



May 30, 2013

Ms. Melanie Bachman
Acting Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

RE: F-2012/2013 Response to CMEEC Pre Hearing Interrogatories

Dear Ms. Bachman:

The Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (CMEEC) herewith submits an original and twenty (20) copies to the Connecticut Siting Council in response to Interrogatories 1 through 6 dated May 16, 2013 from the Connecticut Siting Council in conjunction with Docket No. F-2012/2013 Connecticut Siting Council Review of Connecticut Electric Loads and Resources.

Should you require any additional information, please advise us.

Very truly yours,

CONNECTICUT MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC
ENERGY COOPERATIVE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Drew Rankin", is written over the typed name.

Drew Rankin
Chief Executive Officer

CJC/

Enclosures

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

- Q-CSC-1-CMEEC Provide the predicted (not actual) 50/50 forecast loads for 2003 through 2012 from The Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative's (CMEEC) 2003 forecast report.
- A-CSC-1-CMEEC Please find attached Table 1 which contains CMEEC's projected load forecast which was submitted to the Connecticut Siting Council on March 1, 2003.

Table I
 CONNECTICUT MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC ENERGY COOPERATIVE
 10-YEAR FORECAST OF RETAIL SALES BY CUSTOMER CLASS, ENERGY REQUIREMENTS AND PEAK DEMAND
 2003-2012

YEAR	Residential Service MWh		Small General Service MWh		Medium General Service MWh		Large General Service MWh		Other Service MWh		Total Retail Sales MWh		Mohegan Tribal Authority MWh		Hydro Gener. MWh		Subtrans. & Distri. Losses MWh		Systems Energy Requirements set by CMEEC MWh		CMEEC Summer Coincident Peak Demand MW		CMEEC Winter Coincident Peak Demand MW		Load Factor %
	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	Sales	Peak	
1992	424,463	118,862	250,533	714,329	47,619	1,555,806	0	11,292	68,988	1,606,260	267.49	266.51	68.4												
1993	441,802	115,140	250,426	734,729	47,119	1,589,216	0	11,372	72,747	1,627,239	286.08	263.33	64.9												
1994	450,933	114,205	256,064	720,052	48,728	1,589,982	0	6,524	83,816	1,644,374	296.86	281.06	63.2												
1995	448,638	114,746	247,902	736,106	51,182	1,598,574	0	3,845	85,114	1,654,613	311.63	296.47	60.6												
1996	477,285	114,580	251,441	813,350	52,647	1,709,303	15,497	3,774	74,266	1,766,861	290.17	279.85	69.3												
1997	468,598	113,766	245,795	780,571	53,356	1,662,086	45,138	3,216	78,568	1,751,390	319.54	264.34	62.6												
1998	472,381	115,427	249,085	774,389	53,839	1,665,121	48,027	3,524	75,486	1,745,827	309.16	263.73	64.5												
1999	492,997	116,139	287,677	712,728	57,565	1,667,106	48,036	2,111	75,486	1,758,116	322.39	286.24	62.3												
2000	504,537	119,702	335,887	672,090	59,936	1,692,152	61,694	2,825	67,065	1,787,298	310.46	285.36	65.5												
2001	514,722	122,207	337,878	666,954	61,560	1,703,321	101,918	2,118	65,813	1,844,206	351.12	277.51	60.0												
2002	527,056	119,644	344,415	665,739	66,843	1,723,697	149,846	2,173	74,766	1,921,054	367.87	299.49	59.6												
2003	530,052	120,058	351,558	655,100	68,846	1,725,614	151,167	2,200	61,571	1,910,652	355.73	295.82	61.3												
2004	532,697	120,891	354,478	657,345	70,669	1,736,080	153,963	2,200	62,057	1,924,399	362.85	303.35	60.4												
2005	535,945	122,127	358,931	659,503	72,128	1,748,634	156,015	2,200	62,641	1,939,590	369.19	311.04	60.0												
2006	541,687	124,624	362,223	682,980	72,787	1,784,301	158,497	2,200	65,100	1,980,199	371.86	313.04	60.8												
2007	544,895	125,638	365,785	685,051	73,474	1,794,843	161,020	2,200	65,502	1,993,664	374.08	315.42	60.8												
2008	548,162	126,654	369,328	686,689	74,167	1,805,000	163,999	2,200	65,895	2,007,194	377.05	317.66	60.6												
2009	551,477	127,633	372,766	688,279	74,853	1,815,007	166,188	2,200	66,281	2,019,776	379.54	320.11	60.7												
2010	554,845	128,614	376,208	689,786	75,547	1,825,000	168,834	2,200	66,665	2,032,600	382.57	322.41	60.7												
2011	558,275	129,504	379,346	691,476	76,214	1,834,816	171,523	2,200	67,057	2,045,696	385.18	324.84	60.6												
2012	561,851	130,404	382,524	693,275	76,891	1,844,945	174,697	2,200	67,472	2,059,413	388.34	327.35	60.4												

% INCREASE
 2002-2012

0.64 0.86 1.05 0.41 1.41 0.68 1.55 0.70 0.54 0.89

[1] Totals are the sum of kilowatthours rounded to the nearest megawatthour (MWh) less CT Steele Interruptible.

[2] The forecasted CMEEC coincident peak demands were computed by summing the Groton, Norwich (inclusive of the contribution of Norwich's Second Street and Tenth Street hydro units), Jewett City, East Norwich, South Norwich Wallingford and Bozrah noncoincident peak demands and multiplying by an average historical coincidence factor.

[3] The historical 1994 CMEEC winter and summer peak demand numbers reflect both Wallingford and Bozrah as if they were part of CMEEC at that time. The historical 1995 CMEEC winter and summer peak demand numbers reflect Bozrah as if they were part of CMEEC at that time.

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

Q-CSC-2-CMEEC

Provide CMEEC's weather-normalized historical peak loads for 2003 through 2012.

A-CSC-2-CMEEC

Please refer to the table below which lists both the actual and weather-normalized historical peak loads for CMEEC from 2003 through 2012.

	Actual Peak Demand	Weather Normalized Peak Demand
2003	336	358
2004	328	362
2005	358	361
2006	381	363
2007	350	363
2008	357	359
2009	344	352
2010	361	350
2011	320	337
2012	353	353

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

- Q-CSC-3-CMEEC Explain the methodology of how the historical actual peak load data are converted to weather normalized historical peak load data.
- A-CSC-3-CMEEC CMEEC has developed a time-series based regression model that includes variables that measure the relationship between monthly peak loads and actual weather conditions on the peak day. To develop the weather-normalized historical peak loads, CMEEC replaces the actual peak day weather conditions with "normal" peak day weather conditions. Normal peak day weather is based on an analysis of weather data from the last 10 years. This is the same methodology which CMEEC has utilized for the past four years.

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

Q-CSC-4-CMEEC

Provide a break-down of the projected number of megawatts (MW) of load reduction for CMEEC's territory due to conservation, load response/load management and distributed generation (if applicable) for each year from 2013 through 2022. If possible, also include a similar estimated break-down by megawatt hours or gigawatt-hours.

A-CSC-4-CMEEC

The annual demand peaks listed in the table immediately following reflects the CMEEC system peak, which is not necessarily coincident with the ISO-NE regional peak.

All conservation reductions are cumulative capabilities, meaning, for the specific year, CMEEC projects the ability to realize those reductions levels in total. This is the third year that these tables are being provided to the Council in this format. In previous years, CMEEC filed cumulative results in Demand in Megawatts, but only incremental additions in any specific year for Energy megawatt hours. As was the case in Docket No. F-2011 and F-2012, CMEEC believes this revision to the format is the intent of the filing and clearly quantifies our active and projected capability based on strategies deployed and planned to be deployed.

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

Demand and Capability, measured In Megawatts				
	Annual Peak Demand	Conservation Demand Reductions	Load Response/Management Demand Reductions	Distributed Generation Capability
2013	379	11	0	40
2014	386	13	0	40
2015	390	15	0	40
2016	395	17	0	40
2017	401	19	0	40
2018	402	21	0	40
2019	403	23	0	40
2020	405	25	0	40
2021	406	27	0	40
2022	408	29	0	40

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

Energy, measured In Megawatt hours				
	Annual Projected Energy – net of conservation reductions	Conservation Energy Reductions*	Load Response/Management Energy Reductions	Distributed Generation Energy Reductions
2013	1,802,217	104,037*	Minimal annual energy reductions anticipated	Minimal annual energy reductions anticipated
2014	1,847,335	121,567		
2015	1,869,288	139,097		
2016	1,898,224	156,627		
2017	1,934,277	174,157		
2018	1,940,509	191,687		
2019	1,946,781	209,217		
2020	1,954,753	226,747		
2021	1,957,364	244,277		
2022	1,963,537	261,807		

*Starting in 2012, the statutory mill charge for Conservation and Load Management is 2.5 mills (Please refer to Connecticut General Statute Sec 7-233y (a)(6)) and is expected to remain static. CMEEC expects that programs funded through these changes will achieve an estimated incremental annual reduction of 17,530 MWH (2 MW in peak demand annual reduction).

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

Q-CSC-5-CMEEC Provide the basic underlying assumptions associated with the distributed generation DG included in the 2013 CMEEC Forecast, including but not limited to the DG projects approved, number of megawatts of each DG project, the number of units expected to go into service or the assumed probability that they go into service, etc.

A-CSC-5-CMEEC Please refer to CMEEC's response to Interrogatory CSC-4. The projected distributed generation DG for the 2013-2022 forecast periods is reflected in the Demand Table. The 2012 value of 40 MW represents the total distributed generation (i.e. CMEEC's 50 in 5 Units) currently located and in service in CMEEC's Members/Participants service territories. CMEEC procured a total of 50 MW of distributed generation resources, of which 40 MW are in service. The CMEEC Board of Directors has voted to deploy the remaining 10 MW at a site in Norwich, Connecticut in conjunction with Norwich Public Utilities and Backus Hospital. The expected on-line date is during the first half of 2014. A detailed project development plan is currently being finalized. This project has not yet been included in the data contained in the Table for CSC-4-CMEEC.

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CSC DATA REQUEST Dated May 16, 2013

Q-CSC-6-CMEEC Does CMEEC's 2013 Forecast include any additions due to possible loads and/or electrical energy requirements from electric vehicles? If yes, provide any assumptions made regarding electric vehicles.

A-CSC-6-CMEEC No, CMEEC's 2013 Forecast does not include any additions due to possible loads and/or electrical energy requirements from electric vehicles. At this point none of the municipal electric utilities has identified any major new customer loads that would be attributed to electric vehicle charging. The identification of these new customers in conjunction with the results of time-varying rate pilots and/or planned deployment automated metering infrastructure would form the basis by which CMEEC would be able to produce a discrete electric vehicle forecast for our Members/Participants.