Vermont System Planning Committee
Geotargeting Subcommittee
December 20, 2013
Meeting Summary

<u>In Attendance:</u>

Gillian Eaton, VEIC
Steve Litkovitz, GMP
Deena Frankel, VELCO
Kim Jones, GMP
Jen Lee-Theriault, BED
TJ Poor, PSD
Melissa Bailey, VPPSA
Fred Szufnarowski, Essex Partnership for GMP
John Plunkett, GEEG for GMP
Hantz Presume, VELCO
Bill Powell, WEC

<u>Agenda:</u>

➢ Review the latest St. Albans analysis and agree on a methodology
➢ Establish base case and high case load forecasts for the St. Albans analysis with consideration given to peak load coincidence factor and background load growth

<u>Discussions:</u>

➢ Review the latest St. Albans analysis and agree on a methodology
  o The updated spreadsheet methodology accompanies this meeting summary
  o Tab EE_Programs:
    ▪ Factors in cells J1 and J2 were added to address efficiency measures at the end of their lives. The assumption used is that measures are replaced in kind or with better technologies, i.e., the savings provided by the measures do not expire. This assumption is consistent with the method used by VELCO to forecast loads. For the purposes of this analysis, these factors are set at 100% to indicate no regression in savings value.
    ▪ Rows 27 through 31 show the expected energy efficiency savings, both measured and expected, in the St. Albans area. These data were provided by VEIC. Note that the 1,800 kW total program savings over three years includes the savings that would have occurred from statewide programs plus the expected results from the added GT activities.

- o Tab ST_ Albans_Reliability_Anlys:
  - ▪ The column for Historic EE embedded in the forecast has been removed. In the past, a flat peak was forecast with the assumption that embedded in this forecast was realized energy efficiency. However, the analysis now includes a column for Background Load Growth that explicitly shows background load growth and allows for different assumptions to be analyzed.
  - ▪ Column K has been added to show cumulative EE resource acquisitions, including both statewide and geotargeted.
  - ▪ Column F, Background Load Growth, shows zero background load growth in 2013 and 2014 under the assumption that the ability-to-serve letter loads comprise the background load growth for these two years.

- ➢ Establish base case and high case load forecasts for the St. Albans analysis with consideration given to peak load coincidence factor and background load growth
  - o One possible method would be to choose 1%, 2%, and 3% background load growths and apply these to both 75% and 90% coincidence factors. This would result in six separate scenarios with the goal of developing a reasonable span of assumptions.
  - o Another method would be to choose among background load growths and coincidence factors to arrive at reasonable lowest and reasonable highest values thereby setting a range of values and outcomes.
  - o A third method would be to indicate which sets of values result in load levels that would ultimately trigger the need for a solution, either a new substation or NTAs.
  - o Discussed was a scenario of 2% load growth with a 90% coincidence factor. This may indicate an aggressive load scenario. Applying these inputs shows that resources would not be needed until 2021 (assuming operational measures are available). Implied with this scenario is that GT EE would be unlikely to continue beyond 2014 and into the next EEU performance period.
  - o The actual trigger point for a new substation or NTAs will depend on the amount of load above 28 MW, the duration of that load, and other company priorities at that time.
  - o GMP stated its thanks to all participants for helping develop this tool. GMP looks forward to applying this tool to the upcoming Rutland Area analysis.