



Northeast  
Utilities System®

107 Selden Street, Berlin, CT 06037

Northeast Utilities Service Company  
P.O. Box 270  
Hartford, CT 06141-0270  
(860) 665-5000  
www.nu.com

May 18, 2010

Mr. S. Derek Phelps  
Executive Director  
Connecticut Siting Council  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

RECEIVED  
MAY 18 2010

CONNECTICUT  
SITING COUNCIL

Re: Docket No. 370 - CT Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Dear Mr. Phelps:

This letter provides the response to requests for the information listed below.

Response to CSC-04 Interrogatories dated 05/07/2010

CSC-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020\*,  
021, 022, 023

Very truly yours,

*Robert Carberry /tr*

Robert Carberry  
Project Manager  
NEEWS Siting and Permitting  
NUSCO  
As Agent for CL&P

cc: Service List

\*\* This response is proprietary and confidential and is available only to signatories of the  
nondisclosure agreement and is being provided to the Connecticut Siting Council only.

Witness: CL&P Panel  
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

**Question:**

If the Council approved the Manchester Substation to Meekville Junction Project Variation (MMP-V), when would CL&P expect that the United States Army Corps of Engineers (U.S. ACE) and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (CT DEP) permits would likely be issued? What would be the new expected date of commencement of construction following the Council's proceedings in this docket?

**Response:**

Pending applications before the CT Department of Environmental Protection (CTDEP) include the 401 Water Quality Certificate (WQC) Application and the Stream Channel Encroachment Line (SCEL) Application. The pending application before the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is the Section 404/10 Individual Permit Application.

CL&P has consulted with both the CTDEP and the USACE to understand the potential effect a Council approval of MMP-V may have on these pending applications and the associated processes.

For the purposes of this response, CL&P assumes:

1. the CSC will approve MMP-V;
2. such approval will be made evident by a Council member poll in mid-June 2010; and,
3. the CTDEP and USACE Permits have not been issued at the time of the CSC decision.

Under these circumstances, CL&P will be required to amend the pending applications to include the additional structures and removal activities associated with MMP-V, and to revise the Floodway analysis and hazards report that support, in particular, the CTDEP applications. CL&P would expect to file the necessary amendments in early July 2010.

Once filed, CTDEP has a 90-day time period to complete a sufficiency determination for the amended filing. If the materials are deemed complete no additional review may be needed. If so, the CT DEP may be in position to issue its permits in October 2010.

Issuance of the CTDEP permits will then allow the USACE to act, provided the Massachusetts DEP has issued its permits as well. If so, the USACE would likely act within one month of the CTDEP decisions, issuing the Individual Permit in November 2010. Construction activities, therefore, would likely commence in December 2010.

It should be noted, however, that if any of the assumptions provided above prove incorrect, the dates offered herein will not likely be achievable.

Witness: CL&P Panel  
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

**Question:**

If the MMP-V were approved by the Council, would CL&P modify or eliminate any portion of the Central Connecticut Reliability Project (CCRP)? Would the MMP-V delay the need for the CCRP?

**Response:**

CL&P would not propose to modify, eliminate, or delay any portion of the CCRP because of the approval of MMP-V.

MMP-V would improve system reliability by providing an alternate 345-kV transmission circuit path between Ludlow Substation and Manchester Substation, thus reducing power flows on the underlying 115-kV transmission system, which would otherwise have to be addressed by other transmission improvements, potentially including CCRP. However, MMP-V would not address the previously documented primary need for CCRP. This need, as demonstrated by the SNETR power-flow simulations, is based on N-1-1 contingency events that overload the 345-kV Manchester - Scovill Rock 353 circuit and result in high power flows into the Manchester Substation. CCRP would reduce loads on the 353 circuit and at the Manchester Substation by building a new 345-kV transmission circuit from North Bloomfield to Frost Bridge, which would share load with the 353 circuit and would bypass the Manchester Substation. The MMP-V would not perform these functions. Therefore, the Company does not expect that MMP-V would delay the need for CCRP. This need is currently being reevaluated by ISO-NE, with assumptions that have been updated from those used in the SNETR studies. Although the results of this reevaluation could defer the need date for CCRP, any such deferral would be independent of the MMP-V.

The Connecticut Light and Power Company  
Docket No. 370

Data Request CSC-04  
Dated: 05/07/2010  
Q-CSC-003  
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel  
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

**Question:**

Page 3 of the "Environment" tab states that some transmission line structures associated with MMP-V would "result in additional impacts to the flood storage capacity of the Hop Brook floodway." To what extent would the flood storage capacity be affected?

**Response:**

The MMP-V configuration would require two additional monopoles to be located within the FEMA-established Floodway and would also require removal of an existing lattice-steel tower from the Floodway. The impact associated with the MMP-V configuration would be a reduction in flood storage volume within the Floodway equal to the volume of the two monopoles (minus the volume of the removed lattice-steel tower). These changes could result in an increase of water surface elevation ranging from approximately 0.01 to 0.03 feet. Actual impact will be confirmed by conducting additional hydraulic modeling.

The Connecticut Light and Power Company  
Docket No. 370

Data Request CSC-04  
Dated: 05/07/2010  
Q-CSC-004  
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel  
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

**Question:**

What type of "additional compensatory flood-storage mitigation" would be required to make up for the impact to Hop Brook?

**Response:**

To mitigate for the additional impacts described in the response to Data Request CSC-04, Q-CSC-003, a compensatory area, typically consisting of a minor excavation, would be located downstream of the areas that experience increases in water elevation. In the case of MMP-V such an excavation would be proposed within the Floodway itself, and would be subject to the review and approval of the CTDEP and USACE.