Ms. Melanie Bachman Executive Director Connecticut Siting Council Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. Petition 1310A - Quinebaug Solar Interconnection

Dear Ms. Bachman:

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

Response to CSC-01 Interrogatories dated 01/21/2020 CSC-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 \*, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013

Very truly yours,

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

cc: Service List

<sup>\*</sup> This response is proprietary and confidential and is available only to signatories of the nondisclosure agreement.

Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 01/21/2020 Q-CSC-001 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

# Question:

Referencing page 3-1 of Quinebaug Solar, LLC's (Quinebaug) November 12, 2019 Petition, Eversource is purchasing 40.18% of the Project output via the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA). Is this correct?

# **Response:**

Yes.

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-002
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

#### Question:

Referencing page 8 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, Eversource indicates that its environmental review was based on information provided by Quinebaug and Eversource. To what extent did Eversource evaluate the proposed switching station property to determine potential environmental effects? Provide detail.

#### **Response:**

Quinebaug is responsible for civil construction work prior to Eversource installing the proposed Canterbury Switching Station, which is planned in the area adjacent to Quinebaug's proposed new substation, including any pre- and post-construction protective measures, permits and monitoring requirements. Therefore, Eversource did not conduct any additional, independent studies. However, Eversource conducted a site reconnaissance and reviewed publicly-available environmental information sources (i.e., CT DEEP GIS, UCONN's Center for Land Use Education and Research, and CT ECO) and Quinebaug's environmental documentation relative to the switching station location. Based on the information reviewed, the switching station would have no substantial adverse environmental effects.

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-003
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

What type of material would be installed on the inside of the fence at Canterbury Switching Station?

.

## Response:

The equipment that would be installed within the fence line of the switching station is described on page 6 of Eversource's pre-filed testimony. The surface treatment inside the fence would consist of a 4 inch layer of traprock.

Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 01/21/2020 Q-CSC-004 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

# Question:

Referencing page 6 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, Eversource proposes two single-circuit weathering steel structures. Would these two proposed single circuit steel structures be direct- embed, or would they have foundations?

# **Response:**

The two single-circuit weathering steel structures would be on foundations.

Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 01/21/2020 Q-CSC-005 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing page 6 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, the #1607 Line would be split into two lines: the#1132 Line and the#1316 Line. If one of these two lines is out of service, could the other line continue to support Canterbury Switching Station and thus keep Quinebaug solar facility in service?

#### **Response:**

If one of the 1132 or 1316 Lines is out of service, then the other line would be able to support the Canterbury Switching Station and keep the Quinebaug facility in service.

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-006
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing page 9 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, it states, "The closest residence is approximately 1,000 feet from the proposed switching station and tap structures." What direction (e.g. N, S, E, W) is the closest residence from the proposed switching station area?

## **Response:**

The closest residence is located to the north-northwest of the proposed switching station

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-007
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Are there any protective measures necessary for the New England Cottontail Focus areas in the vicinity of Canterbury Switching Station? Transmission Upgrades in Norwich Questions

#### **Response:**

No protective measures are necessary or planned because this area provides no suitable habitat for this species. Although the Canterbury Switching Station site falls within a location mapped as New England Cottontail Focus Area, it is entirely devoid of vegetation and has experienced substantial earth work as a result of sand and gravel mining operations.

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-008
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing page 11 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, with the simultaneous interruption of both the #1000 and #1080 circuits, where would the thermal overloads occur? Explain.

## **Response:**

For the location of the thermal overloads, please see Eversource's confidential response filed with its Motion for Protective Order. The response is critical energy infrastructure information and confidential and is only available to signatories of a nondisclosure agreement.

.

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-009
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

# Question:

Referencing page 14 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, it states, "This work area is not located within or proximate to FEMA 100-year flood zones." Would any of the 10 new single-circuit monopoles be located within the 500-year flood zone?

## **Response:**

No, none of the new single-circuit monopoles would be located within the 500-year flood

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-010
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing Page 17 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, it states, "[T]he existing vegetation management corridor would be expanded by 35 to 55 feet from a typical width of 50 to 70 feet to a width of approximately I05 feet, resulting in the removal of trees along the length of the ROW segment." Estimate the total tree clearing area in acres.

#### **Response:**

Based on the 50 feet minimum width of the cleared portion of the Eversource ROW and the plan to clear up to an additional 55 feet, Eversource conservatively estimates that approximately 3.6 acres of clearing would be required.

Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 01/21/2020 Q-CSC-011 Page 1 of 3

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing Map Sheets I and 2, the existing double-circuit configuration is identified as "1080/1675 Line." Please explain why one of the lines is identified as the #1675 Line while the proposal is to separate the #1080 and #1000 Lines? Please submit corrected sheet(s) if necessary.

## **Response:**

The identification of Line 1675 was an error. See attached, Attachment C - Quinebaug Double Circuit Tower Split, Map Sheets (revised)

Data Request CSC-01
Dated: 01/21/2020
Q-CSC-012
Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing page 26 of Eversource's Pre-filed Testimony, it states, "The primary source of electric and magnetic fields are the transmission lines. The electric and magnetic fields in the vicinity of the proposed Canterbury Switching Station would increase in the area beneath where the lines enter and interconnect to the station ... Away from the point of the interconnection, the changes to the fields would be negligible." Even with the presence of Quinebaug's Substation immediately north of Eversource's Canterbury Switching Station, would the primary source of electric and magnetic fields still be the transmission lines?

#### **Response:**

Along the property boundaries, the primary sources of electric and magnetic fields would be the Eversource transmission lines and any distribution lines; the contributions to such fields from the Quinebaug Substation would be negligible.

Data Request CSC-01 Dated: 01/21/2020 Q-CSC-013 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Witness Panel

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

## Question:

Referencing Exhibit O of Quinebaug's Petition, Quinebaug performed an Acoustic Analysis taking into account its inverter/transformer pairs (at the solar array portion of the site) and the Quinebaug Substation generator step-up transformer (GSU). Would the addition of Eversource's Canterbury Switching Station increase noise levels at the property boundaries? Explain.

## **Response:**

No, Eversource would not be installing any equipment that would increase noise levels at the property boundaries.