Interrogatory CSC-1 (2nd Set)

The United Illuminating Company
Docket No. F2009

Witness: Christian Bilcheck
Page 1 of 1

Q-CSC-1 (2nd Set): Are any substation upgrades associated with the Naugatuck Valley Reliability Improvement Project being contemplated? If yes, specify which substations would likely be upgraded as part of the project?

A-CSC-1(2nd Set): At this point in time, the Naugatuck Valley Reliability Improvement Project is a conceptual project. A proposed project will result from a comprehensive study of alternatives, which is in progress. Currently, the conceptual project involves a reconfiguration of certain 115 kV transmission lines at Derby Junction and the replacement of existing 115 kV transmission structures along the Derby Junction (Shelton) - Indian Well (Derby) corridor. Substation upgrades are not anticipated at this time.

Q-CSC-2 (2nd Set): The normal weather scenario in Exhibit 2 of The United Illuminating Company's (UI) 2009 Forecast excludes conservation and load management, distributed generation and potential new large customer planned tools. The normal weather forecast in Exhibit 1 includes such measures. However, the difference between the two forecasts does not appear to coincide with the load reductions specified in a table in UI's response to The Connecticut Siting Council's to interrogatory question 8, set one. Reconcile the difference between the forecasts in terms of the load reductions specified.

A-CSC-2 (2nd Set): The difference in the normal weather peak load forecast presented in Exhibit 2 and the normal weather peak load forecast presented in Exhibit 1 is due to peak load reductions of Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) and Distributed Generation (DG) and an increase in peak load due to potential new large customer planned loads.

The response to interrogatory question 8, set one, responded only to the DG component of the difference. The impact to summer peak presented in the response to interrogatory question 8, set one, was represented at the customer (meter) level. The impact to the system level summer peak would require the MW impact to be grossed up to the system level by accounting for system losses. The table below provides the incremental impact of DG at both the customer and system level.

Year	Incremental Impact from DG (MW)	Incremental Impact from DG Grossed-up to System Level (MW)
2009	2.47	2.57
2010	10.68	11.10
2011	6.09	6.33
2012	-	-
2013	-	-
2014	-	-
2015	-	-
2016	-	-
2017	-	-
2018	-	-

Load reductions due to C&LM are also included in Exhibit 1. The table below presents the incremental impact to peak load reductions due to C&LM at both the customer and system level.

Year	Incremental Impact from C&LM (MW)	Incremental Impact from C&LM Grossed-up to System Level (MW)
2009	5.14	5.34
2010	11.47	11.92
2011	12.39	12.88
2012	11.06	11.49
2013	10.45	10.86
2014	9.56	9.94
2015	9.30	9.66
2016	8.26	8.58
2017	7.10	7.38
2018	7.39	7.68

Peak load increases due to potential new large customer planned loads are included in Exhibit 1. The table below shows the incremental impact to peak load increases due to potential new large customer planned loads.

Year	Incremental Impact of Potential Large Customer Planned Load (MW)	Incremental Impact of Potential Large Customer Planned Load Grossed-up to System Level (MW)
2009	8.29	8.61
2010	20.47	21.28
2011	18.91	19.65
2012	12.37	12.85
2013	4.47	4.64
2014	-	-
2015	0.69	0.72
2016	-	-
2017	-	-
2018	-	-

These three components can be used to reconcile the difference in the normal weather peak load forecasts presented in Exhibits 1 and 2.