

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Petition No. 1572

East Windsor Solar Two, LLC, Petition for a

Declaratory Ruling, Pursuant to Connecticut General

Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the Proposed

Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a

4.0-Megawatt AC Solar Photovoltaic Electric Generating

Facility Located at 31 Thrall Road, East Windsor,

Connecticut, and Associated Electrical Interconnection

Zoom Remote Council Meeting (Teleconference), on Thursday, September 7, 2023, beginning at 2 p.m.

Held Before:

JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer

1	Appearances:
2	Council Members:
3	JOHN MORISSETTE, (Hearing Officer)
4	
5	BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI,
6	DEEP Designee
7	
8	QUAT NGUYEN,
9	PURA Designee
10	
11	ROBERT HANNON
12	ROBERT SILVESTRI
13	
14	Council Staff:
15	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
16	Executive Director and Staff Attorney
17	
18	MICHAEL PERRONE
19	Siting Analyst
20	
21	LISA FONTAINE,
22	Fiscal Administrative Officer
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances:(cont'd)
2	For East Windsor Solar II, LLC (EWS2):
3	ROBINSON & COLE, LLP
4	280 Trumbull Street
5	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
6	By: KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQ.
7	KBaldwin@rc.com
8	860.275.8345
9	
10	For The Town of East Windsor:
11	UPDIKE, KELLY & SPELLACY, P.C.
12	Goodwin Square
13	225 Asylum Street, 20th Floor
14	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
15	By: ROBERT M. DeCRESCENZO, ESQ.
16	RDeCrescenzo@uks.com
17	860.548.2625
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Begin: 2 p.m.)

THE HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon, ladies and

gentlemen. Can everyone hear me okay?

Very good. Thank you so much.

This public hearing is called to order this Thursday, September 7, 2023, at 2 p.m. My name is John Morissette, Member and Presiding Officer of the Connecticut Siting Council.

Other members of the Council are Brian

Golembiewski, designee for Commissioner Katie

Dykes of the Department of Energy and

Environmental Protection; Quat Nguyen, designee

for Chairman Marissa Paslick Gillett of the Public

Utilities Regulatory Authority; Robert Hannon; and

Robert Silvestri.

Members of the staff are Melanie Bachman,

Executive Director and Staff Attorney; Michael

Perrone, Siting Analyst; and Lisa Fontaine, Fiscal

Administrative Officer.

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

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

Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative

Procedure Act upon a petition from East Windsor

Solar II, LLC, for a declaratory ruling pursuant

to the Connecticut General Statutes Section 4-176

and Section 16-50k for the proposed construction,

maintenance, and operation of a 4 megawatt AC

solar voltaic electric generating facility located

at 31 Thrall Road in East Windsor, Connecticut,

and the associated electrical interconnection.

This petition was received by the Council on May 5, 2023. The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this public hearing was published in the Journal Inquirer on June 26, 2023.

Upon this Council's request, the Petitioner erected a sign in the vicinity of the proposed site so as to inform the public of the name of the petitioner, the type of the facility, the public hearing date, and contact information for the Council, including the website and phone number.

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

The parties and interveners in the proceedings are as follows. East Windsor Solar

II, LLC, represented by Kenneth C. Baldwin, Esq., of Robinson and Cole, LLP; the party, the Town of East Windsor, represented by Robert M.

DeCrescenzo, Esq., of Updike, Kelly and Spellacy, PC.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, a copy which is available on the Council's Petition Number 1572 webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this remote public hearing, and the Council's citizens guide to Siting Council procedures.

Interested persons may join in any session of this public hearing to listen, but no public comments will be received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session.

At the end of the evidentiary session, we will recess until 6:30 p.m. for a public comment session. Please be advised that any person may be removed from the evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

At 6:30 p.m., the public comment session will be reserved for members of the public who have signed up in advance to make brief statements into the record. I wish to note that the petitioner, parties and intervenors, including their representatives and witnesses are not allowed to participate in the public comment session.

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

The verbatim transcript of this public hearing will be posted on the Council's Petition Number 1572 webpage and deposited with the East Windsor Town Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

Please be advised that the Council does not issue permits for stormwater. If the proposed project is approved by the Council, a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, DEEP stormwater permit is independently required. DEEP could hold a public hearing on any stormwater permit application.

Please also be advised that the Council's project evaluation criteria under the statute does

1 not include the consideration of property value. The Council will take a 10 to 15-minute break 2 3 at a convenient juncture at around 3:30 p.m. 4 We'll now move to administrative notices taken by the Council. I wish to call your 5 attention to those items in the hearing program 6 marked Roman numeral 1B, items 1 through 101. 7 8 Does the petitioner or any party or 9 intervener have an objection to the items that the 10 Council has administratively noticed? 11 Attorney Baldwin, good afternoon. 12 MR. BALDWIN: We have no objection. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. 14 Attorney DeCrescenzo, any objections? 15 MR. DeCRESCENZO: No objection. 16 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 17 Accordingly, I hereby administratively notice 18 these existing documents. 19 We'll now move onto the appearance by the 20 petitioner. Will the petitioner present its 21 witness panel over the purposes of taking the 22 oath? Attorney Bachman will administer the oath. 23 Attorney Baldwin, please begin by verifying 24 all exhibits by the appropriate sworn witnesses --25 after the oath.

MR. BALDWIN: Good afternoon, everyone.

Kenneth Baldwin with Robinson & Cole on behalf of the applicant, East Windsor Solar II, LLC.

Our witness panel today consists of five members. To my far left, I'll start -- my far right, I'll start there -- is Robert Burns, professional engineer with All Points Technology and the project engineer.

Next to me on my right, your left is Dean Gustafson, a senior wetland scientist and professional soil scientist with All-Points Technology.

To my left is Bryan Fitzgerald, the Director of Development with East Windsor Solar II, LLC.

Next is Brad Parsons, a professional engineer and the Director of Design and Permitting with East Windsor Solar II, LLC.

And then to the far left, your right, is Andy Roland, a senior project manager and environmental engineer with WSP.

And I offer them to be sworn at this time.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

Attorney Bachman?

MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

- 1 BRADLEY J. PARSONS,
- 2 BRYAN FITZGERALD,
- 3 ANDY ROLAND,
- 4 ROBERT BURNS,
- 5 DEAN GUSTAFSON,

called as witnesses, being sworn by

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, were examined and

testified under oath as follows:

MR. BALDWIN: I have six exhibits listed in the hearing program under Roman two, subsection B. They include the petition with all of its associated exhibits and figures, dated May 5, 2023; the petitioner's responses to the Council Interrogatory Set 1, dated July 18, 2023; the petitioner's sign posting affidavit, dated August 24, 2023; the petitioner's responses to the Town of East Windsor Interrogatories, dated August 31st, 2023; the petitioner's environmental and community noise assessment, dated August 31st, 2023, concluded by WSP.

And I should explain just ahead of time when we were preparing for the hearing we ran into a problem with the expert we were planning to bring from Brooks Acoustics who provided the initial

1 noise report that was included in the petition. 2 We got WSP involved. 3 Mr. Roland completed a supplemental report 4 which we submitted into the record, and Mr. Roland 5 is here today to answer any questions regarding 6 noise from the proposed facility. 7 And our last Exhibit Number 6 is the 8 petitioner's witness resumes, which we submitted 9 to the Council on August 31st. 10 And I offer them, subject to verification by 11 the witness panel. 12 If I could ask our witness panel then, did 13 you -- we'll do this as a panel, as we typically 14 do, Mr. Morissette. 15 Did you prepare or assist in the preparation 16 of the exhibits listed in the hearing program 17 under Roman two, subsection B, items one through 18 six? Mr. Burns? 19 THE WITNESS (Burns): I did. 20 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 21 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 22 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Fitzgerald? 23 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): I did. 24 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parsons? 25 THE WITNESS (Parsons): I did.

1 MR. BALDWIN: And Mr. Roland? THE WITNESS (Roland): I did. 2 3 MR. BALDWIN: Do you have any corrections, 4 modifications or amendments to offer to any of 5 those exhibits? 6 Mr. Burns? 7 THE WITNESS (Burns): No. 8 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 9 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): One small correction in 10 Applicant Exhibit 1, the petition narrative on 11 page 27. It's the tenth line from the top that 12 starts with development criteria. 13 And the missing word in the following 14 sentence that reads, additionally the proposed 15 facility does result in removal of intact forest, 16 the word "not" should be inserted between "does" 17 and "result." 18 So it should read, additionally the proposed 19 facility does not result in removal of any intact 20 forest. 21 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. 22 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yeah, you're welcome. 23 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Fitzgerald, any amendments or 24 modifications to offer? 25 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): No.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parsons? 2 THE WITNESS (Parsons): No. 3 MR. BALDWIN: And Mr. Roland? 4 THE WITNESS (Roland): No. 5 MR. BALDWIN: And with those modifications, is the 6 information contained in those exhibits true and 7 accurate to the best of your knowledge? 8 Mr. Burns? 9 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. 10 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 11 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 12 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Fitzgerald? 13 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Yes. 14 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parsons? 15 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes. 16 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Roland? 17 THE WITNESS (Roland): Yes. MR. BALDWIN: And do you adopt the information 18 19 contained in those exhibits as your testimony in 20 this proceeding? 21 Mr. Burns? 22 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes. 23 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Gustafson? 24 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes. 25 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Fitzgerald?

1 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Yes. MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parsons? 2 3 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes. 4 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Roland? 5 THE WITNESS (Roland): Yes. 6 MR. BALDWIN: I offer them as full exhibits, 7 Mr. Morissette. 8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. Does the Town object to the admission of the 9 10 petitioner's exhibits? Attorney DeCrescenzo? 11 MR. DeCRESCENZO: No objection. 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 13 The exhibits are hereby admitted. 14 We will now begin with the cross-examination 15 of the petitioner by the Council, starting with 16 Mr. Perrone, followed by Mr. Silvestri. 17 Mr. Perrone? 18 MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 19 Referencing the response to Council 20 Interrogatory 35, do the tracker motors operate 21 and produce noise continuously? Or do they 22 operate intermittently to adjust the panels 23 periodically during the day? THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons. The tracker motors 24 25 operate intermittently during the day very, very

1 slowly when they're moving, unless they need to go 2 to stow mode, but that takes a matter of seconds. 3 So that's still technically kind of an 4 intermittent operation there. 5 MR. PERRONE: So they make periodic adjustments rather 6 than a slow continuous. 7 Regarding the electrical interconnection, 8 does the existing electrical distribution on 9 Thrall Road, do you have three phase? 10 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, we do. 11 MR. PERRONE: What is the line voltage of the proposed 12 electrical interconnection? 13 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. 23 kV. 14 MR. PERRONE: Regarding the interconnection, could the 15 number of poles be reduced by utilizing 16 pad-mounted equipment rather than pole-mounted 17 equipment? THE WITNESS (Parsons): The pad-mounted equipment could 18 19 not be used, mainly because most of the equipment 20 that's being required is -- is required by 21 Eversource, and there, they're their poles. 22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Just as a reminder, could you 23 please state your name before responding for the 24 Thank you. record? 25 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Sorry. Brad Parsons.

1	MR. PERRONE: Regarding the proposed access drive, do
2	you have an approximate linear length for total
3	access length?
4	THE WITNESS (Burns): Yeah, this is Robert Burns from
5	APT. The the length of the access drive is 920
6	feet from the street to the end.
7	MR. PERRONE: And turning to response to Council
8	Interrogatory 48, the racking posts would be
9	installed to an approximate depth of about ten
10	feet.
11	How would the racking posts be driven into
12	the ground?
13	THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons. The racking posts
14	would be driven into the ground with your your
15	standard pile drive equipment.
16	MR. PERRONE: And what if you hit subsurface
17	resistance, such as ledge?
18	Would you drill through it?
19	THE WITNESS (Parsons): Where we again, Brad
20	Parsons. This could there could be a
21	possibility where we would drill through it.
22	However, there are other, other measures that
23	could be taken into account to deal with the
24	refusal method as well. That could be a concrete
25	pad at the surface to deal with any lateral

1 movement as a result of the lack of depth. 2 MR. PERRONE: With regard to the proposed fence, as 3 mentioned in response to Council Interrogatory 44, 4 could you describe the features of the farm-style 5 livestock fence versus the proposed chain-link 6 fence? 7 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. This 8 chain length fence is -- is a standard chain-link 9 fence, and it would be at a height of -- we had it at a height of seven feet. I believe we had a 10 11 privacy mesh along the front side. 12 An ag -- ag-style fence usually consists of 13 wood posts and a lighter gauge fencing material 14 than your standard chain-link fence. 15 MR. PERRONE: Do you know the approximate cost 16 difference between the farm-style livestock fence 17 versus the chain link? 18 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The agricultural fence is 19 probably actually 25 to 30 percent less. 20 Brad Parsons -- 25 to 30 percent less than the 21 chain-link fence. 22 But with the agricultural fence, I'd just 23 like to add that we would not be able to provide 24 any screening, mesh screening on that.

MR. PERRONE: With regard to construction, what types

25

of vehicles would be arriving at the site, and approximately how many per day during construction?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. You'd have various different types of equipment arriving at site, mainly pickup trucks. You'd have equipment such as the pile drive equipment, a smaller excavator for any of the trenching and access road construction.

You would also have delivery trucks, whether they're semis or box trucks, dropping off and unloading equipment. As far as the number of trips per day, it's probably something I need to just investigate and get back to you on that.

- MR. PERRONE: And for construction crews and staff, where would they park?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): They would park along, on the site, along the -- the access road.
- MR. PERRONE: How frequently would the site be visited for maintenance purposes?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): The site would be visited for maintenance purposes probably anywhere for a couple times a year, depending on the need and at site, and if there are any -- any issues. But mainly the most visits would likely be by the

1 sheep grazer during the time of year when the 2 sheep are on site, as they would be checking on 3 the flock frequently. 4 MR. PERRONE: Approximately how frequently would the 5 sheep be visited? THE WITNESS (Parsons): It could be daily. It could 6 7 be -- again, Brad Parsons. It could be daily. It 8 could be two to three times a week, probably May 9 through October. 10 MR. PERRONE: With the project participating in the 11 SCEF program, would the electrical energy and RECs 12 be sold to Eversource per the tariff terms 13 agreement? 14 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Bryan Fitzgerald. Yes, 15 that's correct. Electricity and RECs would be 16 delivered to Eversource per the terms and conditions of the tariff agreement. 17 18 MR. PERRONE: Referencing page 8 of the petition, what 19 was the output capacity of the project on the same 20 distribution circuit that was dropped from the 21 interconnection queue? 22 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): This is Bryan Fitzgerald. 23 Brad, I believe it was about two megawatts AC of 24 nameplate capacity that was ahead of us in the 25 queue that was dropped.

MR. PERRONE: And how is the project consistent with the state plan of conservation and development?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. I would say that the -- the project is consistent with the State's plan as it relates to the energy goals, the -- the comprehensive energy strategy of the State of Connecticut, as it is a new electric generating resource that is zero emission or class one.

Meaning that it's not going to produce any -- any air emissions while in operation, while producing clean renewable energy.

- MR. PERRONE: Referencing the response to Council

 Interrogatory Number 4, which is the cost of the project, is that cost number inclusive of the electrical interconnection?
- THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. That cost number is inclusive of the electrical interconnection.
- MR. PERRONE: Referencing the response to Council

 Interrogatory 33, EWST notes that it's not aware
 of any specific media required to suppress a fire
 at a solar facility. Would water be used for fire
 suppression in such a situation?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons. Yes, it's our

understanding that water would be used,

potentially be used in a fire suppression

situation, but usually it's mainly containing any

fires around the site.

MR. PERRONE: My next questions are related to visibility. Referencing the response to Council Interrogatory 44, privacy mesh is proposed along Thrall Road.

If we look at sheet OP-2, could you indicate where the privacy mesh begins and ends?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Perrone, brad Parsons again. So the intention would be for the privacy mesh to begin at the -- if we're looking at sheet OP-2, the privacy mesh would begin at the -- the gates of the facility where the access road is, and would extend to the east along the fence, along the frontage of Thrall Road, along the backside of the landscaping, all the way to the -- to the north corner of the -- of the facility near where the callout says, existing tree line, typical.

MR. PERRONE: And why were those sections selected for the privacy mesh?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Those sections were selected for the privacy mesh to provide additional

screening for the site, where natural vegetation is -- is not being maintained or does not, actually does not exist. Again, Brad Parsons.

- MR. PERRONE: With respect to the proposed landscape plantings, would they be replaced if they were to die off?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons, yes, those -- those plantings would be replaced if they were to die off.
- MR. PERRONE: How frequently would there be inspections of the condition of the plantings?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Perrone, this is Brad
 Parsons. I think the condition of the plantings
 would be inspected on a more frequent basis,
 probably monthly on their initial, once they were
 initially planted to ensure that the existing
 health is maintained and that they're receiving
 the appropriate water.

Once they've gone through and established after that, they would be inspected on a periodic basis when we do our -- our inspections of the entire site as part of our -- our regular O and M maintenance.

MR. PERRONE: Turning to the viewshed map, Pierce

Memorial Park is located to the west, and it's

shaded in orange for the seasonal visibility area.

Could you describe the views of the facility from Pierce Memorial Park?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. I think, you know, the idea of the -- the viewshed map and the seasonal visibility is understanding that there are -- there are significant tree lines in between the facility and Pierce Memorial Park, both on our subject property as well as to the west.

So with full leaf off, could somebody stand in one spot and -- and stare and potentially catch a glimpse of the facility? Yes, but it's not, you know, in full view of the facility. So that's why we -- we've kind of said seasonal visibility is possible.

- MR. PERRONE: Would those leaf-off views between the trees, hypothetically, would they be the upper sections of the panels and the poles, or a direct view?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): It's really a direct -- I think that the way that this viewshed map is intended to be is that the viewshed is taken from the -- from the top of the panels themselves and projected out.

So anything basically from the top of the

panels down has the potential of -- of being visible as part of this viewshed map.

MR. PERRONE: Could you describe the visibility of the facility from the Village of Windsorville?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Perrone, this is Brad Parsons. We don't believe that there's really going to be any real visibility from the -- the Village of Windsorville.

Again, the -- the seasonal visibility
through -- through existing vegetation, both on
and off site is fairly significant once you get
further away from -- form the project, as well as
just what you physically see with -- with the
naked eye at a specific -- specific distance.

So I think this viewshed map, one thing it doesn't take into account is -- is what that is. So could somebody stand there and see it?

Potentially, but it would take some hard stairs to really understand that once you get past a certain distance.

MR. PERRONE: And my last question, referencing the letter from the Department of Agriculture dated March 23rd, would EWS2 keep agricultural co-use operating for the life of the project?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. Yes, East

1 Windsor Solare II would keep agricultural co-use 2 operating for the life of the project. 3 MR. PERRONE: Thank you. That's all I have. 4 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Thank you. 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Perrone. We'll now continue with cross-examination by 7 Mr. Silvestri, followed by Mr. Golembiewski. 8 Mr. Silvestri, good afternoon. 9 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette, and 10 good afternoon, everyone. 11 I'd like to start with a continuation on what 12 Mr. Perrone was asking about the landscape 13 plantings. And I'm looking at figure three, 14 proposed conditions that actually has the 15 landscape plantings in green. 16 A question I have for you, on the eastern 17 side why doesn't the landscape planting continue 18 further north along the fence? 19 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, this is Brad 20 The -- the thought process there was Parsons. 21 that once you get up to basically the middle half 22 of that fence, was that the -- the existing trees 23 along the eastern side will help protect that, the 24 visibility in that corner from -- from the 25 majority of what you could see from Thrall Road,

especially as you're driving by.

MR. SILVESTRI: Now, would that also be the case on the very top corner, if you will, of where the fence is heading in a westerly direction for the house that's in the far northeast corner?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, I think our intention here was that all of the existing vegetation on site around the facility, with the exception of some -- some minor clear, clearing or tree trimming to get the utility poles in, would remain on this site.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Two related questions. The house directly near the access road on Thrall Road, there's no landscape plantings behind it.

Any reason behind that?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): That existing house behind

Thrall Road is -- there's actually a barn right

behind it. And so where -- where we kind of stop

the plantings is right in line with that barn.

And so we don't believe that there, there's really

much visibility beyond the barn from the house as

well.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. The one final question on this figure. Moving further west, there there's nothing for landscape plantings at all along that

western border. Any reason behind that?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, Mr. Silvestri, Brad

Parsons. We're maintaining the existing

vegetation along all of the other sides of the

facility, and that was the rationale of -- of not

having any additional plantings.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Now, thank you for your responses on that.

What I'd like to do now is turn to the interrogatory responses that are dated July 18, 2023. And I'd like to start with number 15 and number 16, if you could have both of those in front of you? And let me know when you're ready. WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Ready,

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Ready, sir.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. On number 15 it has the nearest property line is approximately 42 feet to the west, and then it has the nearest off-site residence is approximately 150 feet to the southeast. And if we shift to number 36, it has the nearest property line is 300 feet to the north.

So I'm confused between three numbers that are there, and could you explain the differences regarding the nearest property line?

1 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, Mr. Silvestri. Parsons again. So the -- the answer to number 15 2 3 was specific to the facility itself and the fence 4 line of that facility. 5 But the response to the interrogatory, the other interrogatory was specific to the equipment 6 7 on site. So the noise generating equipment on 8 site, sir. 9 MR. SILVESTRI: Equipment, being what? 10 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, Brad Parsons. 11 Inverters, transformers, the equipment area. 12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So 300 feet from the inverters 13 and transformers, et cetera. Then going back, you 14 have 42 feet to the west is from the fence line, and 150 feet to the southeast is another fence 15 16 line. Is that correct? THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri -- Mr. Silvestri, 17 18 yes, that is correct. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And I'm not sure if I've seen 20 it. So if it's there, I apologize for repeating 21 it, but with that nearest offsite residence at 150 22 feet to the southeast, what's the worst case noise 23 propagation calculation in dBA? 24 THE WITNESS (Roland): Mr. Silvestri, this is Andy

Roland here. Are you referring to the property

25

across Thrall Road?

Or the property adjacent to the southeast?

MR. SILVESTRI: Well, I'd have to say whatever you identified as the nearest offsite residence at 150 feet to the southeast.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Across the street.

THE WITNESS (Roland): That would be that one across
the street. We -- we did not model noise at that
receptor. The noise model was conducted on the
four closest residential receptors from -measured from the distance of the inverters, which
are located near the center of the site at the end
of the access road.

And those four residential receptors' locations in order of them --

MR. SILVESTRI: And the -- go ahead.

THE WITNESS (Roland): The order of them are 55 Thrall Road, which is what our noise report refers to as the southeast, their most residential receptor; 57 Thrall Road, which is to the northeast; 17 Thrall Road, which is to the southwest at the cut in on the property line; and 19 Thrall Road, which is out to the northwest.

MR. SILVESTRI: And for those four residences, the noise propagation calculations were based on where

1 the inverters and transformers are located and the distance from them. 2 3 THE WITNESS (Roland): Yes, that was the rationale. 4 This is Andy Roland with WSP. That was the 5 rationale for selecting those four locations to 6 model the north street. 7 MR. SILVESTRI: Offhand, do you have the distances for 8 the four that you just mentioned, the 55, 57, 17, 9 and 19? 10 THE WITNESS (Roland): We do. This is Andy Roland with 11 WSP. 12 And again, I'm referencing exhibit --13 Petitioner's Exhibit Environmental and Community 14 Noise Assessment dated August 31st, 2023. And I'm 15 referencing the distances listed on page 3 of that 16 report, which lists four monitoring locations indicated as PL-1, PL-2, PL-3, PL-4. 17 18 And you can also look at a figure, figure two 19 of that exhibit, which is PDF page 18. And the 20 distances are as follows; 1,070 feet to PL-1, 820 21 feet to PL-2, 430 feet to PL-3, and 720 feet to 22 PL-4.23 MR. SILVESTRI: I copy that. Thank you. 24 Okay. Let me move to Interrogatory Number 40 25 and its response. This interrogatory dealt with

the 12 volt battery attached to the solar charger to power the electric fence.

The question I have for you is under what, say, meteorological conditions would the battery not be able to produce power? For example, if you had three consecutive cloudy days, or four, do you have any idea what the cutoff might be that this battery would not have power enough to supply the electric fence?

THE WITNESS (Roland): Mr. Silvestri, I think we'd have to look at potentially -- I think it should provide enough battery or timeline, but I would say the other thing is that it's pretty -- mainly for the sheep and keeping them corralled.

And as far as -- as part of the daily observations or -- or bi-daily observations of the sheep by the shepherd, they would be able to know if that was powered or not, and if that battery needed to be replaced or -- or recharged based off of the, you know, their visits and maintenance of the site.

MR. SILVESTRI: Is this a lead acid, kind of like a car battery?

THE WITNESS (Roland): I would say it's probably, could be something similar to that, but it also could be

23

24

25

a lithium ion battery as well, you know, whatever the sheep grazer has available to them from -from that fence manufacturer as well.

And if we go back to the application under

attachment one, I have a question on the trackers.

Are they self-powered or grid-powered?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Trackers are grid-powered.

MR. SILVESTRI: So there would be some type of tie-in, if you will, to the distribution system that will power up the trackers and not have it come from the solar production itself?

Would that be correct?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, this is Brad That, I guess, is somewhat correct. Parsons. the power -- if the trackers are generating at that point in time and the -- the system is pushing power onto the grid, the tracker motors could be taking power from the solar panels themselves.

However, if they need to be powered, they would get that, ultimately get that power from the grid, too, if necessary from that panel as well.

Okay. Kind of a related question then. MR. SILVESTRI:

You had an estimate that the project is expected to produce more than 7.57 megawatt hours of energy in its first year of operation. Would you include the electrical losses that the trackers might pull from the solar panel in your estimate?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons.

So yes, that -- that estimate, not only does that include electrical losses that the tracker motors might pull, but it also includes electrical losses from the transformers as well as any of the medium voltage cable, shading from any of the trees that are remaining in place around the site as well.

So all the losses associated with the system are -- are included in that estimate.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you for your response.

I want to turn right now to the stormwater basin for a question or two. And when I look at the existing stormwater basin, there's apparently an outlet control structure that's noted in Appendix B. This is the drawing plan of land sheet one of one.

Am I correct in that, first of all, that it's an outlet control structure? And if I'm correct, what's the nature of that control structure?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns from APT. 2 That structure is, by all accounts, a 3 drywell. It was full of debris. So we have not 4 assumed that it's an outlet structure, and we've 5 modeled the pond without its use. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So any, any water that would 7 flow out would just flow by this, this drywell, 8 supposedly? 9 THE WITNESS (Burns): It's fine to have the stormwater 10 infiltrate. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then if you could turn to both 12 drawing OP-1, which is the overall locus plan, and 13 drawing O-P2, the partial site plan? It seems 14 that both equipment pads will be installed within 15 a portion of the existing stormwater basin. 16 Is that correct? THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, this is Brad 17 18 I can take that. So it -- it will be Parsons. 19 the areas where the -- the inverters are. 20 there, they're actually mounted on racks 21 equipment. 22 So while it is an equipment pad, per se, 23 there they're rack mounted equipment. So they 24 will be sitting up off -- off of the ground. 25 Okay. Then when it has -- I've got to MR. SILVESTRI:

blow up my drawing here. Where it has gravel equipment pad, how does that differ from what you just mentioned about racks?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, Brad Parsons. So the gravel equipment pad goes around where -- where the inverters are going. So that longer, smaller rectangle inside of that area is -- is where the inverter racks would go.

And we tend to just install a gravel pad around those mainly just because we've got, you know, a decent amount of foot traffic right there as those are getting installed and maintained.

And then additionally, you'll see that the -the concrete equipment pads are further to the
south on -- on that same drawing, south of those
two longer rectangular pads. And that's where
the -- the transformer and any other AC electrical
equipment would be -- would be located.

MR. SILVESTRI: So the transformers are on concrete.

The inverters are on racks. Correct?

I didn't hear the response.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Sorry, Mr. Silvestri. Again,

Brad Parsons. That that is correct. The

transformers are on concrete and the inverters on

racks with -- with gravel at their base.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And one transformer each per pad. So two transformers all together? THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. Yes, sir. MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. In the event of a transformer oil leak, what measures would you have in place to prevent the oil from reaching the stormwater basin and potentially going somewhere that we don't want it to go? THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Silvestri. So these, these transformers will be using Fr3 oil. It's a biodegradable oil actually derived from -- from vegetable oil. So it's not your standard mineral oil that's been used in transformers previously. So -- but if this were to -- if those

So -- but if this were to -- if those transformers were to leak for any -- any reason, likely based on the grades there, the transformers would actually flow, that leakage would likely flow into those gravel pads around the inverters themselves and likely be contained in -- in that area before reaching the -- the actual stormwater basin.

MR. SILVESTRI: Do you know how much oil the transformers would contain at this point?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, this is Brad Parsons. I

do not know that exact number at this point.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Just a comment from me.

Basically, everything could be biodegradable.

It's just a question of time. To me, oil is oil,

but I hear what you're saying about the certain

But moving on, will the transformers be equipped with low level alarms?

type of oil that would be used there.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, this is Brad

Parsons. I don't believe we will have low level

alarms on -- on the transformers.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. So if you have a leak, how are you going to know that it's leaking if you don't have any alarms?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): You get an idea because the system itself will start operating in -- in a manner that it doesn't typically operate in. And our systems are monitored 24/7 by -- by a DAS system, which is our -- our system that we have in internally.

And so we would get alarms that the system is -- is not operating correctly. Obviously, the voltage would change or -- or we'd just get a reduction in power based on the transformers not operating at their -- their capacity that they

should be.

And that would alert our -- our maintenance techs to go out and likely investigate the site if they can't see any other issues on -- on that DAS system, like an inverter being down.

- MR. SILVESTRI: But up to a certain point, you'd have no idea that the transformer or transformers would be leaking until something shows you that there's not a good operation with the solar panels.
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Correct at this time.
- MR. SILVESTRI: Is it your intention to store any fuels on site, either during construction or during operation?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): It is not -- not our intention to store any fuels on site.

I do maybe want to add to one thing we could look at, is just putting kind of a concrete curve lip around that said concrete pad. That's enough to contain the -- any potential oil spill from -- from the transformer as well.

- MR. SILVESTRI: If this project happens to be approved, you might want to look at low level alarms. So

 I'm going to leave that part of it at that.
 - But I'm going to go back to drawing GN-2, which is your environmental notes. And would it

be your intention to modify the spill prevention portion of that to include contact information for regulatory agencies, spill cleanup contractors, local responders and the like?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Silvestri, this is Brad

Parsons. Yes, we would -- could definitely be

able to modify that plan to include those items.

MR. SILVESTRI: And you'd have worker training as well to go along with that, correct?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, sir.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Going back to one of the questions that Mr. Perrone had asked you about Eversource and pad-mounted equipment, did you actually work with Eversource to look at pad-mounted equipment along the interconnection to reduce the number of poles?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Yeah. Mr. Silvestri, this is Bryan Fitzgerald. We did work with Eversource during our interconnection approval stage on the pad-mounted equipment, the -- the pole-mounted equipment.

And what Brad Parsons mentioned in response to Mr. Perrone's question I think, kind of, summarized it, because the crux was the required Eversource equipment is producing more poles

1 than -- than we are with our required equipment. 2 And their equipment needs to be pole-mounted. 3 MR. SILVESTRI: I heard your reply. I've seen 4 Eversource come up with pad-mounted equipment in 5 the past, and there just seems to be a back and 6 forth on that. But right now, I'll just thank you 7 for your reply. 8 I'd like to go back to tracker operations for 9 a couple of moments. Is the rotary mechanism for 10 the trackers, is it internal to the trackers or 11 external? 12 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. It is -- it's 13 located in the middle of each tracker itself, and 14 it is -- it's basically a Sleuth drive motor. 15 So it's -- it sits in the center, and then 16 you have two torque tubes coming out of either 17 end, and that motor drives both of those torque 18 tubes that drives each of a half of the tracker. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: So it's more gear driven as opposed to 20 chain drive? 21 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, sir, Mr. Silvestri. 22 It is gear-driven. It's -- it is a Sleuth 23 motor. 24 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. And do they, the trackers 25 require any maintenance or greasing, or anything

else while they're in operation, or over a period of time?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): It's my understanding that -that those motors are -- are completely contained.

It does not require any, any greasing or
maintenance with regards to that over time.

In the event of a forecasted snow event,

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.

would you be able to tilt the panels to be

perpendicular to the ground so you wouldn't have

any snow accumulation on top of the panels?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): There's actually the tracker -
again, Brad Parsons. The tracker is -- is only

designed to go up to 55 degrees. Right? But we

have what we call the -- the algorithm inside the

tracking mechanism there would basically dump snow

at a certain point.

So if it -- if we do get any snow buildup, it will -- it will go all the way to that 55 degree tilt. If it still feels anything on that tracker itself, it's my understanding that it will go fully back to the other side as well to -- to try and do it, a dump it that way.

And again, being that the panels are -- are glass there, you're likely going to get most of

1 that snow sliding, sliding off of it as well. 2 MR. SILVESTRI: So if I understand correctly, you kind 3 of have an automatic weather tracking system, if 4 you will, for snow that will respond accordingly. 5 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. I believe my last question 7 at this point; have you had any panels, say, from 8 previous installations that experienced breakage 9 either during construction or in operational use? 10 And if so, what did you do with those panels? 11 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is -- this is Brad 12 Parsons. Again, yes, we've -- we've definitely 13 experienced breakage of panels as a result of, you 14 know, construction and/or delivery. 15 A lot of times you may find a panel broken in 16 one of the crates after delivery. And those are 17 disposed of in accordance with -- with any federal 18 or state regulations. 19 MR. SILVESTRI: When you mentioned disposed of, would 20 they have been recycled? Or would they have gone 21 to landfill? 22 THE WITNESS (Parsons): I don't have an answer to that. 23 They may have been recycled, but they could also 24 have gone to a landfill, I know. 25 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.

23

24

25

Mr. Morissette, I believe that's all I have at this time. Thank you and thank the panel for your responses.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri.

We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Golembiewski followed by Mr. Hannon. afternoon, Mr. Golembiewski.

MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. I'm going to, I guess, start my questioning primarily about the storm basin, stormwater management basin.

I guess I'm not sure who to direct this question to -- probably to the stormwater engineer. But based on what I can tell from the plans, there is no design for it. Am I missing a set of plans? Because I don't really see any there, and I don't really know what the top elevation of the -- so, all right. Here's my question. How does the storm basin work?

basin works exactly the way it works today. That's an existing basin that the stormwater will flow overland to, and the water will infiltrate into the ground.

And the stormwater report is included in the

packet. And all the comps are there, as well as the elevations for the different year storms, existing and proposed.

- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So I'm on the plan sheet and I see a line, I believe, that is supposed to represent the limits of the stormwater basin. It's like a two dots dash.
- THE WITNESS (Burns): So Robert Burns, again. That's really just for graphical purposes. The top of that basin is dependent on what storm you're analyzing it for.
- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.
- THE WITNESS (Burns): But it is approximately there.

 It sort of falls in the 213 contour on our side,

 but really the top of the -- the basin itself for

 proposed conditions, even in the a hundred-year

 storm is down around to 12.7, so.
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. Golembiewski, this is Brad Parsons. If I could add to that as well? If you could take these, direct attention to EC-5 of the plan sheets, this might help understand what's going on out there a little bit more?

In essence, what we have is there's already a stormwater basin on -- on site. Right? And we've modeled, modeled the set basin. So if you said --

that said stormwater basin.

So, if you look at -- at that EC -- EC-5, if you have it in front of you, you'll see where the existing stormwater line is. And you'll see on the far western side of that, that page where the stormwater line is, you can kind of see that it really is almost right at that 213 contour that -- that Mr. Burns was representing.

So, if you kind of go north of that, that 213 contour, just to the north of where -- where the LOD is, you'll see those contours actually start to go up right there.

So there's actually a natural berm on this site to the north between the -- the limits of disturbance in the facility and -- and that wetlands to -- to the north. So that berm, you know, tends to vary in elevation depending on -- on where you are on site.

so as you kind of work your way towards the eastern side, you can kind of see that berm -- berm drops down a bit, and you'll see right where that 211 contour is at the -- the smallest, the lowest part of the basin and the drywell structure that's called out there? You'll see just to the north of that, north of the LOD, you'll see that

215 contour there as well.

So, again, it's just an existing berm along that northern backside of the parcel. So really there, there's no stormwater basin to grade in because, in essence there there's already one there. And we're further mitigating the -- the stormwater controls by changing from a row crop cover type of tobacco or other row crops to just a standard meadow.

- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. You know, so how the basin functions, say, during a hundred-year storm event, what elevation would that represent in the basin?

 THE WITNESS (Parsons): So, today, the hundred-year storm when we model it is at about 213.3.
- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Once we have redone the -redid the surface with meadow type grasses, we ran
 it and the proposed hundred-year elevation is
 212.69.
- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay.
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): So we're actually reducing the runoff to that basin.
 - MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And then the panels and the other equipment then would likely not be flooded during a hundred-year storm event.

1 THE WITNESS (Parsons): No, there they're right on the 2 edge, I would say. 3 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So the fence would be? 4 THE WITNESS (Parsons): I think that's fair. Yeah, I 5 think that's fair. 6 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So the fence goes across? Okay. 7 So there is no plan -- so there's no plan to 8 have any type of overflow from the basin, a 9 formalized overflow? 10 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns. No, sir, 11 there's not. 12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Okay. Staying with sort of the runoff, I guess, subject, I noticed in one of 13 14 the interrogatories or in the report you said that 15 there would not be, I believe, any drip panel, 16 drip -- soil, additional protection from erosion 17 from panel drip. And I was just wondering if you 18 could explain why? 19 THE WITNESS (Burns): The grades out there and the seed 20 mix we're going to plant, the vegetated cover that 21 they will not be needed. And that they're tracker 22 type panels, maybe Brad, you can add on that a 23 little bit. 24 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yeah. Mr. Golembiewski, this 25 is Brad Parsons again. So again, on top of what

1	Mr. Burns stated there, as well as these being
2	tracker panels, that the drip edge is is
3	constantly moving over over the course of the
4	day. So that, that's another reason as well.
5	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So they're not permanently in one
6	location, so not one line will form. So there
7	they're moving.
8	So sort of dependent on where they are and
9	when it rains, you would not get the drip in the
10	same exact location.
11	THE WITNESS (Parsons): That's correct, Mr.
12	Golembiewski. Brad Parsons.
13	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I guess one more question regarding
14	stormwater. The basin itself will not hold water
15	for more than, say, just after a storm event.
16	Or for how long?
17	I guess the question may be, how long after,
18	say, a hundred-year storm event would water sit in
19	the basin?
20	THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns again. I
21	don't have an answer for that. It's something I
22	would have to get back to you.
23	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: But you are characterizing it as an
24	infiltration basin that will not have permanent
25	water in it?

1 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, sir. MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So, currently, water there -- it's 2 3 generally dry, currently. 4 THE WITNESS (Burns): I think that's fair. Robert --5 this is Robert Burns, yes. 6 THE WITNESS (Parsons): And again, Mr. Golembiewski, this is Brad Parsons, yes. And I think the intent 7 8 here is that that site is going to function as it 9 does today, as we kind of discussed about the --10 the basin and the existing contours that are 11 there. 12 You know, really it's -- it's a dry site as 13 it is today, and our calculations are basically 14 showing -- showing the same in that regards. MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: And the outlet is not a functioning 15 16 outlet, the feature that says catch basin top? 17 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. This is Robert 18 Burns. Yes, that's correct. 19 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. 20 THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. I can add a 21 little bit to this discussion. During our wetland 22 investigation, we took a close look at the 23 existing stormwater basin, and by all field 24 indications and surface evidence that basin does 25 not appear to hold water for any significant

period of time, and -- and it's pretty free draining soils underneath it.

It's -- there's a lot of glacial lacustrine -- I mean, glacial fluvial material, some coarse sand and gravel underneath that. So it appears to drain pretty -- infiltrate pretty quickly.

- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. And there's no chance that any type of water would overflow and flow towards the vernal pools that were identified to the northwest?
- THE WITNESS (Gustafson): As we looked at kind of the north end of that basin, that natural berm, and there's no evidence of any surface flows coming from that basin towards the north, towards the potential vernal pools in the wetland system.
- MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. Is there -- sticking with, I guess, that line of questioning, the area for the development, the habitat there would not -- is it your opinion that any type of amphibian migration to the vernal pools would be going through? Is that a likely area for migration?
- THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. We did take

 a close look at what the anticipated primary

 vectors of migration from the two potential vernal

pools. You know, that's a good distance north of
the closest facility.

the closest facility.

And the areas to the south including the

And the areas to the south including the project area are all maintained, cultivated agricultural field habitat, which is really not supportive of any of the obligate vernal pool species such as spotted salamander and wood frog. It would be considered either suboptimal or non-habitat.

There is no mature forest cover in those areas. So the vectors of migration are anticipated to be kind of east and west from those potential vernal pools, and also to the north.

And those are all forested terrestrial habitats, and also forested wetland habitats.

And I'll just direct you to our response to in Applicant Exhibit 4, our response to the Town of Windsor interrogatories. We included an attachment noted as figure six, and that provides the vectors of migration on that figure.

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

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski.

We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Hannon, followed by myself. Mr. Hannon, good

1 afternoon. 2 MR. HANNON: Good afternoon, Mr. Morissette. Thank 3 you. 4 I want to sort of stay on the same path that 5 Mr. Golembiewski and Mr. Silvestri were following. 6 So I guess as it relates to the equipment pads 7 that you're talking about, do you have sort of a 8 spot elevation as to what those gravel pads will 9 be at? I mean, it will be above the 213 10 elevation, or you may have a different opinion as 11 to what constitutes a gravel pad? 12 So I'm just curious if you have a sort of a 13 spot elevation you anticipate there? 14 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Robert Burns. 15 elevations will be matching what the existing 16 elevations are out there right now. 17 MR. HANNON: Okay. So it will be at ground level, 18 which means that under certain circumstances a 19 portion of the mount could be underwater. 20 Correct? 21 THE WITNESS (Parsons): And yeah, this is Brad Parsons. 22 Yeah, I think, you know, a portion of the 23 structure, the mounting structure racking that

holds up the inverters, the bottom part of that

could -- could be underwater, but those inverters

24

25

52

are sitting, you know, three to four feet above -above existing grade. And that's why there wasn't
really much, much concern with that.

I think we potentially also have some availability onsite to -- to shift that, those areas to the south slightly as well.

MR. HANNON: Thank you. That helped clarify.

Also sticking with what was discussed as far as the elevations go, because I'm looking at EC-5 and EC-6. It looks as though the 215 elevation is north of the bulk of the detention basin, but it also curves around so that it covers the eastern portion.

So you do have a 215-foot elevation where the lower portion of the basement is probably a little under 211-foot elevation. But just out of curiosity, it sounds like what I'm hearing is that you have no intention of doing anything with the drywell to make it work, but yet on page EC-5 it talks about the existing drywell, the contractors to clean it out, clean out the structure and add proposed silt back and hay bale.

So it sounds like that may still be functioning, or it will be functioning during this whole process?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): -- with all points. Yes,
that's the idea. Once we clean it out and
determine what it is, it will function the way it
functions today, or the way it should be
functioning.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And one of the things I did not see, do you happen to have a spot elevation for a top of frame for the drywell?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): No, sir. The surveyors didn't pick up a spot elevation. It looks like it's -- I don't see it. I don't know.

MR. HANNON: Yeah, I didn't see anything marked anywhere. So I was just curious about that.

I want to go to page 27 in the petition. And I think this goes to a comment that Mr. Gustafson made saying that the facility would be located entirely within the cultivated agricultural field that represents suboptimal terrestrial habitat for obligate vernal pool species, and that the agricultural field is considered suboptimal due to the lack of forest cover.

So I think that what Mr. Gustafson was saying is that because of that, it's unlikely that you would have any of the potential amphibians crossing, I'm assuming, through the pond or

through the basin and into what is currently the agricultural field. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Yes, that's -- that's correct. We don't anticipate any significant migration out of those vernal pools or the nearby terrestrial habitat to the north into that field, because it is essentially non habitat for those species.

And further to the south of this property is existing residential and agricultural properties. So there's -- there's really no incentive for migration across that field.

MR. HANNON: Okay. But then in the same paragraph, you go to say, in fact, the conversion of the cultivated field to permanent meadow habitat under the surrounding solar facility represents an improvement to the CTH.

The addition of the meadows habitats vegetation would provide an improved level of cover for any dispersing herpetofauna that may wander into the solar facility. This habitat conversion also eliminates potential mortality of those species due to current conflicts with farming implements.

So to me, the way I'm reading that is it

looks as though by going in and doing some of the seeding, that that may actually open up some of the area to some of the critters that could be at the vernal pool. And it could actually have them moving more towards the field because it may no longer be suboptimal.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): That's -- that's correct.

It's -- it's less specific for the obligate vernal

pool species such as wood frog and salamander who
are going to rely heavily on the terrestrial

habitat, but other associated herpetofauna such

as, you know, turtles and snakes and -- and

whatnot that are inhabiting and utilizing some of

that terrestrial and wetland habitat further to

the north, you could certainly have those species

encroach into the edge of the field.

And under current conditions there, you know, they're subject to injury or mortality from agricultural -- agricultural use of the property, and also to heavier levels of predation because of the open nature of the cultivated field.

Those factors would -- would certainly be

improved with the development of this solar facility and the installation of a native

-

pollinator friendly seed mix to permanently

stabilize the areas in and around the solar facility.

MR. HANNON: Well, thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're welcome.

stormwater runoff fairly quickly.

MR. HANNON: Then on page 28, under hydraulic alterations, second paragraph, the existing stormwater management area would not be considered a decoy pool or sink feature that potentially could affect breeding amphibians intercepted on their way to the nearby vernal pool. Why not?

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): Dean Gustafson. As I had indicated earlier to Mr. Golembiewski's question regarding the basin, our field indications are that that basin drains and infiltrates any

We didn't see any field evidence of, you know surface standing or vegetation standing, any drift lines to that nature. So this is what we would characterize as a dry basin. And if, you know, during heavy storm events, you know, there, any water that would collect in that area would drain the soils fairly rapidly.

And therefore, we wouldn't consider the existing basin -- even the existing basin a decoy pool. And as noted earlier in testimony from

Mr. Burns, that you know, with the change of cover type we're improving the conditions, the runoff conditions from existing conditions.

So there would be less of a chance of it operating as a possible decoy pool.

MR. HANNON: Thank you.

THE WITNESS (Gustafson): You're welcome.

MR. HANNON: The next question really isn't directly related to page 30, but seeing as how it talks about soils and geology I thought I'd raise it here.

My understanding is the property is currently being used for growing tobacco. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Bryan Fitzgerald. I believe they grew rye hay out there this year.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And the reason I'm asking, because
I'm wondering if any soil analysis has been done
for potential hazardous materials. I mean, having
worked with projects up in that part of the state,
some of the pesticide results and chemicals that
are used for tobacco fields can tend to be rather
intense.

So I'm just wondering if any analysis has been done there to determine the soil characteristics and whether or not they may be

potentially hazardous?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is brad Parsons. I can speak to that.

So while we haven't had a phase one ESA completed for this site, we have had phase one ESAs completed for sites of similar nature in the area. And those phase-ones have identified the same concerns that you just raised.

However, it is our intent here -- it will always be our intent not to remove any soil from the property. And if we were to have to, part of that phase one would be having to have some type of soil management plan to do that.

But in this case, we're -- we're not grading, performing any grading on the site. Any excavation would really be limited to the installation of the access road. Any of the trenches would be filled back in. So -- so any limited excavation would be spread on site and further stabilized to avoid any removal of soil.

MR. HANNON: Yeah, I just know it's been a concern for a number of people. And sometimes what ends up happening is even dust blowing off of the site can adversely impact surrounding properties. So just needing to be sure that that's something that's

taken care of. Thank you.

On page GN-2, the environmental notes, resource protection measures, I have a question on -- I think it's number five. So it talks about the use of herbicides and pesticides at the facilities shall be minimized.

Can you give me an idea as to why pesticides and herbicides might be used on site, and how that can possibly linger on the site? And what impact that might have on the sheep being brought in?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. Once -- if the project were to move forward and once East Windsor Solar II were to take possession of the property through the commencement of the lease and proceed with construction, East Windsor Solar II would not use herbicides or pesticides under any circumstance for any vegetative management.

All vegetative management would be completed through sheep grazing throughout the life of the project. So again, the project would not use any herbicides or pesticides while in operation.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. Also in the application, there's the letter from the Commissioner over at Department of Agriculture.

And it talks about -- it concludes that this

project will not materially effect the status of project -- or project land as prime farmland with the use of the sheep on the property.

So I guess the question I have related to that is, given the response, or the question and response in the Siting Council Interrogatories

Number 13. And it states that -- it states the property owner will retain land development rights to develop a cemetery in the future, and the conditions that the property would need to be returned to. It was basically what that owner currently wants.

But if they're using it as, or proposing to use it as a cemetery, why does it matter if there are sheep on this site or not? Because it doesn't sound like the property is going to revert back to farmland.

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. And I think I could clarify maybe a couple of points here written in this response. The landowner for the property is the Catholic Cemetery Association of Arch Diocese of Hartford.

While the property has been in agricultural production in the past and they're pursuing a potential solar project here that continues

agricultural production through the life of that project, some of the underlying themes in working with the landowner -- and knowing that I can't speak directly for them because I'm not them -- is that they -- they tend to try and preserve the ability to put a cemetery at the properties that they own if the event arises in the future where they would look to do so.

They're an organization that thinks for the extreme long-term, for eternity, for example. They like to try and retain development rights of their properties in order to have the ability to install a cemetery at some point in the future if the need arises for it.

MR. HANNON: So then the use of the sheep at this site would be that at the end of whether it's the 20, 30, 40-year window, that the property would be reverting back to a potential agricultural use.

Is that the intent? And then what the diocese might do that may be something beyond that scope?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. I think that's precisely correct. Our goal throughout the useful life of the solar project would be to try and retain and even potentially improve the soil

characteristics there through the -- through the use of the sheep grazing plant.

So when decommissioning comes at some point in the future post-useful life, the ability for the project to return to another type of agricultural use is there and available.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. The last question I have, I believe -- if I can find it -- has to do with the plan for the sheep. And if I'm reading this correctly, this is on page 6 of 8, in tab J.

So it talks about -- it looks as though maybe roughly 43 sheep grazing in the 4 paddocks. So I'm assuming that it's roughly 2.4 sheep per acre. Each of the four sections is about 4.9 acres, give or take a little bit for the paddock, and they would be grazing 15 days in each paddock. So the 45-day rest period.

So for example, you start in paddock one. 15
days are up, they move to paddock two. That gives
paddock 1 sort of the 45 days to refurbish itself.
And I'm assuming there would be, like, what? Two
seasons at the site. Does that sound correct?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. That does sound
correct. And again, I will add that the sheep
grazing plan is developed in conjunction with our

sheep farming partners here in Connecticut. And they reserve the ability to see how things are from a season-to-season basis.

I would assume this year, for example, compared to last year, maybe the continued growth due to the rain that we've had would -- would keep them out there throughout the growth season. I could be mistaken there, but as compared to a season like last year where we had a bit of a drought mid season.

But yes, I believe here the point you're making is correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

I think Mr. Morissette, that does it for me on the questions today.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you,

Mr. Hannon.

I'll start with my questions. I'd like to go back to the discussion about noise quickly, just for some clarification here. In the response to question number 36 we talked about the 300 feet to the north. And I'm trying to reconcile it with the table in the report on page 3. And I believe that the 300 feet would be associated with PL-2, which indicates it's 820 feet.

1 And Mr. Roland, I think it is? Could you try 2 to clarify what I'm missing here? 3 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): If I could just step in and 4 Andy can further clarify that. I think that 300 5 feet was done to the closest property line to the 6 north. And then Andy, I think you can talk about 7 the receptors and those distances that you used 8 there. 9 THE WITNESS (Roland): Yeah, this is Andy Roland with 10 WSP. 11 THE HEARING OFFICER: The -- the distance, that first 12 distance, Mr. Morissette, that you're referring 13 to, can you direct me to the interrogatory 14 question response? 15 Number 36. I think what I'm hearing is MR. HANNON: 16 that the 300 feet is not part of your report. 17 It's something different. 18 THE WITNESS (Roland): This is Andy Roland with WSP. Ι 19 just want to confirm, so we're talking about 20 those, the right locations to use. 21 So I think where we're -- this is Andy 22 Roland with WSP again. The -- the property line, 23 I believe that is referred to as the 300-foot or 24 perhaps the nearest property line is the property 25 line directly to the north of the equipment pads,

the inverter equipment. And there is no residence there.

And where I refer to the WSP noise report, the distances are to the nearest property lines on a straight line path between the inverter pad locations and those residential property lines with residents.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Great. All right, I understand it now. Thank you.

Okay. Mr. Roland, while I have you -- so BAC did the first analysis. And I want to make sure I understood what was said at the beginning of the hearing, that the noise analysis was redone primarily -- that's my understanding. Correct me if I'm wrong -- was redone primarily because someone from BAC was not available to testify.

Did I understand that correctly?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Yes,

that that is -- that is correct. And I can let

Mr. Roland speak to the rationale behind -- behind

him running that report and analysis as well.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Before he does that, so

the BAC analysis had determined that the noise levels at property lines were very low.

And Mr. Rowland's analysis, in his study he

says he was very conservative in his analysis, and the noise levels are higher than BAC's.

just explain in your conservative analysis what shifted from BAC to your analysis to conclude that, yes, it is a little bit higher, and I'll leave it at that? If you could please?

THE WITNESS (Roland): Mr. Morissette, this is Andy Roland, WSP. So we were contacted and contracted by Verigy on this project, as Brad mentioned, due to some scheduling conflicts or some inability to testify here.

We were provided with the BAC acoustical report from April of 2023, and our first task was to -- we were asked -- was review that and provide -- provide our opinions.

And this varies from acoustical consultant to acoustical consultant. I believe the BAC report to be a bit too -- to give credit to a bit too many, too many factors that I do not normally do in terms of attenuations over distances.

And you, you are correct in that the BAC report reported a very low nine decibel impact from the site at the -- what it deemed to be the nearest residential property line, which is I

referred to -- we referred to at WSP as PL-4 in our report, which is the residential property to the -- the west of the -- the inverter panels.

In looking at that number, there are some -there are some factors used in the BAC report,
namely an attenuation accounted for, for
vegetation, which I tend in the Northeast not to
assume in any sort of modeling analysis due to the
fact that vegetation varies from season to season.
That was -- that was one particular factor that
BAC took credit for, whereas our report didn't.

It was also some discrepancies as to how -how models are run, sound pressure versus sound
power. I don't think we need to get into the
technicalities of that. That's -- that's
explained in the report, but otherwise we -- we
uncovered a couple of attenuation metrics that we
chose not to use to predict the maximum
conceivable sound level from the site, and
determined it to remain in compliance with the CT
DEEP noise regulation, despite the fact that we
are quite conservative.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you for that explanation.

Okay. What I'd like to do is I'd like to

1 turn to partial site plan OP-2. I have a couple 2 of questions associated with that. My first 3 question is -- let's see. To the west, the limit 4 of disturbance from the fence line is -- it 5 appears to be quite extensive. Is there a reason 6 for that? 7 Also, on the east side, it's the same thing. 8 THE WITNESS (Burns): Burns with APT. The limited 9 disturbance on those two sides were mainly because 10 they will be seeded. There's no actual work being 11 taken place there, but that area will be seeded, so we included it as a limited disturbance. 12 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. 14 THE WITNESS (Burns): You're welcome. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Moving to the front of the 16 facilities along Thrall Road, can you tell me what 17 the distance is from the road to the fence line? 18 THE WITNESS (Burns): Robert Burns, again. 19 It's 50 feet. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: 50 feet? 21 THE WITNESS (Burns): Yes, sir. 22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And then to the --23 THE WITNESS (Burns): I'm sorry. That's to the 24 property line. 25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Along Thrall Road, where

1 the landscaping is, from the road to the fence line. 2 3 THE WITNESS (Burns): I don't remember offhand. THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, Mr. Morissette, just one 4 5 moment. I'll have that. 6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Great, thank you. 7 I'm also looking for the distance between 8 that and the actual solar panels. 9 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yeah. So Mr. Morissette, this 10 is Brad Parsons. So the distance to the -- to the 11 edge of road -- from the edge of road to -- to the 12 fence line is approximately 75 feet, and then the 13 distance from the edge of the road to the solar 14 panels is approximately 95 feet. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: 95 feet? Okay. Well, I was 16 curious as to whether pushing it back is something 17 that could be accomplished, and the pros and cons 18 of doing that or not doing that. 19 So for example, maybe going to a hundred 20 feet; go to the fence line, move the fence line 21 another 25 feet. Any reaction? 22 THE WITNESS (Parsons): I think, you know, there is --23 Brad Parsons, again. I think there is, you know, 24 where the issues come into play is how, how the 25 layout of these -- these trackers can tend to

work.

And so by doing that, while it could happen in -- in some cases, in some, some instances, as we kind of move more towards the eastern half of that, that array, as you were to shift that to -- to the north, we would start to impact the existing vegetation on the north side potentially with some -- with some of those trackers there.

So while it could happen potentially in certain cases there, there were spots where it was -- was a little difficult there. So we -- we did try to maintain a consistent consistency as well along that, that frontage.

THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Well, considering you have additional space to the west and the east, you could conceivably go wider and push it back an additional 20 feet, 25 feet, to provide a little bit more buffer to Thralls Road.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. With regards to that, again, with -- with keeping the existing vegetation both on -- on the -- on the eastern and southwestern and some western sides of the site, basically that the shading profile comes into play here.

And so -- so by shifting and -- and moving

those, those panels over actually provides some additional impacts with regards to -- to production. And even though those are already taken into account, we're already taking into account some production losses with -- with regards to shading.

So any further -- further pushes in either direction further makes those panels not -- not produce the energy they -- they should be producing.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Fair enough. Yeah, in a drawing it looks -- it doesn't look like it's 75 feet. It looks something much less.

Okay. All right. Concerning the interconnection, we have eight 40-foot distribution poles along the driveway, somewhat concealed by the -- I think it's a shed and a barn, if I am reading that correctly.

I disagree with the statement that was provided earlier that Eversource can't or prefers -- they probably prefer overhead pole interconnects, but they certainly have the ability to do pad mounts.

What I would like to do is to go to the aerial photograph number 18, please? That's

1 associated with the field review. 2 MR. BALDWIN: These are in the interrogatory response 3 that you're referring to? 4 MR. HANNON: Yes. Yes, thank you. 5 MR. BALDWIN: This is photo 18? 6 MR. HANNON: Aerial photo 18. 7 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, Mr. Morissette. I think 8 we have that. 9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. So the way I'm 10 reading this is you've got the shed right on the 11 right-hand side of the photograph, and the 12 interconnect is going to go to the left of that 13 shed. And it's going to come down and 14 interconnect with this pole on Thrall Road. So 15 there's a line of trees there. 16 So my first question is, to what extent are 17 those trees going to be trimmed back and removed 18 to accomplish the eight poles? 19 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The trees would be minimally 20 trimmed back and/or removed I believe in a 21 response to one of the interrogatories. And I 22 find that we had an acreage associated with that, 23 the amount of tree removal. 24 MR. HANNON: Associated with the interconnect? 25 THE WITNESS (Parsons): With the interconnect, yes,

1 sir. MR. HANNON: Okay. So -- go ahead. 2 THE WITNESS (Burns): I was going to say -- it's Robert 3 4 Burns. And we -- in the interrogatories, we said 5 it was a tenth of an acreage. 6 MR. HANNON: Okay. 7 THE WITNESS (Burns): Approximately. 8 MR. HANNON: All right. So where there's -- there's an 9 area that there's no trees on the side of the 10 barn. So that's primarily where the six poles 11 will go. Is that correct? Or is it further? 12 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons, yes. Yes, correct. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So that last pole will we 14 have to angle to the structure that is on Thrall 15 Road? 16 MR. BALDWIN: Clarification, Mr. Morissette? You said 17 a structure that is not on Thrall road? 18 THE HEARING OFFICER: No, that is. It's a distribution 19 pole to the left. 20 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yeah. So -- so Mr. Morissette, 21 this is Brad Parsons. So yeah, I think the intent 22 right now is to actually come off of that existing 23 pole. 24 MR. HANNON: Yeah? 25 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That is right there over

1 twenty-eighty -- at number 2087 and tie, and tie 2 into -- into that. 3 MR. HANNON: Right. Okay. So that will be an angle 4 from the last pole, and it won't be a straight 5 line. It will be an angle, the last structure. 6 THE WITNESS (Parsons): A slight angle to that, to that 7 last structure. Correct. 8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Okay. All right. So I 9 think I understand. 10 That distribution line, is there any upgrades 11 that's necessary on the 23 kV? 12 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. The upgrades 13 that happen to the distribution circuit are a 14 re-conductor-ing of an aerial cable that is 15 further downstream, or further south towards 16 Barber Hill Road -- I'm sorry. Excuse me, towards 17 the Barber Hill Substation. 18 There is not any upgrading to the existing 19 three-phase circuit directly on Thrall Road. 20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So the upgrades have 21 already taken place? 22 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): The thrall road has -- has 23 already taken place, and there's just a small bit 24 of aerial cable that needs to get re-conductor-ed 25 south, close to the Barber Hill Substation.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So that circuit goes back
2	to Barber Hill?
3	THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Yes, sir.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Were there any operational
5	contingencies, constraints that were put on the
6	project?
7	THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Fitzgerald. Not to my
8	knowledge. There were not any operational
9	constraints.
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. All right.
11	That concludes my questioning for this afternoon.
12	Thank you, everybody, for your responses.
13	What we will do now is we're going to take a
14	12-minute break. We'll be back at 3:50, and then
15	we'll continue with cross-examination by Attorney
16	DeCrescenzo.
17	Okay. Thank you, everyone.
18	
19	(Pause: 3:38 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.)
20	
21	THE HEARING OFFICER: Is the Court Reporter back with
22	us?
23	THE REPORTER: Yes, I am here, and we are on the
24	record.
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you.

1 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette? Excuse interruption, 2 please? 3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Attorney Baldwin? 4 MR. BALDWIN: We had some informal homework assignments 5 that at least we thought might be appropriate to 6 address. If we could do that before the Town 7 begins their cross, that might be appropriate? 8 MR. HANNON: Okay. I have one open item. Did you have 9 others? I have the trucks per day. 10 MR. BALDWIN: We had a couple others. We had a total 11 of four that we'd like to address, if we could? 12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Please continue? 13 MR. BALDWIN: Or maybe it's three. One of them is the 14 number of trucks per day. 15 Mr. Parsons has a response to that -- or 16 Mr. Fitzgerald. 17 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Mr. Morissette, this is 18 Bryan Fitzgerald. In regard to Mr. Perrone's 19 question on trucks per day, we are looking at 20 approximately 16 trucks over about a two to 21 three-week period in total that would encompass 22 the site mobilization and during the construction 23 period. 24 We're anticipating about five trucks for 25 racking equipment. These are deliveries received

at the site and this would be a flatbed semi, for example. That's five trucks over that two to three-week period.

We have about seven trucks for the solar modules themselves, and that's in 40-foot shipping containers unloaded onsite, and then shipping containers taken back offsite. And then two other trucks again, flatbed semi style for transformers, inverters, fencing materials, wire rolls, pretty much your balance of system equipment there. So 16 total.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.

- 13 MR. HANNON: Very good. Thank you.
 - MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Parsons, Mr. Silvestri asked about the capacity of the transformer oil containment period. And also touched on potentially protection alarm systems. Could you respond a little bit further to that question?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes. Again, this is Brad

Parsons. So -- so we had -- we have two

transformers on site. One is a 1000 kVA

transformer. That has approximately 354 gallons

of -- the Fr3 oil. And then we have one 3000 kVA

transformer that has approximately 550 gallons of

Fr3 oil.

Additionally, you know, we -- we intend to investigate the ability to add a leak detection to our monitoring system, as well as potentially looking at backup, a concrete curtain containment along around our equipment pad as well.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. Going back quickly to

Mr. Hannon's question regarding the location of

the transformer and inverter pads and their

location within the limits of the defined

location, is there something you can do from a

project design perspective to change that?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Attorney Baldwin, we're hearing a

lot of background noise.

THE REPORTER: This is the reporter. Agreed.

MR. BALDWIN: Sorry about that, Mr. Morissette. Let me repeat that question if I could.

This relates to Mr. Hannon's question regarding the transformer pads and the inverter pads being within the limits, at least in parts within the limits of the stormwater basin shown on that plan.

Mr. Parsons, do you have any additional information to add on that point?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, this is Mr. Parsons. We can shift that, those transformer and equipment

pads directly due south approximately 25 to 50 feet with no wind, and therefore being completely outside that stormwater basin.

MR. BALDWIN: And then lastly, Mr. Morissette, also with respect to a question or line of questions that Mr. Hannon asked regarding soil conditions on the property and dust during construction.

For anyone on the witness panel could you talk a little bit about dust control measures during construction and other features that would help control any dust from the property?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, this is Mr. Parsons.

So -- so in addition to dust control during construction, as required by -- by the general permit, I think Mr. Hannon was -- was referring to, you know, concerns with -- with pesticide, you know, the herbicides and contamination in that, in that dust.

One thing that -- that would be different on this site is obviously we would not be turning over the soil on -- on a yearly basis for any type of crop planting, and would have stabilization over the entire site as required for the general permit.

So as far as from the life of the system,

too, we would ultimately reduce the amount of dust that -- that may happen on site currently as a result of, you know, bare soils due to, you know, fallow crop fields.

MR. BALDWIN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

Those were the questions we'd like to ask.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, Attorney

Baldwin.

Okay. With that, we'll continue with cross-examination of the petitioner by the Town of East Windsor. Attorney DeCrescenzo, if you would please?

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Good afternoon, members of the panel and members of the Council. I'm attorney Robert DeCrescenzo from the firm of Updike, Kelly and Spellacy, representing the Town of East Windsor. We have a few questions that we would like you to respond to.

The first is, I want to focus on the screening along Thrall Road, the proposed screening along Thrall Road. What is the distance of the frontage of the project along Thrall Road?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. You know, measuring it on -- on OP-2, the distance from along Thrall Road from the corner of the --

the start of the LOD to the other corner of -- of the LOD is approximately 915 feet.

- MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. And could you describe the current condition along that stretch of road right now in terms of the view into the site?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. The current condition along Thrall -- Thrall Road right now is -- is an existing farm field with trees on the northern side of that, that field.
- MR. DeCRESCENZO: And could you describe for me the proposed screening of the area along Thrall Road?

 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yeah. So -- so the proposed screening -- again, Brad Parsons -- includes the addition of an 8-foot chain-link fence as part of the petition plans originally with a privacy mesh along the -- the face of that on Thrall Road, as -- as discussed previously with response to Mr. Perrone's question.

And then additionally, we are proposing two rows of evergreen plantings staggered on a 10-foot on center planting along the frontage there allowing for, you know, visibility and reduced visibility to the -- to the site.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: And how tall would these evergreens be when they're first planted?

1	THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. They
2	will probably be approximately 6 to 8 feet in
3	height.
4	MR. DeCRESCENZO: And you're proposing to plant them 10
5	feet apart? Was that a yes?
6	THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Yes,
7	sir, they would they would be planted
8	approximately 10 feet apart on on center.
9	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Will they be planted on grade?
10	THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. Yes,
11	they are intended to be planted on grade.
12	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. So for a good long time you'll
13	be able to see right through them to the fence.
14	Is that correct?
15	THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, this is Brad Parsons.
16	For for a period of time until they reach a
17	larger maturity you will be able to to see to
18	the fence, and that was the intention of the
19	existing, of adding the privacy mesh on the rear
20	side of the fence.
21	MR. DeCRESCENZO: And what is the height at maturity of
22	these, the height and width of these plantings at
23	maturity?
24	THE WITNESS (Parsons): The height and width of the
25	the plantings at at maturity, the width of the

1 plantings get to be approximately 10 feet, 2 filling -- filling those gaps, and ideally get to 3 a mature height of 15 to 20 feet. 4 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And can you describe -- you say 5 evergreen. What species of evergreen are they? 6 THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Bob Burns from APT. On 7 DN-1, on the typical planting detail there is a 8 list of tree species that can be chosen from. 9 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Will they be one uniform type of tree 10 along all 900 feet? 11 THE WITNESS (Burns): I think that's yet to be 12 determined. 13 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And I thought I heard that there 14 won't be any kind of berm. It's just planting on 15 grade. Is that it? 16 THE WITNESS (Burns): That's correct. 17 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And could you describe for me what 18 the fence is? What material is it made out of? 19 What color is it, and how -- it's eight feet high, 20 I think I heard you say? 21 THE WITNESS (Burns): Again, Robert Burns from APT. 22 It is a seven foot high chain-link fence, 23 which will have a mesh on the -- along Thrall 24 Road. 25 What color will it be? Will it be MR. DeCRESCENZO:

1 the typical galvanized fence that you see 2 everywhere? 3 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This -- this is Brad Parsons. 4 On DN-1, the fence is called out as -- as black 5 vinyl chain-link fence. So it will be a black 6 vinyl fence, not -- not a galvanized. And while 7 the majority of the site will be seven feet, the 8 area in -- along the frontage of Thrall Road will 9 be -- will be eight feet high. 10 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And these panels you're talking 11 about, are these the slats that go between the links in the chain-link fence? 12 13 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Again, the intent is not to 14 actually install the slats, but actually to 15 install a privacy mesh on the backside, yeah. 16 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So what you're proposing, today you 17 see a farm field, and when you're done with this 18 screening you're going to see approximately 900 19 feet of a chain-link fence with some form of 20 uniform planting in front of it. 21 Is that what you're proposing? 22 THE WITNESS (Parsons): When we're -- when we're done, 23 we're going to have a hundred -- over 170 24 plantings along the frontage of this site, as well 25 as the chain-link, black vinyl chain-link fence

1 with the privacy mesh on the inside of that. 2 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And how far from the road will the 3 plantings be? 4 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The plantings will be -- again 5 Brad Parsons will be approximately -- from the 6 edge? From the edge Of road, sir. 7 MR. DeCRESCENZO: The edge of road, yes. 8 THE WITNESS (Parsons): From the edge of road, that the 9 plantings will be approximately about 50 feet 10 from -- from the edge of road. 11 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And how does the elevation change 12 from Thrall Road down into the site? Is Thrall 13 Road higher or lower than the site? 14 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons, again. The 15 elevation of -- of the site varies within -- from 16 Thrall Road. It actually heads slightly up as you head into the site. It peaks around the middle 17 18 slightly at a very light grade, and then heads 19 back down to the -- to the rear where the 20 stormwater basin is. 21 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And along the edge of the site that's 22 perpendicular to Thrall Road, you're not proposing 23 any form of screening? 24 MR. BALDWIN: Could we get some clarification? Do you 25 mean, right along the property line?

1 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Well, that's another question. 2 looking at figure three, proposed conditions, page 3 10 of the application. 4 And I see a black -- a thick black line. 5 And my reading of that, is that the 6 delineated wetland boundary? Or is that the 7 property line? 8 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That's the property line, sir. 9 Brad Parsons. That's the property line. 10 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. Is there a line that 11 distinguishes the property line from the lease line? 12 13 THE WITNESS (Parsons): There's not -- there's not a 14 distinguishing of the property line versus the 15 lease line on this plan. 16 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So that black thick line is 17 essentially the lease line? 18 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. No. 19 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Where is the lease line? 20 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The lease line will ultimately 21 be approximately the -- the limits of the -- the 22 facility and/or fence line, or on the items that 23 we need to maintain inside that, that area. 24 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Will the screening be within the 25 lease area, or within the property area?

1 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. 2 screening will be within the -- the lease area and 3 on -- and on site. 4 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. And that house along Thrall 5 Road, is that the unoccupied house owned by the 6 property owner? THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. 7 Yes. 8 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And I think you testified earlier and 9 in your application materials, you're disclaiming 10 any responsibility for the maintenance of that 11 house? 12 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That falls out, outside of our 13 lease and outside of our permit. 14 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Was there any thought given to 15 including that within the lease line and taking 16 responsibility for the exterior maintenance of the 17 house? 18 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Parsons. No. 19 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So getting back to the question of 20 screening, on the right side of the site, as 21 depicted in figure three, I don't see any 22 indication of any screening whatsoever, other than 23 what's the existing condition of the existing 24 foliage.

Is that correct?

25

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Brad Parsons. I guess I would say, that's depending on how you're looking at that, that's slightly incorrect.

Looking at proposed conditions on -- on figure three, if we look at where approximately that, the house and barn are on the -- the lower half of the site where the -- the green circles start, that green represents the landscaping.

That landscaping continues to the east and northeast along the -- the proposed fence line. And once it gets to the -- the eastern, southeastern corner of the -- the facility on the far eastern side, that screening turns directly north and heads north approximately half, half of the fence line in -- in that location, and is, you know, done so to additionally screen that facility from Thrall Road as you're heading south on Thrall -- Thrall Road from that property corner looking -- looking into the site.

And the existing vegetation along that easterly -- easterly property line would be maintained.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Have you submitted a typical section of the proposed screening along Thrall Road in greater detail than just the elevation, proposed

elevations that I've seen in the materials?

THE WITNESS (Burns): This is Bob Burns from APT. No.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Actually, if I could interject one minute please, sir?

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Sure.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Actually, if you look at

Exhibit N -- or attachment N of the petition

itself, there are photo sims that -- that were

provided for the -- for the facility. And so if

you look at the first photo on page 4 of 9 of that

petition, that is actually looking east towards

the site from -- from middle north.

It's more north on the site from Middle Road itself and shows that, that screening of the facility on -- on sheet five of nine, of appendix N.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: But you haven't prepared scaled drawings like you'd see with a site plan submittal where you show a section of the landscaping with detailed callout for type of species of plantings and locations of those species.

You haven't done that?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): You know, we have. We have, sir. I think DN -- DN-2 shows the actual detail, typical detail in the plan set.

1 MR. BALDWIN: (Unintelligible) -- on that? 2 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yeah, so that is attachment --3 MR. BALDWIN: This is Petitioner's Exhibit 1, 4 attachment, or appendix B. 5 THE WITNESS (Parsons): And sheet DN-2. 6 MR. DeCRESCENZO: When you said earlier that the exact 7 details of the plantings haven't been determined. 8 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The species of the plants are 9 listed in that, in that detail on DN -- DN-2. 10 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. And what are they? 11 THE WITNESS (Parsons): They are listed as Spartan 12 Juniper, Brandon's Arborvitae, Emerald Green 13 Arborvitae, Star Powered Juniper, Gillette, Swiss 14 Stone Pine, Iowa Juniper, Sunkist Arborvitae, and 15 Dragon Lady Holly. 16 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So a lot of arborvitae, right? 17 How many arborvitae, versus other plantings? 18 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Those are -- this is Brad 19 Parsons, again. Those, those were the list of 20 plantings that we had -- that we have chosen. 21 intention was to be able to provide, you know, try 22 and provide year-round screening with arborvitae 23 type plantings. 24 And per the site plans, as mentioned earlier, 25 we have over 170 plantings along the frontage.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: But are 150 of those arborvitae? Or I'm trying to get an idea of how much arborvitae you're going to be planting along Thrall Road.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): I think it -- it's really kind of depends on, we've got the list of species there. And sometimes it's a matter of what can be -- being fully stocked from -- from a nursery, so.

But the intention is to have leaf on, you know, non-deciduous plantings to provide year-round screening.

- MR. BALDWIN: I think that the testimony that you heard, Mr. DeCrescenzo, is that the exact species that would be planted would be selected from that list provided on the plan sheet reference.
- MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yes, and my concern is, who will select it? And when will it be selected, and what kind of input will there be in the diversity of plantings along that very long stretch of Thrall Road?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): I think that, that will be partially selected at the time of construction based on -- on availability as well of plantings that can be sourced for the site.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: So right now, the residents of East

1 Windsor drive along Thrall Road and they see a 2 meadow or a field. And someday if this is 3 approved, they'll see some long stretch of 4 plantings that they'll have no idea, or no input 5 into how that's designed. 6 Is that what you're telling us? 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: If I may interrupt? The project 8 will be filing a D and M plan as part of their 9 detailed plans for construction. 10 And part of that D and M plan will most 11 likely require them to file a landscape plan in 12 which the Council will deliberate and rule on 13 whether it's appropriate or not. 14 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Right. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: And at that point in time, if the 16 Town so chooses to provide input, it would be 17 appropriate. 18 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. Thank you. That's very 19 helpful. 20 But right now, there is no plan for a berm to 21 further enhance the screening along Thrall Road. 22 Is that true? Is that correct? 23 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That that is correct. MR. DeCRESCENZO: And why? 24 25 Why not put a planted berm there.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. It
required us to bring soil to the site. I think we
had to actually excavate a significant amount of
soil for the construction of some type of
stormwater basin. That would have been a good,
good place to be able to use -- use that said
soil.

But right now that that would actually

But right now that that would actually increase the amount of actual potential disturbance and the amount of trucks that we would need to bring to the site to install said berm.

- MR. DeCRESCENZO: So discussing that right now, you testified there's essentially no excavation to be undertaken on the site. Is that correct?
- THE WITNESS (Parsons): There is no significant
 excavation for the construction of -- again, Brad
 Parsons -- for the construction of any type of
 stormwater basin. The only excavation on site is
 limited to trenching and the construction and
 installation of the access road.
- MR. DeCRESCENZO: And I think I heard you testify and the materials show that you haven't done any environmental testing on the site.

Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): At this point in time, we have

not done a phase one ESA.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: But in your application, you recite the fact that at some point in its history, the site was a tobacco farm, right?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): Yes, sir. Again, Brad Parsons.

I think in response to Mr. Hannon's questions earlier, you know, phase one ESAs have been done. We have done phase one ESAs on similar, similar sites, which had former tobacco fields, which obviously show a high, high concentration of herbicides and pesticides --

THE HEARING OFFICER: Excuse me for one moment.

Attorney Baldwin, we're hearing some background noise again. Whoever is shuffling papers or whatever, could they please halt until the hearing is over?

Thank you.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: So you haven't done any testing on this site, but you're familiar with testing on similar sites. And on similar sites, the testing shows that there are high levels of pesticides and herbicides that are potentially hazardous materials. Is that correct? Did you respond?

Because if you did, I didn't hear you.

I think the witness panel is muted.

1 THE REPORTER: This is the Reporter. I don't -- oh. 2 MR. BALDWIN: Can you hear us now? 3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, we can hear you. 4 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Okay. Sorry about that. 5 Again, this is Brad Parsons. We have not 6 done any physical testing of the soil on site 7 or -- or previous sites. We've done phase one 8 ESAs to identify the potential for contaminants. 9 Those phase one ESAs identify the potential 10 for contaminants, one of those being the fact in 11 the use of herbicides and pesticides that is 12 prevalent in -- in the farm fields in -- in the 13 area. 14 And so as a result those, those come up and 15 basically it states that if any soil is to be 16 removed from site, that we would need to deal with 17 a soil management plan at -- at that point in time 18 to deal with any potential contaminants. 19 But our -- our intent is not to remove any 20 soil from this site, as such not requiring the 21 need for soil testing. 22 MR. DeCRESCENZO: How many posts will you be installing 23 as a part of the project? 24 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. I don't

have the exact number right this second, but

25

1 approximately 1500. 2 MR. DeCRESCENZO: 1500 posts to support the solar 3 array? 4 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That is correct, sir. 5 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And I think I heard you testify earlier those posts will be driven into the ground 7 for ten feet. 8 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. 9 That's correct, sir. 10 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. And I think I read that the 11 water supply in this area consists solely of 12 private wells. Correct? THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. 13 14 That's our understanding. 15 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And I don't see any evidence that 16 you've done any pre-construction well testing? 17 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. That is 18 correct. We haven't done any, any 19 pre-construction well testing because we're not 20 going to -- as discussed in response to one of the 21 interrogatories, we don't view any of the items 22 that we are going to bring onto site to -- to 23 cause any contamination as a result of our 24 construction. 25 MR. DeCRESCENZO: But if there is contamination in the

ground, which you don't know whether there is or not in the soil, and you drive fifteen hundred posts into the ground to a depth of ten feet, isn't it logical to understand the water table or the nature of the soils, or any of that information given that you're surrounded by private wells?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I'm going to object to the question. It calls for speculation.

I think our Witnesses have responded to the best of their ability as it relates to these questions.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Counsel, I agree it calls for speculation, but only because you haven't done any testing. And I think the Council should absolutely require that the normal soil testing be done here.

I mean, you simply have no idea where the water table is. You don't know the nature of the soils. You don't know where the wells are. You don't know if they're upgrading or downgrading.

You have no idea what impact this project may have on those private wells.

And it doesn't seem logical to me that there will be no infiltration from your project

1 construction period, and even the operational period when you're driving fifteen hundred posts 2 3 into the ground at a depth of ten feet. Yeah, 4 it's speculation. That's my point. 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, it's been determined that 6 the extent that they've done or haven't done 7 testing, and they have testified to that. 8 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yes. 9 THE HEARING OFFICER: And that's on the record. 10 So please continue. 11 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Thank you. I will move on. 12 You also have in your materials that you are 13 not proposing to post a decommissioning bond. 14 Is that correct? 15 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Correct. 16 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And explain why you've chosen not to 17 propose a decommissioning bond? 18 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Mr. DeCrescenzo, this is 19 Bryan Fitzgerald. We are bound through our lease 20 agreements with the landowner to fully 21 decommission and remove the array come the end of 22 term or face legal action. 23 It effectively acts as a decommissioning 24 assurance, and the point that us as the owner of 25 the project are legally bound to complete that

1 decommissioning. 2 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Understood. Were those leases 3 submitted as part of the application? 4 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): I do not believe so. 5 This is Bryan Fitzgerald. 6 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And those leases are contracts 7 between private parties. Is that correct? 8 So if your application is approved as 9 submitted on the area of decommissioning, there 10 is -- you're proposing no surety that can be 11 enforced by any public agency to make sure 25 or 12 35 years from now you decommission the project as 13 you're proposing. Is that correct? 14 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): That is correct, as we are 15 again legally bound by the obligations in our 16 contracts to do so. 17 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So long as those contracts aren't 18 amended or changed or revised. Correct? 19 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): That's correct. And I 20 wouldn't assume a landowner would amend a contract 21 to give the tenant the latitude to do something of 22 that nature. 23 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And we haven't seen the leases, so we 24 don't know. But there's no -- I assume there's no 25 prohibition in these private leases prohibiting

1 this landowner from selling its fee interest to 2 some other landowner that may not be as interested 3 in decommissioning. Is that correct? 4 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Bryan Fitzgerald. And we're 5 happy to share these sections of the lease 6 agreement. We've shared them on numerous 7 occasions with the Siting Council in other dockets 8 at issue. 9 MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, I would also point out 10 that the petition itself in appendix D includes a 11 full decommissioning and restoration plan. 12 we've also responded to the decommissioning bond 13 question in response to Council Interrogatory 14 Number 14. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, thank you. Attorney 16 Baldwin, that is on the record. 17 Please continue. 18 In your application, you state that MR. DeCRESCENZO: 19 you believe your project is inconsistent with East 20 Windsor's plan of conservation and development. 21 Is that correct? 22 Inconsistent or consistent? MR. BALDWIN: 23 Mr. DeCrescenzo, I'm sorry. 24 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Consistent with the plan of 25 conservation and development.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): That that's correct,

Mr. DeCrescenzo. This is Brad Parsons.

On page 16 of the petition, the petition states, the project conforms to the Town of East Windsor's 2016 Plan of Conservation and Development, which includes among its primary goals to promote additional local sustainability initiatives, including solar power, renewable energy, and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the town.

Among these specific areas identified in the -- in this plan of conservation and development, considering allowing solar farms as primary use throughout East Windsor; that's on pages 93 and 94 of the Town's plan of conservation and development, is consistent with that as Section 101 of East Windsor's Solar Zoning Regulations also encourages energy conservation and the use of solar, and other renewable forms of energy.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Can you tell me whether that
encouragement of solar is for industrial-sized
solar facilities such as being proposed? Or is it
limited to solar facilities within the zone that
are more consistent with the zone?

1 As to the question, I don't know that my MR. BALDWIN: 2 witnesses can speak to that level of detail in the 3 plan. 4 The section of the application that 5 Mr. Parsons just referred to is taken right from 6 the Plan of Development. It speaks for itself. 7 MR. DeCRESCENZO: In what zone is this site in, do you 8 know that? 9 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. DeCrescenzo, this, this 10 site is in zone R3. 11 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So it's a residential three zone. 12 Correct? 13 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That is correct. 14 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Is it your position that a 15 utility-sized solar facility like the one being 16 proposed is consistent with the residential nature 17 of everything else in the zone? 18 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): This is Bryan Fitzgerald. 19 And when you phrase it like that, maybe not, but 20 what we're doing here is more than just installing 21 a utility-scale solar farm. 22 We're also continuing agricultural use across 23 the property where we're stopping the use of 24 herbicides and pesticides across that land for the 25 next 20 years at least.

23

24

25

So when -- when you think of the other factors that include a continued agricultural use with no herbicide or pesticide use, I would tend to think that maybe we are consistent with some of that land use type.

is basically an industrial use. Correct? THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): It's an industrial use -and again, this is Bryan Fitzgerald -- simply

because we're not just putting panels here and walking away and putting crushed stone underneath

the array, or just running mowers through there.

We are continuing the agricultural use on that land. And if you -- if you consider, you know, sheep farming, industrial use across a parcel across the street with no solar on it, then maybe.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Could you describe to me the sheep farming aspect of this plan?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): A typical solar project, think of the parcel as it sits today. If you put solar -- if you put solar out there with no sheep, you have to control the vegetation. You have to control the growth.

In a traditional means and methods, you would

run in there with mowers or other mowing equipment and simply trim and cut the grass like individuals do with their lawns on -- on a weekly basis. The sheep farm -- the sheep are there to alleviate the need for that.

So the host farm brings in their sheep. The project is providing feed for those sheep in the form of its meadow that's grown within the array, and the sheep are transferred from paddock to paddock within the project area to control the vegetation in a more sustainable means and methods than using traditional mowers.

So there the sheep farmers are doing the same thing they would do at their home farms, but they're doing it across a broader, broader portfolio of real estate. You could argue land that they wouldn't otherwise have access to because maybe they can't compete with lease rates that rye hay and tobacco are paid.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: How long do the sheep stay on the property?

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): The sheep are typically on property from end of April, early May through October. And they could be rotated on and off during the year for different reasons.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: So it's your testimony that the use of sheep to graze as part of the landscaping plan mitigates the industrial nature of the proposed development.

THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): That's effectively what I'm getting at, because there's more than just the component of putting solar out there and running away from it, and then using, you know, typical tractors and mowers to handle the vegetation.

And again, that's -- that's my opinion.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): I would also state that -- this is Brad Parsons. That you know, when you think of typical industrial nature, if you're thinking of an Amazon distribution warehouse, you know, or some type of factory -- right? Where you're paving for parking, you're installing a building.

You are taking land that is, you know, a farm field and turning it in to impervious area. You know, that, to us, would be more of an industrial use than what is being proposed as part of this project.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Would you agree with me that the proposed screening along Thrall Road is more consistent with an industrial development than a residential development?

1 THE WITNESS (Parsons): I think that maybe is the 2 subject -- subject to somebody's opinion. 3 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Tell me about the interconnection 4 system. Does it require the installation of 5 utility poles? 6 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Bryan Fitzgerald. Yes. MR. DeCRESCENZO: Or are you proposing the installation 7 8 of utility poles? 9 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Correct. Per the 10 interconnection guidelines with Eversource Energy, 11 we would have to install utility poles for our 12 equipment and Eversource's equipment to support 13 the operations of the project. 14 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And what do those poles look like and 15 how tall are they? 16 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): They would be your standard 17 40 to 45-foot utility poles with -- with 18 three-phase infrastructure at the top of them that 19 maybe you saw today driving north. 20 MR. DeCRESCENZO: I think one of the members of the 21 Council asked if there was a way to avoid the 22 installation of those poles and make the 23 interconnection at ground level. Did I hear that 24 right? 25 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Bryan Fitzgerald. You may

1 have heard it partially right. In our experience 2 working with Eversource across almost 50 to 60 3 megawatts of approved interconnections over the 4 last few years, we haven't been presented with an 5 option by Eversource where we haven't uncovered an 6 option from Eversource that completely alleviates 7 the use of poles. 8 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So how many poles will need to be 9 installed to make the interconnection? 10 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): This is Bryan Fitzgerald. 11 Eight utility poles would have to be 12 installed to complete the interconnection. 13 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Eight 40-foot poles that aren't there 14 Is that correct? today. 15 And where would they be located? 16 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. DeCrescenzo, if you're 17 referencing post figure -- proposed figure three, 18 which is the proposed conditions figure, they 19 are shown. They are shown on that figure there --20 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yeah, I don't see them. I guess I 21 don't see them very well because I only have an 22 eight and a half by eleven view of it. 23 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): So you could also view them 24 on the drawings, if you have those drawings as 25 well. I can direct you to the location on there,

1 but if I were to look at figure three in the 2 bottom, kind of, southwest corner of -- of the 3 site, that the larger black line around the site, 4 you'll see the yellow in that area, the yellow 5 lines and dots with the -- and those are the 6 locations of the -- the proposed utility poles. 7 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So they're right along Thrall Road. 8 Is that correct. Or adjacent to Thrall Road? 9 THE WITNESS (Parsons): That is correct. They're 10 adjacent to Thrall Road, where the existing 11 electrical infrastructure is located. 12 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Now, have you done a glare study for 13 the panels? First of all, how many panels are you 14 installing again? 15 THE WITNESS (Parsons): We're installing approximately 16 9,932 panels. 17 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And these panels will move on the 18 framework. Is that correct? 19 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. 20 That is correct. 21 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And have you done any glare study to 22 determine whether or not the panels in the fixed 23 position, or any of the movable positions will create a glare condition for the surrounding 24 25 residential areas?

1 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. We have 2 not conducted a full glare study on this project, 3 but it is our understanding that with the existing vegetation and the angles of the sun, that we 4 5 don't expect there to be any, any glare issue on 6 site. 7 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And how can the people of East 8 Windsor be assured of that if there's no glare 9 study? 10 THE WITNESS (Parsons): The panels themselves, that 11 they are -- they -- they actually have, like, a 12 tempered glass to them. So that they're not --13 they're almost like an anti-glare film on the 14 panels themselves as well. 15 MR. DeCRESCENZO: So that, that's all you can offer in 16 terms of your submission for issues of glare 17 pollution, that you don't think there will be any? 18 Is that what you're saying? 19 I believe that's the testimony, yes. MR. BALDWIN: 20 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. Now, what about a training 21 plan for local emergency management people in East 22 Windsor? I know it's referenced in the 23 application. Do you have a specific plan on how 24 to train East Windsor first responders in case 25 there's some sort of accident, or other sort of

1 calamity on site? THE WITNESS (Parsons): We don't have a specific plan 2 3 in place. We wait until the -- the project is 4 fully -- fully constructed. We make sure we have 5 all of our -- our types of equipment and such that 6 we're using on their locations and how to 7 disconnect those in place. 8 And once that's done, we will provide the --9 the first responders with any opportunity for 10 training that they -- that they would like. 11 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Would you be willing to purchase for 12 the Town of East Windsor specific equipment that 13 may be needed for this type of development? 14 MR. BALDWIN: I'm going to object to the question. 15 It's outside the scope of this proceeding, talking 16 about emergency service equipment. 17 MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. That's fair enough. 18 Will that be included in the D and M plan? 19 MR. BALDWIN: The type of emergency service equipment 20 that the Town might need? MR. DeCRESCENZO: No, no, no. The training plan for 21 22 local first responders. 23 THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. If we 24 need to -- if that wants to be provided prior to 25 the start of construction, we can. We can

Obviously provide that and make sure that it's updated upon completion of construction as well.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Now on the issue of noise, there's been a lot of questioning from the Council about this. And I'm unclear of this.

Was there a study done specific to this site?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): This is Brad Parsons. I will

let Andy speak to specifics that were -- were done
for the site.

But as noted, we -- in addition to the noise study that was included in the filing of the petition, you know, a subsequential noise study done by WSP, which is exhibits for identification Number 5 Petition's Environmental Community Noise Assessment, dated August 31, 2023, was also provided that was completed by WSP. So, yes.

THE WITNESS (Roland): This is Andy Roland with WSP.

And to answer your question, Mr. DeCrescenzo, both studies were, in fact, conducted for this site specifically.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Thank you. Have you had any discussions with the property owner about any willingness to enter into any agricultural easements on other properties in East Windsor to offset the use of this site for the next 35 years?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, this question was asked and answered in the interrogatory responses provided to the Town specifically. I would refer Mr. DeCrescenzo to that response.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Which response was it, Attorney Baldwin?

MR. BALDWIN: It's question 21.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.

Mr. DeCrescenzo, please refer to the response to 21.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yeah, in that response you state that you're unaware of any plans by the site owner to offer agricultural easements across other lands that it owns in East Windsor. I guess my question, and following up on our interrogatory question is whether you would be willing to undertake that initiative?

I mean, we're losing a lot of farmland here for a very long time. I direct your attention to Figure 2, existing conditions. And on that you depict two types of farmland, prime farmland soils, and then statewide important farmland soils. Can you tell me how large the prime farmland soil area is on the site?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, again I would refer

1 Mr. DeCrescenzo to the Department of Agriculture 2 letter dated March 23, 2023, in which they 3 identify the amount of prime farmland soil as 18.1 4 acres. 5 MR. DeCRESCENZO: How much is it? 6 18.1 acres. MR. BALDWIN: 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin. 8 MR. DeCRESCENZO: In looking at your application and 9 other submissions, there will be direct visibility 10 from some of the homes surrounding the site after 11 the project is built. Did I read that correctly? 12 THE WITNESS (Fitzgerald): Mr. DeCrescenzo, this is 13 Bryan Fitzgerald. 14 Yes, I believe you read that correctly. 15 MR. DeCRESCENZO: And could you tell us on referring to 16 figure two -- excuse me, figure three, which homes 17 will have direct visibility into the site? 18 THE WITNESS (Parsons): Mr. DeCrescenzo, this is --19 this is Brad Parsons. I'd actually like to refer 20 you to exhibit -- or attachment N -- N10 of the 21 petition, which shows in the photo viewshed which 22 areas will have visibility, potential seasonal 23 visibility through the site. 24 And mainly, the -- the major visibility is 25 the properties located to the southeast along

1 Thrall Road.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yeah, and the way I'm looking at figure three, you're not proposing any screening there. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): I would say that's incorrect,

Mr. DeCrescenzo. This is Brad Parsons. That's

exactly where we're proposing the screening. All

along that area in yellow to mitigate the

visibility, and then again going back to -- to

that same appendix N, existing photo 1 and

proposed photo 1, pages 4 and 5 of that PDF

showing -- showing that existing and then proposed

photo simulation.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: I guess I'm not seeing it on figure three. I'm looking at the house in the left-hand corner, two or three houses in the left-hand corner of the picture, or the figure that are along Thrall Road; that there's existing vegetation there, but it doesn't appear that you're adding anything to that along the fence line. Am I reading that incorrectly?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): No, no. That that would be correct, Mr. DeCrescenzo. We're -- we're showing that existing vegetation that exists along that southern property line will -- will be maintained

in that section.

I would also like to point out that the contours themselves actually go -- go up along that section as well as you get to the southern property line there. So here our -- actually, on top of the vegetation, there is almost an existing berm along that southern property line that here you're specifically referring to.

- MR. DeCRESCENZO: And is that a deciduous vegetation,
 or evergreen, or a mixture? Or what is it?

 THE WITNESS (Parsons): It's my understanding, it's a
 mixture. Brad Parsons.
- MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. Certainly, during some months of the year, it will not be as effective in visually screening the site as it may be in the middle of the summer.

Am I depicting that correctly?

- THE WITNESS (Parsons): If that is correct, it may have -- it may have some limited seasonal, seasonal views there.
- MR. DeCRESCENZO: Well, you would agree with me that
 you do have the room, it looks like, to put a
 visual barrier along your fence line in that area
 to help screen off your solar array from those
 homes during periods of the year when the

deciduous existing screen doesn't do the job.

THE WITNESS (Parsons): That there may be some, some ability for that, however, you know, the contours on that, that southern side there when -- when I look at -- at the survey that was done for the property, the elevations on that, on that southern side significantly increase as you're -- you're moving to -- to the south there, so -- and then ultimately come back down towards, towards Thrall road.

And so you almost have an existing natural -natural berm in that location. And in my -MR. DeCRESCENZO: But the project site is higher than

the elevation of the homes. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): It could be slightly -- but it could be slightly, and that maybe -- again, there may be some seasonal views at the end of the day, correct.

MR. DeCRESCENZO: Okay. And getting back to the concept of protecting an offsetting amount of farmland somewhere else in East Windsor, have you considered entering into any agreements with other land owners to provide the Town of East Windsor with an agricultural open space easement of a like amount to offset for this, this proposed project?

THE WITNESS (Parsons): I would say -- this is Brad

Parsons -- the letter from the Department of

Agriculture that Mr. Baldwin referred to earlier

dated March 23, 2023, you know, specifically says

that such project will not necessarily affect the

status of such land as prime farmland.

Additionally, we are proposing -- Bryan can talk about it in more detail. We are proposing the use to continue farming the site as a livestock grazing, and that is farming.

- MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yes, but it's going to have 9,000 solar panels on it for 35 years. And what we're asking, the Town is asking is have you considered mitigating the effect of the industrial type development you're proposing in the R3 zone by protecting land elsewhere from a similar type development?
- MR. BALDWIN: To the question, first of all, we've responded to the question in the interrogatory responses. And again, based on the testimony provided, the Department of Agriculture has determined that this will not adversely impact farmland, prime farmland, and statewide important farmland at the property.

So mitigation is not necessary.

1	MR. DeCRESCENZO: So the answer is no? Okay.
2	MR. BALDWIN: I just refer you to the record,
3	Mr. DeCrescenzo, that information is we
4	responded to the question in the interrogatories
5	and we rely on the letter from the Department of
6	Agriculture.
7	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Understood.
8	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin.
9	They've answered the question, so let's move on.
10	MR. BALDWIN: Thank you.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
12	MR. DeCRESCENZO: I have no further questions at this
13	time.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good. Thank you, Attorney
15	DeCrescenzo.
16	We will now continue with the appearance of
17	the Town of East Windsor. Will the Town present
18	its witness panel for the purpose of taking the
19	oath?
20	And we will have Attorney Bachman taking the
21	administrative oath.
22	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yes, we have one witness, Jason
23	Bowsza, who is the First Selectman of the Town of
24	East Windsor.
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

1	Attorney Bachman, would you swear in the
2	witness, please?
3	MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.
4	(FIRST SELECTMAN) JASON BOWSZA,
5	called as a witness, being sworn by
6	THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, was examined and
7	testified under oath as follows:
8	
9	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Bachman.
10	Please begin by verifying all the exhibits by
11	the appropriate sworn witness.
12	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Mr. Bowsza, you submitted a letter to
13	the Siting Council. I'd ask you to review that
14	letter and indicate whether or not that is in your
15	writing?
16	THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Yes, sir, it is.
17	MR. DeCRESCENZO: I offer it as a full exhibit.
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Anything else? You have four
19	exhibits listed in the hearing program.
20	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Yes, I'm sorry, I apologize. We also
21	have the interrogatory responses, the Planning and
22	Zoning Commission comments dated May 4th, the
23	request for party status, and Town's request for
24	public hearing.
25	We'd offer those as full exhibits.

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
2	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Thank you. Is First Selectman Bowsza
3	accepting those as his testimony?
4	THE WITNESS (Bowsza): I do.
5	MR. DeCRESCENZO: Very good. Does the petitioner
6	object to the admission of the Town of East
7	Windsor's exhibits?
8	Attorney Baldwin?
9	MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Morissette, did you hear me?
10	I'm sorry, I said no objection.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Very good, thank you. The
12	exhibits are hereby admitted.
13	We'll now begin with cross-examination of the
14	Town of East Windsor by the Council, starting with
15	Mr. Perrone, followed by Mr. Silvestri.
16	Mr. Perrone?
17	MR. PERRONE: Thank you, Mr. Morissette. First
18	Selectman Bowsza, my questions will be centered on
19	your letter and also the 2016 Town Plan of
20	Conservation and Development.
21	THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Okay.
22	MR. PERRONE: Referring to the Town's letter, on page
23	2, second paragraph, it states the project would
24	disrupt the Town's scenic road loop, and it
25	references the Town Plan of Conservation and

Development. On page 20 of the POCD, at the bottom of the page, it states the beginnings of a scenic loop road have also been envisioned.

My question is, what further action has the Town taken since 2016 to establish the scenic loop?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): That would be the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MR. PERRONE: Looking at the conceptual scenic road

loop in the POCD on page 22, is it the intent to

have an additional layer of scenic road regulation

along this entire conceptual route?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): The regulations, again, are subject to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

We'll say that two years ago, as part of the Town's strategy to allocate our American Rescue Plan Act funds, we sent out a community-wide survey to about 9,000 residences and got about 700 responses back.

Included in those responses were a high priority on passive recreation, esthetics, beautification within the town, walkways, biking trails, hiking trails.

So it does -- the plan of conservation and development continues to be representative of

1 where the interests of the community are as 2 recently as that survey. 3 The project site is zoned residential. MR. PERRONE: 4 How would the residential zoning of that site 5 affect the conceptual scenic road loop? 6 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): It would fit in within it. 7 MR. PERRONE: Are there zoning regulations in place 8 that offer protections to the conceptual scenic 9 road loop? 10 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Yes. 11 MR. PERRONE: How would the project affect the 12 conceptual scenic road loop, given that 13 landscaping is proposed to mitigate views of the 14 facility? 15 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): I think as came up during 16 Attorney DeCrescenzo's cross-examination, the type 17 of landscaping that is proposed would be 18 disruptive to what we're trying to work towards. 19 You know, a thousand-foot wall of arborvitae 20 along an area that's traditionally farming and agriculture doesn't run in concert with what the 21 22 natural landscape is, and what the heritage is and 23 what the -- the culture of that area is. 24 It becomes a wall by another name. 25 MR. PERRONE: On page 25 of the POCD, it states that

1 the Town should consider a scenic road ordinance. 2 Has the town developed and implemented such an 3 ordinance? 4 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): No. 5 MR. PERRONE: Are there any scenic roads adjacent to 6 the site? 7 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Yes. 8 MR. PERRONE: Could you identify those? 9 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Well, let me -- let me ask, can 10 you -- can you define scenic? Is there a specific 11 definition? Or is it based on the typical 12 topography and landscaping in the area? 13 MR. PERRONE: A locally designated scenic road. 14 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): So I would consider Clark Road, Frog Hollow Road, Miller Road, Rockville Road, all 15 16 to be scenic and they're all adjacent to the --17 the subject site. MR. PERRONE: Has the Town developed village plans as 18 19 recommended by the POCD on page 40? 20 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Yes. 21 MR. PERRONE: According to the POCD, the conceptual 22 Windsorville Village District Plan does not 23 contain the site parcel on page 43. Was the village plan boundary modified to include the site 24 25 parcel after the POCD was issued?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): No, but let me clarify what
those maps are -- are talking about. So East
Windsor is made up of five villages. There's
Melrose, Broad Brook, Windsorville, Scantic, and
Warehouse Point. Those five comprise East
Windsor.

What -- what these maps indicate is if you were to basically Google Windsorville Center, that is what would pop up is that intersection there. But in terms of family heritage, it's more expansive than that.

The same thing holds true with Broad Brook. The same thing holds true with the other three villages as well. There is -- there are very unique characteristics about each of the five villages.

And while -- and I'll also tell you quite honestly, the subject parcel that you're talking about with Petition 1572 barely is not in what is referenced in -- in page 43. It's actually -- I believe it's the adjacent parcel to it.

So I mean, you're really talking about a distinction of Google Maps.

MR. PERRONE: There was discussion earlier about landscape plantings and fence design. With

respect to the project, does the Town have any preferences on fence design?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Well, so your question is predicated on the notion we're supportive of the project, which we are not. So our preference would be that there be no screening at all, because there is -- there is no fence design at all, because there is actually no project there.

That said, I'll answer the question I think you asked, which is if there were to be something there, we want something that would be aesthetically compatible with the existing area as can be, something that's unobtrusive, something that's natural, something that looks like it belongs there, not something that looks like it was placed there.

But that said, I'm still not saying that we're in any way interested in seeing it there at all. We like the -- the esthetics as they are.

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

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Perrone.

We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Silvestri, followed by Mr. Golembiewski.

Mr. Silvestri?

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Morissette.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good afternoon, First Selectman Bowsza.

of the page?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Hello. How are you, sir?

MR. SILVESTRI: We're doing okay, thank you. I just wanted to follow up on your letter on page 2. This is a letter dated September 6th. And if you go down to the very end of the fourth paragraph, there's two sentences -- or two concepts that I want to discuss with you. One of them is the

Could you define that a little bit for me? THE WITNESS (Bowsza): You're talking about the fourth paragraph of the letter, or the fourth paragraph

aesthetic degradation that you mentioned.

MR. SILVESTRI: Fourth paragraph of page 2. It begins with, the Town has been working collaboratively.

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Yeah. Okay. So when these projects go in, they -- they materially change the way that a community looks, or that a neighborhood, where they're sited looks. And what we're working with, there is a group of concerned citizens with whom we are working closely to make sure that we're considering all of the concerns of the people that I represent.

And one of the concerns is that many of us, myself included, live in East Windsor because of its rural charm, because of the small-town feel, the open agricultural fields. And what we're seeing is, particularly in the case of East Windsor, is for whatever reason we have become a magnet for these solar developments, and it's -- it's against our will, and it's changing the way that we all view our own community.

It's changing the reason why many people live here. And we're trying to -- to work collaboratively between the Town's resources and the -- the interests of our citizens to express to you folks as the decision makers that we -- we don't like this. We have been asked to do more than is rightfully imposed on any one community.

So that's what I'm trying to get to with the use of the phrase "aesthetic degradation."

MR. SILVESTRI: So in a sense, if I understand correctly, if it's not rural, it would be in the category of aesthetic degradation?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): In that section of town, yes.

But if it were along -- if there were some sort of
a development along Route 5 or along Route 140,
which are our two economic development designated
areas, we'd be more open to that because that fits
with the concept of smart growth. That fits with

where we all understand the type of commercial development need go.

In the Melrose section, really the Broad
Brook section and in the Windsorville section, if
you're going to see development there, it's -it's most appropriately housing.

It's -- we prefer it to stay open and farmland, but if there's going to be development of some sort, it's residential that's appropriate with the -- the contours and the feelings of those areas. Along 140 and along Route 5, those are major commercial -- commercial quarters for us. And so if there were a development along those, there's a different response from the community because it's expected there.

It's not expected in this area when you have people who five, six, seven years ago bought homes and they expected they're going to have the views that they are accustomed to. And maybe someday they're going to get some neighbors and there will be some kids throwing a baseball in the backyard.

They don't expect to live next door to a power plant.

MR. SILVESTRI: Then going back to a response that you gave to Mr. Perrone a few minutes ago, you

mentioned the thousand-foot wall of Arborvitae.

would take it that, in your opinion, that would

fall into the aesthetic degradation category for

this area. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Correct. And it just doesn't fit there. It just doesn't look like this is what nature made for us and how we have been stewards of that area. It looks more like somebody put this here and they're hiding something.

And I can point to real world examples where you can see the same thing. If you're familiar with Palisade -- Palisades Avenue -- Palisado Avenue in the town of Windsor, if you're driving by it, there's a property that's about two acres in width that is a wall of Arborvitae. And it looks righteously out of place with the rest of that historic neighborhood.

And the reason that that wall of Arborvitae is there is because somebody actually is hiding something behind it. There they're storing some sort of construction or landscape equipment in an otherwise residential area. We don't want that here.

MR. SILVESTRI: No. Thank you for that response as well.

One other question I have for you goes back to that fourth paragraph again where you mentioned groundwater contamination. And I'd just like a clarification on that as to what you might be looking at or thinking about for groundwater contamination.

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): Well, I -- I think this was addressed in one of Attorney DeCrescenzo's cross-examination questions. Most of that -- well, actually all of that portion of Windsorville, to my knowledge, is on private wells.

And so if groundwater -- if there's groundwater contaminants that gets into wells that are the result of 1500 puncture wounds into the soil, that creates a very righteous public health concern amongst people who again had an opportunity not to expect that to be a problem for them.

And you know, so we're -- we are concerned about vulnerability of drinking water. And it's very expensive, nigh prohibitive, to run city water to all aspects of East Windsor.

We're doing a project now where we're going to extend city water by a little less than -- a

1 little less than probably 1200 feet. That's going 2 to cost us about \$5 million to get it all the way 3 out to where this project may impact people. 4 there's -- there are many homes in the area. Ιt 5 would be -- it would be just an unattainable task. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: Very good. Thank you for your 7 responses. 8 Mr. Morissette, that's all the questions I 9 have. And I thank you. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Silvestri. 11 We'll now continue with cross-examination by Mr. Golembiewski. Mr. Golembiewski? 12 13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Morissette. 14 I have no questions. 15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Golembiewski. 16 First Selectman Bowsza, I do not have any 17 questions either. Thank you for your time and the 18 responses to the questions that we have had here 19 this afternoon. 20 We will now continue with cross-examination 21 of the Town of East Windsor by the petitioner, 22 Attorney Baldwin. 23 MR. BALDWIN: I have a couple of questions. Mr. 24 Bowsza, I think I heard some conflicting testimony 25 as it relates to the scenic road issue that was

asked earlier. There was discussion about Mr. Perrone's question that the conceptual scenic road plan and the plan of development, and you said -- I thought you said that there was -- no such regulations have been developed since 2016.

You said it was in the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): I didn't say whether -- I didn't say whether or not they had been adopted. I simply said they were in the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission, not the Board of Selectmen.

MR. BALDWIN: Then you said that the zoning regulations to protect scenic roads was in place. Can you identify which section of the regulations that is?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): If I said that, I misstated that, because that is not what I had intended to

say -- nor is it what I believe I did say.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. So there, there are no scenic road ordinances or regulations in place currently in the Town of East Windsor?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): There are no scenic road ordinances, which I can speak to, because that isn't the purview of my board. I cannot speak to what is -- what in the purview of the Planning and

1 Zoning Commission. That was the distinction I was 2 making, sir. 3 MR. BALDWIN: As of your knowledge, Thrall Road today 4 is not a designated scenic road in the Town of 5 East Windsor. Correct? 6 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): What do you mean by designated? 7 MR. BALDWIN: Has the Town of East Windsor designated 8 Thrall Road as a scenic road, formally? 9 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): If you mean, have we put a sign 10 up saying that this is like a village district? 11 The answer to that is no. 12 MR. BALDWIN: And again, there's no ordinance in place 13 that identifies Thrall Road as a scenic road in 14 the town of East Windsor? 15 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): That is correct. 16 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. 17 Just a quick question about your concern for, I think the term you used was "this area of town." 18 19 Not far from this area of town are two other 20 projects that the Siting Council approved. One of 21 them in Docket 492 is the Gravel Pit Solar 22 Facility. That's a facility that is encompassing 23 and developing 485 acres of East Windsor property. 24 Did you express any concerns about wells, 25 impacts of development of groundwater in that

docket? And if so, I see a letter in the docket that refers -- from you, that states that the Town of East Windsor strongly supported that project.

Were you concerned about the wells and groundwater for the 485-acre gravel pit solar project?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): So it's important to recognize
the distinction between where this property is in
relation to residences and where the gravel pit
solar project is in relation to residences.

Particularly, there is -- the gravel pit project is located in its closest proximity to a major area of residential units on -- on a very old, either a brownfield landfill or a gravel pit, which is where it gets its name from.

That the northern half of that project is all brownfield contaminated area, that that is away from most residences. It's not changing any esthetics. It's not changing any neighborhood feel. It's -- it's mostly obstructed from public view.

This is something that is going to have a material impact on the way people view their homes and -- and are having their homes viewed.

MR. BALDWIN: In the gravel pit solar record is a

letter from the Department of Agriculture that says that the project will convert approximately 230 acres of prime farmland, existing agricultural uses for growing crops and feed corn, shade tobacco and vegetables as a part of that development.

230 of the 485 acres is prime farmland, and yet you strongly supported that project?

THE WITNESS (Bowsza): For -- for the reasons that I stated about the gravel pit itself, but also because of the attractive nuisance that that parcel had provided to illegal ATV use and other illicit activities, to including locations where people would be trespassing and in one instance someone was, a young 15-year-old girl was killed there riding -- riding an ATV.

The parcel itself was too expansive for any one police department or any -- several police departments to be able to cordon off. And so one of the requirements that's put -- put in place by Federal Electric Regulatory Commission is that the project be screened, be fenced.

And so that will curtail what has been a public safety and a public health nuisance to the Town for -- I'm going to say 30 years, probably

1 It -- it is a problem. longer. 2 MR. BALDWIN: Proposed as a part of its approval of 3 this project, a requirement through the D and M, 4 the development and management plan, a requirement 5 that East Windsor Solar II investigate area wells, 6 proximity to area wells, and establish a plan for 7 evaluation of those wells to avoid impacts. 8 Would you be supportive of that condition? 9 THE WITNESS (Bowsza): I think that absolutely should 10 be a condition. 11 MR. BALDWIN: Thank you. 12 I have no further questions, Mr. Morissette. 13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Baldwin and 14 thank you First Selectman Bowsza. 15 That concludes our hearing for this 16 afternoon. The Council will recess until 6:30 17 p.m. At which time we will commence with the 18 public comment session of this public hearing. 19 Thank you everyone, and enjoy your dinner. 20 And we will see you at 6:30. 21 22 (End: 4:46 p.m.) 23 24 25

2

3

4

5

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

STATE OF CONNECTICUT CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Petition No. 1572

I hereby certify that the foregoing 138 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the remote teleconference meeting in Re: PETITION NO.: 1572, EAST WINDSOR SOLAR II, LLC, PETITION FOR A DECLARATORY RULING, PURSUANT TO CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES §4-176 AND §16-50K, FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A 4.0-MEGAWATT AC SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITY LOCATED AT 31 THRALL ROAD, EAST WINDSOR, CONNECTICUT, AND ASSOCIATED ELECTRICAL INTERCONNECTION, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, Member and Presiding Officer, on September 7, 2023.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX
2	WITNESSES PAGE
3	Bradley J. Parsons Bryan Fitzgerald
4	Andy Roland Robert Burns
5	Dean Gustafson 10
6	EXAMINERS Del Mer Delderin
7	By Mr. Baldwin 11, (77) By Mr. Perrone 14 By Mr. Silvestri 25
8	By Mr. Silvestil 25 By Ms. Golembiewski 43 By Mr. Hannon 52
9	By The Hearing Officer (Morissette) 64 By Mr. DeCrescenzo 81
10	by Mr. Decrescenzo
11	WITNESS PAGE (First Selectman) Jason Bowsza 120
12	EXAMINERS
13	By Mr. DeCrescenzo 120 By Mr. Perrone 121
14	By Mr. Silvestri 127 By Mr. Baldwin 132
15	by Mr. Dardwin
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	