

Docket No. 00-0660
ICC Staff Exhibit 1.0

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
RONALD LINKENBACK
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
ENERGY DIVISION
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
DOCKET NO. 00-0660

An Application of Commonwealth Edison Company for a
Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity

April 2001

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Ronald Linkenback and my business address is 527 East Capitol
3 Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

5 A. I am employed by the Illinois Commerce Commission as an Economic Analyst in
6 the Electric Section of the Engineering Department of the Energy Division.

7 Q. Please state your experience and educational background.

8 A. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from Iowa State
9 University. I am a registered Professional Engineer in the State of California. I was
10 employed as an Electrical Engineer with San Diego Gas & Electric Company for six
11 years, then with the City of Highland, Illinois as the manager of the municipal electric
12 system for seven years and prior to joining the Illinois Commerce Commission I
13 worked for High Voltage Maintenance Corporation as the manager of the Cleveland
14 Division.

15 Q. What are your responsibilities as an Economic Analyst in the Electric Section of the
16 Energy Division's Engineering Department?

17 A. My primary responsibilities and duties are in the performance of analyses dealing
18 with the day-to-day and long-term operations and planning of the electric utilities
19 serving Illinois. This work includes reviewing cogeneration tariffs, determining the
20 used and usefulness of utilities' capital additions to rate base, and reviewing
21 utilities' applications for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity.

22 Q. What are your responsibilities in this docket?

23 A. On October 5, 2000, Commonwealth Edison Company (“ComEd”) filed an
24 Application requesting a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
25 (“Certificate”), pursuant to Section 8-406 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act (the “Act”)
26 to construct, own, operate, and maintain a new 138,000 volt (“138 kV”) electric
27 transmission line in Kankakee County, Illinois. I was directed by the Chief of the
28 Electric Section to investigate and evaluate ComEd’s need for the Certificate of
29 Public convenience and Necessity.

30 Q. According to the Act, what criteria must a utility satisfy in order to receive
31 a Certificate?

32 A. To obtain a Certificate, a utility must meet the criteria set forth in Section 8-406(b) of
33 the Act, which states as follows:

34 **(1) that the proposed construction is necessary to provide**
35 **adequate, reliable and efficient service to its customers and is**
36 **the least-cost means of satisfying the service needs of its**
37 **customers;**

38 **(2) that the utility is capable of efficiently managing and**
39 **supervising the construction process and has taken sufficient**
40 **action to ensure adequate and efficient construction and**
41 **supervision thereof; and**

42 **(3) that the utility is capable of financing the proposed**
43 **construction without significant adverse financial**
44 **consequences for the utility or its customers.**

45 Q. Have you investigated and evaluated ComEd’s application with regard to
46 all three criteria?

47 A. No. My testimony will offer an opinion pertaining to the evidence that ComEd has
48 submitted in this proceeding to meet the criteria of Section 8-406(b)(1)&(2), of the
49 Act.

50 Q. Has ComEd met the criteria of Section 8-406(b)(1)?

51 A. Yes, for reasons that I will explain below, I believe that ComEd has met the criteria.
52 ComEd's proposed project to construct a 138 kV electric transmission circuit is
53 necessary to provide adequate, reliable, and efficient service to Duke Energy North
54 America, L.L.C. ("Duke Energy"). The proposed project is the least-cost means of
55 satisfying the service needs of Duke Energy.

56 Q. Has ComEd met the criteria of Section 8-406(b)(2)?

57 A. Yes, ComEd has stated in their petition that they are capable of efficiently managing
58 and supervising the construction of the proposed 138 kV line.¹

59 Q. Please describe the proposed 138 kV transmission circuit project.

60 A. ComEd is petitioning for a Certificate authorizing it to build, own, operate and
61 maintain approximately 3.2 miles of new 138 kV transmission line. ComEd
62 indicates that the new circuit is necessary because the Company received a
63 request for transmission service from Duke Energy, an independent power
64 producer. Duke Energy is expecting to produce approximately 600 megawatts of
65 electrical power and requires a new transmission line to connect its generator to
66 ComEd's electric transmission system. The new transmission line will consist of
67 two 138 kV circuits installed on a new set of ComEd owned transmission structures.
68 The new 138 kV line will be supported by new steel poles. The proposed new 138
69 kV line begins at the existing Davis Creek Substation (TSS86), which is connected
70 to ComEd's transmission system, and continues due east to the Duke Energy

¹ Application, page 4, paragraph 12.

71 facility substation, called Kankakee Energy Center (TSS956). With the exception of
72 one span into the Duke Energy substation, the proposed 138 kV line will be
73 installed on the existing ComEd owned right-of-way and will be parallel to existing
74 ComEd 138 kV lines in the same right-of-way.

75 **Necessity**

76 Q. Has ComEd provided information as to why this project is necessary?

77 A. Yes. ComEd stated that Duke Energy, an independent electric power producer,
78 notified ComEd that it is developing a new independent electric generating facility in
79 Kankakee County.² The transmission service is needed to allow ComEd to serve
80 Duke Energy's new generating facility.

81 Q. How have you applied the requirements of Section 8-406(b)(1) to determine if this
82 project is needed?

83 A. This Certificate request is different from the typical Certificate because the
84 proposed project is not required to reinforce or upgrade ComEd's transmission
85 system. Instead, the project is necessary to connect a customer. Therefore, the
86 need for the proposed project is driven by Duke Energy's need for service.

87 Q. Were you provided any verification of Duke Energy's plan to build a generating
88 plant?

89 A. Yes, I was. ComEd has received a request for interconnection from Duke Energy; I
90 have seen the letter requesting service and I have seen an affidavit signed by Duke
91 Energy indicating their intent to proceed with the project dated August 9, 2000.³

² Application, page 1, paragraph 2.

³ Response to Data Request ENG 1.1.

92 Q. When is the Duke Energy facility expected to be ready to produce power?

93 A. ComEd's Application states that Duke Energy expects that the new facility will be
94 on-line in Spring 2002.⁴

95 Q. Did ComEd state when they need to start construction to meet the scheduled start
96 up dates of Duke Energy?

97 A. ComEd feels they need to begin construction around September 2001 to have the
98 transmission line in place to meet the Duke Energy start up schedule.⁵

99 Q. Are there any electric lines near the Duke Energy facility that ComEd can use to
100 provide the required service?

101 A. No. There currently exists a double circuit 138 kV line adjacent to the Duke
102 Energy facility. The existing 138 kV line is too small to handle the output of
103 Duke Energy's generating units.⁶ There are no other electric lines in the area
104 of the proposed Duke Energy facility.

105 Q. Will the 138 kV interconnection provide adequate and reliable service to Duke
106 Energy?

107 A. Yes, ComEd stated that the proposed 138 kV line will provide adequate and
108 reliable service to the Duke Energy facility.⁷

109 **Least-Cost Alternative**

110 Q. Is the 138 kV electric transmission line that ComEd is proposing the least-cost
111 alternative?

⁴ Application, page 2, paragraph 4.

112 A. Yes, it is my opinion that ComEd's proposed 138 kV transmission circuit will
113 provide reliable service for the least cost.

114 Q. What is the cost to construct the transmission line proposed by ComEd to provide
115 Duke Energy access to ComEd's transmission system?

116 A. The total estimated direct cost for the 138 kV transmission line is \$4.85 million in
117 year 2002 dollars.⁸ ComEd will design, build, own, operate and maintain the line.

118 The cost for the entire project, including the transmission line, engineering
119 and substation work, is estimated to be \$9.425 million.⁹ ComEd has stated that
120 Duke Energy has agreed to reimburse ComEd for the entire cost of this project.¹⁰

121 Q. Will ComEd be reimbursed for costs incurred if the Duke Energy plant is not built?

122 A. In a letter of intent, signed by both Duke Energy and ComEd, Duke Energy agreed
123 to reimburse ComEd for all costs and expenses incurred by ComEd in performing
124 the work through the date of termination.¹¹

125 Q. Are there any areas along the proposed route that will require ComEd to utilize a
126 type of construction that would be considered non-standard by the industry?

127 A. No. ComEd does not anticipate having to use any non-standard construction
128 techniques along the proposed transmission route.

129 **Transmission Line Route**

⁵ Mr. Koszyk's Direct Testimony, page 3, lines 55-57.

⁶ Response to Data Request ENG 1.3.

⁷ Response to Data Request ENG 1.6.

⁸ Mr. Koszyk's Direct Testimony, Page 4, Lines 69 & 70.

⁹ Response to Data Request FD-1

¹⁰ Response to Data Request FD-2

¹¹ Response to Data Request ENG 1.1.

130 Q. Did ComEd consider any alternative line routes to serve the Duke Energy plant?

131 A. Yes, ComEd did briefly look at alternative 138 kV line routes. ComEd's
132 recommended line route is on existing transmission right-of-way that is adjacent to
133 the Duke Energy facility, is the shortest route and is the least cost route. For these
134 reasons ComEd did not consider it necessary to strenuously review alternate line
135 routes.¹² I agree with their decision.

136 Q. Did you inspect the proposed route?

137 A. Yes, on March 23, 2001, I conducted an inspection of the proposed route with
138 Mr. Mark Lorenz and Ronald Dyslin, employees of ComEd. Mr. William Riley, an
139 employee of the Illinois Commerce Commission, also participated in the route
140 inspection.

141 Q. What conclusions did you make based on the visual inspection of the proposed
142 route?

143 A. I concur with ComEd's selection of the proposed route to provide Duke Energy
144 access to the transmission system. The proposed route is the most direct and it
145 has minimal impact on the public.

146 Q. Did you have any other issues pertaining to the inspection of the proposed line route
147 that should be addressed as part of this application for a Certificate petition?

148 A. Yes I do. It seems that ComEd's notice of this pending case was not sent to a
149 current property owner whose property either abuts or is very near the proposed
150 138 kV line.

151 Q. Where is this property located?

¹² Mr. Lorenz's Direct Testimony, page 5, lines 101-103.

152 A. The property is approximately 2 miles northwest of the City of Bourbonnais on the
153 East side of county road N1000 and approximately ½ mile north of county road
154 W6000 in Manteno Township in Kankakee County.

155 Q. What is your basis for thinking that ComEd may not have contacted this property
156 owner?

157 A. While reviewing the proposed route we came upon this property. ComEd witness
158 Mr. Dyslin, Senior Real Estate Agent within ComEd's Real Estate Services
159 Department, could not confirm that the owner of this property had been notified.
160 Also, Exhibits C & D of the Petition lists the parties that ComEd sent a Notice of
161 Filing. Among the parties receiving the Notice of Filings were two property owners
162 in close proximity to the proposed line.¹³ Mr. Dyslin did not think that either of the
163 two property owners listed on Exhibit C or D were the owner of the property in
164 question. While at this property location I also noted that a landscaped parcel of the
165 property extended into what was supposed to be ComEd right-of-way.

166 Q. Why is the possibility that ComEd's notice was not provided to this property owner a
167 matter of concern in this proceeding?

168 A. If the property owner was not notified, they would not know of ComEd's intent to
169 construct a 138 kV line. The owner would also not know of this proceeding, and
170 would not have been given the opportunity to participate in this proceeding.

171 Q. What is your recommendation concerning this issue?

172 A. I have three recommendations pertaining to this issue.

173 1) ComEd should offer evidence as part of their rebuttal testimony that either:

174 a) The property owner in question was notified at the time that this petition
175 was filed with the Commission, or

¹³ Mr. Dyslin's Direct Testimony , pages 4 & 5, lines 91 - 94, and page 3 of Exhibit C of the Petition.

- 176 b) the property owner has subsequently been notified of ComEd's intent to
177 construct a new 138 kV line near their property.
- 178 2) ComEd should provide evidence as part of their rebuttal testimony showing that
179 either ComEd owns or has sufficient easement rights to construct the proposed
180 138 kV line across the property owner's yard.
- 181 3) If the property owner wishes to participate in this proceeding, the scheduled May
182 22, 2001, hearing date should be extended to accommodate for the property
183 owner's participation.
- 184 Q. Has ComEd complied with the advance notification requirements of 83 Illinois
185 Administrative Code Part 305.60 and Code Part 200.150?
- 186 A. I don't know. If ComEd did indeed fail to notify this property owner then ComEd may
187 not have complied with the advance notice requirements. However, ComEd has
188 provided information indicating that the local utilities, other property owners,
189 governmental agencies and municipalities along the route have been notified.¹⁴
- 190 Q. Will the proposed transmission line require the acquisition of any land in fee?
- 191 A. No. Except for one span of 138 kV into the Duke Energy facility, the new circuit will
192 be on new ComEd owned structures within existing right-of-way.¹⁵ ComEd is
193 obtaining the needed property rights from Duke Energy for the one span of 138 kV
194 line.
- 195 Q. Will ComEd have to acquire any right-of-way easements for the proposed
196 transmission line?
- 197 A. No.

¹⁴ Application, Attachments C and D and Mr. Dyslin's Direct Testimony, pages 5-6, lines 99-134.

¹⁵ Mr. Dyslin's Direct Testimony, page 3, lines 66-69.

198 Q. Has ComEd met all the criteria under Section 8-406(b)(1)&(2), of the Act in order to
199 obtain a certificate?

200 A. Yes.

201 Q. What is your recommendation?

202 A. ComEd's rebuttal testimony should provide documentation that any remaining
203 property owners have been notified and that ComEd has the appropriate easement
204 rights across the landscaped portion of the property mentioned above. Other than
205 the issue pertaining to the one property owner I see no reason why ComEd should
206 not be granted a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to build, own,
207 operate and maintain the approximately 3.2 miles of new 138 kV transmission line.

208 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

209 A. Yes, it does.