



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

September 20, 2017

Lee D. Hoffman, Esq.
Pullman & Comley, LLC
90 State House Square
Hartford, CT 06103-3702

RE: **PETITION NO. 1313** – DWW Solar II, LLC petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 26.4 megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on approximately 289 acres comprised of 5 separate and abutting privately-owned parcels located generally west of Hopmeadow Street (US 202/CT 10), north and south of Hoskins Road, and north and east of County Road and associated electrical interconnection to Eversource Energy's North Simsbury Substation west of Hopmeadow Street in Simsbury, Connecticut.

Dear Attorney Hoffman:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than October 3, 2017. 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.

Yours very truly,

Melanie A. Bachman
Executive Director

c: Aileen Kenney, Deepwater Wind, LLC
Council Members
Parties and Intervenors

MB/RDM/lm



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

Petition No. 1313

Interrogatories Set 2 - DWW Solar II

September 20, 2017

65. In regards to Petition Exhibit D (Project modifications to address community concerns) – How did the reduction in the footprint of the Project affect the output of the proposed facility?
66. What is the output of the south solar field (south of Hoskins Road), as proposed?
67. Following up on the discussion regarding the layout of the south solar field at the September 12, 2017 public hearing, can the petitioner alter the project layout by relocating the portion of the solar field south of the 85 Hoskins Road property to other areas of the project site? If so, please describe/depict potential changes. Would such a change reduce or increase the project output?
68. In addition to the open public meeting listed in petition Exhibit D, please list all project-related public meetings and meetings held with Town departments.
69. Petition p. 5 states the project will be located on 156-acres. Please define the limits of the Project area.
70. Petition Exhibit L, p. 10 states that the project would replace row crops in dirt with low planting crops which will promote more natural infiltration.
 - a. Please provide some details as to what crops are currently grown on the subject property and in what locations.
 - b. What percentage of current crops represent row crops grown in dirt?
 - c. What percentage of crops represent something other than row crops grown in dirt?
71. Petition Section 4.0 p. 13, lists a number of project benefits, including enhancement of existing farmland by use of long-term cover crops:
 - a. Is this statement based on actual scientific knowledge (i.e., scientific studies) or theory?
 - b. How do you reconcile your position given the statements presented by the Department of Agriculture consultant (i.e., questions 30, 33, 34, 35, 41 and 42)?
72. Petition p. 47 states 126-acres of agricultural fields will be converted to solar arrays. The Department of Agriculture pre-filed testimony states the project will be located on or about 213 acres of farmland soils out of the 289 total acres consisting of 90 acres of prime agricultural soils and 123 acres of agricultural soils of statewide importance. How do you reconcile the differences between petitioner and Department of Agriculture?
73. Referring to the Petitioner's response to DOAg's Interrogatory 7, please submit a revised map that excludes currently forested areas and building areas within the project footprint.
74. Referring to the Petitioner's response to DOAg's Interrogatory 9, what would cause a "failure in vegetative cover"?
75. Referring to Petition Exhibit B, Tree Clearing Map, what equipment will be used to remove the trees within the project limits? Can the use of his equipment be limited to existing farm roads to the extent practical?

76. Referring to Petition Exhibit B, Farmland Soils and Proposed Grading Limits, what equipment will be used to re-grade the designated areas?
77. Petition p. 9 states grading will be required to achieve 15 percent, whereas the grading site plans in Petition Exhibit C depicts grading to achieve a slope of 10 percent. Please clarify.
78. Provide specifications for the racking system.
79. Petition Exhibit C, Grading and Drainage Map C- 4.2 and C 4.4 depict a significant amount of grading upgradient of wetlands. Please clarify what erosion and sediment control measures would be utilized to help stabilize the embankment in both areas.
80. Petition Exhibit C, Grading and Drainage Map C-5.3 identifies a depression approximately 10 feet deep that appears subject to some significant re-grading:
 - a. Does this depression represent one of the wetlands identified on the site?
 - b. What is the purpose of the re-grading in this area as it does not appear to be utilized for the installation of solar panels?
 - c. Is this depression located in the vicinity of Test Pit #2, which indicates a high water table around 80 inches?
81. Referring to Petition Exhibit I, Figure A-5 -Wildlife Passage Corridors. Are corridors shown based on pre-construction patterns or post-construction patterns? If the corridors are based on post-construction patterns, what information or parameters were used to develop the corridors?
82. Petition Section 7.3, p. 49 describes the Pollinator Habitat Enhancement Demonstration Project:
 - a. At what phase of the project will this be implemented?
 - b. What was the rationale for planting "up to" one (1) acre?
 - c. Can more than one (1) acre be planted if the results of the pollinator habitat enhancement shows positive results?
 - d. Can "Milkweed" be incorporated into the pollinator seed mix?
83. Are the residential areas abutting the site served by private wells? Assuming some areas are served by private wells, can vibrations caused by the installation of the racking posts cause sediment buildup in adjacent wells? What measures will the petitioner undertake to ensure there is no disruption or effect on private well water? Describe procedures the petitioner will incorporate to respond to complaints regarding sediment in well water.
84. At the public hearing on September 12, 2017, several public comments pertained to concerns about driving piles into the ground and displacing residual pesticides that may be present further into the ground, either into local wells or the underlying aquifer:
 - a. Please describe the possibility of a situation like this occurring.
 - b. Would the petitioner be willing to test the wells of abutting property owners, both pre and post-construction, to verify any potential well impacts?
 - c. Of the 5 test pits conducted on site, the results indicate test pits #2 and #5 show water at any elevation in the test pit 80 inches and 96 inches, respectively. Would the driven rack posts come in contact with a "high" water table? What is the probability that such an activity would have an adverse impact on local private wells or aquifers?
85. At the public hearing on September 12, 2017, one public comment made reference to the degradation of solar panels that will result in pollutants entering the ground, potentially contaminating groundwater. Please explain if the solar panels degrade over time and if such degradation has the potential to discharge pollutants into the ground and groundwater.

86. In regards to Petition Exhibit L, Hydrological Analysis, are the 24-hour storm rainfall volumes used in the report required by DEEP to obtain a Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities permit? Are there other rainfall volumes that must be used for this permit?
87. In regards to Petition Exhibit L, p. 13 of the Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP) states project commencement will begin in the summer of 2018 and be completed by the summer of 2020:
 - a. What is expected to be completed by 2020, earthwork or project construction?
 - b. If project construction is to be completed by 2020, when would earthwork be completed?
88. Page 16 of the SWPCP states sediment collected in structures shall be disposed of properly. Please provide more information on appropriate sediment disposal methods and locations.
89. Referring to p. 17 of the SWPCP (Turbidity Monitoring), will each drainage area have an associated stormwater control outfall? If not, how many drainage areas would have such structures during construction?
90. Are any post-construction stormwater discharge structures proposed for the site? If not, how would stormwater discharge from the project limits? If there are no post-construction "outfalls" or design structures, how does the petitioner propose to monitor stormwater discharge, especially towards ponds and other wetland areas?
91. Referring to the SWPCP Test Pit information, why were no test pits dug on parcels 3 and 4? In the vicinity of test pit #5, results indicate a water elevation about 96 inches below the surface. What is the distance from test pit #5 to the solar array?
92. Referring to Petition Exhibit O, Phase I Environmental Assessment:
 - a. Section 6.1.9 - Have the asphalt shingles been tested for asbestos?
 - b. Section 6.1.9 - Is there a debris cleanup plan for the site to remove the discarded 55-gallon drums and other debris on site that includes acceptable solid waste disposal standards?
 - c. Section 6.1.9 - Will there be any environmental testing in the vicinity of the empty drums?
 - d. Section 6.1.9 - Will the removal of debris and any necessary remediation be the responsibility of the current landowner?
 - e. Section 6.2.4 - Was the "bulging drum" identified on p. 14 reported to the property owner?
 - f. Section 6.1.8 - If the petitioner or landowner decides not to properly abandon the monitoring wells, will they be restored for reuse?
 - g. Section 8.4 - How did GZA determine the solid/liquid waste identified within the waste manifest records pertained to the 45 Hoskins Road property if no address is associated with the records? Is it common for the same property to have different EPA Generator ID numbers?
93. Under what circumstances would a solar developer have to conduct an aviation glare analysis?
94. Referencing the response to the Town Interrogatories, #91, the response states that SHPO requests that stumps remain in certain areas to avoid disturbing potential archeological sites. Were these potential sites the subject of the Cultural Resource Phase 1B survey?
95. Referring to Petition p. 48- what is the size of the Munnisunk Core Forest area? Would the loss of 18.1 acres of forest in this area cause a change in classification to Edge Forest?
96. Referring to Petition Exhibit I, Wildlife Evaluation, Table B-1- where on the site was the American Kestrel observed? Was this finding reported to the DEEP Natural Diversity Database Program?