

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

Homestead Fuel Cell 1, LLC petition for a declaratory	)	
ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and	)	Petition 1458
§16-50k, for the proposed construction, maintenance and	)	
operation of a grid-side 8.4-megawatt fuel cell facility	)	
located at 441 Homestead Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut,	)	
and associated electrical interconnection to Eversource	)	September 17, 2021
Energy’s existing Northwest Hartford Substation	)	

**ALLCO RENEWABLE ENERGY LIMITED’S INTERROGATORIES TO  
HOMESTEAD FUEL CELL 1, LLC.**

Propounding Party: Allco Renewable Energy Limited

Responding Parties: Homestead Fuel Cell 1, LLC

SET NO.: One

1. Referring to Petition page 6 and the following statement therein: “The Project will provide the state’s electrical system with additional generating capacity that will meet demand using renewable energy, upgrade grid infrastructure, contribute to grid stability and foster the redevelopment and reuse of an underutilized property.”
  - a. Explain how the Project uses renewable energy.
  - b. What source of renewable energy will the Project use?
  - c. Explain how the Project would upgrade grid infrastructure.
  - d. Explain how the Project would contribute to the state’s grid stability.
  - e. Do you have any independent third-party, science-based analyses that reach the conclusion that using natural gas for electricity generation is using renewable energy? If so, please provide it.
  
2. Referring to Petition page 6 and the following statements therein: “The State of Connecticut has articulated its energy goals in the Comprehensive Energy Strategy (“CES”) as encouraging the provision of cheap, clean, reliable electricity, fostering the development of microgrids and promoting economic development and job growth. As a distributed, baseload source of electricity, the Project will reduce the electric load that would otherwise be required of the electric grid, thereby reducing stress on the system and reducing load on overloaded transmission lines. The fuel cell power plants will be manufactured in Connecticut, and installed and operated by FCE on behalf of HFC1. Thus, the Project satisfies the articulated goals of the CES.”
  - a. Please provide the citations to the CES that support those statements.
  - b. Explain how the Project can be considered to generate “clean” electricity.
  - c. Explain how the Project can be considered to generate “cheap” electricity.

- d. Explain how the Project will reduce the electric load.
  - e. Explain how the Project will foster the development of microgrids.
  - f. Explain how the Project will reduce the load on the transmission system in light of the fact that section 2.2.5 of the DEEP RFP in which the Project was selected requires that the Project's electricity be delivered to a New England Pool Transmission Facility ("PTF").
3. Referring to Petition page 8 and the following statements therein: "While HFC1 currently has no immediate plan to install a fourth system, HFC1 wishes to advise the Council that HFC1 bid into the recent SCEF Year 2 RFP for such a project and, if selected, HFC1 will submit an amendment to this Petition to the Council for the planned installation of a fourth separately metered (and entirely separate fuel cell system as permitted under the SCEF Rules)."
    - a. Now that the results of the SCEF Year 2 RFP are known, do you intend to construct a fourth system? If so, please explain. If not, please explain.
  4. Referring to Petition page 9 and the following statements therein: "A feasibility study was conducted by Eversource and completed in December of 2018. That study confirmed that the Northwest Hartford Substation could accommodate the generation of the fuel cell plant with minor upgrades. However, that study has since expired, and HFC1 has requested a new application for an updated feasibility study and likely an associated System Impact Study."
    - a. With an expired study and no system impact study, please explain how Petitioner satisfied, and continues to satisfy, the DEEP RFP requirement under section 2.2.5 that required, and requires, the Petitioner to "demonstrate how the power will get to the PTF, interconnect at the Capacity Capability Interconnection Standard, demonstrate delivery without material constraint or curtailment and show upgrade necessary to ensure full deliverability".
  5. Referring to Petition page 11 and the following statements therein: "It is also important to note that FCE has previously developed, installed, and operated two separate fuel cell systems in the City of Hartford at Trinity College and at Hartford Hospital. Both of these projects were approved by the Council. See Petition Nos. 1317 (Trinity College) (Approved, September 15, 2017); and Petition No. 1067 (Hartford Hospital) (Approved, July 25, 2013)."
    - a. Please explain why it is important to note that FCE has developed those two fuel cell systems.
  6. Referring to Petition page 11 and the following statement therein: "The Project will provide up to 8.4 MW of clean electrical energy without the environmental impacts normally associated with the use of natural gas as a fuel."
    - a. Please explain how the Project provides clean electrical energy.
    - b. Please explain Your definition of clean in the phrase "clean electrical energy."

7. Referring to the Facility Sound Assessment prepared by Modeling Specialties dated October 26, 2020:
  - a. Page 6 states that a wind screen was used. The manual for the RION NA-28 states that the wind screen is recommended only “When making outdoor measurements in windy weather or when measuring air conditioning equipment or similar.” Why was the windscreen used?
  - b. What effects on sound measurement does the wind screen have?
  - c. Why was the microphone placed at a height of five feet?
  - d. What is the effect of changing the height of the microphone?
  - e. Page 8 states that sound from “short term or infrequent sources” were excluded. What short term or infrequent sources were excluded?
  - f. Reference page 8, what was the L<sub>10</sub> measurement for Homestead Ave @ Fence at 12:20AM?
  - g. Reference page 8, what was the L<sub>10</sub> measurement for Homestead Ave @ Fence at 11:47AM?
  
8. Reference page 9 the Facility Sound Assessment prepared by Modeling Specialties dated October 26, 2020 and the statement: “This analysis represents the most likely sound levels to be expected as a result of the normal operation of the facility using manufacturer’s data and measurements of similar equipment at other fuel cell installations.”
  - a. What is the confidence level that equates to the reference “most likely”?
  - b. What data and measurements did the manufacturer provide?
  - c. Did Modeling Specialties take its own sound measurements of existing Fuel Cell Energy facilities? If no, why not? If yes, please provide that data.
  
9. Reference page 9 the Facility Sound Assessment prepared by Modeling Specialties dated October 26, 2020 and the statement: “A computer model was developed for the facility’s sound levels based on conservative sound propagation principles prescribed in the acoustics literature.”
  - a. What software was used for the computer model?
  - b. Please provide all assumptions that were input into the computer model?
  - c. Please elaborate on what sound propagation principles are referred to?
  - d. Please list what acoustics literature is referred to.
  
10. Reference page 9 the Facility Sound Assessment prepared by Modeling Specialties dated October 26, 2020 and the statement: “There are several sources of modest sound at the facility. Under normal conditions, most of those sources will produce consistent sound through the day and night. Several sources will cycle on and off as required by the facility operation.”
  - a. Please list the “several sources of modest sound at the facility.”
  - b. What sources “will produce consistent sound through the day and night.”
  - c. What sources “will cycle on and off.”
  
11. Reference Table 2 and Table 3 of the Facility Sound Assessment prepared by Modeling Specialties dated October 26, 2020. Please provide projected the L<sub>eq</sub>, the L<sub>10</sub> and the L<sub>90</sub>

measurements at 12:20AM for each of the receptors listed in Table 3 (under conditions similar to those that existed at 12:20AM on October 8, 2020).

12. Please list what other fuel cell facilities that Fuel Cell Energy Inc. or an affiliate has installed and that are currently operating in the State of Connecticut.
13. Has there been a noise study or review of the any of the facilities listed in the answer to interrogatory #12 since commencement of commercial operation? If so, please provide it.
14. Referring to the list of the facilities listed in the answer to interrogatory #12:
  - a. What has been the availability factor of each of those facilities since commencement of commercial operation?
  - b. What has been the capacity factor of each of those facilities since commencement of commercial operation?
  - c. What has been the efficiency factor of each of those facilities since commencement of commercial operation?
  - d. Have there been any issues with the operation of any of those facilities? If so, please explain what issues there have been and how they have been addressed.
  - e. Have there been any complaints made by nearby residents with the operation of any of those facilities? If so, please provide a copy of the complaints.
  - f. Has there been an independent, third-party analysis done to determine the non-CO2 emissions produced by any of those facilities? If so, please provide it.
  - g. Has there been an independent, third-party analysis done to determine the CO2 emissions produced by any of those facilities? If so, please provide it.
  - h. Has there been an independent, third-party analysis done of the levels of hazardous materials in the fuel cell stack of any of those facilities? If so, please provide it.
  - i. Has there been an independent, third-party analysis done of the levels of hazardous materials in the components in the fuel processing system of any of those facilities? If so, please provide it.
  - j. Please provide a copy of your procedures for removing and disposing of hazardous materials that exist in the cell stack assemblies and components in the fuel processing system.
15. Referring to Petition page 26 and the statement therein that the height of the facility will be “approximately 33 feet above ground level.”
  - a. At Petition page 21 it is claimed that “[t]he proposed facility will not be visible from residential areas.” Identify the structures that are higher than 70’ and in-between the Project and residential areas.
  - b. Will any part of the Project be viewable from the locations listed under the “Receptor” heading of Table 1. If so, which locations?
16. Referring to Petition page 20, Table 2 and Table 3:
  - a. How many lbs CO2 are produced per megawatt-hour of electricity from the fuel cells?
  - b. How many lbs CO2 are produced per megawatt-hour of electricity from the gas fired start up burners?
  - c. Table 3 states that 644 tpy CO2e of methane is an emission from the facility. How much

- methane is released per megawatt-hour of electricity?
- d. Please provide an independent, third-party analysis of that supports that numbers listed in Tables 2 and 3.
17. Referring to Petition page 21 and the statement therein: “With regard to methane emissions specifically, the methane is normally completely converted to hydrogen by the reforming reaction within the fuel cell stacks, but any remaining unconverted methane (for example at low power conditions) is destroyed by a subsequent catalytic oxidation reactor in the fuel cell process. Between the reforming and oxidation processes, virtually all of the methane is destroyed, although trace amounts may survive and be present in the exhaust at very low levels (parts per million).”
    - a. Please provide an independent, third-party analysis of that supports that statement.
  18. Referring to Petition page 22 and the statement therein: “Electrical energy generated by the Project will generate 980 lbs/MWh of CO<sub>2</sub>.”
    - a. Please provide an independent, third-party analysis of that supports that statement.
  19. Referring to Petition page 22 and the statement therein: “average CO<sub>2</sub> footprint of utility grid power, ...is 1,501 lbs CO<sub>2</sub> per MWh (EPA EGRID 2016 (February 2018) US, non-baseload). Consequently, the Project will generate 521 lbs/MWh less CO<sub>2</sub>—or approximately 19,169 fewer tons per year—than utility grid power.”
    - a. Why is it appropriate to use EPA EGRID 2016, when ISO-New England reported in March 2021 that the average CO<sub>2</sub> footprint of utility grid power was 633 lbs CO<sub>2</sub> per MWh for 2019 and has been steadily declining? See [https://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2021/03/2019\\_air\\_emissions\\_report.pdf](https://www.iso-ne.com/static-assets/documents/2021/03/2019_air_emissions_report.pdf) and

**Table 1-1**  
**2018 and 2019 ISO New England System Emissions (ktons)**  
**and Emission Rates (lbs/MWh)**

Annual System <sup>(a)</sup> Emissions						
	2018 Emissions (ktons)	2019 Emissions (ktons)	Change in Emissions (%)	2018 Emission Rate (lbs/MWh)	2019 Emission Rate (lbs/MWh)	Change in Emission Rate (%)
<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	15.61	12.87	-17.6	0.30	0.26	-13.3
<b>SO<sub>2</sub></b>	4.96	2.34	-52.8	0.10	0.05	-50.0
<b>CO<sub>2</sub></b>	34,096	30,997	-9.1	658	633	-3.8

(a) The term “system” refers to native generation here and throughout the report.

20. Admit that based upon the *2019 ISO-New England 2019 ISO New England Electric Generator Air Emissions Report (March 2021)*, the proposed project will generate at least 347 lbs/MWh more CO<sub>2</sub> than utility grid power in ISO-New England. If you deny, please explain in detail the basis for your denial.
21. Referring to Petition page 23 and the statement therein: “Prior to accessing the spent media, the vessel is inerted with nitrogen to allow safe access into the vessel. During this inertion process, a small volume of natural gas is vented to atmosphere.”

- a. Exactly how much natural gas will be vented into the atmosphere?
  - b. What is the maximum number of times during a year that this venting will occur?
22. Referring to Petition page 23, how much benzene is released each year into the air and not captured by the solid waste media?
23. Referring to Petition page 23 and the statement therein: “The benzene, present in the natural gas in very low parts per million concentrations or less, is co-adsorbed onto the media along with the target sulfur compounds. The total waste generation quantity (media plus adsorbed sulfur compounds) during any single desulfurizer media replacement event is less than 2,000 pounds (900 kg) and previous operating experience throughout Connecticut suggests that desulfurizer maintenance events for any single fuel cell plant will be no more frequent than annually, and more likely less frequent than every two years (it varies, depending on the actual sulfur concentration in the gas locally).”
  - a. What is the exact amount of benzene present in the natural gas in parts per million?
  - b. What has been the maximum number of desulfurizer maintenance events within a single calendar year for a single fuel cell plant built by FCE?
  - c. If all three of the fuel cells that comprise the Project have their media replacements in the same month, would the monthly waste exceed the range for generators that operate under the Small Quantity Generator rules?
24. Referring to Petition page 27 and the statement therein: “the Project will actually provide an environmental benefit to the State of Connecticut by reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by approximately 19,169 tpy as compared to utility grid power.”
  - a. Please explain why that statement is not completely false in light of the *2019 ISO-New England 2019 ISO New England Electric Generator Air Emissions Report* (March 2021) referred to above.
25. Do you agree the addition of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the Project would pollute, impair or aid in destroying the air, water or other natural resources of the State of Connecticut? If not, please explain why not.
26. Do you agree that the area for the proposed Project is an environmental justice community? If not, please explain why not.
27. Do you agree that the residential area surrounding and affected by the proposed Project has one of the highest incidents of emergency room hospital visit rates for asthma in the State of Connecticut? If not, please explain why not.
28. Do you agree that the residential area surrounding and affected by the proposed Project has one of the highest incidents of hospitalizations for asthma in the State of Connecticut? If not, please explain why not.
29. Have you examined how a facility like the Project can affect communities that already have high rates of emergency room visits and hospitalizations for asthma? If not, please explain why not.

30. Do you agree that communities that experience high rates of emergency room visits and hospitalizations for asthma have justifiable safety concern with projects such as the Project? If not, please explain why not.
31. Do you agree with the statement: “Climate change poses an existential threat to humanity.” William Tong, *State of Connecticut v. Exxon Mobil Corp.*, HHD-CV20-6132568-S (Conn. Sup. Ct. filed Sept. 14, 2020) No. 100.31 at P1. If not, please explain why not.
32. Do you agree with the statement: Connecticut is already suffering from “sea level rise, flooding, drought, increases in extreme temperatures and severe storms, decreases in air quality, contamination of drinking water, increases in the spread of diseases, and severe economic consequences.” *Id.* at P17. If not, please explain why not.
33. Do you agree with the statement: “[C]limate change will continue to have increasingly serious, life-threatening, and financially burdensome impacts on the people of Connecticut and the lands, waters, coastline, species, natural resources, critical ecosystems, infrastructure and other assets owned by the State and its political subdivisions.” *Id.* at P23. If not, please explain why not.
34. Do you agree with the statement: “Credible scientific evidence indicates-especially considering recent extreme weather events-that the catastrophic effects of climate change are occurring sooner than anticipated.” *Id.* at P172. If not, please explain why not.
35. Do you agree with the statement: “Climate change has negatively impacted, is negatively impacting, and will continue to negatively impact Connecticut's people, lands, waters, coastline, infrastructure, fish and wildlife, natural resources, critical ecosystems, and other assets owned by or held in the public trust by the state of Connecticut and/or its municipalities.” *Id.* at 173. If not, please explain why not.
36. Do you agree with the statement: “Climate change has caused, is causing, and will cause sea level rise, flooding, drought, an increase in extreme temperatures, a decrease in air quality, an increase in severe storms, contamination of drinking water, and an increase in certain disease-transmitting species.” *Id.* at 174. If not, please explain why not.
37. Do you agree with the statement: “As a result of the negative impacts on Connecticut's environment, climate change has caused, is causing, and will cause an increase in illness, infectious disease and death.” *Id.* at 175. If not, please explain why not.
38. Do you agree with the statement: “As a result of the negative impacts on Connecticut's environment, climate change has caused, is causing, and will cause serious damage to existing infrastructure, including but not limited to coastal and inland development, roadways, railways, dams, water and sewer systems, and other utilities.” *Id.* at 176. If not, please explain why not.

39. Do you agree with the statement: “As a result of the negative impacts on Connecticut's environment, climate change has caused, is causing, and will cause serious detrimental economic impacts on the State of Connecticut, its people, businesses and municipalities, including but not limited to heat-related productivity losses, increased energy cost and consumption, and agriculture, tourism, and recreation losses.” *Id.* at 177. If not, please explain why not.
40. Do you agree with the following statement in the DEEP Brief regarding the Project: “bringing this project on line would increase carbon dioxide emissions when compared with the expected emissions from the grid over the next 20 years, causing Connecticut to backslide on its climate goals.” If not, please explain why not.
41. Have you prepared or commissioned a report to look at the increased health risks, particularly to those with asthma, that the Project would impose upon nearby residents? If not, please explain why not. If yes, please provide a copy of such report(s).
42. Will the presence of sulfur in the fuel cell process cause any odor during the operation and maintenance of the Plant? If not, please explain how sulphur does not emit odor to the surrounding areas?
43. Dual-fuel (hydrogen and natural gas) projects are being constructed even in coal-friendly States for commercial operation in 2025 with a starting mix of 30% hydrogen. *See, e.g., <https://www.bv.com/news/black-veatch-supporting-western-power-agency-first-hydrogen-capable-combined-cycle-units>*. Why is the Project not committing to use a minimum level of hydrogen as a fuel source?
44. Will the Project participate in the ISO-NE market for ancillary services such as regulation, ten-minute synchronized reserves (TMSR), ten-minute non-synchronized reserve (TMNSR); and thirty-minute operating reserves (TMOR)? If not, explain why not. If yes, explain what ancillary services the Project will provide.
45. Will the Project participate in the ISO-NE forward capacity market? If so, commencing in what year?
46. Do you contend that New England has inadequate capacity resources to meet demand? If yes, please explain. If not, please explain why the Project is necessary.
47. Please explain why the Project is necessary in light to the Siting Council’s approval of the Killingly Energy Center (“KEC”) in docket 470B.
48. The Siting Council made a factual finding (number 120) in Docket 470B, order of June 6, 2019, that on a megawatt equivalent basis, a fuel cell project would result in far greater environmental impacts than the KEC. Do you dispute that finding? If so, please explain. If not, please explain why the Project is needed.
49. Please provide the annual quantity of each hazardous material that is expected to be



generated by the Project.

50. Referring to A-CSC-24, please provide the proposed plan or plans that show the location of the new upgraded pipeline.

Respectfully,

/s/Thomas Melone

Thomas Melone

Juris No. 438879

Allco Renewable Energy Limited

157 Church St., 19<sup>th</sup> floor, New Haven, CT 06510

Phone: (212) 681-1120

Email: [Thomas.Melone@AllcoUS.com](mailto:Thomas.Melone@AllcoUS.com)