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

Re: Petition No. Petition 1445 - Line Petition Rebuild Wallingford

Dear Ms. Bachman:

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

Response to CSC-001 Interrogatories dated 05/14/2021 CSC-001, 002, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010

Very truly yours,

Kathleen Shanley Manager Transmission Siting As Agent for CL&P dba Eversource Energy

cc: Service List

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-001 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Samantha Buonafede Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Could The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) avoid the approximately 10,189 square feet of temporary impacts to Wetland 8 by accessing the structures from the opposite directions and relocate the pull pad outside of Wetland 8?

Response:

No, Eversource can not avoid the approximately 10,189 square feet of temporary impacts to Wetland 8 by accessing the structures from the opposite directions and relocate the pull pad outside of Wetland 8. Eversource evaluated several potential options for access to Structure 3627. In-ROW access from Northrup Road was determined to be infeasible because it would require the crossing of Wetland 9 and the associated pond (refer to Map Sheet 4 in Attachment A, Petition No. 1455). Eversource also evaluated potential off-ROW access from the north and the south across adjacent properties (Line List LL120, LL121 and LL122, refer to Map Sheet 4, Attachment A, Petition No. 1455), which are all owned by the same entity. Eversource contacted the property owner to attempt to obtain off-ROW access, but was unable to obtain permission to cross the properties. Due to the configuration of the existing and proposed conductors and structures, the pull pad located in Wetland 8 cannot be moved to a location outside of the wetland.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-002 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Joel Szarkowicz

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Explain why the replacement structures are not being located in the same general location as the existing structures. Why is it necessary to shift the #1588 Line southward in the right-of-way and potentially require additional tree clearing? Could Eversource minimize tree clearing by locating the replacement structures close to the existing structure locations?

Response:

The replacement structures are not being relocated in same general locations because the existing line needs to remain in service for constructability and to minimize a risk of a single contingency loss of load ("SCLL") at Colony and North Wallingford Substations. These stations are served by only two transmission lines and taking the 1588 Line out of service would put customers served by either substation dependent on a single source of supply. Shifting the structures is required to establish appropriate clearances between the proposed and existing configuration to minimize the SCLL risk. In the event that the existing 1588 Line could be de-energized for the full construction duration of the rebuild, the location of the new replacement structures would still need to be shifted farther into the ROW to meet current clearance requirements.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-003 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Joel Szarkowicz

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 5 of the Petition, Eversource notes that it would "Replace 2.54 miles of 4/0 copper conductor with 1272 kcmil aluminum conductor steel supported (ACSS) conductor, 0.04 mile of 954 aluminum conductor steel reinforcement (ACSR) and 0.02 mile of 556 ACSR." Provide the approximate mileage of new ACSS conductor.

Response:

The approximate mileage of the replacement ACSS conductor would be 2.54 miles, replacing 2.54 miles of 4/0 copper conductor. The 0.04 mil of the 954 aluminum conductor steel reinforced ("ACSR") is the existing last span entering the Colony Substation. The 0.02 miles of the 556 ACSR conductor is the existing last span entering the North Wallingford Substation. These existing conductors will remain and be relocated on to the new structures.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-004 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Samantha Buonafede Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 9 of the Petition, how would the proposed project affect visibility of the transmission line (post-construction) from the Wallingford Land Trust Orchard Glen Hiking Trail?

Response:

The proposed project would not significantly change the visibility from the Wallingford Land Trust Orchard Glen Hiking Trail. The trail currently passes beneath and along the transmission line for a distance of approximately 200 feet. The only visible difference would be the shift of the line within the ROW and the removal of vegetation for construction and to maintain proper clearances. Eversource representatives have discussed the project with the Wallingford Land Trust and has committed to working closely with the Land Trust before, during, and after construction to manage any impacts to the trail and plan restoration that might be needed.



February 9, 2021

Mr. David R. George Heritage Consultants PO Box 310249 Newington, CT 06131

Subject: Phase IB Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey

Eversource Energy Line 1588 Wallingford, Connecticut

ENV-21-0419

Dear Mr. George:

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the archeological survey report prepared by Heritage Consultants, LLC (Heritage), dated December 2020. The proposed activities are under the jurisdiction of the Connecticut Siting Council and are subject to review by this office pursuant to the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA). The proposed 7 structure replacements and 6 access roads examined are associated with the Line 1588 Structure Replacement Project. The submitted report is well-written, comprehensive, and meets the standards set forth in the *Environmental Review Primer for Connecticut's Archaeological Resources*.

No previously recorded archaeological sites are located within 500 feet of the line structures. Similarly, no properties listed or previously determined to be eligible for listing on either the State or National Register of Historic Places are located within 500 feet of any utility structures or access roads in the project area.

Phase IB of the reconnaissance survey consisted of subsurface testing of areas deemed to have moderate to high archaeological sensitivity, and that would be subject to ground disturbing impacts as part of the proposed undertaking. A total of 84 of 87 planned shovel tests were excavated successfully throughout the proposed work area. No prehistoric or historic period cultural artifacts or features were identified during the survey.



As a result of the information submitted, SHPO concurs with the findings of the report that additional archeological investigations of the project area are not warranted and that <u>no historic properties will be affected</u> by the proposed activities. However, please be advised that if construction plans change to include previously uninvestigated/undisturbed areas, this office should be contacted for additional consultation.

This office appreciates the opportunity to review and comment upon this project. For additional information, please contact Marena Wisniewski, Environmental Reviewer, at (860) 500-2357 or marena.wisniewski@ct.gov.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Kinney

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-005 Page 1 of 2

Witness: Sara S. Fusco

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 9 of the Petition, Eversource notes that, "The results of the Phase 1B surveys were provided to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs) of the Connecticut Tribe of Mohegan Indians and the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation for their review and concurrence." Has Eversource received any responses from SHPO and/or either of THPOs? If yes, indicate such response(s).

Response:

Eversource received a written letter of concurrence letter from SHPO on February 9, 2021 (attached). The letter stated, in part, "SHPO concurs with the findings of the report that additional archeological investigations of the project area are not warranted and that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed activities." A representative for the Tribal Historical Preservation Office of the Mohegan Tribe of Indians of Connecticut, was present during the Phase 1B archaeological assessment for the project. The representative did not have any comments at that time. No written comments have been received from either THPO.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-006 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Sara S. Fusco

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 12 of the Petition, Eversource notes that, "A follow up presence/absence survey will be conducted in the Spring of 2021 to determine whether this potential vernal pool is a vernal pool." Provide the status and/or conclusion of such vernal pool survey. If the survey concludes a vernal pool exists within Wetland 10, would Eversource implement the recommended protection measures identified in the January 26, 2021 Vernal Pool Habitat Assessment and Recommended Protection Measures report?

Response:

An Eversource contractor performed a follow up presence/absence survey on May 14, 2021. The results of the survey confirmed the presence of obligate vernal pool species. The proposed project activities would not occur within the vernal pool depression or the vernal pool envelope.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-007 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Sara S. Fusco

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 13 of the Petition, did Eversource receive a response from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) regarding the Natural Diversity Database (NDDB)?

Response:

Eversource submitted the NDDB Review Request to the DEEP on January 8, 2021. To date, Eversource has not received a response.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-008 Page 1 of 1

Witness: No Witness

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 14 of the Petition, Eversource notes that, "The Project would not result in a substantial change to the existing visual character of the line...and in some locations may improve the view within and along the ROW." Explain how the project may improve views within and along the ROW.

Response:

While it is not typical to evaluate views from within and along the ROW, as opposed to views of the ROW from adjacent areas, the Wallingford Land Trust Orchard Glen Walking Trail runs along and across the ROW. Specifically, the walking trail crosses the ROW at a relative high point near Route 15. In that location, vegetation will be removed, improving views to the west from the high point of the trail.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-009 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Joel Szarkowicz

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Referencing page 3 of the DEEP Comments dated April 15, 2021, first paragraph, would the proposed modified transmission line have sufficient ground clearance in the vicinity of proposed Structure Nos. 3634 and 3635 given the existing topography?

Response:

The proposed transmission line meets current National Electric Safety Code and Eversource standards for clearance to ground in the vicinity of proposed structures 3634 and 3635.

Data Request CSC-001 Dated: 05/14/2021 Q-CSC-010 Page 1 of 1

Witness: Joel Szarkowicz

Request from: Connecticut Siting Council

Question:

Would notice to the Federal Aviation Administration be required for any of the proposed replacement structures? If yes, would marking and/or lighting be required for any of the proposed replacement structures?

Response:

Eversource filed requests for Obstruction Evaluation with the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") for all of the proposed transmission structures in this project. The FAA studied each proposed replacement structure and determined that marking and/or lighting were not required for any of the proposed replacement structures.