



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](mailto:siting.council@ct.gov)  
Web Site: [portal.ct.gov/csc](http://portal.ct.gov/csc)

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

June 22, 2023

Deborah Denfeld  
Team Lead – Transmission Siting  
Eversource Energy  
P.O. Box 270  
Hartford, CT 06141  
[deborah.denfeld@eversource.com](mailto:deborah.denfeld@eversource.com)

RE: **PETITION NO. 1574** - 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 Southington Substation to Cook Hill Junction Rebuild Project consisting of the replacement and reconductoring of electric transmission line structures along approximately 11.2 miles of its existing electric transmission line right-of-way shared by its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) 1690, 1208, 1355 and 1610 Lines between Southington Substation in Southington and Cook Hill Junction in Wallingford including the installation of approximately 650 feet of the 1690 Line underground at Lucchini Junction in Meriden, traversing the municipalities of Southington, Cheshire, Wallingford, and Meriden, Connecticut, and related electric transmission line and substation improvements.

Dear Deborah Denfeld:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than July 13, 2023. Please submit an original and 15 copies to the Council's office and an electronic copy to [siting.council@ct.gov](mailto: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 July 13, 2023 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

c: Kathleen M. Shanley, Eversource Energy ([Kathleen.shanley@eversource.com](mailto:Kathleen.shanley@eversource.com))

**Petition No. 1574 - Eversource**  
**Southington Substation to Cook Hill Junction Rebuild Project**  
**Southington, Cheshire, Wallingford, and Meriden, Connecticut**

**Interrogatories**  
**June 22, 2023**

**Notice**

1. Referencing Petition p. 41, were there any comments received from the Towns of Southington, Cheshire and Wallingford, the City of Meriden or abutting property owners since the filing of the Petition? If so, what were their concerns, and how were these concerns addressed?
2. Describe outreach efforts to project abutters. Have any abutters requested further information? Were right-of-way (ROW) restoration measures described during public outreach?
3. Referencing Petition p. 21, identify any proposed new and/or replacement structures that are pending Federal Aviation Administration obstruction evaluation. Are any of the existing structures that would be replaced currently marked/lighted?

**Existing Facility Site**

4. Referencing Petition p. 2, what public utility uses/rights are identified under the easements along the existing ROW?
5. Under Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) §16-50j-2a(29), “Site” means a contiguous parcel of property with specified boundaries, including, but not limited to, the leased area, right-of-way, access and easements on which a facility and associated equipment is located, shall be located or is proposed to be located. Is the “Project area” described in the Petition synonymous with the existing facility “site?” Explain.
6. When was the most recent vegetation management conducted in the ROW? What work was performed?

**Project Development**

7. 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? If yes, identify.
8. Are any generation facilities listed on the ISO-NE interconnection queue associated with the proposed project? If so, please identify the generation facilities and the queue position.
9. 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.
10. How does the project relate to other proposed, planned or constructed Connecticut reliability and asset condition projects?

11. Please describe how the proposed project is consistent with the recommendations of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) Report on Transmission Facility Outages During the Northeast Snowstorm of October 29-30, 2011 – Causes and Recommendations.

### **Project Construction**

12. Identify all other permits required to perform the proposed work.
13. Referencing Petition p. 2, after the structure replacements for Sub-Petitions 1293-CW-01 and 1293-SCMW-01 and the structure replacements for the project, what number of existing structures would remain and when is replacement of those structures anticipated?
14. Referring to Petition pp. 8 and 12, provide more information regarding the current National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) clearance requirements that require the addition of five mid-span structures. Provide the span lengths with and without the proposed mid-span structures.
15. Could the number of additional mid-span structures proposed within the existing ROW be reduced by utilization of anti-galloping devices or other design options including, but not limited to, taller structures at both ends of the spans? Explain.
16. Referencing Petition Map Sheet 6, Structure 3674 is marked for replacement; however, this structure was also marked for replacement in Council Sub-Petition No. 1293-SCMW-01, approved by the Council on September 24, 2020 (with an extension to complete improvements to September 24, 2022). Has this structure been replaced prior to the filing of the petition? If yes, why does it need to be replaced again?
17. Referencing Petition Map Sheets 1 through 10, Structures 5235, 5238, 5242 through 5244, 5248, 5251 through 5254, 5256, 5258, 5261, and 5268 are marked for replacement; however, these structures were also marked for replacement in Council Sub-Petition No. 1293-CW-01, approved by the Council on July 31, 2017 and completed on December 15, 2017. Why do these structures need to be replaced again?
18. Referencing Petition pp. 4-13, the existing conductors on the 1208 Line are approximately 34 years old. Why aren't the conductors scheduled for replacement at this time? What is the life span of these conductors?
19. Referencing Petition pp. 6 and 12, the existing conductors on the 1610 Line are approximately 71 years old. Why aren't the conductors scheduled for replacement within the Schwab Junction to Cook Hill Junction portion of the Project at this time? What is the life span of these conductors?
20. Referencing Petition p. 9, why is optical ground wire (OPGW) being utilized in the underground portion of the 1690 Line rather than all dielectric self-supporting (ADSS) fiber?
21. How would OPGW installation avoid contact with water at crossings?
22. Referencing Petition p. 28, footnote 8, a 25-foot structure is proposed to support ADSS. However, page 10 of the Petition notes that the Southington Substation to Lucchini Junction portion of the Project would utilize OPGW for the 1208 Line. Why is ADSS proposed for Structure 3679-1? Why is proposed Structure 3679-1 necessary to support ADSS or OPGW? Explain.

### **Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures**

23. 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?
24. Would Eversource implement the same mitigation measures and/or use the same construction methods (ex. watercourse crossings, secured mats in flood zone areas, etc.) for areas of the Project as were implemented and used in Sub-Petitions 1293-CW-01 and 1293-SCMW-01? Explain how these areas overlap.
25. Has Eversource developed a Protection Plan for wetlands, watercourses and vernal pools in its construction plans for the project? If yes, submit the plan. If no, when would such a plan be developed?
26. Referencing Petition Attachment E, Vernal Pool Assessment, p. 3, how would Eversource deter and/or prevent ATV use of the ROW?
27. What measures would be taken, if necessary, to determine if excavated soils are suitable for reuse or redistribution in other Project areas?
28. Referencing Petition pp. 8, 9 and 11-13, 17 existing wood pole structures would be removed. If known, were the wooden poles chemically treated at the time of installation? Describe any best management practices associated with the disposal of the wooden poles.
29. Referencing Petition p. 26, provide more information as to the specific best management practices that would be employed for work within Aquifer Protection Areas.
30. Referencing Petition p. 26, provide a copy of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) Natural Diversity Database Determination including any recommended protective measures.
31. Referencing Petition p. 26, did Eversource consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information, Planning, and Consultation (IPaC) service regarding federally-listed species? If yes, would the Project impact any federally-listed species (e.g. northern long-eared bat)? Explain.
32. Referencing Petition p. 20, has Eversource received any comments from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and/or the Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs)?
33. Explain how the work contractor is made aware of sensitive environmental and cultural resources along the ROW that require certain protective work procedures? What entity ensures that specified work procedures are adhered to?

### **Public Safety**

34. Referencing Petition pp. 30-32, electric and magnetic field (EMF) tables are included for the Project. Is the underground transmission segment at Lucchini Junction taken into account in the EMF tables? If no, would it be expected to materially impact EMF at the ROW edges?