

August 13, 2021

Ms. Emily Laine
Chair, NEPOOL Reliability Committee
ISO New England, Inc.
One Sullivan Road
Holyoke, MA 01040-2841

Dear Ms. Laine,

In accordance with Schedule 12C of the ISO New England (“ISO-NE”) Transmission, Markets & Services Tariff (“ISO-NE Tariff”), Eversource Energy Service Company (“Eversource”) hereby submits the attached Transmission Cost Allocation (“TCA”) application(s) reporting cost support information associated with the construction, retirement, or modification to facilities rated 69 kV and above that qualify as regional Pool Transmission Facilities (“PTF”) for the following Eversource project:

ES-21-TCA-42 310 345-kV Line Structure Replacements, PINCO Insulator Replacements and Installation of OPGW Project (Manchester substation – Millstone substation)

Eversource is requesting that ISO-NE submit this TCA to the NEPOOL Reliability Committee for review, in accordance with ISO-NE Planning Procedure No. 4 (“PP-4”).

If you have any questions, I can be reached via the information listed above.

Sincerely,

David J. Burnham

David J. Burnham

cc: M. Drzewianowski

Attachment B
TCA Application Form

1. Applicant:	Application #:	ES-21-TCA-42	Date:	Aug-21
Contact Name:	David J. Burnham			
Company Name:	Eversource Energy Service Company			
Address 1:	56 Prospect Street			
Address 2:				
City, State, Zip	Hartford, CT 06103	RSP Project ID # or		
Contact Phone #	860-728-4506	Asset Condition ID #	262	
Email Address	david.burnham@eversource.com	Is Project related to CIP-14		
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

2. Project Description:	In Service Date:	Dec-22
a. High Level Project Details:		
Project Name (If no formal name, then Substation Upgrade, Line Upgrade, etc. are acceptable):		310 345-kV Line Structure and PINCO Insulator Replacement and OPGW Project (Manchester substation - Millstone substation)
Project Location (State only):	State:	CT
	County:	New London
b. Summary of PTF-related work for Project:		
<p>The project will replace 184 wood structures, PINCO Insulators and install approximately 47 miles of OPGW on the 310 345-kV Line (Millstone substation - Manchester substation). The structures have deficiencies such as: woodpecker damage, rot, cracks and deteriorated steel mechanical connections. The PINCO insulators require replacement due to age and deteriorating conditions.</p> <p>Final project cost details will be known following closeout of all project work orders.</p>		
c. Summary of Non-PTF-related work for Project:		
3. Was a transmission Proposed Plan Application required for this work?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PPA Number: n/a
4. Has a transmission Proposed Plan Application been approved?		Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval Date: _____
If yes, attach a copy and reference Proposed Plan Application # and approval date.		(Please check only one)

Need For Project:

5. Need Based On (Check all Categories that apply):	
a. Reliability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Economic	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Service to new load	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. New generator interconnection	<input type="checkbox"/>
Generator Proposed Plan Application Number	_____
Generator Proposed Plan Application Date	_____

(Attach copy of cover letter & Generator Proposed Plan Application)

- e. Public Policy Transmission Upgrade (PPTU)
- f. Market Efficiency Transmission Upgrade (METU)
- g. Asset Condition
- h. Other (specify in line 6)

6. Provide a narrative description of the need for this Project.
(Include available documentation relative to the need for this Project.)

Replacing these structures and replacing the PINCO insulators remediates the potential for structure failures due to asset condition vulnerabilities. To ensure the continued operability of this line segment, the identified structures in this line section need to be replaced.

Cost of Project:

7. Total Project Cost (\$M) equals PTF + Non-PTF + all other Project Costs:	<u>\$61.333</u>
8. Total Proposed PTF Costs	
a. Total Proposed PTF Cost of this Project (\$M):	<u>\$61.333</u>
b. Requested Pool-Supported PTF Costs associated with this Project (\$M):	<u>\$61.333</u>
c. Breakdown of Requested Pool-Supported PTF Cost associated with this Project (\$M): (Consistent with Table 1 and Appendix D of this Procedure)	
Material	<u>\$8.302</u>
Labor	<u>\$33.711</u>
ROW	<u>\$0.000</u>
Engineering/Permitting/Indirects	<u>\$9.160</u>
Escalation	<u>\$0.785</u>
AFUDC (or equivalent)	<u>\$2.451</u>
Contingency	<u>\$6.924</u>
d. Generator Supported PTF Costs* (\$M):	
<p>If the costs in 8.b. plus 8.d. do not equal the total proposed PTF cost (8.a) explain and indicate who is responsible for the remaining costs.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px; width: 100%;"></div>	
9. Total Proposed Non-PTF Cost of this Project (\$M):	<u>\$0.000</u>
10. Proposed PTF Costs (\$M) introduced as a result of local, state or other regulatory/legislative requirements, including costs identified pursuant to Section 1.6.3 of this PP-4.	<u>\$0.000</u>
a. Description of Proposed PTF Cost introduced as a result of local, state or other regulatory/legislative requirements as defined in question 8 above.	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>
11. All other Project Costs not captured in PTF Costs (8) or Non-PTF Costs (9) (\$M) associated with this Project:	<u>\$0.000</u>

12. Total PTF Cost based on: (check one)

Actual Costs

OR

Estimated Costs*

13. Valuation Year(s) of dollar amounts submitted above: 2021

14. If applicable, explain how the cost of common facilities were allocated between PTF and Non-PTF.

15. Does this Project result in a change of existing Non-PTF facilities to PTF?

Yes

No

16. Describe the major transmission alternatives, and their costs consistent with the breakdown provided in item 7 of this Application, that were considered. Provided an explanation why the preferred alternative was selected.
(Include available documentation relative to the major transmission alternatives analysis and selection.)

Alternative: Do nothing but for the reasons stated in 6 above is not acceptable.

Preferred: Field Inspections have indicated a significant amount of degradation and decreased load carrying capacity of wood 345-kV structures (many of the poles show signs of decay, woodpecker damage, rot and deterioration). Replacing the structures and PINCO insulators resolves multiple structural/hardware issues and supports safe and reliable operation of the transmission line.

17. Has state and local siting been completed? If yes, explain the siting process and any provisions that were made during siting, provide docket or siting reference numbers. If no, then explain when siting is expected to be completed and any provisions that have been agreed to.

No unusual siting or permitting was required for this project.

* Pool-Supported PTF costs were determined pursuant to Schedule 11 of Section II of the Tariff.

310 345-kV Line Structure and PINCO Insulator Replacements OPGW Project Correlation Table
 (Manchester substation - Millstone substation)

<u>TCA Item</u>	<u>RSP:</u> Project ID #	<u>Study:</u> Reliability Issues Requiring <u>Action</u>	<u>PPA Application:</u>		<u>PAC/RC Meeting:</u> Presentation Reference	<u>TCA Application (\$1,000s):</u>	
			<u>PPA No.</u>	<u>Preferred Solution Description</u>		<u>PTF Estimate</u>	<u>Non-PTF Estimate</u>
ES-21-TCA-42	<u>262</u>	n/a	n/a	Replace 184 wood 345-kV structures with light-duty steel pole structures, including hardware, insulators, and guys, replace PINCO insulators and install approximately 47 miles of OPGW.	Per PAC Presentation 01/21/2021	\$ 61.333	
				SUBTOTAL		\$ 61.333	\$ -