

**CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION'S
DATA REQUEST NO. 1
DOCKET No. 2008-255**

October 15, 2008

CLF-01-03

Q. Reference: Non-Transmission Alternatives Assessment and Economic Evaluation of the Maine Power Reliability Program, page 39:

Alternative energy resources such as fuel cell, PV solar, micro-turbines, tidal and others were not considered in Petitioners' NTA analysis. Please explain why these resources, as part of a distributed generation system, are not viable NTAs?

A. Fuel cells, PV solar, and micro-turbines were considered as Non-Transmission Alternatives. Over a wide range of capacity factors, these alternatives had higher costs than other forms of generation resources that could serve as Non-Transmission Alternatives and, therefore, were not included in the results. Tidal power was not considered because it is not a dispatchable technology.

Response Prepared and Submitted by:

Richard S. Hahn
Principal Consultant
La Capra Associates, Inc.

**CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO COMPETITIVE ENERGY SERVICES' DATA REQUEST NO. 1
DOCKET No. 2008-255**

September 15, 2008

CES-01-03

- Q.** Please provide in excel format monthly load shape factors used to adjust the average annual hourly load for the 50/50 loading case referred to on Page 3 of 9 in paragraph 4.
- A.** The requested information is provided in the attachment to this data response. In preparing CMP's Fall 2006 net energy and peak load forecast, monthly load shape factors (LSF) were developed for two categories of customers: Residential & Small Commercial, and Medium & Large Customers. Data for January 2002 – August 2006 were utilized to develop monthly LSF for energy and peak load. In the case of energy, a monthly LSF was calculated as the average monthly net energy for load for a particular month of the 2002-2006 interval divided by the average monthly net energy for load for all months. Similarly, a monthly LSF for peak demand was calculated as the average monthly peak for load for a particular month of the 2002-2006 interval divided by the average hourly load for all months.

Response Prepared and Submitted By:

John P. Davulis
Senior Project Manager
GDS Associates, Inc.

Attachment(s):

1. Monthly Load Shape Factors Used in Preparing the CMP Fall 2006 Net Energy & Peak Load Forecast

LSF based on Coincident Peak Load Data for January 2002 - August 2006

		Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Peak	System	1.3893	1.3327	1.2667	1.1474	1.1377	1.3567	1.4166	1.4504	1.2503	1.2299	1.2788	1.4130
	Res. & Small	1.7143	1.6400	1.5835	1.3612	1.1765	1.1780	1.2967	1.3488	1.4322	1.3765	1.4973	1.7576
	Medium & Large	1.1377	1.0947	1.0215	0.9819	1.1077	1.4950	1.5094	1.5291	1.1095	1.1164	1.1095	1.1462
	Growth assumption per annum	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.020	1.020	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Energy	System	1.0711	1.0391	0.9680	0.9237	0.9045	0.9920	1.0543	1.0691	0.9723	0.9724	0.9764	1.0548
	Res. & Small	1.1466	1.0842	0.9967	0.9074	0.8647	0.9313	1.0336	1.0507	0.9205	0.9176	0.9954	1.1494
	Medium & Large	1.0127	1.0042	0.9458	0.9364	0.9353	1.0389	1.0704	1.0834	1.0125	1.0148	0.9617	0.9815
	Hours	744	672	744	720	744	720	744	744	720	744	720	744