PULLMAN &COMLEY

Lee D. Hoffman
90 State House Square
Hartford, CT 06103-3702
p 860 424 4315
f 860 424 4370
lhoffman@pullcom.com
www.pullcom.com

February 8, 2023

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND HAND DELIVERY
Melanie Bachman
Executive Director/Staff Attorney
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Petition 1551 - Petition of C-Tec Solar, LLC for a Declaratory Ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is Required for the Proposed Construction, Operation and Maintenance of a Solar-Based Electric Generating Facility, with an Output of 1.3 MW, to be Located at Deming Road, Berlin, Connecticut

Dear Ms. Bachman:

I am writing on behalf of my client, C-Tec Solar, LLC, in connection with the above-referenced Petition. With this letter, I am enclosing the original and fifteen copies of the Responses to the Interrogatories issued by the Council on January 17, 2023, along with Exhibits A-D for these responses.

Should you have any questions concerning this submittal, please contact me at your convenience. I certify that copies of this submittal have been submitted to all parties on the Application's Service List as of this date.

Sincerely,

Lee D. Hoffman

Lee D. Hoffman
Enclosures

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

C-Tec, LLC Petition for a Declaratory Ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-716 and §16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 1.3-meggawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility located at the former New Britain landfill on Deming Road east of the intersection with Christian Lane, Berlin, Connecticut and associated electrical interconnection

Petition No. 1551

February 8, 2022

Petitioner C-Tec, LLC hereby submits the following responses to the Interrogatories that were directed to C-Tec, LLC by the Connecticut Siting Council on January 17, 2023.

Project Development

1. **What is the estimated cost of the project?**

   Approximately $3,000,000.

2. **Is the project, or any portion of the project, proposed to be undertaken by state departments, institutions or agencies, or to be funded in whole or in part by the state through any contract or grant?**

   No.

3. **What is the revenue mechanism for the proposed project? Is the Project being developed through a Request for Proposals with the City of New Britain?**

   The project was developed and awarded through a request for proposal process with the City of New Britain.

4. **Was this Project bid into any State-program such as the Shared Clean Energy Facility Program? If yes, provide more information.**

   The project was not bid into the SCEF program, however, the project was bid into the LREC/ZREC program before that program was retired as well as the virtual net metering program.

5. **Referencing Petition Attachment C, did the Town of Berlin express concerns about the Project during the virtual meeting held on or about September 15, 2022? If yes, what were their concerns and how were they addressed?**

At that meeting, the Town of Berlin provided one comment to CTEC Solar, which was its concern that there would be a solar PV project being placed on a parcel of land that wasn't powering a significant load or that had a meter on the property. Given the fact that output is being sold through the LREC/ZREC and virtual net metering programs, it was explained that this should not be an issue.

6. If the project is approved, identify all permits necessary for construction and operation and which entity will hold the permit(s)?

CTEC Solar anticipates that in addition to an approval by the Siting Council of this Petition, the Project will require a General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities ("Construction General Permit") and a disruption permit for the landfill, both of which will be issued by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("DEEP"). The project will also require local building and electrical permits. All permits would be held by CTEC Solar LLC.

Proposed Site

7. In the lease agreement with the property owner, are there any provisions related to decommissioning or site restoration at the end of the project's useful life?

The lease contains the following provisions:

ARTICLE 6
MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
Tenant shall repair and maintain, in good repair and in conformity with Laws (except for any compliance issues attributable to Landlord's use of the Property), those portions of the Premises and the Solar Power Facilities located thereon. During the Term, Tenant shall maintain the Solar Power Facilities in good working condition and shall maintain the Premises in good condition and repair.

ARTICLE 7
SURRENDER OF PREMISES AND REMOVAL OF EQUIPMENT
At the end of the Term, Tenant shall surrender the Premises and remove the Solar Power Facilities at its sole cost and expense (other than if such termination and removal is as a result of default by Landlord) within one hundred eighty (180) days after the end of Term, and shall return the Premises to its original condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted.

8. Provide a decommissioning plan to summarize the plans to remove equipment and restore the site after the operational life has been reached and/or the project is removed from service.

The requested report is attached as Exhibit A hereto.

9. What entity manages the landfill?

The City of New Britain.

10. What is the distance and direction from the edge of the solar facility to the nearest residence?

The nearest residence is located at 244 Deming Road, approximately 1151 feet northeast of the edge of the solar facility.

Energy Output

11. Is the project being designed to accommodate a potential future battery storage system? If so, please indicate the anticipated size of the system, where it may be located on the site, and the impact it may have on Project power purchase agreements.

There is currently no battery storage system contemplated for this site. Depending on state programs encouraging battery storage systems in the future, the site could be amended to accommodate such systems.

12. Would the project be submitted to participate in the ISO-NE Forward Capacity Auction? If yes, which auction(s) and capacity commitment period(s)?

It is unclear at this time that the Project will be participating in the ISO-NE Forward Capacity Auction. At this time, it has not done so, and has no capacity commitments.

13. Petition pp. 9-10 states, "…the Project will generate the majority of its power during the summer electrical peak, it will provide *peaking resources* when the State has its greatest need – in turn, decreasing energy costs for ratepayers statewide." (Emphasis added). ISO-NE generally defines peaking resources as quick-start, dispatchable resources that typically operate less than 10% of the year. Would a more accurate statement be that the Project would help serve summer peak loads? Explain.

Yes. The Project will produce most of its electricity during the summer months, which are traditionally the time of peak electric demand in Connecticut and New England.

Site Components and Solar Equipment

14. What is the approximate size of the ballasts supporting the solar panels?

The ballasts are approximately two and a half feet wide by nine and a half feet long and a foot thick. Each ballast weighs approximately 3,575 pounds.

Interconnection

15. Referencing Petition p. 6, what is the status of the interconnection application with Eversource?

The interconnection application process has been completed and an interconnection agreement has been executed.

16. Referencing Petition p. 7, what would be the height of the utility poles above ground level after installation?

Approximately forty feet.

Public Safety

17. Would the project comply with the Connecticut State Building Code - 2022, National Electrical Code, the National Electrical Safety Code and any applicable National Fire Protection Association codes and standards including, but not limited to, NFPA Code Section 11.12.3?

Yes. The Project will comply with these codes and all applicable codes and standards.

18. Referencing Petition Attachment A, p. 22, clarify the following;

a. The property at 131 Deming Road is referred to as residential; however, this address appears to be an industrial property.

b. The property at 604 Berlin Turnpike is referred to as being to the north-northwest and residential, however this address is the abutting property to the south.

c. What is the projected noise level at the nearest property line?

a. There was an error in the Petition. The property at 131 Deming Road should have been referred to as industrial property.

b. The property located at 604 Berlin Turnpike is to the south of the Project and is classified as GI-2 (General Industry 2).

c. The nearest property line from the Project is approximately 231 feet to the southern property boundary with 604 Berlin Turnpike. The projected noise level at that location is calculated to be 28.05 dBA, well below the most conservative standard applicable to Class A (typically residential) receptors.

19. Describe manual shut-off procedures in the event of an emergency.

The Project will have an emergency shut off switch at ground level with appropriate signage that will be accessible to emergency personnel.

Environmental

20. Would the nearest residential properties have year-round or seasonal views of the facility?

The residential properties that are nearest to the Project are located on the south side of Deming Road, northeast of the facility and on the west side of Christian Lane, west of the facility. As shown on the viewshed maps provided in Appendix F of Exhibit A to the Petition, there is no predicted visibility along Christian Lane. Seasonal visibility is predicted to extend along Deming Road; some visibility may be experienced along the roadside at residential properties south of Deming Road, east of the facility.

Facility Construction

21. Did the Petitioner discuss the Project with the DEEP Stormwater Program prior to filing for a General Permit on November 21, 2022? If yes, what suggestions/comments did the DEEP Stormwater Division have regarding the Project? Were these suggestions/comments incorporated in the Project design?

The Petitioner met with representatives of DEEP, including the DEEP Stormwater Program, on October 18, 2022. A summary of that meeting was prepared by Amy Richardson of DEEP and is attached to these Responses as Exhibit B. Based on the comments, no changes to the Project design presented at that time were required.

22. What effect would runoff from the drip edge of each row of solar panels have on the landfill cap or site drainage patterns? Would channelization below the drip edge be expected?

Channelization along the drip edge is not expected. In general, the rows of solar panels are not considered "closed systems" because there are gaps between each module (both north/south and east/west). As a result, stormwater will flow off of the panels in various locations as the panels follow the existing contours and the drip edge will not impact the Site's drainage patterns. In addition, the Project does not disturb existing, fully established slopes of less than 15% that drain from the center of the capped landfill omnidirectionally.

23. Would ballasts be cast on-site? If yes, where would this activity occur?

No. Pre-cast ballasts will be brought onto the site.

24. Submit photographs of the proposed solar facility site construction area with descriptive captions and/or a map identifying the locations of the photographs.

A Remote Field Review has been attached to these Responses as Exhibit C.

25. What are the construction hours/days of week?

The construction hours are anticipated to be from 7a.m. to 5p.m., Monday thru Friday. Occasional weekend hours may also be necessary, but such hours cannot be ascertained at this time.

Maintenance/Decommissioning

26. Would replacement modules be stored on-site in the event solar panels are damaged or are not functioning properly? If so, where? How would damaged panels be detected?

Replacement modules will be stored in an offsite warehouse. Damaged panels would be detected through routine maintenance, inspection, and remote system monitoring.

27. Has the manufacturer of the proposed solar panels conducted Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) testing to determine if the panels would be characterized as hazardous waste at the time of disposal under current regulatory criteria? If so, submit information that indicates the proposed solar modules would not be characterized as hazardous waste. If not, would the Petitioner agree to install solar panels that are not classified as hazardous waste through TCLP testing?

The manufacturer has conducted TCLP testing, and the panels have been characterized as not being hazardous waste under current regulations. A copy of those test results is included with these Responses as Exhibit D.

28. Would the City of New Britain or the Petitioner manage vegetation within the solar array? If the Petitioner is responsible, are there reporting protocols to the City of New Britain and/or DEEP if issues with the landfill cap are discovered during facility inspections/maintenance?

Petitioner will manage the vegetation within the solar array. In terms of reporting potential cap issues, the Petitioner's anticipated maintenance activities will not disturb the surface of the landfill. Should observations of issues with the cap be observed by Petitioner, they will be reported to the City of New Britain.