



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

February 5, 2016

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

RE: **DOCKET NO. 466** - The Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Frost Bridge to Campville 115-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line project that traverses the municipalities of Watertown, Thomaston, Litchfield, and Harwinton, which consists of (a) construction, maintenance and operation of a new 115-kV overhead electric transmission line entirely within existing Eversource right-of-way and associated facilities extending approximately 10.4 miles between Eversource's existing Frost Bridge Substation in the Town of Watertown and existing Campville Substation in the Town of Harwinton; (b) related modifications to Frost Bridge Substation and Campville Substation; and (c) reconfiguration of a 0.4 mile segment of two existing 115-kV electric transmission lines across the Naugatuck River in the Towns of Litchfield and Harwinton within the same existing right-of-way as the new 115-kV electric transmission line.

Dear Attorney Fitzgerald:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than February 16, 2016. 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.

Yours very truly,

Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director

c: Parties and Intervenors
Council Members

MB/CM/RM



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

Docket No. 466

Connecticut Siting Council

Eversource Pre-hearing Interrogatories Set 1

1. 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?
2. When was the most recent Forward Capacity Auction and how would the result of such affect the power flow model for the project?
3. Please explain the “future energy efficiency” component of the power flow analyses.
4. Are renewable generation projects within the study area considered in the power flow analyses?
5. 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?
6. 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.
7. 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?
8. 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?
9. 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.
10. 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?
11. For Table 6-1, provide a listing of the wetlands affected and include corresponding area of temporary and/or permanent filling (in sq. ft).
12. 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?

13. 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)?
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Application p. 9-4 describes the re-location of three structures at the request of two property owners. What structures were re-located?
17. 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?
18. If H-frame structures are used, would that have an impact on the installation of a potential future transmission line within the same ROW?
19. 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.