The United Illuminating Company **Witness: Rob Whelan**
Maritza Estremera Jimenez

Docket No. 26-08-08

Date Submitted: April 2, 2026

PMUI-008 Q:

Please describe how any additional benefits from the NWS alternative were estimated and included in the Cost-Benefit Analysis.

PMUI-008 A:

The Benefit-Cost Analysis supporting the New Haven project was structured to reflect its primary resilience function. Quantified benefits included avoided customer outage hours, improvements in realized reliability performance on New Haven Circuit 1526, and system-wide reliability benefits associated with reduced localized peak demand, consistent with the methodologies approved by the Authority. Local resilience value was evaluated using proxy measures, including avoided or deferred costs of alternative solutions such as poles-and-wires upgrades and on-site fossil backup generation, rather than a single traditional distribution deferral.

Project modeling demonstrates that the BESS microgrid could avoid approximately 98.7 percent of historical unexpected outages affecting the defined microgrid area. These results informed the BCA by quantifying avoided outage impacts while recognizing that certain benefits—particularly those associated with maintaining continuous operation of a designated emergency shelter—are not fully monetizable. Consistent with prior filings and Authority guidance, such benefits were addressed through equivalent solution proxies rather than direct monetization.

When not responding to outage events, the BESS may be dispatched for secondary purposes such as localized peak load reduction and economic dispatch, with any resulting net benefits credited to customers; however, voltage support was not identified, evaluated, or relied upon as a benefit driver for the New Haven project.

For clarity, the New Haven BESS Microgrid project, including its treatment of monetized and non-monetized benefits, was reviewed and approved by the Authority in a separate proceeding, Docket No. 22-06-05[1], pursuant to Public Act 22-55[2]. This response is intended to clarify the

[1] Docket No. 22-06-05
[2] CT P. A. 22-55

existing record and does not represent a reevaluation or re-screening of benefits previously accepted by the Authority.