

Dear All,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the GC3 yesterday afternoon. As promised (or threatened as the case might be) here are my brief follow-up comments on aspects of yesterday's ADM meeting.

1) As said yesterday, I was overwhelmed by the recognition of and expansive use of the term "energy security" in the matrix for the Long Range Energy Alternatives Planning Session. A more thorough examination does present some additional questions of what criteria might have been used to designate technologies as "Enhancing Energy Security System Security" for such diverse technologies as "Expanded Advanced Natural Gas Combined Cycle Gas Turbines" or "Expanded Nuclear". While each may have one or more facets where this is true, in my opinion, each of those also does not meet certain basic metrics for the term "energy security" which should not be used indiscriminately. In preparation for this year's Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES), I have been developing a matrix derived from DEEP's IRP that more precisely constitutes "Energy Security". It is based upon detailed energy security considerations most derived from work done by the well-known and respected Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI) pertaining to decentralization for security. This can be accessed at [this link](#). In blue font it adds additional Resource Strategies and Additional Security Goals. The ratings I have made are still quite preliminary and undergoing greater thought and analysis. In addition, on this point, Chairman House's final report in Docket 14-05-12 on cybersecurity on its final page, it is boldly stated, "Focus on increasing security through greater decentralization of generation and distribution ties in directly with cybersecurity efforts; the two areas need to be approached in concert." This is also holds true for resilience due to what may be very extreme weather induced by climate change.

2) Following up on my comments on nuclear there are two areas to be addressed: A) The Millstone plants were built for a cost of ~\$4.2 Billion (uncorrected for CPI) but were sold to Dominion for a mere \$1.3 Billion so there is less debt services. How is it that this now mature technology, long sold to the public as being "too cheap to meter" is now crying they are uncompetitive and looking for the same treatment reserved for emerging technologies. It must also be noted it is highly doubtful that any contemplated future nuclear facilities will come at that same bargain price. B) The last illustration ([see this link](#)) I waved in front of you yesterday was a map (courtesy Hartford Courant) that harked back to the October Nor'Easter that left 800,000 Connecticut residents out of power. I have taken the liberty of adding the location of the Millstone facilities to in (lower right-hand corner). This is useful to show that in spite of the diversity and reliability that might be claimed for nuclear, which I assume was running during that event, the nature of it being large and heavily centralized added no relief for about two-thirds of the state. This very clearly illustrates the inability of centralized power sources to provide power where they may be needed most at any given time. Placement of smaller, decentralized generation close to loads along with enhanced use of more autoreclosers is where we should steer policy.

Your comments and questions are welcomed.

Very Best Regards,

Joel N. Gordes

(860) 561-0566 www.energysecuritysol.com

