Request No.:	KEDNY-1
Requested By:	Debra LaBelle, Chief, Energy Efficiency Programs
Date of Request:	9/1/2015
Reply Due Date:	9/16/2015
Directed To:	Phil Austen, Director, New York Program Strategy
Topic:	The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY 2016-2018 Budgets and Metrics (BAM) Plan and Energy Efficiency Transition Implementation Plan (ETIP)

Question(s):

1. Please quantify the specific cost categories included in the Portfolio Administration budget. To the extent possible map those categories to the existing EEPS budget categories.
2. By program, please describe and quantify the specific cost categories included in the Program Implementation budget. To the extent possible, map those categories to the existing EEPS budget categories.
3. Please provide the company's rationale for allocating approximately 5% of the total annual ETIP budgets to Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V) when the company is estimating total unspent EEPS EM&V funds to be approximately $2.3 million (Expected Sources of Funds for Future Gas Programs table, page 11), which is approximately 60% of the company's total EEPS EM&V budget.
4. Please clarify whether the proposed Dth targets are net or gross values with supporting rationale. If net, please provide the net to gross factors applied.
5. Although the company states it will monitor greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions, lifetime energy savings and customer engagement metrics the company does not set any targets – please explain why no explicit secondary targets were set.
6. Please list the GHGs the company intends to monitor.
7. Does the company plan on proposing secondary targets in future BAM Plans and ETIPs?
    a. If the company does plan on proposing secondary targets in future BAM Plans and ETIPs, please provide the metrics the company anticipates proposing?
    b. If the company does not plan on proposing secondary targets in future BAM Plans and ETIPS, please provide a justification for not including secondary targets.
8. Please describe the information and historical data the company used to develop its forecasted expenditures and achievements. Please provide the work papers.
9. Please expand the forecasted expenditures and achievements table on pages 10-11 to account for the total 2018 budgets and targets.

10. Please explain why the forecasted expenditures in the year after a program year are lower than forecasted expenditures in the second year after the program year (i.e., for 2016 funds, the expected 2017 expenditures are $295,576 and the expected 2018 expenditures are $344,019).
11. Please provide the work papers supporting the calculation of unspent EEPS funds, with citations to relevant Commission orders.
12. The EM&V activities and schedule are too general and do not link a particular activity (or information gathered through the activity) to a specific year, instead providing ongoing activities and two or three-year periods that will be informed. For each EM&V activity, please provide a more detailed timeline that describes the information that the company expects from the activity and the intended use of the information, when that information would be available, and the program year by which the company anticipates incorporating the information into the program design, implementation, savings calculations, etc.
13. Please explain why total EM&V expenditures provided in the Gas Three-Year EM&V Expenditures table (pages 13-14) only account for approximately 53% of the total three-year Portfolio EM&V Budget proposed in the Three-year Gas Budgets table (pages 7-8).
14. Please provide the work papers for program and portfolio benefit cost analyses (BCA). Please ensure that costs such as Portfolio Administration, Portfolio EM&V, and costs recovered through base rates and customer contributions/costs are disaggregated.
15. The 2018 benefit cost ratio for the Gas Non Residential Engagement & Efficiency Platform is 0.29. Please explain what is driving the ratio to be less than 1.0 and provide the company's rationale for offering the program despite its low benefit cost ratio.
16. The 2016, 2017 and 2018 benefit cost ratios for the Gas Residential Engagement Program are 0.35, 0.65 and 0.76, respectively. Please explain what is driving the ratio to be less than 1.0 and provide the company's rationale for offering this program despite its low benefit cost ratios.
17. The 2017 and 2018 benefit cost ratios for the Gas Residential Efficiency Platform are 0.09, and 0.10, respectively. Please explain what is driving the ratios to be less than 1.0 and provide the company's rationale for offering this program despite its low benefit cost ratios.
18. The 2016, 2017 and 2018 benefit cost ratios for the Gas Residential Program are 0.88, 0.94, and 0.97, respectively. Please explain what is driving the ratios to be less than 1.0 and provide the company's rationale for offering this program despite its low benefit cost ratios.
19. Please clarify the relationships between and expected integration of the new enhancements outlined in the Gas Commercial & Industrial (C&I) Program description. Are these related initiatives to be funded through other sources or are these initiatives that will be integrated into the program and funded with the money associated with ETIP programs?
20. Please clarify the relationship between the Non-Residential Market Assessment, Market Effects and Market Potential Study described in the EM&V activities section (page 14) and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Market Potential Study included as a new enhancement to the C&I Program (page 22-23).
21. Please describe the Boiler Tune-up demonstration program mentioned as part of the company's three year strategy for the C&I Program (page 26).
22. With no budget in 2016 and 2017 to support development of the Non-Residential Engagement and Efficiency Platform, when in 2018 does the company anticipate launching the platform?

23. Please explain the company's rationale for allowing participants in the Residential Engagement Program to use program points for gift cards and charitable donations rather than limiting the use of those points to energy efficiency measures?

24. The company is eliminating the dwelling unit cap in the Multifamily Program, what, if anything, has the company done or planned to do to coordinate with the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) to ensure the program works collaboratively rather than competitively with NYSERDA's Multifamily Performance Program, which is continuing under the Clean Energy Fund?

25. Given the expectation that energy efficiency programs will become more innovative and aligned with a REV environment, please describe how the continuation of programs run under EEPS satisfies this expectation beyond a transitional period.

26. To the extent possible, please provide additional detail regarding specific modifications planned for 2017 and 2018 to make programs more aligned with REV principles.

27. Are any of the programs being offered in coordination with other initiatives (e.g. gas conversion programs, state and federal initiatives, etc.)? If so, describe the relationship and what, if anything is being done to avoid duplicative incentives and double-counting of savings.

28. Please provide a list of programs where, due to system constraint or other reasons, the company intends to offer higher incentives to certain customers.

29. Please provide the assumed install rate for each program/program component that relies on the customers to install the efficiency measures.

30. For each program, please provide the expected timeframe for the project pipeline (i.e., how long it will take an average project to be completed), if different, include separate expectations for providing final payment and acquiring savings.