Supplemental Testimony Gerald Chezik

STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION FOR A ROUTE PERMIT FOR THE MONTICELLO TO ST. CLOUD 345 KV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT PUC DOCKET NO. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH DOCKET NO. 15-2500-20665-2

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF

Gerald Chezik

On Behalf of

APPLICANTS

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY, A MINNESOTA CORPORATION

and

GREAT RIVER ENERGY, A MINNESOTA COOPERATIVE CORPORATION

February 26, 2010

Exhibit _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I.	INTRODUCTION	.1
II.	PROJECT COSTS	. 1
III.	PROJECT SCHEDULE	.3
IV.	CONCLUSION	.4

-i- PUC Docket No. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH Docket No. 15-2500-20665-2 Chezik Supplemental

1		I. INTRODUCTION	
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME.	
3	А.	Gerald Chezik.	
4	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS	
5		PROCEEDING ON BEHALF OF APPLICANTS?	
6	А.	Yes.	
7	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?	
8	А.	I am providing supplemental testimony to supply updated cost information for	
9		Route D and to update the Project schedule.	
10		II. PROJECT COSTS	
11	Q.	IN YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY, YOU STATED THAT APPLICANTS WERE IN THE	
12		PROCESS OF REVIEWING COST ESTIMATES FOR THE ROUTES. DO YOU HAVE	
13		ANY SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION TO PROVIDE?	
14	А.	Yes. We have completed an updated estimate for Route D. This revised cost	
15		estimate, along with the estimated costs for the other routes under consideration,	
16		are shown in the chart below:	

-1- PUC Docket No. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH Docket No. 15-2500-20665-2 Chezik Supplemental

Project Cost Estimates					
Alternative	Cost (\$Million)				
Transmission Line Routes					
Applicants' Preferred Route	\$54.2				
Route A	\$65.4				
Route B	\$71.5				
Route C	\$65.5				
Route D	\$53.6				
Substations					
Monticello Substation Modifications	\$7.8				
Applicants' Substation	\$14.2				
Substation with 115 kV Interconnect	\$15.6				

2

1

3 Q. WHAT ARE THE UPDATED COSTS FOR ROUTE D BASED ON?

A. The Applicants prepared a preliminary assessment of structure locations along
the route for the proposed alignment. Applicants sought to identify structures
and spans that would minimize conflicts with irrigation. Applicants then
prepared cost estimates based on this preliminary assessment.

8 Q. ARE THERE STILL SIGNIFICANT UNCERTAINTIES WITH RESPECT TO COSTS 9 FOR ROUTE D?

10 А. Yes. For example, it is uncertain whether this alignment can be construction on 11 the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant property or if multiple transmission line crossings of the existing transmission lines can be avoided. If the line had to 12 13 be located off plant property or in another location on the property, it would be 14 longer and overall costs would increase. Similarly, crossing or reconfiguration of 15 existing transmission lines in the corridor could cause additional costs. The 16 estimate does not account for any requirements that may be imposed by the 17 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the Army Corps of engineers or 18 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

> -2- PUC Docket No. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH Docket No. 15-2500-20665-2 Chezik Supplemental

1

III. PROJECT SCHEDULE

Q. APPLICANTS HAVE STATED THAT CERTAIN WORK WILL NEED TO BE
PERFORMED AT THE MONTICELLO SUBSTATION. WILL YOU PLEASE
DESCRIBE THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE PERFORMED FOR THIS PROJECT?

A. To accommodate the interconnection, a circuit breaker row must be added to
the Monticello Substation. After this equipment is in place, the new 345 kV line
must be interconnected at the substation.

8 Q. ARE THERE ANY SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING WHEN THIS WORK 9 CAN BE UNDERTAKEN?

A. Yes. The physical interconnection of the new 345 kV transmission line can only
be made when the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant is off-line for a planned
outage. The next planned plant outage is scheduled for 2011. To meet the
Second Quarter 2012 in-service date, the 345 kV interconnection must be
completed during the outage period.

Q. To meet the 2011 timeframe to do interconnection work, when Does substation work need to begin?

17 A. Foundation construction would need to begin in June 2010. The equipment

18 installation would need to begin in September 2010. These timeframes would

- 19 allow Applicants to complete outage work and be ready to make the critical
- 20 cutovers when the plant is off-line.

-3- PUC Docket No. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH Docket No. 15-2500-20665-2 Chezik Supplemental

1	Q.	DOES ANY OF THIS WORK AT MONTICELLO SUBSTATION YOU ARE
2		DESCRIBING REQUIRE ANY EXPANSION OF THE SUBSTATION?
3	А.	No. The Monticello Substation is already designed and graded for the proposed
4		circuit breaker row, so this work will not require an expansion of the Monticello
5		Substation or acquisition of additional land. There also will be no change in the
6		location of transmission lines or an increase in voltage.
7		IV. CONCLUSION
8	О.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?
9		Yes.

10 2471044v1

-4- PUC Docket No. ET2/TL-09-246 OAH Docket No. 15-2500-20665-2 Chezik Supplemental