



111 Founders Plaza Suite 1002
East Hartford, CT 06108
Phone (860) 291-8832
Fax (860) 291-8874

Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc.

June 7, 2005

RECEIVED
JUN 13 2005

Steve Gibelli
Northeast Utilities Service Company
P. O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06141-0270

CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

RE: Docket No. F-2005: Connecticut Siting Council Review of the Ten-Year Forecast
of Connecticut Electric Loads and Resources

Dear Mr. Gibelli:

The Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc. (CCAT) requests that the
Northeast Utilities Service Company respond to the enclosed interrogatories in the
above captioned matter.

Pursuant to the revised docket schedule issued by the Connecticut Siting Council on
May 19, 2005, responses to the interrogatories are due on June 17, 2005. To expedite
review, please file responses as they are available.

If you have questions on any of the interrogatories, please contact me at 860-291-8832.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Joel M. Rinebold

c: Service List
Ms. Pamela Katz, Chair, Connecticut Siting Council

cah

Enclosure

G:\Energy\policy\Siting Council\Steve Gibelli.doc

Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc.

**Docket No. F-2005 – Pre-Hearing Interrogatories
Connecticut Siting Council Review of the Ten-Year Forecast of Connecticut Electric
Loads and Resources**

Have the utilities established any uniform overhead and underground transmission siting guidelines that establish when, where, and how underground or overhead configurations would be developed?

Have the utilities established any preference standards for underground transmission lines for certain system transmission levels or components, or will underground configurations be considered on a case-by case basis for new proposals?

Could the standardization of an underground program for lower transmission voltages (115 KV and below) on a dual-voltage system, that includes higher voltage overhead 345 KV lines configured primarily to support large generation interconnection and regional transfers, be of value to increase impedance and improve system integration?

Have the utilities established any guidelines for the use of standardized transmission buffers that could be managed and enforced by local authorities during land use and zoning proceedings?

With numerous transmission and substation upgrades planned and under consideration, have the utilities come to any agreement to engage local government, regulators, community groups, and other local organizations to assist in proactive, comprehensive planning to identify and evaluate potential opportunities for energy facility development as part of the municipalities' plans of conservation and development?

Have individual circuits, distribution feeders, and substations been assessed for capacity, load, and unused capacity potentially available for application of distributed resources?

What are the typical costs associated with an interconnection study necessary for development of a generation unit 1) above 5 MW, and 2) between 10 KW and 5 MW?

What would these interconnection study costs be if a full integration system study were undertaken?

Please outline the advantages and disadvantages of requiring a full integration interconnection study versus a minimum reliability interconnection study?

Have the generators and/or utilities come to any agreement over the identification of the most appropriate technical mix of resources for conservation, demand response, generation, distributed generation, and transmission, or is there support for this mix to be driven entirely by the market?

Have the generators and/or the utilities come to any agreement over the identification of the most appropriate public and/or ratepayer funding levels for conservation, demand response, and renewable/clean generation?