

**Q:DPS:GMP.1-34: Is GMP aware of investments in peak shaving technologies or flexible load management efforts being made in other New England states to reduce their share of the regional network service charges?**

- a. Will investments made by stakeholders in other New England states affect GMP's ability to predict and respond to monthly peaks?**
- b. If yes, -how?**

Response: Yes, and work in other states does not impact GMP's ability to predict or respond to monthly peaks. When all New England states are successful in working together to reduce the regional peaks, the need for large transmission upgrades in the future should be reduced, benefiting all customers.

Vermont's success as an early adopter in deploying energy storage to manage peak-related costs is critical, as the value of peak reduction is reflected in our regional share of the RNS costs. We are aware of efforts in neighboring states to develop peak shaving resources and manage peak loads and we continue to track these developments. For example, Connecticut is requiring the procurement of approximately 5,000 MW of energy storage by 2030. GMP's growing energy storage programs will help keep pace and avoid shifting these costs to Vermont.

Person(s) Responsible for Response: Josh Castonguay, VP, Chief Innovation Officer, Generation and Power Supply.

**Q:DPS:GMP.1-35: Under the filed analysis, in what year did the cumulative rate payer impact net positive?**

- a. Please provide answers both with and without A&G included.**

Response: The model year in which the costs and benefits over the proceeding years in total become net positive in Scenarios A and B are 12-15 years with A&G, or 12-14 years if all capitalized A&G is excluded. Please refer to Exhibit GMP-JC-3 and Attachment DPS.GMP.1-12.

Person(s) Responsible for Response: Jeremy Ravenelle, Distributed Energy Resources Leader.