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

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

July 27, 2017

Anthony M. Fitzgerald, Esq.
Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP
195 Church Street
P.O. Box 1950
New Haven, CT 06509

RE: **DOCKET NO. 474** - The Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Greater Hartford-Central Connecticut Reliability Project that traverses the municipalities of Hartford, West Hartford, and Newington, which consists of (a) construction, maintenance and operation of a new 115-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line within existing Eversource, Amtrak and public road rights-of-way and associated facilities extending overhead approximately 2.4 miles and underground approximately 1.3 miles between Eversource's existing Newington Substation in the Town of Newington and existing Southwest Hartford Substation in the City of Hartford; (b) modifications to a .01 mile section within existing Eversource right-of-way of the existing overhead 115-kV electric transmission line connection to the Newington Substation (Newington Tap); and (c) related modifications to Newington Substation and Southwest Hartford Substation.

Dear Attorney Fitzgerald:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 15, 2017. 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, 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.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director
MB/MP
c: Parties and Intervenors

Docket No. 474
Interrogatories
July 27, 2017
Set One

Notice and Public Outreach

1. Of the letters sent to abutting property owners of the substations, how many certified mail receipts were received? If any receipts were not returned, which owners did not receive their notice? Were any additional attempts made to contact those property owners, e.g. via First Class Mail?

2. Are the Hartford Courant and the West Hartford News daily publications, e.g. published seven days per week?

3. Provide the addresses and names of the venues that the January 20, 2016 and April 27, 2017 Open Houses were held at.

Site

4. Provide the address and distance from the nearest residence to each of the following transmission line segments:
    a. the proposed underground portion of the transmission line in Newington
    b. the proposed overhead portion of the transmission line; and
    c. the proposed underground portion of the transmission line in Hartford.

Technical

5. Pages 2-10 and 2-11 of Volume 1 of the Application note that the Greater Hartford sub-area has approximately 149 megawatts of "fast start" generating units. Define "fast start" units.

6. Reference page 5 of (Public/Redacted) Greater Hartford and Central Connecticut (GHCC) Area Transmission 2022 Solutions Study in Volume 2 of the Application. Provide a table listing the Eversource filing and Council review/approval status' of the projects noted as Component ID Nos. 3 through 9 and S1 through S4. As an example, is it correct to say that Eversource filed Petition No. 1302 on May 25, 2017 for Component ID No. 5, and the 25.2 MVAR capacitor project at West Side Substation was approved by the Council on July 21, 2017?

Design

7. Page ES-1 of Volume 1 of the Application notes that, "Eversource is in the process of finalizing negotiations with Amtrak for a license agreement for the colocation of the new transmission line within the railroad right-of-way (ROW)." What is the current status of such negotiations?

8. Why is only one circuit with one conductor per phase being proposed? Did Eversource consider a double-circuit configuration or a single-circuit line with two conductors per phase for added capacity?

9. What would be the pros and cons of a delta configuration for the overhead circuits versus the proposed vertical configuration in terms of magnetic fields, required ROW widths and visual impacts? Is it correct to say that a horizontal configuration would not fit within the existing ROW and would have a wider visual profile?

10. On page 7-12, Eversource provided the magnetic field profile for the proposed underground portion of the line. If an all-underground solution were approved, would the magnetic field profile be approximately the same as Figure 7-12? If no, provide a magnetic field profile assuming all of the transmission line project is underground.

11. Referencing page 3-4 of Volume 1 of the Application, how many of the 51 galvanized steel monopoles would be direct-embedded tangent structures, and how many would be strain or dead-end structures with drilled shaft (concrete) foundations?

12. Referencing page 3-6 of Volume 1 of the Application, Eversource notes that Amtrak has requested that Eversource take into account future electrification catenary structures for Amtrak. Is it correct to say that catenary installation and railroad electrification are <u>not</u> part of the New Haven – Hartford – Springfield Rail Program currently under construction? Is the electrification part of a future, upcoming plan for Amtrak?

13. Referencing page 3-7 of Volume 1 of the Application, Eversource notes that, "In order to accommodate these [Amtrak] design requirements, the proposed 115-kV structures along the Amtrak ROW must be taller and more closely spaced…" Explain why the Amtrak requirements result in closer spacing of the proposed transmission structures.

14. Would High Pressure Fluid Filled (HPFF) for the underground portions of the transmission line be a more costly design than the proposed solid dielectric cross-linked polyethylene (XLPE)? Explain.

Substation Expansion Design

15. Page 4-38 of Volume 1 of the Application notes that Newington Substation and Southwest Hartford Substation both have a 7-foot tall chain link fence with 1-foot of barbed wire on top. What is the existing chain link mesh size? Would the expanded fenced areas for both substations have a similar fence design, and would they include an anti-climb mesh or other anti-climb design?

16. Would the expanded areas for Newington Substation and Southwest Hartford Substation be crushed stone (e.g. traprock)?

17. Page 3-20 of Volume 1 of the Application notes that Eversource would install a new approximately 70-foot line terminal structure for the existing #1783 line within Newington Substation. Would this be the tallest structure to be installed within the Newington Substation? How would it compare in height with the tallest existing line terminal structure within Newington Substation?

18. Page 3-23 of Volume 1 of the Application notes that Eversource would install two 70-foot dead-end structures within Southwest Hartford Substation. How does that compare with the existing tallest structure within Southwest Hartford Substation in terms of height?

19. Describe any upgrades that would be required at other substations (besides Newington and Southwest Hartford Substations) to accommodate the proposed project?

20. On page 1-11 of Volume 1 of the Application, Eversource notes that it would remove a 67-foot H-frame structure and a 57-foot single pole and replace it with a 95-foot vertical monopole structure. Is the existing H-frame wood or galvanized steel or weathering steel? Similarly, what is the existing finish for the existing 57-foot single pole? Would the proposed 95-foot pole be galvanized steel?

Construction

21. Are there currently any non-utility structures (e.g. barns, sheds, etc.) within the ROW that would have to be removed for the construction of the proposed project? If so, identify locations.

22. Page 6-21 of Volume 1 of the Application includes the proposed construction hours for Monday through Saturday. Is it possible that some Sunday hours or evening hours may be necessary due to unforeseen conditions such as inclement weather, outage constraints and/or critical path activities?

23. Estimate the amounts of cut and fill for the transmission project and the two substation expansions. Would any fill have to be brought in for the project? If yes, would it be clean fill (e.g. free of contaminants) or at least tested appropriately before use?

24. Would the final stormwater pollution control plan include best management practices to protect against the leakage of fluids from construction vehicles and/or spillage associated with the refueling of such vehicles?

25. How would Eversource minimize the risk of stormwater entering the proposed splice vaults via the manhole covers?

Wetlands

26. How would Eversource restore the wetlands that would be temporarily impacted by timber mats, work pads, etc.? For example, would such areas be seeded with a native wetland seed mix?

27. If the project is approved, could an Invasive Species Control Plan to protect the wetland areas (to be temporarily impacted and restored) be included in the D&M Plan?

28. Page 6-8 of Volume 1 of the Application notes that approximately 0.24 acres of tree removal in wetlands would occur. Would the tree stumps remain in place to minimize wetland disturbance?

Water Resources

29. Would the proposed project adversely impact Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) designated Class A surface water resources as referenced on page 5-8 of Volume 1?

30. Would the proposed project adversely impact Class GA or GB groundwater as noted on pages 5-13 and 5-14 of Volume 1 of the Application?

Wildlife

31. Would the proposed project adversely impact the State-listed Threatened, Endangered or Special Concern breeding birds as identified on pages 5-21 through 5-24 of Volume 1 of the Application or the Migatory Birds of Conservation Concern identified by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the IPaC Trust Resource Report in Volume 2 of the Application? Explain.

32. To date, has Eversource received any additional correspondence from USFWS regarding the northern long-eared bat (NLEB)? If yes, provide a copy of such document(s).

33. By email dated September 2, 2015, the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) indicated that there would be no anticipated impacts to State-listed Species as a result of the project. If the project is approved, could an updated DEEP Natural Diversity Database determination letter be provided in the D&M Plan, with any applicable wildlife protective measures?

Cultural Resources

34. To date, has Eversource received a response from the State Historic Preservation Office? If yes, provide a copy of such document.

35. Which Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) has Evesource consulted with? To date, has Eversoruce received any responses from the THPOs? If yes, provide a copy of such document(s).

Noise

36. Would the project, post-construction comply with DEEP noise control standards both at the limits of the ROW for the transmission line and at the property boundaries of Newington Substation and Southwest Hartford Substation?