

**STATE OF VERMONT  
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

Petition of Green Mountain Power for a Certificate of Public Good pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248 authorizing the rebuild of the Lowell Substation and the upgrade of 18.1 miles of the B20 line from Johnson to Lowell, and Joint Petition of GMP, the Village of Morrisville Water and Light Department, and the Village of Johnson Water and Light Department for a CPG pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248 to authorize the upgrade of 1.5 miles of the B22 line, in the Towns of Lowell, Eden, Johnson, and Morristown, Vermont	
--	--

---

---

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF WITNESS  
KIM L. JONES, P.E.  
ON BEHALF OF GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER

---

November 4, 2019

In this testimony, GMP witness Jones provides evidence in support of the issuance of a Certificate of Public Good authorizing the rebuild of the Lowell Substation and the upgrade of 18.1 miles of the B20 line from Johnson to Lowell and 1.5 miles of the B22 line in the Towns of Lowell, Eden, Johnson, and Morristown, Vermont. Her testimony addresses issues associated with system stability and reliability, need, least-cost planning, consistency with Vermont's Electric Energy Plan, economic benefit, and impacts on existing or planned transmission facilities. Witness Jones also sponsors the project cost estimate.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KIM L. JONES, P.E.**

1   **1.    Q.    Please state your name, business address and occupation.**

2           **A.**    My name is Kim L. Jones. I am employed by Green Mountain Power Corporation  
3 (“GMP” or the “Company”) in the position of Principal Electrical Engineer. My business  
4 address is 2152 Post Road, Rutland, Vermont, 05701. I am a licensed professional engineer in  
5 the State of Vermont with over thirty years of experience in the field of power system planning.  
6 My primary duties include the performance and/or oversight of large, integrated utility planning  
7 studies involving transmission and distribution system reliability, operability, loss mitigation,  
8 cost-justification, and environmental and aesthetic impact. These studies typically assess options  
9 for electrical system improvement, ranging from traditional T&D solutions, to alternative  
10 solutions such as Demand Side Management (“DSM”) and Distributed Energy Resources  
11 (“DERs”). I am involved in Feasibility and System Impact Studies for interconnection of  
12 distributed energy resources on the T&D system. I also have considerable experience in the  
13 disciplines of Integrated Resource Planning (“IRP”) and Distributed Utility Planning (“DUP”).

14

15   **2.    Q.    Have you provided testimony to the Vermont Public Utility Commission (the**  
16 **“Commission”) previously?**

17           **A.**    Yes. I have provided direct, supplemental, and oral testimony before the  
18 Commission in numerous cases on behalf of GMP, most recently for the following:

- 19           • Case No. 18-0269-PET for the Welden Street to East St. Albans (Line 135) 34.5  
20           kV line reconductoring project.

21

- 1           • Case No. 17-4777-PET for the Bethel to East Barnard (Line 107) 46 kV line  
2           reconductoring project.
- 3           • Case No. 17-2675-PET for the upgrade of the existing Cambridge substation  
4           located in Cambridge, Vermont. This was a joint filing with Vermont Electric  
5           Cooperative, Inc. (“VEC”).
- 6           • Docket No. 8727 for the upgrades to the East Barnard substation and the rebuild  
7           of the Sharon substation in Barnard and Sharon, Vermont.
- 8           • Case No. 18-2910-PET for the construction of the new GMP Airport Substation  
9           in South Burlington, Vermont.
- 10          • Case No. 18-4121-PET for the upgrade of the Websterville Substation in Barre,  
11          Vermont.

12

13   **3.    Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony?**

14          **A.**    The purpose of my testimony is to provide evidence in support of the issuance of  
15    a Certificate of Public Good (“CPG”) authorizing the rebuild of the Lowell Substation and the  
16    reconductoring of 18.1 miles of the B20 line from Johnson to Lowell and 1.5 miles of the B22  
17    line in the Towns of Lowell, Eden, Johnson, and Morristown, Vermont (the “Project”). I  
18    conclude that the Project:

- 19           • will not adversely affect system stability and reliability;
- 20
- 21           • is required to meet the need for present and future demand for service  
22           which could not otherwise be provided in a more cost-effective manner  
23           through energy conservation programs and measures, energy-efficiency  
24           and load management measures or the introduction of distributed  
25           generation;
- 26

- 1           • is consistent with the principles for resource selection expressed in the  
2           Company’s last approved least-cost integrated plan;
- 3           • is in compliance with the relevant requirements of the 2016 Vermont  
4           Electric Plan;
- 5
- 6           • will result in an economic benefit to the State and its residents; and  
7
- 8           • can be served economically by existing or planned transmission facilities  
9           without undue adverse effect on Vermont utilities or customers.

10

11   **4.    Q.    Please describe the proposed Project.**

12    **A.**    The proposed Project consists of three components:

- 13           1. Rebuild of the GMP Lowell 46/34.5 kV Substation;  
14
- 15           2. Reconductoring upgrade of the 34.5 kV line between the GMP Lowell Substation  
16           and the GMP Johnson Substation (“B20 Line”); and  
17
- 18           3. Reconductoring upgrade of a portion of the 34.5 kV line between the GMP  
19           Johnson Substation and the Morrisville #3 Substation (“B22 Line”).

20   **5.    Q.    Please describe the Lowell Substation portion of the proposed Project.**

21    **A.**    GMP proposes to rebuild its Lowell Substation adjacent to the existing

22    substation. The proposed design of the Project includes:

- 23           • construction of a new substation yard with all new components including a  
24           yard fence, steel structures and foundations, oil containment system,  
25           ground grid, conduit system, cable trench system, yard stone, fence  
26           lighting, and security system;
- 27           • one 30/40/50//56 MVA, 46 kV to 34.5 kV auto transformer;
- 28           • one 38 kV vacuum circuit breaker and associated disconnect switches;
- 29           • control building for the DC battery system, relay and control equipment,  
30           and supervisory control and data acquisition (“SCADA”); and
- 31           • two 15 kVA station service transformers and one AC distribution panel.

1 Further detail of the proposed Lowell Substation work is described in the direct testimony  
2 of GMP witness John R. Fiske.

3

4 **6. Q. Please describe the two subtransmission line portions of the proposed**  
5 **Project.**

6 **A.** GMP proposes to upgrade and reconductor the 34.5 kV overhead B20 Line. This  
7 line is owned by GMP, is 18.1 miles in length and the existing 4/0 ACSR conductor will be  
8 replaced with 795 ACSR conductor. This Project will include the replacement of a line that  
9 consists of mainly 1950 vintage poles as part of the GMP systematic replacement program to  
10 address the aging poles on the GMP transmission system.

11 In addition, GMP, in collaboration with the Village of Morrisville Water and Light  
12 Department (“MWL”) proposes to reconfigure, upgrade, and reconductor 1.5 miles of the 34.5  
13 kV overhead B22 Line. The B22 line is 6.8 miles in total and is owned by the MWL and the  
14 Village of Johnson Water and Light Department. The B22 project work area to be upgraded is  
15 1.5 miles in length and is double circuit with the B22 in top position and 3319 below. The B22  
16 has existing 336 ACSR conductor and the 3319 has 3/0 ACSR. The upgrade will place taller  
17 poles such that the B22 will be replaced with 477 ACSR conductor and the 3319 will utilize the  
18 336 ACSR that was previously the B22. The smallest conductor 3/0 ACSR will be retired.

19 These line upgrades are in the Towns of Lowell, Eden, Johnson, and Morristown,  
20 Vermont. Further detail of these two line upgrade components of the proposed Project is  
21 described in the direct testimony of GMP witness John R. Fiske.

22

23

1    **7.    Q.    Why is the proposed Project needed at this time?**

2           **A.**    The proposed Project is needed at this time to address asset management concerns  
3 for grid reliability improvements and to help mitigate some of the congestion of the Sheffield-  
4 Highgate Export Interface (“SHEI”) capacity. This Project was identified as a priority T&D  
5 capital project given the overlapping benefits it provides for customers. Below, I explain this  
6 more relative to each Project component.

7

8    **8.    Q.    Please describe the SHEI configuration and the issues created by this**  
9 **constraint.**

10           **A.**    GMP witness Douglas C. Smith describes the SHEI configuration and issues in  
11 detail. The information here is a summary. SHEI is a region in northern Vermont, bounded by  
12 the 115-kV loop spanning from the Sheffield to Lyndonville line (“K39 line”) to the Highgate to  
13 St. Albans line (“K42 line”). The 34.5 kV B20 line is a critical subtransmission asset within the  
14 interface because it creates a parallel path back to the 115kV system, creating a closed loop  
15 system.

16           Power generated in northern Vermont exceeds local demand. Excess power is then  
17 transmitted to points south in the State. Under certain contingencies, this north to south transfer  
18 puts a tremendous strain on the existing aging electrical infrastructure, which could lead to  
19 voltage collapse or overloading of the transmission system. To handle these contingencies,  
20 ISO-New England (“ISO-NE”) created the SHEI to control power flow in the region by  
21 calculating a set of power export limits for different system configurations. When the system is  
22 in a specific configuration, ISO-NE institutes a limit of power that can be transferred across the  
23 interface. In many cases this results in the issuance of do-not-exceed (“DNE”) orders to

1 generators in the region to mitigate contingencies before they happen. Specifically, this means  
2 that certain generation resources inside this interface are limited in real time to ensure that  
3 system capacity is not exceeded in the event of a potential future transmission outage. This  
4 curtailment can impact the economics of these projects for customers, including loss of market  
5 value from the project's energy output, renewable energy certificates, and Production Tax  
6 Credits. As discussed in detail by Douglas C. Smith, among other benefits, this Project will cost-  
7 effectively increase the SHEI capacity, thereby reducing the frequency and magnitude of  
8 interface congestion.

9  
10 **9. Q. Please describe why the Lowell Substation rebuild is needed at this time.**

11 **A.** The rebuild of the Lowell Substation is needed to address asset management  
12 concerns, increase reliability in the area, and will help mitigate the SHEI constraint. Presently,  
13 the Lowell Substation contains aging and obsolete equipment, including one 1973 vintage (46  
14 years old) 15/20 MVA 46kV to 34.5 kV transformer and a 1973 vintage 34.5 kV breaker. The  
15 protection and control technologies are obsolete, utilizing electromechanical relaying. While the  
16 existing transformer is 46 years old, given GMP has an available spare this transformer would  
17 not be replaced for asset maintenance reasons. However, GMP is proposing to replace the  
18 existing transformer with a larger 30/40/50//56 MVA transformer, given the added benefit of  
19 mitigation to increase the SHEI limit, which Douglas C. Smith will discuss in more detail.

20 The Lowell Substation is an important component of the State's grid because it permits  
21 integration of the area's 46 kV and 34.5 kV networks, providing greater connectivity and  
22 strength. GMP, VEC, the Villages of Johnson, Morrisville, and Hyde Park, and the Towns of  
23 Stowe and Hardwick all have customers fed directly or off of other lines dependent on this

1 network. To maintain reliability of this network, the existing substation will remain in service  
2 until the new substation work is completed.

3

4 **10. Q. Please describe why the B20 line reconductoring is needed at this time.**

5 **A.** The reconductoring of the B20 line will also address asset management and  
6 increase reliability, and will help to increase the capacity of the SHEI limit. Below I discuss the  
7 asset maintenance needed for the B20 reconductoring. Douglas C. Smith discusses the SHEI-  
8 related benefits for all aspects of the Project. The asset condition component of this Project is  
9 based on GMP's strategy for addressing aging infrastructure. Accordingly, I start with some  
10 background on how GMP plans its transmission upgrade projects.

11 GMP applies a comprehensive and multi-faceted process to determine which  
12 transmission line projects are in need of maintenance and when to complete them including: (1)  
13 review and evaluation of the asset maintenance pole inventory data of the entire GMP  
14 transmission system; (2) assessing projects for replacement to consider overall size of the project  
15 effort and other benefits associated with this Project; and (3) prioritization of the projects based  
16 on a number of factors.

17 First, GMP evaluates the need to address asset management for transmission line projects  
18 through its review and evaluation of available data. This data includes the number of poles on  
19 the transmission system by decade (1940's, 1950's, etc...) and then assessing individual lines by  
20 taking a weighted average of pole age to produce the average age of the line. Based on this  
21 information, GMP evaluates the near term-replacement projects to identify project scope and  
22 additional system benefits and then determines a schedule to space out the upgrade projects.

23 GMP has approximately 17,700 wood poles making up its transmission line

1 infrastructure. Of these, we currently have 2,641 poles that are 1959 or older (over 60 years old).  
2 GMP must apply a systematic approach to pole replacement to assure that reliability will not  
3 begin to degrade, prevent higher reactive maintenance costs and to also prevent higher future  
4 replacement costs due to increased quantities of older assets requiring replacement. For  
5 example, if GMP deferred replacement of the 2,641 poles for ten years, we would then be  
6 looking at the need to replace at one time over 7,000 poles, all of which would be over 60 years  
7 old. Such a concentrated effort to replace aging poles would increase costs, threaten safety and  
8 reliability, and be hard to implement all at once. Accordingly, GMP develops a plan to  
9 systematically upgrade transmission lines in a manner that maintains safety and reliability and  
10 spreads out reconstruction of identified projects for replacement within a realistic timeframe for  
11 GMP to manage the construction.

12 Third, prioritization of these projects is based on a variety of factors including input from  
13 field personnel, specific operational needs, T&D efficiency and reliability analysis, customer  
14 requests, safety considerations, cost-to-benefit ratios, capacity constraints, regulatory and tariff  
15 obligations, as well as resource availability, timing issues and unforeseen events. Prioritization  
16 is accomplished by discussing the benefits of a given project, assessing the consequences of not  
17 doing a project, and the risk to the Company and customers of deferring the project in order to  
18 complete other projects. Representatives from Engineering, Operations and Operations  
19 Technology attend planning sessions to discuss project details and decide whether deferring  
20 certain projects is justified due to the positive benefits or higher immediacy associated with other  
21 projects. Projects that have overlapping benefits for customers are usually given higher priority  
22 over other projects. GMP has many identified T&D capital projects to address reliability and  
23 safety and these are vetted through GMP's Capital Management Team as part of the budgeting

1 process.

2           The structure plant on the B20 line consists mostly of 1957 vintage poles and associated  
3 hardware. Of the total 348 poles on this line, 292 poles are 1950's vintage. Aside from already  
4 budgeted projects or areas under study, the B20 line is the second oldest line identified on the  
5 basis of weighted line age for replacement, with an average pole age of 1960. Accordingly, the  
6 work that we are performing as part of this Project would need to be performed even if the B20  
7 was not part of a set of solution steps to mitigate adverse SHEI impacts.

8           Since the Project captures the economic benefits associated with increasing the capacity  
9 of SHEI, we assessed whether we could feasibly address the asset condition needs at this time.  
10 Since the oldest line on the basis of average pole age was the Riverside Tap ("Line 96"), is only  
11 ten poles, and the oldest transmission line project based on the number of poles 1959 or older,  
12 Websterville to McIndoes ("Line 3311") is located in the Ryegate Area where a transmission  
13 planning study is currently being analyzed, we determined that addressing the B20 at this time  
14 would be consistent with our long-term planning objectives. Since this Project also secures  
15 additional benefits for customers by reducing SHEI congestion, we determined that it should be a  
16 higher priority than other aging transmission projects.

17           The existing 4/0 ACSR conductor is in need of replacement and will be replaced with  
18 795 ACSR conductor as part of this Project. The 795 ACSR load carrying capacity is equivalent  
19 with the 30/40/50//56 MVA transformer being placed at the Lowell Substation. We chose the  
20 795 ACSR conductor because it experiences very low loss under normal loads, can carry the  
21 post-contingency thermal loadings of this system, and be supported with single pole vertical  
22 construction without the expense of excessively robust structures or short spans.

23

1 **11. Q. Please describe why the B22 line reconductoring is needed at this time.**

2 A. The reconductoring of the B22 line will also address asset management and  
3 increase reliability, and will help to increase the capacity of the SHEI limit. Craig Myotte from  
4 MWL describes the asset condition concerns with respect to the B22 line, and Douglas C. Smith  
5 discusses the SHEI benefit from this reconductoring.

6

7 **12. Q. Are there any anticipated new loads in the area?**

8 A. No. GMP is not aware of any new loads in this area. Discussions with VEC also  
9 indicate no anticipated new loads in the area of the proposed upgrades. Growth for both utilities  
10 has been flat and in some locations declining. As discussed in more detail by Mr. Smith, VEC  
11 has also indicated that substantially increasing load in the area is not a feasible strategy for  
12 addressing SHEI congestion.

13

14 **13. Q. Is this Project being completed for growth in load or growth in DER**  
15 **interconnections?**

16 A. No. This Project is being completed to address the aging infrastructure and asset  
17 management issues discussed above, as well as to reduce curtailment of existing generation. It is  
18 not being completed for growth in either load or DER interconnections.

19

20 **14. Q. Please describe any loss benefits associated with the proposed Project.**

21 A. The new transformer will be purchased utilizing a transformer purchase formula  
22 to maximize efficiency. Load flow analysis using a peak summer case indicated that the State  
23 would see a peak loss reduction of 1 MW due to the reconductoring. Over twenty years, the

1 value of this loss reduction would be over \$1.5 million.

2

3 **15. Q. Please describe what alternatives to this Project were considered.**

4 **A.** Alternatives for an aging transmission line that requires an upgrade to address  
5 asset condition and reliability issues includes: (1) potential delay of the pole replacement; (2) a  
6 relocation of the transmission line; or (3) construction of a new transmission corridor for  
7 redundant supply of, in this case, the B20 line. These alternatives were not feasible in this case  
8 for several reasons. First, delay of the pole replacement presents safety and reliability risks as the  
9 failure of aging pole infrastructure poses a risk to line workers and the public. Moreover, the  
10 transmission lines in this case are off-road, with difficult access. This factor increases the risk  
11 associated with aging infrastructure as this tends to increase the length of outages caused by  
12 structure failure. Other alternatives to address the aging pole infrastructure of the B20, such as  
13 relocation and/or construction of a new transmission corridor, were not pursued here because  
14 they are not cost-competitive with this Project.

15 In addition to the above alternatives to addressing the asset condition needs of the B20,  
16 GMP also considered alternative ways to mitigate SHEI congestion. As discussed by Mr. Smith,  
17 GMP has been involved in a robust discussion about potential solution steps that could mitigate  
18 the adverse impact of current SHEI congestion. In consultation with other Vermont utilities and  
19 Vermont Electric Power Co., Inc. (“VELCO”), GMP determined that this Project was part of a  
20 least-cost package of solution steps, the efficacy of which were studied by VELCO and its  
21 consultant, Energy Initiatives Group (“EIG”), as part of the Northern Vermont Export Study.  
22 That study work involved power flow simulation studies on the northern Vermont transmission  
23 system that assess the ability to reduce curtailment of wind generation by increasing the ability to

1 transfer power across the SHEI for all lines in conditions and facility-out conditions. Power flow  
2 simulation analysis was performed for the existing system and for 45 alternative combinations  
3 containing one or more of the following upgrade elements: reactive support, 115 kV  
4 transmission, 34.5 kV and 46 kV subtransmission, and battery storage.<sup>1</sup>

5

6 **16. Q. Please explain why GMP selected this Project and not the other alternatives**  
7 **to this Project.**

8 **A.** As discussed by Mr. Smith, a SHEI Working Group, with representatives from all  
9 the Vermont Distribution Utilities (“VDU”) and VELCO, was formed in early 2018 to consider a  
10 number of alternatives identified in the Northern Vermont Export Study. The goal of the  
11 Working Group was to find the best alternative to cost-effectively address the current level of  
12 SHEI congestion, with a focus on benefits to Vermont customers. The group determined that  
13 existing congestion could largely be addressed with a combination of solution steps that include  
14 this Project, the Sheldon Springs Automatic Voltage Regulation (“AVR”), and the Sheffield  
15 AVR. This set of solution steps increases the SHEI voltage and thermal limits, and when  
16 combined with the reliability and asset management benefits, represents a unique opportunity to  
17 meaningfully reduce SHEI congestion with only modest incremental costs above those that  
18 would need to be incurred in upgrading the B20 in the near term. Moreover, as discussed by Mr.  
19 Smith in more detail, the B20 and B22 upgrades are a key component of many potential SHEI  
20 solution steps and are therefore an important part of the future transmission backbone in northern  
21 Vermont.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Northern Vermont Export Study, available at:  
[https://www.vermontspc.com/library/document/download/5995/VELCO\\_SHEI\\_Study\\_FinalReport.pdf](https://www.vermontspc.com/library/document/download/5995/VELCO_SHEI_Study_FinalReport.pdf).

1 **17. Q. Can the introduction of DSM or Distributed Generation (“DG”) alleviate the**  
2 **need for the Project?**

3 A. No. The application of DSM measures or DG cannot address the aging assets or  
4 the SHEI constraints. The reduction of load in this area could actually exacerbate the problem. A  
5 battery solution for SHEI was studied as an alternative, however, it was determined that this  
6 alternative was not cost competitive. Quarterly information updates regarding the SHEI have  
7 been provided to the Vermont System Planning Committee (“VSPC”) since October 2017. This  
8 Project was also presented to the VSPC’s Geotargeting Committee in May 2019. The Project  
9 cannot be deferred or avoided with the introduction of conservation, efficiency measures or  
10 distributed resources.

11

12 **18. Q. Is the proposed Project required to meet the need for present and future**  
13 **demand for service which could not otherwise be provided in a more cost-effective manner**  
14 **through energy conservation programs and measures energy-efficiency and load**  
15 **management measures or distributed generation, including but not limited to those**  
16 **developed pursuant to the provisions of 30 V.S.A. §§ 209(d), 218c, and 218(b) (30 V.S.A. §**  
17 **248(b)(2))?**

18 A. The proposed Project is the most cost-effective option to meet present and  
19 projected future demand for service that GMP was able to identify within the affected area. As  
20 discussed above, the application of DSM and DG cannot address the asset management  
21 concerns, nor the SHEI constraints. Mr. Smith elaborates on why this Project is the least cost  
22 approach to mitigating SHEI constraints and the associated adverse impact on Vermont  
23 electricity customers.

1 **19. Q. Will the Project adversely affect system stability and reliability (30 V.S.A. §**  
2 **248(b)(3))?**

3 **A.** No. The Project will not adversely affect system stability or reliability. As  
4 explained above, the proposed Project will actually improve system reliability by addressing  
5 aging infrastructure. The new technologies will allow for identification of fault location,  
6 enhancing response time for outages on the approximately 18.5 mile line between Lowell and  
7 Johnson. The addition of the 46 kV B-30 breaker will provide high-speed transformer protection.  
8 As discussed above and in some detail by Mr. Smith, the SHEI export limitations are imposed by  
9 ISO-NE in order to ensure system stability and reliability under a variety of conditions. The  
10 Project is expected to enable ISO-NE to increase the export limits on the SHEI, resulting in  
11 economic benefits associated with increased output of existing renewable resources, without  
12 adversely effecting system stability and reliability.

13

14 **20. Q. Will the Project result in an economic benefit to the State and its residents**  
15 **(30 V.S.A. § 248(b)(4))?**

16 **A.** Yes. The asset management issues addressed by the Project will prevent  
17 equipment failure and will ensure that the 34.5 kV network stays intact to serve GMP customers  
18 as well as other utilities. The Project's ability to help GMP lower the risk of loss of load due to  
19 equipment failure will provide an economic benefit to the State and its residents. The  
20 performance of the Project work will also result in construction work and additional municipal  
21 tax payments.

22 In addition to the economic benefits of this Project that are typical for any asset  
23 maintenance project that involves substantial construction and municipal tax payment, this

1 Project also benefits Vermont electricity customers by mitigating adverse impacts created by the  
2 existing SHEI constraints. As discussed by Mr. Smith, these economic benefits are  
3 conservatively valued at approximately \$14.7 million.  
4

5 **21. Q. Is the proposed Project consistent with the principles for resource selection**  
6 **expressed in the Company's most recently approved least cost IRP (30 V.S.A. § 248(b)(6))?**

7 A. Yes. GMP seeks to serve projected customer loads in a reliable and efficient  
8 manner as outlined in its approved 2018 IRP. The Project will enable the Company to satisfy its  
9 obligation to serve and to meet the needs of its customers in a reliable and efficient manner  
10 consistent with the resource selection criteria outlined in that plan and with the orders issued by  
11 the Commission relating to transmission and distribution planning.

12 GMP's 2018 IRP, approved by the Commission in Case No. 18-4166-PET, provides  
13 specific transmission reliability recommendations, including "Quicken our pace for replacing  
14 aged poles." Addressing the aging poles on the B20 line is consistent with that recommendation.  
15 In addition, GMP's 2018 IRP included an overview of the SHEI constraint and efforts to resolve  
16 this constraint as quickly as possible.  
17

18 **22. Q. Is this Project consistent with the 2016 Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan**  
19 **which incorporates the Vermont Electric Plan (30 V.S.A. § 248(b)(7))?**

20 A. Yes. The Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan (the "Plan") identifies the basic  
21 objectives that must be satisfied in serving the public interest. Utilities are required to serve their  
22 customers at the lowest life-cycle costs, including environmental and economic costs. These  
23 objectives call for the provision of electric service that is the most efficient and cost-effective.

1 The Project supports these objectives by improving the reliability of the power delivery system  
2 in the affected area at least cost. Additionally, as discussed in more detail by Mr. Smith,  
3 addressing the SHEI constraint is consistent with the Plan by increasing the productivity and  
4 value of existing renewable generators in the SHEI.

5

6 **23. Q. Can the Project be served economically by existing or planned transmission**  
7 **facilities without undue adverse effect on Vermont utilities or customers (30 V.S.A. §**  
8 **248(b)(10))?**

9 **A.** Yes. The Project can be served economically by existing or planned transmission  
10 facilities. The Project will not have an adverse effect on other Vermont utilities or customers. As  
11 noted above, the Project will improve the reliability of the Lowell Substation, which benefits all  
12 the utilities that have customers fed off the 34.5 kV network that originates from this Substation.  
13 This includes VEC, the Villages of Johnson, Morrisville and Hyde Park, and the Towns of Stowe  
14 and Hardwick. In addition, the increased capacity of the SHEI will increase the economic  
15 benefits that Vermont electric customers receive from renewable generation in northern  
16 Vermont, positively impacting Vermont utility customers generally.

17

18 **24. Q. Will the Project require any temporary or portable equipment to be installed**  
19 **during construction?**

20 **A.** No. The project will not require that a portable substation be installed. As stated  
21 above, the existing substation will remain in service until the new substation work is completed.

22

23

1   **25.   Q.    Please provide and explain in detail the cost of the Project.**

2           **A.    GMP estimates that the total Project will cost approximately \$15,455,719, which**  
3 includes a 20% contingency. A copy of the Project's cost estimate is appended to my testimony  
4 as **Exhibit GMP KLJ-1**. The total Project costs can be broken down as follows:

5	Materials	\$ 3,903,371
6	Labor	\$ 478,093
7	Contractor	\$ 5,752,679
8	Indirect adders	\$ 2,526,624
9	AFUDC	\$ 218,999
10	Contingency	<u>\$ 2,575,953</u>
11	Total	\$15,455,719

12

13   **26.   Q.    Does this conclude your testimony?**

14           **A.    Yes, it does.**