

STATE OF MAINE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 2008-255

September 16, 2008

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY
and PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW
HAMPSHIRE Request for Certificate of
Public Convenience and Necessity for the
Maine Power Reliability Program
Consisting of the Construction of
Approximately 350 Miles of 345 kV and 115
kV Transmission Lines ("MPRP")

EXAMINER'S DATA REQUEST
NO. 1

I. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please provide the response to each numbered request on a separate sheet of paper, or papers. Each sheet of paper should be three-hole punched.
2. For each response, please state (1) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) responsible for preparing the response, and (2) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) who are competent to give testimony concerning the response and all documents produced as part of the responses.
3. Where information requested is not available in the precise form described in the question, or is not available for all years indicated, please provide all information with respect to the subject matter of the question that can be identified in the Utility's Work papers and files, or that is otherwise available.
4. As used in this data request, "available" means within the Utility's knowledge, possession, or control, or within the party's power, capacity or ability to retrieve or obtain from an affiliate, a contractor, or any other source.

II. DATA REQUEST

1. When did CMP and others first start its MPRP analysis?
2. (Volume I, Page 93) If the MPRP approvals are required by June 2009, and the system has been deteriorating for the last 30 years since the last major upgrades were performed, please describe why CMP waited so long to identify system needs that are needed so soon in the future?

3. Please also provide an explanation as to what types of annual or periodic review, if any, CMP routinely undertakes on its systems long term planning process. For instance, does CMP prepare a 10 year transmission plan? Please describe how CMP performs its long range transmission planning internally and for submittal to ISO-NE. As part of your response, please explain why the needs of the MPRP in 2012 did not show up years ago.
4. (Volume I, Page 1, Lines 9-10) Please supply all information that shows that the proposed project is the most economically sound. As part of your response, please supply the economic criteria used to make such an evaluation.
5. Please supply a copy of the NERC, NPCC, ISO-NE, CMP, and PSNH transmission planning standards.
6. Please provide all correspondence or other communications between CMP or any of its corporate affiliates and the NERC or NPCC relating to the reliability of CMP's system, reliability standards applicable to CMP's system, and proposals or options to meet reliability standards.
7. Please provide all internal documents, memoranda and other communications that relate to communications between CMP or any of its corporate affiliates and the NERC or NPCC relating to the reliability of CMP's system, reliability standards applicable to CMP's system, and proposals or options to meet reliability standards.
8. Please show in detail which facilities of the 115kV and above systems in both CMP and PSNH must be designed to NERC standards; NPCC standards; ISO-NE standards, CMP standards, and PSNH standards.
9. Please highlight and explain in detail any differences that exist between the CMP and PSNH transmission planning standards.
10. (Volume I, Page 3, Lines 20-21) Please show how the transmission solution proposed produce energy benefits to the rest of New England that exceed the entire cost of the project. Please provide any studies or data that supports this statement.
11. (Volume I, Page 5, Line 3) Please provide a list in chronological order of the date (year) in which each individual transmission segment was first indentified by the CMP planning process as needing upgrades by the year 2012.
12. (Volume I, Page 9, Table 3) Please explain how these lines will be re-rated.

13. (Volume I, Page 14, Lines 2-5) Please explain and identify what portions /line segments of the MPRP filing are mandated to comply with the standards set forth as a bulk power system.
14. (Volume I, Page 20, Lines 7-18) Please supply the specific contingencies referred to.
15. (Volume I, Page 21, Line 11-12) Please identify the governmental and other interests described in this sentence.
16. (Volume I, Page 22) Please supply MPRP study result requirements if new SPSs were put into service. As part of your response, please indicate when the 2012 MPRP requirement date is moved to.
17. (Volume I, Page 22, Lines 1-5) Please describe in detail what the stressed system conditions are in Maine, New Hampshire, New Brunswick, the rest of New England, and areas not mentioned but outside of New England like New York and Quebec.

Dated: September 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

James Buckley
Hearing Examiner