

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

SITING COUNCIL

\* \* \* \* \*

CONNECTICUT LIGHT & POWER COMPANY \* JUNE 2, 2004  
AND UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY \* (10:00 A.M.)

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF \*  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND \*  
PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION \* DOCKET NO. 272  
OF A NEW 345-kV ELECTRIC \*  
TRANSMISSION LINE AND ASSOCIATED \*  
FACILITIES BETWEEN THE SCOVILL ROCK \*  
SWITCHING STATION IN MIDDLETOWN \*  
AND THE NORWALK SUBSTATION IN \*  
NORWALK, CONNECTICUT \*

\* \* \* \* \*

RECEIVED  
JUN 10 2004

BEFORE: PAMELA B. KATZ, CHAIRMAN

CONNECTICUT  
SITING COUNCIL

BOARD MEMBERS: Colin C. Tait, Vice Chairman  
Brian Emerick, DEP Designee  
Gerald J. Heffernan, DPUC Designee  
Daniel P. Lynch, Jr.  
Edward S. Wilensky  
Philip T. Ashton  
Brian O'Neill  
James J. Murphy, Jr.

STAFF MEMBERS: S. Derek Phelps, Executive Director  
Fred O. Cunliffe, Siting Analyst  
Robert L. Marconi, AAG

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE APPLICANT, CONNECTICUT LIGHT & POWER  
COMPANY:

CARMODY & TORRANCE, LLP  
195 Church Street  
P.O. Box 1950  
New Haven, Connecticut

BY: ANTHONY M. FITZGERALD, ESQUIRE  
BRIAN T. HENEERY, ESQUIRE

FOR THE APPLICANT, UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY:

WIGGIN & DANA, LLP  
One Century Tower  
P.O. Box 1832  
New Haven, Connecticut 06508-1832  
BY: LINDA L. RANDELL, ATTORNEY  
BRUCE L. McDERMOTT, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE CITY OF MERIDEN:

DEBORAH L. MOORE, ATTORNEY  
142 East Main Street  
Room 239  
Meriden, Connecticut 06450

FOR THE PARTIES, THE TOWN OF WESTON AND  
THE TOWN OF WOODBRIDGE:

COHEN & WOLF  
1115 Broad Street  
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604  
BY: DAVID BALL, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF MILFORD:

HURWITZ & SAGARIN  
147 North Broad Street  
Box 112  
Milford, Connecticut 06460  
By: JULIE DONALDSON KOHLER, ATTORNEY

FOR THE PARTIES, THE TOWN OF WALLINGFORD AND  
THE TOWN OF DURHAM:

HALLORAN & SAGE  
One Goodwin Square  
225 Asylum Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103  
BY: PETER BOUCHER, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF ORANGE:

SOUSA, STONE & D'AGOSTO  
375 Bridgeport Avenue  
Box 805  
Shelton, Connecticut 06084  
BY: BRIAN M. STONE, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF WILTON:

COHEN & WOLF  
158 Deer Hill Avenue  
Danbury, Connecticut 06810  
BY: MONTE E. FRANK, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, ATTORNEY GENERAL BLUMENTHAL:

MICHAEL WERTHEIMER  
Assistant Attorney General  
Ten Franklin Square  
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

FOR THE PARTY, THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL:

BRUCE C. JOHNSON, ESQUIRE  
Office of Consumer Counsel  
Ten Franklin Square  
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF NORTH HAVEN:

UPDIKE, KELLY & SPELLACY  
One State Street  
Box 231277  
Hartford, Connecticut 06123  
BY: BENJAMIN J. BERGER, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE WOODLANDS COALITION FOR  
RESPONSIBLE ENERGY:

PULLMAN & COMLEY  
90 State House Square  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103  
BY: LAWRENCE J. GOLDEN, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, PSEG POWER CONNECTICUT LLC:

MCCARTER & ENGLISH  
Cityplace I  
185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103  
BY: DAVID REIF, ESQUIRE  
JANE K. WARREN, ATTORNEY  
JOEL B. CASEY, ESQUIRE

FOR THE INTERVENOR, ISO NEW ENGLAND:

WHITMAN, BREED, ABBOTT & MORGAN  
100 Field Point Road  
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830  
BY: ANTHONY MacLEOD, ESQUIRE

FOR THE INTERVENORS, EZRA ACADEMY, B'NAI JACOB,  
THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER OF GREATER NEW HAVEN,  
THE DEPARTMENT OF JEWISH EDUCATION, AND  
THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF GREATER NEW HAVEN:

BRENNER, SALTZMAN & WALLMAN  
271 Whitney Avenue  
New Haven, Connecticut 06511  
BY: DAVID R. SCHAEFER, ESQUIRE

FOR THE INTERVENOR CONNECTICUT BUSINESS & INDUSTRY  
ASSOCIATION:

ROBERT E. EARLEY, ESQUIRE  
350 Church Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103

FOR THE PARTY, THE CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION:

CHARLES W. WALSH, III, AAG  
EILEEN MESKILL, AAG  
Office of the Attorney General  
55 Elm Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF WESTPORT:

WAKE, SEE, DIMES & BRYNICZKA  
27 Imperial Avenue  
Westport, Connecticut 06880  
BY: EUGENE E. CEDERBAUM, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, SOUTH CENTRAL CONNECTICUT WATER  
AUTHORITY:

MURTHA CULLINA LLP  
Cityplace I  
185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06103  
BY: ANDREW W. LORD, ESQUIRE

POST REPORTING SERVICE  
HAMDEN, CT (800) 262-4102

FOR THE PARTY, COMMUNITIES FOR RESPONSIBLE ENERGY:

PATRICIA BRADLEY, PRESIDENT  
47 Ironwood Lane  
Durham, Connecticut 06422

FOR THE PARTY, THE CITY OF NORWALK:  
LOUIS CICCARELLO, ESQUIRE  
Corp. Counsel

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF CHESHIRE:  
RICHARD J. BURTURLA, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE CITY OF MIDDLETOWN:  
TIMOTHY P. LYNCH, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE TOWN OF MIDDLEFIELD:  
BRANSE & WILLIS, LLC  
ERIC KNAPP, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, THE CITY OF BRIDGEPORT:  
MELANIE J. HOWLETT, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY, COMMUNITIES FOR RESPONSIBLE ENERGY:  
TRISH BRADLEY

A PARTY, THE TOWN OF EASTON

A PARTY, THE TOWN OF BETHANY

A PARTY, THE TOWN OF HAMDEN

AN INTERVENOR, THE TOWN OF FAIRFIELD

AN INTERVENOR, THE FIRST DISTRICT WATER COMPANY

AN INTERVENOR, NORWALK ASSOCIATION OF SILVERMINE  
HOMEOWNERS

A PARTY, ROBERT W. MEGNA, STATE REP. 97<sup>th</sup> DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, MARY G. FRITZ, STATE REP. 90<sup>th</sup>  
DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, AL ADINOLFI, STATE REP. 103<sup>rd</sup>  
DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, RAYMOND KALINOWSKI, STATE REP. 100<sup>th</sup>  
DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, THEMIS KLARIDES, STATE REP. 114<sup>th</sup>  
DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, JOHN E. STRIPP, STATE REP. 135<sup>th</sup>  
DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, WILLIAM ANISKOVICH, STATE REP.  
12<sup>th</sup> SEN. DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, JOSEPH CRISCO, JR., STATE REP.  
17<sup>th</sup> SEN. DISTRICT

AN INTERVENOR, LEONARD FASANO, STATE REP.  
34<sup>th</sup> SEN. DISTRICT

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a hearing  
2 before the State of Connecticut Siting Council in the  
3 matter of an application by Connecticut Light & Power  
4 Company and United Illuminating Company, held at Central  
5 Connecticut State University Institute of Technology &  
6 Business, 185 Main Street, New Britain, Connecticut, on  
7 June 2, 2004 at 10:00 a.m., at which time the parties  
8 were represented as hereinbefore set forth . . .

9  
10

11 CHAIRMAN PAMELA B. KATZ: This is the  
12 resumption of the 272 hearing. We're going to start off  
13 with three audio visual presentations. First is on the  
14 East Shore route, the second is on the northerly route,  
15 and third is a homework assignment by the company in  
16 response to Mr. Emerick's questions yesterday concerning  
17 part of the northerly route. So we're going to start  
18 with that and then we will -- the Council will be seated  
19 and we'll go and do the OCC.

20 (Pause)

21 MS. ANNE BARTOSEWICZ: All set? Good  
22 morning. Today's presentation we're going to walk  
23 through the East Shore route, the 387 line on the East  
24 Shore Route. We will -- John Prete and myself we will

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 again go back and forth here on the presentation.  
2 This really affects Segment 2 from Beseck  
3 to East Devon. And yesterday we saw that the proposed  
4 route would be on transmission line rights-of-way. The  
5 blue line -- the right hand of the blue line is the  
6 proposed route. We looked at the Cheshire Cook Hill  
7 route yesterday. And the second way to get to East Devon  
8 is from Beseck through East Wallingford Junction to East  
9 Shore. And then from East Shore you need to get to East  
10 Devon. So the dotted line is the under C route, or you  
11 have two other ways, the red dotted line shows you an all  
12 underground route, that's basically on Route 1, or a  
13 combination route that goes into Orange with a transition  
14 station with switching capabilities to the right-of-way  
15 into East Devon.

16 Now to meet NERC, NPCC and NEPOOL  
17 standards, when we talk about East Shore today, we are  
18 talking about a second line on the right-of-way. The  
19 existing right-of-way has the 387 line that goes from --  
20 it actually goes from Scovill all the way down to East  
21 Shore. To meet these criteria, we need a second line  
22 between Beseck and East Devon to make this route  
23 acceptable to these reliability criteria.

24 So we've broken this into three pieces.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 The first piece is the Beseck to East Wallingford route.

2 And we have two alternative routes to get from Beseck to  
3 East Wallingford. The second piece is between East  
4 Wallingford Junction and East Shore, and we're going to  
5 talk about three different ways to get from East  
6 Wallingford to East Shore. And the third piece is  
7 getting from East Shore to East Devon. And we also have  
8 -- we have two routes that do that for us.

9 From Beseck to East Wallingford we looked  
10 at an overhead route and an underground route. The  
11 overhead route, it uses the existing right-of-way, which  
12 is part of the proposed route. The six miles, the 275-  
13 foot right-of-way, today the 387 line is on that right-  
14 of-way, it's an H-frame. You'd be putting up the second  
15 H-frame along that path. No widening of the right-of-way  
16 is needed.

17 Secondly -- oh, here is -- to refresh and  
18 get a perspective, this is the aerial again from Beseck  
19 to East Wallingford. It continues down through  
20 Wallingford. And the blue circle again is East  
21 Wallingford Junction. To remind you, that is in the  
22 middle of Traditions Golf Course.

23 So we looked at how to get from Beseck to  
24 East Wallingford via an underground route. And this red

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 dotted line is -- essentially uses Williams Road in  
2 Wallingford. The red square would be a transition  
3 station with full switching capabilities and it would be  
4 just south of what is Pond Hill School. I think we'll  
5 see an aerial of that.

6 The three routes to get from East  
7 Wallingford to East Shore would be the transmission  
8 right-of-way and the Conrail and Amtrak, which we saw  
9 yesterday, which John is going to give us a little more  
10 detail and some more photographs on of getting from East  
11 Wallingford to East Shore via those routes.

12 Now this transmission right-of-way --  
13 today on the 387 right-of-way from East Wallingford to  
14 East Shore this right-of-way contains 345 H-frame  
15 structures. The right-of-way is up to 320 feet wide. It  
16 also contains a 115-kV circuit and H-frame structures  
17 there as well. These are the same -- the 345 H-frame is  
18 essentially the same structures as we saw in the proposed  
19 route from Beseck to East Wallingford, they're the 90  
20 feet H-frame structures.

21 Now, we'll start up in Wallingford. As  
22 you come south down Wallingford, the red circle there is  
23 Pond Hill Elementary School. And the only open space for  
24 a potential transition station would be in this block of

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 land down here. There's --

2 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) -- remembers  
3 it's an audio tape.

4 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- it is southeast of  
5 Pond Hill Elementary School on the eastern side of the  
6 right-of-way where the current right-of-way takes the jut  
7 to the east.

8 This is Pond Hill Elementary School. You  
9 can see today that 345 right-of-way and on the left-hand  
10 side of this photograph you can see the actual H-frame  
11 structure. You can see the school is adjacent to this  
12 right-of-way today.

13 Here are just some other photographs that  
14 we took of the 387 line. This one is a house between the  
15 387 line and the airline -- the railroad corridor. It  
16 shows the 387 line fairly close to a variety of homes.

17 Going south into North Haven and North  
18 Branford -- uh -- continue going south, this just takes  
19 us south. It happens to be another photograph of Hansen  
20 Farm Road in North Haven. It shows a fairly new  
21 development. It looks like this house is still under  
22 construction here. So folks are building along the 387  
23 right-of-way today.

24 Another view of East Haven. You can see

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the right-of-way. The H-frames behind this row of  
2 houses.

3 As you go south into East Haven, there is  
4 Connecticut Sports Plex. And if you've ever been here,  
5 over to this right-hand side is this huge dome facility  
6 where it's an indoor facility. This excavation work --  
7 they are building --

8 MR. JOHN PRETE: A paint ball.

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- paint ball -- a paint  
10 ball facility. This parking lot is essentially within  
11 the right-of-way today. To the left there are a variety  
12 of other facilities, golf -- there's a golf -- a  
13 miniature golf --

14 MR. PRETE: A driving range.

15 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- a driving range. So  
16 this sports plex has been here and as you can see they've  
17 been doing recent construction. The lines, the 345 and  
18 the 115's come right through this sports plex today. Go  
19 ahead.

20 The line comes south into Branford, and  
21 this is the Lake Saltonstall region. The existing 387  
22 line crosses Lake Saltonstall to the south of the lake.  
23 Between Beseck and East Shore on this right-of-way you  
24 would need to clear about 150 acres of trees in order to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 put the second line in. And this whole area is the Lake  
2 Saltonstall recreational facility.

3 The next one. This is a view of the  
4 existing 387 line as it goes through Lake Saltonstall.  
5 Coming out of the Lake Saltonstall region, the line  
6 crosses -- actually this line here crosses the lake over  
7 on this side and it turns to go to the west through East  
8 Haven. We've identified areas of interests, and this is  
9 an elementary school right here. It continues going west  
10 to East Haven. As you see as we get into East Haven,  
11 there's certainly more development, there's some  
12 industrial development here.

13 MR. PRETE: (Indiscernible) -- Park.

14 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Where -- here?

15 MR. PRETE: Yeah.

16 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: This is Meadow --

17 MR. PRETE: Peat Meadow.

18 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Peat Meadow Park. The  
19 right-of-way -- actually, the park was built on the  
20 existing right-of-way. Continue through. Here's the --  
21 here's the park itself. Here's Peat Meadow Park and the  
22 345 going through the park.

23 We get closer to New Haven and you  
24 certainly get into a more developed area. You can see

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the line, these lines are actually heading into East  
2 Shore here. And these lines come through and this is  
3 East Shore Substation -- the current East Shore  
4 Substation on the bottom left.

5 A summary. What we did is we've been  
6 trying to gather some data to help the Council evaluate  
7 routes. What we did is we looked at how many homes were  
8 within 150 feet of the right-of-way. And we also have  
9 been looking at the new legislation, which is -- calls  
10 for public facilities -- and this -- this particular path  
11 on the 387 right-of-way from Beseck to East Shore gives  
12 you -- there's 226 homes that are with 150 feet of the  
13 right-of-way and it gives you 13 facilities that are with  
14 1200 feet. And this gives you -- on the right it gives  
15 you an idea of what kind of facilities they are and in  
16 which towns they hit.

17 Now as we continue with the presentation,  
18 John is going to show the same statistics for the airline  
19 routes. We also have the statistics for the proposed  
20 route for a comparison.

21 MR. PRETE: As Anne said, what we'd like  
22 to do is go through this area here, the Segment 2. We  
23 talked about three routes. Anne went through what we  
24 call the 387 corridor. It is a corridor that has a 345

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 line today.

2 What I'd like to do is take you through  
3 our homework assignment, which is the rails that exists.

4 And this green line that's folded in, that's the Amtrak  
5 Railroad, so it kind of gives you a geography of where  
6 that is. This line that's being drawn here is known as  
7 Conrail and/or the Airline. And as you can see, in and  
8 around the New Haven area they merge. So as we begin  
9 talking, we'll talk about the Amtrak in this area and  
10 we'll talk about Conrail, but when you get to this area,  
11 obviously the Amtrak is the only one that can get you  
12 largely to East Shore. So if you can kind of keep that  
13 graphic in mind, I think it would be very helpful, okay.

14 So what we'll do now -- you see an A here  
15 and a B here. What I'd like to do is talk about this  
16 track here, this Amtrak rail, and we'll see some  
17 photographs and some numbers as well. We saw this  
18 yesterday, this is the Amtrak in the Wallingford area.  
19 And this slide points out the fact that there's  
20 businesses that are squashed on either side of the rail.

21 They're squashed in the manner that again on a 345  
22 construction -- remember the right-of-way needs to be  
23 roughly 120 feet, 125 feet in width -- so if the pole is  
24 roughly in the middle, you need about 60, 65 feet on

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 either side. You can see in these areas they're pinched  
2 quite a lot.

3 Similarly coming down through this area,  
4 that's where the slide was prior, getting more south in  
5 Wallingford. The fact of the matter is that whole  
6 Wallingford branch there, there's about 71 businesses as  
7 we calculated that would have to be removed, condemned,  
8 or otherwise acquired to facilitate that line.

9 This gives you a couple of pictures of  
10 just some of the congestion. Obviously rails were in  
11 existence a long time. And the businesses a long time  
12 ago obviously had a lot of economic viability by building  
13 close to those. Okay.

14 What I'd like to do now is know of talk  
15 about this B area. You can see the small purple section  
16 is the right-of-way on our segment from East Wallingford  
17 if we were to go to Cook Hill. So that's really the only  
18 way we can get to the right-of-way here and the Amtrak.  
19 And as this slide shows, this section right here there  
20 would be 60 -- six homes and 50 businesses that would  
21 have to be acquired on that type of construction. We'll  
22 see a couple of photographs.

23 As we get kind of out of the Wallingford  
24 area up to North Haven, you can see along this line here



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 a lot of businesses and residential. We kind of went out  
2 further just to give you an idea of the mix type of  
3 buildings. This is 91 over here and the Wilbur Cross  
4 over in this area.

5 Yeah. Amtrak is over here and the Conrail  
6 is over here. Remember in that slide prior as you get  
7 closer to New Haven they come into a merged area. And  
8 this photograph here shows again heavy concentration on  
9 the Amtrak and the businesses. As we get into the North  
10 Haven area here, it gets into that mixed use and  
11 residential. Similarly, the Conrail here is heavy  
12 residential development. And in these areas here, these  
13 are some of the sensitive areas that are part of the  
14 legislation -- this right here happens to be a school,  
15 Aces, which is here. Right along the rail you can see  
16 it, right over here this particular school was built.

17 This slide here had North Haven on the  
18 south end, but you can see kind of the proximity of North  
19 Haven. And again as we continue on the Conrail Airline,  
20 you can see a lot of the mixed use, largely residential.

21 And this must be a conductor's dream over  
22 here, but this is where Amtrak and Conrail merge. And  
23 there a number of things that we can see. This is all  
24 wetlands -- I'm not sure of the exact definition, I think

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Louise will have that -- but this is the merge whereby if  
2 we were to use either one of these rails, we would have  
3 to then continue on this small loop in this area. And  
4 that small loop is where this is. So we would continue  
5 down on what is now known as the Airline or Conrail.

6 MR. PHILIP T. ASHTON: John, that's the  
7 main line from -- to Boston to New Haven, isn't it?

8 MR. PRETE: That's correct.

9 MR. ASHTON: The loop.

10 MR. PRETE: The loop. Interesting enough  
11 -- I don't travel the rail that much -- but there's a  
12 tunnel here, and those that probably travel know it. And  
13 so that would pose tremendous difficulties obviously on  
14 an overhead route, underground as well.

15 Then as that loop continues -- this is the  
16 387 or 345 corridor that gets into East Shore. You would  
17 essentially try to launch yourself in a manner to come  
18 along this way. And you again see some of the  
19 residential development. A lot of the condo development  
20 that Anne was talking about is in this area here.

21 And as Anne said, we'd like to try to  
22 summarize some of the statistics for the Council and  
23 others. So if we take the Amtrak rail as we had just  
24 defined it, you can see by town the houses that are

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 within 150 feet are 237. And the 5418 bill, in the  
2 sensitive areas there's 18. And you can see to the right  
3 of that some of the definitions of those areas. And  
4 similarly on the Conrail Airline, you can read the  
5 numbers. The numbers are roughly the same, about 260  
6 houses, 18 facilities that are in the sensitive area.  
7 Now, this is clearly just from the Beseck area to East  
8 Shore, that's very important to note. Yes?

9 MR. BRIAN EMERICK: I realize you're  
10 following a rail corridor. Are you actually within their  
11 right-of-way? And how wide is their right-of-way?

12 MR. PRETE: Did everybody hear that  
13 question?

14 MR. ASHTON: No. Say it again.

15 MR. PRETE: The question was around -- you  
16 know, what are we assuming as far as placement of an  
17 overhead line within the rail vicinity? And there's a  
18 couple of things in answering that. If you were to  
19 envision the rail, the outermost rail, by clearance  
20 standards, the pole itself, and we'll call it the face of  
21 the pole, the closest point, needs to be 12 feet away;  
22 okay, so if you can envision 12 feet away from the rail a  
23 pole being erected. Now, we assumed in a manner that  
24 reduces the amount of right-of-way you need, the arms

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 would actually go over the rail. So on a 345 those arms  
2 are roughly 20 feet -- 15 to 20 feet. So those would  
3 extend kind of over the rail. And from that point on,  
4 from where those wires are, you need roughly 62 feet. In  
5 some cases the right-of-way is not nearly wide enough  
6 obviously because you're already into businesses. But  
7 that's, quite frankly, the geography that we had to  
8 contend with.

9 MR. EMERICK: Is there any operational  
10 restriction that Conrail or Amtrak would place on you in  
11 terms of putting the arms or conductors over the rail  
12 line itself?

13 MR. PRETE: Most definitely yeah. I'm  
14 sure that if you'd ask that question, it wouldn't be  
15 something they would be very favorable on.

16 MR. EMERICK: So that, in fact, you  
17 couldn't put the arms, they would have to go on the  
18 outboard side?

19 MR. PRETE: Again, I think those are --  
20 those are the discussions that need to occur if indeed we  
21 would have to go further into this type of proposition.

22 MR. EMERICK: But for your analysis you  
23 assumed they would be inward as opposed to outward?

24 MR. PRETE: Quite frankly, the best case.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 And again you saw some of the numbers in the acquisition  
2 that would have to occur, Mr. Emerick --

3 MR. EMERICK: Thank you --

4 MR. PRETE: -- they would be worse than  
5 that.

6 MR. EMERICK: Okay.

7 MR. PRETE: Okay. Now, the chart we just  
8 had and the discussion really talked about kind of the  
9 Beseck area and the rail that would need to get to East  
10 Shore. And as Anne showed prior, the third segment here  
11 is East Shore and how do you get to East Devon. And  
12 whereas we show two routes, the two routes really are  
13 indicative of overhead and underground or just  
14 underground.

15 The first route if I can just trace it,  
16 was what we call as a hybrid, which has roughly six miles  
17 of underground through this area here to a transition  
18 station right north in the Orange/West Haven area. That  
19 transition station there would have to be two to eight  
20 acres. And then you'd have overhead. Essentially, the  
21 same right-of-way that we talked about yesterday.

22 The other route would be an all  
23 underground route. And there's a number of street  
24 coordinations that we looked at. Certainly as we go

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 forward -- or if we go forward, we'd need to talk to the  
2 towns' CEOs and cities' CEOs to find out if there is any  
3 plans and what else is in the street. But on a high  
4 level reconnaissance we have some routes that we have in  
5 mind.

6 So taking this whole picture, this whole  
7 snapshot, what we tried to do is now all of Segment 2.  
8 So going from Beseck to East Devon, that is Segment 2, we  
9 have the proposed, which we talked about yesterday, and  
10 you can see some of the numbers, the homes that are  
11 within 150 feet and the sensitive areas of 26. Remember  
12 that's that whole right-of-way that exists today.

13 In this particular table here, it has the  
14 underground, or the hybrid. So in other words, we're  
15 going from Beseck to East Shore, and then we're going  
16 from East Shore to East Devon through that Hybrid where  
17 you have the underground and overhead combination. And  
18 you can see this transmission right-of-way, what Anne  
19 talked about, that's that 387 corridor as we call it, and  
20 you can see some of the numbers lining up as far as the  
21 number of homes and the number of sensitive areas along  
22 that.

23 Now if you then take the third look, which  
24 is again the same type of route, but instead of going the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 hybrid from East Shore to East Devon, we go all  
2 underground, you can see some of the numbers. The houses  
3 drop off roughly 240 and the sensitive areas drop off by  
4 about eight. And if you remember just graphically that  
5 hybrid station is roughly on the northern part of Orange.  
6 And as we walked through Orange yesterday, there's a lot  
7 of houses as the picture show. So you can see that the  
8 difference of the hybrid is roughly the 240, 250 there.  
9 And that's the East Shore presentation.

10 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: As a homework assignment  
11 yesterday, we talked about the northerly route. And we  
12 were able to take the aerial photographs of the northerly  
13 route to show you today. (Pause). And these are a  
14 series of eight -- seven or eight overhead, so you're  
15 looking down upon the right-of-way. And we start here at  
16 Chestnut Junction. I will tell you the yellow lines are  
17 the existing right-of-way. The red lines are the  
18 centerlines of the existing 345 within that right-of-way.  
19 And today there are three rows, three circuits of 345 on  
20 H-frames. The pink line right here or the purple line,  
21 that is the alternative if you were to build the new 345  
22 at a monopole, that would be the 40-foot expansion and  
23 the four homes. And the blue line is if you were to  
24 build another H-frame, that would be the 80-foot

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 expansion and the eight homes. And we will walk you  
2 through these slides and I will point out those home  
3 locations and you can have -- get a look at what the  
4 terrain looks like. And when you are here, you are in  
5 Middletown and you are going west into Middlefield. So  
6 this would be going west the first -- the first leg.

7 A VOICE: How long is that leg?

8 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I forget. I don't have  
9 that sheet -- do you have that sheet with the houses --  
10 (pause) -- I'm just going to try to -- to make sure I  
11 identify the houses for you. They're circled, but the  
12 circles are going to be hard to see. What we did is we  
13 circled them in purple and blue. So you see there's this  
14 little blue circle here, that house would be -- would  
15 have to be acquired or removed should we go the 80-foot  
16 expansion, that's one of the eight. The pink circles are  
17 the ones that would be -- would have to be acquired if  
18 you did the H-frame or the monopole. So those are the  
19 combination. So there are four circles in pink. And  
20 there's a blue circle there and another blue circle. So  
21 on this piece of the right-of-way you've got 1, 2 --  
22 three homes that are in the right-of-way should you go  
23 with the 80-foot expansion. And you've got one home  
24 there that's in the right-of-way with the 40-foot



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 expansion.

2 (Pause)

3 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: The town line -- the  
4 town line -- the town line?

5 MR. PRETE: Right there.

6 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Okay, here we go. This  
7 is -- so you're still in Middletown here. The  
8 Middlefield town line is right here. And we've got a  
9 pink circle here, so that would be the monopole house  
10 interference. And -- I think that's the only one on this  
11 segment of the right-of-way.

12 We proceed west into Middlefield. We've  
13 got house impacts here. This is a pink circle, so this  
14 would be the monopole. This is a blue circle, that would  
15 impact the 80-foot expansion. So there are two homes in  
16 this segment of Middlefield.

17 We continue proceeding west through  
18 Middlefield and you see the right-of-way expansion has  
19 shifted to the other side, it's now on the northerly  
20 portion. You've got a pink circle here and a blue circle  
21 down here, so those would be two more impacts.

22 We're still in Middlefield here going west  
23 through this section. I do not see any -- there are --  
24 there are no impacts along this piece of the right-of-

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 way.

2 And the last segment brings you into what  
3 is now Black Pond Junction. You cross from Middlefield  
4 into Meriden. This is currently where Black Pond  
5 Junction is today. This is the Police Academy here.

6 Let me just say a couple of things about  
7 this right-of-way. In those locations where you've got  
8 home impacts, we certainly talked about not expanding the  
9 right-of-way at all and having to build all the lines.  
10 You could have an alternative where you would just  
11 rebuild those lines in the area of the home impact. That  
12 is just one other solution.

13 Basically the reason why we didn't choose  
14 this route is one of the NPCC's criteria is the  
15 contingency on loss of right-of-way. If you lose this  
16 right-of-way between Chestnut and Black Pond, you  
17 essentially cut eastern Connecticut from western  
18 Connecticut. And what you do is you hang Southwest  
19 Connecticut on New York. So once you do that, your  
20 problem is getting from -- trying to get power into  
21 Southwest Connecticut from New York which causes problems  
22 on that contingency. So this is -- this is the northerly  
23 route. This is one of the reasons -- the reason why we  
24 didn't choose this route and we went through -- on the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 existing right-of-way through Durham.

2 Now what we also did is -- because you're  
3 looking for all routes and anything we can do, we took  
4 another look at Durham -- and I have another -- one more  
5 slide to show you -- we looked at could you go around  
6 Royal Oak because it's a neighborhood and that means  
7 under the House Bill -- under the bill it's certainly an  
8 issue -- and so what we -- what we're going to show you  
9 here is another look about could you go around this  
10 neighborhood. And we sent our engineers out to the field  
11 and we looked at is there enough land between the Royal  
12 Oak development down here and the development to the  
13 north, which is a fairly new development, through -- this  
14 is a hardwood forest today -- is there enough room to  
15 actually take the 345 and go around the neighborhood.  
16 And as you can see it is possible, but when you -- when  
17 you change the route, you certainly have to clear this  
18 right-of-way to put the new line in and you potentially  
19 affect others.

20 And I'll just highlight some of those  
21 others. You have -- certainly you have a home here. You  
22 have to get through -- this is Route 17. You have to get  
23 between these two buildings. There is enough room to get  
24 between them. This is a greenhouse facility and this was

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the old DOT emissions testing, it is now an industrial  
2 business, it's -- there's a business there. You can go  
3 through the back of the parking lot. This is also treed  
4 area in Middlefield. This is the existing right-of-way.

5 And the goal would be to go around the neighborhood and  
6 to link back into this right-of-way. This is one path to  
7 get to that right-of-way. You do -- you do have homes  
8 here and here. You certainly could have come out this  
9 way and down to try to avoid as many homes as possible.  
10 It was just another look that we did as we were doing  
11 field work and I just -- we just wanted to share that  
12 with the Council.

13 MR. COLIN C. TAIT: Who owns that land,  
14 the forested land?

15 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: This land here?

16 MR. TAIT: Yes. And the other side too?

17 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I have a list. There  
18 are many owners. We can provide you with that list.

19 MR. TAIT: Not one owner, not a public  
20 facility --

21 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Uh -- no, there are -- I  
22 think there were six or seven -- (mic feedback) --  
23 different owners.

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Can the Council get a copy

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 of that slide?

2 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And on the yellow that you  
4 show there where you have -- I guess doing the two angles  
5 of the triangle instead of the hypotenuse, is there an  
6 existing right-of-way there now for distribution, or --

7 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: No. This is --

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: There's nothing there?

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: There's nothing here.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. Yes, if we can get  
11 a copy of that slide.

12 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Yes. We're going to  
13 file this entire presentation today, including the  
14 northerly and this slide as well. Okay --

15 MR. ANTHONY FITZGERALD: (Indiscernible) -  
16 - Anne --

17 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Yes?

18 MR. FITZGERALD: At least I didn't -- I  
19 didn't hear the number of owners that you gave in  
20 response to Mr. Tait's question. There was a sound -- a  
21 malfunction --

22 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Sure. I believe that  
23 there's six different owners. We have that list and we  
24 can share that if the Council is interested. We have not

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 contacted any owners at this point.

2 I think -- next, we have one more  
3 presentation. This is the homework assignment. Roger  
4 Zaklukiewicz is going to talk to this.

5 (Pause)

6 MR. ROGER ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Thank you. Last  
7 evening we put together a number of slides to try to  
8 answer Mr. Emerick's question. And I'm certain others on  
9 the Commission and others at the hearing had some of the  
10 same issues, so I don't mean to pick on Mr. Emerick as  
11 the only one who didn't understand it. In putting  
12 together these slides last night, I had to second-guess  
13 my own self a few times.

14 So really where I'd start is by grounding  
15 ourselves and trying to indicate what we have presently  
16 on the Connecticut system from east to west, including  
17 the 387 line, which goes between Scovill and East Shore  
18 across mid-Connecticut. Specifically, we have the 348  
19 line, which goes from Millstone up to Oxbow Junction over  
20 to Chestnut Junction on to Southington, and that's the  
21 348 line. We have the 362 line, which goes from Haddam  
22 Neck up to Chestnut Junction, Chestnut Junction west to  
23 Black Pond Junction to Southington. And the third line  
24 we have that goes east/west across this corridor is the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 line from Scovill Rock to Chestnut Junction to Black Pond  
2 Junction, south to East Shore, and that is the 387 line.

3 And that's what we have presently in service. And this  
4 has been operating in this mode for a number of years.

5 Of concern to myself and ISO and others at  
6 this time is the fact that a single contingency along  
7 this corridor basically ends up being a significant  
8 contingency for which I think recovery is questionable  
9 because we could lose all three lines. That would leave  
10 the rest of Southwest Connecticut hanging on or being fed  
11 solely from the New York system on the 345-kV lines,  
12 which come out of Pleasant Valley over to Long Mountain  
13 over to Southington and feed down on the 115-kV systems.

14 Recognize the transfer capability of the 115-kV system  
15 along with the 345-kV lines, it's questionable whether we  
16 could sustain on even a medium load day the load that's  
17 in Southwest Connecticut, and would most likely between  
18 medium and high load days end up having to go into some  
19 form of load shedding. But we -- we've had this  
20 situation and this is what we have lived with for a good  
21 number of years.

22 You can go to the next slide -- no, the  
23 next one. Here's -- here this slide is -- it should be  
24 in your package, Slide No. 2, which is basically what is

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 being proposed. What is being proposed is we would turn  
2 around and add a fourth line east to west. We would take  
3 the 348 line and we would open it between Oxbow Junction  
4 and Chestnut Junction, physically remove the line between  
5 Oxbow and Chestnut Junction and extend it basically to  
6 the west, the red line between Oxbow Junction and a new  
7 Beseck Substation.

8 We would turn around and the line which  
9 goes today from Scovill to the west to Chestnut Junction  
10 to Black Pond Junction down to East Shore is untouched,  
11 it does not go into Beseck Substation, it bypasses Beseck  
12 Substation and provides a direct path between Scovill and  
13 East Shore. We then build, construct a new section of  
14 345-kV line between Scovill Rock and Chestnut Junction.  
15 This would be a brand new line between Scovill and  
16 Chestnut. And we pick up the piece that used to be the  
17 348 line that we cut here and we extend that directly on  
18 to Southington. So we form a new line that goes Scovill  
19 Rock to Southington.

20 We then take the Haddam Neck line, which  
21 was the 362 line, which went from Haddam to Black Pond  
22 Junction over to Southington, we break it at Black Pond  
23 Junction and we extend a leg of the 362 line into Beseck  
24 Substation. And then we come out of Beseck Substation



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 and we tie into the section of the 362 line from Black  
2 Pond over to Southington.

3 So when we're all through with the  
4 construction as proposed, we have four 345-kV lines which  
5 go east to west across the center of Connecticut.

6 What does this do for you? If you  
7 remember in the previous slide, I said anytime if we had  
8 an aircraft come down and hit one of the conductors,  
9 bounce off and get into the other lines, we would lose  
10 this east/west right-of-way. We will still do that with  
11 the proposed route, and we would lose the lines that go  
12 from Haddam Neck to Beseck. We would lose the lines that  
13 go from Scovill -- excuse me -- we would -- and we would  
14 lose the 348 line that go directly from Scovill into  
15 Southington and we would lose the line which goes  
16 directly from Scovill down to East Shore. What we still  
17 have in place is the line which goes from Millstone to  
18 Beseck, from Beseck down to the proposed East Devon  
19 Station. A major, major improvement than what we have  
20 presently today.

21 On file in the -- in part of the documents  
22 that were noted is the NPCC Document A2, which is the  
23 basic criteria for design and operation of the system.  
24 And in 7 -- Section 7 of that document we have to take

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 into account for an extreme contingency, the loss of all  
2 transmission circuits emanating from a generating  
3 station, a switching station, a DC terminal, or a  
4 substation. And secondly, we have to take into account  
5 the loss of all transmission circuits on a common right-  
6 of-way. That is just an extreme contingency for which  
7 ISO New England and the operators at CONVEX have to be  
8 prepared to deal with that extreme contingency. In this  
9 case should that extreme contingency exist, we would have  
10 a strong transmission path from Millstone to Beseck to  
11 East Devon.

12 Can we go back to that previous slide?  
13 No, the next one. That one. I probably should have made  
14 four slides to incorporate the comments from Anne  
15 Bartosewicz a few minutes ago about a fourth transmission  
16 line across here, but I'll speak to this one first. One  
17 option would be to establish a substation at Black Pond.  
18 And I think that was the question that Mr. Emerick  
19 raised yesterday, what does it mean to put a station in  
20 at Black Pond Junction. And what you'd have for a  
21 configuration if you did this is that we would turn  
22 around and have a major switching station at this  
23 location where we would break every one of the lines that  
24 go into Black Pond Junction. So the system in this

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 configuration would be Millstone to Black Pond Junction.  
2 The 348 line then would be -- once it goes through  
3 breakers and the bus would continue to Black Pond  
4 Junction to Southington. We would turn around and have  
5 the 362 line. We would split that at Black Pond  
6 Junction. Have breakers at Black Pond Junction, which  
7 forms the new line Haddam to Black Pond. And then from  
8 Black Pond, it would go Black Pond to Southington on the  
9 existing 362 line. We would take the 387 line, which  
10 today basically goes directly from Scovill down to East  
11 Shore, we would take and place -- and break the 387 line  
12 at Black Pond Junction and form a new Scovill Rock to  
13 Black Pond, Black Pond down to the East Shore Substation.  
14 And we would turn around with the proposal that the  
15 companies have put forth and we would now establish a new  
16 345-kV line from Black Pond down to East Devon Junction.  
17 This -- this still maintains the strong source.

18 Anytime I lose two of these three lines,  
19 having basically one of the lines out of service and  
20 having a failure on the second line, I still maintain a  
21 major transmission line from the east and I still have a  
22 tie then from Southington back to Black Pond Substation,  
23 which is basically the same as what you'd have with the  
24 Beseck Substation. You'd have these three lines going

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 into -- basically Beseck coming -- coming out. So that  
2 is not jeopardized.

3 What we do jeopardize with this scheme is  
4 that a common failure here of these three components  
5 leaves this whole system now tied onto the New York  
6 source, solely on the New York source for this common  
7 mode failure. And much worse would be what happens if we  
8 lost all of this new Black Pond Substation? Basically,  
9 it would be a single source feed from New York only,  
10 because all of these lines now would be open, we would  
11 have to feed the load from the Southington auto, from the  
12 Frost Bridge auto, and from the autos at Plumtree, tied  
13 on to only the New York source, and under medium to high  
14 load conditions, we would be into a load shedding  
15 situation.

16 Anne's comment about what would happen if  
17 you were to place a fourth line on this northern right-  
18 of-way, my sense would be we would come out of Scovill as  
19 was proposed, we would run a line directly from Scovill  
20 to Black Pond Junction, not go into the station itself  
21 but bypass Black Pond and run that into -- this section  
22 of the 362 now would become part of this new line,  
23 Scovill to Southington, which would now assist in making  
24 that equivalent to what we have basically proposed in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 establishing a Beseck Substation.

2 So, I hope this helps to clarify the  
3 differences between what is being proposed, what is there  
4 now, and hopes to answer, Mr. Emerick, your questions. I  
5 think Mr. Ashton asked a question yesterday what happens  
6 if you tap the 362 line into this station if I remember  
7 correctly. I hope it addresses those questions that you  
8 have. If not, I'm willing to try to clarify what we're  
9 proposing and what's there now if I can with these  
10 slides. And if they're not the right ones, we'll make  
11 some new slides again tonight and try again tomorrow.  
12 Yes, Mr. Tait?

13 MR. TAIT: If you put the fourth --

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Maybe you have to get  
15 up to the mic.

16 MR. TAIT: If you put the fourth  
17 alternative there, you have four lines going east/west,  
18 they all -- would they all be in the same right-of-way  
19 and wouldn't one plane take them all out? Isn't --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That -- that's what you  
21 have today and that's a risk. What you do with the  
22 fourth line is you eliminate then the loss of the Black  
23 Pond Substation. That -- that failure now goes away.  
24 What you still have is a plane coming down basically

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 taking out all four of the lines. You're absolutely  
2 correct.

3 MR. TAIT: Or a terrorist or something  
4 else.

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Or something else.  
6 Yes, Mr. Emerick?

7 MR. EMERICK: Does that slide satisfy the  
8 reliability criterias that were up on the screen earlier?  
9 There were three of them, NEPOOL --

10 MR. ASHTON: NPCC.

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Would this slide do it?

12 MR. EMERICK: Yeah.

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, it would. The  
14 extreme contingency is something that we would have to --  
15 we would have to live with. And if FERC changes the  
16 rules later on, then you may have to build a fourth line.  
17 It -- it leaves you with the loss of -- this  
18 transmission path and the substation as severe  
19 contingencies that we need to look at. Go ahead.

20 MR. EMERICK: So the reliability criteria  
21 that were up there before do not take into account that  
22 extreme condition that you're talking about?

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The extreme condition  
24 basically is something that the ISO and we at Northeast

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Utilities and CONVEX look at and prepare for and  
2 recognize how we're going to deal with the situation. It  
3 does not require us to physically remove that  
4 contingency. That's why it's designated severe. It's  
5 something to recognize, it's something that you have to  
6 be prepared to deal with. It does not require us to take  
7 measures or take steps, build infrastructure to minimize  
8 the impact. I'm just saying -- my own experience tells --  
9 -- says to me that under medium to high loads, the loss of  
10 this right-of-way or the loss of Black Pond Substation  
11 will end up being into a load shed condition in Southwest  
12 Connecticut. Those are part of the risks we have to  
13 weigh and say those risks are acceptable, let's not --  
14 let's not build another line east to west.

15 MR. EMERICK: Okay --

16 MR. EDWARD S. WILENSKY: What municipality  
17 is Black Pond in?

18 MR. ASHTON: Meriden --

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: In the Town of Meriden.

20 MR. ASHTON: Meriden -- (indiscernible) --

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Let's hold off on -- we  
22 have these handouts. Let's hold off on further questions  
23 for Mr. Zak on this and we'll take this up when we're  
24 seated at our mics, okay.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Thank you very much for  
2 your time.

3 MR. EMERICK: Thank you.

4 (Pause)

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We'll resume. At this  
6 point, Mr. Johnson, both your witnesses are sworn,  
7 correct?

8 MR. BRUCE JOHNSON: That's not correct,  
9 Chairman Katz.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, let's take care of  
11 that. Why don't you introduce who needs to be sworn.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Is this mic on? Good  
13 morning. I'm Bruce Johnson, attorney with the Office of  
14 Consumer Counsel.

15 We're presenting our two witnesses here  
16 today. Mr. Montalvo submitted testimony earlier in this  
17 docket and was sworn at that time. We also have brought  
18 forward another witness, Mr. Torben Aabo, who needs to be  
19 sworn before we proceed.

20 MR. ROBERT L. MARCONI: Would you have him  
21 -- Attorney Johnson, could you have him spell his name --  
22 give his full name and spell it for the court reporter.

23 MR. TORBEN AABO: My name is Torben Aabo.  
24 And it's spelled T-o-r-b-e-n. The last name is Aabo, A-



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 a-b-o.

2 MR. MARCONI: Well thank you. So only one  
3 witness needs to be sworn, correct?

4 MR. JOHNSON: That's right.

5 MR. MARCONI: Okay. Sir, could I ask you  
6 to please -- please rise and please raise your right  
7 hand.

8 (Whereupon, Torben Aabo was duly sworn  
9 in.)

10 MR. MARCONI: Please be seated, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Johnson, according to  
12 my notes, I have here that you have four additional  
13 exhibits which need to be verified?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Indeed. And that's what I  
15 would like to proceed with --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

17 MR. JOHNSON: -- at this time.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Please.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Montalvo, are you  
20 familiar with a document filed in this proceeding from  
21 OCC dated May 25, '04, labeled as the Supplemental  
22 Testimony of yourself, a document about 28 pages long,  
23 exclusive of attachments?

24 MR. MARC MONTALVO: I am.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. JOHNSON: Did you prepare or supervise  
2 the preparation of that document?

3 MR. MONTALVO: I did.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have any changes or  
5 corrections to that document at this time?

6 MR. MONTALVO: No, I don't.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Also, Mr. Montalvo, are you  
8 familiar with the document filed in this proceeding from  
9 OCC on May 26<sup>th</sup>, interrogatory answers under -- labeled --  
10 with yourself as a witness, labeled CL&P 001 through 005?

11 MR. MONTALVO: I am.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Did you prepare or supervise  
13 the preparation of those items?

14 MR. MONTALVO: I did.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have any changes or  
16 corrections to those materials at this time?

17 MR. MONTALVO: No, I don't.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Do you swear or affirm that  
19 both the written testimony of May 25 and the  
20 interrogatory answers of May 26<sup>th</sup> are true and correct to  
21 the best of your information and belief?

22 MR. MONTALVO: I do.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Aabo, are you familiar  
24 with a document filed on May 25<sup>th</sup> in this proceeding from

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 OCC labeled Testimony of Torben Aabo, a document  
2 approximately 17 pages long, exclusive of attachments?

3 MR. AABO: Yes, I am.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Did you prepare or supervise  
5 the preparation of that document?

6 MR. AABO: Yes, I did.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have any changes or  
8 corrections to that document at this time?

9 MR. AABO: No, I do not.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Also, Mr. Aabo, are you  
11 familiar with a document filed in this proceeding from  
12 OCC on May 26<sup>th</sup> labeled with yourself as a witness and  
13 also numbered as CL&P 1 through 5 being interrogatory  
14 answers?

15 MR. AABO: Yes, I am.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Did you prepare or supervise  
17 the preparation of those documents?

18 MR. AABO: Yes, I did.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have any changes or  
20 corrections to those materials at this time?

21 MR. AABO: No, I do not.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Do you adopt both the  
23 testimony of May 25<sup>th</sup> and the interrogatory answers of May  
24 26<sup>th</sup> as your testimony and answers in this proceeding and

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 as true and correct to the best of your information and  
2 belief?

3 MR. AABO: Yes, I do.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Chairman Katz, our two OCC  
5 witnesses are available for cross-examination.

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Is there any objection to  
7 making these full exhibits? Hearing none, they are full  
8 exhibits.

9 (Whereupon, OCC Exhibit No. 4 and No. 5  
10 were received into evidence as full exhibits.)

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. First the  
12 Applicant, cross for these witnesses?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: If it's acceptable to the  
14 Council, these witnesses have each filed separate  
15 testimony and the subject matter is also separable, and  
16 so what we thought what we would do is that I would take  
17 the lead on questioning Mr. Montalvo and then Miss  
18 Randell will do Mr. Aabo.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Fine.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: One or the other of us  
21 might have a cleanup question or two after hearing the  
22 other, but that's okay. Thank you. Mr. Montalvo, good  
23 morning.

24 MR. MONTALVO: Good morning.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I'd like to ask you a few  
2 questions first about the testimony that you recently  
3 filed concerning the East Shore alternative as you refer  
4 to it. And just so everybody is clear, the -- you  
5 examined some thermal load flow studies that related to a  
6 potential East Shore configuration?

7 MR. MONTALVO: That is correct.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. And the  
9 configuration that was studied in those load flow studies  
10 was not the one that was assumed in the presentation here  
11 today, which assumed the addition of a second 345-kV line  
12 along the existing East Shore right-of-way, right?

13 MR. MONTALVO: Yes -- I think that's  
14 correct, yes.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Which you -- the load  
16 flow studies that you examined looked at upgrading the  
17 existing 387 line within the existing right-of-way by  
18 reconductoring the line, thus increasing its capacity  
19 somewhat but not adding a second line?

20 MR. MONTALVO: That is correct.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And your review of  
22 those load flow studies demonstrated to you that that  
23 type of East Shore route would violate thermal loading  
24 standards required by NERC and the other reliability

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 bodies unless something more were done?

2 MR. MONTALVO: That is correct.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And you noticed  
4 that the scenarios in which the generating capacity of  
5 New Haven Harbor Generating Station was out of service  
6 were particularly problematic for that configuration?

7 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, that appeared to be a  
8 key contingency.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: And so that suggested to  
10 you that there might be an alternative that would involve  
11 a one-line East Shore alternative plus generation, is  
12 that right?

13 MR. MONTALVO: Yes. The basic  
14 configuration of the East Shore alternative relying on  
15 the 387 line as opposed to the construction of an  
16 additional 345 as in the proposal between Beseck and East  
17 Devon plus some quick start generation sited at strategic  
18 locations may actually serve to resolve many of the  
19 thermal overloads observed.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And your  
21 suggestion is that the Council study such an alternative,  
22 that is to say an alternative that would include an East  
23 Shore configuration plus strategically sited new  
24 generation, as well as other potential mixes of

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 generation and transmission to see if there is an optimal  
2 package that would be more cost effective than the  
3 proposed line, is that right?

4 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, either, you know,  
5 more cost effective or have superior performance, some  
6 combination thereof. I do want to stress though that the  
7 East Shore alternative, as I describe it in my testimony,  
8 does include key components from the proposed project,  
9 particularly much of the looping that happens northeast  
10 of Beseck and the Middletown and Middlefield area. That  
11 was kind of discussed a little bit this morning. I think  
12 those are important improvements for those to be  
13 incorporated. But on its face without some kind of study  
14 at least to determine the technical merits, whether or  
15 not the alternative that I proposed is technically  
16 feasible, it's difficult for me to rule it out.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: But you -- you haven't  
18 proposed anything, you -- in other words, you haven't  
19 proposed an alternative, you've proposed --

20 MR. MONTALVO: A recommended course of  
21 study --

22 MR. FITZGERALD: -- more study --

23 MR. MONTALVO: -- yes, yes.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And in order to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 enable that study to go forward in the way you envision  
2 it, you suggest that the Council should issue a notice  
3 denying a certificate for the proposed project, is that  
4 right?

5 MR. MONTALVO: I was not sure that --  
6 well, I think within the context of this proceeding, I  
7 think it's within the Council's purview to ask the  
8 Applicants to study an additional case. And if that case  
9 proves to be technically feasible and have economic  
10 merits, then I'm not a hundred percent sure that the next  
11 steps can happen if the instant proposal is at the same  
12 time approved in total. If you understand my meaning?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: No, actually I don't.

14 MR. MONTALVO: Well, the -- I think that  
15 the Council can ask NU and UI to study an additional case  
16 that they think is important for them to understand --

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, we've seen that.

18 MR. MONTALVO: Right. I think they can do  
19 that. They don't need to deny the proposal in order to  
20 ask for an additional case.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Oh.

22 MR. MONTALVO: Should that case prove to  
23 have merit, then the next steps where I say that it might  
24 be appropriate for them to deny this application either



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 in part or in whole depending on what is allowed in this  
2 instant would have to be considered.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: So when you said at page  
4 10 that the urgency of Southwest Connecticut's need  
5 dictates that the Council consider issuing an interim  
6 decision, indicating that it cannot approve the proposed  
7 project absent formal analysis of the feasible  
8 alternatives, you were talking about something other than  
9 a denial of the application?

10 MR. MONTALVO: Give me a moment to review  
11 that.

12 MR. TAIT: Mr. Fitzgerald, aren't we  
13 getting a little bit legalistic here as to --

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes --

15 MR. TAIT: Why --

16 MR. FITZGERALD: -- but I'm trying to find  
17 out what his testimony is.

18 MR. TAIT: Well maybe we could stick to  
19 the merits of his testimony rather than the legal posture  
20 of the case, I don't know.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Well it's  
22 difficult when you testify about the legal --

23 MR. MONTALVO: Well --

24 MR. FITZGERALD: -- proceedings.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. MONTALVO: Right. Well, I think -- I  
2 -- thank you, Mr. Tait, I appreciate you stepping in  
3 there, but -- you know, I am not an attorney, so  
4 obviously I'm trying to give my best interpretation of  
5 the rules of procedure here as it makes sense to me and  
6 what would be a reasonable way forward. And clearly the  
7 Council better understands the procedures that, you know,  
8 kind of bind its decision-making process than I do. But  
9 to the extent an additional analysis is requested along  
10 the lines that I recommend and this analysis proves to be  
11 technically feasible, that is it resolves the problems  
12 and also seems to have some economic merit, then the next  
13 question is, okay, what do we do. We have now another --  
14 now we have another competing proposal on the table.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, let's -- I'll try  
16 and stay away from procedure and just briefly identify  
17 what it is that you think might be precipitated as a  
18 solution from the procedures I'm not going to ask you  
19 about, and that is that you think that this further study  
20 might show, for instance, that an East Shore alternative  
21 plus strategically sited new generation could provide an  
22 optimal solution that would be better than the proposal  
23 either from an economic or a performance standpoint?

24 MR. MONTALVO: That is correct.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And you suggest  
2 that because it's clear that the market has not produced  
3 generation so far, that in order to induce the generation  
4 that it determines to be optimal to be built, that it may  
5 be necessary to provide for a supplemental income stream  
6 to support that generation beyond what the generator  
7 would obtain through bidding into the market?

8 MR. MONTALVO: That may be the case.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright. And you leave  
10 open how that supplemental income stream could be  
11 generated. It could come from taxpayers, it could come  
12 from the load in Southwest Connecticut, through ISO, it  
13 could come as a subsidy from the Applicants --

14 MR. MONTALVO: It's distinctly possible --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: -- right?

16 MR. MONTALVO: -- yeah.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, all three -- all  
18 three possibilities.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Fitzgerald, if you could  
20 refer specifically to where subsidy from the Applicants  
21 is suggested by Mr. Montalvo, I'd appreciate it? I'm not  
22 sure that's what he said.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I --

24 A VOICE: I thought that's just what --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: -- I thought that's what  
2 he said now.

3 MR. TAIT: I thought that's just what he  
4 agreed to --

5 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, I think that --

6 MR. TAIT: -- whether or not it's in his  
7 prefiled.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: We could -- we could say  
10 -- at page 16 -- but to answer your question, sir, at  
11 page 16, the second paragraph of the answer says the  
12 second option for cost recovery would shift to  
13 Connecticut's investor owned utilities, the cost of  
14 supporting the supplemental revenue stream to generation  
15 owners that are successful in the CEAB solicitation. I  
16 think the Applicants are the two Connecticut investor  
17 owned utilities.

18 MR. MONTALVO: Right. And exactly how  
19 that would look and the structure of that is to be  
20 determined.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Now given that,  
22 how could the Council determine now as a result of any  
23 amount of study that is done, that this hypothetical  
24 combination of generation and transmission would be the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 economically optimal solution? They wouldn't -- they  
2 wouldn't be able to know what the supplemental revenue  
3 stream that's going to be required in the future is,  
4 would they?

5 MR. MONTALVO: Down to the last dollar  
6 probably not, but I think that fair estimates could be  
7 made. I think the -- in this -- in this instance,  
8 however, I think it's important that -- you know,  
9 pursuant to my reading anyway of -- is it Public Act  
10 03140 -- that with the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board  
11 and their responsibility to determine what the proper  
12 resource planning future of the State is, that, you know,  
13 the coordinated efforts of the Siting Council and that  
14 body to ensure that happens, I think it includes the  
15 evaluation of such things and not simply the evaluation  
16 of this proposal assuming that nothing else is possible -  
17 -

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright --

19 MR. MONTALVO: -- just because an exact  
20 cost recovery mechanism hasn't yet been developed.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright. I'm not going  
22 to follow up that answer with questions about legalities  
23 or procedure --

24 MR. MONTALVO: Um-hmm --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: -- but I will ask you for  
2 an answer to the question -- I'm going to try once more -  
3 - isn't it true that in this proceeding -- now in this  
4 proceeding the Council has no way of determining what the  
5 cost of the supplemental revenue stream that would be  
6 required to induce a generator to locate generation that  
7 would make the East Shore alternative viable -- they have  
8 no way of evaluating -- of making a reliable estimate of  
9 that figure in this proceeding?

10 MR. MONTALVO: Prior to the issuance of  
11 the required RFPs and the signing of contracts, I think  
12 you're correct. But I do point out this point, the costs  
13 of the proposed project are still yet estimates, and the  
14 -- you know, the costs there and how much that's going to  
15 cost the State, you know, those are to a certain extent  
16 open questions. The socialization of costs, those are  
17 still open questions. So, I think that as it regards the  
18 issue of costs, there's sufficient uncertainty on all  
19 sides that to take a step back and let's look at  
20 alternatives that at least may have technical merits and  
21 then see if we can't do some additional economic analysis  
22 to make at least best estimates. And you can exclude  
23 things that -- you know, you can exclude things that  
24 clearly end up outside the pail, if you will,

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 economically I think through proper study. I mean --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Let me -- let me ask you  
3 in conclusion just a question or two about cost sharing -  
4 -

5 MR. MONTALVO: Um-hmm --

6 MR. FITZGERALD: -- since you mentioned  
7 that. At page 25 of your testimony you -- in discussing  
8 FERC's December 18, 2003 order you say costs that are  
9 excluded from regional cost support would include  
10 localized costs --

11 MR. MONTALVO: Um-hmm --

12 MR. FITZGERALD: -- which you characterize  
13 as including the costs of constructing underground  
14 transmission lines when such construction is not  
15 justified?

16 MR. MONTALVO: That's correct.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: What -- based on your  
18 understanding of these rules to which you testified in  
19 your direct testimony, what justifies the additional cost  
20 of underground construction?

21 MR. MONTALVO: To the extent that it is a  
22 line or a set of lines determined necessary in order to  
23 support either the reliable performance or improve the  
24 overall market efficiency, which are kind of two -- the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 two of FERC's kind of broad principles -- and the only  
2 way to put those lines into service is to underground  
3 them, then I think that that broadly meets the criterion  
4 of justification. To the extent that those lines are  
5 being underground solely for aesthetic reasons or reasons  
6 not -- you know, a reason such as that, then now there is  
7 a question as to whether or not those costs should be  
8 supported by the entire region where it is a smaller  
9 group of people who actually are desiring such treatment.

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. I have -- I have  
11 nothing further for this witness. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Just one follow-up  
13 question. When you were engaged, were you -- was it  
14 indicated to you that the Council was looking at having a  
15 solution in place by 2007 for Southwest Connecticut? Was  
16 that one of your criteria when you were looking at  
17 solutions?

18 MR. MONTALVO: The -- the time at which  
19 the time the Council wanted to have this proposal or some  
20 other proposal constructed and in service?

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

22 MR. MONTALVO: I proceeded from the  
23 assumption that the Council hoped to have whatever  
24 solution was deemed best in service as soon as possible.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. But you were not  
2 given the 2007 date?

3 MR. MONTALVO: No.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you.

5 MS. LINDA RANDELL: I have very brief  
6 follow-up. Mr. Montalvo, you talked about the looping in  
7 Middletown --

8 MR. MONTALVO: Yes.

9 MS. RANDELL: -- I'm -- if I'm  
10 understanding correctly, then you're talking about  
11 bringing the 387 line into Beseck as part of what you're  
12 assuming as a given here?

13 MR. MONTALVO: Yes, I think that's  
14 correct.

15 MS. RANDELL: And just so I'm clear,  
16 you're not changing or disagreeing with any of your  
17 testimony from March, you're just adding to it today?

18 MR. MONTALVO: That's right, this is  
19 supplemental.

20 MS. RANDELL: And for the purpose of this  
21 testimony you're assuming that the CEAB, the Connecticut  
22 Energy Advisory Board, and this Council have the  
23 authority to do what you're proposing in your testimony,  
24 correct?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. MONTALVO: Yes.

2 MS. RANDELL: Now, the CEAB has no  
3 authority to award contracts, does it?

4 MR. MONTALVO: As far as the -- yeah, the  
5 -- as I understand it, they have -- they have the  
6 authority to issue RFPs, but as far as the award of  
7 contracts, it's somewhat problematic because they have --  
8 my understanding is they have no authorization to fund  
9 those contracts. So you know, so the next step then is  
10 who actually holds the contracts, thus the section of my  
11 testimony that deals with cost recovery, and that becomes  
12 the next kind of issue of contention. And that's why I  
13 lay out several possible paths that the various agencies  
14 in the State might pursue.

15 MS. RANDELL: And in fact, Section 19 of  
16 Public Act 03140 provides that what happens at the end of  
17 the RFP process is that the CEAB issues a report?

18 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, essentially. It's a  
19 recommendation, yeah.

20 MS. RANDELL: And with respect to the  
21 permitting of any generation you're talking about, you  
22 haven't addressed the issue of community support or  
23 opposition?

24 MR. MONTALVO: Right. But I do say that,

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 you know, the issues of siting and permitting of these  
2 facilities will have to return to the various agencies  
3 responsible for those things. For example, the siting of  
4 the generation will return to the Siting Council for  
5 ultimate determination whether they should be sited, but  
6 that as a starting point since it's determined that the  
7 siting of these generation as a general matter meets kind  
8 of a technical and economic test, that there are merits  
9 to their siting, and that should at least theoretically  
10 expedite the process.

11 MS. RANDELL: And you would add  
12 environmental tests?

13 MR. MONTALVO: There would have to --  
14 obviously it would have to comply with all regulations of  
15 the State, yes.

16 MS. RANDELL: And that would include not  
17 only the environmental considerations of this Council but  
18 also air permitting requirements of the Connecticut  
19 Department of Environmental Protection?

20 MR. MONTALVO: Yes.

21 MS. RANDELL: And are you familiar with  
22 recent actions by the Connecticut Department of  
23 Environmental Protection rejecting air permits for a  
24 generator located in New Haven?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. MONTALVO: I am not, no.

2 MS. RANDELL: No further questions.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

4 MR. ASHTON: Do -- do you have any feel  
5 for how long the permitting process would take for a  
6 generating station of some significance?

7 MR. MONTALVO: What I'm suggesting might  
8 be kind of the appropriate scale of generation is a set  
9 of 25 or 50 megawatt generators, some combination, and  
10 they may be all at one location or maybe at several  
11 locations depending on what works best in the power  
12 system for the studies. And so if everything is at one  
13 location, the siting process might actually be faster and  
14 easier. If there are several locations that are required  
15 or make the most sense, it might take a bit longer. As a  
16 general matter -- you know, it's difficult to handicap.  
17 You know, it could take -- it could take a couple of  
18 years, it could take, you know, a year. I don't -- I  
19 just don't know.

20 MR. ASHTON: Let me just back up a little  
21 bit. You mentioned 25 to 50 megawatt units. In  
22 aggregate what would the total generation block that you  
23 would contemplate be assuming it was going in one  
24 location?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. MONTALVO: Something on the order of  
2 200 megawatts.

3 MR. ASHTON: A 200-megawatt --

4 MR. MONTALVO: Right. It may be a little  
5 less, maybe a little more. Again, I think the total  
6 number and the locations would be determined by study.

7 MR. ASHTON: Um-hmm. Have you done any  
8 studies to see how that fits in the load curve for  
9 optimizing economic dispatch at all? You know, would  
10 they be a very simple gas turbine or would they be a  
11 combined cycle unit --

12 MR. MONTALVO: No, I --

13 MR. ASHTON: -- or what's -- what are you  
14 thinking --

15 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, I'm suggesting the  
16 use of quick start gas turbines, simple cycle. And you  
17 know, these facilities would provide a good peaking  
18 resource for the region, for Southwest Connecticut. And  
19 so I think they -- they wouldn't be -- I think they would  
20 dispatch economically in Southwest Connecticut. Most of  
21 the time they would be needed. That's my -- that's my  
22 best guess. There could be times however when that's not  
23 the case where for precontingency posturing of the system  
24 they might have to be run where they otherwise wouldn't

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 be economic, and that's why they might require subsidy  
2 payments of some sort.

3 MR. ASHTON: You mentioned the word guess.  
4 Have you done any studies to see --

5 MR. MONTALVO: I have -- I have not  
6 performed a study --

7 MR. ASHTON: So you have no idea whether  
8 there's a surfeit or a deficiency of peaking in Southwest  
9 Connecticut already, do you?

10 MR. MONTALVO: Well, I'm familiar with the  
11 set of generating facilities that are in Southwest  
12 Connecticut. I'm familiar with the fact that most of the  
13 generating facilities in Southwest Connecticut are in  
14 fact not peaking resources, and that there are many  
15 facilities actually in the region that are seeking  
16 retirement from service. And so I think as part of the  
17 overall power supply of the region, I think the addition  
18 of peaking resources makes sense. Additional base load  
19 resources are likely to be required also in the not too  
20 distant future and I think part of the goal of the  
21 solution is to facilitate the addition of those types of  
22 resources too.

23 MR. ASHTON: Okay, thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Let's go to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the list. Next is Representative Al Adinolfi. Absent.  
2 The Town of Middlefield. Attorney Knapp, questions for  
3 this witness?

4 MR. ERIC KNAPP: I have no questions of  
5 this witness.

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Knapp says no  
7 questions. The Towns, Wallingford, Durham, Woodbridge.  
8 Attorneys -- (pause) -- could you just start off with  
9 which towns you're speaking to at this point for.

10 MR. MONTE FRANK: Sure. Madam Chairman,  
11 Monte Frank for the Town of Woodbridge.

12 MS. JULIE DONALDSON KOHLER: Julie  
13 Donaldson Kohler for the City of Milford.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

15 MR. FRANK: I have some very limited  
16 cross-examination for Mr. -- is it pronounced Aabo? Did  
17 I get that right?

18 MR. AABO: Yes, Aabo.

19 MS. RANDELL: Madam Chairman, we thought  
20 we were just dealing with Mr. Montalvo and then we were  
21 going to do this again with Mr. Aabo. We do have  
22 questions for Mr. Aabo. I have no problem if Mr. Frank  
23 and Miss Kohler would like to start now and just do that,  
24 but I don't want you to think that we had nothing for Mr.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Aabo.

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Oh, okay. What's your --

3 MR. FRANK: And I don't have any -- I do  
4 not have anything for Mr. Montalvo.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, let's --

6 MS. KOHLER: Nor do I.

7 MS. RANDELL: We're cool if you want to  
8 just go ahead --

9 MS. KOHLER: No --

10 MS. RANDELL: -- and do it this way.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: I --

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Go away. (Laughter).

13 A VOICE: See you soon.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, why don't we proceed  
15 then with your questions for the other witness Mr. Aabo,  
16 and then we'll go through the list. How's that?

17 MS. RANDELL: Sure. I'm going to start  
18 and then Mr. Fitzgerald will pick up. Good morning.

19 MR. AABO: Good morning.

20 MS. RANDELL: Mr. Aabo, on page 8 of your  
21 prefiled testimony you spoke of recent HPPF cable system  
22 problems. And towards the bottom of my page you speak of  
23 several failures have occurred over the last few years.  
24 Let's just take them one at a time. At the bottom of



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 page 8 you talk about in one instance a 345-kV HPFF  
2 splice failed. What project was that?

3 MR. AABO: These are -- these are failures  
4 that there are no official records on these failures.  
5 And I will hesitate to tell you what systems that they're  
6 on because what I have -- what I am telling you here, and  
7 I think I say that up front, that these are information I  
8 have learned as a participant in industrial -- in  
9 industry meetings and so on. So, I -- I would prefer not  
10 to point to what failures they are.

11 MS. RANDELL: Mr. Aabo, I don't think you  
12 have that option here --

13 MR. AABO: I don't?

14 MS. RANDELL: -- let's try again --

15 MR. AABO: Well, these are --

16 MS. RANDELL: -- you were -- you were  
17 provided some other information other than there was a  
18 failure somewhere, sometime, on something?

19 MR. AABO: Um-hmm -- yes -- yes, ma'am.

20 MS. RANDELL: Okay. Then let's -- let's  
21 try again. What project is this one you were speaking of  
22 where the splice failed?

23 MR. AABO: These -- these are failures on  
24 345-kV feeders in the ConEdison system in New York City.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. RANDELL: And how many?

2 MR. AABO: There were one failure and a  
3 repair and then there was another failure on this  
4 particular line. I -- I could not tell you what the  
5 feeder number is.

6 MS. RANDELL: Do you know how the failure  
7 was determined? How was it determined that there was a  
8 failure?

9 MR. AABO: Well, I guess the breaker  
10 opened.

11 MS. RANDELL: Okay. How long did it take  
12 to determine where the problem was?

13 MR. AABO: That information I do not have  
14 available.

15 MS. RANDELL: On any of these instances?

16 MR. AABO: I have -- I have -- no, I do  
17 not -- I do not know these kind of details.

18 MS. RANDELL: Okay. And then you don't  
19 know how long it took to repair?

20 MR. AABO: I -- I know it took several --  
21 several months for this system to be repaired and go back  
22 in service. Several months. Maybe even -- maybe even  
23 half a year, maybe even longer than that. I do not have  
24 those numbers.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. RANDELL: And is that also the case  
2 with respect to the splice that failed when problems  
3 occurred with pressurization of the cable pipe?

4 MR. AABO: I do not know how long it took  
5 to get it back in service, no, I do not.

6 MS. RANDELL: And do you know the cause of  
7 the failure?

8 MR. AABO: Well, the -- the hearsay was  
9 that there were --

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, that's -- that's  
11 enough.

12 MR. AABO: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Sir, if you don't have  
14 direct knowledge, just feel free to say that you don't.

15 MR. AABO: I will.

16 MS. RANDELL: Just a technical question.  
17 On page 3 of your prefiled testimony, your Point 4 states  
18 there appears to be no technical reason at this time to  
19 favor under-grounding the segments of the project between  
20 Norwalk and Middletown. Did you mean to say Milford and  
21 Middletown Segments 1 and 2? Your testimony  
22 distinguishes between 1 and 2 and 3 and 4. I just want  
23 to be clear on what you are saying.

24 MR. AABO: Well, these are the two

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 sections, Section 1 and 2, that's the one -- that's the  
2 two sections that I'm referring to.

3 MS. RANDELL: Okay. And subject to check,  
4 you'd agree with me then if that's between Milford and  
5 Middletown, that's what you intended to say there?

6 MR. AABO: From Middletown to -- I'll have  
7 to -- I'll have to check. But if you're saying Section 1  
8 and 2 goes between -- what do you say Milford and  
9 Middletown?

10 MS. RANDELL: Yes.

11 MR. AABO: Then that's -- that's the ones  
12 that I was referring to.

13 MS. RANDELL: We thought so. Thank you.  
14 With respect to your testimony on page 4 with respect to  
15 HPPF cable and XLPE for crossing rivers, creeks and  
16 brooks -- are you with me?

17 MR. AABO: Yes.

18 MS. RANDELL: And you say that the XLPE  
19 system would eliminate the potential for water  
20 contamination. Are you assuming that the cable is just  
21 laid on the bottom?

22 MR. AABO: No, I'm not assuming that at  
23 all.

24 MS. RANDELL: Okay. So you took into

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 account that the cable would be installed through HDD,  
2 directional drilling or jack and bore?

3 MR. AABO: That is correct.

4 MS. RANDELL: So the leaking would not --  
5 if it occurred, would not be into the water system?

6 MR. AABO: Well, it could be. It could  
7 be. I mean where would it leak? It does come up to the  
8 surface.

9 MS. RANDELL: Eventually --

10 MR. AABO: Eventually --

11 MS. RANDELL: -- but it's buried -- HPFF -  
12 - the HPFF would be buried substantially below the water  
13 bed, right?

14 MR. AABO: That's correct.

15 MS. RANDELL: On page 5 you had another  
16 technical issue where you state the volume of dielectric  
17 fluid in the cable pipe is on the order of one gallon per  
18 foot. It's actually one and a half gallons per foot,  
19 isn't it --

20 MR. AABO: Well, I --

21 MS. RANDELL: -- just for technical  
22 accuracy --

23 MR. AABO: Since I -- since I do not have  
24 the design of the cable, I couldn't tell you.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. RANDELL: Okay. With respect to the  
2 manholes for splicing of XLPE, you state on page 6 that  
3 manholes would be installed 2,000 to 2500 feet apart,  
4 correct?

5 MR. AABO: That's correct.

6 MS. RANDELL: Did you take into account  
7 that the reel length or standard reel for non-special  
8 permits is limited to 600 meters, which that's about 1900  
9 feet?

10 MR. AABO: No, I did not take that into  
11 consideration. But since I do not have the size of the  
12 cable, then it's very difficult to say what -- how long  
13 lengths you can have on a standard reel.

14 MS. RANDELL: But whatever your number is  
15 then for placement of manholes, it would be whatever you  
16 can put on the reel?

17 MR. AABO: And whatever you can put on the  
18 reel and whatever you can pull into that conduit.

19 MS. RANDELL: Staying with your prefilled  
20 testimony, you state that ConEd has several long, and you  
21 define that to be 20 plus miles, 345-kV underground  
22 cables connected to long overhead lines at the  
23 substations. How many of those do they have of 20 plus  
24 miles?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: I do not know the number, but  
2 they have several as I say -- 2, 4, 6 -- I do not know.

3 MS. RANDELL: And it's your testimony that  
4 each one of those is 20 miles or longer?

5 MR. AABO: Several of them are 20 miles or  
6 longer.

7 MS. RANDELL: But you can't provide me the  
8 lengths?

9 MR. AABO: No, I did not -- I did not go  
10 in and find the length.

11 MS. RANDELL: Or the terminal substations  
12 of any one of these?

13 MR. AABO: No, I did not do that.

14 MS. RANDELL: So you couldn't tell me when  
15 they were installed?

16 MR. AABO: They were installed in the  
17 60's, late -- they started to install 345-kV cables in  
18 the -- 1964. And so they were installed after -- after  
19 that.

20 MS. RANDELL: And the vintage of those  
21 cables in the 60's then would be such that they would be  
22 using different insulation than would be used for this  
23 project?

24 MR. AABO: Yes. These cables have paper

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1       whereas you would be probably using paper --  
2       polypropylene paper.

3                   MS. RANDELL:  You discuss also  
4       transmission cable circuit installation in tunnels.  
5       Would you agree with me that installation in tunnels is  
6       different than installation when you bury the cable?

7                   MR. AABO:  Yes.

8                   MR. BRIAN O'NEILL:  Excuse me.  It would  
9       be helpful if you referred to the question or the page  
10      number --

11                   MS. RANDELL:  Oh, certainly.  On page --

12                   MR. O'NEILL:  -- when going back and forth  
13      --

14                   MS. RANDELL:  Sure.

15                   MR. O'NEILL:  Thank you.

16                   MS. RANDELL:  On page 18, the top of my  
17      page, the question is what are the longest installed --

18                   MR. JOHNSON:  I don't --

19                   MS. RANDELL:  -- transmission cable  
20      circuits of which you are aware.

21                   MR. JOHNSON:  I don't think page 18 is  
22      possible since that's --

23                   MS. RANDELL:  I'm sorry, page 8.  I  
24      apologize.  Page 8 of 17.  And staying on page 8, you say



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 you are not aware of any operating problems that these  
2 circuits have experienced?

3 MR. AABO: That's correct.

4 MS. RANDELL: And yet earlier in your  
5 testimony you reference the CCI report from December  
6 2001. Do you recall that?

7 MR. AABO: Yes, I do.

8 MS. RANDELL: And that report talks about  
9 several cable failures, doesn't it, at 345-kV or above?

10 MR. AABO: Yes. But what I'm referring to  
11 are the cable circuits that's listed above.

12 MS. RANDELL: Okay. So then there's a  
13 whole other body of information that talks about other  
14 cable failures and that's contained in the CCI report?

15 MR. AABO: That's correct.

16 MS. RANDELL: Turning to page 9 of your  
17 testimony, you talk about -- it's at the bottom of my  
18 page -- in France 225 kilovolt XLPE cables are installed  
19 in ducts?

20 MR. AABO: Yes.

21 MS. RANDELL: That's only been for the  
22 last few years, isn't it?

23 MR. AABO: That has been since the 1990's  
24 -- in 1990 -- I believe the first one was installed in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 1990.

2 MS. RANDELL: Before whatever date that  
3 is, tunnels or direct burial was used, correct?

4 MR. AABO: Correct.

5 MS. RANDELL: Moving all the way along,  
6 Mr. Aabo, to page 14 of your testimony, you reference in  
7 the first answer -- the question is can the transmission  
8 system be designed to minimize threats. And this is with  
9 underground installation. In your answer five lines  
10 down, you talk about compensation equipment. Do you see  
11 that?

12 MR. AABO: Yes, I do.

13 MS. RANDELL: By that -- by compensation  
14 equipment, I take it you mean shunt reactors?

15 MR. AABO: That's correct.

16 MS. RANDELL: And shunt reactors may take  
17 care of VARs, but they don't address transients, correct?

18 MR. AABO: Now you are outside of the area  
19 of my expertise.

20 MS. RANDELL: And the computer based  
21 monitoring systems you're referencing in that answer, is  
22 that SCADA systems?

23 MR. AABO: It could be a type of SCADA  
24 system that will -- that would look at the system and

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 control the system.

2 MS. RANDELL: And what's the approximate  
3 cost of a SCADA system?

4 MR. AABO: I do not know.

5 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

6 (Pause).

7 MS. RANDELL: Would you agree with me, Mr.  
8 Aabo, that transition stations are subject to transients?

9 MR. AABO: Yeah, I -- I -- I guess you're  
10 correct.

11 MS. RANDELL: And transition stations are  
12 subject to vandalism?

13 MR. AABO: Like any other thing, that's  
14 correct.

15 MS. RANDELL: And terminations are less  
16 reliable than the cable?

17 MR. AABO: That's correct.

18 MS. RANDELL: I have no further questions.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: I do have a few simply  
20 directed to the preference you expressed in your prefiled  
21 testimony for the use of XLPE cable over 345 HPFF cable.

22 First of all, as I read your testimony, I gathered that  
23 that preference is based on the elimination of a  
24 potential for water contamination. Is that right?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: Well, from the environmental  
2 issues that the dielectric fluid can have, that -- that's  
3 the issue.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: You do not claim that  
5 XLPE would be a more reliable alternative than HPPF?

6 MR. AABO: I'm not saying more reliable,  
7 but I would say that to date I don't have information  
8 that shows it's less reliable.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, but -- well -- but  
10 the reason for your preference for XLPE is not a  
11 reliability reason, it is an environmental reason?

12 MR. AABO: That is correct.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. You mentioned at  
14 page 7 of your testimony that there is a 230-kV  
15 underground XLPE line being installed in California now  
16 or soon. It's true, isn't it, that the voltage stresses  
17 on the insulation of a 230-kV XLPE cable are  
18 significantly less than the voltage stresses on the  
19 insulation of a 345 XLPE line?

20 MR. AABO: Not necessarily, because  
21 there's more -- there's more insulation on that 345-kV  
22 cable than there is on that 230-kV cable. It's the  
23 matter of the design that you select to use, so --

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Well --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: -- from a material point of  
2 view, you -- you will have maybe slightly higher stresses  
3 on the 345 than that on the 230.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: What is the reason why  
5 115-kV underground XLPE cables have been found to be  
6 quite reliable in their performance, oh, for a  
7 considerable period of time, whereas problems at the  
8 joints, at the splices and terminations have been  
9 experienced with 345-kV XLPE lines?

10 MR. AABO: The reasons for that is the  
11 development of reliable designs of the splices and  
12 terminations.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: And --

14 MR. AABO: Uh --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: -- and does that have  
16 anything to do with the stress on the insulation from the  
17 cable voltage?

18 MR. AABO: It has to do with the control  
19 of the electrical stress at these devices -- at the  
20 splices and at the terminations.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: And the -- and the stress  
22 that is imposed on whatever amount of insulation that's  
23 used is a factor of the cable voltage, isn't it?

24 MR. AABO: That is -- that is a factor

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 that must be taken into consideration for the design of  
2 these devices.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: And that factor is much  
4 higher for a 345 line than it is for a 115 line?

5 MR. AABO: The -- the factor is -- it's --  
6 it's a matter of controlling that stress. And if you  
7 look at the --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Well before you get to  
9 how you deal with it --

10 MR. AABO: Okay --

11 MR. FITZGERALD: -- with how you deal with  
12 it -- I mean isn't it -- isn't there a mathematical or  
13 physical calculation -- first of all, how do you express  
14 the voltage stress on insulation from a cable? And --

15 MR. AABO: Well, it's --

16 MR. FITZGERALD: -- what is the unit of  
17 stress?

18 MR. AABO: You usually use the volts per  
19 mil, which is the volts along one-thousandths of an inch  
20 --

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Right, and --

22 MR. AABO: -- and --

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And the volts per  
24 mil for 115-kV cable are what?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: The volts per mil?

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

3 MR. AABO: Well, you've got to -- you've  
4 got to define where are you looking, because there's  
5 different places that you will need to look. If you're  
6 looking at the average across the insulation, it's a lot  
7 less than if you're looking at -- near the conductor. I  
8 mean now you're getting into the technical issues of  
9 designing a cable and designing an accessory, and --

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Let's -- well, I would --  
11 let's talk about at the -- on the face of the conductor,  
12 on the outer edge of the conductor, what is the -- what  
13 is the volts per mil that the cable -- that the  
14 insulation has to be designed to deal with?

15 MR. AABO: Well, there's -- there's  
16 certain specifications that you use. And I will hesitate  
17 to give numbers because I do not -- I do not have the  
18 specification values listed in my head, so I don't really  
19 want to give you numbers. I can tell you though that the  
20 values for a 345-kV cable is slightly higher than that  
21 for a 230, which is again slightly higher than that for a  
22 115-kV.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Slightly higher? Are we  
24 talking about a factor -- are we talking about

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 percentages such as 50 percent higher?

2 MR. AABO: No.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: No. Okay. You reference  
4 in your testimony the CCI Engineering Report 117,  
5 correct? That's at page 7, the first line of the answer  
6 to the question --

7 MR. AABO: Yes, I do, um-hmm.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Madam Chairperson,  
9 that report was CL&P Exhibit 6C in Docket 217, but it has  
10 not been separately marked in this proceeding. I know  
11 that the Council has taken --

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We've taken administrative  
13 notice of the entire docket, so we'll note that.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. You note that  
15 the 345 cables of HPFF were first installed about 1964,  
16 right? And after about seven years of operation, several  
17 splices failed because the thermal movement of the cables  
18 had pushed some cable into the splicing area. Is that --

19 MR. AABO: That's correct.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: -- right -- yeah, okay.  
21 And that problem was solved eventually after extensive  
22 research that led to retrofitting of many of the joints  
23 of the cables that had been installed up to that time,  
24 right?



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: That's correct.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: And concerns regarding  
3 movement into the pipe led EPRI to perform extensive  
4 research on the cables. And that research defines  
5 specific HPFF manufacturing parameters that were prone to  
6 failure. Right? Yes?

7 MR. AABO: It -- it -- it -- yes. It  
8 showed some -- some of the parameters.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: So the work necessary to  
10 identify and fix the design flaws that caused those  
11 initial failures in the first seven years of operation  
12 has now been done, isn't that right?

13 MR. AABO: That's correct.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: And 345 HPFF cables have  
15 been operating reliably for the last 20 years, right?

16 MR. AABO: Except for the occasional  
17 failure that we have.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay -- right. Now,  
19 isn't the technology for 345 XLPE cables today about  
20 where that for 345-kV HPFF cables was in 1964?

21 MR. AABO: Could you repeat that question?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: Sure. Isn't the  
23 technology for XL -- isn't the technology for XLPE at 345  
24 today just about where that for 345 HPFF technology was

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 in 1964? It's been proven in the lab, but it doesn't  
2 have a proven operating history, and in fact there are  
3 early failures, right?

4 MR. AABO: No, sir.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Why not?

6 MR. AABO: Because as I point out in my  
7 testimony that it took about seven years for these  
8 failures in the pipe cable to occur. We have had several  
9 early failures in the XLPE system. So if you want to  
10 compare where we are with XLPE and you want to use 1964  
11 as a benchmark, I would say that we are in the range of  
12 1980 the quality of the cable, of the pipe type in 1980,  
13 because we have already weeded out the initial design  
14 problems that was in the accessories of the XLPE system.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Aabo, for the 345  
16 HPPF cables, a lot of those failures didn't even occur  
17 for seven years, isn't that right?

18 MR. AABO: That -- that's correct.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright --

20 MR. AABO: But --

21 MR. FITZGERALD: We -- we don't -- we  
22 don't have seven years of operating experience for 345  
23 HPPF cable anywhere, do we?

24 MR. AABO: We have 400-kV operating

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 experience since 1999 --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, let's see, this is

3 --

4 MR. AABO: -- since 1997 --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: -- this is -- this is --

6 MR. AABO: -- I'm sorry, 1997 --

7 MR. FITZGERALD: You just subtracted --

8 MR. AABO: So -- so --

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Where's that?

10 MR. AABO: It's not quite there yet.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, it's not quite.

12 And that -- and that cable that you're referring to for  
13 1997?

14 MR. AABO: I'm sorry?

15 MR. FITZGERALD: That cable that you're  
16 referring to at 500-kV from 1997 is --

17 MR. AABO: 400 -- 400.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: 400 is?

19 MR. AABO: The one in Copenhagen.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: And that's had failures?

21 MR. AABO: No, it hasn't.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, is that the one in  
23 the tunnel?

24 MR. AABO: No, it's not. It's the one

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 direct buried.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Direct buried, okay.  
3 (Pause). Oh, okay. I've just -- it's just been pointed  
4 out to me that I made a mistake in a question. You  
5 understood the question the way I asked it, but so the  
6 record is straight what I meant to say is that we don't  
7 have seven years of experience in operation of 345 XLPE  
8 cables. And your response to that was well we do have  
9 one at 400-kV. Right? Okay. That's just to keep the  
10 record straight.

11 You would agree that there are no U.S.  
12 manufacturers of XLPE cable at 345-kV?

13 MR. AABO: That's correct.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: And there are no U.S.  
15 based companies that are qualified to provide support and  
16 maintenance for 345-kV HPFF -- I'm sorry, 345-kV XLPE?

17 MR. AABO: I'm not sure I understand what  
18 you -- what you mean by support.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Fix them when they break.

20 MR. AABO: There are companies that can  
21 fix XLPE cable systems. There are companies that has  
22 installed XLPE 345-kV systems. So, I -- I would assume  
23 that if they can install it, they can also fix it, U.S.  
24 companies.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: That's an assumption?

2 MR. AABO: Well --

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay.

4 MR. O'NEILL: Excuse me. Does ConEd have  
5 any experience fixing these type of cables to your  
6 knowledge --

7 MR. AABO: Not --

8 MR. O'NEILL: -- at 345?

9 MR. AABO: Not at 345. They have not  
10 installed any 345 XLPE cables as yet.

11 MR. O'NEILL: Do you know what companies  
12 in the United States have had experience with these  
13 cables and doing maintenance on these cables?

14 MR. AABO: I know the companies that have  
15 installed the cables, but I -- since we haven't had any  
16 failures, I do not know of any companies that has  
17 actually done repair on the system.

18 MR. ASHTON: Do you --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about -- what American  
20 companies do the installation of the 345 XLPE?

21 MR. AABO: Well, there were -- a company  
22 from California that did installation on -- of 345-kV  
23 here in Boston.

24 MR. ASHTON: In what, I'm sorry?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: In Boston.

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: For the N-STAR system?

3 MR. AABO: No, it was on a -- on a  
4 generator. It was a generator, it was a very short  
5 section.

6 MR. ASHTON: There are --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So it was not a  
8 transmission per say, it was part of a generation  
9 facility?

10 MR. AABO: It's part of a generation  
11 facility, so -- it's a very short system. It's only  
12 terminations, there's no splices.

13 MR. O'NEILL: How short a system are you  
14 talking about?

15 MR. AABO: A few hundred feet. I believe  
16 that the longest one is a thousand feet. There was about  
17 I think nine -- nine cables ranging from 300 feet to a  
18 thousand feet.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Back to you, Mr.  
20 Fitzgerald.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. Mr. Aabo, it  
22 has been said in another proceeding that if the company  
23 were to install a length such as 24 miles of 345-kV XLPE  
24 cable, that would be the longest installation of that

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 cable at that voltage in the world, and the companies who  
2 did it would be famous. Do -- do you agree with that?

3 MR. AABO: At the time of that proceeding,  
4 I don't know when that was, but I think that might have  
5 changed since then. There are longer lengths that has  
6 been installed or are in the process, in the planning  
7 stage.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: There are lengths longer  
9 than 24 miles of 345-kV XLPE cable that have been  
10 installed, is that -- let's take it one at a time -- is  
11 that your testimony?

12 MR. AABO: You -- you -- you -- you are  
13 talking about 345-kV --

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, I am.

15 MR. AABO: Yeah. And -- then, I must -- I  
16 must agree with you that -- if you could say 345 or  
17 higher, if you could say that, but -- then I would  
18 disagree with you.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: And what higher than 345  
20 and XLPE has been installed?

21 MR. AABO: In Japan they have -- I believe  
22 it's a 500-kV system that they --

23 MR. FITZGERALD: And is that the one in  
24 the tunnel?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: Uh -- it may be, but I believe  
2 some of it may be direct buried as well.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright. Now, let me go  
4 back -- and I -- to the second part of my question, 24  
5 miles of XLPE cable installed in ducts would be the  
6 longest installation of any extra high voltage XLPE cable  
7 installed in ducts, isn't that right?

8 MR. AABO: That is correct.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Alright. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Does that conclude your  
11 cross-examination?

12 MS. RANDELL: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We'll bring Attorneys  
14 Frank and Kohler back up and I apologize for bringing you  
15 up too soon. Just roughly how long would you -- do you  
16 have, just so we can time things?

17 MR. FRANK: I have about five minutes --

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

19 MR. FRANK: -- if that.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: That's perfect.

21 MR. FRANK: Mr. Aabo -- again Monte Frank  
22 for the Town of Woodbridge.

23 Mr. Aabo, on page 16 of your prefiled  
24 testimony you state that you do not believe that there is



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 a justification for under-grounding in Segments 1 and 2  
2 because there are large sections of the line in rural  
3 areas which pass over pastures and through wooded lots.  
4 Other than looking at the photographs in Volume 8 of the  
5 application and the aerial photographs in Volume 9 of the  
6 application, did you do anything else to assess the  
7 current or future land use in Milford and Woodbridge?

8 MR. AABO: No, I did not.

9 MR. FRANK: Okay. Did you visit Milford  
10 or Woodbridge to review the current land uses along the  
11 right-of-way?

12 MR. AABO: No, I did not. As I point out,  
13 I -- the only thing I reviewed were the photographs that  
14 I saw in these documents in the docket.

15 MR. FRANK: Are you aware of any pastures  
16 in the right-of-way in Woodbridge?

17 MR. AABO: I'm not aware -- the pictures  
18 that I looked -- if that was Woodbridge or what town it  
19 was, but there were certain -- quite a few pages where  
20 there were areas of forest, trees, and pastures, and --  
21 yeah, areas like that.

22 MR. FRANK: As you sit here today, you're  
23 not -- you do not know whether those pastures you looked  
24 at are in Woodbridge or in some other town?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. AABO: That's correct. I -- my  
2 statement is a general statement for looking at these  
3 pictures.

4 MR. FRANK: I understand. Are you aware  
5 of the number of homes currently adjacent to the right-  
6 of-way in Milford and Woodbridge?

7 MR. AABO: No, sir.

8 MR. FRANK: Are you aware of the number of  
9 elementary schools located near the right-of-way in  
10 Woodbridge?

11 MR. AABO: No, I'm not.

12 MR. FRANK: Would your opinion change if  
13 the current land use near the right-of-way in Woodbridge  
14 alone included 80 homes, two elementary schools, a day  
15 care facility, a camp and a community center?

16 MR. AABO: I guess you would have to  
17 specify when you say near or what's the -- what's the  
18 distances that you are looking? Are you looking at being  
19 at the right-of-way, or --

20 MR. FRANK: Assume for my question that  
21 these land uses that I've described are adjacent to the  
22 right-of-way.

23 MR. AABO: You would -- you will certainly  
24 have to evaluate what effect that would have on the area.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FRANK: On page 16 of your prefiled  
2 testimony you state that if future uses of the land  
3 include more intensive development for homes or industry,  
4 this could be the basis for considering additional under-  
5 grounding. Do you see that testimony?

6 MR. AABO: Yeah -- yes, I do.

7 MR. FRANK: Do the land uses that I've  
8 just described as being current along the right-of-way in  
9 Woodbridge amount to those future uses that may provide  
10 the basis for considering additional under-grounding in  
11 your opinion?

12 MR. AABO: It -- it sounds like what you  
13 are saying that there are schools and businesses and  
14 homes within the right-of-way or very close to the right-  
15 of-way. I would certainly think that you should evaluate  
16 possibly under-grounding those sections.

17 MR. FRANK: Nothing further.

18 MS. KOHLER: Mr. Aabo, as Mr. Frank just  
19 noted you've testified that intensive development of  
20 homes or commercial, industrial areas might justify  
21 additional under-grounding. Are you familiar with the  
22 significant residential density along the proposed 345-kV  
23 line in Milford?

24 MR. AABO: No, I'm not.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: Are you familiar with the  
2 significant commercial and industrial density along the  
3 proposed 345-kV line in Milford?

4 MR. AABO: No, I'm not.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Just -- I can't --

6 MS. KOHLER: I just said -- the first  
7 question was about residential and the second was about  
8 commercial, industrial.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: I beg your pardon.

10 MS. KOHLER: Would your opinion about  
11 under-grounding in Segment 2 change if the current land  
12 use within or abutting the proposed 345-kV right-of-way  
13 included the largest open space and recreation area in  
14 the city?

15 MR. AABO: We did see some pictures where  
16 there were recreational areas very close to the line.  
17 And it appeared that they had been there for a while. So  
18 if you are --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Aabo, pull your mic a  
20 little closer.

21 MR. AABO: So if you're -- if you're  
22 referring to those areas -- you are not -- you would not  
23 be changing the current use if you have the overhead  
24 lines there already.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: If you were adding addition  
2 345-kV lines?

3 MR. AABO: That's a very -- a very  
4 difficult question for me to answer. You -- you will  
5 have to do the studies -- now we have seen studies that  
6 show that there could be some systems problems with more  
7 under-grounding. And if that's the case and that would  
8 add to that difficulty, you will have to justify it even  
9 more than just from the aesthetic point of view.

10 MS. KOHLER: We're not -- we're not  
11 discussing aesthetics. We're simply discussing your  
12 testimony in which you represent the fact that  
13 residential density and industrial density could justify  
14 additional under-grounding --

15 MR. AABO: That's correct --

16 MS. KOHLER: -- and what I'm asking -- the  
17 question is if there's an open space recreational area  
18 that would be bisected by the 345-kV line, would that in  
19 your opinion be something to consider in additional  
20 under-grounding?

21 MR. TAIT: You mean by an additional line?

22 MS. KOHLER: Well there's an existing 115-  
23 kV line, but --

24 MR. TAIT: The question to the witness is

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 if we put an additional one there --

2 MS. KOHLER: With -- with the additional -  
3 - with the new -- thank you, Mr. Tait --

4 MR. TAIT: There's already one there --

5 MS. KOHLER: With the --

6 MR. TAIT: -- there's already one there --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: (Indiscernible) -- one  
8 there. A new 345-kV --

9 MS. KOHLER: Correct --

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- crossing a large park.

11 MR. ASHTON: As a matter of fact replacing  
12 an existing one.

13 MR. AABO: I would have a tough time -- I  
14 --

15 A VOICE: Don't answer --

16 MR. AABO: From a technical point you can  
17 do it, you don't have to do it, you can do it, whatever,  
18 but --

19 MS. KOHLER: I'm not sure what that means.

20 MR. AABO: No, but I -- I'm not -- I'm not  
21 sure what your -- what your goal here is? I mean if you  
22 have an open space and you already have a transmission  
23 line there, so putting the additional 345-kV line on that  
24 property would not seem to me to alter the use of the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 property. So, I --

2 MS. KOHLER: Is --

3 MS. RANDELL: Madam Chairman, I tried not  
4 to interrupt but here I just did. I'm informed that in  
5 that location there's actually three structures and four  
6 lines there now, and that it would go to two structures  
7 under the proposal. So, I think if the witness is going  
8 to be asked --

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So Miss Kohler, do you  
10 just want to reframe your question with that information.

11 MS. KOHLER: I -- I'm not sure my question  
12 is about necessarily the structures that are involved. I  
13 think there are impacts that are associated with the 345-  
14 kV line that may not necessarily be associated with  
15 simply the number of structures within the line.

16 MR. ASHTON: Well, I think it's important  
17 to accurately portray in words what is there in asking  
18 your question.

19 MS. KOHLER: Okay. Mr. Aabo --

20 MR. AABO: Yes?

21 MS. KOHLER: -- would -- would your  
22 opinion about under-grounding in Milford change if there  
23 were significant density of residences along the proposed  
24 345-kV line, including a residential subdivision like

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Lexington Green that has 250 houses that immediately  
2 abuts the line?

3 MR. AABO: It would certainly change in  
4 the sense that -- you're talking about future use now and  
5 -- but -- and what effect that has of the future use of  
6 the area if it should be under-grounding. And that  
7 certainly should be evaluated very careful.

8 MS. KOHLER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Aabo.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Does that conclude --

10 MR. FRANK: Yes.

11 MS. KOHLER: Yes, it does.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We are adjourned until  
13 1:00 o'clock. At that time we will resume with the  
14 remaining town attorneys.

15 (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.)

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Great, okay. Let's  
17 resume. Mr. Fitzgerald, you had -- we had taken  
18 administrative notice of Docket 217. But in -- I think --  
19 -- as I've been advised by counsel, it would probably be  
20 better to give that CCI report a separate exhibit number.  
21 And we'd like to give that -- Mr. Cunliffe, number --  
22 Applicant's 100?

23 MR. FRED O. CUNLIFFE: Yes, you can do  
24 that, Chairman. And you may also want to take in the



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 East route visual presentation as Exhibit 101. And Mr.  
2 Zaklukiewicz's presentation of Black Pond Junction as  
3 102.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. We'll verify those  
5 others in a minute, but let's --

6 MR. CUNLIFFE: Okay --

7 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: Mr. Fitzgerald, a  
8 microphone.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: While we're at --

10 MR. FITZGERALD: You --

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- while we have these  
12 witnesses - okay --

13 MR. FITZGERALD: You skipped one --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Uh --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: -- it was the -- the  
16 second --

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: The northerly route.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: -- the northerly route  
19 and then -- and then Mr. Zaklukiewicz's Black Pond  
20 slides.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: So we make the northerly  
23 route AV presentation 102. 103 is the -- is Mr. Zak's  
24 Black Pond slides. Okay.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And when your witnesses  
2 are up, we'll have those verified -- though I guess we  
3 could probably take administrative notice of the CCI  
4 report, correct --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah --

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- or have you take  
7 administrative notice --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Uh --

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- instead of an exhibit?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Well --

11 MS. RANDELL: I think an exhibit would be  
12 more appropriate --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: But -- but we --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But it's been previously  
16 verified and the Council --

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. Okay, I've got to  
19 step out for a moment. What I want to do is we'll get  
20 resumption of --

21 MR. MARCONI: Why can't this be an exhibit  
22 too?

23 (Pause)

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, go ahead.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. MARCONI: We've received a letter  
2 dated June 2, 2004 from Assistant Attorney General  
3 Michael Wertheimer, and that simply advises us in writing  
4 that the -- that Kema (phonetic) had been a consultant in  
5 Docket 217 I believe, or Mike can describe that a bit  
6 more.

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Wertheimer.

8 MR. MARCONI: Mr. Wertheimer.

9 MR. MICHAEL WERTHEIMER: (Indiscernible) -  
10 - it's going to be sent to everybody, but Kema was not  
11 involved in 217. The Attorney General's Office hired  
12 Whitfield Russell Associates in Docket 217 --

13 MR. MARCONI: Okay --

14 MR. WERTHEIMER: -- Sedena Eric (phonetic)  
15 was associated with Whitfield Russell at that time --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, so --

17 MR. WERTHEIMER: -- the Siting Council has  
18 now hired Rathan (phonetic) Kema. She is now associated  
19 with Kema --

20 MR. MARCONI: I'm sorry that I misspoke --  
21 I'm sorry that I misspoke then, Assistant Attorney  
22 General Wertheimer --

23 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) --

24 MR. MARCONI: The gentleman who spoke was

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Assistant Attorney General Michael Wertheimer.

2 What we are going to be asking Kema to do  
3 is submit a letter to us indicating their consulting  
4 history with the -- with Northeast utilities. And we  
5 will get that distributed to the service list too so that  
6 for the record anybody who sees any reason to object can  
7 do so, whatever. And can we list this as an exhibit?

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: An AG exhibit, yes.

9 MR. MARCONI: Uh --

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: AG exhibit number -- Mr.  
11 Cunliffe?

12 MR. MARCONI: Mr. Wertheimer, do you have  
13 any problem with this being an AG exhibit number just for  
14 the record?

15 MR. WERTHEIMER: I don't really -- I'm not  
16 prepared -- I'm not offering evidence. It's a  
17 disclosure. I don't think it needs to be --

18 MR. MARCONI: Okay. We don't -- we don't  
19 need this in as an exhibit.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, good. Okay, let's  
21 move on. Can I just have a show of hands of parties and  
22 intervenors who wish to cross-examine the OCC witnesses.  
23 (Pause). Okay, that's attorney -- okay, let's go in  
24 order then. Then we'll have attorneys for Wallingford,

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Durham, followed by Orange, followed by Cheshire. Yes?

2 MS. RANDELL: While they're coming to the  
3 table to cross-examine, I have an accuracy correction  
4 along the lines of my earlier one with respect to  
5 Eisenhower Park. This correction relates to Miss  
6 Kohler's question before the lunch break on Lexington  
7 Green. I believe in her question she asked Mr. Aabo to  
8 consider a situation where there were about 250 or 275  
9 houses in Lexington Green abutting the right-of-way. I'm  
10 told that there are about a dozen houses in Lexington  
11 Green abutting the right-of-way. So just in the interest  
12 of clarifying the record, I'd like that to be noted. And  
13 if Miss Kohler wants to, you know, rephrase her question,  
14 we'd have no objection to that either.

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Fine. I guess I heard it  
16 the way I think it was intended, is that the subdivision  
17 has so many houses, not that they all abut --

18 A VOICE: Some of which abut.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- some of which abut,  
20 thank you. Okay, so I'm going to step out for a moment.  
21 And Mr. Boucher, you have the floor.

22 MR. PETER BOUCHER: Thank you, Madam  
23 Chairman. For the record, I'm Peter Boucher and my  
24 clients are the Towns of Durham and Wallingford. I have

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 a very brief set of questions and I believe they're  
2 primarily going to be directed to Mr. Aabo.

3 Mr. Aabo, in your prefiled testimony you  
4 make reference to what portions of the proposed facility  
5 you've actually visited and walked or otherwise went to.  
6 And my question is to what extent you walked through any  
7 segments of the proposed project that lie within  
8 Wallingford or Durham?

9 MR. AABO: I -- I have not visited that  
10 section of the line at all.

11 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. Then I'd like to ask  
12 you if you would accept, subject to check, that in  
13 Wallingford on Segment Map No. 19 in Volume 9 that there  
14 is depicted on that map condominiums abutting the  
15 existing right-of-way?

16 MR. AABO: I do not -- I do not recall  
17 seeing that particular map.

18 MR. BOUCHER: But would you accept that --

19 MR. AABO: I will accept --

20 MR. BOUCHER: -- subject to check?

21 MR. AABO: -- upon check, yes.

22 MR. BOUCHER: And I would also ask whether  
23 -- with regard to Segment Map 6, whether you would  
24 accept, subject to check, that --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. TAIT: Mr. Boucher --

2 MR. BOUCHER: I'm sorry?

3 MR. TAIT: All this is a matter of record.  
4 Is there a question somewhere? What's all this subject  
5 to check? We know all this.

6 MR. BOUCHER: I'm -- I'm attempting to get  
7 the witness to agree to those facts.

8 MR. TAIT: He doesn't know those facts.

9 MR. BOUCHER: Well then I will ask him if  
10 he would be willing to agree to those facts.

11 MR. TAIT: For what purpose?

12 MR. BOUCHER: Because it deals with the  
13 credibility of his testimony.

14 MR. TAIT: Is it just a matter of  
15 credibility or are you saying would he change his opinion  
16 if he knew this?

17 MR. BOUCHER: I'll be happy to ask that.

18 MR. TAIT: Well, I think that might be a  
19 more productive question than confirming what's in the  
20 record.

21 MR. BOUCHER: Then I would return to  
22 Wallingford, if I may, briefly, and ask whether your  
23 testimony relative to under-grounding and the  
24 justification for under-grounding in Segments 1 and 2

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 would be different if you were aware that in Wallingford  
2 there are condominiums located in the -- that are  
3 abutting the existing right-of-way?

4 MR. AABO: I believe in my testimony I  
5 point out that the use -- the land -- or the property use  
6 and future property use should be evaluated for the areas  
7 that are -- where the route is going to be or the  
8 proposed route. So, I -- I believe that I am telling  
9 that if there are areas where there are structures that  
10 could be affected by the overhead line, that that should  
11 be considered or studies should be made to consider it  
12 for under-grounding --

13 MR. BOUCHER: Okay --

14 MR. AABO: -- that's what -- that's what I  
15 was trying to do in my testimony.

16 MR. TAIT: And Mr. Aabo, the reason for  
17 that is why? Aesthetics?

18 MR. AABO: Well, it's -- it's -- it could  
19 be aesthetics, but it could also be that the future use  
20 of this property or this land are -- may be jeopardized  
21 if you have an overhead line. And therefore, it should  
22 be considered to under-grounding at this point.

23 MR. TAIT: For future land use?

24 MR. AABO: For future, yes.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BOUCHER: May I ask, sir, if -- if you  
2 have reviewed the legislation that was recently adopted?

3 I'm referring now to Public Act 04-246 and the standards  
4 that that legislation imposes on the subject of under-  
5 grounding?

6 MR. AABO: I have -- I have seen the -- I  
7 have seen some information on that -- on that -- yes, on  
8 that law.

9 MR. BOUCHER: I -- I looked without  
10 finding any reference in your testimony to that law.  
11 Does that mean you did not in any way consider the impact  
12 of that law on your -- in the preparation of your  
13 testimony?

14 MR. AABO: I believe that in my Section 7  
15 I talk about EMF in Connecticut law. That's on page 14.  
16 And that -- you're talking -- I assume you're talking  
17 about House Bill Public Act 04-246?

18 MR. BOUCHER: That's correct.

19 MR. AABO: That's -- I have a little  
20 address on that on page 15.

21 MR. JOHNSON: For the record, I would  
22 indicate that Mr. Aabo answered what we designated as  
23 CL&P Question 3, describing what he reviewed in order to  
24 prepare the testimony that's now before the Council. And

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 one of the items mentioned in it -- the answer to that  
2 question was Public Act 04-246.

3 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you. Then Mr. Aabo,  
4 you're aware that there is a presumption in the  
5 referenced public act to the -- there is a presumption  
6 that an aerial configuration is inconsistent with the  
7 purpose of that law?

8 MR. TAIT: Mr. Boucher, I'm again having  
9 problems of where you're going with this witness on  
10 Public Act 246.

11 MR. BOUCHER: The witness is indicating  
12 he's -- in some -- to some extent factored that public  
13 act into his testimony and I'm asking him questions about  
14 that.

15 MR. ASHTON: The answer is right here.

16 MR. AABO: Please -- please repeat your  
17 question.

18 MR. BOUCHER: Are you aware that there is  
19 a presumption in that public act that an aerial  
20 configuration is inconsistent with the purposes of the  
21 public act?

22 MR. AABO: Yes.

23 MR. BOUCHER: Okay.

24 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Boucher, I'm a little bit

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 uncertain as to where you're going either. We're on page  
2 15 of 17 of the prefiled testimony of Mr. Aabo, there is  
3 an explicit question on -- are you familiar with this act  
4 and he said, yes, I reviewed material on the bill, it  
5 appears to favor underground construction of transmission  
6 lines. Hasn't this been asked and answered?

7 MR. TAIT: Are you offering him as an  
8 expert on the act and the interpretation of the act?

9 MR. BOUCHER: The witness refers to -- he  
10 actually uses the term favors under-grounding and  
11 indicates on page 3 that there appears to be no technical  
12 reason at this time to favor under-grounding segments of  
13 the project, then he go on to discuss. And my question -  
14 - my question is whether when he uses the term there's no  
15 reason to favor under-grounding, how do you reconcile  
16 that with the presumption against aerial configurations  
17 that is now part of the law?

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Didn't you just say a  
19 technical reason? And the public act is not really a  
20 technical act, it's a policy act.

21 MR. TAIT: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So --

23 MR. TAIT: Maybe it's quicker to have him  
24 answer it, but it -- it's --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah --

2 MR. TAIT: -- but his interpretation of  
3 whether the act favors it or not is not relevant.

4 MR. BOUCHER: Do you understand the  
5 question, sir?

6 MR. AABO: Not -- not in full I must  
7 confess. However, if you could -- if you could ask me  
8 about what you talk about on page 3 -- what was your  
9 question there about technical --

10 MR. BOUCHER: On page 3 you state that  
11 there appears to be no technical reason at this time to  
12 favor under-grounding the segments of the project between  
13 Norwalk and Middletown. And I'm focusing on your use of  
14 the term favor and I'm asking you how do you reconcile  
15 that with the presumption that's now in the legislation  
16 that we've been discussing?

17 MR. AABO: As it was pointed out, the  
18 public act is a political act and what I'm talking about  
19 is for technical reasons. There's no -- there's no  
20 technical reason why that section should be undergrounded  
21 --

22 MR. BOUCHER: Okay --

23 MR. AABO: -- now -- then the public act  
24 has come into play where, as I say, in favor of under-

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 grounding. However, it does also allow for overhead use  
2 depending on what the Council decides.

3 MR. BOUCHER: Okay, thank you. I have  
4 nothing further.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Next is Mr.  
6 Stone.

7 MR. BRIAN STONE: Thank you. Good  
8 afternoon. For the record, I am Attorney Brian Stone and  
9 I represent the Town of Orange.

10 Mr. Aabo, I'm going to be very brief. Am  
11 I correct in assuming that with respect to your review of  
12 the Town of Orange that you did no more investigation  
13 than you did with the Towns of Woodbridge and Milford and  
14 Wallingford?

15 MR. AABO: That's correct.

16 MR. STONE: Okay. And you didn't check  
17 either any future plans of development -- either the plan  
18 of conservation or development of the Town of Orange or  
19 any demographic studies to determine what the projected  
20 potential future development would be in these areas  
21 along the line?

22 MR. AABO: That's correct.

23 MR. STONE: Mr. Aabo, you are aware that,  
24 I assume, one of the reasons for favoring under-grounding

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 is concern over the health risks from EMF?

2 MR. AABO: Yeah, I'm aware of that.

3 MR. STONE: Whether you agree with it or  
4 not, you're aware that that is --

5 MR. AABO: I'm aware --

6 MR. STONE: -- certainly one of the basis  
7 of it. And in fact the act that Mr. -- that Attorney  
8 Boucher was questioning you on, that's specifically  
9 referenced in that act, isn't that correct?

10 MR. AABO: That's correct.

11 MR. STONE: If you were aware that in the  
12 record before this commission that what some consider to  
13 be elevated levels of EMF, that there are a hundred and  
14 eleven houses and a community center which would have  
15 elevated levels of EMF in the proposed location of the  
16 overhead 345-kV line, would that affect your conclusion  
17 as to whether under-grounding should be proposed in  
18 Orange?

19 MR. AABO: I'm looking at the under-  
20 grounding from a technical point of view. I'm not  
21 looking at the under-grounding from any health effect  
22 point of view. So, I -- I really could not answer your  
23 question.

24 MR. STONE: I have nothing further.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Stone.

2 Your brevity is appreciated. Next is Attorney Burturla.

3 Is there anyone after the Town of Cheshire who wishes to  
4 cross-examine these witnesses? Thank you.

5 MR. RICHARD BURTURLA: For the record,  
6 Richard Burturla on behalf of the Town of Cheshire.

7 Mr. Aabo, I just want to follow up where  
8 Mr. Stone left off. I take it your analysis with respect  
9 to Cheshire was no different than the analysis you  
10 performed in terms of Wallingford, Durham, Milford and  
11 Orange, is that true?

12 MR. AABO: That is correct.

13 MR. BURTURLA: And you're not aware of how  
14 many homes are located within 150 feet of the right-of-  
15 way in Cheshire, is that right.

16 MR. AABO: That's correct.

17 MR. BURTURLA: Nor are you aware of how  
18 many areas of concern are within 1200 feet of the right-  
19 of-way, is that right?

20 MR. AABO: That's correct.

21 MR. BURTURLA: And you're not familiar  
22 with the Old Farm Lane neighborhood in Cheshire, is that  
23 right?

24 MR. AABO: That's correct.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BURTURLA: Alright.

2 MR. AABO: The only thing I've seen is  
3 pictures --

4 MR. BURTURLA: Photos?

5 MR. AABO: Yeah, photos.

6 MR. BURTURLA: So to a great extent your  
7 opinion with regard to under-grounding is supported by  
8 your analysis of photos?

9 MR. AABO: Of the area, that is correct.

10 MR. BURTURLA: And -- and would it be fair  
11 to say that almost solely your opinion with regard to  
12 under-grounding is based upon your analysis of those  
13 photos?

14 MR. TAIT: I'm afraid that --

15 MR. AABO: That's correct --

16 MR. TAIT: His question was on technical  
17 feasibility. I believe your first question of that line  
18 was all you really needed to ask.

19 MR. BURTURLA: Well to be fair, Mr. Tait,  
20 I respectfully differ with you on that. My take on it is  
21 I heard his testimony on cross by Attorney Kohler and he  
22 stated that he relied upon photos and I was just  
23 following up on that. It sounds to me that -- and if I  
24 may just to follow-up, your opinion in terms of under-



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 grounding to a great extent is affected -- if I heard  
2 your answers correctly to Attorney Kohler's line of  
3 questioning, based upon the residential density of a  
4 particular neighborhood, is that right? The more dense,  
5 the less you would be in favor of supporting overhead  
6 lines?

7 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

8 (Pause).

9 MR. AABO: It -- as I was trying to say in  
10 my testimony that the use of the land must be a  
11 consideration for if it should be overhead and  
12 underground. And I tried to stress that in my testimony  
13 and I'm trying to stress it here as well. Now, I have --  
14 I have looked at aerial photographs and I had found that  
15 there were many areas where -- that was wooded land where  
16 there was no homes in the direct vicinity of the line,  
17 and that's what I'm basing my statement on.

18 MR. BURTURLA: Thank you. I have nothing  
19 further. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. That concludes  
21 everyone who indicated they wished to cross-examine these  
22 witnesses. Mr. Johnson, anything else?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman Katz.  
24 We would I believe have some very brief redirect. Could

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 we have about a two or three-minute break to -- for me to  
2 caucus with my witnesses on that point.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes, you may. We'll take  
4 a two-minute break. I would like to ask in the future if  
5 the town attorneys perhaps could pool their questions of  
6 a similar nature. This Council would not have a problem  
7 if one attorney asked the same question that, you know,  
8 was meant for like five or six towns. I think that might  
9 be helpful to the process. We'll take a two-minute  
10 break.

11 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We will resume. Mr.  
13 Johnson.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, attorney -- I'm  
15 Attorney Johnson -- Chairman Katz.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: An engineer and proud of  
17 it.

18 MR. JOHNSON: The -- Mr. Montalvo, do you  
19 recall the discussion this morning prompted in part by  
20 questions from Chairman Katz, the engineer -- (laughter)  
21 -- regarding the 2007 deadline and its significance in  
22 this docket?

23 MR. MONTALVO: Yes, I do.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Do you any -- anything to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 add to clarify that discussion?

2 MR. MONTALVO: Yeah, I just wanted to add  
3 that as I mentioned at the end of my supplemental  
4 testimony, I'm of the opinion that 20 December 2007,  
5 which in some instances have been listed as a certain  
6 drop dead date where, you know, cost sharing after which  
7 is -- and the risks of cost sharing are greatly  
8 increased, that I'm not too sure that that in fact is the  
9 case, and that the materials available -- rulings out of  
10 FERC, for example, seem to suggest that although there  
11 will be certain new risks and certain new uncertainties,  
12 FERC's general pricing guidelines and guidance on whether  
13 or not transmission facilities meet the burden of being  
14 regional facilities with regional benefit would still  
15 seem to be met materially by a project of this sort since  
16 it does have broad -- since it would have broad  
17 reliability benefits for the New England market and also  
18 economic benefits for the New England market. And so I  
19 think that -- where there is a certain amount of  
20 uncertainty, I think that, you know, when considering  
21 2007 as kind of a cliff, I don't think it is in fact a  
22 cliff. And so if the project is materially in service by  
23 that time -- materially complete by that time or in  
24 service six months later than that time, I think that

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 there is a material likelihood that some part of the  
2 project, and probably a material part of the project will  
3 receive regional funding through the tariff.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But you're not  
5 guaranteeing that, correct?

6 MR. MONTALVO: No one can --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Isn't that -- isn't that  
8 expensive if you're wrong?

9 MR. MONTALVO: Well, let me tell you -- I  
10 can't guarantee it, but I think we are as likely to see  
11 FERC change its mind on how cost allocation for  
12 transmission happens in the meanwhile as we are to have  
13 the project be completed along this timeline. So you  
14 know, there are numerous uncertainties and so I don't  
15 think that this is an overwhelming, kind of an overriding  
16 uncertainty in my mind.

17 MR. GERALD J. HEFFERNAN: But you don't  
18 know.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you.

20 MR. O'NEILL: (Indiscernible) -- past  
21 precedent --

22 MR. MONTALVO: Excuse me?

23 MR. O'NEILL: Is there any past precedent  
24 that you're referring to on your part suggesting that

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 that isn't a certain date? Have they bent and shifted  
2 their timetables before to accommodate an application of  
3 this kind?

4 MR. MONTALVO: Well, we are -- we are kind  
5 of walking at a certain level into uncharted territory  
6 and FERC has left open a lot of things largely because  
7 there are many projects not just in New England but in  
8 many places that are in various places of development and  
9 issues of cost allocation and cost sharing are -- loom  
10 large on people's concern.

11 So, I think that as far as your particular  
12 question is concern, you know, there is no real precedent  
13 because it's -- a lot of this -- there's not a lot of  
14 history, alright. But I think that FERC has also  
15 recognized that when dealing with large infrastructure  
16 projects which involve numerous parts, a lot of  
17 logistical issues, that it's not really practical to say  
18 if the project isn't in service in two years and it  
19 takes, you know, say two and a half years instead, tough.

20 I mean, I think that there's a certain pragmatism at the  
21 commission. And you know, I would be -- honestly, I would  
22 be terrifically surprised if anything other than that  
23 would be the case. And I think that there would be --  
24 that -- that you know, a very strong case be made before

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the commission that it would be appropriate to go forward  
2 with socialization of material parts of this project --

3 MR. O'NEILL: Are you --

4 MR. MONTALVO: -- I would argue for it.

5 MR. O'NEILL: Are you suggesting this  
6 Council set aside this application and study this  
7 proposal further before we make any determination?

8 MR. MONTALVO: No, I'm not -- I'm not  
9 suggesting that. I -- I just want to -- I just -- I  
10 guess my only -- my only point here is that the  
11 overriding reason in my mind for the Council to act  
12 expeditiously towards finding a good solution for  
13 Southwest Connecticut's reliability problems is in fact  
14 the reliability problem and the pressing nature of that  
15 problem, not how the costs will get recovered.

16 MR. O'NEILL: Do you think the need has  
17 been exaggerated or the need has --

18 MR. MONTALVO: I don't believe the need  
19 has been exaggerated. I think the need is severe.

20 MR. O'NEILL: Isn't the need enough of a  
21 reason to go forward in expeditious fashion on this  
22 project?

23 MR. MONTALVO: Well, I -- my -- the  
24 purpose of my testimony is to suggest that I think in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 parallel with the work that's being done to prepare this  
2 project, additional analysis can be done that I don't  
3 think ultimately delays the implementation of this  
4 project as a backstop should those other things not prove  
5 fruitful.

6 And, so that you know, ultimately we can  
7 work towards a solution that has the best overall  
8 benefits for Southwest Connecticut. And if it is this  
9 project, build the project. You know, that in my mind is  
10 the rebuttal assertion, that this is not the right  
11 project, if you see my meaning. I'm not suggesting, you  
12 know, that NU and UI have come forward with a project  
13 that is, you know, absurd on its face. I'm just saying  
14 that there are additional -- there are additional  
15 approaches, integrated approaches and things to think  
16 about, solutions to the Southwest Connecticut reliability  
17 problem on a power system basis as opposed to simply a  
18 transmission basis that may be equal if not better  
19 ultimately for the long-term development of Southwest  
20 Connecticut.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Mr. Johnson,  
22 any other redirect?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Mr. Aabo, do you  
24 recall the discussion this morning mostly engaged with

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Attorney Fitzgerald about the -- some of the differences  
2 between XLPE and HPFF?

3 MR. AABO: Yes, I do.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have anything to add  
5 to that discussion at this time?

6 MR. AABO: I'd like to point out to the  
7 Council that we had some discussions on the reliability  
8 of these two different cable systems. And my belief is  
9 that the XLPE system at 230 and above has been in service  
10 for a substantial amount of time and that the reliability  
11 is very very good for these systems, combine that with we  
12 do not have the environmental risks that we have with the  
13 high pressure fluid filled system.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Also, Mr. Aabo, do you  
15 recall the discussion more recently in the hearing with  
16 some of the attorneys from the Towns about the basis upon  
17 which you discussed under-grounding or aerial  
18 construction of the projects?

19 MR. AABO: Yes, I do.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Do you have anything to add  
21 to that discussion at this time?

22 MR. AABO: I want the Council to  
23 understand that I reviewed the proposal that the  
24 companies had presented and that I looked at the photos,



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the aerial photos that were presented to me. And also  
2 that -- I pointed out in my testimony that the actual and  
3 future use of the land surrounding the right-of-way  
4 should be evaluated very careful. I also point out that  
5 some of these locations that was mentioned already were  
6 existing right-of-ways. Thank you.

7 MR. JOHNSON: The -- that's all we have by  
8 way of redirect, Chairman Katz.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.  
10 Mr. Ashton has one question.

11 MR. ASHTON: One question. Given a choice  
12 of under-grounding high voltage versus lower voltage, 345  
13 versus 115, what to your knowledge is the practice in the  
14 world as to which one goes underground first?

15 MR. AABO: Are you talking about the  
16 voltage level --

17 MR. ASHTON: Yeah --

18 MR. AABO: -- which goes underground  
19 first?

20 MR. ASHTON: Yeah. If you have -- if  
21 there's an issue that there's going to be under-  
22 grounding, what is the general practice throughout the  
23 world in the choice of under-grounding first? Do you  
24 underground the highest voltage first or do you

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 underground the lower voltage first?

2 MR. AABO: Well, you -- you underground  
3 the voltage that needs to be undergrounded --

4 MR. ASHTON: I didn't say that --

5 MR. AABO: No, but I'm trying to answer  
6 your question --

7 MR. ASHTON: My question was given a  
8 choice, A or B, which one do you choose?

9 MR. AABO: I don't know --

10 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

11 MR. AABO: -- because the under-grounding  
12 --

13 MR. ASHTON: Nothing further.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you.

15 MR. EMERICK: Chairman --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Emerick.

17 MR. EMERICK: Yes. Mr. Aabo, you just  
18 indicated a preference for XLPE because it avoids  
19 environmental risks. Could you explain those risks  
20 please?

21 MR. AABO: We were talking about that in  
22 the high pressure fluid filled we have a certain amount  
23 of dielectric fluid that has the potential -- it's under  
24 pressure -- it's under about 200 psi of pressure. And if

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 for some reason we -- if the pipe develops a hole, we  
2 will have a leak of dielectric fluid, which could be  
3 environmental unpleasant.

4 MR. EMERICK: Earlier in this proceeding  
5 we had an extensive amount of testimony regarding  
6 dielectric fluid, polybutene. Have you had an occasion  
7 to review the record of that hearing?

8 MR. AABO: No, I have not -- I have not  
9 seen the records of that.

10 MR. EMERICK: Are you aware of the  
11 formulation of polybutene that's proposed to be used in  
12 this project?

13 MR. AABO: No, I'm not.

14 MR. EMERICK: Are you aware of how many  
15 different formulations there are of polybutene?

16 MR. AABO: Many.

17 MR. EMERICK: And do they cover a wide  
18 spectrum in terms of environmental characteristics?

19 MR. AABO: Absolutely. Yes, sir.

20 MR. EMERICK: But you're not aware of what  
21 -- out of the multitude of fluids that are out there are  
22 there some that are shall we say more friendly than  
23 others?

24 MR. AABO: Yes, sir.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. EMERICK: I'll let it go there. Thank  
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. I think that  
4 concludes cross-examination -- Mr. Murphy.

5 MR. JAMES J. MURPHY, JR.: Mr. Montalvo,  
6 you had talked briefly about the cost sharing and what  
7 have you. And I think in a prior appearance you referred  
8 to it as gold-bricking or something along those lines.  
9 Let me ask you this hypothetical question. You're aware  
10 I assume of the legislation that gives some presumption  
11 to under-grounding. What if the General Assembly in  
12 Connecticut and it became law mandated this entire  
13 project to be underground, would there still be the same  
14 evaluation as to what was necessary and whether parts of  
15 the under-grounding or all of the under-grounding might  
16 not qualify for cost sharing even though it's mandated by  
17 law?

18 MR. MONTALVO: When the -- when the issue  
19 of this project as part of the RTEP came before the FERC  
20 and whether -- and what aspects of the project were going  
21 to be requested for socialization, there was a question  
22 as to the amount of under-grounding associated with the  
23 project that FERC asked ISO New England and I believe the  
24 companies also to address. And ISO New England and

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 NEPOOL refrained to address it simply because they didn't  
2 want to kind of bias the outcome. And so it's quite  
3 uncertain in my mind as to how FERC is going to view that  
4 issue, whether or not they will defer to the State's  
5 judgment and say alright the State has decided that it  
6 should all go underground, thus we will allow it to  
7 receive socialized treatment, or say well no we're going  
8 to apply a different standard or a different test, a  
9 technical test of our own creation, or that perhaps the  
10 NEPOOL participants themselves as stakeholders will say  
11 well it's all well and good Connecticut wants it that way  
12 but we and the balance of the five New England states  
13 don't care for that outcome, so it -- I can't give you a  
14 firm answer.

15 I do believe that the decisions of the  
16 Legislature of the State of Connecticut will have some  
17 bearing on the ultimate treatment of the various  
18 components as far as cost allocation is concerned. But  
19 whether or not there is a 100 percent difference or some  
20 kind of partial difference, I can't say for certain.

21 MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Does that  
23 conclude cross-examination? Thank you, Mr. Johnson.  
24 Thank you, gentlemen.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1                   At this time, I'd like the companies'  
2 witness panel to come up and we will go into East Shore  
3 and the northerly route and other alternatives. Off the  
4 record.

5                   (Off the record)

6                   CHAIRMAN KATZ: On the record. Mr.  
7 Fitzgerald, let's identify the new exhibits that need to  
8 be verified.

9                   MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. Mr. Prete and  
10 Miss Bartosewicz, I call your attention to Exhibit 101,  
11 which are the slides exhibited today as the East Shore  
12 Audio Visual Presentation, and to Exhibit 102, the slides  
13 exhibited today as part of the so-called Northerly Route  
14 Audio Visual Presentation. Is the information in those  
15 slides true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

16                   MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Anne Bartosewicz. Yes,  
17 they are.

18                   MR. PRETE: John Prete. Yes, they are.

19                   MR. FITZGERALD: I offer Exhibits 101 and  
20 102 as full exhibits.

21                   CHAIRMAN KATZ: Any objection to making  
22 them full exhibits, 101 and 102? Hearing none, they're  
23 full exhibits.

24                   (Whereupon, Applicants' Exhibit No. 101

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 and No. 102 were received into evidence as full  
2 exhibits.)

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Zaklukiewicz, I call  
4 your attention to what has been marked Exhibit 103, or  
5 what has been given that number, those are the three  
6 slides you presented earlier today to illustrate the  
7 Black Pond alternative to Beseck. Is the information in  
8 those slides true and correct to the best of your  
9 knowledge?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Roger Zaklukiewicz.  
11 Yes, it is.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: I offer Exhibit 103 as a  
13 full exhibit.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, is  
15 there any objection to making 103 a full exhibit?  
16 Hearing none, it's a full exhibit.

17 (Whereupon, Applicants' Exhibit No. 103  
18 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Now, Mr. Zaklukiewicz,  
20 Miss Bartosewicz, Mr. Prete, Mr. Welter, Mr. Hogan, I  
21 call your attention to what was yesterday marked Exhibit  
22 91, your direct testimony regarding the East Shore route.  
23 And before I ask you to adopt it, let me ask whether any  
24 of you have any corrections to the prefiled testimony?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Yes, I do.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: And Miss Bartosewicz,  
3 what is that correction?

4 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Page 7, there is a  
5 series of bullets, the first bullet should read -- and  
6 I'm inserting this at the beginning to say 329 line  
7 between Southington and Frost Bridge Substation (345-kV;  
8 12.7 miles) semicolon. And the last three bullets in  
9 that same section should be deleted.

10 MR. ASHTON: (Indiscernible) -- 91 001 --

11 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Then the 1990 line --  
12 the two 1990 lines and the 91 001 line.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: And we will submit --

14 MR. BRUCE McDERMOTT: We have.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: We have -- we've already  
16 -- Mr. McDermott points out we've already submitted an  
17 errata sheet for page 7.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Was that today?

19 MR. McDERMOTT: Yesterday.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yesterday's errata sheet,  
21 this is on it?

22 MR. McDERMOTT: This is the last page of  
23 yesterday's errata sheet.

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Got it. Thank you.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. As corrected, do  
2 you members of the panel swear that the information  
3 contained in Exhibit 91 is true and correct to the best  
4 of your knowledge?

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Roger Zaklukiewicz.  
6 Yes.

7 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Anne Bartosewicz. Yes.

8 MR. PRETE: John Prete. Yes.

9 MR. JIM HOGAN: Jim Hogan. Yes.

10 MR. CYRIL WELTER: Cyril Welter. Yes.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: I offer -- I ask that it  
12 be admitted as a full exhibit.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Any objection to making it  
14 a full exhibit? Hearing none, it's a full exhibit.

15 (Whereupon, Applicants' Exhibit No. 91 was  
16 received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So --

18 MR. FITZGERALD: And Madam Chairman,  
19 before the cross proceeds, I'd like to just note that  
20 since this testimony does not bear Miss Mango's name, we  
21 haven't put her up here as part of this panel, however  
22 she -- she is, as some would say of Elvis, in the  
23 building. She's doing other -- she's doing other work.  
24 So if questions come up that are appropriate for her, we

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 can bring her in here from the other room.

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Fitzgerald,  
3 we'll --

4 A VOICE: She's here.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: She's here. Okay. What  
6 I'm going to do -- any other procedural matters before we  
7 open this for cross? What I'm going to do is ask the  
8 parties that come up to cross, that they cover all the  
9 topics that have been noted, East Shore, the northerly  
10 route and other alternatives. We're not going to break  
11 them up. And -- let me see, where are we --

12 A VOICE: Louise is out in the corridor --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: First on the list is  
14 Representative Al Adinolfi. Absent. Next, the Town of  
15 Middlefield, Attorney Knapp. Mr. Knapp, I see you  
16 brought the boss.

17 MR. ERIC KNAPP: Yes, I did.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Welcome, Mr. First  
19 Selectman.

20 A VOICE: Thank you, Chairperson Katz.

21 (Voices in background)

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I'm sorry, Mr. Fitzgerald,  
23 is there any procedural problems?

24 MR. FITZGERALD: It was called to my

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 attention that I had meant to ask you to swear in another  
2 witness in case -- Mr. Scarfone, who is to some extent a  
3 substitute for Mr. Brandien. And so --

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: There is no substitute --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: I know. So that he might  
6 -- there might be some questions that we would want him  
7 to answer, so --

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, do you want to do  
9 that now?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Sure.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Al, could you --

13 MS. RANDELL: Might we suggest that Mr.  
14 Knapp move over here and then Mr. Scarfone --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, Mr. Knapp --

16 MR. ERIC KNAPP: I'd be happy to do that.

17 (Pause)

18 MR. MARCONI: Could the witness please  
19 state his name into the microphone and spell his name for  
20 the court reporter's benefit.

21 MR. ALLEN SCARFONE: Allen Scarfone, A-l-  
22 l-e-n, S-c-a-r-f-o-n-e.

23 MR. MARCONI: Now sir, if you could please  
24 raise your right hand.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 (Whereupon, Mr. Allen Scarfone was duly  
2 sworn in.)

3 MR. MARCONI: Please be seated, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Do we need to have him  
5 verify anything?

6 MR. FITZGERALD: No.

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, thank you. Mr.  
8 Knapp, were you given a copy of this yellow -- great,  
9 thank you. I just wanted to make sure you have what we  
10 have. Please identify yourself for the record and  
11 proceed.

12 MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chairman.  
13 Attorney Eric Knapp on behalf of the Town of Middlefield.  
14 Actually, I have just three or four questions, and I  
15 apologize if some of these are in the prefilings.

16 In listening to this morning's testimony,  
17 I understood that there was a blue line and a pink line.

18 I have previous evidence regarding how many acres of  
19 takings the blue line required. It's something over 70  
20 acres if I'm correct. Could you just verify how many  
21 acres that would be?

22 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Yes. For the 80-foot --  
23 for the H-frame structure you would need 80 feet or about  
24 75 acres between Chestnut and Black Pond.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. KNAPP: And for the pink line, the  
2 monopole?

3 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: That would be for a  
4 monopole at 40 feet. It's approximately 34 acres.

5 MR. KNAPP: Thirty-four acres. This is  
6 also a longer route than the route that has been  
7 proposed?

8 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: That's correct. It's  
9 about -- almost three miles longer.

10 MR. KNAPP: Have you been in contact with  
11 the property owners along this route?

12 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I have not.

13 MR. KNAPP: You have not been in contact.  
14 Do you know approximately how many property owners are  
15 along that route?

16 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I do not know the number  
17 of property owners. We would have to do further  
18 investigation.

19 MR. KNAPP: Okay. Are there any other  
20 locations in the State of Connecticut where you have  
21 presently three 345 cables running parallel to one other  
22 besides Middlefield and Middletown?

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: No.

24 MR. KNAPP: So this is the one location in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the State -- you already have the third --

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Oh, excuse me. The  
3 answer to that is, yes, there are other locations, and  
4 they're right out of Millstone.

5 MR. KNAPP: Okay.

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Millstone -- a  
7 significant portion or the lower southern portion of the  
8 lines out of Millstone are on a common right-of-way up to  
9 where they branch to the lines that go off to Montville.  
10 And then after that there are three transmission lines  
11 on that right-of-way all at 345,000 volts.

12 MR. KNAPP: Okay. Are there any present  
13 locations where you have four 345's running together or  
14 is that --

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes. Right outside of  
16 Millstone heading north there are -- for I believe  
17 approximately five or six miles there are four  
18 transmission lines on that right-of-way --

19 MR. KNAPP: Okay --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- all at 345,000  
21 volts.

22 MR. KNAPP: For about how long a length is  
23 that?

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Well, it depends on

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 what sections you're talking about. The Millstone to --  
2 where they are parallel -- in other words, where there  
3 are four 345 lines?

4 MR. KNAPP: Yes --

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe -- I'd say  
6 approximately five miles.

7 MR. KNAPP: Okay. As I understood your  
8 testimony this morning, as a policy matter do you prefer  
9 the concentration or the dispersal of the power line  
10 system?

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Clearly from a pure  
12 planning standpoint, the dispersal of transmission lines  
13 quite clearly minimize the amount of what a single  
14 contingency could impact on the system, so a dispersal of  
15 the facilities.

16 MR. KNAPP: Are there any perceived  
17 technical advantages to the northerly route versus the  
18 route you're proposing?

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The -- the northerly  
20 route -- you mean forming a new Black Pond Substation as  
21 opposed to the proposed Beseck Substation?

22 MR. KNAPP: Yes, that's correct.

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Clearly the Black Pond  
24 Substation alternative or option has not been studied to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 any extent. This was as a result of trying to respond to  
2 questions raised by Commissioner Emerick yesterday. We  
3 had looked at this prior to putting together our proposal  
4 and had discounted that because of the reasons of the  
5 single contingencies having such an impact on the system.

6 MR. KNAPP: Thank you. I have no further  
7 questions at this time.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Knapp.  
9 Next, Attorney Boucher.

10 MR. DAVID BALL: If I may, I'll be  
11 conducting cross-examining on behalf of the Towns,  
12 Chairman Katz.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Oh, on all the Towns?

14 MR. BALL: Uh --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Great, thank you --

16 MR. BALL: Except for --

17 MR. MARCONI: Which one?

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, Durham is the one I  
19 called next.

20 MR. BALL: Do you -- Peter, do you care?

21 MR. BOUCHER: I'm sorry?

22 MR. BALL: Do you want to go first?

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Unless you people have a  
24 preference. I'm flexible.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: We'd just assume that I go  
2 first --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

4 MR. BALL: -- if that's okay.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: That's okay. I'm just  
6 going in the order of the hearing program, but -- so Mr.  
7 Ball and Miss Kohler, I'm going to assume that you're  
8 handling Woodbridge, Milford -- uh -- Orange? Everybody  
9 but Durham and Wallingford?

10 MR. BALL: Yeah -- is that okay?

11 MS. KOHLER: Yeah.

12 MR. BALL: That's correct.

13 MS. KOHLER: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, thank you. I don't  
15 want to inadvertently not call a town.

16 MR. BALL: I'm sure if we don't cover  
17 something, one of them will jump up, but hopefully we  
18 will.

19 Good afternoon, panel. David Ball. I  
20 represent the Town of Woodbridge. I'm going to ask a  
21 number of questions relating to the studies that you  
22 looked at for the East Shore route. Now, when you  
23 studied the East Shore route, you commissioned PowerGEM  
24 to run thermal load flow studies for you to determine

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 whether the system could run reliably, is that correct?

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

3 MR. BALL: And PowerGEM didn't  
4 independently decide what the route was going to be, that  
5 was something that you provided to PowerGEM?

6 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

7 MR. BALL: So -- I'm sorry, was that on  
8 the record?

9 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: Repeat it --

10 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

11 MR. BALL: So it's not as if you  
12 commissioned PowerGEM to come up with the optimal East  
13 Shore route, they simply studied what you told them to  
14 study, isn't that right?

15 MR. SCARFONE: They were studying a  
16 configuration that the Mayor of Wallingford had given us.

17 MR. BALL: Alright, but the specifics of  
18 the configuration of the route you passed on to PowerGEM,  
19 you didn't ask them to exercise discretion in coming up  
20 with the best route, isn't that right?

21 MR. SCARFONE: The 387 line is the  
22 existing route, so we assumed that they were putting the  
23 same line down the existing 387 right-of-way.

24 MR. BALL: No, I understand that. What

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 I'm asking you is whether they came up with --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: We can -- we can  
3 stipulate to that.

4 MR. BALL: Okay. And in your -- in your  
5 testimony you refer to seven different PowerGEM studies  
6 that were performed, is that right?

7 MR. SCARFONE: I believe so. That's  
8 correct.

9 MR. BALL: Okay. And ultimately you  
10 concluded in Addendum No. 3, which is dated February 20<sup>th</sup>,  
11 that based on -- I'll just quote from it -- "based on the  
12 ISO New England Southwest Connecticut Working Group  
13 Comparison Study, the companies have concluded that the  
14 East Shore Alternate studied has been disqualified from  
15 further consideration so that further thermal studies are  
16 not required". Right? That's in Addendum No. 3?

17 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

18 MR. BALL: So as of February 20<sup>th</sup> you made  
19 the decision that an East Shore route was not viable  
20 based on the results of the PowerGEM studies that you  
21 were looking at, right?

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We need to clarify  
23 which East Shore route we're speaking of because there  
24 appears to be two or three different routes depending on

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 whose testimony we're referring to and who's asking the  
2 questions --

3 MR. BALL: Okay --

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and clearly there's  
5 -- there's the East Shore route which is the present  
6 route, Scovill to East Shore, there is --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Which we're calling 287,  
8 correct?

9 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Which is the 387 line.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: 387.

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: There is the  
12 alternative I believe and some testimony that basically  
13 has a reconfiguration of the system and it goes -- the  
14 387 line somehow ends at a bus in Beseck. And then  
15 there's a line from Beseck down to East Shore. And then  
16 there's what we believe is the only viable solution, is  
17 two 345-kV lines down to East Shore, and one of those  
18 would be the existing 387 line which goes direct from  
19 Scovill to East Shore, and then a second line from Beseck  
20 down to East Shore. So these have been used  
21 interchangeably in my reading the questions and other  
22 testimony. So we just need to make certain when we speak  
23 here of which one we're talking about. And I apologize  
24 for the confusion, but I didn't write some of this

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 testimony or add other things here. So, I -- I just want  
2 to make certain, because you could get totally different  
3 answers depending on which one we're talking about, so --

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

5 MR. BALL: Thank you and --

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and if we can get  
7 that clarified, that will help both ourselves responding  
8 to the questions and the commission.

9 MR. BALL: And indeed I will ask questions  
10 that I think will hopefully clarify that. The seven  
11 thermal load flow studies that I was referring to and  
12 that I was asking questions about are listed on pages 5  
13 and 6 of the testimony, okay. Let me know when you see  
14 that.

15 MR. SCARFONE: And page 7.

16 MR. BALL: Alright. Now earlier there was  
17 a slide presentation where you presented the fact that  
18 you believe that the only viable East Shore route would  
19 contain a second line along the 387 right-of-way?

20 MR. SCARFONE: Right. A second line,  
21 that's correct.

22 MR. BALL: Okay.

23 MR. SCARFONE: If I could just clarify  
24 that, that would be a second line that originated from

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Beseck and went to East Shore. I think what we showed in  
2 the slide presentation was three or four different routes  
3 to get there, one of which was the existing 345-kV  
4 corridor that exists.

5 MR. BALL: Right. Now, the seven power  
6 flow -- PowerGEM load flow studies that are listed on  
7 pages 5 and 6 of your testimony, in none of those studies  
8 was a second line included in the study, isn't that  
9 right?

10 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct. It was the  
11 existing 387 line and a sensitivity with partial  
12 reconductoring of the 387 line.

13 MR. BALL: Okay. So essentially, the  
14 elements of those studies included a new 345-kV line from  
15 the East Devon Substation to the East Shore Substation?

16 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

17 MR. BALL: Alright. Some portion of the  
18 387 line being reconductored?

19 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

20 MR. BALL: And reconfiguration of the East  
21 Shore Substation?

22 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

23 MR. BALL: That's generally what those  
24 seven load flow studies looked at?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

2 MR. BALL: Okay. Now I'm going to ask  
3 questions about those studies, those seven studies.  
4 We've heard a lot of testimony over the last couple of  
5 days about the importance of creating a strong source in  
6 Beseck, correct?

7 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

8 MR. BALL: And in fact your application --  
9 the primary route that you're proposing includes a number  
10 of enhancements, including the construction of a new  
11 substation at Beseck, correct?

12 MR. SCARFONE: A switching station, that's  
13 correct.

14 MR. BALL: Okay. And in addition a new  
15 line from Oxbow Junction to Beseck?

16 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

17 MR. BALL: A new 345-kV line I should say.

18 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

19 MR. BALL: And a new 345-kV line from  
20 Black Pond Junction to Beseck?

21 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

22 MR. BALL: Alright. And as we've  
23 discussed already, there's also the proposal of an  
24 additional 345-kV line between Scovill Rock switching

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 station and Chestnut Junction, correct?

2 MR. SCARFONE: Correct.

3 MR. BALL: And as you've testified, all of  
4 those elements are important in creating that strong  
5 source at Beseck. Is that a fair statement?

6 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

7 MR. BALL: Alright. Now getting back to  
8 the seven PowerGEM thermal load flow studies that I was  
9 talking about on pages 5 and 6 of the testimony. In  
10 those studies, the studies did not include a new  
11 substation at Beseck, isn't that right?

12 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

13 MR. BALL: Alright. And they also did not  
14 include the new line from Black Pond to Beseck, correct?

15 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

16 MR. BALL: And they didn't include the  
17 line from Oxbow Junction into Beseck?

18 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

19 MR. BALL: They didn't include the new  
20 line from Scovill Rock to Chestnut Junction, correct?

21 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

22 MR. BALL: And in terms of reconductoring  
23 of the 387 line to the extent that it was looked at in  
24 the studies, the assumption was that only 10 miles of the



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 387 line would be reconductored, correct?

2 MR. SCARFONE: The limiting 2156, yes, was  
3 reconductored --

4 MR. BALL: Alright. And --

5 MR. SCARFONE: -- matched the bundled 954.

6 MR. BALL: Right. And to be more precise  
7 about that, there's a stretch of the 387 line from  
8 Scovill Rock to Black Pond that's about 10 miles, right?

9 MR. SCARFONE: Ten, yes.

10 MR. BALL: Okay. And that is the portion  
11 of the 387 line that you modeled as being reconductored,  
12 correct?

13 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

14 MR. BALL: So the remainder of the 387  
15 line going from Black Pond all the way done to East Shore  
16 you did not assume any reconductoring?

17 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct. We left  
18 bundled 954 --

19 MR. BALL: Okay --

20 MR. SCARFONE: -- because it has a higher  
21 rating than 2156.

22 MR. BALL: Alright. And what is the  
23 entire length of the 387 line from Scovill Rock to East  
24 Shore?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. SCARFONE: It's about 10 miles from  
2 Scovill Rock to Black Pond and about 22 miles from Black  
3 Pond to East Shore.

4 MR. BALL: Now, you testified today as  
5 part of your slide presentation that you believe that for  
6 there to be a viable East Shore route a second 345-kV  
7 line would have to be constructed along the 387 right-of-  
8 way, is that right?

9 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we did.

10 MR. BALL: And in fact this is something  
11 that appears in the application on page G-18. You state  
12 studies of this potential alternative determined that it  
13 would not substantially reduce new 345-kV line  
14 construction because in order to meet national and  
15 regional reliability standards a second 345-kV line would  
16 have to be built on separate structures on the Beseck to  
17 East Shore right-of-way. You recall that?

18 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

19 MR. BALL: Alright. Now, the application  
20 was filed October 9, 2003?

21 MR. SCARFONE: I believe so.

22 MR. BALL: In October when -- shortly  
23 after the application was filed, the Towns in discovery  
24 asked for the studies on which you based the conclusion

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 that a second line was needed in that corridor. And the  
2 initial response to -- and I'll give you the specific  
3 interrogatory so you'll have it in front of you, it's DW-  
4 16 -- (pause) -- let me know when you have it in front of  
5 you -- (pause) --

6 A VOICE: You all set?

7 A VOICE: Yeah, go ahead.

8 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we have it.

9 MR. BALL: Okay. The initial response to  
10 Question 16-A was that this decision was based on the  
11 preliminary results of a draft ISO New England study, ISO  
12 New England has not authorized release of the draft. Do  
13 you see that?

14 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, I do.

15 MR. BALL: Okay. What ISO study are you  
16 referring to?

17 MR. SCARFONE: I believe that was a  
18 preliminary study done by ISO New England. I don't  
19 recall what the status of that study is right now.

20 MR. BALL: That study is not a part of the  
21 record?

22 MR. SCARFONE: I -- (pause) -- no, to my  
23 knowledge the study was not released. It was just part  
24 of an alternative study done by the ISO --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: Alright, so --

2 MR. SCARFONE: -- it was -- I do not think  
3 it's part of this docket.

4 MR. BALL: Alright. So prior to the  
5 application being filed, ISO conducted some sort of study  
6 relating to the need for a second line, but you haven't  
7 produced it to us?

8 MR. SCARFONE: ISO has not produced that  
9 study for this docket.

10 MR. BALL: Help me understand why that is  
11 not capable of being produced?

12 MR. SCARFONE: I would -- I think you  
13 would have to ask the ISO.

14 MR. BALL: Alright. Is the study complete  
15 now, do you know?

16 MR. SCARFONE: I do not know.

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But the study said that  
18 this East Shore route would work if you had a second  
19 line, correct?

20 MR. SCARFONE: I believe so. And I think  
21 from our collective knowledge at CL&P, we believed that  
22 the second line would be needed because if you had lost  
23 the existing 387 line, you would overload the 329 line,  
24 which is from Frost Bridge to Southington and underlying

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 one 115-kV lines. So from our collective knowledge of  
2 the company, we believed that a second line from -- into  
3 East Shore would be required.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, so did you get  
5 comments from the Towns about how they felt about the  
6 second line? Anybody?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I think -- it's --  
8 it's a matter of record that --

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, just point we where  
10 --

11 MR. FITZGERALD: -- that the -- you will  
12 see in the application that an East Shore route was not  
13 identified as an environmentally, technically, and --  
14 whatever the third word is -- practical --

15 A VOICE: Economical --

16 MR. FITZGERALD: -- economically practical  
17 alternative. And so it was not -- it was not presented  
18 in the application as an alternative, and so it was not  
19 part of the municipal consultation process --

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But the municipal  
21 consultation process has been ongoing, wouldn't you  
22 agree, Mr. Fitzgerald? And apparently since this matter  
23 has risen -- and my understanding was if you look at this  
24 as the two legs of the triangle, that the problem wasn't

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the north/south leg, your problem was the east/west leg  
2 from East Shore over toward East Devon. And didn't we  
3 just get testimony that this north/south leg works if you  
4 have two lines?

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Technically it works, yes

6 --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes. Well, that's a good  
8 start.

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Let me add that the  
10 municipal consultation process was primarily done prior  
11 to the application being filed --

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Understood --

13 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- and as this was not  
14 an alternative presented by the companies, we did not go  
15 to those towns to ask their --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But did they come to you  
17 and say --

18 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: There are -- the towns  
19 that are affected by the 387 right-of-way are not one and  
20 the same towns that are affected by our proposal. So  
21 where you have the Town of Wallingford in particular who  
22 asked us to re-look at this, there are other towns on  
23 that right-of-way that had not participated to date in  
24 this application since they were not part of the towns

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 that we went to see in municipal consultation. So you've  
2 got several towns that are -- Branford -- I believe there  
3 are three towns that have not been consulted prior to the  
4 application being filed.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Understood. But have you  
6 heard from the Town of Wallingford that says that we have  
7 a problem if it's two lines on the 387 or we don't have a  
8 problem?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay, now I understand  
10 the question --

11 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I -- I have not heard  
12 from the Town of Wallingford -- well, I shouldn't say  
13 that, let me -- I'd have to go back to the records --  
14 there's an awful lot of correspondence between the  
15 municipalities and the company, I would have to go back  
16 and look at all of the Wallingford correspondence in  
17 order to tell you their opinion of one line versus two  
18 lines

19 COURT REPORTER: One moment please.  
20 (Pause).

21 MR. BALL: Obviously, I can't speak for  
22 any of the Towns as to whether or not a second line is  
23 acceptable, but in the -- apparently, this was some sort  
24 of study upon which this conclusion was drawn that you

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 have to have a second line. And not to have seen this  
2 study and not to have it a part of the record, obviously  
3 makes it difficult for everyone to evaluate the issue.  
4 So --

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, what's frustrating  
6 for me is that people aren't asking the right questions  
7 and here we are already in June. I mean, God, we've been  
8 locked up in the same room for how many months. How long  
9 is it going to take before you people communicate with  
10 each other.

11 MR. BALL: But we specifically asked for  
12 the production of the study and it hasn't been provided,  
13 so --

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I -- I think it's fair  
15 to say, Mr. Ball, that ISO conducts many, many, many  
16 studies, and a number of them where the engineers look at  
17 the solution and say this won't work, is there a formal  
18 report prepared for which it's just more than here's the  
19 data sheets, here's the a formal final report? The  
20 answer is yeah, we look at hundreds of alternatives. Do  
21 we file a formal report for every single alternative?  
22 The ISO does not have the time to do that. And -- and  
23 these discussions are taking place at all of the TEAC  
24 meetings for which are totally open to the public, to all



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 disciplines, including the -- anyone who wants to  
2 participate. And so to turnaround and characterize this  
3 as someone is hiding information, it's just not the case.  
4 It's a -- the fact of the matter is, is that that  
5 specific aspect of it was demonstrated, it didn't work.  
6 Is there a formal report of that, I guess my answer is  
7 no, because if there had been a formal report, we would  
8 have submitted it as part of the testimony in this  
9 hearing. And -- and I believe ISO will be here the  
10 second week in June and you can ask them specifically why  
11 they did not continue on formally and present a formal  
12 report.

13 MR. TAIT: But do I understand right now  
14 you just have said whether or not you had a report from  
15 ISO, this was your company's opinion and that you have  
16 submitted a study that you've been referring to of these  
17 to work over? What are you lacking?

18 MR. BALL: No, no. Apparently, there is  
19 some sort of study upon which the conclusion that a  
20 second line was needed was based.

21 MR. TAIT: And that's in the control of  
22 ISO, which they will be here in June that you can ask  
23 them about.

24 MR. BALL: Okay -- well, I -- I mean I --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 I thought what I just heard was that it was a public  
2 record, a public document, so I'm still --

3 MR. TAIT: I did not --

4 MR. BALL: -- struggling to understand why  
5 --

6 MR. TAIT: -- I did not hear it was --

7 MR. BALL: -- I was not able to get a copy  
8 of it --

9 MR. TAIT: I did not hear that. If you  
10 think there's an ISO document you would like to see, I  
11 think you will have a chance --

12 MR. BALL: Okay --

13 MR. TAIT: -- and you can ask ISO ahead of  
14 time.

15 MR. BALL: Alright, I'll move on.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Just to extend my analogy  
17 from yesterday, we're here to paint a picture of a  
18 solution. While there's a role in this world for art  
19 critics, at some point we've got to pick up the brush and  
20 paint the solution. And please, we're hoping to get the  
21 testimony that shows us what that solution is.

22 MR. BALL: The seven load flow studies  
23 that you asked PowerGEM to run that you referred to in  
24 the testimony, pages 5 and 6, none of those studies

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 included a second line in the 387 corridor. That's  
2 correct?

3 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct. They  
4 showed that we needed a second line in that corridor.

5 MR. ASHTON: Just as a -- just as a matter  
6 of clarification, the term study here, is that correctly  
7 used or are these cases, load flow cases?

8 MR. SCARFONE: These are the load flow  
9 cases based on the twenty-seven seven.

10 MR. ASHTON: Okay. So, I want to be sure  
11 you understand the difference between a study which may  
12 be the aggregation of the results of a lot of cases and a  
13 case which is the response of the system to one set of  
14 parameters, a line in service, a generator in service, a  
15 generator out of service, what have you. And so -- Mr.  
16 Zak has -- Mr. Zaklukiewicz has said that they may take a  
17 look at a case and just say this ain't going to work and  
18 throw it in a wastebasket and the fact they never pursue  
19 it any further, so there is no study per say, there is a  
20 case or was a case.

21 MR. BALL: Thank you, I appreciate that  
22 clarification. And the reason I was using studies is  
23 because that's how it was used in the Applicants'  
24 testimony. But thank you.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ASHTON: That's -- I think there was a  
2 little bit of confusion on that.

3 MR. BALL: Okay. Now, eventually ISO did  
4 in fact perform a reliability study dated February 18,  
5 2004, correct?

6 MR. SCARFONE: Is this the comparison  
7 study you are referring to?

8 MR. BALL: It was attached to Addendum No.  
9 3.

10 MR. SCARFONE: I have it.

11 MR. BALL: Okay. And essentially what ISO  
12 did was they compared your proposed route from Middletown  
13 to Norwalk with the various East Shore routes that you  
14 had asked PowerGEM to look at. Isn't that right?

15 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

16 MR. BALL: Okay. And based on that  
17 comparison of what you had asked PowerGEM to look at, ISO  
18 concluded that your preferred route from Middletown to  
19 Norwalk was a more reliable route, isn't that right?

20 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

21 MR. BALL: Okay. But again ISO was  
22 looking at these seven PowerGEM studies, which did not  
23 include any of the enhancements at the Beseck Substation,  
24 the two lines going into Beseck, the line from Scovill

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Rock to Chestnut Junction or the reconductoring of a  
2 portion of the 387 line?

3 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

4 MR. BALL: Actually, I misstated the last  
5 -- there was a review of a portion -- a reconductoring of  
6 a portion of the 387 line but certainly not the entire  
7 387 line?

8 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct --

9 MR. BALL: Okay --

10 MR. SCARFONE: -- from Scovill to Black  
11 Pond.

12 MR. BALL: And those were the studies that  
13 they looked at and formed the basis of the February 18,  
14 2004 reliability study, right?

15 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

16 MR. BALL: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: When we say study, are we  
18 talking about the GE model at all?

19 MR. BALL: The --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: No --

21 MR. BALL: No.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No, okay.

23 MR. BALL: No. These are --

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: That's separate?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: -- the thermal load flow  
2 studies that PowerGEM was commissioned --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, just the load flow,  
4 not harmonics --

5 MR. BALL: Exactly --

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- and transients -- okay.

7 MR. BALL: That's right. Now, yesterday I  
8 received another PowerGEM, if not a study at least an  
9 analysis that did model a second line along the 387  
10 corridor, is that -- and that's dated May 24<sup>th</sup>. You're  
11 aware of that document?

12 MR. SCARFONE: Just a minute, I have to  
13 get a copy of that --

14 MR. BALL: That was filed in bulk --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Do we have an exhibit  
16 number, Mr. Ball?

17 MR. BALL: Yes, I do. It was a supplement  
18 to Question DW-16, and it's Exhibit No. 94-A.

19 MR. SCARFONE: I have it.

20 MR. BALL: Alright. Now in that document  
21 -- actually before I ask that, is this the last PowerGEM  
22 study that has been commissioned or are there others that  
23 are ongoing that you know of?

24 MR. SCARFONE: I believe this might be the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 last PowerGEM study. I'm not sure on that, it depends on  
2 what other scenarios people want us to look at.

3 MR. BALL: Alright. Now in this study the  
4 Beseck improvements were included, is that right -- or  
5 perhaps you can tell me what improvements were looked at?

6 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we have Beseck in  
7 there.

8 MR. BALL: So did you have the Beseck  
9 Substation and all of the transmission lines going into  
10 Beseck --

11 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we did --

12 MR. BALL: -- that are in your  
13 application?

14 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, we did --

15 MS. RANDELL: Just to clarify, that's the  
16 Beseck Switching Station.

17 MR. BALL: Thank you. The Beseck  
18 Switching Station. And --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: You just want to say  
20 Beseck.

21 MR. BALL: I just -- I will say Beseck.  
22 But to date you have not studied an East Shore route that  
23 includes these Beseck improvements and the reconductoring  
24 of the entire 387 line, isn't that right?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct. With the  
2 existing 387 line if you tie that into Beseck, the  
3 strength -- the strong source of Beseck would probably  
4 overload the 387, similar to the Power -- the existing  
5 PowerGEM studies that you have.

6 MR. BALL: Okay, but again, you simply  
7 haven't studied that to date, that particular  
8 configuration --

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Well --

10 MR. BALL: -- where the entire 387 line  
11 would be reconductored?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I'm -- I'm going to  
13 -- sorry to mince words, but again we're using the term  
14 study. And if you -- you may get a different answer  
15 depending on whether you're asking if they run load  
16 flows, whether he's analyzed it, whether they've  
17 commissioned a study. And so I -- I would just say the  
18 question as asked could be ambiguous.

19 MR. BALL: Have you -- thank you -- have  
20 you performed any load flow analyses which include the  
21 reconductoring of the entire 387 line as well as the  
22 Beseck improvements?

23 MR. SCARFONE: We've performed some  
24 sensitivities. We have not completed what we call a



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 study. We have done some sensitivities based on some of  
2 the -- what we've heard in the Siting Council hearings.

3 MR. BALL: Well -- I'm sorry, what are  
4 sensitivities?

5 MR. SCARFONE: What we did is we took a  
6 look at bringing -- constructing Beseck Switching Station  
7 and tying the 387 line -- the existing 387 line into  
8 Beseck then into East Shore. And then from East Shore  
9 going down to East Devon, Singer, then on to Norwalk.  
10 Those results showed that we still continued to overload  
11 the 387 line and would -- and we would require a second  
12 line from Beseck down to East Shore or East Devon.

13 MR. BALL: And presumably there are some  
14 documents that you have that you'd be willing to produce  
15 if asked?

16 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

17 MR. BALL: Okay. And one other question,  
18 the most recent PowerGEM document dated May 24<sup>th</sup>, we would  
19 ask that the data that you have underlying that report be  
20 produced to us in SAB format if that's -- if we could get  
21 that.

22 MR. SCARFONE: Okay --

23 MR. FITZGERALD: What we've given you for  
24 all the other studies --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: Correct --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: -- sure.

3 MR. BALL: Now on the seven thermal load  
4 flow studies of PowerGEM, in each of those load flow  
5 studies was the Plumtree to Norwalk line that was  
6 approved in Docket 217 assumed to be in service?

7 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, it was.

8 MR. BALL: Okay. Is there another  
9 PowerGEM report dated April 14<sup>th</sup> that you're aware of?

10 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, I have it.

11 MR. BALL: Okay. Well, not having seen  
12 it, again I'd simply ask that that be produced. We  
13 haven't -- I don't believe that was produced to us.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Just a minute, I have no  
15 idea what anybody is talking about --

16 A VOICE: I don't believe it's part of the  
17 record either --

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Off the record for a  
19 minute. Do you want to confer --

20 (Off the record)

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Do you want to re-ask the  
22 question, Mr. Ball.

23 MR. BALL: Well, I simply asked if the  
24 document dated April 14, 2004 that was apparently

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 produced by PowerGEM could be produced. We simply  
2 haven't seen it --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And Mr. Fitzgerald said?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: And I said I'm not --  
5 assuming that it hasn't been produced, which I will  
6 accept as a preface --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: -- I also know it's been  
9 asked for, but we -- we'll produce it in any event. It  
10 apparently does exist, so --

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We'll take that as a yes.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

13 MR. BALL: Let me shift back to the ISO  
14 study that was dated February 18, 2004 that I had asked  
15 you about. There are a number of tables in this study in  
16 which the various PowerGEM documents were compared to  
17 your Middletown to Norwalk route and there appears to be  
18 a comparison of overloads, is that right?

19 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

20 MR. BALL: Alright. Now both the East  
21 Shore configurations and the Middletown to Norwalk route  
22 contain overloads when examined under certain conditions,  
23 isn't that right?

24 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: Now, I'm just looking at Table  
2 4 and noticed that under the Middletown to Norwalk column  
3 in a few instances there are the letters NC rather than a  
4 number. Can you tell me what NC means?

5 MR. SCARFONE: That means the case did not  
6 converge, it was not an acceptable solution. The PTI  
7 load flow package didn't come up with an acceptable  
8 solution.

9 MR. BALL: Alright. So to the extent that  
10 the tables indicate NC, that's actually a worse  
11 performance than some of the numerical ratings that  
12 appear in those columns?

13 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, sir. However, I'd  
14 like to point out to you where that location is. That  
15 basically is the Plumtree to Triangle, really a radial  
16 loop out of Plumtree. It really serves only local load  
17 in the Danbury area. There are three transmission lines  
18 that serve that area, Triangle to Middle River. It is  
19 not -- it's a very localized area. And that -- in  
20 consideration of what happens at Triangle and Middle  
21 River really shouldn't influence your comparison of the  
22 Middletown or East Shore alternative. And we do state  
23 that indeed in the report itself.

24 MR. BALL: Okay. To shift gears --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think one other  
2 factor -- one other factor here is the EPRO software  
3 package that is used is different than the PowerGEM  
4 package when it comes to this, so it's -- what you see  
5 here is slightly different. The fact that you come up  
6 with NC is just indicative of the software package that  
7 is used by EPRO in their studies relative to what the  
8 PowerGEM is.

9 MR. SCARFONE: It's the same load flow  
10 package, it's a different solution technique. Mr. --  
11 Roger is correct, it's just a different solution  
12 technique.

13 MR. BALL: Alright. I will shift gears,  
14 if I can, to reconductoring.

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Just before we leave that  
16 --

17 MR. BALL: Yeah?

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- Mr. Ball, have the  
19 Towns identified an overhead route that they can live  
20 with that you want PowerGEM to look at?

21 MR. BALL: I -- I certainly cannot speak  
22 for all 16 towns on that, but that's certainly a  
23 worthwhile question --

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: -- that we will undertake to  
2 answer. If I may, I'll just switch topics to  
3 reconductoring.

4 MR. PRETE: Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Prete.

6 MR. PRETE: Reflecting on your question,  
7 in hearing your line of questioning and your testimony,  
8 are you not asking for a thermal load flow that assumes  
9 Segment 1 in place and just the 387 line between East  
10 Shore and East -- East Shore and Beseck, and then East  
11 Shore to East Devon? Isn't that what you're asking?

12 MR. BALL: We have, I think, already  
13 indicated the East Shore route that our consultants are  
14 looking at, which would not include a second line, which  
15 would have a new 345-kV line from East Devon to East  
16 Shore, the reconductoring of the 387 line as well as all  
17 the Beseck improvements.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, so you have a  
19 scenario that the Towns are happy with that PowerGEM has  
20 not yet run a load analysis on?

21 MR. BALL: That's right. And --

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And you're going to give  
23 that to them?

24 MR. BALL: We are conducting our own load

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 flow analyses on it. We have also provided that route  
2 with specificity to them.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. But you might --

4 A VOICE: We haven't looked --

5 A VOICE: When --

6 A VOICE: Do you have a timetable --

7 MR. TAIT: I thought the East Shore -- we  
8 would have East Shore -- your East Shore today?

9 MR. BALL: No --

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No, that's July. This is  
11 part of what --

12 MR. BALL: This is part -- in addition.  
13 And I think we're about --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: In addition to the GE  
15 model --

16 MR. BALL: In addition to the GE studies,  
17 we are also conducting our own load flow studies as part  
18 --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, it might be valuable  
20 to the Council if both your expert and their expert does  
21 the same thing, the same scenario. And then if there are  
22 differences, we can talk about it.

23 A VOICE: We will commission PowerGEM  
24 immediately --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Well wait --

3 A VOICE: Go ahead --

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Your client has spoken --

5 MR. FITZGERALD: No, no, the --

6 A VOICE: Yes --

7 MR. FITZGERALD: He hasn't completed the  
8 sentence though. We don't know -- at least we don't know  
9 yet -- maybe we'll know before the end of the day exactly  
10 what they're talking about.

11 MR. TAIT: That's what we need, we need  
12 proposals before us that will work, not proposals that  
13 won't work. We ask all of you if you have some that will  
14 work or you think will work that we can look at it and  
15 the Applicant can say it will or it won't work.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. So Mr. Ball, I'm  
17 going to assume that the Towns are going to provide that  
18 scenario to the companies.

19 MR. BALL: Of course.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you.

21 MR. TAIT: And I'm going to ask Durham to  
22 do the same on the northern routes, what they think will  
23 work if we have to have a line --

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. TAIT: -- so the Applicant can look at  
2 it.

3 MR. BALL: Thank you. I'll -- if I may,  
4 I'll go on reconductoring.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

6 MR. BALL: You -- tell me what  
7 reconductoring is?

8 MR. SCARFONE: Reconductoring is the  
9 replacement of existing conductors on the structures.

10 MR. BALL: And what's the purpose of it?

11 MR. SCARFONE: The purpose is to increase  
12 the thermal capacity of the line.

13 MR. BALL: Now, you indicated that you  
14 modeled the reconductoring of the 10 miles along the 387  
15 line from Scovill Rock to Black Pond, correct?

16 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

17 MR. BALL: But not the remaining 22 miles  
18 I believe you testified from Black Pond down to East  
19 Shore?

20 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Correct.

22 MR. BALL: Okay. Now, the 10-mile segment  
23 from Scovill Rock to Black Pond has single conductors  
24 called Blue Bird conductors, is that right?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Correct.

2 MR. BALL: And the remaining distance of  
3 the 387 line from Black Pond to East Shore has a bundled  
4 pair of conductors, they're referred to as Rail  
5 conductors, is that right?

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's correct.  
7 Bundled 954 ACSR.

8 MR. BALL: Alright. So in the East Shore  
9 studies that you looked at, you modeled the  
10 reconductoring of the 10 miles between Scovill Rock and  
11 Black Pond using the same bundled Rail conductors as  
12 exist on the remaining length of the line, of the 387  
13 line?

14 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct. To match  
15 the thermal capacity of the bundled 954.

16 MR. BALL: Alright. Now, separate from  
17 Blue Bird and Rail conductors there is another conductor  
18 that is called Genesee. Are you familiar with that type?

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, we are.

20 MR. BALL: Alright. That -- that  
21 conductor has the capacity to carry more power, is that  
22 accurate?

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's correct.

24 MR. ASHTON: Just to -- just to clarify

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 things so we get the mystery out of this, the various  
2 names that are applied are names that are applied by the  
3 cable manufacturer that relates to a specific size, is  
4 that correct?

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

6 MR. ASHTON: So a 2156 MCM ACSR means  
7 2,156,000 circular mils and aluminum conductor steel  
8 reinforced and that has a name for sales purposes by  
9 Alcoa of Blue Bird, is that correct?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

11 MR. ASHTON: And so on down the line.

12 MR. BALL: Would it be okay if we referred  
13 to it as Blue Bird going forward?

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I'm with Mr. Ball.

15 (Laughter).

16 MR. BALL: Alright. Now on May 24<sup>th</sup> you  
17 filed with the Siting Council a feasibility study  
18 prepared by Burns and McDonnell relating to  
19 reconductoring. Do you recall that?

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Where's --

21 MS. RANDELL: Yes --

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, we did.

23 MR. BALL: Okay. This is response to  
24 Towns' 66. Correct?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 A VOICE: Yes.

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, it is.

3 MR. BALL: Alright. I'd like to ask a few  
4 questions about that study. I don't know who I should  
5 direct the questions to, but --

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Mr. Hogan will respond  
7 to those specific studies since Burns and McDonnell  
8 conducted the study.

9 MR. BALL: Alright. If -- in the back of  
10 the study is an appendix, Appendix B is the page I want  
11 to just focus on for a moment.

12 MR. HOGAN: I have it in front of me.

13 MR. BALL: Alright. Now, looking at the  
14 chart there appears to be two columns, one is, depending  
15 on the conductor type, the summer normal rating and the  
16 other is the summer long-term emergency rating?

17 MR. HOGAN: That's correct.

18 MR. BALL: Can you describe what the  
19 meaning of those two columns is? What's a normal rating?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Normal rating is -- is  
21 where the conductor can carry that many amperes 24 hours  
22 a day, 365 days a year without damage to the conductors.

23 MR. BALL: And emergency rating?

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Emergency rating for a

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 long-term emergency rating is basically a load cycle  
2 rating that allows by compliance with ISO New England the  
3 loading of the line over a load cycle, which in the  
4 summertime could be for 10, 12, 14 hours. The following  
5 load cycle you have to return down below and be within  
6 the normal rating of the conductor.

7 MR. BALL: Alright. Now, when you perform  
8 load flow studies to test the reliability of a line, you  
9 test the system at stressed conditions, isn't that right?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

11 MR. BALL: And in that context would the  
12 emergency rating of the conductors become particularly  
13 important because it would reflect the ability of the  
14 conductors to carry more power at extreme conditions?

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The -- when we say  
16 stressed conditions, we are using a generation dispatch,  
17 which increases the flows on the lines, but it is not --  
18 it is following a contingency that you are then allowed  
19 to go and exceed the normal rating of the conductor but  
20 cannot exceed the long-term emergency rating of the  
21 conductor because if you had that dispatch day in and day  
22 out and the load was the same level, you would be  
23 operating into the long-term emergency rating day in and  
24 day out, and that is not allowed by the reliability and

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 operating standards.

2 MR. BALL: Alright. Now going back to  
3 Appendix B, the thermal ratings are measured in amps, is  
4 that right?

5 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

6 MR. BALL: So if you look at the normal  
7 rating and you're looking at Blue Bird, which is the  
8 single conductor we talked about before, the number there  
9 is 2075, right?

10 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

11 MR. BALL: And if you use two Genesee  
12 conductors, it increases to 2770 under normal rating?

13 MR. HOGAN: That's correct.

14 MR. BALL: Alright. So for that 10-mile  
15 stretch between Black Pond and Scovill Rock, if you were  
16 to re-conductor that stretch of the line with Genesee  
17 conductors rather than the existing Blue Bird conductors,  
18 the capacity to carry power would increase by whatever  
19 that percentage is, approximately a third, is that right?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Can you -- can you ask  
21 that question again? I think you made a technical error,  
22 so I would like clarification.

23 MR. BALL: Okay. I'm sure you'll correct  
24 me, but the -- I'm asking about the 10-mile stretch --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes --

2 MR. BALL: -- from Black Pond to Scovill  
3 Rock, okay, which currently has the single Blue Bird  
4 conductors. If you were to re-conductor that segment of  
5 the 387 line using the two Genesee conductors, my  
6 question was whether the capacity to carry power would  
7 increase by approximately a third?

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: For that -- for that  
9 section of the line in your hypothetical question, the  
10 answer is yes, recognize the rest of the line with two  
11 954 kcmil ACSR only has a rating of 2490, so you'd have  
12 to do something with the remaining portion of that line  
13 since it's basically a radial line.

14 MR. BALL: Alright.

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: But on that section, in  
16 theory the answer would be yes.

17 MR. BALL: And similarly if you were to  
18 re-conductor the remaining 22 miles from Black Pond to  
19 East Shore and instead of using the two Rail conductors  
20 you were to use the two Genesee conductors, the capacity  
21 to carry power would increase by approximately 10 or 15  
22 percent, isn't that right?

23 MR. HOGAN: That's correct.

24 MR. BALL: Okay. And in terms of the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 emergency rating, if you were to use the Genesee  
2 conductors in that 10-mile segment between Black Pond and  
3 Scovill Rock, the capacity to carry power would increase  
4 using -- going from Blue Bird to Genesee would increase  
5 by about 55 percent, would it not?

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Subject to doing the  
7 math, the difference between 4,170 and 2,685, and if  
8 that's 55 percent, I would agree with that.

9 MR. BALL: And the capacity to carry power  
10 on the remaining 22 miles between Black Pond and East  
11 Shore under an emergency rating would increase by about  
12 30 percent if you reconductored to use the Genesee  
13 conductors, isn't that right?

14 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

15 A VOICE: From Rail conductors --

16 MR. BALL: Alright. Now -- and just to be  
17 clear, to date you have not modeled any East Shore route  
18 that includes the reconductoring of the entire 387 line  
19 using two Genesee conductors, right?

20 MR. HOGAN: That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: If -- if you reconductored  
22 those lines, would East Shore work without a second line?

23 MR. SCARFONE: It would not work without a  
24 second line.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: But you haven't studied it yet?

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes, how do you know that?

3 MR. SCARFONE: How do we know that? The  
4 PowerGEM analysis has shown that if you lost the existing  
5 387 reconductored or existing line, we would overload  
6 other lines, specifically the Southington to Frost Bridge  
7 line and the 1610 line from Southington to -- the 115-kV  
8 line from Southington to Mix Avenue, and the -- I believe  
9 the Bochum to Green Hill. So there are other 115-kV and  
10 345-kV lines that overload. Indifferent to what size  
11 conductor you put on the 387, you could put the biggest  
12 conductor on it, we still have to design the system to  
13 protect for the loss of that line.

14 MR. BALL: Let me ask you a question about  
15 the 329 line, that's the line between Southington and  
16 Frost Bridge, right?

17 MR. SCARFONE: Yes.

18 MR. BALL: Okay, which you just referred  
19 to. One of the things that appears on a page of one of  
20 the feasibility study is that a system analysis of the  
21 alternative determined that reconductoring would be  
22 necessary on the 329 line if you were to reconductor the  
23 387 line, right?

24 MR. SCARFONE: Could you repeat that

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 question please?

2 MR. BALL: The -- well, I'll just read the  
3 sentence. It says systems analysis of this alternative  
4 determined that reconductoring the 387 line would impact  
5 the existing 345-kV line, the 329 line between  
6 Southington and Frost Bridge Substation, so similar  
7 reconductoring would be necessary on the 329 line.

8 MR. SCARFONE: Correct --

9 MR. BALL: Alright --

10 MR. SCARFONE: -- amongst others.

11 MR. BALL: So -- I suppose the next  
12 question is have you modeled any load flow studies that  
13 include the reconductoring of the entire 387 line using  
14 Genesee conductors and the 329 line using Genesee  
15 conductors?

16 MR. SCARFONE: No, we have not. And I  
17 believe Mr. -- Roger has testified that assuming our --  
18 Section G-1 of our application of all that criteria that  
19 we've included in that section, that the second line  
20 would be required into East Shore.

21 MR. BALL: Alright. On the second page of  
22 the feasibility study, it says that if more than 50  
23 percent of the structures have to be replaced when you  
24 reconductor, that would not be considered good utility

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 practice as a replacement of more than 50 percent would  
2 necessitate the reevaluation of all the structures using  
3 the heavier extreme wind loading case of the latest NESC  
4 addition. Do you see that on page 2?

5 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

6 MR. BALL: Alright. First of all, what's  
7 the NESC addition?

8 MR. HOGAN: It's the National Electric  
9 Safety Code. And there were earlier editions, 1961 and -  
10 - that I guess the original design occurred under. And  
11 under reconductoring we did not use the newer code.  
12 You're not required to go up and use the newer code  
13 unless you're replacing out structures.

14 MR. BALL: Can you tell me what the  
15 extreme wind loading case is that you refer to?

16 MR. HOGAN: The National Electric Safety  
17 Code has increased the wind loading that's in the 2002  
18 code. Essentially in 1961 it was 79 miles an hour. And  
19 in 2002 it went up to 112. And those are safety codes  
20 that I guess transmission lines are designed according  
21 to.

22 MR. BALL: Is that the same as heavy  
23 conditions which is a phrase you use later on in the  
24 feasibility study?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. HOGAN: No, there's another case in  
2 the National Electric Safety Code for, if you will, a  
3 district loading, and that's where it's heavy, medium, or  
4 light, and that's another criteria that has to be met.

5 MR. BALL: Alright. So the notion is that  
6 -- obviously if you reconductor, there will be certain  
7 structures that will need to be replaced?

8 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

9 MR. BALL: Okay. And if you exceed that  
10 50 percent threshold, it becomes more problematic because  
11 you have to look at all the structures on the line?

12 MR. HOGAN: That's our feeling, yes.

13 MR. BALL: When you took a look at the  
14 Genesee conductors, you determined that you would not  
15 have to -- you would not exceed that 50 percent  
16 threshold, right?

17 MR. HOGAN: Yes, that's correct.

18 MR. BALL: So, it -- and in fact, I  
19 believe it's on page 9 of the study, that if you were to  
20 use Genesee conductors on the 387 line, approximately 24  
21 percent of the structures would have to be replaced?

22 MR. HOGAN: Uh --

23 MR. BALL: On page 9 it says the failure  
24 rates --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: What paragraph --

2 MR. BALL: -- for the structures were 24  
3 percent --

4 MR. HOGAN: Yes --

5 MR. BALL: -- for the loads from the  
6 Genesee --

7 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

8 MR. BALL: So that would equate with 47  
9 structures out of the total 267 structures on the 387  
10 line that would have to be replaced?

11 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

12 MR. BALL: Alright. And you also took a  
13 look at using Genesee conductors on the 329 line between  
14 Southington and Frost Bridge, right?

15 MR. HOGAN: Yes, we did.

16 MR. BALL: And similarly if you were to  
17 reconductor using Genesee conductors, you would not have  
18 to -- you would not exceed that 50 percent threshold of  
19 structures that would have to be replaced, correct?

20 MR. HOGAN: Correct.

21 MR. BALL: Is it typically the older wood  
22 structures that have to be replaced when you take a look  
23 at the analysis in reconductoring?

24 MR. HOGAN: It depends. You know, what we

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 find is that once computers got into the design, people  
2 were able to give more accuracy and less margin if you  
3 will. And so it seems like before computers there  
4 generally was more capacity by the old hand techniques  
5 than what we see now, people design things closer to the  
6 limits.

7 MR. BALL: The -- when were the structures  
8 constructed on the 387 line, do you know?

9 MR. HOGAN: I know it was in the timeframe  
10 that the 61 National Electric Safety Code was in effect,  
11 so in the 60's.

12 MR. BALL: In the 60's. And what about  
13 the 329 line, do you know?

14 MR. HOGAN: I believe that was more --  
15 let's see -- the 70's vintage -- (pause) -- 387 was in  
16 the 70's and 329 was more in the late 50's.

17 MR. BALL: Alright. I want to follow up  
18 on a question that I believe Mr. O'Neill asked yesterday  
19 --

20 MR. ASHTON: Excuse me for one second.  
21 The 329 line is the Frost Bridge/Southington line?

22 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes.

24 MR. ASHTON: Would you agree that the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 first 345-kV in New England began service in November or  
2 late fall of 1965 from the Pleasant Valley supply?

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: He probably has a picture  
4 of him on a pole to prove it. (Laughter).

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Subject to check, we  
6 will agree to that.

7 MR. ASHTON: So, I don't think it's the  
8 1950's.

9 MR. BALL: I'm going to start asking Mr.  
10 Ashton these questions.

11 MR. ASHTON: That's one advantage of white  
12 hair or a little white hair.

13 MR. BALL: Now, the --

14 MR. ASHTON: Could I ask also one other  
15 question here that gets into bearing on philosophy. Mr.  
16 Zaklukiewicz, if you saw a 345-kV circuit loaded up to  
17 the vicinity of 800 to 1,000 megawatts, regardless of the  
18 conductor size, would you be looking to rebuild the  
19 circuit, or would you be looking more likely to add a  
20 separate additional circuit along that path?

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Flows of that  
22 magnitude, you would be looking to replace -- not  
23 replace, reconductor, but to add a second circuit because  
24 basically the amount of availability between a normal

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 rating and emergency rating is just not there.

2 MR. ASHTON: And also would that apply --  
3 the idea apply that you don't like to see too many eggs  
4 in one basket or electrical watts in one structure, one  
5 line?

6 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

7 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.

8 MR. BALL: Getting back to -- I believe  
9 this was a question that Mr. O'Neill had touched on  
10 yesterday -- at some point is there a limited -- I assume  
11 there's a limited life span for the structures  
12 themselves? Whoever --

13 MR. HOGAN: Yeah, but it varies though  
14 depending on different applications.

15 MR. BALL: And --

16 MR. HOGAN: I mean there are some lines  
17 that are awfully old. You know, 1920's vintage that are  
18 still up and running, but --

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Are you speaking -- are  
20 you speaking of wood structures or are you speaking of  
21 steel lattice? They -- they would have two different  
22 life spans.

23 MR. BALL: Tell me the distinction if you  
24 would?



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Well a lattice  
2 structure would -- especially if the lattice structure  
3 has a concrete foundation to it, those -- we have a  
4 number of lattice structures that are near 60 or 70 years  
5 today.

6 Wood pole structures, depending on the  
7 treatment it's given at the pole line, where you get the  
8 bug infestation is at the ground level and up to a foot  
9 below the ground level, if properly treated, it should  
10 last 45 to 50 years, if not more.

11 MR. BALL: And that -- that was my  
12 question in fact. So if you're talking about the wood  
13 structures, at some point, 45, 50 years, at some point  
14 you look to make -- to replace them, isn't that right?

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes.

16 MR. HOGAN: Yes.

17 MR. BALL: And in fact, many of the  
18 structures that would fail using the Genesee conductors,  
19 are they likely to be among the first that would have to  
20 be replaced anyway?

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: No, I think the 320 --  
22 the 387 line was built somewhere in the late 70's, so  
23 that has got a number of years before we would be looking  
24 to change out those poles.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: But the 387 line, which was  
2 constructed in the 60's, by my math, takes us pretty  
3 close to 40 years --

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The 329 or the 387?

5 MR. BALL: The 387 line. The structures,  
6 I believe the testimony was were constructed largely in  
7 the 60's. (Pause).

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Excuse me, could you  
9 ask that question again.

10 MR. BALL: The -- the 387 line, the  
11 structures were constructed largely in the 1960's --

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: On the northern -- on  
13 the northern piece that you're talking about between  
14 Scovill and Black Pond --

15 MR. BALL: Okay, so --

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- Black Pond south was  
17 in the late -- in the late 70's.

18 MR. BALL: Alright, so separate and apart  
19 from reconductoring, at some point, particularly with  
20 those older wooden structures, you would be looking to  
21 replace them, isn't that right?

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think I testified  
23 that I would expect it to last 40 to 50 years with proper  
24 -- with proper bug treatment. And we have been

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 performing that maintenance religiously. So since we  
2 haven't gotten there yet, I can't tell you whether the  
3 345 poles are going to last 60 years or 70 years with the  
4 treatment we've been providing.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: If you did a second line,  
6 would you want to do it -- replace the H-frames with  
7 steel poles and put them on both?

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Visually, I think we  
9 would have to turn around and determine -- there may be  
10 locations where it would be preferable to do it with an  
11 H-frame to keep the profiles down lower --

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: H-frame next to H-frame?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: H-frame next to H-  
14 frame, which would end up being to low of structures as  
15 opposed to having an H-frame and a delta or a vertical to  
16 get around areas. So, I think -- in answering your  
17 question as briefly as I can, I think it would be  
18 determined area by area. We would try to work with the  
19 towns to make it most compatible to the people living in  
20 close proximity to the line.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Ball, if you've  
22 already asked them what a second line would look like,  
23 just point me in the right direction and I won't waste  
24 time pursuing it?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: I -- I did not ask that  
2 question --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

4 MR. BALL: -- so --

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I just want to make  
6 certain we understand, we can't put both circuits on a  
7 single structure that's all.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. So -- but if you --  
9 if a second line was required to make East Shore work,  
10 and you're not agreeing that it does I understand, but it  
11 would be an H-frame next to an H-frame, so you'd have to  
12 acquire more right-of-way or is the right-of-way wide  
13 enough there?

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The right-of-way is  
15 wide enough from where we already have easements.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you.

17 MR. HOGAN: One point of clarification  
18 might be worth noting. With the higher wind loads there  
19 is a chance that it may be more economical to go to a  
20 steel H-frame as opposed to the wood. And that at this  
21 point isn't really --

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But the height would be --  
23 the height would not change?

24 MR. HOGAN: That is correct.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. BALL: This might be a good time for a  
2 break recognizing that it's 3:00 o'clock, at least in my  
3 examination, unless you want Attorney Kohler to go on --

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But this is a good time  
5 for you?

6 MR. BALL: It's a good time for me.

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And are you finished or  
8 are you going to come back and have more?

9 MR. BALL: I might have a couple of more  
10 questions.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. We will take a 10-  
12 minute recess.

13 MR. BALL: Thank you.

14 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Let us resume. Mr. Ball,  
16 I just want to start with a procedural question to you.  
17 If this Council wanted to know how the Towns felt about  
18 an East Shore route that included two lines -- 345 lines  
19 on the 387 right-of-way, how would you suggest that we do  
20 that?

21 MR. BALL: Other than the fact that you've  
22 just asked us? (Laughter).

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

24 MR. BALL: That might work. You know, it

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 -- I'm not sure that all 16 towns that have been grouped  
2 to some extent would be able to answer that question the  
3 same, but certainly we can all undertake to answer that  
4 question for you.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Great. If all the  
6 affected towns who wish to weigh in, we'd -- I think we'd  
7 appreciate -- under our mantra of no stone unturned, we'd  
8 appreciate hearing that.

9 MR. BALL: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, let's proceed with  
11 cross -- uh -- Mr. Prete.

12 MR. PRETE: Yes. I think Anne pointed out  
13 that North Branford, East Haven and New Haven are not  
14 part of those 16 towns at all.

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Hmm --

16 MR. PRETE: And I know I have had  
17 conversations with New Haven and I won't characterize  
18 exactly what they said, but it wasn't of interest at all.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: It was probably not polite  
20 enough to be repeated.

21 MR. PRETE: That would probably be an  
22 understatement.

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: An interesting dilemma.  
24 Okay, why don't we -- we'll note that for the record.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 But let's -- for the towns that are part of this docket,  
2 let's get some comments.

3 MR. PRETE: Would you like us to proceed  
4 and ask questions to North Branford and East Haven about  
5 their feelings? We'll be happy to do so.

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Oh, yes, if you're  
7 volunteering.

8 MR. TAIT: I think that would be very  
9 helpful.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Is that the only two?  
12 Aren't there -- aren't there more?

13 MR. PRETE: Of the towns that are not in  
14 this particular proceedings --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: Right --

16 MR. PRETE: -- my understanding is North  
17 Branford, East Haven and New Haven.

18 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) -- Branford --

19 MR. PRETE: I'm sorry, and Branford.

20 A VOICE: New Haven is part of this  
21 proceeding.

22 MR. TAIT: Mr. Fitzgerald, this is a  
23 procedural question, and I guess it's for all counsel, I  
24 assume if we seriously consider an East Shore

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 alternative, we will need to hold hearings on that  
2 particular alternative, as well as the alternate north  
3 route? I mean giving some thoughts on it, not tonight,  
4 but if we decide to incorporate any of these alternatives  
5 that were not part of the original application, what do  
6 we do?

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes, we'd like all  
8 attorneys to give that some thought.

9 MR. TAIT: Do we need to hold new hearings  
10 on the East Shore alternative if it's a viable  
11 alternative, the north route, and the route that you  
12 talked -- triangular around Royal Oaks, does that require  
13 a reopening for that particular section?

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I --

15 MR. TAIT: Don't answer me now, just think  
16 about it everybody.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: I've been thinking about  
18 it -- (laughter) -- I've been thinking, not a whole lot -  
19 -

20 MR. TAIT: Good, I have been too.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Emerick.

22 MR. EMERICK: I think something else to  
23 think about is if we were to locate a switching station  
24 at Black Pond in the realm of it wasn't really advertised



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 --

2 MR. TAIT: The neighbors --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right.

4 MR. TAIT: -- the towns.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I think when it comes --  
6 and I hate to say this word September, but if we end up  
7 choosing other than the proposed route, we probably would  
8 have to do a limited reopening in September to fully  
9 flesh out --

10 MR. TAIT: Yeah --

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- that alternative piece.

12 MR. TAIT: But at some point we're going  
13 to have to call this on because of darkness -- (laughter)

14 --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

16 MR. TAIT: -- it's evening.

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right.

18 MR. TAIT: Another analogy.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

20 A VOICE: (Indiscernible) -- no power.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Just food for thought.

22 Let's proceed. Mr. Ball, you have further cross?

23 MR. BALL: I have no further questions.

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Miss Kohler.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: For the record, Julie  
2 Donaldson Kohler for the same towns. I actually do have  
3 a couple of questions for Miss Mango, so if she is in  
4 fact like Elvis in the building.

5 A VOICE: She was --

6 A VOICE: She was and just like Elvis she  
7 --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: I'm sorry, I thought  
9 she'd be back.

10 MS. KOHLER: No, that's okay.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Would you prefer to wait  
12 for her --

13 MS. KOHLER: No, I can --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- or would you prefer to  
15 do the other witnesses --

16 MS. KOHLER: -- I can just do the non-  
17 environmental --

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, let's do the other  
19 witnesses and then we'll get to her.

20 (Pause)

21 MS. KOHLER: I'm sorry, most of it  
22 actually is environmental -- just let me flip through --

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Here she is.

24 MS. KOHLER: Oh. Just a couple of

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 questions about the environmental impacts of East Shore.

2 Mr. Ball dealt with the complex technical aspects of the  
3 East Shore route and I'd just like to focus on the non-  
4 technical aspects of East Shore. And for the purposes of  
5 this entire line of questioning, we're going to focus on  
6 East Shore along the existing 387 corridor, so none of  
7 the railroad right-of-ways or the marine routing.

8 In the prefiled testimony is it true the  
9 conclusions regarding the clearing proximity to  
10 residential areas and a school are based upon the  
11 assumptions that a second line would need to be  
12 implemented in the right-of-way?

13 MS. LOUISE MANGO: Yes.

14 MS. KOHLER: And if it was determined that  
15 a second line was necessary to make this routing feasible  
16 -- I mean you've articulated concerns regarding clearing  
17 and the proximity to certain sensitive receptors.

18 MS. MANGO: Is that a question?

19 MS. KOHLER: Such as a -- yes. Have you?

20 MS. MANGO: We have generally identified  
21 those issues.

22 MS. KOHLER: And I think Chairman Katz  
23 mentioned this earlier, but is it true that the right-of-  
24 way, the existing 387 corridor ranges from 275 to 320

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 feet wide and no further widening of the right-of-way  
2 would be necessary?

3 MR. PRETE: That is correct.

4 MS. KOHLER: And that no private property  
5 would need to be acquired?

6 MS. MANGO: That's correct as I understand  
7 it.

8 MR. PRETE: Except for the transition  
9 station that would be needed in East Shore.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How much room is there on  
11 the East Shore property now? You have that little Cross  
12 Sound station down there -- near there, correct?

13 MR. PRETE: There's adequate land. It's  
14 owned by somebody other than the utility.

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

16 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I --

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Or a different utility  
18 maybe.

19 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Miss Kohler, let me add  
20 one more statement. In Wallingford as you come down  
21 Tradition Golf Course, there would have to be essentially  
22 a swapping of property with the Tradition Golf Course for  
23 the piece of property they own between the golf course  
24 and the railroad and the highway.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: Okay. And you've raised a  
2 concern about the extent of clearing necessary for the  
3 second line?

4 MS. MANGO: Correct.

5 MS. KOHLER: Okay.

6 MR. ASHTON: (Indiscernible) -- I assume  
7 that you're postulating a second circuit that would match  
8 the first circuit, be it an H-frame, there's no  
9 restrained conductors, it's not a delta configuration or  
10 anything like that, is that correct?

11 MS. MANGO: That's correct.

12 MR. ASHTON: So if there were, you could  
13 take steps if -- whether they were merited or not is not  
14 -- I'm not debating -- but you could take steps to make  
15 it a more compact construction than the original line?

16 MS. MANGO: That's correct, with a taller  
17 structure.

18 MR. ASHTON: Um-hmm.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: On June 16<sup>th</sup> can you be  
20 prepared to discuss EMFs on a right-of-way with two  
21 lines?

22 MR. PRETE: I believe that might be very  
23 difficult since we would have to do load flows on an  
24 assumption of a design of an electrical system that we

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 don't have. We don't know how much power would be going  
2 on the line, the new line until such time as we have a  
3 design of exactly what the electrical configuration is.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay.

5 MR. ASHTON: Didn't you look at a second  
6 circuit on there in your load flows? You said the first  
7 circuit wouldn't work, you needed a second circuit. Did  
8 you look at a second circuit as a load flow case?

9 MR. PRETE: We looked at a second circuit  
10 assuming Segment 1 was in place -- is that what you're  
11 asking me?

12 MR. ASHTON: Well, I'm not -- I'm not  
13 quite sure what I'm asking --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: My concern is that I just  
15 don't want to shift the EMF --

16 MR. ASHTON: Insofar as you have a  
17 different --

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- just to a different  
19 group of people.

20 MR. ASHTON: Insofar -- insofar as you  
21 have a load flow which shows a second circuit on the 380  
22 -- paralleling the 387 line, I assume that load flow  
23 could be a basis for EMF calculation?

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think we can do some

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 quick studies to come up with some approximations. I  
2 think the second big piece that needs to give us some  
3 guidance on is whether from East Shore to East Devon is  
4 all underground or it's a composite underground/overhead.  
5 That piece means all the difference in the world over the  
6 flow that flows down the two circuits that would go one  
7 from Beseck to East Shore and one that goes from Scovill  
8 to East Shore --

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, that's fair --

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- that other leg in  
11 there. So can you give us some guidance if we do that?  
12 I think the worst case scenario would be an all  
13 underground from -- with three cables from East Shore to  
14 East Devon. That would give you I believe the worst case  
15 as opposed to using numbers which would be -- because the  
16 flow will want to go down that leg.

17 MR. PRETE: If I can interject, Roger,  
18 just for a second as we're thinking out loud, would you  
19 tend to agree that our cross-section 5 in our proposed  
20 route today, which of course shares the 387 right-of-way  
21 between Beseck and East Wallingford Junction, would be a  
22 similar proxy to the right-of-way if we were to use the  
23 assumption the Chairwoman had asked, which is a line from  
24 Beseck to East Shore?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Nice redirect, Mr. Prete,  
2 you should get a percentage. (Laughter).

3 MR. PRETE: I've been after that for a  
4 while.

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I -- I -- I believe --  
6 well, I believe it will be close. I'm not going to  
7 testify that that would be the worst case. That's the  
8 issue.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. I'm going to have  
10 you all think on that one.

11 MR. TAIT: Because our danger here is  
12 we're talking without people in the room --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right.

14 MR. TAIT: -- and we're just switching  
15 EMFs from one side of the State to the other and not  
16 gaining any ground -- unless we are gaining ground. And  
17 we're talking in a vacuum and it bothers me.

18 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Can we -- can we  
19 discuss this in more detail tonight --

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and then first thing  
22 tomorrow morning --

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- maybe we can report



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 back to you, the Commission, and we'll give you our  
2 thoughts as to what we can and can't do --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: That would be an excellent  
4 idea --

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- as opposed to making  
6 promises here --

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and having to sit  
9 here and say we didn't deliver.

10 MR. ASHTON: Just one other question.  
11 We've used the term right-of-way pretty indiscreetly.  
12 Some of the right --

13 MR. TAIT: Indiscriminately.

14 MR. ASHTON: Indiscriminately, thank you -  
15 - (laughter) -- it's also indiscreetly --

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I'm glad you don't  
17 correct my English -- (laughter) -- we wouldn't have time  
18 for any other testimony.

19 MR. TAIT: I was tempted one or two times.

20 MR. ASHTON: I want you to know it's tough  
21 being a Council member at times. The right-of-way from  
22 Beseck to East Shore, is that a right-of-way or is that  
23 fee owned outright?

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: To the best of my

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 knowledge that is a -- that is an easement.

2 MR. ASHTON: It's an easement and not fee  
3 owned?

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's -- to the best  
5 of my knowledge, but I will double check that.

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Great, we'll expect that  
7 report --

8 MR. ASHTON: How about --

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- tomorrow morning too.

10 MR. ASHTON: How about the right-of-way  
11 from Beseck to -- well if you go to Haddam Substation all  
12 the way, that's a right-of-way, is it not, an easement?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe the answer to  
14 that is yes.

15 MR. ASHTON: And how about from Black Pond  
16 Junction to Scovill, is that an easement or fee owned?

17 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I'd have to double  
18 check it --

19 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and get you an  
21 answer on that.

22 MR. ASHTON: There is a difference in the  
23 title -- in the degree of control of the land, is there  
24 not between the two, fee owned and easement?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We -- that is correct.

2 And we will -- we will get a few answers to those in the  
3 morning.

4 MR. ASHTON: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. O'Neill.

6 MR. O'NEILL: Yes. While we're in the  
7 area of conductors, I was wondering if the Company has  
8 done any analysis of a type of -- of a new type of  
9 conductor called an ACCC conductor, which I understand  
10 uses aluminum and a composite core, thereby reducing EMFs  
11 significantly and creating a lighter conductor? If it's  
12 possible, if you haven't studied this, would you please  
13 give us some kind of report on this new technology?

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe -- I believe  
15 we've looked at those, Mr. O'Neill, and we can provide  
16 you with a document as to our sense of where the industry  
17 is --

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- but my understanding  
20 is that most of the industry is still focused on smaller  
21 conductor sizes, meaning the 556's and 336's as opposed  
22 to into the 1272's and those larger conductors --

23 MR. O'NEILL: Well --

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- but we -- we will

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 clarify that.

2 MR. O'NEILL: And if you could reflect  
3 upon it in the aspect of the 115 as well as the 345, it  
4 would be appreciated.

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We will try to do that,  
6 Mr. O'Neill.

7 MR. O'NEILL: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Back to you,  
9 Miss Kohler.

10 MS. KOHLER: Thank you. Miss Mango, back  
11 to our discussion about the environmental impacts along  
12 the East Shore route, in fact one of the basis for  
13 finding the East Shore route to be unacceptable was the  
14 vegetative clearing required. Is that accurate?

15 MS. MANGO: Well, my understanding is that  
16 there were reliability issues and other issues associated  
17 with it. And also the fact that once one gets to East  
18 Shore, one has to go west and there's some issues there,  
19 how to go west. But the vegetative clearing was a thing  
20 that -- was one factor environmentally that immediately  
21 stands out because although the right-of-way as an  
22 easement we think is wide, there is no other line as  
23 there is say for example from Cook Hill Junction to East  
24 Devon where there's two existing lines -- three existing

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 lines in fact that would be removed and replaced by two.

2 Here -- and that Cook Hill Junction to East Devon is  
3 maintained already. In the case of the 387 line there's  
4 only one H-frame and we would have to add another  
5 structure of some type. So clearing would definitely be  
6 required, including this whole wooded area around Lake  
7 Saltonstall.

8 MS. KOHLER: So the answer to my question  
9 is yes --

10 MS. MANGO: Yes --

11 MS. KOHLER: -- clearing was one of the  
12 basis --

13 MS. MANGO: -- that would be a long  
14 answer, yes. But it wasn't the only factor.

15 MS. KOHLER: I think we might be in the  
16 period of the crisp answer/crisp question point of the  
17 day.

18 Yesterday we talked about the distinction  
19 between vegetative clearing and forested or woody  
20 clearing. And it was my understanding from our dialogue  
21 that vegetative clearing was sort of a global term and  
22 forested or woody clearing was a more specific term. Is  
23 that accurate?

24 MS. MANGO: Yes.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: Okay. And your testimony  
2 states that 150 acres of clearing would be necessary for  
3 the entire East Shore route. And you note that this  
4 amount includes tree clearing in the Lake Saltonstall  
5 area. However, in this morning's presentation it was  
6 indicated that 150 acres of trees would be removed  
7 specifically in the area of Lake Saltonstall.

8 MS. MANGO: I think Mr. Welter can answer  
9 this better --

10 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: No, let me clarify that  
11 presentation. The number we use in that presentation was  
12 for the entire 387 route, not just for Lake Saltonstall.  
13 So, I apologize if it appeared that that was the case.

14 MS. KOHLER: So in the testimony that  
15 talks about 150 acres of vegetative clearing including  
16 tree removal, this morning's presentation talked about  
17 150 acres of tree removal?

18 MS. MANGO: We're talking about 150 acres  
19 of forestland comparable to the 97 or some acres of  
20 forestland that we've identified as estimated to be  
21 removed along the proposed route, the entire proposed  
22 route. So it's not shrub/scrub vegetation, this is --  
23 based on the aerial review that we've done, forested  
24 vegetation only.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: Okay, so in the testimony  
2 when it talks about 150 acres of clearing including tree  
3 removal --

4 MS. MANGO: Including tree removal around  
5 Lake Saltonstall, these are the trees. We're not talking  
6 about a Blueberry Bush, you know, habitat, you know  
7 Dogwood habitat. We're talking about tall trees.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So if there was a second  
9 line next to the 387, more trees near Lake Saltonstall  
10 would have to be removed?

11 MS. MANGO: More trees in general --

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

13 MS. MANGO: -- 60 more acres of trees or,  
14 you know, 53 more, or whatever it was -- 157 minus 97, or  
15 whatever it was -- 150 minus 97 --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And some of those would be  
17 on the watershed lands?

18 MS. MANGO: Yes. The forested area around  
19 Lake Saltonstall was simply called out in the prefiled  
20 testimony as an example because that particular area is  
21 all mature forest.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. Mr. Lord is in the  
23 room. If you could just tell your witness and we'll  
24 explore that tomorrow. Thank you.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: If -- if you could just look  
2 at your -- because now I'm a little confused -- if you  
3 could just look at the prefiled testimony on page 15, the  
4 very last answer, the description of clearing talks about  
5 the existing right-of-way and not just the Lake  
6 Saltonstall area. At the very bottom of page 15, it says  
7 because the existing right-of-way only accommodates one  
8 345-kV line and one 115-kV line, additional vegetation  
9 clearing would be required.

10 MS. MANGO: Yes, I see that. And I guess  
11 I would have to say that that was slightly poorly  
12 written, because my understanding from the calculations  
13 that Burns and McDonnell has done was that it would be 150  
14 acres of forestland, which is the comparison that we made  
15 to the information we have in the application for the  
16 proposed route, the 97 acres of forestland.

17 MS. KOHLER: Okay. Some of the criteria  
18 that you found to be a valid basis for concerns about  
19 this East Shore route is its proximity to certain  
20 sensitive receptors. One of the reasons that were cited  
21 as the basis for the East Shore route being objectionable  
22 is the result in proximity of the new 345-kV line to a  
23 school. Is an -- is opposing an East Shore route, you  
24 agree, that proximity to a school is a valid basis not to



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 construct a transmission --

2 MR. FITZGERALD: I'm going to -- I'm going  
3 to object to the premise to that question. There was a  
4 presentation made that provided data. I think it's an  
5 unfair characterization of the record to say that we have  
6 voiced -- or that anybody in that presentation stated an  
7 objection to the East Shore route based on any of that  
8 proximity data. That was data that is statutorily  
9 relevant and it was provided, but I think the only  
10 objection to the East Shore route that has been expressed  
11 by the companies is one related to reliability.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Why don't we --

13 MS. KOHLER: Maybe --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- rephrase the question -  
15 -

16 MS. KOHLER: -- maybe my characterization  
17 of objection is -- I can rephrase it, but on page 28 of  
18 the prefiled testimony it talks about three reasons that  
19 -- reasons that it perhaps should not be constructed. It  
20 says that a 345-kV line could be constructed along the  
21 387 right-of-way between Beseck and East Shore, however  
22 such an alignment would abut at least one school,  
23 traverse residential areas, would require substantial  
24 clearing of forested vegetation within the right-of-way.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1       So if the forested vegetation clearing was one basis for  
2 concern, the second -- another basis for concern was the  
3 alignment that would abut at least one school?

4               MS. MANGO: I think what we were trying to  
5 explain here is that the 387 line has many  
6 characteristics that are not completely unlike the  
7 proposed route. So it's not as though we looked at this  
8 route and it was all prairie land and it was so startling  
9 different than the proposed route. The proposed route  
10 has some residential areas, the 387 line has residential  
11 areas. You know, the 387 line goes into New Haven. You  
12 know, the proposed route goes into some developed  
13 portions of other areas. We have forested areas, we have  
14 some schools that are in proximity. So, I think all  
15 we're trying to say here is, you know, not that schools  
16 were an ultimate criteria, they were certainly one that  
17 the companies looked at, but just simply to give the  
18 Council and the other parties an idea that this route is  
19 just not startling different on sort of a surrounding  
20 land use basis from the proposed route, so that's --  
21 that's all.

22               MS. KOHLER: But -- but back to my  
23 question about -- because you've cited it --

24               MR. TAIT: (Indiscernible) -- show a chart

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 --

2 MS. KOHLER: -- as being a basis for  
3 concern, do you agree that proximity to a school is an  
4 area of concern for a 345-kV line?

5 MS. MANGO: Well --

6 MR. FITZGERALD: Objection --

7 MS. MANGO: -- I don't think I could say  
8 that.

9 MR. TAIT: It's a statutorily required  
10 indicator. Didn't you folks put on a chart of comparing  
11 -- do we have that in hard copy yet?

12 A VOICE: No --

13 MR. PRETE: It's being printed.

14 MR. TAIT: Okay. Because that tells us --

15 A VOICE: Yes --

16 MR. TAIT: -- because that's my problem,  
17 Miss Kohler, is that we're having a whole new route that  
18 has similar problems to the old route, and you're asking  
19 us to choose somebody else's route, and they aren't here.

20 MR. PRETE: Mr. Tait, I think the basis of  
21 our decision in October not to have the 387 line, the  
22 route as a viable alternative stands clear here as well,  
23 that when you look in comparison, as Miss Mango has  
24 stated, there's 50 percent more wooded vegetation, trees

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 that need to be cleared. In addition, there are  
2 operational and reliability issues as you get to East  
3 Shore and even to get to East Devon because you have to  
4 go underground, you can't simply go, as you know, across  
5 New Haven. And thirdly, the cost is approximately twice  
6 as much. And the companies in looking at the balances  
7 that we're statutorily required to look at do not see any  
8 benefits that over-weigh on a balance basis a doubling of  
9 costs. And that's all we're trying to present.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Let's --

11 MR. TAIT: A chart to that effect  
12 including the costs might be of interest to the Council.

13 MR. PRETE: Yes, sir.

14 MR. TAIT: This morning's was just the  
15 physical comparison.

16 MR. PRETE: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Why don't we note the  
18 proximity to the school and move on.

19 MS. KOHLER: The -- the -- all of this  
20 last discussion is assuming that the second line would be  
21 required. Let's assume that the second line is not  
22 required, is it true to say that the 150 acres of  
23 forested removal would not be required?

24 MS. MANGO: I would imagine so. I mean

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 it's not something that I looked at.

2 MS. KOHLER: Even if you were simply  
3 reconductoring the existing line?

4 MS. MANGO: One would imagine that that  
5 would be the case.

6 MS. KOHLER: Okay.

7 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I would --

8 MS. KOHLER: And --

9 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- I would want to make  
10 certain we clearly understand. When you say simply  
11 reconductoring the existing line, the magnitude and the  
12 time it's going to take to reconductor and change out  
13 structures on the 387 line, which is the only source feed  
14 down to that area, and the uplift costs that are going to  
15 be incurred by Connecticut ratepayers has not been  
16 estimated. And it is far going to surpass in my judgment  
17 the cost of building the second 345-kV line.

18 You know, it's like pumping \$9,000.00 into  
19 an 18-year-old vehicle. Which are you better off doing,  
20 buying a brand new vehicle with a 100,000-mile warranty  
21 or pumping all of that money into it. And all I'm saying  
22 is to reconductor as you're proposing the 387 line from  
23 Scovill to Black Pond, and in addition, as I hear it, you  
24 want to reconductor the 387 line from Black Pond down to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 East Shore, while that is taking place there is no 345  
2 connection any longer down to the New Haven area. We're  
3 already strapped presently because of overloads and now  
4 you're taking out another 345 line for months upon end to  
5 reconductor. And when you're all through, we still have  
6 a single line that's loaded at 85 or 82 percent, you can  
7 argue the difference of whether it's 82 or 97 because  
8 I've reconducted now, but I've got a line that when it  
9 fails, I have to reconductor another 60 miles or so of  
10 345 and 115-kV lines to make this work.

11 So, I -- I just want to jump in here with  
12 the statement that we need to look at what was filed in  
13 the testimony -- and I think if you go into the Southwest  
14 Connecticut studies that were -- which -- what's the date  
15 on that one -- that Mr. Ball spoke to --

16 A VOICE: February 18<sup>th</sup> --

17 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- the February 18<sup>th</sup>  
18 Southwest Connecticut study and you go look at some of  
19 the tables that Mr. Ball led us to -- I think he led us  
20 to tables 3 and 4 -- well, 3 and 4 have a New England  
21 transfer to New York of zero. That is not realistic,  
22 folks. The transfer limit between New York and New  
23 England is approximately 900 megawatts today from New  
24 England to New York. And from New York back to New

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 England it's in the 13 to 1400-megawatt range. And those  
2 tables that reflect the overloads are shown I believe in  
3 Table 6. And we ought to be looking at what is the  
4 realistic flows on those lines. And when you look at  
5 those, you see the loading on the 387 line go up  
6 significantly. And we need to not only put in a line  
7 that's going to last you the twenty-seven seven case we  
8 spoke to could reach twenty-seven seven in New England  
9 and 205 and 206, with the slowest growth rate it would be  
10 210, 211 -- and that's the ISO forecast -- so we're going  
11 to build a line that when you get all through spending  
12 all of this money and all of the uplift charges, it's not  
13 going to be capable any longer and we're going to be  
14 building another 60 or 70 miles of 115-kV line and other  
15 345-kV lines because they also overload now.

16 I think what we're trying to do here when  
17 we're all through is come up with a solution that myself  
18 and my predecessors, and hopefully my predecessors all  
19 the time are not before this Council looking to build  
20 additional 345 and 115-kV lines, because every time we go  
21 in now and we say we need to rebuild this 115 line from  
22 location A to location B, we're going to be going through  
23 all of this all over again. And clearly the majority of  
24 our 115 lines are closer to residents and other areas of

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 concern, and some of the 345 lines, and we're going to  
2 have the EMF issues on every one of these reconductoring  
3 or replacement of structures and upgrades. So, I think  
4 we also need to keep in the back of our minds what are we  
5 -- what are we trying to do here with a solution. And I  
6 hope we all are in agreement we're looking for a long-  
7 term solution and not a solution where we're going to be  
8 back here before the line is even constructed to build  
9 other sections of the line to make it work. So sorry for  
10 the interruption.

11 MR. PRETE: I agree with Roger.

12 MS. KOHLER: I think that's --

13 MS. RANDELL: And just -- at the risk of  
14 being accused of being too picky, I think, Mr. Zak, you  
15 meant successors.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

17 MR. TAIT: I refrained --

18 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I don't know what they  
19 are --

20 MR. TAIT: I refrained, Miss Randell --  
21 (laughter) --

22 MR. PRETE: I still agree with Roger.

23 MS. KOHLER: That's --

24 MR. ASHTON: I got a kick under the table.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: That's the last time I use  
2 the word simply. (Laughter).

3 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I -- I apologize.

4 MS. KOHLER: In the -- from East Shore to  
5 East Devon under-grounding the 345-kV line is described  
6 as challenging. Is it feasible?

7 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Feasible to construct  
8 or feasible to operate after it's built?

9 MS. KOHLER: I apologize. Feasible to  
10 construct?

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think -- in all the  
12 cases we've laid out some routes which we have not turned  
13 around and spoken specifically with the chief elected  
14 officials in each one of those towns. We selected some -  
15 - what we thought were straight routes. I believe Mr.  
16 Prete testified yesterday that there has been no  
17 communications. We are not aware of some of the  
18 infrastructure that is beneath the macadam on all of  
19 those streets. And I'm not certain we can answer that at  
20 this time of whether it's feasible or not feasible to  
21 build some of the underground even under the routes that  
22 we've looked at and said from a routing standpoint here's  
23 where there's four lanes, here's where we think we could  
24 build the cable. So, I'm not even certain we can say

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 with certainty of how you would get from East Shore to  
2 East Devon. And I think we would want the input from the  
3 chief elected officials in those towns for which  
4 underground would be constructed in those towns.

5 MR. PRETE: I would add that in my  
6 experience in digging in New Haven, which I was before  
7 the Council about four years ago, New Haven being as old  
8 as it is has infrastructure that dates a hundred years  
9 back. And in the pipe type cable project that we had,  
10 oftentimes we were digging 12, 15 feet deep just to get  
11 under tunnels and things of that nature. So to say  
12 challenging and feasible, I would say it's going to be  
13 very difficult at the very, very best. And as Mr. Zak  
14 has stated, I think we'd have to go almost entirely  
15 around New Haven to get there, and we do not have a route  
16 that we've talked with the appropriate officials of the  
17 city at this point in time.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about the Route 95  
19 corridor?

20 MR. PRETE: I would say that that would  
21 approach infeasible. The corridor on 95 through New  
22 Haven and West Haven is, quite frankly, raised. In a lot  
23 of cases raised to the point where many roads go  
24 underneath them. Our conversations with C-DOT in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 attaching to an exiting bridge, quite frankly have gone  
2 no where and for the right reasons, they haven't designed  
3 the bridge to accommodate the weight. The pipe itself  
4 expands to unbelievable degrees absent that of the bridge  
5 itself. So, I would say that that would probably border  
6 on infeasible.

7 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Miss Kohler, have the  
8 towns given the companies a possible underground route  
9 that you'd like them to look at?

10 MS. KOHLER: I believe we've given the  
11 companies an itemization of what we've asked GE to study,  
12 which --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No, I mean an actual route  
14 to get from East Shore to East Devon?

15 MR. PRETE: Like I say, I haven't received  
16 anything.

17 MS. KOHLER: We -- we can -- I believe we  
18 can look at it, but I think it's fair to say that it's  
19 along -- under Route 1 --

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

21 MS. KOHLER: -- is the route.

22 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Prete, perhaps you know,  
23 insofar as you build a three-cable -- a three-circuit  
24 cable system, if you will, what kind of width -- and I'd

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1       assume it would be all side-by-side rather than stacked  
2       because of heat transfer issues, what kind of width would  
3       that involve, roughly?

4                   MR. PRETE:  Roughly, I would say the width  
5       would approach 12 feet.  And I would probably be in the  
6       position to say that will be two separate trenches when  
7       you get to a design of that nature going through city  
8       streets --

9                   MR. ASHTON:  In other words, it would be  
10      kind of hard to cut a 12-foot wide trench through any of  
11      these city streets, is that your feeling -- what you're  
12      saying?

13                  MR. PRETE:  Without losing many cars and  
14      things of that nature, that would be very difficult.

15                  CHAIRMAN KATZ:  Well, let's just for the  
16      sake of overturning stones, let's assume Route 1 is the  
17      underground route from East Shore to East Devon, can we  
18      get something from the companies that indicate the pros  
19      and cons of that?

20                  MR. ASHTON:  And the town?

21                  CHAIRMAN KATZ:  And the towns?

22                  MR. FITZGERALD:  And perhaps the  
23      Department of Transportation.

24                  CHAIRMAN KATZ:  And perhaps -- excellent.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Route 1, I think that's an excellent idea.

2 MS. KOHLER: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: This is June, people. We  
4 need to start nailing things down here.

5 MR. PRETE: We will approach the City of  
6 New Haven since that's the area that is most in question  
7 --

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

9 MR. PRETE: -- and find out what their  
10 views are --

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay --

12 MR. PRETE: -- I think they supported our  
13 project just to go on record.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. But I mean if there  
15 are ideas that don't work and we should be tossing them,  
16 let's determine that. If there are ideas that may work,  
17 let's flesh them out.

18 MS. KOHLER: From the testimony that was  
19 presented in Segments 3 and 4, it's evident that the  
20 companies have found some suitable ways to overcome  
21 challenging construction issues. Is it true that the  
22 same creativity could be employed in constructing the  
23 East Shore route?

24 MR. PRETE: I'll answer that question by

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 just looking back over the last six weeks, so that would  
2 be yes.

3 MS. KOHLER: Based upon your presentation  
4 this morning, under the proposed route 436 houses would  
5 be within 150 feet of the proposed 345-kV line. And the  
6 proposed route would also impact 26 sensitive areas as  
7 designated by the recent legislation that are within 1200  
8 feet of the proposed 345-kV line.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: I would object to the  
10 term impact. The -- the -- what has been stated is that  
11 they would be within a certain proximity. We -- we do  
12 not accept the verb impact.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, let's go with  
14 proximity.

15 MS. KOHLER: That -- however, from the  
16 presentation it seems clear that the East Shore route  
17 that implements the all underground East Shore to East  
18 Devon -- I was going to say significantly less impact --  
19 but is in significantly less proximity to homes and  
20 sensitive areas. Is it true that the number of impacted -  
21 - the number of homes in proximity to the 345-kV line  
22 would be cut in half from 436 to 226?

23 MR. PRETE: Those were the numbers that  
24 were provided.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. KOHLER: And in the East Shore --  
2 using the East Shore route, the number of sensitive areas  
3 is also cut in half from 26 to 13?

4 MR. WELTER: Yeah, those were the numbers,  
5 but -- this is Cyril Welter --

6 MR. TAIT: This is the document we don't  
7 yet have --

8 AUDIO TECHNICIAN: Hang on a second --

9 MS. KOHLER: This was the presentation  
10 this morning.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

12 MR. WELTER: The only comment is that that  
13 was quantified for overhead. There would still be  
14 businesses and facilities and residences along all these  
15 underground routes that would be affected during the  
16 construction of the line.

17 MR. PRETE: And I have to add that the  
18 numbers in what you're providing is fine, and they are  
19 numbers, and we need to keep in mind the fact that this  
20 adds a minimum of six miles of underground even in the  
21 hybrid situation, which would be considered porpoising.  
22 In addition to the fact that if it was all underground,  
23 it would be an additional 13. And when we talk about  
24 constructibility, the fact of the matter is we must

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 always talk about the reliability and operability of the  
2 system. So again just a statement to make sure that we're  
3 --

4 MR. FITZGERALD: But that's -- but that's  
5 for another day, Mr. Prete.

6 MS. KOHLER: Right. That's -- that's all  
7 the questions I have.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Next, Mr.  
9 Boucher.

10 MR. EMERICK: Madam Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes, Mr. Emerick, while  
12 we're changing out the table.

13 MR. EMERICK: Mr. Prete, just very  
14 quickly, in terms of the configuration of under-grounding  
15 from East Shore to Devon, what would that be, what would  
16 the configuration look like?

17 MR. PRETE: When you're talking about the  
18 configuration, it would have to include three cable  
19 systems, cable lines, three-phase cables between East  
20 Shore and East Devon.

21 MR. EMERICK: The difference between Devon  
22 and Norwalk?

23 MR. PRETE: Yes, Devon to Norwalk, as Mr.  
24 Zak had testified yesterday, would be two.



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. EMERICK: Two.

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The transfer between  
3 East Devon and East Shore, or East Devon and Beseck,  
4 requires the same 1200-megawatt capability taking into  
5 account a contingency of one of those cables, so you need  
6 three cables, Mr. Emerick.

7 MR. EMERICK: Three cables, okay. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Boucher.

10 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.  
11 I'd like to start with the loop around Royal Oak that was  
12 the subject of the presentation this morning.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Is that loop entirely in  
14 Durham or does that cross the town line, the jog around  
15 Royal Oak?

16 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: It's not a loop. It's -  
17 - I was going to call it a bypass.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: A bypass.

19 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: And is it -- your  
20 question is, is it all in Durham?

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

22 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: No. Actually, the Royal  
23 Oak neighborhood is kind of split in half with the  
24 southerly half in Durham and the northerly half in

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Middletown. North of the Royal Oak neighborhood is where  
2 there is the mature hardwood forest, that would be in  
3 Middletown. I believe it is -- this entire bypass would  
4 be in Middletown.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, thank you.

6 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you --

7 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Middlefield --

8 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I'm sorry. And once you  
9 cross -- once you cross 17 --

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: You're in Middlefield -  
11 -

12 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- you're in  
13 Middlefield.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, understood.

15 COURT REPORTER: One moment.

16 (Pause)

17 A VOICE: Madam Chairman, do you want us  
18 to do it on the wall or something, so when you talk about  
19 it --

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No, we're going to --

21 A VOICE: -- you guys can see it?

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We're going to ask you for  
23 a little more on this, so that's alright.

24 MR. BOUCHER: Alright. Has the company or

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the Applicants determined how many homes would be passed  
2 or that would be abutted by that particular route?

3 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I guess I would need ask  
4 you what you mean by abut before I can answer your  
5 question.

6 MR. BOUCHER: Well to the extent the route  
7 has been delineated, has the company figured out how many  
8 lots it would either cross or homes it would be nearby?

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: From the -- from the  
10 aerial photograph, the -- in Middletown it goes through a  
11 hardwood forest, through the middle of that forest.  
12 Certainly there are properties in Royal Oak that also  
13 abut the hardwood forest. I would have to do a scale to  
14 tell you how many feet their property line edge is from  
15 where we might be able to put this bypass in, but the new  
16 right-of-way area that we're looking at --

17 MR. FITZGERALD: I think you -- in the  
18 presentation this morning you spoke of -- forget about  
19 property lines, the question is -- I think Mr. Boucher is  
20 asking about structures, and what can you say from what  
21 you know so far about the proximity of structures to what  
22 would be the new right-of-way?

23 A VOICE: Maybe less than half a dozen.

24 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Less than half a dozen.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 And they might be structures.

2 MR. TAIT: Are these residential  
3 structures or structures -- are these structures or are  
4 these residential structures?

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Two are commercial,  
6 four are residential.

7 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Right. Two are  
8 commercial and four would be residential.

9 MR. TAIT: Thank you.

10 MR. BOUCHER: Now is this -- is this  
11 bypass something the companies are now currently taking a  
12 look at?

13 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: In an effort to answer  
14 Chairman Katz's questions, we started thinking out of the  
15 box and this is one of the alternatives, one of the  
16 routes that we looked at. And we will provide -- with  
17 today's presentation will be an aerial photograph of just  
18 what we showed this morning. And to answer Chairman  
19 Katz's question, there's a couple of modifications on the  
20 west end to answer the Chairman's questions from this  
21 morning.

22 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. Now is that  
23 presentation something that's going to be submitted --

24 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: It will be filed in the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 morning.

2 MR. BOUCHER: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Boucher, the Council  
4 staff is developing interrogatories on the Royal Oak  
5 bypass and we'll be getting into that in the July --  
6 probably the July hearings --

7 MR. BOUCHER: Alright --

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- we'll take some time.

9 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you.

10 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Excuse me, I've been  
11 told that the data file for this electronic filing is too  
12 big to e-mail, so that we would ask -- we can provide a  
13 disk to anyone who would like these aerial photographs.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Understood.

15 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you.

16 MR. ASHTON: Can I ask one more question  
17 in that vein? In laying out the bypass, you had the  
18 bypass returning to the existing right-of-way more or  
19 less parallel to Route 17 and immediately west of it  
20 behind those structures that are on west -- that are on  
21 the west side of 17. If the bypass was continued to just  
22 where -- roughly where the greenhouse is as you  
23 characterized it, a little further to the west, wouldn't  
24 that leave a little -- wouldn't that make it so it's not

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 right up against the structures, the old former mission  
2 station and so forth, there would be a little clearance  
3 between the line --

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes --

5 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Correct --

6 MR. ASHTON: -- and those structures  
7 lining 17?

8 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: In the drawing that we  
9 will file tomorrow, we'll include that exact  
10 configuration.

11 MR. ASHTON: Okay, thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Great. So we will get the  
13 -- the Council staff will get those interrogatories out  
14 on the Royal Oak bypass. And I highly encourage Durham,  
15 Middlefield and Middletown to respond to those and tell  
16 us what you think of that concept.

17 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.  
18 I -- would I be correct in assuming that that bypass from  
19 a reliability standpoint would be just as reliable as the  
20 preferred route?

21 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: That's correct.

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes.

23 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. I have a few  
24 questions about the northerly route that was also the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 subject of this morning's presentation. My first  
2 question is whether that so-called northerly route that  
3 was discussed, is that basically leaving what's there  
4 there, the same number of conductors?

5 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Leaving what where  
6 where? (Laughter). Sorry.

7 MR. BOUCHER: I was hoping you wouldn't  
8 ask that. My understanding is that that -- the so-called  
9 northerly route is an alternative to what the proposed  
10 route is comprised of as it goes through Durham?

11 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Both -- both this Durham  
12 bypass and use of the northerly route would not change  
13 the existing 115 structures that exist in Durham and  
14 Middlefield today.

15 MR. BOUCHER: Okay, okay. And -- and  
16 that's very helpful for me to understand. Now is that  
17 configuration you've just described what was indicated as  
18 being something which would be -- would meet the  
19 pertinent reliability criteria? I'm referring to a  
20 question from Council Member Emerick, who I believe asked  
21 the question as to whether that configuration would meet  
22 the pertinent or applicable reliability criteria, and I  
23 thought the answer was yes.

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The answer is still

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 yes.

2 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you. With regard to  
3 the East Shore presentation that was done this morning as  
4 well, the -- I understand that the presentation materials  
5 only presented that configuration from the Beseck  
6 Substation and south in terms of the presentation  
7 materials themselves, it didn't -- it didn't include  
8 anything north of the Beseck Substation?

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: That's correct, because  
10 north of Beseck Substation would not change from the  
11 proposed route.

12 MR. BOUCHER: Alright.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Switching station.

14 (Laughter).

15 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Excuse me. Thank you.

16 MR. PRETE: Beseck.

17 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. My -- my request is  
18 that could we have a representation of that material that  
19 would include the northerly segment that was not included  
20 but that would reflect the same data information, meaning  
21 the number of homes within one to one hundred and fifty  
22 feet, and the data that's presented in that presentation  
23 for Beseck on south, so it would include the whole -- it  
24 would include the entire Segment 1 and 2 presented as the



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 East Shore alternative?

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Well --

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So you're looking for the  
4 same tables but for Segment 1 that they did for Segment  
5 2?

6 MR. BOUCHER: I'm not sure if that's the  
7 same thing.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, I think we've said  
9 that we're going to provide that information for the  
10 proposed route, right?

11 MR. PRETE: On Segment 2 that's correct,  
12 Mr. Fitzgerald.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So --

14 MR. BOUCHER: And I'm looking for what the  
15 companies -- what the company sees as the East Shore  
16 route, as what was presented this morning, but in fact it  
17 also includes the companies' preferred route north of  
18 where the northern terminus is of --

19 MR. PRETE: So any of the East Shore  
20 alternatives that we -- oh, boy, I slipped too -- any of  
21 the East Shore routes that we had presented assumes  
22 Segment 1 in place as proposed --

23 MR. BOUCHER: Right --

24 MR. PRETE: -- so there's no changes to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Segment 1 --

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: So you want --

3 MR. PRETE: -- on any of those --

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- an assumption that -- a  
5 northerly Segment 1 plus an East Shore route?

6 MR. BOUCHER: If that gets the information  
7 that was presented this morning to also include Durham,  
8 which is what my primary concern is, the same information  
9 relative to homes within the specified distances that  
10 were included in this morning's presentation --

11 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Let me see if I  
12 understand. We provided today some charts for Segment 2.  
13 And I think you're asking for those same charts to be  
14 done on Segment 1. That information has not been  
15 collected --

16 MR. BOUCHER: Right --

17 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- and it is not a  
18 simple task.

19 MR. BOUCHER: When was it done for Segment  
20 2?

21 MR. PRETE: It took the last two and a  
22 half to three weeks.

23 MR. BOUCHER: Right. Well, I think for  
24 the same reason that that information was important for

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Segment 2, it's important for the Council to have and the  
2 parties to have for Segment 1, so I'd request it.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Response?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: I need -- we need to talk  
5 before we can respond.

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about if we -- Mr.  
7 Boucher, you're going to be here tomorrow morning?

8 MR. BOUCHER: I'm sorry?

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: You're going to be here  
10 tomorrow morning?

11 MR. BOUCHER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about if we let them  
13 think about that overnight and we take that up tomorrow  
14 morning?

15 MR. BOUCHER: That's fine.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I'm putting that on the  
17 morning homework list of reports.

18 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. With regard to the  
19 East Shore presentation this morning there was a  
20 denomination of, quote/unquote, "public facilities".  
21 Could I understand what the definition that was used for  
22 that term is?

23 MR. PRETE: Actually, the column heading  
24 was HB 5418, it is the sensitive areas that were listed

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 in the --

2 MR. BOUCHER: In the public act?

3 MR. PRETE: Correct.

4 MR. BOUCHER: Okay.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Except for residential  
6 areas, which were not separately -- house -- numbers of  
7 houses were given as a total to provide kind of a feel  
8 for that, but we did not make the effort to say this many  
9 houses is one residential area, this many houses is  
10 another.

11 MR. BOUCHER: Thank you. The -- there's  
12 been several exhibits and presentations that have  
13 measured distances of residential structures from the  
14 line. Is there a standard means by which those  
15 measurements have been consistently undertaken as they've  
16 been filed in the various exhibits, including what came  
17 in this morning -- or the presentation rather which came  
18 in this morning?

19 MR. PRETE: Yes. Actually, there's two  
20 ways that I can recall. The first way was a request of  
21 the Council on the proposed route to give them a house  
22 count given a 3 milligauss and a 6 milligauss line in  
23 parallel to both sides of the right-of-way through  
24 Segment 1 and 2 of the proposed route. That was one

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 listing that we had given in a summary form and followed  
2 up in a heroic effort on a detailed basis before the  
3 hearing started this week. The one that we just did,  
4 given no definition in the bill and no EMF line so to  
5 speak, we put in a 150 proxy adjacent to the right-of-way  
6 for the various East Shore routes that we had presented  
7 in the presentation today. And those were the two ways  
8 that were done.

9 MR. BOUCHER: So --

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Maybe it would help if  
11 you explain what you meant by a proxy and why -- why you  
12 picked the 150 feet as a proxy?

13 MR. PRETE: The 150 foot was arrived at in  
14 looking at the 3 milligauss and 6 milligauss lines of the  
15 proposed route. It appeared -- and there's no science  
16 here -- it appeared that the 150 was a legitimate  
17 distance given all the sections and right-of-ways that  
18 were in both Segment 1 and 2, all cross-sections 1  
19 through 8. So as you look down there, the 150 appeared  
20 to be kind of the average so to speak or majority, and  
21 that's where the 150 came from.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: Of what?

23 MR. TAIT: Of what?

24 MR. FITZGERALD: The average or majority

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 of what?

2 MR. TAIT: 3 milligauss, 6 milligauss --

3 MR. PRETE: Three -- the 3 milligauss.

4 MR. BOUCHER: So are there -- are there  
5 indications in what you submitted either today or prior  
6 to today in which what you've measured are the distances  
7 to the right-of-way from the structures that are nearest  
8 by it?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: I don't understand that.

10 MR. PRETE: I'm not sure I understand your  
11 question totally.

12 MR. BOUCHER: In other words, if -- if the  
13 Council wanted to know either within the Durham proposed  
14 or preferred route or whatever, or along the East Shore,  
15 or along the northerly route, how close to the right-of-  
16 way that would be occupied by the line the structures are  
17 physically, is that information in the record?

18 MR. PRETE: No. That would -- that would  
19 be an effort that I'm not sure we could do anytime this  
20 year. What we did is tried to count the houses that fall  
21 within a one foot to 150 foot line from the right-of-way  
22 itself.

23 MR. BOUCHER: Okay.

24 A VOICE: The edge of the right-of-way.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. PRETE: From the edge of the right-of-  
2 way.

3 A VOICE: Correct.

4 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: I would like to add that  
5 our 400 scale maps are accurate maps and that provides  
6 you some way of looking at structures and edge of right-  
7 of-way and what's adjacent to that as your right-of-way.

8 MR. BOUCHER: Okay. Thank you, that's all  
9 I have at the moment.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Boucher.  
11 Mr. Stone.

12 MR. STONE: No questions.

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Stone says no  
14 questions. Mr. Burturla I believe left.

15 A VOICE: He left, he had no questions.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Mr. Burtula  
17 had no questions. The Town of Westport? Absent. The  
18 City of Meriden? They should have been here. Assistant  
19 Attorney General Michael Wertheimer?

20 MR. WERTHEIMER: No questions.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Wertheimer has no  
22 questions. The City of Bridgeport? Absent. The  
23 Communities for Responsible Energy, any questions?

24 A VOICE: No questions.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No questions they said.  
2 OCC, any questions? Absent. Woodlands Coalition, Mr.  
3 Golden?

4 A VOICE: No questions.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Golden said no  
6 questions. ISO New England, Mr. Macleod? Absent. DOT,  
7 Mr. Walsh?

8 MS. EILEEN MESKILL: I have no questions.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Miss Meskill? No  
10 questions. The Town of Fairfield? No questions. I  
11 believe Wilton and Weston we're all set on. Mr. Lord,  
12 any questions?

13 MR. ANDREW LORD: No questions.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: No questions. The Town of  
15 North Haven?

16 A VOICE: No questions.

17 CHAIRMAN KATZ: They said no questions.  
18 Ezra Academy, et al? No questions. Mr. Cunliffe.

19 MR. CUNLIFFE: If you were to construct a  
20 new line adjacent to the 387 line, would that affect the  
21 operation of 387?

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I do not believe it  
23 would. There may be a couple of angle structures where  
24 we would have to take day-to-day clearances to construct,



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 but on the whole the answer would be no.

2 MR. CUNLIFFE: Thank you. And are you  
3 aware of --

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: And that's with the  
5 exception of what we build coming into the substations,  
6 we would have cut-overs at that point.

7 MR. CUNLIFFE: Have you ever lost service  
8 to any of the three 345-kV lines between Chestnut  
9 Junction and Black Pond Junction?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Are you asking have we  
11 ever lost service at one time all of the lines or are you  
12 asking --

13 MR. CUNLIFFE: All at the same time?

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Not to my knowledge.

15 MR. CUNLIFFE: How about two of them?

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I -- I would have to  
17 check on that to see whether we had two faults basically  
18 at approximately the same time. I cannot answer that off  
19 the top of my head, Mr. Cunliffe. We will try to get you  
20 that answer.

21 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Zaklukiewicz, if a -- if  
22 there was a fire in a pasture or brush land crossed by  
23 these lines, is there any risk to the line? Has there  
24 been any industry experience of fire knocking these

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 transmission lines out?

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Anytime we've had a  
3 fire under the lines, we have been notified by the fire  
4 departments and we have -- we have removed the lines from  
5 service. In particular, we've done that a couple of  
6 times the lines coming out of Millstone.

7 MR. ASHTON: Can the products of  
8 combustion cause a line trip?

9 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, they can. They  
10 contaminate the insulators and you are subject to flash-  
11 over.

12 MR. RICHARD REED: Mr. Ashton, we have had  
13 experience --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Just --

15 MR. REED: -- the tanker crash on I-95 in  
16 Bridgeport did take out the transmission line to the  
17 Resco Plant --

18 MR. ASHTON: Thank you --

19 MR. REED: -- and it was combustible gas  
20 that we believe tripped the line out.

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: As a matter of fact, as  
22 you remind me of that, if you recall, I think it was  
23 about '91, the Life Star helicopter hit the transmission  
24 lines --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ASHTON: In Meriden --

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- in 362 and 342, they  
3 bounced off the west line, landed into the east line, and  
4 both lines were tripped out, shield wires pulled down.  
5 So to answer your question, two of the three lines were  
6 permanently removed with that -- and they were out for --  
7 close to -- close to a day as a result of that.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: ISO doesn't require you to  
9 -- in your reliability standards to have a plan for  
10 having something hit and having all the lines go out  
11 between Chestnut and Black Pond?

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That -- that would end  
13 up being a severe contingency --

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right, which you're  
15 allowed, correct? Not recommended, but you're allowed?

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Not recommended, but  
17 allowed. And you then have to study for and be prepared  
18 to act on that contingency and have systems in place to  
19 dump loads such that we do not impact the rest of New  
20 England or the rest of the northeast utility -- the  
21 Northeast electric power grid.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Understood.

23 MR. CUNLIFFE: What types of actions could  
24 you take under that extreme scenario?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Basically, the only  
2 thing -- the only choice you have is load shedding.

3 MR. CUNLIFFE: No other operational --

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Not -- not in the  
5 timeframe that's required for that severe a loss of the  
6 transmission system.

7 MR. ASHTON: And in fact a lot of that  
8 would be automatic, would it not, or probably?

9 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes, it would. I think  
10 what I meant by the statement, Mr. Ashton, was that we  
11 would have to make certain for that contingency that we  
12 have the load shedding in the proper locations. It  
13 doesn't do you any good to load shed up in the Stafford  
14 Springs area where I've got the deficiency in Southwest  
15 Connecticut. So we'd have to make certain we have the  
16 proper load shedding in the area of the state that would  
17 be most affected, which would be the loss of those  
18 transmission lines to the load in the southwest  
19 Connecticut part of the state.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But to load shed -- to  
21 have the scenario where you had to load shed, you'd have  
22 to lose all the lines, correct? If you kept one or two  
23 of the lines and lost one, then you wouldn't have to do  
24 load shedding?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe the answer to  
2 that would be we would be overloading other lines, we  
3 would be putting on gas turbines, quick start generation.  
4 And as long as it's not a peak load day where other  
5 generation is not available in Southwest Connecticut --

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right --

7 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- that would be a  
8 basis where we would have the 30 minutes to evaluate the  
9 system and pick it back up. We would not have an  
10 automatic overloading and a severe voltage depression,  
11 which would take out and initiate the load shedding for a  
12 total loss of the --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, so if --

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- of the interface.

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: If the plane crashes in  
16 and takes out all the lines, it shouldn't do it on a peak  
17 day -- (laughter) -- ideally?

18 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's correct --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- we would be into a  
21 voltage collapse situation.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. Mr. Emerick.

23 MR. EMERICK: Mr. Zak, just to clarify, in  
24 terms of existing conditions, we have three lines, if you

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 were to lose all those three lines today, you have those  
2 -- it would represent a severe contingency and you  
3 already have plans in place to address that?

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

5 MR. EMERICK: Thank you.

6 MR. CUNLIFFE: Is the common rights-of-way  
7 line outage an operating or a planning criteria?

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: It's a planning  
9 criteria.

10 MR. CUNLIFFE: And has NU used this  
11 planning criteria in the past?

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes. We're all  
13 required to as ourselves, along with CONVEX, along with  
14 the ISO, to study it and make certain we understand it in  
15 the planning phase and be prepared to operate under those  
16 conditions.

17 MR. CUNLIFFE: You testified earlier about  
18 the loss of the East Shore/Scovill Rock line. Has that  
19 ever been tripped or overloaded?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: It has tripped -- I can  
21 -- I can swear that it has tripped a number of times in  
22 the past --

23 MR. REED: Yes, the line has tripped a  
24 number of times due to lightning or miss-operation of

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 relays. It has tripped a number of times.

2 MR. CUNLIFFE: Has a study been done to --  
3 a load flow case study been done to confirm the Frost  
4 Bridge/Southington line outage if the East Shore/Scovill  
5 Rock line was overloading?

6 MR. SCARFONE: I don't understand that  
7 question concerning the Southington to Frost Bridge line.

8 MR. CUNLIFFE: Okay. If you lose the East  
9 Shore/Scovill Rock, there's testimony saying that the  
10 Frost Bridge/Southington line would be overloaded, is  
11 that right?

12 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

13 MR. CUNLIFFE: Okay. Has there been a  
14 study done to confirm that?

15 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, that's part of the  
16 PowerGEM studies.

17 MR. CUNLIFFE: It's part of the PowerGEM  
18 studies?

19 MR. SCARFONE: That's correct.

20 MR. CUNLIFFE: Alright, thank you.

21 MR. SCARFONE: I also want to point out  
22 also, sir, that in addition to the 329 line, there's also  
23 additional 115-kV lines that overload in those cases too,  
24 such as the Green Hill/Bochum line and the Southington to

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Mix Ave line.

2 MR. CUNLIFFE: And those are identified in  
3 the prefiled testimony, is that right?

4 MR. SCARFONE: Yes, they are --

5 MR. CUNLIFFE: Thank you --

6 MR. SCARFONE: -- they are in the prefiled  
7 testimony.

8 MR. CUNLIFFE: Those are my questions,  
9 Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. I'm also  
11 contemplating doing interrogatories on the concept of the  
12 Black Pond Substation and getting more information on  
13 that alternative --

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay --

15 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- and again we would take  
16 that up in July. Mr. Emerick.

17 MR. EMERICK: No further questions, thank  
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Heffernan.

20 MR. HEFFERNAN: No questions.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Murphy.

22 MR. MURPHY: No questions.

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Tait.

24 MR. TAIT: From this -- from this



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 morning's presentation, that northern route, at a minimum  
2 you'll be taking four homes? As a maximum you'll be  
3 taking eight homes?

4 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Well, it depends. For  
5 the eight homes -- the impact of eight homes is if you  
6 were to place a structure similar to what's there today -  
7 -

8 MR. TAIT: If you widen it 80 feet?

9 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Correct.

10 MR. TAIT: If you widen it 40 feet, it's  
11 four --

12 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Four homes. If you --  
13 if you do -- if you rebuild the entire right-of-way --

14 MR. TAIT: Oh, okay --

15 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: -- it's a different  
16 story. Now as another configuration choice, some of  
17 these homes are indeed grouped in close proximity to one  
18 another, and one thing you might do is look at rebuilding  
19 the three lines only for a few structures to eliminate  
20 having to acquire those homes.

21 MR. TAIT: Would you look into that  
22 alternative?

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We'll put that in with the  
24 Black Pond Substation interrogatory.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MS. BARTOSEWICZ: Certainly.

2 MR. TAIT: No further questions.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Ashton.

4 MR. ASHTON: A couple of questions. Mr.  
5 Prete, this morning when you were talking about the  
6 railroad, as I recall it, you said you had -- the  
7 structures had to be placed 12 foot off the outside rail,  
8 is that correct?

9 MR. PRETE: The closest face of the pole,  
10 correct.

11 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, okay. And I may have -  
12 - I heard something, I hope I got it right, and that is  
13 that you said there needs to be a 62-foot clearance from  
14 the conductor to the edge of the -- to the nearest  
15 structure on either side, is that correct?

16 MR. PRETE: That's pretty close, yes.

17 MR. ASHTON: And that's not using any  
18 compact construction or anything like that, is it?

19 MR. PRETE: It is not.

20 MR. ASHTON: And is 62 foot consistent  
21 with the clearance to structures on other rights-of-way?  
22 I thought we were down in the 52-foot range.

23 MR. PRETE: Could you point me where the  
24 52 might be, where your recollection is, because --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ASHTON: Well, I -- well, I'm -- I'm  
2 going from memory on the two -- the 362 and 348 circuits  
3 as they cross north of Meriden near where the Life Star  
4 helicopter crashed. My recollection is that there's 52  
5 or 50 -- 50 or 55 clearance from the conductor to the  
6 edge of the right-of-way on those. I don't know whether  
7 there's a slightly different standard between CL&P and UI  
8 in their construction practices.

9 MR. WELTER: Maybe I can inject something.  
10 Mr. Welter. Do you recall the vertical configuration we  
11 used when we were discussing the Route 15 study --

12 MR. ASHTON: Yes --

13 MR. WELTER: -- which is the standard 130-  
14 foot tall vertical with the arms on one side with a 120-  
15 foot wide or a 125-foot wide corridor, that's what we're  
16 talking about here. The centerline is defined by the  
17 conductors themselves --

18 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

19 MR. WELTER: -- so going from that if you  
20 had 125-foot wide corridor that you wanted, it's 62 and a  
21 half to either side.

22 MR. ASHTON: Okay.

23 MR. WELTER: And most of those railroads  
24 are around 60 -- 60, 70 feet based on --

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ASHTON: I recognize the railroad  
2 right-of-way is much narrower --

3 MR. WELTER: Yeah --

4 MR. ASHTON: -- than what is normally  
5 required for a high voltage line, but I was a little bit  
6 surprised by the 62, I thought it was lower than that.

7 Mr. Zaklukiewicz, in your second diagram,  
8 which is the one that has the loop as proposed, in just  
9 staring at it, I wondered why you chose not to bring the  
10 387 line and switch it at Beseck Substation also? It  
11 bypasses Beseck.

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Sure. One of -- one of  
13 the reasons for that was the -- was the total loss of  
14 Beseck Substation --

15 MR. ASHTON: No, I think --

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- as one option from a  
17 severe contingency. If I do that, I still have the  
18 Scovill to East Shore path --

19 MR. ASHTON: Total loss I can understand,  
20 but that was a -- that was a --

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: A second --

22 MR. ASHTON: -- a criterion that I'm not  
23 familiar with. Is that's something that's popped up  
24 recently, a total loss of a substation?

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: No, that's been since  
2 I've been with NPCC for, I don't know, the last 15 years  
3 or more --

4 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- that been part of A2  
6 --

7 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- the planning  
9 criteria --

10 MR. ASHTON: Okay. So that would explain  
11 --

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- Mr. Ashton, for that  
13 one. The second item is that as you make -- as you put  
14 in the Beseck to East Shore line, if you were to tap it  
15 in at that point, I think what we'll -- what we'll see or  
16 we saw on preliminary studies is that the overloads that  
17 occur on some of the cable systems were on the faults  
18 because you made East Shore now so strong --

19 MR. ASHTON: Okay --

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- and you have a line  
21 now between East Shore and Beseck that creates additional  
22 problems.

23 MR. ASHTON: Does the loss of substation -  
24 - the loss of an entire substation dependent upon the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 configuration of breakers in the substation? For  
2 example, would a breaker and a half scheme be looked at  
3 in the same light as a ring bus scheme?

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: A breaker and a half  
5 scheme is, in my mind, much more reliable than an ring  
6 bus scheme.

7 MR. ASHTON: Would a loss -- a total loss  
8 of a substation apply in a case of a breaker and a half  
9 scheme?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think we need to look  
11 at it from a planning standpoint. The probability of the  
12 event occurring would be small.

13 MR. ASHTON: So is -- I don't mean to  
14 pressure you, but would that then not -- the criterion of  
15 a total loss of a station not apply for that instant, for  
16 that type of design?

17 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I -- I hate to say  
18 never is never after I saw Twixberry go down two years  
19 ago.

20 MR. ASHTON: Okay. I think -- no, I have  
21 nothing further. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Wilensky -- oh, gone -  
23 - Mr. Lynch.

24 MR. LYNCH: No questions.

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. O'Neill.

2 MR. O'NEILL: No questions, Madam

3 Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. My inclination is -  
5 - first, have -- have I called on everybody for cross-  
6 examination, did I miss anybody? Okay. My inclination  
7 is to do this, is to on Synapse swear in the witnesses  
8 and get the exhibits in and call it a day and start  
9 tomorrow morning with homework assignments and then  
10 cross-examination of Synapse. Is there any reason anyone  
11 can think of why we shouldn't do that? Mr. Fitzgerald?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: No reasons why --

13 CHAIRMAN KATZ: With Mr. Johnson out, so  
14 you're replacing him -- (laughter) --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: No, I'm not -- this is --  
16 this is in the nature of a friendly amendment rather than  
17 -- rather than an objection. The Synapse testimony has  
18 basically got two components to it, one of those  
19 components deals with the GE studies, okay. And my  
20 thought -- and I just want to make sure that I'm not  
21 getting it wrong -- my thought is that that whole subject  
22 is yet to come, so that the cross of Synapse --

23 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

24 MR. FITZGERALD: -- should just deal with

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 the rest of the testimony, which actually deals with East  
2 Shore.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I think that's a plan.  
4 Does anyone have an objection to that plan? Okay. So  
5 let's do this, why don't we go away and bring down  
6 Synapse --

7 A VOICE: Don't go away mad.

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, don't go away mad,  
9 just --

10 A VOICE: Just go away.

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: -- bring down Synapse,  
12 we'll get them sworn in, and we will verify their  
13 exhibits, and do -- well, we can verify all the exhibits,  
14 correct, since -- and who -- what attorney is going to be  
15 helpful for us on this? Miss Kohler, is this -- your  
16 witnesses? Who -- are these -- are these going to be  
17 your people?

18 MS. KOHLER: Mr. Lanzalotta and Mr.  
19 Schlissel are actually the Towns' witnesses.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes, but which attorney is  
21 going to be --

22 MS. KOHLER: I believe Mr. Ball is going  
23 to --

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Thank you. And they are



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 coming --

2 MR. BALL: They're coming.

3 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well while you're getting  
4 settled in, I had a suggestion from a Council member and  
5 please consider this, that where we're doing maps and  
6 things, you might want to consider in the future doing  
7 some type of base map and transparencies to show  
8 different scenarios. Just something to think about.

9 A VOICE: I'm sorry, are you talking to  
10 us?

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Everybody. Just something  
12 to consider. Okay, Mr. Ball, do you want to introduce  
13 your witnesses.

14 MR. BALL: Thank you, Chairman Katz.  
15 Sitting next to me is Mr. Schlissel. And next to him is  
16 Mr. Lanzalotta from Synapse. I believe there are two  
17 exhibits that they can authenticate, which are exhibits -  
18 -

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: First, let's --

20 MR. BALL: -- 7 and 8.

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: First, let's swear them  
22 in.

23 MR. MARCONI: Well could I ask first both  
24 of them, first of all, before they rise even is to state

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 their full names and spell them for the courtesy of the  
2 court reporter. Go ahead, sir.

3 MR. DAVID A. SCHLISSEL: My name is David  
4 Alan Schlissel, D-a-v-i-d, A-l-a-n, S-c-h-l-i-s-s-e-l.

5 MR. MARCONI: And you, sir?

6 MR. PETER J. LANZALOTTA: Peter J.  
7 Lanzalotta. And that's L-a-n-z-a-l-o-t-t-a.

8 MR. MARCONI: Okay, thank you. Now -- now  
9 you can stand. Okay. And please raise your right hand.

10 (Whereupon, David Schlissel and Peter  
11 Lanzalotta were duly sworn in.)

12 MR. MARCONI: Please be seated.

13 MR. BALL: Gentlemen, let me first direct  
14 your attention to what is listed as Towns' Exhibit No. 7,  
15 which is the Towns' Responses to Applicants'  
16 Interrogatories, Set 1, dated May 25, 2004. Did you  
17 participate in the preparation of that document?

18 MR. SCHLISSEL: Yes --

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: I'm sorry, what number  
20 exhibit?

21 MR. BALL: This is Exhibit 7.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: 7, thank you.

23 MR. LANZALOTTA: Yes.

24 MR. BALL: Is the document true and

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 correct to the best of your knowledge?

2 MR. SCHLISSEL: Yes.

3 MR. LANZALOTTA: Yes.

4 MR. BALL: I'll offer that.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Is there any objection to  
6 making No. 7 a full exhibit? Hearing none, it's a full  
7 exhibit.

8 (Whereupon, Towns' Exhibit No. 7 was  
9 received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

10 MR. BALL: And gentlemen, Exhibit No. 8 is  
11 the Prefiled Direct Testimony of David Schlissel and  
12 Peter Lanzalotta, dated May 25, 2004. Did you each  
13 participate in the preparation of that document?

14 MR. SCHLISSEL: Yes.

15 MR. LANZALOTTA: Yes.

16 MR. BALL: Do you have any revisions or  
17 corrections to that testimony?

18 MR. SCHLISSEL: We've got two small typos.  
19 The first one is on page 6, lines 3 and 4, the word  
20 between is between the wrong words -- (laughter). The --  
21 line 3, it currently says between Black Pond and between  
22 Beseck. It should be between Black Pond and Beseck and  
23 then the word between should be inserted before Scovill.

24 So the sentence should continue and between Scovill Rock

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 and Chestnut Junction.

2 MR. BALL: And subject to those --

3 MR. SCHLISSEL: No, there's one -- there's  
4 one more --

5 MR. BALL: There's another one --

6 MR. SCHLISSEL: -- one more small one.

7 Page 17, line 14, the first two words on it, that line  
8 currently says this line and it should be the plural, it  
9 should be these lines. And those are the two typos.

10 MR. BALL: Are there any other  
11 corrections? Subject to those revisions is the testimony  
12 true and correct to the best of your knowledge and  
13 belief?

14 MR. SCHLISSEL: Yes.

15 MR. LANZALOTTA: yes.

16 MR. BALL: I will offer the testimony as  
17 corrected.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: And this is 8, correct?

19 MR. BALL: That's Exhibit 8, yes.

20 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Any objection to making 8  
21 a full exhibit? Hearing none.

22 (Whereupon, Towns' Exhibit No. 8 was  
23 received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

24 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Ball, how would you

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 like to handle some of the other Town exhibits which are  
2 basically Town comments on various items in this record?

3 MR. BALL: I'll let Miss Kohler speak in  
4 one second. The -- Exhibit No. 10 is -- we characterize  
5 -- the Town of Woodbridge characterizes the supplement to  
6 the municipal consultation filing. And I believe in the  
7 instance of what the Town of Milford had done it was  
8 treated accordingly as part of the Applicants' exhibits  
9 if I'm not mistaken.

10 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Mr. Fitzgerald, any  
11 objection to grouping it with the Applicants' municipal  
12 consultation filing?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: No.

14 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, we'll do that.

15 (Whereupon, Towns' Exhibit No. 10 was  
16 received into evidence and attached to the Applicants'  
17 Municipal Filing.)

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about 1 through 5,  
19 plus 9, how would you like to handle those?

20 MS. KOHLER: I would say that number -- if  
21 I could just deal with them individually because they  
22 deal with different towns -- No. 1, Mr. Boucher will be  
23 able to verify through his -- actually, you know what, I  
24 would say that No. 1, and Mr. Boucher can comment on

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 this, this is simply in regard to the comments to the use  
2 Route 15, and that perhaps could also be included in the  
3 municipal supplementation.

4 There's -- also No. 2 is the Town of  
5 Woodbridge's comments on the Route 15 alternative --

6 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, they're all Town  
7 comments. Is there any problem, Mr. Fitzgerald --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Could somebody give me a  
9 page reference --

10 MS. KOHLER: Sorry. It's --

11 CHAIRMAN KATZ: We are on Hearing Program  
12 page 21, we are talking about Towns' Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4,  
13 5, and 9.

14 MS. KOHLER: I think it's -- 1 through 4  
15 are the Towns' comments to the Route 15 --

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Right --

17 MS. KOHLER: -- route or alternative.

18 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Let's take --

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes, 1 through 4 -- 1  
20 through 4 are all comments. They could be just put in --

21 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay, we will group them  
22 under the Applicants' municipal consultation.

23 (Whereupon, Towns' Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, 3  
24 and 4 were received into evidence and attached to the

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 Applicants' Municipal Consultation Filing.)

2 CHAIRMAN KATZ: How about No. 5?

3 MS. KOHLER: 5 and 6 will be verified  
4 tomorrow by the Land Tech witnesses.

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Uh -- okay. So 5 is Land  
6 Tech -- even though it doesn't say Land Tech, 5 is Land  
7 Tech?

8 MS. KOHLER: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Understood. We will do  
10 that tomorrow. And 9 is Land Tech?

11 MS. KOHLER: Yes

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Fine.

13 MS. KOHLER: And then we're adding 11,  
14 which is the City of Milford's Prefiled Testimony of Land  
15 Tech Consultants, Inc.

16 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. And we will do that  
17 tomorrow also.

18 MS. KOHLER: Correct.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. So tomorrow there  
20 will be four Land Tech exhibits, correct?

21 MS. KOHLER: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. So we have verified  
23 all the exhibits for your witnesses and tomorrow we will  
24 take up cross-examination on all non-GE modeling issues,

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 and that will be right after the companies' homework  
2 assignments. Okay, thank you.

3 Okay, this is how I see tomorrow and  
4 please tell me if I'm -- we won't need a prehearing  
5 conference tomorrow --

6 MS. RANDELL: Madam Chairman, before we  
7 close up today, we had Mr. Kleiman here from ESS to  
8 discuss a possible marine aspect of the East Shore route.

9 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes.

10 MS. RANDELL: There were no questions and  
11 we're not going to bring him back.

12 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Okay. And we do have the  
13 DOA letter.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: We do --

15 MS. RANDELL: Fine. I just wanted to be  
16 clear.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: We -- we haven't -- we  
18 haven't seen it.

19 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Well, we have it and  
20 you're invited to read it.

21 MR. TAIT: It's a DOA letter.

22 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yeah, DOA is DOA.

23 (Laughter). But if we need -- if you'd like to have a  
24 DOA witness here, anyone, to cross-examine on that



HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

1 letter, then just let us know and we will unturn that  
2 stone.

3 MS. RANDELL: It was so much fun the first  
4 time --

5 CHAIRMAN KATZ: Yes --

6 MS. RANDELL: -- that I think we'll just  
7 stop --

8 CHAIRMAN KATZ: But I wanted to make that  
9 offer to the Towns, if you want to cross-examine a DOA  
10 witness, let us know and we'll take care of that.

11 Okay, so tomorrow the way I envision it,  
12 and please let me know if this doesn't work, is that  
13 we'll start with a report on the homework assignments by  
14 the companies, then we'll do cross-examination of  
15 Synapse, then we will do the RWA direct case, and then we  
16 will do Land Tech. Any objections, problems? Great.

17 Any other procedural matters we need to  
18 cover before we adjourn? Great. We are adjourned for  
19 today.

20

21 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 4:40  
22 p.m.)

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

INDEX OF WITNESSES

PAGE

APPLICANTS' PANEL OF WITNESSES:

Re: East Shore & Northerly Routes	
Anne Bartosewicz	
John Prete	
Direct Audio Visual Presentation	7
Re: Black Pond Alternative	
Roger Zaklukiewicz	
Direct Audio Visual Presentation	29
Re: East Shore, Northerly, Black Pond Routes	
Cyril Welter	
Jim Hogan	
Anne Bartosewicz	
John Prete	
Roger Zaklukiewicz	
Allen Scarfone	
Louise Mango	
Richard Reed	
Exhibit Verification by Mr. Fitzgerald	124
Cross-Examination by Mr. Knapp	130
Cross-Examination by Mr. Ball	135
Cross-Examination by Ms. Kohler	191
Cross-Examination by Mr. Boucher	222
Cross-Examination by the Council	237

OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL WITNESSES:

Marc Montalvo	
Torben Aabo	
Direct Examination by Mr. Johnson	41

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

Marc Montalvo

Cross-Examination by Mr. Fitzgerald	44
Cross-Examination by Ms. Randell	57
Redirect Examination by Mr. Johnson	114
Recross-Examination by the Council	124

Torben Aabo

Cross-Examination by Ms. Randell	64
Cross-Examination by Mr. Fitzgerald	75
Cross-Examination by Mr. Frank	88
Cross-Examination by Ms. Kohler	91
Cross-Examination by Mr. Boucher	102
Cross-Examination by Mr. Stone	109
Cross-Examination by Mr. Burturla	111
Redirect Examination by Mr. Johnson	119
Recross-Examination by the Council	121

TOWNS OF WALLINGFORD, DURHAM, WOODBRIDGE,  
MILFORD AND ORANGE WITNESSES:

David Schlissel  
Peter Lanzalotta

Direct Examination by Mr. Ball	257
--------------------------------	-----

INDEX OF OCC EXHIBITS

	NUMBER	PAGE
Supplemental Testimony of M. Montalvo And T. Aabo	4	44
Supplemental Interrogatory Responses 5/26/04	5	44

HEARING RE: CL&P and UI  
JUNE 2, 2004

INDEX OF APPLICANTS' EXHIBITS

Direct Testimony of Zaklukiewicz, Prete, Bartosewicz, Welter and Hogan	91	129
East Shore Audio Visual Presentation	101	126
Northerly Route Audio Visual Presentation	102	126
Black Pond Junction Presentation	103	127

INDEX OF THE TOWNS OF WALLINGFORD, DURHAM  
WOODBIDGE, MILFORD & ORANGE EXHIBITS

Exhibits 1, 2, 3 and 4 were attached to Applicants' Municipal Consultation Filing		262
Responses to Applicants' Interrogatories, Set 1, 5/25/04	7	259
Prefiled Testimonies of David Schlissel and Peter Lanzaotta	8	260
Exhibit No. 10 was attached to Applicants' Municipal Consultation Filing		261

## CERTIFICATE

I, Paul Landman, a Notary Public in and for the State of Connecticut, and President of Post Reporting Service, Inc., do hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing record is a correct and verbatim transcription of the audio recording made of the proceeding hereinbefore set forth.

I further certify that neither the audio operator nor I are attorney or counsel for, nor directly related to or employed by any of the parties to the action and/or proceeding in which this action is taken; and further, that neither the audio operator nor I are a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties, thereto, or financially interested in any way in the outcome of this action or proceeding.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and do so attest to the above, this 9th day of June, 2004.



Paul Landman  
President

**Post Reporting Service**  
**1-800-262-4102**