

Kai Millyard Associates

72 Regal Road, Toronto, Ontario, M6H 2K1, 416-651-7141

Fax: 416-651-4659

July 30, 2009

Mrs Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
26th floor
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON
M4P 1E4

RE: EB-2009-0154 INTERROGATORIES

Dear Ms Walli,

I enclose 2 copies of interrogatories by GEC to Enbridge on its 2010 DSM Plan evidence. These have also been sent to the utility, and PDF versions are being emailed to you.

Sincerely,

(Mr.) Kai Millyard
Case Manager for the
Green Energy Coalition

encl.

Cc: Josh Wasylyk
Michael Millar
Bonnie Adams

EB-2009-0154 GEC Interrogatories for Enbridge Gas

1. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 4, Pages 2-4 of 8 (Home Performance market transformation scorecard):
 - A. Please describe how the survey analysis proposed for measuring the ultimate outcome (i.e. average increase in frequency scores of all weatherization measures) addresses questions regarding the validity and statistical significance of the results. What threshold response rate, if any, is set that assures the respondents are representative of all workshop participants? What approach shall be used if responses are below that threshold? Is the Company committed to using both the same survey questions and the same survey strategy regarding recruitment of respondents for the baseline (i.e. 2009) and program year measurements? If not, why not?
 - B. Please explain the category of contractor engagement. What is the company's definition of engagement? What factors will be measured to ensure that a contractor is "engaged"? How will they be measured? Is the metric the number of contracting firms, or the number of individuals working in contracting firms?
 - C. Please provide the results to date (in 2009) for the second and third metric.
 - D. Please describe how the specific targets for each of the three proposed metrics (e.g. 100% targets of 0.45, 70 and 8) were selected.
2. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 4, Pages 5-7 of 8 (Drain Water Heat Recovery market transformation program)
 - A. Is the focus of this initiative limited to residential new construction (i.e. the units installed metric is limited to units installed in new homes)? Is it all new homes, or a sub-segment (e.g. single family detached) of the market?
 - B. Approximately how many new homes are built each year in Enbridge's target market for this program?
 - C. Please provide the results to date (in 2009) for each of the seven proposed metrics.
 - D. Please describe how the specific targets for each of the three proposed metrics (e.g. 100% targets of 17, 1800, 60%, 70%, 3, 3, and 3) were selected.
 - E. What is the definition of an enrolled builder? Enbridge's text says something about what it is not, but does not provide a measurable criterion for what it is.

- F. Regarding the second metric, units installed, is this the number of units or the number of homes (since some homes could have more than one unit)? If it is number of units, what has been the experience to date and Enbridge's expectation of the future regarding the average number of units per home?
 - G. Regarding the third metric, builder knowledge, is the Company planning on only measuring knowledge among non-enrolled builders? Has this ever been measured to date by either Enbridge or Union? What was the result of any such measurements? Is the Company committed to using both the same survey questions and the same survey strategy regarding recruitment of respondents for the baseline (i.e. 2009) and program year measurements? If not, why not?
 - H. Regarding the fourth metric, service provider promotion, what exactly is being measured? Is it the percentage of items on that list that each service provider fulfilled? What is on that list? Also, are there only three service providers (i.e. those listed on page 5)?
 - I. Regarding the fifth and sixth metrics, numbers of workshops, please describe these workshops. How long are they typically? Is attendance free for participating builders and subcontractors?
- 3. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 2 of 47 (Energy Star for New Homes program description), please explain any significant ways in which this program is different from the program the Company ran in 2008.
 - 4. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 2 Schedule 1 Page 9 of 47 (Custom Resource acquisition Program: Capital Financing):
 - A. Who will provide the financing capital? The Company, existing lending institutions or some other entity?
 - B. Will the financing be "on-bill", in that repayment will be attached to payment of the gas bill (or will it be a separate payment)?
 - C. Is the Company anticipating using DSM budget funds to buy down the interest rates?
 - D. Please explain how the relative effectiveness of financing will be evaluated against traditional incentives. Please include any information on the company's historical experience in this area.
 - 5. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, p. 2, paragraph 6, please list all measures for which changes in free ridership values (relative to EB-2008-0384) are proposed, showing both the previous assumption and the proposed new assumption.

6. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, p. 3, paragraph 8, please list all measures for which changes in incremental costs are being proposed, showing both the previous Navigant assumption and the proposed new Enbridge assumption.
7. In its discussion of prescriptive boilers (Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, p. 4), Enbridge says the measure is for customers “in smaller facilities”. What exactly does the Company mean by a smaller facility? Will boilers installed in buildings above a certain size or a certain annual level of gas consumption still be treated as custom measures? If so, what size or usage or other threshold is the Company planning to use to determine what is prescriptive and what is custom? How will it determine when the threshold criterion has been met?
8. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, pp. 6-7, paragraph 13:
 - A. Is the Company planning to conduct surveys to determine the extent to which the measures provided are actually installed?
 - B. Please explain what is meant by the term “Company market knowledge”? Has the Company conducted any surveys on the frequency with which these measures are installed in new homes? Has it conducted any interviews with samples of builders to reach such conclusions?
 - C. What further information regarding free ridership is the Company planning to gather? How will it be gathered?
9. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, p. 7, paragraph 14, the Company appears to say that it is proposing to use both the gas and electric savings values from the Navigant report. However, this section is titled “Alternative Assumptions”. Is the Company proposing to change one of the two assumptions? If so, which assumption is being changed and by how much? If the gas assumption is being changed, please provide a copy of the report related to the billing analysis or any other research that the Company is proposing be the basis for the change.
10. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 3, p. 37, reference to the Agviro report titled “Prescriptive Commercial Boiler Program – Prescriptive Savings Analysis”:
 - A. Was this report ever shared with and reviewed by the EAC? If not, why not?
 - B. Was the report ever shared with and reviewed by the 2008 Auditor? If not, why not?
 - C. Please provide a copy of the report.
11. Regarding Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 5, are any of the custom measure lives proposed in this schedule different from those previously approved for 2008? If so, which are different, what are the differences and what is the basis for any differences?

12. The Company states that the new 2010 pilot programs are “not proposed to have any SSM or target impacts” (Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 1, p. 1, paragraph 2). Does that mean that the Company will not claim any savings from any measures installed in facilities covered by the pilot initiatives? If the answer is that the Company reserves the right to claim savings, TRC net benefits and SSM rewards for efficiency measures installed in such facilities, how does it proposed to adjust for the impact the metering or other support from the pilot initiatives may have had in promoting the efficiency investments?