

September 17, 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")

EXAMINERS' DATA REQUEST  
NO. 6

---

### 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. (Volume XI-A, Exhibit J, Page 2 of 103) Please confirm that there was no stability analysis performed on any alternative other than N5 and S1.
2. (Volume XI-A, Page 7 of 103) Please identify all current BPS substations by ISO-NE requirements and those that are built to BPS requirements but are not

- classified as BPS. As part of your response, please indicate which substations must be classified as BPS and the timing of the classification through 2027.
3. (Volume XI-A, Page 24 of 103) Please identify the system adjustments made to satisfy the reliability criteria for N-1-1 contingencies by dispatch.
  4. (Volume XI-A, Page 27 of 103) Please explain in detail why grandfathered ratings for specific elements need to be re-rated for long term study conformance. As part of your response, please explain how that does not just negate the grandfather clause. Also as part of your response please explain why the grandfather clause was put into PP-7 to begin with.
  5. (Volume XI-A, Page 35 of 103) Who supplied the L-G system Zs? If self generated, do the companies agree with your calculations?
  6. (Volume XI-A, Page 36 of 103) Who developed the load shedding parameters? On what basis are they founded and please compare them with, and show that they are comparable with NERC, NPCC, and ISO-NE requirements in that regard.
  7. (Volume XI-A, Page 37 of 103) What were the stuck breaker times used in your analysis and who supplied them? If greater than 8 cycles, please explain why.
  8. (Volume XI-A, Page 38 of 103) Please explain and reconcile why you use strict of load restrictions as acceptable reliability response when the STF doesn't do so even for extreme contingencies.
  9. (Volume XI-A, Page 44 of 103) Were these 3 phase stuck breaker contingencies? If so, why wasn't independent pole operation modeled in the stuck breaker scenario?
  10. (Volume XI-A, Page 49 of 103) Why was a 45 percent load level used of a 50/50 forecast when the ISO-NE requires a 90/10 load forecast for its studies? As part of your response please explain what a 1,000 MW difference in load level would make to your study results.
  11. (Volume XI-A, Page 51 of 103) Please show what hydro generation was used in your analysis. As part of your response, also show the full capability of the hydro units.
  12. (Volume XI-A, Table 4-1, Page 52 of 103) Please show any differences between these dispatches and the dispatches used in the alternative selection process.
  13. (Volume XI-A, Page 53 of 103) Please compare all transfer interface limits you used with those used for the thermal analysis that made the alternative selection.

As part of your response, please make the comparison in N-0, N-1 and N-1-1 tables.

14. (Volume XI-A, Page 53 of 103) Please prepare a table that shows all transfer limits for all interfaces in both directions north of and including the North – South interface in New England that depicts existing limits, 2012 limits, 2017 limits, and 2027 limits with and without the MPRP, and under N-0, N-1, and N-1-1 conditions. The intent of this request is to show beneficial increases of transfer capability due to the MPRP.
15. (Volume XI-A, Page 74 of 103) Please explain and reconcile why the petitioners allowed operator intervention for contingencies where STE limits are exceeded when system operation requires that loadings in excess of LTE up to STE must be brought to LTE loadings within 15 minutes.
16. (Volume XI-B, Exhibit J, Page 450 of 595) Please show any differences in the short circuit analyses you performed and that done by NU. As part of your response, please explain why those differences exist between the two models.

Dated: September 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

---

James A. Buckley  
Hearing Examiner