



# 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](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)

[www.ct.gov/csc](http://www.ct.gov/csc)

### VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

July 24, 2017

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

RE: **PETITION NO. 1314** – The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed 1555 Line Rebuild Project consisting of the structure and conductor replacements on its existing 115-kilovolt electric transmission line extending approximately 6.6 miles within existing Eversource electric transmission line right-of-way between the existing Bulls Bridge Substation located at 781 Kent Road and the existing Rocky River Junction located off Boardman Road in New Milford, Connecticut.

Dear Ms. Shanley:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than August 7, 2017. 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  
Executive Director

MB/MP

c: Council Members

**Petition No. 1314**  
**Interrogatories**  
**July 24, 2017**  
**Set One**

**System Planning**

1. Is it correct to say that the proposed project is not on the ISO New England, Inc. (ISO-NE) June 2017 Regional System Plan (RSP) Project List?

**Safety**

2. Would any Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) obstruction marking or lighting of the proposed structures be required? If no, at a minimum, would notice to the FAA be required?
3. Referencing page 23 of the Petition, were the pre and post-construction magnetic field levels based on average or peak line loads?

**Construction Specifications**

4. Which section(s) of the #1555 line have existing 2/0 copper conductors versus 336 kcmil aluminum conductor steel reinforced (ACSR) conductors?
5. Would permanent access roads generally be gravel?

**Visual Resources/Aesthetics**

6. Page 14 of the Petition notes that, "All replacement structures will utilize weathering steel, which, except for the lattice structure replacement, will approximate the look of the original wood structures." Attachment H of the Petition notes that the lattice structure would be replaced with a 3-pole structure. Is it correct to say that the existing lattice structure was originally painted green and is likely a faded green/gray in color? What type of finish is proposed for the 3-pole structure, e.g. galvanized or weathering steel?

**Noise**

7. On page 15 of the Petition, Eversource notes that, "There would be no changes to the sound levels along the transmission corridor after completion of the project." Thus, would the project continue to comply with DEEP Noise Control Standards, post-construction?

**Cultural Resources**

8. To date, has Eversource received a response from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)? If yes, provide a copy of such response.
9. To date, has Eversource received a response from Mashantucket Pequot, Mohegan or Wampanoag Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs)? If yes, provide a copy of any such responses.

## **Wildlife**

10. Page 14 of the Petition notes that, "The minimal tree clearing required for the Project would not impact known northern long-eared bat (NLEB) hibernacula." Would any proposed construction occur within 0.25 miles of a known hibernaculum? Notwithstanding, the Federal Register Final 4(d) Rule dated January 14, 2016 for the NLEB notes that the pup season for the NLEB is June 1 through July 31. Does Eversource intend to conduct tree clearing outside of the NLEB pup season window? If not, explain.
11. Would Eversource implement protective measures for the State-listed Species of Special Concern observed at the site and noted on page 3 of the Technical Memorandum dated May 31, 2017 by Davison Environmental?

## **Wetland and Water Resources**

12. Other than approval from the Council, would Eversource require other permitting for the temporary and permanent wetland impacts, such as filing with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? Explain.
13. How would Eversource facilitate the restoration or regrowth of wetland vegetation in impacted areas? For example, would such areas be seeded?
14. Given the temporary wetland impacts, does Evesource have an Invasive Species Control Plan for the proposed project? If yes, provide a copy of such plan or applicable section of Eversource Best Management Practices.
15. Reference Map Sheet 4 of 12. Could Eversource attempt to relocate proposed Structure No. 556 outside of Wetland No. 13 to avoid direct impacts? Or could it not be avoided due to constraints associated with the span of the transmission line? Explain.
16. Reference Map Sheet 7 of 12. Would the proposed pull pad adversely impact the Intermittent Watercourse S13?
17. Reference Map Sheet 8 of 12. Could Eversource relocate proposed Structure Nos. 2622 and 2623 outside of Wetland No. 18 to avoid direct impacts? Or could it not be avoided due to constraints associated with the span of the transmission line? Explain.
18. Reference Map Sheet 9 of 12. Would proposed Structure No. 2613 result in direct impacts to Wetland 22? Would proposed Structure No. 2613 adversely impact Perennial Watercourse S15? Explain.
19. In areas where proposed structures must be located within wetlands, do direct embed structures have less adverse impact on wetlands than a drilled shaft foundation due to a smaller hole for excavation?