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

www.ct.gov/csc

September 9, 2015

Marianne Barbino Dubuque
Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP
50 Leavenworth Street
Waterbury, CT 06702

RE: **DOCKET NO. 461** - Eversource Energy application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 115-kilovolt (kV) bulk substation located at 290 Railroad Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut, and two 115-kV underground transmission circuits extending approximately 2.3 miles between the proposed substation and the existing Cos Cob Substation, Greenwich, Connecticut, and related substation improvements.

Dear Attorney Dubuque:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 25, 2015.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as send a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies 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. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Copies of your responses shall be provided to all parties and intervenors listed on the service list, which can be found on the Council's pending proceedings website.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/RDM

Council Members

Enclosure

c: Service List dated September 2, 2015 (via electronic mail)
Council Members

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

www.ct.gov/csc

Connecticut Siting Council
Docket No. 461 - Greenwich
Pre-hearing Interrogatories – Set 2

1. In regards to the Yellow Preferred Open Trench Route Variation through the tidal basins in Bruce Park, please explain in detail the following:
   a) construction of the coffer dams;
   b) suitability of coffer dam installation within tidal waters;
   c) amplitude of the tide in the construction area;
   d) biological habitats that would be disturbed by coffer dam installation and trench excavation;
   e) maximum depth of the trenches within the tidal basins;
   f) duration of construction within each tidal basin;
   g) material used for trench backfill within the tidal basins;
   h) type of restoration, if any, of the disturbed area within the tidal basins;
   i) length of time for the disturbed areas to resume its original habitat function; and
   j) maintenance and operation concerns associated with the conduits beneath the tidal basins.

2. In regards to the Bruce Park Yellow, Blue and Orange open trench route variations, please explain the post construction effect on the scenic resources of the park. What open trench route would require the least amount of tree removal in the park?

3. Is it possible to extend the Bruce Park Blue Open Trench Route Variation further southwest so it intersects with the Yellow Preferred Open Trench Route Variation on Kinsman Lane at the corner of the ball field? What would be the approximate duration of trenching for this area (Blue Open Trench Route Variation from north end of Kinsman Lane to Kinsman Lane at ball field corner)?

4. Does the Bruce Park Orange Open Trench Route Variation traverse the only densely wooded area in Bruce Park? If so, does it offer wildlife values not present in other areas of the park? How would this woodland area be restored upon completion of the project?

5. Referring to the March 10 2015 Greenwich Planning and Zoning Commission Transcript p. 29 (bulk file), chemicals that could be used to fracture rock during trenching are mentioned. Please elaborate on what chemicals would be used for this purpose and their potential frequency of use for this project.

6. Provide a table with the estimated cost of each of the Bruce Park variations.

7. What is the estimated construction time for the following
   a) Bruce Park Orange Open Trench Variation;
   b) Bruce Park Blue Open Trench Variation;
   c) Bruce Park Orange/Blue HDD segment;
   d) Yellow Preferred Route HDD (segment 6); and
   e) Bruce Park Yellow Preferred Route Open Trench Variation (segments 5 &6).

8. What is the life span of the HPFF cable system? What would happen to the HPFF installation at this point?

9. How is the HPFF cable system monitored for leaks? If soil becomes saturated with HPFF cable fluid, is it considered a hazardous waste?

10. What is the main reason for HPFF cable system failure? If there was a leak in the HPFF cable system, what is the typical repair time?

11. Is it possible to design the façade of the 290 Railroad Avenue GIS building to appear similar to the existing Pet Pantry building? If so, provide a rendering of what it could look like. Would a simple brick façade blend in better with the surrounding neighborhood rather than the proposed turret design?

12. Referring to the Site Plans in Application Appendix B, is it possible to install a concrete/brick veneer wall from the southwest corner of the GIS building to the swing gate? If such a wall were installed, what height would be necessary to meet security needs? For the remaining fence line along Indian Point Road south of the swing gate, is it possible to install a low concrete/brick veneer wall with a fence mounted on top of the wall?