

In The Matter Of:

*Application from the United Illuminating Company
for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility*

*HEARING Docket No. 465
February 25, 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. 465

5 Application from the United Illuminating Company
6 for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
7 and Public Need for the Construction, Maintenance,
8 and Operation of a 115/13.8-Kilovolt Replacement
9 Substation Facility Located On an Approximately
10 1.5 Acre Portion of Two Adjoining UI-Owned Parcels
11 Directly Adjacent to UI's Existing Baird
12 Substation, 1770 Stratford Avenue, Stratford,
13 Connecticut, and Related Transmission Structure
14 and Interconnection Improvements

15
16 Siting Council Meeting held at the Stratford
17 Town Hall, Council Chambers, 2725 Main Street,
18 Stratford, Connecticut, Thursday, February 25,
19 2016, beginning at 3:00 p.m.

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

22 ROBIN STEIN, Chairman
23
24
25

1 A p p e a r a n c e s :

2 Council Members:

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

5
6 ROBERT HANNON,
7 DEEP Designee

8
9 COMM. MICHAEL A. CARON
10 PURA Designee

11
12 DANIEL P. LYNCH, JR.

13
14 Council Staff:

15 MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
16 Executive Director and
17 Staff Attorney

18
19 MICHAEL PERRONE
20 Siting Analyst

21
22
23
24
25

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

2

3 For THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY:

4 UIL HOLDINGS CORPORATION

5 157 Church Street

6 New Haven, Connecticut 06506

7 By: JAMES R. MORRISSEY, ESQ.

8

9 Also For THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY:

10 MURTHA CULLINA, LLP

11 One Century Tower

12 265 Church Street

13 9th Floor

14 New Haven, CT 06510

15 By: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ.

16

17 For THE TOWN OF STRATFORD:

18 BRUCE JACKSON, ESQ.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon,
2 ladies and gentlemen. I'll do my best to peer
3 over. Apparently the people in Stratford are of
4 much greater height than the Chairman is, but I'll
5 do my best.

6 This hearing of the Connecticut
7 Siting Council is called to order today, Thursday,
8 February 25, 2016, at 3 p.m. My name is Robin
9 Stein. I'm Chairman of the Connecticut Siting
10 Council.

11 Other members of the Council
12 present are Senator Murphy, our Vice Chairman;
13 Mr. Hannon, our designee from the Department of
14 Energy and Environmental Protection; Commissioner
15 Caron, designee from the Public Utilities
16 Regulatory Authority; and Mr. Lynch.

17 Members of the staff present are
18 Attorney Melanie Bachman, our Executive Director
19 Staff Attorney; and Mr. Perrone, our siting
20 analyst.

21 This hearing is held pursuant to
22 the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut
23 General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative
24 Procedure Act upon an Application of the United
25 Illuminating company for a certificate of

1 environmental compatibility and public need for
2 the construction, maintenance and operation of a
3 115-13.8-kilovolt replacement substation facility
4 located on an approximately 1.5-acre portion of
5 two adjoining UI-owned parcels directly adjacent
6 to UI's existing Baird Substation at 1770
7 Stratford Avenue, Stratford, Connecticut, as well
8 as related transmission structures and
9 interconnection improvements. This application
10 was received by the Council on December 21, 2015.

11 As a reminder to all,
12 off-the-record communication with a member of the
13 Council or a member of the Council's staff upon
14 the merits of this application is prohibited by
15 law.

16 The parties and intervenors at the
17 moment are the applicant, UI; and also intervener,
18 the Office of Consumer Counsel.

19 We will proceed in accordance with
20 the prepared agenda, copies of which are available
21 here. Also available are copies of Council's
22 Citizen Guide to Siting Council Procedures.
23 They're over at the door to my left, or near
24 there.

25 At the end of this afternoon's

1 session we will have an evidentiary session. We
2 will recess and resume again at 7 p.m. for the
3 public comment session. The 7 p.m. public comment
4 session will be reserved for the public to make
5 brief oral statements into the record.

6 I wish to note that parties and
7 intervenors, including their representatives and
8 witnesses are not allowed to participate in the
9 public comment session.

10 I also wish to note for those who
11 are here and for the benefit of your friends and
12 neighbors who are unable to join us for the public
13 comment session, that you or they may send written
14 statements to the Council within 30 days of the
15 date hereof and such written statements will be
16 given the same weight as if spoken at the hearing.
17 If necessary, party and intervener presentations
18 may continue after the public comment session --
19 if needed.

20 A verbatim transcript will be made
21 of this hearing and deposited with the town
22 clerk's office in Stratford for the convenience of
23 the public.

24 We do have a motion. The Town of
25 Stratford had filed a motion for party status

1 dated February 19, 2016. Staff recommends
2 approval. Do I have a motion?

3 SEN. MURPHY: So moved, Mr.
4 Chairman, that the Town of Stratford's motion to
5 be familiar party status be granted.

6 COMM. CARON: Second.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: I have a motion and
8 a second. All those in favor signify by saying,
9 aye.

10 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, abstention?

12 The motion carries.

13 I wish to call your attention to
14 those items shown on the hearing program marked as
15 Roman numeral 1D, items one through 58. Does the
16 applicant or any party or intervener have any
17 objection to the items that the Council has
18 administratively noticed?

19 MR. MORRISSEY: The applicant has
20 no objections, Mr. Chairman.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

22 Accordingly, the Council hereby
23 administratively notices these existing documents,
24 statements and comments.

25 And we'll now go to the appearance

1 by the applicant. Would you present your witness
2 panel for the purposes of taking the oath?

3 MR. MORRISSEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm
4 not sure if the Town of Stratford is here, but do
5 you want to make an availability for them to have
6 a public comment?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: They can comment
8 whenever they want. I don't know if -- from the
9 Town, yes. Please.

10 CHRISTOPHER TYMNIAK: How are you?
11 Hello. My name is Chris Tymniak. I'm the Chief
12 Administrative Officer for the Town of Stratford.
13 I want to thank you for coming today and thank you
14 for having this hearing in Stratford.

15 I hope everybody had a good site
16 tour and saw in Stratford where the plan is going
17 to go. I want to let you know that this is a
18 substation which we're excited to have and welcome
19 here into Stratford. Our relationship with UI has
20 been fantastic. They're a great community partner
21 and this is something we definitely look forward
22 to seeing move forward.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
24 We're glad to be here. We were told that we could
25 not detour to the facility that was adjacent. So

1 maybe after. Maybe.

2 So now will you, I guess, first
3 introduce your panel and then have them take the
4 oath?

5 MR. MORRISSEY: Good afternoon,
6 Mr. Chairman. My name is James Morrissey. I'm an
7 attorney for UIL Holdings Corporation. I
8 represent the applicant, the United Illuminating
9 Company. I'd like to start by having the panel
10 introduce themselves.

11 RONALD ROSSETTI: Ronald Rossetti,
12 Director of Engineering at UI.

13 MATTHEW CLOUD: Matthew Cloud,
14 transmission and substation engineer.

15 DAVID BRADT: Dave Bradt, Director
16 of Transmission Planning.

17 SAMANTHA MARONE: Samantha Marone,
18 permitting and public outreach.

19 TONY BUCCHERI: Tony Buccheri,
20 Director of Transmission Substation Project
21 Management.

22 SHAWN CROSBIE: Shawn Crosbie,
23 environmental analyst, UIL Holdings Corporation.

24 MIKE LIBERTINE: Hi. Mike
25 Libertine with All-Points Technology. I'm a

1 consultant working on the project.

2 STEPHEN WRIGHT: Stephen Wright,
3 Black & Veatch, civil site engineer.

4 KYLE ECKERT: Kyle Eckert, GHD
5 Services, consultant.

6 JEFFREY LAMBERT: Jeff Lambert, GHD
7 Services, consultant.

8 DAVID LORD: David Lord, Soil
9 Resource Consultants, consultant.

10 WILLIAM BAILEY: William Bailey
11 from Exponent, consultant.

12 RYAN BAKER: Ryan Baker, acoustical
13 specialist for Black & Veatch.

14 MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you,
15 Mr. Chairman. We have one witness that -- one
16 consultant for UI that just introduced themselves,
17 but they're not actually a witness. They're here
18 as support. That is Stephen Wright. So I just
19 want to make sure of that, to clarify that.
20 Otherwise, the witnesses that we submitted in our
21 prefiling, they are available to be sworn.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Please rise.

23

24

25

1 S A M A N T H A M A R O N E,
2 M A T T H E W C L O U D,
3 R O N A L D R O S S E T T I,
4 S H A W N C R O S B I E,
5 D A V I D B R A D T,
6 T O N Y B U C C H E R I,
7 W I L L I A M B A I L E Y,
8 D A V I D L O R D,
9 R Y A N B A K E R,
10 M I K E L I B E R T I N E,
11 K Y L E E C K E R T,
12 J E F F R E Y L A M B E R T,

13 called as witnesses, being first duly sworn
14 by the Executive Director, were examined and
15 testified on their oaths as follows:

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Would you continue
17 by numbering the exhibits of the filing you've
18 made in a matter in making the request to
19 administratively notice the documents and
20 verifying and -- well, I hope that doesn't take
21 all afternoon, but go ahead.

22 MR. MORRISSEY: I don't believe
23 that. I think we should be able to get through
24 this rather quickly. We have, for the exhibits we
25 have the application along with all of the bulk

1 file. We have Exhibit 2, applicant's responses to
2 Council interrogatories; Exhibit 3, applicant's
3 prehearing submission, All-Points Technology
4 supplemental aerial overlay; and Exhibit 4,
5 applicant's affidavit of sign posting, dated
6 February 19, 2016.

7 And if we could get them into the
8 record, Mr. Rossetti, did you supervise, prepare
9 or assist in the preparation of UI Exhibits 1
10 through 4?

11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, I
12 did.

13 MR. MORRISSEY: Do you have any
14 corrections or modifications?

15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, I do.

16 MR. MORRISSEY: Do you want to
17 start with number one?

18 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, I
19 will. The first correction will be appendix E of
20 the application in the visual analysis report, on
21 page 10 of 27.

22 I'd like to strike this from the
23 report because it is labeled, proposed changes, as
24 it includes changes not proposed as part of this
25 application. UI did submit a supplemental aerial

1 overlay to eliminate any confusion.

2 MR. MORRISSEY: Do you have any
3 others?

4 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, I do.
5 The next one is in appendix G of the application
6 under electric and magnetic fields assessment. On
7 pages 33 through 40, towards the end of the report
8 in the figures 11 to 18, the labels should read,
9 June 4, 2015, and not June 30, 2015.

10 MR. MORRISSEY: Any others?

11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes.
12 The -- in appendix K of the application under the
13 habitat assessment for the northern long-eared bat
14 Baird Substation expansion 717 Stratford Avenue,
15 Stratford, Connecticut, in paragraph 1, page 2, we
16 state that the wetland is 652 square feet in size,
17 but the actual size based on the wetland
18 delineation report dated 10/22 is 664 square feet.

19 MR. MORRISSEY: Do you have any
20 other corrections?

21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, the
22 last one. On interrogatory number 12, the
23 wetlands functions and values assessment, Baird
24 Substation project 717 -- 1770 Stratford Avenue,
25 Stratford, on page 2, the first paragraph, it says

1 the initial site investigation occurred on
2 April 14, 2016. The initial site investigation
3 actually occurred on April 14, 2015.

4 MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you,
5 Mr. Rossetti.

6 With those corrections are
7 Exhibits 1 through 4 true and accurate to the best
8 of your knowledge?

9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, they
10 are.

11 MR. MORRISSEY: And do you adopt
12 them as your testimony here today?

13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, I do.

14 MR. MORRISSEY: Mr. Chairman, I
15 offer Exhibits 1 through 4 as full exhibits.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any
17 objection?

18 (No response.)

19 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, they are
20 admitted as part of the record.

21 MR. MORRISSEY: And we have no
22 additional administrative notice requests.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So we'll
24 now begin cross-examination first by staff,
25 Mr. Perrone.

1 MR. PERRONE: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chairman.

3 I understand the application was
4 received on December 21, 2015. On January 8,
5 2016, the Council received a notification of
6 change in ownership letter for the United
7 Illuminating Company versus UI Holdings
8 Corporation. My question is, would that affect
9 this docket by changing the legal name of the
10 applicant from the United Illuminating Company to
11 UIL Holdings Corporation?

12 MR. MORRISSEY: I think I can take
13 that one.

14 I think there might be some
15 confusion. The applicant's name is not changing
16 from the United Illuminating Company. So I do not
17 believe that that name change request will impact
18 this docket.

19 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So if this
20 project is approved, the certificate holder name
21 would still be the United Illuminating Company?

22 MR. MORRISSEY: That's correct.

23 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Approximately
24 when does UI expect that the roundabout would be
25 constructed and how, if any, would the timeline

1 affect the construction of the substation?

2 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Currently
3 the roundabout is still in design mode from the
4 city -- or the Town of Stratford. We have
5 coordinated with them with our design plans for
6 the new substation and as soon as the design
7 plans -- we will collaborate and cooperate with
8 the Town of Stratford and include those with any
9 changes that are necessary.

10 But we have been working with the
11 Town of Stratford to incorporate any changes in
12 the design of our substation and with any
13 conflicts with the roundabout.

14 MR. PERRONE: And turning to the --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. We
16 have a follow-up question from Mr. Lynch.

17 MR. LYNCH: Yeah. With regards to
18 the roundabout, what role does the Connecticut
19 Department of Transportation play within that?
20 And if they do, is that in their queue for
21 anything that's relatively soon?

22 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So we will
23 have to get permits from the DOT, obviously, if
24 there's any changes with our underground
25 infrastructure moving --

1 MR. LYNCH: No. My real question
2 was, is the roundabout part of the Connecticut
3 DOT's -- is it one of their projects that they're
4 doing for the Town with regards to, you know, the
5 construction?

6 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I do not
7 know that answer.

8 MR. LYNCH: Thank you.

9 MR. MORRISSEY: We can try to get
10 that answer at the break. And if there's a
11 resumption of the evidentiary hearing maybe we
12 could read it into the record later this evening.

13 MR. LYNCH: The reason I ask is
14 that I wanted to know if it's a DOT project or
15 it's a Town of Stratford project. And having done
16 it with the DOT, I know they take a little bit
17 longer than the towns do.

18 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): The
19 roundabout, that is on a state road and that's
20 funded by the State, by the DOT and that's a
21 project for the Town of Stratford.

22 MR. PERRONE: And now turning to,
23 in the prefiled there is the supplemental aerial
24 overlay, the proposed changes and final
25 configuration. Just slightly north of the

1 roundabout there's a clearing between there and
2 the substation fence. If any landscaping is
3 proposed is that where the landscaping would
4 likely be located?

5 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, that
6 is -- that is correct.

7 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the sheet
8 before that, the proposed changes, that has the
9 most up-to-date configuration as far as which
10 monopoles are proposed, versus the petition 1176?

11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, that
12 is correct.

13 MR. PERRONE: Okay. What kinds of
14 work would have to be done to the existing
15 substation and in order to convert it to a
16 training facility?

17 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The planned
18 work at the existing station would be minimal.
19 There would be some removal of some existing
20 equipment, and including the incoming transmission
21 structures on the exterior of the fence -- would
22 be removed in all the conductors entering the
23 substation. But most of the equipment within the
24 existing substation would remain and work there
25 would be minimal besides regular maintenance and

1 upkeep.

2 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And you would
3 disconnect it on the transmission and the
4 distribution side?

5 THE WITNESS (Cloud): That is
6 correct.

7 MR. PERRONE: Where do you
8 currently perform substation training? Do you
9 have another facility in Connecticut or somewhere
10 else?

11 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No,
12 presently we do not have another training facility
13 to -- to do that. That's why we thought this was
14 an opportunity to use the existing substation as a
15 training facility.

16 MR. PERRONE: There is a letter
17 from the Department of Energy and Environmental
18 Protection dated April 14th, and it mentions no
19 impacts to state listed species. And I also
20 understand that critical habitat was not found for
21 the northern long-eared bat.

22 So just to be clear, are there any
23 other federally listed species in the vicinity of
24 the project?

25 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I would

1 like to call up our environmental witness, Shawn
2 Crosbie. Mr. Crosbie, can you respond to that
3 please?

4 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Shawn
5 Crosbie, environmental analyst, UIL holdings
6 Corporation.

7 Based on correspondence from the
8 agency, no, there's not.

9 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And I also
10 understand that in the DEEP letter it mentions
11 that the determination would expire on April 14,
12 2016. If the substation project is approved would
13 UI seek an updated determination? And if so,
14 could that be included in the D and M plan?

15 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, it
16 could.

17 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And with that
18 plan could you also include any wildlife
19 protection measures that may be suggested?

20 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Yes, we
21 could.

22 MR. PERRONE: Okay. I understand
23 that the transformer insulating oil would be
24 mineral oil. So that's basically -- is that a
25 petroleum based oil and avoids the use of PCBs?

1 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): There is
2 no PCBs in that. We call it a dielectric fluid.

3 MR. PERRONE: Okay. In response to
4 interrogatory 12, that's the one where the wetland
5 location relative to the proposed substation is
6 indicated in the drawing. And given that layout
7 could you explain why the wetland -- why you
8 cannot avoid filling the wetland?

9 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The equipment
10 that's placed over the wetland is sufficiently
11 inside the yard to make it difficult to avoid the
12 wetland. Directly over the top of the wetland is
13 a bus support structure and corresponding bus at
14 26 feet. So it is very much within the substation
15 perimeter.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hannon has a
17 follow-up question.

18 MR. HANNON: This one is directed
19 to Mr. Lord. I think it's a relatively simple
20 answer.

21 But I think part of the issue with
22 the wetlands in looking at it today, it looks as
23 though most of that area leading up to the
24 wetlands is probably an urban fill material, and
25 that may be the last sort of small pocket of land

1 that hasn't been filled. Is that a reasonable
2 assumption?

3 THE WITNESS (Lord): Yes, that is a
4 correct assumption. It is an urban fill
5 situation.

6 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. PERRONE: Back to environmental
8 for a moment. On the long-eared bat habitat
9 assessment it notes that there's about .73 acres
10 of trees currently at the site. Would
11 approximately all of that acreage be cleared? Or
12 do you know approximately the tree clearing area?

13 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): That is
14 correct. The whole area would be cleared.

15 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So it would be
16 essentially all of that?

17 THE WITNESS (Crosbie):

18 Essentially, yes.

19 MR. PERRONE: What's the
20 approximate current ground elevation of the center
21 of the substation site, existing?

22 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Approximately
23 13 feet in the NAVD 88 datum.

24 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And you would
25 try to more or less maintain that. You're not

1 really raising or lowering the substation. Is
2 that correct?

3 THE WITNESS (Cloud): That is
4 correct.

5 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Getting into
6 visibility a little bit, I understand that the
7 homes to the north on the opposite side of the
8 tracks -- we went out there in the field. They
9 appear to be at a higher elevation. And my
10 question is, if you knew ballpark, about how much
11 higher that area is?

12 THE WITNESS (Libertine): Hi. Mike
13 Libertine. Yes, that's about 38 feet
14 approximately at a higher elevation using ground
15 level to ground level.

16 In the supplemental information on
17 visibility behind Exhibit E, actually there's a
18 photograph that -- and a schematic photo one,
19 which was taken from essentially the east end of
20 Jackson Avenue. It gives a pretty good indication
21 of today what the existing conditions are in terms
22 of that elevation change. We've also -- if you
23 look two pages later, we provided a profile just
24 to give an idea of what that grade change is.

25 MR. PERRONE: And generally

1 qualitatively assessing, is having the homes at a
2 higher elevation, does that somewhat reduce the
3 issue impact because you would be looking over the
4 substation?

5 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I think
6 from near view certainly along Jackson Avenue that
7 would be the case. I'd make a pretty good
8 analogy, actually where we're sending today,
9 looking out the window gives you kind of about the
10 same perspective, and there is a flagpole. So
11 again, your eye tends to go towards the horizon.
12 So I think it's a fairly good analogy. So I would
13 say yeah, in general that would be the case.

14 MR. PERRONE: Okay.

15 THE WITNESS (Libertine): I'd
16 also -- I might add that the views really of the
17 new substation are limited to that eastern end.
18 As you start moving west along Jackson Avenue
19 there are homes. Now obviously, from the road
20 itself, those homes block views, but as you do
21 move west there's significant infrastructure along
22 the railroad tracks and elsewhere, so that again,
23 your eye is not drawn to those areas.

24 And as was put on the record
25 earlier, the existing substation has two fairly

1 tall transmission structures. Those will be
2 removed. So essentially what is there today is
3 shifting a little bit to the east from what you
4 see.

5 MR. PERRONE: And one other
6 question if you happen to know. Is the substation
7 site located near an important bird area?

8 THE WITNESS (Libertine): That
9 might be Shawn's.

10 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): As far as
11 we have on record, no.

12 MR. PERRONE: And back to
13 substation elevation briefly, would any cut at the
14 site be used as fill? And what would happen with
15 any excess cut? How would that be disposed of?

16 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): Mr.
17 Perrone, could you just repeat the question,
18 please?

19 MR. PERRONE: Sure. In response to
20 interrogatory 27 the amounts of cut and fill were
21 provided. I was just wondering if the cut
22 material would be used on site as fill?

23 THE WITNESS (Crosbie): So some of
24 the cut material would be reused based on the
25 pre-characterization that was performed. The

1 material that was -- did not meet solid waste
2 standards for Connecticut would be shipped off
3 site.

4 MR. PERRONE: UI also noted in
5 interrogatory 17 that notice to the FAA is
6 required and would be provided at least 45 days
7 prior to construction. If the project is approved
8 could a copy of such notice be provided to the
9 Council?

10 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, it
11 could.

12 MR. PERRONE: Also the Connecticut
13 Department of Transportation submitted comments
14 dated February 8th. Would UI also apply for an
15 encroachment permit for any work performed within
16 the state right-of-way?

17 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, we
18 would.

19 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Getting into
20 substation design a little bit, I understand
21 14 feeders would leave the proposed replacement
22 substation. Is that the same amount of feeders
23 that's currently hooked to the existing
24 substation?

25 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Currently

1 at the existing Baird Substation we have 16
2 feeders or circuits leaving. But you are correct
3 in that the new substation will have 14 feeders
4 leaving with two spare positions. So it will have
5 the same amount of positions. We are
6 consolidating some of our circuits.

7 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And that would
8 go underground under Stratford Ave, generally?

9 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Leaving
10 the substation, that is correct.

11 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Turning to the
12 noise report, just probably a minor technical
13 correction.

14 On page 14 of the noise report, it
15 mentions projected sound levels for Two Roads
16 Brewery and the Savings Auto Center. I believe
17 for Two Roads Brewery it says 548. I was just
18 wondering if that was just a typo, and 48 was
19 attended?

20 THE WITNESS (Baker): Can you
21 repeat the page number please?

22 MR. PERRONE: Page 14 of the noise
23 report.

24 THE WITNESS (Baker): And the
25 question please?

1 MR. PERRONE: Okay. The paragraph
2 above the drawing, the second to the last
3 sentence, I believe, anticipated to be 548 dBA and
4 43 dBA. I was just wondering if the 548 was a
5 typo, and if so, what the intended number was.

6 THE WITNESS (Baker): Yes, that is
7 a typo. It should be 48 dBA.

8 MR. PERRONE: Okay. On pages 62
9 and 63 of the application UI discusses the
10 substation lighting plans. If approved, could the
11 final lighting design be included in the D and M
12 plan?

13 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, it
14 could. We will.

15 MR. PERRONE: Now I'm going to move
16 to the EMF report.

17 Turning to page 9 of that report,
18 figure 4. My understanding is the nearest home is
19 the one just south of Jackson Avenue and closest
20 to the proposed substation. So that basically
21 it's the square closest to the right-of-way. Is
22 that right?

23 THE WITNESS (Bailey): That's
24 correct.

25 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And when staff

1 was looking at this we were comparing profiles
2 seven and eight as they occur on -- hold on one
3 second -- as that data is provided on page 28.

4 But is it true that profile seven
5 and profile eight, they start at a different point
6 so the zero foot point is different for those two?

7 THE WITNESS (Bailey): That is
8 correct.

9 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So that being
10 the case, if we're interested in the magnetic
11 field levels both pre and post for the home that's
12 170 feet away, as an approximation would we use
13 profile seven, or do you have more specific
14 numbers pre and post for the closest home magnetic
15 fields?

16 THE WITNESS (Bailey): I think the
17 one to use would be profile eight.

18 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Now if you use
19 profile eight my other question would be, since
20 the zero foot mark is based on the existing Baird
21 Substation it wouldn't be as simple as to just
22 look at it 170 feet. Right?

23 THE WITNESS (Bailey): That's
24 correct.

25 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So there's a

1 shift or a difference between the two. So where
2 about would we end up on profile eight for that
3 home?

4 THE WITNESS (Bailey): I believe
5 that shift would be closer to 200 feet plus.

6 MR. PERRONE: So as an
7 approximation, it would be about 4.6 milligauss
8 pre and 15 milligauss post?

9 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Correct.

10 MR. PERRONE: And we would use that
11 same profile for finding the magnetic fields just
12 generally in the residential area at about
13 200 feet?

14 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

15 MR. PERRONE: Okay. All set on
16 EMF. Thank you.

17 THE WITNESS (Bailey): Thank you.

18 MR. PERRONE: Okay. This goes into
19 substation reliability. I understand that you
20 have two transmission lines that basically loop
21 through. So that essentially gives you the four
22 circuits. Is that right?

23 THE WITNESS (Bradt): That's
24 correct. So there's two circuits along the
25 railroad corridor. They loop in and out and

1 they're separated by a breaker, giving you four,
2 yes.

3 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So with that
4 configuration if you were to lose any of those
5 circuits the substation could still operate?

6 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Yes. We --
7 we study for the loss of any one or two elements
8 and a circuit could be considered an element.
9 Yes.

10 MR. PERRONE: Okay. So any one or
11 two out of that four potentially?

12 THE WITNESS (Bradt): That's
13 correct.

14 MR. PERRONE: Okay. And this is
15 more about the parcels and zoning and everything.
16 I understand the two parcels add up to 3.5 acres.
17 So you basically have an eastern parcel of 1.8 and
18 a western of 1.7. How does it break down on the
19 3.5?

20 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That is
21 correct.

22 MR. PERRONE: And they're both at
23 the 1770 Stratford Ave?

24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): The whole
25 complex is part of 1770 Stratford Avenue. That is

1 correct.

2 MR. PERRONE: Because I understand
3 in the application it mentioned dual zoning. So
4 you have both industrial and commercial zoning.
5 Is that correct?

6 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We'll have
7 to check back on that. I'm not positive. I'm not
8 sure about that. I believe it's industrial,
9 subject to check. I believe it's industrial and
10 commercial. That's subject to check.

11 MR. PERRONE: And let's see.
12 Lastly, I understand there's an 80-foot
13 communications pole in the proposal. Could you
14 explain what that's used for, how that works?

15 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes, that
16 80-foot communication pole is for communication to
17 UI's metering infrastructure.

18 MR. PERRONE: Are those send-only
19 antennas, or send-and-receive?

20 THE WITNESS (Cloud): They are --
21 they are receive, send and receive.

22 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Mr. Perrone,
23 I apologize. I just need to make a correction on
24 one statement I said. I told you that any two of
25 those lines of those four -- I believe I implied

1 that the load would remain served. And there's
2 actually a scenario where we could lose two of
3 those lines and drop the -- and loose the Baird
4 Substation load, but it's considered a tolerable
5 event. So --

6 MR. PERRONE: Okay. Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lynch has a
8 follow-up.

9 MR. LYNCH: I just didn't hear the
10 second to the last answer. Were those immediate
11 antennas that were -- that you're referring to, to
12 Mr. Perrone on the pole. You said they were
13 metering antennas. I just didn't hear it
14 properly. That's all.

15 THE WITNESS (Cloud): They are
16 communication for our -- our meters. Yes.

17 MR. LYNCH: That's all I was
18 clarifying. Thank you.

19 MR. PERRONE: And lastly, on the
20 communication pole topic, the emissions from those
21 antennas would still meet the FCC OET bulletin
22 limits for power density?

23 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I am not
24 prepared to answer that at this time.

25 MR. PERRONE: That's okay. I

1 withdrawal that.

2 Thank you. That's all I have.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now
4 we'll continue with any questions from the
5 Council. Senator Murphy.

6 SEN. MURPHY: Thank you,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 In the application on page 25 you
9 indicate that the alternatives considered in light
10 of doing what you're doing in this application --
11 actually you indicate there are five choices. The
12 first one, I guess, is not a choice at all. And
13 so in the next page and a half you discuss these
14 four alternatives and come to the conclusion that
15 the decision is to file this application.

16 And in making this analysis, did
17 you put together any ballpark figures as to the
18 other alternatives, the relocate replacement and
19 vice versa and in-kind replacement? Was anything
20 put together on the numbers? I mean, we've got a
21 project before us that's 30 and a half mill --
22 million dollars? So --

23 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So we did do
24 a conceptual design and estimated for the in-kind
25 upgrade of the substation. Would you like that in

1 the cost?

2 SEN. MURPHY: What did you get for
3 a figure on that?

4 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The total
5 cost for that in-kind upgrade was estimated at
6 \$36.9 million.

7 SEN. MURPHY: Uh-huh. And did you
8 do any computation on the other two which is the
9 reverse of the rebuild and relocate?

10 THE WITNESS (Cloud): To clarify,
11 are you referring to the rebuild 115 transmission
12 bus, those two alternatives that are listed there?

13 SEN. MURPHY: Right. Yeah, they're
14 back end.

15 THE WITNESS (Cloud): We did do a
16 cursory design review of those alternatives, but
17 found they would not be feasible to address all of
18 the issues that we found.

19 SEN. MURPHY: Okay. And in your
20 discussion and contemplation as to coming to
21 your -- in reaching your conclusion, what weight
22 do you give to the interruption of service if you
23 don't do what you're doing now, if you can rate
24 that?

25 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yeah, the

1 reliability exposure to the customers fed from the
2 substation was absolutely part of our
3 consideration. The duration for an in-kind
4 upgrade construction and cutover time was
5 anticipated to be approximately six months longer
6 than a full replacement.

7 So in that sense, there is an
8 obvious increase in exposure as the construction
9 duration is increased significantly in that
10 upgrade. So that is certainly something that we
11 did consider during that alternative review.

12 SEN. MURPHY: So in your 36.9
13 in-kind, it really comes out to be more than
14 redoing -- putting in a new station, which is
15 before us here today?

16 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes, that is
17 what our -- our alternative investigation found,
18 predominately because of that increased
19 construction duration the increased hazards with
20 working inside of an energized facility while it
21 continues to serve load, among other reasons.

22 SEN. MURPHY: And in order to
23 upgrade the present facility and in order to use
24 it for training, any ballpark figure as to what
25 you might expend to do that to make it reasonably

1 safe for training purposes? Or is that down the
2 road?

3 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I mean,
4 that would be down the road. But -- if that's
5 okay, but we do plan on -- we do plan on
6 maintaining that.

7 SEN. MURPHY: If you don't have it
8 now, that's fine. I just thought I'd ask. But I
9 feel it might be down the road.

10 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yeah, down
11 the road. It would be in the ballpark of about a
12 couple hundred thousand dollars and then we would
13 maintain that property as well moving forward.

14 SEN. MURPHY: Okay. Relatively
15 speaking it's an inconsequential in a million
16 dollars?

17 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes.

18 SEN. MURPHY: All right. I have
19 nothing else, Mr. Chairman at this time.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

21 Mr. Hannon?

22 MR. HANNON: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chairman. I do have some questions. They're
24 more technical in nature, because I'm a little
25 confused with some of the things I found in the

1 documents. I'm just trying to get some of them
2 clarified. My first question actually bounces
3 around to four different pages.

4 On page 2 there's a comment that
5 three of the poles are part of the previously
6 approved project. I understand that. On page 34
7 you make a similar statement that three of these
8 monopoles were previously approved and submitted
9 to the Council under UI Petition 1176. Then on
10 page 40, this modification -- it's the second
11 paragraph. This modification necessitates a
12 change in the location of four of approved poles.
13 So that is part of the question.

14 And then -- but also diving into
15 that, and just so I am sure, in looking at the map
16 behind DR3, I mean, that identifies five poles
17 associated with the PE-1176. I just want to make
18 sure I know which polls are associated with which
19 project?

20 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Perhaps I can
21 provide some clarification. There are the three
22 poles that are shifted as part of the relocation
23 of the substation to the west. Those are the two
24 poles north of the substation site. One pole
25 north of the railroad tracks.

1 The fourth pole referenced here is
2 actually by the existing Baird Substation and
3 covered under petition 1176. And that one will
4 also be moved, but it's not as a consequence as a
5 shift in the substation. That is just a planned
6 shift by that project under 1176.

7 MR. HANNON: Okay. I wanted to
8 make sure, because we had threes in some spots and
9 four in another one. And then I see five poles
10 identified with 1176.

11 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yeah, I could
12 see where that could be confusing.

13 MR. HANNON: On page 34, 35 --

14 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Mr. Hannon,
15 we have a visual on what was just being discussed.

16 MR. HANNON: Well, that's so I had
17 a little bit of understanding, you know, in the
18 site today. But I would appreciate it if you can
19 go forward to that.

20 THE WITNESS (Cloud): These three
21 poles are located here -- are shifted because of
22 the substation shift. The fourth pole that's
23 referenced is actually this pole right here, which
24 is part of the petition 1176. But it is not being
25 shifted because of the change in the substation

1 session.

2 MR. HANNON: Okay. All right.

3 Thank you.

4 On page 34 and 35, the last
5 paragraph on page 34, kind of rolling over onto
6 35, you identify, you know, a number of the poles,
7 but the third item is one pole northeast of the
8 existing railroad catenary structure to support
9 the new transmission conductors. Is that the
10 communication pole?

11 THE WITNESS (Cloud): I'm sorry.
12 Could you repeat the section and the page number,
13 please?

14 MR. HANNON: Okay. It's
15 actually -- my question is at the top of page 35
16 where it talks about, as well as one monopole
17 northeast of the existing railroad catenary
18 structure to support the new transmission
19 conductors. And I just want to make sure that
20 that is the communication pole?

21 THE WITNESS (Cloud): Yes, I'll use
22 the visual again to clarify.

23 So the monopole that that is
24 referring to is -- is this pole here, which is
25 required for the standard for this monopole back

1 to the existing catenary structure for the
2 transmission line.

3 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

4 And I guess part of the reason why
5 I had a question on this is that at the end of the
6 second paragraph on page 35 it says, additionally
7 an 80-foot communication pole will be located on
8 the west side of the site to provide communication
9 between the station, UI's distribution
10 infrastructure. And I don't see anything on the
11 west side of the site.

12 So I'm just wondering if that
13 should be on the east side of the site?

14 MR. MORRISSEY: Mr. Chairman, just
15 for the record, this drawing that we're
16 referencing is in our supplemental filing. It's
17 Exhibit 3.

18 THE WITNESS (Cloud): So the -- the
19 referenced 80-foot communication pole is located
20 here. It is a wooden pole, unlike the monopoles
21 which are galvanized steel.

22 MR. HANNON: And the reason I was
23 asking was because the only 80-foot poles I saw
24 identified on any of the maps, one was a
25 communication pole which is northeast of the site

1 and the other one is the pole that is over by the
2 brewery. Okay. Thank you.

3 And I know in the -- in appendix D
4 dealing with the sound levels, the way the
5 language is in there is the sound levels should
6 not exceed, whether it's the 45 dBA along
7 residential and 62 dBA along commercial zoning.
8 What happens if it does?

9 THE WITNESS (Baker): My apologies.
10 Could you repeat the question?

11 MR. HANNON: Sure. In appendix D
12 there's a statement that says sound levels should
13 not exceed 45 dBA along residential zoning, and
14 sound levels should not exceed 62 dBA along
15 commercial zoning.

16 Seeing the words, "should not," I'm
17 just curious as to what would happen if they do
18 exceed? What measures might be implemented?

19 THE WITNESS (Baker): Well first
20 off, the noise modeling that was conducted is very
21 conservative. It assumes all noise -- all noise
22 receptors are in a downwind condition.

23 MR. HANNON: Uh-huh.

24 THE WITNESS (Baker): Additionally,
25 the transformer operation that was specified in

1 the noise model is consistent with peak loading.
2 So the bands are operating at full capacity.

3 If there was an issue along the
4 property boundary and the sound level were to
5 exceed, mitigation could include a noise
6 barrier -- would probably be the best option.

7 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

8 Just -- I see, should not. To me
9 it just raises a question.

10 And then I don't know who's going
11 to handle the last question, because I'm not sure,
12 so I'll just ask. On page 23, what is your
13 meaning of system topology changes? What are you
14 specifically referring to in this project for
15 that?

16 It's about the middle of the first
17 full paragraph.

18 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Got it. Just
19 give just me a second to read it.

20 MR. HANNON: Uh-huh.

21 THE WITNESS (Bradt): Yes, the
22 context of this meaning is for system topology
23 changes. That's what we would refer to as --
24 there's a couple of things that could change on
25 the transmission system. It might be generation

1 additions, generation retirements, new lines,
2 reconfigurations of lines.

3 So several years ago we put in a
4 new 345 kV project intersecting Connecticut. So
5 that would be a system topology change. It
6 actually changes the flow of power across the
7 state.

8 MR. HANNON: Okay. I just wanted
9 to get a clarification. And then I believe my
10 last question, I think, was the answer in the
11 interrogatories. I think that there was a
12 question about the lightning mast being lowered, I
13 think, to 55, and the question about the number.
14 And I think the number would go from 6 at 70 feet,
15 to 7 and 75?

16 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That is
17 correct.

18 MR. HANNON: And have you talked to
19 the Town in terms of what the Town's preference
20 would be on this?

21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, we
22 did.

23 MR. HANNON: And that is?

24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): They
25 actually liked less mast at the taller height.

1 MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you.

2 I have no further questions.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 Mr. Lynch?

5 MR. LYNCH: Just one or two
6 incidental questions, if I can find them here.
7 But I'm just going to fast forward to the storm we
8 had yesterday.

9 Would the new substation have
10 prevented any of the outages that you had on your
11 system? Or were they due to downed power lines or
12 downed distribution lines, or downed trees, or
13 whatever?

14 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): The storm
15 that we had yesterday was more of a distribution
16 type of event, trees coming down onto distribution
17 power lines. We will be using the same
18 distribution system connected to the new
19 substation as we had with the old substation. So
20 the impact would be the same.

21 MR. LYNCH: Okay. I just had to
22 ask.

23 I noticed that when you're talking
24 about security you did a lot of talk about
25 interrogatories, and in the application on the

1 fencing surrounding the facility. And I'm just
2 trying to comprehend in my own mind, which is
3 scary in itself, that why anyone would try to
4 vandalize or break into an energized substation.
5 Is this a big problem within your system?

6 THE WITNESS (Cloud): These
7 physical security measures, the fence with the
8 slots that I believe you're referring to being one
9 of them, really came about after an incident that
10 occurred in California where a substation was
11 fired upon by an individual outside of the
12 perimeter of the substation. And UI has been
13 reevaluating it's physical security measures to
14 address the potential for a physical attack and
15 assessing the criticality of all of our
16 substations.

17 So based upon this substation's
18 level of criticality, our physical security
19 measures --

20 MR. LYNCH: That's something I
21 didn't think of, being attacked from the outside.
22 I though people would try to break in. Why would
23 you want to be in an energized substation?

24 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): So one
25 thing that has happened in the past in our system

1 is people trying to steal the copper, a lot of
2 copper conductors, the copper inside the
3 equipment. So there, when copper is worth a lot
4 of money we see that as well.

5 MR. LYNCH: That leads right into
6 my next question that I was going to ask. Having
7 discussions with the ironworkers and the police in
8 Hartford that are building the stadium, they have
9 a very difficult time keeping the people from
10 breaking in.

11 Whether it's fenced in, that issue
12 is bolt cutters, and when the police station is
13 only a block away. And they're stealing thousands
14 of dollars of material out of the stadium. And I
15 would just -- you answered the question that, you
16 know, that is a similar problem that you would
17 have with the substation.

18 Now is that more in a construction
19 period, or is that something that once it's up and
20 built and energized they still try to get in?

21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): We --
22 unless people are really smart and they know if
23 the substation is energized or not we've seen both
24 cases. We've also seen, on our distribution
25 system, we have down-grounds that are copper, off

1 our distribution transformers. They'll go and cut
2 that off the pole. And we have energized
3 transformers right on the pole. So people will go
4 and -- and steal this copper not knowing if
5 something is energized or not.

6 MR. LYNCH: All right. I was
7 curious. And thank you for answering the
8 question.

9 That's all, Mr. Chairman.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

11 I just -- what is the use of the
12 property that's adjacent to the older substation?
13 I think it's 1780 Stratford Avenue.

14 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): I believe
15 it's a used car dealership.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, so I don't have
17 to be concerned about you providing a buffer.
18 Maybe you'd like them to provide you a buffer.

19 Is the building on that site, is
20 that coming down eventually?

21 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Are you
22 referring to our existing.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: No. Your existing
24 future training site.

25 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): The

1 control house that I believe you're speaking to,
2 that will stay intact. We do have a switchgear
3 inside the station that we will use to train our
4 employees on how to --

5 For instance, there's circuit
6 breakers within that, that enclosure and we'll
7 have folks learning how to operate in what we call
8 rack-in and rack-out into the switchgear. So
9 there's -- and there's other metering and -- and
10 other things that we will use as training for our
11 substation and transmission technicians.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: If we get to the
13 point of a D and M plan, will you include a
14 decommissioning plan for that substation?

15 THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, we
16 will.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

18 MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Chairman, if I
19 could justify my position at the table here? I
20 had Mr. Libertine go to the zoning office to
21 actually inquire as to the zoning, which I think
22 Mr. Perrone had asked about. And I can either
23 tell you the answer or have Mr. Libertine recite
24 what he learned. And we could mark that off of
25 our to-do list.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, you can.

2 MR. McDERMOTT: The first hundred
3 feet off the road for both parcels is commercial
4 and the rear of both lots is zoned manufacturing.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

6 Mr. Hannon has a question.

7 MR. HANNON: Yes, thank you.

8 I believe you had previously
9 mentioned that the elevation at the site is
10 13 feet. Correct?

11 THE WITNESS (Cloud): That is
12 correct.

13 MR. HANNON: Do you have any
14 information on the elevation for the hundred-year
15 and the 500-year flood zone?

16 THE WITNESS (Cloud): It is outside
17 the hundred-year and 500-year flood zones.

18 MR. HANNON: Okay. Is it possible
19 if you could maybe figure out the actual numbers?
20 I don't need it right now, but if that's something
21 we can figure out it would be appreciated.

22 THE WITNESS (Cloud): The closest
23 hundred-year and 500-year flood elevation is
24 11 feet.

25 MR. HANNON: Okay. All right. So

1 you're at least a couple. Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

3 (No response.)

4 THE CHAIRMAN: So we'll now

5 continue with cross-examination by the

6 parties/intervenors.

7 The office of Consumer Counsel?

8 (No response.)

9 THE CHAIRMAN: The silence is
10 somewhat deafening, so we'll go on. And since the
11 Town has become a party, does the Town have any
12 cross examination?

13 MR. JACKSON: We have no questions,
14 your Honor. Bruce Jackson, town attorney's
15 office.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

17 So we're now going to recess until
18 7 p.m., at which time we'll commence the public
19 comment session of the hearing. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon the witnesses were
21 excused, and the above proceedings were concluded
22 at 4:03 p.m.)

23


24

25

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 51 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Siting Council Meeting in Re: Docket No. 464, APPLICATION FROM THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A 115/13.8-KILOVOLT REPLACEMENT SUBSTATION FACILITY LOCATED ON AN APPROXIMATELY 1.5 ACRE PORTION OF TWO ADJOINING UI-OWNED PARCELS DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO UI'S EXISTING BAIRD SUBSTATION, 1770 STRATFORD AVENUE, STRATFORD, CONNECTICUT, AND RELATED TRANSMISSION STRUCTURE AND INTERCONNECTION IMPROVEMENTS, which was held before ROBIN STEIN, Chairman, at the Stratford Town Hall, Council Chambers, 2725 Main Street, Stratford, Connecticut, February 25, 2016.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857

Notary Public

BCT Reporting, LLC

PO Box 1774

Bristol, Connecticut 06011

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020

I N D E X

1

2

WITNESSES

3

Samantha Marone

4

Matthew Cloud

5

Ronald Rossetti

6

Shawn Crosbie

7

David Bradt

8

Tony Buccheri

9

William Bailey

10

David Lord

11

Ryan Baker

12

Mike Libertine

13

Kyle Eckert

14

Jeffrey Lambert

- Page 11

15

16

17

EXAMINATION

18

Mr. Perrone

- Page 15

19

20

21

22

23

24

25