STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 490

The United Illuminating Company application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Old Town Substation Rebuild Project that entails construction, maintenance and operation of a 115/13.8-kilovolt (kV) air-insulated replacement substation facility located on the existing Old Town Substation parcel at 282 Kaechele Place and two parcels immediately north totaling approximately 3 acres that are owned by the United Illuminating Company at 312 and 330 Kaechele Place, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and related transmission structure and interconnection improvements.

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

Public Hearing held on Thursday, October 15, 2020, beginning at 2 p.m. via remote access.

H e l d B e f o r e:

ROBERT SILVESTRI, Presiding Officer

Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

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

Council Members:

ROBERT HANNON
Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes
Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

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

JOHN MORISSETTE

EDWARD EDELSON

Council Staff:

MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.
Executive Director and
Staff Attorney

MICHAEL PERRONE
Siting Analyst

LISA FONTAINE
Fiscal Administrative Officer

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

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

For The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy:
CARMODY TORRANCE SANDAK HENNESSEY LLP
50 Leavenworth Street
P.O. Box 1110
Waterbury, Connecticut 06702
BY: MARIANNE BARBINO DUBUQUE, ESQ.

EVERSOURCE ENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
107 Selden Street
Berlin, Connecticut 06037-1616
BY: JEFFERY D. COCHRAN, ESQ.

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

MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, everyone. I trust my audio is working the way it should. This remote public hearing is called to order this Thursday, October 15, 2020, at 2 p.m. My name is Robert Silvestri, member and presiding officer of the Connecticut Siting Council.

Other members of the Council are Robert Hannon, designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. And I'd like to welcome our next member, Quat Nguyen, to the Council. Mr. Nguyen is the designee for Chair Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority. Next we have John Morissette and Edward Edelson.

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

As all are keenly aware, there is currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread of the Coronavirus. And this is why the Council is holding this remote public hearing, and we do ask for your patience. If you haven't done so already, I'll ask that everyone please mute their computer audio and/or telephone 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 an application from The United Illuminating Company for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Old Town Substation Rebuild Project that entails construction, maintenance and operation of a 115/13.8-kilovolt air-insulated replacement substation facility located on the existing Old Town Substation parcel at 282 Kaechele Place, in case of mispronunciation that's K-A-E-C-H-E-L-E, and two parcels immediately north totaling approximately 3 acres that are owned by the United Illuminating Company at 312 and 330 Kaechele Place in Bridgeport, Connecticut. This application was received by the Council on June 30, 2020.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this remote public hearing was published in The Connecticut Post on September 1, 2020. Upon this Council's request, the applicant erected a sign near the proposed northern access drive entrance located off of Kaechele Place so as to inform the public of the name of the applicant, the type of facility, the remote public hearing

date, and contact information for the Council.

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

The parties and intervenors to the proceeding are as follows: The applicant is The United Illuminating Company, its representative Bruce McDermott, Esq., from Murtha Cullina LLP. The party, The Connecticut Light and Power Company, doing business as Eversource Energy, its representative Marianne Barbino Dubuque, Esq., from Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's Docket 490 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 2nd 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 this 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 applicant and party, 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 published on the Council's Docket No. 490 web page and deposited with the Bridgeport City Clerk's Office and the Trumbull Town Clerk's Office for the convenience of the

public.

And the Council will take a 10 to 15 minute break at a convenient juncture somewhere around 3:30 p.m. this afternoon.

I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program that are marked as Roman numeral I-B, Items 1 through 92, that the Council has administratively noticed.

Does any party have an objection to the items that the Council has administratively noticed? And I'll start first with Attorney McDermott.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. No objection on behalf of UI.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Attorney Dubuque.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Eversource has no objection. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you also. Accordingly, the Council hereby administratively notices these items.

(Council Administrative Notice Items I-B-1 through I-B-92: Received in evidence.)

MR. SILVESTRI: We'll now have the appearance by the applicant, the United

Illuminating Company. And will the applicant present their witness panel for the purposes of taking the oath, and Attorney Bachman will then administer the oath.

MR. McDERMOTT: Good morning -- or good afternoon, Mr. Silvestri, members of the Council. Bruce McDermott from Murtha Cullina on behalf of the United Illuminating Company. The panel for the United Illuminating Company today is Todd Berman who's the manager of environmental programs and projects. Richard Pinto, who's a senior project manager for substation projects. Ron Rossetti, who's the manager of electric capital projects. MeeNa Sazanowicz, who is in transmission line standards at the United Illuminating Company. Fred Walsh, manager of transmission planning. Jonathan Wolff, lead engineer of substation projects. Dr. William Bailey, who's a principal scientist at Exponent. And Michael Libertine, director of siting and permitting for All-Points Technology Corporation. All those individuals are on the Zoom conference and are ready to be sworn and to testify.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Attorney McDermott.

Attorney Bachman.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

Could all the witnesses please just raise their right hand?

T O D D B E R M A N,

R I C H A R D P I N T O,

R O N A L D R O S S E T T I,

M E E N A S A Z A N O W I C Z,

F R A N K W A L S H,

J O N A T H A N W O L F F,

W I L L I A M H. B A I L E Y,

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

called as witnesses, being first duly sworn (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.

Attorney McDermott, you know their voices better than I do, so I'm going to assume that everybody did swear in, as appropriate.

MR. McDERMOTT: That's a good assumption, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Could you

please begin by verifying all exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses?

MR. McDERMOTT: Yes.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. McDERMOTT: I'll ask Mr. Pinto, who's the senior project manager for this project, to verify all but the resumes of Dr. Bailey and Mr. Libertine. So with that, Mr. Pinto, did you prepare or oversee the preparation of UI Exhibit 1, which is the application, and the various attachments thereto; Exhibit 2, which is UI's responses to the Council's interrogatories, dated September 25th; UI Exhibit 3, which is your affidavit regarding the posting of the sign noticing the hearing, dated September 28, 2020; and UI Exhibit Number 5, which is the public comment presentation site plan? Did you prepare or assist in the preparation of those exhibits, Mr. Pinto?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, I did.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes or revisions to any of those exhibits?

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

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt those exhibits as full exhibits in this proceeding here

today?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And Dr. Bailey, are you with us and off mute?

(No response.)

MR. McDERMOTT: Dr. Bailey, maybe you can unmute, and I'll go on to Mr. Libertine.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): I'm unmuted.

MR. McDERMOTT: Off mute?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: Are you familiar with UI Exhibit 4b, which is your resume?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes, I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes. Did you hear me?

MR. McDERMOTT: Yes, okay, I can hear you now. And do you have any changes or revisions to Exhibit 4b, Mr. Libertine?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Oh, no, I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that here today?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: And then to you, Dr.

Bailey, if you're off mute, are you familiar with UI Exhibit 4a, which is a copy of your CV?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes, I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes or revisions to that document?

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

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

THE WITNESS (Bailey): I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: With that, Mr. Silvestri, I'll ask that UI Exhibits 1 through 5 be admitted into evidence.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Attorney McDermott. Does the party object to admission of the applicant's exhibit, Attorney Dubuque?

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Eversource has no objection. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you kindly. The exhibits are admitted.

(Applicant, United Illuminating Company's Exhibits II-B-1 through II-B-5: Received in evidence - described in index.)

MR. SILVESTRI: We will now begin with cross-examination of the applicants by the Council, and we'll start with Mr. Perrone.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. PERRONE: My first question, could you tell us the general geographical area in Connecticut that UI serves to provide electric distribution service to?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Certainly. So UI serves approximately 320,000 customers in 17 towns located in the southwest section of Connecticut.

MR. PERRONE: After the submittal of the municipal consultation filing, did UI receive any feedback from the City of Bridgeport, Town of Trumbull or abutting property owners?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, we did not.

MR. PERRONE: Turning to page 2-1 of the application under the Land and Access Requirements, there's mention of UI acquiring an easement from the City of Bridgeport for a portion of the project. What is the status of UI acquiring an easement from Bridgeport for part of this project?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): UI has talked to the City of Bridgeport. In regards to the

easement, we've presented to the parks board committee and they are conceptually on board with our easement. We do not have a final easement yet. We are still in detailed engineering. Our expectation is to finalize the boundaries of the easement and then go back to the city with that finalization of the easement requirements, but conceptually they are on board with that, and we're in the process of drafting up easement documentation. But again, until we have more detailed engineering, the final layout and the boundaries of the easement are still being worked on.

MR. PERRONE: Was the Old Town Substation project noted in UI's March 2020 forecast of electric loads and resources filing?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Mr. Walsh.

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Sorry, there was a fair bit of echo. Could you repeat the question?

MR. PERRONE: Sure. In UI's March 2020 forecast of electric loads and resources filing, was the Old Town Substation project noted in there?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): I would have to

read the report itself.

MR. PERRONE: That's okay, I'll move on. Referencing the response to Council Interrogatory Number 4, the existing substation has a capacity of about 85 MVA, and in response to Council Interrogatory Number 8, the forecast load out to 2030 is about 66. So is it correct to say that the proposed replacement of Old Town Substation is not due to a capacity issue?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Going back to the response to Council Interrogatory Number 4, could you explain what a weather-normalized 90/10 loading is?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Sure. So the weather normalizing, it's a method to account for the fact if our actual coincident peak load which occurred in reality had aligned with certain other factors such as weather which would have resulted in a higher load being seen. So it's an alignment of certain external conditions with system demand. So if the highest demand day had occurred on the hottest day of the year, for example, that would contribute to skewing more towards a 90/10 load.

And just to clarify a bit more, the

90/10 distribution, it's essentially saying that there is a 10 percent chance in any given year that that load could occur. So there is a probabilistic component to that number as well.

MR. PERRONE: So you took the actual loading and adjusted it to what it would have been under the 90/10 extreme weather scenario?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Next going to turn to asset condition issues starting with page 1-6 of the application. On the bottom of page 1-6, the last bulleted point is Bus No. 3 Enclosure Problems. It states, "Number 3 bus enclosure requires remediation to eliminate reoccurring issues associated with the buckling of the bus room floor." Could you explain more about that issue?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, so the Bus No. 3, it's a bus that was put in several years ago for capacity issues. It's a separated bus from the existing control room, control house. It's a metal enclosed switchgear, if you want to call it. And the way it's set on the foundation, it's on piers rather than a flat slab. So the steer bus is kind of buckling from the weight of

the circuit breakers, so it becomes very difficult to rack in and rack out the circuit breakers. We've had several incidents where they misoperate it because of the shifting of the floor.

And also another thing to note on that is there's a -- which ties to that same existing point of failure issue -- that both the incoming feeders that feed this bus run through the same manhole to support the load off of that bus.

But to answer your question, the enclosure, it's an old metal building that the floor is buckling due to the age of it.

MR. PERRONE: And you said racking in and racking out the breakers, you mean closing and opening?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No, it's part of the process of closing and opening the breakers. You actually, these are heavy breakers, and they actually roll into a cubicle inside this enclosure. There's several feeders that are fed out of there, and the circuit breakers are not typical like you find in a house. These are big heavy circuit breakers on wheels that actually roll into like a closet, if you want to call it, inside of this enclosure.

MR. PERRONE: Moving on to the bulleted point on the top of page 1-7, the OCB Replacement, "The substation's 115 kV OCB is obsolete and poses increased risks of failure." My question is, could you explain why it has an increased risk of failure?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The OCB, it's the only oil circuit breaker that we have left on our system. We have since changed out all of our OCBs to gas circuit breakers. This particular circuit breaker, due to the age of it and availability of spare parts, it's very difficult to maintain. Even to get at it in the yard, it's a very tight configuration, and we actually cannot replace that circuit breaker with a gas circuit breaker just because of the infrastructure that's in place in the yard. It's too congested to even fit a gas circuit breaker in there.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Perrone, it's Bruce McDermott, if I could just jump in? We do have an answer for you on your question about the forecast of loads and resources and the reference in the report to the Old Town project.

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Yes, Old Town is discussed on page 22.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you. Moving on to page 9-1 of application, the last paragraph, UI notes that an in-kind replacement on the existing site would be less cost effective than the proposed replacement site. Do you have a cost estimate on an in-kind replacement alternative?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The in-kind replacement alternative, it was estimated to be approximately $47 million. And one of the reasons for that increase is it's very difficult, number one, to try to replace and keep the lights on as you're trying to replace the equipment within the yard. So you'd have to do it systematically. And it's not even -- wasn't even determined if it's even feasible to do just because of the footprint of the existing facility. It's just almost impossible to even accommodate an in-kind type replacement.

MR. PERRONE: On the next page, 9-2, second paragraph, it talks about a GIS design and it says, "A GIS substation design, which would be more costly, was not considered as a preferred option." Do you have an estimate of a GIS design or a cost delta between AIS and GIS?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not have an

estimate on a GIS design.

MR. PERRONE: That's okay. Thank you. Moving on to substation design, would any of the monopole structures require a lightning mast on top?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Mr. Perrone, we could not hear you.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Would any of the proposed monopole structures require a lightning mast on top? Can you hear me?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Now we could. Sorry about that.

MR. PERRONE: Okay, I'll repeat it. Would any of the proposed monopole structures require lightning masts on top?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): On top of the monopole structures, no.

MR. PERRONE: So that would leave the monopoles as the tallest structures then; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay, great. As far as the base of the substation, would it be like a crushed stone or a trap rock?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, so the

majority of the facility would be trap rock. There is a paved area driveway that kind of loops through the property to give ingress/egress access for the mobile substation. It pretty much comes into the center of the substation and borders around and goes to the existing facility and comes out the same driveway that's there today.

MR. PERRONE: I understand the fence would use privacy slats. Would those slats be used all the way around?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: And I understand, as proposed, it will be connected to two transmission lines, 1710 and 1722. If one of those lines were to go out of service, could the substation still operate?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: And turning to the response to Council Interrogatory 18, there is the 2014 letter from the ISO Reliability Committee showing an in-service date of 2017. Given the proposed in-service date, would ISO need to seek a revised determination or does this one still stand?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Mr. Walsh.

THE WITNESS (Walsh): I apologize. Could you repeat the question?

MR. PERRONE: The response to Council Interrogatory 18, there's the letter from ISO New England Reliability Committee. Given that this is a 2014 letter with an in-service date of 2017, my question is would UI need to seek a revised determination or does this determination letter still stand?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): The determination letter still stands.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Turning to the response to Council Interrogatory 13, we have the cut and fill numbers, and we have 9,300 cubic feet of cut, 8,800 of fill, so it looks like a net cut of about 500 cubic yards. What would UI do with the excess cut material?

THE WITNESS (Berman): My apologies. The excess cut material would be environmentally characterized, and if necessary, disposed of in accordance with law or reused in accordance with law.

MR. PERRONE: Would the project comply with the 2004 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Now I'm going to turn to the gas filled circuit breaker topic we were discussing earlier. On page 2-3 of the application it notes three 115 kV sulfur hexafluoride dead tank circuit breakers. Could UI explain the pros and cons of these gas filled circuit breakers in the proposed substation versus the oil filled breaker at the existing?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Mr. Perrone, could you repeat that for me, please?

MR. PERRONE: On page 2-3 we have three 115 kV sulphur hexafluoride circuit breakers. Could you explain the pros and cons of these gas filled circuit breakers versus oil filled?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The oil circuit breaker technology is outdated. The new technology is SF6 breakers. It's more robust as compared to the oil, a lot less maintenance requirements for an SF6 circuit breaker as opposed to an oil circuit breaker. Typically an oil circuit breaker you would have to maintain the circuit breaker every roughly two years or so, where the maintenance requirements for an SF6 breaker are prolonged, if you want to call it. I

don't know our exact maintenance cycle on them, but it's certainly less frequent than the oil circuit breaker is.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. What does "dead tank" mean because they're dead tank circuit breakers?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): It means that the actual frame of the breaker itself is de-energized. There are live tank circuit breakers in existence, but they tend to be very specialized.

MR. PERRONE: Is sulfur hexafluoride a greenhouse gas?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Would there be any leakage of the SF6 over time such that you'd have to top off the charge?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Typically there is no leakage from the SF6 circuit breakers. We actually monitor it. We have several levels of alarming on them. In the unforeseen event that there is a leak, you know, it is alarmed. It does respond back to our control center at different levels, so it's monitored 24/7.

MR. PERRONE: And lastly, if you know,

about how much SF6 does each breaker hold?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Subject to check, I believe it's around 80 pounds, 80 psi.

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

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Perrone. I'd like to continue with cross-examination of the applicant by Mr. Morissette, please.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Can you hear me okay? Okay. I'd like to get myself grounded, first of all, as to the location and the surroundings of the substation, and I'd like to turn to the field review visual assessment -- no, I'm sorry, the visual assessment and photo simulation done by All-Points.

MR. McDERMOTT: I believe that's Interrogatory Response 22 for the UI panel.

MR. MORISSETTE: And I think it's the seventh slide. It shows the overall substation oblique area view over Kaechele Place. Just to get my bearings, to the left of the substation entrance that's a funeral home, correct?

THE WITNESS (Libertine): That is

correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: And in front of the entrance, the building where you can sort of see the peak of the roof, what type of -- is that a residence or a commercial building?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is a commercial building.

MR. MORISSETTE: A commercial building, businesses are within the building, okay. Did you receive any comments from either the commercial building or the funeral home?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No. We actually met with the funeral home on occasions to discuss the project with them.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. The entrance going into the funeral home, is that an entrance or an exit, and is it the only entrance or exit?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The traffic goes in and out that driveway, but I also believe there's a driveway in the front off of Main Street.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So this is more like more or less a back entrance --

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: -- to the facility?

So if they were to have a funeral during construction, was anything discussed about how to manage that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah. Briefly we did discuss that with the funeral director. We would work with them. You know, if they have a large event going on, we said that we would, you know, coordinate efforts to not block and work with them as far as keeping vehicles off the road. Most of our vehicles are going to be within the footprint of our property, you know, vehicles would be accessing the property early in the morning, likely well before any event that they may have. So that coordination was discussed.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Ashton would be proud that your design has cut off corners in the back of the substation. That was a pet peeve of his for many years. So well done.

I would like to turn to the application, page 1-6, going back to the single point of failure discussion that Mr. Perrone had earlier. I'm still not really clear as to what the single point of failure is and why the entire -- why customer load would have to be interrupted if there was a fault or something

occurred. Could you --

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, absolutely. So within that rare bus structure, Bus No. 3, it has two feeds that come into it, one from each of the transformers, and both feeds run through the same manhole. So the single point of failure is a catastrophic failure within that manhole. So if one cable fails in that manhole, it has the potential to take out the second cable, in essence, de-energizing that bus and dropping the load off of that bus. So because both feeders run through that manhole, the same manhole, there is that potential for that, we call it, single point of failure to disrupt the load.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, that was very helpful. I think I've got it now.

Okay. I would like to go substation costs. I believe the total cost of the new substation is 40 million. Could you tell me what the cost of the two transformers is of that 40 million?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The two transformers cost roughly, subject to check, 3 million.

MR. MORISSETTE: 3 million apiece?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No, in total.

MR. MORISSETTE: In total. So 37 million is the rest of the stuff?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Does that also include the cost of the Eversource structures?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No, that is part of -- that's Eversource.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, that's separate.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, that 37 million is both transmission and distribution.

MR. MORISSETTE: Just the substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. I'd like to go on to page 9-3 in relation to the in-kind modifications slash upgrades at the existing Old Town Substation. At the bottom of the paragraph it says, in total, the in-kind substation replacement is estimated to cost 47 million.

You had the discussion with Mr. Perrone about why it would cost 7 million more to do the in-kind. Could you talk a little bit more about why the 7 million would be incurred? Now, I understand the tightness of space and the reliability concerns working in the live

substation, but is there one component or another that's driving that 7 million?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Not necessarily. The equipment costs would roughly be the same. It's more about the inefficiencies of trying to build within an energized yard, the sequence of trying to construct, the time frame that it would take would be longer to do it than build a new substation. So with, you know, the inefficiencies and the time frame and different outages that would be required, you can't do a wholesale replacement, you've got to do it in very small pieces, if it was even feasible.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So the cost of scheduling outages and getting crews in during the outages and coordinating that, having them on standby and coordinating all that effort would accumulate to a $7 million increase; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Approximately, yes, correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. On the bottom of that same page it says, the very end of the sentence it says, "The equipment to be replaced would focus only on the items specifically

identified in the March 2014 needs assessment." Can you, in general terms, explain what's in the needs assessment and what is the cost associated with that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): So, yeah, so the needs assessment identified several factors, you know, one being the issues with Bus No. 3, the single point of failure, the OCB, the age of the OCB, the lack of space requirements within the substation and the control house, deteriorated equipment within the yard, the disconnect switches, and the CCVTs. So that needs assessment identified those things. So it would be basically trying to piecemeal, put band-aids on those things to try to fix them rather than a complete state-of-the-art new facility.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Was there an estimate associated with that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not have an estimate associated with that. Those were just identified. I don't believe an estimate was put together to try to address each one of those individual items, you know, as a separate, if you want to call it separate task.

MR. MORISSETTE: But the transformers

were specifically identified in that assessment as well, I would imagine?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, the age of the transformers, you know, they were put in in the sixties. They are actually, I believe, 53 years old. They're well towards the end of their useful life.

MR. MORISSETTE: Is there any major component that was left out --

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No.

MR. MORISSETTE: -- of that needs assessment? So basically, the way that read, it sounded like something was left out.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That needs assessment was a wholesale assessment of all the equipment within the facility, you know, the control enclosure, the control house, the transformers, you know, everything. We don't just look at a particular piece of equipment. When we do a needs assessments of a facility, we look at everything within the facility, the building, you know, everything, the fencing, I mean, all the equipment that houses and supports that substation.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So the needs

assessment aligns with your, or UI's list of physical conditions and equipment that needs to be replaced?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Okay. Thank you for that. I'd like to move on to the noise analysis, on page 7 of the noise analysis. I'll give you a moment to get there.

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Yes.

MR. MORISSETTE: On page 7 under 4.2, Noise Model Inputs, it indicates that the two transformers to be installed with the rebuild project were modeled at a height of 12 feet and having acoustic pressure of 65 dBA for a maximum MVA rating.

My question is, is that assuming that it's operating at max both, both transformers, which is highly unlikely, would be operating at maximum, and the cooling fans are on?

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Hey, John. That essentially means with these transformers that you're looking at both, like you said, the fans running and the pumps running. So in that situation, like you said, that's when the transformer is running at top level, your fan is

running and your pump is running at the same time.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, good. All right. So then it goes on to say that the acoustic pressure level corresponds with an A-weighted sound power level of 86.1 dBA. Can someone explain what A-weighted sound pressure level, what that means?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Can you restate that question once again, John?

MR. MORISSETTE: Sure.

THE WITNESS (Berman): The volume needs to be a little louder at our end.

MR. MORISSETTE: Sure. In that same paragraph, the second sentence, it goes on to say following the methods of IEEE Standard, bla, bla, bla, this acoustic pressure level corresponds to an A-weighted sound pressure level of 86.1 dBA.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Sorry, Mr. Morissette, can you -- I didn't catch the first part of the question.

MR. MORISSETTE: Can somebody explain the A-weighted sound pressure level of 86.1 dBA?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I will have to go back and look at that, and we'll address that shortly.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, that would be great. Let me continue on. Moving to page 8, Table 5, it basically says that you take the 65 dBA rating of the transformers with the fans and the pumps on and predicted -- these are the predicted noise levels at each of the measurement points or identified locations, I should say.

So ST-3 has got your highest reading of 44, and that's at the residence house on Kaechele Place. So based on this, the transformers themselves meet the applicable sound level limits. So I just want to make sure that I'm reviewing this noise study correctly.

And then the analysis goes on to overlay ambient noise levels both day and night. So essentially to make a long story short, what happens is, is that the ambient noise levels supersede what any kind of noise levels are going to be at the property lines and at the areas identified, but they are going to be, the overall sound levels are going to be greater than, specifically for ST-4, is going to be greater than the nighttime noise limits. Now, is the way I'm looking at this correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, in some

respects yes. I'm not sure you have -- you know, we see the highest potential noise impacts not at ST-4 but rather at ST-3 or potentially near the residence adjacent to ST-1. And when I do that, I'm referring to, you know, I'm using Appendix F, the sound study.

And I believe the second part of your question was would they -- could you restate the second part of the question?

MR. MORISSETTE: Well, the observation is, is that they would see, if I'm looking at Table 7, ST-4 is seeing nighttime levels greater than the allowable night one.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, I'm not -- we'll have to -- what page in the application are you looking at? I'm looking at the appendix right now. If you could point me to the page.

MR. MORISSETTE: It's page 9, page 9, Table 7.

(Pause.)

MR. MORISSETTE: It's actually Table 6 and 7, ST-4, the nighttime total sound limits are above the allowable nighttime limits.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So you're looking at Table 7, ST-4, nighttime total sound

level 58?

MR. MORISSETTE: Correct. It is higher than the allowable of 51.

THE WITNESS (Berman): It seems that is correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Right. And the reason that -- this is where I get tripped up. And every time I look through these noise analyses my hair hurts. So the reason why that meets the noise ordinances is because the 33 is at the location because of the transformer, but when you add in the ambient noise level of 58, and you add them together, that because the 33 is not greater than 5 dBA of the peak, then that's allowed, that meets the noise standard?

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

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. All right. So, moving on from that confusing discussion, has there been any discussion about any type of noise mitigation if in chance after the fact that the actual noise levels at the residence and the locations identified are actually higher than predicted?

THE WITNESS (Berman): At this time we

have not had those discussions.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Would UI be amenable to doing after-the-fact noise measurements to ensure that --

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, I feel quite confident the answer to that is yes.

MR. MORISSETTE: And you're comfortable with the 33 being -- well, at that particular location as being what you think you're going to -- what the noise levels are going to be at that particular location?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, that location is a little difficult to tease out because background noise is so high there from Main Street. I would want to take some thought to see how we would tease out background from the noise, if applicable, from the transformers.

MR. MORISSETTE: All right. So the bottom line is that the background noise is overpowering the transformer noises by almost double?

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay.

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Hey, John, if you don't mind, I'll add a quick note to this. So

given the table that's provided, you can see that the two transformers we have today are both approaching 68 decibels at its highest rating of 60 kVA -- or 60 MVA, sorry. The new Avangrid standard, the standard that we're following for these new transformers, is actually going to be a tad less than what's existing. So looking at Avangrid's transformer standards, the acoustic pressure level for a maximum MVA transformer is 65 dB. So what we'd be installing tomorrow is actually going to be quieter than what we have today just by default.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay, great. Those are all the questions I have. Thank you very much, everyone.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Before we continue, Mr. Berman, I wanted to go back to what Mr. Morissette had posed to you to see if we could clear it up about the A-weighted sound level. My understanding is that when you use an A-weighted sound level, it kind of translates to the relative loudness to the human ear; would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So would that be correct? It is a kind of an oversimplification,

but yes it is basically correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Morissette, I don't know if that helped answer your question or not.

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, I'm good. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay, thank you.

I'd like to move on now and continue cross-examination of the applicant by Mr. Hannon, please.

MR. HANNON: Can you hear me all right?

MR. SILVESTRI: I can, yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. I just wanted to make sure because I have lost audio before.

On the application on page 1-10 I've got two very basic questions, so if somebody could provide some answers to this, it would be appreciated. The middle of the page, it starts off the second full paragraph, "After the new Old Town Substation is placed in service, the point of change in ownership...," what does a point of change in ownership mean?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): It would be the point where the line switches ownership between Eversource and UI.

MR. HANNON: And then following that up with the second part of that paragraph, "Eversource will own the monopoles, insulators, conductor loop, and hardware attached to the monopoles. UI will own the monopoles, conductor, and associated equipment located within the substation fence." This may be a very simplistic question, but who owns the wires? I'm assuming Eversource.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): So the wires heading into the station from the monopoles will be owned by UI. So on the east side the wires coming in from the Eversource monopole UI would own. We would own the conductors going through the substation. We would own the conductors heading out to the west to the next Eversource owned monopole.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): You're welcome.

MR. HANNON: And actually, Mr. Pinto, you're also my next question. This is based on Interrogatory Number 6. In reading the response, I'm fine with what you say, but it's just sort of a general question. On page 2 of the Eversource prefile testimony it talks about how Eversource is

participating in Docket 490 solely to allow the Siting Council to consider not only the project proposed by UI, but also the facilities and upgrades to Eversource's transmission system that are required for the project. Now, is some of that done in order to try and help support the position that the split is going to be 75 percent New England and 25 percent Connecticut in terms of the ratepayer base?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I guess I'm having -- Eversource is participating because they own four structures that are within the Eversource right-of-way which are going to be rerouted into the new facility.

MR. HANNON: Okay. I was just wondering if that helps support your position in terms of how the fees would be split between regional and Connecticut. That's all.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, that's a regional calculation, you know, from the ISO. The supported portion of the project, you know, would be regionalized through all of New England, and the local costs would be borne by UI ratepayers.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. My next question is for Mr. Walsh. Interrogatory Number

9, it talks about the potential need for a third transformer realized at some time off in the future. But given how technology changes over time, if you had to put the third unit in there, how certain are you that you've got enough space to be able to put that new transformer in?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): We have layout diagrams that do show that that transformer fits, so I'd say there's a high degree of certainty that the transformer would fit within the yard.

MR. HANNON: Is that based on current size of transformers? I mean, because if things change, I just want to make sure there's adequate room in case maybe things get a little bit bigger in the future and you had to add one. I just want to make sure there's room to put it in. Is that how this is being planned?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): So the diagrams we have would assume that the transformer is the same size as the two units going in. If there was a concern for transformers dramatically increasing in size, I think Jonathan might be the more appropriate person to ask.

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Mr. Hannon, just to answer your question. As we go through

detailed engineering, we have asked our detail engineer to keep these things into account while we are going through design. So if you look at the drawings that we supplied, you'll see that there's quite a bit of space in between the two transformers. The space will allow us to install a foundation with ample space in between the transformers for future buildout.

MR. HANNON: No, that's fine. I mean, that's kind of the answer I was expecting. I just wanted to make sure.

Mr. Berman, you're up. How are you doing, Todd? Interrogatory Number 13, I do have some questions. I know Mr. Perrone had started down that road, but I do have some follow-up questions. Has any soil analysis been done on the sight, seeing as how there is an existing substation there? I'm just curious if any testing has been done with soils.

THE WITNESS (Berman): We have not done comprehensive testing on the existing substation site. We have done a full Phase 1 on the off-site areas but not on the existing station.

MR. HANNON: So at what point in time would you anticipate doing a detailed analysis of

the soils on the existing site?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Really we could advance that at almost any time. I think we'd be comfortable doing that in the spring of 2021.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. And then just sort of following up. I know that there's a bunch of cut and fill material that you're bringing in, but can you give me an idea of the types of materials associated with the fill, is that more crushed stone for the base of the area, that type of thing?

THE WITNESS (Berman): It will probably be specific in different areas, right? So some of the fill will be specific to the geotechnical needs that it's serving in terms of foundation bases. Other parts of the fill might be optimized for drainage. In all cases any imported material is going to go through a sort of pretty rigorous precertification process by UI.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then just sort of following up on that, you've got the cut and fill numbers. But has any number been associated with the cut and fill associated with the dismantling of the existing station, or does the 9,300 and 8,800 cubic yards just deal with the

construction of the new substation?

THE WITNESS (Berman): It is the latter.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then based on site conditions, do you have issues with ledge on the site? I'm assuming there's some testing that's been done in that respect. And then just to follow up on that while I'm going in that direction is, if there is ledge on site, do you need to blast, or are you also able to bring in some type of equipment to maybe crush stone on site?

THE WITNESS (Berman): The answer is geotechnical testing is underway. There is stone that may be ledge exposed. We've actually had this discussion and would certainly prefer to avoid blasting at almost all cost in favor of alternative techniques.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. My next question is going back to Mr. Pinto. I'm assuming I'm reading the maps correctly, and it looks as though on this roadway that's identified around the site that there are some splice vaults that are located within the roadway. But, in particular, I'm trying to look to see if I've got

a north arrow map on here, and I'm not seeing one, so I will say more towards the bottom of the page on the roadway it appears as though there are like three splice vaults that maybe look like houses instead of just a rectangular box.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That's correct.

MR. HANNON: My question on that is, does anything special have to be done with the splice vaults for construction purposes? And the reason I'm asking is because you've designed the roadway to be able to bring in portable transformers, and I'm assuming that those things are not light. So I'm just trying to make sure that what's being proposed with the splice vaults is going to handle the weight of any equipment that's coming in, especially the mobile transformers.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct. The splice terms would be H-20 rated which would suffice for distribution of the weight of the mobile substation if it needed to be brought in.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So all that's been taken into account, we don't have to worry about that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Right. In

detailed engineering we will go through that analysis, but anything that we put in the roadways is always H-20 rated.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. The next set set of questions I have I'm not sure who they may fall on, but I have a feeling it's going to be Mr. Berman. And it's not anything that's that critical at this point in time, but I'm just trying to get some information because I don't see any grading plans that had been provided with this application. The only thing that I'm seeing is there's one map that shows topography; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct. The full grading plan would be provided in the D&M.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So can you give me an idea of what the final base elevation of the proposed facility might be?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, absolutely. So the plan is to match the existing grade.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Because I noticed you've got some relatively high spots there too that would have to come down. So with some of the

work that needs to be done there, will any of the proposed ground work potentially have an impact on either Wetland A or Wetland B? Because you may end up creating some different drainage patterns, and I'm just curious as to what, maybe not a direct but an indirect impact could be on Wetland A and B.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Right. So to the degree there might be temporary construction impacts on Wetland A, that's the one to the north of the site, it's our intention and will be a driving philosophy as we go into more advanced design to make sure that to the degree possible there's no permanent impacts into the wetlands.

Now, to the degree it would change drainage patterns, yeah, it is likely there will be some change in the drainage pattern in the receiving Wetland A, not so much at Wetland B. But with respect to Wetland A, it's really characterized now by the sheet flow from the adjacent parking lot. We'll be designing the station to use stormwater retention best management practices as best we can.

As you may know, there is a little bit of nuance right now with the Connecticut DEP

construction stormwater permit more specifically as to what constitutes an impervious surface, but we will only have -- the only truly impervious surface at the yard will be, I guess, the roofs of the structures and the one roadway that bends through it. The rest of the yard is going to stay pervious.

MR. HANNON: Okay. How do you propose to handle on-site drainage? I mean, you've got a roadway there. Is that going to be a storm drainage system in the road like with the buildings, is there a way to maybe take the roof rain, run a leader down and actually infiltrate that into the ground? I'm just looking for a --

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah.

MR. HANNON: -- general idea how you're dealing with site drainage.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So the answer to your question, Mr. Hannon, is yes, absolutely, it would be our intention to, even the impervious surfaces we would try, to the degree possible, to infiltrate into the yard.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. The roadway that's shown on the map, is that existing or to be constructed?

THE WITNESS (Berman): To be constructed.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then I'm also assuming that because there are no grading plans, I also didn't see any erosion sedimentation control plans, but that would also be submitted as part of a grading plan at a D&M phase, if this is approved, correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Absolutely. And furthermore, the construction would be under whatever the next generation of the general permit for construction activities is.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then I've got one final question. Are there any 100 year or 500 year floodplain elevations even close to the site, or are you far enough away where it's not an issue?

THE WITNESS (Berman): It's not been flagged as an issue.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And then the final comment that I have or question I have is there's an October 18, 2019 letter from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection regarding the Natural Diversity Data Base, and it talks about recommended protection strategies for turtles.

And then in looking at the Fuss & O'Neill submittal under 3.3.1, Rare Species and Critical Habitats, the last sentence on that section prior to 3.3.2, which is the northern long-eared bat, it says, "These management practices can be addressed in the final design and bidding process." I'm asking you if they're going to be addressed in the final plan.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Hannon, the answer to that is unequivocally yes. We know that there are 13 conditions with respect to the eastern box turtle. We've both reviewed them internally, and honestly we've put them into practice in other places as well. They will unequivocally be part of our construction planning.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. That's it on my questions.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.

I'd like to continue with cross-examination of the applicant by Mr. Nguyen. And again, Mr. Nguyen, welcome to the Council.

MR. NGUYEN: Thank you very much. I don't have any questions. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you.

I'd like to continue with Mr. Edelson, please. Mr. Edelson, you still with us?

MR. EDELSON: Yeah, I forgot to unmute. I apologize.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you.

MR. EDELSON: I just started talking louder. I thought that would work.

So a little bit of context for me. Approximately how many substations does UI have responsibility for in Connecticut? I guess that would go to Mr. Pinto. I'm not really sure.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Go ahead, Ron.

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): It's 28 bulk substations.

MR. EDELSON: I'm sorry, there was a little static there. Can you repeat that?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Certainly. It's 28 bulk substations.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. And of those, how many are in a similar situation as far as their life span to this one where they are coming to the end of their useful engineering life?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): This is the oldest or one of the oldest. All the other ones don't have the issues associated with the

congested yard, the cost proximity to, you know, the other electrical devices within the yard, and just the constraints around this Old Town Substation. All the other ones are, they may be in the same age time frame, but they do not have the conditions that reside here, you know, aging infrastructure.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. And thank you for that background. Turning to Interrogatory Number 7, which refers to a question about the, what do we say, the LEED environmental design. And I'm kind of curious. You said it was not something that you were trying to achieve with this, if I understood your answer. And I'm just curious why you did not want to have it designated or achieve a designation of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I can answer that question. It's something that's not part of our corporate philosophy at this time. As mentioned in the interrogatory, we do embrace the concepts of LEED certification. We've actually built office buildings that are LEED certified. And we also look at things like the LED lighting and high efficiency HVAC and things of that

nature. It's just that as part of the LEED certification process you have to acquire so many points, and we do not believe at this time that we would acquire enough points to get to the lowest LEED certification.

MR. EDELSON: So is it fair to say this is not a cost issue for you, this is more of a, it almost sounds like a bureaucratic step that you're just not interested in taking at this point.

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): It's something that we would try to employ as best as we can during our detailed design some of these principles, but like I said, it's not part of our corporate philosophy at this time for an AIS type of substation to inquire, especially an unmanned substation, to try to meet LEED certification for this particular substation.

MR. EDELSON: Now, in terms of the technology that you're going to put here relative to the existing station, are there energy efficiency gains that you will achieve, in other words, the difference between what comes into the existing versus the new substation, more energy, more electricity will go out because there are less losses, are there any benefits along those

lines?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So the power transformers are more efficient than the ones that they are going to replace. Like I mentioned, the LED lighting is definitely more efficient than what we have there today. We have our new control enclosure will certainly be better insulated than what we have there today. So of course it's going to be more efficient than what we have there today. It's just that it probably will not make it to LEED certification status.

MR. EDELSON: And I'm just wondering if that would be something you -- is that something you have calculated or could calculate? In other words, when we look at environmental benefits for many projects, or environmental impacts, we usually are looking at trying to avoid impact. Here it looks to me that you have a benefit in terms of energy efficiency and whatever that's going to substitute for it that you haven't made us aware of. Is that something that you could make us aware of in a metric or in a quantifiable manner?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So we looked at it very quickly to see if we could gain the

points. We didn't do an in-depth analysis, if you will. We can certainly take another look at that, and that could actually be part of the D&M plan. But as of now, as part of the interrogatory response, we said that it would not be LEED certified.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. I would appreciate that in the D&M as a way to understand the benefit of making an upgrade like this.

MR. SILVESTRI: Provided that the project gets approved.

MR. EDELSON: Thank you. I always can count on Mr. Silvestri to make the appropriate caveat. I kind of get the horse before the cart there.

Just for my benefit, on the visuals, Interrogatory 22, the site review, I think it's on photo 26, it caught my eye that there was a police car there, but yet when I understood the location of the photograph, it didn't seem to me that there was a road or anything back there where a police car would be. And I'm just trying to still get a sense of where -- and I do appreciate the response to Interrogatory 22 because it was very helpful to have all of those pictures to get a sense of what

a site visit would have been like. But is that -- I'm just trying to verify that that picture isn't sort of out of position.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, that police car actually it appears to be in the parking lot of the funeral home, the rear parking lot of the funeral home.

MR. EDELSON: So it seems to me that the, what did you call it, the cardinal, the icon there should have been a little further to the west. Is that a reasonable assessment by me in terms of trying to figure it out?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No, that's actually -- that is the rear parking lot where the crosshatch is on the picture in the middle. It's showing that the four photos, the one to the top left is looking to the north. That actually faces the rear parking lot of the funeral home.

MR. EDELSON: And the police car was just parked there at the very, kind of that edge of the parking lot?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It appears to be, yes.

MR. EDELSON: Well, I'm going to leave the police issue aside for now because it's not

really relevant, but I just wanted to make sure I understood where that photograph was.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. EDELSON: And it just flagged for me in the executive summary on page 5, and it was talking about sort of wetland impacts, and you use the word "permanent" there and said there would be no permanent fill of the wetlands, which sort of left the question are you expecting temporary damage to the wetlands? The wording there sort of left that open.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Mr. Edelson, so you have got that basically correct. We view impacts to wetlands in both a temporary and a permanent context. That's traditionally the way most of our permits are submitted. And we do not anticipate at this time any permanent impacts to the wetlands. To the degree that there are temporary impacts during construction, we fully -- I mean, this is standard ops for us -- would be doing a restoration pursuant to a plan to the degree that there are any temporary impacts.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. That's all the questions I have, Mr. Silvestri. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Edelson.

I have a few follow-ups in no particular order. But, Mr. Pinto, I wanted to go back to your discussion with Mr. Perrone regarding Bus No. 3 and wanted to make sure I heard correctly. You were talking about an enclosure, and I believe it was metal, m-e-t-a-l; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right, that's one off my list. Then going back to the discussion on SF6, the first question for you, is there a specialized procedure for handling SF6?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So there are lots of specialized procedures for handling SF6. It's an oxygen displacer, so it has some physical hazards with the handling. But more importantly, you know, recovery from equipment before it's serviced when the SF6 is removed, you know, we're constantly measuring the amounts going in and out, kind of mass balancing to make sure there's no leaks. So in answer to your question, there are numerous special procedures associated with the handling of SF6.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Let me ask one more follow-up on that. In addition to leak detection for SF6, is there anything added to the

equipment to give you any other indication as to what might be going on or any warning hazards?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I think the fundamental of our leak detection system is the SCADA system. So if pressure changes inside the vessel, a system warning is triggered, and that's the kind of -- that's the fundamental control procedure I guess I would say.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Staying with SF6, has UI investigated any alternatives to SF6?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Do you want me to take that, Rich?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

THE WITNESS (Berman): I think UI is always looking for alternatives to SF6. It obviously has incredibly good characteristics in this application, but we also know and acknowledge that it's potent greenhouse gas, and I would say it's fair to conclude that UI and the Avangrid companies are consistently searching for alternatives for SF6.

MR. SILVESTRI: Well, specifically would vacuum work here instead of SF6?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Vacuum breakers

tend to not be used at voltage classes this high.

MR. SILVESTRI: They're usually used at smaller or lower voltage?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then I ran across something called "g cubed." It might be put out by -- well, I won't mention who it's put out by. But are you familiar with a product that is used to replace SF6 called g cubed?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I am not.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I'll leave that one then. Then the last question I have on SF6, my understanding is the California Air Resources Board, or what they like to call themselves, CARB, is looking to phase out SF6 in certain applications by 2025. Do you know if there's any movement coming towards Connecticut that would phase out SF6?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So I am not aware of any pending regulatory or statutory initiative to limit SF6.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Then one or two questions on the transformers. The new transformers, how much oil would be in there?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We'll check that

number, Mr. Silvestri. I believe we have that.

MR. SILVESTRI: And secondary containment would be designed for 110 percent, would that also be correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: And explain to me how rainwater would be removed from secondary containment.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So we have a very good system for this. The secondary containment has pumps that if they sense any oil -- well, the core of your question is rainwater is pumped out of those secondary containment vessels; however, those pumps are equipped with oil sensing shut-offs.

MR. SILVESTRI: Now, the pumping would be automatic, or would somebody have to be on site to do so?

THE WITNESS (Berman): It's automatic.

MR. SILVESTRI: An automatic shut-off so it would sense oil and stop pumping. Would that then send an alarm to wherever to let you know that there's a problem?

THE WITNESS (Berman): You know, I will have to get back to you on that, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Well, last question on that one. Do you need a permit to discharge that water?

THE WITNESS (Berman): You mean to discharge from the secondary containment into the yard?

MR. SILVESTRI: Well, yeah, the pump is going to pump the water somewhere.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Right. So the answer is no we have not sought a specific permit. Obviously, the whole site is subject to stormwater compliance standards. That said, we do not seek a specific permit for the pumping out of the secondary containment vessels.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. I heard your response with some echo. Let me just see if I could clarify. So whatever you're pumping out, it would be under a general stormwater permit; would that be the case?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. A couple follow-ups I have on interrogatories. The first one I have, Mr. Pinto, this is number 6, Interrogatory Number 6 where you have the costs. Does the current estimated project cost of $39.1

million include decommissioning costs for the existing substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, it does include to some extent the decommissioning cost of the existing station. Some of the work that we do for decommissioning is actually part of the project, to make room for the project. There is a small portion of the new facility that comes onto the existing parcel, if you want to call it, but then the remainder of that stuff is just getting rid of the existing equipment that's there, the control building, the Bus No. 3, and removal of the equipment. The foundations, you know, there would be a couple at grade at that level. So there's very minimal decommissioning costs associated with that.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, Bruce McDermott. Sorry to interrupt. But Mr. Wolff can provide you with the question you had about the amount of oil in the transformers at this time, if you'd like.

MR. SILVESTRI: Just before we go there, I'm not totally clear on Mr. Pinto's answer.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. I apologize.

MR. SILVESTRI: Not a problem. And I appreciate you going back to the oil, but give me a minute.

MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Pinto, I wasn't quite sure if that was a yes or a no, if the 39.1 includes the decommissioning.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, it does.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay. I'm ready for the answer on the oil.

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Mr. Silvestri, based upon the documents that we got from the transformer manufacturer, there is going to be 29,000 liters or 7,670 gallons of oil in this transformer.

MR. SILVESTRI: Per transformer?

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Per transformer.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Walsh, going to Interrogatory Number 9, and you mentioned the weather normalized loading, and what you have for a ten-year load forecast, the load is projected to be approximately 66 MVA by 2030. My question to you, does the load forecast include potential for growth in the electric vehicle sector, specifically electric commuter buses that are

coming into the Bridgeport area, or cars, either commercial or residential?

THE WITNESS (Walsh): I myself am not familiar with how the load forecasts are done internally. It's done by a different group. But we can certainly give you that information.

MR. SILVESTRI: I'm not sure how forecasts go these days and looking at how you project. I was just curious if they did include electric vehicles at this point.

THE WITNESS (Walsh): I'm not aware of them particularly including electric vehicles as a subset. I do know there are a number of inputs, but I can't speak to the specifics.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. And I might have one more. No, that's all the follow-up questions that I have. But just before we change gears, because questions and answers can spawn other additional questions, I'd like to go back to our Council members and staff to see if they have any follow-ups, and I'd like to start with Mr. Perrone who also had some comments on the noise part. Mr. Perrone.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Yes, I do have some follow-up.

Going back to the noise report, so is it correct to say that the basic noise limit is 61/51, 61 slash 51?

THE WITNESS (Berman): When you say "61/51," you mean the daytime nighttime?

MR. PERRONE: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Then turning to page 8, there's a section in italics near the bottom of the page where it mentions in the high background areas you can go up to 5. So essentially does that mean that for ST-4 with the ambient of 64/58 we can raise them both by 5 and basically go to 69/63 at that one location?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, you know, yes, but that's a citation from the Connecticut noise regulations, but I think your conclusion is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And lastly just a couple unrelated questions. Mr. Pinto, I had asked you about the amount of SF6. I think you had given a rough number of 80 pounds. I wasn't sure if you had said 80 pounds weight or 80 psi pressure.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): 80 psi pressure.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And last follow-up. Mr. Berman, you were talking about wetland impacts, permanent versus temporary. Would the E&S controls mitigate temporary impacts?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes.

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

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Perrone.

Mr. Morissette, any follow-up questions?

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Yes, I have one follow-up question. It's concerning lighting. How will lighting be handled at the facility? I know that substations have had problems in the past. Will they be on all the time or manually turned off and on, or what's the plan?

THE WITNESS (Wolff): Mr. Morissette, at each site at UI it may be a little different depending on the substation, but generally speaking, we have our general task lighting that's only turned on during maintenance or switching operations. In addition to that, we have, generally speaking, some sort of entry light. Some of those entry lights might be photo

controlled or photocell controlled so at nighttime they'll turn on, but generally those are directional like at a front door or something along those lines.

So at this site we're currently anticipating task lighting as normal, entry lighting as normal, but of course we're able to work with neighbors when necessary. But then in addition to that, our security we also require some sort of lighting. So we're going to be working closely with our security department as well as the people in the direct vicinity when it comes to the security lighting.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Very helpful. Just to follow up on that, so are you planning on installing security cameras at this facility as well?

THE WITNESS (Wolff): That is correct. We'll have security cameras facing the fence lines, correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

Mr. Hannon, any follow-ups?

MR. HANNON: Just one follow-up. I'd

like to get a clarification of what you envision as temporary impacts to Wetland A.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Right. So with respect to temporary impacts from Wetland A, we are fairly sure that the proximity of the base of a retaining wall will fall fairly close to the wetland boundary, so not inside the wetland boundary but close. During the construction of that, we may need to put matting down to have heavy equipment that would be on the outside of that retaining wall. So it would be basically pretty traditional wetland matting, you know, using the most minimal techniques possible, but then the matting gets pulled out and the restoration gets done.

MR. HANNON: And then just following up on that, the retaining wall is what kind of construction, concrete?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, I believe the plan at this time would be concrete construction.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.

Mr. Nguyen, any follow-up questions?

MR. NGUYEN: I have no follow-up questions, Mr. Silvestri. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.

Mr. Edelson, any follow-ups?

MR. EDELSON: No follow-up. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. I did forget one question, so I'll pose it now. Mr. Berman, is an SPCC required for the amount of oil that will be on site with these new transformers?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, I didn't hear John's answer, but I can say confidently that if we trip over the SPCC standard, yes, we will have an SPCC plan. And I can add to that that almost all our stations do, so I can say with a high degree of confidence this one will have one too.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. At this time, I actually overshot the 3:30 mark, but why don't we take a 15 minute break to stretch our legs or whatever and see if we could come back at 3:55 and resume. And at that time I'd like to resume with continued cross-examination of the applicant by Eversource Energy. So we'll see you folks in about 15 minutes. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 3:38 p.m. until 3:55 p.m.)

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, I have 3:55. Just before we begin, I want to make sure we do have our court reporter back on. Lisa, are you with us?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I am. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you very much.

And Attorney McDermott, are you with us as well?

MR. McDERMOTT: I am here. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And I do see Attorney Dubuque. And I'd like to continue with cross-examination of the applicant by Eversource Energy and Attorney Dubuque.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Eversource does not have any questions for the UI panel. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you very much.

All right. Turning now on our agenda, we'll have the appearance by the party, Eversource Energy. And will the party present their witness panel for the purposes of taking the oath, and

then I'll ask Attorney Bachman to administer the oath. Attorney Dubuque.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Silvestri, if I could take the agenda away from you for one second, if I could have an opportunity to ask one redirect question of the UI panel?

MR. SILVESTRI: Oh, we don't do redirect, Attorney McDermott. So I'm going to continue on though. Thank you.

MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sorry. You don't do redirect?

MR. SILVESTRI: That is correct.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Attorney Dubuque.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. As you know, I'm counsel for Connecticut Light and Power Company doing business as Eversource Energy. And with me today is Attorney Jeffery Cochran, senior counsel of the Eversource legal department.

And I would just like the Eversource panel members to briefly introduce themselves by stating their name and title. So first we have Eversource's lead witness, Mr. Soderman.

MR. SODERMAN: Hello, my name is Christopher Soderman. I'm director of transmission line engineering for Eversource Energy Service Company.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Also, we have Mr. Patel who will assist Mr. Soderman.

MR. PATEL: Hello, my name is Shodhan Patel, project manager, transmission projects, employed by Eversource Energy Service Company.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Silvestri, our witnesses are ready to be sworn in.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Attorney Bachman, would you administer the oath?

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Can you just please raise your right hand?

C H R I S T O P H E R P A U L S O D E R M A N, S H O D H A N P A T E L,

called as witnesses, being first duly sworn (remotely) by Ms. Bachman, were examined and testified on their oaths as follows:

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And Attorney Dubuque, could you please begin by verifying all the exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses, please?

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Yes. Thank you. We have two exhibits we would like admitted into evidence.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: And I would like to start with Exhibit 1, Eversource's motion for party status, dated September 22, 2020. And I'll ask Mr. Soderman, are you familiar with the information in Exhibit 1?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I am.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Are there any corrections, clarifications or additions relating to Exhibit 1?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): No.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: To the best of your knowledge as to Exhibit 1, is the information in this exhibit true and accurate, and do you adopt this material as an exhibit?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I do.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you. I'd like to continue with Exhibit 2, Eversource's direct testimony of Christopher Paul Soderman and Shodhan Patel concerning Eversource's transmission interconnection facilities for the Old Town Substation Rebuild Project, dated October 8, 2020.

And I'll ask both Mr. Soderman and Mr. Patel, did you prepare or oversee the preparation of Exhibit 2 with your respective resumes?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I did.

THE WITNESS (Patel): Yes, I did.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Are there any corrections, clarifications or additions relating to Exhibit 2?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I believe Mr. Patel has a correction to make.

THE WITNESS (Patel): There is one correction on page 9 of the direct testimony document. The second line of the paragraph reads, "Eversource's desire to obtain off right-of-way access across the town's property on Scovill Street." The street reference is incorrect. It should have been "Kaechele Place."

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you. To the best of your knowledge, is the information in Exhibit 2 with the correction that Mr. Patel just noted true and accurate, and do you adopt the written testimony and your respective resumes in Exhibit 2 as your sworn testimony?

THE WITNESS (Patel): Yes.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I do.

MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you. Mr. Silvestri, I respectfully request that the Council admit into evidence Exhibits 1 and 2 as full exhibits.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Attorney McDermott, do you object to the admission of Eversource Energy's exhibit with the correction so noted?

MR. McDERMOTT: No objection. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you. The exhibits are admitted.

(Party, Eversource Energy, Exhibits III-B-1 and III-B-2: Received in evidence - described in index.)

MR. SILVESTRI: We will now begin with cross-examination of Eversource by the Council, and I'd like to start with Mr. Perrone, please.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. PERRONE: Referencing pages 8 and 9 of the prefile testimony dated October 8th, other than discussions regarding the permanent access agreement, did UI receive any feedback from the

City of Bridgeport regarding its proposed portion of the project?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I assume you mean "Eversource," Mr. Perrone?

MR. PERRONE: Yes.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Mr. Patel can answer that question.

THE WITNESS (Patel): Mr. Perrone, Eversource is engaged in ongoing discussion with officials of the City of Bridgeport, and we have agreed on the steps required to obtain the easement right, but thus far we have not received any feedback from UI at this point.

MR. PERRONE: But was there any additional feedback from the city outside of the discussions on the access agreement?

THE WITNESS (Patel): Can you repeat the question again?

MR. PERRONE: Did you receive any feedback from the city other than discussions related to the access agreement?

THE WITNESS (Patel): No, we have not.

MR. PERRONE: Would Eversource's portion of the project comply with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and

Sediment Control?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Would it also comply with Eversource BMPs?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: And my last question: What, if any, wildlife protection measures would Eversource employ for its portion of the project?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Depending on what species were identified, Eversource would take advantage of appropriate measures including time of year construction and so on and so forth.

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

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Perrone.

I'd like to continue cross-examination of Eversource by Mr. Morissette, please.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

Good afternoon, Mr. Soderman and Mr. Patel.

THE WITNESS (Patel): Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Good afternoon.

MR. MORISSETTE: Could you give me an

estimated cost of your portion of the project?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Eversource's cost will be approximately $3 million.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Concerning the bypass of the 1714 line, do you have any comments about the bypass, or does Eversource agree with the bypassing of the line at this time?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Eversource has no objections. Currently the 1714 doesn't actually electrically connect to the substation, so very little change is actually happening.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Do you have any concerns with the substation at all?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): We do not.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And one final question. Do you plan on filing a petition for your work associated with this project or somehow obtain approval through this application?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): We were intending to gain approval in conjunction with this application to do our work.

MR. MORISSETTE: Hopefully that will be the case. Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.

Morissette.

I'd like to turn now to Mr. Hannon for continued cross-examination, please.

MR. HANNON: I have two questions. On the bottom of page 2 it talks about upgrades to Eversource's transmission system. Just curious, what kind of benefits will this project yield to Eversource?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I'm sorry, what was that question there?

MR. HANNON: At the bottom of page 2 it talks about this proposed project by UI will also provide Eversource with some upgrades to its transmission system. I'm just trying to figure out if you could specify some of those benefits associated with the upgrades.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): So there are two primary benefits, the first being the installation of new --

MR. SILVESTRI: I'm going to interject for a second. Sometimes we get feedback, which is what's happening right now. It could be feedback going through Mr. Hannon's computer. So I think he has it muted, and you could probably answer the question now without a problem. Sorry to

interject, but just trying to take care of that issue. Please continue.

THE WITNESS (Soderman): I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

The benefit will be twofold: Number one, we'll be able to replace aging lattice tower structures in the vicinity of the Old Town Substation, and we will also be able to upgrade our protection systems at the remote ends of the transmission lines.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. My second question deals with a comment on page 5, and it talks about the existing foundations would be removed to a depth slightly below final grade. This is with the two lattice structures. So would the concrete be removed slightly below grade and then any fill over it, or would it just be left with the concrete a little bit lower than the surrounding ground?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): We would break the concrete just below grade, and then we would cover it with a topsoil or trap rock similar to where it is, right? So if it's inside the UI substation, we would cover it with trap rock. To the east where the transmission line would be in

native soil we would put some topsoil over it.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. That's all I have.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Hannon.

I'd like to continue cross-examination at this time with Mr. Nguyen, please.

MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. Just a quick follow-up regarding the $3 million project that Eversource just spoke about. What would be the allocation cost for that in terms of regionalized or localized, how many percent would go into the distribution portion?

THE WITNESS (Soderman): Eversource expects to regionalize the entire cost of this project.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very much. That's all I have, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.

I'd like to continue now with Mr. Edelson for cross-examination.

MR. EDELSON: No questions, Mr. Silvestri. Thank you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Edelson. And I too have no further questions to ask.

So I'd like to continue with

cross-examination of Eversource by the applicant and Attorney McDermott, please.

MR. McDERMOTT: No questions. Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Okay, the Council will recess until 6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence the public comment session of this remote public hearing. So we'll see you back here at 6:30. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were excused, and the hearing adjourned at 4:08 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 86 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the PUBLIC HEARING HELD BY REMOTE ACCESS IN RE: DOCKET NO. 490, The United Illuminating Company application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Old Town Substation Rebuild Project that entails construction, maintenance and operation of a 115/13.8-kilovolt (kV) air-insulated replacement substation facility located on the existing Old Town Substation parcel at 282 Kaechele Place and two parcels immediately north totaling approximately 3 acres that are owned by the United Illuminating Company at 312 and 330 Kaechele Place, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and related transmission structure and interconnection improvements, which was held before ROBERT SILVESTRI, PRESIDING OFFICER, on October 15, 2020.

Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
Court Reporter
BCT REPORTING, LLC
55 WHITING STREET, SUITE 1A
PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT 06062

I N D E X

APPLICANT UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY'S EXHIBITS
(Received in Evidence.)

I n d e x (Cont'd.)

PARTY, EVERSOURCE EXHIBITS
(Received in evidence.)

**All exhibits were retained by the Council.