STATE OF CONNECTICUT

SITING COUNCIL

Re:	The Connecticut Light and Power Company and The United Illuminating Company Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Construction of a New 345-kV Electric Transmission Line and Associated Facilities Between Scovill Rock Switching Station in Middletown and Norwalk Substation in Norwalk, Connecticut Including the Reconstruction of Portions of Existing 115-kV and 345-kV Electric Transmission Lines, the Construction of the Beseck Switching Station in Wallingford, East Devon Substation in Milford, and Singer Substation in Bridgeport, Modifications at Scovill Rock Switching Station and Norwalk Substation and the Reconfiguration of Certain Interconnections	)	Docket 272 April 20, 2004

ERRATA PAGES FOR CHANGES READ INTO THE RECORD BY APPLICANTS' WITNESSES DURING HEARINGS ON APRIL 20, 2004

The Connecticut Light and Power Company ("CL&P") and The United Illuminating Company ("UI") (together, the "Companies") submit the attached errata pages to document corrections to the pre-filed testimony of the Companies' witnesses. These corrections were read into the record by the Companies and their witnesses during the Connecticut Siting Council ("Council") hearing held in this docket on April 20, 2004.

Errata Pages and Corrections

- Correction to page 36 of the Testimony of Roger Zaklukiewicz regarding the size of the enclosed area of the Singer Substation
- Correction to page 39 of the Testimony of Roger Zaklukiewicz regarding DOT's suggested restriction on hours of construction

- Corrections to pages 20 and 22 of the Testimony of Louise Mango regarding acquisition of easements.

Respectfully Submitted,

Applicants,

The Connecticut Light and Power Company

_____
By: Anne Bartosewicz
Project Director, CL&P

The United Illuminating Company

_____
By: John J. Prete
Project Director, UI

cc: Service List

an integral part of the enclosure. Given the equipment described above, the enclosed area of Singer Substation will be approximately 1.5 acres. If additional equipment is needed as a result of ISO-NE's final review of the Project, additional room may be needed.

Q. Does the change in the proposed site for Singer Substation have any material impact on the cost of the Project?

A. No. The new site is adjacent to the site identified in the Application as the preferred site (referred to in the site selection study as Site #1), so the additional cable cost is minimal. In addition, this marginal cost difference is offset by the fact that there is no need for demolition on Site #8 (as there would be for Site #1), less acreage will be acquired (1.5 acres for Site #8 versus 2.5 acres for Site #1), and transactional costs associated with a condemnation of Site #1 will be avoided.

Q. What modifications will be required at Norwalk Substation?

A. New equipment will be installed within the fenced area approved for the Bethel-Norwalk 345-kV Project, and no new property will be needed in connection with these modifications. The substation will be modified to include a pressurizing plant and two new underground HPFF 345-kV terminations for the additional lines from Singer Substation, along with associated GIS bus work and shunt reactors, as well as the installation of six 345-kV single phase series reactors, three single phase 115-kV/345-kV 200 MVA autotransformers, and associated equipment. The final configuration would accommodate a 345-kV and a 115-kV bus. The 345-kV substation bus utilizes a breaker-and-a-half GIS technology for four 345-kV lines and six single-phase autotransformers. The 115-kV substation bus utilizes an open-air breaker-and-a-half configuration for the five 115-kV lines and five 115-kV transformers. (See Volume 7 of the Application for a

underground route is a more direct, shorter route, and this factor, along with the high cost of property, serves to offset most of the increased cost associated with underground facilities.

Q. Are any significant assumptions on which you have based your estimate of the cost of the proposed construction subject to change?

A. Yes. The cost estimate is based upon the assumption that we will be able to construct the underground segments of the line efficiently, and that the line would typically be buried to a depth of approximately five feet. Preliminary comments on this proposal from the Department of Transportation ("DOT"), and the DOT's recent comments on the draft Development & Management Plan for underground construction in Docket 217, suggest requirements that would drive up the cost of the Project and in some cases interfere with the performance of the proposed underground transmission line. For instance, DOT's suggested restriction on hours of construction would inhibit continuous splicing operations; a requirement to repave the entire street (as opposed to the disabled portion of it) would drive up costs; and a requirement of an 8-foot burial depth would greatly increase cost, would severely reduce the performance of the cable, and could increase the time required for construction.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

A. Because Alternative A would be constructed aboveground between Hawthorne Transition Station and Norwalk Substation, environmental impacts would be greater than if the Project were constructed along the proposed route.

Impacts to birds and wildlife, in general, would be considerably greater along the alternative route than along the proposed route, which would be installed within public roads and would not affect habitats. Approximately 49.5 more acres of predominantly forestland would be cleared for Alternative A, overhead crossings of 49 more wetlands would be required, and an additional 4 miles of transmission line would have to be constructed.

In summary, compared to the proposed route, Alternative A would result in:

- Overhead crossings of 49 wetlands and watercourses, some of which could be impacted by structures or access roads. (Along the underground portion of the proposed route between Singer Substation and Norwalk Substation, the cable would be installed across 11 watercourses and associated wetlands using trenchless technology or other techniques).

- Acquisition of easements over about 49.5 acres of privately-owned land for the expanded overhead ROW in segments 3 and 4 and approximately 2-4 acres of privately-owned land for the Hawthorne Transition Station (in addition to underground easements over approximately 2.4 acres)

- Clearing of approximately 49.5 more acres of predominantly forested areas (it is assumed that the existing vegetation on virtually the entire expanded ROW would have to be cleared).

- Substantially longer alignment through residential areas.

- 4 more miles of overhead transmission line.

Q. Please provide an environmental summary of Alternative B.

A. The eastern portion of Alternative B (to the East Devon Substation) would be the same as the proposed route, whereas the western portion of the alternative (between Hawthorne Substation and Norwalk Substation) would be the same as described

The principal watercourses along the alternative route are the Housatonic River, Yellow Mill Creek, Pequonnock River, Mill River, Aspetuck River, East Branch of the Saugatuck River, and West Branch of the Saugatuck River. The 345-kV transmission line would be installed overhead across all of these river crossings, with the exception of the Pequonnock River crossing in the Bridgeport Harbor area, which would be crossed underground.

The vegetation and wildlife resources along Alternative B would generally be comparable to those along the overhead portion of the proposed route and Alternative A, with the exception of the coastal/estuarine habitat in the vicinity of the overhead crossing of the Housatonic River. The Alternative B crossing would be located within a wetland on the east side of the river and between several islands that contain important tidal marshes, including areas that are part of the Charles E. Wheeler State Wildlife Area. These tidal wetlands provide valuable habitat for migratory waterfowl and waterbirds.

Q. How does Alternative B compare to the proposed route, overall?

A. Compared to the proposed route, Alternative B would result in:

- Construction and operation of approximately 6.0 additional miles of transmission line.
- Potential acquisition of a total of 29 homes in order to expand the ROW.
- Acquisition of easements over about 111.1 acres of privately-owned land for the expanded overhead ROW in segments 3 and 4 (in addition to underground easements over approximately 1 acre)
- Clearing of approximately 111.1 more acres of predominantly forested areas.
- Substantially longer alignment through residential areas.
- Overhead crossings of 85 more wetlands and watercourses, some of which could be impacted by structure locations or access roads.