

**CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S DATA REQUEST NO. 5
DOCKET No. 2008-255**

October 3, 2008

EX-05-10

- Q.** (Volume IX, Pp 168, 169 of 464) Did the 2007 Avoided Energy Supply Study conducted by Synapse Energy Economics include avoidance of the MPRP as a discrete cost that could be avoided through the pursuit of DSM?

If not, shouldn't a NTA study that is focused on avoiding or delaying such a project by definition include some fraction of the project costs in the analysis of what is "cost effective"?

Would such an exercise expand the range of options that would be cost effective and also increase the amount of demand reduction available? Please discuss.

- A.** The Synapse report provided avoided energy and capacity costs, not avoided transmission costs. GDS used the same avoided transmission and distribution (T&D) cost (\$80/kW-Yr.) that Efficiency Maine uses to determine the cost effectiveness of energy efficiency measures and programs. Given that most measures analyzed by GDS were determined to be cost-effective, any increase in the avoided T&D cost to reflect MPRP as a discrete cost would have minimal impact on the results. If reflecting MPRP as a discrete cost were to reduce avoided T&D cost, then the range of cost-effective options would decrease.

Response Prepared and Submitted By:

Robert Fratto
Managing Director
GDS Associates