

Lee D. Hoffman
90 State House Square
Hartford, CT 06103-3702
p 860 424 4315
f 860 424 4370
lhoffman@pullcom.com
www.pullcom.com

June 3, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

Melanie Bachman, Esq.
Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket 550 - Brookfield Husky Solar, LLC d/b/a Verogy application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a 50-megawatt-AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility and associated equipment on 9 parcels generally located east and west of Sterling Road (Route 14) along the Plainfield municipal boundary in Sterling, Connecticut; north of Sterling Hill Road along the Sterling municipal boundary and west of the intersection of Sugar Brook Road and Black Hill Road (Route 14) in Plainfield, Connecticut and associated electrical interconnection

Dear Ms. Bachman:

I am writing on behalf of my client, Brookfield Husky Solar, LLC (“Verogy” or the “Applicant”), in connection with the above-referenced Docket. Specifically, I am writing in response to Sterling Property LLC and Pure Hedge LLC’s (collectively “the Companies”) June 2, 2026 filing in this Docket.

On page 2 of the Companies’ filing, the Companies cite to page 1 of the Council’s Opinion in Docket No. 98 where the Council approved the 115 kV transmission line in question. The Companies go on to say “The Line is on the Companies’ property. The Line was constructed by the former owner of the property in order to enable the Exeter Energy facility to transmit electricity and the Companies currently pay co-maintenance fees for the Line.” *Id.*

The citation to page 1 of the Opinion is apt, but as with the Companies’ previous filing, it is incomplete. The Council went on to note on page 1 of the Opinion that although Exeter would design and construct the line, it would “then transfer the title to CL&P. CL&P would then own the line, with maintenance and repairs conducted under contractual agreement with Exeter.”¹ Thus, the

¹ Council Docket 98, Opinion at 1 (May 15, 1989), *available at* <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/csc/dockets-and-other-pending->

Companies no longer own the line in question, even though it may lie under the Companies' property.

As articulated in greater detail in the Applicant's May 27, 2026 filing in this Docket, there is no doubt that the facility no longer maintains interconnection rights to use any portion of the line. FERC put this matter to bed rather succinctly in March of 2022: "regarding BRTM's request for clarification whether Sterling retains any rights to the use of 87 MW of capacity on the CL&P Tie Line, as the Commission stated in the Termination Order, under the ISO-NE Tariff, a 'retired' resource's interconnection rights are terminated. As such, there have been no interconnection rights associated with the Facility since ISO-NE deemed the Facility 'retired' in 2017."² Thus, in addition to lacking ownership rights outright in the line, the Companies lack *any* interconnection rights as ruled on by FERC.

The Companies are requesting that the Council grant them party status under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-177a. For the Council to grant that request, however, the Companies must demonstrate that their "legal rights, duties or privileges shall be specifically affected by the agency's decision in the contested case." As articulated above, the Companies have no ownership rights in the 115 kV line. CL&P now owns that line, as the Council itself noted in Docket No. 98. Moreover, as FERC decided four years ago, any interconnection rights the Companies may have had in the line ceased to exist nearly a decade ago. As such, the Companies do not meet the standard for party status under section 4-177a.

Should you have any questions concerning this submittal, please contact me or Kate Boucher of this office at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Lee D. Hoffman

cc: Docket 550 Service List

[proceedings/dockets001_100/doc98opn.pdf?rev=5facd48012664fed8451b68bf3c01b78&hash=0B285E17EE3E5055EC749AF0C9E4A04C](https://www.ferc.gov/proceedings/dockets001_100/doc98opn.pdf?rev=5facd48012664fed8451b68bf3c01b78&hash=0B285E17EE3E5055EC749AF0C9E4A04C)

² Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Docket ER21-2860-001, Order Addressing Arguments Raised on Rehearing and Clarification re The Connecticut Light and Power Company under ER21-2860 at P23 (March 24, 2022) (footnotes omitted), *available at* https://elibrary.ferc.gov/eLibrary/filelist?accession_number=20220324-3043&optimized=false&sid=763d1534-e9ba-4234-8c87-a0e665f7ef81.