

**STATE OF 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. 461A May 19, 2017
--	-------------------------------------

**RESPONSE
TO TOWN OF GREENWICH OBJECTION TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

The Town of Greenwich has filed a ten page objection to the granting of Eversource’s Petition for Reconsideration. Seven of these pages are devoted to the contention that the all-underground Alternate Modified Project (AMP) specified by the Town is superior to Eversource’s Proposed Modified Project (PMP), which is based on the Hybrid Alternative that was a focus of the Council’s Opinion in Docket 461. (Objection at 3-10). The Town will have an ample opportunity to explain and justify its preference in the reopened proceeding. Eversource has made clear that it is prepared to construct whichever project the Council determines is more consistent with the Public Utility Environmental Standards Act (*See, e.g.* Petition, at 12); and Eversource is prepared to make an even-handed presentation of the merits and shortcomings of each alternative. The Town’s preference for one of the alternatives accordingly provides no reason to decline reconsideration, but rather supports a full consideration of both alternatives.

The remaining three pages of the Town’s objection are devoted to a mischaracterization of past proceedings and a brief and unsupported assertion that the Council should not limit the proceedings on reconsideration to an evaluation of the merits of the two alternative solutions, but rather should revisit the entire need issue – either by requiring Eversource to file a completely new application, or by imposing no limits on the scope of the proceedings on reconsideration. (Objection, at 1-3). The Council should reject these requests, which would result in inordinate and unnecessary delay.

The Council found in Docket 461:

The record is clear that the proposed GSLP [Greenwich Substation and Line Project], or some variation thereof, is necessary for the reliability of the electric power supply of the

Town of Greenwich....Quite simply, the existing electric distribution system in this area does not have the capacity to backup customers in the event of outages and capacity issues can arise at Cos Cob Substation during high heat index days.” (Opinion, p. 71)

Eversource’s Petition and supporting documents show that there is no reason to re-visit this conclusion. (See, Petition vol. 1, Bowes Test. at 2-9). The Town criticizes Eversource’s initial design assumption of a future load based upon 1% annual growth from the base of the 2013 actual peak load (Objection, at 2).¹ However, load growth above the 2013 actual peak is irrelevant to the reconsideration proceeding, since the design of both the PMP and the AMP are based on the 2013 actual load, with no consideration of future growth. (See, e.g., Petition, vol. 1, Bowes Test. at 4) Moreover, criteria violations occur in system modelling at load levels that are much lower than the actual 2013 peak; indeed, the critical load level at which violations occur is approximately 63% of the 2013 actual peak. (*Id.*, at 5) The Town also asserts that Eversource, in conversations with the Town, adopted a “new” need justification based on “a claimed need to improve aging infrastructure in the Prospect and Byram Substations” rather than “the supposed risk of overloads on the Cos Cob transformers.”² (Objection, at 3) There is no basis for this contention. As the Petition shows, the continuing need for improvement of the Greenwich electric system is the same as that the Council found to exist in the previous proceeding – in general, inadequate distribution feeders, insufficient transformation capacity, an inability to transfer load between substations, and inadequate and aging infrastructure, all of which contribute to the risk of overloads on the existing lines and substations. (Petition, vol. 1, Bowes Test., at 2-9)

This project has already been the subject of protracted proceedings – extending over nearly a year, with many evidentiary hearing days. The length of the proceeding was due in part to the Town’s belated entry as a party. All issues were thoroughly explored and resolved in that proceeding, with the exception of the appropriate cost and other characteristics of a project to address the Greenwich reliability need. In denying Eversource’s application “without prejudice,” the Council, among other things, directed Eversource to fully develop the “Hybrid Alternative” that the Council had identified as a potential solution during the proceeding (Opinion at 6-8); to avoid a route through Bruce Park (Opinion at 7, 8); and to attempt to reach an agreement on a solution with the Town of Greenwich. (Opinion at 3, 7, 8) These three directives seemed consistent, since at the time, Greenwich had indicated that it would support

¹ The Council found this forecast to be “a reasonable projection.” (Docket 461, Opinion, at 5)

² In Docket No. 461, the Council found that the transformers and substation bus at Byram and Prospect Substations were “over 50 years old” and “obsolete.” (FOF 58) Nevertheless, in its Petition for Reconsideration, Eversource does not propose replacement or upgrade of the Byram Substation; rather, it intends to upgrade that distribution substation in the future as needed, by one or more distribution projects. (Bowes Test. at 11)

the Hybrid Alternative³, but adamantly opposed transmission line construction of any kind anywhere in Bruce Park and any underground lines that used fluid filled technology anywhere in Greenwich.⁴ However, the Town's position has changed, and this change in position has protracted the time required to develop proposals for the Council's consideration, with the result that Eversource's Petition for Reconsideration has not been filed until a year after the Council's initial decision.

People and organizations are entitled to change their positions when presented with new or more detailed information, and Eversource does not fault Greenwich for doing so in this case. However, Eversource does object to the unnecessary and burdensome delay that would be caused by a wholesale reopening of Docket 461 or a requirement to file a new application. The Council should confine the proceedings on reconsideration to a comparative evaluation of the two alternate solutions to the urgent need it has already recognized.

Respectfully submitted,

**THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER
COMPANY dba EVERSOURCE ENERGY**

By: 

Anthony M. Fitzgerald
Marianne Barbino Dubuque
of Carmody, Torrance, Sandak & Hennessey LLP
Its Attorneys
195 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06509-1950
(203) 777-5501
afitzgerald@carmodylaw.com
mdubuque@carmodylaw.com

³ Greenwich Ex. 4, P&Z Comments 11/23/2015, at 3,4, 23, 24; Greenwich Ex. 6, Interrogatory Responses CSC Q-18, CSC Q-19; DeLuca Test., Tr. 2/23/16 at 36, 37, 188; Greenwich Post Hearing Brief d. 4/11/16, at 8-10.

⁴ Greenwich Ex. 4, P&Z Comments 11/23/2015 at 3,4, 19, 20; Greenwich Ex. 5, Intervenor Status Request Form, 1/11/2016 at 1; Greenwich Ex. 6, Interrogatory Responses 2/6/16, CSC Q-7, CSC Q-11; DeLuca Test., Tr. 2/23/16 at 36, 37, 118; Greenwich Written Comments to Draft Findings of Fact, 5/6/16, at 2; Greenwich Post Hearing Brief, 4/11/2016 at 8-10.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that a paper copy and a digital copy on compact disc of the foregoing Response has been served on this 19 day of May, 2017 by mail and by e-mail upon all parties and intervenors as referenced in the Connecticut Siting Council's Service List dated February 16, 2016, as amended by subsequent appearances, as stated below.

Office of Consumer Counsel

Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Joseph A. Rosenthal, Esq., Principal Attorney
Joseph.rosenthal@ct.gov
Lauren Henault Bidra, Esq., Staff Attorney
Lauren.bidra@ct.gov

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

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

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

Pet Pantry Super Discount Stores LLC

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

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

Field Point Estate Townhouses, Inc.

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

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

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

The Honorable Peter J. Tesei
First Selectman
Town of Greenwich
101 Field Point Road
Greenwich, CT 06830
ptesei@greenwichct.org

David A. Ball, Esq.
Daved E. Dubin, Esq.
Cohen and Wolf, P.C.
1115 Broad Street
Bridgeport, CT 06604
dball@cohenandwolf.com
ddubin@cohenandwolf.com



Anthony M. Fitzgerald