

Date Filed: August 04, 2021

**Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

What is the total estimated cost of the project? Of this total, what costs would be regionalized, and what costs would be localized? Estimate the percentages of the total cost that would be borne by Eversource ratepayers, Connecticut ratepayers, and the remainder of New England (excluding Connecticut) ratepayers, as applicable

**Response:**

The total estimated cost of the project is approximately \$6.44 million. The Project does not include installation or modification of Pool Transmission Facilities; consequently, the entire cost would be allocated to customers of The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy.

Date Filed: August 04, 2021

**Request from: Connecticut Siting  
Council**

**Question:**

Referencing page 28 of the Petition, were there any comments from the Towns of Windham and Lebanon or property abutters? If so, what were their concerns, and how were these concerns addressed?

**Response:**

Eversource did not receive any comments from the Towns of Windham or Lebanon about this Project or the filing of the Petition. Eversource received one comment from an abutting property owner in Windham, who requested that Eversource remove a distribution pole on the owner's property. Eversource reviewed this request and is unable to remove the pole because it serves as an anchor for the distribution lines crossing the Willimantic River.

Date Filed: August 04, 2021

**Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Referencing page 14 of the Petition, would any restoration of the temporarily impacted wetland areas be necessary? If yes, indicate what restoration measures would be utilized

**Response:**

No. Restoration of the wetlands is not anticipated to be necessary after the construction mats are removed. The only potential restoration measures would be removing any debris caused during the construction mat removal (pieces of wood falling off the mats) or minor correction of any unintended drag marks using hand shovels.

Date Filed: August 04, 2021

**Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

**Question:**

Referencing page 15 of the Petition, two proposed structures would be located within the 100-year flood zone. Would any of the proposed structures be located within the 500-year flood zone

**Response:**

FEMA has mapped a 500-year floodplain (Zone X) on the latest FIRM Map (Panel No. 090119 0004 D, dated November 6, 1998). Because the 100-year zone and the 500-year zone overlap within the 100-year zone in this area, the two replacement structures (6507.5 and 6507.5A) would *de facto* be located within the 500-year flood zone, since they are located within the overlapping area of the flood zones. Other than the two above structures, there are no other structures that would be located within the 100-year flood zone or 500-year zone.

Date Filed: August 04, 2021

**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:**

Yes, notice to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) was required for the proposed replacements for Structures 6500, 6501, 6502, 6502A, 6503, 6504, 6505, 6506, 6506A, 6507, and 6507A.

Accordingly, Eversource filed FAA Requests for Obstruction Evaluation for these replacement structures, and the FAA determined, for each such replacement, that neither marking nor lighting would be required.