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

October 28, 2025

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

RE: **PETITION NO. 1679** – 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 Scovill Rock Switching Station to East of Hurd State Park Rebuild Project consisting of the replacement and reconductoring of electric transmission line structures along approximately 2.4 miles of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) 1772 Line and 345-kV 376 and 362 Lines shared right-of-way and associated Connecticut River Crossing between Scovill Rock Switching Station in Middletown and Structure 19098 in Haddam traversing the municipalities of Middletown, East Hampton, and Haddam, Connecticut, and related electric transmission line and substation improvements. **Council Interrogatories to Petitioner.**

Dear Deborah Denfeld:

The Connecticut Siting Council (Council) requests your responses to the enclosed questions no later than November 18, 2025. 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 November 18, 2025 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

MAB/RDM

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

Enclosure: Revised Schedule, dated October 28, 2025

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

REVISED SCHEDULE

PETITION NO. 1679 – 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 Scovill Rock Switching Station to East of Hurd State Park Rebuild Project consisting of the replacement and reconductoring of electric transmission line structures along approximately 2.4 miles of its existing 115-kilovolt (kV) 1772 Line and 345-kV 376 and 362 Lines shared right-of-way and associated Connecticut River Crossing between Scovill Rock Switching Station in Middletown and Structure 19098 in Haddam traversing the municipalities of Middletown, East Hampton, and Haddam, Connecticut, and related electric transmission line and substation improvements.

Petition received	07/15/2025
Public Comment Period Deadline	08/14/2025
Deadline for Municipal Comments	08/14/2025
Council 60-Day Action – Set Date for Decision to 01/11/2026	08/21/2025
Deadline for Action	09/13/2025
Council Interrogatories • Issued • Responses due	 10/28/2025 11/18/2025
Deadline for Final Decision	**01/11/2026**

Petition No. 1679 - Eversource
Scovill Rock Switching Station to East of Hurd State Park Rebuild Project
Middletown, East Hampton & Haddam

Interrogatories
October 28, 2025

Notice

1. Referencing Petition p. 57, were any comments received from the City of Middletown or the Towns of East Hampton and Haddam or abutting property owners since the filing of the Petition? If so, what were the concerns, and how were these concerns addressed?

2. Referencing Petition pp. 58-59, when did the consultations take place with DEEP and the Valley Railroad Company? What were their concerns and how were they addressed?

3. Referencing Petition p. 57, did the Connecticut River Gateway Commission have concerns regarding the project? What were their concerns and how were they addressed?

Existing Facility Site

4. Referencing Map Sheet 4, provide an aerial image of the river crossing area that only shows existing conditions and structures.

5. What maintenance activities have been performed on the existing structures to extend service life?

6. Referencing Petition p. 9 and Footnote 13, how was the fraying conductor repaired at the Haddam Substation and East Haddam Junction Connecticut River crossing?

7. Have any of the lines experienced any operational issues? Provide operation and outage reports.

8. Referencing Petition p. 58, are the existing switching station and structures visible from the abutting property? How would the Project change visibility from the abutting property?

Project Development

9. Are there any electric generating facilities and/or energy storage facilities listed on the ISO-NE interconnection queue associated with the proposed Project?

10. Who determines and communicates to Eversource as to the appropriate timing associated with Project outage switching? What is the sequence of events that triggers the outage switching determination and timing?

11. What is the total estimated cost of the Project? Of the cost 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.

12. How will the Project cost be collected through rates? What is the estimated rate increase for Eversource customers? Explain.

13. Provide a detailed breakdown of Project costs, including but not limited to; engineering and indirect, structures and conductor installation/replacement (excluding river crossing), river crossing structures and conductors, substation work, commissioning; and environmental.

14. Provide the estimated life cycle costs of the proposed structure 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. If first costs are materially different than the proposed Project cost in Interrogatory No. 10 explain the difference.

15. How would Eversource avoid and/or manage project cost overruns? Who would bear the burden of any cost overruns? Explain.

16. What is the cost delta between galvanized steel structures and weathering steel structures?

17. Referencing Petition Attachment C, pp. 30-31, provide cost estimates for each of the alternatives considered.

18. Referencing Petition p. 10, 1590-kcmil ACSS would be utilized as the proposed replacement conductor. Are there any alternative conductor sizes/types that could reliably serve the projected loads? If yes, provide a conductor cost comparison table including the following columns: conductor size/type, cost per foot, total number of linear feet of conductor, total conductor cost, and Project life cycle cost assuming this conductor/size type. Include the proposed conductor (1590-kcmil ACSS) in the table as a comparison.

19. Referencing Petition p. 4, it states the 954 ASCR and 1272 ASCR conductors are being replaced due to the risk of degradation. Have inspections of the conductors been performed? If yes, when were the inspections conducted and what sections of the conductors were identified as degraded, if any?

20. Were structure-by-structure inspections performed to verify stability and integrity? If yes, when were the inspections conducted? Provide the condition grade of the structures in accordance with Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) guidelines.

21. Referencing Petition p. 10, provide additional information as to the structural capacity of the existing structures to support new conductors and OPGW. By what percentage range are the structures overstressed?

22. Referencing Petition p. 13, what is the weight difference between 1272 kcmil ASCR and 1590 kcmil ACSS per foot?

23. Has Eversource presented the Project before the ISO-NE Planning Advisory Committee? If yes, on what date(s)? What comments did the committee provide, if any?

24. Is the Project listed on the current ISO-NE Asset Condition list?

25. How does the Project relate to other proposed, planned or constructed Connecticut reliability and asset condition projects?

26. Provide a ten-year load forecast for the lines beginning in 2025 and the applicable compound annual growth rate(s).

27. 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.

Public Health and Safety

28. Did Eversource consult with the Connecticut Airport Authority (CAA)? If so, what comments were received from CAA, and how were such comments addressed?

29. Referencing Petition p. 26, provide the proposed marking/lighting plans and marker ball plans if available and describe how the plans comply with any FAA marking/lighting standards.

30. Referencing Petition p. 45 and 56, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) consultation;
    a) on what date did Eversource file its Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)?
    b) on what date did FAA indicate that the proposed structures did not exceed the Notice Criteria?
    c) submit the FAA determination for the project.
    d) what is the diameter and color of the marker balls?
    e) What specific conductors would have marker balls?
    f) how many marker balls are required?
    g) would the marker balls require lighting? If yes, submit lighting details.
    h) Table 11.1 indicates "lighting" – does this refer to the river crossing transmission structures?

31. Referencing Petition Appendix 1 – Visibility Analysis, revise photo-simulations 1-A and 5-A to include the FAA marker balls.

32. Referencing Petition p. 58, are recreational and commercial watercraft allowed to pass through the overhead work zone? If not, how long would river traffic be impeded? Would Eversource deploy watercraft on both sides of the overhead work zone to intercept river traffic that may enter the work zone?

33. Would any access roads or staging areas directly abut residential properties? If yes, can the access roads and/or staging areas be relocated away from property lines?

Environmental Effects and Mitigation Measures

34. How are the limits of watercourses, wetland and vernal pools marked in the field during the construction process?

35. Would any in-water work, such as controlled lowering of the wires into the Connecticut River, be required for installation or removal of any lines? Explain.

36. Referencing Petition pp. 19-20, and Attachment A Map Sheet 6 Wetland 19;
    a) what is the width of the existing gravel road within the wetland?
    b) is the travel surface of the road currently submerged or exposed?
    c) to what height would the access road be raised to prevent future flooding?
    d) provide a site plan detailing how the access road will be improved.
    e) why is it necessary to restore the access drive within Wetland 19 when there is existing access to structures on either side of the wetland from other locations?
    f) describe any proposed access road improvements for the adjacent Axelson Brook crossing

37. What is the reason a temporary pull pad is necessary within Wetland 19 when there are two other pull pads on either side of the wetland?

38. Referencing Petition pp. 29-30, permanent bridge crossing at Stream 5;
    a. provide site plan details/specifications of the proposed permanent bridge;
    b. what bridge design methods would be used to ensure the bridge is not damaged during a 100-year storm event?
    c. Does photo 12 within the Wetlands and Watercourses Report (Petition Attachment G) show Stream 5? If not provide a photograph of the existing stream crossing?

39. Describe spill prevention measures in the BMPs and Stormwater Pollution Control Plan that would be employed for the Project.

40. Referencing Petition p. 24, what is the status of the filing to the State Historic Preservation Office and the Tribal Historic Preservation Offices?

41. Referencing Petition pp. 23-24, characterize the land use of the 1.5 acres of additional facility visibility within the Higganum Landing Historic District.

42. Referencing Petition Attachment A Map Sheets, submit the DEEP Natural Diversity Database Determination for the Project, if available.

43. Is the Project in proximity to osprey habitat? Describe mitigation procedures, if any, if an osprey nest is located on a structure to removed. Would the design of the replacement structures deter osprey nesting?

44. Referencing Petition p. 38, are any residential areas within the area with increased year-round visibility? If yes, describe the views of the facility from these areas?

45. What is the finish of the river crossing triple circuit structures? Would the replacement structures have the same finish? If not, what finish would have the least visual impact from the scenic overlooks in Hurd State Park, Higganum Meadows, the Connecticut River, and adjacent areas? What are the costs associated with different finish options?

46. Describe how the Project river crossing conforms to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Electric Power Transmission and the Environment Guidelines for the Protection of Natural, Historic, Scenic, and Recreational Values in the Design and Location of Rights-of-way and Transmission Facilities.

Project Construction

47. Would counterpoise be installed for the proposed replacement structures? If yes, provide installation detail.

48. Referencing Petition p. 14, what is the status of the DEEP Special Use License (SUL) or State Land Notification (SLN)? What are the anticipated necessary improvements to the existing Hurd State Park gravel access road?

49. For what duration would the Hurd State Park gravel access drive be subject to construction activities? Would the access road be entirely closed to recreational use? Would the paved Hurd State Park access road be subject to closure during construction?

50. Referencing Petition p. 25 do the Army Corps of Engineers Self-Verification and DEEP Land and Water Resource Division Certificate of Permission determinations typically include conditions that alter the Project design?

51. Referencing Petition Attachment A Map Sheet 4, what does the orange solid line represent on the west, south and east sides of the Structure 19090 work pad?

52. What measures would be taken, if necessary, to determine if excavated soils are suitable for reuse or redistribution in other Project areas?

53. What measures would be taken to reduce construction noise and fugitive dust to residential properties that abut the work areas?

54. What site restoration activities would occur once construction is completed?