



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

April 2, 2009

Robert E. Carberry, Manager  
NEEWS Projects Siting and Permitting  
Northeast Utilities Service Company  
P.O. Box 270  
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

RE: **DOCKET 370A** - The Connecticut Light & Power Company application for Certificates of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Connecticut Valley Electric Transmission Reliability Projects which consist of (1) The Connecticut portion of the Greater Springfield Reliability Project that traverses the municipalities of Bloomfield, East Granby, and Suffield, or potentially including an alternate portion that traverses the municipalities of Suffield and Enfield, terminating at the North Bloomfield Substation; and (2) the Manchester Substation to Meekville Junction Circuit Separation Project in Manchester, Connecticut.

Dear Mr. Carberry:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than April 17, 2009. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office including an electronic filing in .pdf format. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. A list of parties and intervenors dated April 1, 2009, is enclosed. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Yours very truly,

S. Derek Phelps  
Executive Director

Enclosure

c: Parties and Intervenors



# STATE OF CONNECTICUT

## CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

### NOTICE OF SERVICE

I hereby affirm that a photocopy of this document was sent to each Party and Intervenor on the service list dated April 1, 2009.

Dated: April 2, 2009

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lisa Fontaine", written over a horizontal line.

Lisa Fontaine  
Custodian of Docket No. 370

Docket No. 370  
Connecticut Siting Council  
Pre-hearing Questions  
Set Two

27. Provide the per capita electric usage for 1990, 2000 and 2008 for the north-central Connecticut area, the entire State of Connecticut and the Springfield, MA area.
28. Provide peak demand and mean demand for each year from 1998 through 2008 for the north-central Connecticut area, the entire State of Connecticut and the Springfield, MA area.
29. Provide projected peak demand and mean demand for 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2025.
30. Identify remote generating units that would export power to Connecticut via the GSRP transmission line. Would any of these generating units provide power at a lower cost than in-state generating units?
31. Describe each overhead segment (structure number to structure number) and its potential underground line route variation, providing a comparison cost for each segment (as identified in Table H-3 of Volume I of the Application).
32. How would the proposed project recover its costs? Have any costs (\$/kWh) been calculated?
33. When does CL&P expect to receive necessary local, state and federal permits?
34. Does CL&P have the authority to install underground cables within the transmission line ROW in areas with non-fee easements? Would easements have to be modified?
35. What would be the approximate distance between each construction site that would be required along the proposed GSRP and the MMP? Approximately how many construction sites would be needed in total?
36. What is the estimated distance between each proposed transmission structure?
37. Would the proposed spacing of transmission structures affect the amount of vegetative clearing that would be needed along the ROW?
38. The response to CSC-005 states that a minimum of 1.7 acres would be needed for the placement of equipment at a transition station site. However, the response to CSC-010 states that approximately two to four acres of clearing would be necessary within the Newgate Wildlife Management Area. Why would the entire two to four acres of vegetation be cleared if only 1.7 acres would be necessary for equipment?
39. For transition stations proposed on non-CL&P property, were the property owners consulted?
40. In response to CSC-015 CL&P stated that during the Middletown to Norwalk project construction had community outreach limitations regarding stakeholder choice of pole

height and finish. How would CL&P change the procedure to limit this problem in future projects, including the GSRP and MMP?

41. What is the maximum distance that a crane boom could be located from a pole structure during installation of the lines?
42. What length of time would be needed for conductor installation for each pulling section?
43. Would CL&P hire an independent environmental inspector to inspect construction conditions? How often?
44. Has CL&P determined what crossing method would be used for each waterbody that may be crossed, if an underground route were chosen? What DEP restrictions are associated with such waterbodies?
45. How much downhill migration would be expected for underground cables? Would migration occur regardless of percent slope?
46. Provide information about each "open house" held in the affected communities (including date, location, description of materials presented).
47. Provide the number of homes and/or properties that would have to be purchased along the entire GSRP northern route and Southern Route Alternative (for both CT and MA).
48. A cross-section listed in Table O-9 of the application is listed as XS-S06, however, the description and profile drawing do not appear in the preceding text of Section O. Please provide information for XS-S06.
49. Provide the Plan as stated on page 2 of Appendix O-1 in Volume I of the Application, for the pre- and post-NEEWs magnetic field line design alternatives for the Southern Route Alternative.
50. In the vicinity of Wyncairne Road in East Granby, would the proposed GSRP result in any vegetative clearing to the west of the existing line? What would be the distance of the proposed 345-kV line to the residences on Wyncairne Road, immediately to the west?
51. In the application (Volume 11, the Connecticut Portion of the North Bloomfield to Agawam Route, Mapsheet 28 of 45), please identify the building structures in Suffield that are immediately east of the proposed transmission line. Are these structures within the CL&P easement? What is the distance of the proposed line to each of these buildings?