

Information Request DPU-Comm 8-2

Refer to the Program Administrator's response to Information Request DPU-Comm 1-1 and Exhs. BGC-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas; Eversource Energy-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas; FGE-2A at 4-5; LU-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas; NG-Gas-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas; Compact-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas; and NG-Electric-2, Att. A at Tabs Electrification, Electric & Gas. Please:

- (a) provide a revised version of the cited table that adds a column recalculating the benefit-cost ratios for each measure to incorporate an SCC of \$128 per short ton;
- (b) identify all measures that are cost effective using an SCC of \$393 per short ton that are not cost effective using an SCC of \$128 per short ton;
- (c) discuss in detail any changes in core initiative budgets that were due to the proposed increase in SCC value; and
- (d) discuss any changes in program design that were due to the proposed increase in SCC value.

Response

- (a) Please see Attachment DPU-Comm 8-2 for the revised table.
- (b) Please see Attachment DPU-Comm 8-2 for the revised table.
- (c) There are no specific changes in core initiative budgets that were due solely to the SCC value. As discussed in Exhibit 1, at 12-14, many factors are considered in the development of budgets.
- (d) There are no specific changes in program design that were due solely to the SCC value. The Program Administrators considered many factors in determining program designs, including the SCC, as well as the GHG goals, savings potential, and Commonwealth and stakeholder priorities. However, the proposed social cost of carbon does affect benefit cost ratios for the programs. If the proposed value were to change, the PAs would need to re-assess the core initiatives and programs to determine if programmatic changes are necessary in order to maintain cost-effectiveness.