

DE 01-057

CONCORD ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
CONNECTICUT VALLEY ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
EXETER & HAMPTON ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
GRANITE STATE ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
NEW HAMPSHIRE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., AND  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joint Petition for Approval of Core Energy Efficiency Programs

Order Approving Settlement Agreement and Joint Request for  
Modification of Previous Commission Determination

O R D E R    N O.    23,850

November 29, 2001

**APPEARANCES:** Gerald M. Eaton, Esq. for Public Service Company of New Hampshire; LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae LLP by Meabh Purcell, Esq. for Concord Electric Company and Exeter & Hampton Electric Company; Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell, P.A. by Seth L. Shortlidge, Esq. for Granite State Electric Company; New Hampshire Legal Assistance by Alan M. Linder, Esq. for the Save Our Homes Organization; William Gabler for New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Ransmeier & Spellman by Dom S. D'Ambruso. Esq. for Connecticut Valley Electric Company; Thomas Irwin, Esq. for the Conservation Law Foundation; Meredith A. Hatfield, Esq. for the Governor's Office of Energy and Community Services; Joanne O. Morin for the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services; Brian Hart for the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests; Office of Consumer Advocate by Kenneth Traum on behalf of residential ratepayers; and Donald M. Kreis, Esq. for the Staff of the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.

**I. BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

This proceeding grows out of our Order No. 23,574 (November 1, 2000) in Docket DR 96-150, approving with certain modifications the recommendations of the New Hampshire Energy Efficiency Working Group (Working Group) relative to the future of ratepayer-funded energy efficiency initiatives in New

Hampshire in light of the significant changes mandated by the Electric Industry Restructuring Act, RSA 374-F. In Order No. 23,574, we directed the state's electric utilities to work together on the development of a set of core energy efficiency programs (Core Programs) that would assure a baseline level of uniformity and consistency in this important aspect of industry restructuring across the state. We directed the utilities to file a petition seeking approval of the Core Programs on or about January 1, 2001, with specified deadlines for utility-specific programs thereafter. The Commission subsequently extended the deadline for the Core Programs filing to March 15, 2001.

On March 14, 2001, the Core Programs filing was submitted to the Commission on behalf of Concord Electric Company (Concord), Connecticut Valley Electric Company (CVEC), Exeter & Hampton Electric Company (E&H), Granite State Electric Company (GSEC), New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc. (NHEC) and Public Service Company of New Hampshire (PSNH) (collectively, the Electric Utilities). For residential customers, the Electric Utilities proposed the following programs: Energy Star® Homes, Energy Star® Appliances, Residential Lighting, Residential Retrofit and Low Income Efficiency Services. For Commercial and Industrial customers, the Electric Utilities proposed programs for Lost Opportunities/New Construction, Large C&I Retrofit and Small C&I Retrofit.

On April 6, 2001, the Commission issued an Order of Notice scheduling a Prehearing Conference, requiring public notice of the Prehearing Conference through publication of the Order and establishing a deadline for intervention petitions. In its Order of Notice, the Commission granted the request of the Electric Utilities to open a new docket to consider the Core Programs, rather than conduct the instant proceeding under the aegis of the Commission's omnibus and longstanding restructuring docket, DR 96-150.

The Order of Notice was duly published and, thereafter, the Commission received timely intervention petitions from the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF); the Environmental Responsibility Committee of the Episcopal Diocese of New Hampshire, the Province I Environmental Network of the Episcopal Church and New Hampshire Interfaith Power and Light (appearing jointly and collectively referred to here as Province I); the Governor's Office of Energy and Community Services (ECS); the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (DES) and the Save Our Homes Organization (SOHO). The Commission also received requests for limited intervention from New Hampshire Ball Bearing, Inc. and EnergyNorth Natural Gas, Inc. d/b/a KeySpan Energy Delivery New England. The Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) exercised its authority to enter an appearance on behalf of residential ratepayers pursuant to RSA 363:28.

The Prehearing Conference took place as scheduled on May 3, 2001. The Commission considered the pending intervention petitions and, thereafter, heard statements of preliminary positions from the parties and Commission Staff (Staff). Subsequent to the Prehearing Conference, the parties and Staff conducted a technical session for the purpose of seeking agreement on a proposed procedural schedule to govern the remainder of the proceeding. On May 4, 2001, Staff filed a letter with the Commission indicating that such an agreement had been reached and outlining the proposed schedule that had been agreed upon. On May 17, 2001, the Commission issued Order No. 23,705 approving the proposed procedural schedule.

On June 15, 2001, the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (Society) filed a Motion for Limited Intervention. Receiving no objections to the Society's motion, the Commission granted intervenor status to the Society on July 16, 2001.

On August 1, 2001, Staff notified the Commission that a settlement conference had taken place on July 31, 2001 and that the parties and Staff agreed to proceed with a second settlement conference on August 6, 2001. On August 9, 2001, Staff, with the concurrence of the parties, filed a motion to revise the previously approved procedural schedule so as to facilitate ongoing settlement discussions. The Commission granted the

motion the same day.

On September 6, 2001, Staff, on behalf of the parties, filed a motion for a partial stay in the procedural schedule. The motion requested that the two deadlines referenced for prefiled testimony be held in abeyance to allow parties and Staff to focus in the near term on achieving settlement. The Commission granted this request.

On October 2, 2001, Staff notified the Commission that an agreement had been reached settling the outstanding issues in this docket and that the Settlement Conference scheduled for October 3, 2001 had been cancelled. On October 5, 2001, Staff filed a comprehensive Settlement Agreement which was entered into among the Electric Utilities, SOHO, CLF, DES, Province I, Society, ECS, OCA, and Staff.

On October 26, 2001, PSNH filed a Joint Request for Modification of Commission Order No. 23,574 (Joint Request) on behalf of the Electric Utilities. In Order No. 23,574, the Commission directed each electric company to apply a utility-specific cost-effectiveness test to the programs and services it will offer based upon each company's avoided generation, transmission and distribution costs. According to the Electric Utilities, after the parties to the Core Programs docket began discussing the design and delivery of common energy efficiency programs, it was discovered that application of utility-specific

cost-effectiveness tests would result in some products and services being approved for one utility while the same products or services would fail the cost-effectiveness test for one or more of the others. The Joint Request asks the Commission to adopt a common cost-effectiveness test to help ensure uniformity of program and service offerings throughout the state.

A hearing on the merits was held before the Commission on October 31, 2001 at which witnesses from PSNH, GSEC, ECS and DES provided testimony supporting the Settlement Agreement. The Commission also heard statements supporting the Joint Request.

## **II. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

The Settlement Agreement (Settlement) is intended to resolve all issues concerning the Core Programs raised thus far in the case, in what the signatories recommend be deemed the first phase of an ongoing proceeding. The signatories intend that the Settlement result in the provision of the Core Programs to New Hampshire customers sooner than would be the case absent the Settlement, so that all New Hampshire customers are offered the same core energy efficiency programs and services throughout the state, and the Electric Utilities work together to capture the efficiencies of statewide cooperation and coordination of programs.

The terms of the Settlement are summarized below:

1. Utilities' Commitment: Consistent with the Commission's mandate in Order No. 23,574, each of the Utilities

represents that it is fully committed to the proposed Core Programs. The Utilities will dedicate sufficient funds and resources, subject to the constraints of each Utility's budget, to deliver the Core Programs in a consistent manner to as many New Hampshire residents, businesses and public facilities as possible through year end 2003, or until such further time as the Commission may direct. Through coordinated efforts wherever possible, the common goal of the Utilities is to achieve the following:

- i) To provide an opportunity for all customer segments to participate in an energy efficiency program in approximate proportion to the contribution by customer sector;
  - ii) To reduce or eliminate market barriers;
  - iii) To promote market transformation;
  - iv) To educate residents, businesses, municipalities and non-profit organizations about energy efficiency opportunities and practices;
  - v) To address the unique needs of low income residents; and
  - vi) To exploit opportunities to reduce the cost and improve the effectiveness of program design, administration, implementation, and evaluation that may be created through coordinated efforts with these Core Program initiatives.
2. Scope of Proceeding: The Parties and Staff agree, in accordance with the Commission's Order of Notice in this docket, that the following issues are reserved for future phases of this docket, and will be addressed in the utility-specific filings following Commission approval of the proposed Core Programs in this phase of the docket:
- i) final Utility-specific budgets for each of the Core Programs;
  - ii) cost-effectiveness analyses for the programs as implemented by each utility;
  - iii) final Utility-specific program goals; and
  - iv) the Utilities' estimated shareholder incentive.
3. Program Modifications: The Parties and Staff agree that the proposed Core Programs, with the following modifications, should be adopted and approved by the Commission.

A. ENERGY STAR® Homes

- i) To determine if builders trained under the ENERGY STAR Homes Program are implementing the practices they learned under the Program, and what services they need to increase the number of ENERGY STAR Homes built in the State, the Utilities shall perform a survey as part of the overall program evaluation. This information will be used to modify the Program in order to increase the number of ENERGY STAR Homes built in New Hampshire. Modifications might include technical assistance to builders, and other education and outreach efforts.
- ii) The Utilities have established their preliminary goals for the ENERGY STAR Homes Program as a number of ENERGY STAR Homes built in each year of the Core Programs.
- iii) Rebates for ENERGY STAR Homes will be offered in addition to the proposed outreach and marketing program, and will be included in the annual review of cost-effectiveness.

B. Low Income Energy Efficiency

- i) The Utilities agree to offer the low income program to income eligible households that heat with natural gas until the Commission requires gas companies to offer similar services to these customers.
- ii) The Utilities will work with the state's Community Action Agencies (CAAs) and ECS to coordinate the delivery of services offered under the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program and the federal Weatherization Assistance Program in order to maximize benefits to participants. The Utilities, ECS, CAAs and SOHO will develop a comprehensive plan to implement the coordination and delivery of Core and Weatherization services. Such a plan should be prepared prior to the submission of the utility-specific filings. Specific coordination actions will include:
  - a) Providing comprehensive services to those low income homes, which have been certified for both Core and Weatherization services, through coordinated expenditure of Core and Weatherization funding, where feasible and appropriate, so as to maximize the scope of

services provided to each home, and in order to capture potential program efficiencies and ensure the sound fiscal management of the System Benefits Charge funds.

- b) CAAs that wish to participate in providing services under the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program agree to participate in a bidding process with other energy service providers to establish qualifications and pricing for program services.
  - c) Qualified CAAs, as set forth below in (1) and (2), will be offered right of first refusal on services provided under the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program provided:
    - (1) The CAAs agree to provide services at established statewide rates. Where the same services are provided in the Residential Retrofit Program, pricing would be the same for both programs.
    - (2) CAAs would meet established statewide standards for customer response time, work quality, and delivery of program services. Where applicable, this would include the use of "before and after" Home Energy Ratings (HERS). These statewide standards will apply to both the Low Income Energy Efficiency as well as the Residential Retrofit Programs.
  - d) The Utilities will strive to market the program in such a fashion as to promote a reasonably level flow of work. In cases where the CAAs cannot provide Low Income Energy Efficiency services in accordance with paragraph ii. c. above, the work will be assigned to other qualified vendors who will be held to the same standards for pricing, customer responsiveness and work quality.
  - e) The Utilities, ECS, and SOHO will work to develop a training and customer education program that could include ECS providing training for all providers who deliver Core Low Income Energy Efficiency Program services.
- iii) The maximum expenditure for services provided under the Core Low Income Energy Efficiency

Program is set at \$3,600.

- iv) The Parties and Staff agree that targeted, individualized customer energy efficiency education is an essential program component. The Parties and Staff further agree that specialized training of field staff is necessary to maximize the opportunity for successful customer education and to secure active customer participation in the program. Accordingly, the Utilities agree to implement an Education and Training Plan.
  - v) The Utilities have provided separate goals and budgets for the Core Low Income Energy Efficiency Program.
- C. Home Energy Ratings: The Utilities will provide Home Energy Ratings (HERS) to residential customers where they are cost-effective and will benefit the customers. The cost of HERS is believed to be comparable to other audit tools.
- D. ENERGY STAR® Appliances:
- i) A key component of the ENERGY STAR Appliances Program is a broad based ENERGY STAR awareness campaign that will be undertaken to educate consumers about the benefits of ENERGY STAR labeled appliances compared to appliances that do not meet ENERGY STAR standards. The Utilities are participating in a national ENERGY STAR awareness study in 2001 that will be used to quantify a baseline awareness level about ENERGY STAR in New Hampshire. This baseline measurement of ENERGY STAR awareness will be used to establish a benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of the ENERGY STAR awareness campaign that the Utilities will support. This study will be updated annually using consistent survey instruments so that program effectiveness can be gauged over time. The results of these efforts will be used to assess the effectiveness of the ENERGY STAR awareness campaign (i.e., the Utilities will be able to determine if ENERGY STAR awareness has increased compared to the initial baseline as a result of the awareness campaign), and to take steps to increase market share of ENERGY STAR appliances in New Hampshire.
  - ii) Rebates will be used to complement other market transformation activities for ENERGY STAR appliances in New Hampshire. These rebates will

be set at no less than \$50.00, and offered for at least one major ENERGY STAR appliance in addition to the proposed ENERGY STAR awareness campaign directed at ENERGY STAR appliances. These efforts will be subject to the annual review of cost-effectiveness.

- E. Commercial & Industrial Programs: The parties and Staff supplemented the Commercial and Industrial Core Program descriptions provided in the Electric Utilities original Core Programs filing.
- F. Program Goals and Budgets:
- i) The Utilities have provided preliminary utility specific and statewide program participation goals and budgets. The Parties and Staff recognize that the goals and budgets provided are preliminary and are subject to reasonable modification in the utility-specific filings. The Utilities will each provide final utility-specific program goals and budgets in the utility-specific phase of this proceeding.
  - ii) Public Service Company of New Hampshire has provided a budget based upon the System Benefits Charge for energy efficiency set at 1.8 mills per kWh by the Legislature in House Bill 489 (2001 Laws 29). The Company will fully comply with the legislative mandate in House Bill 489 to phase in additional funding "as quickly as can be effectively administered by Public Service of New Hampshire." PSNH will provide a plan detailing proposed program funding ramp-up to \$.0018 per kWh in its utility-specific filing.
4. Program Implementation: Each individual utility will be responsible for contracting for and overseeing program services in its service territory, and commits to work together with the other utilities to ensure that all potential efficiencies from program coordination are captured. In addition, to enhance efficiency and reduce administrative costs:
- i) The Utilities will develop and use common vendor Request for Proposals (RFPs), rebate/application forms, and common marketing materials to promote each program.
  - ii) The Utilities will develop and use statewide marketing. Individual utilities will be responsible for directing marketing efforts, using the common

materials, in their service territory in order to manage program participation and prevent over- and under-subscription, but will work together to ensure continuity of marketing messages statewide, and a coordinated effort to reach customers with locations in more than one service territory.

iii) The Utilities will jointly provide a statewide toll-free telephone number and common website to ensure that all customers have access to programs and measures.

iv) The Utilities will perform joint program evaluations to ensure program goals are achieved. Individual utilities may conduct company-specific studies, as needed, to analyze specific program issues.

5. Core Program Management Committee: The Utilities will establish a Core Program Management Team (the Management Team) to oversee all Core Program activities and to resolve problems as they arise. The Management Team will be comprised of representatives from each utility and will make decisions by consensus with one member specifically designated as the liaison with the Parties and Staff. The Management Team will meet at least quarterly to review program progress and to resolve problems.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation: The Utilities will institute a Core Program Monitoring and Evaluation (Core M&E) Team to oversee quarterly reporting, joint program evaluations, share information and seek input from Parties and Staff, and to report to the Commission and Parties on market progress for each program.

i) The Core M&E Team will be comprised of representatives from each utility.

ii) The Utilities will develop Quarterly Reports that compare program goals to actual accomplishments. These reports will compare actual spending, participation levels, and initial estimates of savings to the budget and goals for participation and savings. These reports will be submitted to the Commission with copies to the Parties and Staff in advance of the quarterly meetings of the Management Team with Parties and Staff.

iii) The Utilities will identify proposed evaluation studies to be completed in each calendar year and will discuss the proposed studies with the Parties and Staff. Planned activities will be prioritized with input from the Parties and Staff, informed by

implementation experience in the year. This approach will ensure that evaluation resources are directed at significant program issues, as they will be subject to evaluation budget constraints.

- iv) The Utilities will evaluate the Core Programs using methods that produce results that are reviewable, appropriate, and reliable. The results and findings of program evaluations, along with the input from the Parties and Staff, will feed into the program planning process to ensure the programs are implemented efficiently and effectively.
- v) The evaluation studies will be completed jointly. This approach should result in lower evaluation expenses across the state compared to the costs that would be incurred if these studies were completed independently.
- vi) The Commission, in Order No. 23,574, noted the importance of process evaluations, impact evaluations, and market transformation assessments. The evaluations of the Core Energy Efficiency Programs will include process evaluations, impact evaluations, and market baseline and penetration studies. Process evaluations will be conducted to assess the effectiveness of program delivery, estimate spillover rates, and measure customer satisfaction. Impact evaluations will be conducted periodically to assess the actual demand and energy savings achieved by programs. Market baseline and penetration studies will be conducted to support market transformation programs. For Core Programs offered in 2002, process and/or impact evaluations for selected programs will be initiated twelve months after program implementation so that results from the first year of implementation can be evaluated. Evaluation budgets may place some constraints on the number of programs evaluated in any year. The Utilities will strive to complete these evaluations no later than eighteen months after program implementation. Where possible, the Utilities will participate in regional evaluations for market transformation initiatives that may be undertaken on a different schedule. Evaluations will be filed with the Commission, and copies will be provided to the Parties and Staff. All programs will be evaluated at some point during the course of delivering the multi-year Core Programs.
- vii) In addition to the use of in-house expertise, the Utilities will jointly hire independent consultants to perform evaluation studies. Where appropriate,

consultants will be hired through a competitive solicitation process. The Utilities agree to seek input from the Parties and Staff on planned evaluation efforts and to review study results with the Parties and Staff.

viii) Notwithstanding the above, each utility may individually conduct program evaluations and independently retain outside consultants when appropriate.

7. Participation by Non-Utility/Interested Parties: The Management Team will meet with other Parties and Staff quarterly to review the Core Programs and seek input from the Parties and Staff. These meetings will take place after the quarterly reports have been received and reviewed by the Parties and Staff, and will include: a review of program performance, as reported in the quarterly reports; a discussion of evaluation plans and evaluation studies; a discussion of activities planned for the future; and an opportunity for the Parties and Staff to provide input and suggestions to the Management Team. The Management Team agrees to consider input provided by the Parties and Staff. Any issues with respect to the reports, the data reflected in them, planned future Core Program activities, or actions and inaction by the Management Team may be brought before the Commission for resolution by the Parties and Staff.
8. The Utilities will properly dispose of or recycle any refrigerators and/or other appliances or equipment replaced in the Residential Retrofit and Low Income Energy Efficiency Programs, and will inform residential customers that they are responsible for environmentally sound disposal of other replaced appliances or equipment. The Utilities will also recycle lamps and ballasts when the utility is responsible for installing the measures. The Utilities will require that Commercial and Industrial customers agree, as a condition of participation in the Core Programs, to remove and dispose of replaced equipment in accordance with all laws, rules, and regulations. Commercial and Industrial customers must also agree not to install any of the replaced equipment at any other location in the utility's service territory.

### **III. COMMISSION ANALYSIS**

As noted in Order No. 23,574, our responsibility to implement Core Energy Efficiency Programs arises out of the

Legislature's specific instruction that the state's restructured electric industry "should be designed to reduce market barriers to investments in energy efficiency and provide incentives for appropriate demand-side management and not reduce cost-effective consumer conservation." RSA 374-F:3, X. "Utility sponsored energy efficiency programs should target cost-effective opportunities that may otherwise be lost due to market barriers." *Id.*, see also RSA 374-F:4, VIII (authorizing the Commission to order "service provisions" that are "necessary to implement restructuring and that are substantially consistent with the principles established in this chapter") and Order No. 23,574, slip op. at 10-11 (describing Commission implementation of this mandate and noting that the "benefits of a retail electric market will not be fulfilled without a competitive wholesale market and a vibrant, unsubsidized energy efficiency market"). We stressed that the objective of the Core Programs should be "consistency in both program offering and program design," *id.* at 17, and that our focus in considering them would be on their "efficacy," *id.* at 24.

Against the backdrop of these principles, we have reviewed the terms of the Settlement as well as the Electric Utilities' filing and supporting testimony presented at the October 31, 2001 hearing. Based on our review of the record, we find that the Electric Utilities' petition, as amended by the

terms of the Settlement, creates energy efficiency programs that are reasonable and in the public interest. Therefore, we will approve the Settlement, which resolves all issues heretofore presented in this docket concerning the Core Energy Efficiency Programs of the New Hampshire electric utilities, as filed. We further agree with the parties to the Settlement that it is consistent with administrative efficiency and the public interest to leave this docket open for consideration of the utility-specific filings, as opposed to opening new dockets and requiring new interventions each time a utility presents its individual programs and budgets for approval.

The Core Program designs borrow heavily from programs that are now being run by some utilities in New Hampshire and the region, and are for the most part standard utility programs. The adjustments to the designs negotiated by the settling parties fall mainly in three areas: 1) strengthening the coordination between the low-income programs and the efficiency efforts of the Community Action Agencies; 2) strengthening efforts in outreach and education; and 3) strengthening the coordination between the utilities in the implementation and management of the programs. With respect to this aspect of the Settlement, the parties agree that the Electric Utilities will establish a Core Program Management Team to oversee all Core Program activities and to resolve problems as they arise.

When we rejected the New Hampshire Energy Efficiency Working Group's proposal to form an Energy Efficiency Committee to consider avenues for market transformation, we expressed the concern that such a body would "continue to develop and sponsor traditional programs that have been offered in the past." *Id.* at 12. The Core Programs before us now are of the traditional variety, but provide an appropriate platform for future innovation. We encourage the Electric Utilities and the other interested parties to continue to explore innovative approaches for market transformation. One such approach is the pilot Pay-As-You-Save (PAYS) energy efficiency products program that PSNH and the NHEC are conducting, as approved in Docket DE 01-080. We are confident that other such opportunities will occur, and that the existence of the Core Programs will facilitate rather than discourage their development.

The Electric Utilities have committed to the establishment of a Core Program Monitoring and Evaluation Team to oversee quarterly reporting and joint program evaluations, to share information and seek input from interested parties and Staff, and to report to the Commission and parties on market progress. We believe that this is an important aspect of the Settlement which addresses our concerns regarding monitoring and evaluation as outlined in Order No. 23,574. Further, it establishes an open dialogue between various interest groups and

the Electric Utilities on the operation of the Core Programs. Active Commission oversight of the process is essential, both to further the public policy at issue and to avoid antitrust concerns. *See, e.g., Trigen-Oklahoma City Energy Corp. v. Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.*, 244 F.3d 1220, 1225-27 (10th Cir. 2001) (discussing "state action" immunity from antitrust scrutiny and noting "active supervision" requirement for attainment of such immunity).

It is also our view that the Core Programs will provide the benefits of improved program consistency throughout the state that we envisioned in approving the results of the Working Group's efforts a year ago. We are aware that the process of developing and negotiating these programs has been complex and often difficult, and the parties are to be commended for their efforts in developing a core set of efficiency programs to bring further benefits of energy efficiency to all New Hampshire electricity customers.

Finally, we will approve the Joint Request for Modification of Commission Order No. 23,574 filed by PSNH. RSA 365:28 authorizes us to take such action after notice and hearing. We agree with the Electric Utilities that adoption of a single avoided cost methodology to apply to the cost-effectiveness test used to evaluate each program offering for each utility will promote the goal of having uniform offerings of

Core Programs in all utility service territories. The Electric Utilities correctly point out that the alternative, i.e., applying each utility's uniquely calculated avoided cost figures to the cost-benefit analysis of all its energy efficiency programs, would likely have the effect of making some Core Programs available in some service territories but not others. This would defeat a key objective of the Core Programs, which is statewide uniformity. As stated at hearing, this single avoided-cost methodology is to be used only for the cost-effectiveness screening of the energy efficiency programs and is not to be considered precedent for issues arising in any other proceeding.

**Based upon the foregoing, it is hereby**

**ORDERED**, that the Settlement Agreement is APPROVED; and  
it is

**FURTHER ORDERED**, that Public Service Company of New Hampshire and Granite State Electric Company make their utility-specific filings in this docket on or before December 31, 2001 and that Concord Electric Company, Connecticut Valley Electric Company, Exeter & Hampton Electric Company and the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative make their filings on or before February 27, 2002; and it is

**FURTHER ORDERED**, that the Joint Request submitted by Public Service Company of New Hampshire for Modification of Commission Order No. 23,574 is APPROVED.



By order of the Public Utilities Commission of New  
Hampshire this twenty-ninth day of November, 2001.

---

Thomas B. Getz  
Chairman

---

Susan S. Geiger  
Commissioner

---

Nancy Brockway  
Commissioner

Attested by:

---

Claire D. DiCicco  
Assistant Secretary