

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**DE 10-188**

**2010 CORE Electric Energy Efficiency Program  
& Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs**

**Rebuttal Testimony  
of  
Carol Woods**

**November 15, 2010**

1 **Q. Please state your name, place of employment and your position.**

2  
3 A. My name is Carol Woods. I am employed by the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc.  
4 as Energy Solutions Manager. I am responsible for the implementation of the CORE Energy  
5 Efficiency Programs at NHEC, and I have served in that capacity for 8 years.

6  
7 **Q. Have you reviewed the direct prefiled testimony of Stephen R. Eckberg on behalf of the**  
8 **Office of the Consumer Advocate in this docket?**

9  
10 A. Yes, and the purpose of my testimony here is to address Mr. Eckberg's testimony,  
11 specifically as it relates to OCA's positions concerning NHEC's Load Management Program  
12 and NHEC's ongoing efforts to collect and analyze data from that program. At pages 5- 7 of  
13 that testimony OCA takes the position that, although NHEC has not included its Load  
14 Management Program in this year's CORE filing, NHEC should somehow be required to  
15 "return" the funds for its Load Management Program approved in last year's budget. This  
16 recommendation is based upon OCA's claim that NHEC has not met its obligation under the  
17 Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission in DE 09-170.

18  
19 **Q. What are Settlement Agreement obligations in question?**

20  
21 A. In DE 09-170, my testimony, the Settlement Agreement and the Commission's order  
22 approving that settlement all recognized that NHEC had recently installed software which  
23 would allow it to collect more detailed information concerning the results of NHEC's load  
24 management activities. In relevant part, the Settlement Agreements states:

25 NHEC will provide updates on the progress of this implementation as part of its quarterly  
26 reports. NHEC expects that some data analysis will be available by the end of the second  
27 quarter. Based on reported data, Staff, or any party may make recommendations  
28 regarding whether NHEC should recover costs from the SBC for this program after 2010.  
29 (Emphasis added.)

1 **Q. Do you agree that NHEC has failed to meet its Settlement Agreement obligations?**

2  
3 A. I do not agree. NHEC has installed the software and implemented the data collection  
4 which I described last year. As expected, the data collected through the second quarter of  
5 2010 provided more detailed information for NHEC's analysis of the program's  
6 performance. The analysis, and the report documenting it, were being developed during the  
7 same period of time that Second Quarterly Report was due and all of the parties to this  
8 docket were in the midst of the initial round of discovery. As a result of these conflicting  
9 resource demands the Second Quarterly Report for all utilities was delayed. Similarly,  
10 NHEC did not complete and circulate its initial Load Management data report until  
11 November 10, 2010. OCA was advised that the analysis was being prepared but, due to the  
12 press of other demands, it would be later than expected. OCA raised no objection to the  
13 delay when it was explained. Given that NHEC had not included its Load Management  
14 Program in this year's filing, and given the heavy demands of the discovery in this docket, I  
15 was not at all surprised that there was no objection to the delay. Prior to reading OCA's  
16 testimony, I had no idea that anyone considered the delay unreasonable or in any way a  
17 failure to meet NHEC's Settlement Agreement obligations.

18  
19 **Q. Do you agree with the OCA recommendation concerning the "return" of 2010 Load**  
20 **Management Program funds?**

21  
22 A. No. As stated above, I do not agree that NHEC has in any way failed to meet its  
23 Settlement Agreement obligations. What is more, the stated purpose of NHEC's plan to  
24 provide data and analysis concerning its Load Management Program was to give the parties  
25 information which could inform and support their recommendations concerning SBC funding  
26 for the Load Management Program "**after 2010.**" This information, which has been  
27 provided, was not required for an "after-the-fact" justification for NHEC's 2010 programs

1 and budgets. I do not believe there is any basis for the suggested “return” of 2010 program  
2 funds.

3  
4 **Q. Why has NHEC chosen not to include its Load Management Program in its current**  
5 **CORE proposal?**

6  
7 A. There are several interrelated, cumulative factors which influenced NHEC’s decision not to  
8 include its Load Management Program in the budgets proposed in this docket. The  
9 continuing budgetary impact of the funding constraints imposed by SB300 was a factor.  
10 Additionally, at the time at which the program and budget decisions to be included in this  
11 docket were being made, NHEC was not far enough along in its new Load Management  
12 Program data collection and analysis efforts to incorporate results from those efforts into a  
13 timely filing of its proposals in the docket. The DE 09-170 Settlement Agreement  
14 specifically provided that this data could serve as the basis for recommendations concerning  
15 inclusion of the Load Management Program in SBC funding after 2010. Because this  
16 information was not yet available it seemed appropriate not to include the Load Management  
17 Program in this year’s filing.

18  
19 **Q. Will NHEC continue to operate its Load Management Program?**

20  
21 A. Yes. NHEC believes that this program has and will continue to benefit its members.  
22 NHEC will continue to operate this program, outside of the CORE programs, during the  
23 program years covered by this docket.

24  
25 **Q. Is this the end of your testimony?**

26  
27 A. Yes it is.