

Ontario Energy Board

EB-2015-0049

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act*,
S.O. 1998, c. 15 (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Enbridge Gas
Distribution Inc. pursuant to Section 36(1) of the *Ontario*
Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, for an order or orders
approving its Demand Side Management Plan for 2015-2020

EB2015-0049

OEB BOARD SECRETARY	
File No:	Sub File: 19
Panel:	AD CL
Case No:	LG
Case Name:	MM
Case Status:	SV

Technical Conference Questions Energy Probe Research Foundation

July 6, 2015

easily reconciled with data provided in other IR Responses

- a) 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)
- b) Please provide any qualifiers/comments as to how these metrics fit with the prefiled evidence and IR Responses,
- c) Provide Reconciliations with the prefiled evidence, for example Exhibit BTab1 Schedule 2 Table 1 and IRRs e.g. I.T3.EGDI.CME.3

			or	or	or	or	or	
			\$/Participant	\$/Participant	\$/Participant	\$/Participant	\$/Participant	\$/Participant
FORMAT I.T3.EGDI.EP.14								
Large C&I Customers (Sum)	0.0120	?	0.0123	0.0126	0.0128	0.0130		\$0.0132
Large Custom			0.0114	0.0117	0.0119	0.0121		\$0.0123
Large Prescriptive			0.0195	0.0200	0.0203	0.0207		\$0.0210
Small C&I Customers (Sum)	0.0111	?	0.0414	0.0417	0.0417	0.0417		\$0.0417
Small Custom			0.0257	0.0259	0.0259	0.0259		\$0.0259
Small Prescriptive			0.0138	0.0139	0.0139	0.0139		\$0.0139
Small DI			0.0821	0.0827	0.0827	0.0827		\$0.0827
Small Commercial New			N/A	0.0893	0.1335	0.1251		\$0.1073
Residential Thermostats		?	0.0367	0.0320	0.0304	0.0296		\$0.0294
Residential HEC (CCM)	0.0959	?	0.1184	0.1111	0.1067	0.1037		\$0.1017
TOTAL			0.0330	0.0362	0.0385	0.0386		\$0.0387
Low Income	0.0930	?	?	?	?	?		?
TOTAL I.T3.EGDI.CME.3			0.0490	0.0630	0.0680	0.0690	0.0700	0.0700

FORMAT REQUESTED							
Resource Acquisition	2014 \$/CCM	2015 \$/CCM	2016 \$/CCM	2017 \$/CCM	2018 \$/CCM	2019 \$/CCM	2020 \$/CCM
Residential							
Commercial							
Industrial							
Total Resource Acquisition							
Low Income							
Single Family - Part 9							
Multi Residential - Part 3							
Private							
Total Low Income							
TOTAL RA							

TCQ Energy Probe 5

Ref: I.T2.EGDI, Energy Probe 26

Topic Declining Efficiency on RA and MTEM Scorecards

- a) 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

- b) 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 and 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?**

- a) Confirm who receives Incentive**
- b) 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."

- c) Please Provide a Qualitative/quantitative analysis of Cost to Non participants:
For Example (Illustrative)
Benefits:
Avoided Cost \$m
GHG Reductions (monetized \$)
- d) Explain relevance of Societal (Low Income) benefits from a Residential RA program as opposed to Low Income program paid by other ratepayers
- e) 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

- a) **Please Clarify all references to Tables in the text of the Response and provide the specific evidentiary references**
- b) **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..**
- c) **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

- a) Please explain why Navigant did not include Union Gas in sample**
- b) Please explain why it is not appropriate to position Union on the Bar Charts**
- c) 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,**
- d) 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**