



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
*CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL*

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051  
Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950  
E-Mail: [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)  
Web Site: [www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

March 23, 2021

Carrie Larson Ortolano, Esq.  
Lodestar Energy LLC  
40 Tower Lane, Suite 201  
Avon, CT 06001

RE: **PETITION NO. 1398A** – LSE Pictor, LLC petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 1.99-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on an approximately 104 acre parcel located off of Platt Hill Road, Winchester, Connecticut and associated electrical interconnection. Reopening of this petition based on changed conditions pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-181a(b)

Dear Attorney Ortolano:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 7, 2021. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available. At this time, consistent with the Council's policy to prevent the spread of Coronavirus, please submit an electronic copy only to [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov). However, please be advised that the Council may later request one or more hard copies for records retention purposes.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Sincerely,

*s/ Melanie A. Bachman*

Melanie A. Bachman  
Executive Director

c: Jeffrey Macel, LSE Pictor, LLC

**Petition No. 1398A**  
**Interrogatories**

**March 23, 2021**

1. What is the output of the revised facility at the point of interconnection?
2. Referring to the Wetland Impact Assessment report, p. 11, it appears Table 3 – Fish and Shellfish Habitat, contains incomplete information. Please revise.
3. Referring to the Wetland Impact Assessment report, p. 15:
  - a. What types of wildlife are expected to use the 18-inch diameter HDPE pipes for wildlife passage?
  - b. What type of substrate would be installed within the pipe?
  - c. Would the pipes serve to transfer water during flood events and thus cause erosion on the downstream side?
  - d. What is the maintenance interval of the wildlife passages?
4. Has any consideration been given to spanning both access road wetland crossings with a bridge structure to limit wetland disturbance? If not, why not?
5. The July 5, 2005 Wetland letter from Penelope C. Sharp mentions the potential for vernal pools with the red maple swamp in the eastern portion of the property. Was the red maple swamp surveyed for the presence of vernal pools? If so, submit survey results. If not, why not?
6. Referring to the Stormwater Management Report p. 2, it states the solar array would be placed on slopes less than 15 percent. The response to Petition 1398 interrogatory 78 stated 1.25 acres of the solar array was located on slopes greater than 15 percent, please clarify.
7. Referring to The Council on Environmental Quality letter dated May 27, 2020, discuss the feasibility of accessing the project site from Dayton Road to avoid the proposed wetland crossing.
8. Referring to the Stormwater Management Report p. 10:
  - a. How will mounting posts be installed at the site?
  - b. To what depth will the mounting posts be installed?
  - c. How will the installation of hundreds of mounting posts impact the existing perched seasonal high groundwater table, and hydrology of the site in respect to seeps, wetlands, and the proposed “wet practice” detention basins?
9. Due to the low height of the berms within the pond stormwater basins, what maintenance is required to prevent the berms from being covered in leaf matter/other organic matter so that the flow path is not impeded?
10. Is a pre-treatment basin required for the southeast detention basin?
11. According to the site plans, the southern stormwater basin is located within 100 feet of a tributary to Taylor Brook, a cold water stream. Can the southern stormwater basin be re-located out of the 100-foot buffer to this cold water stream habitat, as recommended by the *2004 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual* and the *DEEP General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities*?

12. Has the manufacturer of the selected solar panels conducted Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) testing to determine if the panels would be characterized as hazardous waste at the time of disposal? If so, please submit relevant information. If the project is approved, would the Petitioner commit to the installation of solar modules that are not classified as hazardous waste through TCLP testing?
  
13. The Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Assessment in Appendix M of Council Petition No. 1352 compared the life cycle GHG emissions from a solar project to a scenario where the solar project is avoided and an equivalent amount of natural gas-fired electric generation operated for the estimated life of the solar facility. For the proposed project, how would the net GHG emissions (or reduction) over the life of the solar facility and carbon debt payback be affected under this natural gas-fired generation versus proposed solar generation scenario?