STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 3B

The United Illuminating Company Amended Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for replacement of a portion of the existing Derby - Shelton 115-kV electric transmission line facility.

Reopening of this Certificate based on changed conditions pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-181a(b).

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Public Hearing held on Thursday July 28, 2022, beginning at 2 p.m., via remote access.

H e l d B e f o r e:

JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

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

Council Members:

QUAT NGUYEN, Designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

ROBERT SILVESTRI
LOUANNE COOLEY
MARK QUINLAN
DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

Council Staff:

MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.
Executive Director and Staff Attorney

MICHAEL PERRONE
Siting Analyst

LISA FONTAINE
Fiscal Administrative Officer

For Certificate Holder, The United Illuminating Company:
MURTHA CULLINA LLP
One Century Tower
265 Church Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510-1220
BY: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ.

Zoom co-host: Aaron Demarest

****All participants were present via remote access.**

*****(Inaudible) - denotes breaks in speech due to interruptions in audio or echo.**

MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public hearing is called to order this Thursday, July 28, 2022, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette, member and presiding officer of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council are Quat Nguyen, designee for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, Robert Silvestri, Louanne Cooley, Mark Quinlan and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

Members of the staff are Melanie Bachman, executive director and staff attorney; Michael Perrone, siting analyst; and Lisa Fontaine, fiscal administrative officer.

If you haven't done so already, I'd ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and/or telephones now.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon a motion to reopen the Council's January 16, 1974 and December 8, 1976 final decisions to issue The United Illuminating Company a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance and operation of an

electric transmission line facility that traverses Ansonia, Derby and Shelton, Connecticut based on changed conditions.

On June 9, 2022, the Council, pursuant to a request filed by The United Illuminating Company and the provisions of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-181a(b), reopened the January 16, 1974 and December 8, 1976 final decisions to consider modifications to the existing electric transmission line facility.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this remote public hearing was published in The Connecticut Post on June 11, 2022. Upon this Council's request, the Certificate Holder erected signs at conspicuous locations along the route so as to inform the public of the name of the Certificate Holder, the type of facility, the remote public hearing date, and contact information for the Council, which includes the website and phone number as follows: At structure 359 along the right-of-way at the intersection of Howe Avenue in Shelton; at Structure 4 at the intersection of Coon Hollow Road and Hawthorne Avenue in Derby; at Derby Public Works on Coon Hollow Road; and at Structure

18 at the Nolan Athletic Complex on Route 34 in Ansonia.

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

The parties and intervenors to the proceeding are as follows: The Certificate Holder, The United Illuminating Company, represented by Bruce McDermott, Esq. of Murtha Cullina.

The parties, the City of Derby, represented by the Honorable Richard Dziekan as mayor.

The City of Shelton, the Honorable Mark A. Lauretti, mayor.

Attorney General, the Honorable William Tong, attorney general.

State Representative, the 104th Assembly District, the Honorable Kara Rochelle.

State Representative, the 113th Assembly District, the Honorable Jason Perillo.

State Senator, 17th Senatorial District, the Honorable Jorge Cabrera.

State Senator, the 32nd Senatorial

District, the Honorable Eric Berthel.

And Intervenor Tanya Malse represented by Tanya Malse.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's Docket No. 3B webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested persons may join any session of this public hearing to listen, but no public comments will be received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session.

At the end of the evidentiary session, we will recess until 6:30 p.m. for the public comment session. Please be advised that any person may be removed from the remote evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council. The 6:30 p.m. public comment session is reserved for the public to make brief statements into the record.

I wish to note that the Certificate Holder, parties and intervenors, including their representatives, witnesses and members, are not allowed to participate in the public comment

session. I also wish to note for those who are listening and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the remote public comment session that you or they may send written comments to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof, either by mail or by email, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken during the remote public comment session.

A verbatim transcript of this remote public hearing will be posted on the Council's Docket No. 3B webpage and deposited with the Ansonia, Derby and Shelton City Clerk's Offices and the Seymour Town Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

Please be advised that the Council's project evaluation criteria under the statute does not include the consideration of property values.

We will take a 10 to 15 minute break at a convenient juncture at around 3:30 p.m.

We'll now move on to administrative notice by the Council. I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman Numeral I-B, Items 1 through 80 that the Council has administratively

noticed. Does any party or intervenor have any objection to the items that the Council has administratively noticed?

Attorney McDermott, good afternoon.

MR. McDERMOTT: Good afternoon.

MR. MORISSETTE: That's an echo.

MR. McDERMOTT: Good afternoon. Does someone have their -- are we all on mute?

Good afternoon.

MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon.

MR. McDERMOTT: I apologize, they left me in charge of the audiovisual. I'm not doing a very good job. Bruce McDermott from Murtha Cullina on behalf of The United Illuminating Company. No objection.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney McDermott. Does any other party or intervenor?

(No response.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Hearing none, accordingly, the Council hereby administratively notices these items.

(Administrative Notice Items I-B-1 through I-B-80: Received in evidence.)

MR. MORISSETTE: I'll move on to the appearance by the Certificate Holder. Will the

Certificate Holder present its witness panel for the purpose of taking the oath? Attorney Bachman will administer the oath.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Good afternoon, members of the Council and Council staff. The witness panel for The United Illuminating Company this afternoon is as follows: Todd Berman who's the manager of environmental programs and projects at The United Illuminating Company. Mr. Joe Dietrich who's a senior project manager, permitting lead at Westwood Professional Services. Mr. Sathish Konduru, principal transmission engineer, also at Westwood. Benjamin Cotts, principal engineer at Exponent. Leslie Downey, outreach specialist, public outreach projects at UI.

Mr. David George, principal investigator at Heritage Consultants. And I'm actually not sure, Mr. George, he's actually traveling, and I'm not sure if he's on or not, Mr. Morissette, but if he's not, Mr. David Lester from his office is available and will be covering for him.

So if I could just have some indication who from Heritage is on, I'd appreciate it. I see

both Mr. George -- okay. Thank you.

Michael Libertine, vice president of All-Points Technology Corporation. Kevin McMahon who is the senior project manager at UI. Annette Potasz from real estate projects at UI. Ed Roedel, principal engineer, strategic planning at UI. MeeNa Sazanowicz, transmission line standards at UI. Jasun Van Horn, environmental permitting and compliance specialist at UI. And Josh Wilson, senior wetland ecologist at Biohabitats, Incorporated.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney McDermott.

Attorney Bachman, please administer the oath.

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Could the witnesses please raise their right hand.

T O D D B E R M A N,

J O E D I E T R I C H,

S A T H I S H K O N D U R U,

B E N J A M I N C O T T S,

L E S L I E D O W N E Y,

D A V I D R. G E O R G E,

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

K E V I N M C M A H O N,
A N N E T T E P O T A S Z,
E D W A R D R O E D E L,
M E E N A S A Z A N O W I C Z,
J A S U N V A N H O R N,
J O S H W I L S O N,

having been first duly sworn (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.

Attorney McDermott, please begin by verifying all exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I believe I can accomplish that through the project manager, Kevin McMahon.

Mr. McMahon, regarding Certificate Holder Exhibit No. 1, which is the motion to reopen and modify dated May 13, 2022; Certificate Holder Exhibit No. 2 which is prefiled testimony of Kevin McMahon dated July 20, 2022; Certificate Holder Exhibit 3 which is the virtual tour of the

project dated July 20th; Certificate Holder Exhibit 4 which is the sign posting affidavit dated July 21st; Certificate Holder Exhibit 5 which is -- I'm sorry, I'll skip 5 and go to 6 which is the responses to the Council's Interrogatories, Set One, dated July 21st; Certificate Holder Attachment F, which is the Exponent supplement to the Council Interrogatory No. 15, dated July 21st; and Certificate Holder Exhibit No. 8, which is a letter from the State Historic Preservation Office, dated July 26, 2022, are you familiar with those documents, Mr. McMahon?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Yes, I am, Mr. McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: Please raise your voice.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Yes, I am, Mr. McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: And did you prepare or oversee the preparation of those various exhibits?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): That is correct, Mr. McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes or revisions thereto?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): No, I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And regarding Certificate Holder Exhibits 1 through 4 and 6 through 8, do you adopt those as exhibits in this proceeding?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. McMahon, you need to raise your voice.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): I do, Mr. McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: Regarding Certificate Holder Exhibit No. 5, Dr. Cotts, one of those exhibits, I believe Letter C, is your resume, you're familiar with that?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes, I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And any changes or revisions to it?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): No.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as an exhibit here today?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And Mr. Konduru, your resume appears as Attachment B, I believe, to that document. Are you familiar with your resume?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: Any changes or revisions thereto?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): No.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that as an exhibit?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. Mr. Libertine, your resume appears as Attachment E. Any changes or revisions to your resume?

(No response.)

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Libertine? I believe you're on mute.

(No response.)

MR. McDERMOTT: I'll come back to Mr. Libertine, hopefully.

Okay. Mr. Wilson?

THE WITNESS (Wilson): I'm here.

MR. McDERMOTT: Your resume appears as Attachment F. Do you have any changes or revisions to your resume, and do you adopt it as an exhibit here today?

THE WITNESS (Wilson): I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And then Mr. Dietrich, your resume appears as Exhibit A.

Do you have any changes or revisions to it, and do you adopt it as an exhibit here today?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): I have no changes and adopt it as an exhibit.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. I see Mr. Libertine. Okay. Well, perhaps we can deal with Mr. Libertine later. I see him, and I see him moving his mouth, but we're not hearing him.

MR. MORISSETTE: Maybe he could give us a thumbs up that he agrees that his resume is okay.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): (Indicating an affirmative response.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. There we go.

MR. McDERMOTT: Excellent idea. There he is. That covers that part. The testimony part will be a little harder, I think.

MR. MORISSETTE: I think so.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. With that, Mr. Morissette, I move that Certificate Holder Exhibits 1 through 8 be admitted into evidence, and the panel is ready for cross-examination. Thank you.

Mr. Morissette, I can no longer hear you.

MR. MORISSETTE: That would be helpful if I took it off of mute.

Does any party or intervenor object to the admission of the Certificate Holder's exhibits?

(No response.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Hearing none, the exhibits are hereby admitted.

(Certificate Holder's Exhibits II-B-1 through II-B-8: Received in evidence - described in index.)

MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now begin with cross-examination of the Certificate Holder by the Council starting with Mr. Perrone followed by Mr. Silvestri and then by Mr. Nguyen.

Mr. Perrone.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

My first question is regarding the sign posting affidavit. The signs were posted over a two-day period?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Mr. Perrone, that is correct.

MR. PERRONE: My question was regarding

the four signs, which signs were installed on which dates?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Mr. Scully would be our expert witness to that response.

THE WITNESS (Downey): I can get that information after the break. I do have it.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Is the proposed project identified in the March 2022 UI forecast of loads and resources?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Perrone, this is Edward Roedel with UI. I'm not familiar with that report.

MR. PERRONE: It's an annual report filed in March. It has forecasted loads and resources for the next ten years. There's a section at the end which has upcoming projects.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Perrone, we'll get to the Council's website and review the report and also give you an answer on that, hopefully not continue to take homework assignments as go forward here. Thank you.

MR. PERRONE: Sure. Moving on to page 3-9 of the OSPRM, there's Footnote 19 at the bottom where there's discussion of tower foundations. And my question is, under what

conditions would you utilize direct embed structures or structures with pile foundations?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): We're trying to go with the pile foundations for all the permanent structures and then temporary structures would be direct embed.

MR. PERRONE: Moving on to page 3-12 which is the second and third paragraph, there's discussion of substation modifications. For Indian Well Substation regarding the hardware modifications, those are going to be performed to the H-frame structures. My question is, would the modifications result in any height increases to the existing H-frame structures?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. And no, they will not.

MR. PERRONE: Similarly, for Ansonia Substation regarding their existing A-frame structure, would the A-frame structure increase in height as a result of modifications?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): No, it will not.

MR. PERRONE: The proposed project would utilize double circuit vertical configuration with optimal phasing. Could you

explain why a vertical conductor configuration was selected versus, say, horizontal?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Yes. Vertical configuration, so that is the current existing configuration. And just to minimize the easements and all, so we are going with the vertical configuration as well since it's a double circuit configuration.

MR. MORISSETTE: Please identify yourself before you respond.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Sorry about that. This is Sathish Konduru.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

MR. PERRONE: The proposed structures would have a galvanized steel finish. What color/finish do the existing lattice structures have?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Perrone, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The existing lattice structures are painted steel. I believe they are yellow.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Perrone, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. They're actually multiple, different structures have different colors, some are yellow, some are

gray.

MR. PERRONE: Moving on to visibility questions. Regarding the visual study, why was a one-mile visual study selected?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So Mr. Perrone, we're hoping that Mike Libertine can weigh in, but he's still maybe having audio troubles.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Is this any better? Can anybody hear me?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Now we can.

THE COURT REPORTER: If the speakers could identify themselves, I can't see name tags or anything on the other end of the table, I'd appreciate it.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): My apologies. Sure. This is Mike Libertine on behalf of UI. And I think we have the, hopefully the audio figured out now, so I apologize.

MR. MORISSETTE: We can hear you well. Thank you.

MR. PERRONE: Mr. Libertine, regarding the visual study area, it utilized a one-mile visual study area. Why was one mile selected?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Primarily, one mile was selected because -- well, it's really

twofold: One was the fact that the existing conditions were such that beyond the mile a lot of the visibility fell out, if not all of it, but the vast majority. The other is that it was just a matter of it's a fairly long linear stretch, and so from just a management standpoint to try to capture all of the elements that go along in the visibility analysis, it made the most sense to limit it to basically the extent of what existing conditions were today and then to evaluate it based on that.

MR. PERRONE: Regarding the viewshed analysis maps, we have the existing and proposed conditions. Comparing the existing viewshed maps to the proposed viewshed maps, generally where do most of the increase in year-round visibility area occur?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): There's not, as demonstrated, I think, on the viewshed maps, you'll note that there is not a significant overall increase in the footprint of the visibility, and that's primarily because we have existing infrastructure that's above the treeline. But there is a slight increase just in the fact that we are going from structures that can be

anywhere from 20 to 30 feet lower than what we're proposing today. So to answer your question, what we found in the analysis is that most, if not all, of the what I'll call the expanded visibility, for lack of a better term, really occurs at what I'll call the fringe area or the outer extent. So what we have today slightly expands mostly in all directions, so there's not one area where I could say, hey, there's, you know, significantly more here.

I will say that if we were to really dig down and analyze, one area in particular, Osbornedale Park, certainly at the higher elevations in the park where you're significantly above the remaining valley or the surrounding valley, you'll notice -- I don't have it handy, but I can tell you in just a moment which simulations and photos would be indicative of this -- but it's one example where we have existing structures that can be seen but they're more or less in the treeline. Then because of the increase in the structure height, they start to eclipse the existing treeline so there are some of those views.

So I think I would ask the Council to

point to, again, in this example I would say either photosimulation 16 and 17 are probably good examples of where you start to see not so much an expansion of the visibility but maybe the difference in the characteristics of the views just simply because of the height. So again, not to beat around the bush, but I guess it's really not a matter of so much expansion of the visibility as it exists today. It's really more about the fact that those characteristic views at those marginal areas tend to be a little bit different just because we have a height increase that's required as part of the project.

MR. PERRONE: Would that also be true for the seasonal visibility area, it would be generally on the fringes or the --

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It certainly would. We found it was not, again, not a great increase in seasonal visibility. I think you're right in the sense that that would be the case. And I think the difference here would be that, again, we're going from structures that tend to be not, in several areas not necessarily eclipsing the treeline and now we are. So when you talk about seasonal visibility, you're still looking

through the trees. So it doesn't change perhaps as dramatically as a few locations certainly as I pointed out with 16 and 17.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Moving on to other environmental topics. Referencing Figure 3 in the ecological report, do you know approximately how much clearing area would be in edge forest?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Perrone, this is Todd Berman. Just give me a second to get to Figure 3.

Mr. Perrone, I'm going to have to get back to you on that.

MR. PERRONE: Sure.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Berman, are you going to do that during the hearing?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Absolutely.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.

MR. PERRONE: Moving on to page 6-22 of the OSPRM, would the project comply with DEEP noise control standards?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Perrone, could you say the question again, please?

MR. PERRONE: Referencing page 6-22, would the project comply with DEEP noise control

standards?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes, it would, Mr. Perrone.

MR. PERRONE: And I have a few questions regarding the comments from DEEP. Referencing the top of page 4 of the DEEP comments, DEEP recommends that tree clearing be avoided during the months of June through August to protect tree roosting bats. Does that coincide with the roosting period of the northern long-eared bat?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes, Mr. Perrone, it does.

MR. PERRONE: Could UI accommodate the seasonal restriction on tree clearing?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Perrone, the answer is yes, and furthermore, intends to.

MR. PERRONE: And also from the DEEP comments also on page 4, could UI utilize a buffer greater than 25 feet from the storage of petroleum products to wetlands?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Perrone, the answer to your question is yes. I mean, I guess I would have to think about any site specific limitations, but I'm quite sure we could

accommodate that.

MR. PERRONE: Do you know approximately how much of a buffer, how much beyond 25?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Maybe I -- let me just pull up the DEEP letter and I'll get back to you with an answer.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, excuse me.

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Attorney McDermott, go ahead.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. McMahon can address the first two questions that Mr. Perrone had regarding the postings of the signs as well as the forecast on loads and resources.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): So in regards to the installation of the signs, we had three of the signs installed, signs at Structure 359 which is in Shelton, Connecticut at Constitution North Boulevard. A second sign on Howe Ave. in Shelton, Connecticut. And then the third sign at the Derby Public Works on Coon Hollow in Derby, Connecticut were installed on Friday, July 15th. And then a

sign was installed on Monday, July 18th at Coon Hollow Road and Hawthorne Avenue in Derby, Connecticut.

Then in regards to the project itself, it is listed on the report of the loads and resources.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, Attorney McDermott. We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri followed by Mr. Nguyen.

Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. And good afternoon, everyone.

I'd like to start my questions referencing Appendix A-4 and the maps that are therein. And I'd like to start with Map 2 of 16, if you could pull those up, and let me know when you're ready.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Morissette, I think we're generally good to go -- I mean, Mr. Silvestri, sorry.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Attorney McDermott. On Map 2 of 16 what is the current access to Derby Junction?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich on behalf of UI. The existing access to Derby Junction is shown on map 1 and it's coming from Constitution Boulevard. If you flip the page forward, there is an existing gravel access road that comes off of Constitution Boulevard and to that Structure 1364 location.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Copy that. Thank you. Then the related question I have, you have Wetland 2 that's listed on both the maps, Map 1 and Map 2. Is there a way that you could avoid spanning Wetland 2 with the proposed access that's there?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): When we initially looked at it, we were attempting to stay within the existing right-of-way, and all those accesses are temporary, proposed temporary impacts, so there would be no permanent impact associated at Wetland 2. The only alternative that we did look at was potentially following the edge of the field around and back into the other area which would, you know, it would avoid the wetland, temporary wetland impact, however, it would provide a temporary impact across the fields.

MR. SILVESTRI: Let me phrase my question a slightly different way. To access Structures 350 and 351, would you go from Derby Junction to get to those or would you be coming from Structure 352 going across the access and across that wetland?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich. The access from, to get to 350, essentially what is being currently planned is sort of a linear progression down the line, and once, you know, during construction UI would be accessing sort of linearly down the entire right-of-way progressing, depending on which way the workflow is occurring, from 350, 351 and 352. Once the permanent access is, once O&M access, the primary access would be from 350 and then to 351. So I don't think a person would -- I'll let UI personnel speak to the operations and maintenance sort of access, but it would stop short at 351, and any access coming to 352 from an O&M perspective would come from the other direction from 353 to 352. I'm just not sure if that answers your question, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Not quite. Again, what I'm hearing, and I could be wrong, is that to get

to 350 and 351 you would actually go through Derby Junction; am I correct on that?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): Correct. Yes, Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich, it would utilize the existing access road that is an Eversource access road.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And then to get to 352 over on the right-hand side of Map 2, you have a different type of access that skirts through, let's see, Wetland 3 to get to 352. So my question is, if you could get to 350 and 351 from Derby Junction and you get to 352 from the right-hand side of that map, why do you have to span Wetland 2?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): At this point -- Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich -- we were presenting the options for a contractor. There's consideration of, you know, showing the maximum potential disturbance.

Mr. Berman, I'm not sure if you're able to add anything to that discussion.

THE WITNESS (Berman): That's fine. This is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. And it's an interesting observation, Mr. Silvestri, that you make. And we can certainly take it as

part of our D&M commitment to look at exactly the sequencing of access to both 351 and 352. I mean, I know that we have looked at skirting that wetland to the north, and there were some complications with that, but that's certainly a question we can reexamine.

MR. SILVESTRI: I would appreciate that. And I think you understand my concern about the Wetland No. 2. So I'll thank you both on that and we'll move on at this point.

The next series of questions I have is on Map 4 of 16. And the first one I have concerns Structure 357. The question I have is, could access to that structure occur via Howe Avenue to avoid a bridge over Wetland No. 5?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich. The access coming from Howe Avenue is very limited from a perspective of the current access that we have shown as sort of in that light pink color is actually currently up a driveway. So we're looking at it at a limited access just to be able to install some concrete trucks and a very limited access coming in that way. So it is a difficult access that would not necessarily be feasible for the larger equipment

or when the structure itself needs to come in from that direction.

MR. SILVESTRI: When you say you're limited with that access, you're limited on width on the structure to support heavier vehicles, how are you limited?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): This is Joe Dietrich. Limited from the potential to 12-foot wide, I think, partially gravel, partial asphalt driveway that has pretty steep grade up to it as well as the several turns that will be necessary to be able to get equipment over to the right-of-way itself.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your response. Staying with that Map 4 of 16 and Structure 358, could access to that structure occur from Howe Avenue to avoid tree clearing through the end of Riverview Avenue?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Silvestri, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. Anything is possible, right? So it is possible, but I will tell you there from personal experience that the terrain there is as striking as you could imagine in terms of vertical topography. We can certainly assess that. However, it's incredibly,

incredibly steep between there and Howe Avenue.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Berman. This is why I asked the question so I could get a decent answer out of it and understand the terrain better. So thank you.

If I now have you look at Map 5 and 6 of 16. The general question I have for both of these is how will the new transmission lines be installed across the Housatonic River.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Mr. Silvestri, we will formulate a response to that right now.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. The followup I have that you could also think about is how will the old lines be removed going across the Housatonic River. So we'll let you digest that and get back to me.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, could I just ask for one minute with the panel here?

MR. SILVESTRI: I don't have a problem as long as Mr. Morissette doesn't have a problem.

MR. MORISSETTE: That would be fine. Thank you.

(Pause.)

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, I think we can get back to your question about how we're

going to put the cables across the Housatonic River.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. Mr. Silvestri, please continue.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Turning then to --

MR. McDERMOTT: Sorry, I was going to say we have the answer, if you want it now.

MR. SILVESTRI: Oh, sure, absolutely.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Hi, Mr. Silvestri. This is Mr. Konduru. So based on the initial discussions, we're going to air transfer the existing connectors and use it as a pulling line for the new conductors or the other option could be pulling the ropes through the helicopter installation. That was based on preliminary discussions.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your response. So it's feasible to use the old conductor lines that are there to pull the new transmission lines in, and that would kind of solve the problem of removing the old lines and putting the new lines in. Do I have that correct?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): That is

correct, sir, yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: And a fallback would be helicopter?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Correct, yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. Now we'll turn to Map 7 of 16. And I'm looking at Indian Well Substation. Are there any concerns with the loads on the bridge that access Indian Well Substation from Route 34 to bring in equipment or remove equipment?

THE WITNESS (Dietrich): Mr. Silvestri, this is Joe Dietrich. Currently there should be no issues. One that's off the map also is, there is a further connection down Roosevelt Boulevard that can be utilized, and also there are existing warehouses and other industrial complexes that are in that area that do access that without any load issues on the bridges that I am aware of.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. If I recall correctly, years ago when Indian Well was constructed and the old substation was removed, there wasn't an issue at that time with access, but I wanted to make sure that nothing changed in all those years. So thank you for your response.

Turning now to Map 11 of 16. And I

know there's been discussion in various submittals that we had about Osbornedale State Park. Could you tell me the current status of discussions with DEEP and if a permanent easement has indeed been acquired.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Silvestri, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. So the status, first of all, the status of discussions I think are very well characterized in DEEP's letter to the Council. We have had four or five specific meetings with DEEP, in fact, we focused them by subject area. We've met with the NDDB folks, we've met with parks, we've met with forestry. And I think we're in a really good place with respect to Connecticut DEEP and securing the easement.

That said, again, I'll reference Connecticut DEEP's letter to the Council, the easement has not been secured. And frankly, there are so many sort of bureaucratic administrative processes that are going to have to go forward with securing the easement that is probably still some number of months away. However, the nature of the communications are very well characterized by Connecticut DEEP. We are, similar to them, we

are extremely confident that an easement based solution will be forthcoming.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Berman. But in the event that an expanded easement cannot be acquired, you would be looking to go underground, would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Silvestri, this is Todd Berman. I think it's probably premature for us to identify conclusively our preferred alternative. I think our preferred alternative would be in some significant measure instructed by the nature of DEEP's objection to the easement, right. So we have a little bit more under -- if they were to not allow a greater easement or a smaller easement, we would have to kind of look at the nature of that to make our preferred alternative selection.

MR. SILVESTRI: But at this point you do not have a preferred alternative; am I correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. Let me have you turn now to Map 13 of 16. And the question I have, has there been any conversations about this project with the residents at 3 Willow Street and at 44 Scotland Street?

THE WITNESS (McMahon): Mr. Silvestri, this is Mr. McMahon. We will have to follow up with our logs based on those addresses.

THE WITNESS (Downey): I can answer that. Hi, this is Leslie Downey from outreach. We've had discussions with the gentleman on 3 Willow Street. He was at our public information hearing on July 14th.

MR. SILVESTRI: And 44 Scotland?

THE WITNESS (Downey): No, I have not had discussions or no one from outreach has had discussions that resident.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Do you plan to?

THE WITNESS (Downey): At this point we can, but it wasn't on my radar to have a discussion with him -- or them. What address was that again, Mr. Silvestri?

MR. SILVESTRI: 44 Scotland Street.

THE WITNESS (Downey): We have, as you know where we've responded, we've had several mailings to abutters, you know, back a year ago. We recently had another mailing on June 28th about the public hearing that we had for all towns, Ansonia, Derby and Shelton in Ansonia and we

received no response from the three or four mailings as well as the website, outreach hotline and things like that.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you again for your response. Let me move on to Appendix E of the application. Within that appendix there's various calculated EMF profiles for various spans. But unless I missed it, I did not see profiles or even tabular data for the span between Structures 16 and 17. Do you have such data? And again, if I look at appendix, attachment D, it only appears to have preconstruction data. So I'm curious about Structure 16 and 17 in EMF.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Silvestri, this is Ben Cotts with Exponent. That assessment was done in a slightly different way than is typically done for these because of the routing of the transmission lines in that area of the project. As you can see from the routing, the transmission lines do not maintain kind of a straight route. They turn at a greater than 90-degree turn right in that area. And so those models were performed using three-dimensional modeling. And if you give me just a moment, I can point you to the page in that report where that

modeling is shown.

MR. SILVESTRI: I would appreciate that.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Silvestri, this is Ben Cotts continuing. In the report on page C-33 -- and I apologize, I don't have a PDF number. I believe it may be near PDF page 74 -- there is a model of both the existing (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) for the spans in that vicinity, as I said before, using the three-dimensional modeling and essentially showing that the results for other portions of the route are generally consistent in this portion of the route as well that the maximum magnetic field levels do not change substantially from the existing to the proposed and that the primary change is simply going to be with exactly where those field levels occur with the offset of the new structures relative to the old structures. But in either case, as shown by these graphics, the area over which the magnetic field level is one milligauss or higher is largely the same between the existing and the proposed configurations.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your response. And if I heard correctly, it's C-33,

correct?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): That is correct. It's C-33 and also Figure C-33.

MR. SILVESTRI: Copy that. Thank you. In the July 21, 2022 submittal, and this goes back to the response to Interrogatory 1-15, there is photographic simulations for proposed structures and a redesigned Structure No. 4 at Coon Hollow Road. Is UI now proposing the redesign into the preferred project design?

MR. McDERMOTT: Could you repeat that again?

MR. SILVESTRI: If you look at the response to Interrogatory 1-15, it shows a redesigned Structure No. 4. Is that redesigned structure the way that UI is proposing to head for this project?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): This is MeeNa Sazanowicz. And yes, that is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Following up on that, is there a cost estimate or a differentiation between what was originally proposed and this new redesigned Structure No. 4?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Silvestri, at this time we do not have a delta.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then a followup I have is, how does EMF differ in this location between what's originally there, what was originally proposed and this preferred project redesign?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Silvestri, this is Ben Cotts with Exponent. I apologize again, I may not have the exact page number for you, but as an attachment to that response, Exponent generated a memorandum looking at the magnetic field levels from the existing Structure 4 design, the originally proposed Structure 4 design, and also the revised Structure 4 design. That is on page 3 of that memorandum and shows a similar graphic to what we looked at on the previous question with the overhead view of the area and the function of distance on the aerial map.

MR. SILVESTRI: You broke up at the end of that, if you could just repeat that one more time.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Certainly. Maybe -- what was the last thing you heard, so I don't go back too far.

MR. SILVESTRI: I heard "similar" and I

wasn't quite sure if it was similar to what's there or similar to what the original structures would look like.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Certainly. Thank you for the clarification. I would answer essentially in this case, similar to, the presentation is similar to how we presented the results near Structure 16 and 17 that we just discussed.

And then following on to your second part of the question, the EMF levels for the existing structure, the originally proposed structure and the revised structure are all largely similar. If you look at that again, the maximum magnetic field level is very much similar between the existing and either the originally proposed or revised configuration. And the field levels over which, again -- or sorry, the distance over which the magnetic field level decreases to one milligauss or less are broadly quite similar between the originally proposed structure and the revised structure.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Cotts. Then a general question I want to put out right now. There's been discussion within the

responses on the interrogatories about temporary structures and, to be honest, I didn't quite understand. What I kind of got out of it is that the only temporary structures that might be installed might be for Structure 4, but I could be mistaken on that. So could somebody fill me in on temporary structures for this project?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Mr. Silvestri, this is Mr. Konduru.

MR. SILVESTRI: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So yeah, No. 4, the two-pole structure based on the visual simulation, so we noticed it could be visually unpleasant and looking from Coon Hollow Road. So then we started having discussions about how could we reduce the height of the structure or change the configuration by following similar construction sequencing as we are doing at Structure 5 and 6. So that's when we were discussing about potentially maybe using temporary structures just for having ones energized on it before installing the final structure.

MR. SILVESTRI: And that would be strictly for the area at Coon Hollow Road; would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): That is correct. And also, we looked at 17, 18 and 19 as well, the feasibility of installing temporary poles there.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you for your response.

And Mr. Morissette, I think that's all I have at this time. And I thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen followed by Mrs. Cooley.

Mr. Nguyen.

(No response.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Nguyen?

(No response.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We'll come back to Mr. Nguyen. We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mrs. Cooley followed by Mr. Quinlan.

Mrs. Cooley.

MRS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I just have a few questions. I wondered if we could go back to the discussions with DEEP about the Osborne Park easements, and

there were also some questions about what the potential mitigation options are. Could we get a little more detail on what those mitigation options are that you've been discussing with DEEP?

A. (McMahon) Mrs. Cooley, this is Kevin McMahon with UI. We have been considering three different mitigation strategies in regards to land infrastructure and then from an ecological standpoint. So we have presented those concepts to DEEP, and they are very accepting of that as we continue to engage in negotiations.

MRS. COOLEY: Okay. Thank you very much. And then also looking at the SHPO letter, SHPO's letter said they had no concerns about issues with historic resources at this time, but there was a note that some of the soils indicated there could potentially be cultural resources, I guess, in the soil. And is there any plan should those turn up how that would be handled?

MR. McDERMOTT: Mrs. Cooley, if I could just jump in for a second. Mr. McMahon was, I think, paused in his answer to your last question about the mitigation options. And if he could just finish answering what those three options are, then we'll go to the SHPO question.

MRS. COOLEY: Thank you.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): So in regards to the land mitigation strategies, we do own a parcel that is adjacent to Osbornedale State Park that we are currently considering from a mitigation strategy standpoint. From an infrastructure standpoint, we're considering potential upgrades to Osbornedale State Park from, whether it's from an observation nest or any of the needs that DEEP has there in the works. And then from an ecological standpoint, we've been working to understand some of the benefits that we can provide DEEP as far as the ecology of that area is concerned.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mrs. Cooley, this is Todd Berman from UI, if I could supplement that answer. One of the interesting strategies we are looking at is an ecologically based mitigation which might involve preferential planting for pollinator species. That's certainly one of the options that we've put out there for them. And I think the guide word, if you will, for potential mitigation options inside the park is things that would, quote, improve the user experience, right, whether that's fixing up a structure or maybe

doing something at the center there. And I think right now DEEP is looking at those choices internally and developing their own internal consensus.

MRS. COOLEY: Okay. Thank you. Before we get to the SHPO question, just to follow up on those improvements, including improving pollinator mixes, I think, there was a comment from some of the people who attended the information session commenting on what they called the poor vegetation management along the right-of-way. Is there any thought about improving that and potentially using pollinator mixes within the right-of-way in those areas where they would be appropriate?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So yes, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating, and the answer to your question is yes.

MRS. COOLEY: Great. Okay. And could you tell me approximately how long a corridor that would potentially be?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Council Member Cooley, this is Todd Berman. That's a tricky question because there are going to be topographic areas and habitat areas that won't be sufficient. So, you know, we can probably go back and

retrospectively calculate sort of an eligible linear potential. I'm not prepared to speak to that at this time.

MRS. COOLEY: That's fine. I don't think that calculation is really necessary. I was just curious whether or not you had a sense of that since there's such a varied terrain here. Okay. And then I'm not sure who to direct the SHPO question to but --

THE WITNESS (Berman): So Council Member Cooley, this is Todd Berman, I can field the SHPO question.

MRS. COOLEY: Great.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So we internally identified that area as having the potential, and that's why we went ahead and did the phase 1B which did not identify any artifacts. But the answer is, you know, in the field we kind of have standing instructions that if the project was to encounter, you know, the one we use as kind of the model, unfortunately, is if you were to encounter bones, right, you know, it's kind of stop work, evaluate what we've seen kind of thing. And those, if some type of thing like an artifact were to be encountered, you know, that would trigger a

stop and for us to figure out what we had encountered.

MRS. COOLEY: Great. All right. Thank you. That's actually all I have. As usual, Mr. Silvestri is very thorough in his questions. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mrs. Cooley. I will now go back to Mr. Nguyen.

Mr. Nguyen, are you with us?

MR. NGUYEN: Mr. Morissette, can you hear me?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can, Mr. Nguyen. Thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: Great. I apologize. I did not unmute myself in time before you moved on. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: Just a couple of questions. If I could ask the panel to go to the response to CSC 1-8. And there's an Exhibit CSC 1-8-1 that talks about two different alternatives. Let me know when you're there, Solution Alternative Assessment, Alternative No. 1 and Alternative No. 2. Alternative No. 1 is a partial rebuild and No. 2 is full rebuild. Now, for the

record, Alternative No. 2, which is a full rebuild, is before the Siting Council in this proceeding; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Nguyen, this is Edward Roedel from UI. Yes, we are here to discuss Alternative No. 2 which is our selected alternative for the project.

MR. NGUYEN: Just briefly, if you could explain what led from Alternative No. 1 to Alternative No. 2. And I understand there's some deficiencies that were recognized.

THE WITNESS (Roedel): That's correct, Mr. Nguyen. Initially, when we did the analysis and determined that we needed to reconductor the line, we did some simulations of the stresses that that that new line would put on the existing lattice field towers and we found that approximately 30 of them needed to be replaced. As we progressed further into detailed designs, we found that additional structures were failing as we got better simulations and better data, the as-built data from the field, we found that more structures were failing which led to the decision to go to a full rebuild which allowed us to have all new equipment, including a larger wire that

would accommodate any future load or generation growth in this area.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And the price tag for the full rebuild is 37 million; is that right?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): At the time that this presentation was given, the price, the cost estimate was 37 million. I believe we have a revised cost estimate that was included in the filing.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Now. If I could ask you to go back to CSC 1-1 and on page 3 of 3. And there are Q and As regarding the projects. And I'm looking at the general project. It asks are there financial impacts to local residents, and the answer has multiple components. Number one, it said there are no project costs that are borne by local residents. Then it talks about the project costs will be shared among all New England electric ratepayers. And then the last part talked about UI customers will be responsible for approximately 5 percent of the project cost.

A couple of questions surrounding this. First of all, what are "local residents"? And the second part is, what does that 5 percent entail?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Nguyen, this

is Edward Roedel from UI. Can you repeat that last part, please?

MR. NGUYEN: Yeah, the last part is the 5 percent of the project cost. What does that mean?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Again, this is Edward Roedel from UI. So the intent of the response regarding local customers was to indicate that any customers that lived in or around the construction area would not have any additional cost burden to them. Their burden would be the same as any other UI customer. The 5 percent that is stated for UI customers is based on UI's total load in New England.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And is that part of the distribution of the infrastructure itself or is that part of (Inaudible) that hasn't been --

THE WITNESS (Roedel): The division of, or the cost allocation, excuse me, of pool transmission facility projects in New England is calculations done continually based on each individual company's share of the load in New England. So that can vary, you know, in small fractions as load is brought onto the system or leaves, it's not a set percentage, but it is

roughly 5 percent for UI customers. And again, that's only pool transmission facility projects that have their costs regionalized as determined by ISO New England.

MR. NGUYEN: And for the record, you are aware that any cost recovery or whatever will be reviewed by a PURA proceeding; is that right?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Can you repeat that, Mr. Nguyen?

MR. NGUYEN: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

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

MR. NGUYEN: Yes. To the extent of all the cost recovery, it's my understanding that will be submitted and reviewed by the PURA agency?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Nguyen, the costs associated with this project are all transmission related and so the cost recovery is handled through --

MR. NGUYEN: I'm talking about the distribution part of it.

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Excuse me?

MR. McDERMOTT: He's talking about distribution.

MR. NGUYEN: I apologize, you were answering.

THE WITNESS (Roedel): So I'm not aware of any -- so there are distribution costs associated with relocation of some facilities, I believe. Those are part of best practice construction methods, so I expect that those costs would be considered regionalized and not paid for by local UI customers.

MR. NGUYEN: But then you talk about "5 percent of the project cost regardless of what part of the UI service territory." So what does that mean? Is that still regionalized? I'm confused on that 5 percent.

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Certainly. Again, this is Edward Roedel from UI. Of all of the transmission projects that occur in New England that are on pool transmission facilities, the costs of all those projects, if they are determined to be for the betterment of the region, are shared amongst all of the New England ratepayers, and that cost sharing is done based on the percentage of load that each of the companies represents. So in the case of a project in Connecticut or in Maine, as long as ISO New

England determines it is a regional benefit to a pool transmission facility, that cost is split. All of that cost UI customers always paid 5 percent regardless of where that project is located, and that's based on UI using approximately one-twentieth of the load in New England.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Quinlan followed by Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Quinlan, good afternoon.

MR. QUINLAN: I have no questions at this time.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Quinlan. We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Lynch.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Most of the concerns I had were answered very well and put forth very well by Mr. Perrone and Mr. Silvestri, but I do have a couple of small items and a couple followups I want to get a clarification for. The first one is, how many

permits are going to be needed from the Army Corps?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Lynch, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. I think at this time we'll have two permits from the Army Corps of Engineers. There will be one for a very small wetland building and then there will be a self-verification for the removal of one footing of the existing structure at the Yale boat house that will be a self-verification only. There will be no permanent or even temporary structures associated with the removal of that footing down at the bank of the Housatonic.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Berman. Now, this is strictly a curiosity question on my part as far as I deal with the military a little bit, and especially with the Coasties. And what function is the Coast Guard performing on the river? It's just a curiosity question for me.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So we actually, Mr. Lynch, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating, we actually queried the Coast Guard basically to see if they had any interest in regulating the crossing and confirmed in conversation, I believe as we detailed in an

interrogatory response, the Coast Guard really has no interest in any sort of regulatory engagement on the project.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I'm just aware that most people don't realize the Coast Guard is everywhere.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah.

MR. LYNCH: Now that we're at the river, I want to get a clarification, Mr. Berman. You said that there was, to Mr. Silvestri's question, that one of the options was not doing any undergrounding; did I hear that correctly?

THE WITNESS (Berman): No. Mr. Lynch, this is Todd Berman. No, I'm not sure you did hear that correctly. We have to -- maybe we could highlight the question, the original question.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Silvestri asked you about alternatives and he mentioned undergrounding, and I thought you said, Mr. Berman, correct me if I'm wrong, that you had no plans for undergrounding.

THE WITNESS (Berman): No. Mr. Lynch, this is Todd Berman. Among several alternatives we looked at for Osbornedale State Park were more than three underground options. We looked at an

underground option that went to the north up Silver Hill Road. We looked at an underground option that actually went through the existing right-of-way in the park. And then we looked at an underground option that sort of circled what I guess would be south and east through Ansonia. So we have a portfolio of three underground options. And which one of those three that we would select, I think, would require us to better understand the nature of Connecticut DEEP's concerns if they were not comfortable with the easement.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I knew I heard that wrong, and I just had to get a clarification. Like I said, now that we're at the river, have you given any consideration for going under the river, direct drill, boring, whatever it's called, like they did in Shelton? And Mr. Silvestri and Mr. Morissette may have more of an understanding of that than I do, but I know it was done down in Shelton.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So the answer -- Mr. Lynch, this is Todd Berman again. The answer is that we certainly had conceptual discussions about the potential to go under the river. That said, both the topography and the land use on the

sides of the river, given the sort of footprint of drilling area and landing pad, the technical and practicabilities of getting under the river, not to mention the cost components, really make that a pretty unfeasible technique.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Berman. I realize there's a cost factor, but I think there's also a better capacity factor there too. That's irrelevant.

I'd like to come back to one of the interrogatories where you said that none of the poles could be used for telecom. I forget which question it was. You're telling me that there's no way you could engineer or design these structures to accommodate telecom?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Lynch, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The poles that we are using are engineered and designed for specific load cases. Currently the project does not have any design for third-party attachments such as cellular or telecom.

MR. LYNCH: The reason I ask is telecom is a tsunami now, it's going to be everywhere, so I was just looking for different avenues that they may be able to utilize.

My last questions concern, now you say that these structures, and I know, I've seen them and I know what they are, could withstand a C3 cat hurricane. We haven't had anything greater than that since 1938. And I'm saying, you know, has UI, have you had in any of our local storms that we've had over the last few months now with climate change coming, you know, have any of your facility towers or lines, I know your lines have come down, but have any towers come down?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Lynch, not to my knowledge, no, we have not had any structural failures in the UI territory.

MR. LYNCH: And my last question goes to something that a former colleague, Mr. Ashton, used to ask all the time, and that's on ice and snow loading on these towers, I guess what's the engineering that is needed to withstand heavy ice and snow loading? I know there's a formal rule that Mr. Ashton used to quote all the time, but I'm not aware of it, so I'm asking if you're aware of it.

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yes, Mr. Lynch, as part of the UI design criteria, we do design a line to withstand UI's specific heavy

load case, which I believe is 1.5 inches of ice loading. So yes, we are definitely prepared with that additional design criteria over the NESC.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. I hand it over to you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. Before we continue with cross-examination by myself, we're going to take a quick break. But also, I want to go over the open items that we have so that during the break if we could answer some of these open items and get them off our plate, that would work out well.

So the open items that I have is a response to Mr. Perrone's question relating to edge forest.

And Attorney McDermott, if you could ensure that I have the right open items here.

The second item, I believe it was also by Mr. Perrone, a wider buffer related to storage of petroleum from 50 to 100 feet, greater than 25, what that number would be.

And then I have eliminating the crossing at Wetland No. 2, we're going to address if the project is approved in the D&M plan.

And then lastly, I'm not sure this is

actually an open item, but Mr. Silvestri, are you in fact looking for the cost delta for Structure No. 4?

MR. SILVESTRI: I'd like to know that, Mr. Morissette. I wouldn't put it high on the priority list, but I'm always interested in costs.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. So, if possible, if we could get an answer to that as well during the break, if we could clean those up so we don't have any open items, we would appreciate it.

Attorney McDermott, does that match your list?

MR. McDERMOTT: It does. I have responses already. I know we have responses for one and two, and I'm not sure about three and four, but we will use the time wisely and productively and try to knock those off as well.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Okay. So we'll see everybody back here at 3:35. We'll take a quick ten minute break and then we'll continue when we return. Thank you, everyone.

MR. NGUYEN: Mr. Morissette.

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Nguyen.

MR. NGUYEN: I just want to let you

know that I will log out during the break. Thank you very much.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you for letting us know that. Thank you.

MR. NGUYEN: Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. See you after the break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 3:26 p.m. until 3:35 p.m.)

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. We will go to Attorney McDermott to see how he made out on our homework assignments.

MR. McDERMOTT: I think we're five for four, in other words, we have answers to the four homeworks and then we also thought we might clarify one of Mr. Silvestri's questions about 44 Scotland Avenue. So why don't I just begin with Mr. Berman who I think has answers about the edge forest question as well as the fuel storage question.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Berman): I guess to Mr. Perrone this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. First, with respect to DEEP's thoughts as to a 100-foot buffer for fuel storage,

we can certainly comply with that recommended standard. So that's the fuel storage line.

With respect to the edge forest, I'm going to ask our witness, Josh Wilson, from Biohabitats to comment.

THE WITNESS (Wilson): Can everybody hear me?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, we can. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Wilson): Thank you. This is Josh Wilson from Biohabitats. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. So the question about the edge forest is a little nuanced in that the way the mapping is developed is based upon aerial imagery and photogrammetric data and also lumps a lot of areas that would be considered non-edge or even forest habitat at all that are with forest habitat. So I say that because on the map itself an estimated calculation of area of that that's shown in yellow on that Figure 3 of the ecologic report comes out to about 9.1 acres of impact area, but within that is existing right-of-way which is more considered old field scrubland or shrubland habitat. So really if you deduct out the area that's not really forested, it's really

shrubland, you really end up with more like something on the order of about 5 acres of edge forest that is treed areas that would be impacted by the activity. I don't know if that -- hopefully that makes sense, that description.

MR. PERRONE: Yes. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Perrone, are you all set with the two answers that you've received?

MR. PERRONE: Yes, Mr. Morissette.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

MR. McDERMOTT: Then Mr. Berman, I think you can also assist on the question about Wetland 2.

THE WITNESS (Berman): That was, I believe, Mr. Silvestri's question relating to Wetland No. 2. This is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. With respect to Wetland 2, one of the things that drove the original plan that you're looking at that does have a temporary impact in Wetland 2 is that we need to be prepared for kind of doing this project before Eversource does theirs and/or after they do theirs. So our plan with respect to that will be to, or what we'd like to do is to keep that option, to keep the option on the table of creating a temporary impact

in Wetland 2. However, if we don't need it by virtue of the sequencing, we can look at and potentially go to the north and avoid that crossing as long as it is, you know, does not restrict us in our ability to execute based on Eversource's timing.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And then, Mr. Morissette, notwithstanding my tee up of this part of the hearing, I guess we're refining the cost information on Structure 4. So if we could pass on that one and maybe we can come back to that after your cross-examination.

MR. MORISSETTE: That would be fine.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Thank you. And then just to clarify one aspect of Mr. Silvestri's question regarding the residence at 44 Scotland. Mr. McMahon, you have a slight, I guess, additional information about that property.

THE WITNESS (McMahon): That's correct, Mr. McDermott. Kevin McMahon. Mr. Silvestri, we, from a public outreach standpoint, we have not heard back from 44, the resident of 44 Scotland Street. However, from a right of entry perspective, we have received on July 6th a right of entry from 44 Scotland Street. So as the

project progresses through construction, we will be more active from a public outreach perspective. As we mentioned earlier, we did send mailings out to all abutters of the line itself.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. McMahon. And with that, I believe those are at least the temporary completion of, or the completion of a few of the homework assignments, and we'll continue to work on number four, the cost delta on Structure 4 as you do your cross-examination.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, Attorney McDermott.

MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. I want to go back, if I can, to Mr. Berman's response on that wetland to ask, when you mentioned timing with Eversource before or after, could you explain a little bit more what you're looking at with timing and how timing could possibly interfere with what might be done with that wetland?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, absolutely. Mr. Silvestri, this is Todd Berman from United Illuminating. Well, first and foremost, we need to be prepared to execute our

project either before Eversource has done theirs or after, or maybe at some level concurrent. That said, if Eversource is utilizing the access, what is it, off Constitution there from I think it's 350, we may not even have access through there. So, you know, this is a potential route that we think we should keep in our list of potentials. But again, that said, if it does not -- if it's not necessary to go that way, I think we can look at looping around to the north around Wetland 2.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you for your clarification.

Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

Okay. I'll start with my cross-examination. Let's start with Mr. Libertine. Mr. Libertine, are you with us?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Can you hear me now, Mr. Morissette?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I can. Thank you, Mr. Libertine.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

MR. MORISSETTE: No problem. My first

question is related to whether you have an opinion on whether we should use galvanized steel versus weathering steel based on visual impact in that area, I'd like to get your opinion on that.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Well, we've actually discussed this internally. It's a tough situation because, again, I'm always of the opinion that there are several attitudes on that or opinions. I think if in fact there's a concern over softening some of the effects, I think if we were to think about, and I'm going to use the term weathered steel, although I'm not really sold on that particular configuration or that particular type of incorporation because I know there's some technical limitations to that or at least some technical concerns, I do think if there are concerns from either DEEP or members of the Council when we talk about the area, in particular, from Osbornedale Park, there may be some techniques that could be used, whether it's the weathering steel or perhaps painting the poles that may do something to soften the effect, I think that would be the one area that you could argue, and I would probably agree, that something could be done. I still think they're going to be

visible. And so, you know, again, it comes back to the weathering steel in some locations tend to actually draw the eye more than they would if it was just a normal steel monopole.

So I guess to answer your question directly, I do think there may be an occasion in a couple of locations where that type of an effect may be beneficial, but again, I think I would hesitate to use the weathering steel as the only option. As they say, I think there are some painting techniques that might be more beneficial and may be less of a technical concern. And somebody else from the UI team may want to talk about some of those technical limitations or at least some of the things that do come up when we talk about the weathered steel and the rusting effect.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Libertine. Does anybody else on the panel have a comment relating to galvanized versus weathering steel?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Morissette, this is Todd Berman from UI. I'll only make the one comment having been involved in the conversations with Connecticut DEEP as relates to

Osbornedale and also at the public outreach sessions that, you know, at this time nobody, I don't think, has called to our attention this bit of nuance or stated preference away from the galvanized finish.

THE WITNESS (Libertine): And Mr. Morissette, if I could, just to make sure that I can clarify my position on that is, I would agree with Mr. Berman. The feedback we've gotten is that nobody has really come forward and said, boy, these are really going to bother us. I'm a proponent always of weathered steel, and when I say weathered steel, not the weathering steel when we talk about the rust, but just the standard monopole, gray monopoles which tend to dull over time. And the fact is these poles are replacing poles that have already been in place with a much larger footprint. Yes, granted they're a bit taller, but personally I'm not sure camouflaging or softening is going to really be a major benefit in any of these areas. I think they are what they are, and people are, for the most part, used to the fact that there's infrastructure in place there.

MR. MORISSETTE: With the exception of

Osbornedale State Park, it does seem like it, you know, it's not an area in which a weathering type of steel would help the aesthetics; however, Osbornedale Park may be a location where it might be warranted.

So speaking of that, I'd like to go to the visual impact Photo No. 16, if we could, which is Osborne State Park in Derby. So this is an example of where we would see a galvanized pole structure within the park. My first question is, the treeline that I'm seeing out in, I'll say, the forefront here, is that treeline going to remain or is that going to be cleared to widen the right-of-way?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Morissette, this is Todd Berman. I can speak to that. The treeline that you're looking at in 16 is going to stay.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So the representation on the next photo is accurate as far as the treeline is concerned?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is correct. And just to echo Mr. Berman, in all the photographs, Mr. Morissette, what we do is we work closely with UI and the engineering team so we

understand what the limits of clearing are going to be. So the photosimulations actually represent not only the new structures but what I'll call the post-development conditions which includes clearing of trees.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. So on Photo 17 the structure looks a little darker than the galvanized in the after photo. Is that just because of shading or the lighting when the photo was taken?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): It's not only when the photo was taken -- well, yes, the proposed conditions, usually when we do that the programs that we have will actually mimic the date, the sun aspect, the time of day, so you get some shadowing effects and some other nuances. So we try to do it as real life as you might if you're standing in that spot on that particular day at that particular time under those lighting conditions.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. I have a question on the Housatonic Crossing. Now I understand that the 80-foot easement is going to be increased to 260 feet. Could you explain why it's increasing by such a large amount?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Hi, Mr. Morissette. This is Mr. Konduru.

MR. MORISSETTE: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So yes, based on the span length, we locate the wide load under NESC requirement and also UI wide load requirement. So based on the load, I mean, like the displaced position of the wires in the horizontal plane, so like we want to make sure those wide loads are within the original UI easement.

MR. MORISSETTE: So the structures on each side of the river, are they increasing in -- how much are they increasing in height?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So they're increasing by about 30 feet. So the existing structures are around 140 feet and the proposed structures are going to be about 170 feet in height.

MR. MORISSETTE: So one cause is the increase in height, but the locations are very similar to where they were. So the locations are similar where they originally were, so I would think that that would cause some increase in the easement but, you know, going from 80 to 260 seems

a big difference.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Correct. The diameter is increasing on this project as well. So we're going with around 1 inch, 1.1 inch diameter cable, but it previously was much smaller.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Morissette, this is Todd Berman from UI. The other thing I can say is when that original, you know, we all need to be mindful, right, that that original easement was done in 1920 something, right, so it probably does not envision the same safety standards or blow-out conditions or material science that, you know, reflects what is necessary today.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Any issues that may come out of that as far as obtaining an easement of that width?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So Mr. Morissette, this is Todd Berman. You know, it's a great question. We've queried it ourselves quite a bit, and I think the answer to your question is no, is that we have spoken to Connecticut DEEP directly on this subject and the Army Corps of Engineers and we're comfortable with our permits

list as is.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. I'd like to get one thing on the record here. Now, I understand that these lines are basically feeding load pockets so there's no need to upgrade -- have the potential to upgrade these lines to 345, but I would like somebody from UI to get on the record as to why there's no need to upgrade this to 345.

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Morissette, this is Edward Roedel with UI. 345 kV or kilovolts is generally used for the delivering of large quantities of power across large geographic regions or from large generators to the transmission system at large. Upgrading these lines to 345 kV is not necessary. There's no 345 kV to interconnect it to in the region, and there's no significant load or generation planned that would require such a conversion.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. Thank you again. I wanted to get that on the record. And I do understand what you're saying completely. Okay. I did see that the summer long-term emergency rating of, I believe, it's both lines, but correct me if I'm wrong, will be

increased by 85 percent. And I know because of CEII purposes that you can't tell us what that loading is. First of all, is it both lines that the increase in line rating or all three lines, I should say, that the increase in line rating will be?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Morissette, this is Edward Roedel from UI. Yes, all the lines will have their, all of their ratings increased, including the long time.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Is there any determination as to when the lines will meet a large increase of that increase in rating?

THE WITNESS (Roedel): Mr. Morissette, this is Edward Roedel with UI. We have no -- there's no forecast that we have that indicates that the load pocket is going to increase to a point where it needs wires or capacity of that size.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Great. Okay. I'm going to switch to EMF questions now. And the first question I have is, the analysis that was performed was done on 2022 projected peak loads and then 2029 projected loads. And given the discussion we just had about the 85 percent

increased potential could carry, the line could carry a 85 percent increase, from a percentage basis, because I know you can't tell me what the loads are, what load increase was 2029 used, what percent increase?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette, this is Ben Cotts with Exponent. Can I clarify briefly what you mean? You would like to know the percent increase between the loading used for 2022 and the loading used for 2029?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, exactly.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): That will probably take me a couple of minutes to find, but I can start looking for that.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I'm just looking for an off-the-cuff number. Certainly it's not 85 percent. It's probably -- and given that there's no calculation as to over time how much loading, I'm trying to get a feel for in your EMF calculations there will be some level of increase in loads, but it's certainly not going to be to the 85 percent level. So I'd like to understand what level of increase in loads you're using when you do your analysis.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): This is Ben Cotts

again with Exponent. Given the fact that the levels do not change dramatically between the existing and proposed, I can say now that the loading levels are also not substantially different. But if there is time, I can come back and give you the precise percentage increase.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I understand. So the existing is based on 2022 loads and the proposed is based on 2029; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): That is correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. Dr. Cotts, that's fine, you don't need to calculate it. I have a feel for where it's going.

I would like to turn to Exhibit C-3 in your analysis, Dr. Cotts, Exhibit E.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): You said Figure C-3?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Okay, I am there.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. I'm curious why at Structure 359 the existing and proposed -- the proposed is significantly lower than the existing, you know, why that is for this particular structure.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Structure 359, I

believe, is crossing the Housatonic River. I may need to check that. This is on one side of the Housatonic River crossing. If you'll give me a moment just to pull up the drawings there, I can give you a more specific answer.

MR. MORISSETTE: Sure. Thank you. And while you're on the drawing, I take it 360 is on the other side?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): That's correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

(Pause.)

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Thank you for the time, Mr. Morissette. I think I have an answer for you now.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Cotts): There are a couple of different reasons for the decrease. The most substantial reason for the decrease in field levels at this location is that the existing phasing of the double circuit lines is the same top to bottom for both of the transmission lines. And in the revised configuration the phasing of the 1808 line was optimized such that the field levels would decrease as a result of that optimization. So that accounts for a large

fraction of the decrease.

An additional factor is that the minimum conductor height in the modeling that was done assumed a minimum of 19 feet of clearance for the existing configuration, and the new standards require 23 feet of minimum clearance to the bottom of the conductor. So that additional 4 feet of clearance will also reduce field levels.

As one additional point here, I can point out that both the existing and the proposed calculations of the Housatonic River crossing likely very much overestimate the field levels at the river. Because, as I said, these models are assuming the clearance of the conductors is 19 or 23 feet aboveground, the actual clearance of the conductors would be much higher than that, and so the field levels for both existing and proposed would be much lower.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. That's very helpful.

Dr. Cotts, I'm trying to get my arms around the levels around Structures 17, 18 and 19. And thank you for your response to Mr. Silvestri's question because I had the same one. C-33 provides the analysis of that. But from a graphic

perspective, I notice that the other structures are basically similar to the existing, the proposed is similar to the existing except it's shifted depending on which side of the right-of-way the structure is shifted to. So for Structures 17 and 18 and 19, is there a particular graph like, say, C-15 that would represent what the magnetic fields would look like in that right-of-way along 17, 18 and 19?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Mr. Morissette, that's an excellent question, and thank you for that. This is Ben Cotts with Exponent. Qualitatively, the graphic, if you were looking at Figure C-3, it would look qualitatively quite similar to what you would see for these structures. And perhaps I can clarify that a little bit. The reason that the calculations are done with the three-dimensional model here is, as I said before, kind of the sharp turn in the structure renders the assumption of essentially that the conductors are infinite in extent to be less than an ideal assumption, and so we did a three-dimensional model.

That being said, the two-dimensional models still predict the field level quite well.

And in this particular case the important factor for determining field levels is going to be, as you know, the loading on the line certainly, but more importantly in this case it's going to be the separation from the conductors from one line to the other. So the horizontal distance between the conductors on the left side of the pole and the conductors on the right side of the pole and also their vertical spacing, this is what we call the phased spacing between the conductors.

And although the structures here on the monopoles are such that the conductors are on separate, supported by separate poles, the spacing between the conductors is largely quite similar between the double circuit structures and these single circuit structures. And so as a result, the magnetic field levels, the electric field levels will also be similar to what you would see from those double circuit structures.

If you would like, I can provide the best comparison, but that will likely take me a few minutes to look at the specific design of those structures and the closest to them from the double circuit structure lines in one of those calculations there.

MR. MORISSETTE: I don't think that's necessary, Dr. Cotts. I understand what you're saying is that, and I'll just summarize for you, I'll feed it back to you to make sure I understood it correctly, is that if we were to install double circuit structures for Structures 17, 18 and 19, the magnetic fields would be similar to what you've characterized in Exhibit C-33. And although they would be shifting to the edge of the right-of-way because of the shifting of the single monopole closer to one side versus the other, but that's the only change that you would see. Does that sort of summarize it?

THE WITNESS (Cotts): Yes, I think you captured that quite well. And just to add one additional point that may be helpful, in particular, we did this analysis for the new Structure 4. The original configuration of Structure 4 was similar to 17 and 18 in that it had two separate structures, and the revised Structure 4 was a double circuit monopole. And the results of that are shown in the memorandum that was submitted along with the response to that interrogatory question. I believe it was No. 15. And if you look there, you can see that the

comparison between the original structure which had two separate structures and the new structure which is the double circuit structure is qualitatively very similar. And so I would expect a very similar response if there were to be a double circuit structure at Structures 17 and 18.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. And thank you for that analysis, by the way. It was very helpful for Structure 4. And I think modifying that to a double circuit structure was appropriate in that location.

Okay. What I'd like to do is shift gears here and talk about the actual constructability of Structures 17, 18 and 19, if we could, and the temporary structures. So far, the way I understand it, you would have a temporary structure for each one, 17, 18 and 19; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Hi, Mr. Morissette. This is Mr. Konduru. That is not correct because at 17, 18, 19 we are proposing to use two single circuit monopoles just to minimize the temporary construction need there. So by using double circuit or two single circuit monopoles, so especially because of the towns at

those locations, so if you go with the two single circuit monopoles, we will be able to install one of the poles for one of the de-energized circuit and then add a second pole installed after the second circuit.

MR. MORISSETTE: So the second pole will be a temporary pole?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): No. Let me rephrase that a little bit, actually.

MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So through that section there we're taking it out there, as per our current construction sequencing plan, we are taking the 1594 circuit which is, if you look from 17 to 19, that's the south circuit. So first we'll be installing a single circuit monopole which is going to be a permanent configuration and then finish the construction of 1594 circuit and then come back later, take 1560-3, demolish all the existing lattice towers and then install the final single circuit monopole which supports the 1560-3 circuit.

MR. MORISSETTE: So that's your sequence for the single circuit monopoles?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Single circuit

monopoles, yes, sir.

MR. MORISSETTE: Right. But if you were to go with a double circuit monopole, you would need to install temporary structures?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): That is correct, the feasibility of installing temporary configuration, but it seemed infeasible at those three locations because of several factors. First is, at 17 and 19 we have huge line angles. So in order to install a temporary pole, like let's say we are doing, we are following similar sequencing, so we have to install a temporary pole underneath 1594 circuit, which is a south circuit, and once we install the guy wires, because temporary configuration, temporary poles we're looking at using off-the-shelf poles, like LD standard poles or light-duty poles. So if you use the light-duty poles, then you have to install guy wires which could be interfering with the other circuit that's already energized, and it's also going to hinder with the construction activities in the area. So that's at 17 and 19.

And at 18, so that location is pretty unique because it has Wakelee Avenue to the east, parking lot to the north, and there is a house

immediately to the south of that tower. So it would be very challenging to install a temporary pole at that structure location there.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. If you had the double circuit configuration with the temporary poles, you would still have 2 feeds into the substation; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Can you repeat that question again? Sorry.

MR. MORISSETTE: So if you had for the double configuration you would have one, I think it's 1594 on one side of the double circuit structure and then you'd have the 1560 line on the temporary structure, so you'd still maintain two feeds into the substation; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So temporary, I mean, we will not be able to do the temporary on 1560 because of the way we sequenced it currently because the way -- I mean, from Structure 14 all the way to Ansonia Substation we are planning to install 1594 line first because of several kind of terrain features and the houses just under the spans, so it might make more sense to do the 1594 site first.

So if you do the 1594 site, like I was

mentioning earlier, we have to go with the temporary. If we go with the temporary poles, then we would have to use guys wires because of the 90-degree line angles, so that would hinder with the clearance issues to the existing 1560 circuit that will be supported on the lattice towers, existing lattice towers.

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So Mr. Morissette, just to give some additional notes there. We will be maintaining one energized circuit at all times, so substations will be adequately fed and we won't have any disruptions to customers.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for that. Is there any concern about the single contingency line loss for that substation?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We are reviewing that currently with our distribution group. There are a number of different switching scenarios that are available to us that can help offload the substations and the risk of an event happening, but we are working closely with our distribution and operations team to make sure we have a plan in place should something happen.

MR. MORISSETTE: Good. Thank you. So

the bottom line here is, is that this area disturbs me, is that you're getting closer to the southern edge of the right-of-way and getting closer to the residence on Scotland Street and, you know, and it has to do with adding the single monopoles to that side of the, southern side of the right-of-way. So I'm struggling with that quite a bit. I'd like to see the double monopoles along that section to eliminate encroaching on the residence on Scotland Street.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Mr. Morissette, this is Mr. Konduru. Can I add a little bit to that actually?

MR. MORISSETTE: Certainly. Please do.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): One of the primary reasons that we use the two single circuit monopoles is essentially try to maintain the position of the conductors, existing conductors, I mean, portion of the proposed conductors same as where the existing conductors are, so there is minimal impact to the existing buildings.

MR. MORISSETTE: So what you're saying is that the conductor on the south side of the right-of-way is basically in the same position as it was when --

THE WITNESS (Konduru): It's actually pretty close to where the existing current configuration is. But if you go with a double circuit single monopole, then wires will be shifting further to the south closer to the residences since we have to maintain adequate clearances to the energized, one of the energized circuits.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I still don't like it though.

Now, in Appendix A there's a drawing XS-15 where the line configuration is to the outside, both to the outside rather than the center. For Structures 17, 18 and 19 is it that configuration or the one on XS-14?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): So this is Mr. Konduru again, Mr. Morissette. So for Structures 17 and 18, they're going to be single circuit monopoles, but there's going to be davit arms installed on 17, but at 18 and 19 it's going to be similar to XS-15 configuration --

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): -- which the wires will be directly on the pole.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So I'm assuming

that south is to the left, the wires will be on the inside, is that correct, am I looking at that properly?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): For instance, if you look at XS-14, circuit 1594, that is the right side pole, that's going to be the south circuit. If you look from 16 to 17, then it's the right side, which is the east side circuit, but if you look from 17 to 18, it's the south side circuit. So the inside pole is going to be the one that's shown on the right side which on the top there it says circuit 1594.

MR. MORISSETTE: So 1594 is on the north side of the right-of-way?

THE WITNESS (Konduru): If you look from 16 to 17, it's on the east side. And if you look from 17 to 18, that's on the south side. Because at 17 there's a 90-degree turn to the right.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I'm not sure I get that, but maybe you can try it again.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Yes. So at 17 when we look at cross-section XS-14, circuit 1594 is going to be on the right side, if you stand next to Structure 16 and look towards Structure

17. And then when you stand at 17 and look at Structure 18, the circuit is still going to be on the right side, but if you look at the global perspective, it's going to be the south side circuit.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Good. Well, thank you. Thank you for your patience on that.

THE WITNESS (Konduru): Sorry about that.

MR. MORISSETTE: No, no problem. All right. That pretty much wraps it up for me. Thank you, everyone, for your patience.

What I'm going to do now is poll everyone on the Council and staff and see if they have any follow-up questions given the information that's been presented here today. We'll start with Mr. Perrone.

Mr. Perrone, any follow-up questions?

MR. PERRONE: No, I don't, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Perrone.

Mr. Silvestri, any follow-up questions?

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Just a quick one, if any cost

comparison came back for Structure No. 4.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. Attorney McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: Ms. Sazanowicz has the answer for Mr. Silvestri, yes.

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Mr. Silvestri, this is MeeNa Sazanowicz. The team estimates conceptually a minimum increase of $350,000 to go from the twin single circuit poles to the single double circuit structure.

MR. SILVESTRI: Quick related question on that. The original proposal had two poles, but now you'd be going to one pole for Structure 4. Why does the price go up?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The single circuit poles were in suspension configuration, and this new double circuit structure will be a deadend which has additional load cases. So you will have a larger foundation, a bigger pole, a heavier duty pole to take additional loads from the deadend cases.

MR. SILVESTRI: As soon as you said "deadend" I understood. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

Silvestri. We'll now go to Mrs. Cooley.

Mrs. Cooley, any follow-up questions?

MRS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette, I am all set.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Quinlan, any follow-up questions?

MR. QUINLAN: I have no additional questions. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

Mr. Lynch, any follow-up questions?

MR. LYNCH: My microphone is giving me trouble here. No follow-up questions.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Lynch. And I have no follow-up questions. So I thank the panel this afternoon.

So we will, the Council will recess until 6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence with the public comment session of this remote public hearing. Thank you, everyone, and we'll see you at 6:30. Have a good evening. Have a nice dinner.

(Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 4:22 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 96 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL of the REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: DOCKET NO. 3B, THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR REPLACEMENT OF A PORTION OF THE EXISTING DERBY - SHELTON 115-kV ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINE FACILITY. REOPENING OF THIS CERTIFICATE BASED ON CHANGED CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES, SECTION 4-181a(b), which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on July 28, 2022.

Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
Court Reporter
Notary Public
My commission expires:
May 31, 2023

I N D E X

(Council's Administrative Notice Items I-B-1 through I-B-80: Received in evidence on page 8.)

WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 10 and 11)
TODD BERMAN
JOE DIETRICH
SATHISH KONDURU
BENJAMIN COTTS
LESLIE DOWNEY
DAVID R. GEORGE
DAVID LESTER
MICHAEL LIBERTINE
KEVIN MCMAHON
ANNETTE POTASZ
EDWARD ROEDEL
MEENA SAZANOWICZ
JASUN VAN HORN
JOSH WILSON

CERTIFICATE HOLDER'S EXHIBITS (Received in evidence)

I n d e x: (Cont'd)