2018 **M08888**

NOVA SCOTIA UTILITY AND REVIEW BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: **THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT**

- and -

IN THE MATTER OF: **IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION** by **EfficiencyOne (E1)** for approval for the use of measure-level Non-Energy Benefits within the context of Cost-Effectiveness testing associated with future DSM planning regulatory processes

NON-CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: **James Gogan**
EfficiencyOne Counsel
The Breton Law Group
jim@bretonlawgroup.com

From: Board Staff
Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board

Responses Due: **Wednesday, November 14, 2018**

Copies: 1 electronic copy (PDF searchable)
4 hard copies

Contact Person: **Steve Pronko, P. Eng.**
Senior Advisor
Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board
Tel: (902) 424-4448
Fax: (902) 424-3919
steve.pronko@novascotia.ca

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 23rd day of October, 2018

Doreen Friis

Doreen Friis, Regulatory Affairs Officer/Clerk

Request IR-1:

Please provide the cost of engaging Vermont Energy Investment Corporation (VEIC) as EOne's consultant regarding Non-Energy Benefits (NEBs).

Request IR-2:

Regarding the NEBs quantification methodology, page 4 of 15 states:

> A minority of [DSMAG] members emphasized that a simple multiplier-based approach would suffice, while many advocated for enhanced precision of a measure-based approach, using existing data from another jurisdiction.

On page 15 of 15, EOne states that the VEIC methodology "…captures the consensus of the DSMAG on the general methodology".

a) Please elaborate on the DSMAG consensus regarding the VEIC methodology; i.e. does this imply full agreement by all DSMAG participants?

Request IR-3:

Page 10 of 15 states:

> The average relative increase to the portfolio TRC test result after the inclusion of NEBs was 24% across all years of the 2016-2018 DSM Resource Plan (including measures with zero NEBs values).

a) What additional programs or measures could have been included in the 2016-2018 programs with inclusion of NEBs in the TRC test?
b) How will inclusion of NEBs in the TRC test affect the level of DSM spending or the level of kW and kWh savings?
c) How do the NEB TRC ratios compare with PAC ratios for the same measures, programs, and portfolio in the 2016-2018 DSM Resource Plan?

Request IR-4:

On page 11 of 15, EOne notes that some NEB enhancements to the TRC test are possible in the future and are currently underway or being investigated. Also, "EfficiencyOne is currently working with Saint Mary's University … to develop a comprehensive primary research survey instrument to address groups of measures for which no NEBs information was adapted by VEIC, and for which NEBs could reasonably be postulated to exist…”.

a) Have any electricity ratepayer funds been spent on this activity? If so, please provide the amount to-date.
b) What cost has been budgeted for this work?
c) Does EOne consider it appropriate to proceed with this work for future NEB enhancement of the TRC test, and any related expenditures, prior to receiving a Board decision on the current NEB application?

Request IR-5:

Page 15 of 15 states that “…not every point of discussion has full agreement amongst the DSMAG…”

a) Please list and describe the issues which EOne considers do not have full agreement amongst the DSMAG.
b) Have any DSMAG participants suggested that NEBs should not be included in the TRC testing?

Request IR-6:

In general, would more measures and programs pass the cost effectiveness test based on the PAC or on the TRC with NEBs included? Please elaborate.

Request IR-7:

If a NEB benefit has no potential to reduce electric load or shift electric load, what benefit does it provide to other electricity ratepayers?

Request IR-8:

If a NEB benefit has no potential to reduce electric load or shift electric load, why should the Board consider it at all?

Request IR-9:

If a NEB benefit has no potential to reduce electric load or shift electric load, what provision of the *Public Utilities Act* permits the Board to take it into account?