## In The Matter Of:

Application for Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate

Evening Hearing Docket No. 466 March 1, 2016

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

Original File 16-03-01 - Part 03.txt

Min-U-Script®

1	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2	CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
3	
4	Docket No. 466
5	Application for Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate
6	of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kilovolt
7	Electric Transmission Line Project that Traverses the Municipalities of Watertown, Thomaston,
8	Litchfield and Harwinton, which Consists of (a) Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a New
9	115-kilovolt Overhead Electric Transmission Line Entirely Within Existing Eversource Right-of-way
LO	and Associated Facilities Extending Approximately 10.4 Miles Between Eversource's Existing Frost
L1	Bridge Substation in the Town of Watertown and Existing Campville Substation in the Town of
L2	Harwinton; (b) Related Modifications to Frost Bridge Substation and Campville Substation; and
L3	(c) Reconfiguration of a 0.4 Mile Segment of Two Existing 115-kilovolt Electric Transmission Lines
L <b>4</b>	Across the Naugatuck River in the Towns of Litchfield and Harwinton Within the Same Existing
L5	Right-of-way as the New 115-kilovolt Electric Transmission Line
L6	Transmission Line
L7	Public Hearing held at the Northfield
L8	Volunteer Fire Department, 12 Knife Shop Road,
L9	Litchfield, Connecticut, Tuesday, March 1, 2016,
20	beginning at 6:29 p.m.
21	
22	
23	Held Before:
24	SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairman
25	

1	Appearances:
2	
3	Council Members:
4	PHILIP T. ASHTON
5	ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee
6	LARRY LEVESQUE, PURA Designee
7	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
8	
9	Council Staff:
LO	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.
L1	Executive Director and
L2	Staff Attorney
L3	
L <b>4</b>	ROBERT MERCIER
L5	Siting Analyst
L6	
L7	For the Connecticut Light and Power Company
L8	d/b/a Eversource Energy:
L9	CARMODY TORRANCE SANDAK & HENNESSEY LLP
20	195 Church Street
21	New Haven, Connecticut 06509
22	BY: ANTHONY M. FITZGERALD, ESQ.
23	
24	
25	

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call this hearing of the Connecticut Siting Council to order this evening, March 1, 2016, at approximately 6:30. My name is Jerry Murphy. I'm the Vice Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. And I'm chairing this evening in the absence of our Chairman. Other members of the staff here this evening are Robert Hannon, the designee for

evening are Robert Hannon, the designee for
Commissioner Robert Klee of the Department of
Energy and Environmental Protection; Larry
Levesque, the designee for Chairman Arthur House
with the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority;
Philip T. Ashton; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.
Members of the staff, Attorney Melanie Bachman,
Acting Executive Director and Staff Attorney, and
Robert Mercier, our siting analyst on this file.

This is a continuation of a public hearing that began on Tuesday, February 23, 2016, at the Connecticut Siting Council offices in New Britain and was continued here at 3:30 p.m. this afternoon. Copies of the hearing program and the Council's Citizen's Guide to Siting Council Procedures are available for members of the public. And they're over on the table, if anyone

cares to help themselves to them.

1

This hearing is held pursuant to the 2 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General 3 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative 4 Procedure Act upon an application from the 5 Connecticut Light and Power Company, doing 6 7 business as Eversource Energy, for a Certificate 8 of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for 9 the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kilovolt electric transmission line project that traverses 10 the municipalities of Watertown, Thomaston, 11 12 Litchfield, and Harwinton, which consists of (a) 13 construction, maintenance and operation of a new 115-kilovolt overhead electric transmission line 14 15 entirely within existing eversource right-of-way and associated facilities extending approximately 16 10.4 miles between Eversource's existing Frost 17 18 Bridge Substation in the Town of Watertown and Existing Campville Substation in the Town of 19 Harwinton; (b) related modifications to Frost 20 Bridge Substation and Campville Substation; and 21 22 (c) reconfiguration of a 0.4 mile segment of two existing 115-kilovolt electric transmission lines 23 24 across the Naugatuck River in the Towns of 25 Litchfield and Harwinton within the same existing

- right-of-way as the new 115-kilovolt electric transmission line. This application was received by the Council on December 23, 2015.
- The applicant published notice of this 4 5 filing with the Council in the Litchfield County Times on December 11 and 18, 2015; the 6 7 Republican-American on December 15 and 17, 2015; and the Torrington Register Citizen also on 8 December 15 and 19, 2015. The Council's legal 9 10 notice of the date and time of this hearing was published in the Republican-American on January 11 12 26, 2016. Upon the Council's request, the 13 applicant erected signs at conspicuous locations along the project route and at both substations so 14 15 as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of facility, the hearing date 16 17 and its location, and the contact information for

This afternoon members of the Council, staff and public personally conducted a field review of the proposed project in order to observe first-hand the potential effects of this proposal.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this Council.

This hearing tonight has been reserved first for the public to make short statements into the record. These public statements are not

subject to questions from the parties or the Council, and members of the public making statements may not ask questions of the parties or the Council. These statements will become part of the record for the Council's consideration. sign-up sheet is available for those who would like to participate, and the sign-up sheets are on the table, again, off to my left. 

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

I wish to note that the parties and intervenors, including their representatives and witnesses, are not allowed to participate in the public comment session this evening. I also wish to note for those who are here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for this public comment session, that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of this date, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken tonight at this hearing. If necessary, party and intervenor cross-examination that began this afternoon at 3:30 may be continued after the

public hearing.

We ask that each person making a public statement in this proceeding this evening to confine his or her statements to the subject matter before the Council and to avoid unreasonable repetition so that we may hear all of the concerns you and your neighbors may have. Please be advised that the Council cannot answer questions from the public about this proposal.

A verbatim transcript will be made of this hearing and deposited with the Towns of Watertown, Thomaston, Litchfield, Harwinton, Plymouth and the City of Waterbury Clerk's Offices for the convenience of the public.

Normally we ask that some member of the applicant's staff make a presentation, but I guess tonight we've got a video. So with that, do you need the lights turned? Can people in the back see the way they've set up the screen? If you can't, just let us know.

(Whereupon the video was played.)

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I will now proceed to call the name of the first -- we only have two people who are signed up so far. So if there are other members of the public who are interested in

speaking this evening, there's more sign-up sheets over there. And when you come up to speak, we'd appreciate it if, in addition to stating your name, if you could spell your last name, which would make it easier for those who are making the recordings to get a better record.

The first person is John Calabrese.

JOHN CALABRESE: Good evening. My name is John Calabrese. Last name is C-a-l-a-b-r-e-s-e. I'm a long-time member and representative for the Town of Thomaston Fish and Game Club to give our positions and concerns for this evening.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of the Council for the hard work you do.

I was at this afternoon's session. And in a room listening to testimony of lawyers and engineers is quite interesting.

The project you have before you is a major project, and it impacts our property. We have a large tract of land within the project area. You'll be deliberating on a lot of points for the project and coming up with your solutions.

There's one section in the application, and it's on page 12-9, and it's Section 12-4, and

it affects us quite substantially. We are land conservators and maintainers, and we are adjacent to property owners and the Mattatuck State Forest. The options that are listed in those sections allow us, at least our section of the project, to choose H-frame structures over the 90 foot -- in preference to the 90-foot monopoles. The natural canopy of our forested areas and the Mattatuck Forest where our land is adjacent to is approximately 70 feet tall. The construction of 110 or 90-foot monopoles would detract greatly of the natural beauty of the canopy.

I would like the Council to understand that we choose to exercise that option of the H-frames for our section of the property in which the project impacts. And that would come under -- it doesn't come under environmental, it doesn't come under engineering, but it comes under the aesthetics environmental. So we're very proud of our trees around here. Everyone in Connecticut is very funny about their trees. And we are also.

The second thing -- and I didn't get to read the part of the application, or I don't have access to it -- the section on access roads.

Access roads, we have some on our property

- 1 already, but we don't have a section to access the
- 2 access roads, which is our 1,000-foot driveway
- 3 that's suitable for pedestrian and passenger
- 4 traffic. And I'm sure in the application there
- 5 are some places where damage to that property that
- 6 has to be repaired and usable during construction
- 7 because that's our only driveway.
- 8 And with that, I thank you all very
- 9 much, and I hope you have an enjoyable evening.
- 10 And thank you again for your service on the
- 11 Council.
- 12 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is
- 13 Roger Guillet.
- 14 ROGER GUILLET: Good evening, my name
- is Roger Guillet, G-u-i-l-l-e-t.
- 16 And my main concern tonight is -- one
- 17 is the pole. We're going to have a monopole on
- 18 our property. That would be number 77. And
- 19 that's going to be 93 feet in height. And as Mr.
- 20 Calabrese stated, I'm wondering if we can get an
- 21 H-pole for that section. We own approximately 11
- 22 and a half acres. We have a 3,000 square foot
- 23 home that's worth half a million dollars. And
- 24 with this new line coming through, it's going to
- 25 depreciate that value of this property very much.

Another concern is I spoke with a couple of gentlemen before is when they come in your cut lines go back 45 feet. Now 45 feet is going to go back into our back lawn. All our privacy -- the reason we bought this home is the privacy is unbelievable. I'm approximately 550 feet back.

And when they do do the cutting, what are they going to leave? Are they going to stump it? Because I had a lot of property. And part of the cutback is going to be in front of the house. And that's really my main concern, what's it going to look like. Is it going to look like a war zone when you people get done?

That's all I have to say. Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is

Daniel Seabourne.

DANIEL SEABOURNE: I'm Daniel
Seabourne. Last name is spelled
S-e-a-b-o-u-r-n-e.

And my main concern is the right-of-way comes very close to my house. And we're in a situation where pole number 61, I'm concerned about the magnetic field that's going to be coming off of those high-power lines. I have young kids,

grandchildren, that are at my house every day.

And everything that I read points in the direction

of issues, health issues, especially with young

children.

And I've asked CL&P if they would consider, if they're running this line, to consider using their existing pole, which is away from the house up on a hill, which would mitigate some of the issue, the electronic magnetic issue, but to try to keep it possibly using the same pole that they have now to run past the house.

The other issue I have is initially when they thought of putting in this line, they were talking about, I think, a 300 versus the 150 when they spoke to us in Thomaston. And I'm just wondering whether or not at the time that they put this line in and the existing wiring that they'll put in, is that going to be capable in two years or five years of being upgraded to a much higher kilovolt line?

And that's a big issue for me right now, as I said before, with my grandchildren being there. I'm worried about another 115 line coming close to my house. And I hate to see in a couple of years that they decide to jack it up to 300,

- 1 which is what they originally had presented to us.
- 2 So I'm concerned with what kind of safeguards are
- 3 going to be in there to lock that out from
- 4 happening in the future. Thank you.
- 5 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
- 6 Sebastian Valenti.
- 7 SEBASTIAN VALENTI: I'm Sebastian
- 8 Valenti, V-a-l-e-n-t-i. I live at 429 Walnut Hill
- 9 Road.
- 10 I'm concerned with pole 62. You said
- 11 you give it a lot of consideration, but you're
- 12 putting it right in front of my windows, 100-foot
- 13 pole right in front of my windows.
- 14 And just like Danny, I'm also concerned
- 15 with the magnetic field and health issues and all
- 16 that and what it has done for my real estate
- 17 property. I talked to them downtown, and they
- 18 said, oh, no, no, you're not going to lose no
- 19 value on your house at all. This sucks the value
- 20 right out of your house, your property. That's
- 21 the way I feel.
- 22 And just like the other guy said, all
- 23 that included, you know. Right in front of my
- 24 window you're going to be putting up 100-foot
- 25 structure. Thank you.

1 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Michael Criss.

And that's the last speaker we have signed up. So if anyone else wants to speak, please sign up.

Go ahead, Mr. Criss.

MICHAEL CRISS: Good evening. Thank
you. It's C-r-i-s-s, and it's Michael Criss. I'm
the first selectman for the Town of Harwinton.
And I've been at most of the hearings for this
particular project.

My main concern, and I want to stress it again tonight for the Siting Council and my residents, many many of our residents have come in about this project. We understand the need to improve the infrastructure of Eversource and CL&P up through that area and clear the right-of-ways and make it a viable option. However, we want to make sure that there's careful consideration, thoughtfulness and a thorough plan in returning it back to its rural character.

Securing the right-of-ways, that has been an ongoing issue when it formerly was CL&P. The right-of-ways get cleared, widened, opened, rock gets dropped, and now these become dragways for quads, dirt bikes and everything else in that

Many of the brush and burden and everything has been cut back recently all the way through the center of Harwinton and all the way down from the Route 8 corridor, School Hill Road, all the way back up through Wildcat Hill, Plymouth Road, Harmony Hill, and that way. All the right-of-ways have been opened up and the stone has been dropped.

residents as it affects down in that area, that is a rural area of the Naugatuck River. Harwinton spent a lot of time protecting a lot of the land down there for open space purposes and fishing purposes. And we want to just be -- we want the Siting Council to make sure that they pay close attention to how that property gets returned back to us, and the fact that Eversource takes the necessary means to secure that area to protect it and return it back to those residents that paid top dollar for those houses for rural character and privacy that they've enjoyed all these years. Thank you.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else here this evening who desires to speak?

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I'd like to ask a couple questions. 2 3 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. 4 BRADLEY BENTLEY, 5 JASON CABRAL, MATTHEW DAVISON, 6 7 RAYMOND GAGNON, 8 LOUISE MANGO, 9 CHRISTOPHER SODERMAN, having been previously duly sworn, testified 10 11 further on their oaths as follows: 12 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. Mr. Soderman. 13 14 THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes. 15 MR. FITZGERALD: You, as the Council's 16 rules require, have calculated what the change in the magnetic field levels along this 17 18 right-of-way --19 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: The purpose of these questions is unusual, but the hearing was 20 21 very quick. And it's really kind of to give you an answer to some of the concerns that the 22 23 speakers gave to us tonight. So just tune in. 24 Hopefully some of you will have a better feeling

when you leave than you had when you came in.

25

Thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: As the Council's rules require, Mr. Soderman, you have calculated what the change will be in the magnetic field levels along the right-of-way, haven't you?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes, I have.

MR. FITZGERALD: And could you tell us what your projection is with respect to the change from the magnetic field levels before this line is constructed to what they will be after the line has been constructed?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes.

13 Particularly --

MR. FITZGERALD: I'm sorry. And in particular -- don't give us the whole -- particularly in the vicinity of poles 61 and 62.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Those are in the areas of between Purgatory Junction and Walnut Hill Junction in Thomaston. So on the eastern portion of the right-of-way under average annual loads magnetic fields would go from about 6.12 milligauss to 3.92 milligauss. So there actually would be a reduction in the magnetic fields as a result of this project. On the west end of the right-of-way the magnetic fields would go from

- 1 7.27 to 4.23, as a result of this project.
- THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Tell us what the
- 3 standard is. That's the important thing.
- THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes. The
- 5 standard, as identified by the International
- 6 Council for Non-ionizing Radiation Protection,
- 7 otherwise known as ICNIRP, is 2,000 milligauss for
- 8 exposure to the general public. The other
- 9 standard that exists out there is from the
- 10 International Council on Electromagnetic Safety,
- 11 the ICES, and their guideline is 9,040 milligauss.
- MR. LYNCH: Mr. Soderman, are those
- 13 calculations to the edge of the right-of-way, is
- 14 that what you're saying?
- 15 THE WITNESS (Soderman): Those
- 16 calculations that I quoted were at the
- 17 right-of-way edges, but there are calculations
- 18 tabulated in the application that go beyond the
- 19 right-of-way.
- 20 MR. LYNCH: I just wanted to clarify
- 21 that.
- 22 THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes. All this
- 23 is included in Section 7 of the application.
- 24 MR. FITZGERALD: Why do magnetic fields
- 25 go down rather than up when a new line is added to

the right-of-way in this location?

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Well, one of 2 3 the things that the applicant -- we have done is in compliance with the Connecticut Siting 4 5 Council's Best Management Practices for Electric and Magnetic Fields was as a base design was 6 7 engaged in what we referred to as optimum phasing 8 where we try and arrange the different phases, the 9 A, B and C phases of the transmission lines, to try and cancel each other out rather than add 10 together. So that's why oftentimes when you're 11 constructing a new transmission line at a corridor 12 13 with an existing transmission line, you can actually see a reduction in electric and magnetic 14 15 fields.

MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. That's all the questions that I have. I did want to offer a couple of exhibits.

First of all, we've referred to the -or you've referred to a booklet that was handed
out as part of the field review. And so I thought
perhaps we should give it a number and make it a
part of the record.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: That's number 7, I believe.

```
(Applicant's Exhibit II-B-7: Received
1
    in evidence - described in index.)
2
3
               MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.
    Bachman, we've got plenty of copies here if you'd
4
5
    like some.
               MS. BACHMAN: Certainly, Attorney
6
7
    Fitzgerald, if you could provide a copy or a few
    copies to the Office of Consumer Counsel?
8
9
               MR. FITZGERALD: Right. We'll do that
10
    directly. Sure.
               MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.
11
12
               MR. FITZGERALD: And next, under the
13
    circumstances that the hearing has gone as it has,
    I would like to ask the Council to receive as full
14
15
    exhibits Section 10.3 of the application, which is
16
    the nontransmission alternatives section, as
    Exhibit 4 of Volume 4, which is the London
17
18
    Economics Report, in the absence of an objection.
19
               THE VICE CHAIRMAN:
                                    I believe, since
    Consumer Counsel is not here to object, so hearing
20
    no objection, it will be so ordered to be
21
22
    admitted.
23
                (Exhibit II-B-1, Volume 4 (Exhibit 4):
    Received in evidence - described in index.)
24
25
               MR. FITZGERALD:
                                 Thank you.
```

```
1
               MS. BACHMAN: Attorney Fitzgerald, I
    just wanted to ask about Exhibit 5, the direct
2
3
    testimony of Ms. Frayer.
               MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, yes. No, I don't
4
5
    think I'll offer that. We'll just go with the
    application and the report covers the bases.
6
7
    rather not put in testimony.
8
               THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Fine.
                                           Very good.
9
               MR. FITZGERALD: Perhaps I might ask
10
    one more question. There were some understandable
    questions raised about the condition in which the
11
12
    right-of-way will be left, or to which it will be
13
    restored after the work is completed. And I
    wonder if we could have a very brief explanation
14
15
    of that from either -- do you want to take a crack
16
    at that, Louise, or Jason?
17
               THE WITNESS (Cabral): All right.
18
               MR. FITZGERALD: Jason, why don't you
    do it.
19
20
               THE WITNESS (Cabral): So, in general,
    our goal is to return these areas to as
21
```

those trees won't be there anymore, but we will
leave the corridor in good shape. We do plan on
and commit to working with the property owners

preconstruction conditions as possible. Obviously

22

where there is tree clearing within manicured lawns or lawn areas that we would remove stumps and do other things to work with the property owners to reduce the impacts that the project has.

Our plan for access roads is access roads are going to be left permanent, but they will be pulled back in for maintenance. Our work pads around the structures will be left in place, unless requested by a property owner to be removed, and those work pads will be removed, and we will reestablish growth up in that corridor. So when we leave the project, the goal is for it to be as good shape as when the project started.

Louise do you want to add anything?

THE WITNESS (Mango): I can just talk

about that we just recently advertised the

interstate project. We're still out there

monitoring the restoration of that particular

project. And interstate was also in a fairly

rural area, so there was a lot of emphasis placed

on restoring the right-of-way to the near

preconstruction conditions to the extent that was

practical and working with landowners. Eversource

had a very effective public outreach program

wherein the Eversource public outreach personnel

- 1 discussed particular needs of individual
- 2 landowners, and if there was a reasonable need for
- 3 landscaping, they certainly considered that and
- 4 worked with the landowners for those kinds of
- 5 things.
- 6 THE WITNESS (Cabral): One other thing,
- 7 Tony, to bring up. Our other process, general
- 8 procedure would be any time that we're putting in
- 9 a new access road or upgrading an access road off
- 10 a public street, we would install a gate to help
- 11 deter that ATV use and things that some of the
- 12 people brought up. So that would be one of the
- methods we'd use to try to deter ATVs on the
- 14 right-of-way.
- MR. FITZGERALD: Nothing further,
- 16 Mr. Chairman.
- 17 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
- 18 Mr. Fitzgerald. Therefore, I'm going to close
- 19 this hearing on this matter.
- 20 MR. SEABOURNE: Sir, can I ask a
- 21 question? They were answering some of our
- 22 questions, but I didn't hear him answer any
- 23 question having to do with that the lines they're
- 24 installing are capable of carrying 300 level
- 25 versus that 150. And I'd just like to know that

- 1 because they also made a point of telling what the
- 2 magnetic field would be on 150 line. And I don't
- 3 know if they've done any calculations that would
- 4 have been on the 300 line, which is what
- 5 Eversource originally had proposed. So I'm just
- 6 wondering if the lines they're putting up are
- 7 capable of carrying the higher load.
- 8 THE VICE CHAIRMAN: I believe they can
- 9 answer that question for you. It's not -- but go
- 10 ahead.
- 11 MR. FITZGERALD: Will the line that is
- 12 proposed in this proceeding be capable of being
- 13 operated at 345 kV?
- 14 THE WITNESS (Bentley): No.
- 15 THE WITNESS (Cabral): No.
- 16 MR. FITZGERALD: And this will be for
- 17 you. There was, once upon a time, a proposal to
- 18 build a 345-kV line on this right-of-way between
- 19 North Bloomfield and, I'm sorry, between --
- 20 THE WITNESS (Bentley): Frost Bridge.
- 21 MR. FITZGERALD: Frost Bridge to North
- 22 Bloomfield, correct?
- THE WITNESS (Bentley): That's correct.
- 24 The original genesis of some of the studies came
- 25 | from the NEEWS set of projects, and that project

was known as the Central Connecticut Reliability
Project that would have proposed a new 345-kV line
to go through that right-of-way.

MR. FITZGERALD: Now this is a different project altogether, isn't it?

THE WITNESS (Bentley): Yes. So this area has been restudied, analyzed to the current conditions, and the proposed project is a 115-kV project between Frost Bridge and Campville.

MR. FITZGERALD: Just to be clear, you're not saying, Mr. Bentley, are you, that Eversource will never in the future propose to build a 345-kV line on this right-of-way, right?

THE WITNESS (Bentley): That's correct.

MR. FITZGERALD: But as of today, are there any plans to do so in the foreseeable -- or within the planning horizon?

THE WITNESS (Bentley): That's correct, there's no current plans at ISO New England to build additional infrastructure in this right-of-way. But however, as you mentioned, as conditions change, we have an obligation to study the system and meet any reliability criteria that is identified. So the future can hold what it can hold, and we'll have to make use of appropriate

- 1 studies and recommendations at that time.
- 2 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. That's all
- 3 we have.
- 4 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Bentley, for the
- 5 general public, could you please explain what ISO
- 6 New England is and what their process is?
- 7 THE WITNESS (Bentley): Sure. ISO New
- 8 England is the regional reliability organization
- 9 that is responsible for analyzing the system and
- 10 being the coordination for all of New England with
- 11 regards to reliability and looking at system needs
- 12 and making sure that those system needs are
- 13 identified, proposed solutions are identified and
- 14 recommended to be built by the local utilities.
- The ISO New England stands for
- 16 Independent System Operator of New England. They
- 17 hold public meetings where it's called the
- 18 Planning Advisory Committee, whereby these studies
- 19 are put forth to the public, and those needs and
- 20 solutions are put out there for review,
- 21 stakeholder comment, and can be identified for the
- 22 public to respond to.
- From that, the ISO New England has an
- 24 obligation to meet the reliability standards and
- 25 through these recommended solutions. So the

Independent System Operator is really the core group in New England to do that.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

MR. FITZGERALD: Now we're through.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN: Now I guess we're ready to close.

Before closing this hearing, the

Connecticut Siting Council announces that briefs
and proposed findings of fact may be filed with
the Council by any party or intervenor no later
than March 31, 2016. The submission of briefs or
proposed findings of fact are not required by this
Council, rather we leave it to the choice of the
parties and intervenors.

Anyone who has not become a party or intervenor, but who desires to make his or her views known to this Council, may file written statements with the Council within 30 days hereof.

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

I hereby declare this hearing closed. And I wish everyone a safe trip home. Thank you. (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused and the above proceedings adjourned at 7:12 p.m.) 

1	CERTIFICATE
2	I hereby certify that the foregoing 28 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided
3	transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Continued Council Meeting in Re: DOCKET
4	NO. 466, APPLICATION FOR THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND
5	POWER COMPANY D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND
6	PUBLIC NEED FOR THE FROST BRIDGE TO CAMPVILLE 115-KILOVOLT ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT
7	THAT TRAVERSES THE MUNICIPALITIES OF WATERTOWN, THOMASTON, LITCHFIELD AND HARWINTON, WHICH
8	CONSISTS OF (A) CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A NEW 115-KILOVOLT OVERHEAD ELECTRIC
•	TRANSMISSION LINE ENTIRELY WITHIN EXISTING
9	EVERSOURCE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES EXTENDING APPROXIMATELY 10.4 MILES BETWEEN
10	EVERSOURCE'S EXISTING FROST BRIDGE SUBSTATION IN
	THE TOWN OF WATERTOWN AND EXISTING CAMPVILLE
11	SUBSTATION IN THE TOWN OF HARWINTON; (B) RELATED
10	MODIFICATIONS TO FROST BRIDGE SUBSTATION AND
12	CAMPVILLE SUBSTATION; AND (C) RECONFIGURATION OF A 0.4 MILE SEGMENT OF TWO EXISTING 115-KILOVOLT
13	ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES ACROSS THE NAUGATUCK RIVER IN THE TOWNS OF LITCHFIELD AND HARWINTON
14	WITHIN THE SAME EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY AS THE NEW 115-KILOVOLT ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINE, which was
15	held before SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairman, at the Northfield Volunteer Fire
16	Department, 12 Knife Shop Road, Litchfield, Connecticut, on Tuesday, March 1, 2016.
17	Connecticut, on luesday, March 1, 2010.
18	
19	1/-1/
20	Lisa Wally
21	
22	Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R., 061
23	Court Reporter

				110
1		INDEX		
2				
3	WITNESSES	BRADLEY BENTLEY	PAGE 96	
4		JASON CABRAL		
5		MATTHEW DAVISON		
6		RAYMOND GAGNON		
7		LOUISE MANGO		
8		CHRISTOPHER SODERMAN		
9	EXA	IINERS:		
10		Mr. Fitzgerald	96	
11		Mr. Lynch	98	
12				
13		APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS		
14		(Received in evidence	)	
15	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	
16	II-B-7	Booklet	100	
17	II-B-1	Volume 4 of Exhibit 1	100	
18		(Exhibit 4) London Ec	onomics,	
19		Non-transmission Alte	rnatives	
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				