

Comments of Green Mountain Power Corporation
On the VSPC Draft, January 27, 2012
2012 Vermont Long-Range Transmission Plan
March 5, 2012

- 1) Pages 17 and 21, Connecticut River Valley regional grouping:

GMP believes that CVPS, rather than GMP, should be lead utility. GMP understands that CVPS is in agreement with this change.
- 2) Pages 17 and 24 Central Vermont regional grouping:

GMP believes that GMP, rather than CVPS, should be the lead utility. GMP understands that CVPS is in agreement with this change.
- 3) Page 28, Colchester Area:
 - a) At the top of the table, the phrase “Suzy Wilson Road, Mallets Bay” should be deleted.
 - b) The lead utility should be GMP, not CVPS.
 - c) The affected utilities are GMP and BED.
 - d) The answers to Q1 should be “No”; Q2 should be “N/A” and Q3 should be “N/A”.
- 4) Page 36, Stowe:
 - a) GMP believes that the lead utility should be Stowe, not GMP.
 - b) Affected utilities should include Morrisville, Hardwick, WEC and Hyde Park.
 - c) If not yet done, this situation should be analyzed with winter peak loads since the Stowe system is a winter peaking system.
 - d) If not yet done, this situation should consider both the loss of the K24 and the common mode loss of the K24 and 3313.
- 5) Page 36, Montpelier:

If not yet done, the affect of the loss of the VELCO Barre transformer on subtransmission voltages should be considered.
- 6) In the work papers supplied to GMP, it appears that some post-contingency subtransmission voltages between 0.9pu and 0.95pu have been flagged as violations. (See for example the voltages at Stowe for the loss of the K24.) It is not clear to GMP why these have been flagged as violations of planning criteria.