



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950

E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov

Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

August 15, 2022

Kathleen M. Shanley
Manager – Transmission Siting
Eversource Energy
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270
Kathleen.shanley@eversource.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1527** – The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy petition for a declaratory ruling, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes §4-176 and §16-50k, for the proposed Stevenson to Pootatuck Rebuild Project consisting of the replacement and reconductoring of electric transmission line structures along approximately 8 miles of its existing Nos. 1560, 1808 and 1580 115-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission lines within existing Eversource electric transmission line right-of-way between Eversource's Stevenson Substation, 1 Roosevelt Drive in Monroe and The United Illuminating Company's Pootatuck Substation, 14 Old Stratford Road in Shelton, Connecticut, and related electric transmission line and substation improvements.

Dear Ms. Shanley:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than September 7, 2022. Please submit an original and 15 copies to the Council's office and an electronic copy to siting.council@ct.gov. In accordance with the State Solid Waste Management Plan and in accordance with Section 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, the Council requests all filings be submitted on recyclable paper, primarily regular weight white office paper. Please avoid using heavy stock paper, colored paper, and metal or plastic binders and separators. Fewer copies of bulk material may be provided as appropriate.

Please be advised that the original and 15 copies are required to be submitted to the Council's office on or before the September 7, 2022 deadline.

Copies of your responses are required to be provided to all parties and intervenors listed in the service list, which can be found on the Council's website under the "Pending Matters" link.

Any request for an extension of time to submit responses to interrogatories shall be submitted to the Council in writing pursuant to §16-50j-22a of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bachman
Executive Director

MB/RM

**Petition No. 1527 - Eversource
Stevenson to Pootatuck Rebuild Project
Monroe- Shelton, Connecticut**

Interrogatories – Set 1

1. What is the total estimated cost of the project? Of this total, what costs would be regionalized, and what costs would be localized? Estimate the percentages of the total cost that would be borne by Eversource ratepayers, Connecticut ratepayers, and the remainder of New England (excluding Connecticut) ratepayers, as applicable.
2. Is the proposed project identified in any ISO-New England, Inc. (ISO-NE) needs and solutions analyses? Is the proposed project on the ISO-NE Regional System Plan (RSP), Project List and/or Asset Condition List?
3. Identify all other permits required to perform the proposed work.
4. Has a response been received from the Federal Aviation Administration regarding requirements for marking and/or lighting of the 3 proposed replacement structures referenced on Petition p. 25?
5. Referencing Petition p. 28, were there any comments from the City of Shelton or Town of Monroe? If so, what were their concerns, and how were these concerns addressed?
6. Referencing Petition p. 29, it states several abutting property owners expressed concerns about the project. What were their concerns, and how were these concerns addressed? What types of “reasonable mitigation options” were discussed?
7. What is the age of the structures and conductors on each line?
8. Why are larger capacity conductors proposed for each line?
9. How does this project relate to the United Illuminating (UI) Derby Junction to Ansonia 115-kV Rebuild Project that is the subject of Docket No. 3B?
10. What modifications, if any, are necessary at Derby Junction to connect the Eversource circuits to UI-owned and operated facilities?
11. Is the design of the project dependent upon the design of the UI project? Could any modifications to the proposed project impact the design of the Eversource and/or UI transmission lines beyond Derby Junction?
12. Referring to Petition p. 2, – Explain in detail the NESC clearance requirements for conductor sway due to wind (blow out).
13. Referring to Petition p. 7, - Explain in detail the NESC ground clearance and blow-out requirements that necessitate the height increases of the structures and repositioning of the structures more than 15 feet from the existing structures.

14. Referring to Petition p. 7, - Explain in detail why removing the current staggered structure configuration for all three lines is necessary to “maintain electrical clearances between alignments during maintenance operations and wind events.”
15. Referring to Petition p. 7, provide more information regarding necessary increases in structure heights to comply with current clearance requirements. Are the proposed structure height increases at the absolute minimum to meet these requirements?
16. Explain why double circuit structures cannot be used. Provide specific criteria/standards.
17. Could the number of additional structures proposed within the existing ROW be reduced by utilization of anti-galloping devices or other design options? Explain.
18. Referring to Attachment C, Structure List – add columns explaining why each midspan structure and new structure is necessary- include a detailed justification for each and the width of the ROW at each location.
19. Referring to Petition p. 7, provide more information on additional easements that would be necessary if new mid span structures were not installed. Where would the new easements be located?
20. Map Sheets 3, 6, 8 & 10 depict several structures in close proximity to residential roadways. Can the structures be moved farther away from the roadways? Explain.
21. Can temporary construction matting be used instead of gravel in the following areas:
 - a. NEC Focus Areas;
 - b. NDDDB buffered areas;
 - c. designated open space areas; and
 - d. adjacent to residential properties.Explain.
22. Describe the clearing that will be required within the ROW to facilitate the Project. To what height will vegetation be cut?
23. Are CT DEEP and/or the US Army Corps of Engineers permits required for working within wetlands and vernal pools? If yes, what is the status of such permits?
24. In addition to Eversource’s Best Management Practices, what other specific environmental mitigation measures and/or monitoring would be conducted for construction within environmentally sensitive areas?
25. Describe site construction inspections that are required for this project under the DEEP General Permit.
26. Could restoration of disturbed areas incorporate habitat for the benefit of pollinator species, such as bees, moths and butterflies?
27. Describe measures that will be taken to ensure the safe use of public recreational trails that cross the ROW.
28. How will ATVs be discouraged from accessing the ROW from public roads/access points?