

September 17, 2008

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY
and PUBLIC SERVICE OF NEW
HAMPSHIRE Request for Certificate of
Public Convenience and Necessity for the
Maine Power Reliability Program
Consisting of the Construction of
Approximately 350 Miles of 345 kV and 115
kV Transmission Lines ("MPRP")

EXAMINER'S DATA REQUEST
NO. 5

I. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please provide the response to each numbered request on a separate sheet of paper, or papers. Each sheet of paper should be three-hole punched.
2. For each response, please state (1) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) responsible for preparing the response, and (2) the name(s) and title(s) of the person(s) who are competent to give testimony concerning the response and all documents produced as part of the responses.
3. Where information requested is not available in the precise form described in the question, or is not available for all years indicated, please provide all information with respect to the subject matter of the question that can be identified in the Utility's Work papers and files, or that is otherwise available.
4. As used in this data request, "available" means within the Utility's knowledge, possession, or control, or within the party's power, capacity or ability to retrieve or obtain from an affiliate, a contractor, or any other source.

II. DATA REQUEST

1. (Volume VIII, Exhibit I-2, Page 3 of 373) Please describe in detail what analysis was performed for transient stability, short circuit, and long term dynamics.
2. (Volume VIII, Page 28 of 373) Please supply what the new operating limits are for the interfaces in Maine and New Hampshire in both directions. As part of your

response, please indicate what changes need to be made in the settings of existing SPSs and whether the operating limits are stability or thermally constrained.

3. (Volume VIII, Page 34 of 373, Table 4-2) Interface I4 is added here. Interface flows for I4 do not appear in Appendix B and base case load flow plots do not appear in Appendix C as stated. Please provide them here.
4. (Volume VIII, Pages 92-95 of 373, Tables 7-8 through 7-11) Are the interface limits all thermal limits?
5. (Volume VIII, Page 110 of 373) Is the widespread low voltage the result of the SPS not triggering? If so, why not change the triggers?
6. (Volume VIII, Page 110 of 373) Please describe in detail how the SPSs were investigated in this section.
7. (Volume IX, Exhibit I-3, Page 24 of 464) Are the interface limits presented here only determined by thermal considerations? If so, what would be the effect on your study results if stability or other analyses determines that the transfer limits are lower?
8. (Volume IX, Pages 144 and 145 of 464) All three graphs here show a significant change in the interface that increase flows from south to north. To the extent possible, please pinpoint the event that created this situation.
9. (Volume IX, Page 167 of 464) Figure 1-1 compares the benefits of the MACE to the costs. Should not the benefits to cost ratio converge closer to one when one is considering the pursuit of all cost effective DSM?
10. (Volume IX, Pp 168, 169 of 464) Did the 2007 Avoided Energy Supply Study conducted by Synapse Energy Economics include avoidance of the MPRP as a discrete cost that could be avoided through the pursuit of DSM?

If not, shouldn't a NTA study that is focused on avoiding or delaying such a project by definition include some fraction of the project costs in the analysis of what is "cost effective"?

Would such an exercise expand the range of options that would be cost effective and also increase the amount of demand reduction available? Please discuss.

11. (Volume IX, Pp 177, 178 of 464) Please explain the impacts (tables 3-4, 3-5) on the Rumford area load forecast from the recently announced shut down of the Wausau paper mill machine number 10. What affect does this action have both on the need for transmission upgrades and non-transmission alternatives in this region.

12. (Volume IX, Page 153 of 464) Please explain how economic evaluations of non transmission alternatives can be compared to transmission alternatives with the amount of the project to be socialized not determined and perhaps not even known total project costs (Sub-transmission costs and additional equipment from yet to be performed analyses)?
13. (Volume X) Please provide a map showing the transmission and 12kV facilities in the local area that is geographically accurate. On this map, please show the location of each generating station, the rating of each unit, and fuel type.
14. (Volume X, Exhibit I-4, Page 38 of 169) Please supply all ratings used for the equipment in the study area, parameters (Temperatures, loss of life, etc.) used to rate them, and the limiting element. If the facilities have been re-rated under PP-7, please supply old and new information.
15. (Volume X, Page 45 of 169) Please supply the vintage of the load forecast, its probability of occurrence, and the percent of load used in your analysis. Is this load forecast compatible and comparable to the load forecast in the main study section of the report?
16. (Volume X, Page 45 of 169) Is the reference to a single transmission element as a line and transformer for a transformer that is tapped off the line that would be isolated by protective devices for a single disturbance? If not, please explain why two elements are removed for a single event.
17. (Volume X, Page 45 of 169) Were extreme contingencies used to justify any system additions? If so, please identify the facilities justified.
18. (Volume X, Page 45 of 169) Was the use of voltage sensing switches investigated to reconnect the unfaulted section of line for the situation where a transformer is tapped off of the line? If not, why not? As part of your response, please detail what the impact on study results would be if they were considered.
19. (Volume X, Page 75 of 169) Please identify Section 87 and explain why it was outaged with Sections 61 and 61A.

Dated: September 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

James Buckley
Hearing Examiner