

Western Massachusetts Electric Company

Docket No. EFSB 08-2/D.P.U. 08-105/08-106

Information Request EFSB

SET 2

Dated: 06/24/2009

Q-EFSB-LU-012

Page 1 of 4

Witness: Scott Newland, Timothy Barton
Request from: Energy Facilities Siting Board

Question:

Please refer to the Petition at 5-93 to 5-95. Please prepare tables similar to Tables 5-25 and 5-26 but showing the additional width and acreage of cleared vegetation, taking into account areas where vegetation has grown back where management was discontinued. Are any rare songbird species present on rights-of-way in the Greater Springfield area?

Response:

Using the project land-use data, specifically the Upland Forest (UF) and Palustrine Wetland Forest (PFO) classifications, acreages of forested areas to be cleared were calculated for the Massachusetts portions of the Preferred Northern Route and Noticed-Alternative Southern Route. The width of these areas varies widely because of varying existing conditions, and past maintenance practices and schedules. Therefore widths are not presented in the tables.

Based on data provided by the NHESP there are no known rare songbird species within the Massachusetts portions of the Preferred Northern Route and Noticed-Alternative Southern Route of the Greater Springfield Reliability Project.

Table 5-25a: Summary of Additional Acreage of Forest Clearing along the Preferred Northern Route

Town(s)	From	To	Mileage ¹	Existing ROW (ft)	Proposed ROW (ft) ¹	Additional Width (ft)	Acres of Additional ROW ¹	Acres of Additional Forest Clearing ²
Agawam	CT/MA Border	South Agawam Switching Station	2.8	100 - 300	110 (for 2.1 miles)	10	2.7	3.2
Agawam	South Agawam Switching Station	Agawam Substation	3.3	100 - 300	135 (for 0.4 miles)	35	1.4	12.8
Agawam, West Springfield	Agawam Substation	Piper Substation	3.6	150	---	---	---	6.4
West Springfield, Chicopee	Piper Substation	Chicopee Substation	3.5	150	---	---	---	5.0
Chicopee	Chicopee Substation	East Springfield Junction	0.7	150	---	---	---	1.3
Chicopee	East Springfield Junction	Fairmont Switching Station	1.7	150	---	---	---	2.1
Chicopee	East Springfield Junction	Shawinigan Switching Station	2.8	100 - 160	125 (for 1.5 miles)	25	4.5	5.1
Chicopee, Ludlow	Shawinigan Switching Station	Orchard Junction	1.4	200	---	---	---	3.2
Ludlow	Orchard Junction	Ludlow Substation	4.8	160	---	---	---	6.2
Ludlow	Orchard Junction	Orchard Substation	0.7	160	---	---	---	0.0
Chicopee, Springfield	Shawinigan Switching Station	Cadwell Substation	0.8	200	---	---	---	.1
Totals	---	---	26.1	---	---	---	8.6	45.4

Notes:

¹Excludes ROW expansion on property owned by WMECO.

²Includes forest clearing at expanded/new substation/switching station sites and on property owned by WMECO. It also reflects areas where vegetation has grown back where management was discontinued.

Width of the cleared areas varies depending on existing conditions, and past maintenance practices and schedules and is therefore difficult to present in a tabular format.

**Table 5-26a: Summary of Additional Acreage of Forest Clearing along the Noticed-Alternative
Southern Route**

Town(s)	From	To	Mileage ¹	Existing ROW (ft)	Proposed ROW (ft) ¹	Additional Width (ft)	Acres of Additional ROW ¹	Acres of Additional Clearing ²
Agawam	CT/MA Border	South Agawam Switching Station	2.8	100	110 (for 2.1 miles)	10	2.7	3.2
Agawam	South Agawam Switching Station	Agawam Substation	3.3	100 150	165 (for 0.5 miles) 165 (for 1.7 miles)	65 15	3.2 2.9	14.9
Agawam, West Springfield	Agawam Substation	Piper Substation	3.6	150	---	---	---	6.4
West Springfield, Chicopee	Piper Substation	Chicopee Substation	3.5	150	---	---	---	5.0
Chicopee	Chicopee Substation	East Springfield Junction	0.7	150	---	---	---	1.3
Chicopee	East Springfield Junction	Fairmont Switching Station	1.7	150	---	---	---	2.1
Chicopee	East Springfield Junction	Shawinigan Switching Station	2.8	100 - 160	---	---	---	4.0
Chicopee, Ludlow	Shawinigan Switching Station	Orchard Junction	1.4	200	---	---	---	3.2
Ludlow	Orchard Junction	Ludlow Substation	4.8	160	---	---	---	6.2
Ludlow	Orchard Junction	Orchard Substation	0.7	160	---	---	---	0.0
Chicopee, Springfield	Shawinigan Switching Station	Cadwell Substation	0.8	200	---	---	---	0.1
Agawam	South Agawam Junction	CT/MA Border	1.8	300	---	---	---	20.1
Longmeadow, East Longmeadow, Hampden	CT/MA Border / Franconia Junction	Hampden Junction	4.0	300	---	---	---	45.0
Hampden, Wilbraham, Ludlow	Hampden Junction	Ludlow Substation	10.8	250	---	---	---	47.4
Totals	---	---	42.7	---	---	---	8.8	158.9

Notes:

¹ Excludes ROW expansion on property owned by WMECO.

² Includes forest clearing at expanded/new substation/switching station sites and on property owned by WMECO. It also reflects areas where vegetation has grown back where management was discontinued.

Width of the cleared areas varies depending on existing conditions, and past maintenance practices and schedules and is therefore difficult to present in a tabular format.



Western Massachusetts Electric Company

Docket No. EFSB 08-2/D.P.U. 08-105/08-106

Information Request EFSB

SET 2

Dated: 06/24/2009

Q-EFSB-LU-019

Page 1 of 1

Witness: Scott Newland, Timothy Barton

Request from: Energy Facilities Siting Board

Question:

Please indicate whether the proposed upgrade and expansion to the Agawam Substation would be the same whether the northern or southern route is selected. If not, please detail the differences and level of expansion.

Response:

The general arrangement and size of the substation expansion at the Agawam Substation would essentially be the same for either the Preferred Northern Route or the Noticed-Alternative Southern Route. The main difference would be that the connections of the line from Ludlow and an autotransformer in the second (north) bay would switch positions, therefore a line-terminal structure would be shifted approximately 150 feet to the east in that bay (adjacent to the terminal structure for the line to North Bloomfield in the first (south) bay.)

Although the details of the line entries have not been evaluated for the southern route, it is expected that the line entries under this alternative would result in additional wetland impacts to the wetlands located to the east of the station.



Western Massachusetts Electric Company

Docket No. EFSB 08-2/D.P.U. 08-105/08-106

**Information Request EFSB
SET 4**

Dated: 07/31/2009

Q-EFSB-LU-026

Page 1 of 1

Witness: Scott Newland, Timothy Barton
Request from: Energy Facilities Siting Board

Question:

Please refer to the responses to EFSB-LU-1 and EFSB-LU-2. Please explain why for the southern route, the number of residences listed for 115 kV route with spurs differs from the response to EFSB-LU-1.

Response:

The Southern Route Alternative requires 115-kV line upgrades along the northern route and its three spurs. The number of residences within 25 feet and 50 feet of edge of the ROW provided in the response to Information Request EFSB-LU-001 is only for the northern route and does not include residences along the 115-kV line spurs (East Springfield Junction to Fairmont Switching Station, Exit 6 Junction/Shawinigan Switching Station to Cadwell Switching Station, and Orchard Junction to Orchard Substation). Thus the numbers of residences presented in the response to Information Request EFSB-LU-002 for the "115-kV route with spurs" are slightly higher than the numbers presented in the response to Information Request EFSB-LU-001.



Western Massachusetts Electric Company

Docket No. EFSB 08-2/D.P.U. 08-105/08-106

Information Request EFSB

SET 4

Dated: 07/31/2009

Q-EFSB-LU-030

Page 1 of 5

Witness: Scott Newland, Timothy Barton

Request from: Energy Facilities Siting Board

Question:

Please refer to the Timothy Barton prefiled testimony: On Table 5-5, it appears that the evaluation criteria includes the Connecticut portion of the route, although the note states that the Connecticut portion is excluded for some criteria. Please clarify. Why is the Connecticut portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border included? Please provide a revised chart that includes only the Massachusetts portion of the northern route. On Table 5-6, it appears that the evaluation criteria includes the Connecticut portion of the route, however, the note states that the Connecticut portion is excluded for some criteria. Does this note pertain to the portion of the southern route noticed in the Petition or just the portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border? Please clarify. Why is the Connecticut portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border included? Please provide a revised chart that includes only the portion of the southern route excluding Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border. Please refer to Tables 5-10 and 5-11. What changed along the southern route to cause such a large change in number of residences within 101 to 300 feet of the edge of the ROW? If the tables both now include the portion in Connecticut from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border, why doesn't the corresponding line item for the northern route change in the same manner?

Response:

Note, if the Southern Route Alternative is selected for the 345-kV connection between Agawam and Ludlow Substations, effects associated with the Preferred Northern Route must be included in the evaluation as 115-kV upgrades will still be required along the Northern Route corridor.

Table 5-5 contained the Connecticut portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border because the northern route was compared to the southern route based on the entire corridor as presented in Section 4 of the EFSB Petition. This data was carried over into the evaluation presented in Section 5 of the EFSB Petition. A revised Table 5-5 is provided below which contains only the Massachusetts portion of the northern route.

Table 5-5: Preferred Northern Route Land Use Evaluation Criteria (REVISED)

Evaluation Criteria Metrics	Preferred Northern Route ¹
Total Length (Miles)	23 miles
Stream Crossings (Number)	27
Residences within 100 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	292
Residences within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	688
Businesses within 100 feet of edge of ROW or centerline (Number)	45
Businesses within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	42
Public Facilities within 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	3
Public Facilities within 301 to 1,200 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	8
Length by land use (Commercial/Industrial)	6.2 miles
Length by land use (Residential)	8.3 miles
Length by land use (Undeveloped Land)	6.7 miles
Length by land use (Park/School/Open Space)	1.5 miles
Length through vegetated wetland	3.6 miles
Length through environmentally sensitive area	7.8 miles
Cultural resources predictive modeling analysis (Rating)	26.3

Note:

1. Excludes the Connecticut portion of the

project.

Table 5-6 contained the Connecticut portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border because the northern route was compared to the southern route based on the entire corridor as presented in Section 4 of the EFSB Petition. This data was carried over into the evaluation presented in Section 5 of the EFSB Petition. A revised Table 5-6 is provided below which contains only the Massachusetts portion of the southern route.

Table 5-6: Noticed-Alternative Southern Route Land Use Evaluation Criteria (REVISED)

Evaluation Criteria Metrics	Southern Route ¹
Total Length (Miles)	23 miles
Stream Crossings (Number)	26
Residences within 100 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	102
Residences within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	444
Businesses within 100 feet of edge of ROW or centerline (Number)	20
Businesses within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	22
Public Facilities within 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	1
Public Facilities within 301 to 1,200 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	5
Length by land use (Commercial/Industrial)	4.3 miles
Length by land use (Residential)	5.7 miles
Length by land use (Undeveloped Land)	12.8 miles
Length by land use (Park/School/Open Space)	0.3 miles
Length through stream or wetland	12.8 miles
Length through environmentally sensitive area	20.5 miles
Cultural resources predictive modeling analysis (Rating)	28.1

Note:

1. Excludes the Connecticut portion of the

project.

Tables 5-10 and 5-11 contained the Connecticut portion from Bloomfield to the Massachusetts border because the northern route was compared to the southern route based on the entire corridor as presented in Section 4 of the EFSB Petition. Table 5-11 as presented in the EFSB petition only contained information on the number of residences within 101 to 300 feet of the edge of ROW for the portion of the southern route from South Agawam Switching Station to Ludlow Substation, which excludes the portion from the Connecticut/Massachusetts border to South Agawam Switching Station continuing on to Agawam Substation. The numbers of residences within 101 to 300 feet of the edge of ROW, which includes the Connecticut portion of the project, should have been 525 residences. Revised Tables 5-10 and 5-11 are provided below which contain only the Massachusetts portion of the northern and southern routes respectively.

Table 5-10: Preferred Northern Route Noise Sensitive Receptors (REVISED)

Evaluation Criteria Metrics	Preferred Northern Route
Residences within 100 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	292
Residences within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	688
Businesses within 100 feet of edge of ROW or centerline (Number)	45
Businesses within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	42
Public Facilities within 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	3
Public Facilities within 301 to 1,200 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	8
Length by land use (Park/School/Open Space)	1.5 miles

Table 5-11: Noticed-Alternative Southern Route Noise Sensitive Receptors (REVISED)

Evaluation Criteria Metrics	Southern Route
Residences within 100 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	102
Residences within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	444
Businesses within 100 feet of edge of ROW or centerline (Number)	20
Businesses within 101 to 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	22
Public Facilities within 300 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	1
Public Facilities within 301 to 1,200 feet of edge of ROW (Number)	5
Length by land use (Park/School/Open Space)	0.3 miles

