

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Energy Facilities Siting Board

In the Matter of the Petition of New England Power)
Company for Approval to Construct Two 115 kV)
Underground Electric Transmission Cables and)
Associated Equipment in Boston and Quincy,)
Massachusetts)

The Petition of New England Power Company for)
a Determination that the Two Proposed Electric)
Transmission Cables in the Cities of Boston and Quincy)
are Necessary and Will Serve the Public Convenience)
and be Consistent with the Public Interest)

EFSB 97-3

The Petition of New England Power Company for)
Exemption of Proposed Electric Substation Improvements)
from the Zoning By-Laws of the City of Quincy)

FINAL DECISION

Jolette A. Westbrook
Hearing Officer
October 9, 1998

On the Decision:
Enid Kumin
Dana G. Reed

APPEARANCES: Kathryn J. Reid, Esq.
New England Power Company
25 Research Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01582
FOR: New England Power Company
Petitioner

Michael K. Crossen, Esq.
Rubin and Rudman, LLP
50 Rowes Wharf
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-3319
FOR: Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
Intervenor

Jack Driscoll, Esq.
Edward J. Corcoran II, Esq.
David P. Mullen, Esq.
Massachusetts Highway Department
10 Park Plaza
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
FOR: Massachusetts Highway Department
Intervenor

Charles R. Tevnan
84 St. Brendan Road
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02124
Interested Person

Jeanne DuBois
Dorchester Bay Economic Development Corp.
594 Columbia Road, Suite 302
Dorchester, Massachusetts 02125
Interested Person

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1. | <u>Standard of Review</u> | 36 |
| 2. | <u>Development of Siting Criteria</u> | 36 |
| | a. <u>Description</u> | 36 |
| | b. <u>Analysis</u> | 43 |
| 3. | <u>Geographic Diversity</u> | 44 |
| 4. | <u>Conclusions on the Site Selection Process</u> | 45 |
| C. | <u>Environmental Impacts, Cost and Reliability of the Proposed and Alternative Facilities</u> | 45 |
| | 1. <u>Standard of Review</u> | 45 |
| | 2. <u>Analysis of the Proposed Facilities Along the Primary Route</u> | 47 |
| | a. <u>Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Facilities Along the Primary Route</u> | 47 |
| | (i) <u>Water Resources</u> | 48 |
| | (ii) <u>Land Resources</u> | 50 |
| | (iii) <u>Land Use</u> | 52 |
| | (iv) <u>Visual</u> | 57 |
| | (v) <u>Magnetic Field Levels</u> | 59 |
| | (vi) <u>Conclusions on Environmental Impacts</u> | 61 |
| | b. <u>Cost of the Proposed Facilities Along the Primary Route</u> | 62 |
| | c. <u>Conclusions</u> | 63 |
| | 3. <u>Analysis of the Proposed Facilities Along the Alternative Route</u> | 63 |
| | a. <u>Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Facilities Along the Alternative Route and Comparison</u> | 63 |
| | (i) <u>Water Resources</u> | 64 |
| | (ii) <u>Land Resources</u> | 65 |
| | (iii) <u>Land Use</u> | 67 |
| | (iv) <u>Visual Impacts</u> | 69 |
| | (v) <u>Magnetic Field Levels</u> | 70 |
| | (vi) <u>Conclusions on Environmental Impacts</u> | 70 |
| | b. <u>Cost of the Proposed Facilities along the Alternative Route and Comparison</u> | 71 |
| | c. <u>Conclusions</u> | 71 |
| IV. | <u>ZONING EXEMPTIONS/PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND INTEREST</u> | 72 |
| | A. <u>Standard of Review</u> | 73 |
| | B. <u>Analysis and Findings</u> | 76 |
| V. | <u>DECISION</u> | 78 |

FIGURES:

FIGURE 1: PRIMARY AND ALTERNATIVE ROUTES

FIGURE 2: ALTERNATIVE ROUTES EVALUATED

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| MVA | Megavoltamperes |
| MW | Megawatt |
| NEES | New England Electric System |
| NEPCo | New England Power Company |
| Neponset River ACEC | Neponset River Area of Critical Environmental Concern |
| NEPOOL | New England Power Pool |
| NEPSCo | New England Power Service Company |
| Quincy | City of Quincy |
| ROW | Right-of-way |
| RPA | Rivers Protection Act |
| Siting Board | Energy Facilities Siting Board |
| Siting Council | Energy Facilities Siting Council |

Unanimously APPROVED by the Energy Facilities Siting Board at its meeting of October 8, 1998 by the members and designees present and voting. Voting for approval of the Tentative Decision as amended: Janet Gail Besser (Chair, EFSB/DTE); James Connelly (Commissioner, DTE); W. Robert Keating (Commissioner, DTE); and David L. O'Connor (for David A. Tibbetts, Director, Department of Economic Development).

Janet Gail Besser
Chair

Dated this 9th day of October, 1998.

Appeal as to matters of law from any final decision, order or ruling of the Siting Board may be taken to the Supreme Judicial Court by an aggrieved party in interest by the filing of a written petition praying that the order of the Siting Board be modified or set aside in whole or in part.

Such petition for appeal shall be filed with the Siting Board within twenty days after the date of service of the decision, order or ruling of the Siting Board, or within such further time as the Siting Board may allow upon request filed prior to the expiration of the twenty days after the date of service of said decision, order or ruling. Within ten days after such petition has been filed, the appealing party shall enter the appeal in the Supreme Judicial Court sitting in Suffolk County by filing a copy thereof with the clerk of said court. (Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 25, Sec. 5; Chapter 164, Sec. 69P).