

VSPC Geotargeting Subcommittee

Draft Agenda 3.11.13

1. Agenda Review
2. Previous Meeting's Minutes
3. Status of where we are in process (see [process map](#)) St. Albans Reliability Plan results
4. Rutland Reliability Plan results
5. Geotargeting Evaluation (see below)
6. Next Steps/Meeting
 - a. May – DU identification of any new projects screen in/out; Rutland update (?)

Geotargeting Evaluation

- In 2010, the Department completed a comprehensive [process and impact evaluation](#) of GT programs. Since then, the state implemented many of the process related recommendations that were made in the report, and addressed questions raised (e.g. VSPC process; cost allocation). The evaluation of GT area load patterns indicated savings from customers participating in the program can be detected at the utility system level, but with some significant uncertainty as the targeted and claimed savings were a small percentage of overall load in the area.
- Potential Research Questions:
 - (TJ estimate - \$15-20k) Can the total net benefits (costs) of past investments in Geotargeted Efficiency, including specific infrastructure deferral and/or avoidance, be quantified? If so, what are the net benefits (costs) for St. Albans & Susie Wilson?
 - What are the GT T&D benefits (voltage, capacity, infrastructure (T&D), losses, etc.), Are these applicable in the same manner to each utility?
 - How are these benefits allocated across utilities and across the region?
 - (TJ estimate - \$40-50k, plus GMP involvement in circuit analysis). Can the actual impact from GT investments in a particular area be better detected at the utility system level given longer, sustained period of GT investment? What are those impacts?