



CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
Transcript of
PETITION NUMBER 1120
March 31, 2015
VOLUME 1

Printed On: April 15, 2015

UNITED REPORTERS, INC.
Phone: 866-534-3383
Fax: 877-534-3383
Email: info@unitedreporters.com
Internet: www.unitedreporters.com

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Petition No. 1120

The United Illuminating Company Petition for
a Declaratory Ruling That No Certificate of
Environmental Compatibility and Public Need
Is Required for the Proposed Modifications to
the Hawthorne Substation Located at 180
Hawthorne Drive, Fairfield, Connecticut

Council Meeting held at the Education
Center, 2nd Floor Conference Room, 501 Kings
Highway East, Fairfield, Connecticut,
Tuesday, March 31, 2015, beginning at 3:00
p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e:

ROBERT STEIN, Chairperson
SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.,
Vice Chairperson

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 A p p e a r a n c e s: 2 Council Members: 3 PHILIP ASHTON 4 DR. BARBARA C. BELL 5 ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee 6 DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS 7 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR. 8 LARRY LEVESQUE, PURA Designee 9 10 Council Staff: 11 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ., 12 Executive Director and 13 Staff Attorney 14 15 ROBERT MERCIER, 16 Siting Analyst 17 18 For the United Illuminating Company: 19 UIL HOLDINGS CORPORATION 20 157 Church Street 21 New Haven, Connecticut 06506 22 (203) 499-2000 23 By: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ. 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good 2 afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to 3 call to order this meeting of the Connecticut 4 Siting Council, today, Tuesday, March 31, 5 2015, approximately 3 p.m. My name is Robin 6 Stein. I'm Chairman of the Connecticut 7 Siting Council. 8 Other members of the Council 9 present are Senator Murphy, our Vice 10 Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the 11 Department of Energy and Environmental 12 Protection; Mr. Levesque, designee from the 13 Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; 14 Mr. Ashton; Dr. Klemens; Dr. Bell; and 15 Mr. Lynch. 16 Members of the staff, our 17 staff attorney and our Executive Director, 18 Melanie Bachman, and Mr. Mercier, our siting 19 analyst. 20 This hearing is held pursuant 21 to provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut 22 General Statutes and of the Uniform 23 Administrative Procedure Act upon a Petition 24 from United Illuminating Company for a 25 declaratory ruling that no certificate of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd.) 2 For the Town of Fairfield: 3 STANTON H. LESSER, ATTORNEY 4 1 Eliot Place 5 Fairfield, Connecticut 06824 6 (203) 336-1811 7 8 Intervenor: 9 ARTHUR TOURNAS and 10 VINCENT GIANDURCO 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 environmental compatibility and public need 2 is required for the proposed modifications to 3 the existing Hawthorne Substation, located at 4 180 Hawthorne Drive, Fairfield, Connecticut. 5 This petition was received by the Council on 6 November 5, 2014, deemed complete on 7 December 4, 2014. 8 As a reminder to all, 9 off-the-record communication with a member of 10 the Council or a member of the staff upon the 11 merits of this petition is prohibited by law. 12 The parties and intervenors to 13 the proceeding are as follows: United 14 Illuminating Company, or UI, Attorney 15 McDermott is their representative; the Town 16 of Fairfield, Attorney Lesser; and grouped 17 intervenors, Mr. Tournas and Mr. Giandurco. 18 We will proceed in accordance 19 with the prepared agenda, copies of which are 20 available here. Also available here are 21 copies of the Council's Guide to Siting 22 Council procedures. And I believe they are 23 both in the back, near the door. 24 At the end of the afternoon 25 session, we will recess and resume again at 7</p>

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 6

1 p.m. The 7 p.m. hearing is reserved for the
2 public to make brief oral statements into the
3 record. I wish to note that parties and
4 intervenors, including their representatives
5 and witnesses, are not allowed to participate
6 in the public comment session.
7 I also wish to note for those
8 who are here and for the benefit of your
9 friends and neighbors who are unable to join
10 us for the public comment session that you or
11 they may send written statements to the
12 Council within 30 days of the date hereof,
13 and such written statements will be given the
14 same weight as if spoken at the hearing. If
15 necessary, party and intervenor presentations
16 may continue after the public comment session
17 if time remains.
18 A verbatim transcript will be
19 made of this hearing and deposited with the
20 Town Clerk's Office in the towns of Fairfield
21 and Easton for the convenience of the public.
22 Is there any public official
23 who would like to make a statement at this
24 time?
25 (No response.)

Page 7

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We
2 have a motion. We have a request -- a
3 request for intervenor, Mr. Tournas, dated
4 March 13th.
5 MR. ASHTON: Move to be
6 accepted.
7 SENATOR MURPHY: Second.
8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Wait a
9 minute. If I haven't -- first of all, let me
10 finish. Requesting that UI meet with the
11 abutters, Town of Fairfield and the other
12 neighbors, regarding the project.
13 Attorney Bachman may wish to
14 comment.
15 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.
17 We received a request from
18 Intervenor Tournas, dated March 13th, asking
19 the Siting Council to assist with arranging a
20 meeting between the abutters and UI.
21 There is no prohibition on
22 parties and intervenors meeting outside of
23 the Council proceeding; however, this Council
24 doesn't have the authority to compel the
25 parties to have a meeting, and therefore, I

Page 8

1 recommend that the request be denied.
2 MR. ASHTON: And I will move.
3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I have a
4 motion. Do I have a second?
5 SENATOR MURPHY: Second.
6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Motion, and
7 a second.
8 All those in favor signify by
9 saying, aye.
10 VOICES: Aye.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Opposed?
12 Abstention? The motion carries.
13 We also have a request from
14 intervenor, Mr. Tournas, dated March 19,
15 2015, requesting the Council to walk through
16 abutting properties adjacent to the
17 substation.
18 Again, I'll ask Attorney
19 Bachman to comment.
20 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chairman. Due to the site conditions
22 today with the snow, certainly a walk through
23 the backyards wasn't recommended. At this
24 point, since the field review is concluded,
25 this motion has become moot.

Page 9

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: So I still
2 need a motion to, I guess, to deny since it's
3 moot. But --
4 MR. ASHTON: Deny forcing it.
5 Yes, I'll move it.
6 SENATOR MURPHY: Second.
7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Motion and a
8 second. All those in favor signify by
9 saying, aye.
10 VOICES: Aye.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Opposed?
12 Abstention? The motion carries.
13 I wish to call your attention
14 to those items shown on the hearing program
15 marked as Roman numeral ID, items one through
16 53.
17 Does the petitioner or any
18 party or intervenor have any objection to the
19 items that the Council has administratively
20 noticed?
21 (No response.)
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Hearing and
23 seeing none, the Council hereby
24 administratively notices these existing
25 documents, statements and comments.

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 10

1 We'll now ask the petitioner
2 if you would present your witness panel for
3 the purpose of taking the oath.
4 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council, Bruce
6 McDermott on behalf of the United
7 Illuminating Company. Good afternoon. I'll
8 introduce the panel.
9 At the beginning of my
10 immediate left, Mr. Tony Buccheri, who is
11 director of Transmission and Substation
12 Project Management.
13 Next to him is Mr. Bohdan
14 Katreczko, manager of Environmental and Real
15 Estate Services, followed by Mr. Ronald
16 Rossetti, senior director, Engineering and
17 Project Excellence.
18 Next to him is Matthew Cloud,
19 Transmission and Substation engineer; David
20 Bradt, director of Transmission Planning;
21 Dr. Amy Williams, managing scientist from
22 Exponent.
23 Scattered throughout the
24 audience we also have Ryan Baker, acoustic
25 specialist from Black & Veatch, and Rick

Page 11

1 Landino, graphic specialist from All-Points
2 Technology Corporation.
3 And, Mr. Chairman, also, given
4 the interest that has taken place recently
5 and the -- concerning potential impacts of
6 the project on the box turtle, we've asked
7 our herpetologist, Dennis Quinn, to come.
8 He's available. I did not identify him
9 previously as a witness. But I, again,
10 thinking that it was going to be a topic of
11 some interest today, Mr. Quinn is also
12 available for cross-examination on -- on the
13 topic of the box turtle. Mr. Quinn is owner
14 of CT Herp Consultants, LLC, in Plantsville,
15 Connecticut, where he has been since 2007.
16 And with that, I should also
17 mention, as -- as we usually do,
18 Mr. Chairman, we have other members of the
19 company and consultants who are present
20 should the need arise for their particular
21 interest. But we think with that extensive
22 panel, we should be able to answer all the
23 questions the Council might have, and they
24 are available for swearing in.
25 THE CHAIRPERSON: So if you --

Page 12

1 all of those who have been named, please rise
2 so we can take the oath, please.
3 DENNIS QUINN,
4 MATTHEW P. CLOUD,
5 RONALD M. ROSSETTI,
6 TONY BUCCHERI,
7 DAVID BRADT,
8 BOHDAN KATRECZKO,
9 RYAN L. BAKER,
10 DR. AMY WILLIAMS,
11 RICK LANDINO,
12 called as witnesses, being first duly
13 sworn by the Executive Director, were
14 examined and testified on their oaths
15 as follows:
16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you
17 continue by numbering the exhibits and
18 filings, please?
19 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you,
20 Mr. Chairman. UI has -- I'm sorry. Is
21 anyone else getting feedback, or is it just
22 me? Okay. As long as the audio people are
23 fine, that's good.
24 We have 16 exhibits for
25 identification. And I'll try to introduce

Page 13

1 most of them without using the whole panel
2 for that purpose, but rely on Mr. Rossetti
3 who has oversight of this project.
4 Mr. Rossetti, concerning the
5 petition -- I'm sorry -- Exhibit Number 1,
6 the Petition for Declaratory Ruling, are you
7 familiar with that docket -- excuse me --
8 that document?
9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
10 I am.
11 MR. McDERMOTT: Did you
12 prepare or assist in the preparation of that
13 document?
14 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
15 I have.
16 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you
17 have any changes to the petition?
18 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, I
19 do not.
20 MR. McDERMOTT: Regarding the
21 affidavit of service, Exhibit 2 for
22 identification, did you prepare or oversee
23 the preparation of that document?
24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
25 I have.

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 14

1 MR. McDERMOTT: Any changes or
2 modifications thereto?
3 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No,
4 there is not.
5 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you
6 adopt that docket -- document here today?
7 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes.
8 MR. McDERMOTT: Exhibit 3 is
9 the photo rendering of the proposed pavement
10 area of the Hawthorne Substation as provided
11 by e-mail to the Council on December 5th.
12 Are you familiar with that document?
13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
14 I am.
15 MR. McDERMOTT: Any changes or
16 revisions thereto?
17 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No,
18 there is not.
19 MR. McDERMOTT: And maybe we
20 could take the interrogatory responses, which
21 are Number 4, the Petitioner's Response to
22 the Council Interrogatory Set 1; the Number
23 8, Responses to Council Interrogatories Set
24 2; 9, Petitioners Response to Town of
25 Fairfield Interrogatory Set 1; 10,

Page 15

1 Petitioner's Response to Town Interrogatory
2 Set 2; 11, Petitioner's Response to Arthur
3 Tournas Interrogatory Set 1; 12, Petitioner's
4 Response to Tournas Interrogatory Set 2; 13,
5 Petitioner's Response to Tournas
6 Interrogatory Set 3; 14, Petitioner's
7 Response to Giandurco Interrogatories, dated
8 March 23, 2015.
9 Are you familiar with those
10 documents?
11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
12 I am.
13 MR. McDERMOTT: Did you
14 prepare or assist in the responses contained
15 in those -- in those documents?
16 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
17 I did.
18 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you
19 have changes to any of those documents?
20 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
21 I do.
22 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.
23 Specifically where? Which document?
24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I
25 have three changes regarding the first set of

Page 16

1 the Connecticut Siting Council
2 Interrogatories, Number 6. It discusses the
3 need to purchase and install infrared
4 security cameras. That should read thermal
5 imaging cameras, not infrared cameras.
6 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Just to
7 give everyone a chance to catch up with you
8 and make that change, please. So that would
9 be in the next to last sentence that begins
10 "Screening would require the purchase and
11 installation of infrared security cameras."
12 And you wish to change that to "installation
13 of thermal imaging security cameras."
14 Correct?
15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
16 is correct.
17 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Thank
18 you, Mr. Rossetti.
19 And the next change that you
20 wish to make in the interrogatory responses?
21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes.
22 It was in the Town of Fairfield set of
23 interrogatories, Number 4, Attachment A. It
24 was the lighting plan. There was a reference
25 to the LED wattage of 150 watts. That should

Page 17

1 read 421 watts.
2 MR. McDERMOTT: And just to
3 help the Council, Mr. Rossetti, that's in the
4 fixture list, I believe, in the upper
5 right-hand corner?
6 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
7 is correct.
8 MR. McDERMOTT: And, again, so
9 changing 150 to 440 -- 421?
10 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
11 That's correct.
12 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Thank
13 you, Mr. Rossetti. And then, I believe, as
14 you said, you had a third change?
15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
16 is correct. Regarding the Town of Fairfield,
17 the second set of interrogatories, Number 1.
18 After consideration of interrogatories that
19 have received -- that the company has
20 received from the Town of Fairfield, UI has
21 consulted with its engineering contractor,
22 engineering staff, security personnel and
23 management and we looked at an alternative
24 security plan that can be implemented which
25 would eliminate the need for lighting of

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 the -- of the substation at night during 2 normal conditions. 3 One, the proposed lights would 4 remain as designed, but they would not be 5 turned on during normal operations -- 6 operating conditions at night. One LED light 7 would remain on that would illuminate the 8 substation entrance to allow personnel to 9 enter the substation at night, if they are 10 deemed -- it was necessary, such as an 11 emergency. 12 So we would have one LED light 13 facing the entrance, the gate to the 14 substation, that would remain on. All the 15 other lights that were mentioned in the 16 lighting plan would remain off. 17 MR. McDERMOTT: And 18 Mr. Rossetti, that would be a modification to 19 the Town of Fairfield Interrogatory Set 2, 20 Number 1? 21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That 22 is correct. 23 MR. McDERMOTT: Which asks 24 about designing the lighting system which 25 illuminates light trespass on adjoining</p>	<p>1 changes or revisions to any material in 2 Exhibit 6? 3 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, 4 there is not. 5 MR. McDERMOTT: Exhibit 7 is 6 the affidavit regarding the posting of the 7 sign noticing the hearing, dated March 13th. 8 Any changes or modifications to that exhibit? 9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, 10 there is not. 11 MR. McDERMOTT: Exhibit 15 is 12 the noise evaluation prepared by Black & 13 Veatch, dated March 24th. Are you familiar 14 with that document? 15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, 16 I am. 17 MR. McDERMOTT: And do you 18 have any changes or revisions to that 19 document? 20 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, I 21 do not. 22 MR. McDERMOTT: And finally, 23 Exhibit 16 is the petitioner's letter 24 regarding EMF assessment, dated March 24, 25 2015. Are you familiar with that document?</p>
Page 19	Page 21
<p>1 properties. We can substitute your 2 previously provided testimony for that 3 answer? 4 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That 5 is correct. 6 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, 7 Mr. Rossetti. Continuing along, Exhibit 8 Number 5 is a letter from the -- to the Town 9 of Easton regarding the project -- providing 10 notice of the project, dated January 22, 11 2015. Are you familiar with that document? 12 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, 13 I am. 14 MR. McDERMOTT: And any 15 changes or revisions thereto? 16 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, 17 there is not. 18 MR. McDERMOTT: Exhibit 6 is 19 the petitioner's material with cover letter 20 that was presented to the Town of Fairfield 21 at a February 4th public information meeting. 22 Are you familiar with that document? 23 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, 24 I am. 25 MR. McDERMOTT: And any</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, 2 I am. 3 MR. McDERMOTT: And any 4 changes thereto? 5 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, 6 there is not. 7 MR. McDERMOTT: So, in total, 8 Mr. Rossetti, do you adopt Exhibits 1 through 9 15 as the United Illuminating Company's 10 exhibits in this proceeding? 11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, 12 I do. 13 MR. McDERMOTT: And 14 Mr. Chairman, I'd move that Exhibits 1 15 through 16 UI be admitted into evidence. 16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there 17 any objections to the admission of these 18 documents into the record? 19 (No response.) 20 THE CHAIRPERSON: If not, 21 these documents are admitted. 22 (Exhibits II-B-1 through 23 II-B-16: Received in evidence - described in 24 index.) 25 THE CHAIRPERSON: We'll now</p>

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 22

1 begin with cross-examination by staff,
2 Mr. Mercier.
3 CROSS-EXAMINATION
4 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Just
5 in regards to the lighting change, I
6 understand you'll have all the lights off
7 except one. Are there lights in the facility
8 now that are on at night?
9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
10 there is.
11 MR. MERCIER: And those
12 will -- will they be replaced during the new
13 lighting scheme?
14 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The
15 existing lights will no longer be necessary.
16 The lights that will be in the proposed plan
17 will illuminate the substation sufficiently
18 for work if a -- if individuals need to enter
19 for maintenance at night.
20 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
21 you.
22 I'm just going to turn to UI
23 Exhibit 4. This is the responses to Council
24 Interrogatories Set 1. There is a site plan
25 towards the back. And I'll just be referring

Page 23

1 to that as I ask a couple of questions. I
2 just want to go over some of the items that
3 were mentioned during the walk-through today,
4 just to clarify.
5 What is the current size of
6 the substation parcel with the GE land
7 addition? Does anybody have that
8 information?
9 THE WITNESS (Katrezko): 2.8
10 acres.
11 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. And
12 what was the size of the parcel that was
13 purchased from GE?
14 THE WITNESS (Katrezko):
15 Approximately 0.72 acres, point seven two.
16 MR. MERCIER: And for the
17 existing substation equipment, what is the --
18 what's the height of the existing dead-end
19 structures inside the fence line,
20 approximately?
21 THE WITNESS (Katrezko):
22 Eleven feet for the bus work.
23 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The bus
24 work is at 26 feet.
25 MR. LYNCH: I didn't hear

Page 24

1 that.
2 THE WITNESS (Cloud): I'm
3 sorry. The bus work is at 26 feet.
4 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, that's the
5 dead-end structure. There's a -- there's a
6 pi-shaped, the letter pi, shaped dead-end
7 structure connected back to the back
8 structure. And he asked about that dead-end
9 structure, I think.
10 THE WITNESS (Cloud): It's
11 35 feet.
12 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
13 MR. MERCIER: And does anybody
14 have any information regarding the heights of
15 the transmission towers adjacent to the
16 substation that carry the CL&P lines? Any
17 estimate of the height of those?
18 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I
19 don't -- we don't have that information on
20 us.
21 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
22 you.
23 How many existing lightning
24 masts are there in the substation currently?
25 THE WITNESS (Cloud): There

Page 25

1 are three lightning masts.
2 MR. MERCIER: And what are the
3 heights of those?
4 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Seventy
5 feet.
6 MR. MERCIER: Okay.
7 How many additional lightning
8 masts will be installed?
9 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So there
10 will be an additional six masts added.
11 MR. MERCIER: Are those also
12 at 70 feet?
13 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes.
14 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.
15 Looking at the plan, there's
16 some green and blue noted areas for
17 screening. And just -- just assuming that
18 there was permission granted by CL&P, or now
19 Eversource, and the underlying landowner to
20 put some height-appropriate shrubs there, how
21 far away from the fence do the shrubs have to
22 be so it does not interfere with the regular
23 security cameras, not the -- the ones you
24 just revised? I forgot what they were going
25 to be.

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 26

1 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
2 Thermal imaging?
3 MR. MERCIER: Yes.
4 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We
5 would propose that we would put the
6 vegetation screening -- in this case, we
7 proposed -- recommended rhododendrons --
8 would be on the actual property owner's side
9 of the -- the abutters, actually, of the
10 property line.
11 MR. MERCIER: On -- on the
12 abutter's property line?
13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
14 on the south side of the station, if that's
15 what you're referring to.
16 MR. MERCIER: Yes. But will
17 you have a sufficient clearance between
18 those -- those new shrubs and the new fence
19 line to install the nonthermal imaging
20 cameras?
21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes.
22 MR. MERCIER: Looking at
23 the -- the site plan again, over on the
24 northeast corner, there's a notation for some
25 new paving. Do you have the approximate size

Page 27

1 of the new paved area? Is it 5,000 square
2 feet approximately or -- or some other
3 quantity?
4 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes,
5 it's 5,000 square feet.
6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Now that
7 you have a new -- excuse me -- an added
8 paving to the existing up there by the
9 building, where would the runoff actually go
10 from the newly paved surfaces? Are they
11 going -- is it going down the driveway or
12 towards the rear, towards the north?
13 THE WITNESS (Katricezko): The
14 runoff will be heading down towards the
15 driveway, so southeasterly.
16 MR. MERCIER: So there will be
17 a slope. So it will go down the driveway?
18 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
19 Correct.
20 MR. MERCIER: How many catch
21 basins are on the -- in the existing
22 driveway?
23 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
24 There's one about halfway down and two at the
25 bottom.

Page 28

1 MR. MERCIER: The two at the
2 bottom, is that on -- on your leased
3 driveway, or is that actually in the street?
4 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
5 That's in the street.
6 MR. MERCIER: Okay. In close
7 proximity to the driveway apron entrance, do
8 you know?
9 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
10 Fairly closely, a few feet
11 away.
12 MR. MERCIER: Will there be
13 curbs installed like there are presently at
14 the site?
15 I saw some curbing along the
16 driveway and up near the parking area. Will
17 the new paved area have any curbs?
18 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The --
19 the new paved area will have a curb --
20 MR. MERCIER: Okay.
21 THE WITNESS (Cloud): -- in
22 the northeast corner where the mobile will
23 need to back in. It will be a mountable
24 curb, but there will be a curb around the new
25 pavement.

Page 29

1 MR. MERCIER: The catch basin
2 in the driveway halfway up, as you just
3 mentioned, has that been evaluated for its
4 effectiveness? Is it -- could it be replaced
5 at all, or is that staying as is?
6 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
7 Current plans were to have it as is, but we
8 can -- we can look at and evaluate having to
9 rebuild. That's something we can look into.
10 MR. MERCIER: In the storm
11 water pollution control plan that was in UI
12 Exhibit 9, is this a plan that has to be
13 submitted to the Department of
14 Environmental -- excuse me -- of Energy and
15 Environmental Protection?
16 THE WITNESS (Katricezko): It
17 is. And, actually, we've been -- because
18 that is something that needs to be submitted,
19 it was submitted in December of 2014. And
20 it's actually been approved as of March 25th.
21 MR. MERCIER: That was already
22 approved?
23 THE WITNESS (Katricezko):
24 Correct.
25 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Is it an

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 30

1 official permit that you obtain? Is -- is
2 that what the approval is?
3 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): It's
4 -- it is. We received a letter from the
5 DEEP. It stayed on their website for a while
6 for public comment.
7 MR. MERCIER: Okay. In
8 Section 3, site description, there was a
9 sentence that mentioned the increase in
10 runoff. Does that only pertain to the newly
11 paved surfaces?
12 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
13 That's for the total -- for the total site.
14 MR. MERCIER: Okay.
15 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): So
16 it's like a runoff coefficient for the entire
17 site.
18 MR. MERCIER: So with the --
19 the new substation area where the capacitor
20 banks are going to be, that -- that's gravel,
21 but does that -- that has runoff
22 characteristics associated with it?
23 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): The
24 gravel is pervious, so it's -- it's meant to
25 help the storm water infiltrate into the

Page 31

1 ground.
2 MR. MERCIER: Just one thing I
3 noticed on 3.2, it stated there were no
4 wetlands within 500 feet. I don't know if
5 that's an error or --
6 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): It's
7 an error because the -- the soil scientist
8 that we had hired from a different company
9 did find a delineated wetland to the north.
10 MR. MERCIER: Does that error
11 affect the outcome of the report that was
12 submitted to -- to DEEP?
13 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): No.
14 MR. MERCIER: And -- and
15 why -- why not?
16 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
17 Because we -- taking into account the -- the
18 grading of the site, and based on our
19 measures that we're going have in place as
20 far as erosion control and siltation, it's --
21 it's a small impact from the asphalt that
22 we'll be adding in the northeast. But as far
23 as the fill and the cutting that are -- that
24 are proposed, it's not going to affect the --
25 the measures that we put in the storm water

Page 32

1 plan.
2 MR. MERCIER: On the site plan
3 it does show a wetland in the -- I'll call it
4 the north central portion of the diagram,
5 right off the property on the abutting GE
6 land. What's your siltation barriers
7 proposed for that particular area, from --
8 from your construction zone to the property
9 line with GE? What specific erosion and
10 sedimentation controls do you have in that
11 area?
12 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
13 After the -- that portion of the property is
14 leveled, there will be, like, erosion
15 blankets, the siltation fence. That's as a
16 last resort so that nothing really migrates
17 from the site.
18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So
19 during -- during the actual grading process,
20 you're going to establish some perimeter
21 erosion controls?
22 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): That
23 will be the first thing.
24 MR. MERCIER: Okay.
25 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):

Page 33

1 Siltation fence.
2 MR. MERCIER: What -- what
3 type are you going to specify there? Are you
4 going to do two rows? Are you doing some
5 kind of hay bale system or --
6 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): I
7 don't know the details. It's described
8 better in the plan.
9 And Figure 4 shows some
10 details of the plan.
11 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sorry.
12 Mr. Katreyczko, Figure 4 of what plan?
13 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
14 Figure 4 of the storm water pollution plan.
15 MR. MERCIER: Do you have that
16 in front of you?
17 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): Yes.
18 MR. MERCIER: I was just
19 curious if there's two rows or one row or --
20 or --
21 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): The
22 Town of Fairfield Interrogatory, TOF3-C.
23 MR. MERCIER: Okay. I'll take
24 a look. Thank you.
25 Actually, I have no other

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 34

1 questions at this time. Thank you.
2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
3 We'll now go to questions by
4 the Council. Senator Murphy.
5 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,
6 Mr. Chairman.
7 I just want to go over a
8 couple of matters at this time. On the
9 change in lighting, you indicated that just
10 the one light -- and the other lights would
11 not be on during normal conditions. What's
12 not normal conditions?
13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So
14 not normal -- not normal conditions would be
15 if something -- if something failed at the
16 substation, if we had to do some switching to
17 restore a transmission line. If we had to
18 take a transformer out of service for some
19 reason and it was happening at night, then we
20 would have to turn the lights on in order for
21 our folks to go in there and do some work.
22 SENATOR MURPHY: And would it
23 be all the lights have to go on, or would
24 it -- the system be set up so that the lights
25 would go on just in the critical area?

Page 35

1 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): All
2 the lights would then be on, at that point in
3 time, for the duration of whatever our
4 substation electricians would have to work
5 on.
6 SENATOR MURPHY: Worst-case
7 scenario, how long might that be some night?
8 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
9 could vary. It could be four to eight hours
10 possibly. It would vary on a case-by-case
11 basis.
12 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay. My --
13 my knowledgeable guy to my right says, for
14 transformers, it would be longer, but --
15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Well,
16 we're -- to clarify --
17 SENATOR MURPHY: From your
18 experience, how often during the course of 12
19 months would you expect it not to be normal
20 conditions on a given time, just a ballpark
21 number?
22 THE WITNESS (Buccheri): It
23 would probably be less than six days per
24 year.
25 SENATOR MURPHY: Oh, six --

Page 36

1 six days per year. Thank you.
2 The other -- the other matter
3 I'd like to touch on is your Number 16. What
4 is it that makes you think your EMF
5 assessments are subject to a protective order
6 and not to be given to us and to the public?
7 MR. McDERMOTT: So it's
8 primarily the line information. And I've had
9 a discussion with our CEII. I don't know
10 what her --
11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
12 Analyst.
13 MR. McDERMOTT: -- analyst is.
14 She informs me that she has been meeting with
15 the -- kind of the regional transmission
16 companies, Eversource, Bangor Hydro -- some
17 of the other names are escaping me -- but --
18 and the regional transmission companies.
19 I -- I've kind of
20 cross-examined her myself as to whether or
21 not line numbers were, in fact, CEII. She
22 assures me that they are, that the company
23 has taken that position, and the other
24 companies that she's dealing with have taken
25 that position.

Page 37

1 I have received from her the
2 PTO AC guidelines for handling CEII materials
3 and CEII requests. I would say, in that
4 document, there's an exhibit, for example,
5 where the circuit numbers are -- are blanked
6 out. So it seems to be kind of the industry
7 standard now to take line numbers out.
8 SENATOR MURPHY: Why? Why is
9 it you can't give us the readings like we
10 have received them in every other docket that
11 we've had, at least in my experience here,
12 involving meetings of this nature?
13 MR. McDERMOTT: So --
14 SENATOR MURPHY: I mean, on
15 the -- these line things, if you want to line
16 them out, but --
17 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.
18 SENATOR MURPHY: You know, the
19 readings, as to what they are, I mean --
20 MR. McDERMOTT: No. I don't
21 want to give the impression that we can't.
22 I'm going to kind of look down at the far
23 end. I know we had discussed this over the
24 last few days with Mr. Rossetti and
25 Dr. Williams. And I believe Mr. Cloud was

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 38

1 actually prepared to -- we have some of the
2 slides that are not CEII that do show the
3 readings, I believe. But I should look down
4 to my subject matter expert at the far end of
5 the table, Dr. Williams, from Exponent, and
6 ask her.

7 THE WITNESS (Williams):
8 That's correct. We do have
9 some slides that show profiles of the
10 magnetic fields stepping from the fence line
11 out that can be shown that do not have CEII
12 information on them.

13 SENATOR MURPHY: Do you have
14 readings as to what it is, roughly?

15 THE WITNESS (Williams): Yes.

16 SENATOR MURPHY: Because every
17 other docket that we've had, we've -- we've
18 had these and made available. And, you know,
19 I realize that the medical question, and what
20 have you, but there's a tremendous amount of
21 concern among the public on -- on these
22 readings.

23 MR. McDERMOTT: Senator --
24 Senator Murphy, if I could jump in again --

25 SENATOR MURPHY: Yeah.

Page 40

1 I would be happy to take back
2 a homework assignment to, kind of, rescrub
3 the -- the CEII out so that it's a little bit
4 more readable. The problem was that, in the
5 draft that we received on the 23rd, that the
6 redaction was going to make it essentially
7 unreadable. And we didn't want to present
8 the Council with something that was
9 essentially unreadable, which is why we took
10 the approach we did.

11 Having said all that, I could
12 go back down to my left to Dr. Williams, and
13 we could -- we could bring forth the -- the
14 information that we have.

15 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, I -- I
16 think it's not only -- it's something that
17 not only I, as a member of the Council, would
18 like to know what they are, I think others
19 would also.

20 But I think what may be more
21 important to us is the perception of the
22 public. I mean, there -- there is a concern
23 by a great number people about the health
24 aspects of this. And we've heard it in --
25 and you -- you've been through these hearings

Page 39

1 MR. McDERMOTT: -- one more
2 time. The production of the EMF study was a
3 result of an interrogatory, I believe.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: Frankly, I'm
5 surprised you didn't have it ready when you
6 filed your petition.

7 MR. McDERMOTT: With all due
8 respect, Mr. Murphy, this is not the type of
9 project the company has typically done an EMF
10 study for. In fact, since I've been doing
11 siting for the company 15 years, it's the
12 first time we've done one for a substation
13 modification. We have done them from
14 transmission lines, of course, and we've done
15 them for new build substations, but we have
16 not ever done one for a modification.

17 So that point being aside, we
18 were a little bit behind the curve when we
19 got the interrogatory. Attorney Bachman was
20 kind enough to tell me that it was coming, so
21 we were able to launch Exponent a few days
22 before it came. We got it literally the day
23 before it was due. We scrubbed it that night
24 and turned it around the next day so that it
25 was on time for the 24th filing.

Page 41

1 with us.

2 MR. McDERMOTT: Yes, sir, I
3 have.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: And heard the
5 testimony on both sides, and what have you.
6 And to just say that they're fine and they're
7 within the limits, and so forth, is
8 wonderful, but people really like to see the
9 numbers. So if you could put something
10 together for us that doesn't violate your
11 privilege but gives us some satisfaction as
12 to -- you're within our limits and you know
13 what they are, that we could make available
14 for people to read, I think it would be very
15 important.

16 MR. McDERMOTT: Again, we will
17 absolutely take that as a homework
18 assignment, Senator Murphy, and -- but we can
19 also still discuss the numbers. You know,
20 we're -- we're perfectly prepared to do that.
21 Dr. Williams could do that today, you know,
22 the existing, the background, what -- what we
23 see as the levels of the EMF falling.

24 SENATOR MURPHY: Well, fine.
25 If you're willing to discuss it today, let's

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 42

1 do it. Absolutely. Or would it be easier to
2 just file what those levels are?
3 MR. McDERMOTT: I -- we -- we
4 can do both. To -- to get over the
5 appearance for --
6 SENATOR MURPHY: Let's -- why
7 don't you put it in as a late file, and we'll
8 get a chance to look at it.
9 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.
10 THE CHAIRPERSON: I can --
11 well, the late file is one thing, but if --
12 if you have the information, we have the
13 public here. I'd rather --
14 SENATOR MURPHY: All right.
15 Let's do it.
16 THE CHAIRPERSON: -- I'd
17 rather either do it now, or if we had to, we
18 could do it after -- after the break. But --
19 MR. McDERMOTT: No, we're --
20 we're absolutely prepared to discuss the
21 results of the study. The only -- you know,
22 just -- and we can have a very detailed
23 discussion about the lack of EMF impacts from
24 this project here today without getting
25 anywhere near CEII discussions. And so any

Page 43

1 cross-examination that the Council or the
2 intervenors have regarding the EMF impacts,
3 we can absolutely have that today.
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Could we
5 have it starting right now?
6 THE WITNESS (Williams): Sure.
7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, we
8 have the expert here, I --
9 THE WITNESS (Williams): Sure.
10 Engineers at Exponent modeled the
11 electromagnetic fields associated with the
12 Hawthorne Substation expansion using inputs
13 provided by United Illuminating regarding the
14 existing and proposed substation
15 configurations, the transmission line,
16 voltages and loads, and other pertinent
17 information. And they modeled the fields
18 both based on annual average load conditions
19 in 2021 and annual -- or peak annual loads in
20 2016.
21 Using this information, they
22 found that the addition to the proposed
23 capacitor banks would not cause any
24 significant changes at the boundary in the
25 electric and magnetic fields at the boundary

Page 44

1 of the site. Basically, at the property line
2 of the Hawthorne substation, there was hardly
3 any change in the fields. The greatest
4 change was at the south side of the property
5 direct -- where the transmission lines feed
6 into the property.
7 And at that location, directly
8 underneath the lines, under average loads, it
9 was two milligauss higher than existing, and
10 under peak loads, it was four milligauss
11 higher. And this related to an anticipated
12 change in the load that the transmission line
13 would be carrying.
14 And at residential distances,
15 which are two --
16 SENATOR MURPHY: What -- what
17 were the milligauss readings beforehand that
18 went up two and four?
19 MR. McDERMOTT: Dr. Williams,
20 to be clear, the two and the four was an
21 increase level?
22 THE WITNESS (Williams): Those
23 were increases, yes.
24 SENATOR MURPHY: I'm asking
25 the base before the increase?

Page 45

1 THE WITNESS (Williams): So I
2 don't have the exact measurements for the
3 property line, but it's approximately -- it's
4 around 35 milligauss directly underneath the
5 line, and that has to do with the
6 transmission line.
7 SENATOR MURPHY: So it's
8 32 and -- it's 37 and 39. Is that what
9 you're saying?
10 THE WITNESS (Williams):
11 No. It's -- it's around 35.
12 And under average conditions and under peak
13 conditions, it's up around 40.
14 MR. ASHTON: Is that under the
15 tap or under the through line?
16 THE WITNESS (Williams): It's
17 under the through line.
18 At residential distances at
19 150 feet or more, the fields differed by half
20 a milligauss or less under average conditions
21 and a milligauss or less under peak
22 conditions.
23 MR. ASHTON: What should the
24 residential exposure be?
25 THE WITNESS (Williams): It

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 46

1 would depend on the distance from the
2 location.
3 MR. ASHTON: Oh.
4 THE WITNESS (Williams): They
5 are virtually identical to what they have
6 been.
7 SENATOR MURPHY: And what were
8 they?
9 THE WITNESS (Williams): So at
10 150 feet or more from the existing fence
11 line, the fields ranged from .7 milligauss up
12 to 7.7 -- or, no -- excuse me -- 8.9
13 milligauss.
14 SENATOR MURPHY: 8.9?
15 THE WITNESS (Williams):
16 Correct. That's under average
17 load conditions.
18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you
19 compare that with, I don't know, microwave?
20 I mean, is there some -- some comparison of
21 some appliance or something so we get a sense
22 of what that is?
23 THE WITNESS (Williams): So
24 those fields would be similar to what you
25 might find in a household. I don't have

Page 47

1 exact numbers in front of me, but for
2 example, it's very similar to what you would
3 see, one, five, seven, ten milligauss in a
4 home.
5 Exposures can be higher when
6 using appliances depending on the particular
7 source of the fields and your user distance.
8 For example, a foot from a microwave, you
9 could have up to 300 milligauss or so.
10 MR. LYNCH: Mr. Chairman? Mr.
11 Chairman?
12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh, forgive
13 me. Mr. Lynch.
14 MR. LYNCH: Dr. Williams, just
15 for a clarification, When we're talking
16 milligauss, we're just talking about a
17 magnetic field. Correct?
18 THE WITNESS (Williams): We're
19 talking about a magnetic field. That's
20 correct.
21 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Klemens.
23 DR. KLEMENS: Are there -- are
24 there standards for exposure?
25 THE WITNESS (Williams): There

Page 48

1 are no federal or State of Connecticut
2 standards for exposures. There are some
3 recommended exposure guidelines by the
4 International Committee on Electromagnetic
5 Safety and the International Commission on
6 Ionizing Radiation Protection, or ICIRP. The
7 most stringent of these is the ICIRP's
8 recommendations, which is 4.2 kilovolts per
9 meter for an electric field and 2,000
10 milligauss for a magnetic field, and that's
11 for the general public.
12 DR. KLEMENS: So this is well
13 below that?
14 THE WITNESS (Williams): Yes.
15 At the property line, it -- the highest
16 reading was approximately 3 percent of that
17 recommendation.
18 DR. KLEMENS: And even if
19 someone had a variety of appliances in their
20 home, this extra would not reach a tipping
21 point?
22 THE WITNESS (Williams):
23 Correct.
24 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. No
25 further questions.

Page 49

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Mercier.
2 MR. MERCIER: Just to -- just
3 to clarify. Did you say under average load
4 at the substation fence line the readings
5 were .7 ranging up to 8.9 milligauss?
6 THE WITNESS (Williams): No.
7 That was average loads at 150 feet from the
8 fence line, the existing fence line.
9 MR. MERCIER: Thank you. Is
10 it fair to say that the actual transmission
11 line traversing this area is a higher source
12 of magnetic fields than the substation
13 itself?
14 THE WITNESS (Williams): That
15 is correct.
16 MR. MERCIER: Okay. Thank
17 you.
18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Senator
19 Murphy, you have any other questions?
20 SENATOR MURPHY: I have no
21 other questions.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ashton.
23 MR. ASHTON: I have great
24 problems with this confidentiality of --
25 based on line numbers, to wit, even in the

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 50

1 document before us -- I don't know what the
2 exhibit number is, but it's the December 30th
3 letter to the Siting Council with the
4 original and 15 copies of UI responses to the
5 first set of interrogatories.
6 On drawing number -- Site Plan
7 Drawing 25242-899, we have line numbers
8 listed. And the line numbers are -- don't
9 say anything specific. Fifty years ago,
10 before we had computers with big memories, we
11 put in abbreviations for the line terminals,
12 Hawthorne to Trumbull junction. What's the
13 difference between that and a line number?
14 Can anybody tell me?
15 MR. McDERMOTT: Well, since I
16 was the originator of the comments about the
17 line numbers and why we protect them, I would
18 say that I don't know. The company is trying
19 to be consistent. We now have an analyst
20 whose entire job it is -- is to scrub our
21 documents for CEII for all kinds of PURA
22 filings, FERC filings, DOE filings, et
23 cetera. This is all the person does.
24 I have to rely, to a certain
25 extent, on what she tells me, Mr. Ashton.

Page 51

1 I've had similar conversations with John
2 Morissette in Eversource. We're trying to be
3 consistent across the industry.
4 The exhibit you have in front
5 of you, I don't know. It sounds to me like
6 it was a mistake and I should be pulling it
7 off the -- the website.
8 MR. ASHTON: I would be so
9 bold as to suggest it's a gross waste of
10 customer money. UI and Eversource are just
11 -- it's ridiculous because anybody with a
12 semi-trained mind, a high school senior,
13 could trace a line out from Hawthorne to
14 Trumbull Junction. And whether you call it
15 Number 1222 or Hawthorne to Trumbull
16 Junction, you've identified the line
17 terminals.
18 It's -- we're -- we're
19 paranoid here over nothing. And some of you
20 know I have a significant background in this
21 area, so I'm not talking as an amateur.
22 Also, I've been one who's been ramming for
23 security, so I think you're barking up the
24 wrong tree completely.
25 Let's go to the specifics

Page 52

1 here.
2 MR. McDERMOTT: And by the
3 way, Mr. Ashton, I will take that back. I
4 think that's an important comment, and we
5 will make sure that the --
6 MR. ASHTON: And by the way,
7 it's not only on this petition. On the last
8 petition crossing -- rebuilding the crossing
9 of the Housatonic River, the same kind of
10 errors occurred. There were line
11 designations in there, and you were asking
12 for confidentiality. I think it's
13 ridiculous. I think you wasted money. And I
14 have no problem saying it out loud.
15 Who owns the property in back,
16 i.e., south of the substation? Is -- CL&P
17 has an easement across it. Does UI own a
18 portion of that or does the property owner
19 behind?
20 THE WITNESS (Cloud): UI does
21 own a portion of the easement of CL&P, as
22 well as the property abutters to the South.
23 MR. ASHTON: Okay.
24 THE WITNESS (Cloud): It
25 bisects both.

Page 53

1 MR. ASHTON: I was so rash as
2 to walk around the substation, and I admitted
3 it was not the kind of thing I would
4 recommend for everybody to do, but I'm
5 reasonably spry for a young guy.
6 To my horror and amazement,
7 right near the tap structures, the two
8 vertical structures which tap the
9 transmission line, there's an active dump
10 there. And the Town of Fairfield -- I see a
11 lawyer who, I think, represents Fairfield.
12 You ought to hang your head in shame that the
13 health department hasn't cracked down on
14 that. There's an air conditioner in there.
15 There's toilets. There's shelving. There's
16 all kinds of crap. It's a disgrace. And the
17 property owners also ought to hang their head
18 in shame for not raising Cain about it or
19 cleaning it up.
20 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Ashton, I
21 dare -- I dare speak again, but let me see if
22 I can redeem myself on the CEII.
23 Mr. Buccheri and Mr. Reed have
24 spoken about the -- the situation that you
25 brought up to me at the field visit, and I

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 54

1 can ask Mr. Buccheri to comment a little bit
2 further and hopefully to address that
3 situation.
4 MR. ASHTON: Okay. Good.
5 I'm sorry. I missed the last
6 bit.
7 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm saying Mr.
8 Buccheri can address the conversation that he
9 and Mr. Reed had following the field visit in
10 response to the comments you made to me at
11 the field review.
12 MR. ASHTON: Right. Thank
13 you. I'm -- I'm very happy to hear it.
14 THE WITNESS (Buccheri): We --
15 we will go out there and take care of what's
16 out there today. And if -- if we need to put
17 measures in place to control that during our
18 normal sub patrols and make sure that that
19 doesn't happen in the future, we'll do that.
20 MR. McDERMOTT: And -- and
21 just to lawyer it one second. We're not
22 saying that we did it and we're responsible
23 for it --
24 MR. ASHTON: I didn't ask you
25 if you did it.

Page 55

1 MR. McDERMOTT: -- but we're
2 going to -- but we're going to take care of
3 the problem.
4 MR. ASHTON: That's good.
5 MR. McDERMOTT: And we will
6 make sure it doesn't happen going forward.
7 MR. ASHTON: Good. That takes
8 care of that.
9 I have a minor problem with
10 the paved area and the expansion area, and
11 minor only insofar as it does affect runoff.
12 Hard surfaces do affect it, but the stone
13 surfaces are actually beneficial in that
14 they -- they cause water to percolate into
15 the ground.
16 And I would ask if it's
17 possible to cut back on the amount of paving
18 you have to do, given it's a relatively steep
19 slope on the driveway. You'll get more rain
20 that's concentrated and accelerated. I'm a
21 past chairman of the flood control agency in
22 Meriden. It's the kind of thing I've been
23 spending a lot of time on trying to correct.
24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
25 we can take a look at that. And I believe we

Page 56

1 can pull -- pull back some of the paving in
2 that area.
3 MR. ASHTON: My point would be
4 that experience tells me that even very large
5 portable substations can go across crushed
6 stone and, in fact, do go across crushed
7 stone. And your plans, in that document I
8 cited, show it being parked in what is now
9 crushed stone, so that I'm not sure you need
10 a lot of paving.
11 I do understand -- by the way,
12 I think this is one of the best looking
13 control houses I've seen. I compliment UI on
14 it. It's very good. I'm going to beat you
15 up where I think you're wrong, and I'm going
16 to give you a pat on the back where you were
17 right, and clearly you were right in the
18 design of that. It's one to be followed in a
19 number of stations.
20 The area where I get a little
21 bit concerned is the -- two things. There's
22 fencing, and I'll come back to it, and then
23 in the lightning mast. Do you use a code of
24 protection in designing your lightning mast?
25 THE WITNESS (Cloud): No.

Page 57

1 We -- we utilize the rolling sphere method.
2 MR. ASHTON: The rolling
3 sphere?
4 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes.
5 MR. ASHTON: Okay. Which is a
6 much more recent standard. The thing that
7 caught my eye is a certain substation north
8 of -- northeast of Hartford yesterday, a very
9 large one. You could drop two or three
10 Hawthornes in it. And they have dead-end
11 structures where the ground wire is going
12 into the dead-end structure. I think they
13 had four 45-foot lightning masts in there.
14 And you've got six new ones and three
15 existing ones. There's nine in a relatively
16 small area.
17 I would urge that you go back
18 and take a look at it to see whether they can
19 be cut down because I've never seen so many
20 lightning masts in a substation. I'm
21 familiar with Southington substation. I
22 don't think they have that many all told and
23 that's like a ten-acre station.
24 The other thing that bothers
25 me a little bit is that you are pulling the

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 58

1 fence to the west outside of the lightning
2 masts. If the lightning masts could be moved
3 in closer to the bus, that whole fence line
4 could be pulled in. By my measure -- or the
5 measurement on the drawing that I cited, the
6 404A, you have -- show 26 feet from the fence
7 line to part of the pasture installation,
8 which is pretty wide.
9 I know you've got to keep
10 distance from live parts, but insofar as
11 those lightning masts can stay outside of the
12 fence, and I have no -- I can't think of any
13 technical reason why they have to be inside,
14 you could perhaps pull that fence line in,
15 save some grading, cut down your fencing, and
16 save some money and make it a little better
17 looking, too.
18 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So the
19 reference, 26 feet, is to allow for a drive
20 access around the opposite side of the bus
21 structure and capacitor bank between the
22 lightning mast and the aluminum bus that's
23 running between the two capacitor banks.
24 MR. ASHTON: Well, do you have
25 26 feet on the east side of the station near

Page 59

1 where the dead-end structure is?
2 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Are you
3 referencing by the -- where the reactors are,
4 to clarify?
5 MR. ASHTON: Yes.
6 THE WITNESS (Cloud): I
7 believe we -- we have slightly less than
8 20 feet; however, there's areas for us to
9 access just north of where that location is.
10 So the fence line currently is directly
11 behind where the reactors are --
12 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.
13 THE WITNESS (Cloud): -- so we
14 do not need drive access to get around the
15 reactors because the fence line is there. We
16 have nowhere to drive to.
17 MR. ASHTON: I guess I would
18 leave it to your creative imagination as to
19 how to cut back the acreage you're going --
20 proposing to grade, fill, stone and fence
21 because I think there's more there than you
22 really need. You also have 44 feet between
23 your bus going into the west transformer and
24 the bus support on the capacitors. And I
25 don't know whether that could be tightened up

Page 60

1 at all.
2 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The --
3 the reason for the distance between -- that
4 the capacitors are to the west is to ensure
5 that if we do have to remove the transformer
6 on the west side --
7 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.
8 THE WITNESS (Cloud): -- from
9 service --
10 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.
11 THE WITNESS (Cloud): -- that
12 a large tractor trailer can maneuver into the
13 yard for the transformer to be craned onto
14 it.
15 MR. ASHTON: Right. That
16 would clearly say that the north capacitor
17 has to give that kind of clearance, where you
18 show a driveway coming in, because that's the
19 way you get access; isn't it? But does it
20 mean that the south one has to do it too?
21 I'll leave it to you. What can you do to
22 pull that down? Do you need the lightning
23 stands inside the fence and why?
24 THE WITNESS (Cloud): UI would
25 like to keep the lightning masts inside the

Page 61

1 perimeter as -- and that way it is under a
2 secure perimeter, so that no individual could
3 be in contact with that lightning mast during
4 a lightning storm. That way we can keep
5 control of any individuals that may be in
6 contact with it for safety.
7 MR. ASHTON: If -- if they are
8 contacting the fence, aren't they at the same
9 risk?
10 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The
11 lightning masts are at a higher risk of
12 being --
13 MR. ASHTON: Right.
14 THE WITNESS (Cloud): --
15 struck by lightning.
16 MR. ASHTON: Right. And the
17 fence is just as much at risk of being --
18 carrying lightning surges to ground, isn't
19 it? The fences are all grounded into the
20 station mesh, aren't they?
21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
22 Mr. Ashton, what we can do -- what -- we can
23 go back, and we'll take a look at this and
24 see if we could become more creative and see
25 if we can do something.

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 62

1 MR. ASHTON: I think you've
2 got a little room there. And I really would
3 wonder about the number of masts, too. I'm
4 just -- I've looked at four major stations in
5 the past few weeks, and all of them are
6 bigger than this, and all have fewer masts
7 than this, and all use the rolling sphere.
8 MR. McDERMOTT: But, Mr.
9 Ashton, maybe I could ask the panel if they
10 could -- do you want them to address why --
11 the analysis that went into the determination
12 that we need that number of masts?
13 MR. ASHTON: Well, I --
14 MR. McDERMOTT: I mean, it's
15 not --
16 MR. ASHTON: -- I would
17 recommend it be reviewed. If you could
18 reduce the number of masts, you're reducing
19 costs without sacrificing protection. I know
20 what the lightning mast is there for. I
21 don't disagree with that one iota, but I do
22 wonder if you can't come up with a cheaper
23 and better way of doing it.
24 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. I was
25 just going to get on the record. You asked

Page 63

1 the question. We're putting six new masts,
2 and I was going to give the panel an
3 opportunity to describe why it was that we
4 arrived at that number -- not some --
5 MR. ASHTON: I -- I know what
6 the roll is here. I've got the standard
7 right here, because this was a relatively new
8 one for me, and I went and did some digging
9 on it. But the point is, can you do it
10 cheaper and better?
11 And rolling sphere
12 applications in other yards have shown that
13 there were fewer masts. And so, what's
14 unique about this that requires such a high
15 number of masts and pushes that fence out,
16 too? Okay. I won't flog about it anymore.
17 The fencing -- I assume all
18 your new fencing would be a mesh of an inch
19 and a quarter or something like that. Is
20 that now standard in UI?
21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): It
22 would be a 2-inch mesh.
23 MR. ASHTON: It will be what?
24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
25 Two-inch mesh.

Page 64

1 MR. ASHTON: No, it won't.
2 You don't want a 2-inch mesh.
3 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's
4 definitely the wrong answer, but it's --
5 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, go back and
6 do over.
7 MR. McDERMOTT: I will say
8 there was a second part of the answer, if I
9 could help the witness. It's a 2-inch mesh
10 with a slat so that the --
11 MR. ASHTON: I know another
12 company that's prominent in the state that's
13 gone to one and a quarter inch standard.
14 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Rossetti,
15 you want to address the slats?
16 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
17 the --
18 MR. ASHTON: The reason for it
19 is it's not climbable.
20 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yeah,
21 it's for physical security.
22 MR. ASHTON: Right. And a
23 slat can be pulled out.
24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): And
25 it's also -- this slat is also used for

Page 65

1 screening as well.
2 MR. ASHTON: Right. And if
3 you put slats in, I guarantee in a couple of
4 years you're going to have a lot of them out
5 anyway. That's what happens with these
6 things.
7 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Just
8 -- sorry -- just to clarify. The slats that
9 we will be using specifically are not the
10 bottom lock type slats where they simply
11 slide in and are locked on the bottom. They
12 are a wing slat type, which means for the
13 entire length of the 14-foot fence, there are
14 winged perforations that secure it in place.
15 So it's a little different than some of the
16 slats that are commonly used to provide some
17 level of screening. The wing slats provide
18 more screening and more secure holding in the
19 fence.
20 MR. ASHTON: The fence jogging
21 out near the reactors, is that to give you
22 access around that set of reactors? You move
23 it out by, my guess, by 5 or 6 feet?
24 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So the
25 jog on the eastern fence is to accommodate

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 66

1 the backup maneuver for the mobile
2 transformer. The 24-foot drive gate needs to
3 be in that location to accommodate the --
4 MR. ASHTON: Well, I saw that,
5 and that was not my question. My question
6 was, you moving the fence eastward at --
7 where the reactors are, that's not where the
8 mobile is going?
9 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yeah, so
10 the -- this northern portion of the fence is
11 jogging out. However, we didn't feel it
12 necessary to move the fence on the southern
13 portion because there is no need for the
14 mobile sub in that location. And by leaving
15 it in that location, we minimize the amount
16 of site preparation on the east side to
17 minimize cost.
18 MR. ASHTON: My drawing shows
19 that it's moving, and I'm referring to
20 drawing 404A.
21 THE WITNESS (Cloud): And it's
22 a very minimal move. It -- outside the
23 existing perimeter, there is a flat location,
24 so it is a minor adjustment of the existing
25 fence to allow us to install the new fence

Page 67

1 while the existing fence remains in place
2 during construction.
3 MR. ASHTON: Okay. You think
4 you can knock off that corner in the -- where
5 you show the lightning mast just southeast of
6 the reactors? The corners are where you
7 accumulate junk.
8 THE WITNESS (Cloud):
9 To clarify, you mean angle the
10 corner?
11 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, 45 degrees.
12 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes, we
13 could do that.
14 MR. ASHTON: That cuts --
15 allows for a little more landscape in the
16 area. Now, does -- and UI, I believe, is
17 willing to do some landscaping that's subject
18 to CL&P's blessing -- pardon me --
19 Eversource. Is that right? Eversource, have
20 I got that right? I have trouble with the
21 word. Is that correct?
22 THE WITNESS (Cloud): That's
23 correct.
24 MR. ASHTON: And you'd also
25 angle a southwest corner, too, couldn't you?

Page 68

1 That way you get no blind corners.
2 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes, we
3 can angle both of those corners.
4 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.
5 THE WITNESS (Cloud): However,
6 the angling of both those corners requires us
7 to install an additional camera so that we
8 can see that corner, depending on the camera
9 angle.
10 MR. ASHTON: Well, your --
11 your camera is -- is not a pencil-thin beam.
12 How wide is -- if you -- if you have -- well,
13 if have a camera, how wide is your beam
14 100 feet away?
15 THE WITNESS (Cloud): It --
16 our existing cameras will be sufficient.
17 MR. ASHTON: My guess is they
18 would. Yeah. Thank you. I think that does
19 it for me.
20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
21 Dr. Bell.
22 DR. BELL: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.
24 Just to pursue this discussion
25 about the lightning masts, I -- I was

Page 69

1 confused by what we -- what was said at the
2 site walk, so I just want to review this. At
3 the site walk, we were standing by the
4 control facility, and there were two -- also
5 two aerial maps on easels there. And they
6 showed a lightning mast, one lightning mast
7 that was to be positioned close to the CL&P
8 transmission lines in -- in one corner of
9 the -- of the substation. And that was the
10 only one that was referred to and it was the
11 only one that was called out on this aerial
12 map. It had a red and white dotted circle
13 around the lightning mast.
14 So I know that in other parts
15 of the documents that you submitted that
16 we've gone over, there are -- so then five
17 other lightning masts, but we weren't talking
18 about those at the site walk. Why not?
19 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So the
20 rendering that was created called out three
21 distinct locations where work was being
22 performed. It had a large rectangle around
23 the capacitor banks, which includes the
24 referenced five additional lightning masts.
25 And then the other lightning mast on the east

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 70

1 side was a stand-alone, not near any other
2 work performed. So it was --
3 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Cloud, I'm
4 just going to interrupt. Dr. Bell and Mr.
5 Cloud, the exhibit that everyone is referring
6 to is off to my right here.
7 DR. BELL: Oh, I'm sorry.
8 Yes, it certainly is. That's exactly -- I
9 just didn't see it over there. I was looking
10 straight ahead.
11 MR. McDERMOTT: I thought it
12 would help with the discussion so I can move
13 it closer if you need to see it.
14 MR. ASHTON: That shows you
15 how invisible this thing is.
16 THE WITNESS (Cloud): If I
17 may, I will point out what I was referring to
18 during the site walk-through.
19 So when referencing the
20 locations of major construction, we were
21 standing here in front of the control
22 building. And I pointed out this area for
23 the capacitor banks as one of the major areas
24 for construction, which encompasses the
25 six -- or the five masts that are on this

Page 71

1 side located here, here, here, here, here and
2 here.
3 So I did not specifically call
4 out the masts in this location. I called out
5 this one specifically because it is not
6 associated with any of the major construction
7 on the west side.
8 DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you.
9 That helps.
10 MR. McDERMOTT: And
11 Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to note for the
12 record that that exhibit is being referred to
13 as UI Exhibit Number 3, a slight variant of
14 it, but the pictures and renderings are the
15 same.
16 DR. BELL: Thank you. And I
17 have one other question on another area of
18 the proposal. We -- we see that you have
19 submitted in your materials quite a bit of
20 information to SHPO. My question is, do you
21 have a letter back from SHPO?
22 THE WITNESS (Katrecko): Yes,
23 we do. We received that on March 18th.
24 DR. BELL: Okay. And is that
25 included here and I just missed it, or is

Page 72

1 that something you haven't yet submitted?
2 THE WITNESS (Katrecko):
3 That's something that we have to submit
4 because we just received it recently.
5 DR. BELL: And what did the
6 letter say?
7 THE WITNESS (Katrecko): That
8 they didn't find anything.
9 DR. BELL: Thank you. That
10 answers that question.
11 I -- I said I had only one
12 more question, but I actually have one more
13 to ask Ms. Williams, Dr. Williams. Are you
14 familiar with the Council's best management
15 practices document regarding EMFs?
16 THE WITNESS (Williams): Yes,
17 I have looked at it.
18 DR. BELL: And, in your
19 opinion, does that -- do the figures that you
20 talked about and your report, does it show
21 that you're in compliance with the Council's
22 best management practices?
23 THE WITNESS (Williams): So,
24 consistent with those practices, they are
25 maximizing the horizontal distances to

Page 73

1 surrounding residences to the new electrical
2 sources. And they're doing this both by
3 positioning the new capacitor banks on the
4 west side, so furthest from residences as
5 possible, and maintaining as well. They're
6 maintaining the buffer zone between the fence
7 line and the UI property line at the site.
8 So yes, these are consistent with the best
9 practice management recommendations.
10 DR. BELL: Thank you.
11 Those are my questions
12 Mr. Chair.
13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
14 Dr. Klemens.
15 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.
17 I have questions in three
18 areas. The first is going to deal with the
19 Phase 1 -- Phase 2 analysis. Is there
20 someone here who can speak to that?
21 Okay. On the very last page,
22 there's the reasonable confidence protocol
23 for the laboratory analysis. And I look
24 under 1A and it says, "Where the methods
25 specify preservation and holding time

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 74

1 requirements met".
2 And it was answered, "No."
3 Question Number 5B, were these
4 reporting limits met remains unanswered. And
5 then, at the bottom it says, in the notes,
6 "If answer to Question 1, 1A, or 1B is no,
7 the data package does not meet the
8 requirements for reasonable confidence." And
9 it says that all questions must be answered.
10 So reading that, I don't
11 understand whether or not you have met the
12 standard of reasonable confidence, as
13 outlined by the DEEP.
14 MR. McDERMOTT: Dr. Klemens,
15 maybe Mr. Katreczko knows, but I don't.
16 Could you tell me what you're looking at and
17 what the exhibit is?
18 DR. KLEMENS: The very last
19 page of your TOF3B, UI Number 9, there is a
20 summary sheet which goes to the DEEP which
21 gives you the standard of a reasonable
22 confidence protocol for this entire data
23 package. And as I read the back here, you
24 did not meet, at least by what you've said,
25 did not meet the reasonable confidence

Page 75

1 protocol as outlined by the DEEP. Tell me if
2 I'm wrong?
3 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
4 Thank you. I believe what you're reading is
5 referring to the method used for preservation
6 time. So I think -- I think that's a
7 specific -- they maybe didn't use the proper
8 preservation and holding requirements, but
9 that doesn't negate the entire approval of
10 the plan --
11 DR. KLEMENS: Well, why does
12 it say --
13 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): Part
14 of the laboratory.
15 DR. KLEMENS: It says the data
16 package does not meet the requirements for
17 reasonable confidence. If 1A or 1B is no, it
18 doesn't meet -- it does not meet the
19 requirements for reasonable confidence. Can
20 you explain that to me then, please, sir?
21 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I
22 have no answer for that. I have not -- I did
23 not do this report.
24 DR. KLEMENS: You didn't do
25 this report?

Page 76

1 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I
2 did not. This is a laboratory analysis, so I
3 do not work for that laboratory.
4 DR. KLEMENS: So how can we
5 get this information -- find out whether or
6 not we can rely on these results?
7 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I
8 can follow up by calling the manager of the
9 laboratory and, you know, the confirmation
10 that -- that these protocols were indeed
11 followed.
12 DR. KLEMENS: Well, what you
13 submitted, they weren't. So either the sheet
14 is wrong -- something doesn't line up for me.
15 That's my first set of questions. Okay.
16 The next -- the next question
17 has to do with wetlands. And it says -- I
18 don't even know what the number of this -- is
19 there a number on this? This is the
20 December 30, 2014, the first set of
21 interrogatories. On the top of the BL
22 wetlands report it says "Witness Shawn
23 Crosby." Is Shawn Crosby here to answer
24 questions about this report?
25 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I

Page 77

1 will answer for him. He is in the audience
2 if need be.
3 DR. KLEMENS: Is he in the
4 audience?
5 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): He
6 is.
7 DR. KLEMENS: He is. Are you
8 a wetlands scientist, sir?
9 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I am
10 not.
11 DR. KLEMENS: Is Mr. Crosby a
12 wetlands scientist?
13 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): He
14 is not.
15 DR. KLEMENS: Is there a
16 wetland scientist who can answer these
17 questions among your panel?
18 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
19 The --
20 MR. McDERMOTT: There is not,
21 but we can have, as we did in the Bridgeport
22 project, we can have the wetlands scientist.
23 DR. KLEMENS: I kind of hoped
24 that after the Bridgeport project one would
25 have anticipated that these questions would

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 78

1 come up and that I'd like to speak to the
2 wetlands scientist because there are
3 questions about this report.
4 And the very first question I
5 have is -- is there is a Ms. Rayner Hubner,
6 which I imagine is someone who works for BL,
7 identified a potential vernal pool right off
8 the site. She says that right in the report.
9 In the field visit today, I
10 looked on the property that you now own and
11 saw it very wet. I saw evidence of -- around
12 the trees of roots exposed. To me, it looked
13 like at least part of that property was a
14 wetland. And what I don't see on this was
15 did anyone look at that? Was there any
16 investigation of that wet bowl that feeds
17 from your property under the fence to this
18 wetland that is on the GE property?
19 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): The
20 soil scientist did do her analysis on our
21 site as well as adjacent properties and --
22 and that was not identified.
23 DR. KLEMENS: She looked at
24 that entire area that was wet when I was down
25 there walking, looking at it, including the

Page 79

1 area where the roots were exposed by the
2 percolating water right at the fence line,
3 and determined that was not a wetland or a
4 watercourse?
5 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): This
6 is what her report says.
7 DR. KLEMENS: Maybe she could
8 come on the continue. We're going to have a
9 continuation, so maybe she could come to that
10 continuation so I could ask the questions.
11 MR. McDERMOTT: She -- she
12 will be here.
13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Hannon
14 has a follow-up.
15 MR. HANNON: And to follow up
16 on that, I'm curious as to whether or not the
17 raw data is available, where were the test
18 pits done, what was the result of modeling,
19 anything along those lines. Not just saying
20 in a report there are no wetlands there.
21 I mean, I agree with
22 Dr. Klemens, that that -- the area that we're
23 looking at is somewhat questionable. There
24 are some indicators that it could very well
25 be a wetland area. But I'd like to see some

Page 80

1 of the data that was actually taken at that
2 site to determine whether or not it was or
3 was not a wetland soil.
4 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): We
5 can do that.
6 DR. KLEMENS: Because my
7 concern is that, depending where the wetland
8 is, you have a fill and a fence that's going
9 in. I'm not even convinced you're not
10 actually right up in a wetland or potentially
11 filling a wetland. So I think we do need to
12 know that.
13 Also, you have no data on
14 whether or not that -- that area on the GE
15 property -- she says it's potentially a
16 vernal pool. You have no further data on
17 whether or not that is a vernal pool.
18 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
19 Correct. Which she outlined was a freshwater
20 -- that is correct that she only identified
21 that that area flagged was a freshwater
22 inland wetland.
23 DR. KLEMENS: And she said it
24 was potentially an amphibian breeding habitat
25 in her report. It's right on page -- page

Page 81

1 number 6: The wetland located out by the
2 project site, and as this wetland is
3 isolated, there is a potential it acts as
4 breeding habitat for amphibians during the
5 spring season.
6 And so my next question then
7 is, if it is a vernal pool, is the fence or
8 the structure or the fill that you are
9 proposing is that within what would be called
10 the first hundred feet, the vernal pool
11 envelope? That may be something else when
12 she comes in we could discuss, if it's a
13 vernal pool, how that affects the placement
14 of what you're doing.
15 MR. McDERMOTT: So noted.
16 DR. KLEMENS: The last set of
17 questions -- I wouldn't have wanted Mr. Quinn
18 to have made this trip for -- for naught.
19 We're going to talk about box turtles. Is
20 Mr. Quinn available?
21 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Quinn, why
22 don't you come up and sit to the left of Mr.
23 Buccheri here. I think there's a chair.
24 DR. KLEMENS: Mr. Quinn,
25 you've seen the letter that came from

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 82

1 Collette Adkins -- Have you reviewed that? --
2 from the Center for Biological Diversity?
3 THE WITNESS (Quinn): Yes, I
4 have read that and reviewed that letter.
5 DR. KLEMENS: And is, to your
6 knowledge, Ms. Adkins a biologist?
7 THE WITNESS (Quinn): Not to
8 my knowledge, she's not.
9 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.
10 You're familiar with the box turtle in
11 Connecticut.
12 THE WITNESS (Quinn): That is
13 correct.
14 DR. KLEMENS: And looking at
15 the overall landscape that you've see around
16 the site, how -- what is your professional
17 judgment as to the landscape integrity for a
18 viable population of box turtles to occur in
19 that area?
20 THE WITNESS (Quinn): It is my
21 professional opinion, within the adjacent
22 forests surrounding the substation, that
23 habitat is suboptimal for the Eastern box
24 turtle.
25 DR. KLEMENS: Could you

Page 83

1 elaborate why?
2 THE WITNESS (Quinn): One,
3 it's heavily developed; two, if you -- there
4 is -- box turtles use habitats seasonally,
5 and the biggest impact that would -- would
6 occur due to the additional tree clearing
7 would be to the overwintering habitat of the
8 Eastern box turtle which tends to be within
9 mature upland forest.
10 The forest within the adjacent
11 surrounding area of this substation, to me,
12 is suboptimal hibernacula areas, or
13 suboptimal forests for hibernacula areas to
14 occur in. A couple of reasons, one has
15 already been mentioned, this seep of water is
16 not typically conducive to an actual area of
17 hibernation; and two, they typically do not
18 hibernate within proximity to forested edges.
19 They tend to be within the forest interior
20 when selecting suitable hibernacula.
21 DR. KLEMENS: And you looked
22 at the overall habitat matrix that this --
23 this station -- this substation is located.
24 One of the things I'm grappling with is we
25 have a report from the Natural Diversity

Page 84

1 Database of, I guess, a single box turtle.
2 Could you maybe give some input into what
3 single box turtle records may mean in terms
4 of population viability?
5 THE WITNESS (Quinn): Right.
6 When you're -- when you're dealing with box
7 turtle populations, box turtles are a
8 long-lived species. One individual does not
9 give an indication on the actual population
10 itself. You would need to do an extensive
11 study out there and determine, you know, the
12 demographics of the population to determine
13 the suitability, looking at various things
14 about the population including sets ratios
15 and, of course, you know, the demographics of
16 the individuals within the population,
17 specifically the age.
18 The one individual that was
19 located was -- was found along the actual
20 power line easement itself in the early
21 successional habitat that is created by
22 these -- maintaining these easements. That
23 in itself does not lend credence to the fact
24 that it's a healthy population out there.
25 One would need to go out and do a full box

Page 85

1 turtle survey to make those sort of
2 assessments.
3 DR. KLEMENS: Have you
4 actually found areas where you found odd box
5 turtles that, basically residual populations,
6 and they live for a while because they're so
7 long lived and it's --
8 THE WITNESS (Quinn):
9 Absolutely. One of the things
10 when I do an assessment of habitat for box
11 turtles, I look for suitable nesting habitat.
12 One of the things you absolutely need is the
13 nesting area to be within, intact and
14 associated with the forested habitat to
15 sustain an actual large-scale or functioning
16 population of box turtles.
17 If there is nesting occurring
18 on the site, it would likely be along the
19 power line easement, but when looking at a
20 long-lived species such as the box turtle,
21 one of the most important things, personally,
22 for me is looking at the sex ratios. The sex
23 ratios can tell you a lot about a population
24 of box turtles.
25 For instance, if you have an

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 86

1 overabundance of male box turtles, it would
2 tell you that your nesting grounds are likely
3 bisected by some sort of a structure,
4 potentially a roadway where box turtles would
5 inadvertently be getting killed. And without
6 doing such work, I would not be able to
7 attest that there is a strong population
8 there, but of course this one box -- box
9 turtle is not evidence that there is.
10 DR. KLEMENS: And you have
11 reviewed the protocols that the applicant
12 is -- is proposing, the box turtle avoidance
13 protocols? They're sort of the standard DEEP
14 protocols that are part of this submission.
15 Do you think that would adequately protect,
16 if there is box turtle in that area or a few
17 box turtles, would they be adequately
18 protected by this -- this protocol?
19 THE WITNESS (Quinn): They
20 absolutely will be protected by this
21 protocol.
22 DR. KLEMENS: Do you agree
23 with -- in there there's a seasonal
24 restriction that's April 1st through
25 September 30th, that was suggested in

Page 87

1 Collette Adkins' letter. Do you think that
2 that is prudent to have no activity going on
3 there, or do you believe that activity on the
4 site could be managed by these -- by these
5 protocols?
6 THE WITNESS (Quinn): I think
7 that the activity period called out is
8 reasonable. And I think that construction
9 activities should take place during a
10 seasonal restricted period as to not
11 potentially impact turtles that could be
12 overwintering.
13 DR. KLEMENS: Can I ask you
14 about turkeys?
15 THE WITNESS (Quinn): I'm not
16 a turkey expert.
17 DR. KLEMENS: Is there anyone
18 who could talk about turkeys here?
19 MR. McDERMOTT: We are without
20 a turkey expert.
21 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. I just
22 wanted to -- do you have any sense -- do you
23 know -- do you know if the turkey is on any
24 state lists?
25 THE WITNESS (Quinn): The

Page 88

1 turkey is a game bird prohibited from being
2 on state lists is my understanding. It's a
3 game species.
4 DR. KLEMENS: So it's not a --
5 THE WITNESS (Quinn): -- but
6 I'm not an expert.
7 DR. KLEMENS: Right. It's not
8 an endangered, threatened or special concern
9 species?
10 THE WITNESS (Quinn): Oh,
11 absolutely not. No, absolutely not. It's
12 found in every town in Connecticut.
13 DR. KLEMENS: Increasing?
14 THE WITNESS (Quinn):
15 Absolutely increasing. No
16 question about it.
17 DR. KLEMENS: Do you have any
18 evidence that turkeys are injurious to other
19 wildlife? I know from -- let's say, for
20 example, things like rattlesnakes and that?
21 THE WITNESS (Quinn): They can
22 be. They absolutely can be. One -- there's
23 been documented cases where they have
24 actually preyed on juvenile rattlesnakes in
25 the past, yes.

Page 89

1 DR. KLEMENS: So basically,
2 on -- on the big spectrum of species, we
3 should be concerned about, we should be
4 concerned about the box turtles but maybe not
5 the turkeys so much?
6 THE WITNESS (Quinn): If I had
7 to be concerned about one, I would choose the
8 box turtles for sure.
9 DR. KLEMENS: Thank you. I
10 have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
12 Mr. Hannon.
13 MR. HANNON: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chairman.
15 To follow up on something that
16 Mr. Ashton asked earlier, I'm just curious
17 about this dump area that he mentioned. And
18 I'm just wondering whether or not it's
19 accessible to vehicles, but yet, out of the
20 way so it kind of invites illegal dumping.
21 I'm just curious if that may have been what
22 happened over here.
23 THE WITNESS (Buccheri): Yeah.
24 I -- I didn't walk that area, so I'm not
25 certain on whether it's accessible to

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 90

1 vehicles or not. I mean, I don't believe our
2 vehicles can get back there at this point.
3 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
4 -- that area is actually between our fence
5 line and the neighbor's property lines. It
6 does not appear that there can be any
7 vehicles getting back there, but obviously,
8 some of the things that Mr. Ashton found is
9 quite heavy, so I can't comment on how that
10 got there.
11 MR. HANNON: You'd be amazed
12 on what we find on state property, and there
13 are no vehicle access points there either
14 so -- I do have a couple of follow-up
15 questions.
16 Let's see. On -- this is
17 Interrogatory TOU dash -- I'm assuming it's
18 III-22. And the question was regarding
19 fugitive dust exposure. And the response
20 was: "When conditions are conducive to
21 generating dust from construction activities,
22 fugitive dust control measures will be
23 implemented." Who decides when conditions
24 are conducive to generating dust?
25 Because it seems that that

Page 91

1 response is a little less likely to work than
2 what was actually put in the response for the
3 Town of Fairfield because they're talking
4 about actually going in and spraying and
5 things of that nature. So I just want to
6 make sure, who's going to be responsible for
7 making sure that as truck traffic is coming
8 in, things of that nature, the -- the site is
9 maintained so that it's not creating any type
10 of adverse impact on the surrounding
11 properties due to dust issues?
12 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): It
13 will be the construction contractor that will
14 be responsible. And I think maybe the
15 difference in responses from the Town of
16 Fairfield versus Connecticut Siting Council,
17 I think we were -- we were specifying the
18 storm water control pollution plan as well as
19 if there is any type of civil activities
20 being carried on on-site, that just on a
21 daily basis, we're going to be using all
22 kinds of methods and controls to keep any
23 type of dust-generating activities,
24 whether -- whether it be cutting or anything
25 else.

Page 92

1 MR. HANNON: And I'm assuming
2 you're talking about using water?
3 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
4 Correct.
5 MR. HANNON: Where would the
6 water come from?
7 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): Wet
8 methods.
9 MR. HANNON: Where would the
10 water come from?
11 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): From
12 a truck, from a -- one of those --
13 MR. HANNON: Yeah. But I
14 mean -- so you're not going to have any type
15 of a well on site?
16 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): No.
17 MR. HANNON: Can we draw the
18 water from the site?
19 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): Some
20 water will be drawn from the site and others
21 from trucks that carry water on them.
22 MR. HANNON: And the reason
23 I'm going in that direction is because I'm
24 not sure exactly what you're referring to
25 with the washout areas. I think there are a

Page 93

1 couple of different washout areas that are
2 proposed.
3 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
4 There's going to be --
5 MR. HANNON: You're using
6 water there. So where is the water coming
7 from? You're talking about storing water, so
8 there's no overflow. Where is that water
9 eventually going to go, and what's it being
10 stored in? I mean, are you talking about
11 putting it into some type of a container and
12 then eventually it's going to be pumped out?
13 And I'm just kind of curious as to what's
14 being proposed with these washout areas.
15 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): I
16 think the washout area is -- is going to be
17 self-contained where the vehicles, that
18 before they leave, will be washed down.
19 MR. HANNON: Uh-huh.
20 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): So,
21 as you say, it's going to be contained within
22 that area and then taken off-site. So it
23 will be in a containerized vehicle.
24 MR. LEVESQUE: Excuse me.
25 That -- that driveway area in front of the

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 94

1 building, I thought I saw a Call Before You
2 Dig marking for water line?
3 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
4 That's because we -- we abandoned our well.
5 And we're -- we're going to get -- we already
6 got approval to have the water company give
7 us a direct line.
8 MR. LEVESQUE: So the line
9 that was marked is not an active water line?
10 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I
11 believe that water line has been cut over and
12 the well has been abandoned.
13 MR. HANNON: All right. I
14 guess where I'm still a little confused is
15 there's a wheel washout station at the
16 construction entrance and exit to the site,
17 but then there's an additional self-contained
18 washout station. So what's the difference
19 between this additional self-contained and
20 then the other washout stations, or are they
21 all the same? Because that -- that's where
22 I'm kind of confused on this. And what is
23 happening with the water that is being used
24 for the washing?
25 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Rossetti,

Page 95

1 would this be a question for one of our Black
2 & Veatch? Just -- I'm trying to get the
3 right people on the panel to answer the
4 question.
5 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We do
6 have a concrete -- concrete truck washout
7 that would be in a contained area. And that
8 will be -- the water and everything will be
9 taken off-site for that. I don't know if
10 that helps clarify your -- the question, or
11 the answer.
12 MR. HANNON: But my
13 understanding is there's going to be these
14 wash areas in different locations. And it's
15 not referring in the document that they are
16 all these self-contained systems. So I guess
17 my basic point then is are they all
18 self-contained -- self-contained systems that
19 you're proposing to use on-site?
20 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): I'll
21 have to get back to you because I believe
22 that was going to be just that one location.
23 MR. HANNON: Okay. So if it
24 is just that one, then what happens to the
25 water at the other wheel wash areas?

Page 96

1 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko):
2 There are no other wheel wash areas, just at
3 that --
4 MR. HANNON: But that's not
5 what the report states. I'm just going by
6 what I read in the report. This is item 552,
7 Town of Fairfield, Question 3, I believe.
8 And this is part of the report that came in.
9 Item 552 says: "UI will construct a wheel
10 washout station at the construction entrance
11 and exit of the site and an additional
12 self-contained washout station adjacent to
13 the construction activities."
14 So, to me, that's at least two
15 different units, and I'm trying to get an
16 answer to what's happening with the water
17 with the one that doesn't appear to be a
18 self-contained system.
19 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sorry,
20 Mr. Hannon. I'm -- I'm struggling. What is
21 552 that you're referencing to?
22 MR. HANNON: This report,
23 under post construction control measures.
24 This was the storm water
25 pollution control plan prepared by Conestoga

Page 97

1 Rovers & Associates.
2 THE WITNESS (Katreyczko): Yes,
3 you are correct that the wash waters from
4 both of those locations will be removed
5 from -- from the site at the -- at the end of
6 all the activities. So, in other words, at
7 the end of the wheel wash station, the
8 construction entrance, once that washout is
9 complete for the vehicles, that water will be
10 disposed of, as well as up on top, that other
11 self-contained one that's adjacent to the
12 construction activities, that will also be
13 characterized and disposed of properly.
14 MR. HANNON: I'm -- I'm -- you
15 know, I apologize. I'm still just having a
16 problem with the one, in fact, the wheel
17 washout station at the construction entrance
18 in that it doesn't say it's self-contained.
19 So is it self-contained or not? And if it's
20 not self-contained, how are you storing the
21 water until the activities are done and it
22 can be removed off-site?
23 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Hannon,
24 could we just have a second, please?
25 MR. HANNON: Sure.

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 98

1 (Pause.)
2 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Hannon, I
3 took a break because I thought it would help,
4 but I don't think it did. Why don't -- let
5 me take it as a homework, and we'll get you
6 the answer.
7 MR. HANNON: I'm just trying
8 to make sure that the wastewater that is
9 generated by these wheel washouts is not
10 being disposed of in an inappropriate way.
11 That's the bottom line. So --
12 MR. McDERMOTT: It's a simple
13 question. I hope there's a simple answer,
14 and we will get to that as soon as we can.
15 MR. HANNON: I have no other
16 questions.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
18 Mr. Levesque.
19 MR. LEVESQUE: I don't have
20 any questions that weren't already answered.
21 Thank you.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
23 Mr. Lynch.
24 MR. LYNCH: Thankfully, going
25 last, most of my questions have been

Page 99

1 answered, but I do have an area of concern,
2 and that's with the -- the trucks that are
3 come -- delivering your equipment, whether it
4 be the fences or the, you know, your
5 electrical equipment, are they coming in on a
6 trailer because you've got your permanent
7 turnaround area?
8 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Some of
9 the equipment will be delivered on a trailer,
10 yes.
11 MR. LYNCH: All right.
12 Because my question really is, when they --
13 you do the turnaround and you back into the
14 substation, how is it -- how is it being
15 off-loaded? You mentioned a crane earlier.
16 Well, where is the crane?
17 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So a
18 crane, a small crane would be brought to the
19 site to off-load some of that equipment.
20 MR. LYNCH: Would it be inside
21 the substation or outside the substation?
22 THE WITNESS (Cloud): It would
23 be in the northeast corner of -- of the yard,
24 so that is where the trailers would position
25 themselves to be off-loaded.

Page 100

1 MR. LYNCH: Okay. So then
2 the -- the trailer isn't actually backing
3 into the substation like you said this
4 afternoon, or is it?
5 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So what
6 I was referencing with the backup maneuver is
7 UI's mobile transformer, which positioned
8 itself in the yard, which is separate from
9 the tractor trailers that would deliver
10 equipment to the yard for the proposed
11 construction.
12 MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.
13 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Mercier.
15 MR. MERCIER: Yes. I think I
16 forgot to ask this earlier about some of the
17 height of the equipment. The new capacitor
18 equipment, what's -- what's the total height
19 of that?
20 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Are
21 you -- you referencing the highest piece of
22 equipment?
23 MR. MERCIER: Yes.
24 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So 26
25 feet. That is the highest piece of

Page 101

1 equipment. The masts themselves, however,
2 will be 70 feet. So --
3 MR. MERCIER: Yes, yes.
4 THE WITNESS (Cloud): -- the
5 bulk of the electrical energized equipment is
6 26 feet.
7 MR. MERCIER: Thank you for
8 that clarification. Thank you.
9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Klemens.
10 DR. KLEMENS: I also have one
11 question I forgot in my notes. You're going
12 to be using rhododendrons for screening. Is
13 that what you're proposing?
14 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
15 that's correct.
16 DR. KLEMENS: And you're aware
17 that rhododendrons are a favorite deer food.
18 Have you considered any other types of
19 screening that may not be as attractive to
20 deer?
21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We
22 are open for any of those considerations.
23 DR. KLEMENS: Okay. Thank
24 you.
25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We'll

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 102

1 now go to cross-examination by the Town of
2 Fairfield. Would you please come up and --
3 to this table, please.
4 MR. GIANDURCO: I would ask
5 Mr. Tournas to go first, and then I'll follow
6 up, if that's acceptable to you.
7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure. Okay,
8 Mr. Tournas.
9 MR. McDERMOTT: And to -- and
10 to be clear, Mr. Chairman, this is cross by
11 Mr. Tournas and Mr. Giandurco, because
12 they've been grouped?
13 THE CHAIRPERSON: They've been
14 grouped, so I don't know if Mr. Tournas is
15 speaking for both of them and --
16 MR. GIANDURCO: No.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: And I'm not
18 sure whether we should have grouped the town,
19 too, but I assume you're going to be
20 cross-examining separately. Right?
21 MR. GIANDURCO: Right. Yes.
22 MR. LESSER: I don't have a
23 lot.
24 MR. McDERMOTT: Excuse me,
25 Mr. Chairman. I object to that. The -- the

Page 103

1 grouping is Mr. Tournas and Mr. Giandurco
2 together, so they should be cross-examining
3 together. They're not independent.
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh, I
5 thought they were.
6 MR. McDERMOTT: Well, I think
7 the Council considered a motion in -- in
8 granting the intervenor status for Mr.
9 Tournas and Giandurco. Part of the approval
10 was that they be grouped together.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: They are, so
12 you --
13 MR. TOURNAS: Is that better?
14 I don't think either of us have a problem of
15 being grouped together as long as, you know,
16 we can share our answers and questions and
17 question the witnesses.
18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, now
19 I'm totally confused. Where's Mr. Giandurco?
20 MR. GIANDURCO: I'm here.
21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Why aren't
22 you --
23 MR. GIANDURCO: I was doing
24 that. I just wasn't sure.
25 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're

Page 104

1 supposed to be there, and I'm not sure why
2 the Town is -- if the Town --
3 MR. GIANDURCO: I just had
4 questions. I was going to sit next to him.
5 THE CHAIRPERSON: I mean,
6 they've had a number of interrogatories, I
7 think.
8 MR. TOURNAS: We apologize.
9 It's a first time for us, and we are doing
10 the best we can.
11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Now,
12 you can decide in what order, or if one is
13 speaking for the other.
14 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Gary
15 Azarian was going to be called as a witness,
16 but because of his work he had to leave.
17 THE CHAIRPERSON: But wait a
18 minute. Your cross -- this is -- this is --
19 you will have a separate opportunity to
20 present, to -- to be cross-examined, but
21 right now, your only -- your role is to
22 ask --
23 MR. TOURNAS: Okay.
24 THE CHAIRPERSON: -- questions
25 of the applicant.

Page 105

1 MR. TOURNAS: We apologize.
2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.
3 MR. TOURNAS: A lot of the
4 questions have been already answered. So
5 just one question. You're requesting a
6 70-foot lightning mast on the east side on
7 the existing station. That station has been
8 there since the 1980s or seventies, if I'm
9 correct to say. Why is that needed now?
10 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
11 Again, when we mentioned before with the
12 rolling sphere methodology of looking at our
13 lightning -- lightning protection, any time
14 we do an existing modification, we took a
15 look at the entire yard to see what the
16 lightning protection was. And when we did
17 the rolling sphere method of determining that
18 protection, it did call for a lightning mast
19 in the southeast corner of the yard.
20 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Rossetti,
21 just as a clarification. The rolling sphere
22 method, I believe, is a technique to
23 determine the location, height and number of
24 lightning masts to offer lightning protection
25 to the substation. Is that fair to say?

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 106

1 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
2 that's correct.
3 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.
4 MR. TOURNAS: I did have --
5 MR. LYNCH: Excuse me.
6 Mr. Tournas, could you just move the
7 microphone in front of you. Your voice is
8 carrying away from you here.
9 MR. TOURNAS: I know we did
10 have a few questions about the lighting,
11 however. Just to confirm, lighting will not
12 be on at night, only if there's an intruder
13 or if equipment does have to be repaired.
14 Correct?
15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): The
16 only light that would -- that will stay on is
17 this -- that -- our new proposal is one LED
18 light facing the substation gate entrance.
19 That is correct.
20 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Now, the
21 height of the lightning rods, you're saying,
22 will be 70 feet?
23 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That
24 is correct.
25 MR. TOURNAS: Can they be

Page 107

1 lowered?
2 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes,
3 they could be lowered, but then we run the
4 risk of adding more lightning rods at a lower
5 height, or lightning masts at a lower height.
6 MR. TOURNAS: Now, the
7 Trumbull station, can you tell me the height
8 of those lightning masts?
9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Those
10 are also 70 feet.
11 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Because
12 according to the decision made by the Council
13 when that station was built, it said 55 feet,
14 so I'm just questioning that.
15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We
16 can double-check on that, but I -- I believe
17 they were 70 feet. But we can -- we can
18 double-check that.
19 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Well, I
20 have the decision if you want to see it.
21 MR. McDERMOTT: No, we're --
22 well -- but we need to confirm that we did
23 what the decision said. And there's also a
24 development and management plan that was
25 filed subsequent to the approval, which would

Page 108

1 have addressed the height of all the
2 structures. So we'll have to check that
3 and --
4 MR. TOURNAS: So you'll get
5 back. Okay.
6 MR. McDERMOTT: -- the
7 approval as well.
8 I'm sorry. And that was
9 Trumbull, Mr. Tournas?
10 MR. TOURNAS: I'm sorry.
11 MR. McDERMOTT: That was the
12 Trumbull substation you're referencing?
13 MR. TOURNAS: Yes.
14 And how many lights are on
15 that Trumbull station?
16 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Chairman,
17 I'm going to object to the questions. Again,
18 it's hard to make analogies between projects.
19 Each is unique, although somewhat similar.
20 And simply because we have X number of lights
21 or a lightning mast or a height at Trumbull
22 doesn't mean that it's necessarily applicable
23 to this substation or the Shelton substation
24 or the Singer substation.
25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, in

Page 109

1 view of the fact that they've just told us
2 that they're only going to have one light on,
3 is there any relevance to the question?
4 MR. TOURNAS: Well, it's the
5 number of lightning masts that will be
6 included on the Hawthorne station. That's my
7 only question.
8 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sorry.
9 Are we discussing lightning or lighting?
10 MR. TOURNAS: At this point
11 light masts.
12 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay.
13 Illumination.
14 MR. TOURNAS: Illumination.
15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Again, why
16 is that relevant, since they're only going to
17 have one that's going to be --
18 MR. TOURNAS: Well, the height
19 will make a difference from looking at
20 different perspectives from the abutters,
21 from the cascades.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: If you have
23 that answer now, that's fine. If not, I'm
24 not going to, you know, spend more time
25 comparing some -- another substation that may

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 110

1 or may not have any relevance.
2 MR. McDERMOTT: Appreciate
3 that. We have no problems answering
4 questions about this project, but I just
5 don't want to be in a comparison mode between
6 different UI projects. So to the extent the
7 panel knows, Mr. Rossetti?
8 MR. TOURNAS: Would you be
9 able to tell me if any of the security
10 cameras will intrude on any of the abutters'
11 properties?
12 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Tournas,
13 we're happy to answer that question. I
14 just -- do you want the number of lighting
15 masts answered?
16 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): There
17 will be five lighting, or illumination masts
18 installed at Hawthorne.
19 MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Now,
20 can someone field question about the -- the
21 cameras?
22 I will say, Mr. Ashton, the
23 range of the cameras is a CEII issue for the
24 company. I --
25 MR. ASHTON: It's perfectly

Page 111

1 reasonable to make that confidential.
2 MR. McDERMOTT: So we -- we
3 can have a -- we can have a little bit of a
4 discussion, but in terms of the strength and
5 the, you know, whatever other -- the
6 capabilities of the cameras, we have to be a
7 little bit sensitive on that.
8 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Just our
9 concern is a couple of neighbors with
10 swimming pools that are close to the
11 borderline, and our -- their concern is the
12 security cameras.
13 MR. McDERMOTT: I appreciate
14 that, Mr. Tournas. And I think we can answer
15 that question with Mr. --
16 MR. TOURNAS: Okay.
17 MR. McDERMOTT: -- Mr. Cloud.
18 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So the
19 proposed security cameras are there to
20 monitor the areas directly in close proximity
21 to the perimeter of the substation fence as
22 well as the interior of the substation yard.
23 Their intent is -- is not to look outside the
24 direct proximity of the fence line onto
25 abutter properties.

Page 112

1 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. For the
2 fencing, is there any other proposals that
3 can be made or any type of material?
4 You've mentioned in your
5 questions to interrogatory -- interrogatory,
6 that there are alternative methods. Can you
7 explain those?
8 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): If
9 there are alternatives to putting in a fence,
10 like we've mentioned before, there's things
11 like putting up a wall, for example.
12 MR. TOURNAS: Any others?
13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
14 That's -- that's really the two that we're
15 familiar with.
16 MR. GIANDURCO: I'll just step
17 in with a question. I'm sorry. I'll ask a
18 question while he goes through his paperwork.
19 A couple of things. In my
20 Interrogatory GIA-3, the UI response
21 referenced their response to the Town of
22 Fairfield Question 3, Interrogatories 1. In
23 that response, UI lists their environmental
24 reports. And the storm water pollution
25 control plan submitted states, in Section 53

Page 113

1 that, quote, The post development runoff
2 characteristics will not differ significantly
3 from the predevelopment conditions.
4 By looking at the diagram and
5 trying to go to scale, it seems to me that
6 what we're doing is adding an addition of
7 level land covered in a semi-pervious
8 material approximately 160-by-80. I may be
9 wrong. I was trying to go by your scale.
10 And a substantial addition of this kind of
11 level area with less permeability than the
12 current slope, grasses does not seem to be
13 addressed with a casual conclusion that it
14 will not differ significantly in runoff
15 characteristics.
16 In other words, what I'm
17 saying here is we currently have the paved
18 area and then a rolling -- a sloping area
19 that goes down to the surrounding site. What
20 will happen now is there will be an extension
21 of the level area, and that's going to
22 necessarily --
23 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Giandurco,
24 I'm going to object to the testimony that
25 you're providing.

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 114

1 Mr. Chairman, if he wants to
2 ask a question, we're happy to answer the
3 question, but there's a lot of --
4 MR. GIANDURCO: But my
5 question is --
6 MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you.
7 MR. GIANDURCO: -- in what way
8 is this -- how can we conclude that this will
9 not differ significantly?
10 It seems to be a large
11 addition of level area.
12 MR. McDERMOTT: To summarize
13 the question, correct me if I'm wrong, storm
14 water runoff, how do we ensure that we're not
15 increasing the amount of runoff following
16 construction?
17 MR. GIANDURCO: Yes.
18 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): The
19 estimated -- estimated runoff coefficient was
20 calculated to be .47 after, but -- this is
21 postconstruction.
22 MR. GIANDURCO: And what is it
23 currently?
24 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): It's
25 currently 3.7.

Page 115

1 MR. GIANDURCO: So it's 23.7?
2 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
3 Three -- point three seven. So there's a
4 differential of .10, 10 percent.
5 MR. GIANDURCO: Oh, I see,
6 .37.
7 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
8 Because I -- I think what you were saying
9 before about the area of concern is -- is
10 really pervious, not semi-pervious. It's
11 typical of what we use in substations, you
12 know, traprock. So it is going to have the
13 capability for the rainwater and everything
14 else to percolate and get into the ground.
15 MR. GIANDURCO: Okay. I see.
16 Is -- is that considered a substantial
17 increase? I mean, just roughly, it looks to
18 me that that's an increase of about 15, 17,
19 18 percent. Is that not significant, or is
20 it considered appropriate in terms of not
21 differing significantly? The reason I ask is
22 I have wetlands on my property. I --
23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Wait a
24 minute. Let the man answer. You asked a
25 question. Let him answer.

Page 116

1 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
2 Based on the site conditions and the acreage
3 that -- we feel that that is sufficient.
4 MR. GIANDURCO: Okay. Go
5 ahead.
6 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, I
7 can I ask one question? Mr. Katreczko, you
8 mentioned the discharges of runoff. Can you
9 put that in an analogous form? Is that the
10 equivalent to roughly what would be expected
11 normally on a residential lot, two
12 residential lots, something like that?
13 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I
14 can't really equate it to how many
15 residential lots that would be equal to. I'm
16 not an engineer, so I can't.
17 MR. ASHTON: You're not an
18 engineer.
19 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): I
20 didn't do that analysis.
21 MR. ASHTON: Gee, I thought
22 you were. Okay. I couldn't get it.
23 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. You
24 mentioned that the soil that will be
25 excavated will stay on the property, and on

Page 117

1 the map I saw the location. How long will
2 that stay on the property and why is that
3 being stored on the property?
4 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): The
5 -- it's -- the reason it would be -- the
6 reason it's stored on the property is because
7 of the civil construction portion of the
8 project will -- might have some access -- you
9 know, excess soil so it's going to be stored
10 there temporarily. And it gets characterized
11 to see if it's hazardous or not. If it can
12 be reused, it will be put in places where it
13 can be reused. But if it's deemed to be
14 hazardous, has hazardous constituents in
15 there, then it will be taken off-site.
16 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. So once
17 the site is completed --
18 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): It's
19 just not going to be there permanently.
20 MR. TOURNAS: -- it won't be
21 there. In Number 13, question was asked what
22 capacity will the expanded station operate at
23 its present condition? The answer was a
24 proposed modification would ensure that the
25 substation operates below its rated capacity.

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 However, it still didn't answer the question 2 of the existing station, what capacity it is 3 currently running at. 4 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I 5 would just like to clarify. Which 6 interrogatory are you referring to? 7 MR. TOURNAS: It's 13 on the 8 docket, TOU3, it's Tournas 3, Set 3. 9 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Tournas, 10 what question, set number? 11 MR. TOURNAS: It's Number 40 12 on Interrogatory TOU3-4-40 on the Siting 13 Council's Dockets, Number 13, as evidence. 14 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): 15 Mr. Bradt will answer that 16 question. 17 THE WITNESS (Bradt): So the 18 substation will be operating -- actually 19 right now, the substation is operating very 20 close to its capacity. I think one of the 21 other questions that was asked by yourself or 22 someone else, how many times have we actually 23 reached the peak capacity in the last several 24 years, and the answer, that it reached the 25 full peak capacity, that's a hundred percent</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 if the loading exceeds that level. So it's 2 not unusual to see the average to be 3 something less than that value. 4 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. Just, I 5 guess, the question -- this is Interrogatory 6 GIA-18, which is number 14 on the -- I'm not 7 sure the procedure or the docket -- document 8 that was sent out the other day. 9 It was in regards to the 10 new -- the possible plans to install a new 11 substation in Fairfield in the year 2020. 12 And the answer is that you do not have any 13 plans at this time. Can I ask why that plan 14 was changed? 15 DR. KLEMENS: Could you use 16 that microphone -- 17 MR. TOURNAS: Oh, I'm sorry. 18 DR. KLEMENS: -- in front of 19 you so we can hear what you're saying. Put 20 it closer to you. 21 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Bradt, can 22 you answer that question? 23 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Yes. 24 The Fairfield substation that you're 25 referring to, in year 2020, has been</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 of its capacity one time. 2 And so there's a little bit of 3 randomness to that. But we -- I would say 4 we're essentially at our peak capacity, that 5 substation. We do have a small margin left. 6 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. The 7 question before that, yes, you said that 8 would be running at full capacity once in the 9 last seven summers. And then you answered, 10 the average of the last seven years is 11 90 percent. To me, it doesn't make sense to 12 me that the average is 90 years for the -- 13 90 percent for the past 7 years, and it's 14 running now close to a hundred percent. I'm 15 sorry, but I don't understand. 16 THE WITNESS (Bradt): 17 No, I understand. 18 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. 19 THE WITNESS (Bradt): 20 There's -- there is some variability in the 21 seasonal peak loading that we see at our 22 substations. And -- and from summer to 23 summer, they're never identical. So what we 24 do is we have to plan for the peak to make 25 sure that we don't have a reliability concern</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 deferred. And one of the most significant 2 factors is the -- this upgrade at this 3 substation. 4 This substation adds 5 significant capacity to this area, this 6 Bridgeport/Fairfield area. And we consider 7 it a modest upgrade that defers a very costly 8 substation upgrade in future years. 9 MR. TOURNAS: If that 10 substation that we're questioning in 2020 was 11 built, what areas would that supply? Would 12 it be the same area that the Hawthorne is 13 supplying, Norwalk to New Haven? 14 THE WITNESS (Bradt): 15 Conceivably, yes. 16 MR. GIANDURCO: Are those -- 17 are those -- excuse me. Are those plans 18 subject to change? You're saying now there 19 is no plan on the horizon to build a new 20 substation. Is that subject to change in the 21 interim? 22 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Based on 23 our most current load forecasts, based on 24 that and the -- this project here that we're 25 proposing, we don't see the need for it</p>

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 122

1 within the ten-year planning horizon. We do
2 not look out past the ten-year horizon.
3 MR. GIANDURCO: Okay. That's
4 perfect.
5 While he's looking, I have
6 another question. We've addressed several of
7 my most -- my most important -- several of my
8 most important concerns involve light
9 pollution. I'm pleased with the concept of
10 the modification of the plan in terms of not
11 having nighttime illumination, and I would
12 hope that the Council will stipulate to that.
13 One thing that I am concerned
14 about is sort of the visual impact of -- of
15 the additional masts. And I found it, you
16 know, unusual. Again, I did a sort of
17 measurement of the proposal, just doing a
18 simulation. And it appears what we're doing
19 is adding to the footprint something between
20 50 and 60 percent additional siting --
21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you --
22 can you get to a question, please?
23 MR. GIANDURCO: Yes. It's an
24 introduction. I'm sorry, Chairman. But I
25 don't understand, if we are adding

Page 123

1 approximately 50 percent more ground area,
2 why we need triple the number of lightning
3 masts. We have -- we have gone through this,
4 but I just -- if that could be clarified.
5 Because it seems to me that perhaps there's
6 some reason that has not been -- been
7 clarified so far.
8 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So to
9 try to explain why the lightning masts are
10 proposed how they are, the existing three
11 masts, obviously, protect the majority of the
12 substation with the exception of that eastern
13 portion. However, after, with the proposed
14 expansion, there is an additional area. But
15 it's not so much dependent on the land area
16 as it is the equipment height, the height of
17 the lightning masts, the lightning levels,
18 the isochronic levels in the area.
19 So to explain it a little
20 easier, the lightning masts kind of create a
21 zone of protection around them. The existing
22 lightning masts are located in the center of
23 the substation, so they provide an area of
24 protection directly around them.
25 When we add additional

Page 124

1 equipment to the west side of the site, now
2 we need to carry that protection along to the
3 equipment on the west side, which requires us
4 to put lightning masts, not only around that
5 existing equipment, but also the equipment
6 that passes over to the capacitor banks and
7 their arrangement.
8 So as we look at the models
9 showing the areas that are protected by these
10 lightning masts, we determined the number
11 that is required in order to protect the
12 equipment for the height proposed. And from
13 that analysis, that's the number of masts
14 that is required, per UI standards, to
15 achieve 100 percent protection of the new
16 equipment.
17 MR. GIANDURCO: Okay. And as
18 I said, it did seem excessive in terms of the
19 tripling of the number. And then --
20 THE WITNESS (Rossetti):
21 Actually, I have a question, if I could ask?
22 Would -- would the residents, or the folks
23 rather, have more masts at a lower height?
24 THE CHAIRPERSON: You know,
25 you'll -- you'll get a chance at a subsequent

Page 125

1 because --
2 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Sorry
3 about that. I apologize.
4 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Rossetti
5 missed that part of the witness prep session
6 that I had with him, where I explained his
7 role was to answer the questions, not ask
8 them. I apologize.
9 MR. GIANDURCO: We missed the
10 intervenor prep session, so we're even.
11 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. I just
12 have a few more questions. Mostly, I think
13 it consists of our visit today. Sorry about
14 that. We mentioned there were some pink
15 flags on GE's property. Would you know what
16 they were there for?
17 THE WITNESS (Katreczko): Yes.
18 They were to delineate the inland wetland
19 that was identified.
20 MR. TOURNAS: Wetlands? Okay.
21 THE WITNESS (Katreczko):
22 Habitat, yeah.
23 MR. GIANDURCO: This will be
24 my final question. I'm looking at my
25 interrogatory GIA20 and its effects on

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 126

1 neighboring wetlands. And I know that
2 members of the Council have addressed this,
3 but in more specific ways. I have wetlands
4 on my property, so I'm very familiar with --
5 that there are wetlands maps available. Mine
6 is of the federal wetlands in addition to --
7 say, your response is that the wetlands are
8 outside the UI property and will not be
9 impacted.

10 Is it possible for you to
11 provide a map showing the exact distance
12 between the site and the runoff areas and
13 existing wetlands? Is that possible, like,
14 as in addition to this petition? Because,
15 like, when saying that the wetlands are
16 outside the UI property, again, it appears,
17 just from a visual inspection today, that
18 there are vernal pools.

19 And I know that my wetlands is
20 very, very close to the property as well and
21 that there are several more in the vicinity.
22 Is it possible that you could provide a
23 wetlands map, if not today?

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: That
25 could -- that could be something, when you

Page 127

1 have your wetlands expert at our subsequent
2 hearing, that you could provide that
3 information so I can --

4 MR. McDERMOTT: Sure. We'll
5 go out and do a radius around the -- around
6 the substation, and we can provide that.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: And there
8 are town -- well, presumably the town has
9 wetland maps as well.

10 MR. McDERMOTT: I'm sure they
11 do.

12 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. I guess
13 my last question. Regarding the noise level,
14 and I know, you know, we went through most of
15 that, but my concern, and I may not
16 understand all that, which I don't
17 understand, but it shows the noise level can
18 be as high as 51 decibels, and -- in a
19 residential area, and the Town of Fairfield's
20 limit is 45 within the zoning.

21 Can you explain a little to us
22 about the noise level ratio of, you know,
23 going as high as 51, however, the limit is
24 45?

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Yes. We

Page 128

1 absolutely can do that. I just need to do a
2 quick shuffling of seats and ask Mr. Baker,
3 who is our acoustic specialist, to come up.
4 And he has, so we're all set. Thank you.

5 THE WITNESS (Baker): Yes, we
6 did do a noise study, a noise model for this
7 project. And the worst case predicted noise
8 level is below 45.

9 MR. TOURNAS: But it did say
10 it could go high as 51?

11 THE WITNESS (Baker): I -- I
12 believe what you may be referring to is the
13 measured ambient conditions, which include
14 traffic influences and -- and other
15 non-substation noise sources.

16 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. At that
17 51, would you be able to tell us when that
18 was taken? What time?

19 THE WITNESS (Baker): The peak
20 periods align with high traffic volume, so
21 you know, early morning hours, rush hour or
22 evening hours.

23 MR. TOURNAS: Well, you're not
24 being specific.

25 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Baker,

Page 129

1 maybe you could refer to the report and
2 identify the figure that shows the time
3 calculations.

4 MR. TOURNAS: I have the
5 report here. If you could tell me what page,
6 I can refer to it.

7 THE WITNESS (Baker): I guess
8 I'm a little bit confused on the question.
9 Can you repeat, please?

10 MR. TOURNAS: You measured
11 ambient sound level in the vicinity of the
12 substation ranging from 34 to 51.

13 THE WITNESS (Baker): Yes.

14 MR. TOURNAS: I'm asking what
15 time of the day and where was that taken when
16 it measured at 51?

17 THE WITNESS (Baker): We
18 actually had four different measurement
19 locations. The 51, referring to Table three
20 two occurred at NML 2, on page three six, of
21 the project noise evaluation. And the
22 specific time of the 51 appears to have
23 occurred -- and this is in reference to
24 Figure three three, page 3-4, roughly
25 7:30-ish.

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

SITING COUNCIL
PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 130

1 MR. McDERMOTT: 7:30 a.m. or
2 p.m.?
3 THE WITNESS (Baker): That is
4 a.m.
5 MR. GIANDURCO: So 7:30. Just
6 to follow up. In other words, this increase
7 usually came from traffic on an adjacent
8 road. Is that what you were finding?
9 THE WITNESS (Baker): Correct.
10 MR. TOURNAS: Okay. No other
11 questions.
12 MR. GIANDURCO: I have one
13 more that I did leave out, and I apologize.
14 It's brief. In your response to GIA17 on the
15 esthetic impact, your response says UI,
16 quote, can, unquote, place disguising plant
17 life around the site without specificity.
18 You mentioned before -- the Council asked
19 that perhaps you might use something that is
20 not attractive to the local deer population.
21 I would like to know if you
22 could give a concrete plan in the future
23 related to disguising plant life?
24 THE CHAIRPERSON: I'll just --
25 if this were to be approved, there will be a

Page 131

1 subsequent detailed -- we call it D and M
2 plan, in which all these details, including
3 the exact type of vegetation, the fencing
4 material, will all be determined in that, but
5 we're -- we're not there yet. So those
6 details will -- will come if this, you know,
7 project moves forward.
8 MR. GIANDURCO: Thank you,
9 Mr. Chairman.
10 MR. TOURNAS: So any questions
11 we have relating to that or any evidence that
12 we should hold off until that meeting?
13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Well, if
14 you -- if you have specific questions now
15 relating to that, you can ask them now, but
16 they may not have the answer until that
17 period so...
18 MR. TOURNAS: So that would be
19 a no. Okay. Thank you.
20 MR. GIANDURCO: I'm done.
21 MR. TOURNAS: I can wait.
22 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right.
23 Thank you. Thank both of you.
24 We'll now recess until 7 p.m.,
25 at which time we'll commence the public

Page 132

1 comment session. We're going for dinner now
2 so we may, if time permits, depending on how
3 long the public session, after that we could
4 resume the evidentiary, or if not, we'll do
5 it at are -- we're going to have a subsequent
6 meeting, so --
7 (Whereupon, the witnesses were
8 excused, and the above proceedings were
9 adjourned at 5:10 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 133

1 CERTIFICATE
2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 132
4 pages are a complete and accurate
5 computer-aided transcription of my original
6 verbatim notes taken of the Council Meeting
7 in Re: Petition No. 1120, THE UNITED
8 ILLUMINATING COMPANY PETITION FOR A
9 DECLARATORY RULING THAT NO CERTIFICATE OF
10 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED
11 IS REQUIRED FOR THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO
12 THE EXISTING HAWTHORNE SUBSTATION LOCATED AT
13 180 HAWTHORNE DRIVE, FAIRFIELD, CONNECTICUT,
14 which was held before ROBERT STEIN,
15 Chairperson, and SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY,
16 JR., Vice Chairperson, at the Education
17 Center, 2nd Floor Conference Room, 501 Kings
18 Highway East, Fairfield, Connecticut, on
19 March 31, 2015.
20
21
22
23 _____
24 Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
25 Court Reporter
UNITED REPORTERS, INC.
90 Brainard Road, Suite 103
Hartford, Connecticut 06114

SITING COUNCIL
 PETITION NUMBER 1120 - March 31, 2015

Page 134

1	INDEX	
	WITNESSES	PAGE
2	DENNIS QUINN	11
3	MATTHEW P. CLOUD	
	RONALD M. ROSSETTI	
4	TONY BUCCHERI	
	DAVID BRADT	
5	BOHDAN KATRECKZO	
	RYAN BAKER	
6	DR. AMY WILLIAMS	
	RICK LANDINO	
	EXAMINERS:	PAGE
7	Mr. Mercier	22
	Senator Murphy	34
8	Mr. Ashton	50
	Dr. Bell	69
9	Dr. Klemens	73
	Mr. Hannon	89
10	Mr. Lynch	99
	Mr. Tourmas	105
11	Mr. Giandurco	112
12		
	EXHIBITS	
13	(Received in evidence.)	
	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
14	II-B-1	Petition received Nov. 5, 2014, 21
		with attachments (subject to
15		Critical Energy Infrastructure
		Information
16		a.) Development & Management Plan
17		b.) Affidavit of Service of Notice,
18		dated October 29, 2014
19	II-B-2	Petitioner's Affidavit of 21
		Service of Notice, dated
20		December 2, 2014
21	II-B-3	E-mail from Adla Reddy, 21
		UI Project Manager, regarding
22		photo rendering of proposed
		Pavement area at Hawthorne
23		Substation, with Photo Simulation
		Attachment, dated Dec. 5, 2014
24	II-B-4	Petitioner's Response to 21
25		Council Interrogatories,

Page 136

1	INDEX (Cont'd.)	
	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
2	II-B-14	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Vincent Giandurco Interrogatories,
3		dated March 23, 2015
4	II-B-15	Hawthorne Substation Project 21
		Noise Evaluation Report prepared
5		by Black & Veatch and Related
		cover letter, dated March 24, 2015
6		
7	II-B-16	Petitioner's Letter Regarding 21
		the Electric and Magnetic Field
8		Assessment of the Hawthorne
		Substation, dated March 24, 2015,
9		with attachments (subject to
		Critical Energy Infrastructure
10		Information Protective Order dated
11		December 11, 2014)
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 135

1	INDEX (Cont'd.)	
	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
2	II-B-5	Letter to Town of Easton 21
		regarding Project Notice,
3		dated January 22, 2015
4	II-B-6	Petitioner's Materials, 21
		with cover letter, presented
5		to Town of Fairfield and
6		residents at February 4, 2015
		public information meeting,
7		dated February 27, 2015
8		a.) Slideshow Materials
9		b.) FAQ Sheet
10		c.) Site Plan
11		d.) Visibility Analysis
12	II-B-7	Petitioner's Affidavit of 21
		Sign Posting, dated March 13, 2015
13	II-B-8	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Council Interrogatories, Set Two,
14		dated March 16, 2015
15	II-B-9	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Town of Fairfield
16		Interrogatories, Set One,
		dated March 16, 2015
17	II-B-10	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Town of Fairfield
18		Interrogatories, Set Two,
19		dated March 23, 2015
20	II-B-11	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Arthur Tourmas Interrogatories,
21		Set One, dated March 23, 2015
22	II-B-12	Petitioner's Response to Arthur 21
		Tourmas Interrogatories, Set Two,
23		dated March 23, 2015
24	II-B-13	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Arthur Tourmas Interrogatories,
25		Set Three, dated March 23, 2015

Page 136

1	INDEX (Cont'd.)	
	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION
2	II-B-14	Petitioner's Response to 21
		Vincent Giandurco Interrogatories,
3		dated March 23, 2015
4	II-B-15	Hawthorne Substation Project 21
		Noise Evaluation Report prepared
5		by Black & Veatch and Related
		cover letter, dated March 24, 2015
6		
7	II-B-16	Petitioner's Letter Regarding 21
		the Electric and Magnetic Field
8		Assessment of the Hawthorne
		Substation, dated March 24, 2015,
9		with attachments (subject to
10		Critical Energy Infrastructure
11		Information Protective Order dated
12		December 11, 2014)
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		