Petition No. 1294
NORCAP North Solar Facility
East Windsor, CT
Responses to Interrogatories

1. The abutters map does not depict the Gilson property. Please revise.

   The current abutters map and Site Plans are correct not showing any abutting property owned by Gilson. It is possible that this interrogatory has been issued after a review of the Town of East Windsor GIS mapping. The Town GIS mapping shows a 0.66 acre strip of land owned by Gilson along the western edge of the Project Site. However, the project's boundary survey and research revealed that the GIS mapping is inaccurate and a strip of land owned by Gilson does not exist. The strip appears to correspond with a former easement/right-of-way which has subsequently been extinguished through common ownership. Both the land where the easement existed and the parcel for which the easement was in favor are currently owned by the Northern Capital Regional Disposal Facility, otherwise known as NORCAP.

2. Site Plan Sheet 4 shows the temporary sedimentation basin extending onto the abutting property to the west (Gilson property). Does the Petitioner have a lease agreement to utilize this property?

   As discussed above, the property to the west of the project site where the temporary sedimentation basin extends is owned by the Northern Capital Regional Disposal Facility, not Gilson. Although there is currently a verbal agreement to allow for the construction of the sedimentation basin, the applicant will formalize this agreement with a temporary grading easement around this area. The final plans will be revised to depict this new easement.

3. How was the size of temporary sedimentation basin determined?

   The temporary sedimentation basin was sized in accordance with the methodology outlined in the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. The sizing calculations are attached.

4. At what point would the temporary sedimentation basin be removed?

   The proposed basin will be utilized as a temporary sedimentation basin only during the construction phase of the project until site soils have been stabilized with vegetation. After that time the basin will not be necessary, but there is no plan to fill it in. It will be seeded and remain to provide an added level of protection against sedimentation of the downgradient wetland.

5. The petition describes on-site soils as bare/exposed. Would topsoil be imported to the site to create favorable conditions for site seeding? If so, to what thickness would the topsoil be applied? Estimate the amount of imported topsoil required to create favorable growing conditions.

   The Site Plan calls for all disturbed areas to be loamed (i.e. topsoil spread) and seeded. The minimum depth of topsoil to be installed is 3 inches. The approximate disturbed area requiring topsoil is approximately 12.2 acres. This corresponds to approximately 4,920 cubic yards of topsoil.

6. If low-growth ground cover is being used, would a permanent stormwater dentition basin be necessary to capture site runoff?

   As discussed in Stormwater Management section of the petition on page 15, replacing the existing bare soils at the site with a low-growth cover type will result in a reduction in the runoff from the site. As a result, a permanent detention basin is not warranted.

7. Does the Petitioner anticipate changes to the proposed construction and post-construction stormwater control features based on DEEP review of the Stormwater Pollution Control Plan?

   The proposed stormwater control features were designed to comply with the requirements of DEEP General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities. Thus, no plan changes are anticipated to result from the DEEP review of the Stormwater Pollution Control Plan.

8. Once ground cover is established, would the Petitioner use herbicides and/or pesticides to maintain healthy growth?

   The facility will be seeded with a low growth solar mix and mowed twice a year. We do not anticipate the need to use herbicides or pesticides to maintain healthy growth.

9. Does the proposed site contain mapped prime farmland soils? If so, do any prime farmland soils remain at the site due to past land use?

   Based on the Farmland Classification Map available on the Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey (see attached), a portion of the parcel is mapped as prime farmland. However, based on the historic removal of topsoil and gravel from this area, it does not appear that any of the prime farmland soils remain at the site.

10. The REMA Listed-Species Investigation report at Petition Tab 10 states wood turtle use of the site is potentially moderate. Would the Petitioner be willing to implement the recommended wood turtle protection measures listed on page 4 of the report?

   Yes. The project will implement CT DEEP protocols to protect against incidental taking during construction. After construction is completed, the area of the temporary sedimentation basin will be maintained to grasses and forbs to create a favorable wood turtle habitat. Mowing of the area will be limited to once a year, outside the wood turtle peak activity period.

11. Petition Page 6 lists several issues regarding potential use of adjacent capped landfills for a solar facility. Would the south face of landfill on the abutting property to the south be appropriate for a solar installation rather than the top of the landfill? Is there an existing access road that ascends the south face of this landfill? Could this access road be used to facilitate solar installation on the sides or top of the landfill?

   Several of the potential issues with siting a solar field on the top of the landfill also apply to siting a solar field on the southern face of the capped landfill including higher visibility from the surrounding area, the necessity to clear trees, and the potential for compromising the landfill cap. In addition, the southern slope of the landfill has been finished at a slope between 3:1 and 4:1. No viable module racking technology exists to mount modules on a slope of this magnitude, especially without penetrating the cap. The steep slope would also increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation. An unimproved, narrow dirt access road does exist

along the southern face of the capped landfill providing access to the top of the landfill. However, this road would likely need to be widened and improved to facilitate solar installation on the sides or top of the landfill.

12. What are the proposed construction work hours for the facility?

    Proposed construction hours are 7am – 7pm weekdays and Saturdays, or otherwise in compliance with the local authority having jurisdiction.

13. What is the anticipated life-span of the proposed facility? Please submit a facility Decommissioning Plan.

The facility is expected to have a lifespan of at least 20 years. A decommissioning plan is attached.

14. Petition pages 11-12 lists several Town meetings attended by the Petitioner. Did the Town request specific changes to the Project, and if so, were these changes made prior to submission of the Petition to the Council?

    No specific changes to the plan were requested by the Town at the meetings with the Town Boards and Commissions.

15. Is the site property within the State of Connecticut Department of Agriculture Farmland Preservation Program? If so, is a solar facility a permitted use? Please explain.

No easements or deeds were found in the Town Land Records indicating that the site property is part of the Farmland Preservation Program.

16. Provide the specifications sheets for a) proposed inverters and b) solar photovoltaic panels.

Please see attached specification sheets.

17. Are there trees adjacent to the site that would shade portions of the solar field?

    Limits of clearing are represented on the site plan. Shading loss from adjacent trees is minimal. Any shading of panels would be primarily in early morning conditions.