DE 15-137
EERS Technical Session (9/16/2015)
Staff Informational Notes

Procedural Issues

- Discussion of timing of filing of testimony and responses

- Topics for presentation in testimony include issues raised in the Order of Notice (OON)

- Parties could address all issues raised in the OON; or, any party could address one or a select number of issues

- Two options: (1) Testimony, (2) Comments

  - (1) If testimony is not preferred by any party, comments could be provided on the record
  - (2) Pre-filed testimony would carry more weight than comments since pre-filed testimony is sworn testimony subject to cross examination; whereas, comments are not subject to cross examination
  - Parties are not obligated to do either one

Rate Design Presentation by Richard Sedano (RAP)

- Rated Design Slides were presented by Richard Sedano

- Richard Sedano provided a copy of "Smart Rate Design For a Smart Future - Executive Summary", by Jim Lazar and Wilson Gonzalez

Rate Structures Discussion by the Utilities

- Preliminary comments re-iterating the utilities' commitment to EERS, noting what helps is: (1) program cost recovery, (2) EE savings targets over time, (3) low-cost financing mechanisms as implemented in the past and current third-party financing mechanisms and (4) rate structures that address lower sales due to EE. On the last point, the utilities noted that Massachusetts and Rhode Island have addressed this issue.

- Presentation by Ed Davis, Rate Structures, September 16, 2015, including decoupling, on behalf of all the utilities
  - Rate Structures were illustrated, p. 4 and p. 5
  - SBC and LDAC (gas) can accommodate funding to support EE program expansion (p.7)
  - Decoupling discussion and preference for Lost Revenue methodology (p. 8)
  - Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism can be readily included in the existing mechanism for funding (i.e., as part of SBC or LDAC)

- Preparation for Next Technical Session
  - What is needed for "regulatory Process" technical session?
  - Wrap-up Rate Structures 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
  - Send topics to be discussed for regulatory process to Les before next meeting
  - Send suggestions as to whether or not the October 12th meeting is necessary

Rate Structures)

- Staff inquired about electric bill impacts if SBC were doubled and tripled
- Reference for response was provided – i.e., Non-docketed information #42
- Similar question for natural gas bill impacts was asked by Staff, with response indicating that a doubling and tripling of LDAC would provide a corresponding doubling and tripling of bill impacts.

Review of Items Agreed Upon From Previous Meeting (8/27/2015) – i.e., EERS Funding

- Summary of additional meeting held at DES on August 27th:

    - kWh savings vs. KW Savings:
        - ✓ the presentation by the Utilities describing customer billing components (Generation, Transmissions and Distribution) and…broad discussion of kW demand savings versus kWh energy efficiency savings, ISO hourly load, general observations about trends in New England and New Hampshire.
        - ✓ Presentation by the Utilities describing additional column showing added to the Utilities slides of 8/13/2015 showing estimated lifetime savings dollars. Estimated lifetime savings dollars are based on as simple calculation. The calculation utilizes 2014 Core electric utilities' default energy service rates in effect in 2014 of 9.34 cents/kWh. This rate is multiplied by lifetime kWh. Results show that estimated lifetime savings dollars are 2.7 times the total annual program cost (i.e., utility cost + customer cost).
        - ✓ No consensus reached on whether kWh savings alone (vs. kWh and kW savings) should be targeted.

    - Funding Mechanisms
        - ✓ Electric versus Gas (SBC + RGGI + ISO for Electric and LDAC for Gas)
        - ✓ Ideas on how to get more funds for electric utilizing three options Increase:
            - SBC
            - Additional surcharge (such as Cam in CT and EERF in MA)
            - Incorporate into base rates distribution charge
        - ✓ No consensus was reached on what mechanism or combination of mechanisms should be used.

    - What might the "Process" look like?

        - ✓ "Process" considerations – i.e., "Tops-Down"
            - November 2015 filing could include high level "tops-down" savings, spending, funding, rate structures, lost revenue.
            - November 2015 filing could consider ranges of savings, spending.
            - November 2015 filing could consider cost-effective goals over time, infrastructure capability, and bill impacts.

- ✓ "Process" considerations – i.e., "Bottoms-up":
  - o Initial EERS filing could provide more granular details for programs, measures, input savings assumptions, design, etc.
  - o Initial EERS filing could be the next Multi-Year Core filing, with annual updates (similar to current practice).

- ✓ No consensus reached on "process".

➢ Minutes were not yet available but will be circulated when completed.

- **<u>Completion of Last Week's Funding Discussion:</u>**

  ➢ With respect to who will file on November 2, 2015:

  - ✓ Utilities
  - ✓ Staff
  - ✓ Group of Advocates are considering joint filing.

  ➢ My notes indicate that there were no suggestions/modifications to the previous meeting results that Staff circulated to the Stakeholders.

- **Today's Topic – EERS Stakeholder Involvement:**

  ➢ Presentation by William E. Dornbos, Chair, CT Energy Efficiency Board
  - ✓ Presentation will be posted to the Commission's website
  - ✓ Additional comments/discussions:
  - ✓ Board is largely volunteer
  - ✓ Board has an administrative consultant ($750,000 per year)
    - o Consultant assists Board in reviewing utility proposals
    - o Board advises and assists utilities in energy efficiency (EE) plans
  - ✓ Board reviews and approves energy efficiency plans and programs
  - ✓ Board then reviews "final" plan with Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) which, in turn, approves Utilities' plans approved by the Board. Also, DEEP holds public input sessions, publishes minutes of meetings of these sessions.
  - ✓ Unlike the NHPUC, the CT PURA appears to be a monitoring body, with no authority to review and approve EE filings. That authority is vested in DEEP.
  - ✓ Energy Efficiency Plans are filed for 3-Year periods with annual updates, similar to the existing NH Core programs practice.

  ➢ Presentation by NH Utilities

- ✓ Utilize the EESE board as a "Stakeholder Board" to provide comments to the Utilities on a "draft" plan and comments to the Commission on the final plan.
- ✓ Provide a funded administrative assistant for the EESE Board, possibly using RGGI funds.
- ✓ Staff noted that current RGGI funds are limited, given the allocation of RGGI monies to the Municipal Program, Low Income Program, All Fuels Program, and administrative expenses to run the RGGI Auction program.

- Discussion Regarding Agreements Re. Advisory Board

  - Some not sure – i.e., how would it work, what are the timelines, other details
  - William Dornbos noted that most states require legislative authority for Boards.
  - Some thought the protocols would have to be examined – i.e., currently, the NH PUC sets procedural schedule, as compared to CT's Energy Efficiency Board.
  - Some thought the cost of attaining objectives of the Board would be expensive – i.e., include costs for consultants to assist the Board on planning and funding issues, cost of consultants for Evaluation ($750,000).
  - Some wondered how a balance of interests on the Board could be ensured.
  - Utilities noted the multiple layers of approval. If the CT model were adopted in NH, Utilities' EE filings would be subject to review and approval by the equivalent of the Energy Efficiency Board, DEEP and, ultimately, the NH PUC.
  - If there were a Board in NH, would it require NH to promulgate rules?
  - Should we spend incremental monies on funding a Board, or should we spend incremental monies on EE programs?
  - Some wondered how certain funds would be dedicated to low income programs.
  - Others were concerned that NH might need Technical Resource Manuals, as are used in Connecticut.
  - Staff involvement in a potential Board would likely require Staff to be involved from the beginning.

- **September Technical Sessions:**

- September 16, 2015 – Rate Structures
- September 28, 2015 - Regulatory Process

Note: As a result of today's meeting, the following documents will be posted to the NH PUC website are as follows:

1. *Staff's Informational Notes (8/31/2015)*
2. *Discussion Notes (8/31/2015)*
3. *Meeting Results (8/31/2015)*
4. *Connecticut's Energy Efficiency Board Presentation, William E. Dornbos, Chair*
5. *Stakeholder Involvement Discussion slides, NH Utilities*
6. *Comments from NEEP's Natalie Treat*