

# CONNECTICUT ENERGY ADVISORY BOARD

*Mailing Address:* Office of Policy and Management  
450 Capitol Avenue  
ATTN: CEAB  
Hartford, CT 06106

May 26, 2005

RECEIVED  
MAY 26 2005

CONNECTICUT  
SITING COUNCIL

Linda Randell, Esq.  
Wiggin and Dana LLP  
One Century Tower  
PO Box 1832  
New Haven, CT 06508

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

Dear Attorney Randell:

The Connecticut Energy Advisory Board (CEAB) requests that The United Illuminating 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:

Brian Abbanat  
La Capra Associates  
20 Winthrop Square  
Boston, Mass. 02110  
(617) 367-6500  
[babbanat@lacapra.com](mailto:babbanat@lacapra.com)

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Mary Healey, Consumer Counsel  
Vice Chairman  
Connecticut Energy Advisory Board

cc: Service List  
Ms. Pam Katz, Chair  
Connecticut Siting Council

**Information Requests From  
The Connecticut Energy Advisory Board  
To The United Illuminating Company**

**CSC Docket No. F-2005**

1. Please provide a complete description of the methodologies and procedures employed by UI in preparing forecasts of peak demand and energy requirements, including development of projections at the customer class level. Identify the sources of all economic data collected and describe the assumptions made by UI management in development of the economic outlook upon which UI's load forecasts are based.
  
2. (a)(i) Is the load forecast presented by UI in its March 11, 2005 filing to the Siting Council established simply by (1) applying growth projections to a base, historical, weather-normalized, system load value, then (2) adjusting the resulting annual peak loads for the estimated capacity contributions from DSM programs and foreseeable changes in capacity requirements of large customers? Please explain. (ii) Is the methodology by which the "extreme weather" forecast presented in Exhibit 2 largely the same? Please explain.
  - (b) Please explain how the growth projections identified in Exhibit 1 were established.
  - (c) Please explain how the growth projections identified in Exhibit 2 were established.
  - (d) Please explain how the load factors identified in Exhibit 1 were established.
  - (e) Please explain how the load factors identified in Exhibit 2 were established.
  - (f) Please describe the source of the "known consumption changes in the future for our large actively-managed commercial and industrial customers and incremental sales efforts." That is, by whom and how are the capacity "changes" developed?
  
3. (a) Please provide any forecast of peak loads and energy developed by UI's distribution planning department (i.e., as may be developed "by substation"). Please provide any other information the Company possesses or has access to regarding a forecast of peak loads that may facilitate an understanding of resource needs at specific locations on the Company's power delivery system.
  - (b) Please describe how UI's distribution planning department develops its forecasts of peak loads and energy requirements for use in distribution system planning.
  - (c) Please describe the relationship between the forecast submitted to the Siting Council in this docket and the forecast developed by the Company's distribution planning department.

(d) Please provide the historical peak loads and energy (across the last 5 years) at a level that corresponds to the forecast information provided in response to Part (a), above (i.e., by town or by substation, depending).

4. (a) Please provide the historical peak loads and monthly electric energy (on a “net electrical energy output” basis) for the past five years for each town in UI’s service area. In responding to this information request, please provide the historical load data based on both actual metered loads and on a weather-normalized basis.

(b) Please provide a description of UI’s weather-normalization methodology, as used in determining the load data provided in response to Part (a), above.

5. (a) Please provide a copy of the study of loads in Southwest Connecticut areas that was developed to support the transmission facility application to the Siting Council in Docket No. 272.

(b) Please also provide an explanation of any information the Company possesses or has access to that could influence the study if it were performed today.

6. With respect to the projects listed in Exhibit 5 of the Company’s filing to the Siting Council in Docket No. F-2005:

(a) Please indicate the projects that have not yet been approved by the Siting Council; and

(b) For each transmission project identified in the response to Part (a), please identify the load forecast that establishes the need for the project, and provide a copy of the load forecast (if not otherwise provided).

7. (a) Please provide the most recently completed distribution work plan (i.e., a plan that describes the Company’s current plans for distribution system improvements).

(b) Please provide a current list of the capital projects for distribution facilities (e.g., a “five year plan”) that the Company plans to undertake (if different from the above).

(c) Please provide a map that identifies the location (i.e., by town) of each distribution substation.

8. Please confirm that the contributions from conservation and load management programs that the Company included in its F-2005 filing load forecast are the same as those that are anticipated to result (i.e., in terms of capacity and energy contributions) from the programs

and budget approved by the DPUC in the Final Decision in Docket No. 04-11-01 dated March 30, 2005. If they are not identical, please identify and explain all differences.

9. (a) Please indicate whether and how contributions from (i) existing and (ii) planned cogeneration facilities affect the Company's resource requirements.  
  
(b) Please provide a tabulation of the load and energy forecast that reflects the impacts (i.e., before and after) of the existing and planned cogeneration facility load and energy reductions referred to in Part (a), above.
10. Please confirm that, for planning purposes, transmission facilities are those that are 69 kV and above, and distribution facilities fall below that level.
11. Please provide any studies the Company has performed or has access to that provide information or analysis on how distribution system planners may consider distributed generation ("DG") options together with traditional infrastructure solutions.
12. (a) Please confirm that the forecast peak loads identified in Exhibits 1 and 2 of the Company's filing to the Siting Council have been reduced to reflect savings contributions from previously installed conservation and load management measures (i.e., those installed through December, 2004), but not those measures that will be installed in the future (i.e., programs and program measures approved by the DPUC in its March 30, 2005 Decision in Docket No. 04-11-01).  
  
(b) In relation to Part (a), above, please provide a table that depicts (i.e., in separate rows or columns) (i) the peak load forecast, (ii) the reductions associated with previously installed measures, (iii) the reductions associated with measures assumed to be implemented in the future (i.e., in keeping with program budgets approved in the March 30, 2005 DPUC Decision at 20), and (iv) the resulting peak load as reduced by all conservation and load management measures.  
  
(c) Please provide an estimate of the contributions from load response programs that are likely to reflect "significantly higher participation in the years ahead" after consideration of ISO-NE program support and performance (see March 30, 2005 Decision at 20).
13. Please refer to the DPUC's Final Decision in Docket No. 04-11-01 dated March 30, 2005:  
  
(a) Please provide any "forecasted peak demand and energy use for SWCT and the rest of Connecticut, and the impact on growth due to conservation programs" (see Decision at 18).

14. Please provide a copy of all updates to the UI forecast presented to the Siting Council with its March 11, 2005 filing in Docket No. F-2005, as they become available.
  
15. (a) Please provide a summary of the Company's 5-year history of winter peak loads.  
  
(b) Please provide the most recent forecast of winter peak loads on UI's system.  
  
(c) Please provide a copy of all analyses performed by the Company, or that the Company has access to, that discuss the reliability of Connecticut's electric system during the winter months as affected by generating units fired by natural gas.
  
16. Please provide hourly loads by substation for the five years ended December 2004.
  
17. Please provide peak day loads (both summer and winter) broken down by major electric end-use category.
  
18. (a) Please provide the electricity price forecast information that was considered (or used as inputs) to the Company's load forecast filed on March 11, 2005, and for all updates to that forecast.  
  
(b) Please provide all studies of (i) electricity prices and (ii) electricity price elasticity considered by the Company in developing the electricity prices provided in response to Part (a), above.  
  
(c) Please provide any assessments made by or for UI regarding the affect on UI's forecast of peak loads and energy that would result if the military installation closure recommendations for issued in early May 2005 were to be implemented. Please include both the direct effects of the base closures and the indirect effects on the Connecticut economy.
  
19. Please provide disaggregations of (a) the load forecast included in the March 11, 2005 filing to the Siting Council and (b) all updates to that forecast by customer class (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, other) and by end use.