

**In The Matter Of:**

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

---

*Hearing  
September 22, 2016*

---

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

Original File 9-22-16 Hearing.txt

**Min-U-Script®**

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3  
4 Docket No. 468  
5

6  
7 Application from the Connecticut Light & Power  
8 Company d/b/a Eversource Energy for a Certificate of  
9 Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Southwest  
10 Connecticut Reliability Project that traverses the  
11 municipalities of Bethel, Danbury, and Brookfield, which  
12 consists of (a) construction, maintenance and operation of a  
13 new 115-kV double-circuit electric transmission line entirely  
14 within existing Eversource right-of-way and associated  
15 facilities extending approximately 3.4 miles between  
16 Eversource's existing Plumtree Substation and Town of Bethel  
17 to its existing Brookfield Junction in the Town of  
18 Brookfield; (b) refiguration of two existing 115-kV  
19 double-circuit electric transmission lines at Eversource's  
20 existing Stony Hill Substation in the Town of Brookfield; and  
21 (c) related substation modifications.

22  
23 Held Before:

24 ROBIN STEIN, Chairman  
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

A P P E A R A N C E S

Council Members:

DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice Chairman

CHENCHAO LU, Designee

PHILIP T. ASHTON

DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS

Council Staff:

MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,

Executive Directed and Staff Attorney

ROBERT MERCIER, Siting Analyst

For Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a

Eversource Energy:

CARMODY, TORRANCE, SANDAK & HENNESSEY, LLP

195 Church Street

New Haven, CT 06509

BY: BRIAN HENEERY, ESQ.

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

APPLICANT'S SWORN WITNESSES:

David Coleman

Eric Davison

Julia Frayer

Raymond Gagnon

Paul Knapik

Louise Mango

Gabor Mezei

Farah Omokaro

Allen Scarfone

Christopher Soderman

1 (Commenced: 3:07 p.m.)

2  
3 MR. STEIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd  
4 like to call to order the meeting of the Connecticut Siting  
5 Council, Docket No. 468. Today is Thursday, September 22,  
6 2016, approximately 3:05. My name is Robin Stein, the  
7 chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Members of the  
8 Council present are Senator Murphy, our vice chairman; Mr.  
9 Lu, who is the designee from the Public Utility Regulatory  
10 Authority; Philip T. Ashton; and Dr. Michael Klemens; members  
11 of the staff present, staff attorney, Melanie Bachman, and  
12 Robert Mercier, our siting analyst.

13 This hearing is held pursuant to the  
14 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes  
15 and the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an  
16 application for the Connecticut Light & Power Company, d/b/a  
17 Eversource Energy, for a certificate of Environmental  
18 Compatibility and Public Need for the Southwest Connecticut  
19 Reliability Project that traverses the municipalities of  
20 Bethel, Danbury, Brookfield, which consists of (a)  
21 construction, maintenance and operation of a new 115 kV  
22 overhead electric transmission line entirely within existing  
23 Eversource right-of-way and associated facilities extending  
24 approximately 3.4 miles between Eversource's existing  
25 Plumtree substation in the town of Bethel to its existing

1 Brookfield junction in the town of Brookfield; (b)  
2 reconfiguration of two existing 115-kV double-circuit  
3 electric transmission lines at Eversource's existing Stony  
4 Hill substation in the town of Brookfield; and (c) related  
5 substation modifications. This application was received by  
6 the Council on June 29, 2016.

7 As a reminder to all, off-the-record  
8 communication with a member of the Council or a member of the  
9 council's staff on the merits of this application is  
10 prohibited by law.

11 The parties to the proceeding is the applicant  
12 with its representative, Attorney Henebry. We will proceed  
13 in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are  
14 available here. Also available here are copies of the  
15 Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures over to my right.

16 At the end of this afternoon's evidentiary  
17 session, we will recess and resume again at 7:00 p.m. for the  
18 public comment session.

19 The 7:00 p.m. public comment session will be  
20 reserved for the public to make brief oral statements into  
21 the record. I -- I will also note for your -- those that are  
22 here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who  
23 are unable to join us in the public comment session that you  
24 or they may send written statements to the Council within 30  
25 days of the date hereof, and such written statements will be

1 given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing. If  
2 necessary -- a verbatim transcript will be made of this  
3 hearing and deposited with the clerk's offices in the town of  
4 Bethel, city of Danbury, and the town of Brookfield for the  
5 convenience of the public.

6 First off, is there any public official who  
7 would like to make a public statement at this time?

8 Okay. I'd like to call your attention to  
9 those items shown in the hearing program. Marked as Roman  
10 Numeral 1D, Items 1 through 83. Does the applicant have any  
11 objection to the items that the Council has administratively  
12 noticed?

13 MR. HENEERY: No objection. Thank you.

14 MR. STEIN: Council hereby administratively notices  
15 these documents, statements, and comments.

16 Will the applicant present its witness panel  
17 for the purposes of taking the oath?

18 MR. HENEERY: On my left, we have Allen Scarfone, Farah  
19 Omokaro, David Coleman and Raymond Gagnon from Connecticut  
20 Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy.

21 On my right, we have consultant Louise Mango  
22 of Phenix Environmental, Paul Knapik, Environmental  
23 Consultant from BSC; Eric Davison, also another environmental  
24 consultant; Christopher Soderman of Eversource, and Dr. Gabor  
25 Mazei from Exponent as a consultant.

1                   MR. STEIN: Would you all please rise for the  
2 council's staff attorney to administer the oath?

3  
4                   (The witnesses were sworn by Ms. Bachman.)

5  
6                   MR. STEIN: Please continue by numbering the exhibits  
7 and making requests to administratively notice exhibits and  
8 verifying all exhibits?

9                   MR. HENEERY: Thank you. Yes. I believe we have a  
10 series of administrative items that we request administrative  
11 notice for. We seek to have administrative notice for those  
12 items, taken for those, absent any objection. They are  
13 listed in the hearing program.

14                  MR. STEIN: No objection.

15                  MR. HENEERY: At this point, I'd like to move to tend to  
16 the introduction of our six exhibits.

17                               The first item marked for identification is  
18 the Siting Council application. What I will do is I will ask  
19 a series of panel witnesses regarding the particular sections  
20 they worked on, that they prepared, and after reviewing it  
21 with all those panel witnesses, I will then seek to move for  
22 the introduction of the exhibit.

23                               So first, starting with Mr. Coleman, Ms.  
24 Omokaro, and Mr. Gagnon, did you supervise the preparation of  
25 the formal requirement section of the application as well as

1 Sections 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12 in Volume 1, project drawings  
2 and maps in Volume 5, and Bulk Filing 1 and 2 and the  
3 affidavits which are part of the bulk file?

4 MR. COLEMAN: Yes, I did.

5 MR. GAGNON: Yes, I did.

6 MS. OMOKARO: Yes, I did.

7 MR. HENEERY: And are the statements and representations  
8 in those sections of the application true and correct to the  
9 best of your knowledge and belief?

10 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

11 MR. GAGNON: Yes.

12 MR. COLEMAN: Yes.

13 MR. HENEERY: And do any of you have any additions or  
14 corrections to those sections?

15 MR. GAGNON: Yes, I do. As discussed in the pre-filed  
16 testimony of Page 5 of the exhibits, the application  
17 incorrectly states that the existing Stony Hill substation  
18 occupies 3.2 acres of a 24-acre parcel. The correct figures  
19 that the Stony Hill substation occupies is 1.7 acres of an  
20 18.8-acre parcel, which is correctly identified in Page 12-1  
21 of the application.

22 MR. HENEERY: Thank you. I'll note for the record that  
23 these corrections that will be noted during this introduction  
24 will all included and summarized in the pre-filed testimony  
25 of the witnesses as part of the application.

1                   Moving next to Ms. Mango and Mr. Knapik, did  
2 you supervise the preparation of the executive summary of the  
3 application, Sections 5 and 6 of Volume 1 and the  
4 environmental exhibits provided in Volumes 2 and 3?

5           MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

6           MR. HENEBRY: Are the statements and representations in  
7 those sections in the application true and correct to the  
8 best of your knowledge and belief?

9           MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

10          MS. MANGO: They are.

11          MR. HENEBRY: Do you have any additions or corrections  
12 to those sections?

13          MR. KNAPIK: Yes. I have one additional correction, one  
14 addition in response to the comments raised in the DEEP  
15 comments received on Monday in letter form regarding plant  
16 species surveys in the right-of-way. The additional field  
17 surveys referenced in the DEEP comments were completed the  
18 week of September 12th. During those surveys, the plant  
19 species of special concern was found within the project area.

20                   The results of the September, 2016 field  
21 investigation are in the process of being compiled in  
22 accordance with DEEP requirements, and we expect to submit  
23 the investigation by October 7, 2016. Such data is  
24 considered privileged, not for public dissemination, to  
25 protect the known locations of plant habitat.

1           After this review, the field survey results,  
2 Eversource expects to coordinate further with the DEEP to  
3 define appropriate measures for avoiding or minimizing  
4 impacts to the plant species during the construction of the  
5 project. Such measures, once approved by the DEEP, will be  
6 incorporated in the D&M plan and implemented as part of the  
7 construction process.

8           MR. HENEERY: Okay. Now, moving to Mr. Scarfone and Ms.  
9 Omokaro, did you supervise the preparation of Section 2, the  
10 Need section, of Volume 1 of the application as well as  
11 Section 10 of the Volume 1? With the exception of Section  
12 10.3, did you also supervise the preparation of the materials  
13 in Volume 4 of the application, again, excluding the report  
14 of London Economics [inaudible] in Volume 4, as well as  
15 supervise the preparation of the CEII?

16           MS. OMOKARO: I did.

17           MR. SCARFONE: Yes. Are your statements and  
18 representations in those sections of the application true and  
19 correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

20           MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

21           MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

22           MR. HENEERY: Do you have any additions or corrections  
23 to those sections?

24           MR. SCARFONE: No.

25           MS. OMOKARO: No.

1 MR. HENEERY: Moving to Mr. Soderman. Mr. Soderman, did  
2 you prepare Section 7 of Volume 1 of the application with the  
3 exception of 7D, Appendix 7D report on health research? Did  
4 you prepare those sections under the health research?

5 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

6 MR. HENEERY: Are the statements and representations in  
7 those sections true and correct to the best of your knowledge  
8 and belief?

9 MR. SODERMAN: Yes, they are.

10 MR. HENEERY: Do you have any additions or corrections  
11 to those sections?

12 MR. SODERMAN: Yes. On Page 7C-3 of Appendix 7C, there  
13 is the post-construction electric field calculation column  
14 has been omitted and a replacement page has been included in  
15 pre-filed testimony that includes post-construction electric  
16 field calculations.

17 MR. HENEERY: So that was additional information that  
18 wasn't included in the application; correct?

19 MR. SODERMAN: That is correct.

20 MR. HENEERY: Thank you. Dr. Mazei, did you prepare the  
21 report on EMF health effects research as included in Appendix  
22 7D to the application?

23 DR. MAZEI: Yes, I did.

24 MR. HENEERY: And are the statements and representations  
25 in that section of the application true and correct to the

1 best of your knowledge and belief?

2 DR. MAZEI: Yes, they are.

3 MR. HENEERY: And do you have any additions or  
4 corrections to those sections of the application?

5 DR. MAZEI: No, sir.

6 MR. HENEERY: And moving to -- do we have Ms. Frayer?  
7 Are you with us? If you could just come up so we can get you  
8 before the microphone. Did you participate in the swearing  
9 in of the witnesses?

10 MS. FRAYER: No, I did not.

11 MR. HENEERY: May the witness be sworn in, please? Are  
12 there any other witnesses --

13 MS. BACHMAN: I see Mr. Russo in back there.

14

15 (Ms. Frayer was sworn in by Ms. Bachman.)

16

17 MR. HENEERY: Did you prepare the report on  
18 non-transmission alternatives, which is found in Volume 4 in  
19 the application?

20 MS. FRAYER: Yes, I did.

21 MR. HENEERY: Are the statements and representations in  
22 there true and correct to the best of your knowledge and  
23 belief?

24 MS. FRAYER: Yes, they are.

25 MR. HENEERY: Do you have any additions or corrections

1 to your report regarding non-transmission alternatives?

2 MS. FRAYER: Yes. In the pre-filed direct testimony, we  
3 made one correction and one clarification that we described  
4 in relation to some information in my report. I also have a  
5 small typographical error we found in one of the figures that  
6 we need to correct for the record.

7 MR. HENEERY: Okay. The first one you mentioned, a  
8 correction that's outlined in the pre-filed direct testimony?

9 MS. FRAYER: Yes.

10 MR. HENEERY: Can you just tell us the typographical  
11 error with reference to the page of your report and what the  
12 issue is?

13 MS. FRAYER: Yes, sir. It's on Figure 10 on Page 24.  
14 In the figure itself, there's a number of rows, and Rows 11  
15 and 12, there's a 25 percent that should actually be a 15  
16 percent. So two versus the one.

17 MR. HENEERY: Do you have any other corrections or  
18 additions to your report?

19 MS. FRAYER: No.

20 MR. HENEERY: At this point, I would ask that the  
21 application which has been marked as Exhibit 1 for  
22 identification be accepted as a full exhibit.

23 MR. STEIN: Exhibit is accepted.

24 MR. HENEERY: Moving now to Exhibit 2, these are the  
25 applicant's responses to data requests issued by the Council.

1 I will ask Mr. Gagnon, Mr. Scarfone, Ms. Omokaro, Mr.  
2 Soderman, and Mr. Knapik, were each of you involved in  
3 preparing responses to the data requests that were issued by  
4 the Siting Council?

5 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

6 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

7 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

8 MR. GAGNON: Yes.

9 MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

10 MR. HENEERY: Thank you. If all of you would respond to  
11 the questions just for the record. Thank you. And are the  
12 applicant's responses to those data requests true and  
13 accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?

14 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

15 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

16 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

17 MR. GAGNON: Yes.

18 MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

19 MR. HENEERY: Are there any corrections or additions  
20 those responses?

21 MR. SCARFONE: No.

22 MR. HENEERY: At this point in time, I would offer  
23 Exhibit 2 as a full exhibit.

24 MR. STEIN: Exhibit is accepted.

25 MR. HENEERY: Next, I would like to move what we've

1 marked for identification as Exhibit 3. This is a list of  
2 all our witnesses and their curriculum vitae. So I would ask  
3 that each of the panel members whose CVs are included, just  
4 respond whether or not the statement of qualifications  
5 included in your resume in that file, is that true and  
6 accurate with respect to [inaudible]? If each witness will  
7 respond.

8 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

9 MR. GAGNON: Yes.

10 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

11 MS. MANGO: Yes.

12 MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

13 MR. COLEMAN: Yes.

14 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

15 MR. DAVISON: Yes.

16 DR. MAZEI: Yes.

17 MS. FRAYER: Yes.

18 MR. HENEBRY: Thank you. Do any of you have any  
19 corrections to any of the resumes included in Exhibit 3?

20 MR. SODERMAN: No.

21 MR. COLEMAN: No.

22 MR. DAVISON: No.

23 MR. KNAPIK: No.

24 MS. MANGO: No.

25 MS. FRAYER: No.

1 DR. MAZEI: No.

2 MS. OMOKARO: No.

3 MR. SCARFONE: No.

4 MR. GAGNON: No.

5 MR. HENEERY: So no corrections to Exhibit 3 at this  
6 point. I would offer Exhibit 3 as full exhibit.

7 MR. STEIN: The exhibit is admitted.

8 MR. HENEERY: Now I'd like to move to -- to move for  
9 identification the direct testimony of Ray Gagnon and several  
10 other witnesses. So I'll direct this question to Mr. Gagnon,  
11 Mr. Scarfone, Ms. Omokaro, and Mr. Soderman. Did you  
12 supervise the preparation of your pre-filed testimony  
13 regarding engineering, design, route selection, project need,  
14 construction, EMF characteristics, and outreach for the  
15 project?

16 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

17 MR. GAGNON: Yes.

18 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

19 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

20 MR. HENEERY: Thank you. And do you have any additions  
21 or corrections to that testimony?

22 MR. GAGNON: No.

23 MR. SODERMAN: No.

24 MR. SCARFONE: No.

25 MS. OMOKARO: No.

1 MR. HENEERY: At this point in time, I would offer  
2 Exhibit 4 as a full exhibit.

3 MR. STEIN: Exhibit 4 is admitted.

4 MR. HENEERY: Ms. Frayer, moving to what's been marked  
5 as Exhibit 5 for identification, your direct pre-filed  
6 testimony, did you prepare that testimony concerning  
7 non-transmission alternatives for this project?

8 MS. FRAYER: Yes.

9 MR. HENEERY: And are the statements and representations  
10 included in that pre-filed testimony true and correct to the  
11 best of your knowledge and belief?

12 MS. FRAYER: Yes.

13 MR. HENEERY: Do you have any corrections or additions  
14 to that testimony?

15 MS. FRAYER: No with the exception of what I mentioned  
16 earlier.

17 MR. HENEERY: Okay. At this time, I will offer Exhibit  
18 5 as a full exhibit.

19 MR. STEIN: Exhibit 5 is admitted.

20 MR. HENEERY: Thank you. And last but not least, I will  
21 move to what's been marked as Exhibit 6 for identification of  
22 the direct testimony of Louise Mango and Paul Knapik. Ms.  
23 Mango and Mr. Knapik, did you prepare this pre-filed  
24 testimony concerning environmental features, impacts, and  
25 mitigation measures for the Southwest Connecticut project?

1 MS. MANGO: Yes.

2 MR. KNAPIK: Yes.

3 MR. HENEERY: Is that testimony true and correct to the  
4 best of your knowledge and belief?

5 MS. MANGO: Yes, with the exception of the clarification  
6 that Mr. Knapik provided earlier today regarding the plant  
7 species.

8 MR. HENEERY: Do you have any other corrections or  
9 additions to that testimony?

10 MS. MANGO: No.

11 MR. KNAPIK: No.

12 MR. HENEERY: At this time, I will offer Exhibit 6 as a  
13 full exhibit.

14 MR. STEIN: Exhibit 6 is admitted.

15 MR. HENEERY: That concludes our exhibits.

16 MR. ASHTON: You may have missed -- exhibit 7 and 8?

17 MS. BACHMAN: Exhibits 7 and 8, field review and agenda  
18 maps that we received yesterday?

19 MR. HENEERY: Yes. I apologize. So let's move to  
20 Exhibit 7, which is field review agenda maps for the route  
21 tour that was just conducted prior to that. I'll move to  
22 you, Ms. Okomaro. Did you supervise the preparation of the  
23 field review agenda and maps?

24 MS. OKOMARO: Yes.

25 MR. HENEERY: Is the information contained in that

1 exhibit true and correct to the best of your knowledge and  
2 belief?

3 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

4 MR. HENEERY: Any corrections?

5 MS. OKOMARO: No.

6 MR. HENEERY: I'll move for the introduction of Exhibit  
7 7 as a full exhibit.

8 MR. STEIN: Okay. Exhibit 7 is admitted. And finally,  
9 Mr. Chairman, what's been marked as Exhibit 8 for  
10 identification is a copy of the applicant's video, summary  
11 video of the project that will be shown at tonight's public  
12 session. I'll ask, did you supervise the preparation of that  
13 video, Ms. Omokaro?

14 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

15 MR. HENEERY: Are the statements and representations in  
16 that video true and correct to the best of your knowledge and  
17 belief?

18 MS. OMOKARO: Yes.

19 MR. HENEERY: Okay. I'll move for the introduction of  
20 Exhibit 8 as a full exhibit.

21 MR. STEIN: Exhibit 8 is admitted.

22 MR. HENEERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That concludes  
23 our exhibits. We will now begin the cross-examination of the  
24 applicant with Mr. Mercier and the staff.

25 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. I'm going to begin with just

1 reviewing the comments of the Department of Energy and  
2 Environmental Protection that just came in with a date of  
3 September 19th.

4 Now, on Page 2 of the third paragraph,  
5 basically the question regarding the use of a perimeter road  
6 at the Danbury landfill. And Mr. Riese, who wrote these  
7 comments, gave the contact information for the city. But has  
8 Eversource reached out to the City of Danbury regarding use  
9 of the perimeter road at the landfill?

10 MR. GAGNON: Yes, we have.

11 MR. MERCIER: Are there any upgrades required of the  
12 existing road?

13 MR. GAGNON: I think Mr. Soderman could probably -- we  
14 actually met we Dave Day up there, the superintendent of  
15 public works.

16 MR. SODERMAN: That is correct. We drove the road,  
17 Superintendent Day and myself on Tuesday. The road appears  
18 to be in good condition. If anything, it would just be some  
19 laid out gravel on top, but there is very little -- no road  
20 improvement is necessary.

21 MR. MERCIER: Do you know if the road actually goes on  
22 the cap portion of the landfill or the surrounding perimeter,  
23 lower edge?

24 MR. SODERMAN: It is actually beyond the cap. There is  
25 a swale on the inside of the circle, and the cap is within

1 that swale; so the road, it does not go over the cap.

2 MR. MERCIER: When the original line was built in that  
3 area, the original transmission line that exists today, were  
4 any of the access roads, did that come in off a landfill, if  
5 anybody knows? Are those roads still there or is it  
6 something that's based on a new access --

7 MR. SODERMAN: I'm not exactly sure of what was done in  
8 the 1970s, but this is the access we're proposing to use now.

9 MS. MANGO: I think, just a point of clarification, our  
10 effort here is to try to minimize the impact to the wetland,  
11 even though we would want to try put in a temporary access  
12 road to the extent practical, and so I think that, you know,  
13 in the DEEP letter, Mr. Riese indicated that perhaps if the  
14 access road was to get to Structure 1011, in fact, it's to  
15 get to Structures 1009 and 1010. And then there's an actual  
16 gap that we propose to not include any access roads, between  
17 Structure 1010 and 1011. So I think in the '70s, maybe they  
18 didn't care about preserving the wetlands. It's hard to say.

19 MR. MERCIER: Thank you for that clarification. Page 2,  
20 natural diversity data base review. I know you just  
21 mentioned all the plant studies you just did, and finding a  
22 rare plant in the field survey that you did in accordance  
23 with DEEP procedures, as you noted.

24 In the application regarding the bog turtle,  
25 it did state that you may want to -- you may consult with the

1 United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Is that  
2 consultation necessary at this point based on the DEEP  
3 comments here?

4 MR. KNAPIK: It actually occurred before we received the  
5 recent comments from the DEEP. We sent out our notification  
6 to the Fish and Wildlife and included our report on the bog  
7 turtle concurrent with the submission to the DEEP.

8 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I'll move to Page 3, which has to  
9 do the EMF modeling question. Essentially, the question was  
10 why would the magnetic field levels increase slightly if the  
11 tower heights are actually increased? If someone could  
12 clarify that.

13 MR. SODERMAN: Yup. The answer to that is that the  
14 dominant source of magnetic field at the edge of the  
15 right-of-way is the existing 345 kV transmission line. As  
16 you move the proposed 115 kV transmission line higher and  
17 thus further away, you are reducing its ability to cancel out  
18 the field from that 345 kV transmission line.

19 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Mr. Riese's remaining comments  
20 have to do with a walk of the right-of-way. I guess one of  
21 his comments had to do, on Page 4, second paragraph, had to  
22 do with Structure 1009, which he noticed was an area of  
23 difficult topography. Is the new tower going to be in the  
24 same general vicinity, in line with tower -- excuse me, the  
25 stake for 1009 that sits in a difficult area of topography?

1 I wasn't sure if you were going to move that sub floor or are  
2 you going to level the area to make it more stable or some  
3 other type of engineering technique to make it more stable a  
4 surface?

5 MR. SODERMAN: There will be some grading done locally,  
6 but that structure does have to remain in place because it is  
7 an angle point in the right-of-way.

8 MR. MERCIER: So is it a matter of grading, potentially  
9 leveling off the area until, you know, types of retaining  
10 walls or anything stabilizing the slope?

11 MR. SODERMAN: No.

12 MR. MERCIER: Now, second to last paragraph talks about  
13 a Norway maple in front of 12 Chimney Drive. That also was  
14 mentioned in the field review drive today. Is there any way  
15 to save the tree that appears to be in the new right-of-way  
16 location in front of that home?

17 MR. SODERMAN: Right now, based off of our analysis,  
18 that tree would have to be removed because it would represent  
19 a clearance issue for the new transmission line.

20 MR. MERCIER: What is the approximate height it could  
21 probably reach before it becomes a concern with the proposed  
22 line site? Ten, fifteen feet?

23 MR. SODERMAN: Around eight, ten feet, yes.

24 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. In his description, he noted  
25 several telecommunications sites that were located on the

1 various towers on the existing line today during the  
2 drive-through. Has Eversource reached out to any of the  
3 telecommunication carriers regarding the proposed project or  
4 is there any impact anticipated to those carriers for  
5 construction of the new line?

6 MR. GAGNON: We have not reached out to them as of yet.  
7 We don't anticipate any issues with it. It presents a random  
8 line off to the side. If we are doing construction in the  
9 area, we'll probably let you know about it because of the --  
10 with machinery running right next to electronics equipment,  
11 we'll probably want to do something to verify a certain place  
12 for that.

13 MR. MERCIER: So based on your outreach to them, it  
14 could be possible that they may want, a carrier, they may  
15 want to locate on the new structures. Is that something that  
16 could be accommodated during the design phase?

17 MR. GAGNON: It could be, but my personal [inaudible]  
18 the existing structures are going to be taller. They're  
19 going to want to go for the height to get the further  
20 radiation signals.

21 MR. MERCIER: I have no other questions on Mr. Riese's  
22 commentary at this time. I do have a question regarding the  
23 pre-filed testimony of the environmental section, I believe  
24 Ms. Mango and Mr. Knapik.

25 On Page 11 of the pre-filed, the environmental

1 as well as the property owner concerns, I'm trying to  
2 determine at what point do you reach out to the property  
3 owners to determine any concerns they may have with the  
4 construction of the project, affecting anything that they may  
5 have a concern about? Yeah, on Page 11 of the pre-filed,  
6 Line 4 talks about a design of the project that would  
7 minimize the impacts to the property owners to the extent  
8 practical. I'm just trying to determine at what point do you  
9 reach out to the property owners to finalize the designs of  
10 the project?

11 MR. GAGNON: As part of outreach project, early on, back  
12 in March, actually, we reached out to about 30 landowners.  
13 And we go and try to contact them, let them know about the  
14 project, update them, and gather their concerns, as we did at  
15 the open house in which we captured their comments and  
16 anything special that they wanted to do. We have some  
17 commitments to one or two of homeowners at this point, so we  
18 try to accommodate what we can do. In terms -- sometimes  
19 we're not exactly sure the impact of the construction, so as  
20 we go further on in it, we can develop those specific  
21 locations and visualization aspects as we move forward.

22 MR. MERCIER: The comments at the open house, do you do  
23 follow up based on those comments with those specific  
24 landowners?

25 MR. GAGNON: We do go and we gather the comments. We

1 actually record them and we make sure that we are at some  
2 point following up with them, yes.

3 MR. MERCIER: So at some point you will catch up with  
4 the open house comments, if you have not done that already?

5 MR. GAGNON: When did we have the open house? We've  
6 actually followed up with all of those at this point.

7 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

8 MR. HENEERY: I just want to note, the bulk files  
9 include summaries of the outreach homeowners.

10 MR. MERCIER: Yes. In the bulk files, I did see two  
11 comments from two different residences, so I was just curious  
12 if, based on those comment cards they filled out, if there  
13 was a follow-up with them.

14 Now, in the application, I didn't see any  
15 exhibit in the pre-filed, but in the application, two state  
16 listed birds that could occur in the project area that was  
17 the brown thrasher and American kestrel. Although DEEP  
18 didn't comment on those in the receipt letter, is there  
19 additional follow-up required with them for those two  
20 species?

21 MR. KNAPIK: No, there isn't. They're species that  
22 could occur given the cover type that exists within the  
23 right-of-way, specifically shrub habitat, but because they're  
24 not listed there, there is no follow-up protection measures.

25 MR. MERCIER: So they're not specifically listed in the

1 project construction zone, although they stated they occur in  
2 the area of the project in general?

3 MR. KNAPIK: Right. Because the right-of-way does  
4 support the cover types that could support those birds,  
5 that's why we mentioned it in the application.

6 MS. MANGO: Just to follow up, too, for example, the  
7 brown thrasher, its habitat would increase by a tree clearing  
8 associated with the project; so there wasn't really a need  
9 for further studies at that point.

10 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I did notice in the application,  
11 Volume 3, that is the environmental section of the  
12 application, there was a breeding bird assessment that was  
13 done; and there was a recommendation on Page 61 of that that  
14 basically recommended to conduct vegetative clearing from  
15 mid-August to late March because of the impact to breeding  
16 birds, is that something Eversource proposes to adhere to  
17 that recommendation or does that not fit into your time frame  
18 of construction?

19 MS. MANGO: Well, I think I always say it is the  
20 preferred thing to do because the majority of birds do breed  
21 in that time frame, so it's preferable to do your clearing  
22 outside of that, but it depends on the schedule, you know,  
23 depends on when we do get our approvals from the Siting  
24 Council and any other approvals that we need. So if it falls  
25 into that time frame, we certainly try to do that. And then

1 you never really want to take a nest that you see, obviously.  
2 This happened to us on other projects where, if we see a nest  
3 in a tree, we put up a drone during clearing; and you know,  
4 thus far, thank goodness, the drones had revealed that there  
5 weren't eggs in the nest. But if there were, we probably  
6 would have a way to [inaudible] temporarily. So we have the  
7 technology to deal with this. It's almost impossible to see  
8 in the nest. The short answer is, if you can clear outside  
9 of the window, yes, that's the preferable thing to do; but  
10 it's not always possible.

11 MR. MERCIER: If the project was approved, then you  
12 would have the clearing -- is the clearing done all at once,  
13 say, within a two-month span or are there certain segments of  
14 the project -- say you might start on the north end first,  
15 and in a couple months, come back three months later, and do  
16 the south end or something? Is the contractor out there  
17 continually for this portion of the project?

18 MR. GAGNON: Yeah. We try to match up the civil  
19 contractor in front of the construction, the line  
20 construction contractor, that they may need to be in front of  
21 them. We first start building access roads and getting the  
22 right-of-way prepared before the line contractor gets in. So  
23 there might be a period of one or two months prior to the  
24 actual line construction for the civil contractors.

25 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. In the application -- I'm

1 sorry. Follow up?

2 MR. LYNCH: Yes. Now, so wading through all of that  
3 discussion, as I read, you're not committing to a seasonal  
4 restriction to conserve the birds, only if it fits into the  
5 construction schedule?

6 MS. MANGO: Yes because there's other factors involved.  
7 Like this project shouldn't have outages, but if there were,  
8 there would be other factors to consider.

9 MR. LYNCH: I expect that we are to balance the need  
10 with the environment in any way we can. To better the  
11 environment during this project is a good thing. Thank you,  
12 Mr. Chairman.

13 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Just talking about clearing, I  
14 just had a question in regard to the interrogatory response  
15 that had to do with the Eversource standards for clearing.

16 You essentially said cleared 25 feet from the  
17 center line of construction. I wasn't really sure what that  
18 meant. By "construction," you mean the actual structures  
19 that are going down the right-of-way or is there some other  
20 terminology?

21 MR. SODERMAN: The center line of the poles.

22 MR. MERCIER: Center line of the poles. Also in that  
23 interrogatory response, it further states that there's also a  
24 recommendation out there to clear to the edge of the  
25 right-of-way.

1 MR. GAGNON: Right now, Eversource has testified in  
2 front of FERC, going back now, they did a big investigation  
3 on us during the storm event, the nor'easter that caused 54  
4 different transmission line outages. And they put a -- in  
5 May, they put a big report together. We went down there, and  
6 they had several recommendations. One of the recommendations  
7 that they told us to do is that Eversource use best known  
8 practices to reclaim full width of the right-of-way. So  
9 we're trying to comply with the spirit of what they're asking  
10 us. They didn't give us specific direction what that means.  
11 And specifically in terms of how NERC and FERC work is they  
12 give you the parameters to work with, and you develop the  
13 policies [inaudible].

14 MR. MERCIER: So with this project, are you clearing 25  
15 feet from the center line of the poles, or are you going to  
16 clear the right-of-way as necessary to [inaudible]?

17 MR. GAGNON: I'm going to describe most of the  
18 right-of-ways as 170 feet wide, of right-of-ways that we  
19 have, except for the piece near Plumtree. That's 175. When  
20 we look at what we're doing on the right-hand side, that's on  
21 the east side, and that's where we'll put up new structures.  
22 Those new structures, we are going to go with what we call  
23 enhanced right-of-way clearing. I think in the  
24 interrogatory, it talks about that extra 10 feet. The  
25 procedures today state that we would go out 25 feet from the

1 midpoint of that structure. So today, we have -- the way the  
2 line of construction we have 15 feet of that cover.

3 MR. MERCIER: In some locations, the edge of the  
4 right-of-way way is greater than the 25 that we're talking  
5 about?

6 MR. GAGNON: We have right-of-way areas with easements  
7 of 175 feet. We do have fee-owned parcels that run beyond  
8 that 175, and the project is not planning at this time to  
9 clear all of that.

10 MR. MERCIER: I was just looking at some of the scales  
11 on some of the drawings. It appears to be clearing about 40  
12 feet rather than 25 feet, so maybe that answers my question.

13 MR. GAGNON: I would have to ask.

14 MR. SODERMAN: The 40 feet -- right. Essentially, the  
15 25 feet is what Mr. Gagnon had testified to earlier, which  
16 kind of is that additional -- enhanced clearing is what is  
17 taking it out of that 40-foot width.

18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Are you going to be clearing out  
19 the other side of the existing line that's there now to  
20 maintain?

21 MR. GAGNON: No. That's not part of the project. We  
22 are leaving that alone. We're not touching that side of the  
23 right-of-way.

24 MR. ASHTON: While we're on the topic of clearances, am  
25 I not correct in understanding that the clearance of 25 foot

1 is a guideline and not a requirement? In other words, you're  
2 not going to tear a house down if you don't happen to make  
3 the 25 feet; is that fair to say?

4 MR. SODERMAN: The 25 feet is based off of the  
5 right-of-way width that we would need to acquire. Okay? So  
6 if we just had the 115 kV line and we map out how much  
7 right-of-way we need for blow out based on the span length of  
8 the match. That's what it would be based off of.

9 MR. ASHTON: But where you have an existing  
10 right-of-way, you won't necessarily go with that additional  
11 purchase unless there's clearing available. Is that fair to  
12 say?

13 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

14 MR. ASHTON: And isn't it fair to say that the  
15 construction style, my term, can dictate a lot as to what you  
16 require? For example, if you choose to go to dead-end  
17 construction versus tangent construction or constrained  
18 tangent construction, you can tinker with the right-of-way  
19 clearances, can you not?

20 MR. SODERMAN: Yes. In this case, because of the  
21 insulator string length, it will probably buy us about  
22 two-and-a-half feet.

23 MR. ASHTON: I just want to assess the ground rules so I  
24 understand clearly where you're coming from. And it is  
25 preferable, a guideline, not a requirement in certain cases,

1 and you can skin the cat in other ways; is that -- that's my  
2 opinion? Is that fair?

3 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

4 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.

5 MR. MURPHY: The maple tree that we saw today, what's  
6 the distance between where the new line is going in and the  
7 edge of the house that's on the property? I didn't think of  
8 it then.

9 MR. SODERMAN: The house is beyond the edge of the  
10 right-of-way.

11 MR. MURPHY: It's beyond the edge of the right-of-way.  
12 The dwelling itself, is that--

13 MR. SODERMAN: It's shown on Page 8 of the 100-scale  
14 maps, which can be found at Volume 5, by the way.

15 MR. MURPHY: So your right-of-way, obviously, would not  
16 be within your ability to clear. Okay. Thank you very much.

17 MR. MERCIER: Looking at that house, I have the page  
18 open, seems just the deck, there's a deck there in the aerial  
19 photograph, and it looks like there's some kind of shed. Are  
20 those going to be impacted at all or is it just outside or  
21 not a concern?

22 MR. SODERMAN: I think that the aerial photography, this  
23 is, you know, the aerial photography is not surveyed with  
24 kind of a GIS layer. So what you see in the aerial  
25 photograph may be off one or two feet. The LiDAR was, the

1 flights that we took for our line design shows it as being on  
2 the edge of the right-of-way.

3 MR. GAGNON: Just to add to that a little bit, we talked  
4 about the line. We upgraded it in 1975. We actually  
5 condemned across that property years ago in 1975 to get that  
6 right-of-way. The house was built in 1977.

7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Staying with this sheet, 8, over on  
8 the far left side, there's structure, 10257. And next to it  
9 would be a new structure, 1015. Is 1015, that's just a  
10 regular monopole, angled pole?

11 MR. SODERMAN: That would be a dead-end monopole where  
12 the wires come into the pole itself as opposed to coming into  
13 the arm.

14 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I'm noticing the -- the line  
15 leaves that going to the north. It kind of widens out, and  
16 that's the reason why. Okay. Thank you for that  
17 clarification.

18 If you flip to Page 7, since you have it open,  
19 one of Mr. Riese's comments had to do with a house. I think  
20 it was Number -- it's on your map at No. 236, and that  
21 corresponds to 27 Hearthstone drive. Basically, the wooded  
22 buffer would be lost between the home and the cleared edge of  
23 the right-of-way. I'm just looking at what appears to be  
24 some kind of lawn area and maybe a driveway. Well, according  
25 to this, it extends onto your property. Would you agree

1 that's probably greater than a 50-percent loss based on those  
2 open areas?

3 MR. SODERMAN: Objectively, subject to check, it appears  
4 that way.

5 MR. MERCIER: Going back to a couple of environmental  
6 notes on the application, there's a section regarding soil  
7 and groundwater contamination. Are there any locations out  
8 on the project route that have already been identified as  
9 containing potential contaminants or, actually, contaminated  
10 soil or groundwater?

11 MS. MANGO: No, not so far. No studies have been done.

12 MR. MERCIER: So when you're estimating or drawing  
13 groundwater, there's a protocol in place, such as  
14 pre-characterization of discolored soils or other kinds of  
15 field techniques to determine?

16 MS. MANGO: Typically, for a project like this, maybe in  
17 particular near the Danbury landfill, or along the coastline,  
18 geotechnical studies initially to determine the type of  
19 structure, foundation and design. What we've done in the  
20 past is have studies conducted at the same time for soil and  
21 groundwater if there's any concerns so that we would actually  
22 take pre-characterization surveys. Or if we don't do that,  
23 we would, you know, be prepared to test during construction  
24 if something funny appeared.

25 MR. MERCIER: Yeah. That's my question. I just have

1 one other question regarding the existing line out there. I  
2 understand that 345 and 115 that's located on -- they share a  
3 monopole structure. Since they share a common structure,  
4 would you be anticipating any kind of project in the future  
5 where a line separation would be needed for each line, be on  
6 their own dedicated structures to eliminate any type of  
7 consistency issues?

8 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, but only if the studies dictate that  
9 it needs to be separated in the future.

10 MR. MERCIER: I assume there's no timetable? That's  
11 just a preliminary study or something that is going to  
12 be proposed down the [inaudible]?

13 MR. SCARFONE: Yes. There is no timetable, but we  
14 continuously look at the contingency events all the time.

15 MS. OKOMARO: I just want to clarify that we don't have  
16 a study going on right now that shows that this is something  
17 we're anticipating. In the future, if we did do a study in  
18 this area.

19 MR. GAGNON: Just to follow up on that, the study that I  
20 was referring to was for 2022, based on predicted loads; and  
21 so until that point, you know, we don't see an issue.

22 MR. MERCIER: If it was done with this right-of-way, if  
23 you're building a new line, would there be enough space for  
24 something of that nature or --

25 MR. GAGNON: Let me answer it two ways: When they do

1 their studies, they're going to look at a set, and they're  
2 going to go with the least cost, the most environmentally  
3 effective, or the least-impact solution. So they could see  
4 that this might be an issue at some point, but there might be  
5 a different workaround. So if there was no other workaround,  
6 could we build that line on right-of-way? Mr. Soderman,  
7 would you agree with me? We don't have the space for it.

8 MR. SODERMAN: Unless you remove the 1770 line from the  
9 double circuit pole, there's not room to fit yet a fourth  
10 circuit in there. If you remove the 1770 line and  
11 constructed it on a new pole, you could fit it in the  
12 right-of-way.

13 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank you. I have no other  
14 questions at this point.

15 MR. STEIN: Thank you. Now continue with question from  
16 the Council, Senator Murphy.

17 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The improvements  
18 to the Brookfield substation, Petition 1230, which I haven't  
19 looked at, whereas your Plumtree and Stony Hill are in here,  
20 why was work the done in Brookfield not part of this for us  
21 today?

22 MR. GAGNON: We looked at the ISO - New England study  
23 and solutions report, and the solution report looked at five  
24 different load pocket areas; and solutions identified at the  
25 load pocket areas were going to be solved by components that

1 are what I would call local, not a global, solution, a local  
2 solution. So the major issue in that area was actually  
3 feeding power into that load pocket. And what we did is put  
4 in the application and focused on getting power in that load  
5 pocket, bringing that new line in from Plumtree up to the  
6 West Brookfield junction, where it will then interconnect  
7 with the existing 115.

8 MR. MURPHY: So in essence, what you're telling me is,  
9 Docket 468 stands by itself? That is, if 468 is approved,  
10 and 1230 is not, theoretically, you can proceed to do what  
11 we've been talking about today?

12 MR. GAGNON: I don't think that, you know, looking at  
13 the solution studies -- but yes. That is correct. We would  
14 be able to -- I mean, this focuses on getting things into  
15 that load pocket, focuses on support right in that --

16 MR. MURPHY: 1230, this is a junction, but this by  
17 itself really does what I [inaudible.] Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. STEIN: Mr. Ashton?

19 MR. ASHTON: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you have a  
20 problem hearing me, give me a little bit of a yell. I have  
21 voice troubles.

22 In looking at this application, there are a  
23 couple of a mechanical questions I've got. One of them is,  
24 does the 115 kV line from Rocky River south to Stony Hill  
25 terminate at Rocky River or does it go all the way north to

1 Plumtree? Not Plumtree -- I have a problem with the maps  
2 that are coming out of the applicant. They're so tiny that  
3 even somebody knowledgeable and with a magnifying glass has a  
4 hell of a time trying to read them.

5 MR. SODERMAN: The 345 continues to Long Mountain.

6 MR. ASHTON: Yes, I know it continues to Long Mountain.  
7 How about the 115?

8 MR. SODERMAN: The 115 kV line, it terminates -- it  
9 actually meets up at Brookfield junction to go into  
10 Brookfield substation, but also continues on north up to the  
11 West Brookfield substation.

12 MR. ASHTON: I'm trying to find out if there's switching  
13 in that line at Rocky Hill -- Rocky River.

14 MR. SODERMAN: That's a different circuit.

15 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?

16 MR. SODERMAN: That's a different circuit up there.

17 MR. ASHTON: Okay. So, you know, Long Mountain to Rocky  
18 River, breaker, Rocky River to the next station south, and  
19 then you get into Stony Hill?

20 MR. SODERMAN: There's no direct connection between Long  
21 Mountain and Rocky River.

22 MR. GAGNON: I think we're confusing the 115 line and  
23 the 345 line. There is a 115 line that goes from Shepaug  
24 right now to Stony Hill, but it goes up to West Brookfield.  
25 That's the existing 1887. From West Brookfield it goes to

1 Rocky River. It's a separate line up there. I think where  
2 Chris was talking about is the 345 line that goes from  
3 Plumtree along over to the --

4 MR. ASHTON: There is no 115 connection -- hear me out.  
5 There's no 115 connection between Rocky River and Long  
6 Mountain?

7 MR. GAGNON: No, there is not.

8 MR. ASHTON: There is not. Okay. As I recall reading  
9 this, there was mentioned that at some point, there would be  
10 strong interest in building a line from Bates Rock over to  
11 Carmen Hill or somewhere up in that area. Is that fair to  
12 say?

13 MR. GAGNON: Yeah, actually, [inaudible] but it was  
14 Bates Rock over to Bunker Hill.

15 MR. ASHTON: Has anybody ever looked at the record on  
16 discussions of that kind, from Bates Rock to Shepaug or Bates  
17 Rock going north? There was discussion before the sign came  
18 out internally, possibly external. Are you aware of that?

19 MR. GAGNON: I'm not aware of that.

20 MR. ASHTON: Can I save you time? The answer was  
21 generally, hell, no. You ain't going to get it. I can say  
22 that with a measure of reliability.

23 What I'm concerned about is not that we  
24 upgrade the system at some point. It's how we upgrade and  
25 when we upgrade is really the issue before the house because

1 I don't see any technological feature that would prevent the  
2 need for electricity increasing in what is a very sparsely  
3 populated area. What kind of alternatives did you look at  
4 here? And by the way, I will identify myself as the guilty  
5 party in asking the question about bussing everything at  
6 Stony Hill because it would seem to me that it would offer a  
7 temporary solution, not a permanent problem, but a short-term  
8 solution for this.

9 MR. SCARFONE: We did look at that. When you do look at  
10 that, you have to reconstruct a line from Stony Hill over to  
11 the West Brookfield junction. You would have to probably add  
12 another synchronous condenser at Stony Hill.

13 MR. ASHTON: Stop for just a second. If you're going to  
14 bus Stony Hill, it means you have to beef up the capacity  
15 from Stony Hill and West Brookfield junction. How far is  
16 that roughly? Roughly half a mile? Three miles?

17 MR. SODERMAN: Couple miles.

18 MR. ASHTON: Couple miles? So that helps. Go ahead.  
19 Continue.

20 MR. SCARFONE: Oh, okay. So that's one of the reasons  
21 why we didn't bus at Stony Hill. The other question  
22 concerning expansion of Bates Rock into sort of like the  
23 tides coming out of Frost Bridge, that was identified in the  
24 ISO solutions study as an alternative. That was the G set.  
25 There were two global alternatives that they looked at. That

1 line was included. It's just that in the end of the solution  
2 study and discussions with ISO, it was cheaper to do this set  
3 of projects.

4 MR. ASHTON: I'm not going to pursue this, but let me  
5 just suggest you [inaudible] one awful job, Frost Bridge and  
6 Bates Rock. If you look at that, look at it carefully.  
7 Worst scenario was 15 years ago up at -- Mr. Henebry, have  
8 you moved from that area yet?

9 MR. HENEBRY: I live a tenth of a mile from Bates Rock.

10 MR. ASHTON: So, then, are you telling me that bussing  
11 at Stony Hill would be roughly the equivalent of the proposal  
12 before the house today in terms of what you're going to do?

13 MR. SCARFONE: What we're doing today is we're taking  
14 the line and moving it out of Stony Hill and not bringing it,  
15 not touching, not leaving another line there. It's  
16 eliminating the potential of having four terminal lines,  
17 which we don't like, and the need to upgrade from Stony Hill  
18 over to West Brookfield junction and adding additional  
19 reactive support in the area.

20 MR. ASHTON: Would it be fair to say there's no material  
21 advantage if you did it that way?

22 MR. SCARFONE: I could agree to that, yes.

23 MR. ASHTON: One of the other things in here that I do  
24 want to pursue is the use of hydro to back up the area. I  
25 read this on Page 40 of -- I'm not sure what the exhibit

1 number is. It is Table 4.6, Projected loading in  
2 Connecticut, 2013 to '22. It says, and this is where I was a  
3 bit surprised, in 2013, 7,055 megawatts; 2014, 7,165  
4 megawatts; and in 2015, 7,292. Are they actual or what?

5 MR. SCARFONE: No. They were forecasted loads when this  
6 study was done back in 2013. We were using a 2013 south  
7 report, so the 2013 south report projected out loads.

8 MR. ASHTON: Okay. It really isn't clear to me that  
9 this is forecast load. Do we have any upgraded data that  
10 tell us a little bit more past the 17? Put a number in?

11 MR. SCARFONE: I can give you two recent load values in  
12 the state of Connecticut. The 2015 summer at peak 6,342  
13 megawatts.

14 MR. ASHTON: Six thousand what?

15 MR. SCARFONE: 342. 2016, summer at peak to date. That  
16 was on August 11th, 6,494.

17 MR. ASHTON: How about a hundred and -- hundred and  
18 something?

19 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct, Mr. Ashton. That table,  
20 remember the table on Table 4-6 on Page 40, that's a forecast  
21 using a 90/10 forecast that we use in planning.

22 MR. ASHTON: Thank you. That clarification helps. When  
23 you use a 90/10 forecast, and you're looking into  
24 contingencies, does the 90/10 severity give you a little bit  
25 more assistance? For example, I raised the question about

1 the hydroelectric, and I came back with the applicant's  
2 application as both versions at zero or something close to  
3 zero. My recollection from the data a few years ago was an  
4 80 percent load factor, capacity factor. There was a world a  
5 difference between the two.

6 Another thing that I noticed also with load  
7 capacity factor, Shepaug, which is not too far, from my  
8 memory. I think my memory is 35 percent. And Rocky River is  
9 a horse of another color. My point here is that if you lose  
10 a transmission line on a first contingency basis, aren't you  
11 entitled to crank up those hydro units and get them online if  
12 not carrying a load so you are anticipating a second  
13 contingency?

14 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, absolutely. If there is water  
15 available --

16 MR. ASHTON: I didn't say that. Shepaug usually has  
17 some water available, and Rocky River usually has water  
18 available. And if the property owners around may not be  
19 happy to see their rates [inaudible] in summertime. But when  
20 the lights go out, aren't you entitled to do that?

21 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we are. We -- in operation, what  
22 we'll do is that if they follow a contingency event, and they  
23 see the potential to disconnect customers, we will turn those  
24 plants on.

25 MR. ASHTON: That's what I did '65.

1 MR. SCARFONE: Did it work?

2 MR. ASHTON: I ran those units. You threw the rule book  
3 in the garbage can, and you use good judgment.

4 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

5 MR. ASHTON: We can muddle through. But anyway, I'm  
6 very concerned that the hydro capability certainly deserves  
7 consideration. But depending on what that impact is, the  
8 consideration, this leads me to a question that to my mind is  
9 very important, and that is, when you look at alternatives,  
10 obviously, you're looking for the impact on the electric  
11 system. I'll go back and pick on Mr. Soderman sitting right  
12 there. When you look at alternatives, do you not look at,  
13 besides electrical efficiency capability, impact on rates?

14 MR. SCARFONE: When we do reliability studies, we  
15 absolutely get cost estimates. So inherently in our  
16 selection of a preferred solution, we typically, in most  
17 cases, will pick the lowest cost projects, sets of projects.  
18 So inherently, you could argue that because you picked the  
19 lowest cost project, you've reduced the level of rate  
20 increase that might -- that the customer might see. We're  
21 always trying to find the lowest cost solution.

22 MR. ASHTON: Lowest cost defined as?

23 MR. SCARFONE: In this case, a total L2, which is a  
24 group of projects that we selected, was about 165 million,  
25 while the other alternatives were much more than that 165.

1 MR. ASHTON: [Inaudible] sermon, and I will give it. I  
2 am extremely concerned as a professional in the field that  
3 the cost of electric is doing grave damage to the cost of  
4 doing business in Connecticut. That's by no means -- by no  
5 means -- to pick on electricity as the only issue before the  
6 house. Natural gas is a consideration and certainly taxes,  
7 too. But I am very concerned that we have to look hard, very  
8 hard, to find alternatives that solve the problem without  
9 increasing the cost and ideally, to actually decrease the  
10 cost and solve the problem. This is what I'm boring in on.

11 MR. SCARFONE: Yes. Remember that we're dictated by  
12 NERC standards, so we have to comply with NERC standards.

13 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, I hear that, but by the same token, I  
14 don't see it in many, many aspects of the business today.  
15 For example, one of the things that we talked about is using  
16 one structure to carry service. If Eversource may do it in  
17 certain instances, but I know, I know because I've seen it,  
18 the hard fact that other utilities are not following the same  
19 line. I point you to a 500 kV double-circuit structure that  
20 crosses 287. I think it is in New Jersey. And they are not  
21 doing it. We are. Now, if we're going to play the game,  
22 we've all got to play with the same rules and the same  
23 yardsticks.

24 This is what concerns me. We are killing  
25 ourselves. We're pricing ourselves out of the business. I

1 want to make sure that we're on board --

2 (Cell phone interruption.)

3 I know this area. I know what was there, I know what is  
4 there now, and I have an opinion. Obviously, that's not  
5 fully concrete yet, but our concern is that what we do works  
6 well in the future but also works for today.

7 Let me just go on and see if I can find  
8 couple other things. I enjoyed your system planning process  
9 and reliability criteria. I'm looking -- I assume that these  
10 structures south of Commerce Park will all be COR-TEN or  
11 weathering steel, or what do you call it? -- COR-TEN or  
12 Pyoriar [phonetic]; is that fair to say?

13 MR. GAGNON: That's correct.

14 MR. ASHTON: We've had testimony that weathering steel  
15 is cheaper than galvanized.

16 MR. GAGNON: Yes. In the same breath, we've been  
17 pushing 20-mile long lines of galvanized steel. That's  
18 sometime leaves me a little bit uncertain as to what's going  
19 on. Thank you.

20 Access roads. Without rereading the whole  
21 thing, my recollection is you're looking at access roads that  
22 are 20 feet wide or thereabouts, and the argument is that you  
23 want to be able to have vehicles pass mid span. Is that  
24 correct, Mr. Soderman?

25 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

1 MR. ASHTON: Okay. Why do we have to have capability of  
2 having vehicles cross anywhere along the right-of-way, which  
3 is what you're telling me, and rather than in certain areas?  
4 All these vehicles have great little devices that are called  
5 radios. And if I call Chris and I say, Chris, I'm going to  
6 move my crane up; stay where you are, why do you need to  
7 build a 20-foot wide right-of-way?

8 MR. SODERMAN: I mean, we can look at things like that,  
9 have maybe --

10 MR. ASHTON: That's cost. That's cost. C-o-s-t.  
11 That's money that comes out of the ratepayer's hide and comes  
12 out of the state's treasury. I don't understand that. And  
13 I've noticed a number of rights-of-way where the roads are  
14 superlative, to say the very least. They're great. If you  
15 put a little concrete on the top and let it cure for a couple  
16 of days, you got another section of interstate highway.

17 Another question I've got is, can you use  
18 low-pressure, low-ground-pressure vehicles in sensitive  
19 areas?

20 MR. SODERMAN: We have use tracked vehicles.

21 MR. ASHTON: You have used them. Do you use them?

22 MR. SODERMAN: Yes.

23 MR. ASHTON: That's part of your regular bag of tricks?

24 MR. SODERMAN: Right. It's a tool in the toolbox.

25 MR. ASHTON: Okay. All right. I'll let it go at that.

1 I think you're getting the point. You're getting at  
2 something that sits in my craw.

3 I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.  
4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. STEIN: Thank you, Mr. Ashton. Dr. Klemens?

6 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a hard  
7 act to follow. But I'm going to shift gears and talk very  
8 briefly about that house we saw today, No. 227. I'd like to  
9 ask a couple of questions, and I'm going to move to quite a  
10 few questions about the environment, environmental studies.

11 I wasn't quite clear when someone said that  
12 this property had been condemned in '75, and then the house  
13 was built in '77. Could you elaborate? I'm trying to  
14 understand from a land-use perspective.

15 MR. GAGNON: From my understanding, from the records  
16 when we built this line into a 345 corridor, we needed  
17 additional right-of-way. And during that period, we  
18 condemned a piece of property to have enough right-of-way for  
19 that line. That was in 1975. Two years later, the house was  
20 built.

21 DR. KLEMENS: So you condemned it for easement purposes;  
22 you didn't condemn it to [inaudible]?

23 MR. GAGNON: That's correct.

24 DR. KLEMENS: So what you're telling me is that the  
25 people who, or the developer, the person who built that

1 house, the developer who built that house, built that house  
2 with the full knowledge that there was about half the  
3 building lot had -- was encumbered by an easement, I guess,  
4 in favor of CL&P?

5 MR. GAGNON: I don't know who built it, but just by  
6 looking at the photograph of where the house is compared to  
7 where that is, compared the homes next to that lot, that one  
8 is set further back; so I would assume, yes. The builder who  
9 built that knew where that easement was.

10 DR. KLEMENS: So the person ostensibly purchased a house  
11 seeing that on a title search?

12 MR. GAGNON: I wouldn't know.

13 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. I'm just trying to understand that.

14 Let's move to the environment which is, and I  
15 tell you, I have my open rants about things, what I call  
16 corporate ties, environmental studies, which is very, very  
17 hard to pick out who has done what and who owns what. And so  
18 I'm going to start off with asking somebody who K. Bednaz,  
19 Chris Fox, and Marleigh Sullivan are who prepared the wetland  
20 assessments and what their qualifications are, and are their  
21 qualifications in the record?

22 MR. KNAPIK: I could answer those questions. Kate  
23 Bednaz is a soil scientist. She has a degree in soil science  
24 and is a registered soil scientist in the state of  
25 Connecticut. She basically spearheaded field studies along

1 with Mr. Fox and Ms. Sullivan during the field season of  
2 2015, which occurred between April and May of 2015.

3 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. Fox and Sullivan are also  
4 wetland scientists?

5 MR. KNAPIK: Yes, they are.

6 DR. KLEMENS: Those forms were filled out by wetland  
7 scientists. Are their CVs and resumes in the record?

8 MR. KNAPIK: I don't believe they are, no.

9 DR. KLEMENS: Okay.

10 MR. KNAPIK: I may add, I am representing them on behalf  
11 of the field site. We could --

12 MR. GAGNON: We can provide resumes, if you like.

13 DR. KLEMENS: I'm going to ask the chair about that.  
14 It's up to the chairman to decide.

15 MR. STEIN: Yes, we could accept them as a late file.

16 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay. That's  
17 the first piece. The next thing is, was there any  
18 consideration, there's going to be quite a bit of clearing,  
19 anything about bats show up? Any reference to discussion  
20 about bats, which is a big issue on forest clearing.

21 MR. KNAPIK: Yes. We did compile a checklist with  
22 respect to the long-eared bat, as you know, a species that is  
23 fairly threatened as well as state threatened. There is a  
24 process to follow, which we did follow. We submitted the  
25 streamlined consultation form checklist to the U.S. Fish and

1 Wildlife. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has a 30-day  
2 review of that. If there's no response from Fish and  
3 Wildlife within that 30 days, it's considered a constructive  
4 approval of our determination. That was submitted, I  
5 believe, in May of this year, May 21st, I believe was the  
6 date, and by June 21st, we had not heard back.

7 DR. KLEMENS: Is this anywhere in that --

8 MR. KNAPIK: That correspondence is in one of the  
9 volumes.

10 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Thank you. I must have missed  
11 that.

12 Vernal pools -- there are some very -- I mean,  
13 on the field today, driving down that wetland corridor, huge  
14 wetland corridor, slopes on both sides, and are you telling  
15 me, as I understand from your report, nowhere in that entire  
16 corridor underneath those power lines, there is a ponded area  
17 where either wood frogs or spotted salamanders breeding? I  
18 find that peculiar, I mean, just from what I know about  
19 Connecticut. Could you elaborate? Who did the pool studies?  
20 How did you get to that point?

21 MR. KNAPIK: Sure. The vernal pool studies were  
22 conducted when the wetland delineation study was done, the  
23 field season of 2015, which went from April through May of  
24 2015. That's typically regarded as the vernal pool season,  
25 as it were.

1 DR. KLEMENS: But they were conducted by soil  
2 scientists, not by anyone who has competence identifying  
3 vernal pools?

4 MR. KNAPIK: Ms. Bednaz, as you will see, has  
5 credentials in verifying the presence of vernal pools.

6 DR. KLEMENS: And there was not a vernal pool anywhere  
7 on this --

8 MR. KNAPIK: It's not a typical situation, I'll agree,  
9 for any rights-of-way in the state of Connecticut not to have  
10 a vernal pool subcapacity. Unfortunately, we didn't get to  
11 drive down to look at the extent of Wetland 1, which, what  
12 you would have seen is a very large wetland complex  
13 associated with Limekiln and East Swamp Road.

14 DR. KLEMENS: I'm quite familiar with that. I've been  
15 there. I'm quite familiar with that.

16 MR. KNAPIK: In my opinion, one would expect vernal  
17 pools within a floodplain situation, particularly on higher  
18 margins where you have fluctuating water, which might pond  
19 and then dissipates as the season progresses.

20 In this situation, within the right-of-way,  
21 within the constraints of the right-of-way, much of that  
22 right-of-way is, characterizes a riverine system for March,  
23 which is mainly permanent, semi-permanent, with flooding most  
24 of the year. Again, both of those waterways have, actually,  
25 active stock programs, from what I understand, with the State

1 of Connecticut, and you wouldn't typically encounter  
2 vernal-pool-indicated species where you have populations. So  
3 again, it's not a typical situation to have no vernal pools,  
4 but at least within the confines --

5 DR. KLEMENS: Your testimony is whether there's fish,  
6 where there's fish, there's no vernal pool species?

7 MR. KNAPIK: You would typically not find some indicated  
8 species.

9 DR. KLEMENS: In the pre-filed testimony, I believe, of  
10 Ms. Mango, something about that Mr. Davison also was involved  
11 with the vernal pool? Is he able to speak on that too?

12 MR. KNAPIK: Mr. Davison was mainly retained for his  
13 expertise with the bog turtle species, not the vernal pool.  
14 His capacity with respect the vernal pools, again, we did  
15 have multiple studies in 2015 vernal pool season and  
16 [inaudible] delineation, and we retained Mr. Davison in May  
17 of this year to perform the Phase 1 assessment for the bog  
18 turtle. And during that time, it was suggested that if we  
19 did encounter any presence of vernal pools, any types of  
20 indication that there were vernal pools that may not have  
21 been witnessed during the 2015 season, he reported that  
22 information. That was his capacity with respect to the  
23 vernal pools.

24 DR. KLEMENS: Are we going to allow Mr. Davison to talk  
25 at any time today?

1 MR. KNAPIK: We could, yes.

2 DR. KLEMENS: That would be much appreciated.

3 MR. HENEERY: He is sworn in.

4 DR. KLEMENS: Okay.

5 MR. DAVISON: Dr. Klemens, how are you?

6 DR. KLEMENS: Fine, fine. But I have a bunch of  
7 questions relative to -- I understand we're not allowed to  
8 see the bog turtle, and I know that, obviously, there is a  
9 historical record of a bog turtle there. You did a Phase 1  
10 survey?

11 MR. DAVISON: That's correct.

12 MR. KLEMENS: Can you explain for the Council Phase 1  
13 program, what parameters you looked at?

14 MR. DAVISON: Phase 1 survey, as described in the bog  
15 turtle recovery plan written by the United States Fish and  
16 Wildlife Service requires that you assess a variety of  
17 wetland characteristics, primarily whether there are suitable  
18 soils, suitable hydrology, and suitable vegetation that meet  
19 the criteria for habitat and for recovery. It describes  
20 those conditions that you're looking for.

21 DR. KLEMENS: And there was no part in the area of that  
22 corridor where you had correct hydrology, the correct  
23 vegetation, the correct muck depth that could sustain a bog  
24 turtle?

25 MR. DAVISON: Not that I saw. That entire -- I know

1 you're familiar with this wetlands. I'm saying this is with  
2 that understanding. Essentially all the areas that I looked  
3 at were nearly 100 percent phrag cover. All were permanent  
4 flooded or semi-permanently flooded, those hillside seeps and  
5 groundwater-fed wetlands you're looking for were not present.  
6 There are some soils out there, but most of the muck soils  
7 were Sacko [phonetic] floodplain soils with evidence of  
8 active flooding, so if it muck technically, but.

9 DR. KLEMENS: In your profession, looking at some of the  
10 pictures, particularly, the BSC Group, particularly Page No.  
11 1, do you see that habitat as potentially could support  
12 either the wood turtle or the spotted turtle?

13 MR. DAVISON: Hold on one second. Let me take a look at  
14 that.

15 DR. KLEMENS: BSC report, Page 1, site photographs.  
16 First one is showing the area around Plumtree substation,  
17 which is where [inaudible] to drive in to rather diverse  
18 wetland surrounding that substation.

19 MR. STEIN: Dr. Klemens, can you clarify, is that a  
20 wetland watercourse report that you're referring to or Mr.  
21 Davison's report?

22 DR. KLEMENS: Sorry. I'm referring to the BSC report,  
23 and it's right in front of the assessment.

24 MR. DAVISON: I think I have it here. I'm sorry. Which  
25 photo did you say?

1 DR. KLEMENS: I'm asking about Photo No. 1 and Photo No.  
2 2, and the potential for -- these are represented wetland  
3 photographs Appendix A, on the wetlands and watercourses  
4 report. I'm asking you your professional judgment of the  
5 suitability of that kind of habitat potentially for a wood  
6 turtle and spotted turtle.

7 MR. DAVISON: Just to make sure I'm looking at the same,  
8 Photo 1 has three structures in it?

9 DR. KLEMENS: Photo 1 is a view of wetland B1, west side  
10 of Plumtree station, existing at 321 line structure. And  
11 below is a sort of a shrub scrub swamp along the southern  
12 edge of Plumtree substation.

13 I'm just asking you, based on your experience  
14 in Connecticut, looking at these habitats in part of the  
15 state, would you think there is a potential that wood turtles  
16 and spotted turtles could inhabit those wetlands?

17 MR. DAVISON: Yes, I do think that's possible. I'm not  
18 directly familiar with spotted turtle records in the area,  
19 but I'm fairly certain there are wood turtle wetlands  
20 drainage.

21 DR. KLEMENS: Did you see them during your surveys?

22 MR. DAVISON: No, but my survey was in -- it was --

23 DR. KLEMENS: So based on your professional opinion,  
24 there is potential wood and spotted turtle habitat possibly  
25 there?

1 MR. DAVISON: Yes.

2 DR. KLEMENS: So then I direct Eversource, is Eversource  
3 willing to put in the turtle protection protocols of other  
4 projects on this project?

5 MR. KNAPIK: For the record, with respect to the wood  
6 turtle, we did state on the application that we couldn't  
7 state that a wood turtle habitat wasn't present within that  
8 large wetlands system. We accepted the fact that they would  
9 be there in some capacity, mainly off the right-of-way --  
10 beyond the right-of-way habitat. So it does appear to  
11 support the preferred habitat for the wood turtle, so we did  
12 commit to implementing BMPs during the construction for the  
13 protection of the wood turtle.

14 DR. KLEMENS: Where are those located? This is a  
15 massive application.

16 MR. KNAPIK: Section 6 of our Volume 1.

17 DR. KLEMENS: So you are going to do that?

18 MR. DAVISON: Yes. That's what we committed to.

19 DR. KLEMENS: And the spotted turtles would also be  
20 encompassed by that?

21 MR. KNAPIK: They would be. We didn't recognize spotted  
22 turtle, but that would be easily accommodated.

23 DR. KLEMENS: All right. So we've established that.

24 Lastly, I noticed, when we went to the end of  
25 Research Drive today, going into any consideration given to

1 the hognose snake, which is here in this valley and it was a  
2 major issue on Route 7, Brookfield, and certainly is within  
3 the zone that they have been reported. How are you going to  
4 deal with hognose snake in terms of traversing and going  
5 through the right-of-ways?

6 MR. KNAPIK: If I may, it wasn't a species that was  
7 provided by the DEEP as a species of concern with within this  
8 corridor. It's certainly a consideration that we could make  
9 for any mitigation that could be done.

10 DR. KLEMENS: So the DEEP provides you, and maybe this  
11 is a question I'll direct to Mr. Davison, the DEEP provides  
12 you what records they have, not what potentially could be  
13 there?

14 MR. DAVISON: That's correct. It's very similar to a  
15 typical NDDB submission that a homeowner would develop but  
16 with probably more detail.

17 DR. KLEMENS: Correct. So a project of this size and  
18 this magnitude, even though it's a reconstruction of an  
19 existing right-of-way, I would think that one has to rethink  
20 a little bit about, based on knowledge of distribution of  
21 these animals of what possibly would be there to be  
22 responsible in mitigating impact to them. That's sort of my  
23 point here. You can take a dot here and a dot here to the  
24 NDDB, but anyone who understands these systems realizes the  
25 high potential for quite a few of these species within that

1 corridor; and that includes also bog turtles in some of these  
2 areas you're clearing.

3 I think I've kind of exhausted -- oh, I do  
4 have a question on the birds. What actual field studies, I  
5 think there some sort of elaborate, sort of methodology that,  
6 theoretical methodology. What is the actual breeding birds  
7 survey? Was this all done on a desktop analysis? It's very  
8 hard to figure that out. It's a very fancy populating model,  
9 and this is what you think, but I'm interested in what was  
10 actually done in the field on this site as opposed to  
11 theoretical desktop models. So would you elaborate on that,  
12 please?

13 MR. KNAPIK: I can, yes. All our field studies begin  
14 with a desktop analysis of the work area we're going to be  
15 conducting the studies. So we'll remotely, using aerial  
16 photography, for potential presence of vernal pools,  
17 vegetative cover types, development, watercourses, compile  
18 mapping. We then use that for the field investigations that  
19 follow. Once we get out in the field, we'll do pool studies,  
20 delineations, in addition to a characterization of the  
21 species using the right-of-way field investigation, and that  
22 includes breeding bird surveys.

23 DR. KLEMENS: So what field work was done and by whom?

24 MR. KNAPIK: Again, it was done by the field staff that  
25 conducted delineation, spearheaded by Ms. Bednaz.

1 DR. KLEMENS: And they're also qualified to do breeding  
2 bird analyses?

3 MR. KNAPIK: Yes, they are. And again, those CVs will  
4 show that; they will show experience in conducting those  
5 studies.

6 MR. KLEMENS: Okay. I think that pretty much wraps up  
7 my questions. Let me give you one piece of advice going into  
8 the future. A lot of this application is spread all over the  
9 place. There was an executive -- you've told me more. Maybe  
10 that's part of the evidentiary hearing, about your thought  
11 process. Maybe some of these concepts as we go forward could  
12 be put in at the very beginning? Maybe would help someone  
13 like myself when there are six volumes of stuff appearing on  
14 my desk to actually wade through.

15 Thank you very much. I have no further  
16 questions, Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. STEIN: Thank you, Dr. Klemens. Mr. Lynch?

18 MR. LYNCH: Just a few questions, Mr. Chairman. First,  
19 a housekeeping type of thing. I noticed in this application  
20 and in other applications from Eversource or your  
21 predecessor, CL&P, or petitions, you're doing a new line, but  
22 you changed the number of the old lines. I don't understand  
23 the purpose for that.

24 MR. GAGNON: It has to do with safety, safety of the  
25 line crews out in the field. At one time, we used changed

1 one of the lines and not the other. We actually had an  
2 incident where we had a cell tower go up after we did some  
3 reconstruction of the line, and no one knew if that line was  
4 on the new piece or the old piece, the way it was designated.  
5 So we've taken a new approach where we renamed the line on  
6 both sides.

7 MR. LYNCH: Oh, okay. That was a simple one. And my  
8 second housekeeping question, you say within the application  
9 that during construction, you're trying to keep the lay down  
10 there, you're within the right-of-way. But if you have to go  
11 outside, would you rent or buy the properties?

12 MR. GAGNON: Yes. We would try to use Eversource  
13 properties first, but then we'd look for commercial  
14 properties that have maybe parking lots not being used or  
15 properties that have available space. Yes. We'd usually  
16 have the contractor go and acquire those. Not necessarily  
17 acquire, but rent the location from the landowner.

18 MR. LYNCH: The -- you discuss within the application  
19 undergrounding viability, and I'm sure we will hear more  
20 about it. How viable is the undergrounding alternative, and  
21 would you -- I know why you're going over it, but would you  
22 entertain something if the Council says that you've got to do  
23 undergrounding and mix and match?

24 MR. GAGNON: We did look at doing some undergrounding.  
25 When you compare it to the cost of overheading, it becomes

1 pretty prohibitive.

2 MR. LYNCH: I know that's reason for it, it's  
3 prohibitive; but I'm just saying, if you could mix and match  
4 it -- some underground, some overhead?

5 MR. GAGNON: Maybe I'll ask -- he's in the real estate  
6 group. I'm not sure if we actually have underground rights  
7 on some of these, so we have to investigate having  
8 underground rights. If we're looking at the transmission on  
9 a right-of-way. Going into public roads which might --

10 MR. LYNCH: Yes. That's the super --

11 MR. GAGNON: That was something --

12 MR. LYNCH: That was actually mentioned something about  
13 going out public --

14 MR. GAGNON: Yes. That was one of our options that we  
15 looked at. A lot more expensive.

16 MR. LYNCH: Now, this is something that -- I mean, I've  
17 been hearing now for 20 years, the Southwest Connecticut  
18 Reliability Project. And I remember Mr. Soderman's father  
19 coming in and talking about it 20 years ago. And here it is  
20 in the application, you know, and ISO [inaudible] how much  
21 longer are we going to have this Southwest Connecticut  
22 Reliability Project in place? Are we ever going to finish  
23 it?

24 MR. GAGNON: I wouldn't really know the details, but  
25 overall, what we did is just split up the project. We just

1 couldn't tackle everything at once. Southwest Connecticut is  
2 a very congested area, so they wanted to build a backbone  
3 first; so they focused on that. At this point, we're  
4 beginning to look at the load pocket issues, and that's what  
5 ISO is focusing on.

6 MR. LYNCH: I'm going to go back. Excuse me. We did  
7 the 345. We did the first 115. That was supposed to take  
8 care of the load pockets here. Here we are again, a few  
9 years later, still looking at the same problem.

10 MR. SCARFONE: I was here then. Remember what we said  
11 in the Southwest Connecticut 345 kV group?

12 MR. LYNCH: You will have to refresh my memory.

13 MR. SCARFONE: So we came in and we go hand first, and  
14 then we came back. And we indicated to the Siting Council,  
15 Mr. Zak, that in our studies, there were still, I think,  
16 about 20 other load pocket issues that we didn't address back  
17 then. We were very concentrated on addressing the 345 kV  
18 network. So we hit that, we solved that problem first, and  
19 now we have come back to this application and many petitions  
20 to clean up the local 115 kV problems that were identified  
21 back then.

22 MR. LYNCH: I just I had to ask. And lastly, when you  
23 get done with the new right-of-way, and it's all cleared, are  
24 you opening up an attractive nuisance once it's cleared for  
25 ATVs, dirt bikes, snowmobiles in the winter and so on?

1 MR. GAGNON: We're going to be working with the land  
2 owners to see if someone wants that opened. I have a teenage  
3 boy. Yes, I'd look at something like that; but we do try to  
4 have barriers and work with the landowners of that property  
5 and see if they want gates or barrage.

6 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you,  
7 Eversource.

8 MR. STEIN: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. Attorney Lu?

9 MR. LU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I was just  
10 wondering, how did Eversource determine which residents  
11 receive notice of this project and which don't?

12 MR. GAGNON: I think it's actually out on the  
13 application process. It identifies that all abutting  
14 landowners have to be notified. And do you want to take --  
15 I'll have Farah answer the question.

16 MS. OKOMARO: We notified the substation abutters  
17 according to the application guideline.

18 MR. LU: Okay. And Eversource doesn't go beyond what's  
19 required at all?

20 MS. OKOMARO: We sometimes do outreach separate from the  
21 application; however, what's notified and documented and  
22 received, receipt of the notification to the substation  
23 abutters.

24 MR. GAGNON: One of the big things we do to make sure  
25 folks in the town are notified is we do have an open house,

1 and we invite the public to come in and take a look at the  
2 proposed project.

3 MR. LU: How are they notified of the open house? Just  
4 by mail or signs?

5 MS. OKOMARO: We do a bill insert to notify them.

6 MR. LU: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr.  
7 Chairman.

8 MR. STEIN: Just to follow up, do you know how many  
9 people approximately showed up for the open house?

10 MS. OKOMARO: It was lightly attended. I'm going to say  
11 maybe 30, if that. I don't know if it was that much. I  
12 don't recall the exact number.

13 MR. STEIN: Are there any more questions?

14 MR. MURPHY: The definition of "abutter" is someone who  
15 touches the right-of-way with their land? What about the  
16 cross street?

17 MS. OKOMARO: The definition is someone that actually  
18 abuts, you know, directly touches the --

19 MR. MURPHY: "Abutting" means "touching"?

20 MS. OKOMARO: Correct.

21 MR. MURPHY: Or what if someone has a right-of-way that  
22 abuts?

23 MS. OKOMARO: The right-of-way abuts?

24 MR. MURPHY: Correct. Someone across the street would  
25 not?

1 MS. OKOMARO: Correct.

2 MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

3 MR. STEIN: Dr. Klemens?

4 DR. KLEMENS: Senator Murphy asked the very questions I  
5 was going to ask.

6 MR. STEIN: Mr. Mercier?

7 MR. MERCIER: Yeah. Just to go back on road discussion  
8 that we had earlier, the access road that would be built, a  
9 20-foot-wide travel surface was discussed and potentially  
10 could be reduced slightly. Once the project is finished and  
11 it's operational, for your access road, I believe in the  
12 application, they remain in place. Is that correct? Unless  
13 the property opener wants them removed?

14 MR. GAGNON: Yes. The preferred method is to leave them  
15 in place unless the property owner is requesting us not to.

16 MR. MERCIER: Are they going to be painting a clear  
17 stake so that 10 years from now when shrubs are growing,  
18 you'll trim those back?

19 MR. GAGNON: Well, what we do is, we would talk with the  
20 landowner. Sometimes we actually cover them with some  
21 topsoil if the landowner prefers it be covered. Sometimes we  
22 leave it all open, and the natural re-vegetation of the area  
23 would --

24 MR. MERCIER: Again, I assume that's the same with the  
25 work pads?

1 MR. GAGNON: True.

2 MR. MERCIER: We figure a work pad is 100 X 100, a  
3 gravel zone, does the crane utilize one half of that? Or why  
4 such a large amount of space for --

5 MR. GAGNON: There's different setups for different  
6 types of work tasks. If you're pulling the transmission line  
7 in, you need to have a pulling station, a tensioner, and some  
8 vehicles. If you're working at a structure, you can just use  
9 a large bucket truck next to the structure. So it really  
10 just depends on the size of the work task that needs to be  
11 done.

12 MR. MERCIER: There's also a minimum, generally, of 100  
13 X 100, even though the task could be the smallest?

14 MR. GAGNON: The smallest, yeah. In the application, it  
15 talks about 100 X 300.

16 MS. MANGO: Just to clarify this issue about the work  
17 pads and roads. I think, you know, I've been involved in the  
18 project for a long time, and I think we initially asked for  
19 less wide roads; but on the Greater Springfield Reliability  
20 Project, for example, where we had rugged terrain and there  
21 had to be grading, the access roads got wider than -- we  
22 used to ask for 16 feet was the standard road; and in  
23 wetlands, typically 16 feet wide with timber mats. But what  
24 happened was that we were bleeding over the 16 feet and ended  
25 up having to grade. So then we kept having to come back to

1 not only you, to inland/wetland or something for changes, and  
2 literally had some people out there measuring with a tape.

3 So we subsequently developed projects, for  
4 example, for the Interstate Reliability Project, we simply  
5 asked for like a 16- to 20-foot-wide travel surface with  
6 maybe 25-feet wide, your total impact area.

7 Now, if the contractor gets out there, and he  
8 doesn't need that, he doesn't build it. The contracts are, I  
9 think, fairly well written. Mr. Gagnon and Mr. Soderman can  
10 talk about that. So that doesn't happen, just spreading  
11 gravel willy-nilly; but we didn't want to get into a  
12 situation where every single time we went 18 feet or 20 feet,  
13 we had to go back for a change.

14 And the other thing is, when these work pads,  
15 100 x 100, that's the standard, as Mr. Gagnon explained. But  
16 we use this to estimate our impacts, too, because we have to  
17 estimate something.

18 Now, if we have a -- this project, we don't  
19 have a situation -- this situation, but if you went back and  
20 looked at the D & M plans for the interstate project, those  
21 pads looked like jigsaw puzzles. We had to jigger our way  
22 around coastal resources. Some had corners cut off.

23 So there's a lot of things that we can do at a  
24 particular site, but we don't want to ever say, Let's go with  
25 60, 40, that's always going to be great, because you may need

1 100 once you're in the field. Once you figure things out,  
2 the contractor can maybe do better. If anyone else wants to  
3 add something. I've spent three years on interstate, so I've  
4 seen all of this.

5 MR. MERCIER: So I think what you're saying is that  
6 there is a field attempt to minimize some of the construction  
7 related --

8 MS. MANGO: Absolutely, but we need some kind of  
9 standard to go into our applications with, with all the  
10 different agencies. And in some cases, yes, you're going to  
11 need 100 feet. You're going to need 100 X 100, full work  
12 pads. If you're at an angle, you're going to need more. Can  
13 you do something to maybe reduce it at the resource site? We  
14 can certainly try. In some cases, we had to put sand down  
15 and, you know, create some kind of a pad to reduce the  
16 pressure so that we could still use the work pad without  
17 damaging the subsurface. So there is things that we can do  
18 when we get into, like, a field plan, final construction  
19 analysis.

20 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Dr. Klemens?

21 DR. KLEMENS: I do have one more question, getting back  
22 to the notification. We received a letter from the resident  
23 of 29 Birch Drive in Bethel. Can you tell me where that is  
24 on your map so I can see where that particular residence is?  
25 They said they were not notified, and it might be because

1 they don't fall within the notification zone.

2 MR. GAGNON: I think that would be explained on Page 11  
3 of 14.

4 DR. KLEMENS: Page 11 of 14. I believe it's 210, Line  
5 210. Is that the page on your definition of "abutter"?

6 MR. GAGNON: Well, the abutters that we talked about  
7 were abutters to the substation. And the right-of-way,  
8 people were notified by doing the open house session.

9 DR. KLEMENS: So you don't notify any of the abutters on  
10 the right-of-way?

11 MR. GAGNON: What we do is we -- for the open house,  
12 what we do is we contact them through the billing service;  
13 and we have public outreach people call if someone comes and  
14 contacts them and wants more information regarding the  
15 project.

16 DR. KLEMENS: So the only people that are formally  
17 notified is abutters, the people around the substation, and  
18 all these people along the right-of-way, including the people  
19 that have the red, big maple tree we're talking about? None  
20 of those people were formally sent a letter from Eversource  
21 informing them of these proceedings?

22 MS. OKOMARO: They were notified via the open house,  
23 which we included in a bill insert; so they were notified  
24 from that standpoint. They weren't formally notified by  
25 certified letter, in getting receipts back, which were part

1 of the guidelines, things we only needed to do for substation  
2 abutters.

3 MR. GAGNON: For example, in talking about the tree, we  
4 went forward and made contact with them. We know they're  
5 going to want to know more about the project, and we had  
6 outreach folks go and make contact with them, and we did.

7 MR. STEIN: There are specific requirements, and I  
8 believe our executive director will enlighten us.

9 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under 16-50 l,  
10 the notice requirements are very well spelled out for  
11 transmission lines, because we often have transmission lines  
12 that are multiple miles long with maybe thousands of  
13 abutters, that legislature has required that billing inserts  
14 be included for at least 60 days before a contact -- an  
15 application, and that is deemed to be proper notification for  
16 a project of this scope. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 MR. STEIN: Thank you. Mr. Mercer?

18 MR. MERCIER: Yes. In regards to that property number,  
19 210, on your map here, that was 29 Birch Drive, and that  
20 individual did write a comment card at the open house. And  
21 one of their concerns on the card was, you know, you will be  
22 clearing up to the right-of-way, obviously, the edge of the  
23 right-of-way, but one of their comments was they were  
24 concerned they would go onto their property outside the  
25 right-of-way and chop down large trees. Do you anticipate

1 something like that occurring as part of this project, if  
2 they were not sick or --

3 MR. GAGNON: The only time they would go outside of the  
4 limits of clearing is if there's something called a "danger  
5 tree." That tree is substantially large, where it has the  
6 potential, if it does fall, close enough to where the line  
7 can fall. So these areas, we work with the landowner to see  
8 if we can -- anything outside of the clearing limits, we have  
9 to make sure we have landowner permission. It cannot be done  
10 without landowner permission.

11 MR. MERCIER: So a "danger tree" includes healthy, large  
12 trees also, if they're very large -- not sick, no soil  
13 conditions, just a general large tree?

14 MR. GAGNON: That's correct. There are two categories  
15 -- a hazard tree and in-danger tree.

16 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Any other questions or  
17 comments? If not, Council is going to recess at this point.  
18 We're going to resume at 7:00 p.m. for the public comments  
19 session. Thank you.

20

21

22 (Adjourned: 5:02 p.m.)

23

24

25

*Kirsten Telhiard*

---

**Kirsten Telhiard, LSR #361**