Mr. Robert Stein Connecticut Siting Council 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

 $Re\colon Docket\ No.\ 461A$ - CSC 461A Greenwich Substation and Line Project - Petition for Reconsideration

Dear Mr. Stein:

This letter provides the response to requests for the information listed below.

 $\frac{Response\ to\ CSC\text{-}01\ Interrogatories\ dated\ 06/12/2017}{CSC\text{-}061\text{-}RV01}$

Very truly yours,

Kathleen Shanley Manager Transmission, Siting As Agent for CL&P dba EversourceEnergy

cc: Service List

CL&P dba Eversource Energy Docket No. 461A Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 06/12/2017 Q-CSC-061-RV01 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Reference Reopened Application Vol. 1, Pre-filed Testimony pp. 19-20. What are the costs to comply with the Town requested conditions?

Response:

The cost presented in the third bullet for the jack and bore has been revised from \$2.8M to \$1.5M. In addition, Eversource prefers not to attach to bridges (bullet #2 and 3) due to reliability and maintenance concerns.

The costs to comply with the Town requested conditions would be composed of the following:

•

• All-indoor substation with architectural enclosure. The incremental cost of the substation design preferred by the Town, as compared with an open air substation enclosed by a masonry wall, is \$1.4 million (M). This cost is included in the estimated cost of the AMP.

_

• **Pedestrian Bridge Attachment**: Utilizing a pedestrian bridge to cross Indian Harbor is estimated to cost approximately \$1.8M more than using an open trench with a cofferdam and approximately \$850 thousand more than utilizing a HDD. This cost is included in the estimated cost of the AMP.

• I-95 Bridge Attachment: The Town condition to attach the transmission lines to the Indian Field Road overpass is the least cost alternative to cross I-95. However, at a March 15, 2017 meeting, ConnDot Highways stated that it was "heavily opposed" to attaching the cable to the underside of the Indian Field Road overpass as it poses safety and maintenance concerns. If the cable cannot be attached to the overpass, a jack and bore would be utilized to cross under I-95. A jack and bore would cost approximately \$1.5M more than attaching to the Indian Field Road overpass. The estimated cost of the AMP assumes that the cables would be attached to the bridge.

•

• Construction in Bruce Park: The challenges with construction within Bruce Park are associated with requiring all work and equipment to be confined to the paved roadways and not performing any vegetation removal. We do not have an estimate of the incremental cost of the additional time and complexity of the construction effort that would result from compliance with these conditions. Our primary concern is that the project cannot be constructed while strictly complying with these conditions.

•

• Arch Street Vault The referenced testimony expresses a concern with respect to challenges to locating the Arch Street Vault in the public parking lot if ConnDOT would not allow it to be installed in the paved surface of Arch Street. That concern was misplaced, because Eversource may install the vault in the parking lot pursuant to its franchise right to locate its facilities in "public grounds." Accordingly, there should be no incremental cost above the estimated AMP cost related to the Arch Street Vault.