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 www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

January 16, 2019

Bruce L. McDermott, Esq. Murtha Cullina LLP 265 Church Street New Haven, CT 06510

RE:

PETITION NO. 1354 – Chatfield Solar Fund, 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 1.98-megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on approximately 25 acres located generally south of Route 80 (North Branford Road) and east of Chestnut Hill Road in Killingworth, Connecticut, and associated electrical interconnection to Eversource Energy's Green Hill Substation located at 775 Green Hill Road, Madison, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney McDermott:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than February 6, 2019. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Bachman Executive Director

c: Council Members

Charles Geppi, Chatfield Solar Fund, LLC



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 Retition No.c1354 Interrogatories - Set Two January 17, 2019

- 91. Provide an estimate the total upfront cost of the proposed project. Break down the total cost into the following categories: Land acquisition, Environmental Studies, Engineering, Permitting.
- 92. Due to the submittal of the revised site layout to the Council on January 3, 2019, please revise the information contained in the following interrogatory responses:
 - a) CSC-1-17
 - b) CSC-1-18
 - c) CSC-1-19
 - d) CSC-1-20 what is the size of the wooded buffer to all property lines?
 - e) CSC-1-53 and corresponding diagram.
 - f) CSC-1-55
 - g) CSC-1-59 and corresponding diagram (1-18, Att. A)
 - j) CSC-1-67
 - h) CSC-1-81
- 93. Referring to CSC-1-22, provide more detail regarding site restoration measures. Are these measures specified in the land-lease?
- 94. Referring to CSC-1-34 and CSC-1-49 different solar row aisle widths are given, please clarify.
- 95. Referring to CSC-1-41, will each row of solar panels connect to an above ground cable tray? Would this cable tray then connect to a centralized cable tray that extends to the transformers at the Project site entrance?
- 96. Referring to CSC-1-50, does Chatfield Solar Fund intend to adhere to the recommended tree clearing restriction concerning potential on-site Northern Long-Eared Bat populations? Would other bat species that may inhabit the site benefit from this tree clearing restriction?
- 97. Referring to CSC-1-60, were the infiltration trenches designed specifically to mitigate stormwater flows or thermal impacts to the eastern wetland?
- 98. Referring to CSC-1-68, why was a proposed condition of 2-7 percent sloping lawn used in the drainage calculations if the average Project slope is 9 percent, as shown on the CSC-1-59 Attachment? Would the wetlands between each distinct solar array area act as a stormwater divide within the Project site and thus require a stormwater analysis of each sub-drainage area?
- 99. Referring to CSC-1-78;
 - a) How was a land disturbance value of 0.91-acres determined for solar array stump grubbing?
 - b) Regarding the proposed flush cut tree removal and selective grubbing procedure for the solar field area, has Chatfield Solar Fund used these methods during construction of a solar facility elsewhere in New England? If so, identify the location of the facility.
 - c) What minimum stump diameter will be used to determine if a stump and associated root ball must be removed for the proper installation of a racking post?
- 100. Referring to response CSC-1-69, the revised site layout has three distinct solar field areas- northern area, southeast area and southwest area. What is the energy output (AC) of each area?



- 101. The site plans contained within CSC-1-18 depicted forested buffer zones between the development area and on-site wetlands. It appears the revised Project layout (CSC-1-69) eliminates these forested buffer zones. Describe the width of the revised wetland buffer zones to each wetland and the reason for changes.
- 102. Referring to response CSC-1-69, provide detail for the infiltration trenches, the relocated road crossing, and associated stilling basin (Sheet 2 is reference but was not submitted).
- 103. Referring to response CSC-1-69, what is the total land disturbance/grubbing associated with the installation of the infiltration trenches?
- 104. Referring to response CSC-1-69, three site phases are shown. What is the acreage of each phase? Detail the activities that would occur in each phase. Would each phase be constructed concurrently? If not, provide a phasing timeline.
- 105. Referring to response CSC-1-69, Attachment 1-69-2 tree clearing is depicted up to the edge of potential vernal pool 2. How would site clearing and subsequent construction affect the water quality of this vernal pool? How would thermal effects be mitigated? How would trees be removed to prevent direct tree fall into the pool?
- 106. Referring to the January 3, 2019 submittal to the Council, the clearing limits shown on the CSC-1-69 response Site Plan Attachment and the December 27, 2018 Addendum Figure 2 Proposed Conditions Plan do not match. Provide revised drawings and associated wetland and upland clearing values.
- 107. Referring to the January 3, 2019 submittal to the Council, p. 3 of the December 27, 2018 Addendum describes an initial site evaluation for listed NDDB species. Provide a copy of the referenced evaluation.
- 108. Referring to the January 3, 2019 submittal to the Council, Appendix A of the December 27, 2018 Addendum uses a proposed condition drainage area description of "wooded (light underbrush)". Is this representative of post-construction conditions if part of the drainage area will be a grassy solar field?
- 109. Is a Federal Aviation Administration No Hazard Determination required for this facility? Was any filing made to the FAA?
- 110. Please address the comments from Town of Killingworth Fire Marshal that were submitted to the Council on January 4, 2019.