

May 10, 2004

Ms. Pamela B. Katz
Chairman
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 272 - Middletown-Norwalk 345kV Transmission Line

Dear Ms. Katz:

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

While it is not possible to provide all the information requested at this time, the Company is attaching the information which has been completed.

Response to CSC-02 Interrogatories dated 03/31/2004
CSC - 048

Very truly yours,

Anne B. Bartosewicz
Project Director - Transmission Business

ABB/tms
cc: Service List

**Witness: Louise Mango
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

What procedures and precautions would be required in crossing the Mill River in Fairfield, which may be contaminated with lead and chromium, according to a letter from the Town of Fairfield Conservation Commission dated June 23, 2003? How would the fish spawning area of Sasco Creek be protected during construction? Provide a copy of any response the applicant may have made to the letter of June 23, 2003.

Response:

(A) The Companies are aware of the contamination in the Mill River and have consulted, and will continue to consult, with the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regarding such contaminants and the status of third-party sediment cleanup efforts.

The Companies propose to install the cable across the Mill River using a method that would not involve disturbance to sediments. In the Application, the Companies proposed to install the cable beneath the bed of the Mill River using a trenchless technology method (i.e., horizontal directional drilling [HDD] or jack and bore). Such trenchless methods would allow the cable to be installed well below the depth of the contaminated sediments.

As the engineering of the Project proceeds, the Companies continue to evaluate alternative methods for installing the cable across smaller rivers and streams, such as the Mill River. The Companies are considering options such as constructing a self supported structure adjacent to existing bridges, installing the cable on existing bridges, or a shallow trench configuration that will allow placement of the cables within the existing roadway. For the Mill River, the Companies are currently evaluating the option of constructing a self supported structure, as well as the option of suspending the cables from the existing bridge as possible methods for crossing the river.

In developing specifications for the detailed design of the any type of cable crossing at the Mill River, the Companies will obtain baseline information from DEP regarding the location and depth of contamination. Further, the Companies will apply to the USACOE and to DEP Office of Long Island Sound Programs for a permit for the Mill River and other tidal crossings. The Companies will perform construction in accordance with the conditions of the resultant permits, which also will serve to protect water quality and aquatic resources.

(B) As described for the Mill River in response (A), the Companies also propose to install the cable across Sasco Creek using methods that would avoid impacts to sediments or water quality. In the Application, the Companies proposed to install the cable beneath Sasco Creek using trenchless technology (HDD). This technology is designed to install the cable well below the river bed (the estimated drill path is expected to be approximately 20 feet below mean low water or 15 feet below the river bed), thereby avoiding potential impacts to river banks, sediments, water quality, and aquatic resources. Using this technology, the Companies do not anticipate any conflicts with the fish species that inhabit Sasco Creek.

As noted above for the Mill River, the Companies are also investigating the feasibility of other construction options, such as installing the cables on a self supported structure adjacent to the existing bridge or suspending the cables from the existing bridge. These methods would also avoid potential impacts to sediments, water quality, and aquatic resources.

Further, as described for the Mill River, the Companies would comply with the conditions of permits issued by the USACOE and DEP, which also can be expected to serve to protect fishery resources.

(C.) The Companies responded verbally to the municipality on June 4, 2003.