

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3
4 Petition No. 1443A

5 SR North Stonington, LLC petition for a
6 declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut
7 General Statutes Section 4-176 and Section 16-50k,
8 for the proposed construction, maintenance and
9 operation of a 9.9-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic
10 electric generating facility on five parcels
11 located north and south of Providence New London
12 Turnpike (State Route 184), west of Boombridge
13 Road and north of Interstate 95 in North
14 Stonington, Connecticut, and associated electrical
15 interconnection.

16 ***

17 Reopening of this petition based on changed
18 conditions pursuant to Connecticut General
19 Statutes, Section 4-181a(b)

20 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

21 Public Hearing held on Tuesday, February 15, 2022,
22 beginning at 2 p.m., via remote access.

23 H e l d B e f o r e:

24 JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

25 Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

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

2 **Council Members:**

3 **KENNETH COLLETTE, Designee for Commissioner**
4 **Katie Dykes, Department of Energy and**
 Environmental Protection

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

7 **ROBERT SILVESTRI**
8 **DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.**
 LOUANNE COOLEY

9 **Council Staff:**

10 **MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.**
11 **Executive Director and Staff Attorney**

12 **MICHAEL PERRONE**
 Siting Analyst

13 **LISA FONTAINE**
14 **Fiscal Administrative Officer**

15 **For Applicant, SR North Stonington, LLC:**
16 **ROBINSON & COLE LLP**
17 **280 Trumbull Street**
 Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3597
 BY: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.
18 **JONATHAN H. SCHAEFER, ESQ.**

19 **For Party, Town of North Stonington:**
20 **SUISMAN, SHAPIRO, WOOL, BRENNAN, GRAY &**
 GREENBERG, P.C.
 2 Union Plaza, Suite 200
21 **P.O. Box 1591**
 New London, Connecticut 06320
22 **BY: ROBERT A. AVENA, ESQ.**

23
24 **Zoom co-host: Aaron Demarest**

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

1 MR. MORISSETTE: This remote public
2 hearing is called to order this Tuesday, February
3 15, 2022, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette,
4 member and presiding officer of the Connecticut
5 Siting Council.

6 Other members of the Council are
7 Kenneth Collette, designee for Commissioner Katie
8 Dykes of the Department of Energy and
9 Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee
10 for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett, Public
11 Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Silvestri;
12 Louanne Cooley; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr. Members
13 of the staff are Melanie Bachman, executive
14 director and staff attorney; Michael Perrone,
15 siting analyst; and Lisa Fontaine, fiscal
16 administrative officer.

17 As everyone is aware, there is
18 currently a statewide effort to prevent the spread
19 of the Coronavirus. This is why the Council is
20 holding this remote public hearing, and we ask for
21 your patience. If you haven't done so already, I
22 ask that everyone please mute their computer audio
23 and/or telephones now.

24 This hearing is held pursuant to the
25 provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General

1 Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
2 Procedure Act upon a motion to reopen a petition
3 from SR North Stonington, LLC for a declaratory
4 ruling pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes,
5 Section 4-176 and Section 16-50k, for the proposed
6 construction, maintenance and operation of a
7 9.9-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric
8 generating facility on five parcels located north
9 and south of Providence New London Turnpike, State
10 Route 184, west of Boombridge Road and north of
11 Interstate 95 in North Stonington, Connecticut and
12 its associated electrical interconnection.

13 On December 16, 2021, the Council,
14 pursuant to a request filed by SR North
15 Stonington, LLC and the provisions of Connecticut
16 General Statutes, Section 4-181a(b), reopened the
17 Council's September 14, 2021 decision not to issue
18 a declaratory ruling in this matter.

19 The Council's legal notice of the date
20 and time of this remote public hearing was
21 published in The Day on January 19, 2022. Upon
22 this Council's request, the petitioner erected a
23 sign near the proposed access road off the
24 southern side of Providence New London Turnpike so
25 as to inform the public of the name of the

1 petitioner, the type of facility, the remote
2 public hearing date, and contact information for
3 the Council, including the website and phone
4 number.

5 As a reminder to all, off-the-record
6 communication with a member of the Council or a
7 member of the Council's staff upon the merits of
8 this petition is prohibited by law.

9 The parties and intervenors in this
10 proceeding are as follows: SR North Stonington,
11 LLC, the petitioner, represented by Kenneth C.
12 Baldwin, Esq. and Jonathan H. Schaefer, Esq. of
13 Robinson & Cole LLP. And the party, Town of North
14 Stonington, represented by Robert A. Avena, Esq.
15 of Suisman, Shapiro, Wool, Brennan, Gray &
16 Greenberg, P.C.

17 We will proceed in accordance with the
18 prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on
19 the Council's Petition No. 1443A webpage, along
20 with the record of this matter, the public hearing
21 notice, instructions for public access to this
22 remote public hearing, and the Council's Citizens
23 Guide to Siting Council procedures. Interested
24 persons may join any session of this public
25 hearing to listen, but no public comments will be

1 received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session.

2 At the end of evidentiary session, we
3 will recess until 6:30 for the remote public
4 comment session. Please be advised that any
5 person may be removed from the remote evidentiary
6 session or the public comment session at the
7 discretion of the Council. The 6:30 p.m. public
8 comment session will be reserved for members of
9 the public who have signed up in advance to make
10 brief statements into the record.

11 I wish to note that the petitioner,
12 parties and intervenors, including their
13 representatives and witnesses, are not allowed to
14 participate in the public comment session. I also
15 wish to note for those who are listening and for
16 the benefit of your friends and family who are
17 unable to join us for this remote public comment
18 session that you or they may send written
19 statements to the Council within 30 days of the
20 date hereof, either by mail or by email, and such
21 written statements will be given the same weight
22 as if spoken during the remote public comment
23 session.

24 A verbatim transcript of this remote
25 public hearing will be posted on the Council's

1 Petition No. 1443A webpage and deposited with the
2 North Stonington Town Clerk's Office for the
3 convenience of the public.

4 Please be advised that the Council does
5 not issue permits for stormwater management. If
6 the proposed project is approved by the Council, a
7 Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
8 Stormwater Permit is independently required. DEEP
9 could hold a public hearing on any stormwater
10 application.

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

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

17 Administrative notices taken by the
18 Council. I wish to call your attention to those
19 items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman
20 Numeral I-B, Items 1 through 93.

21 Does the petitioner or any party or
22 intervenor have an objection to the items that the
23 Council has administratively noticed?

24 Good afternoon, Attorney Baldwin. Any
25 objection?

1 MR. BALDWIN: No objection, Mr.
2 Morissette. Thank you.

3 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
4 Baldwin.

5 Attorney Avena, any objection?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. MORISSETTE: Attorney Avena, I
8 thought I saw you here earlier.

9 MS. BACHMAN: Mr. Morissette, it
10 appears Attorney Avena is having connection
11 issues, but when he comes back -- oh, there he is.
12 It will just be a moment.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
14 Bachman.

15 Thank you. Attorney Avena, I see that
16 you're now connected. Do you have any objections
17 to the administrative notices taken by the
18 Council?

19 MR. AVENA: Thank you. I think I'm
20 back on. And no objection.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
22 Avena. Accordingly, the Council hereby
23 administratively notices these existing documents.

24 (Council's Administrative Notice Items
25 I-B-1 through I-B-93: Received in evidence.)

1 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue
2 with the appearance of the petitioner. Will the
3 petitioner present its witness panel for purposes
4 of taking the oath, and Attorney Bachman will
5 administer the oath. Attorney Baldwin.

6 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.
7 Morissette. Again, for the record, on behalf of
8 the petitioner, SR North Stonington, LLC, my name
9 is Ken Baldwin with Robinson & Cole. I'm joined
10 today by Jonathan Schaefer also with Robinson &
11 Cole.

12 Just very quickly, I want to thank the
13 Siting Council for their willingness to reopen
14 this proceeding and hear information on the
15 revised proposal that we're happy to present to
16 you today. I also want to thank the Town of North
17 Stonington for their cooperation since the
18 Council's last decision on this matter. And we'll
19 talk more about our interaction with the town, but
20 they've been very cooperative, and we want to
21 thank them for that officially on the record.

22 Our hearing panel today, Mr.
23 Morissette, consists of five folks. To my
24 immediate left is Peter Candelaria. Mr.
25 Candelaria advised me today that his title is

1 chief operating officer with Silicon Ranch, so if
2 we can make that correction to the hearing
3 program. Next to Pete is Ali Weaver. Ali is the
4 project development director for the North
5 Stonington project for Silicon Ranch. To Ali's
6 left is Matt Brawley, senior civil engineer with
7 HDR, the project engineers. On the phone we are
8 joined by Dean Gustafson. Dean is the manager of
9 natural resources with All-Points Technology. And
10 Vince Ginter with Urban Solutions Group, our noise
11 consultant on the project. And I would offer them
12 to be sworn at this time.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
14 Baldwin.

15 Attorney Bachman, would you please
16 administer the oath.

17 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
18 Morissette.

19 If the witnesses could please just
20 raise their right hand.

- 21 P E T E R C A N D E L A R I A,
- 22 A L I W E A V E R,
- 23 M A T T B R A W L E Y,
- 24 D E A N G U S T A F S O N,
- 25 V I N C E N T G I N T E R,

1 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
2 (remotely) by Attorney Bachman, testified on
3 their oaths as follows:

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
5 Bachman.

6 Attorney Baldwin, please begin by
7 verifying all the exhibits by the appropriate
8 sworn witnesses.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr.
10 Morissette. The petitioner would like to add
11 three exhibits into this proceeding listed in the
12 hearing program under Roman II-B. They include
13 the motion to reopen the proceeding, including all
14 of its attachments; the petitioner's sign posting
15 affidavit; and finally, the petitioner's responses
16 to Council interrogatories, Set One, dated
17 February 8, 2022.

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 MR. BALDWIN: I would ask our witnesses
20 to answer the following questions: Did you
21 prepare or assist in the preparation of those
22 exhibits listed in the hearing program as Items 1
23 through 3 under Roman II-B?

24 Mr. Candelaria.

25 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Weaver.

2 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes.

3 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brawley.

4 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Yes.

5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

6 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

7 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ginter.

8 THE WITNESS (Ginter): Yes.

9 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any
10 corrections, clarifications or modifications to
11 offer to any of those exhibits?

12 Mr. Candelaria.

13 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): I do not.

14 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Weaver.

15 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. To the
16 response for Interrogatory Number 9 we had
17 mentioned that the project output of the western
18 array was 5.4 megawatts. I'd like to update that
19 to say 5.43 megawatts. Thank you.

20 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brawley?

21 THE WITNESS (Brawley): No.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson, any
23 modifications, amendments or clarifications?

24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No.

25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ginter?

1 THE WITNESS (Ginter): No.

2 MR. BALDWIN: And is the information

3 contained in those exhibits, including the one

4 modification, true and accurate to the best of

5 your knowledge?

6 Mr. Candelaria.

7 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes.

8 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Weaver.

9 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes.

10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brawley.

11 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Yes.

12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

13 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

14 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ginter.

15 THE WITNESS (Ginter): Yes.

16 MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the

17 information in those exhibits as your testimony in

18 this proceeding?

19 Mr. Candelaria.

20 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes.

21 MR. BALDWIN: Ms. Weaver.

22 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes.

23 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Brawley.

24 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Yes.

25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson.

1 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Ginter.

3 THE WITNESS (Ginter): Yes.

4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I offer
5 them as full exhibits.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
7 Baldwin.

8 Does the town object to the admission
9 of the petitioner's exhibits? Attorney Avena.

10 MR. AVENA: No objection.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
12 Avena. The exhibits are hereby admitted.

13 (Petitioner's Exhibits II-B-1 through
14 II-B-3: Received in evidence - described in
15 index.)

16 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now begin with
17 cross-examination of the petitioner by the
18 Council, starting with Mr. Perrone, followed by
19 Mr. Lynch.

20 Mr. Perrone.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr.
23 Morissette.

24 Beginning with page 5 of the motion to
25 reopen towards the bottom, the petitioner notes

1 that a presentation was made before the Town Board
2 of Selectmen and members of the public on November
3 30, 2021. My question is, what types of comments
4 or key discussion points came up at that meeting?

5 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Thank you, Mr.
6 Perrone, for the question. This is Ali Weaver
7 speaking. The presentation really was comprised
8 of identifying the changes that have been made to
9 the project which we can go into further detail
10 throughout this hearing. Most of the comments and
11 questions that we received were surrounding those
12 changes that had been made and identifying and
13 requantifying the impacts associated with the
14 project, which we've outlined through the motion
15 to reopen as well as through the interrogatories
16 as well. We did speak specifically with a couple
17 of the abutters that have been listed here
18 throughout.

19 MR. PERRONE: Turning to the response
20 to the first Council Interrogatory Number 1, which
21 gets into the power purchase agreements, my
22 question is, while the modified project will
23 utilize existing PPAs, did you need to seek PURA
24 approval of any amendments to the PPA given the
25 reduction in capacity?

1 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
2 Weaver. Yes, we do need to seek an amendment, and
3 that is in process and will be ultimately approved
4 by PURA.

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
6 this is Peter Candelaria speaking on behalf of SR
7 North Stonington. Our hope is that we can find a
8 viable path forward here so that we will be able
9 to close out conversations with our offtaker to
10 tie out our PPAs and consummate this adjustment.

11 MR. PERRONE: And under the PPAs would
12 Eversource purchase both the energy and RECs?

13 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): This is
14 Peter Candelaria. That is correct. It is
15 Eversource and United Illuminating are the two
16 offtakers for these projects, and they would
17 maintain their positions as energy and REC
18 purchasers under those agreements.

19 MR. PERRONE: So energy and REC but not
20 capacity; is that correct?

21 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Right now
22 it's a bundled product for all three components.

23 MR. PERRONE: And on Petition 1443
24 Finding of Fact 59, referencing that, is it still
25 correct to say that the petitioner has no plans

1 for virtual net metering?

2 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes, that's
3 correct.

4 MR. PERRONE: And turning to response
5 to Council Interrogatory Number 4, which gets into
6 the wattage of the panel, I understand you have a
7 nominal or front wattage of 480 and then 525
8 total. My question is, when you're designing the
9 site and determining the number of panels
10 required, which wattage do you use?

11 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): 480 is the
12 wattage that we use for designing these
13 facilities. The back side --

14 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. This
15 is the court reporter. Could you start your
16 answer again? You got cut off in the beginning.

17 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Absolutely.
18 This is Peter Candelaria. The wattage that we use
19 to design the facility as the front side wattage
20 is the 480 watts.

21 MR. PERRONE: So that's done to be
22 conservative, and then whatever you pick up on the
23 back side is just extra?

24 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): What we pick
25 up on the back side is typically a fraction of

1 what is identified in the material cut sheets that
2 are provided by the equipment vendors. So the 525
3 is only going to be realized in an area where you
4 get a lot of back side sun exposure, highly
5 unlikely for this application.

6 MR. PERRONE: And next I'd like to ask
7 about the capacity factor. In response to Council
8 Interrogatory 5 the capacity factor is 19.7. I
9 believe we had about 21 for the original and
10 revised project. Could you explain the
11 difference?

12 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Changing
13 impacts on the consolidation of the project, we're
14 seeing a loss of overall capacity value and
15 capacity factor contribution due to the fact that
16 we're picking up some more shading in the
17 afternoons due to the consolidation of the site
18 and the lack of tree clearing. We've minimized
19 the amount of tree clearing which then in turn
20 impacts the amount of generation and capacity
21 we'll have during early and afternoon hours of
22 production.

23 MR. PERRONE: Now I'd like to get into
24 the fence design. For the security fence are you
25 still keeping a 7-foot chain link with a foot of

1 barbed wire on top?

2 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes.

3 MR. PERRONE: And I believe the linear
4 feet you gave us was 7,058?

5 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Perrone, can you
6 reference a particular response that you're
7 speaking of?

8 MR. PERRONE: Yes. Give me one second
9 here. Sheet C002.

10 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
11 Brawley. And that would be correct.

12 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And just to be
13 clear on that, that's just the chain link, not the
14 wood stockade section, right?

15 THE WITNESS (Brawley): That's correct,
16 that's just the chain link security fence.

17 MR. PERRONE: And with the chain link
18 fence, are you still going to keep the wildlife
19 gap on the bottom?

20 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Yes, that is in
21 the plans.

22 MR. PERRONE: And 7 foot with a foot of
23 barbed wire on top, does the National Electrical
24 Code require the barbed wire on top, or is the 7
25 foot alone sufficient?

1 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone,
2 this is Ali Weaver. The National Electric Code
3 has a height requirement. It does not
4 specifically require the barbed wire. That's a
5 petitioner preference just because it helps with
6 security.

7 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Are you still
8 planning to perform your tree -- avoid the tree
9 clearing during the June, July pup season of the
10 northern long-eared bat?

11 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
12 Weaver. Yes, that is our plan. We're working
13 with CT DEEP to get our NDDB final letter of
14 determination which we're hopeful we'll receive
15 imminently. We submitted the findings back in
16 November with the goal of clearing all trees
17 before that June window.

18 MR. PERRONE: And as far as flood
19 zones, I believe the zone A is considerably off to
20 the southwest. So would you be completely out of
21 the 100 and 500 year flood zones?

22 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
23 Brawley. And yes, we are outside the flood zones.

24 MR. PERRONE: And just also as an
25 update for the modified project, would the

1 modified project still comply with the 2002
2 guidelines for soil erosion and sediment control?

3 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
4 Brawley. And yes, it would.

5 MR. PERRONE: And also for the 2004
6 Storm Water Quality Manual?

7 (No response.)

8 THE COURT REPORTER: I didn't hear that
9 answer.

10 MR. PERRONE: Could you also for the
11 modified project, could you give us your updated
12 construction timeline in work hours?

13 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
14 this is Peter Candelaria. At this point, we're
15 waiting to get confirmation that we can get
16 through this process before we can firmly
17 establish what that mobilization date looks like.
18 To Ali Weaver's point, we would like to start tree
19 clearing in advance of that June timeline, that
20 freeze, and we can start construction subsequent
21 to that tree clearing activity, but it's all
22 pending this approval process.

23 MR. PERRONE: Next --

24 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, Mr. Morissette.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Lynch.

1 MR. LYNCH: I'm having a difficult time
2 hearing the applicant in the room with Attorney
3 Baldwin. It could be the acoustics. But is there
4 anything they can do to get closer to the
5 microphone or anything?

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
7 Attorney Baldwin, is there anything you
8 can do to improve the acoustics?

9 MR. BALDWIN: I'll have our witnesses
10 speak up a little bit, Mr. Morissette. I know the
11 microphones are actually in the ceiling of the
12 room. So usually they're pretty good.

13 Mr. Lynch, can you hear me okay now?

14 MR. LYNCH: Yes, I can, but I thought
15 it would be an acoustic problem. You just
16 explained it.

17 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. We'll do our
18 best to keep our voices up.

19 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
20 Attorney Baldwin.

21 Please continue, Mr. Perrone.

22 MR. PERRONE: The next questions are
23 related to the electrical interconnection. So
24 I'll refer you to sheet PV-100. It's attachment
25 A, motion to reopen. And I'll get to the wetland

1 crossing in a moment, but in general, would the
2 entire electrical interconnection route be
3 underground and then the utility pole existing,
4 would that act as a riser?

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): This is
6 Peter Candelaria. The existing structures are
7 already there for our interconnection, we would be
8 tied into those existing structures, and those
9 existing structures would act as a riser going
10 back to the point of delivery.

11 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
12 Weaver. If I can add on, we did an
13 interconnection rendering as Exhibit Y of the
14 original petition as well to show those existing
15 poles that they are above ground currently and at
16 the interconnection point would be an addition of
17 three more poles also above ground.

18 MR. PERRONE: And as far as the wetland
19 crossing of Wetland E for the electrical
20 interconnection, I understand there's an option
21 for an overhead span or an option to bore under
22 Wetland E. Could you tell us the pros and cons of
23 the overhead versus the underground, cost,
24 visibility, constructability?

25 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Sure. So

1 this is Peter Candelaria. The pros and cons, I
2 mean, they both have pros. There's maintenance
3 challenges with overhead. Sometimes you can run
4 into a downed line if there's a severe weather
5 event. They're cheaper to install than going
6 underground as long as you can span that with
7 standard tangent structures. So the pros,
8 cheaper, easier to install. Cons, subject to more
9 maintenance costs. Underground, a little bit more
10 expensive, can be cheaper on our O&M opex
11 expenses. So on a high level, that's how the two
12 would play against one another.

13 MR. PERRONE: As far as cost to
14 construct, do you have a rough idea what the cost
15 difference would be for the underground versus the
16 overhead?

17 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): It would be
18 contingent on the total linear feet of cable and
19 how much of underground versus the overhead span
20 that we would need. And I don't have those
21 figures at my fingertips.

22 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And also for the
23 overhead span would you have any idea how many
24 poles that would require or that's subject to the
25 span length?

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): It's subject
2 to the span length, but I would expect we could do
3 that with two poles, one span.

4 MR. PERRONE: And about how tall on
5 those?

6 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): A standard
7 distribution structure 25, 30 feet.

8 MR. PERRONE: Next, I'd like to move
9 into agricultural topic. The original and
10 proposed revised projects had about a half acre of
11 prime farmland soil impacts. Do you have an
12 estimate of prime farmland soil impacts for the
13 modified project?

14 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone, at
15 the break we will try to get that number to you
16 and follow up.

17 MR. PERRONE: Okay. We received the
18 final report on the eastern spadefoot. My
19 question is, was that final report filed with
20 DEEP; and if so, when?

21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Good
22 afternoon, Mr. Perrone. Dean Gustafson. Yes,
23 that final spadefoot toad survey report was filed
24 with DEEP as part of our submission to the
25 National Diversity Data Base review request which

1 was on November 30th, I believe.

2 MR. PERRONE: And in that report
3 there's some wildlife protection measures or
4 mitigation measures. Are those what are proposed
5 at this time, or are those potentially being
6 revised in consultation with DEEP?

7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): No, the
8 recommended protection measures included in that
9 report were incorporated into a comprehensive Rare
10 Species Protection Plan that was submitted to DEEP
11 as part of the NDDB review request.

12 MR. PERRONE: I had asked about ag soil
13 impacts. My other question, would there be any
14 core forest impacts associated with the modified
15 project; and if so, how many acres?

16 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
17 Weaver. The core forest was located on the
18 northern parcel, so with the removal of the
19 project on the northern parcel, there are no
20 longer any impacts to core forest.

21 MR. PERRONE: And we're in receipt of
22 the report on the TCLP testing of the solar
23 panels. Could you explain how the TCLP testing
24 process works?

25 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,

1 the TCLP testing is a standard. I don't have the
2 specific -- I'm not sure if you're looking for the
3 procedure or process or --

4 MR. PERRONE: Yeah, the procedure
5 roughly.

6 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): We can
7 provide that also at the break, if that's what
8 you're looking for, a breakdown of how that
9 procedure is meant to work for that testing. We
10 can provide that information to you.

11 MR. PERRONE: Okay. In that report
12 there's references to soil. I'm just wondering
13 how that fits in with the procedure.

14 All right. Moving on --

15 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Mr. Perrone,
16 sorry, sorry to interrupt. I just wanted to
17 correct a statement I made. It was when we
18 submitted the NDDB review request. I thought it
19 was November 30th. It was actually November 23,
20 2021.

21 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Thank you.

23 MR. PERRONE: Back on the, related to
24 TCLP, is there potential for toxins to leach out
25 of the solar panels and potentially into wetlands,

1 groundwater or wells?

2 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
3 this is Peter Candelaria. There is not. Our TCLP
4 testing was done by a lab under the same procedure
5 that the Council has seen before, same testing
6 standards that you all have approved with other
7 solar projects previously, and it was deemed to be
8 nonhazardous.

9 MR. PERRONE: Turning to the response
10 to Council Interrogatory 14, it's the noise
11 question related to the modified project, and it
12 references the NIA, the Noise Impact Assessment,
13 Petition Exhibit N. A general question about that
14 assessment, does that assessment take into account
15 noise attenuation from trees or does it
16 conservatively neglect that?

17 THE WITNESS (Ginter): Yes. This is
18 Vince Ginter from Urban Solution Group, the noise
19 consultant on the project. The assessment
20 basically ignores the trees, the attenuation from
21 the trees, so that the predicted noise levels from
22 the facility itself, it's actually a conservative
23 assessment.

24 MR. PERRONE: And based on the
25 reduction and relocation of the inverters, would

1 you need any noise mitigation measures to achieve
2 compliance with DEEP noise control standards?

3 THE WITNESS (Ginter): No, DEEP noise
4 control requirements, a 55 dBA level during the
5 daytime. The facility, as modeled in the Noise
6 Impact Assessment, actually meets the nighttime,
7 it's below the nighttime levels. So it meets
8 without any additional noise mitigation
9 requirements.

10 MR. PERRONE: Turning to the response
11 to Council Interrogatory 13, this gets into
12 shading or the shade study. I understand the
13 shade study is still applicable to the modified
14 project. Despite the changes for the modified
15 project, is it still applicable because shade
16 trees are typically located to the south?

17 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
18 this is Peter Candelaria. It's still applicable
19 because we are taking on additional shading.
20 Typically what we would do is run an additional
21 shading analysis and then determine what that
22 offset would look like so that we could go back
23 through and clear cut some additional trees to
24 mitigate further shading. We've accepted the fact
25 that we're going to have to condense this down and

1 work within the boundary that we've been given.
2 So we are not conducting another shade analysis
3 because it doesn't make sense to establish another
4 tree clearing boundary if we're not going to
5 utilize it.

6 MR. PERRONE: Next are some
7 construction related questions. How would you
8 control dust during construction, would you use
9 water, for example, to suppress it?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
11 yes, sir, that is correct, we would use water and
12 all the standard best practices for construction
13 and dust mitigation efforts.

14 MR. PERRONE: And how would you control
15 the tracking of mud onto streets, would you have
16 like anti-tracking pads or entrance apron?

17 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
18 Brawley. What we'd be using would be the best
19 management practices of putting in construction
20 side entrances that, you know, help knock off any
21 debris before it leaves the site, along with the
22 gravel laydown area that's directly next to the
23 entrances.

24 MR. PERRONE: And where would you
25 dispose of excess cut or stone wall material?

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Perrone,
2 if we have any excess cut, we will utilize it on
3 site as part, for swift measures, you know, we are
4 currently engineering this facility as a balanced
5 cut fill, not anticipating any excessive cut, but
6 in the event there would be some, we would utilize
7 it on site.

8 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the exact
9 location has not been determined yet?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Currently
11 we're engineering this to be a balanced cut and
12 fill for the project. We're not anticipating
13 having any excess spoils.

14 MR. PERRONE: Moving on to -- so under
15 the motion there's attachment B drawings, and
16 there is Sheet 401, C401, looking at the
17 stormwater basin 1A which is in the northern area
18 right next to the western array. So looking at
19 that, I understand that the piping coming out of
20 it for outflow, it goes to the east. The question
21 is, are you potentially encountering more tree
22 clearing and disturbance near an abutter by having
23 that piping go to the east rather than, say,
24 piping it out toward the northwest?

25 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt

1 Brawley. When we're doing this design, we have to
2 keep the water that flows to certain drainage
3 areas in those same watershed areas. So that
4 water goes to the creek, so we had to keep it
5 going to the creek. And if we were to go to the
6 northwest, we would be actually changing the
7 drainage area it was draining to.

8 MR. PERRONE: And turning to attachment
9 A, a motion to reopen, sheet PV-100. On the
10 western array the equipment pad is roughly in the
11 center on the northern limits of the array.
12 Question, would you be able to, or had you
13 considered shifting that pad maybe to the west to
14 avoid the abutter to the north for noise reduction
15 purposes?

16 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone, I'm
17 sorry, will you repeat the question? We were
18 looking for the exhibit while you were talking.
19 Just one more time.

20 MR. PERRONE: Sure.

21 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Thank you.

22 MR. PERRONE: On PV-100, the equipment
23 pad that's on the western array. My question is,
24 why had you selected the eastern part of that area
25 instead of the west, would that bring you closer

1 to abutters?

2 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone,
3 this is Ali Weaver. So when we go back to
4 previous designs of the project, well, we had
5 inverters located in two different spots. We have
6 to have access roads to those inverters. And so
7 the least disturbance for the project was to have
8 an access road that could go to both, and that
9 would keep them in the center of the project while
10 also meeting our electrical requirements as well
11 for having so many strings per inverter. So it
12 was a combination of those two factors as to why
13 that inverter location is where it is.

14 MR. PERRONE: And let's see, Ms.
15 Weaver, in the beginning, when I had asked about
16 the discussion at the presentation, you had
17 mentioned you had heard from abutters. Generally,
18 have you been in contact with abutters, and what
19 kind of discussions have you had with them
20 regarding visual impacts?

21 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. We reached
22 out to all of our abutters back in April of last
23 year, and I think it's probably well documented, I
24 guess, the outreach that we've had. So focusing
25 on since our last hearing before the Siting

1 Council, we did reach out to our abutters again.
2 We also hosted or were on the meeting for the
3 Board of Selectmen with the town where all of the
4 abutters were invited to attend and were given an
5 updated presentation of what we're discussing
6 before you today.

7 We've been in consistent conversations
8 with one abutter at 476 Providence New London.
9 Besides that, we have not had any additional
10 communication. Abutters have not -- we've made
11 ourselves available, but no one has requested to
12 meet or continue conversations with us besides
13 that abutter.

14 MR. PERRONE: My next few questions are
15 related to visibility and potential updates
16 resulting from the modified project. Referencing
17 Finding of Fact 186, would the majority of the
18 project be shielded from view due to landscaping
19 and topography for the modified project?

20 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
21 Weaver. Yes, it will because of where we're
22 located off Providence New London and with the
23 removal of the northern arrays from the project.
24 There is one location where the project will be
25 visible, heavily visible, and that's to our

1 abutter at 476 Providence New London Turnpike.
2 Based on that and a lot of the feedback that we
3 received specifically from Mr. Morissette and
4 other Council members in the previous hearings, we
5 took a look at that corner and have been working
6 with the abutter there to install the wood
7 blockade fence on site which we listed at 470 feet
8 worth of fence to help with her visual screening.

9 Since the motion was filed in December,
10 we did have another meeting with that abutter
11 where we're going to update the length, the linear
12 feet, and increase that an additional -- sorry --
13 we're going to increase it an additional 170 feet
14 to the east and south to help her viewshed even
15 further. And then we're also going to be planting
16 trees between the property line and that wood
17 fence to help break up the viewshed of the wood
18 fence that she will see. The motion states that
19 we'll install a 6-foot wood fence, but we're
20 actually increasing that height to 8 feet as to
21 block the viewshed of the chain link and the three
22 strands of barbed wire on top

23 MR. PERRONE: So it would be located
24 between the chain link fence and the property
25 line?

1 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Correct. We
2 will have the wood fence sit flush up against the
3 chain link fence, and then, yes, that will be the
4 block between the property line.

5 MR. PERRONE: Would that result in any
6 additional tree clearing to fit in the wood fence;
7 and if so, to what extent?

8 THE WITNESS (Weaver): The wood fence
9 will sit flush up against the chain link. It's
10 going to be in the same corridor path. It will
11 not result in any additional tree clearing.

12 MR. PERRONE: And also back to
13 visibility. For the modified project would most
14 of the project be set back from adjoining roadways
15 and behind vegetated buffers?

16 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. This is
17 Ali Weaver. The project is set back off of
18 roadways, and we can get you the number.

19 MR. PERRONE: That's fine.

20 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Okay.

21 MR. PERRONE: And let's see, Finding of
22 Fact 193. For the revised project year-round
23 views of some portions of the solar arrays were
24 estimated for about seven homes. For the modified
25 project do you have an estimate of the number of

1 homes that would have views of the project?

2 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone,
3 this is Ali Weaver. If you let us double check
4 that, we can get you a number, hopefully, after
5 the break.

6 MR. PERRONE: Sure, sure. Thank you.
7 That's all I have.

8 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Perrone, if
9 I may, you had asked us about the number of acres
10 in the statewide prime farmland. And I did
11 confirm that that number has not changed. It's
12 still half of an acre of disturbance. It has not
13 changed since the original filing.

14 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

15 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Thank you.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
17 Perrone. We'll now continue with
18 cross-examination by Mr. Lynch, followed by Mr.
19 Silvestri.

20 Mr. Lynch.

21 MR. LYNCH: You're starting with me,
22 Mr. Morissette?

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Lynch.

24 MR. LYNCH: You caught me off guard.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm keeping you on

1 your toes.

2 MR. LYNCH: I've got a few questions,
3 but I want to go back to the fence for a minute
4 before I get into my other questions. Your 7-foot
5 fence is designed to prevent animals or people
6 from getting in, but a large animal such as a
7 bear, and maybe even a moose, can actually, from
8 what my beekeeper friends tell me, break through
9 any fence that's there. And before you answer,
10 and I know foxes and coyotes and fisher cats can
11 go under a fence. If they get into the facility,
12 what type of damage can they do?

13 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Hello, Mr.
14 Lynch. This is Peter Candelaria. I suspect bears
15 and large animals, moose, can potentially damage
16 modules if they go to climb up on them. I can't
17 imagine there's much else they could do. And I
18 don't know why they would look to climb up on
19 glass. It seems like that would not, there's not
20 necessarily a reason for them to get up on them.
21 There's nothing to give a scent or any sort of
22 allure to the site.

23 Small animals are typically the larger
24 risk, rodents and foxes, I suppose, but rodents
25 are probably the largest challenge, which, you

1 know, they can gnaw into cables, and we've got
2 means and methods to mitigate against that. But
3 that's really the biggest risk that we've seen
4 across the country is having small rodents that
5 can gnaw on the cable, create a ground fault, and
6 basically takes a string of an array out until we
7 can get a technician out there to repair it.

8 MR. LYNCH: Sticking with damage
9 control for a second. In the event of a large
10 storm, be it a wind storm, rainstorm, hurricane,
11 you know, the damage to the panels, you know,
12 could be caused by flying objects or icing, how
13 long does it take, if anything does damage the
14 panels, for you to repair them?

15 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
16 this is Peter Candelaria. We respond to those
17 immediately. So we go through routine weather
18 occurrences all over the country. Pre-hurricanes
19 we've got a procedure to deal with emergency
20 preparedness. And in many parts of the country we
21 have tracking systems where the modules actually
22 do track the sun. This facility is a fixed
23 system, so there's not as much risk associated
24 with having the panels in an incorrect orientation
25 in the event of a storm. These are much more, I

1 shouldn't say they're more secure, but they're
2 fixed in place designed for those storm events.

3 So post-storms we will immediately send
4 out a technician team to inspect facilities,
5 assess the damage, and begin any repair efforts to
6 the extent there is damage. And that happens the
7 following day after a big storm event.

8 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
9 Weaver. I'll also add that our systems are
10 remotely monitored 24/7/365 and then during
11 business hours, of course, by our staff as well,
12 and we can hone in down to the module what's going
13 on specific to any specific piece of equipment.
14 So we'll have a good idea of what's out, what's
15 not working, you know, while it's happening.

16 MR. LYNCH: I'll get to those monitors
17 with another set of questions.

18 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Sure.

19 MR. LYNCH: As far as your tech team,
20 are they employees or are they contract hire?

21 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
22 this is Peter Candelaria. We have a mix. We have
23 portions of our fleet that are managed with direct
24 hire employees that we employ under our O&M,
25 direct O&M efforts, and then there's parts of the

1 country, like these two projects here will likely
2 be done under a contract with a third-party
3 provider to help us do those services. And we
4 maintain a set of spare parts on site to quickly
5 facilitate the repair of our projects in the event
6 there is damage. So we will dispatch out a
7 third-party representative, in the event there is
8 a third-party, to help expedite the repair
9 process.

10 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, are you
11 finished?

12 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes, sir.

13 MR. LYNCH: Okay. In the DEEP letter
14 they reference the, so do you in your questions,
15 the Army Corps of Engineers. Would you need
16 any -- and I didn't see that. If I missed it,
17 please forgive me -- any special permits from the
18 Army Corps?

19 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Good
20 afternoon, Mr. Lynch. Dean Gustafson. So the
21 question or the comment from DEEP with respect to
22 Army Corps jurisdiction, the two culvert crossings
23 that we are proposing, culverts C-3 and C-4 that
24 cross Wetlands B and A respectively, those
25 wetlands are assumed to be jurisdiction,

1 considered waters of the United States, and as
2 such, they would be jurisdiction by the Army Corps
3 of Engineers. Those impacts are considered
4 minimal and minor in nature and would be eligible
5 under the Connecticut General Permits program as a
6 self-verification notification process.

7 MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Gustafson.

8 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): And just a
9 quick followup. The applicant does intend to
10 submit an SV form to the Army Corps of Engineers
11 once we get through this process.

12 MR. LYNCH: Now, the letter also
13 references an ATV problem that they have. I'm
14 assuming that's going to be rectified.

15 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
16 Weaver, Mr. Lynch. Yes, we've had a history, a
17 long history of trespassing on the site with folks
18 using ATVs. The installation of the culverts that
19 Mr. Gustafson was referencing will help actually
20 get those wetlands better protected. Right now
21 there's no formal crossings at those wetlands, so
22 we'll be installing those. And the intent with
23 the security fence, of course, is that will be
24 properly securing the site.

25 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. In your

1 interrogatories, I think it's number 6 or 7,
2 somewhere around there, you said that there will
3 be no battery use on this project. Now, I'm
4 having a problem with any project that has a long
5 life, that as it goes into the future is it going
6 to look at batteries for long, for more, better
7 storage and better efficiency. Explain to me why
8 you're not going to use batteries for the life of
9 this project.

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
11 this is Peter Candelaria.

12 MR. LYNCH: I know.

13 (Laughter.)

14 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So we would
15 love to entertain that conversation with
16 Eversource and United Illuminating. We just need
17 to have those conversations to see what we could
18 do to introduce that topic and hopefully work out
19 a plan to help them better manage the system. At
20 the moment, we are contracted under a solar only
21 PPA and, you know, would be happy to present
22 additional solutions for them.

23 MR. LYNCH: So I think in Question
24 Number 7, I think, they reference a mini grid. If
25 in the future you could adapt your project to

1 conform to a mini grid, would you consider that?

2 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes, we
3 would consider that, but we have to work with the
4 utilities to coordinate those efforts. That's not
5 something that we can unilaterally determine on
6 our own.

7 MR. LYNCH: I want to start with your
8 Emergency Management Plan which I'll have to
9 compliment, it was done very well. Mr. Baldwin
10 has been preparing you very nicely.

11 In regards to fire preparation, I've
12 talked to many firefighters, both paid and
13 volunteer, and they're concerned about fighting
14 any type of fire that involves solar panels
15 because they're always hot. And they're
16 concerned, especially in a big facility like this,
17 being able to get in and out. Now, you've only
18 got one access to these. Are you going to build
19 in any other exit points for their big trucks to
20 get in and out of?

21 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Lynch, Ali
22 Weaver. We've got one access point for each array
23 so that way we don't cross the wetland. Those are
24 the only access points that we've suggested just
25 in an effort to keep our limits of disturbance

1 limited. And Pete can speak to this a bit
2 further, but in the event of a fire we can
3 remotely shut down the facility so that way the
4 system is not hot. If you want to --

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Sure. Mr.
6 Lynch, this is Peter Candelaria again. So, we
7 also advise the fire department not to put water
8 on an electrical fire. What we've done with other
9 jurisdictions elsewhere is to isolate the areas
10 that, if there is indeed a thermal event, which
11 we've experienced isolated hotspots with the
12 electrical equipment, not necessarily a full, you
13 know, five-alarm blaze, but we have had some
14 electrical hotspots. We've isolated those. We
15 can do that remotely and allow that to dissipate
16 before we send in our technicians to commence any
17 sort of assessment and repair work. But we've not
18 looked at, you know, there's not been a single
19 jurisdiction in this country that has opted for a
20 scenario or a deluge type of approach to an
21 electrical fire.

22 To your point at the beginning of your
23 comment, any time there is light, there is going
24 to be electricity. Water and electricity do not
25 naturally mix, so in order to keep the

1 firefighting crews safe, it's best to let the fire
2 burn.

3 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. You led right
4 into my next question. The firefighters want to
5 fight the fire with water, but you just explained
6 some of the dangers for that. But the other
7 sources for fighting the fire would be foam or
8 CO2. Now, if either one of those are used rather
9 than water, you know, would they cause any
10 environmental hazards to the property?

11 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Lynch, I
12 think we would need to look into that, if we can,
13 and see --

14 MR. LYNCH: And I'll tell you the
15 reason I asked is because when we last -- sometime
16 last year, I forget, when they had the airplane
17 crash over Bradley, the old B-17, they used foam
18 to put out that fire, and the foam leached into
19 the water system and caused a hazardous problem in
20 the Windsor Locks area. So that's the reason I
21 ask. And I was just wondering, if foam was used,
22 and I don't know about CO2, you know, I know it's
23 used to fight fires, but I don't know what
24 quantities you need, but that's the reason I
25 asked.

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
2 this is Peter Candelaria. CO2 is often used in
3 enclosures in an area where you could literally
4 choke the fire out, you're basically starving it
5 of oxygen. That would not be an option for us in
6 this location given its open air application. So
7 we could certainly look at the foam application,
8 but that would likely result in challenges.

9 THE WITNESS (Weaver): And foam in
10 Connecticut is required to be PFAS free as well is
11 our understanding. So we would expect, at least
12 for foam that's held by a fire department, our
13 plan is, after speaking with the town, is that we
14 would host a meeting with the local fire
15 department at mobilization to talk through fire
16 mitigation through construction. And then after
17 the project comes online, then we would have a
18 second discussion for ongoing operations and
19 maintenance of the facility of how it's handled.
20 And as Pete mentioned, our preference would be not
21 to deploy anything and let it burn.

22 MR. LYNCH: Thank you. In the event of
23 an emergency, any type of emergency, not
24 necessarily fire, can you turn off the transformer
25 and the inverters from outside the compound?

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
2 this is Peter Candelaria. Yes, sir, we can
3 remotely isolate the facility from the point of
4 interconnection.

5 MR. LYNCH: Now, would that require
6 help from Eversource or United grid, whoever is
7 servicing out there?

8 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): No, sir. We
9 can do that remotely from our headquarters.

10 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you. Now, as
11 far as any type of emergency inside the compound
12 or leading to the compound, I noticed you
13 referenced the nearest hospital would be in
14 Westerly and that's a few miles away. I've
15 actually been to that hospital. Don't ask. But
16 as far as a serious injury that would need a Level
17 1 trauma center, the nearest one that I know of
18 would either be Hartford or Providence. Now,
19 would you have the ability to land a HELO there
20 somewhere to get to a Level 1 trauma center?

21 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
22 this is Peter Candelaria. I don't believe we've
23 got enough real estate to accommodate a helicopter
24 landing at this location.

25 MR. LYNCH: Or do you have a, I guess I

1 should ask if you have the ability to get an
2 injury to a Level 1 trauma center on the ground
3 with notification to the center whether you go
4 Providence or Hartford?

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Our typical
6 process is to establish that right at the onset of
7 our mobilization efforts. So we'll go through and
8 our safety, our director of safety, Jim Barfield,
9 will work with our contractors to identify what
10 that life safety program needs to look like. So
11 in the event we do have a major life emergency
12 during construction, we have solutions to address
13 it.

14 Subsequent to construction when we get
15 into the long-term operation of the facilities,
16 Jim also works with the local jurisdictions to
17 identify a plan to help them identify if an
18 individual or employee goes down within the
19 facility. You know, the bigger challenge is
20 really finding somebody in an area that large that
21 is, you know, in the middle of a heart attack.
22 That can be very difficult. So having a
23 communication plan, we've worked with the local
24 fire departments and emergency responders to help
25 them understand how to find one of our employees

1 within the arrays.

2 MR. LYNCH: The other thing that was in
3 your emergency plan, and I was impressed with it,
4 I'll let you know, was your explanation about any
5 type of terrorist activity like a bomb. You
6 referenced, you know, calling in local police and
7 then you had a National Responders Center. I'm
8 assuming they would get in touch with ATF and
9 Homeland; am I correct?

10 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Lynch, this
11 is Ali Weaver. Yes, we'll call the National
12 Response Center. I'm not sure if they then turn
13 around and call Homeland, how that process looks.
14 I'm sorry.

15 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you. You also
16 explained, I forget where, that you have your
17 personnel on site, then you have visitors. Who
18 would be visiting your site other than the Siting
19 Council?

20 (Laughter.)

21 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Lynch,
22 this is Peter Candelaria. So typically we'll have
23 inspectors come out, we'll have the building
24 department inspectors, that's who we host as
25 visitors, building department inspectors, state

1 environmental inspectors, SWPPP inspectors, you
2 know, just typical type of governmental inspection
3 type visitors.

4 MR. LYNCH: Now, any of these visitors
5 that went inside the compound, would they have to
6 wear helmets or eye protection or anything like
7 that, or like Mr. Carberry maybe wear a couple
8 years back like a bunny suit?

9 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes. So
10 prior to allowing visitors on site, we put them
11 through a safety orientation and we provide them
12 with the appropriate personal protective equipment
13 for, depending on the state of construction or
14 operation of the facility. So that if they're in
15 there, they're safe to be in there, and they've
16 been given an orientation as to the hazards of the
17 visit.

18 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette, those are
19 all the questions I have for the present.

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

23 Mr. Silvestri.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
25 Morissette. And good afternoon, everyone. I will

1 try not to repeat some of the questions that have
2 been asked already, but I may expand upon some of
3 them. But to start with, I'd like to verify some
4 numbers. First off, you're proposing to install
5 25,125 panels. Do I have that number correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Weaver): That's correct.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: And again, we talked
8 about the wattage, it being 480. Why was the 480
9 module selected?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Hello, Mr.
11 Silvestri. This is Peter Candelaria. The 480
12 watt module was selected as the best possible
13 solution for the amount of density that we wanted
14 to get out of that site. So we're trying to
15 minimize our footprint as best possible and
16 identify the, you know, the product that would
17 help us get there.

18 MR. SILVESTRI: Now, earlier I believe
19 you mentioned that you wouldn't be able to obtain
20 back side production with the bifacial panels. Why
21 is that?

22 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): We are not
23 going to obtain the full, the marketed value of
24 the back side production. So I believe the
25 previous question was asking why weren't we taking

1 full credit for the back side production. And
2 what I tried to clarify in my response was that
3 you're not going to necessarily get the full back
4 side production. We've compressed this down
5 where, you know, there's going to be some
6 road (inaudible), and so the ultimate impact to
7 the back side of what you're trying to pick up in
8 terms of reflectivity back from the soil is not
9 going to be what it -- it's not going to optimize
10 your back side production. So we will effectively
11 reduce the amount of bifaciality contribution.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: But you don't have an
13 estimate at this time as to what the contribution
14 of the back side might be?

15 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So it's
16 going to be dependent on the albedo factor of the
17 actual sub -- or the surface of the facility. So,
18 depending on how much grass we have, the relative
19 length of the grass, and how much shading is
20 impacting that back side of the surface will
21 dictate what that albedo factor is and then in
22 turn determine how much back side production we
23 have. We've not seen a great or substantial
24 impact from the bifaciality in other regions where
25 we have a lot of grass of varying length, height,

1 you know, they don't necessarily provide the
2 reflectivity that you get in, say, a desert
3 southwest of the U.S., you get quite a bit more
4 reflectivity off of that rock in bare soil versus
5 what we have here. So there will be some impact,
6 but it will be relatively minor.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: The follow-up question
8 I have then is why use them, why go bifacial?

9 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So the
10 module type itself, it's a PERC module. It's one
11 of the more superior products in the industry.
12 And, you know, they come with a bifaciality
13 component. The big difference being is the
14 backsheet, instead of it being, you know, like
15 more of a hard surface, it's a translucent
16 surface, so it allows some light to come through.
17 And for us we may as well get the best product for
18 the project. And so if it has some bifaciality
19 component to it, that's great, but we're looking
20 for the best front side solution for us, period,
21 and this, you know, gets us there.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Let me follow
23 through. The original project you had listed at
24 9.9 megawatts AC. Now we're at approximately 8.35
25 megawatts AC. So you do have a drop, if you will,

1 on this modified project versus the original. Was
2 any consideration given to a higher wattage panel?
3 For example, I've seen 570 watts. Any reason why
4 you didn't go higher than a 480?

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So the
6 wattage is going to be dictated by what is
7 actually being produced at the point in time of
8 production. The 480 is what's currently
9 available, like that's what the manufacturers will
10 stand behind. There is conversation that a 570
11 may become available in the next year, maybe 18
12 months plus, but that's not been -- that's not
13 something a manufacturer is standing behind at the
14 moment for us.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Should the project be
16 approved and something happens to make the 570
17 more viable, would you be looking to switch panels
18 to a higher wattage panel?

19 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): I would say,
20 so I will tell you right now we're contracted at
21 480. So we contracted our modules. I don't know
22 that that's a legitimate viable option for us at
23 this point.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. No, that's fine.
25 Thank you.

1 And again, getting back to the power
2 purchase agreements, I'm not sure if they're the
3 same as with the original proposal. Could you
4 clarify that?

5 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
6 Silvestri, could you repeat the question, please?

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah. Going back to
8 the power purchase agreements, the PPAs, I'm not
9 sure if they're the same as what you had with the
10 original proposal or not. So I'm looking for some
11 type of explanation as to where we stand with a
12 PPA.

13 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): You're
14 speaking to the capacity, not necessarily the
15 modules, right?

16 MR. SILVESTRI: No, no, forget the
17 modules. Just look at the overall project.

18 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So in terms
19 of the PPAs, so we have had conversations with
20 both of the offtakers. They're aware of the
21 challenges that we're having to work through and
22 accommodate a lot of the requests from the
23 Council. And pending the successful approval of
24 this project, we felt confident that we'll be able
25 to get the balance of what we need done to

1 consummate all of the adjustments and
2 considerations we've made. But that conversation
3 is ongoing and is pending a successful outcome of
4 this procedure, this process.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Thank you.
6 And do you know if the term would be the same, 20
7 years?

8 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): That is the
9 current expectation, we would maintain the same
10 term.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: That's the standard.
12 Okay. Thank you.

13 I want to change gears now, get away
14 from the panels, just to briefly look at estimated
15 project cost. You provided an estimate that it
16 might be between 15 million and 25 million. Why
17 such a large spread?

18 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
19 Silvestri, this is Peter Candelaria again. We've
20 had some challenges getting our arms around how
21 dramatic supply chain issues are going to impact
22 the project. In fact, we had suspected -- we had
23 hoped that by reducing the footprint of the
24 project we would see some opportunities for
25 savings, and unfortunately it just has not panned

1 out. There's been some inflationary impacts to
2 this project that I'm sure the Council has seen in
3 other parts of the industry, in other industries,
4 and we're not immune to those. So we've given
5 ourselves some room on our capex budget to work
6 through those challenges.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: But even if the
8 estimates went onto the high end of 25 million,
9 the project would still be viable for you?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Very
11 attractive.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Let me move on
13 to a different topic. From previous proceedings
14 with the original application there was
15 considerable discussion about fuel storage.
16 What's proposed in the modified project for fuel
17 storage?

18 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): We are not
19 proposing it. We're using off site fuel support,
20 so we will not be utilizing any on site fuel
21 storage.

22 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And just
23 going back to what Mr. Lynch had mentioned about
24 the Emergency Action Plan. If you look at
25 appendix B, as in "bravo," the DEEP spill

1 reporting flow chart, was that revised to reflect
2 the latest DEEP spill reporting requirements?

3 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Silvestri,
4 this is Ali Weaver. This is accurate as of the
5 date of submittal. So if DEEP has updated their
6 requirements since we've submitted this, then no,
7 but we could have that updated through the D&M
8 plan.

9 MR. SILVESTRI: I know for, I want to
10 say 25 years, if not more, the department has been
11 working on spill reporting regulations. I know
12 they had a proposal that was out. I don't know if
13 it was finalized. So, I do agree with you, if
14 it's finalized and the project is approved or for
15 other projects you might have in Connecticut, it's
16 worth looking at where they're going with their
17 spill reporting requirements and maybe updating
18 that. So just a comment.

19 I'd like to turn attention now to
20 livestock. And again, back with the original
21 proposal we discussed livestock grazing within the
22 fenced perimeter areas. Is livestock grazing
23 being proposed for this modified project, is it
24 different from what was originally proposed?

25 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali

1 Weaver. No, it is not different than what is
2 originally proposed. We're still proposing the
3 Integrated Vegetation Management Plan which
4 includes the use of sheep on site. And a lot of
5 that -- sorry.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Go ahead.

7 THE WITNESS (Weaver): I was going to
8 say, that was after a conversation with the town
9 that we had with them back in November that they
10 felt like the regenerative energy program, and
11 specifically the sheep component, was a redeeming
12 quality of the project and that they would like to
13 see the sheep on site working with local vendors
14 to make it happen.

15 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. The reason for
16 my asking is based on the Integrated Vegetation
17 Management Plan. The document was amended
18 November 23, 2021. It has the same acreage listed
19 as the original submittal which is 157.16 acres,
20 yet the modified project is reduced in size.
21 That's why I asked what's different and what's
22 changed.

23 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Silvestri,
24 are you referencing on page 2 the property
25 acreage?

1 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm on page 2 under
2 property description.

3 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. I think
4 that was an attempt to reference just how large
5 our property is in general and not meant to be
6 specific to the sheep maintenance. It was just in
7 reference to the overall property size. We
8 certainly through the D&M phase could issue an
9 update or a correction there to make it clear how
10 many acres would be under the maintenance program.

11 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. To keep
12 going on that though, the Stormwater Pollution
13 Control Plan lists 125 acres, and then it has
14 approximately 34.6 acres will be disturbed. So I
15 think somewhere along the line we need to be
16 consistent in what we're talking about for acres.

17 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
18 Silvestri, this is Peter Candelaria. For purposes
19 of clarity, the sheep will be grazing within the
20 solar array footprint area, right. We've
21 purchased additional land beyond that, which the
22 Council is aware of. We'll still be maintaining,
23 the team that manages our vegetation manages it
24 for all the properties that we own beyond just
25 that portion that is managed under grazing. So

1 that's why there's some different numbers. But
2 obviously there's a bit of confusion there. We'll
3 clarify that. We can modify this to bring more
4 clarity to that.

5 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Like I say,
6 it is confusing, and I'm just looking for
7 consistency at this point. So let's move on from
8 here.

9 Mr. Perrone had you look at drawing
10 PV-100 when he posed a couple questions to you.
11 Could you pull that drawing up, and also have
12 drawings C401, C601 and C700 near you because I'm
13 going to need you to reference those as well.
14 When I'm looking at PV-100 and the eastern array,
15 the fence line on the northern edge of that array
16 is represented by a series of Xs. Is that where
17 the, what was originally proposed as a 6-foot tall
18 wooden fence, is that where that would be located?

19 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
20 Weaver. Yes, the wood fence is going to sit flush
21 up against the security fence which is represented
22 by the Xs. If you flip to PV-102, it gives a bit
23 more of a zoom-in there. It shows it in better
24 detail. You can see that yellow line, which
25 represents the wood fence, sits right basically on

1 top of the security fence, and then there is a
2 space there to the LOD and then ultimately the
3 property line.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm just pulling up 102
5 because my computer is a little slow. Bear with
6 me.

7 THE WITNESS (Weaver): No problem.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: And then it will turn
9 the corner and then go up towards Providence New
10 London Turnpike. Is that the area you had
11 mentioned that you would have an extension of that
12 wood fence as well?

13 THE WITNESS (Weaver): No, sir. We're
14 going to be extending it on the eastern side of
15 that wood fence to make it --

16 MR. SILVESTRI: On the eastern side.

17 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes, and we'll
18 take it all the way to the edge of the security
19 fence, and then we're going to also wrap it down
20 to the access road where the gate is. So it will
21 have that same wraparound effect. The point being
22 is the abutter at 476 Providence New London, her
23 property line extends further east than this site,
24 so by wrapping the wood fence further south it
25 will help her view from further east to bring the

1 fence, the wood fence all the way to match the
2 security fence.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: And again, that's going
4 from 6 feet to 8 feet, correct?

5 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes, sir.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: And then on page 10 of
7 15 of the December 1, 2021 motion to reopen, it
8 states, in part, that after discussions with this
9 property owner, the petitioner has offered to
10 install, and then it goes on to talk about the
11 fence. It doesn't mention if the property owner
12 agreed to that measure. Was there agreements
13 accepted by the property owner at this point?

14 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes, so we --
15 this is Ali Weaver. We met with the abutter in
16 January to discuss the proposal, what had been
17 proposed at the time, which is reflected on page
18 10 that you just identified. What we came to an
19 agreement on, and we have come to an agreement, is
20 to extend the wood fence in the manner to the east
21 and south that we had just discussed which is
22 extending it an additional 170 feet, and then also
23 putting in a series of trees in between the wood
24 fence and the property line that would help break
25 up her viewshed of the wood fence as well, yes.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Great. Thank you for
2 the response. If you could pull up C401, C601 and
3 C700, I'd just like to get a clarification on
4 those drawings as well. With C401 and C601 they
5 reference "fence typical, see detail 1 on sheet
6 C700." However, when I look at C700, it depicts a
7 chain link fence and not the wooden fence. Would
8 that have to be revised to include the wood fence?

9 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. Mr.
10 Silvestri, this is Ali Weaver. Yes, we can add
11 the wood fence into that page 700 as a separate
12 detail as well.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Then one
14 last question on fences I think I have at this
15 point. Looking at 454 Providence New London
16 Turnpike, it's located to the northeast corner of
17 the western array, and I believe the address is a
18 pet boarding service. What I found is it's known
19 as Creature Comforts Animal Inn, LLC. Are there
20 any plans for visual mitigation, landscaping or
21 fences in that area?

22 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
23 Weaver. We've reached out to that abutter, and
24 she in our conversation over the phone declined or
25 didn't have a desire to meet further to talk about

1 any screening or anymore details of the project.
2 She was also invited to the hearing with the Board
3 of Selectmen back in November. And we did not
4 hear any correspondence from her since, so we have
5 not deployed any visual mitigation specifically to
6 that area.

7 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for
8 that response. Moving on and trying not to repeat
9 a question that was posed before, looking at the
10 interconnection between the eastern and western
11 arrays, you had mentioned the overhead span could
12 have, I believe, two poles, one span maybe 25 to
13 30 feet high. If it were bored, how deep would
14 the boring need to go under Wetland E?

15 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Mr. Silvestri,
16 Ali Weaver. We would work with Mr. Gustafson and
17 make sure we had best management practices based
18 on the wetland and the size there to make sure we
19 had the best CMPs in place for the depth. At this
20 time we don't not have the boring designed
21 specifically but could follow up with those
22 details as a part of the D&M process.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: At this point do you
24 have a preference as to which way you may go
25 between overhead and boring?

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
2 Silvestri, this is Peter Candelaria. I do not.

3 MR. SILVESTRI: And just to follow up
4 on that, what would make you decide one way or
5 another which way to go?

6 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So we would
7 run our cost analysis on what's, you know, capex
8 versus opex, a capital expenditure versus
9 operating expenditures on the two scenarios and
10 look at the designs and details of the two and
11 figure out what makes the most sense for the
12 project.

13 MR. SILVESTRI: And again, based on the
14 response that you gave to Mr. Perrone earlier.
15 Thank you.

16 Going back to the culvert and access
17 from Boombridge Road, you're looking at crossing
18 C-3 and C-4. What type of culvert is being
19 proposed?

20 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Mr. Silvestri,
21 this is Matt Brawley. What we are looking at
22 putting in for those two are arch culverts with no
23 bottom.

24 MR. SILVESTRI: So open bottom?

25 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Yes.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. And again,
2 you answered the question about self-verification
3 before as well. Thank you.

4 A couple other questions that I have.
5 I believe Mr. Perrone was asking about the
6 interconnection that you have ultimately to
7 Eversource's lines, and I heard two answers. The
8 first answer I heard was that the existing
9 structures, being poles, are already in place.
10 And then about a minute or two afterwards I heard
11 that there would be an addition of three more
12 poles. Could you clarify that interconnection?

13 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
14 Weaver. Yes, I think I made that statement. What
15 I was intending to say is that Eversource's
16 distribution line already exists, and that runs
17 along Providence New London Turnpike on the south
18 side of the road. That infrastructure is already
19 in place and doesn't need to be updated to support
20 this project. The only addition to the project
21 will be three new poles that will be located on
22 our property to facilitate the interconnection.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: And those poles would
24 come after the pad-mounted infrastructure?

25 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): This is

1 Peter Candelaria. That would be after our
2 pad-mounted structure and it goes to the utility
3 poles.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: Are they depicted on
5 any drawing that we might have?

6 THE WITNESS (Weaver): The three poles,
7 is that what you're asking, if they're depicted on
8 a drawing?

9 MR. SILVESTRI: Yes.

10 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
11 Weaver. On PV-101 we show the location of the MV
12 switchgear. And it's only shown as one box, but
13 there will be three poles. And you can see the
14 red line that ties into the existing three-phase
15 distribution line that already exists along the
16 road. And then for visual purposes of what that
17 looks like, we did submit Exhibit Y as a part of
18 the original petition. Figure 2 shows the
19 current, what's out there now which is that
20 three-phase distribution line, and then we propose
21 Figure 3 of what the facility will look like after
22 installed.

23 MR. SILVESTRI: So that interconnection
24 wouldn't change from what was originally proposed?

25 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Correct.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: Got you. Thank you.
2 Two other questions I have left. Going back to
3 the spade foot toad surveys, is anything else
4 being proposed for any additional surveys with the
5 warmer weather coming, either visual or
6 acoustical?

7 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): At the
8 current moment no further surveys are being
9 performed. The level of investigation that was
10 performed last season was enough to conclude that
11 spade foots do not exist on this site.

12 MR. SILVESTRI: Great. Thank you for
13 that response.

14 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're
15 welcome.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: And the last question I
17 have is more of a curiosity question. Does any
18 technology exist that you know of that could
19 provide a small amount of heat to the panels to
20 facilitate snow removal?

21 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): This is
22 Peter Candelaria. It's a good question. I don't
23 know that there's anything out in the industry to
24 provide that yet. You may be onto something.

25 MR. SILVESTRI: Well, I keep looking at

1 the panels on my roof. I can't reach them with
2 anything to get the snow off, so I just hope that
3 nature does its job, hence my question to you.

4 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): It's a good
5 question.

6 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for your
7 response.

8 Mr. Morissette, I am all set. Thank
9 you.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
11 Silvestri. We will now take a 12-minute break and
12 reconvene at 3:40, and we will continue with
13 cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen and then by Ms.
14 Cooley. Thank you, everyone. We'll see you at
15 3:40.

16 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
17 3:28 p.m. until 3:40 p.m.)

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
19 everyone. We are back on the record. Is our
20 court reporter with us?

21 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I am.

22 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.
23 Before we continue with cross-examination by Mr.
24 Nguyen, Attorney Baldwin, do you have any
25 responses to the open questions that we have?

1 MR. BALDWIN: We do, Mr. Morissette.
2 Thank you. I think there were two that we were
3 talking about. First, Ali Weaver is going to
4 respond to the question related to visibility that
5 was raised.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

7 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes. The
8 original project had seven homes having year-round
9 views. This modified project now has four homes
10 with year-round views. But we'd like to say,
11 because of the mitigation that is being proposed
12 adjacent to 476 Providence New London Turnpike,
13 that the year-round views should only be to three
14 homes for this modified project.

15 MR. BALDWIN: And then the second item,
16 Mr. Morissette, was relating to the TCLP testing
17 process that Mr. Candelaria will address.

18 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes. This
19 is Peter Candelaria. In response to Mr. Perrone's
20 question, the soil that's referenced in the
21 SunStar Laboratories report is in reference to the
22 actual sample that's taken. So, generically
23 speaking, under the TCLP standards the test
24 subject is referred to as a soil sample, and they
25 test those for toxicities and metals and the like.

1 And that, I believe, was what Mr. Perrone was
2 getting at is what was the -- why was the word
3 soil used in the laboratory report. Well, that's
4 the actual test sample that's collected. It's
5 referred to generically as soil, soil sample.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

7 Mr. Perrone, are you all set with the response?

8 MR. PERRONE: I just had one quick
9 question on that. So is it an actual soil sample
10 or is that a solar panel that is broken down into
11 fragments and tested?

12 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): It's a solar
13 panel that's broken down. And they refer to that
14 broken down, those remnants, as soil sample, as
15 the soil sample that's, I guess, the residual
16 product.

17 MR. PERRONE: Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
19 Perrone.

20 Attorney Baldwin, I had two other
21 questions that were on the table. They may have
22 been answered, but I want to confirm before we
23 move on. The first one was relating to Mr.
24 Lynch's question relating to the type of material
25 to be used to fight the fire, whether it's CO2 or

1 foam.

2 Mr. Lynch, were you satisfied with the
3 answer or are you expecting additional
4 elaboration?

5 MR. LYNCH: Yes.

6 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.
7 And the next question that I had was a
8 clarification on the acreage by Mr. Silvestri.

9 Mr. Silvestri, are you all set, are you
10 looking for a response or are you satisfied?

11 MR. SILVESTRI: I'm all set at this
12 point, Mr. Morissette. Thank you.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
14 Mr. Silvestri. Very good. We will now continue
15 with cross-examination by Mr. Nguyen followed by
16 Ms. Cooley.

17 Mr. Nguyen.

18 MR. NGUYEN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
19 And good afternoon, everyone. I have a few
20 clarifying questions to the witness panel. And
21 this is related to the Emergency Action Plan,
22 attachment G, that was submitted by the applicant.
23 Now, when I look at the plan and I see the
24 abbreviation "EHS&S," I don't see it spelled out
25 in the emergency plan here. Could you clarify

1 what does that stand for, for the record?

2 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Nguyen,
3 this is Peter Candelaria. EHS&S stands for
4 environmental, health, safety and security.

5 MR. NGUYEN: And this is the office of
6 the Department of Energy; is that right?

7 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): No, sir.
8 This is a department internal to Silicon Ranch.

9 MR. NGUYEN: Right, but it belongs to
10 the Department of Energy or --

11 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes -- well,
12 no, I'm sorry, it's our department. It's a
13 department that we formed internal to our
14 organization.

15 MR. NGUYEN: Oh, I see. Okay.

16 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yeah.

17 MR. NGUYEN: And I'm looking at the
18 contact list, which is appendix A of the plan.
19 And I see that there are "to be determined" with
20 evacuation coordinator and "to be determined" with
21 the solar site manager. When will these be
22 determined?

23 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr. Nguyen,
24 this is Peter Candelaria. Those are generally
25 determined in advance of mobilization to the site.

1 So once we know a firm date of when we can start
2 construction, we'll determine and allocate the
3 appropriate resources for those projects.

4 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And I see there's
5 an evacuation team that was mentioned in the plan,
6 and I don't see it on the contact list. Is there
7 any reason why, or should there be a contact list
8 for the evacuation team?

9 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): The
10 evacuation coordinator is the one that will
11 assemble, that will work with the team for that
12 purpose. The evacuation team is really determined
13 at the onset for each of those projects to make
14 sure all of the appropriate parties are aware of
15 their roles in the event of an emergency. And
16 then that coordinator that's identified on that
17 contact list is the one that's meant to shepherd
18 everybody to the right role and responsibility
19 that they're meant to maintain.

20 MR. NGUYEN: I'm sorry, what was the
21 last part?

22 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): So the
23 coordinator, the emergency event coordinator is
24 the one that's meant to shepherd that process
25 through to get the team on page.

1 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. And where will this
2 EAP be filed with or be provided to other than
3 your internal?

4 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Internal to
5 our organization. And it's filed, you know, as
6 part of our project file.

7 MR. NGUYEN: And will another agency or
8 any entity that would have this contact list or
9 this emergency plan?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): We typically
11 work with local fire departments and fire and life
12 rescue, first responders, and provide our
13 Emergency Action Plan to those groups as well.
14 Believe it or not, there are some jurisdictions
15 that don't want to participate too much, but we
16 suspect most do and would anticipate that they
17 would maintain a similar record on file at their
18 location. These are kept on site at our
19 construction trailers, and our management team is
20 trained on them.

21 MR. NGUYEN: And looking at the contact
22 list, I see that there's for emergency I see
23 Westerly Hospital which is in Rhode Island. It's
24 on the contact list here. And understanding that
25 Westerly provides services to southeastern of

1 Connecticut, southeastern Connecticut residents as
2 well, is that why it's included in the contact
3 list?

4 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): That is our
5 understanding of the nearest hospital to treat
6 injury victims.

7 MR. NGUYEN: Any other Connecticut
8 hospital that could be the next one closest to the
9 site?

10 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): I don't
11 know.

12 MR. NGUYEN: And as you mentioned
13 before, I just want to confirm that once
14 everything is finalized then all of the "to be
15 determined" will be filled out or will be
16 established; is that right?

17 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes, sir,
18 that is correct.

19 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very
20 much. And that's all I have, Mr. Morissette.

21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
22 Thank you. We'll now continue with
23 cross-examination by Ms. Cooley, followed by Mr.
24 Collette.

25 Ms. Cooley.

1 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
2 Many of my questions have been asked and answered
3 by my fellow Council members and Mr. Perrone, but
4 I do have a few questions.

5 Going back to fencing, you had
6 mentioned that there was a property abutter that I
7 believe was a business involving dogs that you had
8 not had contact with or who had not engaged, I
9 guess is a better way to put it. My concern is,
10 if your vegetation management plan involves sheep
11 and you know that you have an abutter that has a
12 business with dogs, that seems problematic. Even
13 if you haven't yet engaged with that abutter, it
14 seems like that would be something you would need
15 to do, otherwise your sheep manager, whoever that
16 is, may have some issues with that. Is that --

17 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
18 Weaver. I think I know where your statement and
19 questions are going, but if I'm off please let me
20 know. Where we left the conversations with the
21 town, and I think specifically with the abutters
22 that will be a part of that discussion, is coming
23 up with a plan that the town would like to see and
24 also that's kind of within the realm of what
25 Silicon Ranch thrives in. We kind of have an

1 assortment of ways that we could deploy the
2 regenerative energy program, sheep being one
3 component of that. We want to make sure that it
4 was included in the Council's review in case that
5 is something that the town and Silicon Ranch come
6 up with as being possible for the site.

7 But I think the discussion that you're
8 mentioning for that abutter we certainly would,
9 that would be one of the conversations we would
10 expect to have is making sure that whatever plan
11 that we come up with, with the town and its
12 residents is also taking into account any issues
13 that the kennel may or may not have. So that is
14 our plan.

15 MS. COOLEY: Sure. It seems like one
16 of the possible mitigations could be having a
17 visually opaque fence in that area as you are
18 doing for your other abutter as a suggestion, just
19 a thought about that.

20 And then I have another question about
21 the spade foot toad survey. While no spade foot
22 toads were found on the site, and it seems like a
23 very thorough survey, it does note that previous
24 surveys on the site within the last few years did
25 find a box turtle, a spotted turtle and ribbon

1 snake, and in that report there were some pretty
2 extensive construction protective measures to
3 avoid potentially damaging the habitat of these
4 animals. Have those protective measures been
5 incorporated into your plan, are you intending to
6 do any of those? I see that the barrier fences
7 have been included, but things like the contractor
8 education parts and some continued monitoring?

9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. Dean
10 Gustafson. Those protection measures have been
11 incorporated into a comprehensive Resource
12 Protection Measure Plan that's been submitted to
13 NDDDB as part of our review request. So those will
14 be implemented and incorporated into the final
15 project plans, and we will be implementing those
16 at the start of construction.

17 MS. COOLEY: Okay. Very good to hear.
18 I think that is -- I think that's all that I have.
19 Thank you.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Ms. Cooley.
21 We'll now continue with cross-examination by
22 Mr. Collette.

23 Mr. Collette.

24 MR. COLLETTE: Thank you, Mr.
25 Morissette. And I'll just offer for informational

1 purposes for Mr. Silvestri and for the project
2 proponent that there are indeed release reporting
3 regulations proposed by DEEP. Those are in the
4 regulation adoption process. They are currently
5 on the agenda at the Legislative Regulation Review
6 Committee for the meeting to be held on February
7 22nd. That is one of the final steps in the
8 adoption process. DEEP has no control over that
9 approval, obviously, because it is a legislative
10 committee, but they are pending approval, and DEEP
11 is optimistic that those changed regs will in fact
12 be approved.

13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
14 Collette. Anything else?

15 MR. COLLETTE: Yes. So just a couple
16 of questions. I think a lot of good questions
17 already have been asked and answered, so I don't
18 want to prolong things. But does the applicant
19 have any update on its conversations with DEEP's
20 Dam Safety Program? There's references in the
21 previous determination, draft determination about
22 needs to continue to consult with DEEP on any
23 requirements for dam safety permits, and I was
24 wondering in the meantime if there's been any
25 discussions or definitive answers given of the

1 need for dam safety permitting.

2 THE WITNESS (Brawley): Matt Brawley.
3 We had a preapplication meeting with them, and we
4 had discussed with them that stormwater basin
5 Number 5, which is the basin at the south end of
6 the east array, would need a dam safety permit,
7 and we would be doing that during the CT DEEP
8 permitting process.

9 MR. COLLETTE: Okay. Thank you. In
10 consolidating the footprint of the array itself,
11 were there any changes to what had to be accounted
12 for as far as the runoff from the panels and sort
13 of whether it still maintained an ability to sheet
14 flow or whether in consolidating the footprint you
15 would see anymore, sort of, you know, channelizing
16 type runoff that would need to be accounted for in
17 the stormwater general permit registration?

18 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
19 Brawley. We've been working through Appendix I on
20 the erosion control design and stormwater design,
21 and we're going to be putting in there gravel
22 level spreaders along the contours even though
23 that's not going to be at the drip edge of the
24 panels since the panels don't follow the contours.
25 We discussed with them and they seemed amenable to

1 putting them along the contours instead to keep
2 that flow broken up and keep the sheet flow.

3 MR. COLLETTE: Okay. Thank you. And
4 then just going to the tree clearing window and
5 the hope to get some of that accomplished in short
6 order before that window sort of closes for those
7 couple of months, you still intend to maintain all
8 the sequencing and phasing that were identified in
9 the sheets provided in the details on the second
10 page of that set of sheets right before C101, it
11 would be your intent to still maintain all that
12 sequencing?

13 THE WITNESS (Brawley): This is Matt
14 Brawley. Yes, that is correct.

15 MR. COLLETTE: Okay. I have nothing
16 further, Mr. Morissette. I appreciate the
17 answers. Thank you.

18 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
19 Collette.

20 First of all, I appreciate Mr. Perrone
21 and the other Council members' questions, they
22 were very detailed and thorough, but I do have a
23 couple of follow-up questions just for
24 clarification. I'll start with the questions that
25 were filed. Question Number 16 discusses a

1 habitat enhancement program which I believe was
2 part of the eastern spade foot review. Could you
3 elaborate on what that habitat enhancement is
4 intended to be, or cover?

5 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Sure. Dean
6 Gustafson. In general terms, you know, the old
7 gravel pit area has a dominance of invasive shrub
8 species, and so the basic plan is to remove those
9 invasive shrubs and do select plantings and
10 seeding with native species and native shrubs to
11 enhance the wildlife habitat value and also
12 enhance the habitat value of not only the
13 terrestrial habitat in that area but it's
14 scattered with various wetlands and vernal pool
15 areas, so it will enhance the habitat for those
16 aquatic features as well.

17 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
18 Mr. Gustafson. Is that something that is included
19 in your NDDDB submittal or is it a commitment that
20 you're making here?

21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): It's both. I
22 guess, to put it simply, it was, those
23 recommendations are included in the NDDDB review
24 request, the final submission, so through that
25 coordination with DEEP the applicant is committing

1 to performing those habitat assessments, but also
2 through testimony and filings of this petition the
3 applicant is committing to the Council that will
4 occur as well.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

6 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're
7 welcome.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: That's very good for
9 the project to do that, I would add.

10 I will move on to Question Number 17.
11 Just a clarification. I'm a little confused
12 concerning Vernal Pool dash E. I compared the
13 response. It says that you have three vernal
14 pools that are greater than 25 percent. And
15 Vernal Pool E is 46 percent developed. Could you
16 clarify for me what that means? And I believe
17 what it means is that a percentage was
18 predeveloped therefore it doesn't contribute to
19 the 25 percent, but a piece above that is part of
20 the 25 percent. So if you could clarify that for
21 me, I'd appreciate it.

22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, could I
23 just clarify? You said Interrogatory 17. I think
24 you meant 19. Is that 19?

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. Thank you.

1 Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

2 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.

3 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): So for Vernal
4 Pool E, you know, what we did was assess both the
5 existing condition and then the proposed developed
6 condition with the solar facilities. And under
7 existing condition, you know, Vernal Pool E has
8 approximately 3 percent developed in the existing
9 condition, and in the proposed condition it will
10 be 46 percent. So with respect to the reference
11 25 percent developed critical terrestrial habitat
12 zone in the Interrogatory 18, the project would
13 exceed that 25 percent development.

14 However, we also drew this out in our
15 response. You know, the current recognized
16 methodology for impacting assessments to vernal
17 pools goes beyond and has been replaced by a
18 methodology commonly known as vector analysis
19 that's been developed by Calhoun, and that's been
20 accepted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as an
21 acceptable impact methodology. So although we're
22 impacting greater than 25 percent to the CTH for
23 Vernal Pool E, an analysis of the migratory
24 vectors that are supporting both the force of
25 wetland habitat and the terrestrial habitat to

1 Vernal Pool E, those vectors are primarily
2 associated with the wetland, surrounding wetland
3 system, and also the terrestrial habitat both
4 adjacent to that wetland and also into the
5 northern portion of the project.

6 So our conclusions are that even though
7 we're impacting more than 25 percent of the CTH,
8 we're not significantly impacting the principal
9 vectors of migration of the typical vernal pool
10 indicator species that are utilizing both the
11 force of wetland habitat and the terrestrial
12 habitat for feeding, for cover, and also for
13 hibernation. And so the project will not have a
14 likely adverse effect to that breeding population
15 that's using Vernal Pool E.

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you
17 for that, Mr. Gustafson.

18 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're
19 welcome.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: I would like to switch
21 gears here and unfortunately go back to the
22 interconnection. I thought I had it, and then as
23 more questions came up, I don't think I have it.
24 Turning to drawing E-100. I'll give you a moment
25 to get there. All set?

1 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Yes.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: In the checkered box
3 it said pad-mount switchgear, and it has primary
4 metering within that pad-mount switchgear. Is
5 that the utilities' revenue meter or is that the
6 project's primary meter?

7 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
8 Morissette, this is Peter Candelaria. This is the
9 project's meter, so this is our meter. It's
10 revenue grade metering, so highly accurate, but it
11 is our meter.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: That's what I was
13 afraid of. So the three poles that are mentioned,
14 that were mentioned that would go on the property
15 towards the utility pole for the point of
16 interconnection, will include equipment on those
17 three poles; is that right?

18 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): That's
19 right.

20 MR. MORISSETTE: There will be a
21 revenue meter, a GOAB switch on those 30 to 40
22 foot distribution poles?

23 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): That's
24 correct. That's fairly typical.

25 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Have you had

1 discussions with Eversource about including the
2 utility revenue metering as a pad-mount?

3 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): We've made
4 several attempts to have that conversation with
5 Eversource. They have not been very accommodating
6 in making any adjustments to their standard
7 details.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So the three
9 poles are going to go on the access road to the
10 internal pad-mount switchgear so you'll have three
11 poles within that access route, correct?

12 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): That's our
13 understanding. Eversource's equipment is
14 installed, so we're working as hard as we can
15 to --

16 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Well, again,
17 that's unfortunate Eversource is not hearing our
18 cry for pad-mount equipment. Very good. Thank
19 you for your response. That concludes my
20 questioning. Thank you, everyone on the panel.

21 We will now move on. We'll continue
22 with cross-examination of the petitioner by the
23 Town of Stonington, Attorney Avena.

24 MR. AVENA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25 Again, it's for the Town of North Stonington, just

1 to the north of Stonington.

2 MR. MORISSETTE: Oh, sorry. Thank you.

3 MR. AVENA: I'll note for the record as
4 the local that the other hospital is Lawrence &
5 Memorial Hospital in New London. They are both
6 Yale subsidiary hospitals, and they are both
7 equidistant. I suppose Westerly is a little bit
8 shorter, but they are both full facility
9 hospitals.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you for that.

11 MR. AVENA: And with that,
12 Mr. Chairman, the town has been pleased to
13 continue as a party to this second hearing on this
14 matter, but has, you know, been heard and listened
15 to at that Board of Selectmen meeting and deem the
16 resubmittal as comfortable with the fact that the
17 applicant has not gone into the north parcel on
18 this particular application, which we thought it
19 was of some critical significance environmentally
20 for sure and for that area. And so we have no
21 other, further questions at this time of the
22 panel.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
24 Avena. On the agenda we will now continue with
25 the appearance of the Town of North Stonington.

1 Will the party present its witness panel for the
2 purpose of taking the oath, and Attorney Bachman
3 will administer the oath.

4 Attorney Avena, do you have any
5 witnesses?

6 MR. AVENA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 We have not submitted any written submissions on
8 this new application, and we have no witnesses for
9 you today.

10 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
11 Avena.

12 I will ask Attorney Bachman how to
13 proceed in this situation with no witness to be
14 sworn in and no testimony to be cross-examined. I
15 would believe that would conclude our hearing for
16 today, but I will yield to Attorney Bachman for
17 guidance.

18 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
19 Morissette. The only item from the town that is
20 in the record is the town's comments just on the
21 request to reopen before the Council, you know,
22 voted to reopen the matter. And I would just ask
23 Attorney Baldwin if he had any objection to adding
24 the town's comments on the request to reopen to
25 the municipal comments in the record.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
2 Bachman.

3 Attorney Baldwin?

4 MR. BALDWIN: We certainly have no
5 objection to the First Selectman's comments, dated
6 December 14, 2021, Mr. Morissette, and we thank
7 them again for their cooperation throughout this
8 entire process.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
10 Baldwin.

11 So Attorney Bachman, that would then
12 conclude our cross-examination of the Town of
13 North Stonington and we can move to recess, if
14 that's correct, if you would concur.

15 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr.
16 Morissette. Certainly, we can close the
17 evidentiary record at this point as long as
18 Council members or Mr. Perrone do not have any
19 outstanding homework assignments or questions,
20 which I think they covered when they returned from
21 the break, but certainly if there are any further
22 questions this would be the time. Thank you.

23 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you.

24 So before we close for this afternoon,
25 I will poll Mr. Perrone and the Council members

1 for any additional questions.

2 Mr. Perrone?

3 MR. PERRONE: I have none, Mr.
4 Morissette.

5 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
6 Perrone.

7 Mr. Lynch?

8 MR. LYNCH: Negative.

9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

10 Mr. Silvestri?

11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.
12 Morissette. Just a clarification because I'm also
13 a little bit confused on that interconnection. So
14 what I found back in the original proceedings that
15 we had, and I just want to make sure this is still
16 consistent, it says, The final location of the
17 three utility poles that will be used to
18 interconnect the project to the existing
19 electrical distribution system is solely
20 determined by Eversource. The locations have not
21 yet been identified. Based on preliminary
22 conversations with Eversource, the poles are
23 likely to be located within the proposed laydown
24 yard between Providence New London Turnpike and
25 the medium voltage switchgear near the

1 southwesterly solar array.

2 Is that still current? Is that still
3 true?

4 THE WITNESS (Candelaria): Mr.
5 Silvestri, this is Peter Candelaria. That is
6 still where we are currently sitting with
7 Eversource. No update.

8 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you
9 for the clarification. That's all I have, Mr.
10 Morissette. Thanks again.

11 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.
12 Silvestri.

13 Mr. Nguyen, anything further?

14 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, Mr. Morissette. I
15 just want to thank you, Attorney Avena, for
16 information regarding the local hospital, the
17 Lawrence & Memorial Hospital.

18 And my question to the panel is that,
19 given the information that you received, would you
20 be able to go back and take a look and update or
21 add in the contact list on the appendix A of the
22 Emergency Action Plan?

23 THE WITNESS (Weaver): Yes, as a part
24 of finalizing the Emergency Access Plan we
25 certainly would be willing to add that hospital in

1 as well.

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

4 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen.
5 Ms. Cooley, any follow-up questions?

6 MS. COOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
7 I'm all set.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you.
9 Mr. Collette, any follow-up questions?

10 MR. COLLETTE: No further questions.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have
13 no further questions either.

14 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette?

15 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, Mr. Silvestri.

16 MR. SILVESTRI: I apologize, I did
17 overlook one question that I had. When the
18 applicant was talking about the racking, it
19 mentions that it could accommodate slopes up to 20
20 percent, and it gave a breakdown that slopes would
21 go maybe to 17 and a half percent. My last
22 question that I have, and I again appreciate the
23 opportunity to ask it, are there any slopes at 20
24 percent or greater than 20 percent with the
25 modified proposal?

1 THE WITNESS (Weaver): This is Ali
2 Weaver. No, there are not. 17 and a half percent
3 is the greatest slope.

4 MR. SILVESTRI: Excellent. Thank you
5 very much.

6 Thank you, Mr. Morissette. Again, my
7 apologies.

8 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you,
9 Mr. Silvestri.

10 Very good. So that will conclude our
11 hearing for today. The Council will recess until
12 6:30 p.m., at which time we will commence with the
13 public comment session of this remote public
14 hearing. So thank you everyone, and we'll see you
15 tonight at 6:30 p.m. Thank you.

16 (Whereupon the witnesses were excused
17 and the hearing adjourned at 4:13 p.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 97 pages
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
6 before the Connecticut Siting Council of the
7 REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: PETITION NO. 1443A,
8 SR NORTH STONINGTON, LLC PETITION FOR A
9 DECLARATORY RULING, PURSUANT TO CONNECTICUT
10 GENERAL STATUTES SECTION 4-176 AND SECTION 16-50k,
11 FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND
12 OPERATION OF A 9.9-MEGAWATT AC SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC
13 ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITY ON FIVE PARCELS
14 LOCATED NORTH AND SOUTH OF PROVIDENCE NEW LONDON
15 TURNPIKE (STATE ROUTE 184), WEST OF BOOMBRIDGE
16 ROAD AND NORTH OF INTERSTATE 95 IN NORTH
17 STONINGTON, CONNECTICUT, AND ASSOCIATED ELECTRICAL
18 INTERCONNECTION. REOPENING OF THIS PETITION BASED
19 ON CHANGED CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO CONNECTICUT
20 GENERAL STATUTES, SECTION 4-181a(b), which was
21 held before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on
22 February 15, 2022.
23
24
25

Lisa Warner

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

I N D E X

PETITIONER'S WITNESSES: (Sworn on page 10/11)

**PETER CANDELARIA
ALI WEAVER
MATT BRAWLEY
DEAN GUSTAFSON
VINCENT GINTER**

EXAMINERS:	PAGE
Mr. Baldwin (Direct)	11
Mr. Perrone (Start of cross)	14, 73
Mr. Lynch	37
Mr. Silvestri	51, 94, 96
Mr. Nguyen	74, 95
Ms. Cooley	79
Mr. Collette	82
Mr. Morissette	84

**PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS
(Received in evidence)**

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
II-B-1	Motion to reopen based on changed conditions, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-181a(b) on Petition for a Declaratory Ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-176 and Section 16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 9.9-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on five parcels located north and south of Providence New London Turnpike (State Route 184), west of Boombridge Road and north of Interstate 95 in North Stonington, Connecticut, dated December 1, 2021, and attachments.	14
II-B-2	Petitioner sign posting affidavit, dated January 28, 2022	14
II-B-3	Petitioner responses to Council interrogatories, Set One, dated February 8, 2022	14