2 giving you stiff competition, that it is because
3 they have a more user friendly environment in
4 their state legislature and elsewhere. Is that
5 correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's not what I
7 said. And I don't think you characterized what
8 we're trying to do. Where the rules don't
9 presently exist, we work with the policymakers to
10 write new rules that will, again, enable clean
11 energy. And in the case of fuel cells in
12 Connecticut, it also has an economic development
13 angle because we're the fuel cell capital of the
14 world with many jobs created here in Connecticut.
15 So it makes natural sense for us to push for that
16 renewable energy in the state. I can't speak to
17 the State of Vermont.

18 MR. STACY: I know. I know that. I
19 think that concludes my questions.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

21 So we'll now go to staff, Mr. Mercier,
22 for additional cross of the applicant.

23 MR. MERCIER: I just have a few
24 questions regarding the town's prefiled testimony
25 of July 18th. That was an additional distribution

1 slash reliability solution presented on pages 23
2 and 24. And in that item there was several
3 bulleted -- in that response there were several
4 bulleted items. So I just want to review each of
5 the items and ask your opinion as to what you
6 thought of the reliability benefits of each.

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I have the
8 testimony.

9 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. So bullet
10 one, obviously as part of the town's proposal
11 here, it's a new indoor substation at 281 Railroad
12 Avenue in place of the aged equipment at Prospect
13 Substation. So, first off, is Eversource in
14 agreement that, yes, a new substation would be
15 required, whether it's indoor or outdoor?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

17 MR. MERCIER: And item two here is
18 reconductor and reconfigure all four of the
19 27.6-kV feeders. And I believe in the
20 cross-examination of Mr. Mailman, he specified the
21 use of the modern feeders. I'll just call them
22 that. That's the term he used. And what is your
23 sense of the reliability of replacing all four
24 feeders with these new type of feeders to provide
25 power to the new Greenwich Substation?

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We've used the
2 reduced insulation size or smaller conductor size
3 for about 20 years in Connecticut. In this case
4 the replacement of these feeders with larger
5 conductors is not possible. We consulted both of
6 our equipment suppliers, Okonite, as well as
7 Kerite, and the dimensions that would be required
8 to fit in a 4-inch duct bank would be -- the
9 cables are too large to do that at a higher
10 capacity than what we have today. So that would
11 entail providing an alternate path and a new duct
12 bank system.

13 So this is very similar to distribution
14 Option 4 that we proposed to the town. We went
15 through those limitations of that proposal which,
16 while it's technically possible to do that, it is
17 an inferior project. It does not solve the issues
18 at Cos Cob Substation being a single point of
19 failure, as well as the configuration of the 2X
20 and 3X transformers and the potential for a bus
21 fault on the 27-kV system at Cos Cob. It also was
22 a more expensive project than what we had
23 proposed, that entire solution. It was \$122
24 million, and that would be an entire distribution
25 cost. There would be no costs borne by customers

1 outside of Connecticut, so it would be much more
2 costly to the average customer in Connecticut than
3 the proposed project we have.

4 So I would not agree that we could
5 reconductor and reconfigure these feeders to solve
6 the issue for this project.

7 MR. MERCIER: And I assume obviously
8 associated with that was bullet three which was,
9 as you just mentioned, reconfigure, so that
10 wouldn't work is what you're stating, just because
11 you can't fit the new type of technology in there.
12 Is there a slightly larger cable that could fit
13 into these existing duct banks or --

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not as a standard
15 size. You might be able to special order
16 something. But again, to have an equipment
17 manufacturer build and warranty that product, and
18 then to have a unique system, or a unique type of
19 conductor on the system, we don't think it's a
20 prudent option, nor does it solve the issues at
21 Cos Cob Substation.

22 MR. MERCIER: Regarding the chart you
23 just mentioned as Option 4, this is similar to
24 that one. There was -- I misplaced my chart.
25 Anyway, I have some notes. In the options on the

1 right-hand side, say for Option 3, it basically
2 said something to the effect that a new substation
3 would have to be constructed, and I believe you
4 say for Option 3 the cost was \$102 million for
5 that option. But on the right-hand side it said a
6 new substation had to be constructed. Are you
7 stating that is for the replacement of the
8 Prospect, or an additional substation?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I was actually
10 referring to distribution Option Number 4, the
11 next one.

12 MR. MERCIER: I know. I understand
13 that. I just have a general question regarding
14 that table. That statement, it's in several
15 options. I just want to confirm that. When you
16 say a new substation, you're talking about a new
17 Greenwich Substation, not an additional one on top
18 of, say, the one that's proposed?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. If you look
20 at the fourth bullet down, it says a new
21 substation on Railroad Ave. It could be either
22 location, but it would be a new Greenwich
23 Substation --

24 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Referring to that.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): -- to replace the

1 Prospect Street Substation.

2 MR. MERCIER: And do those costs that
3 are listed for all the options at the new
4 substation, is that new substation included in the
5 cost?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

7 MR. MERCIER: All right. Thank you.

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's an
9 equivalent project for the same capacity.

10 MR. MERCIER: Going back to the July
11 18th prefile testimony on page 23, we just talked
12 about the first three bullet items. And the last
13 bullet item on page 23 has to do with the Tomac
14 Substation. And they're concerned about the
15 reliability of that station serving the customers.
16 Now, would the proposed project do anything for
17 the Tomac Substation?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would not.

19 MR. MERCIER: So that's a whole
20 separate issue?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): And I spoke to
22 some of that in the last meeting as well. We do
23 have plans to convert the 4.8-kV system there, and
24 provide a redundant backup at the 13.2-kV level,
25 but it is outside of the scope of this project.

1 MR. MERCIER: What type of equipment is
2 being installed to accomplish that redundant
3 backup?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In this case each
5 of the distribution or customer transformers would
6 be replaced with dual voltage transformers, 13.2
7 and 4.8 kV. So we would require an investment to
8 replace that. The pole tops on the distribution
9 side would probably have to be rebuilt as well. I
10 believe we identified about 105 Frontier telephone
11 poles or utility poles that would need to be
12 replaced to be larger in size to allow the
13 electrical clearances at 13.2 kV. And then the
14 substation equipment could then remove the 4.8 kV
15 transformer and 4.8-kV switchgear at the Tomac
16 Substation.

17 MR. MERCIER: Just out of curiosity, do
18 you have an anticipated timeline for that?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe it's
20 scheduled now in the 2018/2019 time frame.

21 MR. MERCIER: There was also some
22 discussion regarding the single transmission tap
23 to Tomac. Is there any plan to -- or is there any
24 concern that there's just one tap there? Is there
25 any plan to upgrade that to a two tap --

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There is. And
2 this is a substation, along with many others in
3 the Connecticut service territory, that Eversource
4 has plans to upgrade. It's on a list and is
5 prioritized based on the number of customers and
6 the cost to make those upgrades. But we would
7 intend to remove the three terminal line at this
8 location and have two two-terminal lines take its
9 place to alleviate the loss of any one
10 transmission circuit taking out Tomac Substation.

11 MR. MERCIER: You just mentioned it's
12 on a list. Do you have any idea where on the
13 list? Is this like ten years down the road, 15?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Certainly within
15 the ten-year window. I can't say if it's three
16 years or five years out. It would require, again,
17 planning studies and work with ISO New England.
18 And this, along with many others in the State of
19 Connecticut, are things that we will ultimately
20 get to.

21 MR. MERCIER: I have no other
22 questions. Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

24 Any cross by the Council of the
25 applicant?

1 Mr. Harder.

2 MR. HARDER: I just have a couple of
3 questions. Last week I think the town was
4 questioning you, Mr. Bowes, about a lot of things,
5 but one of the issues concerned the different
6 feeders that exist on the system down in
7 Greenwich. And I think you had indicated -- one
8 of the questions concerned data that was
9 available, or not, and you were going to be
10 providing some data on feeders out of the Cos Cob
11 Station. I think you said three years of data
12 would be provided for that. And I just wanted to
13 be sure. I wasn't sure of the specific question
14 that was asked. Are there any other feeders? I
15 think you had indicated there was no data for one
16 particular feeder, maybe all feeders, out of the
17 Prospect Substation.

18 My question is, are there any other
19 feeders besides the three out of the Cos Cob
20 Substation for which you do have information?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I believe we
22 talk about four feeders out of Cos Cob
23 Substation --

24 MR. HARRINGTON: Four, okay.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): -- that feed the

1 Prospect Substation. We did file that update for
2 three years of data. I believe that data is
3 available for all feeders out of Cos Cob, but not
4 available from the other substations in Greenwich.

5 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

6 Also, just one other question. This is
7 on the response to interrogatories dated August
8 22nd. Let's see. Council 02. A question about
9 costs associated with the architectural treatment
10 of 281 Railroad Avenue, and the town requested a
11 pedestrian bridge. The question was, would it not
12 be regionalized, but rather be borne by
13 Connecticut ratepayers? The response is a little
14 bit of -- I think it's a little confusing. Could
15 you answer that more specifically? Is it going to
16 be borne in each of those cases borne generally by
17 the Connecticut ratepayers or locally or
18 regionally in Greenwich?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I will start, and
20 John may be able to supplement what I'm saying as
21 well, is that for the architectural treatment for
22 the substation, that would be a distribution cost
23 shared by all CL&P ratepayers. For the pedestrian
24 bridge, it would be a local network service
25 transmission cost. The allocation of those costs

1 are about 60 percent to Connecticut ratepayers,
2 and about 40 percent to ratepayers outside of
3 Connecticut.

4 MR. HARDER: So none of it's going to
5 be directed at the Greenwich ratepayers?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's no --

7 MR. HARDER: Excuse me. None of it,
8 other than that which is covered by that 60
9 percent figure, or generally by --

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I think I
11 understand your question. None of those costs
12 would be localized specifically to Greenwich
13 customers, but Greenwich customers would pay their
14 share of those costs for the distribution tariff
15 for the architectural treatment, and they would
16 pay their share of the 60 percent of the local
17 network service transmission cost, but no more
18 than their share.

19 MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you. No
20 other questions.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

22 Mr. Levesque?

23 MR. LEVESQUE: No further questions.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri?

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 Last week there was discussion with the
3 town about splice vaults, and I believe they're on
4 the Bruce Park area, that the number of splice
5 vaults could be reduced. What's your opinion on
6 reducing that number?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I know John
8 has looked at this, so I'm going to direct it to
9 John.

10 THE WITNESS (Case): Thanks. So the
11 town request was to avoid vaults in Bruce Park.
12 The length from Indian Field to the Davis Avenue
13 underpass is roughly about 4,000 feet. So we
14 don't believe it's feasible to avoid the entire
15 park without a vault. It's too long of a pull.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: Different question.
17 Could you explain the role of firewalls within a
18 substation?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. We place
20 firewalls between transformers, power
21 transformers, in substations to limit the impact
22 of one transformer on the adjacent or other
23 transformers within the substation. They also are
24 very effective at attenuating sound levels.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: If I look at the

1 diagram for the substation proposed at 290
2 Railroad Avenue, it appears that both transformers
3 would be surrounded by firewalls. Is that
4 correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Is there a
6 reference, just to make sure?

7 MR. SILVESTRI: This goes back to
8 volume two, and it's appendix 4, and it's the
9 drawing in red that's on the back page of the
10 substation location.

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So though the
12 diagram does show potentially four walls, there's
13 really three there. The connection for the 115 kV
14 to the -- well, it's on the top of the page --
15 that is actually open. So the firewall is
16 actually on three sides to the east, south and
17 west of each of the transformers, but it is open
18 or exposed back towards the 115-kV system or
19 towards Railroad Avenue.

20 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. And at least
21 with the transformer on the east side, there's
22 also a potential for a removable firewall on that
23 side. Is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, there would
25 be to transport or replace the transformer.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: The reason I'm asking,
2 Airgas is to the south, basically, of that
3 proposed site at 290 Railroad Avenue. Would an
4 additional firewall somewhere south of the
5 transformer setup be another safety precaution?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is actually
7 proposed here. Do you see the wall around the
8 substation? It is a wall, not a fence. So the
9 wall just to the south of what says distribution
10 switchgear, that rectangular building fed from two
11 transformers, there is another 15-foot wall at
12 this location just to the south.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm not sure if I
14 really see that here.

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So around the
16 entire perimeter of the substation, and you can
17 see there are various arrows that say A and B,
18 there's a property line depicted with a dashed
19 line, and then just inside that, a few feet,
20 there's an entire wall around the substation.

21 MR. SILVESTRI: And that wall would be
22 acting as a firewall as well?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would. It's
24 fireproof and 15 foot in height.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. Thank you. I

1 don't have any further questions.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

3 MR. HANNON: I do not have any
4 questions other than the fact that he just asked
5 the one I was going to ask. Thank you.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Sorry about that.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

8 MR. LYNCH: No questions.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: I think I just have one
10 question. In Eversource's experience in
11 Connecticut, is it always the utility, in this
12 case Eversource, who takes the initiative
13 regarding energy efficiency and renewable
14 projects? Are there any -- and I don't need
15 examples -- cases where municipalities also not
16 only take initiatives but contribute to these
17 programs?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. I'll start,
19 and Mr. Araujo maybe can add as well. I would say
20 that there are many communities inside the State
21 of Connecticut that are very active with zero
22 energy or no carbon programs, and have taken
23 pledges to that effect. I also think the
24 Connecticut Green Bank, Connecticut DEEP, and the
25 PURA are also, I would say, very progressive in

1 these programs. And I would say we have one of
2 the leading programs in the country for energy
3 efficiency in the State of Connecticut.

4 THE WITNESS (Araujo): Just to add to
5 that, projects do come in from a variety of means.
6 Eversource technical professionals do go out and
7 visit customer sites to help identify
8 opportunities and propose energy efficiency
9 projects. We also have a vast vendor network that
10 we meet with on a regular basis to make sure that
11 they're out there exploring projects and bringing
12 them to us, so that way we can get them done. And
13 customers do identify them on their own and ask
14 for help, and we'll either work with a contractor
15 directly, or bring it to Eversource and we'll work
16 with the customer directly.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: To make my question more
18 specific. Municipalities, do they on occasion
19 take the lead and also contribute and work with
20 you?

21 THE WITNESS (Araujo): Yes, they do.
22 And the Town of Greenwich has taken the lead in a
23 couple of instances of the projects we've worked
24 with them in the past. And we've also worked with
25 them to help identify projects.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

2 Okay. We'll continue. Let's see who
3 else wants to cross-examine the applicant.

4 Office of Consumer Counsel?

5 (No response.)

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Field Point Estate
7 Townhouses?

8 MR. UEDA: We have no questions.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?
10 Richard Granoff?

11 (No response.)

12 THE CHAIRMAN: I'll get to the town. I
13 haven't gotten there yet.

14 Richard Granoff?

15 (No response.)

16 THE CHAIRMAN: The grouped intervenors,
17 the restaurant, the chiropractic, Joel Paul
18 Berger, and Meg Glass?

19 (No response.)

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

21 MS. MORGAN: I have no questions.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Morningside Circle
23 Association?

24 (No response.)

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Town of Greenwich?

1 MR. BALL: Thank you.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Excuse me,
3 Mr. Chairman. I have two matters, if you'd
4 indulge me. One is that Eversource filed a
5 supplemental response to one of the
6 interrogatories at your direction, and that has
7 not yet been adopted. So I would suggest that it
8 would be appropriate to do that at this time.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure. Would you put
10 that into the record?

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.

12 Now, Mr. Bowes, directing your
13 attention to item 15 under part II-B of
14 Eversource's exhibits, entitled Eversource
15 Energy's supplemental response to Town of
16 Greenwich Set Two Interrogatory No. 77, dated
17 September 1, 2017. Is the information in that
18 response true and correct to the best of your
19 knowledge and belief?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: And so I'd offer that
22 as a full exhibit.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any
24 objection from any of the intervenors?

25 MR. BALL: No.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Seeing none, the exhibit
2 is added to the record.

3 (Applicant's Exhibit II-B-15: Received
4 in evidence - described in index.)

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Now we'll have
6 cross-examination by the Town of Greenwich.

7 MR. FITZGERALD: My other query --

8 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: -- is it's a little
10 unusual. So is the Town of Greenwich's
11 cross-examination that we're going to hear now, is
12 it limited to the new matter that has been asked
13 about today, or is it just a wide open opportunity
14 to ask all the questions that they didn't think of
15 before?

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I would certainly hope
17 that it is limited. We've already had ample time.
18 Is that correct?

19 MR. BALL: Yes, that is correct,
20 Chairman. And I intend to cross-examine on the
21 new information.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

23 MR. BALL: Thank you.

24 CROSS-EXAMINATION

25 MR. BALL: Good afternoon, Mr. Bowes.

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Good afternoon.

2 MR. BALL: In the new exhibit, which is
3 Exhibit 77, or it's the exhibit in response to
4 Town 77, that's what you just filed. Right?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

6 MR. BALL: Just so that I understand
7 what the exhibit purports to show, it is a graphic
8 depiction in 2014, '15 and '16 of the actual loads
9 on the four feeders that go from Cos Cob to
10 Prospect during the 24-hour peak load in any given
11 year. Is that accurate?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): The peak load
13 day, yes.

14 MR. BALL: The peak load day. So if I
15 were to take 2015, we know from what you've given
16 us what Cos Cob's peak load was, and what you've
17 done is shown the actual distribution of the load
18 across the four feeders on the day that the peak
19 load occurred. Is that accurate?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it's based
21 on the Cos Cob.

22 MR. BALL: On the Cos Cob. Thank you
23 for clarifying. That's what I meant, yes.

24 Now, one of the points, Mr. Bowes, that
25 the company has made to support the claim of a

1 need for this project is based on computerized
2 simulations of certain contingency events where
3 the 27.6-kV feeders from Cos Cob to Prospect are
4 shown to exceed their rating. Are you familiar
5 with that?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I am.

7 MR. BALL: And you provided those
8 single contingency scenarios in response to Siting
9 Council Question 1. Right?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): And it was also
11 in the prefile testimony.

12 MR. BALL: That's right.

13 So a single contingency scenario,
14 Mr. Bowes, is where you assume one of those four
15 feeders going from Cos Cob to Prospect is out of
16 service. Right?

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

18 MR. BALL: And then you look at the
19 peak load, and the computer simulation tells you
20 what the load would be on the remaining three
21 feeders that are in service. Is that basically
22 it?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

24 MR. BALL: And that's how you plan.
25 You plan for that single contingency where one of

1 those four feeders is down to see how the other
2 three feeders can handle the load. That's part of
3 your planning process?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's part of
5 the planning process, yes.

6 MR. BALL: And part of your claim in --
7 do we have CSC 1?

8 So CSC 1 -- this is what you provided
9 to us -- it shows some of the results of your
10 single contingency scenario simulations. Am I
11 right?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

13 MR. BALL: All right. So if I were to
14 look at 2015, let's just take 2015 -- there we go,
15 okay -- so the demand, it says 114.8 MVA, that was
16 the peak load at Cos Cob for 2015. Right?

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

18 MR. BALL: And then you've run four
19 different computerized simulations showing each of
20 the four feeders being out of service, and the
21 correlating increase in load on the other feeders?

22 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

23 MR. BALL: So I'm just going to focus
24 on one of the computerized simulations, and then
25 I'm going to connect all this. 11R52, do you see

1 that second column, "OOS" where it's out of
2 service?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I do see it.

4 MR. BALL: When that happens, according
5 to the computerized simulation, 11R51, the load
6 goes to 135 percent of its normal cable rating?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

8 MR. BALL: And that's presumably a
9 concern for the company?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

11 MR. BALL: And according to the
12 simulation, 11R55 also exceeds the normal cable
13 rating, 104 percent?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

15 MR. BALL: And 11R58 is 65 percent, so
16 it's within its normal cable rating. Right?

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

18 MR. BALL: Now, let's take a look at,
19 if we can, the new chart in response to Town 77.
20 So this is what you just filed.

21 All right. Now, let's take a look at
22 2015, because I just looked at it. Here we go.
23 So if we look at 2015 at the peak load moment,
24 there actually was a failure of one of those four
25 feeders going from Cos Cob to Prospect. Am I

1 right? I'm looking at 11R52, Mr. Bowes.

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the failure
3 occurred around 1700?

4 MR. BALL: Yes.

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm not sure when
6 the actual peak load occurred.

7 MR. BALL: Okay. But it was on this
8 day?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was definitely
10 on this day. It may have been a little earlier in
11 the day.

12 MR. BALL: Okay. Fair enough. But
13 what we see is --

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was about
15 1530, I believe, is when the peak occurred.

16 MR. BALL: So at some point one of the
17 four feeders goes out of service. Right?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): The 11R52, yes.

19 MR. BALL: Right. And then if you look
20 at 1800 hours, you see an increase in the load
21 being carried by the other three feeders. Do you
22 see that?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I do.

24 MR. BALL: So if I'm understanding the
25 chart, this is actual, this is not a computerized

1 simulation, this is actually what your data shows.
2 Right?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

4 MR. BALL: So let's just look at each
5 one. 11R51, that's the blue one. It looks like
6 at 1800 hours it's just shy of 30 MVA?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe the
8 number is 29.5.

9 MR. BALL: 29.5. 11R55, which is the
10 gray one, looks to be 25 MVA?

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes,
12 approximately.

13 MR. BALL: And 11R58, which is the
14 yellow one, goes up to 15 MVA. Right?

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes,
16 approximately 15.

17 MR. BALL: So when 11R52, the orange
18 one, goes out of service, the load gets shifted to
19 the other three feeders, right, the load that
20 would have been carried?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Instantaneously,
22 yes. And then a switching can occur after that.

23 MR. BALL: Sure. So you're not
24 surprised to see an increase in the load being
25 carried by the other three feeders when 11R52 went

1 down. That's how the system is designed to work.
2 Isn't that right?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

4 MR. BALL: And because the system
5 worked -- in fact, there was no impact to
6 customers on that day in 2015. Right?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Not for this
8 fault, no.

9 MR. BALL: So let's take a look at the
10 ratings of these feeders, what you call the normal
11 rating. 11R51, based on your response to Town
12 Question 1, has a normal rating of 24.6 MVA?

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

14 MR. BALL: And what you're showing here
15 is that it was at 30 MVA for that moment in time
16 at 1800 hours. Right?

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

18 MR. BALL: Okay. 11R55 has a normal
19 rating of 32.5 MVA?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

21 MR. BALL: And, as we just discussed,
22 when the load got shifted, it peaked at 25 MVA on
23 this chart. Right?

24 MR. FITZGERALD: I'm going to object to
25 that question. I don't think you meant to say

1 when the load gets shifted. Do you mean when the
2 load redistributed?

3 MR. BALL: I'll accept your
4 terminology, Mr. Fitzgerald.

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, that's
6 correct.

7 MR. BALL: So, just sticking with
8 11R55, when the load increased to 25 MVA on that
9 feeder, it was well within its normal rate of
10 32.5?

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): For that feeder,
12 yes.

13 MR. BALL: So that feeder did not
14 overload?

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

16 MR. BALL: And, in fact, it's -- unless
17 my math is wrong -- it was loaded to 76.9 percent
18 of its normal rating. Right?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Subject to check
20 on the math, I'll agree with that.

21 MR. BALL: Good. And if we go back to
22 your computerized simulation, 11R55, when 11R52
23 goes out of service, you projected would exceed
24 its normal rating, it would have gone to 104
25 percent?

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

2 MR. BALL: But in actuality that's not
3 what happened?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Because we
5 shifted load.

6 MR. BALL: Okay. Because you have the
7 ability to do that, you were able to shift load?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

9 MR. BALL: 11R58, the yellow feeder,
10 has 15 MVA at 1800 hours?

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

12 MR. BALL: That was the actual load on
13 the feeder. And its normal rating being 25.6 MVA.
14 I'm sure you'll confirm that's true.

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

16 MR. BALL: So at that moment in time at
17 1800 hours in 2015, 11R58 was loaded to 58.6
18 percent of its normal rating?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Subject to check
20 on the math, I'll agree.

21 MR. BALL: However, your computerized
22 simulation shows a higher -- even though it was
23 within the rating, it shows that you projected a
24 load of 65 percent higher than in actuality?

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

1 MR. BALL: And similarly, I'll go
2 through the same exercise with 11R51, your
3 projection of 135 percent against the normal
4 rating with 11R51 having a normal rating of 24.6,
5 it's closer to about 120 percent of its normal
6 rating, in actuality, it didn't get as high as
7 your simulation?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'd say
9 approximately, yes.

10 MR. BALL: So when the actual event
11 happened that 11R52 went out of service, you got a
12 real-life opportunity to see how the system
13 operated, as compared to a computerized
14 simulation. Right?

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

16 MR. BALL: And in actuality the system
17 worked in multiple respects, first of all, load
18 was redistributed to the other feeders. You agree
19 with that?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, as well as
21 other feeders.

22 MR. BALL: Okay. And --

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm not sure you
24 understood me when I said we redistributed load to
25 other circuits, not these four, but other

1 circuits.

2 MR. BALL: Understood. I'm just trying
3 to understand what happened in this contingency.
4 In this contingency customers were not impacted by
5 the peak load that occurred that day?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

7 MR. BALL: Under real-life conditions
8 customers did not lose power that day. Right?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

10 MR. BALL: And in actuality, the loads
11 shown on the other three feeders that were in
12 service did not reach the loads that you projected
13 in your computerized simulation. Right?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say none
15 of the three circuits hit their projected loads.

16 MR. BALL: Right.

17 THE WITNESS (Omokaro): Okay. Can I
18 just make one statement about that? That's
19 because the simulations that we do does not
20 include load shifting. So that's what Ken was
21 trying to make a distinction.

22 MR. BALL: Thank you.

23 THE WITNESS (Omokaro): It's
24 instantaneous. The minute you take an element out
25 of service, it redistributes the load. So the

1 table is accurate based on that. So it's two
2 different factors that you're looking at, before
3 shifting and after shifting.

4 MR. BALL: Right. So because the
5 company has the ability to shift load, the concern
6 about the cables reaching 135 percent of their
7 rating in actuality doesn't come into play?

8 THE WITNESS (Omokaro): Agreed, but
9 that's after shifting.

10 MR. BALL: Understood.

11 THE WITNESS (Omokaro): I just want to
12 make sure you understood that.

13 MR. BALL: Because you have the ability
14 to engage in actions to avoid the contingency
15 simulations that your computer shows?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, I would say
17 that we can avoid the full extent of them.

18 MR. BALL: Fair enough.

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In this case the
20 one circuit was still 20 percent overloaded. We
21 made a conscious decision to shift load to the
22 11R53 and 54, and accept an overload on those two
23 circuits to minimize the overload on these
24 remaining three.

25 MR. BALL: The effect of which was that

1 it worked, you would agree?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): And that's the
3 whole idea of using short-term ratings to deal
4 with this type of situation.

5 MR. BALL: One last question, if I may,
6 Mr. Bowes. These charts all assume a normal cable
7 rating. You gave us those ratings. We're all
8 working off of those numbers. They assume a 75
9 percent load factor?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): They do.

11 MR. BALL: The higher the load factor,
12 the less the capacity of the feeder?

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Could you repeat
14 that?

15 MR. BALL: Yeah. If I have a load
16 factor of, let's say, 70 percent, instead of 75
17 percent, the feeder is going to have more
18 ampacity; is it not?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So I wouldn't say
20 it has anymore ampacity. It just means how we
21 would rate the cables differently.

22 MR. BALL: Okay. So you've chosen to
23 rate it at 75 percent load factor. Correct?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

25 MR. BALL: If you had rated it, let's

1 say, at 70 percent load factor, you might not have
2 had a situation where the load to ratings is shown
3 to be as great a percentage. Would you agree with
4 that?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So again, I'm not
6 quite clear on the question.

7 MR. BALL: If you have a lower cable
8 rating, if you rated them lower, right, you would
9 have the ability to carry more load on that cable
10 without there being a concern about overloads
11 against rating?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So you've asked a
13 different question this time.

14 MR. BALL: Okay. Go ahead.

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So you said lower
16 cable rating. If the rating were lower, the
17 overloads would be higher. If the capacity
18 factors were lower, the overloads would be lower.

19 MR. BALL: Okay.

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): But you mixed two
21 different things.

22 MR. BALL: Okay. Fair enough. So you
23 would agree that, depending on how you rate the
24 cables, that has an impact in determining whether
25 the cable is overloaded when we use that term?

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

2 MR. BALL: And -- well, I'll leave it
3 at that. I have nothing further.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: One follow-up question.

5 MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
6 I'm just curious, on the shifting that you were
7 talking about. Is this done automatically, or is
8 it manual, or a combination thereof?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the initial
10 shifting of load that takes place instantaneously
11 is automatic. So when that cable faulted, the
12 flows automatically redistribute around the
13 system. Then the operators look at what overloads
14 they have on the system and manually reconfigure
15 the system. So that will take a series of either
16 automatic switching steps, which can be directed
17 by the control center, or in some cases manual
18 switching steps where you have to dispatch someone
19 to the field to make field switching to effect the
20 change in flows around the system. Most of the
21 work we can do in Greenwich is automatic in
22 nature.

23 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Next we're going
25 to have the town come for cross-examination.

1 But Attorney Fitzgerald, do you have
2 any redirect at this point, or do you want to
3 continue?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, yes, just very
5 quickly.

6 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Bowes, are these
8 cable ratings and load factors assigned
9 arbitrarily, or is there some underlying basis for
10 them?

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We base our
12 ratings on IEEE standards, AEIC standards, and
13 industry accepted practices. We tend to be, as I
14 mentioned before, we tend to use emergency ratings
15 for equipment sometimes two hours, sometimes 22
16 hour, that most other utilities do not. And we've
17 done that to avoid capacity additions over many
18 decades. Our sister utility, NSTAR, does not use
19 emergency ratings. United Illuminating does not
20 use emergency ratings. Con Edison does not use
21 emergency ratings. So we are reevaluating whether
22 we should be using emergency ratings, especially
23 locations, for example, at Cos Cob, where there's
24 no other backup. Other locations on the system we
25 can accept a two-hour or 22 hour, because we can

1 shift loads away from bulk substations. In
2 Greenwich we don't have that opportunity.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: On the 2015 peak day
4 you did shift some load?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We thought the
6 risk to the three remaining feeders from Prospect,
7 or Cos Cob to Prospect, was a greater risk than
8 the two feeders to North Greenwich. So we did
9 shift the load. We could not sustain a second
10 loss of one of those remaining three circuits, but
11 we could sustain a loss of one of the circuits to
12 North Greenwich. So it was a calculated risk that
13 we took to minimize the loading on those three
14 remaining circuits and only put one of them into a
15 20 percent overload.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: What was the
17 consequence of shifting the load to the North
18 Greenwich feeders, what was the consequence to
19 those feeders?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's a
21 consequence to any feeder that you overload, you
22 sustain loss of life. And we project to take a 2
23 percent loss of life every time we do that. So
24 the reliability of the 11R51, the 11R53, and the
25 11R54, we lost life on those cables by doing that.

1 MR. FITZGERALD: That's all I have.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: So we'll take a
3 five-minute break while I guess Eversource and the
4 town shift seats.

5 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
6 and a recess was taken from 2:28 p.m. until 2:36
7 p.m.)

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, everybody.
9 We'll now resume our cross-examination.

10 First, Mr. Mercier.

11 MR. BALL: Chairman Stein, if I may,
12 just a housekeeping matter. We do have a new
13 exhibit, a Late-Filed exhibit, that we should,
14 with your permission, I'd like to just put into
15 the record.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Do you want
17 to go through the process of verifying it?

18 MR. BALL: Yes. Thank you, Chairman
19 Stein.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 J A M E S W. M I C H E L,
2 A M Y J. S I E B E R T,
3 B R U C E S P A M A N,
4 M I T C H E L L E. M A I L M A N,
5 K A T H A R I N E A. D E L U C A,
6 D E N I S E M. S A V A G E A U,

7 called as witnesses, being previously duly
8 sworn, testified further on their oaths as
9 follows:

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 MR. BALL: And I'll just direct -- this
12 is a Late-File exhibit, dated September 1, 2017.

13 Ms. Savageau, I'll just ask you.
14 Exhibit 4 for identification is a Late-Filed
15 exhibit filed by the town September 1. Did you
16 participate in the creation of that exhibit?

17 THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.

18 MR. BALL: Is the exhibit true and
19 correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

20 THE WITNESS (Savageau): Yes.

21 MR. BALL: With that, I'll offer it,
22 Chairman Stein.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection?

24 (No response.)

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none.

1 (Town Late-Filed Exhibit X-B-4:
2 Received in evidence - described in index.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I can't help but remark
4 that the installed renewable energy I see, New
5 Haven, Bridgeport, Hartford, Waterbury, among the
6 top ten. That's quite outstanding for cities
7 which are either on the verge of or in bankruptcy.
8 So I just couldn't help it. You submitted that.
9 That struck me more than whoever placed 40 or
10 another town that I was once upon a time involved
11 with, which is way down the list. But okay.

12 Mr. Mercier?

13 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions.
14 Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go to the Council.
16 Mr. Harder?

17 MR. HARDER: No questions.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Levesque?

19 MR. LEVESQUE: No.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri?

21 MR. SILVESTRI: No, sir.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

23 MR. HANNON: No, I do not. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch?

25 MR. LYNCH: No questions.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stein. Okay.

2 So we'll now go to cross-examination by
3 the applicant.

4 MR. BALL: Chairman Stein, if I may, I
5 assume the same ground rules are going to apply to
6 the town. We've just submitted a new exhibit.
7 Mr. Fitzgerald had substantial cross-examination
8 last time. I assume his cross will be limited to
9 the new exhibit.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I assume so.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: I have no questions.

12 MR. BALL: That answers my question.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Office of
14 Consumer Counsel? They're right here in this
15 building, but they can't seem to -- okay.

16 Field Point Estate Townhouses?

17 Yes. I think you can sit next to
18 Attorney Fitzgerald. That shouldn't be a problem.

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 MR. UEDA: All right. I've heard
21 people say that the town tried to influence the
22 Department of Transportation to reject the
23 Metro-North Railroad route. Can you tell me what
24 happened?

25 MR. FITZGERALD: Objection. This is

1 not a new matter that has been introduced. It's
2 the last cross-examination.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, he didn't have a
4 chance to cross-examine before so --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Oh.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: So I guess I'll allow it
7 up to a point, as long as you're not going to --
8 so respond to that question.

9 THE WITNESS (Mailman): Mr. Ueda, I
10 think you might be a little mistaken here. I
11 don't think anybody specifically said that the
12 town tried to influence DOT, because the truth of
13 the matter is, there are only two people in this
14 room who were in that meeting. Now, I tried to
15 convey what happened last time. In fact, I asked
16 the person questioning do you want to know what
17 happened in that meeting, and that person said no
18 I don't. But Mr. Michel was in the same meeting
19 that I was at.

20 THE WITNESS (Michel): Yes. And the
21 purpose of the meeting was for the town to get
22 clarity on how the long-term maintenance and
23 reliability and the replacement of our force main
24 system would be handled, assuming that this
25 project would be constructed. We went there

1 primarily to find out what the rights are that the
2 town would have to access that through DOT, and
3 find out what DOT -- how it may look if DOT
4 planned to expand I-95 or the Metro-North
5 corridor.

6 THE WITNESS (Mailman): You also have
7 to remember, all right, that we had no way to know
8 at that point the hybrid scheme wasn't approved.
9 We couldn't believe, or couldn't even fathom that
10 anybody would offer something to the Council for
11 their approval that had not yet been vetted by
12 DOT. So there was never, never any thought in our
13 mind, all right, that this could be rejected.

14 If you remember, in Docket 461 the
15 utility testified that DOT did not want them in
16 the Metro-North right-of-way. So as soon as they
17 presented the hybrid route to us, we presumed that
18 they had already gotten DOT to reverse their
19 position.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ueda, one thing I
21 will not though permit. We had testimony at the
22 last meeting on this. And if you weren't there,
23 you weren't there, but I'm not going to allow you
24 to go over testimony that we heard basically the
25 same testimony. So you're going to have to -- you

1 know, you should have been there.

2 MR. UEDA: Okay.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: You're going to have to
4 ask questions that are either on the Late-Filing,
5 or somehow figure out what was not asked because
6 we all heard this. We don't have to hear it
7 twice.

8 MR. UEDA: Okay. So let me ask my
9 questions. Then I can ask -- I'll leave it up to
10 you as to whether you'll permit the question.
11 Would that work?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

13 MR. UEDA: I appreciate that. Thank
14 you.

15 Should Greenwich residents be concerned
16 about the reliability of electric service if this
17 project is not built? Are the lights about to go
18 out if Eversource's application is denied?

19 THE WITNESS (Mailman): I certainly
20 think that's probably the most relevant question
21 asked ever, all right, if you don't build the
22 project what happens. But I really don't want to
23 answer yes or no, because I don't want to be in a
24 situation where someone could take my words out of
25 context. All right. But in truth, the answer is

1 yes and no.

2 We've outlined numerous reliability
3 issues, numerous issues. I don't want to repeat
4 the testimony, but we heard how there are only two
5 circuits coming into Cos Cob, both of which are on
6 the same structures, which in a lot of utilities
7 is known as zero contingency. All right. We
8 heard Mr. Bowes testify that 11 of the top 100
9 worst distribution circuits, 13-kV circuits, are
10 in Greenwich

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Again, we heard all
12 this.

13 THE WITNESS (Mailman): And by the
14 way --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: You're going to have to
16 go -- no. We heard you before.

17 THE WITNESS (Mailman): I have --

18 THE CHAIRMAN: No, we heard you
19 already.

20 THE WITNESS (Mailman): What happens if
21 I have something more to say? Am I not allowed to
22 say it?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm the chairman. I'm
24 sorry. I'm still the chair of this. That
25 question, you answered it, and you gave detailed

1 explanation at the last meeting. So I don't see
2 any reason why we have to go over this.

3 So what's your next question?

4 MR. UEDA: Okay. I understand from
5 your testimony last week that you disagree with
6 certain data, such as the peak demand forecast
7 provided by Eversource. Can you elaborate?

8 MR. FITZGERALD: I'm going to object.
9 This is clearly -- this may be why Mr. Mailman
10 decided he could come back. This is a series of
11 questions designed to throw softballs so that
12 testimony that has already been given can be given
13 again or repackaged or improved. It has nothing
14 to do with the interests stated of Field Point
15 Estates or stated in their prefile testimony.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. You really
17 should have been here. These are rehashing.
18 You're giving them an opportunity of -- we've had
19 detailed answers. I don't quite understand why
20 you were not here last week, and you're here today
21 asking questions that somebody could have told you
22 that we've already gone over in detail. I don't
23 understand. I wish you'd explain why you're doing
24 this.

25 MR. UEDA: Well, the reason why I'm

1 doing this, as I said, I was unfortunately away
2 with family --

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That's unfortunate. But
4 everybody else has spent hours here we spent on
5 this, and I don't think -- it's not fair.

6 MR. UEDA: But that said, a lot of
7 these people are paid to be here as well. I had
8 personal business as well.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm sorry. I'm
10 not worried about those people. That's not the
11 point. Obviously people who are sitting there are
12 also paid to be here. That's definitely not the
13 point. The point is --

14 MR. UEDA: Right. But the question was
15 directed at me as to why I'm here now.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right.
17 Well --

18 MR. UEDA: No. I apologize. I
19 understand your point that you want to be
20 expedient.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, then you should
22 have been prepared to ask questions that are
23 germane and were not asked and answered in detail
24 at the last meeting.

25 MR. UEDA: Okay.

1 MR. BALL: May I, Chairman Stein,
2 address this one particular question that I heard?
3 Two things. One, I don't believe all the
4 intervenors had a chance to ask questions. So
5 whether he was here or not, I still think he has a
6 right to ask questions. I think the question
7 related to data, I don't remember that question
8 coming up in cross in the last hearing. So to me
9 it's an open question that hasn't been asked
10 before.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, the
12 intervenors have had ample opportunity. We've
13 gone, as we did today, gone through the list. And
14 if you're here, you get a chance. If you're not
15 here, what would you like me to do?

16 MR. BALL: I was simply responding to
17 your point that I think -- I thought that
18 particular question happened to be something that
19 hadn't been asked before.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll allow that
21 particular question, but I'm just telling you, I'm
22 not going to allow other questions that we've gone
23 through.

24 MR. UEDA: Okay. I appreciate that. I
25 understand.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I hope you do.

2 MR. UEDA: Well, the problem is, I
3 don't have the benefit of having been to the last
4 meeting, so I don't know which questions have been
5 asked. So I'll leave it up to you --

6 THE CHAIRMAN: And apparently you're
7 not relying on the Chair to tell you. All right.
8 Let's see if we can get a concise answer to that
9 question.

10 THE WITNESS (Mailman): I believe the
11 question is, have I questioned data. Right. We
12 sat here today, and we heard the utilities say
13 that they have maximum load data on all eight
14 feeders coming out of Cos Cob, yet when we asked
15 for it, we were only given four, and we were given
16 it in chart form. So yes, I believe there's data
17 out there, but understand something. If you go
18 back to Docket 461, what was the most repeated
19 number, 130.5 MVA. That was known as the maximum
20 peak load sustained at Cos Cob in 2013. It just
21 so happens, when you do the math, it doesn't equal
22 130.5, it equals 126.7 MVA. Right.

23 I got questioned last time as to why I
24 carried on about one-tenth of an inch, and I
25 explained that one-tenth of an inch makes a

1 difference between duct sizes that are 6 inch and
2 duct sizes that are 8 inch. In any event, the
3 number is critical is 130.5 MVA to have been wrong
4 by that high a percentage. And understand, from
5 an engineering standpoint, had it been reversed,
6 had you added up the five loads and they came out
7 to 130.5, but the load at Cos Cob was 126, you
8 could explain that. What's being offered today is
9 simply unexplainable.

10 Another situation. Mr. Case testified
11 last week that if you reduce --

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Objection. The answer
13 is far beyond the question.

14 THE WITNESS (Mailman): I don't think
15 so.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: It's just a speech.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: It always is. But can
18 you wrap up your --

19 THE WITNESS (Mailman): Yes. Mr. Case
20 testified last week that if you save \$10 a foot on
21 the conductor, it would equal \$60,000 over the
22 cost of the project. By my math, there's over
23 70,000 feet of conductor needed to do the 115-kV
24 feeder from Cos Cob to Prospect. That's a savings
25 of \$700,000.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

2 MR. UEDA: Can you explain why you
3 believe that Greenwich's outage problems can be
4 solved with a distribution solution, and why you
5 think Eversource has always pushed for a
6 transmission solution?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: You don't have to
8 object. That was discussed in detail. So that
9 question has already been --

10 MR. UEDA: Okay. Can I ask, would you
11 consider the transmission solution to be an
12 example of gold plating or gilding the lily?

13 THE WITNESS (Mailman): Absolutely.
14 Absolutely. If you think about Con Edison --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: You got the answer. You
16 got the answer.

17 MR. UEDA: I got the answer. You're
18 right.

19 And then I also understand there was a
20 discussion about the failures of the 27.6-kV
21 cables. Do you believe that this can be addressed
22 easily and inexpensively?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: That was also dealt
24 with.

25 MR. UEDA: I have no other questions.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

2 Okay. Next Christine Edwards?

3 (No response.)

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Richard Granoff?

5 (No response.)

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Grouped intervenors,
7 Bella Nonna Restaurant, Greenwich Chiropractic &
8 Nutrition, Joel Paul Berger, and Meg Glass?

9 (No response.)

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

11 Thank you. And, if I'm not mistaken, I
12 believe you were here last week, so we should not
13 have the same issues I had with --

14 MS. MORGAN: I didn't address anybody
15 last week.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: No, no, but you were
17 here, so you know what the questions were.

18 MS. MORGAN: Well, forgive me, I'm not
19 a technical person, so sometimes my questions
20 might sound like somebody else had asked them.
21 And I'll ask it, and if you don't allow it, then I
22 understand.

23 This is for Ms. Savageau because she's
24 our conservation director.

25 Denise, I wonder how do you feel that

1 the town's efforts to conserve energy and reduce
2 demand at town facilities have worked?

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Savageau, whom I
4 have a great deal of respect for, answered that
5 question in full. And I thought your answer was
6 fine. And I don't see any reason necessarily to
7 elaborate.

8 MS. MORGAN: You're saying she answered
9 it last week?

10 THE CHAIRMAN: She's answered the
11 question in one of the hearings.

12 MS. MORGAN: Okay. Because I don't
13 recall seeing that in any transcript.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. And whatever
15 didn't answer verbally, if you look at what was
16 just submitted by the town, it's answered in
17 considerable detail there. So I think we have the
18 answer to that question.

19 MS. MORGAN: That's fine.

20 This is for Ms. Siebert. How could we
21 expedite and improve progress toward energy
22 conservation and demand reduction on the grid in
23 town overall, residential, commercial, industrial?

24 THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to make
25 specific on how you can, I assume that means in

1 the future beyond what you're doing, you can
2 answer that question.

3 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

4 THE WITNESS (Siebert): Okay. Well,
5 I'll throw in my two cents then, and Denise, if
6 you have anything you want to add.

7 I think what we're trying to do moving
8 forward, I think you're suggesting, Chairman
9 Stein --

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I think that was it,
11 what can you do. So I assume what can you do is
12 future.

13 THE WITNESS (Siebert): As we upgrade
14 all our facilities, whether it's something as
15 mundane as our treatment and collection
16 facilities, as we deal with all our town
17 buildings, we look at how to make them more energy
18 efficient, we look at all the best lighting, we
19 are looking at alternative energies, we're looking
20 at whether we can use more solar, and so forth.
21 So everything we have available to us because, of
22 course, that would also lower our bills, in
23 addition to making us save energy.

24 We also are very much looking forward
25 to -- and I think Denise outlined it in

1 information that was given -- to do a lot more
2 work with Eversource. We'd love to, you know,
3 deal with those large clients that they alluded
4 to. We don't know who they are, but we'd love to
5 team up with them to try to help them see what we
6 can do to help them save energy, talk of all the
7 benefits of same.

8 What else am I leaving out there,
9 Denise?

10 THE WITNESS (Savageau): I think
11 there's two things when we're talking about energy
12 conservation and where we want to go with the
13 town. And one is what the town can do, and then
14 what the greater community within the town can do.
15 And with the information I provided you, one of
16 the things we looked at was what's the percent of
17 energy used by the town versus what's used
18 overall.

19 So the town is about 3 percent of the
20 energy used, about 6 percent -- or, excuse me,
21 about 12 percent of the large users. So obviously
22 the town knew by example we needed to do that, but
23 to solve -- and this is where all communities are
24 working on it, or working on their clean energy
25 community programs. When we talk about the town,

1 we talk about the town in general, and I think we
2 really need people to understand that, that when
3 you're talking about a municipality making a
4 pledge to reduce its energy use, then it's about
5 the town, but only as a leader, and not to really
6 get where you need to go for net zero.

7 So I think when you're looking at this
8 particular problem and how the town could address,
9 for example, like, okay, that nagging issue, what
10 about peak? Can we address it a different way?
11 Can we look at microgrids? Can we look at things?

12 So that's where I think is the
13 opportunity. Amy alluded to working on the energy
14 efficiency, and we are doing that. But the piece
15 that's not being discussed, the piece that we
16 really want to engage in, is how do we work on not
17 only the energy efficiency, but how do we expand
18 this conversation to the grid solution which is, I
19 think, where we need to go. And I think there are
20 opportunities.

21 Public Act 15-5, Section 103, not only
22 starts working on wanting grids, but requires the
23 public utility to submit proposals to Connecticut
24 DEEP Energy Bureau. Under that they put out an
25 RFP last year that was due October 2016. I think

1 it was a perfect opportunity for the town and
2 Eversource to engage in a larger discussion on
3 grids, so that we're talking in that energy
4 efficiency, but we're looking at the grids and how
5 do we get there.

6 Grids are new solutions. They are
7 something that needs to be planned, and you don't
8 just jump on them right away. But I think we can
9 certainly move there. I think there's
10 opportunity. And, by the way, that RFP that went
11 out in October 2016 is still open. It is not
12 closed. There is an opportunity for the town and
13 Eversource to meet this requirement of Public Act
14 15-5, and come up with a solution for a microgrid
15 and the whole -- excuse me -- well, whether it be
16 a microgrid or some type of a community grid, but
17 basically the challenge. And it gets to the heart
18 of the new energy plan that we submitted, the new
19 draft energy plan that the State of Connecticut
20 said can we find alternatives to substations.

21 So that's where I think we can go. I
22 think the town has really worked hard on this
23 saying do we need the energy? What's the nag?
24 What else can we do? And I think the idea is that
25 if in the back is like, well, what if we still had

1 that peak issue, how do we address the peak issue,
2 and I honestly believe that requiring the town, or
3 directing the town and Eversource to work
4 cooperatively on all of this, not just energy
5 efficiency, but on the grid, is a way forward that
6 we could move forward, and we don't have to sit
7 here, Robin, we can actually move this forward and
8 think about a town like Greenwich.

9 I think you saw in some of the numbers
10 with alternatives, and whatever, in the lower
11 Fairfield County, they're not where they should
12 be. So moving not only Greenwich, but lower
13 Fairfield County to looking at modern grids and
14 looking at more alternatives is a good place for
15 us to go.

16 And I had just one comment on the chart
17 I sent out is that the chart that says renewables,
18 that's not renewables being installed by the town,
19 but in the town. And that's why you see the large
20 cities, because there's a lot of folks looking at
21 all the opportunities with large cities, looking
22 at performance contracting, and those type of
23 things, on different facilities to move that
24 forward. So I just want to make sure people
25 understood that report is for all alternatives

1 within a community, not by a community just on
2 town property. So I just wanted to make sure that
3 was clear.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: All the more reason why
5 the next time -- and actually I hope there won't
6 be a next time, at least under these conditions --
7 that we meet that Greenwich will be number 1, not
8 number 40.

9 THE WITNESS (Savageau): That's what
10 we're looking for.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: That should be your
12 challenge.

13 THE WITNESS (Savageau): That's our
14 challenge.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: And then we might not
16 have to --

17 THE WITNESS (DeLuca): We need
18 Eversource's help to do that.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other
20 questions?

21 MS. MORGAN: No. Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

23 I can't quite believe it, but the
24 individual who really runs the Siting Council has
25 just mentioned something about maybe we can go

1 home at some point. So I think we've given all
2 the intervenors a chance to do their cross. If
3 there's anybody else that I've missed, because I'm
4 about to close the hearing, unless --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Is there an
6 opportunity for rebuttal?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: How long? I'm going to
8 ask both of you, because I'm sure if you rebut,
9 there might be somebody else who wants to rebut.
10 I'm going to ask you both how long -- first since
11 you -- how long is your rebuttal planned -- do you
12 plan to --

13 MR. FITZGERALD: I wonder if we -- it's
14 3 o'clock. I wonder if we might take ten minutes
15 so that I could consult with my panel, and then I
16 could give you a more authoritative answer to that
17 question.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: And how many additional
19 minutes do you need to consult with your team
20 before --

21 MR. BALL: I don't need any. When
22 Attorney Fitzgerald says "rebuttal," I'm not sure
23 exactly what he means, other than I assume he
24 wants to call his witnesses to ask them softball
25 questions, as he just criticized an intervenor for

1 doing, which was completely unfair.

2 If he opens up the door to more
3 examination of his witnesses, I intend to
4 cross-examine. It's entirely up to him. I don't
5 think he should be allowed to.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, it's --

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I really hope
8 you're not intending to open it up to that.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, let me share my
10 understanding with you, and maybe I'm wrong. It's
11 been a while since I've done one of these
12 proceedings but, in general, I thought that they
13 operated the same way that a trial does, in that
14 the applicant who has the burden of proof, in
15 addition to -- each party presenting a witness has
16 an opportunity at redirect of that witness. But
17 the applicant, who has the burden of proof of the
18 issue, generally is given an opportunity, after
19 all of the evidence is otherwise in, to present
20 affirmative testimony that responds to points that
21 have been made in the course of the proceeding by
22 the adversaries.

23 And in terms of there being rebuttal or
24 surrebuttals, my recollection is that that's
25 generally not been the case, but the mother of all

1 rules is that you make the rules. So it's
2 entirely up to you whether in this instance you're
3 going to allow the party that has the burden of
4 proof an opportunity for rebuttal, or not. And
5 we'll obviously be guided by that ruling.

6 I will still need to, if there is a
7 consideration of giving us an opportunity for
8 rebuttal, I will need a couple of minutes to see
9 how I can skinny that down. I already left out
10 half my cross because Mr. Mailman wasn't going to
11 be able to be here. But I have had some fairly
12 extensive rebuttal mapped out, but I see that in
13 the interest of expedition it should be cut back.
14 So that's what I need to do, if there's to be an
15 opportunity at all.

16 MR. BALL: May I respond, Chairman
17 Stein?

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

19 MR. BALL: Two quick responses. One, a
20 potshot at Mr. Mailman is below the belt. He
21 cancelled his vacation to come back early at
22 extraordinary inconvenience, so I don't appreciate
23 Mr. Fitzgerald's comment.

24 The second point is that I happen to
25 try cases for a living, as I'm sure Mr. Fitzgerald

1 does as well, and he knows darn well that if this
2 were a courtroom and he wanted to present rebuttal
3 evidence, he would have to be prepared for me to
4 present rebuttal evidence. So what's good for the
5 goose is good for the gander. We can go around ad
6 infinitum. But I expect the town to be treated as
7 fairly as Eversource, and it's up to him as to how
8 much he wants to drag this on.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to take a
10 ten-minute break. I guess, to make sure, in
11 fairness to everybody, we will give both the
12 applicant a chance for, hopefully, a relatively
13 brief rebuttal, and then the town will also have a
14 chance, and then that will be it. We'll be back
15 at 3:15.

16 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
17 3:07 p.m. until 3:17 p.m.)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll resume our
19 meeting.

20 Attorney Fitzgerald.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.

22 Mr. Chairman. Well, cooler heads have prevailed,
23 so we are not going to present a rebuttal case.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

25 Attorney for the town?

1 MR. BALL: We have no further
2 questions.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So before closing
4 this hearing, the Connecticut Siting Council
5 announces that briefs and proposed findings of
6 fact may be filed with the Council by any party or
7 intervenor no later than October 5, 2017. The
8 submission of briefs or proposed findings of fact
9 are not required by this Council, rather we leave
10 it to the choice of the parties and intervenors.

11 Anyone who has not become a party or
12 intervenor, but who desires to make his or her
13 views known to the Council, may file written
14 statements with the Council within 30 days of
15 today's date.

16 The Council will issue draft findings
17 of fact, and thereafter the parties and
18 intervenors may identify errors or inconsistencies
19 between the Council's draft findings of fact and
20 the record. However, no new information, no new
21 evidence, no argument, and no reply briefs without
22 our permission, will be considered by the Council.

23 Copies of the transcript of this
24 hearing will be filed at the Greenwich Town
25 Clerk's office.

1 And I hereby declare the hearing
2 adjourned. Thank you all for your participation.
3 And drive home safely.

4 (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused
5 and the hearing adjourned at 3:19 p.m.)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 95 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Council Meeting in Re: DOCKET NO. 461A, 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, Connecticut, and two 115-kilovolt transmission circuits extending approximately 2.3 miles between the proposed substation and the existing Cos Cob Substation, Greenwich, Connecticut, and related substation improvements, which was held before ROBERT STEIN, Chairman, at the Connecticut Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on September 5, 2017.



Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R., 061

Court Reporter

1 I N D E X

2

3 WITNESS PARKER STACY PAGE 5

4 EXAMINERS:

5 The Chairman

6 Mr. Silvestri

7 Mr. Lynch

8

9 WITNESSES KENNETH B. BOWES PAGE 12

10 FARAH S. OMOKARO

11 JASON CABRAL

12 MICHAEL LIBERTINE

13 CHRISTOPHER PAUL SODERMAN

14 RONALD J. ARAUJO

15 JOHN C. CASE

16 EXAMINERS:

17 Mr. Stacy

18 Mr. Mercier

19 Mr. Harder

20 Mr. Silvestri

21 The Chairman

22 Mr. Ball

23 Mr. Hannon

24 Mr. Fitzgerald

25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s : (Cont'd)

2

3 WITNESSES JAMES W. MICHEL PAGE 68

4 AMY J. SIEBERT

5 MITCHELL E. MAILMAN

6 KATHARINE A. DELUCA

7 DENISE M. SAVAGEAU

8 BRUCE SPAMAN

9 EXAMINERS:

10 Mr. Ball

11 Mr. Ueda

12 Ms. Morgan

13

14 PARKER STACY EXHIBIT

15 (Received in evidence)

16 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

17 IV-B-1 Parker Stacy's pre-filed 7

18 testimony, dated 7/10/17

19 APPLICANT'S EXHIBIT

20 (Received in evidence)

21 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

22 II-B-15 Eversource Energy's 50

23 supplemental response to Town of

24 Greenwich Set Two interrogatories

25 No. 77, dated September 1, 2017

1 A p p e a r a n c e s : (Cont'd)

2

3 TOWN OF GREENWICH EXHIBIT

4 (Received in evidence)

5 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

6 X-B-4 Town of Greenwich Late-Filed 69

7 Exhibit, dated September 1, 2017

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25