

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. 2

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. Please provide a geographically accurate map showing the transmission facilities in Maine. On this map please indicate the local areas used to structure the various dispatches. On this same map, please show the location of each generating station over 25 MW, the rating of each unit, and fuel type.

2. Please supply all ISO-NE documentation that requires a system to be designed with 2 generators out of service in the local area as a starting point.
3. Please supply the approximated frequency of occurrence of having 2 generators out of service, being at the peak load day that has a 90/10 probability, and having one element out of service and the occurrence of a failed breaker. Please show all calculations.
4. (Volume I, Page 22, Lines 1-12) CMP removed all existing SPS's from its analysis to better understand how the underlying transmission system responds. Please supply MPRP study result requirements if the existing SPS's were left in service. As part of your response, please indicate when the 2012 MPRP requirement date is moved to,
5. (Volume I, Page 23) Please explain how a single line outage can cause a blackout for a significant portion of the state. As part of your response, please describe how operators would allow such an event to occur if they operate the system with first contingency coverage and any impact the removal of SPSs had on this result.
6. (Volume I, Page 23, Lines 13-15) Please show how the loss of the South Gorham substation is a design criterion.
7. (Volume I, Page 24, Lines 5-7) Please supply a copy of the ISO-NE PP-7. Also please include all appendices in your response that show temperatures, formulas, etc.
8. (Volume I, Page 24, Lines 5-7) Please supply a copy of all Maine and PSNH 345kV transformer ratings including normal, LTE, STE, and DAL ratings. As part of your response, please include allowable temperatures or temperature restrictions and loss of life allowed for each rating.
9. (Volume I, Page 24, Lines 5-7) For each line segment 115kV and above in Maine and in the seacoast region of New Hampshire, please provide ratings tables that show the various ratings for all line components and the limiting component rating. If PP-7 was used to calculate ratings for these facilities, please supply the same information for the previously used ratings.
10. (Volume I, Page 24, Lines 5-7) Please explain in detail any obligations that a member of ISO-NE has or does not have regarding the utilization of its PP-7 for *rating equipment*. As part of your response, please include the use of PP-7 on RNS versus LNS facilities, existing versus new facilities, and facilities not required to be designed to ISO-NE standards. As part of your response, please supply all documentation regarding PP-7 that allows a participant to deviate from its global use.

11. (Volume I, Page 25, Table 4) This table shows an approximate 2.3 percent load growth continuously occurring from 2008 through 2017. Please show what the average cost of electricity for CMP is in each year of the table in nominal year dollars. As part of your response, please describe the impact that rising electricity prices has on electrical usage.
12. (Volume I, Page 27, Lines 9-17) Please explain how the scenario described is required to be designed to the NERC, NPCC, ISO-NE, CMP, and PSNH transmission design criteria. As part of your response, please supply section references.
13. (Volume I, Page 27, Lines 9-17) Are system operators required to operate the system to whatever contingencies present themselves even if they exceed system design criteria?
14. (Volume I, Page 28, Lines 5-6) Please provide an explanation as to what is considered an "Out of merit generation unit" and why it appears in this sentence to be an issue.
15. (Volume I, Page 29, Lines 11-16) Were stability limits determined out to 2027? If not, could stability limits be lower than the thermal limits determined reducing the longevity of the scenarios?
16. (Volume I, Page 29, Lines 17-19) Please supply the stability limits for the three interface limits mentioned in 2017. Please repeat the request for stability limits out to 2027.
17. (Volume I, Page 29, Lines 11-19) Please supply the stability and thermal limits for interfaces in New Hampshire and from Northern New England to Southern New England for the present, 2017, and 2027. As part of your response, please indicate the transfer levels simulated in the analyses.
18. (Volume I, Page 38, Lines 6-10) Please supply a listing of the dwellings by line segment that exist within 300 feet of a ROW (after property acquisition) containing any new line segment, rebuilt line segment, or line segment that is to be re-rated, the distance to the ROW before and after property acquisition, and the identity of the parcel.
19. (Volume I, Page 38, Lines 6-10) Please supply a listing of schools by line segment that exist within 500 feet of a ROW (after property acquisition) containing any new line segment, rebuilt line segment, or line segment that is to be re-rated, the distance to the ROW before and after property acquisition, and the identity of the parcel.
20. (Volume I, Page 41, Line 8) Please file the PSNH portion of Exhibit D-2 as soon as it is completed.

21. (Volume I, Page 41, Lines 16-17) Here it states that there are 36 towns where the MPRP could not be built with the ordinances currently in effect. Please list each of those towns and the ordinance that is problematic. Please by town, list any electric utility facilities that currently exist (substations, distribution, transmission) that do not comply with the problematic ordinance and for each facility supply a brief statement how the facility was approved for construction.
22. (Volume I, Page 45, Lines 13-17) Please supply copies of official meeting minutes for each Study Group meeting, each PAC meeting, each Reliability Committee meeting, and any other meeting at ISO-NE where the MPRP was discussed. Include in your response meetings where inclusion in PTF or project costs was discussed. Include in your response meetings where inclusion in PTF or project costs was discussed. As part of your response, please include a tabulation of any votes taken by market group, how each participant voted, and a list of all participants by market group.
23. (Volume I, Page 45, Lines 13-17) Please explain how the Study Group reached its decisions. Include in your response, a discussion of the process when differences arose. Please also include a listing of what study group members attended what meetings. As part of that response, please also include the time which each study group member was part of the study group team.
24. (Volume I, Page 45, Lines 13-17) Please supply internal notes made by each of the joint petitioners for each Study Group meeting, each PAC meeting, each Reliability Committee meeting, and any other meeting at ISO-NE where the MPRP was discussed.
25. (Volume I, Page 53, Line 7) Please supply a copy of referenced document T-56. As part of your response, please have each petitioner supply their similar document.
26. (Volume I, Page 53, Lines 23-24) Please explain in more detail what was being used as "readily available unit price information".
27. (Volume I, Page 59, Lines 17-22 and Page 61, lines 1&2) Please provide an estimate of when CMP would have available any cost estimate of the Distribution impacts to support this statement.
28. (Volume I, Page 60, Lines 10-11) Please affirm your expectation that almost all MPRP has been designated as PTF and will their costs regionalized. Please supply any cost cap placed on the PTF designation. If such a determination has not yet been made, please provide an update on the status of such a determination.

29. (Volume I, Page 69, Lines 12-14) Please clarify the designation of the Maine Yankee double circuit towers. Were those towers granted a waiver by NPCC? Please explain why it is on the contingency list.
30. (Volume I, Page 70, Lines 6-8) Please show where NERC, NPCC, ISO-NE, or any petitioners design criteria indicates that the use of SPSs results in inferior reliability. In addition, are the petitioners stating that if the use of an SPS is allowed by NERC, NPCC, or ISO-NE design criteria that those organizations are providing inferior reliability?
31. (Volume I, Page 70, Lines 6-8) The petitioners plan to use static var devices in some of their proposed solution scenarios. As understood, an SVC is an electronic device that is programmed to do "X" if "Y" occurs much like an SPS. Please explain how an SPS operation creates inferior reliability while an SVC operation creates reliability that would be superior.

Dated: September 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

James Buckley
Hearing Examiner