

Attachment B: Form for Selection of Distributed Utility Planning Areas

The purpose of this form is to (1) guide the selection of DUP areas while (2) documenting which criteria apply to the decision.

Identity of the upgrade (description or project number): New Bridge St. Substation owned by Green Mountain Power Corp.

1.	Is the cost of the upgrade greater than \$2,000,000? (See note.)	Yes ... <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>If so, check "Yes" and continue to Line 4; otherwise check "No" and continue to Line 2</i>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Would the upgrade relieve a T&D delivery constraint in a Capacity Constrained Area? (See note.)	Yes ... <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>If so, check "Yes" and continue to Line 3; otherwise check "No" and exclude the expected upgrade from DU analysis.</i>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Is the cost of the upgrade less than \$250,000? (See note.)	Yes ... <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>If so, check "Yes" and exclude the expected upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to Line 4.</i>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.	Is the upgrade driven by an emergency situation requiring the immediate replacement of equipment that has failed or is at imminent risk of failure?	Yes ... <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>If so, check "Yes" and exclude the upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to line 5.</i>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.	Does the upgrade constitute a minor change for the purpose of system tuning or efficiency improvements? (See note.)	Yes ... <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>If so, check "Yes," indicate which of the below upgrades are included (check all that apply), and exclude the upgrade from DU analysis. Otherwise check "No" and continue to line 6.</i>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5.a	• installation or changes to relays, reclosers, fuses, switches, sectionalizers, breakers, breaker bypass switches, MOABs, capacitors, regulators, arresters, insulators, or meters.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.b	• installation or replacement of underground getaways.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.c	• upgrade of substation bus work.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.d	• upgrade of substation structural work, fencing, or oil containment.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.e	• installation or upgrade to SCADA.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.f	• transformer swaps.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.g	• addition of fans to transformers.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.h	• balancing of feeder phases.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.i	• replacement of deteriorated poles, crossarms, structures, poles and conduit; and replacement of wires on such equipment with the least-cost wires. (See note.).....	<input type="checkbox"/>

5.j • Other (please describe): _____

(Attach further explanation if needed.)

6. Is the upgrade a line-reconstruction project pursuant to joint use agreements with telephone or CATV or pole-attachment tariff requirements? Yes...
No....

If so, check "Yes" and exclude the upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to line 7.

7. Is the upgrade the result of a customer's request for a specific equipment or service for which distributed resources would not be acceptable? (See note.) Yes...
No....

*If so, check "Yes," describe the situation, _____

_____*

and exclude the expected upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to line 8.

8. Is the upgrade required to remedy reliability, stability, or safety problems? Yes...
No....

If so, check "Yes" and continue to line 9; otherwise check "No" and skip to line 11.

9. Could the scope and cost of the resulting project be reduced by a reduction in load level or by the installation of distributed generation? (See note to clarify the extent of load reduction.) Yes...
No....

If so, check "Yes" and continue to line 10; otherwise check "No" and skip to line 11.

10. Is the likely reduction in costs from the potential reduction in scope less than \$250,000? (See note.) Yes...
No....

If so, check "Yes" and exclude the upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to line 11.

11. Would load reduction or generation allow for the elimination or deferral of all of the upgrade? (See note to clarify the extent of load reduction.) Yes...
No....

If so, check "Yes" and proceed to define the scope and timing of the local DU analysis; otherwise check "No" and continue to line 12.

12. Can the upgrade be implemented with different levels of capacity in the replacement equipment, with costs that could differ by more than \$250,000? Yes...
No....

If not, check "No" and exclude the expected upgrade from DU analysis; otherwise check "Yes" and proceed to define the scope and timing of the local DU analysis.

Remember to sign and date this form.

This analysis performed by Patrick Kearney on 11/26/07
Name Date
Patrick Kearney
Print Name

Notes, Examples, and Descriptions

- Line 1 Any T&D project whose capital cost is expected to exceed \$2 million (in year 2002 dollars, adjusted for inflation in future years), including any reasonably foreseeable related projects, sub-projects, and multiple phases, should be reviewed for the applicability of DUP.
- Line 2 DUs may exclude from DUP analysis Non-Constrained Area Projects, as defined in the Docket No. 6290 MOU, of \$2 million or less (determined as described in the note to line 1).
- Line 3 Projects of less than \$250,000 (in year 2002 dollars, adjusted for inflation in future years) may be excluded from DUP analysis. This step is intended to identify constrained situations in which the DU study would be disproportionately costly, compared to the budgeted project cost.
- Line 5: Minor projects that are only parts of a larger project should not be screened using this step. For example, a substation rebuild would include many of the items listed in 5.a-j, but would not be a project that is minor in size and scope. Therefore, larger projects such as substation rebuilds should be analyzed according to the criteria in lines 7 through 12.
- Line 5i: These situations do not include upgrading equipment *specifically* to *significantly* increase capacity, which should be reviewed at lines 11 and 12.
- Line 7: For example, the customer may be willing to pay for a distribution upgrade, but not for distributed resources. In other situations, the customer may be willing to pay for distributed resources, but may be unwilling to have the distributed resources on its premises, and resources elsewhere may not provide the required service.
- Lines 9 and 11: If reduction in present load by 25% and the elimination of all load growth would not affect the need for the project, or its cost, the project may be considered to be independent of load. The feasibility of the required load reductions will be reviewed in the resource-scoping stage of the DU analysis.
- The determination that load reductions would not avoid a particular investment can be established by reference to an approved policy (such as standards adopted to capture lost opportunities or simplify system operations). If so, indicate the document that specifies the policy.
- Line 10: This line addresses situations in which the upgrade is driven by considerations other than load growth, but the upgrade could be avoided, in whole or in part, by load reductions or distributed generation. Examples of situations in which significant costs may be avoidable, even though some part of the project is unavoidable, include the following:
- Replacement of large transformers
 - looping projects or adding tie-lines to create first-contingency reliability
- More rarely load reductions may reduce the costs of
- line relocations due to road or bridge reconstruction
 - line relocations in response to local, state, or federal requests
 - line rebuilds due to deterioration
- Examples of situations in which loads would matter for these latter projects include (1) capacity increases planned to coincide with the relocation or rebuilding, and (2) lines that serve no customers along a considerable distance (e.g., over a mountain or through a wetland), where reduced loads at the other end of the line could be picked up by other facilities.
- Lines 10 and 12: The \$250,000 is in year 2002 dollars, to be adjusted for inflation in future years.