

CONNECTICUT
MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC
ENERGY COOPERATIVE



30 Stott Avenue
Norwich, CT 06360-1526
860-889-4088 Fax 860-889-8158

RECEIVED
JUN 24 2005

CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

June 24, 2005

Mr. Joel M. Rinebold
Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc.
111 Founders Plaza Suite 1002
East Hartford, CT 06108

Dear Mr. Rinebold:

The Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (CMEEC) herewith submits a copy to the Connecticut Center for Advance Technology, Inc. of responses to Interrogatories 1 through 7 dated June 7, 2005 from the Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc. in conjunction with Docket No. F-2005 Connecticut Siting Council Review of the Ten-Year Forecast of Connecticut Electric Loads and Resources.

Should you require any additional information, please advise us.

Very truly yours,

CONNECTICUT MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC
ENERGY COOPERATIVE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Scully", is written over the typed name and title of the signatory.

Maurice R. Scully
Executive Director

cc: Service List

CJC/

Enclosures

Serving Public Power in Connecticut

Groton
Utilities

Jewett City
Dept. of Public Utilities

Norwich Public
Utilities

Norwalk Third Taxing
District Electrical
Department

South Norwalk
Electric and Water

Town of Wallingford
Department of Public
Utilities

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request

Dated June 7,

CCAT-1 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Gabriel B. Stern

RESPONSE TO Connecticut Center for Advanced Technology, Inc DATA REQUEST
Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-1-CMEEC What is the current status of the temporary 22.8 MW peaking project off Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard in South Norwalk, Connecticut, the subject of Siting Council Petition 662? Has that proposed project been constructed? If not, what is the expected timetable for the commercial operation for that proposed generating facility?

A-CCAT-1-CMEEC This project was constructed and came on-line in June 2003 and was decommissioned in October 2003.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-1

Data Request

CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Dated June 7,

CCAT-2 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Gabriel B. Stern

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-2-CMEEC What is the current status of the proposed 50 MW natural gas-fired electric generating project at the site of the existing South Norwalk Electric and Water (SNEW) facility, the subject of Siting Council Petition 663? Has that proposed project been constructed? If not, is it anticipated that all construction would be completed on or before October 7, 2006?

A-CCAT-2-CMEEC This project has not been constructed. The economic viability of this project is being reviewed by CMEEC.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request

Dated June 7,

CCAT-3 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Gabriel B. Stern

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-3-CMEEC Does CMEEEC or the City of Norwich have any plans and/or conceptual schedules to upgrade its existing hydropower facilities in order to increase their capacity and/or capacity factor?

A-CCAT-3-CMEEC No, water conditions do not support any upgrade at this time. There are no plans at the present time to upgrade the existing facilities.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request
Dated June 7,
2005
CCAT-4 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-4-CMEEC Could the Norwich Second Street hydropower facility and or the Norwich Tenth Street hydropower facility be operated in a manner that would qualify the units as a Class I renewable facility? If so, which units could be reclassified as a Class I renewable facility? What would be the effect on capacity and/or capacity factor if the existing hydropower could be reclassified as a Class I renewable facility?

A-CCAT-4-CMEEC No. Both of these hydropower facilities began operation prior to July 1, 2003. By definition, they could not qualify as a Class I renewable facility. CMEEC understands that the only way either of these existing hydropower facilities could be reclassified as a Class I after July 1, 2003 is if new capacity is added onto the current facility. Only that portion of new capacity added may be eligible for Class I status. The total MW capacity for these types of hydropower facilities (original plus additional capacity) must be less than 5 MW in total.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request

Dated June 7,

CCAT-5 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Gabriel B. Stern

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-5-CMEEC Have any of the municipal electric companies within CMEEC considered offering either a 100% or 50% alternative/renewable energy service, similar to the Alternative Transitional Standard Offer, to its customers/taxpayers? Have any of the municipal electric companies within CMEEC considered utilizing fuel cell technology to provide a Class I designated electric power option to its customers/taxpayers?

A-CCAT-5-CMEEC These and related programs are under active review and development by CMEEC.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request

Dated June 7,

CCAT-6 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-6-CMEEC 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?

A-CCAT-6-CMEEC CMEEC has set conservation and demand response goals each year. All other resource decisions are market driven.

Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
CCAT-I
CSC Docket No. F-2005
2005

Data Request

Dated June 7,

CCAT-7 Page

1 of 1

Witness Responsible: Charles J. Carpinella

RESPONSE TO CCAT DATA REQUEST Dated June 7, 2005

Q-CCAT-7-CMEEC Have the generators and/or 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?

A-CCAT-7-CMEEC Municipal utilities are not-for-profit and all conservation, demand response and renewable/clean generation activities are therefore ratepayer funded.