

BEFORE THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

In the matter of: )  
Granite State Electric Company d/b/a Liberty Utilities )  
New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc. )  
Public Service Company of New Hampshire )  
Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. ) DE 12-262  
EnergyNorth Natural Gas, Inc. d/b/a Liberty Utilities )  
Northern Utilities, Inc. )  
)  
)  
2014 CORE Energy Efficiency Programs Update Filing )

Direct Prefiled Testimony

of

Stephen R. Eckberg

Utility Analyst

on behalf of

the Office of Consumer Advocate

*Dated:* November 1, 2013

1 **I. Introduction**

2 **Q. Please state your name, business address and position.**

3 A. My name is Stephen R. Eckberg. I am employed by the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) as  
4 a Utility Analyst. I include as Attachment SRE-1 to my testimony a statement of my education  
5 and experience.

6  
7 **Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission?**

8 A. Yes. I have testified on behalf of the OCA in a number of dockets including the initial phase of  
9 this Docket.

10  
11 **II. Summary of Testimony**

12 **Q. Please summarize the purpose of your testimony.**

13 A. The purpose of my testimony is to address an issue from the Settlement in the DE 09-170 CORE  
14 docket, which was approved by the Commission by Order No. 25,062. In that Order the  
15 Commission affirmed that Staff and Settling Parties will work together to prepare and issue a  
16 request for proposals (RFP) to engage a consultant to prepare a multi-year Monitoring and  
17 Evaluation Plan by a specified date. See Order at pp.13-14. The OCA has previously offered  
18 testimony asking the Commission to direct Staff to proceed with this effort. See Testimony of  
19 Eckberg in DE 10-188 filed October 15, 2010 at p. 3.

20 **Q. Please address the OCA's current concern about Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).**

21 A. Effective monitoring and evaluation is critical to ensuring quality energy efficiency programs  
22 from a number of perspectives which include: accurate energy savings estimates, ensuring that  
23 administrative and implementation procedures are efficient, effective, and appropriate; increasing  
24 the credibility of energy efficiency resources in regional planning. See, for example, information

1 provided by the Evaluation, Monitoring & Verification Forum of the Northeast Energy Efficiency  
2 Partnership (NEEP) at <http://neep.org/emv-forum/about-the-emv-forum/index>. NEEP promotes  
3 knowledge and the use of best practices that support the expansion and implementation of  
4 policies and programs to increase and accelerate energy efficiency.

5 **Q. Why is the OCA raising this issue regarding the multi-year M&E plan again?**

6 A. The OCA continues to believe that this effort would be valuable for the CORE programs.  
7 Further, in the course of reviewing the 2014 CORE Update filing, information was provided in  
8 discovery which indicates that certain programs could benefit from evaluation efforts to update  
9 the technical assumptions used therein to estimate energy savings.

10 **Q. Please provide more details about these technical assumptions you refer to above.**

11 A. In a response provided by Mr. Thomas Belair of PSNH to question OCA 3-012 which inquired  
12 about differences among electric utilities in the benefit cost ratio for the Energy Star New Homes  
13 program. Mr. Belair stated that “The source of incremental costs for Liberty, PSNH, and NHEC  
14 is the *2002 Incremental Cost of Energy Star Homes in Massachusetts and New Hampshire*.  
15 Unutil participated in the *2013 RNC MA Incremental Cost Report* study in MA...” The OCA  
16 understands this response to mean that three of four electric utilities are using assumptions related  
17 to new home construction costs that are nearly twelve years old. See response to OCA 3-012  
18 included as Attachment SRE-2.

19 **Q. Are the values used by the three utilities very different than those used by the fourth?**

20 A. Yes. The values representing the incremental costs to build a new home to ENERGY STAR  
21 standards are very different among the utilities. The data response indicates that Liberty and  
22 PSNH used the value \$2,922 as the average incremental cost to build to ENERGY STAR  
23 standards while NHEC used \$3,665. Unutil, which participated in a more recent study due to its

1 program offerings in its Massachusetts (MA) service territory, used an incremental cost value of  
2 over \$11,000. While the program in MA is somewhat different than that in NH, substantial cost  
3 differences such as this, combined with the fact that the most recent evaluation of the ENERGY  
4 STAR new homes program in NH is over 10 years old, indicate that updates are needed.  
5 Specifically, updates to the savings assumptions used in assessing the program's benefit-cost ratio  
6 would likely be components of a program evaluation.

7 **Q. What is the status of the agreed upon RFP for the Monitoring & Evaluation plan?**

8 A. The OCA is uncertain of the RFP status at this time. We inquired about the status of the RFP at  
9 the most recent CORE quarterly meeting and did not get a firm status update. We believe it is  
10 important that Staff address the issue of the multi-year M&E plan directly with the settling parties  
11 in order to inform them about the current status of this task.

12 **Q. What is Staff's overall role in Monitoring and Evaluation of the CORE energy efficiency**  
13 **programs?**

14 A. As the 2014 CORE Update Filing states at page 17, "A settlement agreement approved by the  
15 Commission on March 17, 2006 (Order No 24,599 in DE 05-157) transferred responsibility for  
16 monitoring and evaluation efforts from the NH CORE Utilities to Commission Staff."

17 **Q. Does this complete your testimony?**

18 A. Yes.