STATE OF CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051
Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950
E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov
www.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

April 28, 2016

Kathleen M. Shanley, Manager – Transmission Siting
Eversource Energy
56 Prospect Street
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06103

RE: **PETITION NO. 1226** – Eversource Energy petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of the new 115-kV Towantic Switching Station to be located adjacent to the Towantic Generating Station on Woodruff Hill Road, Oxford, Connecticut and the proposed modifications within existing right-of-way to its existing 1575 and 1585 115-kV electric transmission line extending 6.1 miles from Bunker Hill Substation, located at Clough Road, Waterbury, south through Middlebury to the proposed Towantic Switching station and reconductoring of its existing 1575 115-kV electric transmission line extending one mile from the proposed new switching station south to Structure 1446 (Oxford Tap) located near the Oxford Substation, Commerce Drive, Oxford.

Dear Ms. Shanley:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than May 12, 2016. To help expedite the Council's review, please file individual responses as soon as they are available.

Please forward an original and 15 copies to this office, as well as a copy via electronic mail. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan, the Council is requesting that all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Yours very truly,

Melanie A. Bachman
Acting Executive Director

MB/MP/lm

c: Council Members

Petition No. 1226
Eversource
Waterbury, Middlebury and Oxford
Interrogatories – Set One

General Questions

1. What is the area bounded by the proposed fenced switching station in square feet or acres? Would that area be crushed traprock?

2. While the tree clearing would be performed by CPV as noted on page 6 of the Petition, approximately how much tree clearing (in acres) would be required for the switching station?

3. Calculate the amounts of cut and fill required for the proposed switching station.

4. Would any blasting be required to construct the switching station, or would mechanical chipping be used if necessary (such as if ledge is encountered)?

5. Provide a simplified drawing (or aerial photo) depicting existing versus proposed access to the switching station itself. Would all new and/or improved access be gravel? Provide the total length of the access to the switching station.

6. What is the tallest proposed object within the proposed switching station (e.g. terminal structure at approximately 67 feet)?

7. What size fence and mesh size would be utilized for the switching station? As an anti-climbing measure, has Eversource considered utilizing a mesh size that is smaller than the typical 2-inch? Would the fence have barbed wire?

8. "Baldwin Tap" is identified on Sheets 11 and 12. Identify the location of "Oxford Tap" by sheet number and structure number(s).

9. Provide the structure number of the tallest proposed transmission structure (e.g. 140 feet) as noted on page 4 of the Petition or as applicable.

10. Would all proposed new or replacement structures be galvanized steel to match the existing structures to remain? Are there any weathering steel transmission structures in the vicinity of Eversource's proposed project?

11. Eversource seeks to maintain the double-circuit tower (DCT) configuration for the 1575 and 1585 lines (except for replacing lattice structures with monopoles). Has Eversource determined that it is not necessary to separate the two circuits onto single-circuit structures to comply with reliability standards?

12. On Page B-3 of the Petition, four new structures would be located within the 100-year flood zone. Would any new structures be located within the 500-year flood zone? How many? Has Eversource sought to avoid flood zones for structure locations where feasible?

13. On Sheets 10 and 11, would the proposed "Construction Mat to Span Wetland and Vernal Pool" create any permanent adverse impacts to the vernal pool?

14. Provide a detailed vernal pool analysis consistent with Calhoun and Klemens (2002) Best Development Practices for the existing vernal pools in the vicinity of the proposed project. Could construction be performed outside of the active breeding season for vernal pool species?

15. How would Evesource remove old conductors and string new conductors across Long Meadow Pond? See Sheet 19.

16. Would an underground transmission connection from the switching station to the 1575, 1585, and 1990 lines be feasible? Please provide a cost estimate of an underground transmission connection from the proposed switching station to the transmission lines in the right-of-way. Compare this cost to the proposed overhead configuration.

17. On page B-8 of the Petition, Eversource notes that impulse noise from circuit breakers are possible during short-circuit events or for maintenance outages. Would Eversource meet DEEP Noise Standards relative to Impulse Noise in Section 22a-69-3.2 of such noise standards?

18. How would the proposed switching station affect magnetic field levels at the boundaries of CPV's property?

19. Does Eversource plan to use optimum phasing of the two circuits (1575 and 1585) on the proposed double-circuit structures as an EMF mitigation measure?

20. On page D-18 of the Petition, Eversource notes that, "Calculations of EMF were not performed for the reconductoring portion of the Project, between Towantic Switching Station and Oxford Substation, as no change to the electric field at the edges of the ROW will occur as result of the Project." How would magnetic fields change from pre-construction to post-construction at the eastern and western edges of the ROW for the reconductoring portion of the project? While the line geometry/configuration would be very similar, would the change in magnetic fields, if applicable, be due to changing power flows due to the power plant?