



To: Mr. Jeffery M. Towle
Project Manager
Greater Springfield Reliability Project

From: John Mengacci
Chairman, Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Subject: Requests for Information Regarding the Greater Springfield Reliability Project
Municipal Consultation Filing

Date: July 2, 2008

On June 16, 2008, The Connecticut Light and Power Company (CL&P) submitted a Municipal Consultation Filing ("MCF") for the Connecticut portion of the Greater Springfield Reliability Project ("GSRP"). In that filing, CL&P indicated its intent to file this project for approval by the Connecticut Siting Council in September, 2008.

In accordance with Connecticut General Statute Section 16a-7c, the CEAB is to issue a Request for Proposal ("RFP") seeking alternatives to the GSRP unless the CEAB determines it is appropriate to exempt the GSRP from an RFP. To inform the development of an RFP that effectively solicits alternatives to the stated need, and/or to inform a decision to exempt, the CEAB requires certain information about the proposed project.

Accordingly, to facilitate the CEAB's review of the GSRP, the CEAB hereby submits the attached set of initial questions on the GSRP to CL&P. Based on prior conversations with representative of CL&P, we believe CL&P possesses the information and data requested. To the extent any information or analysis is in the possession of the Independent System Operator-New England ("ISO-NE"), we request that you work cooperatively with the ISO-NE to provide responses to each question. If you require clarity on any of the questions presented, please contact Dick Hahn, La Capra Associates at 617-367-6500, extension 127.

The CEAB requests responses by close of business on July 15, 2008. An electronic copy of your replies should be e-mailed to gdeans@cerc.com. In addition, one paper copy should be sent via regular mail to:

CEAB
c/o Gretchen Deans
CERC
805 Brook Street, Building 4
Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067

Consistent with the process the CEAB and CL&P have used in advance of previous Request for Proposal processes, after reviewing the written responses, we will be in contact with CL&P to schedule a technical session at a mutually convenient time.

The CEAB appreciates your time and assistance in this matter.

CC: Mr. David Boguslawski – NU
Mr. Alan Scarfone – NU
Mr. Eric Johnson – ISO-NE
Mr. Frank Mezzanotte – ISO-NE
Mr. Dan Peaco – La Capra Associates
Mr. Richard Hahn – La Capra Associates

Connecticut Energy Advisory Board
Greater Springfield Reliability Project
First Set of Questions to CL&P on the Municipal Consulting Filing
Dated July 2, 2008

1. Please provide a detailed breakdown of the capital cost of each of the alternatives considered in CL&P's analysis of the Greater Springfield Reliability Project ("GSRP"). The requested level of detail should include as a minimum the breakdown between OH and UG transmission lines by voltage class, substations, and large components of substation equipment (such as transformers). Please indicate how much escalation and contingency is included in these estimates. Also, please provide the basis for the cost estimates.
2. Page IV-4 of the Municipal Consultation Filing ("MCF") states that the need for the GSRP is based upon a study titled "Southern New England Transmission Reliability Report 1 January 2008" (referred to as the "Needs Analysis"). Does CL&P possess any other studies, reports or assessments that evaluate, examine or summarize the need for this project? If so, please provide.
3. Page IV-4 of the MCF states that the identification of the best solution for the GSRP is based upon a study titled "New England East-West Solutions Draft Report 2, April 2008" (referred to as the "Options Analysis"). Does CL&P have any other studies, reports or analysis that identifies and evaluates solutions? If so, please provide.
4. On August 3, 2007, interested persons, including United Illuminating and CMEEC, submitted Written Comments and recommendations on issues associated with a Request for Proposal process in connection with the NEEWS project. UI, for example, at page 1-2 of its comments, stated that the 2006-2007 ISO-NE regional system plan is no longer a reasonable sole basis for identifying large scale statewide needs and listed developments that should be considered. CMEEC, at page 8 of its comments, also noted developments that it said may not have been fully considered in the NEEWS project planning as of that date. Based on the those Written Comments, on September 11, 2007, the CEAB requested CL&P, UI, and CMEEC to review recent market and other developments and identify those developments, if any, that were considered in the course of establishing the need for NEEWS. Those included, but were not limited to, the following:
 - Capacity additions resulting from the implementation of Public Act 05-01.
 - Capacity additions and demand side measures resulting from the implementation of Public Act 07-242.
 - The implementation of the Locational Forward Reserve Market in Connecticut.
 - The Independent System Operator-New England's Forward Capacity Market.
 - Current load forecasts.
 - The implementation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, including changes in reliability standards, energy efficiency appliance standards, and demand response.
 - Any other developments in Connecticut that would affect the need for, or the justification for, the NEEWS project.

Since CL&P's initial response dated September 21, 2007, has CL&P performed any further assessment or otherwise reviewed the impacts of the developments described above, or any other market developments on the NEEWS project? If so, please provide all information relative to those assessments.

5. Is the Needs Analysis based upon a 2005 ISO-NE load forecast? If so, has CL&P performed a needs assessment with more recent load forecast? If so, please provide that assessment.
6. Is the Options Analysis based upon the same load forecast as the Needs Analysis? If not, please provide the load forecast utilized in the Options Analysis.
7. Does CL&P utilize solely the ISO-NE load forecasts, or does CL&P develop its own load forecasts? Please provide any load forecasts developed by CL&P since the 2005 ISO-NE load forecast was made public.
8. Did CL&P analyze only annual peak loads, or were off-peak or light load conditions analyzed? If light load conditions were analyzed, please describe that analysis in detail.
9. Are the Needs Analysis and the Options Analysis based upon load flow simulations? If so, please provide the name and version of the load flow software that was used. Also, please provide the following information:
 1. System Model, Study Scope and Assumptions:
 - a. System model used in study (PSS/E)
 - b. Complete PSS/E files/data
 - c. Year(s) of study
 - d. Generation dispatches and assumptions
 - e. Load levels (ISO-NE, by load areas and by substation bus)
 - f. Power Factor assumptions
 - g. Contingency deck (N-1)
 - h. Lines assumed out of service for N-1-1 testing
 - i. Major interface assumptions
 - j. Interface flows tested
 - k. Other projects assumed in service (generation and transmission)
 - l. Criteria used for system evaluation
 2. Study Results:
 - a. Thermal and Voltage violations (N-1 and N-1-1) with associated contingencies
 - b. Resulting transfers
 - c. Detailed description of project(s) to address identified needs
 - d. Comparison of thermal and voltage violations and resulting transfer capabilities before and after project(s)
10. What database or system representation did CL&P utilize in the load flow analysis upon which the Needs Analysis and the Options Analysis are based? Please describe that system representation, and its source. Also, please identify any facilities that were included in this representation but that were not in service as of 12/31/2005, including other components of the New England East-West Solution (“NEEWS”).
11. Please provide a list of all buses representing CL&P or WMECO loads that are included in the system representation in the question above. Include the bus name, approximate location, and the loads for any year for which load flow, transient stability, or short circuit analyses were performed. Also, please provide the most recent actual peak load (i.e., 2007 peak loads) for those buses.

12. Please provide one-line diagram of the system being analyzed as part of the GSRP in as much detail as is represented in the load flow simulations. This diagram should show station, lines, breakers, generators, and loads. Please refer to Figure 3-10 on page 29 of the Needs Analysis as a sample of what is being requested. This figure should be expanded to include all facilities analyzed or affected by the GSRP. (Many load flow programs have the capability to display results, highlighting criteria violations such as thermal overloads and low voltages, on one-line diagrams. That form of the one-line diagram would be preferable here.)
13. Please describe all generation dispatch scenarios considered in the Needs Analysis or the Options Analysis, specifically listing which units are assumed off-line or on-line, and the associated output, in each scenario studied.
14. Please describe all system contingencies studied in the Needs Analysis or the Options Analysis. List the specific facilities that were assumed to be out of service.
15. Did CL&P perform a transient stability analysis or short circuit analysis of the GSRP? If so, please provide the results of those analyses. Also provide the name and version of the software that was used.
16. The GRSP, which includes new transmission lines from Ludlow to Agawam to North Bloomfield, is one component of the NEEWS project. How does the GSRP relate to the other components, especially the proposed North Bloomfield to Frost Bridge transmission line that is part of the Central Connecticut Reliability Project? Can the GSRP be an effective solution without the other components of NEEWS? Given that the GSRP and the Central Connecticut Reliability Project both interconnect at North Bloomfield, explain why CL&P did not provide municipal consultations filings for both components simultaneously. Please describe in detail how CL&P analyzed the various components of the NEEWS project, specifically addressing how the various components affect each other.