

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

SITING COUNCIL

<p><b>Docket 370A:</b> The Connecticut Light and Power Company application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the Manchester Substation to Meekville Junction Circuit Separation Project in Manchester, Connecticut.</p>	<p>DOCKET 370A-MR</p> <p>PROCEEDINGS ON RECONSIDERATION</p> <p>July 9, 2010</p>
--	---

**SUGGESTED MINOR AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS  
TO THE DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT (RECONSIDERATION)**

**A. Additional Findings of Fact**

1. **Comment:** Given that the Council adopted findings of fact as to MMP and MMP-V in its decision in Docket 370A, several findings of fact are now inconsistent with the earlier findings. Therefore, for clarity, CL&P requests finding of fact #1 from CL&P's "Proposed Supplemental Findings of Fact" dated June 14, 2010 as follows:

These Findings of Fact supplement the Council's previous Findings of Fact in Docket 370, dated March 16, 2010, which are incorporated herein by reference. To the extent these Findings are inconsistent with any of the previous Findings of Fact, these Findings shall supersede the earlier Findings.

or in the alternative, a statement by the Council prior to its vote on the findings of fact to the same effect.

2. **Comment:** In response to Senator Murphy's request to include ISO-NE's testimony, CL&P suggests findings of fact #31 and #32 from CL&P's "Proposed Supplemental Findings of Fact" dated June 14, 2010 as follows:

ISO-NE has no preference for the MMP or the MMP-V; however, ISO-NE recognizes that the MMP-V provides benefits in addition to those provided by the MMP such as the likely elimination of the need for the Ludlow Substation capacitors, some nominal improvements in Connecticut import capability, especially under a number of line outage conditions, and improved maintenance conditions. (ISO-NE 7, CSC-2; Tr. 1 - MR, Kowalski, pp. 33-35)

Although ISO-NE is performing a full assessment of the need and timing for the Interstate Reliability Project and Central Connecticut Reliability Project (CCRP), in light of differences in load forecast due to the economy, system changes and resource additions in Connecticut, ISO-NE does not expect the need for MMP or MMP-V to be altered by this assessment. (ISO-NE 7, CSC-1; Tr. 1 – MR, Kowalski, pp. 14-15)

**B. Technical Revisions (*see italics*)**

FOF #1. Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) §16-50g et seq., on October 20, 2008, The Connecticut Light and Power Company (CL&P) applied to the Connecticut Siting Council (Council) for Certificates of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need (Certificate) for the construction, operation and maintenance of the Connecticut portion of “The Connecticut Valley Electric Transmission Reliability Projects.” These projects include the Greater Springfield Reliability Project (GSRP) and the Manchester to Meekville Junction Circuit Separation Project (MMP). The MMP portion of the application was denied without prejudice on **March 9, 2010**. The decision was mailed to the applicant and parties and intervenors on March 24, 2010. (CL&P 1, Vol. 1, p. ES-1; CL&P 44, pp. 1,2; record)

FOF #3. In the MMP Opinion of **March 9, 2010** the Council found that although the MMP would cost less than the MMP-V, the MMP-V may make more efficient use of the existing right-of-way (ROW) by significantly improving reliability at a relatively small additional cost. However, at the time of the decision, the Council did not have enough information regarding the MMP-V to make a decision on the project. Information requested by the Council includes: a confirmation of reliability improvements; potential additional environmental impact; electric and magnetic field (EMF) levels; clarification and details of the additional cost associated with the MMP-V; and further discussion of ISO-NE’s approach to MMP-V in terms of cost allocation. (Opinion 3/09/10)

**Comment/Revision:** The Council acted on CL&P’s application on *March 16, 2010* (although the documents reflect a date of March 9, 2010).

FOF #8. Pursuant to CGS §16-50j (h), on May 7, 2010, the following state agencies were requested to submit written comments regarding the proposed MMP and MMP-V: Department of Environmental Protection (DEP); Department of Agriculture (DOAg); Department of Public Health (DPH); Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ); Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC); Office of Policy and Management (OPM); Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD); and Connecticut Department of Transportation (CDOT). (Record)

**Comment/Revision:** Add: *Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security (DEMHS)*

FOF #14. Four homes abut MMP-V that would not abut MMP: two on Mary Drive and two on Botticello Drive in Manchester. On May 11, 2010, CL&P mailed notice of the project and the Council's hearing to each of these residents. On May 20, 2010, a project representative went to each house and reminded the resident of the letter of May 11 and informed of the Council's scheduled hearing. On May 21, 2010, CL&P hand-delivered a copy of the same letter that was mailed on May 11 to each of the four residences. (CL&P 46, p. 6)

**Comment/Revision:** The four homes do not technically "abut" MMP-V, but rather abut *the existing ROW within which the MMP-V line would be located*. Also, on May 21, 2010, CL&P hand-delivered a copy of the same letter that was mailed on May 11 to *three* of the four residences (the fourth resident recalled receiving it).

FOF #39. The proposed circuit separation would include constructing a new line of steel monopoles down the middle of the ROW. These structures would be approximately 155 feet tall, with a vertical configuration of the conductors. The 115-kV circuit segment on the easterly set of towers would be inactivated, and a circuit segment replacing it, using bundled 1,590-kcmil aluminum conductors with steel reinforcement, would be put onto the new monopoles. The 345-kV circuit that is also currently on the eastern towers would be left where it is. (CL&P 1, Vol. 1, pp. O-49, O-55, Fig. O-18, O-51; CL&P 15, Carberry/Newland, pp. 56, 57)

**Comment/Revision:** Although the 115-kV circuit segment on the easterly set of towers would be inactivated for MMP, as an EMF BMP, CL&P would then upgrade and reactivate this circuit segment at 345 kV making the existing 345-kV circuit segment a split-phase line as mentioned in FOF #86. Thus, CL&P suggests adding after the word "inactivated" the following language: *and then upgraded and reactivated at 345 kV making the existing 345-kV circuit segment a split-phase line*.

FOF #66. The portion of MMP-V closest to the Manchester Substation would require the installation of **portions of the 345-kV line structures** within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated floodway of Hop Brook. The installation of the transmission line structures would impact the flood storage capacity of the Hop Brook Floodway. (CL&P 44, Environment, p. 3)

**Comment/Revision:** For the Hop Brook Floodplain, not just “portions” of the new 345-kV structures would be installed in the floodway; rather, all of the two structures would be in the floodway. Therefore, CL&P suggests the following language: would require the installation of portions of the 345-kV *line and associated 345-kV* structures within the Hop Brook Floodway.

FOF #73. There are no threatened or endangered species habitat or amphibian breeding habitat within the 0.4 mile MMP-V segment. Also, there are no federal, state, or locally designated recreational areas or state wildlife management areas within the 0.4 mile section. (CL&P 44, Environment, p. 7)

FOF #78. There are no known structures listed on or eligible for the National or State Registers of Historic Places within 0.25 miles of the 0.4 mile segment of ROW associated with the MMP-V. (CL&P 44, Environment, p. 7)

**Comment/Revision:** For clarity, location of the segment should be identified as *north of the MMP alignment* after the reference to “MMP-V” at the end of the first sentence of each finding of fact.

FOF #74. No threatened or endangered species or cultural resources would be affected by the 0.1 mile segment of MMP-V. One structure that is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the Charles Bunce House, is located approximately 0.25 miles south of the substation. However, the MMP and MMP-V would have no adverse affect on that property. (CL&P 44, Environment, p. 8)

**Comment/Revision:** For clarity, location of the segment should be identified as *to the northeast of Manchester Substation* after “MMP-V” at the end of the first sentence and “affect” should be *effect*.

FOF #88. Since the power flow would double back to Meekville Junction and then to North Bloomfield Substation, some of that power would shift to the Agawam to North Bloomfield line. This change would increase current on the GSRP line, which would increase MF levels along that line by approximately 2.3 % from the modeling provided under the GSRP. (CL&P 44, EMF, pp. 12, 13)

**Comment/Revision:** For clarity, the first sentence should read: Since *some of the power flow south from the Ludlow Substation to Manchester Substation* would double back to Meekville Junction and then to North Bloomfield Substation, *a longer electrical path from Ludlow to North Bloomfield*, some of that power flow would shift to the Agawam to North Bloomfield line.

**C. Corrections to Text and/or Citations (*see italics*)**

FOF #9. (DPH comments dated *May 20, 2010*)

FOF #18. delete: Refer to Figure 1 (only shows MMP - see FOF #17)

Figure 1 citation: Add *Vol. 1*

FOF #23. A new 345-kV connection between North Bloomfield Substation and Manchester Substation would reduce power flow on the existing 115-kV network between the two substations *following* N-1 and N-1-1 contingency events. (CL&P 44, System Benefits, p. 2)

FOF #28. CL&P performed additional power flow analyses for the MMP-V with additional cases. The results of these analyses confirmed that MMP-V did not solve any *thermal reliability* criteria violations that are not also solved by MMP. However, the new 345-kV line associated with MMP-V would reduce power flow on the existing 115-kV network between North Bloomfield Substation and Manchester Substation following N-1 and N-1-1 contingency events. (CL&P 44, System Benefits, p. 6; CL&P 45, R. 2)

FOF #29. (CL&P 44, *System Benefits*, p. 6)

FOF #30. (Tr. 18, *Scarfone*, p. 67)

FOF #34. (Tr. 18, *Kowalski*, pp. 22-24)

FOF #35. suitable for use *as* a 345-kV line *segment* in the future

FOF #38. delete from the citation: CL&P 1, Vol. 1, p. I-5  
[Note: The citation to CL&P 15 is accurate.]

FOF #42. (CL&P, Vol. 1, pp. I-6, O-65, 66)

FOF #45. If the MMP were approved, conversion of the 115-kV circuit *segment* to a 345-kV circuit *segment* in the future would be relatively insignificant. The only work that would need to be done would be removal of cross connections so that one set of conductors on the structures could be operated *again* at 115-kV.

FOF #58. (CL&P 44, *Systems Benefits*, p. 6 and Facilities/Cost, p. 5)

FOF #60. (Tr. 18, *Kowalski*, pp. 20, 21)

FOF #65. (Tr. 18, *Carberry*, p. 45)

- FOF #75. Approximately 2.4 acres of vegetation removal is required ....
- FOF #77. The MMP-V *ROW segment* is bordered by ....
- FOF #79. Forested Wetland Clearing MMP: 43,568 sq. ft. (1 acre)
- FOF #83. Cross Section 21 extends from *a point on the ROW north of*
- FOF #89. Pre-const. (2012) MF west/south ROW: 4.6
- FOF #90. ... the existing conductors on the south side of the *towers* would not *otherwise* be needed
- FOF #91. Pre-const. (2012) EF east/north ROW: .20