

Anthony M. Fitzgerald Partner Main: 203-777-5501 Direct: 203-784-3122 Fax: 203-784-3199 afitzgerald@carmodylaw.corr

195 Church Street P.O. Box 1950 New Haven, CT 06509-1950

August 4, 2017

Attorney Melanie Bachman Acting Executive Director Connecticut Siting Council Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

Re: DOCKET NO. 461A – Greenwich Substation and Line Project

Dear Attorney Bachman:

As discussed at the evidentiary hearing in this matter on July 25, 2017, I submit herewith an original and 15 copies of the following substitute pages:

- 1) Pages D-4 and D-5 of Exhibit B to the Motion to Reopen, which now includes a cross section of the revised pedestrian bridge design.
- 2) Page 4 of Eversource's initial pre-filed testimony, which includes a revised Figure 1.
- 3) Page 10 of Eversource's initial pre-filed testimony, which includes a revised Figure 5.

Very truly yours,

Thomp Marked

Anthony M. Fitzgerald

AMF/kas Enc. cc (w/enc): Attached Service List dated July 11, 2017

(N5387919)

Docket No. 461A Page 1 of 3

| | Document | Status Holder | Representative |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------------------------|--|
| Status Granted | Service | (name, address & phone number) | (name, address & phone number) |
| Applicant | E-Mail | Eversource Energy | Kathleen Shanley Manager-Transmission Siting Eversource Energy 56 Prospect Street Hartford, CT 06103 kathleen.shanley@eversource.com Raymond Gagnon Director – Transmission Projects Eversource Energy 56 Prospect Street Hartford, CT 06103 Raymond.gagnon@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 Anthony M. Fitzgerald, Esq. Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP |
| Party Approved on July 23, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Giffice of Consumer Counsel | Lauren Henault Bidra, Esq. Staff Attorney Office of Consumer Counsel Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051 Lauren.bidra@ct.gov |

LIST OF PARTIES AND INTERVENORS SERVICE LIST

| Status Granted | Document Service | Status Holder | Representative |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Party Approved on July 23, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Office of Consumer Counsel continued | Joseph A. Rosenthal, Esq. Principal Attorney Office of Consumer Counsel Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051 Joseph.rosenthal@ct.gov |
| Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Parker Stacy 1 Kinsman Lane Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>pstacy@optonline.net</u> | |
| Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Field Point Estate Townhouses, Inc. | Carissa Depetris Dwight Ueda Field Point Estate Townhouses 172 Field Point Road, #10 Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>carissa.depetris@gmail.com</u> <u>d_ueda@yahoo.com</u> |
| Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Christine Edwards 111 Bible Street Cos Cob, CT 06807 <u>SeeEdwards@aol.com</u> | |
| Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Richard Granoff, AIA, LEED AP Granoff Architects 30 West Putnam Avenue Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>rg@granoffarchitects.com</u> | |
| Grouped Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🔀 E-Mail | Anthony Crudele Bella Nonna Restaurant & Pizzeria 280 Railroad Avenue Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>bellanonnagreenwich@gmail.com</u> | |
| Intervenor Approved on September 1, 2015 | 🗙 E-Mail | Cecilia H. Morgan 3 Kinsman Lane Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>cecimorgan@aol.com</u> | |

Date: July 11, 2017

| Status Granted | Document | Status Holder | Representative |
|---|----------|--|---|
| Grouped Intervenor Approved on September 17, 2015 | E-Mail | Joel Paul Berger 4208 Bell Boulevard Flushing, NY 11361 <u>communityrealty@msn.com</u> | (name, address & phone number) |
| Grouped Intervenor Approved on October 1, 2015 | 🛛 E-Mail | Meg Glass 9 Bolling Place Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>glass50@hotmail.com</u> | |
| Party Approved on January 12, 2016 | ⊠ E-Mail | The Honorable Peter J. Tesei First Selectman Town of Greenwich 101 Field Point Road Greenwich, CT 06830 <u>ptesei@greenwichct.org</u> | David A. Ball, Esq. David E. Dobin, Esq. Cohen and Wolf, P.C. P.O. Box 1821 Bridgeport, CT 06601 <u>dball@cohenandwolf.com</u> (203) 368-0211 (203) 394-9901 – fax |
| Intervenor Approved on May 25, 2017 | 🗙 E-Mail | Morningside Circle Association | P. Jude Collins, President Morningside Circle Association 67 Circle Drive Greenwich, CT 06830 (203) 918-1076 <u>Mail@morningsidecircle.org</u> |



Figure D-4, Depiction of Conduits constructed in Pedestrian Bridge

The proximity of the cables to the travel surface of the bridge would result in higher fields directly above the bridge surface relative to the remainder of the project. A summary of the calculated fields is included in *Table D-2*. The calculations are also depicted in *Figure D-5*.

Table D-2, Summary of Calculated Magnetic Fields for the Pedestrian Bridge

| Calculated Magnetic Field Levels (mG; AAL) – Revised 7/24/2017 | | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------|--|--|
| Section | Edge of Bridge | Max on Bridge | | |
| Pedestrian Bridge | 27.8 | 49.4 | | |



Figure D-5, Calculated Magnetic Fields in the vicinity of the Pedestrian Bridge

Reduction of these magnetic field levels immediately above the bridge could be achieved by one of three potential techniques, including:

- Addition of ground continuity conductors
- Installation of a conducting plate such as aluminum or copper
- Installation of a steel plate

In the event that the Council were to approve a project design that incorporated the pedestrian bridge, it would require a Field Management Design Plan specific to the pedestrian bridge. In contrast to the pedestrian bridge, a trenchless crossing of Indian Harbor would result in low above ground magnetic fields typical to the rest of the Alternate Modified Project.

Pre-filed Testimony

119 Q. In the course of developing the Proposed Modified Project, did Eversource confirm 120 the reliability need the Council found to exist in its Opinion and Findings of Fact?

- 121 A. Yes, we did.
- 122 **Q**

Q. What did you do to confirm that need?

123 First, in light of the Council's conclusion that the scope of the GSLP, which would have A. provided reliability for a 30- to 40-year planning horizon, was unnecessarily large and therefore 124 125 unnecessarily costly, we determined to assess the needed scope of system improvements based upon the 126 historical 2013 peak load on the Greenwich 27.6-kV system served by the Cos Cob Substation, which 127 was 130.5 MVA. We felt that this peak load, which had occurred within the last three years, could be 128 deemed representative of current conditions. We then ran a set of contingency simulations assuming that 129 peak load. The results of those simulations confirmed the same reliability deficiencies in the existing 130 system identified by the Council in its May 2016 decision: potential overloads of the distribution feeders 131 supplying power to Prospect Substation from Cos Cob Substation; and potential transformer overloads 132 at Cos Cob Substation and at Prospect Substation. 133 Q. Please explain the contingencies that were simulated to test the reliability of the

134 Greenwich distribution system using the 2013 peak load, and the results of those tests.

A. In order to understand the contingencies that were simulated and their results, it is useful
to refer to the simplified schematic one-line diagram of the Greenwich 27.6-kV system in *Figure 1* below.
This illustration is consistent with, but less detailed than, the diagram in Finding of Fact 143.



138 139

140





293 A one-line diagram of the Proposed Modified Project is provided below:



295

296

297

Q. Does the Proposed Modified Project resolve the existing reliability problems you previously described of overloaded distribution feeders and insufficient transformation capacity?

Figure 5, Proposed Modified Greenwich Substation and Line Project (Rev. 1)

A. Yes, it does. The addition of the two new 115-kV supply lines to the new Greenwich Substation provides ample feeder capacity, and the addition of the two new transformers at the new Greenwich Substation, together with the existing transformers at Cos Cob, provides ample transformation capacity. The four existing 27.6-kV distribution feeders will be off-loaded in this configuration, which will provide redundancy for the Greenwich secondary network under all load conditions.

```
304
```

305

Q. Does the Proposed Modified Project resolve the inability of the existing system to transfer load between substations in the event of transformer losses?

A. Yes. In the event of the failure of a single transformer at the new Greenwich Substation, the remaining transformer would be capable of serving the load until the failed transformer was returned to service, even under peak conditions, so there would be no need for transferring load to another substation. In the event of the loss of a single transformer at Cos Cob under peak conditions, load would be automatically transferred to the new Greenwich Substation, and the capacity of the remaining