

February 16, 2016

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

Re: Docket No. CSC 466 - GHCC Frost Bridge to Campville

Dear Mr. Stein:

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

Response to CSC-01 Interrogatories dated 02/05/2016

CSC-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019

Very truly yours,

John Morissette  
Project Manager  
Siting  
As Agent for CL&P  
dba EversourceEnergy

cc: Service List

**Witness:** Witness Panel  
**Request from:** Connecticut Siting Council

**Question:**

In terms of power-flow modeling, is the generation considered “out-of-service” the same as generation that is considered “retired”? Are there other types of “out of service” criteria?

**Response:**

No, generation that is considered "out of service" is not the same as generation that is considered "retired."

Generation that is considered to be "retired" is assumed to be permanently withdrawn from service and is not considered in any dispatch scenario. A unit assumed to be retired may be in operation at the time the study is performed, but is expected to be shut down before the year represented in the study. Typically, the operator of the unit will have announced a plan to retire it by a certain date, and may have submitted a non-price retirement request to ISO-NE. Thus, in the *GHCC Needs Report*,: "Certain generation units that were expected to retire imminently (and which have since retired) were assumed to be out of service. [Units assumed OOS were Bridgeport Harbor 2, AES Thames, Norwalk 1, 2 and 10.]" *Application*, p. 2-11.

Generation that is modeled as "out of service" (OOS) is assumed to be generally operable and available in the study year, but not available at the particular time and under the conditions represented in the power-flow study. This assumption reflects that on a given day, significant generation capacity may be unavailable because of mechanical breakdowns, scheduled maintenance, fuel shortages, and many other causes. Typically, one or two generators are assumed to be OOS for such reasons in a power-flow study. Thus, in the GHCC power-flow studies, generation "dispatches were set up by taking out either one or two critical units in each sub-area studied." (*Application*, p.2-11)

There is one respect in which modeling a generator as OOS is related to its retirement. A generator that is in-service at the time a study is performed and is expected to still be in-service at the time represented in the study may be retired unexpectedly before the study year, for mechanical, technical or economic reasons. Modelling generators as OOS is meant to account for such sudden and unforeseen permanent retirements, as well as for the many conditions and events that can cause a generator to be temporarily unavailable on a given day.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-002**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

When was the most recent Forward Capacity Auction and how would the result of such affect the power flow model for the project?

**Response:**

The most recent Forward Capacity Auction (FCA) for which the results are now public was FCA 9 completed in February 2015. The results FCA 9 results were reflected in the power flow modelling for the project.

The results of FCA 10 are expected to be announced very soon and Eversource will supplement this response when those results are announced.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-003**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Please explain the “future energy efficiency” component of the power flow analyses.

**Response:**

Power-flow studies attempt to model supply and demand conditions expected to exist in the future year represented in the study. One of the factors that reduces expected net load is energy efficiency measures. The ISO-NE forecasts future reductions in load due to Energy Efficiency (EE) as a part of its annual CELT forecast. Thus, in the GHCC Studies, forecasted customer loads were "adjusted downwards to reflect the effect of passive and active demand response measures committed in FCA 7 and predicted future energy efficiency measures that were expected to be implemented by 2022." (*Application*, p. 2-11)

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-004**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Are renewable generation projects within the study area considered in the power flow analyses?

**Response:**

Yes, all renewable generation projects within the study area are considered in the power-flow analysis. The levels of each generator's output is based on the type of generator, e.g. solar, wind, etc., and either its historical output or specific percentage of its nameplate rating.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-005**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Do any wireless telecommunications carrier transmission structure mounted antennas exist within the project boundaries? If so, how would these facilities be impacted by the project?

**Response:**

There are no transmission structure mounted antennas within the Project Right-of-Way.

**Witness:**           **Witness Panel**  
**Request from:** **Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

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.

**Response:**

Yes, the following non-utility structures are located within Eversource's existing ROW and have been identified for potential removal or relocation during Project construction.

- Line List 42029 – Corner portion of a fence may need to be removed during construction to make room for the work pad at structure 79 in Litchfield.
- Line List 41033 - A shed will be removed at the request of the property owner (owner no longer wants the shed) to gain off right-of-way access by avoiding a wetland to structure 58 in Thomaston.

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

In regards to clearing of upland forest to accommodate the new section of ROW:

- a) are stumps removed from any part ROW expansion area?
- b) how are the stumps removed?
- c) once removed, how are stumps disposed of?
- d) if stumps remain in place, is there any application of herbicide on the stump?
- e) when/where would upland seeding (p. 4-20) be necessary?
- f) would all permanent pre-made erosion and sedimentation control fabric used for the project (p. 4-20) be composed of 100% natural materials, including the woven fabric?

**Response:**

- a) Any stumps within a work pad area will typically be removed; in addition, some stumps may have to be removed to create level access roads. Any stumps in manicured lawns will be ground if requested by the property owner.
- b) Stumps within work pads and access roads (where necessary to be removed) will be dug out with an excavator or a bull dozer. Stumps in manicured lawns will be ground with a stump grinder, as requested by the property owner.
- c) Stumps removed from construction work areas would be hauled off site, chipped on site, or temporarily piled in upland areas along the ROW. If stumps are temporarily piled along the ROW, as part of ROW restoration (if not before), the stumps will be loaded into a triaxle truck (or equivalent), hauled off-site, and properly disposed of. If stumps are chipped or ground on the ROW, the chips will either be spread on the ROW in upland (non-lawn) areas or hauled off site and properly disposed of.
- d) No herbicides will be applied during Project construction. During future maintenance of the ROW, Eversource may apply herbicide as part of its standard integrated vegetation management.
- e) All areas of upland soils disturbed by construction would be seeded to facilitate revegetation. The only upland areas that would not be seeded are those that would be otherwise stabilized, such as permanent gravel access roads or work pads that would be stabilized with a gravel base.



- f) Typically, Eversource's preferred restoration approach is to apply seed and mulch, and to maintain temporary erosion and sedimentation controls (e.g., silt fence, hay bales) until revegetation is successful (after which the temporary controls would be removed). However, if permanent erosion / sedimentation control "blankets", fabric, or netting are deemed necessary based on site-specific conditions, Eversource would require that the materials used be biodegradable. Biodegradable erosion controls are typically all-natural materials (e.g., straw, jute netting, coconut fiber). No plastic netting materials would be used because they could entangle wildlife, such as reptiles, amphibians, birds, and small mammals.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-008**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 4-2 mentions hazard trees outside easement areas would be removed with permission from the landowner. Is landowner permission required? What if the landowner denies the request?

**Response:**

The discussion regarding danger and hazard trees on pages 4-12 to 4-13 of the Application clarifies this issue. Specifically, Eversource would evaluate trees outside the limits of clearing, both on and off the ROW, to assess whether any trees or portions thereof pose a danger or hazard to the transmission line. Identified danger or hazard trees would be marked. In locations where Eversource has identified hazard trees outside the cleared limits for construction, but within the limits of the applicable easements, those hazards will be removed as part of the Project work. Property owners will be informed of these hazard removals in advance of the work. In locations where the hazard trees are outside the limits of the applicable easement and the easement does not allow for off right-of-way danger tree removals as a right under the easement, permission of the property owner is required for such removals. Typically, property owners have granted Eversource permission to remove trees that have been identified as hazards to its transmission lines.

**Witness:**           **Witness Panel**  
**Request from:** **Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 5-23 states Northern Long-eared bat studies may be conducted whereas p. 6-26 states such studies will be conducted. Please clarify.

**Response:**

Northern Long-eared bat (NLEB) studies are no longer required under the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) “final 4(d) rule.” When the Application was filed, the USFWS “interim 4d rule” was in place for the protection of NLEB.

Subsequent to the submission of the Application, the final 4(d) rule was published (January 14, 2016). Eversource has evaluated the project using the final 4(d) rule framework and key, as prescribed by the USFWS, for streamlined Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultations for federal actions that may affect the NLEB, but will not cause prohibited take. The primary objective of the framework is to provide an efficient means for USFWS verification of federal agency determinations that their proposed actions are consistent with those evaluated in the programmatic intra-Service consultation for the final 4(d) rule and do not require separate consultation. Eversource's evaluation for the Project (see Attachment) was sent to the USFWS on February 4, 2016.

In accordance with the final 4(d) rule, Eversource evaluated the potential for the Project facilities to be located in or near NLEB hibernacula or known maternity roost trees. No NLEB occurrences were identified within Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDB) polygons that currently overlap the Project area. Additionally, Eversource met with CT DEEP on July 30, 2015 to discuss the Project. At that time, CT DEEP indicated there are no known records or species occurrences or hibernacula in the vicinity of the Project area.

As stated in its February 4, 2016 consultation with USFWS, Eversource is requesting concurrence that the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kV Project is exempt from the incidental taking prohibitions of the final 4(d) rule.



Justin Adams  
107 Selden Street  
Berlin, CT 06037

February 4, 2016

Tom Chapman  
USFWS New England Field Office  
70 Commerce Street, Suite 300  
Concord, NH 03301-5087

**RE: Northern Long-Eared Bat Section 7 Consultation  
Programmatic Intra-Service Consultation for the Final 4(d) Rule  
Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kV Project  
Watertown, Thomaston, Litchfield, and Harwinton, Connecticut**

Dear Mr. Chapman:

In support of Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Section 404 permitting of portions of the above-referenced project, the Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) has conducted a review for federal-listed species potentially occurring within the project area. Screening using the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC service indicated that only one species – the northern long-eared bat (NLEB), a federal-threatened (state-endangered) species, may be present.

Eversource has evaluated the project using the 4(d) rule framework and key, as prescribed by the USFWS, for streamlined section 7 consultation for federal actions that may affect the northern long-eared bat but will not cause prohibited take. The primary objective of the framework is to provide an efficient means for USFWS verification of federal agency determinations that their proposed actions are consistent with those evaluated in the programmatic intra-Service consultation for the final 4(d) rule and do not require separate consultation. As determined by the key below, the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kV Project is excepted from the incidental taking prohibitions of the final 4(d) rule.

As prescribed in the optional framework for streamlined section 7 consultation, this determination must be provided to the USFWS at least 30 days in advance of authorizing.

**Project Description**

The proposed Project includes construction of a new 10.4 mile 115-kV transmission line from the Frost Bridge Substation in Watertown, Connecticut (41.3643, -73.0341) to the Campville Substation in Harwinton, Connecticut (41.4451, -73.0510), as well as improvements at each substation. Please refer to the attached *Project Location Map* for reference.

To accommodate the construction and subsequent operation of the new 115-kV line, additional vegetation removal would be required within Eversource's existing ROW. Vegetation along the ROW would be removed to allow for construction equipment at each structure location, to provide



Justin Adams  
107 Selden Street  
Berlin, CT 06037

cleared access roads and spurs to structure sites, as needed, and to provide no imminent risk to the new line along the new or existing edge from danger trees.

From Frost Bridge Substation to Purgatory Junction ( $\pm 2.6$  miles) the new line will be located in the center of the maintained ROW between the existing lines, and minimal additional tree clearing is required. From Purgatory Junction, north to Campville Substation ( $\pm 7.8$  miles), the new line will be located on the east side of the ROW. In this area clearing of approximately 40 to 45 feet to the east of the maintained ROW will be required to construct the new line, with the exception of a 0.4 mile span over the Naugatuck River where approximately 70 feet of clearing will be required.

### **Key to the Northern Long-Eared Bat 4(d) Rule for Federal Actions that May Affect Northern Long-Eared Bats**

1. Is the action area (i.e., the area affected by all direct and indirect project effects) located wholly **outside the White-nose Syndrome Zone?**

**No**, the action area is located in Litchfield County, Connecticut which is inside the white-nose syndrome zone.

Continue to #2

2. Will the action take place **within a cave or mine where northern long-eared bats hibernate** (i.e., hibernaculum) **or could it alter the entrance or the environment (physical or other alteration)** of a hibernaculum?

**No**, the action will not take place within a northern long-eared bat hibernaculum or alter its entrance or environment. To assess the potential for the Project facilities to be located in or near NLEB hibernacula, Eversource reviewed publically-available maps depicting CT DEEP Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB) polygons within which listed-species may occur. In addition, because of its state-wide transmission facilities and projects, Eversource has a data-sharing agreement with CT DEEP whereby authorized Eversource personnel and its representatives are allowed to review more specific, confidential information about the potential location of listed species, including NLEB, within a polygon. As a part of this data sharing agreement, the CT DEEP Bureau of Natural Resources Wildlife Division provided Eversource with species information associated with the publically-available NDDDB polygons in the Project area.

No NLEB occurrences were identified within NDDDB polygons that currently overlap the Project area. Additionally, Eversource met with Jenny Dickson and Kate Moran (CT DEEP) on July 30, 2015 to discuss the Project. At that time CT DEEP indicated there are no known records or species occurrences or hibernacula in the vicinity of the Project area.

Continue to #3



Justin Adams  
107 Selden Street  
Berlin, CT 06037

3. Will the action involve **tree removal** (see definition below)?

**Yes**

Continue to #4

4. Is the action the **removal of hazardous trees** for protection of human life or property?

**No**, the action is not removing hazardous trees.

Continue to #5

5. Will the action include one or both of the following: **1) removing a northern long-eared bat known occupied maternity roost tree or any trees within 150 feet of a known occupied maternity roost tree from June 1 through July 31; or 2) removing any trees within 0.25 miles of a northern long-eared bat hibernaculum at any time of year?**

**No**, as documented in #2 above.

For these reasons, the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kV Project is excepted from the incidental taking prohibitions of the final 4(d) rule.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (860) 665-3951 or via email at [justin.adams@eversource.com](mailto:justin.adams@eversource.com)

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Justin Adams", written over a blue horizontal line.

Justin Adams

Attachments

Cc: Dawn McKay, CT DEEP  
Susan Lee, ACOE

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-010**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 6-11 Table 6-1 includes a footnote indicating that temporary wetland filling for the widening of existing access roads was not included in the data provided. When would this data be provided? If the exact figure is not presently known, is there an estimate?

**Response:**

Eversource does not anticipate a need for temporary wetland filling in any existing access roads through wetlands. Following a field review in October 2015, Eversource confirmed that the existing access road widths are sufficient for the types of equipment required to construct the proposed 115-kV transmission line.

Please see Eversource's response to Q-CSC-011 for information concerning temporary fill (construction mats) that the Company plans to use for new temporary access roads and tree clearing access through wetlands.

**Witness:**           **Witness Panel**  
**Request from:** **Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

For Table 6-1, provide a listing of the wetlands affected and include corresponding area of temporary and/or permanent filling (in sq. ft).

**Response:**

The attached Table 6-1A lists wetlands along the Proposed Route, by wetland number, and identifies the estimated area (in square feet) of temporary and permanent fill in each wetland as a result of the proposed Project. The areas of fill depicted are documented in the Project's U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit application, which is scheduled to be submitted later this month. Of a total of 91 wetlands delineated along the Proposed Route, only 28 would be affected by temporary or permanent fill. As presently planned, the Project will result in a total of 117,499 square feet. (2.70 acres) of temporary fill (construction matting) in wetlands and 1,765 square feet (0.04 acre) of permanent fill (access road improvements and one structure foundation) in wetlands.

Table 6-1 of the Application estimated a total of 2.34 acres of temporary fill and 0.16 acre of permanent fill in wetlands as a result of the Project. The increase of 0.35 acre in the amount of temporary fill and the reduction of 0.12 acre in permanent fill in wetlands is the result of the following recently-identified changes to the Project's proposed construction plans:

1. The addition of approximately 8,672 square feet of temporary access road in Wetland E-10 in the Town of Litchfield (refer to Volume 5, Appendix 2B, mapsheet 28 of 35). The temporary fill will be within the maintained ROW over an area recently matted during routine transmission line maintenance;
2. Redesign of the access across Wetland D-12 in the Town of Thomaston to eliminate permanent fill and use temporary fill (construction matting) instead (refer to Volume 5, Appendix 2B, mapsheet 22 of 35). Thus, approximately 5,892 square feet of initially-planned permanent access road improvements in Wetland D-12 are redesignated as temporary improvements (matting); and
3. The addition of approximately 1,500 square feet of permanent fill in Wetland F-11 associated with the proposed replacement of a culvert along an existing permanent on-ROW access road north of Valley Road in the Town of Harwinton (refer to Volume 5, Appendix 2B, mapsheet 32 of 35). The need for this proposed permanent fill results from a grading analysis that demonstrated additional fill was required, given topographic conditions, to conform to USACE stream crossing requirements.





Table 6-1A: Estimated Area (Sq. Ft) of Discharge of Fill to Waters of the United States  
 (Temporary and Permanent)

Wetland ID/Town	Activity Type					Total Discharge of Fill Materials (Sq. Ft.)	
	Temporary Discharge of Fill Materials (Sq. Ft.)			Permanent Discharge of Fill Materials (Sq. Ft.)			
	Work Pad	Access Road	Clearing Access	Structure Foundation	Access Road	Temporary	Permanent
<b>Watertown</b>							
W-A9	3,335	-	-	-	-	3,335	-
W-B2	712	-	-	-	-	712	-
W-B6	877	-	-	-	-	877	-
W-B11	855	-	-	-	-	855	-
W-C1	-	-	2,913	-	-	2,913	-
W-C4	-	-	2,277	-	-	2,277	-
W-C12	-	-	2,315	-	-	2,315	-
W-C15	1,184	-	6,879	-	-	8,063	-
W-C20	3,929	-	-	-	-	3,929	-
<b>Thomaston</b>							
W-D3	1,026	-	2,580	-	-	3,606	-
W-D10	-	-	3,184	-	-	3,184	-
W-D11	-	-	2,384	-	-	2,384	-
W-D12	4,197	5,892	-	-	-	10,089	-
<b>Thomaston/Litchfield</b>							
W-E2	-	-	6,203	-	-	6,203	-
<b>Litchfield</b>							
W-E4	-	-	1,201	-	-	1,201	-
W-E6	672	-	2,190	-	-	2,862	-
W-E8	2,055	478	3,665	-	-	6,198	-
W-E9	739	-	5,670	-	-	6,409	-
W-E10	7,442	8,672	5,487	-	-	21,601	-
W-E12	636	-	-	-	-	636	-
W-F4	221	-	-	-	-	221	-
W-F7	-	-	3,195	-	-	3,195	-
<b>Harwinton</b>							
W-F11	335	-	-	-	1,505	335	1,505
W-F12	-	-	-	-	232	-	232
W-F13	-	-	2,986	-	-	2,986	-
W-F14	894	-	-	-	-	894	-
W-F15	9,364	-	7,199	28	-	16,563	28
W-G1	1,223	-	2,433	-	-	3,656	-
<b>Total</b>						<b>117,499</b>	<b>1,765</b>

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-012**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Referring to Application Volume 5, Appendix 2B, Mapsheet 19, two potential pull pads are shown. What would be the reason why one pad would be chosen over the other? Is it possible to only use the pull pad between structure 52-53 to reduce disturbance to the area surrounding VP-D4-1?

**Response:**

Two pull pads were shown in this area to allow Eversource's Project construction contractor flexibility regarding the preferred pulling location, given factors such as conductor lengths, etc. However, to reduce the potential for disturbance along the portion of the ROW surrounding VP-D4-1, Eversource will remove the pad between Structures 53 and 54 from the Project plans. Therefore, the construction contractor will be directed to use the proposed work (pull) pad identified between Structures 52-53.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-013**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 6-39 mentions consultation with Native American Tribes; what tribes are involved in the archeological consultation? Are the planned additional archeological investigations at the request of the tribe(s)?

**Response:**

Per federal regulation, Eversource consulted with the Connecticut Native American Tribes (i.e., the Mohegans and Mashantucket Pequot) regarding the proposed Project. An unofficial consultation was sent to one Massachusetts-based Native American Tribe, the Wampanoags (Aquinnah). To date, the tribal consultations have not resulted in the need for any additional archeological investigations beyond those which were identified by Eversource's cultural resource consultant, Heritage Consultants, LLC, and which are planned for select sensitive areas based on the potential for locating as yet undiscovered cultural resource sites.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-014**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 6-42 and p. 6-43 describes the expansion of the Campville Substation fence as 90 feet and 70 feet, respectively. Please clarify and include any necessary revision of tree clearing quantities and distance to wetlands.

**Response:**

Eversource proposes to expand the Campville Substation fence by 90 feet to the east. Application Volume 1, Section 6.2.2, page 6-43, incorrectly listed the expansion as 70 feet. The distance from the proposed substation fence line expansion to Wetland W-G3 is correctly listed in the Application as 75 feet. Tree clearing quantities and the distance from the proposed Project's limits of disturbance to Wetland W-G3 will be determined during the detailed grading design, which is underway. The detailed grading design drawings, which will be included in the substation D&M Plan for the Project, are expected to be completed in May 2016.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-015**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Are there any detailed contour maps of the Campville Substation expansion? If so, please provide and include clearing, cut and fill areas, drainage features and identification of the larger proposed substation components.

**Response:**

Detailed contour maps of Campville Substation will be developed in conjunction with the detailed grading design, which is in progress as described in response to Interrogatory Q-CSC-014. The contour mapping, as well as details regarding vegetation clearing, cut and fill, drainage features, and the proposed equipment modifications to the substation, will be incorporated into the substation D&M Plan for the Project.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-016**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 9-4 describes the re-location of three structures at the request of two property owners. What structures were re-located?

**Response:**

Structures 11 and 13 in Watertown and Structure 63 in Thomaston were shifted as requested by property owners.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-017**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Application p. 9-4 describes efforts to reduce the height of structures 50-60 at the request of the Town of Thomaston and several property owners. The associated aerial maps show this area as being mostly undeveloped. Is there a specific area that the Town and landowner(s) were concerned about? Was there any discussion of reducing the height of the structures further north in the immediate area of Walnut Hill Road?

**Response:**

The request originated from the owners of property along the ROW segment between Structures 50 and Structure 60, i.e., the Thomaston Fish and Game Club, and two abutting property owners. These property owners requested that Eversource investigate the use of shorter transmission line structures for the entire ROW segment between Structure 50 and Structure 60 to potentially reduce the visual impacts of the taller delta structures. The property owners shared their request with the Thomaston First Selectman who also asked Eversource to evaluate the request. Eversource did not receive a request to reduce structure heights in the immediate area of Walnut Hill Road.



**Witness:**           **Witness Panel**  
**Request from:** **Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

If H-frame structures are used, would that have an impact on the installation of a potential future transmission line within the same ROW?

**Response:**

Utilizing an H-frame structure design for the currently proposed Project would have the following impacts on the installation of a potential future transmission line within the Frost Bridge to Campville ROW:

- A future transmission line between Frost Bridge Substation and Purgatory Junction (i.e., through XS-2) would not be feasible without the acquisition of additional ROW or a rebuild/conversion of the H-frame structures to a monopole design at the time the new line was proposed.
- A future transmission line could be feasibly installed within Eversource's existing ROW between Purgatory Junction and Campville Substation (i.e., through XS-3, XS-4, XS-5, and XS-6), without the need for additional property acquisition.

**CL&P dba Eversource Energy**  
**Docket No. CSC 466**

**Data Request CSC-01**  
**Dated: 02/05/2016**  
**Q-CSC-019**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Witness:           Witness Panel**  
**Request from:   Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

In regards to certified mailings to the landowners abutting both substations, were return receipts received for each landowner? If not, please list the abutters that did not receive the certified mailing.

**Response:**

Eversource received receipts from each landowner abutting the substations.