

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF test the effect of including additional CHP, DSM, and new generation resources in Connecticut? If so, please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of each such resource included at each bus? If not, please explain why not, especially considering the statement on page 7 that "power flows from the Springfield area to Connecticut".

Response:

Under the Reference Case, ICF included 1,132 MW of DSM savings at the net generation level including 508 MW of passive resources in the power-flow modeling for 2013. Further, ICF included 99 MW of CHP in Connecticut. The DSM and CHP were treated as demand reduction and were distributed across all the load buses in Connecticut in proportion to the individual load at each bus.

In addition, ICF included a total of approximately 1,184 MW of new generation including a unit uprate in Connecticut. The locations of these capacity additions are shown in the table below.

Capacity Additions in Connecticut

Bus No	Bus Name	Unit Type	Capacity (MW)
73700	PEQUONIC	Biomass	75
73246	S.MEADOW	Biomass	75
73594	WALL LV1	CT	100
73163	COS COB	GT	40
73501	KLEENGT1	CC	187
73502	KLEENGT2	CC	187
73503	KLEEN ST	CC	358
73189	FREIGHT	CT	80
73563	MILL#3	Nuclear Uprate	81
73162	WATERSDE	Wind	1
Total			1,184

Within the sensitivity cases, ICF further examined the impact of larger load reductions in Connecticut. Similar to the Reference Case, the reductions were distributed across all load nodes in proportion to the individual load at each bus. The largest Connecticut load reduction considered in the sensitivity cases included an incremental passive DSM reduction of 1,000 MW over and above the Reference Case DSM and CHP assumptions discussed above.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-002
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF or NU perform any economic evaluation of transmission alternatives compared to NTAs? If so, please provide.

Response:

ICF was asked to make an economic evaluation of transmission alternatives to NTA's only if it determined that there were one or more practical and feasible NTA's. Since ICF determined that there were no practical and feasible NTA's, it did not evaluate them. NU did not attempt any such economic evaluation either.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-003
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF consider in its load flow simulations new Connecticut peaking capacity that was approved or proposed in Connecticut DPUC No. 08-01-01? If so, please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of each such resource included at each bus? If not, please explain why these resources were not considered.

Response:

No, ICF did not include the peaking units recently approved by the CTDPUC in docket 08-01-01. At the time ICF began the analysis, the peakers noted had yet to be approved and it was only after modeling began that the approvals were received. ICF did however, in case 1, reduce Connecticut zonal demand by 1000 MW. This demand reduction is in addition to the aggressive DSM in the base case. See the response to CEAB-04, Q-CEAB-001 for additional information. This zonal demand reduction did not eliminate the overloads, so there is no reason to believe the 700 MW from the peakers at specific locations would eliminate the overloads.

Due on: 10/10/2008
 The Connecticut Light and Power Company
 Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
 Dated: 09/29/2008
 Q-CEAB-004
 Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
 Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF include in its load flow simulations any non-renewable generation additions, or any other new generating capacity not yet on-line, in New England? If so, please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of each such resource included at each bus and the name of the transmission planning zone in which each bus is located?

Response:

Yes, ICF considered generation additions throughout New England. Additions in Connecticut are described in the response to Data Request CEAB-04, Q-CEAB-001. In the remaining New England markets, only renewable capacity was assumed to be added. Total renewable generation additions were 4,391 MW as listed in the table below.

Bus No	Bus Name	Planning Zone	Capacity (MW)
72726	KEENE	NH	63
70172	BIGELOW	ME	99
70101	RUMFRDGN	ME	194
72694	SEBRK345	NH	904
72731	LOST NAT	NH	129
72844	WHITEFLD	NH	187
70015	ENFIELD	BHE	82
71123	KENDALL	BOSTON	3
71972	LENERGIA	CNEMA	369
73162	WATERSDE	NOR	1
72572	W.KINGST	RI	196
71516	BROCKTON	SEMA	3
72427	WILBRAHM	VT	305
72413	SEARSBUR	VT	323
70522	BNNINGTN	VT	65
70527	IRASBURG	VT	287
70520	W RUTLND	VT	539
71581	STNY_BRK	WMA	280
71749	BUCK PND	WMA	353
72966	MT TOM	WMA	9
Total Capacity (MW)			4,391

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

What existing generating units were assumed to be retired in the ICF load flow simulations? Please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW at each bus that each such retirement removed from the system and the name of the transmission planning zone in which each bus is located.

Response:

In the base case, ICF assumed that any non-hydro generating facility reaching the age of 60years old by the year 2013 would be retired. In addition, ICF assumed that any facility currently under an RMR agreement with fixed annual payments exceeding the annualized ISO-NE assumed cost of new entry in FCM would be retired. The table below shows the bus numbers, bus names, and generation capacity retired at each location. See pages 47 and 48 of the report for additional information pertaining to the retirements.

Generation Retirements

Bus No	Bus Name	Unit Name	Zone Name	Capacity (MW)
71946	SALEM G1	Salem Harbor	BOSTON	81
71947	SALEM G2	Salem Harbor	BOSTON	78
72870	SCHILLER	Schiller	NH	48
73558	MONTV#5	Montville	CT	81
73073	ALT34 PF	Altresco Pittsfield	WMA	33
73073	ALT34 PF	Altresco Pittsfield	WMA	49
73551	NORHAR#1	Norwalk Harbor	NOR	162
73552	NORHAR#2	Norwalk Harbor	NOR	168
73647	BPTHBR#2	Bridgeport Harbor	SWCT	170
73081	W.SPRING	West Springfield	WMA	72

73086	W.SPRCED	West Springfield	WMA	50
72986	BERKPWR	Berkshire Power	WMA	305

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-006
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF model 193 MW of CHP in Massachusetts and 33 MW in Western Massachusetts in the load flow simulations? Please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of CHP included at each bus?

Response:

Yes. These are described on pages 34 and 50 of ICF's report. The CHP additions were treated as demand reduction and were distributed across all the load buses in the respective area in proportion to the individual load at each bus.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-007
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF model 527 MW of renewable energy resources in Western Massachusetts in the load flow simulations? Please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of renewable energy resources included at each bus?

Response:

No. As shown on Page 44 of ICF's report, ICF modeled 642 MW of renewable energy resources in Western Massachusetts in lieu of generators currently proposed in the ISO-NE queue. The specific bus names and locations of these modeled capacity additions are shown in the table below.

Capacity Additions in Western Massachusetts

Bus No	Bus Name	Zone	Capacity (MW)
71581	STNY_BRK	WMA	280
71749	BUCK PND	WMA	353
72966	MT TOM	WMA	9
Total Capacity (MW)			642

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-008
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF model 642 MW of DSM resources in Western Massachusetts in the load flow simulations?
Please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing the MW of DSM included at each bus?

Response:

No. As shown on Page 39, Exhibit 3-3 of ICF's report, ICF's analysis considered that a total of 527 MW of DSM would exist in Western Massachusetts by 2013. Of this total, 225 MW is a load reduction, and 302 MW represents dispatchable demand resources reserved by ISO-NE for emergency operations under Operating Procedure No. 4. ICF distributed the 225 MW of load reduction across all the load buses in the area in proportion to the individual load at each bus.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-009
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Does ICF use PSS/e load flow simulation software in this NTA study? What is the name and version number of the power flow simulation software that ICF used to perform this study?

Response:

No. ICF used GE-PSLF version 16.0 for the NTA study.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-010
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF analyze the same options as NU provided in the Proposed Plan Application submitted to ISO-NE? If not, please provide a detailed list of all the differences between the options analyzed in the Proposed Plan Application and those analyzed by ICF.

Response:

No. ICF analyzed the addition of the Greater Springfield Reliability Project (GSRP) only. The Proposed Plan Applications submitted by NU and National Grid USA to ISO-NE includes the entire set of projects proposed under the New England East - West Solution, including the GSRP, Rhode Island Reliability, Interstate Reliability, and Central Connecticut Reliability Projects.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-011
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Is the system representation used by ICF in this study the same as the one that was provided to CEAB consultant La Capra Associates on 9-12-08? If not please provide a detailed list of the differences.

Response:

Yes, the system topology used by ICF to model Western Massachusetts and Connecticut, the areas of concern, are the essentially same.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-012
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

On page 12, the ICF report states that NU provided the power flow planning case to ICF. When did NU provide this case to ICF? Is this the same as the case that NU provided to CEAB consultant La Capra Associates on 9-12-08? If not, provide a detailed list of the differences, and explain why NU provided different cases to ICF and La Capra Associates.

Response:

The ICF report was based on a case provided by NU on August 13, 2008 to ICF. NU and National Grid began providing information to ICF with which to build its model in January 2008. The bus loads that ICF modeled are provided in the response to Data Request CEAB-04, Q-CEAB-013.

On September 12, 2008, LaCapra was provided a case with NU loads that were slightly modified to incorporate minor redistribution of some load among substations based on recently received information from CL&P and WMECO. The ICF work had begun and had significantly progressed previous to receiving this new information. The revised load distribution is not substantive to the work ICF was performing.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-013
Page 1 of 7

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

For the planning case utilized by ICF, please provide a list of bus names and numbers showing voltages and individual bus loads in the Greater Springfield area. Also provide the same information for buses in Connecticut.

Response:

The voltages and loads are shown in Attachment 1: Voltages and Loads.

Bus No	Bus Name	kV	Status	Load		Voltages (pu)		Area
				P (MW)	Q (MVAR)	Pre-GSRP	GSRP	
73113	HADDM NK	345	1	0.0	0.0	1.0135	1.0146	CT
73149	WILIAMSA	115	1	3.9	0.5	1.0093	1.0100	CT
73218	STKHOUSE	115	1	30.6	0.0	1.0071	1.0086	CT
73239	WILIAMSB	115	1	3.9	0.5	1.0092	1.0100	CT
73245	TORR TER	115	1	14.4	2.0	1.0317	1.0356	CT
73249	P+W MIDD	115	1	16.2	2.5	1.0351	1.0358	CT
73288	NESMBY	115	1	33.2	4.9	1.0378	1.0474	CT
73291	FORTHF	115	1	20.1	0.0	1.0130	1.0140	CT
73291	FORTHF	115	1	40.1	5.9	1.0130	1.0140	CT
73303	SHUNOCK	115	0	0.0	0.0	1.0165	1.0175	CT
73338	STANLEY	69	1	3.9	0.6	1.0448	1.0461	CT
73342	BLACK RK	69	1	0.0	0.0	1.0452	1.0465	CT
73393	CAMPVILL	27.6	1	47.2	7.0	1.0022	1.0056	CT
73394	FALLS V	13.2	1	8.2	1.2	1.0306	1.0354	CT
73395	THOMASTN	13.2	1	25.3	3.7	1.0347	1.0314	CT
73398	N.CANAAN	13.2	1	18.6	2.7	1.0300	1.0353	CT
73404	GREEN HL	23	1	94.7	13.9	1.0331	1.0341	CT
73407	HANOV55	23	1	21.0	3.0	1.0320	1.0335	CT
73408	HANOV55	13.8	1	34.9	5.1	1.0296	1.0313	CT
73411	E.MERIDN	13.8	1	51.2	7.5	1.0325	1.0340	CT
73416	CHIP HIL	13.8	1	34.1	5.0	1.0297	1.0318	CT
73417	BLKRK A	13.8	1	28.7	4.3	1.0450	1.0464	CT
73418	BLKRK B	13.8	1	58.2	8.5	1.0313	1.0336	CT
73419	BLACK RK	4.8	1	4.7	0.7	1.0344	1.0304	CT
73422	HADDAM	23	1	56.4	8.3	1.0288	1.0299	CT
73423	BOKUM	27.6	1	77.4	11.3	1.0018	1.0028	CT
73425	WESTSIDE	13.2	1	62.9	9.2	1.0316	1.0343	CT
73426	DOOLEY	13.2	1	28.2	4.3	1.0340	1.0355	CT
73427	E.NBRITN	13.8	1	70.7	10.5	1.0315	1.0301	CT
73428	ROCKY HL	23	1	107.8	15.9	1.0444	1.0480	CT
73429	MYSTIC	34.5	1	26.4	3.9	1.0291	1.0301	CT
73430	MYSTIC	13.8	1	19.6	2.9	1.0472	1.0482	CT
73433	GALES FY	13.8	1	17.3	2.6	0.9970	0.9979	CT
73434	CARD	23	1	52.8	7.6	1.0343	1.0315	CT
73435	MANSFLD	27.6	1	25.8	3.7	1.0010	1.0036	CT
73436	MANSFLD	13.8	1	21.3	3.1	1.0294	1.0319	CT
73437	SKUNGAMG	13.8	1	18.3	2.7	1.0431	1.0459	CT
73440	WILLMNTC	27.6	1	59.1	8.7	1.0203	1.0227	CT
73441	WILLMNTC	4.8	1	6.7	1.0	1.0291	1.0315	CT
73442	TRACY	23	1	19.8	2.9	1.0266	1.0282	CT
73442	TRACY	23	1	19.8	2.9	1.0266	1.0282	CT
73443	FRY BRK	23	1	51.9	7.7	1.0278	1.0293	CT
73444	BROOKLYN	23	1	43.6	6.5	1.0321	1.0339	CT
73445	UNCASVLA	13.2	1	19.3	2.9	1.0340	1.0348	CT
73446	WILIAMSA	13.2	1	36.9	5.5	1.0336	1.0345	CT

73447	FLNDRSA	23	1	38.0	5.6	1.0351	1.0301	CT
73448	UNCASVIL	27.6	1	17.3	2.5	1.0154	1.0162	CT
73449	FLANDRSB	23	1	38.0	5.6	1.0323	1.0331	CT
73450	WILIAMSB	13.2	1	36.9	5.5	1.0338	1.0347	CT
73451	UNCASVLB	13.2	1	19.3	2.9	1.0343	1.0351	CT
73452	ROCKVILL	27.6	1	15.5	2.2	0.9787	0.9809	CT
73453	ROCKVILL	13.8	1	70.8	10.5	1.0318	1.0286	CT
73454	BARBR HL	23	1	71.2	10.5	1.0295	1.0318	CT
73455	ENFIELD	27.6	1	51.1	7.5	0.9837	0.9859	CT
73456	ENFIELD	23	1	48.2	7.1	0.9584	0.9616	CT
73458	SO.WNDSR	13.8	1	45.2	6.6	1.0278	1.0294	CT
73459	WNDSRLK	27.6	1	12.8	1.9	1.0431	1.0452	CT
73460	WNDSRLK	4.8	1	4.8	0.7	1.0321	1.0280	CT
73463	MANCHSTR	23	1	132.2	19.5	1.0250	1.0256	CT
73464	N.BLMFLD	23	1	70.4	10.4	1.0281	1.0330	CT
73465	FARMNGTN	23	1	130.7	19.3	1.0306	1.0322	CT
73466	NEWINGTN	23	1	133.4	19.7	1.0339	1.0337	CT
73467	BLOOMFLD	23	1	133.1	19.5	1.0292	1.0357	CT
73468	NW.HTFD	23	1	139.8	20.6	1.0279	1.0328	CT
73469	SW.HTFD	23	1	67.9	10.1	1.0273	1.0313	CT
73470	E.HTFD	23	1	81.3	12.0	1.0324	1.0285	CT
73471	WNDSRLK	23	1	49.1	7.3	1.0336	1.0298	CT
73472	HOPEWELL	23	1	50.5	7.5	1.0322	1.0328	CT
73474	PORTLAND	23	1	32.3	4.7	1.0314	1.0321	CT
73474	PORTLAND	23	1	0.0	0.0	1.0314	1.0321	CT
73477	SHUNOCK	13.8	1	23.9	3.5	1.0339	1.0349	CT
73478	TORRTERM	13.2	1	15.8	2.2	1.0310	1.0350	CT
73536	FORST PF	13.8	1	118.6	17.6	1.0300	1.0300	CT
73537	RVRSD PF	23	1	48.2	7.1	1.0457	1.0487	CT
73543	FRKLN DR	13.2	1	39.5	5.8	1.0345	1.0324	CT
73544	TUNNEL	23	1	62.3	9.1	1.0284	1.0297	CT
73546	SMEAD PF	23	1	176.3	25.8	1.0309	1.0335	CT
73562	MILL#2	24	1	34.7	26.9	0.9933	0.9933	CT
73563	MILL#3	24	1	48.2	36.9	0.9915	0.9915	CT
73611	DUDLEY T	115	1	28.2	4.2	1.0157	1.0166	CT
73612	BEAN HLL	115	1	31.7	4.6	1.0158	1.0168	CT
73617	TUNNEL	69	1	32.9	4.7	1.0014	1.0020	CT
73620	BUDDGTNB	34.5	1	85.7	12.5	1.0352	1.0360	CT
73620	BUDDGTNB	34.5	1	18.8	2.6	1.0352	1.0360	CT
73621	BUDDGTNA	34.5	1	0.0	0.0	1.0261	1.0269	CT
73633	NO.WALLF	115	1	35.4	5.2	1.0189	1.0204	CT
73634	COLONY	115	1	34.2	5.0	1.0179	1.0194	CT
73728	E.SHORE	13.8	1	42.7	0.9	1.0849	1.0854	CT
73140	WILTON	13.8	1	32.6	5.0	1.0321	1.0324	CT
73142	COMPO	13.8	1	53.6	8.1	1.0288	1.0290	CT
73163	COS COB	115	1	12.5	1.9	1.0251	1.0251	CT
73173	SASCO CR	115	1	6.8	1.2	1.0342	1.0343	CT
73356	DARIEN	13.8	1	59.5	9.1	1.0302	1.0302	CT

73357	WATERSDE	13.2	1	82.5	12.7	1.0295	1.0295	CT
73358	COS COB	27.6	1	134.6	20.6	0.9997	0.9997	CT
73359	SO.END	13.2	1	107.3	16.4	1.0248	1.0248	CT
73360	GLNBROOK	13.2	1	118.0	18.1	1.0290	1.0290	CT
73361	WESTON A	27.6	1	28.5	4.5	0.9987	0.9990	CT
73362	CDR HGTS	13.2	1	68.5	10.5	1.0275	1.0275	CT
73363	WESTON B	27.6	1	36.3	5.4	1.0063	1.0065	CT
73364	NORWALK	27.6	1	102.6	20.4	1.0001	1.0002	CT
73365	NORWALK	4.8	1	9.8	1.6	1.0277	1.0279	CT
73368	NORWALK	13.8	1	60.7	11.1	1.0264	1.0266	CT
73369	FLAX HIL	13.8	1	56.8	8.8	1.0252	1.0253	CT
73370	PEACEABL	13.8	1	48.2	12.6	1.0325	1.0330	CT
73372	RDGEFLD	13.8	1	61.4	9.3	1.0323	1.0328	CT
73374	TOMAC	27.6	1	31.3	4.8	0.9963	0.9963	CT
73622	CMEECNOR	27.6	1	36.0	5.5	1.0000	1.0002	CT
73763	ASHCREEK	13.8	1	82.6	-0.8	1.0306	1.0308	CT
73768	OLDTWN1	13.8	1	32.0	1.6	1.0424	1.0427	CT
73769	OLTWN2&3	13.8	1	34.7	1.6	1.0424	1.0427	CT
73770	HAWTHORN	13.8	1	67.1	3.5	1.0300	1.0303	CT
73100	JACKSHL	13.8	1	0.0	0.0	1.0449	1.0459	CT
73101	STEPSTNE	23	1	32.5	5.1	1.0324	1.0332	CT
73136	OXFORD13	13.8	1	13.1	2.0	1.0319	1.0331	CT
73170	PLUMTREE	115	1	19.9	3.1	1.0177	1.0183	CT
73195	DEVON	115	1	18.9	3.0	1.0409	1.0413	CT
73224	TRMB J A	115	1	33.3	2.7	1.0303	1.0306	CT
73228	BALDWNJB	115	1	0.0	0.0	1.0266	1.0278	CT
73287	BRANF RR	115	1	6.4	0.9	1.0448	1.0454	CT
73296	GLNBROOK	14.6	1	35.9	0.7	1.0343	1.0343	CT
73333	JACKSHL	115	1	0.0	0.0	1.0322	1.0332	CT
73341	SHEPAUG	69	1	0.2	0.0	1.0257	1.0263	CT
73373	SNDYHOOK	23	1	25.0	3.9	1.0314	1.0323	CT
73375	STONY HL	13.8	1	57.7	9.1	1.0441	1.0445	CT
73376	MIDDLRIV	13.8	1	82.1	12.8	1.0295	1.0301	CT
73377	TRIANGLA	13.8	1	88.3	13.8	1.0280	1.0287	CT
73378	BATES RK	13.8	1	63.7	10.0	1.0308	1.0313	CT
73379	W.BRKFLD	13.8	1	46.1	7.2	1.0271	1.0279	CT
73380	CARMHILL	23	1	17.6	2.8	1.0317	1.0329	CT
73381	BULLS BR	27.6	1	20.5	3.2	1.0004	1.0011	CT
73382	BALDWINB	13.8	1	33.2	5.0	1.0333	1.0347	CT
73383	TRIANGLB	13.8	1	43.5	6.7	1.0280	1.0286	CT
73384	SHAWSHIL	13.8	1	35.4	5.4	1.0299	1.0314	CT
73385	BUNKER H	13.8	1	67.5	10.4	1.0327	1.0341	CT
73386	BALDWINA	13.8	1	33.2	5.0	1.0315	1.0328	CT
73387	BEACON F	13.8	1	66.1	9.5	1.0295	1.0307	CT
73388	SO.NAUG	13.8	1	41.4	6.5	1.0581	1.0591	CT
73389	FREIGHT	13.8	1	35.7	5.6	1.0338	1.0352	CT
73390	STEVENS	27.6	1	17.2	2.6	0.9945	0.9953	CT
73391	CANAL50	23	1	38.7	5.9	1.0340	1.0355	CT

73392	NEWTOWN	13.8	1	40.4	6.2	1.0287	1.0295	CT
73399	NOERA	13.8	1	49.9	7.7	1.0511	1.0525	CT
73400	NOERA	4.8	1	6.6	1.1	1.0305	1.0320	CT
73402	TODD	13.8	1	45.8	7.2	1.0295	1.0310	CT
73403	BRANFORD	27.6	1	70.9	11.0	1.0400	1.0407	CT
73405	HANOV90	23	1	19.9	3.0	1.0320	1.0335	CT
73406	HANOV90	13.8	1	33.2	5.1	1.0312	1.0326	CT
73409	SOUTHGTN	27.6	1	27.7	4.5	1.0172	1.0185	CT
73410	SOUTHGTN	13.8	1	52.5	8.1	1.0326	1.0344	CT
73541	ROCK RIV	13.8	1	66.0	10.4	1.0289	1.0289	CT
73631	WLNGF PF	115	1	100.0	15.4	1.0457	1.0464	CT
73675	MIX AVE	115	1	25.0	-0.3	1.0378	1.0385	CT
73730	QUINIPAC	13.8	1	64.4	5.5	1.0960	1.0965	CT
73731	NO.HAVEN	13.8	1	32.0	0.2	1.1119	1.1127	CT
73732	SACKETT	13.8	1	45.8	-0.8	1.0265	1.0271	CT
73735	MIX AVE	13.8	1	63.7	4.9	1.0283	1.0291	CT
73736	MILLRIV1	13.8	1	44.0	4.1	1.0331	1.0336	CT
73737	MILLRIV2	13.8	1	42.2	-0.1	1.0780	1.0785	CT
73738	BROADWAY	13.8	1	48.5	3.9	1.0605	1.0610	CT
73740	WATER ST	13.8	1	74.9	5.2	1.0284	1.0289	CT
73742	ELMWEST	13.8	1	59.1	0.2	1.0424	1.0429	CT
73744	ALLINGS	13.8	1	53.0	0.0	1.0867	1.0872	CT
73746	WOODMONT	13.8	1	71.2	-0.5	1.0900	1.0904	CT
73748	MILVON	13.8	1	63.2	1.6	1.0186	1.0190	CT
73752	BARNUM	13.8	1	47.3	-0.7	1.0267	1.0270	CT
73754	BAIRD	13.8	1	18.1	-0.6	1.1243	1.1247	CT
73755	CONGRES2	13.8	1	28.6	-2.0	1.0415	1.0417	CT
73756	CONGRESS	13.8	1	73.9	-3.3	1.0342	1.0345	CT
73758	E. MAIN	13.8	0	44.4	24.2	1.0169	1.0169	CT
73760	PEQUONIC	13.8	1	30.1	0.4	1.0332	1.0334	CT
73761	TRUM JCT	13.8	1	29.7	-0.6	1.0278	1.0281	CT
73764	TRAP FLS	13.8	1	61.0	1.6	1.0363	1.0369	CT
73765	DERBY PH	13.8	1	69.8	4.2	1.1098	1.1106	CT
73766	ANSONIA	13.8	1	46.2	1.5	1.0837	1.0845	CT
73767	JUNE ST	13.8	1	43.0	4.3	1.0300	1.0308	CT
70468	SUMMERGT	69	1	66.5	14.3	1.0119	1.0121	WMA
70469	RIVR TP2	69	1	26.0	5.6	1.0135	1.0137	WMA
70472	CANTON 1	69	1	7.9	1.6	1.0120	1.0122	WMA
70474	RIVR TP1	69	1	13.3	2.9	1.0140	1.0142	WMA
70475	BEECH J2	69	1	16.9	3.6	1.0127	1.0129	WMA
70493	WDFRD 46	46	1	41.7	16.8	1.0265	1.0272	WMA
70494	ARLNGTN	46	1	8.1	-1.2	1.0291	1.0302	WMA
70495	MANCH 46	46	1	16.2	5.0	1.0450	1.0459	WMA
70590	WILMNTN	69	1	5.1	0.0	1.0603	1.0608	WMA
70618	VT SEARS	2.4	1	2.5	-1.5	1.0765	1.0769	WMA
70623	VT.VERN	13.2	1	3.8	1.7	0.9960	0.9961	WMA
71659	TEMPLETN	69	1	12.8	2.7	0.9624	0.9625	WMA
71663	ASHBR 1	13.8	1	3.8	0.0	1.0111	1.0113	WMA

71664	ASHBR 2	13.8	1	7.6	0.0	1.0188	1.0190	WMA
71687	PAXTON	13.8	1	5.6	1.2	0.9909	0.9908	WMA
71752	ELM	23	1	57.7	8.7	1.0424	1.0423	WMA
71753	BUCK PND	23	1	32.1	4.8	1.0439	1.0375	WMA
71758	PINESHED	13.8	1	38.4	5.8	1.0467	1.0409	WMA
71761	CHICOPEE	13.8	1	59.3	8.9	0.9881	0.9835	WMA
71762	CHICPROS	13.8	1	33.9	5.1	1.0464	1.0419	WMA
71767	INGLESDE	115	1	41.8	6.3	1.0195	1.0202	WMA
71768	HOLYOKE	115	1	41.9	6.3	1.0217	1.0227	WMA
72106	SNOW 73	115	1	12.4	0.0	1.0242	1.0239	WMA
72106	SNOW 73	115	1	17.2	0.0	1.0242	1.0239	WMA
72189	LEICESTR	13.8	1	5.4	0.0	1.0450	1.0439	WMA
72190	PONDVL 1	13.8	1	12.1	0.0	1.0169	1.0162	WMA
72193	LEICST2	13.8	1	5.4	0.0	1.0497	1.0486	WMA
72198	WEBSTR S	13.8	1	41.6	12.0	1.0053	1.0053	WMA
72198	WEBSTR S	13.8	1	67.7	12.7	1.0053	1.0053	WMA
72207	LITCHFD2	13.8	1	19.4	0.0	1.0359	1.0361	WMA
72215	N.OXFORD	13.2	1	27.2	0.0	1.0283	1.0282	WMA
72216	SNOW ST	23	1	20.2	2.4	1.0663	1.0660	WMA
72217	WCHARLTN	13.2	1	34.0	0.0	1.0206	1.0201	WMA
72222	E.WINCH	13.8	1	7.9	0.0	1.0298	1.0299	WMA
72223	PARK ST2	13.8	1	6.6	0.0	1.0129	1.0130	WMA
72224	PARK ST	13.8	1	14.8	0.0	1.0332	1.0334	WMA
72458	NEP-PLST	23	1	50.0	12.3	1.0225	1.0215	WMA
72463	BELCHTWN	13.2	1	14.8	0.0	1.0237	1.0218	WMA
72465	E.LONG 1	13.2	1	8.2	0.0	1.0408	1.0392	WMA
72466	E.LONG 2	13.2	1	24.0	0.0	1.0399	1.0044	WMA
72467	HALMAR	4.8	1	0.3	0.0	1.0265	1.0135	WMA
72468	HAMDENT1	13.2	1	17.1	0.0	1.0516	1.0499	WMA
72469	LASHAWAY	13.2	1	6.6	0.0	0.9980	0.9963	WMA
72470	MEADOWL1	13.2	1	19.7	0.0	1.0031	1.0017	WMA
72471	PALMER	13.2	1	22.8	0.0	1.0439	1.0407	WMA
72472	PALMER	23	1	8.9	1.3	1.0071	1.0029	WMA
72473	SHKRT2	13.2	1	17.4	0.0	1.0210	1.0076	WMA
72474	THRNDIKE	13.2	1	14.6	0.0	1.0447	1.0414	WMA
72475	LILRSTRD	13.2	1	15.7	0.0	1.0407	1.0389	WMA
72476	WARE	13.2	1	17.9	0.0	1.0601	1.0578	WMA
72477	WILBRAHM	13.2	1	25.5	0.0	1.0935	1.0834	WMA
72479	5 CORNR	13.2	1	6.8	0.0	1.0631	1.0630	WMA
72480	LASHAWAY	23	1	0.0	0.0	0.9755	0.9738	WMA
72480	LASHAWAY	23	1	12.7	0.4	0.9755	0.9738	WMA
72481	CHESHILS	13.8	1	11.2	0.0	1.0467	1.0469	WMA
72482	CHESHILN	13.8	1	6.8	0.0	1.0488	1.0490	WMA
72483	BARRE T1	13.8	1	4.3	0.0	1.0635	1.0636	WMA
72484	BARRE T2	13.8	1	4.8	0.0	1.0344	1.0344	WMA
72485	ROYALSTN	4.16	1	0.8	0.0	0.9612	0.9613	WMA
72486	WENDELL	13.8	1	23.4	0.0	1.0378	1.0379	WMA
72487	ADAMS	23	1	65.2	13.7	1.0618	1.0625	WMA

72488	BEAR SWP	13.8	1	2.3	0.0	1.0372	1.0375	WMA
72489	LENX DP1	23	1	10.3	1.1	1.0041	1.0036	WMA
72490	LENX DP2	23	1	4.3	0.2	1.0136	1.0132	WMA
72491	FLORENCE	13.8	1	23.8	0.0	1.0294	1.0298	WMA
72491	FLORENCE	13.8	1	5.3	0.9	1.0294	1.0298	WMA
72492	NORTHAMP	13.8	1	36.1	8.8	0.9987	0.9991	WMA
72494	SHUTSBRY	13.8	1	1.1	0.0	1.0284	1.0272	WMA
72515	DRFLD 3G	2.4	1	0.3	0.1	0.9730	0.9727	WMA
72516	DRFLD 4G	2.4	1	0.6	0.0	1.0211	1.0209	WMA
72517	DRFLD 5G	13.8	1	0.5	0.0	1.0744	1.0750	WMA
72939	FRENCH K	115	1	5.0	0.8	1.0044	1.0045	WMA
72957	DOREEN	115	1	1.7	0.3	1.0317	1.0326	WMA
72981	SLVRLKE	115	1	5.0	0.8	1.0315	1.0324	WMA
73005	SHELBN	69	1	3.9	0.6	1.0217	1.0215	WMA
73010	BERKSHIR	23	1	10.8	1.6	0.9862	0.9873	WMA
73011	OSWALD	23	1	42.5	6.4	1.0214	1.0222	WMA
73012	DOREEN	23	1	24.4	3.7	1.0193	1.0202	WMA
73013	WOODLAND	23	1	21.9	3.3	1.0194	1.0189	WMA
73014	PLEASANT	23	1	6.8	1.0	1.0225	1.0215	WMA
73015	PARTRDGE	23	1	16.4	2.5	1.0229	1.0238	WMA
73016	PLNFLD	23	1	3.0	0.4	1.0230	1.0238	WMA
73017	AMHRST S	13.8	1	20.3	2.9	1.0422	1.0375	WMA
73018	AMHRST N	13.8	1	20.3	2.9	1.0042	1.0044	WMA
73019	PODICK A	13.8	1	38.6	5.7	1.0296	1.0299	WMA
73020	ASHFIELD	23	1	2.0	0.3	1.0205	1.0212	WMA
73021	LUDLOW	13.8	1	17.1	2.5	1.0126	1.0090	WMA
73022	BLANDFRD	23	1	13.6	2.0	1.0442	1.0391	WMA
73023	SOUTHWCK	13.8	1	25.6	3.8	1.0395	1.0303	WMA
73024	AGAWAM	13.8	1	43.5	6.7	1.0390	1.0293	WMA
73025	MIDWAY	13.8	1	6.3	1.0	0.9987	0.9992	WMA
73026	CLINTON	13.8	1	57.9	8.6	1.0269	1.0275	WMA
73027	BRECKWD	13.8	1	52.6	7.9	1.0118	1.0038	WMA
73028	E.SPGFLD	13.8	1	59.9	8.9	1.0031	0.9998	WMA
73029	GUNN	23	1	29.1	4.4	1.0126	1.0068	WMA
73030	PIPER	13.8	1	43.0	6.6	1.0210	1.0151	WMA
73031	FRANCONA	13.8	1	57.8	8.7	1.0263	1.0234	WMA
73032	SILVER	13.8	1	38.3	5.7	1.0394	1.0296	WMA
73074	CUMBRND	13.8	1	31.6	4.7	1.0436	1.0439	WMA
73075	MONTAGUE	13.8	1	26.4	4.0	1.0470	1.0472	WMA
73077	ORCHARD	13.8	1	39.9	6.0	1.0101	1.0079	WMA
73081	W.SPRING	13.8	1	38.1	5.8	1.0237	1.0183	WMA
73457	SCITICO	23	1	82.2	12.4	1.0356	1.0282	WMA

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-014
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Does ICF assume that any ISO-NE dispatchable DSM resources have been dispatched in the load flow simulations under either N-1 or N-1-1 testing? If so, please provide a list of the bus names and numbers and the level that these resources are dispatched to.

Response:

Consistent with the ISO-NE Operating Procedure No. 4, ICF did not assume the dispatch of the active (dispatchable) DSM resources under either N-1 or N-1-1 testing.

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

What assumptions did ICF make about imports and / or exports into or out of ISO-NE with neighboring control area? Please provide a detailed list, including any power flows over the Cross Sound Cable? Did ICF make the same assumptions as NU did, in the material NU provided to La Capra on September 12, 2008, concerning flows from Connecticut to Long Island over the Cross Sound Cable in its load flow simulations? If so, please provide the basis for this assumption.

Response:

The table below shows the imports and/or exports into or out of ISO-NE area assumed by ICF. These assumptions are within the range typically used for modeling of the New England interfaces.

Import-Export into or out of ISO-NE

Area	Power Flow ¹ (MW)
NB to ISO-NE	1,000
NYISO to ISO-NE	162
HQ to ISO-NE	288
Cross Sound Cable (ISO-NE to LIPA)	-300
Nwk Hrbr-Northport Cables (ISO-NE to LIPA)	-3
HQ DC Line to ISO-NE	2,000
Total Imports into ISO-NE (MW)	3,147
¹ Power flows into ISO-NE are considered to be positive and vice-versa	

The materials NU provided to LaCapra on September 12, 2008 made essentially consistent assumptions. Small differences in some values would not have any significant impact on the results or conclusions of any analysis in the Western Massachusetts or Connecticut area.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-016
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

What assumptions did ICF make about imports into the Greater Springfield area and into Connecticut under N-1 and N-1-1 testing? Please describe in detail.

Response:

No assumption was made concerning "imports into the Greater Springfield area" because there is no such defined interface. Power flows into the Greater Springfield area are dependent on local load, local generation sources and transfers through Greater Springfield into Connecticut.

ICF assumed that the Connecticut imports would be 2,500 MW and 1,700 MW prior to N-1 and N-1-1 conditions, respectively.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-017
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

The ICF report appears to conclude that the loss of Millstone unit 3 in Connecticut exacerbates overloads in the pre-GSRP case. If the loss of generation in Connecticut worsens reliability, could the inclusion of additional generation in Connecticut improve or help mitigate reliability? Did NU or ICF analyze such a possibility? If so, please provide that analysis and all supporting material? If not, please explain why not.

Response:

Under certain contingencies, overloads in the Springfield area occur without regard to the level of Connecticut generation. The overloads in the pre-GSRP cases are severe and greatly depend on the dispatch of Springfield area generation.

The loss of Millstone unit 3 is the single largest contingency which must be considered in Southern New England system planning. Inclusion of additional generation in Connecticut could help to improve reliability. However, it will not provide a practical solution to resolve the overloads and low voltages addressed by the GSRP.

ICF analyzed the effect of adding 1,184 MW of Connecticut generation. See the response to Data Request CEAB-04, Q-CEAB-001. In addition, in a sensitivity case ICF included an incremental reduction of Connecticut demand by 1,000 MW. This analysis is included within the data provided in the response to Data Request CEAB-04, Q-CEAB-024.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-018
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

In its N-1 and N-1-1 testing, did ICF utilize the same contingencies as NU provided to CEAB consultant La Capra Associates on 9-12-08? If not please provide and describe the contingencies that ICF did use, and explain any difference from what NU provided on 9-12-08.

Response:

ICF did not use the same contingency file. ICF was asked to develop its own independent analysis and used its expertise to develop a contingency list for analyzing and developing a non-transmission alternative. NU also developed its own contingency list, which it provided to La Capra, independently. Both contingency decks were subsets of the files used by the ISO-NE working group. The two contingency decks are substantially similar, and both adequately test the system in accordance with reliability standards.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-019
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

On page 52, ICF states that it considered scenarios where West Springfield and Berkshire Power units were on-line, but tables 6-1 through 6-6 seem to show only scenarios where these units are off line. Please provide the results of the scenarios where West Springfield and Berkshire Power units were on-line.

Response:

ICF analyzed scenarios with the West Springfield and Berkshire Power units on-line. These scenarios are described as Cases 3, 4, 5 and 6 in Exhibit 6-8 on page 62 of ICF's report. The results of these cases are presented on Pages 66 and 67 of ICF's report.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-020
Page 1 of 2

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Did ICF analyze any scenarios that are not included in this report? If so, please provide a description of the scenario and the results.

Response:

Yes, ICF analyzed other scenarios that were not included in the report. These scenarios are described in Attachment 2. In these additional scenarios, since line overloads persisted under N-1 contingency conditions, ICF did not find it necessary to analyze the N-1-1 contingencies.

Description of Additional Scenarios Analyzed by ICF	
Case	Case Description
A	Reduce Western Massachusetts Zonal Demand by 2000 MWs and Generation by 2000 MWs
B	Reduce Connecticut Zonal Demand by 1000 MW and Western Massachusetts Zonal Demand by 1000 MW
C	West Springfield and Berkshire power plants operational, new 400-MW facility at Berkshire Power, and new 200-MW facility at Mount Tom (Total of 1054 MW in Springfield area) and reduce Western Massachusetts Zonal Demand by 1000 MW.
D	Reduce Western Massachusetts Zonal Demand by 1000 MW which includes specific load reduction in certain substations and West Springfield and Berkshire plants operational.

Results of N-1 Contingency Analysis of Additional Scenarios analyzed by ICF										
From Bus No	From Bus Name	From kV	To Bus No	To Bus Name	To Bus kV	Ckt	Case A	Case B	Case C	Case D
72955	SOUTHWCK	115	73244	N.BLMFLD	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	148%	97%
72977	SO.AGAWM	115	72991	SAGAR	115	2	< 90%	< 90%	134%	94%
72977	SO.AGAWM	115	72992	SAGBR	115	2	< 90%	< 90%	134%	94%
72991	SAGAR	115	73244	N.BLMFLD	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	134%	94%
72992	SAGBR	115	73244	N.BLMFLD	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	134%	94%
72955	SOUTHWCK	115	72967	GRANVL J	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	134%	91%
71750	ELM	115	72962	AGAWM PF	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	129%	< 90%
71750	ELM	115	72967	GRANVL J	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	122%	< 90%
72961	W.SPRING	115	72969	BRECKWD	115	1	129%	169%	121%	123%
72972	LUDLOW	115	72980	SHAWINGN	115	1	< 90%	108%	120%	< 90%
72977	SO.AGAWM	115	72979	SILVER82	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	117%	< 90%
72966	MT TOM	115	72973	FRMNT SO	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	117%	< 90%
72977	SO.AGAWM	115	72987	SILVER81	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	117%	< 90%
72962	AGAWM PF	115	72987	SILVER81	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	113%	< 90%
72962	AGAWM PF	115	72979	SILVER82	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	113%	< 90%
71756	PINESHED	115	72966	MT TOM	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	110%	< 90%
72962	AGAWM PF	115	72963	POCHASSC	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	109%	< 90%
71756	PINESHED	115	72965	FRMNT NO	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	106%	< 90%
72969	BRECKWD	115	72970	E.SPGFLD	115	1	132%	187%	103%	120%
72965	FRMNT NO	115	72976	ESPJ1723	115	1	< 90%	< 90%	101%	< 90%
72961	W.SPRING	115	72962	AGAWM PF	115	2	< 90%	< 90%	< 90%	114%

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-021
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Will the GSRP, either with or without the other components of NEEWS, change any limits on the ability of Connecticut to import power? If so, please provide what those limits are today and what they will be after the GSRP and / or the other components of NEEWS.

Response:

ISO-NE determines transfer limits, which vary with system conditions, and are thus properly expressed as a range rather than a single point estimate. ISO-NE has determined the current CT import limit to be 1,700 MW - 2,500 MW. The construction of GSRP will result in system conditions that enable higher imports more often. ISO-NE has not determined what the impact of GSRP alone on the CT import limit will be. However, NU estimates that it will be approximately 200 MW - 300 MW.

ISO-NE has estimated that with the completion of all of the NEEWS projects, the Connecticut import limits will increase by approximately 1,100 MW -- from a maximum of 2,500 MW to a maximum of 3,600 MW.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-022
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Has NU or ICF evaluated the impact of the GSRP on zonal or nodal LMPs anywhere in the ISO-NE control area? If so, please provide those analyses.

Response:

ICF and NU have not evaluated the impact of GSRP on zonal or nodal LMP's in the ISO-NE control area.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-023
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

In the ICF NTA Study for RI, ICF assessed the load levels to which load in RI must be reduced in order to resolve reliability issues. Did NU or ICF perform a similar study of load reductions in Western Massachusetts and / or Connecticut? If so, please provide those analyses. If not, please explain why not.

Response:

ICF studied the effect of reducing the demand in the Western Massachusetts zone by more than 80% of the total. Similarly, ICF also analyzed a scenario which included incremental demand reduction above Reference Case assumptions for both Western Massachusetts and Connecticut (see data responses CEAB-004 Q-CEAB-008 and CEAB-004 Q-CEAB-001). In that case the load in Western Massachusetts is reduced by 1,000 MW (about 45% of the demand in that zone) and the load in Connecticut is reduced by 1,000 MW (about 26% of the demand in that zone). Under all these scenarios, line overloads persisted under N-1 contingency conditions. Since these scenarios reflect unrealistic levels of resources in terms of demand reduction, ICF did not find it necessary to pursue further load reduction, and concluded that there are no demand reduction scenarios that could achieve the same level of reliability as the GSRP.

Due on: 10/10/2008
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
Docket No. Greater Springfield Reliability Project

Data Request CEAB-04
Dated: 09/29/2008
Q-CEAB-024
Page 1 of 1

Witness: CL&P Panel
Request from: Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

Question:

Please provide the input and solved output files in electronic format (preferably PSS/E format) for the cases and scenarios analyzed by ICF.

Response:

A CD containing input and solved output files for the cases and scenarios will be provided directly to Messrs. Peaco, Athas, and Hahn of LaCapra Associates, CEAB's consultant, pursuant to Critical Energy Infrastructure Information non-disclosure agreements which enable them to review and use the information and to disclose conclusions based on that information, but not to disseminate the information itself.