In The Matter Of:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 483

June 14, 2018

BCT Reporting LLC

55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A

Plainville, CT 06062

860.302.1876

Original File 14Jun2018 CT Siting Bridgeport Regular 1500-1646 98pgs LP98.txt

Min-U-Script®

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Docket No. 483

Application from United Illuminating Company for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for Pequonnock Substation Rebuild Project That Entails Construction, Maintenance and Operation of 115/13.8-Kilovolt (kV) Gas Insulated Replacement Substation Located On an Approximately 3.7-acre Parcel Owned by PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC, at 1 Kiefer Street In Bridgeport, Connecticut

Regular Hearing held at the Bridgeport City Hall, Council Chambers, 45 Lyon Terrace, Bridgeport, Connecticut, Thursday, June 14, 2018, beginning at 3:00 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e:

ROBIN STEIN, Chairman

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

Council Members:

JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.
Vice Chairman

LARRY LEVESQUE,
PURA Designee

ROBERT HANNON,
DEEP Designee

MICHAEL HARDER
DR. MICHAEL W. KLEMENS
ROBERT SILVESTRI
EDWARD EDELSON
DAVID LYNCH

Council Staff:

MELANIE BACHMAN, ESQ.,
Executive Director and
Staff Attorney

MICHAEL PERRONE,
Siting Analyst

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

For the Applicant, UIL Holdings Corporation:

MURTHA CULLINA
85 Asylum St
29th Floor,
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
By: BRUCE McDERMOTT, ESQ.
Bmcdermott@murthalaw.com
203-772-7787

For the Intervenor, PSEG:

BROWN RUDNICK, LLP
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
By: KYLE JOHNSON, ESQ.
Kjohnson@brownrudnick.com
860-509-6570

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Connecticut Siting Council today, Thursday, June 14, 2018, at approximately 3 p.m.

My name is Robin Stein. I'm chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other members of the Council present are Senator James Murphy, our Vice Chairman; Mr. Hannon, designee from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection; Mr. Levesque, designee from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; Mr. Silvestri; Dr. Klemens; Mr. Edelson; Mr. Harder; and Mr. Lynch.

Members of the staff present are Melanie Bachman, our Executive Director and staff attorney; and Michael Perrone our citing analyst.

This hearing is held pursuant to the provisions of Title 16 of the Connecticut General Statutes and of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act upon an application from United Illuminating Company for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for a Pequonnock Substation rebuild project that entails construction, maintenance and operation of 115/13.8 kilovolts gas insulated replacement substation located on an approximately 3.7 acre

parcel owned by PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC, at 1 Kiefer Street in Bridgeport, Connecticut. The application was received by the Council on April 26, 2018.

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

The parties and interveners to the proceeding are as follows. The applicant, UI representative Attorney Bruce McDermott; intervenor PSEG Power Connecticut, LLC, Attorney Kyle Johnson.

We will proceed in accordance with the prepared agenda, copies of which are available here next to the podium. Also available are copies of the Council's citizen guide to Siting council procedures.

At the end of this afternoon's evidentiary session we will recess and resume again at 6:30 p.m. for the public comment session. The 6:30 public comment session will be reserved for the public to make brief oral statements into the record.

I wish to note that the applicant or

interveners, including their representatives and witnesses are not allowed to participate in the public comment session. I also wish to note for those of you who are here and for the benefit of your friends and neighbors who are unable to join us for the public comment session, that you or they may send written statements to the Council within 30 days of the date hereof, and such written statements will be made part of the record as if spoken at the hearing.

A verbatim transcript will be made of the hearing and deposited with the city clerk's office in Bridgeport for the convenience of the public.

At this point is there any public official who wishes to make a statement at this time?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to call your attention to those items shown on the hearing program marked as Roman number 1D, items one through 85.

Does the applicant have any objection to

the items that the Council has administratively noticed?

MR. McDERMOTT: No objection, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Accordingly the Council hereby administratively notices these existing documents, statements and comments.

Attorney McDermott, will you please present your witness panel for the purposes of taking the oath?

MR. McDERMOTT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Bruce McDermott from the law firm of Murtha Cullina on behalf of the applicant, United Illuminating Company. I'm joined by Nick Cicale who is counsel at UIL Holdings Corporation, as well as Sam Volet, also of Murtha Cullina.

So again good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, Attorney Bachman and Mr. Perrone.

We have all the witnesses who we believe will be needed to testify sitting at the dais, and I'll begin with introductions to my immediate right which is Mr. Ron Rossetti who's the manager of electric capital projects.

Next to him is Mr. Richard Pinto, project manager for substation projects and the project manager for the Pequonnock substation project.

Next to him is Mr. Todd Berman who's an associate and senior project manager with Fuss & O'Neill. And finally at the end of the row is Samantha Marone who's the manager of public outreach for UI.

Behind me is Mr. Robert Sazanowicz, who is the lead engineer for substation projects, followed by MeeNa Cullen-Corson who's the transmission line engineer for projects for UI. Mr. David Bradt is next who's the director of transmission planning. And finally next to him is Dr. Bailey who's the principal scientist at Exponent.

And with that all the witnesses are available for swearing in, Attorney Bachman.

D A V I D B R A D T,
M E E N N A C U L L E N - C O R S O N,
S A M A N T H A M A R O N E,
M I C H A E L L I B E R T I N E,
R I C H A R D P I N T O,
R O N A L D R O S S E T T I,
R O B E R T S A Z A N O W I C Z,
W I L L I A M B A I L E Y,
T O D D B E R M A N,
called as witnesses, being first duly sworn by the Executive Director, were examined and testified under oath as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN: Continue with the exhibits that you have filed, verification.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to accomplish all this through Mr. Pinto.

Mr. Pinto, are you familiar with UI Exhibit 1, which is the application for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need that was filed by the company on April 26th of 2018?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any

changes or revisions to that application?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And on behalf of the company do you adopt that as a full exhibit here today?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: And similarly Mr. Pinto, are you familiar with applicant's Exhibit Number 2, which is the letter that was filed by Murtha Cullina regarding the posting of the sign -- signs, excuse me, plural, that was dated June 16, 2018 -- June 6, 2018?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: And you're familiar with the posting of the signs?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes to that filing?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it here today?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: And then regarding Applicant's Exhibit Number 3, which is UI's responses to the Council's interrogatories dated

June 7, 2018, are you familiar with that, that filing?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes to any of those interrogatory responses?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt that on behalf of the company here today?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: And then regarding UI Exhibit 4A, Dr. Bailey, that is a copy of your CV. Are you familiar with that document?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any changes to that document?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): I have no amendments to it.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Thank you. And do you adopt it here today as a full exhibit?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you. And then Mr. Berman, are you familiar with Exhibit 4B, which is a copy of your resume?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I am.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you have any

changes or revisions to that document?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I do not.

MR. McDERMOTT: And do you adopt it as a full exhibit here today?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes, I do.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you.

With that Mr. Chairman, I move that Exhibits 1 through 4A and B be admitted as full exhibits.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone, the intervenor have any objection?

MR. JOHNSON: No objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The exhibits are admitted.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

I do note that I believe an official from the City of Bridgeport is --

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to note that, but thank you.

MR. McDERMOTT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it Mr. Coleman?

WILLIAM COLEMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to speak at this point?

WILLIAM COLEMAN: Yes. Thank you all very much. I'm Bill Coleman. I'm the Deputy Director for the City's Office of Planning and Economic Development. And I'm here on behalf of the City, on behalf of Mayor Ganim, on behalf of the director of our office Thomas Gill, to speak in favor of the application, UI's application for a certificate of environmental compatibility and public need for the Pequonnock substation rebuild project.

We've had occasions to talk on a number of times with officials from UI about this project and others. And it's one that we see very much as being compatible with the City's overall efforts to make itself -- in and of itself more resilient in the wake of some of the storm damage we've experienced.

We've had a bit of a dubious distinction of being hit pretty hard by the various storms, and then by virtue of that being given some federal money in a considerable amount of $50 million or so, to focus on a pretty broad ranging green infrastructure project in the southern end of the city. There will be berms. There will be some swales to absorb water.

So all I mean to say, by sharing that in a broader context with you is that we see this project very much in keeping with that. It's certainly important for us to keep our neighborhood safe and the residents that live there safe, but if we don't have our critical infrastructure likewise in a safe position vis-a-vis these kinds of storms we're probably missing a big component of the overall picture.

So we feel very gratified that UI has taken the progressive approach that it has with regard to this substation, and I want to make sure that we let you all know that we're very supportive and appreciative of it.

And that would be my statement. If you have any questions -- I'm having a bit of deja vu. You should be the city council. You look like you should be the city council. We're glad you're here. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We thought the city council would have a special place for us because by the time I look across I get confused as to who I'm supposed to be addressing -- but we're not the city council -- so thank you.

WILLIAM COLEMAN: We appreciate all your

work in the city. We know you've done a number of projects for us, particularly in the green energy sector. So thank you. And thank you, all the folks at UI.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll now begin cross-examination starting with staff, Mr. Perrone.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Turning to the very end of the application, there's a notice of an April 12 public meeting with South End residents. What kind of input did UI receive at that meeting?

THE WITNESS (Marone): We received a whole litany of questions from them. They were very interested in the project. They were looking for ways that we could employ or engage South End neighbor folks with the project and things that we were doing.

We have a whole list of questions that they asked us. We provided them with answers on May 23rd to all those questions.

MR. PERRONE: Moving to the front of the application on page FR-1, where it discusses the purpose of the facility, to improve reliability of service to customers in the Bridgeport area.

My question is, which portions of the Bridgeport area are served by the existing Pequonnock substation, generally speaking?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Generally speaking, it's the south and the west portion of the Bridgeport, town of Bridgeport -- or city of Bridgeport.

MR. PERRONE: Does the existing Pequonnock substation serve any other municipalities? Any part of Stratford?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): No, it does not. It's entirely served in Bridgeport.

MR. PERRONE: And on page 1-6 of the application there's discussion about, under extreme cases such as Hurricane Sandy, the existing substation had to be preemptively deenergized.

In a case like that where it's deenergized, are basically all the customers served by it out of service? Or could you offload some of it to another substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): When a station is preemptively deenergized all the customers are without power.

MR. PERRONE: And turning to the

response to Council interrogatory 10 where it gets into capacity, I understand the proposed transformers. There's 2 of them, and they're each 72 MVA. So is the 72 MVA based on 1 transformer so that if 1 is out of service you could still run as high as 72?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: And how long could you ran at 72 MVA?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It's typically a 24-hour load cycle.

MR. PERRONE: Also in the case of a failed transformer, would you bring a mobile transformer in, in the interim?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): If the loading on the station is below the 72 MVA it may not be necessary to bring the mobile in. If it's, you know, summertime and we expect heavy loads we would likely bring the mobile sub in.

MR. PERRONE: Also in response to number ten there's some forecast data. I see the loading for 2027. Do you have the loading for 2017 or 2018, the forecast number so I have the beginning point of the forecast?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The loading for

2017 is roughly 26 megawatts. That's the actual measured load.

MR. PERRONE: Actually, do you have the forecast number, not the actual?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not have the forecast for 2017.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Do you have a 2018 forecast number?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not have the 2018 forecast number. We did the ten-year projection.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. That's fine.

The Council received comments from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection dated June 6th. And on page 1 on the third paragraph it talks about how the project is consistent with and even exceeds the design requirements of PA 18-82.

Does UI agree with that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Next I'd like to get into some cost information. I understand the grand total for the project is in excess of 125 million. Could you break that down into, say, three categories? Transmission, distribution or

other?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The cost that we're looking at today at a 50-25 level estimate in total is roughly $175 million of which 130 dollars million of that would be transmission and 40 million would be distribution.

MR. PERRONE: So you're at a grand total of about 170 right now?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Approximately.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And as I was looking at the PURA review of the United Illuminating Company's storm resiliency plan initially they had about 31 million on the distribution side.

So that number went up?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No, that 30 -- that 30 million dollars of the -- 30 -- 31 million dollars of the 41 million-dollar distribution is part of that resiliency plan.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Do you have an approximate cost of the project at the alternative site, 375 Main Street?

Or an estimate if it's a certain percentage different?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I will tell you

that it is -- the transmission would have to be extended from the -- further from the current location and also the distribution would have to be extended.

The alternate -- the alternate site is roughly, I would say, around 20 to 25 million dollars more, subject to check, because you have to increase. There's three 115-kV cables that have to be extended, and 17 distribution feeders that have to be somehow tied into the existing system.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a follow-up question from Mr. Edelson.

MR. EDELSON: I must have missed something. I thought the number we had was 125 million?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The application states in excess of 125 million.

MR. EDELSON: And so the 170 you're saying is the revised figure?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That's the 50-25 level estimate. Correct.

MR. EDELSON: Thank you.

MR. PERRONE: I understand one of the other alternatives that was looked at was

rebuilding this substation in place. Did you have a cost number on that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do.

MR. PERRONE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't -- oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We build in place. The total for both transmission and distribution is roughly 270 million dollars of which 197 million -- excuse me, 201 million would be transmission, and roughly 70 million would be the distribution.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Lynch has --

MR. LYNCH: That was my question.

THE CHAIRMAN: You got the answer?

MR. LYNCH: He answered it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. PERRONE: And could you tell us why the total went up from 125 plus to 170?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): For the rebuild in place there's a significant amount of work that needs to get done. We would have to keep the station energized as we're doing the work. In the proposed project we could build a project then cut and energize pieces of it over in sequence.

When you try to rebuild in place we would have to keep the transmission system energized and the distribution in order to keep the lights on for the customers.

MR. PERRONE: Just maybe two more cost questions. Back to the proposed project, could you explain roughly why the numbers increased from 125 to 170?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): In the application we have since -- we got better estimates. From on the application, it was actually developed to be -- we were in the process of getting, we have RPs -- RFPs out for equipment and material. So we have used those numbers with the adjusted to come up with the 1 -- roughly 170.

MR. PERRONE: On page ES-7 I understand you're utilizing a GIS substation because of insufficient space, versus an air insulated substation. Did your cost increase by having to go to a GIS substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): GIS is generally a bit more expensive than AIS equipment, but the minimum requirements for the AIS is roughly two and a half to three times the size for a GIS type substation.

MR. PERRONE: Was there a certain delta where if it wasn't AIS it would have been, say, 10 million less, or something like that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): But the minimum requirements, one of the issues is demand is not -- that sized property is not available in local -- the local area.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Onto some construction topics. Roughly where would your distribution getaways be located on the footprint?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): On the footprint there's -- there's actually one on the northeast corner and one on the northwest corner just adjacent to the PDC enclosures, just south of Ferry Access Road just inside the fence line. There would be a manhole either side of that.

From there we would -- there would be a distribution duct bank heading east and one heading west to tie into the existing system.

MR. PERRONE: On page 3-2 there's mention of a backup station service generator. Could you tell us about that, the fuel type and kilowatts if you know?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It would be -- it would be sized to handle the 24-hour full load of

the station, which estimated right now is 250 kW, and it would be diesel.

MR. PERRONE: And would it contain proper containment measures for fuel, oil, coolant in case of leakage?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The gen -- the generators today are self contained. There the fuel tanks are -- are part of the station service generator.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And turning to response to Council Interrogatory Number 5, I understand the closest residence -- there's actually two of them, equal distance. But just so we're looking at the same thing, is that roughly the corner of Main Street and Whiting Street?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And that's W-h-i-t-i-n-g.

And I understand they're equal distance. Do you have an estimate on that distance?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): It's somewhere between 700 and 800 feet.

MR. PERRONE: And I understand construction access would be Ferry Access Road.

Would you use any other access locations for construction, like the main access at Atlantic Street?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We would likely not use the main excess at Atlantic Street. It would be Kiefer Street, the -- the gate on the west side of the property and also Ferry Access Road.

MR. PERRONE: Could you tell us about construction laydown or staging areas, where you might be thinking they would be located?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The staging areas, whatever we could stage on the property we would stage on the property. We're also looking at available properties in the area.

Other projects we have used, I believe it's 370 Main. It's the Bridgeport hub property right at -- on main street where we're looking at that as well as use for laydown.

MR. PERRONE: And back to access. If this project is approved and the substation is in service I understand you have several gates to the substation.

Would there be a primary entrance gate?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The primary

entrance gate would be fair -- off of Ferry Access Road.

MR. PERRONE: And looking at the footprint where the access comes in, would that be paved?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. PERRONE: And then the rest of the substation footprint, would that be like a crushed stone or traprock?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Generally it's a one-inch grade stone that we top -- top off the surface with.

MR. PERRONE: I understand from Council Interrogatory Response 16 no trees over six inches diameter would be removed. Does that also take into account your overhead transmission work?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And as far as the timing and the decommissioning, obviously you have to move the circuits over, but would much of the existing Pequonnock substation remain in place until after the replacement substation is in service?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct. We would not decommission until the last feeder

circuit is cut over.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Next are more environmental questions. And I understand you have a groundwater depth of about five to nine feet. Would you have a dewatering plan?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes. Certainly there would be a dewatering plan. The site development will be done under a Connecticut DEP General permit for stormwater and de -- dewatering.

MR. PERRONE: And how would you handle any potentially contaminated groundwater?

THE WITNESS (Berman): We're, you know, again we'll be working with DEP and most likely have some type of treatment system to address that.

MR. PERRONE: As far as the two power transformers, is it correct that the insulating oil does not contain PCBs?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And the transformers will have their own containment system?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. I also understand

the soils at the site, 99.9 percent are listed as urban land. So is it correct to say that there are no prime farmland or statewide important farmland soils at the site?

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: The response to question number 20, there's some information regarding the northern long-eared bat. Would you expect any impact to the northern long-eared bat?

THE WITNESS (Berman): We do not.

MR. PERRONE: Moving onto the Peregrine falcon, I understand we have a Fuss & O'Neill letter with BMPs, and then DEEP took a look at that and responded with their follow-up letter.

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct.

MR. PERRONE: With respect to DEEP's follow-up letter, does UI agree with those BMPs?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. So you would be able to comply with those?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Correct.

MR. PERRONE: One more on the bird topic. I understand for our admin notice list there's an important bird area, Stratford Great Meadows to the east. Would that important bird

area be impacted by the proposed project and its structures?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I don't have any information on that on -- on impacts associated with that area specifically.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Next I'd like to move onto EMF briefly.

When we were speaking about the nearest home, because the nearest residence is also referenced in the EMF report on page 6, 480 feet to the southwest. Are we basically speaking about the same thing, the corner of Main and Whiting Street?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. And on page 33 of the EMF report it notes, at structure and dwellings along Main Street, for instance, calculated magnetic fields before and after operation of the project would differ by about .2 milligauss. Is that about right for the two closest homes?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Excuse me, can you restate the page again?

MR. PERRONE: Page 33 of the EMF report.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Okay. And this

is concerning -- on my 33 is the electric fields.

MR. PERRONE: Magnetic fields. So in the center of page 33 there's a sentence, at structures and dwellings along Main Street, for instance, calculated magnetic fields before and after operation of the project differ by about 0.2 milligauss. And my question is, is that approximately the case for the two closest homes.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Would you consider that a significant change in magnetic fields.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes, that's roughly about one fifth of what the average magnetic field level is in the center of a home not near any appliance.

MR. PERRONE: So one fifth? So would their background level would be about one milligauss.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): The background levels generally throughout a developed area would be less than four milligauss, but if you go within homes, if you're not near a particular appliance or source of wiring, then the average field is about one milligauss, but it can vary from one house to another.

But the average for a thousand homes across the United States is about one milligauss.

MR. McDERMOTT: Excuse me, Mr. Perrone?

MR. PERRONE: Sure.

MR. McDERMOTT: Can I just ask you to repeat the question? I thought you asked Dr. Bailey if it was a significant change, and I wasn't sure I heard.

MR. PERRONE: I did.

MR. McDERMOTT: And did you say, yes, Dr. Bailey, it is a significant change?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): I'm sorry. An insignificant change.

MR. McDERMOTT: No, he's asking if it was a significant change and you said, yes.

THE WITNESS (Bailey): No. I'm sorry. I'm having trouble hearing here with the chamber, but it would be a -- .2 milligauss would be an insignificant change.

MR. PERRONE: Thank you for the clarification.

And lastly, regarding that 0.2 milligauss delta on page 33, is that based on average load conditions?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): Yes.

MR. PERRONE: Okay. Thank you very much. That's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We'll now go to questions by members of the Council, starting with Senator Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As has been pointed noted out, the acoustics in this room are less than desirable.

But the cost of this project has increased from 125 to 170. Did I hear that correctly?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That -- that is the current updated cost estimate.

MR. MURPHY: Does any portion of that increase in cost include an increase in the acquisition of any real estate, or was that fixed before you went in?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is negotiated, but the -- in the estimate that was -- we carried a fixed price.

MR. MURPHY: There was a fixed price beforehand. That's part of the, added to 125?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It's not -- when I meant fixed price we carry the same estimate for the land acquisition in the original estimate and

the current updated estimate.

MR. MURPHY: So if I follow what you're saying, is the price of the real estate that you estimated before you fix it at 125 is the same price as at 170?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct. We didn't change the -- the real estate portion of the estimate. We're still in design, you know, for -- for the project and you know, as we get bids in and as we fine tune the design the estimate will fluctuate.

MR. MURPHY: The increase from 125 to 170, is any remedial work included in that increase?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): There's soil remediation -- no, not in the increase.

MR. MURPHY: Not in the increase? So the remedial estimate for the 125 continues to be the same as in the 170?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): What we carried in the original estimate, what we had in out revised estimate that was the same.

MR. MURPHY: So it's the same in both lists, so to speak?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): These numbers have

been refined. There's certain things in the estimate, original estimates what we are today.

MR. MURPHY: Basically speaking, what is it that jacks it from 125 to 170? And you may have answered this, but it's really tough to hear in this room.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Sorry about that. The original estimate, again was an estimate and we've gotten better numbers. And we've --

MR. MURPHY: Unfortunately they're higher, of course.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): But it also could go down as we, you know, clearly define the project and get better designed. So that's, again that's a 50-25 out west of it as well.

MR. MURPHY: Possibly we could get a filing from them with the new breakdown with the 170 at this point in the assignment?

I'm sure that's readily available, Mr. McDermott. It should be no problem. It's just that we really should really see what the 170 consists of, having seen a ballpark number of 125, and it's a substantial difference percentagewise.

I think at this point, Mr. Chairman, I have no other questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Edelson.

MR. EDELSON: My first question might just be a grammatical one. The very bottom of page 2-1 in the report, and this is talking about some of the new structures that are needed.

On the very last line it's referring to one of these structures may be installed on City of Bridgeport property. By the use of the word "may," it sort of implied that if not there, somewhere else -- but I wasn't clear reading what the alternative was. So either I misunderstood the purpose of the statement or there's something else to be thought of?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): 2-1, you said?

MR. EDELSON: 2-1.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Okay. I believe the tower that's being referenced there is the one on the north side of the Metro-North right-of-way, and it borders both CDOT property and City of Bridgeport property.

And depending on the location it could be on CDOT property or City of Bridgeport property. It kind of straddles the property lines.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. So it's either the City of Bridgeport or CDOT?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct. Once final placement is done it could be --

MR. EDELSON: It's not that you're without a site. You definitely know where it's going to be approximately?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. EDELSON: It's just a question of a couple feet this way or that way on the border?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. EDELSON: The existing plant, how old is that, the existing substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The existing substation was commissioned in 1956.

MR. EDELSON: So it's been out there over 60 years or so?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. EDELSON: Now the forecast that you showed in terms of looking at the flood levels -- or I should say, the capacity, that was ten years. When you were looking at flood levels, you know, most of us know these terms hundred-year floods, 500-year floods. These are not set in stone. These numbers can move around. They're

statistically based. And the more flooding we have, the higher a hundred-year flood could be when we go back and look at that same statistic ten years from now.

So my question is, from what we know of sealevel rise you're making a move that seems to me to gain you something on the order of three feet.

I'm wondering what you're planning horizon is for this particular substation to be online without any further modifications? And why looking, you know, we're looking now really to the end of this century that I assume you're thinking this substation should be able to still be running.

I'm wondering how you came to the conclusion that a three-feet difference is sufficient and why not more feet? Why wouldn't you want to be at a higher level, a higher elevation and make that investment now?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Right. We designed this substation to the hundred-year flood level plus three feet, and a foot of that is future sealevel rise. The FEMA plus -- the hundred-year plus two is the ASCE recommendation

for a critical facility.

MR. EDELSON: For a facility that's going to last through the end of this century? Because a lot of these things I think are made -- you folks really deal in longer time periods than many other people.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That's correct.

MR. EDELSON: And it's difficult. Right? I mean, nobody has got a magic ball here, but we are seeing some numbers that kind of look at even higher figures.

I don't know if you saw the report -- I think it was in yesterday's paper about, you know, Antarctica is basically melting at three times I think the rate that they were just three years ago, or four years ago.

So I'm just -- but I guess the answer you're saying to me is you just relied on, not any internal guidelines, but guidelines that come from external sources and relying on them?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Relying on industry -- industry standards, you know, for this design.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. I guess I'm expressing a little nervousness there and if

you're going to make such a move, you know, this is $170 million that the ratepayers are eventually going to pay for and I'd rather -- well, we want to make sure it's the right investment to get the right level of safety.

And again, when I look at the pictures of the existing substation during Storm Sandy, I mean, I don't really know the height of the fence, but it looks like it was a couple feet on that chain-link fence. So I'm thinking that in and of itself would say to me, you almost have three feet right there of water from Storm Sandy, and that's five years ago now.

I mean, things keep moving, but rather that dwell on that, let me turn to the D and M plan. Which I understand you haven't put, you know, a pencil to paper yet to really put in a D and M plan. But given the nature of the materials you're using, are you willing to commit that all hazardous materials, tanks, barrels, anything that would be holding chemicals of any nature would be removed from that site?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes, is the answer to your question. You know, any -- any site activities are going to be completely

compliant with the Connecticut RSR. So to the degree we found either a reportable condition, or something that needed to be removed? Absolutely.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. And to me that would be very important to spell that out in the D and M plan when you come forward to that, come forward with that.

And I guess my last question -- and I don't want to belabor this, because I don't expect you to give me a course in transmission technology, but maybe on interrogatory ten which talks about the transformers. It appears to me that the proposed transformers you characterize as 30/40/50 megawatts and the ones that exist are 42/56/70.

I would have thought the numbers would either be about the same or higher. Is there some reason that they're actually lower when we're talking about a transformer?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): So we size the transformers based on the loads available.

MR. EDELSON: It's hard to hear.

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): We size the transformers based on the forecasted load values. When we looked at the load and saw that it was

significantly lower than it used to be, we identified that we didn't need to put in transformers that were as large as were existing.

MR. EDELSON: The load is lower now?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): That's correct.

MR. EDELSON: Than when the existing plant was designed?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): Yeah, that's correct.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Well, the reason for a lot of that load, the Pequonnock substation the distribution portion of that used to feed the station's service for the Bridgeport Harbor Station, or the FD fans and ID fans associated with generator units. That was a tremendous amount of load.

They now take their station service off of the transmission system. So the distribution system, the load on distribution has significantly dropped because of that.

MR. EDELSON: Okay. It sounds like a good answer to me.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Levesque?

MR. LEVESQUE: No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Hannon?

MR. HANNON: Yes, I do. Thank you.

This time at least hopefully it will help because I wrote down the page number to make it easier for everybody. On page ES-2, you talk about UI and PSEG have entered into an MOU regarding UI's purchase of the site which has long been used for various industrial purposes.

Will this property be subject to the Property Transfer Act?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes, it will.

MR. HANNON: And have any types of environmental studies been undertaken on this site? Or is this perhaps shooting what you're going for.

THE WITNESS (Berman): It's actually a little bit of the opposite. So the -- the site overall has been very well characterized really going back to 2004. Sitewide DEEP has already granted an engineering control variance. That was in 2013. So the site has been very well-characterized.

Right now we're going through a due

diligence process that you'd say is pretty typical for a transaction of this type. And no real wild cards have been identified thus far and we know that, you know, post transaction, you know, the property will be going through the Connecticut Transfer Act. And subsequently the site development will have to be, you know, compliant with RSRs, with the RSRs.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Hannon, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I believe the site -- Mr. Berman can correct -- is also currently in the transfer act.

Is that correct Mr. Berman?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Correct.

MR. HANNON: Now none of that, what you just said, is in the report. Correct? Because I didn't see anything associated with the review in the report. That's why I was asking in the first place. So it sounds like there's a bunch of work that is currently or already has been done?

THE WITNESS (Berman): There is. There's ongoing work right now that you would call characterization work, not remedial work.

MR. HANNON: Okay. On page ES-5 that talks about to connect to the new substation, all

three of the underground cables will be aligned across PSEG or UI. I'm not sure what that means.

I mean, is it some of it may be PSEG property? Some of it may be UI property. And if it's PSEG property I'm assuming there's going to be easements associated with that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct. With the purchase of the property our properties would be adjacent to one another. So where it comes from the -- crossing the Pequonnock River it currently enters UI property. To get into the new -- the new proposed site it would have to cross PSEG property as well.

MR. HANNON: Okay. This next one is sort of a combination. It's page 1-4 and 2-5. It talks about the fixed overhead lines located at PSEG property that connects the substation to PSEG unit number three, and on 2-5 it states, three monopoles will be installed on PSEG property to connect to Bridgeport Harbor Station Number 3.

The new substation length, or connection length is approximately 1,050 feet. My question is associated with that. One is, I didn't see anything about the new power unit that's being built. So where would that be connecting? Would

it be this station, or another station?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, the new unit five that PSEG is building is actually being interconnected into Singer substation.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. And then based on the table that's on page 7-1 it talks about the construction plans call for a completion date roughly between October and December of 2021. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. My understanding is that by July 1, 2021, Bridgeport Harbor Unit Number Three is supposed to close. So why would you be closing - or why would you be running lines through a closed powerplant?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Actually the interconnection for -- that goes over to PSEG for the unit three, also there's a -- I believe it's called unit four. It's the jet that is also tied to that interconnection.

MR. HANNON: Okay. I read that by being Bridgeport Harbor Station Unit three, that's the coal plant, which to my understanding, that there's an agreement to close that by July 1, 2021. That's why I'm asking?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Right. What I'm saying is that connection that we have there today supplies/interconnects unit three and unit four, and unit four will remain.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. On page 1-4 it says, during Hurricane Sandy water levels rose to within inches of the control room floor. What's the elevation of the control room floor?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The control room floor is approximately ten feet.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So basically the same as what the old hundred year flood elevation was?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. On page 3-6 it and talks about the steel pipe will be installed in the trench in lengths of 30 to 40 feet welded and x-rayed at the connection to detect any weld defects.

Who's going to be responsible for operating the x-ray equipment? Is that going to be UI? Is that a contractor?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That would be an outside contractor. They're specialized in doing that type of work.

MR. HANNON: And UI will guarantee that they have their equipment license within the State of Connecticut? Because it's not on one of the items that's listed for state permit, and I believe it has to be registered for an ionizing radiation permit.

So you may just want to double check on that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We will.

MR. HANNON: On page 3-6 it talks about the HPGF lines. The trench is backfilled with additional bedding material. And then on page 3-8 it talks about the XLPE trench will be backfilled with high-strength concrete to protect conduits. What's the difference between the two materials and why different types of backfill?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Right. The -- the pipe type cables, the HPGF is typically a sand that you put around the tables. The high-strength concrete around the XLPE duct bank is just that. It provides strength to the duct bank itself. Then there's available fill that fills up to the top, the top of the elevation which is essentially -- does essentially the same for the thermal heat dissipation on the cables.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Thank you. On page 3-12 it says, UI will install low-level LED lighting. What do you mean by low-level LED lighting?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Standard outdoor type task lighting.

MR. HANNON: But I mean, low level? Does that mean the height of the tower, or the wattage in the bulbs? I'm just not sure what it means.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The height of it is typically 12 to 15 feet up. It's just task lighting around the yard for nighttime work.

MR. HANNON: Okay. On page 5-1 it talks about the new substation and the 115-kilovolt line interconnects -- or interconnections will be located entirely within upland areas affected by previous industrial users. As a result environmental effects are expected to be minor.

Are you talking about environmental effects of the new substation?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yes.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And I mean, we had talked a little bit earlier about potential soil contamination, but you're already dealing with

that issue. So I don't need to ask that one. And I'm okay on the next one.

On page 10-1 it talks -- you have your acronyms. One that I did not see there, and it's on some of the design pages, is TOC. I'm assuming that's top of concrete?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. HANNON: Okay. So for example, where the transformers are being constructed the ground level is twelve, but you're putting in a concrete structure that's at least five feet above that. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct. If the top -- if that's what's identified as top of concrete on the drawing.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And sort of tying in with that in appendix A1, and it was map PEQ-PR01, you identified the GIS building and the control building, but north of the two transformers there's a box that says, PCD. What's that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That's the power distribution center. That's the distribute -- that's the distribution feeders leaving the station.

MR. HANNON: Okay.

On map PEQ-PR-SK4, I'm not sure what structure that is, what building that is?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The one with the height of 33, roughly 33 feet, that's the GIS enclosure. The one with the height of 14 feet is the GIS control room.

MR. HANNON: Okay. Because I have a question then going to the next page, which is PEQ-SK-PDC2. It only shows a one-foot elevation, it looks like, between the ground at the bottom of the structure. My understanding is all of these are supposed to be at least three feet above the 14-foot elevation which would put it at 17 feet, but that's not what this design is saying.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Which drawing is that?

MR. HANNON: PEQ-SK-PDC2. And it's the same thing with PDC1. So that structure there, it shows -- at least it appears to be a one-foot elevation difference between the ground and the top of the concrete, but yet you're calling for at least a 17-foot high. So I would think that the concrete should be three feet.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): All the equipment, the base of the equipment will be at elevation,

FEMA plus 100 it should 17 -- FEMA plus 100 plus 3, which would be 17.

MR. HANNON: Okay. And the reason I'm asking here is because this looks like a one-foot high concrete wall, and the previous was three feet in concrete. So that's why I'm asking.

And then my final issue is when plans were being put together for this project, did UI go back and look at what was in the record for Bridgeport Harbor Unit Five? And the reason I'm asking is because there appears to be a significant difference between the elevations that are being proposed for the substation versus those elevations that were being proposed for the powerplant, and that does have me a bit concerned.

Again, here you're looking at a base elevation of 14 feet for the ground and then going up 3 feet. The powerplant has a retaining wall built at an elevation of at least 20 feet. There, soil level inside that frame is, I think 16-6. That's the elevation of the runways. They're putting their buildings in at 18.5 feet. So I'm just kind of curious as to why such a difference in that information?

I mean, I went back and looked at the

Bridgeport Harbor Unit Number Five application to just double check some of the numbers to see if we're talking consistency here, because it's on basically the same piece of property -- but there appears to be a significant difference.

And one of the other issues that came up in the finding of facts as it relates to the powergenerating plant is it talks about the elevation according to the federal quadrennial energy review. Sea levels under the high-end scenario could rise about 32 inches, or about 2.7 feet by 2060. So that's kind of why I'm a little concerned in terms of the elevations that you're going in at, versus the elevations for the powerplant.

So I don't know if you want to respond to that, but that's the question I have, or an issue that I have.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Hannon, maybe I can ask the panel just to address the analysis that the company undertook. I don't want to presuppose that PSEG got it right and UI has gotten it wrong. So I think maybe the panel could just explain the analysis that the company undertook in arriving at their plans.

And I will throw that to Mr. Pinto or Mr. Rossetti or Mr. Brant.

THE WITNESS (Bradt): So I'm probably going to repeat what Rich already said, but our philosophy has been to take the updated FEMA maps that were updated in 2013, I believe it was. And then we applied the current standard which is the ASCE-24 says that electrical substation facilities should be built to the hundred-year plus two feet, and then there's a -- there's a 500-year flood level comparison also. But in this, at this site the hundred-year plus two-foot level is limiting.

And then we did look at sealevel rise predictions. There's a lot of different predictions out there that range from inches to feet, to several feet over the next 50 years or century. And looking for direct guidance we could not get that, and we wanted to make sure that the region was comfortable with paying for the additional costs.

So what we -- where we landed was we had conversations with DEEP, ISO New England and other stakeholders involving cost recovery. And where we landed was we elected to use one foot of sea level rise, which is the minimum recommendation

that FEMA says that you should use.

They say, if you have -- if you have a sealevel rise study, you're -- they recommend that you add that to current standards, or at a minimum add one foot.

So because we did not have any kind of consensus document, any kind of single number to use we defaulted to the one-foot level. And we had a number of conversations with the State of Connecticut on that and also ISO New England, and that's -- that's where we had consensus.

MR. HANNON: Yeah, because I think one of the things -- is it here? I thought the 500-year flood elevation is up to what? I think 15.4 feet, 15.5, something like that.

So again, the numbers start getting pretty close. And I know the siting Council has looked at other projects looking more of the 500-year flood elevation to try to make sure that all of the required electronic components, all the critical elements are going to be above that, and it's usually been one to two feet.

So this is why I'm a little concerned just based on some of the issues that the Council has been looking at over the last several years?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The FEMA plus 3 is essentially equal to the 500 plus 1. It's fifteen nine plus a foot is sixty-nine and the FEMA one hundred is seventeen. So the 500 plus one or the FEMA plus -- hundred plus three is essentially the same.

MR. HANNON: Does that take into consideration increases in water elevation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That we used that one for, like, Dave had mentioned we had used the one foot for future sealevel rise.

MR. HANNON: Okay. I do not have any other questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Silvestri?

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

But first off, I'm going to apologize for any repetition of questions because I'm having a difficult time with acoustics here.

My first question for you. In addition to flooding of the existing Pequonnock substation, is salt spray a concern and another reason for the relocation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It is not actually part of our plan for it, but it is of concern. Any substation along the coast, adverse weather,

we've had it happen at Pequonnock and we've had it happen at other stations. The salt spray is of concern, but that was not taken into consideration here.

MR. SILVESTRI: Just a related question to that. When you mentioned the rebuild in place option, how would that addresses salt spray?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): If it was a rebuild in place it would actually be the type of equipment is has, that type of equipment, and it would not address salt spray.

MR. SILVESTRI: Let me move onto reference Council Interrogatory Number 14. This talks about SF6. The first question I have for you is, how much SF6 would be used in the proposed substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We currently don't have a vendor onboard, but I can -- can use a reference. Our existing GIS substation at Grant Avenue has approximately 20,000 pounds of GIS -- excuse me, SF6.

MR. SILVESTRI: Does that amount trigger anything for risk management plans with EPA or with the State?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We monitor how

much VAS we have on our property, not just that, our substations, but all of our facilities. We monitor on a yearly basis and we document any stuff we use, the stuff that is calculated against losses.

MR. SILVESTRI: But the actual quantity on site, does that trigger anything?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I don't know, is the answer. I would have to look at the characteristics of SF6 against the tier-two requirements, but I'm not prepared to answer that right now.

MR. SILVESTRI: Does the company have an SF6 handling plan?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes.

MR. SILVESTRI: Does the plan include leak detection monitoring specifically for inside the GIS building?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Our design has a gas density monitoring system which it alarms the levels of gas in each of the gas zones within the GIS equipment. It's alarmed physically at the station and back at our control.

MR. SILVESTRI: If something happened with a leak you would know it before anybody went

into that building?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We would actually see it trending. Certainly we would see it trending and monitor it. And we would address it before it gets to be a severity.

MR. SILVESTRI: Thank you. Going back to Mr. Perrone's question about the diesel generator -- and this was one of the ones I had a hard time hearing -- what the size, or the proposed size of the generator?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): They're sized to handle the 20 -- our 24-hour load cycle at the station. Right now it's up at around a 2050 kW generator.

MR. SILVESTRI: And how large would the fuel tank be to go along with that?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I don't have that answer with me.

MR. SILVESTRI: You're proposing a aboveground or belowground tank?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Aboveground tank. They're self-contained units.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Again going back to Council's interrogatory number eight and also a question follow-up from Mr. Hannon that I

also had a hard time hearing. The current grade for the land of the proposed substation is twelve feet. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): On the proposed property?

MR. SILVESTRI: Right now, yes.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It ranges ten to twelve feet. Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: So the proposal will raise the entire grade and not just the tops of foundations. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct. There the grade will be increased gradually.

MR. SILVESTRI: Then going back to the building, specifically drawing SK-PDC2, I'm not sure when I look at that drawing what the elevation of the base of the building is. Could you tell me what that elevation is?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The elevation of the base of the buildings, again is at the FEMA 100 plus three, which would be elevation 17, NAVD-88.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you.

Let me turn your attention to section three on page 3-5. There's a statement at the

bottom of the page about concrete and concrete trucks. Will the project have an area to wash out these trucks?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yes, that will be identified in the D and M plan.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Thank you. Also on the page there's mention about a Petro Barrier gravity drain system for the transformer containment. Could you explain how that works, where the loader would go and if a discharge permit is required?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): The transformers have a full oil containment system. It's a concrete pit that will capture any oil that has leaked from that unit. The Petro Barrier is a product that's used that in the event that we do have rainwater that fills up into that pit, we can safely drain that rainwater and the Petro Barrier will block any oil contaminants from getting out of it.

MR. SILVESTRI: So the two related questions, where does it go? Where does the water go and is a discharge permit needed?

THE WITNESS (Sazanowicz): I don't have that answer.

THE WITNESS (Berman): So the answer is, I don't -- with respect to the discharge from rainwater, you know, that -- that accumulated in the containment and then went out after the Petrol Barrier. Would that be subject to a unique permit? I -- I would have to look at that.

It's not, you know, the whole site will be subject, naturally, to Connecticut DEEP permitting. That is a line item that we have to think about separately -- or not separately. You know, that would be part of the discussion, I'm sure, with DEEP.

MR. SILVESTRI: One other followup on that. Would the discharge be manual or automatic?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Manual. So it -- manual.

MR. SILVESTRI: So somebody would be there to operate whatever the system may be? Okay. All right.

If I could have you do turn to page 3-8, there's discussion about the use of fluidized thermal backfill, or FTB. How does FTB differ from flowable fill?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It's the same.

MR. SILVESTRI: It's the same? Okay.

Thank you.

When we drove into the proposed site we kind of have a little paved road that's over there, and we parked on the right side. If you look at the left as we drove in there, there's a manhole cover. Do you know what that manhole cover is for?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Related to that then, the City of Bridgeport maintains, I would think, stormwater sewers and catchbasins on Main Street, Kiefer Street -- maybe on Singer. Do you know if any of those flow through your proposed property out to the harbor?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I do not.

MR. SILVESTRI: So somewhere along the line I would think before you start construction you would need to identify what that manhole is, probably where the cities sewers are, too?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We have done a subsurface investigation. I just don't have that answer readily available with me.

MR. SILVESTRI: All right. Going back to a question that Mr. Hannon had asked you as well. With the line for unit three and unit

three's proposed retirement, that line would still connect to unit four to the proposed substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. All right. Now moving on. Assuming that the new substation is constructed and it's operational, but something went amiss such that you would need to bring in a mobile transformer, how would that mobile transformer come into the substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): The way it's designed, it would come in from either Ferry Access Road or Kiefer Street. There's a paved area and it would line up underneath the stream bus between the GIS enclosure and the high side of the transformers.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Would that mobile transformer be off either road, either Ferry Access or Kiefer?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: And it would be on the property, not there.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It would be off the road. It would be on the property.

MR. SILVESTRI: If I could have you look at drawing PEQ-PR01?

When I look at this, I see retaining walls on both the north and the south sides of the proposed substation property. Can you explain the function of those walls?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): What was that drawing again, please?

MR. SILVESTRI: PEQ-PR01.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That's to retain the -- the soil that we're raising the elevation with.

MR. SILVESTRI: Well, you wouldn't need them on the east and west sides?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I believe on the east and west sides it would be soil up to the corners and back down to grade.

MR. SILVESTRI: So any access that you would have going into the substation I would think would be from either the east or west side, and not going over that retaining wall.

Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. A couple other questions for you relating to elevation. There's a program out there, Resilience Bridgeport and it lays out an approach to protecting against climate

change, storm surge and even rainfall flooding. And I've also heard it called Rebuild By Design. Okay? The South End neighborhood was reviewed for a pilot project that was seeking to elevate Singer Street, to build basically a waterfront berm and establish other flood mitigation measures.

So my question to you is, how does your proposal to construct on Kiefer Street fare with Resilient Bridgeport and the potential to elevate Singer Street?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): If you're referring to the Resilient Bridgeport project that I'm aware of, they have several options. They haven't -- they don't have a final plan yet, but if they elevate Singer Street that would put us actually inside -- or outside of the protected area. But with our design we would be above the hundred-year plus three, or the 500 plus one flood elevation.

MR. SILVESTRI: Yeah, my concern again -- this is one of the proposals they had, that Singer Street gets elevated. You're below that.

So is there a chance that somehow flooding occurs within the area of your proposed

substation? Water can't go anywhere because you have a berm behind you at Singer Street and then there's problems.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Right. We've been working with the Resilient Bridgeport Project. They are well aware of our project. We're aware of theirs as well. So we'll work out engineering with them.

MR. SILVESTRI: The last question I have, and it's also related to elevation. The Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation published new sealevel rise projections and new planning recommendations back in October of 2017. How does the proposed elevations for the Kiefer Street substation, the new substation compare to the institute's projections and recommendations?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So we actually have a very good response from Connecticut DEP on exactly that point. There's a -- I believe it's part of the record already, a June 6th letter to the Council from DEEP indicating that -- well, I'll just read from it.

We note that the proposed substation design which elevates all substation components --

three feet above base flood elevation of 14 feet is consistent with and in fact exceeds the design requirements of Section 9 of Public Act 1882.

Right now the sealevel rise estimates out of CIRCA are out in draft, but those are the sealevel rise estimates that Public Act 1882 will rely on. So you know, DEEP has already kind of weighed in on that.

MR. SILVESTRI: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I think I'm set with my question, although I wish I did get a couple answers back on some of the questions I asked.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Dr. Klemens?

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I also had trouble hearing a lot of the conversation, particularly the questions coming from my colleagues toward you.

I understand I'm going to echo some of the concerns Mr. Hannon had about the elevation of this structure. Would you say that this proposal is really driven by resiliency as the primary goal?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): There the project

is designed for both flood resiliency and also asset condition issues.

DR. KLEMENS: Well, as I understand the asset condition issues are in large part due to the old substation being flooded. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): No. The asset condition issues are -- is separate than the flooding. The asset condition issues, there's -- we've seen and have evidence of significant settling of the foundations both on the control room and 115-kV steel box structure.

There's evidence that either we have disconnect switches that get misaligned soon after we install them because of the site settling.

DR. KLEMENS: Now there was a discussion I believe, Mr. Brant, about the cost factor of this design. Mr. Hannon spoke about the protection of the PSEG plant, I believe, with a 20-foot retaining wall around it. So my questions are twofold.

If we have a storm surge and the water started coming in, would the fact that you have a large structure with -- this is similar to what Mr. Silvestri was talking about on Singer Street. What would the effect be of that enclosed area,

that island as the water moves around it? Would it artificially raise the water levels around your structure?

Am I being clear what I'm asking?

A storm surge comes in, hits the 20-foot enclosed PSEG station. Does that create a larger amount of water surging into your substation?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I believe we had a response to that question in one of the interrogatories. And subject to check, I believe it was insignificant because it's flooding from Long Island Sound and not, like, a river type flooding.

DR. KLEMENS: Not flooding coming down the river? Okay.

What would the cost differential be -- because we talk a lot about cost to ratepayers -- the differential be if we were to either raise that station higher, the substation, or put a wall around it similar to the PSEG station, the power station?

I mean, this is an expensive project and we're talking about containing costs, but percentagewise how much more cost would that be to do it analogous to what they did at the

powerplant?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I don't have a figure with me, but putting a wall around the property would be pretty significant. There would have to be flood type gates, because we still need to access the property with our mobile sub.

The PSEG property where the generator is, I believe it's a gentle slope getting up inside the -- inside of the wall, if you want to call it. But we don't have the luxury of a lot of land of having a gradual slope getting into things. So we need floodgates, so it's a pretty significant endeavor to put a wall around that property.

DR. KLEMENS: You said you could not find any consensus on flood projections and you went with the 500-year flood plus one, but admittedly there are other projections that are more severe, correct? More dire for sealevel rise?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): So I just want to separate the two numbers. The 500 year, the standard that we use that we applied is ASE-24. And it says for an electrical substation that supplies critical facilities, which this facility

does. You should construct it to the hundred-year plus two, or the 500-year. So that was our -- our base calculation elevation.

And then it also -- there is a recommendation somewhere in that document that says, you should also add something to account for sealevel rise.

So the place that we have difficulty getting consensus was on what exactly -- how much should we include to account for that sealevel rise prediction? So that's how we went from the hundred-year plus two as required by the standard, which is approximately equal to the 500-year within inches.

So it's a hundred-year plus two, and then we defaulted to the FEMA minimum recommendation. They said that if you can do your own calculation of sealevel rise or have some site-specific study, or FEMA recommends you add at least one foot.

DR. KLEMENS: At least one foot?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): Yes.

DR. KLEMENS: How many feet have you added?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): We added exactly

one foot.

DR. KLEMENS: So you're already at the very minimum of what FEMA is recommending?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): That's correct.

DR. KLEMENS: And how long do you anticipate the life of this facility to be?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): Fifty years. That's a typical expectation that we would have for a substation of this type.

DR. KLEMENS: Don't you feel using the precautionary principle minimum that using the minimum that FEMA asks is probably not prudent, and doing something more for such a critical piece of infrastructure would make sense over the longterm?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): So as an engineer I would tend to be very conservative. So I would -- I would prefer to add margin on top of standards, however we are -- we are limited by cost recovery considerations. So that's where we ended up.

We -- we did a lot of work on this, this precise subject and the consensus that we came to was that with the State of Connecticut and with ISO New England, who's going to be paying for a

significant share of this project cost -- I shouldn't say ISO New England. The New England stakeholders.

The consensus that we came to is the -- the one foot of sealevel rise was considered, I would say, reasonable and that the cost to do this would be regionalized because it was considered a reasonable design.

DR. KLEMENS: So if were to raise it another foot, what would the cost be and who would bear that cost?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): So I don't have that, but it would be -- a possible outcome of that would be that the State of Connecticut, if we were ordered by Siting to add additional margin, that additional cost would be paid by Connecticut ratepayers. That's a likely outcome.

Now of course, you know, we would file this with ISO New England. And there's a TCA determination. It's a processed total cost allocation process that we submit this through.

But one of the questions they ask is, you know, we are asked to justify our design, justify its pudency. And then a question that they will ask is, were you willing to do anything

additional beyond that as a result of siting. So something like this would very likely end up being localized.

DR. KLEMENS: But you can't even give a guestimate as to what that would mean per ratepayer on this security?

THE WITNESS (Bradt): I -- I could not do that here. I understand that it would be a relatively small cost in the case of a new construction substitution, but -- so it would be a cost that we would have to calculate. I'm not sure what -- exactly what that would be.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Rossetti and I have exchanged notes and we will take that on as a homework assignment and report back to the Council either at the 6:30 hearing, or as a late file exhibit, but we will get you a cost to increase the height by one foot.

DR. KLEMENS: Two feet. One foot and two feet.

MR. McDERMOTT: One foot and two foot. Okay. Thank you.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Coming into the hearing I didn't have any questions on the elevation issue, but I have one question now. It's an interesting issue.

My question is, I see you have designed to -- I'm not sure exactly how to put it with all the discussion here, but the 500-foot flood level plus one foot. That gives you one design or one elevation, I guess, on which to build the facility. And I assume there's other provisions, not just the elevation, but certain other aspects of the system and the equipment, and the facilities are designed a certain way because of that issue.

My question is -- I guess there's two questions that come to mind. One is, is the facility designed with the possibility or the potential for retrofitting should sealevel rise become more of an issue, or when sealevel rise becomes more of an issue without having to build a new facility?

In other words, when you go to a 500-feet -- or 500-year flood year plus one, and is there kind of a baseline system design that

accomplishes that? But is there maybe a baseline plus, or a premium baseline that calls for building in the potential for retrofitting without having to, you know, redesign the whole facility? And is there an element of that that you're proposing?

I don't know if that's clear or not, but --

THE WITNESS (Pinto): So I understand your question, so we've designed -- just for clarity, the design flood elevation is a hundred-year plus three, which equals the 500 plus one.

So what that means is the top of the concrete in the GIS enclosure, the control enclosure and the PDC enclosure would all be at that elevation. The equipment would actually be mounted, you know, on the concrete floor.

So an effort to try to raise that equipment later on, you know, it's pretty much infeasible because you've got control cables. It would be a lot of work to try to raise that equipment down the road, and that type of consideration has not been taken in the current design.

I think that was your question. Correct?

MR. HARDER: It sounds like it. I guess the other thought or question in light of the question one in the Council raised on constructing a seawall is, if Bridgeport Harbor started lapping at the hundred-year plus three or 500 plus one elevation on a regular basis, or it got to the point where, you know, you had to think about what you were going to, do you have any idea at this point what you would do?

Do you think you would have to construct a wall? Or would you have to do what you just said, it would be a significant undertaking to move equipment up and raise the elevation of equipment and whatever else would be entailed?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I believe if that, you know, was to happen we would have to take a look at putting a wall around the facility.

MR. HARDER: I mean, I know you're kind of guessing to some extent now, but do you think that would probably be the most likely first step to take, or solution to look at?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): We would probably -- we would look at both solutions. We

would look at, you know, putting a wall around the facility and what kind of effort it would take to raise the equipment, rather than rebuilding it.

MR. HARDER: Okay. All right. Thank you.

A couple other questions, or a couple of areas first on the issue of control. I think in a couple places in the application there's mention or discussion, or comments made that erosion controls in some record would be removed after the site is stabilized.

Could you define what's meant in this context by stabilized?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, I think the definition of stabilized, I -- I think it's drawn from the 2002 Connecticut guidelines for soil and sediment control, but you know, vegetated, just if there is was open soils they would be vegetated. The site is going to be covered with crushed stone, you know. And stabilized requires three months of careful observation to confirm that there is not sediment or soil runoff.

MR. HARDER: Okay. So you would have a good growth, a protective growth of vegetation?

THE WITNESS (Berman): To the degree

there's -- I don't think the final plan has a lot of vegetated area and it, but to the degree there were open soils, absolutely.

MR. HARDER: Right. Okay. The reason I ask that question is at least in one other situation the proposal or the applicant, or their consultant indicated by stabilized they meant application of mulch and seed and other controls without necessarily having a good growth of vegetation. So I'm glad that was your answer.

The only other question or area I had a question on was on the issue of site contamination. I'm glad that the site is subject to the Property Transfer Act. I think that will address a lot of the issues.

Although, one questions I do have is, is it the entire site that is subject? It's not going to be carved up into sub parcels such that some areas would not be subject to the transfer act, but are still going to be part of the project?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So let me -- let me address the question this way. The parcel that United Illuminating is acquiring would be subject to this transfer act. I can't really speak to

other transactions or other carveouts that might happen.

MR. HARDER: Okay. But the property that UI is acquiring includes the entire substation. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Berman): That is correct.

MR. McDERMOTT: Okay. Mr. Harder, just to be clear the property that UI is acquiring actually includes property beyond the substation also.

MR. HARDER: Right. So the substation at a minimum?

MR. McDERMOTT: Right.

MR. HARDER: Okay. Thank you.

Will the site grading -- do you know if the site grading and the process of grading the site and any other work, will that expose any previously inaccessible soil that might be or is contaminated?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So the characterization -- here's how I'll answer that. Because the wrap is not implemented there's probably no soils which are officially already characterized as isolated.

Could you restate the question? I want

to make sure I answer it exactly correctly.

MR. HARDER: I'm just wondering. I don't want to necessarily -- I don't want to use terms that have a meaning under the RSRs, but maybe aren't as broad as I'm intending.

I just want to make sure that in the process of grading, regrading and excavating that you're not going to be exposing soils that are contaminated and leaving them in a situation or at an elevation perhaps that renders them accessible when now they're not accessible?

THE WITNESS (Berman): I understand. So the answer to your question is, you know, A, we have done due diligence to understand the characteristics of the soils on the property now. To the degree that conditions were encountered such that there were soils that needed to be isolated from a runoff perspective, absolutely that would be done, you know, pursuant to best management practices.

MR. HARDER: Okay. And my final question is, you had mentioned that an engineered control was approved by the department in 2013, I think. Was that, or is that engineered control part of the final design? Or will it be, if the

design is subject to change, part of the final design of the facility? Or would that need to be modified at all?

THE WITNESS (Berman): There's no question we're going to have to work with PSE -- PSEG to make sure that the new substation is not an island where there is no engineered control that doesn't sort of fit in with the grid or site, or the greater wrap. All those details are not yet worked out. But conceptually, no, this site will fit in with the -- the existing wrap.

MR. HARDER: Okay. All right.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all the questions that I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Lynch?

MR. LYNCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Most of the questions I had have been discussed, but I'd like to get a clarification on a few of them.

Mr. Berman, you mentioned that you're getting all the DEP permits that are needed under -- that was section nine. Does that also included army corps permits for the area?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Yeah, I don't --

we don't have any filling activities that I think would be subject to Army Corps permitting.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. And there's been a lot of discussion on the flooding in the hundred-year floodplain and so on, and the damage that it can do. Having lived through a few of them, my question is really a simple one.

The federal government kind of requires residences and commercial institutions to have flood insurance. Does that apply to utilities also, or do you self insure, or buy into the reinsurance market?

MR. McDERMOTT: Everyone is looking at me for some reason on this one.

So the company is self insured for the first $2 million, and then after that the company does have insurance. But I'm not sure that's current info, but I will take that as a homework assignment.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. I think it's Mr. Rossetti, you threw out a lot of numbers to Mr. Perrone earlier on the cost of the project, and as I added them up it went from 125 million almost to a billion dollars. Could you break that down again for me? I couldn't really hear a lot

of what you were saying?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): So the current estimate is, I mean, from my numbers it's $170 million. 140 of that -- excuse me, $130 million is transmission. $40 million of that is distribution.

MR. LYNCH: That part I got. Then you threw in a construction something for 200 million or something?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I believe that 200 million was constructing the facility off -- at a different location. It's not to promote this project. It was an alternative project.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. As far as the old substation is concerned -- we'll call it the old one, what currently -- you reference that it has problems, misalignment, so on and so forth. With all the stress bearing caused by the current old substation, is that in any way affecting your system now?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Can you clarify what you mean by affecting? We've had issues with we were switching out equipment and we could not operate a switch. And we had to make alternate plans and switch out more than what we needed to

operate that switch, because it would not operate.

It was either stuck in position or we could not get it closed. And we had to take an hour just to do emergency maintenance on it to actually get a switch closed. We've had several instances, you know, over the years like that.

MR. LYNCH: Then let me ask you in a simpler way. Does the status of the current station cause any of the outages within your system?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Distribution outages? No.

MR. LYNCH: Transmission?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It has not caused any transmission outages.

MR. LYNCH: And I'm going to come to the underground cables. I know they're going to be extended into the new substation. My question is -- it's more of a curiosity question.

There's two different types, the XLPE and HPGF. If you could have designed the system to have just one type of cable, which one would you have selected?

THE WITNESS (Cullen-Corson): The XLPE cables are a newer type design for the

transmission industry. So with this project I guess we would obviously look at extending using the crossing -- or using the crossing polyethylene for the -- crossing polyethylene circuits and then the high-pressure gas filled for those circuits as well.

MR. LYNCH: Which one is more cost-efficient? I was under the assumption that XLPE is more expensive.

THE WITNESS (Cullen-Corson): That, I'm not sure of.

MR. LYNCH: And now we'll go to Dr. Bailey for a second. With these underground cables and previous underground cable transmission systems that we've gone through that you've been around for, they still emanate a magnetic field. Now is that driven by the amount of voltage going through these lines, or is it one type of cable is superior to the other?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): The -- the field from underground lines is purely, yeah, driven by the flow of currents in the magnetic field. And the electric field would be totally shielded by the grounded coverings on the cables themselves, and the earth itself. So the only emission above

ground would be the 60 hertz magnetic field.

MR. LYNCH: Now would that magnetic field spread out, or just go, you know, vertical?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): It would go in all directions around the cable. Think of a, sort of a circular area around the cable both in the air and in the ground.

Depending upon the design of the cables it will -- it will be highest directly over the cables and then attenuate rapidly with distance. If those cables are -- are not coalesced together in one bundle, then field would decay somewhat more slowly, but the typical configuration is to put the conductors close together to maximize -- minimize construction impacts and also that has the effect of maximizing mutual cancellation of the magnetic field.

MR. LYNCH: Now because they're underground emitting a magnetic field, you know, whatever they are, you know, 3, 4 feet as opposed to being 60 feet in the air, is that a more potential danger -- or not danger. I'm after another word. You know, to gain this?

THE WITNESS (Bailey): The strength of the magnetic field of overhead lines and under --

underground lines of the -- of the same, carrying the same currents might well be, for a person walking on the ground above the cable or underneath the overhead line, it might well be higher for the underground line.

And if you go 25 feet away from the centerline, however, that condition could well be reversed under the circumstances in that the magnetic field from the underground line decays more rapidly with distance in most cases.

MR. LYNCH: Thank you. Now also referenced in the DEP letter was a note indicating that there was nesting of the Peregrine falcon. Has that been researched?

THE WITNESS (Berman): So we have a fairly robust exchange with DEEP on the Peregrine falcon. Could you point me to where on the DEEP letter?

MR. LYNCH: It's on page 2, and it's the second paragraph.

THE WITNESS (Berman): Right. What's described there is very consistent with our last correspondence from DEEP and the people that administer the Natural Diversity Database.

You know, for the period from April 1 to

June 30th that would be the nesting period that we'll have an ornithologist observing for the potential for nesting Peregrines.

MR. LYNCH: Would that also include -- certainly they're on a costal area -- the osprey?

THE WITNESS (Berman): No. At this time we -- we don't anticipate including the osprey in that endeavor.

MR. LYNCH: Why not?

THE WITNESS (Berman): Well, it's not a -- it's not a species that was flagged on the Natural Diversity Database finding. It's nothing that we, you know, we've also contacted the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and neither agency flagged the osprey as a species of unique concern.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.

And lastly, the fence surrounding the new facility is 14 feet high. Is that normal for the surrounding fence for a substation?

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, that's correct. Actually, our standard is 14 feet high with a 2-inch mesh, and then 1 foot of barbed wire on top of that.

MR. LYNCH: Now I've have noticed, not

necessarily in UI's area, that -- but in Eversource's, they're also putting a screening inside the -- I don't know what it's called, because that's something that UI would be considering for security purposes.

THE WITNESS (Rossetti): Yes, that's -- they're called opaque slats. And we've actually used those at a couple of our substations already, and that is the plan for this substation as well. Typically that would be a light gray color.

MR. LYNCH: Okay. Thank you.

That's all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Obviously, you have heard the concern by most of the Councilmembers regarding the issue of potential sea level rise elevation. From what I read you looked at one other site, 375 Main Street. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: It probably is somewhere here, a map showing that, but how is that relative to this site as far as proximity to the sea?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Well, it's a block further west than the proposed site.

THE CHAIRMAN: And was the reason you

chose the alternative you did based primarily on cost?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): It's more costly to -- to build on that site. Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: And did you estimate the cost of that, of the alternative site? Am I correct, 200 million? Or did I just make that up?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): I don't have the number for the 375 Main Street, but there's no -- as far as getting further, it's the same, roughly the same elevation as the -- the proposed site. So we had the same issues, if you're thinking about --

THE CHAIRMAN: It will just take the water a little longer to get there. So the question is, did you look at other sites more inland? Was there any other --

THE WITNESS (Pinto): You did an analysis to move the facility within a half mile radius of the proposed site. And the size of parcel was not available, but we did estimate it if we were to have to move it, sort of, a half mile within that radius. And that's where that number really takes off.

And I believe that's in the range of the

260, 260 million dollars to get there, because you've got to extend all that transmission, all that distribution. You've got a new transmission wire to raise, you know, depending on where it is if it's not directly around the railroad.

MR. McDERMOTT: Mr. Chairman, I will -- if I could interrupt? I will say that on page 9-12 of the application for 375 Main Street the estimated cost is indicated, at least in the application to be a plus 20 million more than development at the 1 Kiefer Street site. So --

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that before or after you increased it to 170?

MR. McDERMOTT: That would --

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, I guess you don't have to answer that.

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Well, I will say that the project -- in the application project cost it's always identified as in excess of, you know, the $125 million. And that was trying -- trying to put a band on the cost of the project.

I know there's been a lot of discussion on it, but again as we get into more detailed engineering the estimates, you know, will get better.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I just share others' concerns. My guess is if FEMA were to revise their 2013, which doesn't seem like a long time ago, based on the most recent information we might be talking about, you know, a different number.

And I just think we're talking about, particularly 50 years out, having a resilient infrastructure. I'm not sure we want to put it that close to, you know, flooding. And I think whatever it's called, pennywise and pound foolish. I think to consider -- and I guess you're going to do that as a homework assignment.

My grandson would be very happy to know that kids are not the only ones that have homework assignments, but you know, look into what the cost of raising it. I mean, the minimum sounds like just cost, and I'm not sure that councilmembers are really satisfied without looking at alternatives to -- and I don't know what that number is.

Is it another foot that would give us a better sense? And I'm, as usual, I'm disappointed with a sister agency that didn't, I think look a little harder at that. So we will appreciate and

I guess we have no choice but to schedule another -- there will be another hearing, which I guess is what? On the 30th?

July 24th. I thought I was going to be on vacation, but timed it wrong. So there will be time for that, but I hope you take it very serious. We're serious.

Somebody -- I don't have eyes in the back of my head, but I do hear.

Yes, sir?

DR. KLEMENS: I was thinking about the response you gave me concerning the 20-foot wall and the incoming water. And you characterize that as flooding caused by Long Island Sound, and therefore the rise would be minimal.

After you answered that I went and looked at map. There's the Pequonnock River. There's the Yellow Mill Channel, two streams that are coming down and meeting just above the site.

So what happens when you have heavy rain as we have in storms, and we have an incoming tide and the riverine water starts to back up in the mouth of the harbor? That no longer is just Long Island Sound flooding there. You are having a riverine component to your flooding. Correct?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Yeah, I mean -- but I think a majority of the water would be coming from Long Island Sound as opposed to the -- I think you said the Yellow Mill and the Pequonnock River.

DR. KLEMENS: Does that in any way alter your assumption then about what would happen with water going around that 20-foot enclosure and affecting the level around your facility? If you added that riverine component, that is heavy rains, incoming tide during a storm, the water has nowhere to go but east-west?

THE WITNESS (Pinto): Well, it would certainly push -- push it out. Right? I don't believe that it would increase the elevation of it, but it would fan out more than -- well, there's no wall around that facility. That would make it, I guess if it's -- to better characterize it, if the floodplain went to -- I'm going to just use an example of, let's say, Main Street today it may move it out to Main Street plus something.

DR. KLEMENS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're going to recess now and resume at 6:30, at which time we'll commence the public comment session.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above proceedings were concluded at 4:46 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 96 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Regular Hearing in Re: 483, APPLICATION FROM UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR PEQUONNOCK SUBSTATION REBUILD PROJECT THAT ENTAILS CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF 115/13.8-KILOVOLT (KV) GAS INSULATED REPLACEMENT SUBSTATION LOCATED ON AN APPROXIMATELY 3.7-ACRE PARCEL OWNED BY PSEG POWER CONNECTICUT, LLC, AT 1 KIEFER STREET IN BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT, which was held before ROBIN STEIN, Chairman, at the Bridgeport City Hall, Council Chambers, 45 Lyon Terrace, Bridgeport, Connecticut, June 14, 2018.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857
Notary Public
BCT Reporting
55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A
Plainville, CT 06062
My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020

I N D E X