COHEN and WOLF P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

DAVID A. BALL

Please Reply To Bridgeport
E-Mail: dball@cohenandwolf.com

May 6, 2016

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING AND OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Chairman Robert Stein
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

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 Chairman Stein:

Enclosed please find an original and fifteen (15) copies of the Town of Greenwich's Written Comments to the Council's Draft Findings of Fact dated April 22, 2016 in the above referenced docket.

I certify that a copy of this document has been electronically filed with the Council and sent on this date to all participants of record as reflected on the Council's service list dated February 1, 2016. The Council's copies are being delivered by overnight mail.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Very truly yours,

David A. Ball

DAB/lcc

cc: Service List *(Via Electronic Mail)*
Honorable Peter J. Tesei, Town of Greenwich (*Via Electronic Mail*)
John Wayne Fox, Esq., Town of Greenwich *(Via Electronic Mail)*
John Wetmore, Esq., Town of Greenwich *(Via Electronic Mail)*
Katie Deluca, Town of Greenwich *(Via Electronic Mail)*

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

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.

DOCKET NO. 461

DATE: MAY 6, 2016

TOWN OF GREENWICH WRITTEN COMMENTS TO DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT

The Town of Greenwich ("Town") submits the following comments to the draft findings of fact issued by the Siting Council on April 29, 2016.

Municipal Consultation and Community Outreach

24. On April 6, 2015, the Town of Greenwich Planning and Zoning Commission submitted correspondence to the Council and Eversource with the following recommendations regarding the GSLP:

a) If the Council determines that 290 Railroad Avenue is the appropriate location for the new substation, that the site be designed by a local architect;

b) Further exploration of the location and pre- and post-construction considerations of the transmission line routes;

c) Additional information should be provided to the Council about the appropriateness of the proposed substation site; and

d) Avoidance of any intrusion on Cos Cob Park located at 22 Sound Shore Drive.

(Town 1)

Comment: This finding presents an incomplete statement of the Town's recommendations concerning the GSLP. On November 23, 2015, Town of Greenwich First Selectman Peter J. Tesei submitted a letter from the Town of Greenwich Director of Planning and Zoning, Katie DeLuca, AICP, together with an attached Report detailing the Town's comments and recommendations concerning the GSLP. An additional finding should be added to reference this filing and the fact that the Town expressed: 1) opposition to any siting of a transmission line through Bruce Park; 2) its position that Eversource based its Application on projections of load growth using 2013 load data, but ignoring actual load data in 2014 and 2015, and that the capacity of the Cos Cob transformers would not be exceeded until 2031; 3) the GSLP would result in significant over-capacity, far beyond what is necessary to address the possibility of existing transformers reaching their rating capacities; and 4) the Town's concern over the environmental impact associated with the proposed construction of a new transmission line.

Project Need

Needs Assessment

41. Southwest Connecticut is the largest load area in the state that comprises 54 towns and accounts for 50% of Connecticut's peak electric load demand. The Town of Greenwich has the third highest electrical usage for the 149 municipalities served by Eversource in Connecticut. Greenwich customers use more than two times the electricity of the average Connecticut residential customers. (Eversource 1, p. E-11; Eversource 25, p. 6; Eversource 9, p. 31)

Comment: This finding is incomplete and inconsistent with the record. The figures contained in this finding include electric usage by Metro North Railroad. Once Metro North load is removed from the overall usage figures, the load usage attributable to the Town of Greenwich declines, and the Town drops to the fourth highest usage. (Tr. 2/23/16 at 171-172).

Greenwich Area Electric System

56. Although the population of Greenwich has grown by 2,700 persons from 1990 (58,441 population) to 2010 (61,171 population), electric demand increased by 45 percent. In the last few years, usage growth has been modest overall, fluctuating up and down. (Tr. 7, pp. 50-52).

Comment: This finding presents an incomplete statement of the Town's future plans. The record demonstrates that the Town's 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development contemplates that any future development will be limited to existing development, rather than planning for growth. (See p. 4 of 26 of Report attached to letter from Town of Greenwich Director of Planning and Zoning, Katie DeLuca, AICP, dated November 23, 2015, and attached 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development at pp. ii-iii). In addition, this finding is incomplete and inconsistent with the record. The record demonstrates that even if some reasonable amount of future increased electric demand is assumed, the GSLP would result in significant overcapacity on the transformers serving Greenwich, under the most far-reaching projections. (See Town's Proposed Findings of Fact dated April 11, 2016, Nos. 14-20; Eversource Responses to OCC-81 and OCC-83, Tr. 7 at 98-99, Eversource 1 at Table E-1).

57. Greenwich customer usage, based on electric meter data, increased 1.5 percent from 2014 to 2015. (Tr. 7, pp. 140-141)

Comment: This finding is erroneous. Eversource reported a decline in Greenwich kWh usage from 2014 to 2015 in its LF-20 filing. Eversource later filed revised usage figures in LF-20-RV, stating that it had found that there was missing data from a non-registering meter in Cos Cob for a 49-day period in 2015. Eversource's revised filing, LF-20-RV, merely contains an estimate of the missing data and an estimated increase in usage on the Cos Cob transformers, rather than actual meter data. (LF-20 and LF-20-RV).

60. Greenwich is third largest user of electricity in Eversource's service territory, behind Hartford and Stamford. (Tr. 3 p. 85-86)

Comment: This finding is incomplete and inconsistent with the record. The figures contained in Finding of Fact No. 41, on which this finding is based, include electric usage by Metro North Railroad. Once Metro North load is removed from the overall usage figures, the load usage attributable to the Town of Greenwich declines, and the Town drops to the fourth highest usage. (Tr. 2/23/16 at 171-172). That said, the Town is fully supportive of cost-effective improvements that will enhance reliability in the Town and in the region. However, the record demonstrates that even if some reasonable amount of future increased electric demand is assumed, the GSLP would result in significant overcapacity on the transformers serving Greenwich, under the most far-reaching projections. (See Town's Proposed Findings of Fact dated April 11, 2016, Nos. 14-20; Eversource Responses to OCC-81 and OCC-83, Tr. 7 at 98-99, Eversource 1 at Table E-1).

Electric System Interim Measures

67. There are no additional cost-effective measures that could be undertaken to address both the reliability of the Greenwich distribution system and capacity issues at Cos Cob Substation. (Tr. 4, pp. 70-71).

Comment: This finding is erroneous and should be deleted. The record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation.

Current Electric System Reliability and Capacity Issues

86. Under existing circumstances, with no increase in capacity, there is a possibility that there would be an overload at the Cos Cob Substation.

Comment: This finding is incomplete. As the record shows, Eversource based its Application on inflated projections which have proven to be false. Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 of 131.8 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2014 was 107.7 MVA, a decline of 17.5% from actual peak load in 2013. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 92; Eversource Response to OCC-22.) Eversource overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 by 24.1 MVA, an overprojection of 18.3%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 of 133.1 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2015 was 114.8 MVA, a decline of 12% from actual peak load in 2013. *Tr. 3-10-16 at 93; Eversource Response to OCC-22.* Eversource overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 by 18.3 MVA, an overprojection of 13.7%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93).

Accordingly, while the possibility of an overload at the Cos Cob Substation may exist at some point, the finding should be revised to clarify that this risk has been proven not to be imminent in light of the fact that Eversource's projections have been demonstrated to be false.

Load Forecasting

88. Eversource developed projected summer peak loads based on the highest peak load value recorded in the study period of 2010 to 2014. The maximum peak load in the study was 130.5 MVA that occurred in 2013. (Eversource 24, R. 22; Eversource 3, R. 12; Tr. 5, pp. 102-103; Tr. 3, pp. 153-153 (sic); Tr. 7, pp. 38-39)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. As the record shows, Eversource based its inflated load projections on 2013 actual data, which constituted the highest peak load recorded on the Cos Cob transformers for the 12-year period 2004

through 2015, even though actual data showed a decline in load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2014 and 2015, and not an increase. (Eversource Response to OCC-22).

91. A portion of the one percent growth projection assumes a certain amount of distributed generation and a certain amount of energy efficiency. (Tr. 3, p. 70)
Comment: This finding is incomplete and inconsistent with the record. As the record shows, Eversource does not take into account future increases in energy efficiency measures in its projections. (Tr. 2-23-16 at 181).

99. Based on current and projected loads, the transformation (sic) capacity and distribution feeders are at or near maximum operational ratings under peak or near peak conditions. (Eversource 1, p. E-6)
100. Eversource is projecting that the 2017 summer peak load on the Cos Cob 27.6-kV system would be 135.8 MVA under certain contingency conditions, exceeding the permissible load rating of 135 MVA. (Eversource 1, p. E-5)
101. The new Greenwich Substation should be in service by 2018 to prevent potential future summer peak overloading. (Eversource 1, p. E-5)
Comment: These findings are erroneous and inconsistent with the record. As the record shows, Eversource based its Application on inflated projections which have proven to be false. Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 of 131.8 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2014 was 107.7 MVA, a decline of 17.5% from actual peak load in 2013. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 92; Eversource Response to OCC-22.) Eversource overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 by 24.1 MVA, an overprojection of 18.3%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 of 133.1 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2015 was 114.8 MVA, a decline of 12% from actual peak load in 2013. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 93; Eversource Response to OCC-22.) Eversource

overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 by 18.3 MVA, an overprojection of 13.7%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93).

For the Cos Cob Substation transformers to be overloaded by 2018, the increase in load would have to increase by *18%* from 2015 (114.8 MVA) in just three years. Applying Eversource's projected 1% load growth from 2015, the Cos Cob transformers will not be overloaded until *2031*.

GSLP Reliability and Capacity Improvements

105. Eversource examined the electric system in the Greenwich area and determined that the existing system is limited and cannot be strengthened without a new bulk substation west of Indian Harbor. The new bulk substation would lessen the load on the Cos Cob Substation. (Eversource 1, p. E-14; Eversource 9, p.32).

Comment: This finding is incomplete. While it is true that Eversource would like to construct a new bulk substation and transmission line, the record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation.

110. Excess capacity at the new Greenwich Substation would be utilized during contingency events, thus increasing reliability of the Greenwich electric system. (Tr. 7, pp. 97-99).

Comment: This finding is incomplete. While it is true that a new bulk substation would increase reliability, the finding should better reflect the record, which demonstrates that the GSLP would result in significant overcapacity on the transformers serving Greenwich, under the most far-reaching projections. (See Town's Proposed Findings of Fact dated April 11, 2016, Nos. 14-20; Eversource Responses to OCC-81 and OCC-83, Tr. 7 at 98-99, Eversource 1 at Table E-1).

111. The proposed Greenwich Substation would provide a reliable source of power for projected peak loads, and additional load increases arising from economic development in the Greenwich area. (Eversource 1, pp. E-1, E-5)

Comment: This finding is inconsistent with the record which demonstrates that the Town has adopted a 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development which contemplates that any future development will be limited to existing development, rather than planning for growth. There is therefore no basis to assume additional load increases based on future economic development. (See p. 4 of 26 of Report attached to letter from Town of Greenwich Director of Planning and Zoning, Katie DeLuca, AICP, dated November 23, 2015, and attached 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development at pp. ii-iii).

115. The proposed substation is the only solution for backing up customers served by Cos Cob or the North Greenwich Substation. (Tr. 7, p. 78).

Comment: This finding is inconsistent with the record and incomplete. The record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation.

Project Alternatives

No Action Alternative

124. Eversource considered and rejected a "no action" alternative to the GSLP because without additional capacity, Greenwich would be at increased risk in 2017 when, under certain contingencies, the transformers at Cos Cob substation are projected to reach their capacity limits and anticipated future demand growth could not be reliably served. Doing nothing would undermine Eversource's obligation to serve the load in Greenwich. (Eversource 1, p. F-1; Tr. 3, p. 84; Eversource 9, p. 33)

Comment: This finding is erroneous and inconsistent with the record. As the record shows, Eversource based its Application on inflated projections which have proven to be false. Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 of 131.8 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2014 was 107.7 MVA, a decline of 17.5% from actual peak load in 2013. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 92; Eversource Response to OCC-22.) Eversource overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2014 by 24.1 MVA, an overprojection of 18.3%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 92.) Eversource projected a peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 of 133.1 MVA. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93.) The actual peak load on the Cos Cob transformers in 2015 was 114.8 MVA, a decline of 12% from actual peak load in 2013. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 93; Eversource Response to OCC-22.) Eversource overprojected the peak load on the Cos Cob transformers for 2015 by 18.3 MVA, an overprojection of 13.7%. (Eversource Application at Table E-1; Tr. 3-10-16 at 93).

For the Cos Cob Substation transformers to be overloaded by 2017, the increase in load would have to increase by *18%* from 2015 (114.8 MVA) in just two years. Applying Eversource's projected 1% load growth from 2015, the Cos Cob transformers will not be overloaded until *2031*.

Non-Transmission Alternatives

129. Eversource analyzed a range of non-transmission alternatives including distribution alternatives, generation alternatives and demand side management alternatives, as well as several combinations thereof. Non-transmission alternatives could provide incremental load relief benefits, but could not provide enhanced reliability of the distribution system in the location near the center of customer demand in Greenwich and are not cost-effective. (Eversource 1, pp. F-1, F-2, F-18; Eversource 9, p. 34)

130. As a result of this analysis, Eversource determined that non-transmission alternatives are not currently available or not currently available in sufficient amounts to meet the immediate needs the GSLP would address. Non-transmission alternatives would not increase the reliability of the system with a new reliable capacity source sufficient to supply anticipated customer demand for the long-term future or extend the bulk power transmission infrastructure closer to the demand center. Therefore, issuance and analysis of requests for proposal for non-transmission alternatives to the proposed GSLP would not be a prudent exercise. (Eversource 1, p. F-18; Eversource 24, R. 35)

Comment: These findings are inconsistent with the record and incomplete. The record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation.

Distribution Alternatives

134. The Town suggested that the proposed project would not be needed if Eversource performs upgrades to the distribution system. (Tr. 6, pp. 67-68)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. The record demonstrates that the Town has suggested that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation. (Town of Greenwich First Selectman Peter J. Tesei letter attaching letter from the Town of Greenwich Director of Planning and Zoning, Katie DeLuca, AICP, together with attached Report, dated November 23, 2015).

Load Transfer Between Existing Substations in Greenwich

148. No additional distribution level interim measures could provide reliable service other than construction of a new substation in Greenwich because Greenwich is electrically isolated – the transmission lines end at Cos Cob substation and the distribution substations that serve customer load are fed by distribution feeders that originate at Cos Cob substation. (Eversource 1, pp. E-17 – E-22; Tr. 3, p. 139; Tr. 4, p. 147; Eversource 9, p. 36)

Comment: This finding is inconsistent with the record and incomplete. The record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation, upgrading the existing distribution lines in Greenwich, shifting load from the Prospect Substation to the North Greenwich Substation, and installing higher capacity transformers at the Prospect Substation.

Larger Transformers at Cos Cob Substation

163. Eversource considered removing the existing transformers at Cos Cob Substation and replacing them with larger transformers, specifically 36 / 48 / 60 MVA or 48 / 64 / 80 MVA, but there is insufficient space to accommodate the larger transformers and associated feeders at the existing Cos Cob Substation without acquiring additional property. The Cos Cob Substation is a fully utilized property. (Eversource 1, p. E-15; Eversource 39, p. 1; Tr. 5, pp. 66-69)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. When asked whether it consulted the manufacturer(s) of the Cos Cob 115-to-27.6 kV transformers about retrofitting and upsizing the transformer(s), Eversource admitted that it had not, responding that "...there is no benefit in contacting the manufacturers of the Cos Cob 115–27.6 kV transformers because it is the Company's judgment that the transformers cannot be uprated above the currently applicable 61 MVA rating." The record demonstrates that Eversource can and should do more to identify cost-effective solutions to the need for reliable electric service in Greenwich, including

installing larger capacity transformers in the Cos Cob Substation. (Eversource Response to OCC-56).

Project Description

205. The GSLP consists of the installation of a new 115-kV bulk power substation, referred to as the Greenwich Substation, a new 115-kV electric transmission line, and modifications to the existing Cos Cob, Prospect, and Byram Substations. Details of each portion of the Project are described in the following subsections. (Eversource 1, p. ES-1, G-9).

Comment: This finding is incomplete. The finding should also state that Eversource projects the cost of the Project to be $140 million. (Eversource 1, ES-11).

New 115-kV Transmission Line – Potential Routes

270. The new substation would be supplied by two new 115-kV transmission circuits originating from the Cos Cob Substation located on Sound Shore Drive in Greenwich. (Eversource 1, p. ES-2)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. Eversource has not determined whether an easement for the proposed exit from the Cos Cob Substation designated as "1A" is required. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 119). As Cos Cob Park is a brownfield remediation site and to the extent that the access road at Cos Cob Park is disturbed, Eversource would address it during the Development and Management stage. (Tr. 3-10-16 at 121).

294. The Town maintains a force main located along a portion of the Hybrid Alternative route where it extends south of the MNRR tracks. The Town is currently under a federal consent decree requiring it to replace and upgrade the force main. If the Hybrid Alternative is approved, the overhead portion to the south of the MNRR tracks would require Eversource to construct the line in a way that would allow the Town to replace and upgrade **and maintain** its force main in accordance with the federal consent decree

and to ensure that the Town would be able to access the force main to perform any necessary work in the future. (Tr. 7, pp. 150-106).

COMMENT: The emphasized text should be included in this finding of fact to allow the Town to maintain its infrastructure in the future.

Public Safety

349. The substation design includes acceptable physical separation distances from substation equipment to abutting properties. (Tr. 7, p. 34)

COMMENT: This finding is incomplete. The following should be noted:

A. The proposed site fronts on a heavily trafficked road, and is bounded by commercial buildings and a railroad. (Tr. 02/23/16 at 147).

B. The Airgas, Inc. building, which houses compressed gases, oxygen, acetylene and propane for distribution, abuts the site. (Tr. 02/23/2016 at 145; Tr. 09/01/15 Public Comment Session at 29, 50; Field Point Estate Townhouses Administrative Notice photographs 1 and 2 filed 03/01/16).

C. Eversource does not know what is kept on site at Airgas and has the same fire emergency plans for any abutting property. (Tr. 03/10/16 at 33-34).

Environmental Considerations

Land Use

370. Bruce Park is Greenwich's oldest park and was established in 1908. It consists of 60-acres of maintained lawn, woodland, picnic areas, roadways, athletic fields and two tidal ponds. (Town 6, R. 11)

Comment: This finding is incomplete in the following ways:

Bruce Park is subject to a deed restriction limiting the property to use as a public park. (Town's Exhibit 8, Supplemental at 6, Exhibit D-1).

Implementation of the proposed routes through Bruce Park would impact recreational facilities, specifically the ball field. (Tr. 2-23-16 at 29-31).

Soil and Earthwork

377. Trench construction in roads would be similar to other types of construction projects that occur in roads such as water main replacements or natural gas line installations. (Tr. 3, pp. 59-62)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. At least 114 residential properties would be directly impacted by the installation by any route that traverses Bruce Park. (Town's Exhibit 6, Response to CSC – 16, Tr. 2-16-16 at 1).

396. If there was a fluid leak into soil, the soil would not be considered a hazardous waste. The soil must be treated and or removed and disposed of as a solid waste in accordance with applicable regulatory criteria. (Eversource 20, R. 9)

Comment: This finding is incomplete. The Town is very concerned about the potential impact of drilling and long term installation of HPFF because of the connectivity between the soils, tidal ponds and Long Island Sound. (Town's Exhibit 6, Response to CSC-11).

Water Resources

Coastal Area Resources

401. Portions of the GSLP are located within the coastal resource boundary, as defined by the Connecticut Coastal Management Act (CCMA). However, none of the coastal resources identified by the CCMA would be adversely affected by GSLP. (Eversource 1, pp. I-20, I-21, I-23, I-28, I-31, I-33, J-5 to J-8)

Comment: This finding is incomplete as portions of the Project Area lie within the 100 year and 500 year flood boundaries (Eversource 1, pp I.1.2.2).

402. Bruce Park contains a complex of open water estuarine tidal water features. (Eversource 1, pp. I-7, I-8).

Comment: This finding is incomplete. These water features have been identified by CT DEEP as a salt marsh migration area for resiliency to sea level rise. There are very limited areas like this in the state. (Town's Exhibit 6, Response to CSC-11).

407. Restoration of disturbed shore areas adjacent to the harbor and small tidal pond would take one full growing season. (Tr. 7, p. 118)

Comment: This finding is incomplete as the carefully protected shellfish beds are also at risk, which are an important aspect of the ecosystem. (Town's Exhibit 6, Response to CSC-11, Tr. 2-16-16 at 3, Exhibit H).

410. In March of 2015, the Town Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency indicated to Eversource that the Preferred Route -HDD would have the least potential of causing adverse wetland impact when compared to the Preferred Route-Trench. (Eversource 9, pp. 25-26)

Comment: This finding is incomplete in that it should refer only to adverse <u>inland</u> wetland impact.

Vegetation

422. The Preferred Route - HDD Variation 2, (orange route) includes a trench route through a small wooded area of Bruce Park, east of Kinsman Lane. Approximately 15,000 square feet of woodland would be removed to accommodate a 25-foot wide, 600-foot long trench construction area. After construction is complete, the trench area would be maintained as a field area by Eversource to prevent regrowth of trees over the trench installation. (Eversource 20, R. 1, R. 4, Tr. 3, pp. 15-16, 106).

Comment: This finding is incomplete. Tree removal in Bruce Park impacts the urban forest quality of the Park and jeopardizes the Town's plans for the Bruce Park Arboretum. (Town's Exhibit 8, Response to CSC-15 at 11, Exhibit I-1).

Fish and Wildlife

428. The GSLP would not impact any DEEP designated critical habitats. (Eversource 1, pp. I-11, J-10).

Comment: This finding is incomplete and erroneous. Bruce Park is a coastal park with several key features including the tidal ponds that lead to Indian Harbor and out to Long Island Sound. The tidal ponds and adjoining Indian Harbor are part of an estuarine environment, where fresh water meets salt water. In ecological terms, this area is called an "edge" where two different habitat types meet. As such, estuaries are regarded as some of the most important habits in the world. DEEP has designated all tidal marshes as important. (Town's Exhibit 6, Response to CSC-11).

Respectfully submitted,

Town of Greenwich

By: _____

Julie D. Kohler, Esq.
David A. Ball, Esq.
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
Tel. (203) 368-0211
Fax (203) 394-9901
jkohler@cohenandwolf.com
dball@cohenandwolf.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day a copy of the foregoing was delivered by electronic mail to all parties and intervenors of record, as follows:

Jacqueline Gardell
Project Manager
Eversource Energy
56 Prospect Street
Hartford, CT 06103
jacqueline.gardell@eversource.com

John Morissette
Project Manager-Transmission Siting-CT
Eversource Energy
56 Prospect Street
Hartford, CT 06103
john.morissette@eversource.com

Jeffery Cochran, Esq.
Senior Counsel, Legal Department
Eversource Energy
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037
jeffery.cochran@eversource.com

Marianne Barbino Dubuque
Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP
50 Leavenworth Street
Waterbury, CT 06702
mdubuque@carmodylaw.com

Lauren Henault Bidra, Esq.
Staff Attorney
Office of Consumer Counsel
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Lauren.bidra@ct.gov

Joseph A. Rosenthal, Esq.
Principal Attorney
Office of Consumer Counsel
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Joseph.rosenthal@ct.gov

Margaret Bain
Associate Rate Specialist
Office of Consumer Counsel
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Margaret.bain@ct.gov

Parker Stacy
1 Kinsman Lane
Greenwich, CT 06830
pstacy@optonline.net

Mark L. Bergamo, Esq.
Edward L. Marcus, Esq.
The Marcus Law Firm
275 Branford Road
North Branford, CT 06471
mbergamo@marcuslawfirm.com
emarcus@marcuslawfirm.com

Carissa Depetris
Dwight Ueda
Field Point Estate Townhouses
172 Field Point Road, #10
Greenwich, CT 06830
carissa.depetris@gmail.com
d_ueda@yahoo.com

Christine Edwards
111 Bible Street
Cos Cob, CT 06807
SeeEdwards@aol.com

Richard Granoff, AIA, LEED AP
Granoff Architects
30 West Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
rg@granoffarchitects.com

Anthony Crudele
Bella Nonna Restaurant & Pizzeria
280 Railroad Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
bellanonnagreenwich@gmail.com

Cecilia H. Morgan
3 Kinsman Lane
Greenwich, CT 06830
cecimorgan@aol.com

Dr. Danielle Luzzo
Greenwich Chiropractic & Nutrition
282 Railroad Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
drdanielleluzzo@gmail.com

Joel Paul Berger
4208 Bell Boulevard
Flushing, NY 11361
communityrealty@msn.com

Meg Glass
9 Bolling Place
Greenwich, CT 06830
glass50@hotmail.com

David A. Ball, Esq.