

May 11, 2006

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

Re: Docket D&M Plans - D&M Plans

Dear Ms. Katz:

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

Response to CSC-05 Interrogatories dated 04/27/2006

D&M-002*, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009*, 010, 011, 012, 015, 016, 017, 020, 021, 022, 025, 026

Very truly yours,

Anne Bartosewicz
Project Director
Transmission Business
NUSCO
As Agent for CL&P

AB/tms
cc: Service List

* Due to the bulk nature of this material, copies are being provided to the CSC only.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-002
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:
Identify existing lattice structure 4664.

Response:
Drawing 01229-15001, sheets 21 and 22 of 30 have been revised to correct structure numbers and show structure number 4664. Additionally, sheet 21 has been revised to show structure number 4663 as a lattice structure to be removed. The revised drawings are included with this response.

* Due to the bulk nature of this material, copies are being provided to the CSC only.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-004
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Explain the 15 foot difference in height from a range of 130-155 feet to 145-170 feet for structure numbers 24209, 4663 and 4663A as it relates to the 100-foot relocation in a westerly direction.

Response:

This 15-foot increase in height results from relocating structures 24209, 4663 and 4663A 100 feet to the west. The relocation of these structures causes a 100-foot increase in span, and increases the conductor sag over Tuttle Avenue. The structure heights needed to be increased by 15 feet in order to provide electrical clearance over Tuttle Avenue and the distribution line on Tuttle Avenue.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-005
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:
Could structure number 24216 be eliminated? If not, explain.

Response:
Structure 24216 can not be eliminated. Without this structure, there would be insufficient electrical clearance from line conductors to the existing lattice structure number 4670 during maximum conductor blow-out conditions.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-006
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:
Explain the difference between a restricted area and environmentally sensitive area.

Response:
Restricted areas are portions of the ROW where access will be restricted to avoid crossing wetlands and watercourses, areas noted on the D&M Plan drawings as "Gaps".

Environmentally sensitive areas, as defined in Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies Sec. 16-50j-61, *Requirements for a right-of-way development and management plan*, include but are not limited to watercourses, wetlands, areas of high erosion potential, areas with known critical habitats for state- and federal-listed species, and locations of known underground facilities to be crossed.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-007
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Is the access road between structure numbers 24226-24228 within a drainage swale? Is the existing width and substrate of the drainage swale capable of supporting construction vehicles? If not describe improvements? Would the improvements be temporary or permanent? Could CL&P use the drainage swale during dry periods?

Response:

Field investigation indicates that the area between structures 24226-24228 is a valley. This area is wide enough and capable of supporting construction activities without improvements. This area can be used during dry periods, but CL&P will avoid it during wet periods.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-008
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

What type of mitigation would be used to minimize capture of runoff west of a new access road from Woodhouse Ave. to structure number 24244?

Response:

Run-off would be controlled by placement of crushed stone , through which the run-off would slowly percolate, thereby minimizing the potential for ponding.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-009
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Does CL&P intend to develop an access road to structure number 24254? If so, provide an 8.5x11 1-inch copy of correction.

Response:

Yes, the access road to existing structure number 8796 will be extended in order to gain access to new structure number 24254. The revision is shown on drawing 01229-15001, sheet 27 and is attached to this response.

* Due to the bulk nature of this material, copies are being provided to the CSC only.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-010
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Could CL&P avoid use of the access road between structure numbers 24257 and 24258 but to reserve use of this access road as an alternative?

Response:

Yes, however, if the access road between structure numbers 24257 and 25258 were avoided, access to structure 24258 will have to be from the access road from structure 24260 over a longer distance. CL&P prefers the proposed access to structure 24258 using the already established access road in the ROW because it provides a shorter access route to this structure from the south.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-011
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Compare and contrast an access road [in a diagonal direction to the west] off East Center Street to structure number 24256.

Response:

A new access road in a diagonal direction from East Center Street to gain access to structure 24256 is more difficult to construct and utilize. Along this portion of East Center Street on the west side there is a steep slope from the road and a guardrail along the roadway.

The existing access road is adequate for construction. Where the existing access road crosses the stone wall there is an opening; so there is no impact to the stone wall.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-012
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Would the proposed access depicted on the plan to approach structure number 24256, impact the existing stonewall? If so, what would be the proposed restoration?

Response:

The stone wall shown on drawing 01229-15001, sheet 27 in the vicinity of structure 24256 does not exist. The revised drawing that was provided in response to CSC-05, Q-D&M-009 includes this change.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-015
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Is the existing culvert between structure 24262 and 24263 capable of supporting construction vehicles? If not, describe how CL&P would reinforce or replace the existing culvert. Could these structures be constructed during dry periods?

Response:

There is no culvert between structures 24262 and 24263. Drawing 01229-15001, sheet 27, that was provided in response to CSC-05, Q-D&M-009, has been revised to reflect this.

It is possible to construct in this area during dry periods to limit the impact on wetland 64.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-016
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Does Liney Hall Lane intersect with Williams Road at the railroad tracks near structure number 24268? If no, describe how CL&P would access Liney Hall Lane?

Response:

Yes, Liney Hall Lane does intersect with Williams Road at the railroad tracks near structure 24268.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-017
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Could CL&P eliminate structure number 24291 and shift structure 24290 to the north to eliminate the construction of an access road through a wetland? If no, explain.

Response:

No, structure 24291 can not be eliminated. The new 345-kV transmission line on structure numbers 24290 and 24291 runs parallel to the existing 387 line (a 345-kV transmission line on structure numbers 8760 and 8759 shown on Drawing 01229-15001, Sheet 30). Without the proposed angle structure 24291, the conductors of the new 345-kV circuit would interfere with the 387 line and not be far enough apart to meet requirements of the National Electrical Safety Code.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-020
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Describe the railroad crossing near structure number 24272. Is the railroad crossing structurally capable of supporting construction vehicles? If not explain mitigating methods to protect the railroad. Is the owner/operator of the railroad informed of construction traffic at this crossing? If not what actions would CL&P use when crossing the railroad?

Response:

The railroad crossing between structure 24272 and 24273 uses timbers to create a gap on both sides of the rails and has an asphalt apron. Asphalt has also been laid between the rails. This railroad crossing is structurally capable of supporting construction vehicles. The owner of the railroad is Tilcon Connecticut, Inc. and the operator is Providence and Worcester Railroad Company. Both the owner and operator of the railroad will be informed of the construction traffic. CL&P and its construction contractor will use proper protocol as determined by the railroad owner/operator for crossing traffic.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-021
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

In Appendix B, the February 6, 2006 letter from Anne Bartosewicz to Mayor Dickinson, see attached table page 3, the 1010 Center Street refers to structure number 24262. Is this the same for structure number 24262 in the D&M Plan submitted to the Council? If not, identify the structure the Carruthers refer to, provide its original location prior to moving 100 feet and identify the Carruther property.

Response:

No. A February 7, 2006 letter from Anne Bartosewicz to Mayor Dickinson (not February 6, 2006) found in Appendix B refers to structure number 24262 which has been renumbered in the D&M Plan submitted to the Council to structure number 24257. This structure was previously located 100 feet southwest of its current location next to existing structure number 8793. The Carruthers house, shown on Drawing 01229-15001, Sheet 27, parcel number 217 1 19, is located west of existing structure number 8793.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-022
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:
Describe special erosion control notes for structure numbers 24255 and 24256.

Response:
Drawing 01229-15001, sheet 27, that was provided in response to CSC-05, Q-D&M-09, shows special erosion and control notes for structures 24255 and 24256.

The soil erosion note "1" near structure numbers 24255 and 24256 indicates the use of silt fencing around the spoil piles associated with the installation of these structures in wetlands. The erosion note "2" near structure number 24256 indicates the use of a berm, or waterbar, at the base of the slope before the wetland surrounding structure number 24256.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-025
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Has the Town of Cheshire reviewed and commented on the Traffic Inventory Report for Maintenance and Protection of Traffic. If so, provide the Town's comments.

Response:

The Town of Cheshire was provided the Traffic Inventory Report on February 8, 2006 as part of the draft D&M Plan. CL&P has not received any comments from the Town on this report. The Maintenance and Protection of Traffic (MPT) Report is a separate report from the Traffic Inventory Report. CL&P expects to provide the Town of Cheshire the MPT report in May, 2006.

**The Connecticut Light and Power
Company
Docket No. D&M Plans**

Data Request CSC-05

**Dated: 04/27/2006
Q-D&M-026
Page 1 of 1**

**Witness: NO WITNESS
Request from: Connecticut Siting Council**

Question:

Is the Circuit 1630 line being rebuilt between New Haven Junction and Pent Road Junction as detailed in the Council's Finding of Fact No. 178? If yes, describe the nature of the work.

Response:

The few spans of the 1630 line that are between New Haven Junction and Pent Road Junction will not be rebuilt. During the CSC's evidentiary proceedings in Docket No. 272, it appeared that the existing Line 1630 was positioned in the ROW between these two junctions such that it would be in conflict with the installation of the new 345-kV line and would need to be rebuilt. CL&P subsequently determined that the new 345-kV line could be built without having to shift the position of the existing 1630 Line. Therefore, rebuilding Line 1630 between New Haven Junction and Pent Road Junction is no longer required.