CERTIFIED COPY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

PETITION NO. 1589

Petition from USS Somers Solar, LLC for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-176 and Section 16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 3.0-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility located at 360 Somers Road, Ellington, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection

VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE

> Public Hearing held on Tuesday, December 5, 2023, beginning at 2 p.m., via remote access.

JOHN MORISSETTE, Presiding Officer

16 H e

Held Before:

Reporter: Lisa L. Warner, CSR #061

1	Appearances:
2	
3	Council Members:
4	BRIAN GOLEMBIEWSKI, Designee for
5	Commissioner Katie Dykes, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
6 7	QUAT NGUYEN, Designee for Commissioner Katie Dykes, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
8	ROBERT SILVESTRI
9	DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.
10	
11	Council Staff:
12	MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ. Executive Director and Staff Attorney
13 14	IFEANYI NWANKWO Siting Analyst
15	LISA FONTAINE Fiscal Administrative Officer
16	DAKOTA LaFOUNTAIN
17	Clerk Typist
18	
19	For USS Somers Solar, LLC:
20	PULLMAN & COMLEY, LLC 90 State Street
21	Hartford, Connecticut 06103-3702 Phone: 860.424.4315
22	BY: LEE D. HOFFMAN, ESQ. lhoffman@pullcom.com
23	
24	_
25	Zoom co-host: Aaron Demarest

MR. MORISSETTE: This public hearing is called to order this Tuesday, December 5, 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; and Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.; and Robert Silvestri.

Members of the staff are Melanie
Bachman, executive director and staff attorney;
Ifeanyi Nwankwo, siting analyst; Lisa Fontaine,
fiscal administrative officer; and Dakota
LaFountain, clerk typist.

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

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon a petition from USS Somers Solar, LLC for a declaratory ruling pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-176 and

16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 3.0-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility located at 360 Somers Road in Ellington, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection. This petition was received by the Council on August 23, 2023.

The Council's legal notice of the date and time of this public hearing was published in The Journal Inquirer on November 13, 2023. Upon this Council's request, the petitioner erected a sign in the vicinity of the proposed site as to inform the public of the name of the petitioner, type of facility, the public hearing date, and contact information for the Council, including the website and phone number.

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

The party to the proceeding is as follows: The petitioner is USS Somers Solar, LLC, represented by Lee D. Hoffman, Esq. of Pullman & Comley, LLC.

We will proceed in accordance with the

prepared agenda, a copy of which is available on the Council's Petition Number 1589 webpage, along with the record of this matter, the public hearing notice, instructions for public access to this public hearing, and the Council's Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures. Interested persons may join any session of this public hearing to listen, but no public comments will be received during the 2 p.m. evidentiary session. At the end of the evidentiary session, we will recess until 6:30 p.m. for the public comment session. Please be advised that any person may be removed from the evidentiary session or the public comment session at the discretion of the Council.

The 6:30 p.m. public comment session will be reserved for members of the public who 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 benefit 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 by either mail or by email, and such written statements will be given the same weight as if spoken during the public comment session.

A verbatim transcript of this public hearing will be posted on the Council's Petition Number 1589 webpage and deposited with the Ellington Town Clerk's Office for the convenience of the public.

Please be advised that the Council does not issue permits for stormwater management. If the proposed project is approved by the Council, a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, also known as 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 not include consideration of property values.

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

We have one motion to take care of before we start the hearing. The motion is from USS Somers Solar, LLC, a motion for protective

1 order, dated November 9, 2023. Attorney Bachman 2 may wish to comment. 3 Attorney Bachman. 4 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. 5 Morissette. The petitioner filed a motion for 6 protective order under Connecticut General 7 Statutes, Section 1-210(b) related to the project 8 costs, and staff recommends approval. Thank you. 9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 10 Bachman. Is there a motion? 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Mr. Morissette, I'll 12 move to approve the motion for protective order. 13 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. 14 Silvestri. Is there a second? 15 MR. NGUYEN: I second it, Mr. 16 Morissette. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. We have a motion by Mr. Silvestri to approve the 18 19 motion for protective order, and we have a second 20 by Mr. Nguyen. We'll now move to discussion. 21 Mr. Silvestri, any discussion? 22 MR. SILVESTRI: No discussion. Thank 23 you. 24 Thank you. MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. 25 Nguyen, any discussion?

1	MR. NGUYEN: No discussion. Thank you.
2	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
3	Golembiewski, any discussion?
4	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: No discussion.
5	Thank you.
6	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch,
7	any discussion?
8	MR. LYNCH: I have no discussion.
9	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. And I have
10	no discussion. We'll now move to the vote.
11	Mr. Silvestri, how do you vote?
12	MR. SILVESTRI: Vote to approve. Thank
13	you.
14	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
15	Nguyen, how do you vote?
16	MR. NGUYEN: Vote to approve. Thank
17	you.
18	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr.
19	Golembiewski?
20	MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Vote to approve.
21	Thank you.
22	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Mr. Lynch?
23	MR. LYNCH: Vote to deny.
24	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch.
25	And I also vote to approve. We have four for

approval and one for denial. The motion passes. 1 2 The motion for protective order is granted. Thank 3 you. 4 We'll now move on to administrative 5 notice taken by the Council. I wish to call your 6 attention to those items shown in the hearing 7 program marked as Roman Numerals I-C, Items 1 8 through 99. Does the petitioner have any 9 objection to the items that the Council has 10 administratively noticed? 11 Attorney Hoffman, good afternoon. 12 MR. HOFFMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. 13 Morissette. We have no objection, sir. 14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 15 Accordingly, the Council hereby Hoffman. 16 administratively notices these existing documents. 17 (Administrative Notice Items I-C-1 18 through I-C-99: Received in evidence.) 19 MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now continue 20 with the appearance of the petitioner. Will the 21 petitioner present its witness panel for the 22 purpose of taking the oath, and we'll have 23 Attorney Bachman administer the oath. 24 Attorney Hoffman. 25 MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you, Mr.

1 Morissette. With us today for USS Somers Solar we 2 have Daniel Csaplar from United States Solar; 3 Mitchell Ott from Westwood; and Larry Durocher who 4 represents the -- who's the managing member of the 5 property owner. I'd ask that all three be sworn 6 in as witnesses. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 8 Hoffman. 9 Attorney Bachman, please administer the 10 oath. 11 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. 12 Morissette. Could the witnesses please raise 13 their right hand. 14 DANIEL CSAPLAR, 15 MITCHELL OTT, 16 LARRY DUROCHER, 17 having been first duly sworn by Attorney 18 Bachman, were examined and testified on their 19 oaths as follows: 20 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you. 21 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 22 Bachman. 23 Attorney Hoffman, please begin by verifying all the exhibits by the appropriate 24 25 sworn witnesses.

1	MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, Mr. Morissette.
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	MR. HOFFMAN: So Mr. Csaplar, we'll
4	start with you. Are you familiar with the
5	petition itself as well as the responses to the
6	interrogatories that the petitioner provided in
7	this petition?
8	THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes.
9	MR. HOFFMAN: And did you prepare those
10	pieces of information or cause them to be
11	prepared?
12	THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes.
13	MR. HOFFMAN: And are they accurate to
14	the best of your knowledge and belief?
15	THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes.
16	MR. HOFFMAN: And do you have any
17	changes to those materials?
18	THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Not at this
19	time.
20	MR. HOFFMAN: And do you adopt those as
21	your sworn testimony here today subject to
22	cross-examination?
23	THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes.
24	MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Ott, I'm going to ask
25	you the same series of questions. So are you

1 familiar with the petition and the interrogatory 2 responses that were served in this petition by the 3 petitioner? 4 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes. 5 MR. HOFFMAN: And did you prepare those 6 materials or cause them to be prepared? 7 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes. 8 MR. HOFFMAN: And are those materials 9 accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief? 10 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes. 11 MR. HOFFMAN: And do you have any 12 changes to those materials? 13 THE WITNESS (Ott): 14 MR. HOFFMAN: And do you adopt those as 15 your sworn testimony today subject to 16 cross-examination? 17 THE WITNESS (Ott): 18 MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Durocher, we have a 19 slightly different set of questions for you. 20 you file prefile testimony in this petition, sir? 21 Mr. Durocher, you're on mute. 22 THE WITNESS (Durocher): Yes. 23 MR. HOFFMAN: And is that prefile 24 testimony correct and accurate to the best of your 25 knowledge and belief?

```
1
               THE WITNESS (Durocher): Yes.
2
               MR. HOFFMAN: And do you have any
3
   changes to that prefile testimony?
4
               THE WITNESS (Durocher):
5
               MR. HOFFMAN: And do you adopt that
6
   testimony as your sworn testimony today?
7
               THE WITNESS (Durocher): Yes.
8
               MR. HOFFMAN: With that, Mr.
9
   Morissette, I would ask that the Council adopt for
10
   evidentiary purposes the petition, the
11
   interrogatory responses and the prefiled testimony
12
   of Mr. Durocher.
13
               MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
14
   Hoffman. The exhibits are hereby admitted.
15
               (Petitioner's Exhibits II-B-1 through
16
             Received in evidence - described in
   II-B-5:
17
   index.)
18
               MR. MORISSETTE: We'll now begin with
19
   cross-examination of the petitioner by the Council
20
   starting with Mr. Nwankwo followed by Mr.
21
   Silvestri.
22
               Mr. Nwankwo, good afternoon.
23
               MR. NWANKWO: Good afternoon, Mr.
24
   Morissette.
                 Thank you.
25
```

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. NWANKWO: My first question to the petitioner will be why was the site selected for the proposed solar facility?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes. So we go through an extensive process of siting for these solar facilities. There are a few criteria that we look out for, whether the parcel is clear, flat, dry and next to existing utility infrastructure, 3 phase, and we believe that this parcel met all of those criteria.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Before we continue, please state your name before responding to the question so that the court reporter may properly and accurately document the testimony. Thank you.

MR. NWANKWO: My next question. How is the proposed solar facility consistent with the State Plan of Conservation and Development?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Sure. My name is Dan Csaplar on behalf of USS Solar. It's consistent with the state's plan in that we actually bid into the Eversource SCEF program in their attempt to build a more renewable

1 infrastructure. We bid into the Year 1 SCEF 2 program again through Eversource and were awarded 3 a 4-megawatt slot within the Eversource --4 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me, Mr. Morissette. 5 Could you have the witness speak up or talk into 6 the microphone? I have a hard time hearing. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. 8 Mr. Csaplar, could you kindly speak up 9 a little bit? Thank you. 10 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So I was just 11 explaining that we were awarded a Year 1 SCEF PPA 12 through the Eversource SCEF program. And, you 13 know, we believe that this project will help 14 Connecticut meet its renewable energy target. 15 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Will the 16 number of utility poles associated with the 17 interconnection be reduced by the use of pad 18 mounted equipment or any other alternate design? 19 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. 20 an engineering standpoint, the way the design is 21 currently laid out as poles that have been 22 approved through the FAA notice criteria 23 procedures. 24 Dan, if you have anything to add to 25 that.

1 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Dan Csaplar, 2 USS. We can talk with Eversource, but, you know, 3 it is standard procedure to have three poles at 4 the point of interconnection. 5 Thank you. Approximately MR. NWANKWO: 6 how many construction vehicles and what type of 7 vehicles will be expected to enter the site during 8 construction? 9 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 10 from USS. Mitchell, I don't know if you have that 11 information, but I can get back to you. 12 THE WITNESS (Ott): This is Mitchell. 13 I do not have that immediately available. 14 MR. NWANKWO: Any idea where they will 15 park these vehicles? 16 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. In 17 the project staging or laydown area. 18 MR. NWANKWO: Where will that be 19 referenced in the observation layout map provided 20 in the photosimulation? 21 THE WITNESS (Ott): In the 22 photosimulation I don't know if that was called 23 out specifically in that log. 24 Would you be able to MR. NWANKWO: 25 provide that information at a later date?

1

THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes.

2

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. How

3

frequently would the site be visited for

4

maintenance purposes?

5

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan

6

Csaplar from USS. We'll send an operation and maintenance team out there quarterly to inspect

7

the panels, clean them off, mow any grasses, and

8

make sure everything looks clean and tidy, but to

9

answer your question, roughly quarterly.

10

11

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. How

12

frequently would the sheep farmer typically visit

13

the site while sheep are being hosted at the

14

15 **THE WIT**

facility?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So part of our

preliminary -- sorry, this is Dan Csaplar, USS.

17

16

Part of our preliminary grazing plan has five

18

padlocks, and they will rotate the sheep through

1920

the padlocks, but I will have to get back to you on how many times the grazer will visit the site.

21

That is yet to be determined as we are going to

22

enter into an agreement with a grazer in the

23

future.

24

25

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Just to add

to that, would the sheep farmer require 24/7

access?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Dan Csaplar from USS. Yes, we'll abide by that and grant the sheep grazer 24-hour access.

MR. MORISSETTE: Excuse me, if I may interrupt for one moment here. Our intent here is not to have Late-Files and follow up. If we could answer the questions this afternoon, we do have a break at around 3:30. You can respond to those questions at that point, or sooner, so we can get these all off the record -- or on the record prior to the closing of the hearing this afternoon. That would be greatly appreciated.

MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Morissette, if I may?

MR. MORISSETTE: Sure. Yes, Attorney

Hoffman.

MR. HOFFMAN: I think that that was Mr. Csaplar's intent with the question on the number of construction vehicles. And I'm sure that during the break we can look at the drawing and point the Council to where -- look at the drawings that were included in the petition and point out to where the construction laydown and parking area will be.

With respect to the grazing plan, I

1 think if there is a concern that the Council has as to how often the sheep farmer will be there, I 2 3 think that that is going to have to be a 4 post-approval, assuming the Council approves, a 5 post-approval condition because we simply don't 6 yet have the contract with the sheep farming 7 company yet. 8 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. 9 I'm certain that Mr. MR. HOFFMAN: 10 Csaplar would be willing to provide that as a 11 condition of approval. 12 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you. 13 Thank you for that. And we can now continue, Mr. 14 Nwankwo. 15 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you, Mr. 16 Morissette. 17 I also have one more question on the 18 sheep pasture rotation and grazing plan. 19 question would be how would water be brought to 20 the site for the sheep? 21 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 22 Csaplar. We can get that answer for you. 23 MR. NWANKWO: Also, in addition, what 24 months, during what months would grazing most

likely occur, will the sheep be on the site

25

1 continuously for a certain period or will there be 2 periods where there are no sheep on site? 3 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Dan Csaplar. 4 There will be periods when the sheep will not be 5 on site. 6 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. 7 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): And what was 8 the first part of your question? 9 MR. NWANKWO: During what months would 10 sheep grazing most likely occur? 11 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): It would be 12 April through November. 13 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I'd like to 14 refer to the response to Council Interrogatory 15 Number 20, and also the letter from Westwood 16 Engineering to the Farmland Preservation Program, 17 dated July 10, 2023. My question is, where would 18 the proposed facility host an apiary or beekeeping 19 operations in the future? 20 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 21 Csaplar. We don't have an exact location for the 22 hives. We keep this option open for, you know, a 23 potential partnership later on down the road with 24 a potential beekeeper in order to maximize the 25

efficiency of the parcel.

1 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. 2 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): We don't have 3 an exact location at this time. Again, we have 4 not entered into an agreement with a beekeeper. 5 Thank you. I would like MR. NWANKWO: 6 to refer to the prefile testimony of Larry 7 Durocher with the Connecticut Parachuters 8 Association. Sorry, I apologize for that. That 9 was an error. 10 I'd like to refer to the prefile 11 testimony of Larry Durocher. My question is, did 12 the Connecticut Parachuters Association at any 13 time indicate any preference for a different 14 location on the site development of the solar 15 facility? 16 THE WITNESS (Durocher): They cited 17 concerns. This is Larry Durocher. They cited 18 several concerns about the size of the area used, 19 especially on the west side, and we adapted it. 20 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Has the 21 petitioner conducted any preliminary soil testing 22 within the project area? 23 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Dan Csaplar. 24 I'm sorry, did you say "salt" testing? 25 MR. NWANKWO: Soil, soil testing.

1 THE WITNESS (Ott): The geotech report 2 had not been completed at the time of this 3 hearing. There has been existing soil mapping 4 that has taken place via public data sources and 5 then investigations for the cultural resources 6 which, again, is not specifically soil testing but 7 is related to investigation within that soil. 8 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. 9 THE WITNESS (Ott): That was Mitchell 10 Ott. Sorry. 11 Thank you. I'd like to MR. NWANKWO: 12 refer to Item Number 3, herbicide restrictions, as 13 shown on page 3 of the Resource Protection Plan. 14 Under what circumstances will pesticides and/or 15 herbicides be used for vegetative management 16 within the project area? 17 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan Csaplar, USS. Mitchell, I don't know if you have 18 19 an answer to that, otherwise we can get an answer 20 for you. 21 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. 22 Typical procedures I've seen is in spot type of 23 treatment in isolated locations to limit that, 24 particularly during establishment of the native

grasses that are being put out there. Once those

25

1 are established, you usually see that maintaining 2 the general openness -- or not openness -- cover 3 that doesn't require much of any herbicide 4 treatment. 5 Thank you. Will they be MR. NWANKWO: 6 used while sheep are present on site? 7 THE WITNESS (Ott): Dan, I don't have 8 an answer to that. 9 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So we'll work 10 with the potential grazer on that to get their 11 best input. 12 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. What will be 13 the dominant source of noise from the solar 14 facility? 15 THE WITNESS (Ott): It would come 16 from -- Mitchell Ott. It would come from the 17 project transformer primarily. The project 18 inverters, those are string inverters, and 19 distributed throughout the array area also have 20 some noise, but the loudest component would be the 21 transformer, which is located centrally within the 22 array, to minimize its impact on any surrounding 23 properties. 24 Thank you. I would like

MR. NWANKWO:

to refer to the FAA lighting requirement for the

25

1 utility poles as referenced on petition page 28. My question is, is it a steady light or a 2 3 pulsating red light? 4 THE WITNESS (Ott): I would have to 5 double check what the regulations on that are. I 6 am not familiar off the top of my head. 7 MR. NWANKWO: I would like to reference 8 attachment K of the response to interrogatories. 9 Could the petitioner please identify the locations 10 of Solar Panel Somers 5, 6 and 7? You could use 11 the observation site map as provided in response 12 to Council Interrogatory Number 7. 13 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 14 Csaplar. I'm sorry, could you repeat the 15 question? 16 MR. NWANKWO: I would like to refer to 17 attachment K, which is the FAA determination, the 18 three locations Solar Panel Somers 5, 6 and 7. 19 Could you identify those locations? 20 I'm sorry, sir. MR. HOFFMAN: 21 Attachment K of -- I'm having a hard time locating 22 the document. Attachment K of what document? 23 MR. NWANKWO: Part of the response to 24 interrogatories was Exhibits A to K. 25 MR. HOFFMAN: Oh, exhibit, I'm sorry.

1 I was looking at the petition. Okay. So on Exhibit K where are you, sir? 2 3 MR. NWANKWO: So that would be, yeah, 4 Solar Panel 5, the second page, and then the next 5 determination will be Somers 6, and the next one 6 would be Somers 7. 7 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. So is your 8 question matching up the FAA determinations to the 9 locations? 10 MR. NWANKWO: Yes, of those arrays, 11 yes. 12 THE WITNESS (Ott): I'm having a hard 13 time locating that document. I can take a look at 14 that and get back to you and make sure that that's 15 the FAA locations. 16 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. 17 THE WITNESS (Ott): Specific to the POI 18 is what you're asking, is that correct, the poles? 19 MR. NWANKWO: Yeah. I was also 20 referencing the response to Interrogatory Number 21 7 -- 17, which is the photosimulation. There's a 22 map there with locations. So that will make it 23 easier and clear to identify the location of those 24 arrays. 25 THE WITNESS (Ott): Okay.

MR. NWANKWO: Next question. I would like to refer to the label woven wire fabric, Figure FN01 on Sheet C400 of the construction plans. Could you please describe the appearance of the security fence?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes. This is
Dan Csaplar from USS. We like to use more of a
farm style cattle fencing. It's more of a type of
square woven wire instead of chain linked. We
think this meshes better with the surrounding
community than a chain linked fence. We also use
wooden posts instead of your typical metal posts
that would accompany a chain linked fence.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I would like to refer to answers provided in attachment F as part of the response to Council interrogatories, or Exhibit F, if that's more clear. Are the Savannah sparrow protection measures consistent with the growing season?

THE WITNESS (Ott): They are more in line with the nesting season of the sparrows than with the growing season as a whole.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. Also referring to Sheet C200 of attachment B, can the fence line on the northwestern side be adjusted to

1 the 100-foot wetland setback? THE WITNESS (Ott): Not without 2 3 capacity implications on the array itself. 4 MR. NWANKWO: So you mean the arrays 5 will be affected? 6 THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct. 7 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. I also have a 8 question about aisle width. Will there be a 9 consistent aisle width or will there be varying 10 dimensions for the aisle width? 11 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here. 12 When you say "aisle," are you talking the 13 east-west gap between the modules or the 14 north-south gap between rows, which aisle? 15 MR. NWANKWO: Between rows. 16 THE WITNESS (Ott): Between rows. That 17 will be consistent. In the northern array there's 18 only one gap there. There's only two north-south 19 gaps. On the northern one it will be consistent 20 for the full range, and on the southern gap it's 21 where the road is, so that will have a different 22 north-south gap. 23 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. That will be 24 all my questions, Mr. Morissette. 25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

1 Nwankwo. We'll now continue with 2 cross-examination of the petitioner by Mr. 3 Silvestri followed by Mr. Nguyen. 4 Mr. Silvestri, good afternoon. 5 MR. SILVESTRI: Good afternoon, Mr. 6 Morissette. Good afternoon, everyone. I have a 7 few follow-ups to Mr. Nwankwo's questions that I'd 8 like to start with. 9 Mr. Csaplar, you mentioned that the 10 panels would be cleaned. How would the panels be 11 cleaned? 12 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So the 13 operation and maintenance team will simply brush 14 off any, you know, fallen, more or less anything 15 would hinder, you know, the panel from accruing 16 electricity. 17 MR. SILVESTRI: So you're looking at 18 mechanical just to brush it off, no chemicals, no 19 water, et cetera, correct? 20 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Correct. 21 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. The 22 second follow-up I had goes back to the herbicide 23 and pesticide question. My question is, do you 24 need to use them at all or could you rely more on

mechanical methods or the sheep to do the job?

25

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Mitchell, I'll defer to you on the herbicide.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Sorry about that.

The way we might typically see it used is in spot treatment. It is typically an O&M decision on whether or not the herbicides and pesticides are used and to what extent. Westwood specifically doesn't specify those. We leave that to whoever the operator or maintenance contractor may be.

MR. SILVESTRI: So you're not sure if they would actually use a mechanical means and not use herbicides or pesticides at this point?

THE WITNESS (Ott): At this point in time, no, I don't have an answer for that.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Then one other follow-up I had goes back to the electric poly fencing. That is an electric fence, correct?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan
Csaplar. We are going to just go off the
Department of Ag's recommendation of not using an electric fence.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Because the follow-up I was going to have is how is it powered, but if you're not using an electric fence then I don't have to ask that question. Thank

23

24

25

All right. That's all the follow-ups I had for Mr. Nwankwo, and I appreciate the comments. For my questions I'm looking at a number of drawings and plot plans that were They show the proposed southern array that's located west of the runway, and I want to clarify that that southern array has been eliminated from consideration. Am I correct? THE WITNESS (Durocher): Larry Durocher. Yes, you're correct. This is west, directly west of the runway, correct? MR. SILVESTRI: That is correct, yes. One of the reports I'm looking at is the environmental, for example, page 179 out of 446 has that array still posted there which is why I

But a follow-up to that is did the stormwater analysis report include that southern array that has since been eliminated?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. Ιt did at one point. It has been revised to just be the northern remainder now.

MR. SILVESTRI: So what we looked at that was submitted does not have the southern array in whatever calculations for stormwater,

1 correct? 2 THE WITNESS (Ott): That's correct. 3 MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Thank you. 4 All right. Moving on to the transformers, how 5 many transformers are proposed for the project? 6 THE WITNESS (Ott): There's one 7 transformer on this project. 8 MR. SILVESTRI: Just one, okay. Do you 9 know how much oil that transformer might contain? 10 THE WITNESS (Ott): I don't have that 11 value off the top. 12 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Do you know if 13 the transformer would be equipped with low level 14 alarms? 15 THE WITNESS (Ott): I'm not familiar 16 with that term. Can you further clarify? 17 MR. SILVESTRI: If the transformer has a leak, the oil level is going to drop and there 18 19 is a sensor and an alarm that would indicate that 20 you have a problem because the oil level is low. 21 THE WITNESS (Ott): Low level, got it. 22 I'm not familiar with that. 23 Dan, do you know? 24 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): We can get an 25 answer for you.

MR. SILVESTRI: Because a related question I have, if you don't have one in the event of a transformer oil leak, first of all, how would you know; and secondly, what measures might be in place to prevent the oil from potentially going somewhere that you don't want it to go? That's the follow-up question.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Understood.

Oftentimes transformers have a self-containment within them for this size transformer, but we will confirm the plan for that.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Then related to oil, is it your intention to store any fuels on site during construction?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): It is not our intention. Sorry, this is Dan Csaplar. It is not our intention to store any fuels on site.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. All right. Now, this might go back to the absence of soil testing, I'm not sure, but on a number of site plot plans there are blue crosshatched areas that are designated as high water areas, and then it has greater than 0.5 feet flooding. Could you explain what is meant by high water area?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott.

Those areas are areas where water will temporarily be standing after a storm event of a 24-hour 100 year event until it infiltrates or runs off.

MR. SILVESTRI: So it would be from rainwater as opposed to groundwater migrating up, correct?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Is there any intent to, how should we say, level out the areas so you don't have any pooling of rainwater at those high water areas?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott again. At this time that's not the intent. It changes surface conditions more than existing than would be necessary for existing, and the equipment that is being installed over it is set up to be that, or is raised out of any flood depths.

MR. SILVESTRI: And the high water areas were taken into account in the stormwater report?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Let me shift gears at this point. I'd like to talk about the trackers and their operations. First question I have, for the rotary mechanism that actually turns the

1 trackers do you know if it's internal to the 2 tractors or an external mechanism? 3 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here. 4 Internal to the tractors or external, can you 5 clarify, or maybe I can explain how it will work. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: Well, is it gear driven 7 or chain driven? 8 THE WITNESS (Ott): There are gears, 9 but they are exterior. So this is intended at 10 this point in time to be an ATI system which has a 11 drive shaft with a single motor per row. So 12 there's a drive shaft connecting all of the 13 arrays. So there would be one motor turning a 14 gear on each single tracker and rotating it in 15 sequence. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: Understood. Do you 17 know if the tracker and the gears and the rotating 18 mechanisms would require any periodic maintenance? 19 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes, they typically 20 I don't know the frequency of that as, again, do. 21 that kind of comes under the O&M area. 22 Dan, do you have any input on that? 23 But yes, over the life of any mechanism they typically do. 24 25 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan

1 Csaplar. Mitchell, I think that's a valid 2 assumption. There's really no typical amount of 3 maintenance that is required. It's just kind of 4 on a case-by-case basis. 5 MR. SILVESTRI: Do you know if they'd 6 need greasing of the gears or anything like that? 7 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 8 Csaplar. It's part of the O&M. I'm unsure, but I 9 can look into that. 10 MR. SILVESTRI: Do you know how the 11 trackers would be actually powered to move? 12 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. They 13 are powered by the system itself. There's power 14 coming through. It's backfed from the transformer 15 essentially, so the system powers its own self. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: So when you say the 17 system powers it, would the power for the trackers 18 actually come from the distribution grid or would 19 it actually feed from the solar panels to the 20 transformer and then back to the trackers? 21 THE WITNESS (Ott): The latter. 22 MR. SILVESTRI: The latter. 23 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes. 24 MR. SILVESTRI: So if you don't have 25 sufficient solar power to generate anything, then

the trackers won't move?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct, if there was not sufficient solar power. And in no way is this trying to come off combative. If there's not sufficient solar energy to move the trackers, then there's not usually a good reason to be moving them.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Now, in the event of, say, a forecasted snow event, would you be able to tilt the panels so that they're perpendicular to the ground to avoid snow accumulation?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. The feasibility of the system is such that it could be like that, yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: Do you know if the panels would have what I call an automatic weather tracking system that would do that automatically?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Not to my

knowledge. Dan?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): I don't believe it does. Often cases when there is snow accumulation on the panels, since this is a tracker system, they essentially shake the snow off themselves.

1 MR. SILVESTRI: But you might have to 2 go in there just in case to remove snow or would 3 you let nature take its course? 4 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): We would let 5 nature take its course. 6 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 7 Mr. Nwankwo brought up the three new utility 8 poles, but I have some related questions to that. 9 Do you know the distance of the poles to the 10 nearest residence? 11 THE WITNESS (Ott): I would have to 12 look at the document here if we've dimensioned 13 that already. I don't know it off the top of my 14 head, but I will look into it here as I pull up 15 the drawings. 16 MR. SILVESTRI: And then related to the FAA determination, the way I read it is that the 17 18 pole structures are to be marked/lighted. To me 19 that could be a difference. Is the intent to 20 either mark the poles or to light the poles? 21 THE WITNESS (Ott): That FAA 22 determination in our understanding is that they 23 will be lighted. 24 Lighted. All right. MR. SILVESTRI: 25 Are there any other structures at the airport that are currently lighted?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): The only other structure would be the windsock located south of the runway.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. And then going back to the distance from the proposed lighted poles to the residences, would the residences be impacted by either, you know, the constant red light or blinking red light; and if so, how could it be mitigated?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan
Csaplar. We'd have to determine how any
residences would be affected by any of this
lighting. There is natural vegetation that will
essentially (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) --

MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, Mr. Csaplar, you're cutting in and out. You're not coming in real clear.

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): I was just mentioning that there is natural vegetation that, you know, surrounds those poles as where they're located near the POI.

MR. SILVESTRI: If you can get back to me with the distance part of it, I might have a follow-up on that. But my concern is, is if we

approve the project, you have different plantings for the solar panels themselves, but I worry that you have this blinking light or constant light that could be an impact to residents in the area. That's where I'm coming from on this. All right. Let me move on.

We received an airside alternative 4 drawing that I believe came in from the town, and that depicts the potential runway extension. And I just want to be sure that that extension, is it going to be south of the existing runway; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): No, there are no immediate plans for an extension on the runway. However, if there was, it would be to the north end of the runway.

MR. SILVESTRI: To the north end of the runway more towards where the solar panels would be located?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): Correct.

That's why we allowed for the cutout at the north end.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right, so the north. All right. Thank you for that clarification.

1 THE WITNESS (Durocher): You're 2 welcome. 3 MR. SILVESTRI: And with the comments 4 that you provided back to the town about the 5 modifications that you had for the project, have 6 you heard anything further from the town 7 concerning your modifications or the way the 8 layout is proposed right now? 9 THE WITNESS (Durocher): Larry Durocher 10 No, I have not heard anything. here. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you for that 12 This kind of goes back to Mr. Nwankwo's response. 13 question about the trucks and construction 14 vehicles. If the project is approved, how would 15 construction actually proceed without interfering 16 with airport operations? 17 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Hi, this is Dan 18 Csaplar. Mr. Silvestri, we have not selected an 19 EPC contractor at this time. We'd be happy to 20 make that a condition in that we could have our 21 future EPC contractor -- (AUDIO INTERRUPTION) 22 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Perhaps one last 23 question at least at this point until we get 24 feedback on the questions that couldn't be 25 answered at this time. This goes back to the

1 sheep pasture rotation and grazing plan. Ιt 2 comments that various soil plantings would be 3 established, and I noted such as rye grass, native 4 grasses and flowers, alfalfa, for example, and 5 climbing vegetables. Would these plantings be 6 specific for the sheep or would they be harvested 7 or serve some other purpose? 8 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 9 Csaplar. Within the grazing plan, the preliminary 10 grazing plan, this would be used to supplement the 11 sheep's diet. 12 MR. SILVESTRI: You kind of broke up at 13 the end, if you could repeat that. 14 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes. This 15 would be used to supplement the sheep's diet and 16 then to also contribute to soil health. 17 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. So you wouldn't 18 be doing any harvesting of vegetables or anything 19 like that? 20 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Not at this 21 time. 22 MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. 23 Mr. Morissette, I believe that's all I 24 have at this point. Thank you. 25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

1 Silvestri. We'll now continue with 2 cross-examination of the petitioner by Mr. Nguyen 3 followed by Mr. Golembiewski. 4 Mr. Nguyen, good afternoon. 5 MR. NGUYEN: Good afternoon, Mr. 6 Morissette. Thank you. 7 Let me ask the company, bring your 8 attention to application page 11, under 10 and 11 9 under public health and safety. The application 10 indicated that USS will coordinate with regional 11 emergency response personnel. To me that seems 12 very generic. Could you identify which entity 13 would that be? 14 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes. This is 15 Dan Csaplar. Was the question which entity that 16 would be? 17 MR. NGUYEN: Yes. 18 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So USS Somers 19 Solar, LLC would be conducting the training. 20 MR. NGUYEN: Who would be the regional 21 emergency response personnel to develop an 22 appropriate means for accessing the facility in 23 case of emergency? 24 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): I'm sorry, I'm 25 a little confused by the question.

MR. NGUYEN: Your application stated that the company will coordinate with regional emergency response personnel. Who would that be?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes, that would

be whoever would essentially respond to any emergency within the Town of Ellington's airport, so I believe it would be the Ellington Fire Department.

MR. NGUYEN: Have you talked to them?

Have you consulted with them as part of the
planning here?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): We have not as we have not received approval on the project.

MR. NGUYEN: You did not receive approval? I'm sorry, could you please restate your answer?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Sure. This is
Dan from USS Somers Solar. Usually the
progression of this is for a solar project like
this we will receive approval of the project and
then contact the fire department. We don't really
want to put the cart before the horse, per se, and
training the fire department if the project is not
going to move forward and get constructed.

MR. NGUYEN: The system -- on the same

1 page 11, the application stated that the system 2 will be remotely monitored and will have the 3 ability to remotely de-energize in case of an 4 emergency; is that correct? 5 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Hi, this is Dan 6 Csaplar. Yes, that is correct. 7 MR. NGUYEN: And where is that remotely 8 monitored, is it in state, is it out of state? 9 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan. 10 It is out of state, but we do use a 24-hour 11 monitoring system, and are currently going to 12 partner with a company called QE Solar which will 13 handle all of that. 14 MR. NGUYEN: So you're going to 15 contract out the system monitor? 16 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): That's correct. 17 MR. NGUYEN: And what does it mean by 18 "the ability to remotely de-energize," how does 19 that work in case of emergency? 20 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So QE Solar --21 Mitchell, do you have anything on that? 22 THE WITNESS (Ott): There are controls 23 within the system that are remotely communicative 24 that can disconnect either physically or via, you 25 know, breakers, which is physical, but physically

1 disconnect the system. And that is true typically 2 at the POI and within either the inverters or 3 transformer. So to back it up, I guess, starting 4 at the panels, there's no way to shut off a panel, 5 but you can stop the energy coming from the panels 6 going farther into the inverters via disconnects. 7 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. That's all I have, 8 Mr. Morissette. Thank you. 9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. 10 We'll now continue with cross-examination of the 11 petitioner by Mr. Golembiewski followed by Mr. 12 Lynch. 13 Mr. Golembiewski, good afternoon. 14 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Good afternoon, Mr. 15 Morissette. I have no questions. All my 16 questions have been asked. Thank you. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. Thank you, 18 Mr. Golembiewski. We'll now continue with 19 cross-examination of the petitioner by Mr. Lynch 20 followed by myself. 21 Mr. Lynch, good afternoon. 22 MR. LYNCH: Before I ask any questions, 23 Mr. Morissette, I'm going to ask a favor. Seeing 24 that nature is calling, would you mind giving me a 25 few minutes?

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Not at all. Why don't 2 I continue with my cross-examination and when you 3 get back we can jump back to you. Does that work? 4 MR. LYNCH: I hope so. 5 MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. So I will 6 start with my cross-examination. What I would 7 like to do is go to the exhibits that were part of 8 the interrogatory responses starting with Exhibit 9 A, and that has to do with the comparison of the 3 10 megawatt to the 4 megawatt. And I just want to 11 make sure. We talked about the area to the west 12 of the runway is being eliminated. Was there 13 anything that was further north that was 14 eliminated? It's difficult for me to tell. The 15 lines are very light on the drawings. So is that 16 basically it except for the, I'll say, an access 17 point going between the north and south arrays? 18 THE WITNESS (Ott): This is Mitchell 19 Ott. Yes, that's correct. 20 MR. MORISSETTE: Great. Thank you. 21 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette, I have 22 returned. 23 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Very good. Ι 24 just got one question in. So please continue, Mr.

25

Lynch.

Thank you.

MR. LYNCH: I've got a number of questions, but I'm going to start with some that have already been asked that I have inquiries about. And that would be, the first part, the sheep being on site, if you get approval for the sheep and then some other vegetables and stuff, what's to prevent bears, coyotes and deer from getting into the compound and doing damage?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Dan, if you have something specific to the sheep there. I can talk to the fence. This is Mitchell Ott, sorry. The fence as it's currently designed is set 4 inches above grade to allow for traverse of small game and reptiles, but it is the hope that that is small enough that larger animals such as a bear wouldn't make it through that gap.

I don't know if, Dan, you have more.

MR. LVNCH: Just to continue on with

MR. LYNCH: Just to continue on with that same thinking, coyotes could go under, but bears and deer, that fence is not going to stop them. They could easily get over that fence. And whether they go after the sheep, which they probably think it's McDonald's or something, you've got them all out there. But if a bear, especially a bear, if he gets inside the facility,

what damage can he do to your panels? And seeing that the panels are hot, what's going to happen, could the bear start a fire?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here.

I've never heard of a bear getting inside of a facility, so that would be a new one for me. And I know that US Solar has also never seen deer inside any of their facilities. So not that that isn't, you know, that potential possible, but the feasibility of either of those occurring seems relatively low. And I don't know that they would have any interest in the electrical equipment.

MR. LYNCH: Mr. Ott, I'm not questioning you, and I can't testify, but I know bears get into facilities around here, so I'm just letting you -- again, I can't testify.

My other question, could you explain or could someone explain to me the phrase that you used in your application, the usual life span of the project is the phrase you used. Now, your project could be 20 years, if you exercise the option to go up to 40 years. What exactly is the usual life span of the project if you could just define that for me?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan

Csaplar. So we actually have a 20-year PPA in place with Eversource, so at a minimum the life span of the project will be 20 years. We here are just at the whim of Eversource. So if they enact a new program at the end of the 20-year life cycle, we will adjust accordingly, but I would say that the life span as it stands now will be 20 years.

MR. LYNCH: Now, that leads me to a couple follow-up questions. I forget which question in the interrogatories where you say you're not going to use batteries, but you leave it open for the future. Now, if you decide to use -- well, I guess I'll backtrack. I'll come back to the batteries in a minute. The panels you're putting in now are not going to have the same power output that panels 20 years from now are going to have. During the life span of 20 years and when new and more powerful solar panels come out will you substitute them or not?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan Csaplar. If it makes economic sense, we will substitute them.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. And the same question pertaining to the batteries. If you find

1 out somewhere in the future, you know, 5, 10, 15 2 years that batteries will be more useful for the 3 facility, is this something you would consider 4 implementing? 5 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 6 Csaplar. Yes, that is something we would consider 7 implementing. 8 MR. LYNCH: Huh? 9 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes, that is 10 something we will --11 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you very much. 12 Now, Mr. Silvestri asked you about the power to 13 the trackers, and you said they were going to come 14 from the solar -- I hope I've got this right --15 from the solar panel project itself. So that 16 would mean internally you're supplying the power 17 for the trackers; is that correct? 18 THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct. 19 MR. LYNCH: And now I forget which 20 question it is. It's in my notes. But you also 21 say that the output of the project will be less .5 22 percent. Is that what is included in the tracking 23 system? 24 THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here. 25 I think you're referring to the losses that are

assumed in the design. And yes, those internal requirements are part of that.

MR. LYNCH: Hold on a second here. You also talked about the inverters and the transformer, from what you said to Mr. Silvestri, one transformer. And the inverters, are they going to be on each panel, or how are they set up?

THE WITNESS (Ott): The inverters are string inverters -- sorry, this is Mitchell Ott -- distributed throughout the array. They are at the ends of rows but not at the ends of all the rows. They collect a handful of arrays and combine them into one inverter, and those are distributed. Those can be seen also on the overall site plans that have been provided. But there are some along the road and a few in the northern array gap as well.

MR. LYNCH: Now, you also -- I think it pertains to both the inverters and the transformer you said you have a shut-off valve or something. Who turns off that valve, is that the company or do you have to get Eversource in there to throw that switch?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Dan, correct me if I'm wrong. US Solar would control any shut-offs

within the fence line itself. Eversource would stop their ownership, as it were, or control at the POI.

MR. LYNCH: But Eversource has control of the transformer; am I wrong or right?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Dan, can you speak to the interconnection?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yeah. This is Dan Csaplar. Eversource owns -- the transfer of ownership is the last pole that we are proposing at the POI, so US Solar retains control over all the inverters.

MR. LYNCH: But as far as if Eversource has control of the transformer, they're the only one that can turn it off or can someone in your operation shut down the transformer? In other words, my question really is, do you have to call Eversource in to shut off the transformer?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. No would be my understanding. Their disconnect is at the pole at the POI.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. There was talk earlier about the expansion of the airport runway. I guess the original proposal was 700 feet, and I guess it's now cut down to 500. How would that

impact -- the 700 expansion was to allow other planes a little bit bigger than what they have there now to come in. Would a shorter runway impact how many, what types of airplanes can arrive at the airport?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): This is Larry
Durocher again. Again, there are no immediate
plans to extend the runway at all. It was
proposed about a year ago, and it's since been
eliminated.

MR. LYNCH: All right. I'll now come to what I'm really interested in is the parachute school or parachute club. They have a school there too. I would think having been there watching them jump, you know, there could be an incident where they get, you know, out of their control and end up in your solar field and your panels are all hot. How much of a danger is that to any of these parachuters that end up in that solar field?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): The chances are really remote of any of them drifting over to the solar area. But I have no idea what the temperature is on those solar panels. Can you advise me, Dan?

MR. LYNCH: I guess would it give somebody a shock or could it electrocute them? That's my question.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here. When you say "hot" I think you mean and they're electrified?

MR. LYNCH: That's what I meant. Sorry.

of the electrical system it requires via the electric code to undergo a grounding study that reduces the step and touch potential below the, again, code level of safety. So they have to have a grounding system in place that if you accidentally touch something you're not electrified. There is some step touch potential, but it is below the threshold that would be required by code.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. I'm familiar with grounding. Thank you. Now, the question I have is, I forget again which question it was. I don't have it in front of me. You say that all the power from the solar panels will be exported out to Eversource and you will not be using net metering; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): That's correct.

This will participate in the Eversource SCEF

program where all of the energy will be fed back

to Eversource.

MR. LYNCH: Now, coming back to questions that were asked earlier on emergency response, whether it's fire or, you know, other responders, you're going to provide -- what type of training are you going to provide for them because Ellington has a volunteer fire department, not a paid fire department, not that it should make any difference, but what are you going to give them for training, on site or classroom?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan Csaplar. That is yet to be determined. Again, we will put together an extensive training program that will likely be on site and will use industry, will teach industry best practices to the volunteer fire department.

MR. LYNCH: I know the firefighters have a concern about getting their trucks in and out of a facility. Their big ladder trucks would never go into the compound, but can rescue trucks and other smaller fire vehicles get in and out of the compound without any problem?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan

Csaplar. Yes, and we're happy to work with the

fire department to put in KnoxBox, and we've also

implemented a hammerhead turnaround within the

site plan for vehicles to gain access and then

turn around, if need be.

MR. LYNCH: Now, in your training of the firefighters would you provide them with any type of material for fighting a fire other than with water using either CO2, and now I think foam is outlawed, but CO2 probably or would you still let them use water?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan Csaplar. Industry best practices are to let the electrical fire burn out and then contain with water around the site. If those industry best practices do change between now and construction of the site, we will implement them.

MR. LYNCH: Now, if there is a fire inside the facility and the fire department is unable to put it out with water, how much damage can that do as it spreads to your facility? And I'm saying a hot summer day when everything is dry.

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan

1 Csaplar. We really do not foresee a fire 2 occurring. However, I guess, you know, the answer 3 to you, Dan, is if a fire were to occur then there 4 is a hypothetical situation where the entire array could catch fire, but again, we do not foresee 5 6 that whatsoever. 7 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Morissette, I think I'm 8 all set here. 9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. 10 I will now continue with my 11 cross-examination. I would like to go like to 12 response to Question Number 31 just for 13 clarification. The response indicates that it's 14 relating to capacity of the facility, and at the 15 end it says the project has no capacity 16 commitments. Isn't capacity assigned to 17 Eversource as part of their PPA along with the 18 energy and the RECs? 19 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan 20 Csaplar. Yes, that is correct. 21 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. 22 I would like to go to the responses -- the 23 attachments, excuse me, attachment C -- Exhibit C,

excuse me, which is the abutting property owners

list of off site residents distances exhibits.

24

25

57

think this will actually answer one of Mr. Silvestri's questions. The resident to the east of the access road is 246 feet, and that's approximately where the point of interconnection is. So the interconnection facilities are 246 feet or greater.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Concerning that resident on the hill, now that hill is like a ridge line, it goes up very quickly. So my concern is twofold. concern is the view from all those residents down to the solar array and also the interconnection facility. So we'll have three poles plus the Eversource pole which I believe that will be four I don't know if the Eversource pole will poles. also be lit. That property owner is going to have a birds-eye view right down to the lighted poles, and that's a real concern of mine because I would not want to be looking at those poles every day and every night given that there's three of them, or possibly four. So there is two questions in there I'd like you to respond to. The first is, has anybody looked at the views from the ridge line onto the solar facility?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. At this time, a viewshed analysis has not been

performed. However, much of the area is screened via a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees that would screen a lot of the views. And that, I know it's not the specific house that you were referencing, but in the photolog we show some of the adjacent residents and the view that they would have at the cul-de-sac on other side. So that's the approach at this point. And I know it's slightly off, but it's slightly related, related to the FAA lighting, flashing versus steady, that was a question earlier. It would be steady lighting based on the FAA guidance.

MR. MORISSETTE: You just have to follow up the lines -- yes, Attorney Hoffman, did you have something to add?

MR. HOFFMAN: I think during the break we need to revisit that FAA guidance, Mr. Morissette.

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. And please consider whether the FAA guidance is, is that going to be on 24/7 and what color it's going to be, if it's going to be red, for example. So the property owner at 389 Somers Road is going to be looking right down at those three, possibility four, poles. So that's a real concern of mine.

So think about that in your response.

So using the same drawing, I'd like to go over a couple of additional items. Now, the transformer is in the middle of the array, is that correct, that's the black box in the middle, that's the transformer pad?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. Yes, that's correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. And the inverters are the little black dashes that go along the access road; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott. Yes, that's correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: So the inverters are all in the inside of the solar array with the exception of the three inverters that are in the northern array which are delineated but are not along the access road, those are also inverters in the northern array; is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Ott): That is correct.

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Concerning the safety zone for the runway, is the safety zone at the end of the runway to the road, is that accurate, or should I be thinking of it in another way?

1 THE WITNESS (Durocher): I'm not sure what you are referring to. You're talking about 2 3 the north end? 4 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. 5 THE WITNESS (Durocher): We are -- I'm 6 sorry, go ahead. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, there was 8 testimony that there is also a safety zone built 9 into the design, and I'm just trying to figure out 10 where that safety zone is to the runway. 11 THE WITNESS (Durocher): So we actually 12 added that safety road. It was not required by 13 the FAA, nor is it right now, unless the runway is 14 eventually extended, of course. The FAA requires 15 nothing greater than I believe 3 feet high within 16 125 feet of the centerline of the runway. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So in the exhibit that I'm looking at the runway ends. 18 19 That's the shaded area. I think it's with a --20 it's a 61 or an upside down 19. So beyond the 21 shaded area where the runway is depicted, that's 22 it, there's no additional runway safety zone 23 beyond that; is that accurate? 24 THE WITNESS (Durocher): That's 25 correct.

1 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. So -- (AUDIO 2 INTERRUPTION) -- is that correct? 3 THE COURT REPORTER: This is the court 4 reporter. You were cutting in and out. 5 MR. MORISSETTE: I'll repeat the 6 question. Thank you. 7 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. 8 MR. MORISSETTE: I understand that 9 because there's no control tower at this location 10 for the airport that the FAA did not require a 11 glare analysis. 12 THE WITNESS (Durocher): What type of 13 analysis? 14 MR. MORISSETTE: A glare. 15 THE WITNESS (Durocher): No, I've never 16 been asked that before. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Well, I understand that there has been no glare analysis performed 18 19 for this facility; is that correct? 20 THE WITNESS (Durocher): That's 21 correct. It's my understanding there is no glare 22 concerning the pilots. I've flown over many solar 23 panels in my lifetime, and I've never noticed any 24 glare. 25 Okay. My next set of MR. MORISSETTE:

24

25

questions is relating to the panels themselves. Now, I understand that these specific panels that you're going to be using you're going to be using a panel that has a film to eliminate glare. Could you further elaborate on that for me, please? THE WITNESS (Ott): Mitchell Ott here, Larry, unless you're going to go. (No response.) THE WITNESS (Ott): Okay. So the panels have a nonreflective coating that's applied to the front face of them to limit glare off of them. MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Is that just the normal type of panel? THE WITNESS (Ott): Correct. Almost all tier 1 panels, I would say. To my knowledge, all tier 1 panels, which is what's being considered for this project, and almost all panels in general have a nonreflective coating for the reason of glare but also for the production reason of if we're reflecting sunlight then we're not capturing sunlight with the panels. So it's both an engineering increase as well as a glare resistance.

> That's the normal MR. MORISSETTE:

1 design, it wasn't specifically to eliminate or to 2 mitigate any glare for the airport? 3 THE WITNESS (Ott): That's correct. 4 The other thing related to glare that I'll, just 5 to add context, is you are correct that the FAA 6 does not require a glare study unless there is a 7 control tower, and there is not in this case. 8 That said, there was a glare study performed, 9 though it wasn't required, and the results of that 10 were clean as well. 11 MR. MORISSETTE: I'm sorry, I didn't 12 quite understand that response. Could you repeat 13 that again? 14 THE WITNESS (Ott): The FAA does not 15 require a glare study, but a glare study was 16 performed given its proximity and doing due 17 diligence, and the results were favorable. 18 MR. MORISSETTE: Oh, so there was a 19 glare study. Is that part of the record? 20 THE WITNESS (Ott): I don't believe so 21 because it was not a requirement from the FAA. 22 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. 23 Concerning the town's comments, one of their 24 concerns was that they just spent a million 25 dollars to get a sewer extension into the area to

1 supply or for the industrial land in that area. 2 Do you happen to know what percentage of the solar 3 array will consume of the entire industrial area? 4 THE WITNESS (Ott): This is Mitchell 5 Ott. I don't have that value immediately handy, 6 but I can find that out. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: Mr. Csaplar, do you 8 have any rough idea? 9 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): You're asking a 10 percentage of what the solar array would consume 11 of the industrial area, correct? 12 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. 13 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So the entire 14 parcel is 127 acres. I believe the entire parcel 15 is zoned industrial, and our project is taking up 16 19.2 acres and that would be 15.1 percent. 17 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. Do you know if the industrial area goes beyond your 127 18 19 acres in this area? I believe it goes further 20 north as well. And was the sewer, you know, 21 intended specifically for this area or is it 22 encompassing a greater area beyond your project? 23 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): I do not know 24 the intentions of the sewer installation nor the 25 extent to the industrial zoning.

1 Larry, I don't know if you have an 2 answer to that. 3 THE WITNESS (Durocher): Originally the 4 intent was one business on Route 83. The airport 5 was actually against a sewer initially, and this 6 goes back quite a few years. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Thank you. 8 Okay. I would like to go to, I believe it's 9 Interrogatory Number 70 which was filed on its own 10 which is basically the photos, the photolog, and I would like to view location 1. So this is 11 12 basically where the interconnection facility is 13 going to go. Now, the pole on the right is 14 Eversource's pole. Is that pole the point of 15 interconnection or are they going to put a new 16 pole where the arrow goes? 17 THE WITNESS (Ott): I'm pulling it up right at this moment. This is Mitchell Ott. 18 19 MR. MORISSETTE: Sure. I'm sorry, I'll 20 give you time to pull it up. THE WITNESS (Ott): I think I did have 21 22 it open, but there's a few of them open right now. 23 Mitchell Ott here. Yes, that is correct, the pole 24 on the right would be the interconnected pole. 25 MR. MORISSETTE: All right. So you

1 probably don't know this yet. Are they going to 2 replace that pole or -- it doesn't really matter, 3 never mind. So, in addition to that 4 interconnection pole, there's going to be three 5 other poles kind of hugging the road on the right? 6 THE WITNESS (Ott): That's correct, as 7 of this time. 8 MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. All right. So 9 just for the Siting Council's observations, so 10 that's, you know, going downhill, and across the 11 street the terrain goes uphill, and the resident 12 on Route 83 will have a clear shot of the lights 13 on top of the poles. Okay. 14 Now, you had mentioned that there was 15 photos, photo views that I may want to look at 16 that's from across the street, or is that really 17 from the cul-de-sac only?

THE WITNESS (Ott): That was from the cul-de-sac.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MORISSETTE: Okay. Great. All right. I think that pretty much covers the questions that I have this afternoon. Thank you, everyone, for answering.

So we'll take a quick break. Attorney Hoffman, you have a laundry list of questions to answer here.

MR. HOFFMAN: So Mr. Morissette, I want to make sure that we have all of the questions that we need to have answered so that we don't have to come back later because I recognize that you want to close out the hearing tonight.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you.

MR. HOFFMAN: So on my list, and if I'm missing something please correct me, but on my list I have the question of how many vehicles will we have out there during construction, where they will be parked, how often the sheep farmer will come out. The question about, and I want to make it clear that the question is about FAA marking or lighting, correct, of the poles?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

MR. HOFFMAN: And then there is the linkage between the pieces, I believe it's 5, 6 and 7, for the FAA determinations, exactly where they are at the facility?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. You successfully answered the distances from the poles to the residences, so I think that that one is done.

Am I missing anything, sir?

1	MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, two. The
2	low-level oil design and self-containment.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: Correct. I'm sorry, yes.
4	MR. MORISSETTE: And the gear tracking
5	maintenance asked by Mr. Silvestri.
6	MR. HOFFMAN: Part of the problem, sir,
7	is that actual transformers haven't been selected
8	so there may be an issue there, but we can get you
9	those answers.
10	MR. MORISSETTE: Take a look at it, and
11	if this is approved we can make it a condition of
12	approval.
13	MR. HOFFMAN: So I know that it is
14	tradition for the Council to take a 15-minute
15	break right about now.
16	MR. MORISSETTE: Yes.
17	MR. HOFFMAN: I might ask that we take
18	a 20-minute break.
19	MR. MORISSETTE: That would be fine.
20	So let's reconvene at 10 of 4 or 3:50.
21	MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you very much.
22	MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney
23	Hoffman.
24	MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.
25	(Whereupon, a recess was taken from

3:31 p.m. until 3:51 p.m.)

MR. MORISSETTE: We are back on the record. Please continue.

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. So I believe that we have successfully completed our homework.

Mr. Csaplar, how many vehicles do you anticipate will be present during construction?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): So this is going to be a small construction project, so we do not anticipate more than 20 construction vehicles.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you. And Mr. Ott, can you describe where those vehicles will be parked during construction?

THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes, the vehicles will be parked along the access road and within the fence line but within the disturbed limits as noted currently.

MR. HOFFMAN: Very good. And Mr. Durocher, when we ended the evidentiary session with Mr. Morissette, Mr. Morissette pointed out the point of interconnection and the poles that were there, and we pulled up a photograph of that point of interconnection. And when you looked at that point of interconnection there were no lights on those poles. Can you explain? That was on

1 page 3 of 14 in the response to Interrogatory 7 --2 70, excuse me, which was the photolog. You could 3 see the proposed point of interconnection, if you 4 look at it, and there's no lights on those utility 5 poles. Can you explain why that is? 6 THE WITNESS (Durocher): I don't have a 7 copy on hand here, but the FAA only requires 8 lighting if it's within 125 feet of the centerline 9 of the runway, which this obviously is not, or if 10 it's going to be greater than 190 feet in altitude 11 in height. Again, these poles are going to be up 12 on Route 83 which is much greater than 125 feet. 13 MR. HOFFMAN: And Mr. Ott, when you 14 originally did the FAA determination, you also 15 included the southern arrays which are now 16 eliminated. Were those closer to the runway than 17 the northern arrays? 18 THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes. 19 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. So Mr. Durocher, 20 you're saying that we do not need lighting for the 21 points of interconnection given their heights?

MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. And Mr. Csaplar, if that changes, will we notify the Siting

THE WITNESS (Durocher): I do not

22

23

24

25

1 Council? 2 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yes. 3 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Mr. Csaplar, can 4 you talk about the low level gauges and systems 5 for the transformers? 6 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yeah. So 7 again, we haven't decided on a final inverter make 8 or model. However, the inverters are filled with 9 a mineral oil --10 MR. HOFFMAN: I'm sorry, sir, did you 11 say inverters or transformers? 12 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Sorry, I meant 13 the transformers, excuse me, they're filled with a 14 natural mineral oil, and they will have a low 15 level detection. 16 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. And then finally, 17 what can you tell me about the maintenance for the 18 tracking gears for the trackers? 19 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Yeah, we will 20 be using oil to put on a natural lubricant for the 21 trackers during operation and maintenance. 22 MR. HOFFMAN: And I think we covered 23 this during testimony, but just in case we didn't, 24 Mr. Csaplar, as we sit here now, you do not know

how often the sheep farmer will come out to

25

1 investigate the flock, but you're willing to 2 provide that information to the Siting Council 3 once a sheep farmer has been selected for this 4 project, correct? 5 THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Correct. 6 MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Morissette, if 7 there's a question that I missed, I apologize, it 8 was inadvertent. 9 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Attorney 10 Hoffman. I believe you covered them all. Thank 11 you. 12 MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. I'm sure that 13 you'll have follow-ups as a result of those 14 answers. 15 MR. MORISSETTE: Yes. What we're going 16 to do now is we're going to go back and poll the 17 Council to see if they have any follow-up 18 questions. We will start with Mr. Nwankwo and 19 then followed by Mr. Silvestri. 20 Mr. Nwankwo, do you have any follow-ups 21 on the questions that were just answered? 22 MR. NWANKWO: Thank you, Mr. 23 Morissette. Yes, I have two questions. One would 24 be an original question, I don't think we got an 25 answer to that, and the question was how water

will be brought to the site for the livestock, the grazing livestock.

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): Similar to our answer of how many times the grazer will be out, I can provide the Siting Council with that once a grazer is chosen.

MR. HOFFMAN: And I apologize, Mr. Nwankwo. Mr. Ott has the information on linking the 5, 6 and 7 FAA determinations and where that is. I did skip over that, and I apologize.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you, Attorney
Hoffman. My second question will be in reference
to response to Interrogatory Number 62. I do
believe Mr. Lynch asked the question about the
fence, and the petitioner responded that there
will be a 4-inch gap, but the response to the
interrogatory does state that there will be no gap
below the fence to protect the sheep from
predators. I just wanted to get clarity of that.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Sorry. This is
Mitchell Ott. That was a mistake on my behalf.
That gap was there originally because at the onset of the project there was a turtle that was flagged as a species, but that has since been removed from a concern for the project through correspondence

so that a gap can be lowered or removed.

MR. NWANKWO: Thank you. That will be all. Thank you.

MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

Nwankwo.

Mr. Ott, Attorney Hoffman indicated that you had a response to the FAA plots and the point of interconnection.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Yes, sir. So I believe the question was where are the filings 5, 6, 7 from the FAA determinations that were included. And if you can go to Exhibit D in the Appendixes A through K, it's page 13 of that PDF. It's an overall site plan, C106. I know I threw a lot of direction there, but let me know when you find that. Is that available?

MR. MORISSETTE: Yes, please continue.

THE WITNESS (Ott): Okay. So on that overall site plan number 5, the filing is the first fence corner to the northwest from the end of the runway. So if you go from the runway and travel northwest, the first fence corner that is there, which is also the southeast fence corner, that's filing number 5.

If you traverse straight north from

1 that to the next corner past the fence line --2 excuse me, past the access road to the north 3 immediately south of the north-south array gap, 4 that's number 6. 5 And then from there if you go east to 6 the farthest eastern fence corner of the project, 7 that is number 7. Let me know if that wasn't 8 clear. MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Ott. 10 Mr. Nwankwo, does that answer your 11 question? 12 MR. NWANKWO: It does for number 5, but 13 I would like a little -- a second explanation for 14 number 6. I didn't get number 6. THE WITNESS (Ott): Sure. So number 6 15 16 is, if from number 5 you traverse all the way north to where the fence takes an eastward turn, 17 it's the inner corner. 18 19 MR. NWANKWO: Okay. 20 THE WITNESS (Ott): That's number 6. And then number 7 is the east traverse from that, 21 22 so it's the farthest east corner. 23 MR. NWANKWO: I'm clear on that now. 24 Thank you, Mr. Morissette. 25 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr.

Nwankwo, and thank you, Mr. Ott. We will now continue with Mr. Silvestri.

Mr. Silvestri, any follow-up?

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr.

Morissette. I want to go back to the lighting or not lighting issue. If the determination was just made now that lighting is not needed, does the applicant need to get back to the FAA for clarification or any type of modification that FAA has already sent to them regarding the project?

THE WITNESS (Ott): This is Mitchell Ott. I don't have an answer for that at this time.

I don't know if, Larry, you have any thoughts.

THE WITNESS (Durocher): No. I'm not even sure how the FAA got involved in it concerning these poles. They certainly should have had the correct answers.

MR. SILVESTRI: This is where I have concern now, because when you read what was submitted already, you know, they should be marked/lighted with the new information you had about, you know, distance from center of runway, that you wouldn't need it, but should the project

1 be approved, it gets built without lights, what 2 happens with the FAA? That's where my confusion 3 exists at this point. 4 MR. HOFFMAN: I suppose, Mr. Silvestri, 5 that the answer is a legal one, and I know that I 6 can't testify, but it has to be lighted in 7 accordance with the FAA guidance. And 8 Mr. Durocher defined for you what the FAA guidance 9 is, so the FAA can't go out and make individual 10 determinations. 11 MR. SILVESTRI: I just want to make 12 sure we're aboveboard, Mr. Hoffman. Thank you. 13 MR. HOFFMAN: Fully understood, sir. 14 MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. 15 Morissette. 16 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. 17 Silvestri. 18 Mr. Nguyen, any follow-up questions? 19 MR. NGUYEN: Yes, I do. Thank you. 20 The FAA requirements for safety, in the prefile 21 testimony, Mr. Durocher -- I apologize if I 22 mispronounced your last name -- on page 3 of your 23 prefile testimony it talks about an extension that 24 has been added to the runway touchdown zone at the

north end of the runway that meets FAA

25

1

2

3

4

5

question though.

6

7

8

9

10

safety?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

strictly a question of safety at the time.

implemented about seven or eight months ago. We decided to do a cutout there just for safety in the event of an overrun by an airplane. There's

requirements for safety. Do you see that?

this is Larry Durocher. I think I might be able

to answer the question. I didn't hear the entire

last sentence on page 3? The question is when was

that runway, the extension was implemented, do you

have any idea what was the reason other than

THE WITNESS (Durocher):

THE WITNESS (Durocher): I think I --

MR. NGUYEN: Are you on page 3, the

It was

no intention at this time of extending the runway.

MR. NGUYEN: And with respect to the skydivers, for the past few years or prior to that were there any incidents where skydivers that drifted away and landed in the north array, proposed north array area, do you know?

THE WITNESS (Durocher): I'm sure there's been several incidents in which they used the north end for an alternate landing area. use several fields around the airport, including

1 the west side. They've landed on people's property at times. So it depends on the 2 3 situation. But they have many, many, many areas 4 to land in the event of an emergency. 5 MR. NGUYEN: Okay. Thank you very 6 That's all I have, Mr. Morissette. much. 7 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Nguyen. 8 We'll now continue with Mr. Golembiewski followed 9 by Mr. Lynch. 10 Mr. Golembiewski, any follow-up 11 questions? 12 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Mr. Morissette, no 13 follow-up questions. Thank you. 14 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you. 15 Mr. Lynch, any follow-up questions? 16 MR. LYNCH: All my questions have been 17 asked by my colleagues. Thank you, Mr. 18 Morissette. 19 MR. MORISSETTE: Thank you, Mr. Lynch. 20 I have one follow-up question, and it 21 concerns the ridge, I'll call it, going up to the 22 Is there any loss of energy production due east. 23 to the hill going to the east? So, in other 24 words, your sunrises are going to, the sun will 25 rise later, and does that have an impact on your

energy production?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): This is Dan from US Solar. It could, Mr. Morissette. We run what is called a PVsyst for all of our arrays, and what this does is give us a generation value. So I'm sure the PVsyst tool that we use took this into consideration.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. So your analysis is based on real-time measurements of the sun and then you incorporate that into your energy production calculation?

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): That's correct, as well as the actual location of the array.

MR. MORISSETTE: Right.

THE WITNESS (Csaplar): It takes into consideration shading and all that good stuff.

MR. MORISSETTE: Very good. I was just curious about that. That's the only question I had. So that concludes our hearing for this afternoon.

p.m., at which time we will commence with the public comment session of this public hearing.

And thank you, everyone, for your participation, and we will see you at 6:30. Thank you.

CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

I hereby certify that the foregoing 82 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken before the CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL of the REMOTE PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: PETITION NO. 1589, Petition from USS Somers Solar, LLC for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-176 and Section 16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 3.0-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility located at 360 Somers Road, Ellington, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection, which was held before JOHN MORISSETTE, PRESIDING OFFICER, on December 5, 2023.

Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061 Court Reporter

1	INDEX	
2	*Administrative Notice Items I-C-1 through I-C-99	
3	received in evidence on page 9.	
4	WITNESSES: DANIEL CSAPLAR MITCHELL OTT	
5	LARRY DUROCHER	
6	EAAM	Mr. Hoffman (Direct) 11
7		Mr. Nwankwo (Start of cross) 14,73 Mr. Silvestri 28,77 Mr. Nguyen 42,78
8		Mr. Morissette 46,57,80 Mr. Lynch 47
9		
10		PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS (Received in evidence)
12	EXHIBIT II-B-1	DESCRIPTION PAGE Petition for a declaratory ruling 13
13 14		filed by USS Somers Solar, LLC, received August 23, 2023, and attachments
15	II-B-2	Petitioner's responses to Council's 13 interrogatories (Redacted), Set One, dated November 9, 2023
16	II-B-3	Petitioner's sign posting affidavit, 13
17		dated November 28, 2023
18	II-B-4	Petitioner's pre-filed testimony of 13 Larry Durocher, dated
19		November 28, 2023
20		Petitioner's response to Council 13 Interrogatory Number 70, dated
21		December 4, 2023
22	*All exhi	bits were retained by the Council.
23		
24		
25		