

**In The Matter Of:**  
*Application of Eversource Energy*

---

*Hearing Docket No. 461*  
*January 12, 2016*

---

*BCT Reporting LLC*  
*PO Box 1774*  
*Bristol, CT 06010*  
*860.302.1876*

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
2 CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

3  
4 Docket No. 461

5 Application of Eversource Energy for a  
6 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and  
7 Public Need for the Construction, Maintenance and  
8 Operation of a 115-kilovolt (kV) Bulk Substation  
9 Located at 290 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich,  
10 Connecticut, and Two 115-kV Underground  
11 Transmission Circuits Extending Approximately 2.3  
12 Miles Between the Proposed Substation and the  
13 Existing Cos Cob Substation, Greenwich,  
14 Connecticut, and Related Substation Improvements

15  
16 Continued Hearing held at the Connecticut  
17 Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain,  
18 Connecticut, Tuesday, January 12, 2016, at 11:05  
19 a.m.

20  
21 H e l d B e f o r e:

22 ROBERT STEIN, Chairman  
23  
24  
25

1    A p p e a r a n c e s :

2            Council Members:

3                    SENATOR JAMES J. MURPHY, JR., Vice  
4                    Chairman

5                    PHILIP T. ASHTON

6                    CHAIRMAN ARTHUR H. HOUSE,  
7                    PURA, Designee

8                    COMM. MICHAEL A. CARON,  
9                    PURA Designee

10                    ROBERT HANNON, DEEP Designee

11

12            Council Staff:

13                    MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.

14                    Executive Director and  
15                    Staff Attorney

16                    ROBERT MERCIER  
17                    Siting Analyst

18

19            For Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a  
20            Eversource Energy:

21                    CARMODY TORRANCE SANDAK HENNESSEY LLP

22                    50 Leavenworth Street

23                    P.O. Box 1110

24                    Waterbury, Connecticut 06721-1110

25                    BY:    MARIANNE BARBINO DUBUQUE, ESQ.

1 A p p e a r a n c e s (Cont'd):

2 For the Office of Consumer Counsel:

3 LAUREN HENAULT BIDRA, ESQ.

4 MARGARET BAIN

5 For Pet Pantry Super Discount Stores LLC:

6 THE MARCUS LAW FIRM

7 275 Branford Road

8 North Branford, Connecticut 06471

9 BY: MARK L. BERGAMO, ESQ.

10 EDWARD L. MARCUS, ESQ.

11 Intervenor:

12 DWIGHT UEDA

13 Field Point Estate Townhouses

14 172 Field Point Road, #10

15 Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

16 Intervenor:

17 CHRISTINE EDWARDS

18 111 Bible Street

19 Cos Cob, Connecticut 06807

20 Intervenor, Town of Greenwich:

21 KATIE DeLUCA

22 Director of Planning and Zoning

23 Town Hall

24 101 Field Point Road

25 Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

1           THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and  
2 gentlemen. I'd like to call to order a meeting of  
3 the Siting Council today, Tuesday, January 12,  
4 2016, at approximately 11:05. My name is Robin  
5 Stein. I'm Chairman of the Siting Council.

6           This hearing is a continuation of a  
7 hearing held on September 1, 2015 in Greenwich, on  
8 November 6, 2015 and December 1, 2015, here in New  
9 Britain. It is held pursuant to the provisions of  
10 Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and  
11 of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon  
12 an application from Eversource Energy for a  
13 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and  
14 Public Need for the construction, maintenance and  
15 operation of a 115-kilovolt bulk substation  
16 located at 290 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich,  
17 Connecticut, and two 115-kilovolt underground  
18 transmission circuits extending approximately 2.3  
19 miles between the proposed substation and the  
20 existing Cos Cob Substation, Greenwich,  
21 Connecticut, and related substation improvements.  
22 The application was received by the Council on  
23 June 26, 2015.

24           A verbatim transcript will be made of  
25 this hearing and deposited with the Town Clerk's

1 Office in the Greenwich Town Hall for the  
2 convenience of the public.

3 We will proceed in accordance with the  
4 prepared agenda, copies of which are available  
5 here.

6 The first item: The Council received a  
7 request for party status from the Town of  
8 Greenwich, dated January 11, 2016. Staff  
9 recommends approval.

10 MR. ASHTON: So moved.

11 SENATOR MURPHY: Second, Mr. Chairman.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion and second.

13 All those in favor, signify by saying  
14 aye.

15 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Abstention?

17 (No response.)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

19 Item B --

20 SENATOR MURPHY: Are they going to be  
21 here today? I was just curious. There's another  
22 date, and they're coming, so their  
23 cross-examination will be then?

24 MS. BACHMAN: Their appearance would be  
25 then. Today they would have the opportunity to

1 cross-examine all the other parties and  
2 intervenors, including the applicant, if we can  
3 get to that point.

4 SENATOR MURPHY: So everything dealing  
5 with Greenwich is postponed?

6 MS. BACHMAN: Everything for the town  
7 is postponed.

8 SENATOR MURPHY: I just wanted to get  
9 the ground rules. That's all.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: The Council received a  
11 motion for the Siting Council to direct Eversource  
12 to follow OCC's proposed process to acquire  
13 transformer manufacturer information. This was  
14 dated December 21, 2015 from the Office of  
15 Consumer Counsel. On January 5, 2016, Eversource  
16 Energy filed an objection to the Office of  
17 Consumer Counsel's motion. On January 11, 2016,  
18 the Office of Consumer Counsel filed a response to  
19 Eversource's objection.

20 I will now request Attorney Bachman to  
21 comment.

22 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
23 OCC was granted party status in this proceeding on  
24 July 24th. They've been an active participant,  
25 including the issuance of five sets of

1 interrogatories amounting to 70 total questions.  
2 In OCC Interrogatory Number 56 from Set IV, dated  
3 November 17th, OCC had inquired whether the  
4 applicant had consulted with the manufacturers of  
5 the Cos Cob transformers regarding retrofitting  
6 and upsizing a larger capacity unit.

7           The Applicant did respond to this  
8 interrogatory on November 30th. Thereafter, we  
9 held a hearing on December 1st, at the time at  
10 which OCC had an opportunity to follow up with  
11 cross-examination. However, in the interim the  
12 third supplemental prefile testimony of Kenneth  
13 Bowes, dated January 5, 2016, directly addresses  
14 the question. OCC will have a further opportunity  
15 to cross-examine on the issue or submit its own  
16 exhibit on the issue, if that's their contention.  
17 It's their burden to prove the contention.

18           The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to  
19 deny the motion for Eversource to conduct the  
20 acquisition of manufacturer information.

21           THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will entertain  
22 a motion to deny.

23           MR. LYNCH: So moved.

24           MR. ASHTON: Second.

25           THE CHAIRMAN: Motion and second.



1 Any discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of  
4 the motion to deny, signify by saying aye.

5 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Abstention?

9 (No response.)

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

11 The next item: The Council received a  
12 motion for administrative notice, dated December  
13 23, 2015, from the Office of Consumer Counsel.  
14 These items are listed and highlighted on the  
15 hearing program as Roman numeral III, Items A.2  
16 through 16. Staff recommends approval of the  
17 motion.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: So moved,  
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 MR. LYNCH: Second.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor,  
22 signify by saying aye.

23 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Abstention?

2 (No response.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

4 The Council received a motion to  
5 exclude cross-examination of Applicant on issues  
6 of real property ownership, dated January 5, 2016,  
7 from Eversource Energy. On January 6, 2016, Pet  
8 Pantry Super Discount Stores LLC filed an  
9 objection to Eversource's motion.

10 Attorney Bachman, again, can you please  
11 comment?

12 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 In its December 21st brief on the issue, Pet  
14 Pantry cites to the case of Corcoran v.  
15 Connecticut Siting Council who tell that the  
16 Siting Council has the discretion to consider an  
17 applicant having acquired an interest in real  
18 property during a proceeding. However, that case  
19 is distinguishable as it involved a  
20 telecommunications service provider and an  
21 application for a cell tower on a country club  
22 site that was privately owned, and they had an  
23 agreement to lease a finite amount of space for  
24 the cell tower.

25 The Council had asked whether or not it

1 would be possible for the applicant to move the  
2 location of the cell tower on the country club  
3 property, and the country club declined. The  
4 difference here is this is a public service  
5 company application, and public service companies,  
6 through their charters, through 16-50z of the  
7 Public Utility Environmental Standards Act, have  
8 powers of eminent domain.

9           This Council is the ultimate authority  
10 on the selection of the site and the route for  
11 that transmission line despite any ownership  
12 interests. An applicant cannot begin any eminent  
13 domain proceedings until receipt of a Certificate  
14 of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need.  
15 It cannot exercise the power until they get the  
16 certificate. And again, it is the Council's  
17 authority to determine the site location and  
18 route.

19           This certificate vests the applicant  
20 with that legal authority, and therefore,  
21 Mr. Chairman, in exercising the discretion that  
22 was granted from the Corcoran case, in the  
23 interest of time, efficiency and fairness, I  
24 recommend the Council grant the motion in part as  
25 it relates to cross-examination of real property

1 matters outside of any information in the record  
2 as it stands today; and denied, in part, as it  
3 relates to cross-examination of real property  
4 ownership matters that are already in the record,  
5 such as Section H of the application that Mr.  
6 Hannon was questioning during the hearing on  
7 December 1st.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

9 MR. ASHTON: Move it.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I have a motion.

11 MR. HANNON: Second.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor,  
15 signify by saying aye.

16 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Abstention?

20 (No response.)

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries. Thank  
22 you.

23 The Council also added two items to its  
24 administrative notice list, which are listed as  
25 Roman numeral I, D, Items 21 and 27, Connecticut

1 Siting Council, Petition Number 237, and Docket  
2 Number 304.

3 Do any of the parties or intervenors  
4 object to the inclusion of these notices?

5 (No response.)

6 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman,  
7 good morning. Marianne Barbino Dubuque on behalf  
8 of Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey,  
9 representing CL&P, doing business as Eversource  
10 Energy. We have no objection.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none,  
12 these will be made part of the record.

13 And we'll now proceed with the  
14 appearance of the party, the Office of Consumer  
15 Counsel.

16 And Attorney Bachman, can you please  
17 begin by swearing in the witness?

18 Would you please stand?

19 MS. BIDRA: We don't have witnesses,  
20 Mr. Chairman. If you mean witnesses for the  
21 motion for party status, that's the only document  
22 that we've submitted.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I guess just for that  
24 one.

25 MS. BIDRA: Absolutely.

1 MS. BACHMAN: Will you be the only one  
2 answering questions about the --

3 MS. BIDRA: Well, let's both do it.

4 M A R G A R E T B A I N,

5 L A U R E N H E N A U L T B I D R A,

6 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn  
7 by Ms. Bachman, were examined and testified  
8 on their oaths as follows:

9 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: We just have to go  
11 through the verification of the one exhibit, which  
12 is listed under Roman numeral III, Number 1. I  
13 guess this would go to either or both of you.

14 Did you prepare or assist in the  
15 preparation of Exhibit 1?

16 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Yes, I did.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any  
18 additions, qualifications, deletions or  
19 modifications?

20 THE WITNESS (Bidra): None.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Is this exhibit true and  
22 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

23 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Yes.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer this  
25 exhibit as your testimony here today?

1 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Yes.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: And do you offer it as a  
3 full exhibit?

4 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Yes.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection  
6 from anyone about having this admitted?

7 (No response.)

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing and seeing none,  
9 this item will be admitted as a full exhibit in  
10 the proceeding.

11 (OCC Exhibit III-B-1: Received in  
12 evidence - described in index.)

13 THE CHAIRMAN: And now we'll begin with  
14 the cross-examination. I'll start with staff.

15 Mr. Mercier?

16 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions,  
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll go to  
19 members of the Council.

20 Senator Murphy?

21 SENATOR MURPHY: I don't have any  
22 questions in reference to the document.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashton?

24 CROSS-EXAMINATION

25 MR. ASHTON: I have a couple of

1 questions, if you'll bear with me. I'm having a  
2 little trouble.

3           You are indicating you'd like to get  
4 information about upgrading Cos Cob; is that  
5 correct?

6           THE WITNESS (Bidra): If I may,  
7 respectfully the topic that you're referring to,  
8 Mr. Ashton, does not pertain to the exhibit I  
9 thought we were being cross-examined on.

10           MR. ASHTON: Okay. I have nothing.  
11 I'll pass then. Thank you.

12           THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
13 Commissioner House?

14           MR. HOUSE: I have no questions.

15           THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

16           MR. HANNON: I guess my question to you  
17 is what can we ask questions on and what can't we  
18 ask questions on?

19           MS. BACHMAN: Certainly any of the  
20 information in their request for status you may  
21 ask questions on, if you have a question on  
22 interrogatories that were submitted.

23           MR. HANNON: I have a general question.  
24 In looking at the questions that have been raised  
25 by the office, maybe I'm missing it, but almost



1 everything that I'm seeing it appears to be  
2 related to utility company rates, but I didn't see  
3 much of anything associated with quality of  
4 service, which I believe is also part of the  
5 office's mission. So am I missing something on  
6 that?

7 THE WITNESS (Bidra): If we just may  
8 have one minute, please, to consider that  
9 question?

10 MR. HANNON: Sure.

11 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Thank you.

12 (Pause.)

13 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Thank you,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 Your question, Mr. Hannon, does not  
16 pertain to the exhibit that we're being  
17 cross-examined on, but we would be happy to give  
18 you a general answer right now; and if you want  
19 more specifics, we'd be glad to follow up, but  
20 Ms. Bain can answer generally as to your question.

21 MR. HANNON: Thank you.

22 THE WITNESS (Bain): Generally, I think  
23 with quality of service here I think possibly are  
24 you referring to reliability?

25 MR. HANNON: Yes, and to a degree,

1 redundancy in the system. Because one of the  
2 concerns I have, based on some of the  
3 interrogatories that were presented, it looks as  
4 though there's a focus on possibly expanding the  
5 Cos Cob facility. And if that is the case, and  
6 that's the end of the line, if something happens  
7 at the Cos Cob facility, what does that do for the  
8 Town of Greenwich?

9 THE WITNESS (Bain): Actually the  
10 Consumer Counsel's office is looking for  
11 information. We want to know what the status of  
12 the system is. We're not taking a position.  
13 We're looking for information, and that's our  
14 whole point here. So we are looking for  
15 information.

16 MR. HANNON: Okay. That's my question.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have questions.  
18 These are really just to protect the council  
19 members from anything that might be thrown on  
20 them.

21 I have questions that are based on some  
22 of your interrogatories. And I hope I can get  
23 answers because this is really -- the whole point  
24 of this is, at least from our standpoint, is to  
25 help us make the best decision we can in this

1 case. So because there are just some things  
2 that -- and I assume you have all 70 of them  
3 memorized, so you don't have to take them all out,  
4 but on I think both 22 -- well, not both -- 22,  
5 31, 67, you express concern that Eversource had  
6 used the 2013 peak instead of the average, and  
7 noted that the heat wave we had in 2013 didn't  
8 have 2014 and 2015.

9           And my concern with the question is if  
10 anyone -- and I'm sure you have been following  
11 what led up to the accords signed in Paris by 195  
12 nations. It's not just about the last two or  
13 three years or the last ten years, it's about what  
14 may lie before us. And to insist that Eversource  
15 should take some average and not be concerned  
16 about what the future, as it relates to climate  
17 change, I think is very -- well, my question,  
18 isn't that shortsighted?

19           And I'll just add one more caveat. In  
20 December we had record heat. Now, fortunately as  
21 far as our electric utility is concerned, it  
22 happened in December, but is there anything -- and  
23 without profits. But to say that we couldn't have  
24 that records in July and August, I mean, I just --  
25 well, isn't this comment a bit shortsighted when,

1 as I said, with the exception of some people who  
2 are running for president or Congress, 195 nations  
3 seem to think that climate change is something we  
4 should be concerned about?

5 THE WITNESS (Bain): I think our  
6 questions here, which we are trying to get  
7 information, as I say, on the record about this.  
8 That's our point here in participating, get the  
9 information on the record so everybody can make a  
10 good decision. But one of the issues here with  
11 the forecast is that it's been cast as a  
12 weather-normalized forecast.

13 So I think what you're talking about is  
14 a peak issue that would be abnormal weather. And  
15 I think there's a distinction between how you  
16 design a system, and you might design it for the  
17 abnormal weather, but to call your forecast  
18 weather normalized when you've actually maybe  
19 not -- you know, this is what we're asking  
20 about -- maybe not used a weather-normalized base  
21 is a distinction that we have to bring out.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I guess there's a  
23 distinction between the terms, but I think we  
24 would be remiss if we didn't understand that what  
25 we may call "abnormal" may be the new normal. I'm

1 not sure how you develop that, but I think that's  
2 something we should all be concerned about. Okay.  
3 Thank you.

4           You gave -- it was Exhibit A, so I  
5 assume it was part of the record. This was from  
6 New York State Public Service Commission order  
7 establishing Brooklyn/Queens Demand Management  
8 Program. My initial reaction was why. My second  
9 reaction was, as I read it, I thought it was very  
10 interesting and fascinating. But I guess before I  
11 ask the question -- well, my question is really  
12 are you suggesting that that type of a process be  
13 utilized in this particular docket, or are you  
14 suggesting, which may or may not make more sense,  
15 that this is something that maybe DEEP and PURA  
16 and the Siting Council, and maybe even the  
17 Legislature, should think about on major projects  
18 of requiring such a process, which I think has  
19 some real legitimacy? Of course, remembering in  
20 New York they were talking about a billion-dollar  
21 project. So obviously you submitted it for a  
22 purpose. So what was the purpose?

23           THE WITNESS (Bain): Yes. We submitted  
24 it. I don't think there's much on the record  
25 about non-transmission alternatives, and this is

1 just something to add to the record that we could  
2 look at and consider something that someone else  
3 right next door to us is doing. So it's to make  
4 hopefully a better record so we can look at many  
5 alternatives.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just as I think  
7 my prerogative since I'm here, one, is according  
8 to that record, it said it was not only the first  
9 in New York State, but it was the first in the  
10 country of something like this, not to say that  
11 Connecticut shouldn't be ideally first too but --  
12 and also I noted, to me particular interest, that  
13 although ConEdison was the entity sort of charged  
14 with doing this, it was really a collaborative  
15 partnership between the utility, ConEdison, the  
16 City of New York, and various entities of the City  
17 and the State of New York, so there was a true  
18 partnership in that. If nothing else, it would be  
19 nice to see that coming out of this.

20 Okay. I think you had requested and  
21 you received it from Eversource -- this was  
22 Interrogatory 64 -- about the highest users of  
23 electricity in Eversource's area. And I thought  
24 it was interesting that the third highest is  
25 Greenwich. And just looking on a per capita

1 basis, the table is not per capita, I think  
2 Greenwich would easily be the number one user.

3 Do you have any thoughts of why  
4 Greenwich would be such a large user of  
5 electricity? They're not noted for their industry  
6 certainly. Do you have any --

7 THE WITNESS (Bain): That was going to  
8 be the subject of some of my cross today.

9 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Yes. And  
10 respectfully, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would  
11 be appropriate for us to comment on an Eversource  
12 answer to an interrogatory. We simply asked the  
13 question.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. But you asked the  
15 question, you got an answer, and the answer might  
16 be helpful to us, and to get your evaluation of  
17 the answer might be helpful for us in evaluation.  
18 That's the point of my question.

19 THE WITNESS (Bidra): The Office of  
20 Consumer Counsel has more cross-examination for  
21 the applicant, and perhaps follow-up  
22 cross-examination could elucidate testimony from  
23 the applicant that would get to your question.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the second part of  
25 my question, which you may choose the same answer,

1 is because of what I read from that answer about  
2 the amount of usage in the Town of Greenwich was  
3 are you aware of any significant energy efficiency  
4 measures that the town has undertaken? And there  
5 are some listed in one of the -- I guess they now  
6 will become exhibits from the town, but there  
7 also -- the concentration was on Eversource. And  
8 I guess that gets back to my preceding question  
9 that this really has to be a partnership.

10 So I'm just trying to get from your  
11 standpoint of whether you think, based on your  
12 knowledge and also based on your knowledge, I  
13 assume, of what other towns are doing, and  
14 municipalities, do you think Greenwich is really  
15 dealing with the issue of energy efficiency and  
16 reduction in demand?

17 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Mr. Chairman, we  
18 can certainly revisit this question during our  
19 brief. And now, given the Council's vote that the  
20 Town of Greenwich has been granted party status,  
21 perhaps they could also shed some light on that  
22 question.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: What would be helpful,  
24 and maybe subsequently since you obviously service  
25 the entire state, whereas Greenwich services



1 Greenwich, it would be good to get that broader  
2 perspective, so hopefully you will provide that.  
3 I could name some examples with communities who I  
4 believe have done more and have a grant list  
5 quarter the size of Greenwich. Let me just say  
6 that.

7           There were just a couple of questions  
8 that I couldn't understand in the interrogatories  
9 of relevance. And I don't want to go into detail  
10 but, for example, 36 you had an interrogatory  
11 about tree or no-tree requirements. And why is  
12 that something that the Office of Consumer Counsel  
13 is concerned about?

14           And then 55 was a question about test  
15 borings and potential blasting. I mean, these  
16 questions I think the Town of Greenwich would be  
17 concerned about, but I couldn't quite follow how  
18 these were issues that you were concerned about.  
19 Maybe I just don't understand.

20           THE WITNESS (Bain): I believe you  
21 mentioned OCC-36.

22           THE CHAIRMAN: Right. That was about  
23 no-tree. Why is that --

24           THE WITNESS (Bain): This question goes  
25 to are there any standards that you have to meet

1 before you put something down, a piece of  
2 infrastructure down, you know, as far as  
3 clearances and that type of thing. So that was  
4 that question, and to find out if there's anybody  
5 that puts out those standards or how they get  
6 developed.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: And then in 14, Question  
8 14, what is the relevance of the completed  
9 Stamford Reliability Project to this proceeding?  
10 You asked the question. So what's the takeaway?

11 THE WITNESS (Bain): I think there was  
12 some talk about -- I think this is based on  
13 something that was said previously, and I think  
14 there was some talk about the Stamford/Greenwich  
15 subarea and how it's all interconnected, et  
16 cetera. And so I said, okay, how is it  
17 interconnected. And just recently there was the  
18 Stamford Reliability Project, as you know. And so  
19 I said how is that improving Greenwich, how does  
20 this work, would this go here, you know, how did  
21 that improve Greenwich. Because that's a pretty  
22 recent project, and to see how it would impact the  
23 whole Greenwich system, you know, what  
24 improvements were recently made, and this  
25 supposedly would have been one of them, according

1 to what they said.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. My last question,  
3 which is probably the most important one to me, is  
4 you submitted 70 interrogatories, I believe. You  
5 outdid even the attorney for Pet Pantry. I don't  
6 know whether you were in competition, but in any  
7 case -- and I know you're talking about additional  
8 ones, but eventually -- and I may no longer be  
9 with the Council when you get to that -- the  
10 Council is going to have to make a decision.

11 So I'm trying -- and the reason some of  
12 my questions were asked, I'm trying to get what  
13 are the major concerns, I mean, what alternatives.  
14 I mean, we have to -- which of course could be  
15 total denial, of course, but what -- you've  
16 obviously spent a lot of time and effort on this.  
17 So narrow those 70 interrogatories. What do you  
18 want the Council to really take away from this?

19 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Mr. Chairman, the  
20 70 questions were to learn more information from  
21 the applicant to help form our office's opinions,  
22 which at the close of evidence being taken, we  
23 would be glad to put our opinions down in a brief.  
24 It's still premature to discuss them given that  
25 evidence is still being taken. And perhaps you

1 misheard me earlier. I had meant we have  
2 follow-up cross-examination.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: No, I did hear you.

4 Okay. Anybody else?

5 (No response.)

6 THE WITNESS (Bidra): And if I may add  
7 one thing?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

9 THE WITNESS (Bidra): Our office is  
10 very concerned overall about the application, and  
11 our interest has been piqued, given the high  
12 amount of money at stake to Connecticut ratepayers  
13 if it goes forward.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: We're definitely not in  
15 opposition to that overall objective, but how we  
16 get to the best solution which includes the  
17 standpoint of the ratepayers.

18 Okay. Now we'll continue with  
19 cross-examination by the applicant.

20 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, the  
21 applicant has no questions for OCC. Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll continue with the  
23 other parties, intervenors.

24 Parker Stacy. Is there somebody here?

25 (No response.)

1 THE CHAIRMAN: No.

2 I just advise those who are here, thank  
3 you for coming; but those who are not, you did get  
4 proper notice in a timely way that this hearing  
5 would be -- this would be the date for the  
6 continuation and your opportunity.

7 Pet Pantry?

8 MR. MARCUS: We're prepared to go  
9 forward with additional cross.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Of OCC?

11 MR. MARCUS: No, of the applicant.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: We're not there yet.

13 MR. MARCUS: I didn't think so, but I  
14 wasn't sure what your question exactly said.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: This is just, at the  
16 moment, cross-examination of OCC.

17 Field Point Estate Townhouses?

18 MR. UEDA: I have no questions for OCC.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?

20 MS. EDWARDS: I have no questions at  
21 this time for OCC.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Richard Granoff?

23 (No response.)

24 THE CHAIRMAN: The grouped intervenors,  
25 which are the Bella Nonna Restaurant, Greenwich

1     Chiropractic, Joel Berger and Meg Glass, anybody  
2     representing them have questions?

3                     (No response.)

4             THE CHAIRMAN:   Cecilia Morgan?

5                     (No response.)

6             THE CHAIRMAN:   And now since the Town  
7     of Greenwich is a party, the Town of Greenwich?

8                     (No response.)

9             THE CHAIRMAN:   So thank you very much.

10            MS. BIDRA:    Thank you.

11                     (Witnesses excused.)

12            THE CHAIRMAN:   So the next  
13     cross-examination will be of representatives,  
14     Attorney Marcus, Pet Pantry.  So if you have your  
15     witnesses, you can please come up.

16            MR. MARCUS:   We have no witnesses.

17            THE CHAIRMAN:   Well, you still have to  
18     verify your exhibit, sir.  Maybe you can do it.  
19     In order to verify, you have to be sworn in.

20            MR. MARCUS:   Okay.  I can do that with  
21     Attorney Bergamo.

22            THE CHAIRMAN:   Okay.  Please stand,  
23     whoever it is that's going to be sworn in.

24            MR. BERGAMO:   Excuse me, Mr. Chairman,  
25     I do not know which exhibit that you're talking

1 about.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: It's Pet Pantry Discount  
3 Stores LLC request for party and intervenor  
4 status, dated August 5, 2015. It's your request  
5 to be here. I assume somebody must have prepared  
6 that.

7 MR. BERGAMO: Yes. Yes, I did.

8 M A R K L. B E R G A M O,  
9 called as a witness, being first duly sworn  
10 by Ms. Bachman, was examined and testified on  
11 his oath as follows:

12 MS. BACHMAN: Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Attorney Bergamo, you  
14 have to go through that same process. You offered  
15 the exhibit listed as Roman numeral V, Number 1.  
16 Did you prepare or assist in the preparation of  
17 this exhibit?

18 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Yes, I did.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any  
20 additions, qualifications, deletions or  
21 modifications?

22 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): No, I do not.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Is this exhibit true and  
24 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

25 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): That is

1 correct.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer this  
3 exhibit as your testimony here today?

4 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): That's correct.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer it as a  
6 full exhibit?

7 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Yes, I do.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection  
9 to admitting this exhibit by anybody?

10 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: No objection.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: No objection. So the  
12 exhibit is admitted for the record.

13 (Pet Pantry Exhibit V-B-1: Received in  
14 evidence - described in index.)

15 THE CHAIRMAN: And we'll now start with  
16 staff. Mr. Mercier.

17 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions,  
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Vice Chairman?

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 SENATOR MURPHY: It's not really on  
22 this document. I'll slide over here.

23 So I'll ask the question, which  
24 apparently directly is not supposed to come out,  
25 but your desire to cross-examine on the real



1 estate issue, is it really to demonstrate that in  
2 order to obtain the property that's the subject of  
3 the application that they'll have to go for  
4 eminent domain, or is it something else?

5 MR. MARCUS: Well, the basis for our  
6 interest in crossing on the property issue is to  
7 point out, A, that the record that was made at the  
8 last hearing --

9 SENATOR MURPHY: Just answer it. And  
10 actually, with all due respect, you're not the one  
11 sworn in.

12 Is that the purpose of your desires to  
13 cross-examine?

14 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): There was a  
15 number of reasons for cross-examination, not only  
16 the question of the status, but a question of time  
17 frames, costs, things of that nature, which were  
18 going to affect the project overall.

19 MR. MARCUS: And also the interests --

20 SENATOR MURPHY: Please.

21 MR. MARCUS: May I finish what I have  
22 to say?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: You should have been  
24 sworn in as well, but you chose to stay seated.

25 MR. MARCUS: I'm responding to a

1 question.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: But you have a witness  
3 there who apparently should know everything that  
4 you know.

5 SENATOR MURPHY: I realize that in  
6 asking the question it potentially opens up  
7 Pandora's box, which I don't really want to do. I  
8 really was asking for myself. I have mixed  
9 emotions about whether or not that  
10 cross-examination might not be appropriate in this  
11 case. But be that as it may, the decision has  
12 been made, which is fine with me, but this is my  
13 opportunity to ask the question and get it simply  
14 answered. So the answer is yes with more besides  
15 that?

16 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): It's more  
17 encompassing, that's correct.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you. That's all  
19 I have, Mr. Chairman.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashton?

21 MR. ASHTON: No questions.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

23 MR. HANNON: I have some questions, but  
24 I'm not sure that the people present can answer  
25 them because it's really related to some of the

1 property issues associated with the company that  
2 is there. I mean, I can try.

3 How long has Pet Pantry been at this  
4 location?

5 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I don't have my  
6 notes with --

7 MR. MARCUS: Since about 1970.

8 MR. HANNON: Has the company made some  
9 improvements to the building which in fact sort of  
10 remain with the building, so if they move they  
11 could not take those improvements with them?

12 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): That I could  
13 not say. I do not know.

14 MR. HANNON: Okay. If they've been  
15 there since about 1970, have they ever tried to  
16 purchase the property?

17 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I believe they  
18 have.

19 MR. HANNON: And I'm assuming that that  
20 has not been successful?

21 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): It was a  
22 negotiation. So the bottom line is at this point  
23 in time it has not been successful.

24 MR. HANNON: Because the only reason  
25 I'm bringing this up is because if you have

1 somebody that owns a piece of property and  
2 somebody is renting and the owner decides to sell,  
3 I understand that that may not be in the best  
4 interest of the party that is renting the  
5 property, but unfortunately that's kind of the way  
6 that it goes.

7 MR. MARCUS: The applicant is not the  
8 owner of the property.

9 MR. HANNON: I understand that. And I  
10 was just trying to find out if they had tried to  
11 purchase it, and apparently they had and they have  
12 not been successful, so that's basically where I  
13 was going. So I'm done.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

15 I have just a couple of questions. One  
16 relates -- these are related to your  
17 interrogatories. And if I have it correctly, in  
18 both Interrogatory 17, 18, 22, 34 and 49, you  
19 mention in these numerous interrogatories  
20 apparently your concern, grave concern, over the  
21 possibility that the proposed upgrade to the  
22 facilities that are proposed in Greenwich by  
23 Eversource will somehow be used in or by  
24 communities or persons outside of Greenwich.  
25 Since you asked it so many times, I assume this

1 was not a fishing expedition, but do you have some  
2 basis for your suspicion?

3 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I need to refer  
4 to the actual interrogatories. I cannot recall  
5 them.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Go ahead,  
7 17, 18, 22, 28, 34 and 49, and they're somewhat  
8 repetitive. Some mention towns to the east. Some  
9 mention towns to the west. Some mention you're  
10 concerned that Eversource will somehow be required  
11 to affirm that nobody in those towns will in any  
12 way benefit from this. So you must have some  
13 basis since you mentioned it six times.

14 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Well,  
15 Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me look at them  
16 right off the bat. You said 17, 28 --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Seventeen, 18, 22 --

18 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Basically just  
19 addressing each -- trying to address each one, the  
20 concern was is in the public sense since Pet  
21 Pantry is a business that's located in the Town of  
22 Greenwich, naturally it pays taxes in the Town of  
23 Greenwich. It's concerned about what is going to  
24 be implemented in the Town of Greenwich, and  
25 therefore it was interested in how the Town of

1 Greenwich is going to be affected as well just as  
2 a concerned citizen.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: You've got me so far,  
4 but then your interrogatories I'm lost. So what  
5 difference does it make if by some, I don't know  
6 what, that somebody or some entity in another town  
7 also somehow benefits, what world-shaking event  
8 would that create?

9 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I don't see  
10 anything -- and pardon me if I'm looking at  
11 something that maybe I don't see. I mean, I'm  
12 looking at 17, 17 is dealing with soil samples.  
13 Eighteen was dealing with summer of 2011 customer  
14 load. And am I reading the same ones?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I may have not  
16 given you the proper numbers. I apologize for  
17 that.

18 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, the  
19 numbers are correct. It's from Set I, September  
20 22, 2015.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: So please answer the  
22 question.

23 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Number I?  
24 Pardon me.

25 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: September 22,

1 2015.

2 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Okay, I have  
3 the -- 22 --

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So then I don't  
5 apologize.

6 MR. MARCUS: He believed you were  
7 talking about the second set of interrogatories.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: You gave us 67. I can  
9 understand why some of us might be confused.

10 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I need to find  
11 where my first set is and look at them.

12 (Pause.)

13 THE CHAIRMAN: And if you don't know  
14 how to answer the question, you can say that too.

15 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): At this point  
16 in time I do not, just because --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I just --

18 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I mean, I'm  
19 just going to say in general I was probably  
20 looking at this from an overall standpoint to see  
21 what type of options that were available, what the  
22 type of use was, who the users of the facility  
23 were, whether or not there were any type of  
24 efficiency -- efficient uses of other means of  
25 producing energy or reducing energy demand.

1           THE CHAIRMAN: But this has nothing to  
2 do with that. Your interrogatories harp on that  
3 other towns and other municipalities might be  
4 impacted, and I was just wondering what you base  
5 that on. And obviously since you don't --

6           THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I also wanted  
7 to see whether the electrical services that were  
8 being provided for Greenwich were solely for  
9 Greenwich.

10          THE CHAIRMAN: Right. My question is,  
11 you know, as part of an interconnected system,  
12 Greenwich is unique in it's end of the line. But  
13 if every other municipality that's had this deal  
14 with transmission lines and upgrades to service  
15 the entire grid were to take that same attitude,  
16 I'm not going to ask anymore on that because --

17          THE WITNESS (Bergamo): I would have to  
18 look at this more specifically.

19          THE CHAIRMAN: I'd just appreciate that  
20 next time -- I don't know if there will be a next  
21 time -- but that you try to not go on what I  
22 consider is just a fishing expedition. I'm not a  
23 good fisherman, but I suspect you're, at least on  
24 this one, you're not. And since neither of you,  
25 or since you represent your client, but your



1 client is not there, so I had another couple of  
2 questions, but without the client, I don't think  
3 it would be -- so okay, I'm done.

4 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Okay.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll go on to  
6 cross-examination by the applicant.

7 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: No questions.  
8 Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Office of Consumer  
10 Counsel?

11 MS. BIDRA: No questions. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Field Point Estates?

13 MR. UEDA: No questions.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?

15 MS. EDWARDS: No questions.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Richard Granoff?

17 (No response.)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Grouped intervenors, the  
19 restaurant, chiropractic and the other, anybody  
20 there? No.

21 (No response.)

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

23 (No response.)

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Town of Greenwich?

25 KATIE DELUCA: I would just state my

1 name is Katie DeLuca. I'm the director of  
2 planning and zoning. And the reason I'm not  
3 addressing your question is that I don't speak for  
4 the town, since we've now been made an intervenor  
5 and party status, that's why I'm not directly  
6 responding because I don't believe at this point I  
7 should be speaking on behalf of the town.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. I  
9 will just say it's unfortunate that the town who  
10 knew about this probably before anybody took so  
11 long to decide to be a party.

12 MS. DELUCA: Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Despite receiving what I  
14 consider some excellent documentation, but  
15 obviously now it's just going to prolong this  
16 process. But anyway, thank you for at least  
17 attending.

18 MS. DELUCA: Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 THE WITNESS (Bergamo): Thank you, Mr.  
21 Chairman.

22 (Witness excused.)

23 THE CHAIRMAN: And the next would be  
24 Field Point Estate Townhouses. Remain standing,  
25 and I'll swear you in, please.

1 D W I G H T U E D A,

2 called as a witness, being first duly sworn  
3 by Ms. Bachman, was examined and testified on  
4 his oath as follows:

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Please give your name  
6 for our stenographer.

7 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Dwight Ueda, Field  
8 Point Estate Townhouses.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We also have to  
10 go through the -- we have one exhibit, which was  
11 the initial exhibit -- just go through the same  
12 process which is listed as Roman numeral VI,  
13 Number 1.

14 Did you prepare or assist in the  
15 preparation of this exhibit?

16 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Yes.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any  
18 clarifications, additions, deletions or  
19 modifications?

20 THE WITNESS (Ueda): No.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Is this exhibit true and  
22 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

23 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Yes.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer this  
25 exhibit as your testimony?

1 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Yes.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you offer it as a  
3 full exhibit?

4 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Yes.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection  
6 to this?

7 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: No objection.  
8 Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So the exhibit is  
10 admitted.

11 (Field Point Estate Townhouses Exhibit  
12 VI-B-1: Received in evidence - described in  
13 index.)

14 THE CHAIRMAN: So now cross-examination  
15 by staff?

16 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions, Mr.  
17 Chairman.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: I have no questions,  
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 MR. HANNON: I have no questions.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to totally  
23 waste your time. I have a question.

24 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Okay.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: I think this goes to

1 Items maybe 7 and 8 in the interrogatories where I  
2 believe you questioned Eversource as to their  
3 program for, I call it, conservation demand  
4 management. And you received an answer, so I  
5 won't question you on that, but are you aware of  
6 any programs to reduce demand or conservation that  
7 have been initiated or sponsored specifically by  
8 the town?

9 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Well, the only  
10 thing that I remember getting and that I do  
11 participate in is that I think this happened about  
12 ten years ago where they offered people who lived  
13 maybe in the town or whoever, maybe the customers,  
14 an opportunity to have something put on the air  
15 conditioner so that during peak energy months that  
16 it would basically, I guess, oppress the air  
17 conditioner or do something so that the energy can  
18 be used elsewhere. And we participated in that  
19 program. And I think once I received a check for  
20 the energy that wasn't used, but that was it. And  
21 I still have that attachment on my AC. I don't  
22 know who again --

23 THE CHAIRMAN: It was the utility, and  
24 I also have that attachment on my -- which my  
25 understanding is is that program is no longer in

1 existence other than we have the attachment which  
2 we could maybe try to sell on eBay or something  
3 like that. Okay, that's the only thing.

4 THE WITNESS (Ueda): That's the only  
5 thing I was aware of, and that's the only thing I  
6 participated in.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That's all I  
8 had.

9 I'll go down the list. You'll probably  
10 be able to exit in a short period, my guess.

11 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Okay.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: The applicant,  
13 questions?

14 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: No questions.  
15 Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Office of Consumer  
17 Counsel?

18 MS. BIDRA: Nothing. Thank you,  
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: I'll just name them even  
21 though some people aren't even here.

22 Parker Stacy?

23 (No response.)

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Pet Pantry?

25 MR. MARCUS: No questions.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?

2 MS. EDWARDS: No questions.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Richard Granoff?

4 (No response.)

5 THE CHAIRMAN: The grouped intervenors,  
6 the restaurant, Chiropractic & Nutrition, Mr.  
7 Berger and Ms. Glass?

8 (No response.)

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

10 (No response.)

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Town of Greenwich, you  
12 know, I don't know of any reason, if you had any  
13 questions, why you couldn't. You do work for the  
14 town, but it's your call.

15 MS. DELUCA: No questions. Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very  
17 much.

18 THE WITNESS (Ueda): Thank you.

19 (Witness excused.)

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Next one, Christine  
21 Edwards. Might as well stay standing so you can  
22 be sworn in. Thank you.

23 C H R I S T I N E E D W A R D S ,

24 called as a witness, being first duly sworn

25 by Ms. Bachman, was examined and testified on

1 her oath as follows:

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Also,  
3 Ms. Edwards, you offered one exhibit, Roman  
4 numeral VII, Number 1, so I'll just go through  
5 that list of questions about the preparation of  
6 which was your request for intervenor status.

7 THE WITNESS (Edwards): I did not bring  
8 that with me.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: No, but do you remember  
10 drafting it?

11 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Yes, I do.  
12 Yes. I drafted it myself.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Believe me, that's all.  
14 You just have to answer questions, not --

15 THE WITNESS (Edwards): That's okay. I  
16 thought I brought it with me.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: -- about your drafting  
18 abilities. That's all.

19 Did you prepare or assist in the  
20 preparation of this exhibit?

21 THE WITNESS (Edwards): I did the  
22 exhibit, yes.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any  
24 additions, clarifications, deletions or  
25 modifications?



1 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Not at this  
2 time.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: This may be your only  
4 time, but anyway.

5 THE WITNESS (Edwards): I understand  
6 that now.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Is this exhibit true and  
8 accurate to the best of your knowledge?

9 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Yes, it is.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: And do you offer this  
11 exhibit as your testimony here today?

12 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Yes, I do.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: And do you offer it as a  
14 full exhibit?

15 THE WITNESS (Edwards): At this point I  
16 do.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection  
18 to this exhibit being made part of the record?

19 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Respectfully,  
20 Chairman Stein, I do object to portions of the  
21 prehearing information. I don't object to the  
22 actual request for intervenor status. But if this  
23 information is being submitted into the record and  
24 being attested to as statements of fact, I have an  
25 issue with some of the questions because that's

1 what they are, questions; they're not statements  
2 of fact. So I'm not understanding how these  
3 questions can be attested to as statements for the  
4 record for which the Council can rely on in terms  
5 of its decisionmaking. So if it's being accepted  
6 for purposes of just being comments or rhetorical  
7 questions, that's one thing; but if it's being  
8 accepted as statement of facts, I certainly object  
9 to that.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to just let  
11 it in for what it's worth.

12 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: That would be  
13 fine. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any  
16 objections?

17 (No response.)

18 THE CHAIRMAN: So the exhibit with that  
19 caveat is admitted.

20 (Christine Edwards Exhibit VII-B-1:  
21 Received in evidence - described in index.)

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Now we'll go with the  
23 cross-examination.

24 Mr. Mercier?

25 MR. MERCIER: I have no questions.

1           SENATOR MURPHY: I have no questions,  
2 Mr. Chairman.

3           MR. ASHTON: No questions.

4           MR. HOUSE: No questions.

5           THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon?

6           MR. HANNON: No questions. Thank you.

7           THE CHAIRMAN: No questions. Thank  
8 you.

9           THE WITNESS (Edwards): And anyone  
10 else, do the intervenors have questions?

11          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for correcting  
12 me. We'll see, maybe we will be surprised.

13          Applicant, do you have any questions?

14          MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: No questions.  
15 Thank you.

16          THE CHAIRMAN: Office of Consumer  
17 Counsel?

18          MS. BIDRA: Nothing. Thank you.

19          THE CHAIRMAN: Parker Stacy?

20          (No response.)

21          THE CHAIRMAN: Pet Pantry?

22          MR. MARCUS: No questions.

23          THE CHAIRMAN: Field Point Estate  
24 Townhouses?

25          MR. UEDA: I do.

1 Christine --

2 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: You have to come up.  
4 You can sit right next to --

5 MR. UEDA: Okay. Maybe this will be  
6 helpful.

7 Christine, can you answer the same  
8 question --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Wait until you sit down  
10 and get closer. Give your name again.

11 MR. UEDA: Dwight Ueda, Field Point  
12 Estates. Last name is spelled U-e-d-a.

13 So my question is the same question  
14 that was posed to me. Do you know of any energy  
15 efficiency programs that were -- that solicited  
16 you at your home that are supposed to reduce your  
17 energy usage?

18 THE WITNESS (Edwards): I have a home  
19 that's very young that I built, so I have the  
20 highest level that I could get for any of my  
21 energy efficiencies. But I have had regular  
22 ongoing phone calls from time to time from a  
23 vendor who purports to lower your usage by going  
24 solar, which my husband and I are looking at very  
25 seriously.

1           And in addition to that is the general  
2 let's come into your house and do your water  
3 heater, wrap it, you know, all of these things  
4 that aren't necessary for a brand new house. We  
5 have, again, very high energy efficiencies on it.

6           MR. UEDA: Any from the town or  
7 Eversource?

8           THE WITNESS (Edwards): The town was  
9 the offer to attend for solar energy which, again,  
10 has piqued our interest and we're still interested  
11 to do. Because of the way we have formatted the  
12 use of electricity in the house, we are using  
13 probably a third of what our neighbor has for the  
14 same size house by, instead of using our large air  
15 conditioner, we're using room air conditioners so  
16 we don't keep the house completely cool during  
17 that whole whatever the day is because we're out  
18 working. So that has brought our energy use down,  
19 and that was something that I had talked about  
20 with a friend who is a builder and an engineer.

21           But the town had brought up information  
22 for the solar usage and also this -- and I don't  
23 know who the vendor is because I've never been  
24 able to take a call that always comes in while I'm  
25 driving -- that offers ways to, again, I believe

1 solar activity and to look at that efficiency. So  
2 it is something that I'm looking at. But I  
3 wouldn't say that I get anything really to speak  
4 of in my bill.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other  
6 questions?

7 MR. UEDA: No, that's it.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

9 Mr. Granoff?

10 (No response.)

11 THE CHAIRMAN: The grouped intervenors  
12 from the restaurant, Chiropractic & Nutrition?

13 (No response.)

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Berger and Ms.  
15 Glass?

16 (No response.)

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Cecilia Morgan?

18 (No response.)

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Town of Greenwich?

20 MS. DELUCA: Nothing.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

22 THE WITNESS (Edwards): Thank you very  
23 much.

24 (Witness excused.)

25 THE CHAIRMAN: The next intervenor, but

1 I'm not sure he's here, Mr. Granoff? Is he here?

2 (No response.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there at least one  
4 representative from the grouped intervenors, the  
5 Bella Nonna Restaurant & Pizzeria, Greenwich  
6 Chiropractic & Nutrition, Joel Berger and Meg  
7 Glass, anybody in that grouping?

8 (No response.)

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Most unfortunate.  
10 Okay. Next intervenor, Cecilia Morgan?

11 (No response.)

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Again, not here.

13 The next one on the list is the Town of  
14 Greenwich, but we understand there will be a  
15 subsequent meeting, and we hope that you'll be  
16 prepared for that or tell whoever it is to be  
17 prepared for that.

18 MS. DELUCA: I will certainly relay  
19 that message. And we intend to be here for that.  
20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Needless to say, I think  
22 the Siting Council is very much interested in  
23 hearing from the Town. We've heard in writing  
24 but --

25 So now, I guess, we'll go to

1 cross-examination of the applicant. So if you  
2 could, you have to move, and whoever else is to  
3 participate in the cross from Eversource's  
4 standpoint --

5 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we take a  
7 five-minute break for those that need to stretch  
8 or something.

9 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from  
10 12:12 p.m. until 12:17 p.m.)

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's now good  
12 afternoon, but we'll now resume with the  
13 appearance of the applicant, Eversource Energy, to  
14 verify new exhibits, Roman numeral II, Items B-38  
15 through 41.

16 Attorney Dubuque, can you identify --  
17 are all of your witnesses already sworn?

18 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Yes,  
19 Mr. Chairman. We have Mr. Bowes, Mr. Gagnon, Ms.  
20 Gardell and Mr. Libertine who were sworn in at the  
21 very first hearing.

22 M I C H A E L P. L I B E R T I N E,  
23 J A C Q U E L I N E A. G A R D E L L,  
24 R A Y M O N D L. G A G N O N,  
25 K E N N E T H B. B O W E S,



1           called as witnesses, being previously duly  
2           sworn, were examined and continued to testify  
3           on their oaths as follows:

4                   MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: And beginning  
5           with Exhibits 39, 40 and 41, Eversource Energy  
6           responses to Council interrogatories, Set III,  
7           dated January 5, 2016; Eversource Energy  
8           Late-Filed Exhibits 8 through 14, dated January 5,  
9           2016; and Eversource Energy responses to OCC  
10          interrogatories, Set V, dated January 5, 2016; I  
11          would like to ask Mr. Bowes, Mr. Gagnon and Ms.  
12          Gardell, did you prepare or oversee the  
13          preparation of these exhibits?

14                   THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I did.

15                   THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I did.

16                   THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, I did.

17                   MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Are there any  
18          corrections, clarifications or additions?

19                   THE WITNESS (Bowes): There are none.

20                   THE WITNESS (Gagnon): There are none.

21                   THE WITNESS (Gardell): There are none.

22                   MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: And to the best  
23          of your knowledge, is the information in these  
24          exhibits true and accurate?

25                   THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

1 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it is.

2 THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, it is.

3 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: And do you adopt  
4 the information in Exhibits 39, 40 and 41 as full  
5 exhibits?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I do.

7 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, I do.

8 THE WITNESS (Gardell): Yes, I do.

9 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: And also as to  
10 Exhibit 39, Question 1A; and Late-File 14, which  
11 is part of Exhibit 40, I would like to also ask  
12 Mr. Libertine if he prepared the photo simulations  
13 and provided the information on drainage or did he  
14 oversee the preparation of that information?

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes.

16 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Is it true and  
17 accurate?

18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, it is.

19 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Are there any  
20 corrections, clarifications or additions?

21 THE WITNESS (Libertine): No.

22 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Turning back to  
23 Exhibit 38, which is Eversource Energy third  
24 supplemental testimony of Kenneth Bowes, dated  
25 January 5, 2016, Mr. Bowes, did you prepare or

1 oversee the preparation of the supplemental  
2 prefile testimony?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I did.

4 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Are there any  
5 corrections, clarifications or additions?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There are not.

7 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: To the best of  
8 your knowledge, is the information in this exhibit  
9 true and accurate?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

11 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Do you adopt the  
12 information in Exhibit 38 as your sworn testimony  
13 and a full exhibit?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I do.

15 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you.

16 Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request  
17 that the Council admit into evidence as full  
18 exhibits 38, 39, 40 and 41. Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

20 Does any party or intervenor object to  
21 the admission of the applicant's new exhibits?

22 (No response.)

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I assume silence means  
24 no, so the exhibits are admitted.

25 (Applicant Exhibits II-B-38-41:

1 Received in evidence - described in index.)

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I will now begin  
3 cross-examination by Mr. Mercier.

4 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 MR. MERCIER: I just have a few  
7 questions regarding the submittal of Exhibit  
8 Numbers 39 and 40.

9 (Whereupon, Mr. Caron entered the  
10 hearing room.)

11 MR. MERCIER: This is essentially  
12 attached as a single packet, responses to  
13 Council's interrogatories and Late-Filed exhibits,  
14 and also responses to OCC's interrogatories.

15 Turn to the photo simulations.  
16 Mr. Libertine, I just have a few questions  
17 regarding those. For the tower simulations in the  
18 photos, what height was used to create a  
19 representative potential view?

20 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Just bear  
21 with us just one second.

22 MR. MERCIER: Sure.

23 (Pause.)

24 THE WITNESS (Libertine): The heights  
25 vary on the location, and they were anywhere from

1 80 feet to approximately 130-feet tall.

2 MR. MERCIER: So the variation of this  
3 potential loop was already known in the initial  
4 design phase, I guess I'll call it, or preliminary  
5 phase?

6 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes and no.  
7 Several alternatives were originally looked at  
8 over the past few years. When we looked at this  
9 particular option, when requested, one of the  
10 things we did was to work with the line engineers  
11 to understand what sags would be appropriate, what  
12 the clearances were.

13 So to answer your question, it was not  
14 one of our original designs, but we have gone back  
15 and looked to at least provide as accurate  
16 information as we possibly could if we had to  
17 design and build that.

18 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So I'll just flip  
19 through. If you had the specific heights per  
20 image of the grade, if you knew, for instance,  
21 Photo 1, would you know what the preliminary  
22 design was?

23 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Excuse me,  
24 Mr. Chairman, would it be helpful if we posted  
25 Photo 1 on the screen?

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

2 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: We have the author of  
4 our technology here, so we might as well use it.

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Mercier,  
6 I apologize, I did not bring the actual line  
7 profiles we worked off of. So if there are  
8 specific questions to each one of these, could I  
9 provide that at a later time? I can provide some  
10 guidance here, but I just don't have the profile  
11 with me, and we worked off a specific engineering  
12 profile.

13 MR. MERCIER: My question just pertains  
14 to what was shown on this specific profile, so  
15 that could obviously be provided a little bit  
16 later.

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Okay.

18 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

19 I'm going to flip over to Photo Number  
20 5 and also to Number 6. I guess I'll begin with  
21 Photo 5. It's looking down the Eversource  
22 right-of-way, and you put a photo simulation of a  
23 tower there. I understand you have minimum  
24 clearance requirements to put such structures in a  
25 crowded corridor such as this. Is the design

1 shown or your profile that you worked with, is  
2 that designed to the minimum clearance standard,  
3 or is there some other leeway that was thrown into  
4 the design?

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Yes, that's  
6 the closest that we're allowed by code to be next  
7 to the railroad catenary, which is a limiting  
8 factor in that particular area. Just for  
9 everyone's orientation, we're looking generally  
10 east, northeast. That's the south side of the  
11 rail line.

12 MR. MERCIER: So essentially the height  
13 of the tower would be determined by the distance  
14 to the railroad catenary. What about the trees to  
15 the right, would those have to be cut or trimmed,  
16 or is there enough clearance there also?

17 THE WITNESS (Libertine): We did not  
18 eliminate trees in any of the photos, just for the  
19 record. Our feeling is when we were in the field  
20 we were able to more or less provide at least a  
21 minimum of 25 feet to any, what I'll call, mature  
22 trees. There were some scrub vegetation that may  
23 have to go, but we're fairly confident that from a  
24 tree clearing standpoint there's not a substantive  
25 amount of trees that are going to have to be

1 modified to accommodate that line.

2 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So that's for the  
3 entire line along the railway?

4 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Along the  
5 rail line itself, correct.

6 MR. MERCIER: I'm going to flip to --

7 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Mr. Mercier,  
8 it was just brought to my attention we should  
9 probably get this on the record. Again, we were  
10 looking at it strictly as a corridor for allowing  
11 allowances for the poles' clearances. What might  
12 be factored in is if there needs to be some  
13 expansion of the access into that area. So if  
14 that has to widen a bit, that could impact a few  
15 trees on the margin.

16 MR. MERCIER: I assume that would  
17 probably be in each pole construction location?

18 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Right, for  
19 pads and for access around it, correct.

20 MR. MERCIER: Bear with me for a  
21 moment. In this same package I'm going to turn to  
22 the enlarged segment routes that were provided.  
23 They're photos of the potential segment routes in  
24 response to Late-File Number 8. This Segment 4B,  
25 which is the last segment in that series of



1 photographs, and it shows the underground route  
2 coming from Steamboat Road and then down Railroad  
3 Avenue to the substation location. And I just  
4 noticed -- I didn't see it elsewhere in any other  
5 documents -- it looks like there's a potential  
6 easement on the property at 280 Railroad Avenue.  
7 I'm not understanding what that easement is for.

8 THE WITNESS (Gardell): Just to  
9 clarify, is that the overhead or the underground  
10 option?

11 MR. MERCIER: It's the underground  
12 route, according to this diagram. It's labeled  
13 page 9 of 9, question LF-008.

14 THE WITNESS (Gardell): We're not sure  
15 if we need to minimize to get a getaway for the  
16 XLPE. We're trying to minimize the number of  
17 bends, so we might have to cut across the front  
18 edge of that property. So it's outlined a little  
19 bit more than probably it should be.

20 MR. MERCIER: Okay. So instead of the  
21 red line going through the word "railroad," it  
22 might cut across?

23 THE WITNESS (Gardell): It might have  
24 to cut across.

25 MR. MERCIER: Thank you.

1           Mr. Bowes, I believe you testified at  
2 the last hearing that construction of this  
3 potential railroad overhead line would be in  
4 coordination with already-scheduled railroad  
5 outages scheduled in the next year or two; is that  
6 correct?

7           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Where possible,  
8 yes. I mean, there may be some individual daily  
9 outages that would be required for conductor  
10 pulling. As we cross over the railroad tracks,  
11 there may be specific instances where rail outages  
12 would be required that are in addition to what's  
13 already in the multi-year plan that Metro-North  
14 has.

15           MR. MERCIER: For the multi-year plan  
16 that Metro-North has, is it a long duration  
17 project they have?

18           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, it is.

19           MR. MERCIER: Is it typically day or  
20 night, or is it down for a week for the railroad  
21 outages, a specific railroad line, do they  
22 typically do it in short windows?

23           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Again, there's a  
24 long list of outages that they need to take for  
25 their own work, and Eversource, as well as United

1 Illuminating, are trying to work within those  
2 existing planned outages they have. Some of those  
3 are very long in duration where the entire track  
4 is being relocated, others are shorter duration,  
5 which we may be able to coordinate with as well.

6 MR. MERCIER: If the potential railroad  
7 transmission line, the red line, was selected,  
8 what would be the approximate construction time on  
9 that, completed within two years?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would clearly  
11 be less than two years and would fit within the  
12 project in-service date at this point.

13 MR. MERCIER: I have no other questions  
14 at this time.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

16 Senator Murphy?

17 SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you,  
18 Mr. Chairman.

19 I just have a couple of questions in  
20 reference to the recent pre-filed testimony of  
21 Mr. Bowes and in talking about the replacement of  
22 transformers at Cos Cob, January 5th. It's very  
23 short, and it was filed January 5th, and on page  
24 3.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I have it.

1           SENATOR MURPHY: It discusses the  
2 evaluation of the 36/48/60, whatever the heck that  
3 means. But in any event, on the top of Page 3 it  
4 indicates that they were "insufficient to meet the  
5 load requirements." It then goes on to indicate  
6 that they weren't being used because there's space  
7 limitations.

8           Which of the two is the reason you're  
9 giving Consumer Counsel for not using, or do I  
10 misunderstand what it says here?

11           THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we looked at  
12 both types of transformers. We used just maximum  
13 ratings, the 60 MVA or the 80 MVA transformers,  
14 and we used both of those for comparison purposes  
15 and looked at the Eversource standards for those  
16 transformer sizes and applied those to the  
17 existing footprint within Cos Cob Substation and  
18 determined that we did not have adequate  
19 electrical clearances to place larger transformers  
20 within the Cos Cob Substation.

21           SENATOR MURPHY: What do you mean by  
22 "electrical clearance"?

23           THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we have to  
24 maintain some minimum separation between energized  
25 electrical parts and grounded electrical parts,

1 foundations and structures that support insulators  
2 and things like that. There are minimum distances  
3 we have to maintain. In the case of the 80 MVA  
4 transformers, they would physically hit each  
5 other. That's how close the spacing is. With the  
6 60 MVA transformers, they are so close that we  
7 could not work around them, the door openings and  
8 things like that could not be maintained. We  
9 build our substations today to an IEEE standard  
10 that seeks 50-foot minimum clearance between  
11 transformers or to put firewalls in where we can't  
12 attain that separation.

13 SENATOR MURPHY: Okay. Let me ask you  
14 this: Is there room at Cos Cob for anymore  
15 transformers?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There is not  
17 within the existing Cos Cob Substation.

18 SENATOR MURPHY: There's room for none.

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So what we looked  
20 at was enlarging ones that are presently there.

21 SENATOR MURPHY: My fellow member to  
22 the right said under what existing circumstances  
23 could there be more room?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): You'd have to  
25 acquire additional property, and then you'd also

1 have to have the capability of providing the  
2 higher voltage interconnection to the transmission  
3 system, as well as the lower voltage, in this case  
4 27-kV equipment that would feed the Town of  
5 Greenwich. That was an alternative that we looked  
6 at ultimately, the distribution alternative, and  
7 there were some property considerations included  
8 in that.

9           SENATOR MURPHY: Of the anticipated  
10 load that you intend to handle at the new  
11 facility, which is the subject of this  
12 application, is there any percentage of that  
13 anticipated load that could be handled by some  
14 improvements at Cos Cob?

15           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Based on the  
16 physical separation of the transformers today, I  
17 would say no there is not.

18           SENATOR MURPHY: So essentially what  
19 you're telling me, if there's any meaningful  
20 increase in need at Cos Cob, the new substation is  
21 necessary, that's your opinion?

22           THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is my  
23 opinion, yes.

24           SENATOR MURPHY: Okay. I have nothing  
25 else at this time, Mr. Chairman.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ashton?

2 MR. ASHTON: If I may, Mr. Chairman, we  
3 received two replies in OCC-5 data request. They  
4 have not been admitted yet, have they? That's  
5 this table here? They are? Okay.

6 Just some housekeeping items on the two  
7 data requests from OCC. The first one is OCC-5,  
8 and the reply is dated December 22nd. One of the  
9 things that's haunted me about this whole  
10 application is that we talk about ratings,  
11 loadings and whatnot, and we never really  
12 precisely pinned down what that rating is. Is it  
13 a two-hour rating? What is it? And I would be  
14 very grateful if the Applicant could quickly clean  
15 this one up and pin down what are the ratings that  
16 are used. It does specify to a certain extent,  
17 but not all of it, and I'm looking to try and  
18 figure out consistency and thoroughness. Is that  
19 unreasonable?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So again, we're  
21 talking about, just to be crystal clear, we're  
22 talking about the ratings of the 27-kV  
23 transformers?

24 MR. ASHTON: Right, transformer  
25 ratings, peak load ratings, what have you. I just

1 want to pin down exactly what that is so we're  
2 sure we're talking a consistent story.

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Let's go to the  
4 maximum rating of each transformer.

5 MR. ASHTON: Okay.

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's a  
7 nameplate rating on that with all the fans and  
8 pumps in operation.

9 MR. ASHTON: That's what I would call  
10 FOA, FOA, but that's probably obsolete now.

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the maximum  
12 rating that that transformer at nameplate was  
13 rated for by the manufacturer.

14 MR. ASHTON: And for a certain finite  
15 period of time?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): For continuous  
17 operation.

18 MR. ASHTON: Right. That's exactly the  
19 kind of information I want to get here so we can  
20 be sure we're talking about the same thing. I'm  
21 worried that somebody is talking one thing and  
22 somebody is talking another.

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So in this case  
24 that OF/OA or OF/AF rating for the 1X transformer  
25 the nameplate is 50.4 MVA. For the 2X transformer



1 it's 46.7 MVA. And for the 3X transformer it's  
2 46.7 MVA. So the three ratings together are the  
3 nameplate maximum rating continuous operation for  
4 those three transformers.

5 MR. ASHTON: Perfect. That's exactly  
6 what I'm looking for.

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Now Eversource  
8 goes well beyond that. We're willing to accept  
9 additional risk on our equipment and put a rating  
10 on them for short periods of time that are far  
11 above the nameplate rating.

12 MR. ASHTON: Why don't you tell the  
13 story.

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we start with  
15 a nameplate rating, so maximum nameplate ratings.  
16 We take the temperature data from the factory  
17 acceptance tests and input that into a thermal  
18 model.

19 MR. ASHTON: You're talking about the  
20 temperature data of the transformer under certain  
21 conditions?

22 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct, from the  
23 actual manufacturer and when it was assembled and  
24 tested.

25 MR. ASHTON: Fine.

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): We look at a  
2 period of time, a 24-hour period for the normal  
3 load cycle, or a 72-hour cycle where the  
4 transformer load is increased above that, and it's  
5 what's called in general terms a thermal run on  
6 the transformer.

7           MR. ASHTON: Right.

8           THE WITNESS (Bowes): It calculates  
9 what temperatures for the oil inside the  
10 transformer and what temperatures for the windings  
11 inside the transformer are attained during that  
12 thermal run.

13          MR. ASHTON: And your concern here is  
14 that excessive temperature deteriorates the  
15 windings and could cause transformer failure?

16          THE WITNESS (Bowes): Or the insulation  
17 as well, right, the windings, insulation, or a hot  
18 spot would develop. That's a term that's normally  
19 used. The maximum temperature within the  
20 transformer enclosure becomes a limiting factor in  
21 how much load you can have on that transformer  
22 over the course of time.

23          MR. ASHTON: Okay. Thank you. That's  
24 good. Your actual peak is an hourly or a  
25 15-minute peak?

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is an hourly  
2 peak.

3           MR. ASHTON: It's an hourly peak. And  
4 for 15 minutes you could go higher than that?

5           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, by  
6 definition, you would in the maximum one-hour  
7 interval you will probably have four 15-minute  
8 intervals that are not identical. So there will  
9 be some that are lower than the peak and some that  
10 are above the one-hour peak.

11          MR. ASHTON: Okay. Now, would that  
12 kind of logic also apply to the feeder capacity?

13          THE WITNESS (Bowes): The same logic is  
14 applied, although it's a very different dynamic.  
15 The feeder capacity, again, these are different  
16 types of cable. There are paper and lead cables,  
17 there are extruded insulation solid dielectric  
18 insulation cables, and we rate them based upon,  
19 again, the ampacity rating from the manufacturer  
20 for a normal continuous rating and assume that  
21 there is a certain conduit fill.

22          So the spacing of underground cables  
23 becomes a very critical determinant in the  
24 ampacity or capacity of those cables. And then we  
25 operate, again, in the same manner. We rate them

1 far above the nameplate or manufacturer ratings of  
2 those cables for short periods of time. We're  
3 willing to accept a loss of life of the  
4 insulation. For example, cables are normally  
5 rated around 90 degrees C for short periods of  
6 time. We'll allow those temperatures to go to 135  
7 degrees C.

8 MR. ASHTON: Is it fair to say that  
9 utilities in general and Eversource, in  
10 particular, push the capability of their equipment  
11 so that they get the maximum capacity that's  
12 reasonable out of it without jeopardizing its  
13 physical integrity?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I would say that  
15 in general that's an industry-accepted practice.  
16 However, many utilities now are only using  
17 nameplate ratings. They will not allow their  
18 equipment to tolerate increased loading, even for  
19 short periods of time.

20 MR. ASHTON: And is the reason for that  
21 out of fear of loss of capability of the  
22 equipment?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's twofold:  
24 It's one, for damage to the equipment; and the  
25 second is is the age of the equipment. This may

1 be fine to do for the first 10 years, 20 years, 30  
2 years, 40 years of a piece of equipment, but at a  
3 certain period of time the ability for it to  
4 continue to operate at those extreme temperatures  
5 becomes a risk factor.

6 MR. ASHTON: Okay. OCC-5, page 1 of 1,  
7 lists overhead transmission lines in Metro-North  
8 railroad corridors. That white hair on what  
9 little hair I have takes me back to some dates  
10 that go to precede this, and I had some questions  
11 on it. Under year of construction is that the  
12 year of initial construction? I'll wait until you  
13 get the paper. I'm sorry.

14 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, that is  
15 correct.

16 MR. ASHTON: So, by way of non-specific  
17 example, the transmission system may have begun as  
18 a 69-kV double circuit line, and then it evolved  
19 over time into a double circuit 115-kV line; is  
20 that fair to say?

21 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is true,  
22 yes.

23 MR. ASHTON: So that Cos Cob to  
24 Greenwich -- the first one, Cos Cob Substation,  
25 the Southend Substation, which is listed as 115 in

1 1971, there weren't any 115 in 1971 there, was  
2 there; it was 69?

3 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That's true,  
4 yes.

5 MR. ASHTON: And Southend, Stamford to  
6 Norwalk, 115 in 1967, that strikes me as being a  
7 little bit too recent because wasn't those  
8 circuits built as part of Norwalk Harbor coming on  
9 line in the early sixties, 1959 to 1961, I  
10 believe?

11 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): My little  
12 understanding is that there's two sets of line in  
13 that area.

14 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?

15 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): My understanding  
16 there is there's two sets or two parts of that  
17 line. One part was built in 1967, and the other  
18 part was built later.

19 MR. ASHTON: Well, there was no 113  
20 down at Southend in 1967 -- pardon me. I beg your  
21 pardon. It was earlier than '67, 1961 or '59  
22 probably. That's fair enough. You don't have to  
23 stay after school if you don't know.

24 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Okay. Thanks.

25 MR. ASHTON: Southend to Norwalk, 1937,

1 that would be a 69-kV line, wouldn't it?

2 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes, it would.

3 MR. ASHTON: Okay. And so on. There  
4 could be a few other minor things there.

5 One question that I asked at our last  
6 soiree about a month ago, maybe a little longer,  
7 was what's going on in New York State, and I  
8 haven't seen an answer to it. I don't object to  
9 an oral reply, but can you tell us what, if  
10 anything, there is in New York State that would be  
11 helpful in this situation?

12 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may  
13 I just point to Late-File 13? There is  
14 information that Eversource supplied, but I'm sure  
15 the witnesses will be happy to discuss it further.

16 MR. ASHTON: I confess I have not been  
17 absolutely diligent in following all paper coming  
18 in, and I apologize.

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Is it okay if we  
20 put it up on the screen?

21 MR. ASHTON: That would be wonderful.  
22 Thank you so much.

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the question  
24 we had from the last hearing was investigate  
25 having, in essence, 50 megawatts supplied from New

1 York. And we did look at some alternatives for  
2 that, and they're listed here. The distribution  
3 alternative to start with would require us to  
4 provide circuits at 13.2 kV to feed the existing  
5 Byram Substation and also the existing Prospect  
6 Substation. So those are detailed here in items  
7 number --

8 MR. ASHTON: They're both pretty close  
9 to New York, aren't they? Byram is right on the  
10 New York line.

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think it was --  
12 I can't recall exactly how long. There's not a  
13 great distance, no. We assumed that those would  
14 be built from the New York border to those two  
15 existing substations in Greenwich. We thought  
16 we'd probably need some feeder regulation just  
17 because now we're using two sources, one from Cos  
18 Cob, and one from New York. And the ultimate  
19 buildout would also include the same design we  
20 proposed for our own Greenwich Substation  
21 interconnecting the 13.2-kV feeders at North  
22 Greenwich and at the new Greenwich Substation. We  
23 would gain the same or very similar reliability  
24 benefits of a preferred and alternate source for  
25 13.2-kV customers in Greenwich. So to try to make



1 it apples and apples.

2 That all is fairly easy to do. That is  
3 contained within the State of Connecticut, and it  
4 assumes that there is a supply right across the  
5 border in New York. Unfortunately that's not the  
6 case.

7 MR. ASHTON: I was going to say that's  
8 the \$64 million question.

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the next part  
10 of this goes into two different options for a  
11 transmission source in the State of New York, and  
12 they are common or they are related in some  
13 manner. So if we were to supply -- continue on  
14 with that distribution alternative that we  
15 presented, we would have the substation located  
16 just across the New York border. That would  
17 require us to build a new or require ConEd to  
18 build a new bulk substation right across the  
19 border in New York. We thought that the closest  
20 place, and confirmed with ConEd, would be the  
21 Eastview Substation, which is a ConEd substation  
22 located in Hawthorne, New York, and that's about 7  
23 miles away from the New York border where we would  
24 interconnect the distribution systems.  
25 Unfortunately it does not have a 115-kV source at

1 that substation, so we would be required to put an  
2 autotransformer in from 345 to 115 kV. The length  
3 of the --

4 MR. ASHTON: Excuse me, isn't their  
5 system over there 138 kV?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe it is  
7 at that comparable voltage, correct. So I guess  
8 it could be -- ultimately it could be 345 to 138  
9 kV, because we were only really interested in the  
10 lower voltage sources at 13.2 kV.

11 So we looked at that alternative. The  
12 distribution portion of this is approximately  
13 twice the cost of the distribution portion for the  
14 Greenwich Substation. And the transmission,  
15 although we did not cost it out, because it's 7  
16 miles away versus 2.3 miles away, if you just  
17 assume the similar type of construction  
18 underground, and I don't believe there are any  
19 rights-of-way available, so the likely source  
20 would be an underground supply, two circuits at  
21 about 7 miles each. So you're looking at about 14  
22 circuit miles versus about 4.6 circuit miles for  
23 the Connecticut solution. And there's also  
24 additional costs at Eastview Substation.

25 MR. ASHTON: What you're gently telling

1 me is that, forget it, Phil, it's time to move on  
2 and think of something else; is that fair?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we looked at  
4 another alternative, which would be to supply the  
5 Greenwich Substation in the proposed location from  
6 New York, Eastview Substation in Hawthorne. So  
7 again, that case would be a transmission  
8 alternative the entire way to the same Greenwich  
9 Substation that we're proposing. That again would  
10 be more costly because it's about 14 miles away,  
11 and then the transmission conductor runs would be  
12 more than --

13 MR. ASHTON: The Chairman may rap my  
14 knuckles, but I can remember doing studies on this  
15 exact question 45 years ago, and the answer came  
16 out the same way, forget about it.

17 So let's move on. Thank you. I  
18 appreciate that. But I thought it was important  
19 to get it in the record because it is conceivably  
20 an option.

21 I was very pleased to read Exhibit  
22 HD-01, Late-Filed Question 3, which gives  
23 estimated cost of transmission line routes. I  
24 applaud the applicant for doing their little speed  
25 work and coming up with a substantial savings on

1 the first leg of transmission from the Greenwich  
2 Substation to Steamboat Road.

3 Now, having done so brilliantly there,  
4 what's the encore to go a little further? Is this  
5 something now that we ought to seriously consider  
6 in following this underground route all the way  
7 because 22 million bucks ain't bad savings off the  
8 top? Are you with me?

9 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Almost with you.

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So this is the  
11 overhead alternative along Metro-North Railroad  
12 split between on either side of the railroad with  
13 an XLPE solution at the end of it supplying the  
14 proposed Greenwich Substation?

15 MR. ASHTON: Right.

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So what we've  
17 heard so far from the various stakeholders and  
18 from the Council is that we need to sharpen the  
19 pencil and look at other alternatives, including  
20 this one. We have confirmed it with the  
21 Connecticut Department of Transportation, and it  
22 is a viable constructible solution. It avoids  
23 some of the sensitive areas that the Town of  
24 Greenwich is concerned about in Bruce Park. It  
25 addresses some of the concerns of the OCC with the

1 cost of the project. Again, it would lower the  
2 cost about 20-plus million dollars. It is a  
3 viable route variation to what we've proposed, and  
4 we would build it if the Council approved that  
5 option.

6 MR. ASHTON: Fine. Can we sharpen at  
7 all the overhead portion? And let me -- forgive  
8 me, my thought processes are somewhat screwed up.  
9 I'm having trouble with short-term memory. In  
10 this specific document you show a double-circuit  
11 restrained conductor overhead solution. Is that  
12 the one that we really want to think about, or, or  
13 could we use a single-circuit restrained conductor  
14 solution where one circuit is on the north side of  
15 the tracks and one circuit is on the south side of  
16 the tracks? That gets you out of the one failure  
17 causing a catastrophic situation. I'm looking for  
18 a little help here. There are instances in  
19 Connecticut, and elsewhere, where a restrained  
20 conductor is used. I'm not too familiar with  
21 anywhere there's a double circuit, and that's what  
22 I'm poking at a little bit.

23 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): We did look  
24 at -- you know, we looked at -- we broke up that  
25 whole path into four segments. In Segment 3 we

1 did look at the possibility of going with --

2 MR. ASHTON: Would you raise your voice  
3 a bit? I'm sorry.

4 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm sorry. We  
5 broke the whole project into like four segments,  
6 and the third segment along the railroad, this is  
7 west of Indian Harbor, we looked at going with two  
8 structures, one on each side of the railroad, with  
9 the post insulators facing in to that. The trick  
10 with that piece is although it really narrowed the  
11 right-of-way, which is what we were trying to do  
12 there, it also increased the number of poles that  
13 we're actually putting in the ground, so we're  
14 doubling the construction effort.

15 MR. ASHTON: You're damned if you do  
16 and damned if you don't.

17 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Right.

18 MR. ASHTON: What do you do?

19 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): So when we  
20 looked at it, we looked at, you know, going on the  
21 south part of the railroad along what we call  
22 Segment 2 and 3, and then keep that continuous and  
23 not going to a double structure. That's what we  
24 kind of looked at as the recommended best  
25 alternative.

1           MR. ASHTON: Is there any reasonable --  
2 I'll use the word advisedly -- reasonable option  
3 to go underground going out of Greenwich to  
4 Steamboat Road and then either -- and then a  
5 mixture of overhead and underground going further  
6 east? And I don't know where to put it. Did you  
7 look at a combination?

8           THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Well, Segment 4,  
9 which is pretty much from Steamboat Road all the  
10 way to the Greenwich Substation, we did look at an  
11 underground piece there. And then we went  
12 overhead from Steamboat pretty much all the way to  
13 Indian Field. It was just so much cheaper to stay  
14 overhead crossing I-95 and getting to the Cos Cob  
15 Substation.

16          MR. ASHTON: I understand.

17          THE WITNESS (Gagnon): And as we did  
18 this piece of underground along the railroad, it  
19 was short enough that we didn't need any extra  
20 splice vault, so it's splice vault less --

21          MR. ASHTON: I noticed that. That was  
22 quite clever of you.

23                 So what are you saying? Am I correct  
24 in understanding that the first section, Greenwich  
25 to Steamboat, looks good, and then you can do some

1 east of that?

2 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I am --

3 MR. ASHTON: Does that make sense?

4 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm looking at a  
5 possibility of going underground from Glenbrook  
6 along Railroad Avenue over to Steamboat and then  
7 transitioning to overhead once we get past  
8 Steamboat. Go overhead on the south side of the  
9 tracks all the way up to Indian Field Road. And  
10 then cross the tracks at that point, go on the  
11 north side of the tracks, and then head west all  
12 the way to the Cos Cob Substation, and then just  
13 have a little underground piece right in front of  
14 Cos Cob to go into the substation.

15 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, are we going  
16 to be having another hearing?

17 THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is yes.

18 MR. ASHTON: I would be grateful for my  
19 own benefit -- these people are smarter than I am  
20 right now -- if this could be written up a little  
21 bit so I can look at it and think about it. And I  
22 don't need transient stability studies, I don't  
23 need a lot, but it would be very helpful if I  
24 could just see it in schematic form.

25 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Schematic form,



1 okay.

2 MR. ASHTON: Is that reasonable?

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I usually don't make  
4 definitive statements, but I think without a doubt  
5 the smartest individual in this room on this topic  
6 is sitting at the end of this table to my right,  
7 without a doubt. So thank you, Mr. Ashton.

8 MR. ASHTON: Senility sets in --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: I try to keep my -- at  
10 least my council members --

11 MR. ASHTON: Thank you very much.  
12 That's all I have. And I appreciate the fact that  
13 you did what you did. I think it's a good start,  
14 and it's the kind of barn buster we need to try  
15 and figure out how to do this. You know, I  
16 appreciate the OCC's concern. I'm going to tell  
17 you, they're my concerns too. We've got to figure  
18 out how the hell to beat their cost of capital  
19 construction into a more manageable form. It's  
20 our hide that it's coming out of.

21 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Right.

22 MR. ASHTON: Thank you. Thank you,  
23 Mr. Chairman.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll now  
25 break for lunch and resume at 1:45, 45 minutes.

1                   (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused  
2 and a recess for lunch was taken at 1:02 p.m.)

3  
4                   AFTERNOON SESSION

5                   1:47 P.M.

6   M I C H A E L   P.   L I B E R T I N E,  
7   J A C Q U E L I N E   A.   G A R D E L L,  
8   R A Y M O N D   L.   G A G N O N,  
9   K E N N E T H   B.   B O W E S,

10                  called as witnesses, being previously duly  
11                  sworn, were examined and continued to testify  
12                  on their oaths as follows:

13                  THE CHAIRMAN: We're now going to  
14                  resume our hearing that started this morning and  
15                  questions continued by the Council.

16                  Mr. Hannon?

17                  CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION

18                  MR. HANNON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19                  I have a few questions. Some are  
20                  related to what was originally filed, but then  
21                  subsequent to other questions that were being  
22                  raised.

23                  If, for example, at this point in time  
24                  with the Cos Cob facility, if that facility went  
25                  down, what would the impact be for the Town of

1 Greenwich?

2           THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the majority  
3 of the customers from Greenwich would be without  
4 service until Cos Cob is restored. There's a  
5 portion of customers that are fed from the Tomac  
6 Substation, which is northerly of Cos Cob between  
7 the Southend and Cos Cob Substations. So that  
8 portion in the northern part of -- or I guess it  
9 would be the portion around I-95. The northern  
10 part of I-95 in the Town of Greenwich would be  
11 served from Tomac.

12           MR. ASHTON: And Tomac is a 115 to 13.2  
13 substation, a relatively small one, is it not?

14           THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is a single  
15 transformer substation, so a small amount of  
16 Greenwich would still be supplied power.

17           MR. HANNON: So theoretically if the  
18 proposed substation were built and Cos Cob went  
19 down, what would the impact be on the town?

20           THE WITNESS (Bowes): So initially we  
21 were planning to move about half of the load from  
22 Cos Cob to the new Greenwich Substation. So  
23 immediately there would be no impact to about half  
24 of the residents of Greenwich. And then over time  
25 we laid out -- I think it was in the OCC maybe 56

1 or 57 -- the optimum would be ultimate buildout of  
2 interconnecting the new Greenwich Substation to  
3 the North Greenwich Substation and  
4 interconnections with Cos Cob.

5 So ultimately nearly all of the  
6 customers would be picked up with our automation  
7 on the distribution side. So ultimately after the  
8 substation is built and the automation is in  
9 place, very few customers would have a permanent  
10 interruption.

11 MR. HANNON: So then, also following up  
12 with one of the issues that was being questioned  
13 about, putting more capacity at Cos Cob really  
14 would kind of defeat the purpose because then if  
15 Cos Cob went out, it's out, and people in  
16 Greenwich are pretty much out of power. So you  
17 don't have as much reliability if everything is at  
18 Cos Cob.

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, again, if  
20 it's on the transformers, that's an accurate  
21 statement. If the transmission path is lost from  
22 Southend then --

23 MR. HANNON: Understood.

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): -- both Tomac,  
25 Cos Cob and the new Greenwich Substation would be

1 interrupted. But by adding capacity at Cos Cob,  
2 it only provides say one of the three project  
3 benefits. It eliminates the overloading of the  
4 substation transformers, but it does not impact  
5 the distribution feeder reliability, including the  
6 underground network in downtown Greenwich, and it  
7 does not provide that flexibility that I just  
8 talked about, the redundancy between the two  
9 substations.

10 MR. HANNON: Thank you.

11 And the one other area that I'm having  
12 problems with -- and please bear with me on  
13 this -- the numbers that are being thrown around  
14 in dollar values, I'm having a difficult time  
15 trying to figure out what costs are related to  
16 what aspects.

17 So, for example, originally you're  
18 talking about \$140 million for the project.  
19 Distribution feeder work is about 68 million.  
20 Estimated cost of underground transmission line  
21 work is about 72 million. But then some of the  
22 categories are based on not just Eversource  
23 customers, but I guess regional costs for setup.  
24 You have other aspects of the project where  
25 Connecticut electricity customers are going to pay

1 a percentage, then another portion Eversource  
2 companies are going to be paying a portion. Then  
3 I'm looking at some of the questions from OCC, and  
4 it's talking about 12 million annual this and 8  
5 million annual that.

6 So is there a way to kind of come up  
7 with a simple sheet -- Mr. Ashton had asked for  
8 something previously -- but just giving a better  
9 breakdown of what the numbers are, both in terms  
10 of what the initial cost is and sort of the dollar  
11 value in terms of who's responsible for that and  
12 then the associated annual costs? Rather than  
13 trying to pull this from five or six different  
14 sources, if that could be summarized, that would  
15 be greatly appreciated.

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we could  
17 prepare something for that that would show the  
18 original project costs. There were some questions  
19 around contingency, which is around 10 percent.  
20 So the 140 million with a 10 percent contingency.  
21 We've since looked at components of that cost, as  
22 you mentioned. There's a distribution-only  
23 component. There's a component that is  
24 transmission related but is paid for through the  
25 local network service, and then there's a portion,

1 fairly small, that is part of the transmission  
2 component that's part of the regional network  
3 service. So we can break out those three  
4 components for you, and we can also break out the  
5 annual carrying costs for each one of those three  
6 components.

7 MR. ASHTON: That would be along the  
8 railroad route, the one we were talking about?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We could do the  
10 original project cost, which is 140 million, and  
11 then another number that's been thrown out again,  
12 about \$22 million reduction would come from the  
13 overhead route variation that we have talked about  
14 today, and we can identify which component that  
15 would come out of, and it's actually the local  
16 network service paid for by transmission  
17 customers, including customers outside of  
18 Connecticut, but it is very confusing how the rate  
19 structure works in this case.

20 MR. HANNON: So that would be greatly  
21 appreciated. Thank you. I have no further  
22 questions.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Just a couple of  
24 questions, just a follow-up to Mr. Hannon's  
25 question. Is Metro-North affected by the -- is

1 that affected by something that might happen at  
2 the Cos Cob Substation, or is that totally  
3 separate?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, Metro-North  
5 is supplied from the Cos Cob Substation. So yes,  
6 that's a key concern, and I think it got a lot of  
7 attention when there were issues in Metro-North on  
8 the New York side, the adjacent substation in New  
9 York that supplies Metro-North and all the  
10 activity they had around loss of transmission  
11 supply a couple of years ago.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that  
13 answer.

14 And then just one more. This was the  
15 famous missing Page 4, which you may remember  
16 anyway, November 24, 2015, testimony by -- I'm not  
17 sure -- by several of -- it was Q and A by Mr.  
18 Bowes, Mr. Gagnon. So I don't know who -- anyway  
19 there was a missing Page 4, you may remember, and  
20 Page 4 was readmitted. And in my due diligence on  
21 Saturday afternoon, I found the missing Page 4,  
22 but I couldn't figure out where the heck it came  
23 from. Fortunately our executive director, who I  
24 decided not to bother over the weekend, told me.

25 Anyway, my question is, or if you could



1 provide this, it's a question of has the company  
2 engaged town officials in promoting energy  
3 efficiency in Greenwich? And you talked about --  
4 or in your answer only about 5 percent of  
5 homeowners participated in the program from 2010  
6 to 2015. So I assume if you have it for  
7 Greenwich, do you have that for the other  
8 municipalities, because I don't know without a  
9 comparison what 5 percent --

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we do. We  
11 have it broken down by town and a percentage of  
12 customers that take advantage of the various  
13 programs.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: If you could provide  
15 that?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: That's all I have.

18 So next go to cross-examination by  
19 Office of Consumer Counsel.

20 MS. BAIN: Good afternoon, everyone.  
21 Margaret Bain for the Office of Consumer Counsel.

22 And I'd like to start with some  
23 clarification. I'm looking at the responses to  
24 OCC-30 and OCC-64. In OCC-30 there's a table.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Thirty and 64?

1 MS. BAIN: Yes.

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we have  
3 them.

4 MS. BAIN: So if you look at the table  
5 in 30 under Item D, it has Cos Cob 13.2, Cos Cob  
6 27.6, and Tomac. And if we added those together  
7 for 2014, I would get 594 -- I would get  
8 594,527,226. And adding in Tomac, let's see, I  
9 would get 697,000,383 for Tomac and the two Cos  
10 Cobs. And would you agree that that looks like  
11 the number taken, subject to check?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So this, again,  
13 is the data table -- I just want to make sure --  
14 listing the substations in Part D, and then by  
15 year it has annual usages.

16 MS. BAIN: Right.

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Okay.

18 MS. BAIN: And we have under 2014  
19 you'll see we have Cos Cob 13.2, and for 2014 it's  
20 96.7 million?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

22 MS. BAIN: And then there's the 27.6,  
23 and then further down there's Tomac?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

25 MS. BAIN: So that gives us a total of

1 approximately 697 million?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Okay, subject to  
3 check.

4 MS. BAIN: And if we look at OCC-64, it  
5 has Greenwich for 2014 at approximately 870  
6 million. So can you tell us what that difference  
7 is between those numbers?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the question  
9 is what's the difference between them?

10 MS. BAIN: Yes, those two totals.

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So the summation  
12 for OCC-064 is a summation of the customer usage  
13 for all the customers with an address in  
14 Greenwich, where the other is the summation of  
15 what the substation loads were. So it should be  
16 consistent, but it's not the same data source.

17 MS. BAIN: Because the difference is  
18 173 million, which is significant. Can you try  
19 and find out for us what that consists of?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure. I know in  
21 past responses when we looked into the details,  
22 some of the metering at the substation may have  
23 been out of service for an upgrade project or  
24 things like that. So that's a possible  
25 explanation, but we'll look into the details for

1 this.

2 MS. BAIN: Okay. Now, also looking at  
3 OCC-30, Item C, there's a table concerning the  
4 forecast area. It has Greenwich, Stamford and  
5 Norwalk in that.

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): This is Part B  
7 again?

8 MS. BAIN: It's C.

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So yes, this is a  
10 breakdown of customer types and the three work  
11 centers in the Southwest Connecticut area.

12 MS. BAIN: And now if I understand you  
13 correctly, with the forecast the company used the  
14 Stamford/Norwalk area, and including Greenwich, to  
15 develop its forecast, they used some information  
16 from there. Can you expand on that about how you  
17 used Stamford and Norwalk in your Greenwich  
18 forecast?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we did. And  
20 actually it's probably -- it's under Part B  
21 actually is what we used to forecast the load  
22 growth rates. So there's a data table there that  
23 includes substations in Stamford, Greenwich and  
24 Norwalk. It lists them by name and nomenclature  
25 and does a load growth factor for each one of

1 those substations. It walks through kind of the  
2 years used and the description in the text  
3 portion, and then it takes an overall average of  
4 those substations in those towns to come up with  
5 about a 1 percent annual growth rate.

6 MS. BAIN: Now, if we look at these  
7 areas, they have many differences, correct, as a  
8 profile as to how the energy is used in each town?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): They do. So Part  
10 C would show you kind of a breakdown by the types  
11 of customers in each one of the geographic areas.  
12 So there is some differences. There's obviously  
13 in the Stamford district, which includes the towns  
14 of Stamford and Darien, there are far more  
15 commercial customers than there are, say, in the  
16 Town of Greenwich.

17 MS. BAIN: And industrial, right?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Uh-huh.

19 MS. BAIN: Many more industrial?

20 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

21 MS. BAIN: And actually residential  
22 space heating is very much more significant for  
23 Stamford and Norwalk than for Greenwich?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That is correct.

25 MS. BAIN: So in including Greenwich in

1 with these two areas, what similarities did you  
2 see that so far on here it doesn't look that  
3 they're very similar?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So there's  
5 clearly differences between the makeup of Stamford  
6 and Greenwich, but many of the towns out of our  
7 Norwalk area work center are similar in, I would  
8 say, in customer patterns. They tend to be, you  
9 know, rather affluent residential towns that are  
10 in the suburbs of either Stamford or New York  
11 City. The size of the homes, the growth rates of  
12 various home businesses, I'll say, have been  
13 somewhat consistent, hedge funds and trading, you  
14 know, moving into even residential properties, so  
15 the usage patterns.

16 So we looked at a broader view than  
17 just the one substation we had in Greenwich and  
18 wanted to make sure that we had a better basis for  
19 a growth factor. With the one substation in  
20 Greenwich Cos Cob, it's just over 1 percent annual  
21 growth factor, and that's now compared against all  
22 of the substations in these other towns, which  
23 kind of validated the 1 percent in that general  
24 area. So that was really why we looked a little  
25 broader because we only had one data point in the

1 Town of Greenwich.

2 MS. BAIN: So energy usage is  
3 different, but you're saying it's affluent and  
4 size of homes, that type of thing?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, they're  
6 more similar. New Canaan is probably more similar  
7 to Greenwich than, say, Stamford is to Greenwich.  
8 Darien, you know, more the same.

9 MS. BAIN: In OCC's administrative  
10 notice we took notice of the CERC reports, the  
11 Connecticut Energy Research Center.

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Okay.

13 MS. BAIN: And the one for Greenwich  
14 has a population decrease from 2012 to 2020,  
15 whereas the ones for Stamford and Norwalk have a  
16 slight increase. So in the forecast I don't  
17 imagine you took into account that any type of  
18 growth like that or decrease in population?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We typically  
20 don't look at population or number of meters as  
21 part of the load growth analysis. It's really  
22 focused on the metered data that we collect.

23 MS. BAIN: Now on OCC-31. Now, as the  
24 company says, it used the highest peak demand, it  
25 says, in the response to Item A. It used the

1 highest peak demand 2013 as the basis for its  
2 projections, and it says because it represents the  
3 highest peak demand of the last five years. I  
4 think it's six years in the table, is that  
5 correct, it's the highest in six years? We have  
6 2010 through 2015.

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think at that  
8 point we didn't have the 2015 actuals, so we used  
9 five years, 2010 through 2014, I think.

10 MS. BAIN: So it's the highest in six,  
11 right?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Now it would be  
13 the highest in six, correct.

14 MS. BAIN: If your goal was to weather  
15 normalize the forecast, was that your goal here  
16 when you talk about weather normalization?

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. So there  
18 has been some confusing testimony, I admit. When  
19 our transmission planning group does planning,  
20 including for the approvals for ISO New England  
21 for the transmission portion of this project, they  
22 use weather normalized data directly from ISO New  
23 England as part of their planning studies or  
24 planning analysis. The distribution portion does  
25 not. We went through just the last couple of



1 questions about how we do that. We do look at the  
2 ISO forecast for distribution planning, but we  
3 also look at what's happening more locally to take  
4 a forecast that is either all of New England, all  
5 of Connecticut, or even a subarea, and then apply  
6 it to either a distribution feeder or a  
7 distribution substation in this case. We look to  
8 kind of validate that against the ISO forecast.

9           So in this case the Eversource  
10 distribution load forecast is 1 percent. The ISO  
11 New England, which is weather normalized, is 1.2  
12 percent. So both of those were used as part of  
13 this project because they had to be -- or they had  
14 to be for the ISO New England portion.

15           MS. BAIN: Just focusing on the  
16 starting point, the starting point that's the  
17 highest point in six years, can you tell us why  
18 you didn't weather normalize your starting point?

19           THE WITNESS (Bowes): We don't weather  
20 normalize the data for our distribution planning  
21 analysis. That's the practice we have.

22           MS. BAIN: I think we had testimony  
23 when I think Mr. Ashton asked a question whether  
24 it was weather normalized, so I think that may be  
25 a confusion here on the record. So the answer is

1 that you do not weather normalize?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): For the  
3 distribution portion of the planning studies,  
4 that's correct.

5 MS. BAIN: And that would include this  
6 forecast that you have where you started with the  
7 130?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

9 MS. BAIN: Okay. Turning to OCC-65.

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I have it.

11 MS. BAIN: I'm looking at the table  
12 here. It's labeled Page 1 on the attachment, and  
13 it has the substations and the incoming feeder  
14 capacity, the transformer capacity, and the actual  
15 peak.

16 So, let's see, going down, let's start  
17 with Cos Cob. In 2013 what was the load duration  
18 of the peak?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): By definition,  
20 all of the load durations for the peaks will be  
21 one hour.

22 MS. BAIN: This one, okay. And that's,  
23 as you said, in 15-minute increments and the  
24 average?

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I believe that's

1 how the data is collected, yes, four 15-minute  
2 intervals within a clock hour from 1 o'clock to 2  
3 o'clock, for example.

4 MS. BAIN: And you footnoted it to say  
5 that after two hours the permissible is a two-hour  
6 rating, okay.

7 And looking at Mianus, in 2013 it looks  
8 like it went to 23.7, so that was the closest it  
9 came to its capacity. Then after that it dropped  
10 significantly to 17.8, 18.5. Was there anything  
11 that caused that drop? Was there a load transfer  
12 or --

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): No permanent load  
14 transfers were done, but it may have been a  
15 switching incident.

16 It happened in 2013, correct?

17 (Off the record discussion.)

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So it was not a  
19 transient event in 2013. It was actual load, and  
20 it's just been a declining load since then.

21 MS. BAIN: So now we're down to  
22 Prospect, 2013 in Prospect was 51.2, and then 2014  
23 was only 44, 2015 was only 47. There was just a  
24 drop again in total --

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

1 MS. BAIN: A drop in usage?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, drop in peak  
3 demand.

4 MS. BAIN: Pardon?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): These are peak  
6 demands.

7 MS. BAIN: Right, drop in peak demand.

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): They're not  
9 usages.

10 MS. BAIN: Right, drop in peak demand  
11 use. Okay.

12 And then in Byram it looks like it  
13 peaked in 2012, and then it drops down from there  
14 from that peak.

15 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I actually see  
16 2010 for Byram.

17 MS. BAIN: But that says "temporary  
18 switching load." Can you explain what that is,  
19 that footnote? The footnote goes onto the next  
20 page. On mine it says "Reading included temporary  
21 switching load."

22 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I don't see  
23 that on my Byram sheet. Oh, for 2014 and 2015,  
24 yes, but not for 2010. So the peak for Byram was  
25 in 2010, 28.1 MVA.

1 MS. BAIN: So can you explain what that  
2 is, the "temporary switching load"?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I cannot explain  
4 it, but I don't think it was necessarily temporary  
5 switching. I think it was just the peak load at  
6 that year.

7 MS. BAIN: Okay. Because it has a  
8 Footnote C.

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't have a  
10 footnote on my page.

11 MS. BAIN: It goes onto the next page.  
12 It prints out on another page.

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): But not for --  
14 there's no footnote on Byram for 2010.

15 MS. BAIN: It's 2014 and '15.

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Right where the  
17 numbers are in that column for 2014 and 2015 is  
18 Footnote C?

19 MS. BAIN: Do you want me to show you  
20 on mine?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure. But that's  
22 in 2014 and '15, not in 2010 where the peak load  
23 was.

24 MS. BAIN: I was just asking what this  
25 means in this little C item.

1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Oh, for 2014 and  
2 2015 the footnote is accurate, yes.

3 MS. BAIN: And what does that mean?  
4 "Temporary switching load," can you define that  
5 for me?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So when there's  
7 an interruption on the circuits and they  
8 reconfigure automatically, the loads are  
9 transferred between individual primary circuits,  
10 and some of those may actually transfer between  
11 substations. So it's a temporary load transfer  
12 while the automation operates, and that will  
13 typically last for several hours until the outage  
14 is repaired and then the system is returned to  
15 normal.

16 MS. BAIN: Now, was this an outage that  
17 was caused by -- what was it caused by?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't have that  
19 level of detail. We can probably find it.

20 MS. BAIN: Okay.

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Would you like  
22 that?

23 MS. BAIN: Yes, I would like to know  
24 that.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So again, just so

1 I'm clear, that is the Byram substation 2014 and  
2 2015, the temporary switching loads?

3 MS. BAIN: Right. Exactly.

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): And the cause.

5 MS. BAIN: Thank you.

6 Now, the next one is on OCC-66. Now,  
7 Item A asks about the CL&P ratepayers' share of  
8 these costs, and the carrying costs, it looks like  
9 they were approximately 18 million total. And  
10 then back when we discussed this in another  
11 interrogatory, OCC-4, it looked as if CL&P  
12 ratepayers would be paying two-thirds of that  
13 estimated. So can you tell me how you got the  
14 10.2 million in your response?

15 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes. Okay. The  
16 10.2 million is really -- there's two different  
17 rates that we're looking at in the transmission  
18 forum. All right. You have \$107 million in LNS  
19 rates. That represents part of the substation  
20 itself, the new substation, the transmission  
21 portion and the line. And then you have \$12  
22 million in RNS rates associated with Cos Cob.

23 So sticking with LNS, we'll stick with  
24 that first, so the LNS rate at 107 million for  
25 Connecticut ratepayers pays about 63.5 percent of

1 that amount, so that's 68 million. Sixty-eight  
2 million with a carrying charge is 14.94, roughly  
3 15, is 9.7 million. So you've got 9.7 million.

4 And then you go to the RNS rates for  
5 Cos Cob. You've got 12 million to start with for  
6 the price. Connecticut ratepayers pay about 24.9  
7 percent of that, so it's \$3 million; \$3 million  
8 with a carrying cost of 15.25, gives you .35  
9 million. Add those together and you get about  
10 10.2.

11 MS. BAIN: I think there were two  
12 different carrying charges, right?

13 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): There actually  
14 are two different carrying charges. One is LNS  
15 rates and one is RNS rates. But in our response  
16 we -- they're very close. One is 14.94, the other  
17 one is 15.25. So for simplification we said 15 in  
18 the response.

19 MS. BAIN: I was just looking at  
20 OCC-004. Okay. Now, in the response to OCC-004  
21 it says that the carrying charge -- it says  
22 applying this carrying charge, which was  
23 approximately 15 percent, to the total estimated  
24 transmission costs of 119 million, equates to  
25 approximately 18 million in annual transmission



1 revenue requirements.

2 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.

3 MS. BAIN: Then if we took two-thirds  
4 of that --

5 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm not sure --

6 MS. BAIN: -- you get approximately 12  
7 million?

8 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): And where is the  
9 two-thirds coming from?

10 (Pause.)

11 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may  
12 we go off the record for one moment, please?

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

14 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you.

15 (Off the record discussion.)

16 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Thank you.

17 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm still  
18 thinking.

19 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I think what  
20 we'll do is if we could take that as a Late-File  
21 because there are other folks in the company that  
22 I think Mr. Gagnon would like to consult with.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's go on then.

24 MR. ASHTON: Can I raise a question?

25 Is it really necessary? We're getting close to

1 the end of the hearing, and these Late-Files are  
2 just dragging the process out.

3 MS. BAIN: Well, this one involves how  
4 much ratepayers would pay on an annual basis, so I  
5 think that's kind of --

6 MR. ASHTON: For what?

7 MS. BAIN: For the project, this whole  
8 project.

9 MR. ASHTON: Isn't that already in the  
10 record?

11 MS. BAIN: Not exactly how much  
12 ratepayers would pay. There are different numbers  
13 in the record but --

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): We can answer  
15 that question.

16 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: We figured it  
17 out.

18 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Sorry about  
19 that. My notes are kind of sloppy here. But what  
20 it really is, it has to do, one, is we're  
21 looking -- the second response of the OCC, that  
22 had to do with CL&P's costs, CL&P ratepayers.

23 When we looked at OCC's 004, we were talking about  
24 Connecticut ratepayers. So there is a difference  
25 between Connecticut ratepayers and CL&P

1 ratepayers. It's a different subset of people  
2 that are paying it. So if you're going to have --  
3 sum up, you're going to come up with a different  
4 number. So it's the difference between CL&P  
5 versus all of Connecticut.

6 MS. BAIN: So you're talking, for  
7 instance, CMEEC?

8 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct, and UI.

9 MS. BAIN: I know UI is not involved in  
10 this?

11 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, not in the  
12 LNS rate, but in the RNS portion.

13 MS. BAIN: And now on OCC-42 it talks  
14 about feeder failure in 2015. Can you tell me if  
15 there were any feeder failures in 2013? That  
16 seems to be a very high year for the peak.

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So this question  
18 is around the three failures that I had identified  
19 in July of 2015. Because they happened during a  
20 peak weather period, they were of more concern. I  
21 don't believe we had any in 2014.

22 MS. BAIN: In 2013?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): 2013 or 2014?

24 MS. BAIN: In 2013, which was the  
25 highest.

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): The week of the  
2 peak weather of 2013 we did not have any  
3 underground failures in Greenwich.

4           MS. BAIN: Okay. Thank you.

5           And on Late-Filed 11, how far away is  
6 the North Greenwich Substation from the Cedar  
7 Heights?

8           THE WITNESS (Bowes): So it's 5.3 miles  
9 direct route, as the crow flies, so linear  
10 distance.

11          MS. BAIN: And how far away will North  
12 Greenwich be from the proposed new substation --  
13 or no, actually it will still be fed out of the  
14 Cos Cob Substation, right, North Greenwich?

15          THE WITNESS (Bowes): North Greenwich  
16 will still be fed from Cos Cob on the supply side.  
17 On the secondary side there will be  
18 interconnections with Greenwich Substation.

19          MS. BAIN: So how far away is it from  
20 Cos Cob right now?

21          THE WITNESS (Bowes): I know we have an  
22 interrogatory on this with all of the distances.  
23 It's in the record.

24          MS. BAIN: Okay, I'll find it.

25          THE WITNESS (Bowes): We can have

1 someone take a look and find it. There was an  
2 earlier question of all the distances from every  
3 substation in the area.

4 MS. BAIN: I do recall that. I'll find  
5 that.

6 And how about the new one, how far will  
7 it be from that?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): The new proposed  
9 Greenwich Substation to North Greenwich? I know,  
10 again, although it wouldn't be in -- I'm not sure  
11 if it's in the filing. The Prospect Street  
12 distance to North Greenwich is in the filing, and  
13 it's going to be almost the same. We think it's  
14 about 5 circuit miles, but I don't have the linear  
15 miles.

16 MS. BAIN: And if you didn't have North  
17 Greenwich fed from the Cos Cob Substation, could  
18 it be fed from Cedar Heights?

19 THE WITNESS (Bowes): The reason I'm  
20 pausing is there's no 27-kV supply at Cedar  
21 Heights today, so it would require us to build  
22 that capability at Cedar Heights. I don't know if  
23 the transmission system can support that. I'd  
24 have to check on that. That would be a question  
25 mark.

1           But could it physically be done? Yes.  
2           There may be some limitations. The issue with  
3           Cedar Heights is there are two underground  
4           transmission cables that supply that, and if they  
5           were the limiting factor, then we'd have to deal  
6           with the transmission supply, as well as the  
7           transformation in circuits to North Greenwich.

8           MS. BAIN: One more thing. Could you  
9           update OCC-46 and the OCC-30, D table, with the  
10          numbers for 2015?

11          THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we have the  
12          2015 numbers.

13          MS. BAIN: Okay. Thank you. So you'll  
14          just send those in?

15          THE WITNESS (Bowes): It was OCC-46 and  
16          30, update the data tables for 2015 numbers.  
17          We'll supplement those.

18          MS. BAIN: Thank you. And I think  
19          that's it for me.

20          THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

21          Pet Pantry, Attorney Marcus?

22          MR. MARCUS: For the record, Edward L.  
23          Marcus and Mark Bergamo from the Marcus Law Firm  
24          for Pet Pantry.

25          Chairman, before we begin, I've got a

1 question for you. Town of Greenwich is now a  
2 party. Town of Greenwich submitted a letter,  
3 transmittal letter and report, which, if I put my  
4 glasses on, is dated November 23, 2015. Is that  
5 now an exhibit?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is yes.

7 MR. MARCUS: And one more question.  
8 The Town of Greenwich presumably is going to  
9 cross-examine on whatever the new date may be  
10 selected by the Council. We also have questions  
11 based on the report that was filed. I'd like to  
12 reserve my right of cross-examination relative to  
13 the report submitted by the Town of Greenwich  
14 until they have completed their cross-examination.  
15 I think it will be more efficient. They may ask  
16 questions that I would be asking today. So I'd  
17 like to have that right of reservation that we  
18 cross-examine after the town has completed their  
19 cross.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: You are cross-examining  
21 the town or --

22 MR. MARCUS: Based on their report. We  
23 have questions based on the report filed by the  
24 town, which is now an exhibit. And we'd be  
25 cross-examining Eversource.

1           THE CHAIRMAN: I guess the answer is a  
2 qualified yes. I would guess the daffodils will  
3 be in bloom by then.

4           MR. BERGAMO: Hopefully not.

5           THE CHAIRMAN: It's really unfortunate  
6 that the town decided at the Eleventh Hour, but  
7 they did.

8           MR. MARCUS: I don't disagree with that  
9 but --

10          THE CHAIRMAN: I have to call my wife  
11 and tell her that my vacation plans have been put  
12 on some kind of hold. Go ahead. Let's go if we  
13 want to get home.

14          MR. MARCUS: Is it a "yes"?

15          THE CHAIRMAN: It's a yes, a reluctant  
16 yes.

17          MR. MARCUS: Thank you.

18                 We had testimony at the end of the last  
19 hearing based on questions asked by Mr. Hannon of  
20 Mr. Gagnon, and those questions related to the  
21 lease that Eversource has on the 290 Railroad  
22 Avenue property. And to be helpful, if you look  
23 at pages 152, pages 153 of the December 1st  
24 transcript, it has the questions that I would like  
25 to cross-examine Mr. Gagnon on. So if you can



1 find those, tell me when you're ready, and then  
2 we'll move forward.

3 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm on those  
4 pages.

5 MR. MARCUS: You're on the pages?

6 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Correct. Yes.

7 MR. MARCUS: Mr. Gagnon, are you  
8 familiar with the lease presently held by now  
9 Eversource on the 290 Railroad Avenue property?

10 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I've never read  
11 it. I'm familiar with it a little bit due to my  
12 conversations with our real estate agent  
13 internally.

14 MR. MARCUS: So you've never read the  
15 document?

16 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

17 MR. MARCUS: Now, you were asked by  
18 Mr. Hannon about closing on the option in 2021.  
19 It's on the top of page 153.

20 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.

21 MR. MARCUS: Do you know that there is  
22 an option?

23 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): I'm aware that  
24 there's a mechanism within the contract that talks  
25 about being able to close early on the lease or to

1 be able to purchase the piece of property.

2 MR. MARCUS: And I'm not going to ask  
3 you to look at the document, although it is an  
4 exhibit. Could you tell me what paragraph that  
5 would be contained in because I can't locate any  
6 language that provides an option prior to 2021 to  
7 close?

8 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): No, I could not  
9 point out that specific paragraph.

10 MR. MARCUS: And is it true that your  
11 answers to Mr. Hannon's questions were based on  
12 what someone else told you or what you believe  
13 they told you?

14 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Yes.

15 MR. MARCUS: Okay. So you don't really  
16 know --

17 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I think  
18 Mr. Gagnon is answering the questions and then  
19 they're being editorialized. So could we just ask  
20 questions?

21 MR. MARCUS: I think this is fair  
22 cross.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead. Continue.

24 MR. MARCUS: Mr. Gagnon, you were asked  
25 a question about whether you could close prior to

1 2021, and you said there's a mechanism in the  
2 contract. What mechanism exists -- by contract  
3 you meant the lease, correct?

4 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): That is correct.

5 MR. MARCUS: And what mechanism is  
6 there that provides for closing prior to 2021?  
7 Because I've looked at the lease over and over  
8 again and I can't find anything. So is that --

9 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, may  
10 I --

11 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Except I  
12 think he already answered. He doesn't know where  
13 it is so --

14 MR. MARCUS: Well, do you know based  
15 upon your own knowledge that there is any such  
16 mechanism?

17 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Mr. Chairman, at  
18 this point I think it would be more suitable if we  
19 had Mr. Giuliano testify because he is here, he  
20 does have knowledge of the leasing issues, and I  
21 think that would be more productive. And he was  
22 previously sworn in as a witness. So could we  
23 bring Mr. Giuliano to the table and have him  
24 answer the questions?

25 MR. MARCUS: I don't object to that.



1 position is that it should not be stricken.

2 Mr. Gagnon has indicated that he --

3 MR. MARCUS: And I agree.

4 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Excuse me, let me  
5 finish, sir.

6 MR. MARCUS: Go ahead.

7 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: -- that he gave  
8 his testimony based on the information that was  
9 given to him. That's perfectly proper.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: We understand. Can we  
11 now --

12 MR. MARCUS: Is the witness sworn in?

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

14 S A L V A T O R E G I U L I A N O,

15 called as a witness, being previously duly  
16 sworn, was examined and continued to testify  
17 on his oath as follows:

18 MR. MARCUS: Mr. Giuliano, have you  
19 read the lease between the owners, dated February  
20 12, 1971, and Connecticut Light and Power Company?

21 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): My name is Sal  
22 Giuliano, and I have read the lease.

23 MR. MARCUS: And you're familiar with  
24 it?

25 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): I am familiar

1 with it.

2 MR. MARCUS: When is the last time that  
3 you actually looked at the document?

4 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I'm going to  
5 object on the grounds of relevance.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: I agree.

7 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: Where are we  
8 headed?

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Your objection is  
10 sustained.

11 Let's get to substance, please.

12 MR. MARCUS: Is there any provision in  
13 the lease I just referred to which provides for  
14 the ability to exercise an option to purchase the  
15 property on the part of the lessee any time prior  
16 to 2021?

17 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): There is an  
18 option for Eversource, as tenant, to exercise its  
19 rights to acquire the property at the end of the  
20 lease term.

21 MR. MARCUS: And the end of the lease  
22 term is 2021, correct?

23 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): Correct,  
24 February of 2021.

25 MR. MARCUS: And there is no other --

1 can we agree that there is no provision in the  
2 lease document that I've referred to that provides  
3 now Eversource with an option to acquire the  
4 property prior to 2021?

5 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): There is no  
6 provision in the lease document that provides the  
7 company to acquire the property before the end of  
8 the lease term.

9 MR. MARCUS: So that if you, you being  
10 Eversource, were granted the right to put a  
11 substation on 290 Railroad Avenue, you would not  
12 or could not own the property until 2021, based on  
13 the lease document; is that correct?

14 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): Based on the  
15 current terms of the lease document, that's  
16 correct.

17 MR. MARCUS: Is there any other  
18 document that exists at the moment as between the  
19 owners and Eversource?

20 THE WITNESS (Giuliano): There are no  
21 other written documents, no.

22 MR. MARCUS: I have no further  
23 questions --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. MARCUS: -- of this witness.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh.

2 MR. MARCUS: Mr. Gagnon, who currently  
3 occupies the property known as 290 Railroad  
4 Avenue?

5 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I believe this  
6 information is in the application, so I think it  
7 would be appropriate to just point to the  
8 information that's already been provided on the  
9 record about this particular property.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Just tell us what page  
11 it's on, and we'll leave it at that and find it.

12 MR. MARCUS: Does Mr. Gagnon not know  
13 who occupies the --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: That doesn't matter. We  
15 want the information. I know you like to play the  
16 "got-you," but I'm not interested. We're just  
17 trying to get the information.

18 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: That would be  
19 Page G.1 of the application.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Page G.1 of the  
21 application.

22 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I'm sorry, and  
23 G.2 also.

24 MR. MARCUS: Mr. Gagnon, are you aware  
25 of the fact that Eversource currently is



1 attempting to evict Pet Pantry from the property  
2 based on a claim that a substation will be  
3 actually placed on the property?

4 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I'm going to  
5 object to that question. It is not within the  
6 jurisdiction of this Council to rule on any  
7 matters involving eviction proceedings in  
8 courthouses, so I don't think it's germane to this  
9 particular application.

10 MR. MARCUS: Okay. What is germane is  
11 the fact that Eversource has based an eviction  
12 action on an allegation that a substation will be  
13 placed on this property, and the fact is that  
14 until there is a ruling, an appeal and a final  
15 decision, that allegation cannot be made. And I  
16 think it is germane because I think the Council  
17 has to be aware of the fact that, A, there is no  
18 option for ownership; and B, that an eviction  
19 action is being brought based on, in essence, a  
20 claim that as of today they have the right to  
21 evict this tenant, and the only way they can do it  
22 is by alleging that a substation is going to be  
23 erected. So they're placing that out as a fact,  
24 and that is not factual. That is germane.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: It seems like you've

1 asked and answered the question. I'm not sure if  
2 there is a question at this point.

3 MR. MARCUS: There's no question  
4 pending. I'm just responding to counsel's  
5 comments.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Go on.

7 MR. MARCUS: I have a few questions  
8 based on the second set of interrogatories, and  
9 this would be Number 1.

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, I have it.

11 MR. MARCUS: And we asked whether or  
12 not the firefighters in Greenwich were trained to  
13 combat an electrical disaster at the proposed  
14 facilities. Would it be fair to say that your  
15 answer is no?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): There's a unique  
17 aspect to the Greenwich -- proposed Greenwich  
18 Substation, the fact that it's an indoor  
19 substation. So although that in the Town of  
20 Greenwich there have been substations there for  
21 many years, that is a unique aspect which we would  
22 review with the fire department and other  
23 emergency responders prior to the operation of the  
24 facility.

25 MR. MARCUS: Can I ask why you would

1 not have reviewed it prior to submitting your  
2 application?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure. We would  
4 actually conduct a training on the site in the  
5 actual facility so we could better address the  
6 issues that they may have.

7 MR. MARCUS: Do you know where the  
8 location of the -- is there more than one fire  
9 station in Greenwich?

10 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, there is.

11 MR. MARCUS: And how far away is the  
12 closest one to the proposed substation?

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's located, I  
14 think, in the same neighborhood.

15 MR. MARCUS: Now, we asked the question  
16 about Amtrak -- this is Number 3.

17 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

18 MR. MARCUS: -- being a customer of  
19 Eversource. And if the application is granted,  
20 would you be supplying them through the new  
21 substation?

22 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Amtrak through  
23 the new Greenwich Substation?

24 MR. MARCUS: Yes.

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I don't believe

1 so, no. There is an Amtrak facility in Greenwich,  
2 but not necessarily a train-related facility. So  
3 I know I've seen it on the map. I'm not sure if  
4 it's active or not at this point.

5 MR. MARCUS: And if we turn to Number  
6 4 -- Mr. Chairman, we're not going to go through  
7 all of them -- can we agree that Metro-North would  
8 be considered as a major customer of Eversource?

9 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes.

10 MR. MARCUS: And their demand is, you  
11 say, less than 10 percent. Is it near 10 percent?

12 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In this  
13 particular case the transmission capacity they use  
14 about 10 percent of it from Southend to Cos Cob  
15 Substation.

16 MR. MARCUS: So they are a major,  
17 clearly a major customer?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): For this one  
19 location I would say a relatively minor customer,  
20 but across the entire state they are one of our  
21 largest customers.

22 MR. MARCUS: Turning to Number 7, if  
23 you look at your response at Item D, how did you  
24 arrive at that answer? You said depending on  
25 traffic it would take 15 to 30 minutes to arrive

1 at the site.

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Just a  
3 calculation of the distance and with the average  
4 speed to arrive in that distance.

5 MR. MARCUS: And if there were -- what  
6 would you consider as an emergency so that you  
7 would require the additional resources?

8 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we have a  
9 system that monitors the various equipment within  
10 the substation, the security of the substation.  
11 So if we were to notice something abnormal, either  
12 activity or equipment operation, we would dispatch  
13 a serviceperson to the substation to investigate  
14 or, depending on the nature, law enforcement to  
15 the substation.

16 MR. MARCUS: I call your attention to  
17 Number 10. You've previously testified either  
18 through documents or testimony that you're going  
19 to be working closely with DOT in order to  
20 complete this project?

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, we would.

22 MR. MARCUS: And your response to our  
23 question was that DOT has not provided any  
24 information on the extent of the 95 highway  
25 expansion in Greenwich. How can you go forward

1 with this project without knowing or having that  
2 information?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): The proposed  
4 route variation that goes along the Metro-North  
5 Railroad has been reviewed with Connecticut  
6 Department of Transportation. They did have some  
7 comments on that and indicated that a route  
8 variation between I-95 and the tracks would not be  
9 acceptable in certain areas, but that's all of the  
10 information they've given us. They basically told  
11 us where we could not be, and they said that the  
12 proposed route variation that we provided to the  
13 Council is acceptable to them. So I think it was  
14 accurate in its response is the extent is really  
15 the issue here. We don't know what their plans  
16 are for the I-95 expansion in Greenwich.

17 THE WITNESS (Gardell): And to add to  
18 Ken's comment, we will be outside the highway  
19 taking line, so when their plans come through it  
20 shouldn't impact them.

21 MR. MARCUS: If we can move to Number  
22 12, can you explain what a cable failure is?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Sure.

24 MR. MARCUS: It's a break in the cable  
25 or --

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): In this case the  
2 three cable failures were an electrical short  
3 circuit, a fault caused by insulation breakdown,  
4 not necessarily a physical break, but an  
5 electrical fault ended up causing a short circuit,  
6 and then it caused the cable to fail at that  
7 localized point where the energized part of the  
8 conductor came in contact with ground.

9           MR. MARCUS: And what was the time  
10 frame for the three cable failures?

11           THE WITNESS (Bowes): If you want to go  
12 to that other interrogatory or wait while I do it,  
13 I can give you the exact times. It was part of  
14 that response. There was a date and a time given.

15           THE CHAIRMAN: So it's already in the  
16 file?

17           THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's actually in  
18 OCC-4 and 42.

19           THE CHAIRMAN: So the information is  
20 available.

21           MR. MARCUS: Okay. We'll move on.

22           Turn to page or Interrogatory 13. Why  
23 do you use 2013 as the peak load year?

24           THE WITNESS (Bowes): That was the year  
25 of the highest load recorded in the substation.

1           MR. MARCUS: And why is 2013 higher  
2 than 2014 and 2015?

3           THE WITNESS (Bowes): The weather  
4 pattern that developed in 2013 was a series of 90  
5 to 95-plus degree days with high humidity. So  
6 over the course of several days we saw the  
7 electric loads build, and it was a situation where  
8 after the fourth or fifth day we achieved that  
9 peak load. We did not see that same weather  
10 pattern develop in 2014 or again in this summer in  
11 2015.

12          MR. MARCUS: And a peak load means  
13 what?

14          THE WITNESS (Bowes): It means it's the  
15 maximum one-hour of load recorded by our metering  
16 equipment for, it could be for a customer, it  
17 could be for a circuit, it could be for a  
18 transformer or entire substation.

19          MR. MARCUS: So it's not for a period  
20 of a year, it's the peak that you had at any given  
21 moment?

22          THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's the largest  
23 or the highest one-hour loading on a piece of  
24 equipment or a customer location.

25          MR. MARCUS: In the course of a year?



1 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In the course of  
2 a year, yes.

3 MR. MARCUS: So it doesn't mean that  
4 it's repeated ten times a year, it could just be  
5 once?

6 THE WITNESS (Bowes): In fact, by  
7 definition, it can only be once.

8 MR. MARCUS: Turning to Interrogatory  
9 16, what is the life cycle of a transmission line?

10 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Are you talking  
11 life cycle cost or just life cycle?

12 MR. MARCUS: Life cycle.

13 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): Life cycle is  
14 the initial installation, the period of operation  
15 until it's decommissioned.

16 MR. MARCUS: And how long is it  
17 normally from the point of installation to it no  
18 longer being utilized?

19 THE WITNESS (Gagnon): It depends on  
20 the equipment, but most equipment is between 30  
21 and 40 years is our life cycle cost calculated by.

22 MR. MARCUS: Just give us a moment,  
23 please?

24 (Pause.)

25 MR. MARCUS: I have several more

1 questions, and then we're going to be through.

2           And part of this is my probably lack of  
3 engineering understanding, but if Cos Cob were to  
4 go down, let's say tomorrow, does that cut off the  
5 supply to the other substations that feed into  
6 Greenwich, would that be the end of any electrical  
7 availability to Greenwich?

8           THE WITNESS (Bowes): The supply from  
9 Cos Cob Substation feeds many of the other  
10 substations inside Greenwich, all of the ones at  
11 27 kV, Mianus, North Greenwich, Prospect, Byram.  
12 There would still be a portion of Greenwich  
13 supplied from the Tomac Substation, and I think  
14 there are some electric circuits that come from  
15 maybe other Stamford substations that feed a small  
16 number of customers in the Town of Greenwich, but  
17 the bulk of Greenwich would be without electricity  
18 if Cos Cob was impacted.

19           MR. MARCUS: In the last five years how  
20 many times has Cos Cob actually gone down, if at  
21 all?

22           THE WITNESS (Bowes): I know we've  
23 answered an interrogatory on it. I think,  
24 excluding the major hurricanes and tropical  
25 storms, I think once the supply to Cos Cob was

1 lost.

2 MR. MARCUS: And that was caused by?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): A tree on the  
4 transmission right-of-way.

5 MR. MARCUS: And how long did it take  
6 for you to restore electrical power?

7 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm trying to  
8 recall because we required coordination between  
9 Eversource and Metro-North. I would say it was  
10 probably several hours in duration.

11 MR. MARCUS: So it wasn't a matter of  
12 days or weeks, it was relatively a minor  
13 interruption of service?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Correct.

15 MR. MARCUS: Thank you.

16 Now, is the proposed substation both a  
17 generating plant and distributing facility?

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It is not.  
19 Existing Cos Cob has a variety of uses, including  
20 CL&P's substation, Metro-North substation and NRG  
21 generating substation. The proposed Greenwich  
22 Substation is strictly a distribution substation.

23 MR. MARCUS: Now, you just mentioned  
24 Metro-North. How does Metro-North affect the use  
25 of the system that's available to the Town of

1 Greenwich, if at all?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So they are fed  
3 off the transmission system that supplies Cos Cob.  
4 So although they don't take any power directly  
5 from Cos Cob, it is all at that one location. So  
6 they don't really take away the capacity from  
7 Greenwich, but they are served from the same  
8 source, which is the Southend Substation in  
9 Stamford.

10 MR. MARCUS: And would Metro-North --  
11 is there any set of facts that could exist that  
12 would result in Metro-North causing a shutdown of  
13 Cos Cob?

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, there  
15 probably is. If there was an equipment failure at  
16 the Metro-North Substation and the system either  
17 failed to operate properly or some other  
18 abnormality were to occur, it could interrupt the  
19 supply to both Metro-North and Cos Cob  
20 Substations.

21 MR. MARCUS: And would that also be  
22 true in the case of the proposed new substation?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, that would  
24 remain unchanged.

25 MR. MARCUS: No further questions, but

1 we reserve our right to continue with cross after  
2 the Town of Greenwich completes their cross.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. MARCUS: Thank you.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Field Point Estates?

6 MR. UEDA: Dwight Ueda, Field Point  
7 Estate Townhouses.

8 I'd like to focus on the Late-Filing  
9 Number 11, dated December 8th, and this has to do  
10 with the question regarding turning North  
11 Greenwich into a bulk station.

12 Looking at your response, Response C,  
13 you said that Cedar Heights Substation has about  
14 15 megawatts of spare capacity. What does that  
15 convert to in megavolt amps?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): It's  
17 approximately the same.

18 MR. UEDA: About the same.

19 And if we were to get it from -- if  
20 North Greenwich were to be supplied by Cedar  
21 Heights, could that potentially free up Cos Cob by  
22 that same amount?

23 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes,  
24 theoretically it could.

25 MR. UEDA: Can that be supplied now?

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): The previous  
2 question, which now I have the answer to of 15  
3 megawatts, the issue at Cedar heights is there's  
4 no 27-kV supply there, so it would be required to  
5 be added at Cedar Heights.

6           MR. UEDA: So what improvements need to  
7 be made so that Cedar Heights can be the primary  
8 supplier of power to North Greenwich?

9           THE WITNESS (Bowes): The two  
10 transmission cables that supply Cedar Heights from  
11 Glenbrook Substation would need to be upgraded.

12          MR. UEDA: And so how much of North  
13 Greenwich's 75-megavolt amp capacity can Cedar  
14 Heights provide if those cables are upgraded?

15          THE WITNESS (Bowes): We would size it  
16 to upgrade to handle the entire substation.

17          MR. UEDA: All the 75, okay.

18           I was just wondering if the Siting  
19 Council could consider that as an alternative to  
20 the proposal that they made to convert the North  
21 Greenwich distribution station so that it's fed by  
22 Cedar Heights, as opposed to Cos Cob Station. The  
23 benefit would be that it would increase the  
24 service into the Town of Greenwich by 75 megavolt  
25 amps; is that correct?

1           THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes, there's  
2 three transformers at North Greenwich, so it would  
3 still account for the loss of one of those  
4 transformers. So the rating would be -- so it  
5 would be about 50 MVA.

6           MR. UEDA: Okay. So we could free up  
7 50 MVA by doing this.

8           Okay. Is it something that we can  
9 consider, or can we have, what was it, a proposal  
10 with estimates?

11          THE CHAIRMAN: A proposal with  
12 estimates only applied to the Town of Greenwich.  
13 If you want to bring other work in, other  
14 municipalities, which I believe this would  
15 entail -- am I correct?

16          THE WITNESS (Bowes): It would be  
17 Stamford as well.

18          THE CHAIRMAN: -- then I think it would  
19 be procedural, as well as technical, as well as  
20 cost, as well as I don't know how many other  
21 issues. So I'm not saying it can't be considered,  
22 but I'm saying --

23          MR. UEDA: Okay. Because I'm just  
24 wondering if it provides a cleaner and more  
25 elegant solution to the proposal at hand. I agree

1 that it includes another municipality, but in  
2 terms of its footprint and impact.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm under supreme self  
4 control when I've heard, I think from you, as well  
5 as others, we don't want one drop of electricity  
6 from this project to go to any neighboring town,  
7 and now you're asking about neighboring -- but go  
8 ahead, let's keep going.

9 MR. UEDA: Anyway, those are my  
10 questions.

11 THE WITNESS (Boves): So is there an  
12 action out of this to --

13 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Can we speak  
14 to that a little bit?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't you just  
16 provide a -- it's too late to crack a joke. Why  
17 don't you just provide some conceptual of what  
18 would be the issues involved and cost.

19 MS. BARBINO DUBUQUE: I think though  
20 part of our Late-File has already evaluated that.  
21 And I think if Ken can just finish his thought  
22 here, I think you'll see that this information is  
23 already on the record.

24 THE WITNESS (Boves): So maybe there's  
25 a compromise we can do here is that there is quite



1 a bit of information in this interrogatory  
2 response.

3 MR. UEDA: In this one?

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Yes. And it  
5 includes some limitations on the existing site  
6 there.

7 MR. UEDA: Yeah, if you can familiarize  
8 me with it, because I couldn't find it. The only  
9 limitation I was able to find was -- because  
10 basically Answer F basically addresses the  
11 question if you were to turn it into a bulk  
12 station. I presume a distribution station is  
13 different.

14 THE WITNESS (Bowes): No. What you're  
15 asking for us to do would be to turn it into a  
16 bulk substation and bring a transmission or a  
17 supply from -- I guess you're not. You're asking  
18 a 27-kV supply --

19 MR. UEDA: Correct. We're not touching  
20 115.

21 THE WITNESS (Bowes): -- from Cedar  
22 Heights?

23 MR. UEDA: Yes.

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): So we can prepare  
25 a supplement to this interrogatory that would

1 probably identify the issues. We've done  
2 something similar for Waterside in Stamford. So I  
3 think we can repeat that for Cedar Heights to  
4 North Greenwich and define some order of magnitude  
5 costs and some of the concerns that could arise.

6 MR. UEDA: Would that still concern the  
7 Town of Stamford given that all we're talking  
8 about is upgrading the cable?

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Let them provide the  
10 information, and the City of Stamford, I'm sure,  
11 would be interested at some point if this was to  
12 become a viable alternative.

13 MR. UEDA: All right. Thank you. That  
14 will be all.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Christine Edwards?

16 MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, again.

17 I wanted to follow up with what Dwight  
18 had just asked, and that is that if we look at 10  
19 to 25 percent of Cos Cob being used by Metro-North  
20 and shift that to the Stamford Substation just  
21 down the block a bit, would that allow the need  
22 for Greenwich to be fulfilled in terms of the  
23 generation?

24 THE WITNESS (Bowes): A couple  
25 different issues there. The question was going

1 along very nicely until you put "generation" in.

2 MS. EDWARDS: I'm sorry, I may have  
3 used the wrong word on that. My apologies.

4 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'll try to  
5 separate the two and respond. It sometimes --  
6 I'll accept that sometimes it's confusing to  
7 understand how Metro-North is supplied at this  
8 location. They are supplied off the 115-kV  
9 system, which is fed from the Southend Substation.  
10 So they are in effect already supplied from  
11 Stamford. It does not impact the capacity of the  
12 Cos Cob Substation to serve customers in  
13 Greenwich. They are separate and distinct. They  
14 happen to co-locate at the same location, but  
15 additional load for Metro-North does not reduce  
16 the load or the capability of Cos Cob Substation  
17 to serve Greenwich.

18 MS. EDWARDS: Then just help me out  
19 with this because when we were talking about the  
20 load from Cos Cob -- and I remember just a few  
21 years ago there was really very little except a  
22 little backup, not being able to supply or to  
23 produce or whatever the energy that we're saying  
24 is going to be impacted for a lot of Greenwich. I  
25 remember it was really just a very small

1     substation.  So if it's been that enlarged, why  
2     couldn't it be shifted so that we don't have any  
3     use for Metro-North at that substation allowing it  
4     to be therefore used for Greenwich without  
5     incurring more development in Greenwich?

6                   THE WITNESS (Bowes):  So again, that  
7     is -- I guess I can answer it a couple different  
8     ways.  Metro-North has not indicated any  
9     willingness to abandon their facilities there.  In  
10    fact, they have just added some redundancy and  
11    expanded the substation at that location adding  
12    additional redundancy and additional  
13    transformation.  So I don't think they have any  
14    plans to leave.  The company has little ability to  
15    ask the sovereign to relocate their facilities.  
16    We just don't have any legal rights to do that.  
17    It would have to be a cooperative effort.  And  
18    they've indicated nothing at this point that they  
19    want to leave the Metro-North -- leave the Cos Cob  
20    location.

21                   MS. EDWARDS:  But if it's in the best  
22    interest of the ratepayers to have that substation  
23    really be defined for Greenwich rather than  
24    Metro-North, then it takes a higher order of  
25    responsibility for Eversource to have that happen

1 and therefore save the money for the ratepayers in  
2 the area.

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I understand your  
4 opinion in this. I don't necessarily agree with  
5 it.

6 MS. EDWARDS: You may not agree, but we  
7 have to look at what the cost is to the ratepayers  
8 because if you have --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Can you ask questions?  
10 You're supposed to ask questions.

11 MS. EDWARDS: There's a question in it.  
12 But if this is going to save the ratepayers money,  
13 then it would seem that it would be in your best  
14 interest to act on their behalf; would that not be  
15 the case?

16 THE WITNESS (Bowes): But not  
17 necessarily at the taxpayers' expense is where the  
18 Metro-North costs would be incurred. So there's a  
19 balance here, and the higher authority in this  
20 instance is the State of Connecticut. It's not  
21 Eversource.

22 MS. EDWARDS: And the State of  
23 Connecticut being the Metro-North supplier for  
24 money?

25 THE WITNESS (Bowes): No, the State of

1 Connecticut being the Department of  
2 Transportation.

3 MS. EDWARDS: Which is funding the  
4 Metro-North for their electricity costs?

5 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Which has a  
6 contract with Metro-North to operate on the  
7 Metro-North rail system.

8 MS. EDWARDS: So you're just, in  
9 effect, shifting money from one ratepayer to  
10 another ratepayer; is that not correct?

11 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I'm not shifting  
12 anything.

13 MS. EDWARDS: Well, it would be because  
14 you would not, as I understand it, be choosing the  
15 best for your own participant ratepayers for  
16 electricity. It would be looking at serving our  
17 -- and I'm talking the Town of Greenwich here --  
18 our real needs and our costs that would be kept  
19 down by this, and even if it does shift to the  
20 ratepayers, they're the ones who have to pay --  
21 I'm sorry, shift to DOT to Connecticut, they're  
22 the ones who pay for the train anyway, they have  
23 costs to take that train, but at the same time I'm  
24 looking at a ratepayer as myself in Greenwich. I  
25 don't want to see that we're being overwhelmed by

1 this when another solution, could it not, be  
2 there?

3 THE WITNESS (Bowes): Well, again,  
4 there's been a lot of discussion around increasing  
5 the supply at the Cos Cob Substation, and that  
6 does satisfy one of the needs of this project, but  
7 it does not satisfy the other needs.

8 MS. EDWARDS: What year did the Cos Cob  
9 station come on with this much power, if you will?  
10 Because I do remember it just being a very small  
11 supplier, if you will. When did this come on when  
12 it was rebuilt and expanded, what year was that?

13 THE WITNESS (Bowes): I think the last  
14 transformer was added in 1991.

15 MS. EDWARDS: Isn't it after that? I  
16 remember all the building that was going on for  
17 the NRG and such was much after that.

18 THE WITNESS (Bowes): That's the  
19 generating station that's co-located there. And I  
20 think in 2014 Metro-North did a sizable expansion  
21 of their substation there as well. So there have  
22 been many projects through the years. As long as  
23 I've worked in the company, which is now 32 years,  
24 it's been the major substation for Greenwich.  
25 That has not changed in three decades.

1 MS. EDWARDS: For Cos Cob?

2 THE WITNESS (Bowes): For Cos Cob.

3 MS. EDWARDS: I don't recall that at  
4 all, and I've been there quite a long time as well  
5 as a ratepayer. Thank you very much.

6 I would like to also reserve my right  
7 to question when the Town of Greenwich presents  
8 when they bring forward their information.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Everybody is going to  
10 have an opportunity.

11 MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much, and  
12 thank you for your time.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Has anybody come that  
14 represents any of the other intervenors?

15 (No response.)

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'd like to  
17 announce that the Council will continue the  
18 evidentiary portion of this hearing at its offices  
19 here, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, on Tuesday,  
20 February 23, 2016, and again, at 11 a.m. in this  
21 hearing room.

22 Please note that anyone who has not  
23 become a party or intervenor but who desires to  
24 make his or her views known to the Council may  
25 file written statements with the Council until the



1 record closes.

2           Copies of the transcript of this  
3 hearing will be filed at the Greenwich Town  
4 Clerk's Office. And I hereby declare this  
5 hearing --

6           MR. MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, before you  
7 close the hearing, would it be possible to set the  
8 date for some time prior to the 23rd, even the  
9 22nd? I'm not going to be available on the 23rd.

10           THE CHAIRMAN: We have a whole  
11 schedule. We're down Council members, and that's  
12 really the only date. Hopefully an attorney in  
13 your office can be equipped. I'm changing my  
14 vacation plans because of this. I'm sorry. We do  
15 the best we can with scheduling, but you can see  
16 we have multiple parties, some of whom don't  
17 even -- file as intervenors and then don't even  
18 show up. So we do the best we can.

19           MR. MARCUS: If you have the 22nd  
20 available --

21           THE CHAIRMAN: It's got to be the 23rd.  
22 I'm sorry.

23           (Whereupon, the witnesses were excused  
24 and the above proceedings were adjourned at 3:29  
25 p.m.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 152 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original stenotype notes taken of the Council Meeting in Re: DOCKET NO. 461, APPLICATION OF EVERSOURCE ENERGY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A 115-KILOVOLT (kV) BULK SUBSTATION LOCATED AT 290 RAILROAD AVENUE, GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT, AND TWO 115-kV UNDERGROUND TRANSMISSION CIRCUITS EXTENDING APPROXIMATELY 2.3 MILES BETWEEN THE PROPOSED SUBSTATION AND THE EXISTING COS COB SUBSTATION, GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT, AND RELATED SUBSTATION IMPROVEMENTS, which was held before ROBERT STEIN, Chairman, at the Connecticut Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, Connecticut, on January 12, 2016.



-----  
Lisa L. Warner, L.S.R., 061

Court Reporter

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I N D E X

WITNESSES MARGARET BAIN	PAGE	13
LAUREN HENAULT BIDRA		
EXAMINERS:		
Mr. Ashton		14
Mr. Hannon		15
The Chairman		17
WITNESS MARK BERGAMO		30
EXAMINERS:		
Mr. Murphy		31
Mr. Hannon		33
The Chairman		35
WITNESS DWIGHT UEDA		42
EXAMINER:		
The Chairman		43
WITNESS CHRISTINE EDWARDS		46
EXAMINER:		
Mr. Ueda		51

1 I N D E X (cont'd)

2

3 WITNESSES MICHAEL LIBERTINE PAGE 55

4 JACQUELINE GARDELL

5 RAYMOND GAGNON

6 KENNETH BOWES

7 SALVATORE GIULIANO 124

8 EXAMINERS:

9 Mr. Mercier 59

10 Mr. Murphy 66

11 Mr. Ashton 70

12 Mr. Hannon 89

13 The Chairman 94

14 Ms. Bain 96

15 Mr. Marcus 119

16 Mr. Ueda 140

17 Ms. Edwards 145

18

19 OCC EXHIBIT

20 (Received in evidence)

21 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

22 III-B-1 OCC request for party status, 14

23 dated July 13, 2015

24

25

## 1 I N D E X (Cont'd)

2

## 3 PET PANTRY EXHIBIT

4 (Received in evidence)

5 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

6 V-B-1 Pet Pantry Super Discount Stores 31

7 Stores LLC request for party and

8 intervenor status, dated 8/5/15

9

## 10 FIELD POINT ESTATE TOWNHOUSES EXHIBIT

11 (Received in evidence)

12 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

13 VI-B-1 Field Point Estate Townhouses, 43

14 Inc. request for intervenor status,

15 dated August 20, 2015

16

## 17 CHRISTINE EDWARDS EXHIBIT

18 (Received in evidence)

19 EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE

20 VII-B-1 Christine Edwards request for 49

21 intervenor status and pre-filed

22 information, dated 8/25/15

23

24

25

## I N D E X (Cont'd)

APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS  
(Received in evidence)

EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
II-B-38	Eversource Energy third supplemental testimony of Kenneth Bowes, dated 1/5/16	58
II-B-39	Eversource Energy responses to Council Interrogatories, Set III, dated 1/5/16	58
II-B-40	Eversource Energy Late-Filed Exhibits 8-14, dated 1/5/16	58
II-B-41	Eversource Energy responses to OCC interrogatories, Set V, dated 1/5/16	58