



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

April 22, 2024

Deborah Denfeld
Team Lead – Transmission Siting
Eversource Energy
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141
deborah.denfeld@eversource.com

RE: **PETITION NO. 1605** – 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 Hartford Underground Cable Replacement Project consisting of the replacement and partial relocation of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) 1722 and 1740 high pressure fluid filled (HPFF) electric transmission cables with cross linked polyethylene (XLPE) electric transmission cables along approximately 6.7 miles of existing and new right-of-way between Northwest Hartford Substation, Southwest Hartford Substation and South Meadow Substation and retirement of two transmission line taps at Capital District Energy Center Cogeneration Associates and O'Brien Energy Systems, Inc. cogeneration facilities in Hartford, Connecticut and related electric transmission cable and substation improvements. **Council Interrogatories to Petitioner – Set 2.**

Dear Deborah Denfeld:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than May 6, 2024. 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 May 6, 2024 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: Service List dated January 2, 2024

**Petition No. 1605 - Eversource
Hartford Underground Cable Replacement Project
Hartford, Connecticut
Interrogatories – Set Two
April 22, 2024**

Project Development

43. Did Eversource consider high pressure gas filled (HPGF) cables as an alternative? If so, why was such alternative rejected? If HPGF was rejected on the basis of cost, provide the total estimated cost of an HPGF alternative to the proposed Project.
44. Provide the estimated life cycle costs of the proposed cable replacement Project based on the three primary cost components from the Council's 2022 Life Cycle Report: first costs, operations and maintenance costs and electrical loss costs. Include the net present value totals of these three components and any assumptions.
45. Referencing response to Council interrogatory 6, given the proposed plans to replace the HPFF cables with cross-linked polyethylene (XLPE) cables, explain why the conductor size increased from 3000 kcmil to 5000 kcmil? Are the cables functionally equivalent in terms of capacity, or does the XLPE design have slightly higher capacity?
46. In the event that higher capacity cables than currently proposed are installed, what would the approximate capacity be (as compared to proposed capacity in response to Council interrogatory 18)? What would the incremental cost be relative to the proposed Project?
47. Referencing the response to Council interrogatory 15, and assuming an estimated replacement cable cost of approximately \$40 million per mile as noted in response to Council interrogatory 13, why is the 1704 Line Colt Park Deviation incremental cost projection of about \$410k approximately one-half of the cost of a 100-foot long segment that would cost approximately \$758k based on its length?
48. Referencing the response to Council interrogatory 16, generally, which portions of the Project are associated with the \$1.4 million in non-Pool Transmission Facility costs?
49. Referencing the response to Council interrogatory 24, are there other methods for retiring HPFF cables that does not include pressurized nitrogen requiring long term monitoring and maintenance?
50. Referencing the response to Council interrogatory 11, provide a more detailed breakdown of each line replacement estimate based on the following components, and include any assumptions and approximate accuracy band:
 - a) Engineering and Indirect
 - b) Cable installation
 - c) Duct bank installation
 - d) Micro-tunneling
 - e) Jack and Bore
 - f) Substation work
 - g) Commissioning
 - h) Land Rights
 - i) Environmental
 - j) AFUDC
 - k) Contingency