



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

Special Meeting Minutes

Special Meeting of November 20, 2025

A Zoom remote conference special meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council (energy/telecommunications) was held on Thursday, November 20, 2025. The meeting was called to order with a quorum present by Vice Chair Morissette, at 2:00 p.m.

Council Members Present:

John Morissette
Vice Chair
Chance Carter
Khristine Hall
Dr. Scott C. Williams

Brian Golembiewski
(designee for Commissioner Dykes)
Quat Nguyen
(designee for Chairman Elect Wiehl)
Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.

Council Member Absent:

Bill Syme

Staff Members Present:

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director/Staff Attorney
Michael Perrone
Siting Analyst 2

Christina Walsh
Supervising Siting Analyst

Recording Secretary:

Lisa Fontaine

1. **DOCKET NO. 516R – The United Illuminating Company (UI) application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Fairfield to Congress Railroad Transmission Line 115-kV Rebuild Project that consists of the relocation and rebuild of its existing 115- kilovolt (kV) electric transmission lines from the railroad catenary structures to new steel monopole structures and related modifications along approximately 7.3 miles of the Connecticut Department of Transportation’s Metro-North Railroad corridor between Structure B648S located east of Sasco Creek in Fairfield and UI’s Congress Street Substation in Bridgeport, and the rebuild of two existing 115-kV transmission lines along 0.23 mile of existing UI right-of-way to facilitate interconnection of the rebuilt 115-kV electric transmission lines at UI’s existing Ash Creek, Resco, Pequonnock and Congress Street Substations traversing the municipalities of Bridgeport and Fairfield, Connecticut. Court-ordered Remand Regarding Connecticut Siting Council’s February 15, 2024 Final Decision pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-183(j). UI Petition for Reconsideration.**

Ms. Hall moved to deny the Petition for Reconsideration; seconded by Dr. Williams. The motion failed with Mr. Golembiewski, Mr. Nguyen, Dr. Williams and Vice Chair Morissette voting no, and Mr. Carter, Ms. Hall and Mr. Lynch voting yes.

During discussion, Mr. Golembiewski supported approval of the Petition for Reconsideration to correct the record and align the Remand Opinion with the Council's October 16, 2025 vote to deny the application and stated the proposed Project and alternatives were inadequate to address the visual, historic and cultural resource impacts, did not provide sufficient ratepayer cost information, and did not include a regional reliability alternative;

Mr. Nguyen supported approval of the Petition for Reconsideration to correct the Remand Opinion to reflect the Council's October 16, 2025 vote to deny the application and stated the record was insufficient, did not provide sufficient alternatives, did not provide a robust and transparent analysis of costs that would be paid by ratepayers, and the proposed Project does not represent the most appropriate alternative based on a life-cycle cost analysis of the facility and underground alternatives to such facility under Connecticut General Statutes §16-50p, although there is a need for the Project to support the electric transmission system;

Ms. Hall did not support approval of the Petition for Reconsideration and stated that under Connecticut General Statutes §16-50p, there is a public need for the Project that is balanced with energy policies, public safety, cultural and environmental aspects, and costs to ratepayers;

Mr. Carter did not support approval of the Petition for Reconsideration and stated UI did not present any alternatives to the Project that balanced the concerns of the community;

Dr. Williams supported approval of the Petition for Reconsideration and stated development of the Project in an existing transportation corridor is an appropriate location that has minimal ecological impacts noting that the electric transmission line needs to be removed from the train catenaries;

Mr. Lynch did not support approval of the Petition for Reconsideration and had no discussion;

Vice Chair Morissette supported approval of the Petition for Reconsideration and stated the Project is needed for reliability and to relocate the transmission lines from the catenaries, and the environmental impacts are minimal and do not outweigh the need for the Project.

Vice Chair Morissette directed staff to draft a revised Remand Opinion consistent with the Council's discussion during the special meeting to be reviewed by the Council at a regular meeting within 90 days.

Adjournment.

Dr. Williams moved to adjourn the special meeting; seconded by Mr. Carter. The motion passed unanimously. Vice Chair Morissette adjourned the special meeting at 2:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Melanie A. Bachman
Executive Director

MAB/laf