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**EGDI TCQs**

**TCQ Energy Probe 1**

**Ref: BT1S3; I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 4; I.T3.EGDI, Energy Probe 2; I.T2.EGDI,**

**CCC.11**

**Topic 2015 (Board Directed) Targets vs 2014 Achievement and 3 year average**

**Achievement**

1. **Please provide the EP Excel Schedule (Tab 2) with Corrections/Updates (live Excel format)**
2. **Please provide for each Program with Reference to I.T2.EGDI.CCC.11, the Basis of the 2015 Targets/ Scorecards**
3. **For each Program provide Explanatory notes how the Targets are appropriate relative to 2014 Actual Achievements and to 2012-2014 average Achievement**



**TCQ Energy Probe 2**

**Ref: I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 4, Page 10**

**Topic Update re Clearance of 2014 accounts to rate Classes**

**Please provide an estimate in the Format of Page 10 of the IR Response and qualify this re Estimate/Unaudited etc,**

**TCQ Energy Probe 3**

**Ref: Exhibit I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 4; I.T3.EGDI, Energy Probe 7; I.T3.EGDI,**

**Energy Probe 14 c, d, e**

**Topic Efficiency Metrics $/CCM 2012-2014 and 2015**

**TCQ Energy Probe 4**

**Ref: I.T3.EGDI, Energy Probe, 14.**

**Topic Efficiency Metrics $/CCM 2016-2020**

**The Efficiency Metrics provided in the referenced IR responses are not**

**easily reconciled with data provided in other IR Responses**

1. **Please provide a set of efficiency metrics ($/CCM) in the format provided in the Template provided in the EP Schedule. Provided in KT 1.1 subject to a copy in Excel Format, and subject to part b)**
2. **Please provide any qualifiers/comments as to how these metrics fit with the prefiled evidence and IR Responses,**
3. **Provide Reconciliations with the prefiled evidence, for example Exhibit BTab1 Schedule 2 Table 1 and IRRs e.g. I.T3.EGDI.CME.3**

****

**TCQ Energy Probe 5**

**Ref: I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 26**

**Topic Declining Efficiency on RA and MTEM Scorecards**

1. **The IR Response indicates Declining RA Program Efficiency ($/CCM) please provide information on two (hypothetical) scenarios**

**1. the target be shifted down by 25% i.e. 100% at 75% and 125%**

**Please provide the scorecard for this Scenario and Show the Budget, CCM and Incentives for the Rate 1 and Rate 6.**

**2. Eliminate the 150% Stretch from the Scorecard**

**Please provide a revised Scorecard and show the Impacts on Budgets CCM and Shareholder Incentive allocated to Rate 1 and Rate 6**

1. **With regard to the Response on the MTEM Program (accepting that the MTEM Program has two goals-- CCM and MT) it appears that for the CCM portion the 150% stretch factor is showing dramatically higher costs allocated to Rates 1 and 6 and significantly lower efficiency $/CCM**

**Please provide (as a hypothetical) revised Scorecard with no 150% stretch and provide the impact on CCM and shareholder Incentive**

**TCQ Energy Probe 6**

**Ref: I.T3.EGDI, Energy Probe, 15; I.T8.EGDI.CCC.30**

**Topic Value Proposition for Residential customer paying $0.67/month in**

**2014 and 2.00/month in 2016 and beyond**

**Preamble: EGD has not accepted the Proposition in the Interrogatory-We asked EGD to provide in qualitative/quantitative terms the incremental value received by a typical Residential Customer that Paid on average $0.67/month for DSM Programs in 2014 and will now pay above 2.00/month in 2016 onward.**

**Referred to I.T8.EGDI.CCC.30. So EP requests a response based on that IRR.**

Background

EGD Distinguishes **Participants** and **Non Participants** in the HEC RA program.

**Participants**

Exhibit BTab 1Schedule 4 Page 9 Table 7, shows a budget (including Overheads) of $12.5 million for HEC (and $0.88 million for Adaptive Thermostats); Table 8 shows CCM of **290.2 m3 a**nd **7,508** Participants

Direct Benefits are cited (based onTRC?) as $23.6 million in 2016, while the

incremental costs to the (participating) customer, after receiving an incentive from Enbridge, is $10.9 million. Please provide EGD’s Cost/Benefit Analysis for **the 7,508**  HEC participants?

1. Confirm who receives Incentive
2. Provide an analysis of Direct Benefits ( breakdown of the inputs/outputs of the TRC + Test?)

For Example (illustrative) :

Benefits to Participating customers: 7508 x avg. Incentive=$X million

Benefits to All Customers: TRC+ benefits =$Y million

Net Benefit (Y-X): =Z Million

**Non-Participants**

IRR states ”The benefits to non-participants are largely societal in nature and include impacts such as environmental benefits through reduced greenhouse gas emission, societal benefits, particularly for low income consumers, and economic stimulus.”

1. Please Provide a Qualitative/quantitative analysis of Cost to Non participants:

For Example (Illustrative)

Benefits:

Avoided Cost $m

GHG Reductions (monetized $)

1. Explain relevance of Societal (Low Income ) benefits from a Residential RA program as opposed to Low Income program paid by other ratepayers
2. Economic Stimulus; Is this the gross capital investment times an appropriate multiplier? Does it include annual operating costs/benefits

**Please provide an cost/benefit analysis.**

**TCQ Energy Probe 7**

**Ref: C Tab 1, Schedule 1; I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 34**

**Topic Alignment of Residential and Low Income Sector Budgets and CCM**

**to Navigant DSM Potential Study**

1. **Please Clarify all references to Tables in the text of the Response and provide the specific evidentiary references**
2. **Confirm the Budget 2015-2020 of $302.1m includes “only non CCM” and indicate if it does/does not include Overheads. Clarify what is included/excluded at program level etc..**
3. **Chart Provided in IRR Part a) Figure 1 Gas Savings with Simulated Plan**

**Please provide a chart/graph or charts showing the Savings and Budgets 2015-2020:**

**Savings**

**Achievable Savings Potential lines –Base case and upper and lower scenarios and positioning the Plan Savings (100%) from 2015-2020.**

**Budgets/Spend**

**On the same or separate chart the Achievable Scenario Budgets Base Case Upper and Lower and Plan Budgets**

**TCQ Energy Probe 8**

**Ref: C Tab 1 Schedule 1 Page 157-159 Figures E-3, E-4 and E-5; I.T2.EGDI,**

**Energy Probe 38; I.T13.EGDI, Energy Probe 36**

**Topic Benchmarking 2016 and Union Gas** B/T1/S3/p. 6) T2.EGDI.CCC.11

1. **Please explain why Navigant did not include Union Gas in sample**
2. **Please explain why it is not appropriate to position Union on the Bar Charts**
3. **Please explain why it is not appropriate to take the 2016 plans and position EGD and Union on the chart, assuming all other utilities stay at 2012 levels,**
4. **Please provide the requested information in the format of Charts E-2 and E3 based on the information filed in this combined EGD/Union hearing**