

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

IN RE: ISSUANCE OF ADVISORY OPINION :  
TO THE ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD :  
REGARDING THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC : DOCKET NO. 4360  
COMPANY D/B/A NATIONAL GRID'S APPLICATION :  
TO CONSTRUCT AND ALTER MAJOR FACILITIES :  
(INTERSTATE RELIABILITY PROJECT) :

**ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD  
PURSUANT TO NOTICE OF DESIGNATION ISSUED OCTOBER 10, 2012**

**I. Travel**

On July 19, 2012, The Narragansett Electric Company d/b/a National Grid (“National Grid” or “Company”), filed with the EFSB an application to construct and alter major facilities. In its application, which covers the Rhode Island components of the Interstate Reliability Project (“Project”), National Grid proposed to construct two new 345 KV transmission lines, relocate, reconstruct, and in some cases, reconductor existing 345 kV and 115 kV transmission lines, and reconstruct an existing switching station.<sup>1</sup> On October 10, 2012, the EFSB issued an Order which, among other things, requested an Advisory Opinion from the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) on the question of the need for the Project and on whether the Project will allow the transmission of energy at the lowest reasonable cost to the consumer. The EFSB Order directed the Commission to “specifically analyze the cost impact of the Project and [to] examine the economics of reasonable alternatives to the various components of the Project, including those proposed by National Grid.”<sup>2</sup>

In response to the EFSB’s Order, Commission Staff conducted a pre-hearing conference on October 22, 2012 to identify parties and set the procedural schedule. The Motion to Intervene was set for November 15, 2012. ISO-NE filed a Motion to Intervene which was granted

<sup>1</sup> EFSB Order No. 66 (issued October 10, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> EFSB Order No. 66 at 11-12.

pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 1.13(e). Although included on the Service List in this docket, neither the Office of Energy Resources nor Statewide Planning offered any input into the Commission's analysis. The Division of Public Utilities and Carriers ("Division") was a full participant in this case.

On November 21, 2012, National Grid submitted the Pre-filed Testimony of David J. Beron, P.E., P.M.P., Principal Project Manager of National Grid USA Service Company,<sup>3</sup> the Joint Pre-Filed Testimony of Gabriel Gabremicael, P.E., Manager of Transmission Planning New England of National Grid USA Service Company and Mark Stevens, P.E., Lead Engineer of National Grid USA Service Company,<sup>4</sup> the Pre-Filed Testimony of Judah L. Rose, Managing Director of ICF Resources, LLC,<sup>5</sup> and David M. Campilii, Consulting Engineer in the Asset Management – Transmission Department of National Grid USA Service Company in support of National Grid's proposed Project.<sup>6</sup>

In his Pre-Filed Testimony, Mr. Beron provided an overview of the Project, including the cost and alternatives reviewed. Mr. Beron identified four parts of the Project: (1) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (2) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of

---

<sup>3</sup> National Grid Exhibit 2.

<sup>4</sup> National Grid Exhibit 3.

<sup>5</sup> National Grid Exhibit 4.

<sup>6</sup> National Grid Exhibit 5. National Grid also provided the Commission with the Environmental Report prepared as part of the development of this Project. Parts 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0 were most relevant to the Commission's analysis in this matter. (National Grid Exhibit 1).

the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (4) Replace and/or modify a number of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.<sup>7</sup>

Mr. Beron explained that National Grid considered several alternatives to the design of the Project, including a “No-Build” alternative, alternate overhead routes and configurations, underground alternatives and non-transmission alternatives.<sup>8</sup> Noting that transmission upgrades are necessary to relieve existing transmission constraints on the electric grid, particularly from east to west and from west to east across Southern New England and to satisfy both national and regional transmission planning standards, Mr. Beron maintained that the “no-build” alternative would be contrary to these necessities. However, he indicated that National Grid reviewed non-transmission alternatives with the assistance of its consultant ICF Resources. According to Mr. Beron, ICF Resources determined that non-transmission alternatives were not feasible alternatives to the Project.<sup>9</sup>

National Grid considered five (5) electrical alternatives to the Project, according to Mr. Beron, including the proposed Project. He indicated that four of the alternatives were found to have significant disadvantages to the proposed option. Likewise, alternate overhead routes evaluated by National Grid would result in significantly longer routes in Rhode Island and Massachusetts and thus, were not deemed the preferred option.<sup>10</sup> Additionally, National Grid considered various structure types and determined that “the proposed single-circuit H-Frame structures for constructing the new transmission lines offered more advantages, created fewer

---

<sup>7</sup> National Grid Exhibit 2 at 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 5. ICF’s findings are discussed in Mr. Rose’s testimony, summarized below.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 5-6.

impacts, and was a more cost-effective solution than either of the alternative structure types.<sup>11</sup> In addition to these options, National Grid also evaluated underground alternatives, selecting an alternative using solid dielectric cable installed along the public roadway network as the most feasible choice. However, when compared to the overhead options, the underground option was less desirable due to both cost and operational issues.<sup>12</sup>

Discussing the estimated costs of the preferred alternative, Mr. Beron stated that the study grade estimate (plus or minus twenty-five percent) for the Proposed Project is expected to be \$181,000,000 for the Rhode Island components.<sup>13</sup> Mr. Beron provided a high level discussion of the construction schedule to take place following the receipt of all permits and licenses. First, vegetation will be cleared as necessary within the right-of-way. Second is the completion of access road and work pad construction and maintenance, including the construction of temporary swamp mat access roads, as necessary. Third, unused steel lattice towers will be removed. Fourth, foundations and pole structures will be installed. Fifth, insulators, shield wires and conductors will be installed. Sixth, restoration efforts will be completed. Finally, the Sherman Road Switching Station will be reconstructed.<sup>14</sup> This is all expected to be started in early 2014 with an in-service date in late 2015.<sup>15</sup>

In their Pre-Filed Testimony Mr. Gabremicael and Mr. Stevens provided additional testimony regarding the need for the proposed Project. They described the process by which National Grid determined the transmission system improvements were necessary, including participation in the working group comprised of ISO-NE, National Grid and Northeast Utilities to find solutions to certain problems with the reliability of the bulk transmission system as

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 7-8.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 8.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 8-9.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 9.

identified in the New England East-West solutions.<sup>16</sup> Without the upgrades, according to Messers. Gabremicael and Stevens, “the system would experience thermal overloads and voltage performance issues under certain conditions and the inability to transfer power across southern New England.”<sup>17</sup>

In his Pre-Filed Testimony, Mr. Rose discussed the feasibility of non-electric alternatives to address the constraints in the transmission system described by Messers. Gabremicael and Stevens. Mr. Rose stated that ICF’s assessment was designed “to determine whether new generation or incremental demand resources, alone or in combination, could resolve the transmission network thermal violations that the Interstate Reliability Project resolved.”<sup>18</sup> The conclusion was that there was no feasible or practical non-transmission solution that would meet the needs to be resolved by the Interstate Reliability Project.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, according to Mr. Rose, even hypothetical solutions identified would be “unprecedented in scope, immensely costly, difficult or impossible to implement, and less flexible and robust in operation than Interstate” Reliability Project.<sup>20</sup> Explaining the basis for his conclusion, Mr. Rose discussed the modeling process used to determine the extent of the problems to be solved, the non-transmission alternatives examined, including demand side resources, central generation and a combination of the two.<sup>21</sup> Mr. Rose highlighted the challenges associated with these non-transmission solutions, particularly the need for multiple power plants and demand resources in several locations, the “absence of centralized multi-state procedures for non-transmission alternative implementation,” too much reliance on demand response by ISO-NE, a higher

---

<sup>16</sup> National Grid Exhibit 3 at 4-6.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

<sup>18</sup> National Grid Exhibit 4 at 3.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 4-7.

financial risk to ratepayers from the likely need for contracts to recover revenue shortfalls, large capital costs and the inability to spread costs over the region.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, he stated that ICF determined that the cost associated with these solutions would be approximately thirty (30) times the cost of the Interstate Reliability Project. Mr. Rose stated that ICF ultimately determined that the proposed Interstate Reliability Project was superior to the non-transmission alternatives reviewed, both in reliability and cost.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, in his Pre-Filed Testimony Mr. Campilli discussed the underground alternatives National Grid reviewed in the course of developing the proposed Project. He discussed the parameters of underground routes in the existing right-of-way and using a public roadway network. Next, he discussed the type of underground cable that would be used. Then he discussed the challenges that exist with the underground alternative, including lengthy outage times, matching line ratings, additional equipment that would be necessary to match the overhead line ratings, and power control issues. Finally, Mr. Campilli estimated that construction of the underground alternative, based on a study grade estimate would cost approximately \$1.26 billion compared to the estimated \$214 million for the overhead construction.<sup>24</sup>

On December 20, 2012, ISO-NE submitted the Pre-Filed Joint Direct Testimony of Stephen Rourke, Vice President of System Planning and Brent Oberlin, Director of Transmission Planning at ISO New England. Messers. Rourke and Oberlin discussed the ISO's concerns with the reliability of the transmission system in southern New England, noting critical weaknesses

---

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* at 8-16.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 18.

<sup>24</sup> National Grid Exhibit 5 at 3-7.

identified in Rhode Island as part of the September 2012 Needs Assessment.<sup>25</sup> The witnesses explained that “there is an increasingly high risk that the system will be unable to withstand single and multiple element contingencies following the single loss or outage of certain critical facilities...as the system approaches or exceeds forecasted peak load levels.”<sup>26</sup> According to ISO-NE, the Interstate Reliability Project component of the New England East-West Solution (“NEEWS”) is still needed and is the preferred transmission solution to address the reliability concerns previously noted.<sup>27</sup>

On January 19, 2013, the Division of Public Utilities and Carriers (“Division”) submitted the Pre-Filed Direct Testimony of Gregory L. Booth, its consultant. Mr. Booth is the President of PowerServices, Inc., an engineering and management services firm. He stated that the proposed Project was designed to meet a “very specific reliability and load serving need in Rhode Island.”<sup>28</sup> He dismissed a “no build” option as unacceptable. Likewise, he stated that while the alternatives, both transmission and non-transmission, reviewed by National Grid may represent solutions to the transmission reliability problem, they do not represent the best solution due to environmental impact and overall cost.<sup>29</sup> Mr. Booth opined that National Grid’s overhead costs may be somewhat overstated and the underground somewhat understated.<sup>30</sup> However, while he did not necessarily concur with every one of National Grid’s assumptions, he reached the conclusion that the proposed Project is necessary, is the most cost effective solution for

---

<sup>25</sup> National Grid Exhibit 6 at 3-4. The September 2012 Need Assessment is an updated assessment to previous ones performed as part of the New England East-West Solution.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 12.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>28</sup> Division Exhibit 1 at 37.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* at 37-40. Mr. Booth was skeptical of the level of demand resources that would be required to achieve the same results as the proposed Project, but did agree that the cost of such resources would exceed the costs of the proposed Project. *Id.* at 24-28.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 11-17, 29-32. Mr. Booth also expressed concern that National Grid’s construction schedule may be very aggressive given the availability of materials and construction crews. *Id.* at 17-19.

meeting the reliability needs of the transmission system, and provides an integrated transmission solution for the NEEWS.<sup>31</sup>

On February 7, 2013, National Grid submitted Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Beron, Messers. Gabremicael and Stevens, Mr. Rose, and Mr. Campilii in response to Mr. Booth's Pre-Filed Testimony. In response to a concern raised by Mr. Booth regarding the construction schedule, Mr. Beron provided more detail regarding the Project schedule, noting that only physical construction is included in the two-year schedule while material procurement will be initiated as early as February 2013 in order to receive the necessary materials for the start of construction in the first quarter of 2014. Likewise, the contractor pre-qualification process will begin in March 2013 in order to secure the limited workforce that is available for these types of projects. Therefore, Mr. Beron maintained that National Grid's proposed Project schedule is reasonable.<sup>32</sup> Messers. Gabremicael and Stevens provided more information regarding the manner in which the various alternatives to the proposed Project were designed.<sup>33</sup>

In addition to providing Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Rose also provided Supplemental Testimony to update his analysis of the non-transmission solutions based on corrected transmission line ratings. He concluded that while certain emergency line ratings were increased due to upgrades and the necessary demand reductions in Rhode Island are less than contained in his direct testimony, his overall opinion was still that "any hypothetical non-transmission alternative that was considered would be unprecedented in scope, immensely costly, difficult or impossible to implement, and less flexible in operation than [the proposed Project]."<sup>34</sup> In his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Rose acknowledged that additional concerns raised by Mr. Booth in his

---

<sup>31</sup> *Id.* at 36-41.

<sup>32</sup> National Grid Exhibit 6 at 1-3.

<sup>33</sup> National Grid Exhibit 7 at 1-3.

<sup>34</sup> National Grid Exhibit 8 at 1, 5-11, 18.



testimony regarding non-transmission alternatives were valid. He responded to some comments by Mr. Booth regarding the real-time availability of certain non-transmission alternatives, but ultimately noted that he and Mr. Booth both concluded that the non-transmission alternatives were not sufficient to resolve the reliability concerns addressed by the proposed Project.<sup>35</sup>

In his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Campilli provided some clarification on the development of his estimates for the underground routes reviewed, noting that the cost estimates were based on representative routes and thus, were not as detailed as they would be if the underground alternative were to be pursued. Additionally, Mr. Campilli provided some clarification on the development of his cost ratio calculations for the overhead and underground routes. Additionally, Mr. Campilli pointed to a math error behind one of Mr. Booth's calculations. Finally, Mr. Campilli stated that Mr. Booth's comments regarding the uncertainty of underground transmission construction, but noted that there was no dispute that the costs of the underground transmission are much higher than the proposed Project costs.<sup>36</sup>

## II. Hearing

On March 5, 2013, following public notice, the Commission conducted an evidentiary hearing at its offices at 89 Jefferson Boulevard, Warwick, Rhode Island. The following appearances were entered:

FOR NATIONAL GRID:

Peter V. Lacouture, Esq.  
Bess B. Gorman, Esq.

FOR ISO-NE:

Erika Bigelow, Esq.

FOR DIVISION:

Christy Hetherington, Esq.  
Special Assistant Attorney General

FOR COMMISSION:

Cynthia G. Wilson-Frias, Esq.  
Senior Legal Counsel

---

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at 21-27.

<sup>36</sup> *Id.* at 1-5.

National Grid presented Mr. Beron, Mr. Gabremicael, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Rose<sup>37</sup> and Mr. Campilii<sup>38</sup> for cross-examination. Mr. Beron showed the Commission a Power Point presentation to provide an overview of the proposed Project.<sup>39</sup> He explained that the proposed Project includes the construction of additional facilities which will make the transmission system more robust for Rhode Island.<sup>40</sup> Mr. Gabremicael testified that analysis showed that there are transmission deficiencies that exist now and this proposed Project is designed to address the current, as well as future, need.<sup>41</sup>

Regarding the cost component, Mr. Beron, Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Gabremicael expressed confidence that the costs of the proposed Project as designed would be subject to regionalization. As Mr. Stevens noted, “the ISO was chair of the working group and they were part of the formulation of studying the need and coming up with a proposed alternative and they agreed with the proposed alternative as the best one.”<sup>42</sup> The Company is in the process of completing the application package for submission.<sup>43</sup> Mr. Beron had explained that the application is submitted after much of the siting and permitting has been completed in case “some variation of the project or some aspect of the project were ordered that would not necessarily meet the regional cost allocation test, for example, the underground of an element.”<sup>44</sup>

Addressing the construction schedule, Mr. Beron agreed with Mr. Booth’s characterization of the schedule as aggressive, but explained that National Grid is not awaiting

---

<sup>37</sup> Mr. Rose summarized that his Supplemental Testimony addressed his determination that a non-transmission alternative, relying primarily on demand resources, would be a bit less of a problem than his initial testimony suggested, but it remained a very big problem and was still impractical in scope and cost. Tr. 3/5/13 at 76.

<sup>38</sup> Mr. Campilii summarized his Pre-Filed Testimony and reaffirmed that the cost of the underground alternative would still exceed \$1 billion. Tr. 3/5/13 at 89.

<sup>39</sup> Tr. 3/5/13 at 9-21.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.* at 22-23, 30-31.

<sup>41</sup> *Id.* at 64, 68-69.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 65-66.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* at 65.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 34.

receipt of all permits before proceeding with its procurement activities, noting that there is an active Request for Proposals for certain materials while the final permit will most likely not be received until as late as 2014.<sup>45</sup> He indicated that the schedule allows approximately two years for construction with the project split into two parts. One part will be the construction of the line from Millbury, Massachusetts to West Farnum and the other from West Farnum to the Rhode Island/Connecticut border. Therefore, National Grid expects each part to be constructed simultaneously, thus reducing the construction time frame.<sup>46</sup> With regard to the design components, Mr. Beron explained that the H frame construction is more cost effective and more environmentally friendly.<sup>47</sup>

The Division presented Mr. Booth for cross-examination. Mr. Booth summarized his position that the proposed Project is needed and that National Grid chose an economical way to construct the lines with the least impact on property owners and the environment using the least cost design.<sup>48</sup> He confirmed that his disagreements with National Grid were not with the ultimate conclusion, but with certain assumptions, particularly with the cost of the underground solution which he deemed doable but much more expensive. In addition, Mr. Booth opined that the underground option would expose Rhode Island to reliability problems for a longer period due to longer construction times that would be needed.<sup>49</sup> He continued to express some skepticism with the construction schedule based on his recent experience with transmission construction, noting that “there is an enormous amount of transmission being built in the United States” with a limited skilled labor force and limited manufacturing of the necessary products.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* at 37-40.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* at 43-45.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.* at 40-42.

<sup>48</sup> *Id.* at 105.

<sup>49</sup> *Id.* at 99-101.

<sup>50</sup> *Id.* at 102.

However, he stated that “Mr. Beron did a nice job of laying out how they are starting the bidding and acquiring materials in advance of all the design being completed and that will give them a better opportunity of meeting the schedule that they are proposing.”<sup>51</sup>

### **III. Commission Findings/Recommendation**

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission considered the evidence presented and voted unanimously (2-0) that the proposed Project using the preferred alternative (A-1) is needed and represents the best and most effective cost solution.<sup>52</sup> It was undisputed in the Record that there are transmission upgrades necessary to relieve existing transmission constraints on the electric grid, particularly from east to west and from west to east across Southern New England and to satisfy both national and regional transmission planning standards. It was also undisputed that the overhead alternative presented as the preferred alternative was the least cost solution. Additionally, it was undisputed that the non-transmission alternatives were not practical or cost-effective. Therefore, the Commission advises the EFSB that it finds the proposed Project as filed to be needed and to be the least cost solution.

Accordingly, it is hereby

(21003) RECOMMENDED:

1. That the Energy Facility Siting Board find that there is a need to (1) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (2) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the

---

<sup>51</sup> *Id.* at 101.


<sup>52</sup> *Id.* at 111. Commission Chairman Germani, as the Chairman of the EFSB, did not participate in the Commission’s process to develop an Advisory Opinion to the EFSB.

Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (4) Replace and/or modify a number of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.

2. That the Energy Facility Siting Board find that Narragansett's proposed overhead configuration represents the most reasonable cost alternative to provide adequate, safe and reliable transmission service to the region.


EFFECTIVE AT WARWICK, RHODE ISLAND PURSUANT TO A BENCH  
DECISION MEETING DECISION MARCH 5, 2013. WRITTEN ADVISORY OPINION  
ISSUED APRIL 8, 2013.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION



\_\_\_\_\_  
\*Elia Germani, Chairman

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary E. Bray, Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul J. Roberti, Commissioner

\*Chairman Germani recused himself from this proceeding due to his involvement in the EFSB Proceeding as Chairman of the EFSB.

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

IN RE: ISSUANCE OF ADVISORY OPINION :  
TO THE ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD :  
REGARDING THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC : DOCKET NO. 4360  
COMPANY D/B/A NATIONAL GRID'S APPLICATION :  
TO CONSTRUCT AND ALTER MAJOR FACILITIES :  
(INTERSTATE RELIABILITY PROJECT) :

**ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ENERGY FACILITY SITING BOARD  
PURSUANT TO NOTICE OF DESIGNATION ISSUED OCTOBER 10, 2012  
ERRATA**

Whereas, Pursuant to Rule 1.28(a) of the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission through this notice of erratum corrects a "clerical mistake" contained in Commission Advisory Opinion No. 21003 to the Energy Facility Siting Board, previously issued in this docket, on April 8, 2013; and

Whereas, on Page 2, paragraph two, which reads:

In his Pre-Filed Testimony, Mr. Beron provided an overview of the Project, including the cost and alternatives reviewed. Mr. Beron identified four parts of the Project: (1) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (2) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (4) Replace and/or modify a number of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.<sup>1</sup>

is hereby corrected to read:

In his Pre-Filed Testimony, Mr. Beron provided an overview of the Project, including the cost and alternatives reviewed. Mr. Beron identified eight parts of the Project: (1) Construct approximately 4.8 miles of new 345 kV transmission line (366 Line) on existing Right-of-Ways ("ROWS") from the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in North Smithfield, Rhode Island to the West Farnum Substation in North Smithfield; (2) Construct approximately 17.7 miles of new 345 kV transmission line (341 Line) on existing ROWs from the West Farnum Substation to the Rhode Island/Connecticut border in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and reconductor approximately 9.2 miles of an existing 345 kV transmission line (328 Line) from the West Farnum Substation in North Smithfield to the Sherman Road Switching Station in Burrillville; (4) Reconstruct the

---

<sup>1</sup> National Grid Exhibit 2 at 4.

existing Sherman Road Switching Station; (5) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (6) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (7) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (8) Replace and/or modify a number of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.<sup>2</sup> and

Whereas, on pages 12-13, Ordering Paragraph One, which reads:

1. That the Energy Facility Siting Board find that there is a need to (1) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (2) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (4) Replace and/or modify a number of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.

is hereby corrected to read:

1. That the Energy Facility Siting Board find that there is a need to (1) Construct approximately 4.8 miles of new 345 kV transmission line (366 Line) on existing Right-of-Ways ("ROWs") from the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in North Smithfield, Rhode Island to the West Farnum Substation in North Smithfield; (2) Construct approximately 17.7 miles of new 345 kV transmission line (341 Line) on existing ROWs from the West Farnum Substation to the Rhode Island/Connecticut border in Burrillville; (3) Reconstruct and reconductor approximately 9.2 miles of an existing 345 kV transmission line (328 Line) from the West Farnum Substation in North Smithfield to the Sherman Road Switching Station in Burrillville; (4) Reconstruct the existing Sherman Road Switching Station; (5) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (3361 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the NSTAR segment of the 3361 Line at the Massachusetts/Rhode Island border in Burrillville; (6) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (333 Line) from the Sherman Road Switching Station to the Ocean State Power Generating Plant in Burrillville; (7) Reconstruct and realign approximately 0.25 miles of the existing 345 kV transmission line (347 Line) outside of the Sherman Road Switching Station, and replace and/or modify other 346 Line structures to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line; and (8) Replace and/or modify a number

---

<sup>2</sup> National Grid Exhibit 2 at 3-4.

of existing structures of the 115 kV transmission line (B-32 Line) to accommodate the construction of the 341 Line.


Accordingly, it is hereby

(21007) ORDERED:

That the correction described herein is adopted by the Commission and shall constitute a permanent amendment to Commission Advisory Opinion No. 21003 to the Energy Facility Siting Board issued in Docket 4360.


DATED AND EFFECTIVE AT WARWICK, RHODE ISLAND, ON APRIL 9,  
2013.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION



\_\_\_\_\_  
\*Elia Germani, Chairman

  
Mary E. Bray, Commissioner

  
Paul J. Roberti, Commissioner

\*Chairman Germani recused himself from this proceeding due to his involvement in the EFSB Proceeding as Chairman of the EFSB.