

Petition No. 1312
Interrogatories to Petitioner
Set Three
October 24, 2017

Project Alternatives

110. *Which project alternatives, consistent with the Tri-State Clean Energy RFP (Tri-State RFP) requirements, were considered by Candlewood Solar LLC? For example, was a floating solar facility on Candlewood Lake considered, rather than a fixed facility on the ground?*

As described in the response below to Interrogatory #111, Candlewood Solar and its land development partner New Milford Clean Power considered several other land based sites in preparing a response to the Tri-State RFP. Given the minimum required size of 20 MW AC, land based, ground mounted solar PV is the only feasible siting alternative. A floating solar facility would pose considerable technical, permitting, environmental, aesthetic, and recreational concerns, as well as being costly and therefore not competitive. We therefore did not pursue this type of facility.

111. *Were any other raw land sites (consistent with Tri-State RFP requirements) considered? Were any of these sites already developed? Would any of those alternative sites potentially require less tree clearing than the proposed site and/or would avoid Natural Diversity Database areas? Provide the addresses of such raw land site alternatives and the reason(s) for rejection.*

The following other sites were considered by Candlewood Solar and our land development partner, New England Clean Power:

Kimberly Clarke Property, Route 7, New Milford

This property consists of a closed landfill and adjacent unused farm and forest area. This site was not large enough to accommodate 20 MW AC. Part of the site is also mapped as Prime Farmland and State Important Farmland Soils. It is unknown whether there would be significant NDDDB issues, but the site is on the northeast flank of Candlewood Mountain, and therefore there is potential for endangered/threatened species. In addition, the site would have required significant site work, clearing and grading, with the presence of extensive wetland areas. Lastly, building an array at this location would be highly visible to Route 7 traffic, and potentially to abutters.

Private Farmland, New Milford

This working farm consisted of a total of over 122 acres, but was surrounded by single family homes with steep grades facing east with significant wetlands. Buildable area was determined to be less than 40 acres, which cannot accommodate a minimum 20 MW AC project. A solar array at this site would be visible to abutters.

Parcel on Pickett District Road, New Milford

Located on Pickett District Rd., this it is currently under contract with an affiliate of New Milford Clean Power. At only approximately 40 acres, it can not accommodate a minimum 20 MW AC solar facility. It is also valued at much too highly to be economical for solar development.

Candlelight Valley Country Club - 401 Danbury Rd., New Milford

Total size of this site is 129 acres. However, much of the site is in the 100 year floodplain, and/or has active wetlands, making the total feasibly buildable area less than 40 acres. Purchase cost would make it uneconomical for solar, and a solar array would also likely be visible to abutters.

112. *Were any brownfield sites considered? If yes, provide the addresses of such sites and the reason(s) for rejection.*

Yes, brownfield sites were considered.

Century Brass Site, New Milford

The Century Brass site was not large enough, at 72-acres with significant wetland areas to accommodate a 20 MW AC solar array. At the time of site screening, this site was also was under contract to Panda Power, Inc. who proposed a 500MW gas powered electric plant.