

Maine, Brennan

From: Amy S Hicks <Amy.Hicks@uinet.com>
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 5:03 PM
To: CSC-DL Siting Council
Cc: Maine, Brennan; James Morrissey; Samantha Marone; Jim Yeske; Christopher Hughes; Shawn Crosbie
Subject: RE: PE1304_Interrogatories
Attachments: CSC PE1304 Interrogatory Set 1 6-23-2017.pdf; CSC-I-1 Attachment 1.pdf; CSC-I-13 Attachment 2.pdf
Importance: High

Please find attached UI's Interrogatory responses for PE1304.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Respectfully,
Amy Hicks



Amy Hicks
Analyst, Permitting & Public Outreach

180 Marsh Hill Road, 1st Floor, Mail Stop AD-2B, Orange, CT 06477
Telephone 203.499.2586 (c) 203.545.5345



amy.hicks@uinet.com

In the interests of the environment,
please print only if necessary and recycle.

From: Maine, Brennan [mailto:Brennan.Maine@ct.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Amy S Hicks; James Morrissey
Cc: CSC-DL Siting Council
Subject: PE1304_Interrogatories

Please see attached correspondence.

Brennan Maine
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Interrogatory CSC-I-1

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Samantha Marone
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-II-1: Have any comments been received by UI from abutting property owners regarding the proposed project? Provide the addresses of such abutters and the nature of the comments and/or inquiries.

A-CSC-I-1: Yes. Please see Attachment 1, Outreach Log.

Interrogatory CSC-I-2

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-2: The proposed monopoles will raise the conductors higher than their existing height on the bonnets. Explain why. For example, is this due to more recent National Electric Safety Code (or other) clearance requirements as proposed to when the bonnets were originally installed?

A-CSC-I-2: Yes. The current edition of the National Electric Safety Code requires a design clearance higher than the existing height.. In addition, the proposed structures are designed to support 2156 (sized conductor); with 2156 there is greater sag. As a result, structure heights have to increase to account for the corresponding sag.

Interrogatory CSC-I-3

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-3: On page 3 of the Petition, UI notes that, "The Project will result in safer conditions for UI maintenance crews..." Is this because the new structures would be taller (with greater clearances) and would also result in the transmission lines being farther (e.g. north and south) from the active railroad tracks?

A-CSC-I-3: Placing the facilities further away from MNR facilities allows for inspection and maintenance without necessarily requiring MNR feeder/signal/track outages.

Interrogatory CSC-I-4

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-4: On page 17 of the Petition, UI notes that, "...[S]ince the proposed structures are below 200 feet in height, no Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) mandated navigational strobe lights or any special painting of the proposed structures will be required." However, is it correct to say that the Sikorsky Memorial Airport is less than three nautical miles from the proposed project? Would that distance impact that need for FAA marking or lighting of the proposed permanent structures or necessitate notice to FAA? Would UI need to provide notices to FAA for any temporary construction structures such as cranes? If the project is approved, could copies of any applicable notices to FAA be submitted to the Council?

A-CSC-I-4: Yes, the Sikorsky Memorial Airport is within three nautical miles from the proposed project. This will require notice to be given to the FAA, but does not require marking or lighting as the structures are not in the glide path or taller than 200 feet. UI will provide copies of applicable notices to FAA. Cranes may require FAA permits, but those are filed by the construction contractors.

Interrogatory CSC-I-5

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-5: Reference the drawings included in Attachment A of the Petition. Are the areas identified in beige as "construction area" that connect the work pads essentially "new access?"

A-CSC-I-5: Yes the areas identified in beige are essentially temporary access roads and work pads that will be removed and the area restored upon completion of the project.

Interrogatory CSC-I-6

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-6: On page 18 of the Petition, UI notes that, "Through the construction of access roads and work pads UI intends to trim and remove vegetation, install E&S controls, flatten un-level ground and excavate areas where and when necessary." Would UI need to improve such new access with gravel? Would existing access (identified in green) need to be improved with gravel?

A-CSC-I-6: Temporary access roads will consist of gravel (1-1/4" stone) which will be removed upon project completion. Existing paved access roads will not require the installation of gravel. Other existing access roads may require stone as necessary to allow for equipment travel.

Interrogatory CSC-I-7

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-7: All proposed structure foundations in the Petition appear to be drilled pier design. Is that correct? To what depth below grade would the foundations extend?

A-CSC-I-7: Yes, these are drilled piers. The average depth is 18 feet with the shortest 13.5 feet and deepest at 37.5 feet.

Interrogatory CSC-I-8

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-8: What would be the anticipated useful life span of the 1590-kcmil conductors? Should UI investigate a larger gauge (i.e. size) conductor to obtain a longer useful life, and would such additional cost be justified?

A-CSC-I-8: Either conductor size would have an anticipated 50 year life span. Structures are designed to support 2156 ACSS if the need should ever arise. Currently the additional cost cannot be justified from a capacity standpoint.

Interrogatory CSC-I-9

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-9: On pages 7 or 8 of the Petition, UI proposes to change the gauge of the conductors from 1272-kcmil to 1590-kcmil. What is the approximate weight load on the current catenary bonnets with the current gauge? If the new conductors were installed on the current bonnets, what would be the new weight load? How much weight can the current bonnets support?

A-CSC-I-9: UI has extensively studied reusing existing catenary structures. Based on this analysis, the existing structures cannot support the increased loading and minimum conductor clearance requirements cannot be met without significant reinforcing / rebuilding of existing structures.

Interrogatory CSC-I-10

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-10: Would all of the proposed structures be galvanized steel, consistent with the Petition No. 1138 project?

A-CSC-I-10: Yes, UI will install galvanized steel consistent with the Petition No. 1138 project.

Interrogatory CSC-I-11

The United Illuminating Company

Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Shawn Crosbie

Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-11: On page 12 of the Petition, UI notes that, "No permanent noise increase will result upon completion of the Project." Thus, would the project continue to comply with DEEP Noise Control Standards, post-construction?

A-CSC-I-11: Yes, the project would continue to comply with DEEP Noise Control Standards, post-construction.

Interrogatory CSC-I-12

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-12: Based on page 1 and Appendix B of the Wetland Delineation and Vernal Pool Identification Report (Wetland Report), it appears that virtually all of the proposed project area, except for the easternmost section, is located outside the Coastal Area Management Zone. Thus, would the proposed project adversely impact the Connecticut Coastal Boundary as defined in Section 22a-94 of Connecticut General Statutes?

A-CSC-I-12: No, UI does not intend to adversely impact Connecticut's Coastal Boundaries. No impacts to tidal areas are anticipated on the project.

Interrogatory CSC-I-13

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-13: On page 17 of the Petition, UI notes that (at the time of filing the Petition) it had not yet received a response from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). To date, has UI received a response from SHPO? If yes, provide a copy of such response.

A-CSC-I-13: Yes, please see Attachment 2, SHPO Letter.

Interrogatory CSC-I-14

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-14: Would the proposed project adversely impact migratory birds identified in the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Report (USFWS Report) in Appendix C of the Petition?

A-CSC-I-14: No, the proposed project would not adversely impact migratory birds identified in the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Report.

Interrogatory CSC-I-15

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-15: Page 1 of the Wetland Report notes that, "Potential habitat for the northern long-eared bat (NLEB) exists north of the railroad tracks and south of Knowlton Street where forest is present." Page 2 of the USFWS Report notes that there is no critical habitat for the NLEB in the proposed project area. However, given the vegetative clearing to the north side of the railroad tracks, would the proposed project adversely impact the NLEB? If yes, how might UI mitigate such impact?

A-CSC-I-15: No, UI would not adversely impact the potential habitat of the NLEB.

Interrogatory CSC-I-16

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-16: Areas suspected of being potential vernal pools were initially investigated in June 2016 (a period of moderate drought) and reinvestigated on April 24, 2017. Earlier this year, we experienced swings in precipitation and temperatures. With the swings that we experienced, was the April date appropriate for reinvestigation?

A-CSC-I-16: Yes, UI's consultant BL Companies felt that doing the vernal pool delineation in April of 2017 was appropriate to clearly assess the project area for the presence of vernal pools.

Interrogatory CSC-I-17

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-17: In Appendix B of the Wetland Report, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps are provided. Are any of the proposed structures to be located in the 100-year or 500-year flood zones? If yes, how many of each? If yes, is it necessary to locate in flood zones, e.g. due to conductor span limits? Also if yes, would such structures be designed to withstand such inundation?

A-CSC-I-17: Yes, there are 6 structures (listed below) that UI proposes to install in the 100-year or 500-year flood zones. the allowable conductor span length limits the location of the structures to these areas. Conductor sway (outside of acceptable levels) issues arise when the structures are no longer located in those positions. However, the foundations are designed in such a way that the top of the drilled pier foundation is 0.5' above the 100-year flood zone elevation.

Structures in 100-year and 500-year flood zones:

- 836N
- 837N
- 838N
- 834S
- 839S
- 845S

Interrogatory CSC-I-18

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-18: Page 13 of the Petition notes that UI would, "...cut approximately 20,150 square feet of wetlands type vegetation...to grade." How would UI facilitate the restoration or regrowth of wetland vegetation? For example, would such areas be seeded?

A-CSC-I-18: To facilitate the restoration or regrowth of wetland vegetation where UI has temporary impacts to inland wetlands from construction activities or has the need to cut wetland type vegetation in order to gain safe access UI will use a New England Wetmix (i.e., Wetland Seed Mix).

Interrogatory CSC-I-19

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-19: Would there be any excavation or soil disturbance within the Raymark Industries EPA Contaminated Area as identified by BL Companies in Appendix H of the Petition, e.g. in the vicinity of Structure Nos. 852N through 854N? Has CTDEEP and /or EPA provided guidance on how to manage “Raymark” waste soils? Is groundwater expected to be contacted in these areas? If so, how would the contaminated groundwater be handled?

A-CSC-I-19: Yes, there will be excavation and soil disturbance within the vicinity of Structure Nos. 852N through 854N. UI has been working closely with both CT DEEP and EPA on providing guidance for the management of soil and groundwater during the construction activities of the project. Further, groundwater is expected to be encountered in the above referenced area. Groundwater will be sent to a treatment facility for disposal.

Interrogatory CSC-I-20

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Shawn Crosbie
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-20: On Page 7 of the Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP), Section 3.2.1, UI notes that, "Should the (natural soil) material not be able to be re-used onsite, the material will need to be transported to an approved aggregate facility." Would such materials be put back in or adjacent to the excavation areas from which they were obtained?

A-CSC-I-20: Due to certain logistical hurdles and space constraints on linear railroad projects UI typically will remove all spoils from the project area and manage accordingly. In certain circumstances where clean spoils can be re-used onsite UI will re-use them.

Interrogatory CSC-I-21

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: James Yeske
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-21: How does the timing of this transmission upgrade project fit in with the construction of the approved replacement Baird Substation (Council Docket 465)? Is it correct to say that the replacement Baird Substation commenced construction on or about the week of May 8, 2017? What is the most current estimated in-service date of the replacement Baird Substation?

A-CSC-I-21: This project will not start construction until the new Baird Substation is in-service. Yes, construction started on the new Baird Substation in May, 2017. Estimated in-service date for Baird is May, 2018.

Interrogatory CSC-I-22

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: Sara Cullen-Corson
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-22: In terms of the construction sequence, does UI plan to construct the new lines on monopoles first, then change over to the use of the new lines, and then remove the old lines? Explain.

A-CSC-I-22: Yes, UI intends to install the new lines first and then remove the old lines.

Interrogatory CSC-I-23

The United Illuminating Company
Petition No. 1304

Witness: James Yeske
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-I-23: Provide the proposed work hours for the project, e.g. Monday through Saturday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Is it possible that some work might be necessary on Sundays due to inclement weather, outage schedules or unforeseen delays that may impact the critical path of the schedule?

A-CSC-I-23: Typical work hours will be Monday through Saturday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. For certain MNR outages contractors will need to work nights typically 8:00 PM to 6:00 AM. It is also possible that the contractors may need to work Sunday but as of right now there are no plans to work Sunday (with the exception of wire pulling during a 4 track outage which is only granted by MNR Friday night 11PM to 6AM Saturday morning and Saturday night 11PM to 6AM Sunday morning.)

Interrogatory CSC-I-1
Attachment 1, Outreach Log

OUTREACH LOG

5/31/2017	Andre Beaudoin Tower Equipment 1320 West Broad Street Stratford, CT 203.375.4420	Returned the call on 6/1. Customer asked how UI contractors would be gaining access to the M/N R.O.W. He was advised of the route, and was happy with what was proposed.
6/1/2017	Robert Whitman 98 Knowlton Street Stratford, CT	Customer called to inquire whether or not the trains would be blowing their horns more during construction. Customer was reassured that the construction would not require additional horn blowing.
6/5/2017	Teresa Denning 34 Whitewood Drive Monroe, CT 203-814-8260	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Customer called and sent an email to be sure that nothing would block her driveway during construction.She used this contact information to complain of a pole issue. The pole issue was forwarded to our customer field service group and resolved.Returned call on 6/5/2017, advised that her driveway would not be blocked during construction or otherwise.
6/6/2017	Tom DeCerbo Representing St. John the Baptist Church 1240 Broadbridge Avenue Stratford, CT	Customer called asking for a copy of the Petition. He was referred to the CSC website to review, advised that he call back if he had additional questions about the Project.
6/7/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	Customer inquired asking to see the Petition; he had gone to the website but did not find it. The customer also inquired about compliance to the Council's notification requirements.
6/7/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer was emailed the Petition, without attachments.

Interrogatory CSC-I-1
Attachment 1, Outreach Log

6/7/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer requested a complete copy of the Petition, and inquired about Section §16-50j-40 regarding the letter, notice requirements and response time.
6/7/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer was notified that a full copy of the Petition would be sent via FedEx the following day, and provided the link to view Section §16-50j-40, and also the link to view the Council's "Citizens Guide to Siting Council Procedures"
6/8/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	Responded to the customer regarding notice requirements
6/8/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	Customer was notified that a hard copy of the Petition would be sent via FedEx.
6/15/2017	Charles Kashetta Jr. 1175 Broadbridge Ave. Stratford, CT 203.360.2226	Called to inquire how the crews would access the R.O.W. behind his business. Called back and sent the drawing showing the access plan. Advised that if things changed, we would let him know.
6/16/2017	Brian Wilk The Hudson Paper Company 1341 West Broad Street Stratford, CT 203.378.0123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6/16/2017: Received an email from M. Bachman – customer had reached out to her. • 6/16/2017: Called the customer to discuss his concerns about drainage behind his property. • 6/19/2017: Sent an email to customer with answers to his questions. • 6/19/2017: UI project manager and construction supervisor met with Mr. Wilk and did a field review of the area. It was determined that the project as planned will not impact the drainage. UI agreed to include notes on future drawings indicating that the drainage is to be maintained at all times during construction.

Interrogatory CSC-I-1
Attachment 1, Outreach Log

6/20/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer inquired again regarding the regulations for deadlines for customer comments, asking if they were the same as the Town.
6/22/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer was advised to respond as soon as possible if they would prefer to be involved or submit questions or comments.
6/26/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	The customer emailed two questions and copied the Council.
6/29/2017	Rachael Rosario Shakespeare Estates 25 Miranda Lane Stratford rachaelr@westfordmgt.com	Customer called to discuss whether or not the proposed construction would impact Shakespeare Estates. Customer was emailed the plan drawing which showed on monopole and some vegetation clearing. This was explained in the email.
6/30/2017	Matthew Mihaly Representing the Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, Inc located at 1240 Broadbridge Ave	Responded to two questions the customer had regarding the Project.



June 30, 2017

Mr. Shawn Crosbie
Environmental Analyst
United Illuminating Holdings Corporation
180 Marsh Hill Road
Orange, CT 06477

Subject: Baird to Housatonic Crossing Upgrade Project
Along Metro North Railroad Line
From 1772 Stratford Avenue, Stratford to 732 Naugatuck Avenue, Milford
Milford and Stratford, CT

Dear Mr. Crosbie,

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the referenced project in response to your request for our comments regarding potential effects to historic properties pursuant to the provisions the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act.

The proposal includes separation of United Illuminating's (UI) two existing utility transmission lines from railway corridor catenaries owned by Metro North to new, freestanding galvanized steel monopoles owned and operated by UI. The project will take place within a 1.9 mile corridor between Baird Substation in Stratford, CT to just west of the Housatonic River in Milford, CT.

The majority of work proposed will take place along the Metro North railroad corridor. The rail line between New York and New Haven was completed by 1849 and was completely electrified by 1907. The entire line is potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NR) based on both its important role in regional transportation and technological innovations. In addition, a portion of the project's 500 foot buffer zone passes within the National Register-listed Stratford Center Historic District (NR# 83003511).

The catenary system for the New Haven Railroad was documented in 2000 by Historical Technologies ("The New Haven Railroad Catenary System" CHPC #937) for a catenary replacement project between Milford and West Haven (project no. 301-T086) at the request of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The documentation covers the catenary system between Greenwich and Milford.



Department of Economic and
Community Development

State Historic Preservation Office

SHPO notes that all work will be confined to previously disturbed deposits within existing rights-of-way. As a result, it is unlikely that the proposed installation will impact significant archeological deposits. In addition, although properties listed on and eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were identified within the project area, the proposed undertaking will not change the character defining features of any nearby historic properties provided that the catenary system is retained and not modified. Based on the information provided to this office, it is SHPO's opinion that the undertaking as proposed will have no adverse effect to historic properties.

The State Historic Preservation Office appreciates the opportunity to review and comment upon this project. These comments are provided in accordance with the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act. For additional information, please contact Marena Wisniewski, Environmental Reviewer, at (860) 256-2754 or marena.wisniewski@ct.gov.

Sincerely,

Mary B. Dunne

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

State Historic Preservation Office

One Constitution Plaza | Hartford, CT 06103 | P: 860.256.2800 | Cultureandtourism.org

An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer An Equal Opportunity Lender