

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
SITING COUNCIL

\* \* \* \* \*

CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER CO. \* JULY 31, 2012  
\* (11:05 a.m.)

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF \*  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND \*  
PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONNECTICUT \* PETITION NO. 424  
PORTION OF THE INTERSTATE \*  
RELIABILITY PROJECT THAT TRAVERSES \*  
THE MUNICIPALITIES OF LEBANON, \*  
COLUMBIA, COVENTRY, MANSFIELD, \*  
CHAPLIN, HAMPTON, BROOKLYN, POMFRET, \*  
KILLINGLY, PUTNAM, THOMPSON, AND \*  
WINDHAM, WHICH CONSISTS OF (A) NEW \*  
OVERHEAD 345-kV ELECTRIC \*  
TRANSMISSION LINES AND ASSOCIATED \*  
FACILITIES EXTENDING BETWEEN CL&P'S \*  
CARD STREET SUBSTATION IN THE TOWN \*  
OF LEBANON, LAKE ROAD SWITCHING \*  
STATION IN THE TOWN OF KILLINGLY, \*  
AND THE CONNECTICUT/RHODE ISLAND \*  
BORDER IN THE TOWN OF THOMPSON; AND \*  
(B) RELATED ADDITIONS AT CL&P'S \*  
EXISTING CARD STREET SUBSTATION, \*  
LAKE ROAD SWITCHING STATION, AND \*  
KILLINGLY SUBSTATION, REQUEST FOR \*  
PARTY/INTERVENOR STATUS. \*  
REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE. \*

\* \* \* \* \*

BEFORE: COLIN TAIT, CHAIRMAN

BOARD MEMBERS: Larry P. Levesque, DPUC Designee  
Edward S. Wilensky  
Dr. Barbara Currier Bell  
Philip Ashton  
Daniel Lynch, Jr.  
Brian Golembiewski

STAFF MEMBERS: Linda Roberts, Executive Director  
Christina Walsh, Siting Analyst  
Melanie Bachman, Staff Attorney

## APPEARANCES:

FOR THE APPLICANT CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER CO.:

NEEWS SITING AND PERMITTING  
NORTHEAST UTILITIES SERVICE COMPANY  
P.O. BOX 270  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06141-0270  
BY: ROBERT E. CARBERRY, PROJECT MANAGER

NORTHEAST UTILITIES SERVICE COMPANY  
P.O. BOX 270  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06141-0270  
BY: JANE P. SEIDL, SENIOR COUNSEL

CARMODY AND TORRANCE LLP  
195 CHURCH STREET  
P.O. BOX 1950  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06509-1950  
BY: ANTHONY M. FITZGERALD, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY NRG ENERGY, INCORPORATED,  
NRG POWER MARKETING, INCORPORATED, CONNECTICUT  
JET POWER LLC, DEVON POWER LLC, MIDDLETOWN  
POWER LLC, MONTVILLE POWER LLC, NORWALK  
POWER LLC, AND MERIDEN GAS TURBINES, LLC  
(COLLECTIVE, NRG):

MURTHA CULLINA LLP  
CITYPLACE 1, 29th FLOOR  
185 ASYLUM STREET  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103-3469  
BY: ANDREW W. LORD, ESQUIRE

ELIZABETH QUIRK-HENDRY  
GENERAL COUNSEL, NORTHEAST REGION  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
211 CARNEGIE CENTER  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540-6213

JUDITH E. LAGANO  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
MANRESA ISLAND AVENUE  
SOUTH NORWALK, CONNECTICUT 06854

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

RAYMOND G. LONG  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
P.O. BOX 1001  
1866 RIVER ROAD  
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT 06457

JONATHAN GORDON  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
P.O. BOX 1001  
1866 RIVER ROAD  
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT 06457

PETER FULLER  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
270 CHERRY STREET  
BRIDGEWATER, MASSACHUSETTS 02324

FOR THE PARTY VICTOR CIVIE:

VICTOR CIVIE  
160 BEECH MOUNTAIN ROAD  
MANSFIELD, CONNECTICUT 06250

RICHARD CIVIE  
43 MAIN STREET  
EAST HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06512

FOR THE PARTY EQUIPOWER RESOURCES CORP.,  
LAKE ROAD GENERATING COMPANY LP, AND  
MILFORD POWER COMPANY, LLP  
(COLLECTIVELY, EQUIPOWER):

DONNA PORESKY  
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL  
EQUIPOWER RESOURCES CORP.  
100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10th FLOOR  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

JIM GINNETTI  
EQUIPOWER RESOURCES CORP.  
100 CONSTITUTION PLAZA, 10th FLOOR  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

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

ROBINSON AND COLE LLP  
280 TRUMBULL STREET  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103  
BY: DAVID W. BROGAN, ESQUIRE  
KENNETH C. BALDWIN, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY THE UNITED ILLUMINATING  
COMPANY (UI) :

BRUCE L. MCDERMOTT, ESQUIRE  
UIL HOLDINGS CORPORATION  
157 CHURCH STREET  
P.O. BOX 1564  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06506-0901

JOHN J. PRETE  
THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY  
157 CHURCH STREET  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT 06506-0901

FOR THE PARTY EDWARD HILL BULLARD:

EDWARD HILL BULLARD  
42 SHUBA LANE  
CHAPLIN, CONNECTICUT 06235

FOR THE PARTY THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL  
(IF GRANTED) :

ELIN SWANSON KATZ  
CONSUMER COUNSEL  
TEN FRANKLIN SQUARE  
NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT 06051

VICTORIA HACKETT  
STAFF ATTORNEY III  
OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL  
TEN FRANKLIN SQUARE  
NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT 06051

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

FOR THE PARTY RICHARD CHENEY AND THE  
HIGHLAND RIDGE GOLF RANGE, LLC  
(HIGHLAND RIDGE)

BRANSE, WILLIS AND KNAPP, LLC  
148 EASTERN BOULEVARD, SUITE 301  
GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT 06033  
BY: ERIC KNAPP, ESQUIRE

FOR THE PARTY MOUNT HOPE MONTESSORI  
SCHOOL, INCORPORATED

EVANS FELDMAN AND AINSWORTH, L.L.C.  
261 BRADLEY STREET  
P.O. BOX 1694  
NEW HAVEN, CT 06507-1694  
BY: KEITH R. AINSWORTH, ESQUIRE

ADAM N. RABINOWITZ, BOARD CHAIR  
MOUNT HOPE MONTESSORI SCHOOL  
P.O. BOX 267  
MANSFIELD CENTER, CONNECTICUT 06250

FOR THE INTERVENOR ISO-NEW ENGLAND, INCORPORATED

WHITMAN BREED ABBOTT and MORGAN  
500 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE  
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT 06830  
BY: ANTHONY M. MACLEOD, ESQUIRE

KEVIN FLYNN, ESQUIRE  
REGULATORY COUNSEL  
ISO NEW ENGLAND, INCORPORATED  
ONE SULLIVAN ROAD  
HOLYOKE, MASSACHUSETTS 01040

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 . . .Verbatim proceedings of a hearing  
2 before the State of Connecticut Siting Council in the  
3 matter of an Application by The Connecticut Light and  
4 Power Company for a Certificate of Environmental  
5 Compatibility and Public Need, held at the Central  
6 Connecticut State University, 185 Main Street, New  
7 Britain, Connecticut, on July 31, 2012 at 11:05 a.m., at  
8 which time the parties were represented as hereinbefore  
9 set forth . . .

10  
11  
12 VICE CHAIRMAN COLIN TAIT: Ladies and  
13 gentlemen, this hearing is called to order this Tuesday,  
14 July 31st, 2012 at 11:05 a.m. My name is Colin C. Tait,  
15 Vice Chairman of the Connecticut Siting Council. Other  
16 members of the Council are Brian Golembiewski, designee  
17 for Commissioner Dan Esty, Department of Environmental --  
18 Energy and Environmental Protection; Larry P. Levesque,  
19 designee for Chairman Arthur House, Public Utilities  
20 Regulatory Authority; Philip T. Ashton; Daniel P. Lynch,  
21 Jr., and Dr. Barbara C. Bell.

22 Members of the staff are Linda Roberts,  
23 Executive Director; Melanie Bachman, Staff Attorney;  
24 Christina Walsh, Supervising Siting Analyst; Court

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Reporter, Gail Gregoriades; and the Audio Technician is  
2 Aaron DeMarest.

3 This hearing is a continuation of the  
4 evidentiary hearing -- evidentiary portion of the  
5 proceedings that began on June 4th on CL&P's proposed  
6 Interstate Reliability Project. We will proceed in  
7 accordance with a prepared agenda, copies of which are  
8 available here.

9 A verbatim transcript will be made of each  
10 hearing session and all hearing transcripts will be  
11 deposited with the Town Clerk offices of the effected  
12 towns for the convenience of the public. I wish to call  
13 your attention to those items shown in the hearing  
14 program marked as Roman numeral ID, items 20 and ID item  
15 39.

16 Does the applicant or any party or  
17 intervenor have an objection to the item that the Council  
18 has administratively noticed? Hearing no objections,  
19 they'll be noticed.

20 CL&P sent in additional exhibits. Can the  
21 applicant please begin by numbering the exhibits of the  
22 filings you've made in this matter and make your request  
23 for administrative notice in existing documents and  
24 verify all exhibits by appropriate witnesses?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ANTHONY FITZGERALD: Good morning.

2 COURT REPORTER: Is your microphone on?

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, it was green, I  
4 pushed, push. Anything else? Good morning. The first  
5 highlighted item in the hearing program is administrative  
6 notice item number 25 under the items of which CL&P has  
7 asked that administrative notice be taken. I ask that  
8 the Council take administrative notice of that report,  
9 which is a presentation by ISO New England to the  
10 Connecticut Energy Advisory Board.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: What page of the  
12 program does that appear on?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: Page 11.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Page 11. Any  
15 objections to administrative notice of item 25? Hearing  
16 none, it'll be so noticed.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Now, if it pleases the  
18 panel, or the Council, I'd like to proceed to the items  
19 that are going to be sponsored by this non-need panel.  
20 So I won't be taking everything right in order. We'll  
21 first of all finish up with them and then we'll go on to  
22 the need panel. There are some other matters that are --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Do you think we're up  
24 to it?



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: -- I do, I do.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Lead us by the hand  
3 then.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. The first thing  
5 that I would like to deal with is Exhibit 23 for  
6 identification, which appears at the bottom of page 12 of  
7 the hearing program. This is a transmittal letter and  
8 several items that were asked for at the last hearing.  
9 And I will ask the panel whether this transmittal letter  
10 and its enclosures --

11 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Excuse me. Are these  
12 new witnesses?

13 MR. FITZGERALD: -- no. All of these  
14 witnesses have been previously sworn.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Thank you.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah, Tony testified. So  
17 I would ask the panel if the items listed under Exhibit  
18 23, which had previously been submitted, are true and  
19 correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

20 MS. LOUISE MANGO: That is true.

21 MR. JOHN CASE: Yes, that is true.

22 MR. ROBERT CARBERRY: Yes.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: I ask that Exhibit 23 be  
24 admitted as a full exhibit.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Are there any  
2 objections? Hearing none, it's a full exhibit.

3 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 23  
4 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Now, Exhibit 24 is still  
6 highlighted. This is the Applicant's agreement with  
7 Highland Ridge, the cover letter and drawing. Now the  
8 exhibit was actually qualified by Mr. Cage at page -- Mr.  
9 Case at page 14 of the June 26th transcript, but I failed  
10 to move it into evidence at that time, so it's still  
11 highlighted. But all of the foundation questions have  
12 been asked and answered, so I would ask that it be marked  
13 as a full exhibit?

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Any objections?  
15 Admitted.

16 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 24  
17 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Case, Exhibit 25 for  
19 identification, is the detailed cost estimate for the  
20 Mount Hope underground variation. Although you were  
21 questioned about this exhibit at the last hearing by Mr.  
22 Civie, there were no foundation questions asked about it  
23 and it wasn't admitted into evidence. So I'll ask you  
24 the foundation questions now. Does that document provide

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 -- first of all, did you prepare that document?

2 MR. CASE: Yes I did.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: And does it provide your  
4 best estimate of the costs set forth in it based on your  
5 training, experience, and knowledge, and the information  
6 available?

7 MR. CASE: Yes it does.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: I ask that Exhibit 25 be  
9 received as a full exhibit?

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Any objections? So  
11 admitted.

12 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 25  
13 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibits 27 consists of  
15 parts A through F, which are all photographs that were  
16 testified about at the last hearing. And they were  
17 actually admitted.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: They certainly were  
19 discussed.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. And they were --

21 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: I thought they were  
22 admitted.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: -- and they were  
24 admitted. I think we were asked to submit additional of

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 the 20 copies that serve the service list, which we did  
2 afterwards. But -- and the reference is the June 26th  
3 transcript at page 26, those are already in.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: So we don't need to  
5 do anything with item 27?

6 MR. FITZGERALD: Correct. And Exhibit 28  
7 is a cover letter with two items in it, the Green Dragon  
8 Day Care license and a supplemental direct testimony and  
9 they're not separately numbered on the hearing program  
10 but I'll deal with them separately.

11 Mr. Carberry, at the request of the  
12 Council CL&P filed on July 10, 2012 copies of the license  
13 issued by the Connecticut Department of Public Health for  
14 the Green Dragon Day Care, which is been marked as part  
15 of CL&P 28 for identification. Was that copy that was  
16 submitted a copy of the document that was provided to  
17 CL&P by the Department of Public Health as the license  
18 for Green Dragon Day Care in response to a freedom of  
19 information request?

20 MR. CARBERRY: Yes it is.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: So I move that part of  
22 Exhibit --

23 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Would it be advisable  
24 to call it 28A?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: -- good. Let's call it  
2 28A, and I move 28A as a full exhibit.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
4 Admitted.

5 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 28  
6 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

7 MR. FITZGERALD: And while we're on the  
8 subject of day care facilities has CL&P obtained any  
9 further information about the status of day care  
10 facilities along the right-of-way since we were last here  
11 on June 26th?

12 MR. CARBERRY: Yes. There is a day care  
13 facility in Brooklyn at 350 Church Street. The  
14 proprietor of that day care is Jacqueline Ben, and she  
15 contacted us to let us know that she was moving from that  
16 location by the end of August and would no longer be  
17 operating as a day care facility.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: What was the name of  
19 that day care facility?

20 MR. CARBERRY: The Jacqueline Ben Day Care  
21 Facility.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: And did Mrs. Ben give you  
23 any indication that the reason for her moving and going  
24 out of the day care business at that location had

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 anything to do with the project?

2 MR. CARBERRY: No, she did not.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: All right. Ms. Mango,  
4 Mr. Carberry and Mr. Case, on July 10th CL&P filed your  
5 supplemental direct testimony concerning comments of the  
6 Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, which  
7 appears here as part of Exhibit 28, which I think we'll  
8 probably be calling Exhibit 28B. Did you prepare that  
9 testimony?

10 MR. CARBERRY: Yes we did.

11 MS. MANGO: Yes.

12 MR. CASE: Yes.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: And do you have any  
14 corrections or additions to that testimony?

15 MS. MANGO: I have only one addition and  
16 that is that on pages four and five of Exhibit 28B our  
17 comments referred to a pending application for a 401  
18 water quality certification stream channel encroachment  
19 permit that was to be filed with the Connecticut DEEP.  
20 And in fact, that was filed with the DEEP on July 23rd.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Carberry, do you have  
22 an addition?

23 MR. CARBERRY: I would like to add only  
24 that on the day that CL&P filed this marked up copy of

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 the DEEP letter, that I also sent that as a courtesy to  
2 Fred Riese at the DEEP, that is the name at the bottom of  
3 the letter and is responsible I think for most of the  
4 content of that letter. And I offered it to him and he  
5 responded by e-mail to me, with a short e-mail that  
6 included comments, I do not disagree with any of your  
7 comments. And the bottom line is that I can see the  
8 logic in each of your responses and find them reasonable.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: And is the testimony,  
10 that has been marked as Exhibit 28B, true and accurate to  
11 the best of your knowledge and believe?

12 MR. CASE: Yes it is.

13 MR. CARBERRY: Yes.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: And I offer it as a full  
15 exhibit?

16 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Does Louise have to  
17 say yes?

18 MS. MANGO: Yes.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: I don't want to leave  
20 her out. Any objections? Admitted.

21 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 28B  
22 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Case, Exhibit 25 for  
24 identification, going back a little bit here, no, wait a

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 minute, we already did that.

2 MR. TILLES: We've already done that.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: Right. Okay. And to my  
4 left here is Mr. Johnson, who was sworn and who testified  
5 at the last hearings, but because he came on the second  
6 day I overlooked asking him about the interrogatory  
7 answers for which he was responsible. So I'd like to put  
8 them in.

9 Mr. Johnson, were you responsible for the  
10 responses to questions two, 18, and 19 of the Council's  
11 first set of interrogatories to CL&P, which are included  
12 in the exhibit previously marked as CL&P Exhibit 9 for  
13 identification?

14 MR. ANTHONY JOHNSON: Yes I am.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: And were you also  
16 responsible for the response to question 40 of the  
17 Council's second set of interrogatories, which has been  
18 marked as Exhibit 15 for identification in this  
19 proceeding?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: And are those responses  
22 true and correct to the best of your knowledge and  
23 belief?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Yes they are.



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: I move that those  
2 specific pieces of Exhibits 15 and 19 be (indiscernible,  
3 too far from mic.) nine and 15, yeah, that's right.  
4 Okay. I'd just ask that those pieces of exhibits nine  
5 and 15 be considered into evidence? We still have a few  
6 more bits to go before the whole documents come in.

7 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Admitted.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you. Just for the  
9 record --

10 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: So, these remain for  
11 identification only?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: -- yeah. I think  
13 questions --

14 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Nine and 15 --

15 MR. FITZGERALD: -- nine and 15 I think  
16 there's still some more to come from the need witnesses.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Yeah.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. And that is it --

19 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: I'm worried about --

20 MR. FITZGERALD: -- for this panel.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: -- I'm worried about  
22 number 26.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: 26. Civie  
24 interrogatories set three --

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Maybe in your grand  
2 scheme of things --

3 MR. FITZGERALD: -- no, let me not just  
4 see if they are -- and set three consists of two  
5 questions, one was previously -- the answer to number one  
6 was previously sponsored by Mr. Carberry. Question two  
7 is a need question, which will be answered -- or which  
8 will be sponsored as soon as these folks leave and the  
9 new panel comes in.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: And question number  
11 three?

12 MR. FITZGERALD: No, 26, set three --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: I'm sorry.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: -- there's only two.  
15 There's two questions, although question number two has  
16 two parts, A and B.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Okay. One which will  
18 come under need later?

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: So it's still up for  
21 identification?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: So it's still for  
23 identification. And the panel is available for any  
24 questions on this (indiscernible, too far from mic.).

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Christina?

2 MS. CHRISTINA WALSH: I have no further  
3 questions for this panel. I'm saving up for the new  
4 panel. Thank you.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Okay. Dr. Bell?

6 DR. BARBARA BELL: Thank you Mr. Chairman.  
7 I'm in exactly the same position as Ms. Walsh, no  
8 further questions for this panel.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Mr. Ashton?

10 MR. PHILIP ASHTON: No questions. Thank  
11 you Mr. Chairman.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Brian?

13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: No questions. Thank  
14 you.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: No questions Danny?

16 MR. DANIEL P. LYNCH: No questions Mr.  
17 Chairman.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: If we could just have a  
19 moment to switch personnel? We have one witness on this  
20 panel who was not been previously sworn, that's Mr.  
21 Laskowski, to my left.

22 (Witness sworn)

23 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Laskowski and Mr.  
24 Zaklukiewicz, your resumes are included in the volume of

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 resumes of CL&P witnesses that has been marked as Exhibit  
2 19 in this matter. Are the statements of your  
3 qualifications and experience as set forth in your  
4 respective resumes true and correct to the best of your  
5 knowledge and belief?

6 MR. TIMOTHY LASKOWSKI: Yes.

7 MR. ROGER ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes they are,  
8 except for one omission.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, the next question  
10 was whether you have any additions?

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes I do.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: And please give it to us?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Regarding the question  
14 of testifying before agencies, omitted was the fact that  
15 I have testified before the Massachusetts Energy  
16 Facilities Siting Board.

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Laskowski, are there  
18 any additions required to your CV?

19 MR. LASKOWSKI: I also have testified in  
20 front of the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting  
21 Board.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Mr. Laskowski,  
23 were you and your colleagues in the NUSCO Planning  
24 Department with the assistance of Mr. Zak and Mr.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Carberry responsible for the preparation of Section 2 of  
2 CL&P's application, which is Exhibit 1 in this docket  
3 concerning the project background and need?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Mr. Fitzgerald? Do I  
5 gather that Exhibit 19 is now a full exhibit? You've now  
6 done all of the resumes?

7 MR. FITZGERALD: Oh, no.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: No? Okay.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: No, we have the ICF  
10 witnesses yet.

11 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: All right. It's  
12 still out there for identification. Sorry to interrupt.

13 MR. FITZGERALD: So Mr. Laskowski, were  
14 you and your colleagues at the NUSCO Planning Department,  
15 with the assistance of Mr. Zak and Mr. Carberry,  
16 responsible for the preparation of Section 2 of CL&P's  
17 application, which is Exhibit 1 of this docket concerning  
18 the project background and need?

19 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes, we were.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: And is the information in  
21 that section of the application true and correct to the  
22 best of your knowledge and belief?

23 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: And Mr. Laskowski and Mr.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Carberry, were you responsible for the compilation of the  
2 materials that comprise Volume 5 of the application,  
3 which is the planning volume?

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

5 MR. CARBERRY: Yes.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: And with the exception of  
7 the report prepared by ICF on transmission alternatives  
8 are you familiar -- oh, and non-transmission  
9 alternatives, excuse me, are you familiar with those  
10 materials which are prepared either by you and National  
11 Grid and ISO New England or by ISO New England?

12 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I am.

13 MR. CARBERRY: Yes.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: And are they true and  
15 correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

16 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

17 MR. CARBERRY: Yes.

18 MR. FITZGERALD: And I'll note Mr. Tate,  
19 we've now covered the entire application and the CEAI  
20 appendix, except for the pieces for which ICF Consulting  
21 is responsible, and they will be here tomorrow.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: So that remains for  
23 identification.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: Right. Exhibit 8 is a

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 copy of a redacted solution study report dated February  
2 2012, with a cover letter dated March 2nd, 2012, is the  
3 information in that document true and correct to the best  
4 of your knowledge and belief?

5 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

6 MR. CARBERRY: Yes.

7 MR. FITZGERALD: And Mr. Laskowski, was NU  
8 involved in the preparation of that report?

9 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

10 MR. FITZGERALD: I move Exhibit 8 as a  
11 full exhibit?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
13 Hearing none, this is so admitted.

14 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 8  
15 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibit 9 for  
17 identification is a partial set of responses to the  
18 Council's first set of interrogatories to CL&P. Were you  
19 responsible for the responses to questions three, five  
20 and six in this set?

21 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I was.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: And do you have any  
23 corrections to any of those answers?

24 MR. LASKOWSKI: No, I do not.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: Is the information in  
2 those responses true and correct to the best of your  
3 knowledge and belief?

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes they are.

5 MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, we have now  
6 sponsored all of the answers to the interrogatories that  
7 have been marked as Exhibit 9. I'd move that that  
8 exhibit be admitted as a full exhibit?

9 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
10 Hearing none, it's so admitted.

11 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 9  
12 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

13 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibit 10 for  
14 identification consists of a second partial set of  
15 responses to the Council's first set of interrogatories  
16 to CL&P. Were you responsible for the responses to  
17 questions 12, 15, 16, 23 and 24 of this set?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I am.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: Do you have any  
20 corrections or additions to those responses?

21 MR. LASKOWSKI: No I do not.

22 MR. FITZGERALD: There is one response  
23 awaiting sponsorship in this set, No. 25, it's about cost  
24 impact on rates. That will come from Ms. Topier



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 (phonetic), who is off on storm duty today, or storm  
2 drill duty today.

3 (Discussion off the record.)

4 MR. FITZGERALD: But she will be here  
5 tomorrow. I'd like to put her on just before we pick up  
6 tomorrow to knock that one off and then I'll offer that  
7 as a full exhibit.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Thursday?

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Thursday, yes, excuse me.  
10 Exhibit 15 consists of CL&P's responses to the Council's  
11 second set of interrogatories. Were you responsible for  
12 the answer to question 37 in this set?

13 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I was.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: And this was the question  
15 that asked about the status of ISO New England's  
16 assessment of need for the project. Do you have any  
17 corrections or additions to that answer?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: Since then I think the  
19 report has been updated, a new needs report has come up  
20 by ISO.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: Right. And does the --  
22 does the status of that reassessment since the answer was  
23 filed covered by your supplemental prefiled need  
24 testimony?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: All right. So with that  
3 qualification I move that Exhibit 15 be admitted as a  
4 full exhibit. All interrogatories in Exhibit -- all  
5 answers in Exhibit 15 have now been fully verified.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
7 Hearing none, so admitted.

8 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 15  
9 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

10 MR. FITZGERALD: And Exhibit 22 for  
11 identification is a response to set two of  
12 interrogatories of Victor and Richard Civie. Were you  
13 responsible for the answers to questions two, three and  
14 four in that set?

15 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I was.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Do you have any  
17 corrections or additions to that response?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: No, I do not.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: The previous -- the other  
20 question in that said question one was previously  
21 sponsored by the non-need panel, so we've now covered all  
22 four questions and I asked about Exhibit 22 be admitted  
23 as a full exhibit?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Hearing none, it's so admitted.

2 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 22  
3 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibit 26 is a set of  
5 responses to set three of the Civie interrogatories. Mr.  
6 Laskowski, were you responsible for the answer to  
7 question two of that set, which has two subparts, A and  
8 B?

9 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I was. I was  
10 responsible for the parts that I answered.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: All right. Oh, yes, and  
12 part of that response is actually an objection rather  
13 than an answer. And who was responsible for the  
14 objection?

15 MR. LASKOWSKI: You were.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: I was, that's right, yep.  
17 But in terms of the actual information in the question  
18 is given, is a true and correct to the best of your  
19 knowledge and belief?

20 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: That is the last response  
22 to this set to be sponsored, so I move Exhibit 26 as a  
23 full exhibit?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Hearing none, so admitted.

2 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 26  
3 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibit 29 for  
5 identification, which was submitted pursuant to the CEII  
6 protective order is a copy of the draft ISO New England  
7 follow-up analysis to its updated needs assessment, dated  
8 July 2012. And do you understand this to be a true copy  
9 of the analysis prepared by ISO New England?

10 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: And do you understand  
12 that ISO New England will be here to answer questions on  
13 it?

14 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I do.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: And are you able to  
16 interpret it and provide helpful information concerning  
17 it if asked by the Council?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes I am.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: I move Exhibit 29 as a  
20 full exhibit?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?

22 Hearing none, so admitted.

23 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 29  
24 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: And Mr. Laskowski and Mr.  
2 Zak, Exhibit 16 is a copy of your direct testimony  
3 concerning the need for this project dated May 21st,  
4 2012, and Exhibit 30 is your supplemental testimony on  
5 that subject. Is the factual matter in those documents  
6 taken together a true and accurate statement to the best  
7 of your knowledge and belief and the opinions that are  
8 expressed in that document honestly held by you?

9 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes they are.

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes they are.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: I move that Exhibits 16  
12 and 30 be admitted as full exhibits?

13 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
14 Hearing none, so admitted.

15 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit Nos. 16  
16 and 30 were received into evidence as full exhibits.)

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Exhibit 32 for  
18 identification is a copy of the draft ISO New England  
19 follow-up analysis to its 2012 solution report, which has  
20 been filed under the CEII protective order. Is the  
21 document that's been filed a true copy of the analysis  
22 prepared by ISO New England?

23 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

24 MR. FITZGERALD: And to the best of your

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 knowledge is it an accurate analysis based on the  
2 assumptions disclosed in the study?

3 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

4 MR. FITZGERALD: And ISO New England will  
5 be available to answer questions about it later in the  
6 preceding, correct?

7 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

8 MR. FITZGERALD: And are you in a position  
9 to give the Council helpful information to interpret the  
10 report as necessary?

11 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: I ask that Exhibit 32 be  
13 marked as a full exhibit?

14 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections?  
15 Hearing none, so admitted.

16 (Whereupon, Applicant CL&P Exhibit No. 32  
17 was received into evidence as a full exhibit.)

18 MR. FITZGERALD: And with that I offer the  
19 panel for examination --

20 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Can I go back? Is  
21 No. 26 still for identification?

22 MR. FITZGERALD: -- oh, no. I just -- if  
23 I neglected to ask that it be accepted as full I erred,  
24 because that was the last -- we just covered the last

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 piece of it that needed sponsorship.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Okay. So we should  
3 do it now?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes please.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Any objections to  
6 Exhibit No. 26? Hearing none, so admitted. I have 31 by  
7 itself, is that --

8 MR. FITZGERALD: That's to come tomorrow.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: -- okay. Ms. Walsh?

10 MS. WALSH: Thank you. What is the  
11 current status of the associated applications before the  
12 Rhode Island and Massachusetts Siting Boards?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: To my knowledge both  
14 have been filed with the Massachusetts and Rhode Island  
15 regulatory entities. I believe the Rhode Island one was  
16 in --

17 MR. CARBERRY: July 19th.

18 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- July 19th.

19 MR. CARBERRY: Massachusetts I believe was  
20 June 21st.

21 MS. WALSH: So those were just recently --  
22 of this year you're saying, correct?

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes. It should have  
24 been 2012.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MS. WALSH: Okay. Do you foresee than the  
2 Connecticut Siting decision coming before the other two  
3 states?

4 MR. CARBERRY: At this point, yes.

5 MS. WALSH: And how will that effect  
6 potential construction if the projects are approved if  
7 the other states haven't made a decision yet?

8 MR. CARBERRY: I don't think it has the  
9 direct effect you might be imagining in your question.  
10 The Army Corps of Engineers permit is still the critical  
11 path that applies to all three states as one permit for  
12 all three states and it takes the longest. But to the  
13 extent that Connecticut had a certificate and the others  
14 did not and the company wished to proceed to work in  
15 areas not subject to the Army Corps permit, it could do  
16 so.

17 MS. WALSH: Okay. Thank you. Under  
18 normal operating circumstances is Connecticut typically  
19 an exporter of power?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: At this time, under  
21 most hours, I would say the answer to that is no, we're  
22 an importer.

23 MS. WALSH: Okay. And is that consist in  
24 Massachusetts and Rhode Island, are they exporters or



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 importers?

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I would say from the  
3 power flows that I'm aware of I would consider Rhode  
4 Island to be an exporter. I would assume -- I would  
5 assume Massachusetts, if you include Phase 2, that is the  
6 HVDC line from Hydro Quebec into the Massachusetts area,  
7 a station called Sandy Pond, and I'm also aware of a  
8 portion of the output from the Seabrook nuclear plant  
9 moves south into Massachusetts. I would say they are  
10 also an importer on some hours and I would assume in  
11 other hours, depending on how generation is dispatched  
12 from the ISO in the state of Massachusetts there may be  
13 some hours where it is considered to be an exporter.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Just as a matter of  
15 interest, why is Rhode Island an exporter?

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Basically because they  
17 have a number of generators on the 345 interface, which  
18 goes between Cod Street, Lake Road, Sherman Road over to  
19 West Midway, there's about 2500 megawatts of generation  
20 there. Those were recent, high-efficiency, gas driven  
21 generation, which tends to be lowest-priced and therefore  
22 first called on by the ISO to operate.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Thank you.

24 MS. WALSH: And just in a lot of storm

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 discussions I've heard the term micro-grids come up. And  
2 just from your point of view, how would that if at all,  
3 effect the proposed project if micro-grids are put into  
4 local municipalities within the state?

5 MR. ASHTON: Could we have a definition of  
6 a micro-grid first? I've heard the term thrown around  
7 awful lot and I really don't know what it means.

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Micro-grid, Mr. Ashton,  
9 as I understand it is the ability for the distribution  
10 facilities to basically isolate from the remaining  
11 distribution facilities and use as a local generating  
12 source, a resource such as a fuel-cell, a resource such  
13 as a one or two megawatt generator diesel driven or some  
14 other type of facility -- excuse me, a resource that can  
15 be used to power certain facilities within an  
16 infrastructure. In other words, you would have a micro-  
17 grid built up around the state capital and the  
18 legislative office buildings such that if there was a  
19 total blackout in Hartford that facility then would  
20 switch over automatically and power that area so that you  
21 would keep emergency -- the emergency center in Hartford  
22 in operation while there was a blackout.

23 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Is that similar to a  
24 home generator? That you isolate your home?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Just much bigger in  
2 size Mr. Tait. Significantly bigger. And I've seen them  
3 where they're proposed using the smaller, what's called  
4 the jet turbine, a cap jet. I've seen them where they  
5 have used, and are relying upon fuel cells, where I would  
6 assume in those cases you would have some kind of a  
7 natural gas supply or a liquefied gas supply there in  
8 case those infrastructures were to be not in service and  
9 keep the electricity on in critical areas.

10 MR. ASHTON: Are you aware of any such  
11 operation -- micro-grids that are in operation today in  
12 Connecticut?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Not to my knowledge,  
14 but I thought from the storm, the DEEP hearings on the  
15 storm that there was a commitment to study that further  
16 and to implement -- to come up with recommendations as to  
17 locations within the state of Connecticut that CL&P and  
18 United Illuminating are required to look into further.

19 MR. ASHTON: But nothing yet? Nothing  
20 today?

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Again, that's not  
22 really my area of expertise Mr. Ashton.

23 MR. ASHTON: I understand.

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: And I'm shooting from

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 the hip a little bit.

2 MR. ASHTON: You're reasonably  
3 knowledgeable I suspect, and you're not aware of any  
4 today, is that fair?

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: To my knowledge there  
6 are none in service.

7 MR. FITZGERALD: So that's the definition.  
8 Now, what about the question?

9 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think Mr. Lynch had  
10 his hand raised to maybe provide additional comment?

11 MR. LYNCH: My only question Mr.  
12 Zaklukiewicz is from what you've just said the ideal  
13 setting for a micro-grid is an urban area and not a rural  
14 area?

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That would be correct.

16 MR. FITZGERALD: Now Mr. Zak, going back  
17 to Ms. LaPage's question --

18 A MALE VOICE: Walsh.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: -- Ms. Walsh, I'm sorry.  
20 Would you expect that the development of micro-grids  
21 would have any impact on the need for this project?

22 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: No I do not.

23 MS. WALSH: Just quickly, so from my  
24 understanding then a micro-grid is basically only used in

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 a blackout situation where there's no power in a  
2 particular area, they wouldn't be providing anything all  
3 the time?

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: To the best of my  
5 knowledge that is the case. I mean, a one or two  
6 megawatt fossil fired or even gas-fired generator is not  
7 really economic relative to the larger combined cycle gas  
8 turbines. So, if it is operational it would be at that  
9 agency's or that entity's discretion to reduce its own  
10 load. But I think on the whole it would not be economic  
11 for that entity to turn around and run that local  
12 generation source as opposed to purchasing power from the  
13 grid.

14 MS. WALSH: Okay. Thank you very much.  
15 Thank you, no further questions at this time.

16 DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm  
17 having a little bit of a problem with Exhibit A in the  
18 sense that Exhibit A is part of your testimony, or the  
19 revised Exhibit A, but it actually consists of ISO  
20 slides. So I guess really the question should be  
21 addressed to ISO. How would you --

22 MR. FITZGERALD: I think these -- I'm  
23 sure, not that you wouldn't want to ask ISO, but I think  
24 you'll find that these witnesses can help.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 DR. BELL: -- okay, good.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: You're talking about  
3 Exhibit 25?

4 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. Exhibit A to -- not  
5 Exhibit 25, no, to Exhibit 28B. Exhibit 28B is the  
6 supplemental direct testimony on need, and it has an  
7 exhibit, which is the set of ISO slides that Dr. Bell  
8 just referred to.

9 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Thank you.

10 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. It's just been  
11 called to my attention that when we submitted the  
12 corrected set of slides it was separately marked as  
13 Exhibit 30. So Exhibit 28 has the old slides attached as  
14 Exhibit A, whereas Exhibit 30 has the revised -- is the  
15 revised slides. So that's really what we should be  
16 referring to as Exhibit 30. And I don't think that I  
17 asked questions about Exhibit 30. So if you don't mind  
18 Dr. Bell, I'll now ask these witnesses if Exhibit 30 is a  
19 correct copy of the revised presentation of ISO New  
20 England concerning the follow-up needs and solutions  
21 study dated July 18th, 2012?

22 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

23 MR. FITZGERALD: And is the copy that we  
24 filed a true copy of the ISO presentation?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: And are you able to  
3 provide the Siting Council with some interpretation to  
4 help them get through this exhibit?

5 MR. LASKOWSKI: I think I can.

6 MR. FITZGERALD: And so I offer it as a  
7 full exhibit?

8 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Dr. Bell?

9 DR. BELL: Yes?

10 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Dr. Bell, I think --

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe the  
12 difference --

13 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: -- I believe we  
14 should admit it as a full exhibit if there's no  
15 objections? Hearing none, it's admitted.

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- I believe the  
17 difference to the two presentations is there is an  
18 addition on page five to the original and then there's a  
19 table on page six, which was not in the original draft of  
20 that presentation that we provided as an attachment. So  
21 those are the two major -- the two differences.

22 DR. BELL: Okay. Say the first one again?  
23 I got the table on page six --

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Right.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 DR. BELL: -- and what was the first one  
2 you said?

3 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: And the bottom -- the  
4 last bulleted item on page five, which says, demand  
5 resources eligible for termination removed, that was not  
6 in the draft, nor was the table on page six. I hope that  
7 clarifies it.

8 DR. BELL: Okay. Thank you. Yes. All  
9 right. Thank you for the housekeeping and I will ask a  
10 couple of questions and I'll have other questions for  
11 ISO. The attachment A, the slides, say that transfer  
12 capability testing was not done as part of the follow-up  
13 study. That's on page nine where they're describing the  
14 scope of the work before they come to the summary of what  
15 they found. So I don't quite understand what is meant  
16 there. I mean, I thought transfer was supposed to be  
17 considered in these tests?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: Okay. When we perform  
19 these needs and solution type studies we perform two  
20 different types of analysis. One is a straight thermal  
21 analysis where we make assumptions on dispatches, which  
22 generation, and what the load is, and that tells you if  
23 you could have reliability criteria violations. You'll  
24 have a line overloaded or you will not.



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 The other type of thermal type studies we do is we try to  
2 see how much power can be transferred from one area to  
3 another by saying, okay, we'll either reduce -- increase  
4 the load in an area, or decrease the generation, and see  
5 how much power can flow into that area. And it's that  
6 second study where we did the transfers to see what the  
7 current levels are and whether they need to be increased  
8 was not performed in this follow-up needs study. But the  
9 study just concentrated on seeing is their reliability  
10 criteria violations and do those have to be fixed?

11 DR. BELL: So, Connecticut was isolated in  
12 these -- in this -- I'm still not quite understanding why  
13 you would do that since you're supposed to be assessing  
14 the need under contingencies of certain kinds and this is  
15 supposed to be considering whether a project would be  
16 needed for reliability, but the project itself by  
17 definition involves transfers from Connecticut to Rhode  
18 Island and Massachusetts. So why wouldn't you want to be  
19 considering for reliability purposes whether to solve a  
20 contingency problem? You could bring in electricity from  
21 another source.

22 MR. LASKOWSKI: I'm sorry, I wasn't clear  
23 in my full answer. Okay. Connecticut was not isolated  
24 in the study. What we did -- what the study did, I'm

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1       sorry I didn't do it, the ISO did, was they picked a  
2       generation dispatch, dispatches such that only certain  
3       generators were not available, okay? And whatever the  
4       transfer was into Connecticut, because for example, they  
5       chose the two Millstone units not in service, which after  
6       you take those units out some power has to be flowing  
7       into the area. So there was a set transfer, but we  
8       didn't calculate what the maximum transfer could be by  
9       even turning off more than the two Millstone units  
10      because it's standard philosophy now is you can take out  
11      up to two generators and then you must run other units.

12                   DR. BELL: So, you are assuming a certain  
13      amount of transfer capacity, not you, but ISO, transfer  
14      in the contingency?

15                   MR. LASKOWSKI: No. We assume -- whatever  
16      transfer that resulted from the generators out and the  
17      loads are, that was the starting point.

18                   DR. BELL: I see.

19                   MR. LASKOWSKI: Okay. And we indirectly  
20      tested whether that transfer was available or not because  
21      it did all of the contingencies and everything, it  
22      checked it. But it didn't calculate what the maximum  
23      could be.

24                   DR. BELL: Okay. I see.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: May I try it at a  
2 higher level?

3 DR. BELL: Sure.

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We had in April of 2011  
5 a needs assessment that was very, very detailed, Dr.  
6 Bell, and it included everything from Delta P testing of  
7 the generators at Lake Road and AMP. We did all kinds of  
8 stability tests along with that study. The follow-up,  
9 update testing, which took place in I believe somewhere  
10 in April and May and June of 2012 just took the updated  
11 resource and load data from the CELT reports, they took  
12 the revised that were obtained from FCA-6, whereas with  
13 the April 2011 report, took the data from the FCA-10 --  
14 excuse me, FCA-4, it also turned around and in the April  
15 2011 report it escalated out at the end of the FCA-4  
16 period, the DR and the active DR out into the years 2015  
17 in 2020.

18 The revised report took the data from FCA-  
19 6, below data and the projected demand response, the  
20 projected active demand response and then projected what  
21 these energy efficiency reductions would be at the end of  
22 2022. It looked at that and did a high-level number of  
23 studies, which then reaffirmed that the solutions that  
24 were found in 2011 report, that's the April 2011 report,

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 were still valid and that the solutions, which is the  
2 Interstate Solution A-1, still works, still resolved all  
3 of the national, regional and ISO standard reliability  
4 violations.

5 And so coming out with the report in July  
6 they found there was no need to retest Delta P. There  
7 was no need to go after and reestablish again what the  
8 transfers were going to be, since none of that really  
9 changed except for modeling what were the new loads as a  
10 result of the projections and the recession that we're  
11 presently in, and what were the impacts of DR, an active  
12 DR and energy efficiencies into the solution. So, when  
13 you look at the July needs report, that's July 2012, the  
14 draft report, it does not go into all of the details of  
15 all of these other aspects that were studied during, and  
16 incorporated in the needs study of April 2011. Okay,  
17 does that help a little bit explain that there was a  
18 determination it was necessary to go into all of those  
19 details? To restudy those we wouldn't have had to report  
20 out again until the end of 2012 or 2013, but they did  
21 reaffirm and confirm that the project as proposed does  
22 resolve all of the reliability issues that were  
23 previously identified and will do so throughout the 10  
24 year study period.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 DR. BELL: Yes. Thank you. Looking at  
2 the summary of what they found, which is stated on page  
3 10, 11, and 12, of Attachment A, we come to -- on page 12  
4 we come to the statement for Connecticut, down at the  
5 bottom of the page, it says, 115 kV thermal violations in  
6 Connecticut are up to 102 percent of LTE rating. My  
7 question is about the 102 percent of LTE rating. Would  
8 you characterize this as a minor thermal violation, a  
9 significant thermal violation, how would you characterize  
10 102 percent of LTE rating?

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I personally would not  
12 just focus on that one item. This is a project, the  
13 Interstate Project addresses the Rhode Island foliage  
14 collapse problems, the inability to move power from west  
15 to east because of west to east transfer restrictions,  
16 and therefore, even if you had excess generation in the  
17 west you couldn't move it to the east to solve the  
18 reliability problems and vice versa, we had limitations  
19 on moving power from eastern New England to the  
20 Connecticut western region area, and those restrictions  
21 prevented the movement of power back and forth. And then  
22 we also have for a number of the cases that show up, this  
23 is an N minus 1, minus 1 violation, primarily opening up  
24 two of the three paths ago from west to east across New

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 England, which are the Scobee Amherst lines, the lines  
2 that go from Millbury to the west, to Ludlow, that's the  
3 301/302 lines, and the lines than the cross in the  
4 Connecticut area, which is a West Midway over to Sherman  
5 Road, over to Lake Road, over to Cod Street, that path.

6 When you open up two of the three you end  
7 up having these overloads on the 115 kV system. And I  
8 thought, Mr. Laskowski, there were also some problems  
9 opening up some of those where you have overloads on the  
10 lines from Millbury over to Ludlow, and that would be the  
11 301/302. In a number of these cases what we found was  
12 voltage violations on the southern 115 kV inter-tie  
13 between Connecticut and Rhode Island, those are the ones  
14 that come out of West Kingston and call it the middle of  
15 Rhode Island, south middle of Rhode Island, down along  
16 the shoreline and crossover into the Mystic area and then  
17 tie into Montville substation, which is our large  
18 substation in that area. So the flows are just for that,  
19 but there are a number of cases where that southern line  
20 also overloads appreciatively more than 102 percent.

21 DR. BELL: Well, I understand your answer.

22 What you're saying is you're basically saying you don't  
23 want to answer that question, but want to describe the  
24 larger situation because this is a very big project it

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 doesn't just involve Connecticut. And I appreciate that  
2 answer. It's a fair answer and I understand it. But I  
3 still would like to get a response to the question I  
4 asked, just for my own understanding, just from a  
5 Connecticut point of view where looking at thermal  
6 violations in Connecticut up to 102 percent of LTE  
7 rating, and even if we looked at the east/west and  
8 east/west we're considering just Connecticut, we're still  
9 not going above 110 percent, we're still at 108 percent  
10 on the Rhode Island to Connecticut shoreline path in  
11 terms of violation.

12 So, I'm just trying to get a bead on  
13 something around 102, 105, or something like that, under  
14 110 percent violation. How would you characterize that?

15 MR. LASKOWSKI: If you -- reading the  
16 NERC, the MPCC, and the ISO New England criteria and  
17 guidelines and everything, they never distinguish between  
18 a minor or a major one. They just say a violation must  
19 be fixed and NERC could find people if they don't fix  
20 these violations. So that's one of the reasons we're  
21 tending to not wanting to answer your question.

22 DR. BELL: I see. All right.

23 MR. LASKOWSKI: A violation has to be  
24 fixed by the company.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 DR. BELL: I see. All right. Thank you.

2 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: 99 percent of the LTE,  
3 is that a violation?

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: Right now, no. 99.999 is  
5 not a violation.

6 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. So once it  
7 exceeds 100 percent it's a violation?

8 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it is.

9 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: So 102 -- 102 versus  
10 say 150, 102 would be a lesser violation than 150  
11 magnitude wise?

12 MR. LASKOWSKI: Magnitude wise, yes.

13 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: Okay. I'll have to --  
14 when it comes to me I'll have to remember what my other  
15 question was. Thank you Chairman.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: What is 100 on the  
17 nose? A violation or not?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: It's a violation.

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think we have to  
20 remember in the studies in April of 2011, in the studies  
21 in July of 2012 there have been no generator retirements  
22 incorporated in those studies that have not delisted or  
23 filed that they were no longer in operation. The latest  
24 study basically says AES Thames is not included in the



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 study, and part of that plan doesn't exist anymore. We  
2 have the fact that Bridgeport 2 has delisted in FCA-4,  
3 FCA-5, FCA-6, and the other addition that was removed was  
4 in the July 2012 study Ansonia was removed. That's a  
5 state sponsored 60 megawatt generator, which I believe to  
6 date has never received financing, so there is no steel  
7 in the ground, okay?

8 We have the DEEP IRP report for 2012,  
9 which basically says there are going to be a number of  
10 generator retirements coming forth and they drew that  
11 conclusion from the detailed studies done by the Brotto  
12 (phonetic) Group for DEEP, which basically said by year  
13 2015 because of the environmental improvements, capital  
14 improvements that need to be made to those facilities,  
15 Brotto just doesn't see how additional generators,  
16 generating units in Connecticut can survive economically.

17 And in their conclusion the 938 included Bridgeport 2,  
18 Bridgeport Harbor 2, which is already delisted, it  
19 included Middletown 4, it included Montville 6, some 938  
20 megawatts of generation. So where Mr. Golembiewski said,  
21 what happens at the 99 percent mark? Well, as soon as we  
22 lose a 400 megawatt generator, who cannot economically  
23 make it anymore, by 215 you just went over the 100  
24 percent mark from where you were at 99 percent.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1                   In other words, and DEEP than also  
2 projects there's going to be another 1,100 megawatts in  
3 Connecticut that are on the border. These of the Norwalk  
4 units, these are the Middletown, I think two, three  
5 units, and so on and so forth. So if you included those  
6 and in ISO at this time --

7                   MR. FITZGERALD: You mean, if you included  
8 them as retired?

9                   MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- if you included them  
10 as retirements, and ISO does not in their studies, then  
11 Connecticut's situation could change dramatically from  
12 what you have studied. And, you know, when you look at  
13 another ISO report that just came out I believe in May,  
14 they project there will be 5,000 megawatts throughout New  
15 England retired. You've got the FERC, Commissioner  
16 Muller, who has stated there will be somewhere between  
17 2,000 and 6,000 megawatts retired shortly within New  
18 England. These are concerning to the T.O. sitting here  
19 where some of those retirements could be in critical  
20 locations where on a crash basis you're going to have to  
21 install some transmission lines to avoid additional  
22 violations of the national standards.

23                   So I would not get too concerned over the  
24 102 percent mark or the 99 percent mark, because I think

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 we all see in the hours these generating units are being  
2 dispatched, and should there be new rules and how  
3 generators get paid, it's a concern. And just as AES  
4 Thames says, I'm closing the door tomorrow morning, they  
5 may not be there. Okay? And when we lose the generation  
6 in Connecticut we increase the transfers into the state  
7 of Connecticut to make up and meet those customer needs,  
8 not like India, and so the transfers into the state of  
9 Connecticut will also increase as not demonstrated in the  
10 studies that were done. Does that help Dr. Bell?

11 DR. BELL: Yes it does help. I'm going to  
12 paraphrase your answer. First of all, I think that you  
13 are answering my question even though this may be  
14 improper, but you are giving me an answer, but you are  
15 also at the same time saying that you wouldn't  
16 characterize -- you're saying it's a minor matter in one  
17 sense, but you're saying that really that such  
18 characterizations don't apply, not only because it's NERC  
19 policy not to apply those characterizations, but because  
20 there are very large swings in the power biz and they can  
21 happen for economic as well as technical engineering  
22 reasons and so given that situation where you can have a  
23 big swing of a lot of megawatts because of their big  
24 power plants then the characterization, minor, doesn't

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 really apply. Usually the swings turn out to be pretty  
2 major.

3                   Anyway, that's my paraphrase. If it's an  
4 incorrect paraphrase I apologize, but it is -- I am  
5 getting an answer and I thank you for that.

6                   MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: You're welcome.

7                   DR. BELL: I have one more question, it's  
8 not about Exhibit A. It's coming off of a statement  
9 that's made in the February updated solutions report. On  
10 page 15 it says, it outlines the Lake Road situation in  
11 Connecticut. Now, Lake Road is part of this project.  
12 Lake Road has been a thorn in Connecticut's side in a way  
13 from in terms of how it's handled or how it's regarded in  
14 the ISO system. And on page 15 it says, Lake Road is  
15 considered outside of Connecticut under Connecticut  
16 import conditions, but conversely is considered within  
17 Connecticut when Connecticut export is modeled. So I'm  
18 just referring to that as a takeoff.

19                   My question is simply, now, under -- or in  
20 the future if 424 is approved is it fair to say that Lake  
21 Road will be regarded as part of Connecticut in either an  
22 export or an import situation, will that be fair to say?

23                   MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Let me first start --  
24 you're smiling for some reason.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 (Laughter)

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Let me first start that  
3 -- make the statement, ISO and only ISO can make that  
4 decision where Lake Road will be located within zones,  
5 and Connecticut is a zone. Clearly, my personal belief  
6 is that with Interstate and the fact that we now install  
7 two 345 kV lines between western portions of Connecticut  
8 with the Lake Road facility it should be considered where  
9 it has not been considered in the past part of the  
10 Connecticut load area, or for load source requirements  
11 anyway.

12 Recognize that this study itself, the  
13 Interstate Project, which was part of NEEWS, the overall  
14 bigger piece of, you know, with GSRP already in  
15 construction and other pieces of it, was put forth to  
16 address the reliability violations that are occurring  
17 today within southern New England. And the fact that the  
18 proposed Interstate line goes from Cod Street to Lake  
19 Road, from Lake Road over to West Farnam, and then  
20 there's a new line from West Farnam up to Millbury and  
21 there's a rebuilding of the existing line from Sherman  
22 Road east down to West Farnam are all part of a solution  
23 that, number one, increases the transfer limits into the  
24 state of Connecticut. And they increase them primarily

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 on the -- also on the N minus 1, minus 1, which is used  
2 to determine the state of Connecticut's local source  
3 requirements. So we increase those by seven to 800  
4 megawatts by completing the Interstate Project as it is  
5 being proposed right now within the states of  
6 Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

7 Exactly how the ISO is going to treat Lake  
8 Road for your question specifically, is it or is it not  
9 in Lake Road for both the movement of power west to east  
10 and east to west, I cannot personally ask that --

11 MR. FITZGERALD: You mean answer.

12 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: -- answer that, I can  
13 maybe ask it, which we have been doing for the last  
14 number of months of the ISO to complete their studies and  
15 make that determination. I think some of the issues come  
16 up Dr. Bell because ISO is responsible for both the  
17 markets and reliability, okay? So the piece we've been  
18 dealing with is primarily reliability here and I think  
19 what you end up is some -- I shouldn't say the word  
20 conflict, but there is a mixing of how are the markets  
21 going to operate with reliability needs? There's no  
22 question the Interstate Project is needed from a  
23 reliability standpoint, but at the same time it gets into  
24 the market's piece of the New England situation. And we

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 have -- we have -- NU/CL&P has no control over that, that  
2 becomes 100 percent an ISO decision. And as of last week  
3 they had not made that decision yet on how it is going to  
4 be treated or whether there should be a shift in the  
5 interfaces that presently are known today to exist in the  
6 operate world.

7 But there are some benefits to this and  
8 some of it is, is an increase of seven to 800 megawatts  
9 into the transfer into Connecticut, which Connecticut  
10 will be able to apply and say, I need seven, 800  
11 megawatts fewer generation -- less generation installed,  
12 steel in the ground, in the state of Connecticut to meet  
13 my local source requirements. So there are some major  
14 benefits that will be obtained or achieved by the  
15 construction and placing in service the Interstate  
16 Project.

17 DR. BELL: Thank you. I'll ask ISO the  
18 same question.

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Hopefully they'll give  
20 you the same answer.

21 (Laughter)

22 DR. BELL: Thank you Mr. Chairman, those  
23 are my questions.

24 MR. ASHTON: Back to the transmission, if

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 my memory serves me correctly your about at your 50th  
2 anniversary in this transmission planning game, is that  
3 right?

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We're approaching 46 or  
5 47. I feel like 80.

6 MR. ASHTON: Would you agree with me that  
7 transmission planning involves a lot of judgment in that  
8 you can have, for example, a case where you have to  
9 connect a major new generator, 1,000, 1,200 megawatt unit  
10 is installed at Millstone Point that has a clear explicit  
11 impact on the transmission system and on the other hand,  
12 load can gradually grow over a period of time such that  
13 power swings through the system implicitly put a new or  
14 greater strain on that system, is that fair to say?

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yes it is.

16 MR. ASHTON: I want to just get my own  
17 history straightened out a little bit. If I recall, the  
18 2012 CELT report, we're looking at about a little over  
19 34,000 megawatt peak load in New England in 2022, is that  
20 right?

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's about right,  
22 approximately.

23 MR. ASHTON: And in 2012 would be looking  
24 at a peak load, if we haven't had one already, of



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 somewhere 29,000 megawatts, is that about right? As a  
2 working number? I'm not going to get mathematically  
3 precise.

4 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Just one minute, we'll  
5 check one of the reports.

6 MR. ASHTON: Okay.

7 MR. LASKOWSKI: 2012 forecasts a 9010  
8 summer peak of 28,910, or 29,000 megawatts.

9 MR. ASHTON: Okay. 29. You'll allow me  
10 that 90 megawatts, won't you? Do you have any idea what  
11 the peak load was back in 1970 when the initial 345 kV  
12 loop was I think completed throughout New England from  
13 New York up to Maine? Would that be somewhere in the  
14 15,000 range?

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think that was -- I  
16 was a little bit lower than that in my mind before you  
17 spoke, but I was in the 13 or 14.

18 MR. ASHTON: Okay.

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: In that ballpark,  
20 approximately.

21 MR. ASHTON: It's fair to say that a lot  
22 of the system that we're grappling with now, and it's  
23 specifically the Card Street to Rhode Island line that  
24 goes back to 1970, we've had a system load growth to date

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 of something on the order of 200 plus percent, and we're  
2 going to have something on the order of 250 percent if  
3 things go as they're expected in the year 2022, is that  
4 fair to say?

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's correct, with  
6 the lowest.

7 MR. ASHTON: So, it would not be -- it  
8 wouldn't come as a great shock to anybody familiar with  
9 transmission planning that you've got to do some  
10 reinforcement of the system to reflect the larger loads,  
11 the larger swings that can occur on a system over that  
12 period of time, fair enough?

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That's a correct  
14 statement.

15 MR. ASHTON: Okay. You have already  
16 raised the issue of generation unit retirements coming  
17 up, or possible, in the next 10 years. And that would  
18 exacerbate potentially the burdens on the transmission  
19 system, fair to say?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe they would  
21 have a significant impact on the reliable operation.

22 MR. ASHTON: Now, in looking -- oh, one  
23 other question I have, a specific question. Dr. Bell  
24 raised a whole bunch of thermal ratings, LTE ratings of

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 102 or 108 or 152, what year did those occur? Excuse me.  
2 Roughly. Are those out at the end of the 2022 period or  
3 are we facing those today?

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: This analysis was --  
5 that's centered on 2022.

6 MR. ASHTON: I'm sorry?

7 MR. LASKOWSKI: The analysis was 2022 in  
8 the ISO proposal.

9 MR. ASHTON: So, if those are occurring in  
10 2022, what's driving the decision today?

11 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Let me clarify that  
12 statement. The ISO report of July 2012 does not go back  
13 and identify the year in which the overloads occurred.  
14 All they did was reconfirm when, that there still are  
15 violations out there and the proposed project resolves  
16 those reliability violations. In the report they  
17 basically state that they have not done a specific study  
18 as was done in the April 2011 report where the 2011  
19 report identified the dates of need specifically, saying  
20 Rhode Island has got an eminent problem right now,  
21 Connecticut had a need of 2014/15, the western region had  
22 a need of 2017/18. The reconfirmation or what's called  
23 the follow-up updated needs assessment does not go into  
24 the detail of, are they still needed in 2014/15. All

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 they did was say, we took the load at 2022 and here we  
2 still have a need for the project. So as far as  
3 Northeast Utilities is concerned, and I believe ISO, and  
4 I don't want to speak for them, you could ask them that  
5 question when they sit up here, there's still a need for  
6 the project somewhere around 2014/15 for the state of  
7 Connecticut. The western region still has a need for the  
8 project around 2018. Rhode Island has a need for the  
9 project yesterday and eastern New England I thought had a  
10 need somewhere around 2015 also when you take into  
11 account the loss of the Salem Harbor units 1, 2, 3, 4,  
12 which is about the loss of an 800 megawatt, 750 megawatt  
13 generating station, which will be totally out of service  
14 in 2014.

15 And you look at the studies, Mr. Ashton,  
16 where I've got the New Brunswick import at zero, and you  
17 look at the overloads that are occurring, there's just  
18 still a definite need for the project now as projected in  
19 the dates I've already specified.

20 MR. ASHTON: Would you agree that all of  
21 these studies are an aid to good judgment in the design,  
22 operation, and construction of a transmission system?

23 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think it's good  
24 judgment and the fact that as I stated before, and I

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 don't want to be repetitive, there are no retirements in  
2 this package.

3 MR. FITZGERALD: (Indiscernible, too far  
4 from mic.).

5 MR. ASHTON: I hear you. I believe you  
6 too.

7 (Laughter)

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: And when those units  
9 retire it's going to take us at best three to five years  
10 to put transmission facilities in place to meet the  
11 reliability needs of the state of Connecticut.

12 MR. ASHTON: In looking at -- I'm going to  
13 work both sides of this issue so, Mike, don't read  
14 anything into my questions here. One of the things that  
15 concerns me is that we're looking at a half a billion  
16 dollars more or less of investment in a transmission  
17 system and the record of that transmission system has  
18 been pretty darn good, has it not, excluding the storms  
19 last fall, and if I remember right we have had zero loss  
20 of customer load for a five-year period, something like  
21 that, whereas we get a hellacious loss of just due to  
22 distribution failures. Then a question comes as to, if  
23 I'm going to spend \$500,000,000 where should I spend it?  
24 Should I spend it on transmission where the record is

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 phenomenally good, trees falling into the transmission  
2 line notwithstanding, or should I spend it on  
3 distribution which is not so good? This is some of the  
4 issue as a manager of a company and as a regulator I  
5 would think are going through people's minds. And so my  
6 questions are to how to get at that judgment? You have a  
7 comment I'm sure.

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Certainly. I think we  
9 have to remember what, you know, when you look at it and  
10 you say well, what does one transmission line do? It  
11 moves power from point one to point two. But the whole  
12 system on a whole is necessary to meet reliability  
13 requirements. The transmission system without question  
14 has improved the efficiency of system operations. The  
15 transmission facilities, as we spoke before with Dr.  
16 Bell, increase the ability to move power into like the  
17 state of Connecticut, the transfer limits go up, they  
18 provide emergency backup for resources. In other words,  
19 whenever we lose a generating unit within the state of  
20 Connecticut the power doesn't come from anywheres, it  
21 comes from that transmission system that we have built  
22 throughout New England to allow a generator in Maine or a  
23 generator in Massachusetts to bring that power into the  
24 state.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Day to day when you look at generator  
2 dispatch the economics of it are driven -- only driven by  
3 the fact that we have the transmission in place where we  
4 can take a unit which is operating at \$45 a megawatt and  
5 move that power in where the next generator that could be  
6 put on the system in Connecticut may be \$65, is a  
7 substantially economic benefit to have in the  
8 transmission. It reduces that requirement to have a  
9 local generation in place. And if you just go back a few  
10 years, look at where we were. We had built a brand-new  
11 Milford generating unit, high-efficiency, low cost, and  
12 yet because Connecticut was in the position it was in we  
13 were paying them \$125,000,000 a year as must run to  
14 operate along with other units in the state of  
15 Connecticut. A brand-new generating plant, \$125,000,000  
16 whether they operated or not is what they got paid. So  
17 when we talk about economics and being able to move stuff  
18 around this becomes critical to the ratepayers of the  
19 state of Connecticut.

20 MR. ASHTON: No argument there. My  
21 question is judgment as to balance. As I say, I think  
22 the must run situation down southwest Connecticut is a  
23 story into itself that someday I hope will get written  
24 because it's not one of Connecticut's moments of glory.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 Talking About Lake Road, Lake Road right  
2 now is tied to the 345 system and it's also tied into  
3 Killingly Substation. Is there any credit whatsoever  
4 given to the fact that you can supply load to Connecticut  
5 through that Killingly connection from Lake Road at all?

6 Is there one unit that's given credit for it at all?  
7 And if not, why not?

8 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes there is credit given  
9 for that. And if you look at a report written by ISO a  
10 couple of years ago they -- they had said one unit could  
11 be considered a Connecticut unit.

12 MR. ASHTON: Okay. So we're really  
13 concerned about two units is in Rhode Island, the net two  
14 units. You mentioning east/west flows that takes me back  
15 quite -- 50 odd years to what I think was a fiasco, and  
16 that's the construction of the Rotterdam Pratts Junction  
17 line, 230 kV. Technically an anomaly. Is there any  
18 consideration in these studies to beef up the east/west  
19 capability by converting that line to 345 or possibly  
20 even a higher voltage?

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Not to my knowledge Mr.  
22 Ashton.

23 MR. ASHTON: Part of your east/west  
24 problem is that we are still dependent upon 1970



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 interconnection between New England and New York, is that  
2 not the case?

3 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We do have those  
4 limitations between what is the transfer limits between  
5 New York and New England, whether we're talking east to  
6 west or west to east.

7 MR. ASHTON: If we -- and that limit I  
8 believe is still the same limit that's applied for 40  
9 years, is that all right?

10 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: It's 1,200 one way and  
11 15 the other, isn't it?

12 MR. LASKOWSKI: It's approximately 1,400.

13 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: The limit is  
14 approximately 1,400 in both directions. Not much  
15 different than they were 20 years ago.

16 MR. ASHTON: How many years ago?

17 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: 30 years ago?

18 (Laughter)

19 MR. ASHTON: How many years ago?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I don't want to give  
21 you my age.

22 (Laughter)

23 MR. ASHTON: A long time ago anyway.

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: A long time ago, I'll

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 agree with that.

2 MR. ASHTON: Okay. If we do have a  
3 transfer, east/west transfer limit, and if the transfer  
4 limits between New York and New England essentially  
5 haven't changed for this period of time, why would that  
6 not be an unreasonable -- or a reasonable solution to the  
7 east/west problem by throwing another major tie between  
8 New England and New York? Would that help you out, A, in  
9 the east, the New York/New England frontier, and B, in  
10 the internal New England east/west problem?

11 MR. LASKOWSKI: That tie would have no  
12 benefit at all of transferring power from -- specifically  
13 from western New England to eastern New England. It  
14 would be able to pump power into western New England, but  
15 it couldn't get it across the interface --

16 MR. ASHTON: Wouldn't it depend where the  
17 eastern terminal of that line was?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: -- well, if you're going  
19 to build a line all the way across Connecticut --

20 MR. ASHTON: Well, not necessarily across  
21 Connecticut, couldn't it be from Pleasant Valley or  
22 through Pittsfield through the Northfield Mountain plant  
23 and over to somewhere in central New England?

24 MR. LASKOWSKI: -- okay, yes. If you want

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 to build a line that long. That would be much longer.

2 MR. ASHTON: Well, that kills two birds  
3 with one stone, doesn't it? It gives you better  
4 east/west New England capability and gives you better  
5 east/west New England versus New York capability.

6 MR. LASKOWSKI: You're essentially  
7 doubling the size of the line.

8 MR. ASHTON: Right. That's what you're  
9 doing here between Card Street and Rhode Island, you're  
10 doubling the size of the line.

11 MR. LASKOWSKI: Doubling -- I meant in  
12 terms of length, you're building the line from Card  
13 Street up to Millbury, you're essentially saying, why  
14 don't we not add onto that all the way over to New York.

15 MR. ASHTON: But wouldn't that also give  
16 you an added benefit that this line does not give you?

17 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes it would, of course.

18 MR. ASHTON: So the proposition isn't an  
19 unreasonable one, is it?

20 MR. LASKOWSKI: In terms of adding  
21 benefit, no, it's not unreasonable. In terms of  
22 justifying it and who's going to pay for it I would think  
23 you're going to have a hard time --

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Mr. Ashton?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ASHTON: Well, that's okay. Yes sir?

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I would keep that  
3 question when the ISO people are here.

4 MR. ASHTON: I intend to.

5 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: As I recall, there is a  
6 group of individuals from the PJM -- PJM entity, from New  
7 York ISO and the New England ISO, who have extensively  
8 studied how to increase transfers between New York and  
9 New England. And I think their committee is called  
10 ISPAC, and you could go onto the ISO website for that  
11 under committees -- other committees and then you click  
12 down on ISPAC. My recollection was around 2008-2009 they  
13 looked at what could be done to increase basically the  
14 generation on the HVDC line, in other words, a loss of  
15 source studies, how best to do that.

16 And as I recall, there was only like 100  
17 megawatts difference of installing a new line between  
18 Pleasant Valley and Long Mountain. There was a small  
19 difference in putting in another line from Alps over the  
20 Berkshire and I'm not certain whether it went all the way  
21 into Northfield, but it just increased, if you would, the  
22 amount of power that can be moved from New York into New  
23 England at any given time. And the problem ends up being  
24 a voltage problem in the Idic (phonetic) area and when

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 that's not the issue it becomes a problem on the southern  
2 New Jersey transmission system, even with the proposed  
3 new 500 kV lines down in that area, they become the  
4 limiting factor of how can the system without going  
5 unstable or without violating voltage criteria increase  
6 the power transfers between New York and New England.

7 So there are two areas today that dictate  
8 that and that is the amount of power you can move on  
9 central east across New York. And the second is, is what  
10 can you move for power down in the Pennsylvania, New  
11 Jersey area, where if you have a lot of generation down  
12 there it actually becomes a more limiting tie then the  
13 New York/Central East. I don't know if that helps or  
14 not.

15 MR. ASHTON: No, I understand what you're  
16 saying and it does help. The thing I'm concerned about  
17 is that to my recollection we've had three instances, I  
18 think it was, to certainly, where the system had suffered  
19 some outages during very big power swings. It's not the  
20 fact that a unit drops off that seems to get us in  
21 trouble, is the fact that some idiot out in Ohio forgot  
22 to trip at tree and the whole system falls apart and that  
23 creates a very substantial power swing.

24 You and I can remember, at least I can,

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 remember the 1965 blackout and they were big power swings  
2 there again. And that's where the system really gets  
3 tested and it's not the loss of a unit, it's the loss of  
4 a unit which triggers a major system contingency. And  
5 that's where I'm -- my questioning is poking at what can  
6 we do that kills two birds with one stone, Mr. Laskowski,  
7 that would benefit that? You know, what is a little bit  
8 out-of-the-box thinking in that direction? That's no  
9 question pending so I don't expect you to answer it.

10 What determines a transfer limit? What  
11 testing do you do and what conclusion, how do you make a  
12 conclusion that the transfer limit is X? You swing one  
13 part of the system against another. You can put a  
14 generator at Southington Bus versus generator at the  
15 Boston Bus, swing them, I understand philosophically, but  
16 when do you say the transfer limit has been reached?  
17 What is it?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: It occurs when you get  
19 your -- well, there's two different transfer limits. We  
20 do one for thermal, and we do also one for stability.

21 MR. ASHTON: I'm looking at the stability  
22 type.

23 MR. LASKOWSKI: The stability type?

24 MR. ASHTON: Yeah.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. LASKOWSKI: Okay. Stability type --

2 MR. ASHTON: Where there's not necessarily  
3 a stuck breaker or something like that.

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: -- even for stability we  
5 do consider stuck breakers in that we'll do a simulation,  
6 we'll set up a transfer, run the simulations and look if  
7 the system splits apart, or if we have a specific amount,  
8 loss of source. And to come up with the stability  
9 transfer limit we'll keep increasing, turning on more  
10 generators until we do get a significant loss of source.

11 There is a specific criteria that says for whether it is  
12 normal contingency or extreme contingency where extreme  
13 contingency such as stuck breakers we're allowed more  
14 loss of source. So it's -- in doing the stability type  
15 transfer limit there is a little bit of, try this and  
16 then go on to the next level, try this or back down  
17 either way.

18 MR. ASHTON: In looking at this project  
19 before the House now, what kinds of alternatives were  
20 considered in terms of a different approach to it?  
21 Obviously, double circuiting is, you know, a bread-and-  
22 butter type of answer to a problem. Was there any  
23 examination made of perhaps a transfer of, a connection  
24 between a bus such as Montville, not over to West Farnam,

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 going through a different route, not necessarily the  
2 Montville Bus, did you look at that kind of option?

3 MR. LASKOWSKI: In the original 2000 --  
4 when we started this study back in 2004-2005 we looked at  
5 several different options and one was a line coming down  
6 from Rhode Island, crossing over to the  
7 Millstone/Montville area and that option was eliminated.

8 MR. ASHTON: Why?

9 MR. LASKOWSKI: Combination of economics  
10 and environmental mostly. And it also did not have as  
11 much -- it ran into other problems because then at  
12 Millstone we started to see overloads, so it wasn't quite  
13 as robust as the other solutions that we kept with.  
14 Early on even I was told to think out-of-the-box, and we  
15 even thought of potentially a DC line going through the  
16 Sound, but again, from an economic standpoint that would  
17 not have been --

18 MR. ASHTON: Yeah, well, I could believe  
19 that.

20 MR. LASKOWSKI: -- you know, it was right  
21 after doing some of the other cable -- undersea cables  
22 where the Sound became, we don't want to touch the Sound,  
23 so you know, from an environmental standpoint that was  
24 not -- not acceptable.



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: We also had an HVDC  
2 line, potentially underground or overhead, from Millbury  
3 to Southington, was considered as one of the other  
4 options. We considered a direct line from Millbury  
5 directly down to Manchester not following any of the  
6 existing rights-of-way, which would be a line that  
7 basically paralleled the Connecticut, I mean, excuse me,  
8 the Massachusetts Turnpike and 84, coming in that way is  
9 one of the alternatives. We studied what was in the  
10 original SNETRP report, that's the Southern New England  
11 Transmission Reliability Project that was the first piece  
12 that came out in January 2008. There was reviewed an  
13 option which went from Millbury over to Ludlow and tied  
14 into the Ludlow Bus, required a rebuilding of the  
15 existing Manchester to Ludlow line. That was turned down  
16 because to rebuild that you might as well build another  
17 one parallel to it because you couldn't operate the  
18 system without the line in place.

19 So there were a number of other  
20 alternatives that were studied to address all of the  
21 voltage violations that came out besides the 10 or 12  
22 that never got documented, Mr. Ashton. There were five  
23 that were documented and then we had to modify when the  
24 2011 reports were done there was a west to east problem

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 that came up and so the options that we put together in  
2 the August 2008 report were basically modified to address  
3 those issues, which were a rebuilt primarily of the  
4 Sherman Road to the existing 328 line from Sherman Road  
5 to West Farnam.

6 But clearly they addressed all of the  
7 interface issues. And then the last one was the report  
8 was to modifying Carpenter Hill. The original reports  
9 had us just tapping into Carpenter Hill, doing nothing  
10 else with Carpenter Hill. In the April 2011 report we  
11 had a rebuild of the Carpenter Hill Substation with  
12 another auto transformer there as one of the other  
13 options. So yes, there were quite a few alternatives.  
14 It just wasn't, hey, we think we've got something here,  
15 let's just focus on this one.

16 MR. ASHTON: If Rhode Island, for whatever  
17 reason, turns down the proposal, what would -- would you  
18 still want to build the Card Street to Rhode Island  
19 borderline or Card Street to Killingly line?

20 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I personally cannot  
21 envision Rhode Island turning down the project.

22 MR. ASHTON: Well, I can't either, but  
23 strange things happen.

24 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Today an N minus 1,

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 minus 1 situation results in a total collapse. There's  
2 only two lines that go into West Farnam and West Farnam  
3 is key to their whole system. I lose both lines in a 115  
4 kV system, this cannot handle it and you've got -- call  
5 it India III in Rhode Island, you know?

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. ASHTON: Okay. I guess that's enough  
8 for me, Mr. Chair, thank you.

9 MR. LASKOWSKI: I was going to add, I  
10 don't think we'd build Card just to the border and stop  
11 the line there.

12 MR. ASHTON: No, no, that's why I said  
13 Killingly.

14 MR. LASKOWSKI: Okay.

15 MR. ASHTON: I said Card to Killingly.

16 MR. LASKOWSKI: Card to Killingly? Okay.

17 MR. ASHTON: As the alternative.

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: That wouldn't solve the  
19 east/west problem.

20 MR. ASHTON: I understand you don't  
21 normally do that. Thank you.

22 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Are you done? We'll  
23 take a break for lunch until two o'clock.

24 (Whereupon, a one hour lunch break was

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 taken.)

2 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Continue Council  
3 cross-examination? Brian, any questions?

4 MR. GOLEMBIEWSKI: I have no questions.

5 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Brian, you have no  
6 questions. Larry is not here. Ed?

7 MR. EDWARD WILENSKY: Just one question.  
8 With 424, Docket 424, is the reason for it to import  
9 energy into the state or to distribute energy within the  
10 state? In other words, what is the main purpose of 424?

11 MR. LASKOWSKI: 424 actually has multiple  
12 reasons. One is to import energy into the state because  
13 --

14 MR. WILENSKY: Well, isn't there enough  
15 energy in the state right now for the need of the state  
16 of Connecticut? Or is it still necessary to import  
17 energy?

18 MR. LASKOWSKI: -- there are situations  
19 during peak load in the future that there will not be  
20 enough energy in the state to supply all the load.

21 MR. WILENSKY: So then -- and the reason  
22 for the 424 Docket is what then?

23 MR. LASKOWSKI: One, to import energy  
24 during peak conditions. Also to be able to export energy

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 across the New England east/west boundary in both  
2 directions. Depending on which units are not available  
3 the power could be needed in either direction in New  
4 England.

5 MR. WILENSKY: The need then, the reason  
6 for it being that to distribute energy within the state  
7 and also to import energy into the state?

8 MR. LASKOWSKI: Yes.

9 MR. WILENSKY: Do we export any energy?

10 MR. LASKOWSKI: Generally very, very  
11 little.

12 MR. WILENSKY: Pardon? I'm sorry.

13 MR. LASKOWSKI: Generally very little.

14 MR. WILENSKY: Okay. Very good.

15 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Mr. Wilensky?

16 MR. WILENSKY: Yes, Mr. Zak?

17 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: You recall back when  
18 the nuclear plants were all running? In other words,  
19 Millstone 1, 2, 3 and Connecticut Yankee and then we had  
20 the Middletown four unit, we had the Montville six unit.  
21 At that time we were typically exporting power and then  
22 when we had the problems with the nuclear plants and  
23 Millstone 1, 2 and 3 and CY were shut down we became a  
24 major importer of power in those years. Then Millstone 2

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 and Millstone 3 came back on in '98, we were on the  
2 border. Some hours you would and some hours you  
3 wouldn't. Even though we've got enough power now  
4 generator-wise, when you add it all up the fact of the  
5 matter is from hour to hour a lot of the generation in  
6 Connecticut is oil fired. And oil fired at this time is  
7 extremely more expensive than gas-fired generation. So  
8 new England dispatches generation, unless there's a local  
9 problem that can't be solved with the transmission system  
10 that is there, you bring on the next unit which is the  
11 least, or the least most costly to put on the next unit.

12 So on a lot of the hours of the day you could say, well,  
13 Connecticut's got more generation than the load in the  
14 state of Connecticut, however, except for Millstone 2 and  
15 3 and maybe one or two other fossil fired units on low to  
16 medium peak days, those are the only units running in the  
17 state of Connecticut, and the load is being served by  
18 that coming into the state.

19 If you look at June 20 to 22, where we had  
20 the peak days a few weeks ago, on June 20 from the hours  
21 0100 to 0600 we were exporting. The rest of the hours  
22 all the way up to bringing in 1,800 megawatts of power we  
23 were importing, okay? If you look at last week, when we  
24 had the hot spell, July 16, 17, 18, there's not a single

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 hour in that period where we were exporting anything.

2 So if we are exporting it is during the  
3 wee hours of the morning when the load is, the New  
4 England load is probably somewhere between nine and 12  
5 for 13,000 megawatts. We've got the nukes and some other  
6 units that have must run contracts that must run, but  
7 were needed during the day and they've got a 24-hour  
8 start up period. We may be exporting some, but I think  
9 it's fair to say in today's world we're probably  
10 importing 90 plus percent of the hours of the year.

11 MR. WILENSKY: During that hot spell in  
12 July that you mentioned, were we importing in that time,  
13 July whatever?

14 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: July 16, 17, 18?

15 MR. WILENSKY: Yes, yes, yes.

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Yeah. The numbers go  
17 for July 16 the low number is about 356 megawatts all the  
18 way up to 1,906 megawatts. On the 17th, which would have  
19 been the Tuesday, the low number was 300, all the way up  
20 to 1,811 megawatts, all hours importing. On Wednesday  
21 the 18th we were importing the entire time. Load number  
22 was 480 megawatts.

23 MR. WILENSKY: Would you say that more  
24 energy plants are needed within the state of Connecticut

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 then being that we had to import so much?

2 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I think what I would  
3 say is we need more low cost, more efficient generating  
4 plants in the state of Connecticut. Plants that can  
5 compete with the rest of New England and be lower in  
6 costs such that they are called on to operate when the  
7 load is down lower than having units now which are way up  
8 in the price range, such that they are only called upon  
9 to operate when you're looking to have a very high load  
10 day or a peak load day.

11 MR. WILENSKY: Okay. Thank you very much.  
12 Thank you Mr. Chairman.

13 MR. LYNCH: Just one question. This  
14 morning -- in this morning's session you mentioned to Mr.  
15 Ashton that the likelihood of the state of Rhode Island  
16 or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts denying this project  
17 was not a matter -- not likely to happen. My question  
18 reverts back not to the states, but to the Army Corps,  
19 they're notoriously slow and not consistent. And Mr.  
20 Carberry referenced it this morning also. And they --  
21 and Ms. Mango in other sessions was talking about this  
22 too. I just want to get more of a clarification.

23 If the Army Corps should deny part of your  
24 permit where does that leave the project or how do you



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 get around the areas that they have jurisdiction over?

2 MR. CARBERRY: Well, part of the answer to  
3 your question, Mr. Lynch, is that we -- seeing the  
4 experience that we've had with GSRP and the long time  
5 that it took, we are much further along this time. Have  
6 made our major filings both of the 404 in the 401. Have  
7 had a great -- well, yes, the 404 is the Army Corps and  
8 the 401 is the Associated Water Quality Certificate with  
9 the state DEPs, so there's one in each state. And so  
10 we're much further along and there's a great deal of  
11 advance work with those agencies that done as well.

12 One of the things that was, I guess, a  
13 learning experience for us on the GSRP was the extent of  
14 the involvement of American tribes in a portion of the  
15 work that the Army Corps must go through before they can  
16 issue a permit. So we're much further along with them as  
17 well. So we've done everything we can this time I guess  
18 to make sure that that permit is not the source of delay  
19 that it was to us on GSRP.

20 Fortunately on GSRP we could work on other  
21 places that were in uplands and make progress without  
22 having that permit, but in this case we're trying to make  
23 sure that we get it in a more timely fashion. So we've  
24 done a lot more work in that regard.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 I look at these things as the -- the  
2 siting is whether you can do the project or not, this is  
3 the right project or not. And the permitting is, how do  
4 we do it in a way that's the least environmentally  
5 damaging practical way to do it? So they, first of all,  
6 are anxious to see that it's been sited, that this is the  
7 appropriate solution that the siting agencies have  
8 chosen, and then you look at how to do it in a least  
9 environmentally damaging and practical way, or if there  
10 is damage, how do you -- you can't avoid it, how do you  
11 mitigate it?

12 So, we're even at the point where we're  
13 discussing mitigation actions with these agencies as  
14 well. So I think that it's not the premise of your  
15 question that they could just deny the permit out right,  
16 or stop us to make a completely big change, it's not very  
17 likely.

18 MR. WILENSKY: Thank you very much Mr.  
19 Carberry.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Dr. Bell?

21 DR. BELL: I just want to ask a follow-up  
22 question to that. I'm not sure exactly whether Mr. Lynch  
23 just meant what we're doing in Connecticut. I heard your  
24 answer on that. But when you say, we're doing this or

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 we're doing that, were you also including Rhode Island?  
2 Because Rhode Island -- when you gave the dates for when  
3 the application was made to the ACOE for Rhode Island and  
4 Massachusetts they were both like in late June, or mid-  
5 June, as I remember from this morning what you said. So  
6 they don't seem to be very much ahead. Is there any  
7 chance that the Rhode Island people and the Massachusetts  
8 people would not be doing the kind of preparatory work  
9 that you've just spoke about to Mr. Lynch?

10 MR. CARBERRY: Okay. I should have when I  
11 used the word, we, have explained that we did include  
12 National Grid. They are joint with us on the Army Corps  
13 permit filing and just as we have made our state filings  
14 they have as well. In Massachusetts they have a  
15 companion process as well that precedes everything,  
16 Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, so they have to  
17 go through a process and get a certificate before they  
18 can make a permit application to any state agency. No  
19 state agency is allowed to issue its permit in  
20 Massachusetts until they've cleared that certificate  
21 process. So Massachusetts cleared that process, I think  
22 they got that certificate at the end of 2011.

23 DR. BELL: Okay.

24 MR. CARBERRY: So, they're with us. The

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 only thing that held up their -- they were prepared to  
2 file their application about the same time we were and  
3 they were held up after speaking with the EFSB staff and  
4 the staff wanting them to do some further studies. And  
5 then after they did that additional study they realize  
6 that ISO was going to do some follow-up as well. But  
7 while that effected the siting progress it did not effect  
8 the permitting progress.

9 DR. BELL: Okay. Thanks. I understand.

10 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Okay. We're ready  
11 for the cross-examination by other parties. NRG  
12 Companies? The Civie's are not here. Equipower  
13 Resources Corporation? Not here. UI?

14 A FEMALE VOICE: No questions.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Edward Bullard?  
16 Office of Consumer Counsel? Richard Cheney and the  
17 Highland Ridge Golf Range, LLC? Mount Hope Montessori  
18 School, Incorporated? ISO New England?

19 MR. ANTHONY MACLEOD: No questions.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: We're then ready for  
21 the appearance by the NRG Companies, which I understand -  
22 -

23 HEARING OFFICER GAITHER: Redirect?

24 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: -- certainly.

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. FITZGERALD: There's just one little  
2 line. Mr. Zak, you explained in the April 2011 needs  
3 report ISO put a year need on each of the several needs  
4 that were identified in the report. And just quickly to  
5 set up the next question, would you review what those  
6 needs and years of need were?

7 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: I believe I stated that  
8 the Rhode Island need was now, has been for a number of  
9 years. I believe I said Connecticut was 2014-2015. I  
10 believe I stated previously that the western region need  
11 was 2017-2018, or 2018-2019, in that ballpark of one of  
12 those ranges. And I believe the eastern region is 2015-  
13 2016, or 2016-2017, in that spread also.

14 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. By the way, when  
15 you're saying 216, you made 2016, right?

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Excuse me, yes, the  
17 answer is 2000 for all of those, 2013, 14, the year,  
18 calendar year.

19 MR. FITZGERALD: In this most recent  
20 follow-up report, which was kind of a last look to  
21 confirm that the project was still needed, many of the  
22 detailed analyses that were done in the earlier report  
23 were not done, and that includes this year -- revisit the  
24 year of need analysis, is that right?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: Okay. Now, what they did  
3 do though, was introduce a new methodology, a change in  
4 methodology for this report that hadn't been used in the  
5 previous reports, and that was to predict what energy  
6 efficiency measures might be added in future years to  
7 reduce loads, correct?

8 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: That is correct. That  
9 is correct.

10 MR. FITZGERALD: And so, the result was to  
11 generally reduce the loads that were being analyzed as  
12 compared to the previous several studies. So if the year  
13 of need analysis was redone on the 2012 assumptions,  
14 wouldn't you expect that those years would be moved out  
15 some, moved forward some and become later?

16 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: You mean by that  
17 question they would move from like where we were  
18 previously protecting them to be 2014-2015 two 2016-17 or  
19 17-18?

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Right, in that direction.

21 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: From an EE standpoint,  
22 that's energy efficiency, the EE stands for energy  
23 efficiency, that would be a correct assumption. But I'd  
24 like to point out two items now. One is the CELT report

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 and what's being projected assumes we are still in a  
2 recession, meaning we have very low load growth rates.  
3 In other words, the energy projected to be used in the  
4 peak loads are increasing at less than one percent up to  
5 a percent and a half. And secondly, I and others have a  
6 great concern that even though the ISO has projected load  
7 and energy efficiencies out to the years they have not  
8 taken into account generator retirements, which everyone  
9 knows is going to happen. But because they do not have a  
10 specific year, and have not been provided the  
11 documentation, in other words, in the form of delist in  
12 the forward capacity market auctions they do not project  
13 any retirements of generation.

14 And as I said before, the Brotto Group for  
15 DEEP has projected, I think starting in 2016 when you  
16 look at the Integrated Resource Plan for the state of  
17 Connecticut, they've got an additional 938 megawatts of  
18 generation out there, which they predict will retire  
19 because it is not economic for those units to continue to  
20 operate. And they have an additional 1,100 and almost 50  
21 megawatts of generation, which may or may not retire  
22 during that timeframe. So to predict exactly how much  
23 that timeframe for the need of this project in the state  
24 of Connecticut to meet violations, would it move or not?

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 I'm not certain. If we do have those retirements before  
2 year 2015, as the DEEP predicts, that timeframe is not  
3 going to move.

4 MR. LASKOWSKI: I would just like to add  
5 one other item. In that ISO presentation, which we were  
6 reviewing earlier with Dr. Bell, if you look at that  
7 Table 6, with the change in assumptions if a load  
8 decrease was only 370 megawatts, and that's less than a  
9 year's growth in the ISO that they're typically  
10 predicting for year to year throughout New England.

11 MR. FITZGERALD: Thank you.

12 MR. ASHTON: Mr. Zak, I have one question.  
13 In retirements, in the scheme of retirements, what would  
14 happen if the company went bankrupt? For example, NRG is  
15 one of the larger players in southern New England. If  
16 NRG went bankrupt would that -- could that accelerate  
17 retirements? Or should I wait till ISO is on the stand  
18 for that?

19 MR. ZAKLUKIEWICZ: Well, I know each of  
20 the plants in NRG are their own Inc. So, as in the case  
21 of AES Thames, the Inc. that had AES Thames, Connecticut,  
22 Inc., when it filed bankruptcy the doors were closed to  
23 that unit the following day.

24 MR. ASHTON: Okay. Thank you. That's it.



HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: All right. NRG  
2 Companies, I understand you do not have a presentation?

3 MR. ANDREW CORD: Correct.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: The Civie's are on  
5 for later on next month. Equipower Resources  
6 Corporation, not here. UI Company?

7 A FEMALE VOICE: Nothing.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: No presentation,  
9 thank you. Edward Hill Bullard, not present. Office of  
10 Consumer Counsel, not present. Richard Cheney and  
11 Highland Ridge Golf Range, LLC, not present. Mount Hope  
12 Montessori School Incorporated, not present. ISO New  
13 England?

14 MR. MACLEOD: No questions.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Thank you. You have  
16 a chance at rebuttal. Are you speechless?

17 MR. FITZGERALD: Well, as we do, you know,  
18 we're not -- no, because we have the ICF non-transmission  
19 alternative witnesses coming tomorrow morning.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Yes.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: We didn't think we'd --

22 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Let's see where we  
23 are. This concludes today's evidentiary session. The  
24 evidentiary hearing will continue here on Thursday at

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 11:00 a.m. Please note additional hearing dates have  
2 been scheduled for Tuesday, August 28th and Thursday,  
3 August 30th. A memo will be sent to the service list.

4 Other parties and intervenors will have  
5 the opportunity to present their cases on those dates.  
6 Any questions? So on Thursday who will we be -- will the  
7 applicant's panel be back? Non-transmission alternative  
8 and --

9 MR. FITZGERALD: Yeah. All we have left  
10 now is we have the one interrogatory that Ms. Topier  
11 needs to adopt and then we have the three witnesses from  
12 ICF Consulting, who will adopt their prefiled testimony  
13 and take cross-examination questions on them. Then we're  
14 done.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: And ISO New England  
16 will be when?

17 MR. MACLEOD: We will have prefiled  
18 testimony --

19 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, you need to  
20 come to the microphone.

21 MR. MACLEOD: -- we will have prefiled  
22 testimony that we will be introducing into the record.  
23 We will have witnesses available.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: And when is that

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 scheduled for?

2 MR. MACLEOD: Well, I think August 28th  
3 would be an appropriate date. I understand that one of  
4 the witnesses on our panel is not going to be available  
5 on the 30th, so we would ask that to the extent possible  
6 we try to get everything done. The individual who will  
7 not be available on the 30th is Mr. Rourke, Steve Rourke.

8 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: So you would hope to  
9 get all that done on the 28th?

10 MR. MACLEOD: On the 28th if possible,  
11 yes.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: When are the Civie's  
13 available?

14 A FEMALE VOICE: The 28th.

15 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: The 28th. And  
16 they're back from vacation?

17 A FEMALE VOICE: Yes.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Okay. Does that help  
19 everybody on our scheduling?

20 MR. FITZGERALD: Yes. That works. I  
21 mean, because the Civie's availability has a double  
22 significance apparently because they want to question ISO  
23 as well as present their own case. So that works.  
24 Maybe, to be sure that we finish with ISO, if at all

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

1 possible on the 28th, they could go first and then Mr.  
2 Civie -- the Civie's case could follow?

3 VICE CHAIRMAN TAIT: Why don't we work  
4 that out -- I understand the thought of -- so why don't  
5 you work it out with Melanie and get the schedule set up?

6 Okay. Thank you all for your participation this  
7 afternoon. We stand adjourned until Thursday.

8 (Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at 2:30  
9 p.m.)

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

INDEX OF SPEAKERS

	PAGE
APPLICANT'S PANEL OF WITNESSES:	
John Case	
Robert Carberry	
Louise Mango	
Anthony Johnson	
Roger Zaklukiewicz	
Timothy Laskowski	
Direct Examination by Mr. Fitzgerald	9
Cross-Examination by Staff	31
Cross-Examination by Council Members	37
Redirect Examination by Mr. Fitzgerald	85
Recross-Examination by Council Members	88

INDEX OF APPLICANT EXHIBITS

	NUMBER	PAGE
Transmittal Letter	23	10
Agreement with Highland Ridge	24	10
Cost Estimate for the Mount Hope Underground Variation	25	11
Green Dragon Day Care License	28A	13
Supplemental Testimony w/letter from Frederick Riese of the DEEP	28B	15
Redacted Updated Solution Study Report	8	23
Responses to CSC Interrogatories	9	24
Responses to CSC Interrogatories	15	26
Responses to Civie Interrogatories	22	27
Responses to Civie Interrogatories	26	28

HEARING RE: CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY  
JULY 31, 2012

ISO New England's follow-up Analysis To NEEWS Interstate Reliability Project Component Updated Needs Assessment	29	28
Direct Testimony of Mr. Laskowski And Mr. Zaklukiewicz	16	29
Supplemental Testimony of Mr. Laskowski And Mr. Zaklukiewicz	30	29
ISO Draft Report	32	30