

MATTER M08349

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY NS POWER FOR APPROVAL OF ITS
ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN**

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
PAUL CHERNICK
ON BEHALF OF
THE CONSUMER ADVOCATE**

Resource Insight, Inc.

JANUARY 19, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Identification	1
II.	Introduction and Summary	2
III.	Load balancing.....	8
IV.	Critical Peak Pricing	12
V.	Avoided Net Meters	16
VI.	Accounting Credits	17
VII.	Shifting Costs to Customers	18
	A. Unbilled Revenue due to Under-metering.....	18
	B. Reduced Write-offs for Abandoned Accounts.....	19
	C. Improved Cash Flow	20
VIII.	Understated Costs of AMI	21
IX.	Opt-out Charges	22
X.	Conclusion	25

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit PLC-1

Qualifications of Paul Chernick

1 **I. Identification**

2 **Q: Mr. Chernick, please state your name, occupation, and business address.**

3 A: I am Paul L. Chernick. I am the president of Resource Insight, Inc., 5 Water
4 St., Arlington, Massachusetts.

5 **Q: Summarize your professional education and experience.**

6 A: I received a BS degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in June
7 1974 from the Civil Engineering Department, and an MS degree from the
8 Massachusetts Institute of Technology in February 1978 in technology and
9 policy. I have been elected to membership in the civil engineering honorary
10 society Chi Epsilon, and the engineering honor society Tau Beta Pi, and to
11 associate membership in the research honorary society Sigma Xi.

12 I was a utility analyst for the Massachusetts Attorney General for more
13 than three years, and was involved in numerous aspects of utility rate design,
14 costing, load forecasting, and the evaluation of power supply options. Since
15 1981, I have been a consultant in utility regulation and planning, first as a
16 research associate at Analysis and Inference, after 1986 as president of PLC,
17 Inc., and in my current position at Resource Insight. In these capacities, I have
18 advised a variety of clients on utility matters.

19 My work has considered, among other things, the cost-effectiveness of
20 prospective new electric generation plants and transmission lines, retrospec-
21 tive review of generation-planning decisions, ratemaking for plant under con-
22 struction, ratemaking for excess and/or uneconomical plant entering service,
23 conservation program design, cost recovery for utility efficiency programs,
24 the valuation of environmental externalities from energy production and use,
25 allocation of costs of service between rate classes and jurisdictions, design of

1 retail and wholesale rates, and performance-based ratemaking and cost
2 recovery in restructured gas and electric industries. My professional qualifi-
3 cations are further summarized in Exhibit PLC-1.

4 **Q: Have you testified previously in utility proceedings?**

5 A: Yes. I have testified more than 300 times on utility issues before various
6 regulatory, legislative, and judicial bodies, including utility regulators in
7 thirty-five states and five Canadian provinces, and two U.S. Federal agencies.
8 This testimony has included the review of many utility-proposed power
9 plants and purchased-power contracts.

10 **Q: Have you testified previously regarding advanced metering deployment**
11 **utility investments?**

12 A: Yes. I have testified in proceedings on advanced metering infrastructures,
13 specifically evaluating the proposed business case for utilities in MD and
14 Nova Scotia, as listed in my resume.

15 **Q: Have you previously testified before this Board?**

16 A: Yes. I have testified in approximately two dozen matters before the Board.

17 **II. Introduction and Summary**

18 **Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?**

19 A: My testimony is sponsored by the Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate.

20 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?**

21 A: I review the proposed business case presented by Nova Scotia Power, Inc.
22 (NSP or NS Power) for deploying an advanced metering infrastructure (AMI)
23 and evaluate certain elements of the proposed AMI system, primarily
24 regarding the dependability of NS Power's estimate of benefits from the AMI

1 deployment. In addition, I address the appropriate level the opt-out charges
2 for those consumers deciding to decline an advanced meter, for whatever
3 reason.

4 **Q: What is NS Power currently requesting in this matter?**

5 A: NS Power is requesting a total budget of \$133.2 million to deploy an
6 advanced metering infrastructure. (Application at 6). The full deployment
7 would include:

- 8 • Installation of approximately 480,000 advanced meters to replace
9 conventional energy and demand meters on essentially every metered
10 customer in its service territory.
- 11 • Installation of approximately 513 collectors/ routers and 133 repeaters
12 that communicate with the meters and communication hardware to
13 transmit the meter data to the central data management system.
- 14 • Acquisition of the hardware and software for the central data
15 management system.

16 To offset these costs, NS Power proposes to use the AMI meters to do
17 the following:

- 18 • Read meters without meter readers.
- 19 • Determine whether power is flowing to the meter, for no-power calls
20 and storm restoration
- 21 • Connect and disconnect meters remotely.
- 22 • Detect theft and reduce underbilling.
- 23 • Deploy customer conservation engagement initiatives, including
24 critical-peak pricing, bill alerts, and an enhanced web portal.
- 25 • Balance load among the phases of each feeder.
- 26 • Avoid installations of the following:

- 1 • Additional meters for distributed generation.
- 2 • Replacements of the conventional meters as they wear out.
- 3 • Sensors for monitoring power flows and quality as distributed
- 4 generation penetration rises.

5 NS Power asserts that the present value of the benefits arising from the

6 AMI system (\$208 million) would exceed the costs (\$170 million).

7 **Q: What is the history of Board review of NS Power’s AMI proposals?**

8 A: In Matter M07767, NS Power requested approval for an AMI pilot program

9 to inform the design of the full deployment project and inform cost

10 development. In fact, NS Power had been planning for full deployment of an

11 AMI system for several years; the results of the pilot program were intended

12 to guide the details of the full deployment, but not determine whether it

13 would proceed. Following filing of evidence by the Consumer Advocate and

14 Board consultant Synapse, NS Power withdrew the pilot application and filed

15 for approval of full AMI deployment.

16 **Q: Which issues do you address in this evidence?**

17 A: My testimony evaluates certain of NS Power’s estimated benefits, including

18 capacity and energy from:

- 19 • Balancing of loads among feeder phases.
- 20 • Critical peak pricing.
- 21 • Avoiding net meters.
- 22 • Reducing unbilled revenues and write-off and improving cash flow from
- 23 customers.

24 I also evaluate NS Power’s estimates of the costs of replacing AMI

25 meters as they fail.

1 **Q: Are there any other issues you address in your testimony that are not**
2 **specifically related to the estimation of the AMI costs and benefits?**

3 A: Yes. I comment on NS Power's estimate of the incremental costs of reading
4 the meters of customers who decline AMI meters and on the propriety of a
5 surcharge for customers who choose to maintain the status quo.

6 **Q: What are the capabilities of AMI meters?**

7 A: AMI meters are able to send information to and receive instructions from the
8 utility; this known as two-way communication. The utility can retrieve a
9 variety of data from the meters on a frequent basis, including energy usage,
10 voltage, and power factor; identify whether the meter is receiving power
11 from the distribution system, and perform disconnections and reconnections
12 remotely through the meter.

13 AMI meters are themselves typically located on the exterior of homes or
14 inaccessible areas of multi-family and commercial buildings. They do not
15 provide any direct information to the utility or the customer. The utility must
16 add a communication system to interact with the meter; another
17 communication system is required if the utility is to provide data to the
18 customer, through an in-home display or an existing device (e.g., a computer
19 or smart phone).

20 **Q: What AMI information does NS Power propose to provide to customers?**

21 A: NS Power proposes to provide a web portal that would allow customers to
22 look up information on their past usage; NS Power has not specified the time
23 lag from energy usage to reporting on the portal, nor the level of detail to be
24 provided (Application at 69, Synapse IR-59).¹ NS Power would send weekly

¹ NS Power anticipates that customers would be able to use the portal to set up notifications when usage exceeds a threshold, NS Power has not specified the breadth of the customer's

1 usage emails to customers; NS Power refers to this feature as “bill alerts,”
2 even though it does not appear to be oriented to alerting customers to unusual
3 usage (Application, Appendix A, at 13).

4 **Q: Why has NS Power decided to undertake this project now?**

5 A: That is far from clear. Utilities generally start their AMI deployment by
6 running one or more pilot programs to determine whether customer response
7 to rate and information incentives are likely to generate sufficient benefits to
8 pay for the costs of the program. As noted above, NS Power decided that it
9 would undertake the full-scale AMI deployment before it even proposed the
10 pilot program in Matter No. M07767. When questions arose regarding the
11 design of the pilot and the timing of full deployment, NS Power decided to
12 undertake aggressive deployment without any pilot efforts.

13 The actual driving consideration in NS Power’s timing may be its desire
14 to coordinate with other Emera subsidiaries in their AMI build-out. “Integral
15 to the AMI Project timing was the opportunity for NS Power to enter into a
16 procurement process with a consortium of other utilities with similar
17 requirements in a similar timeframe (Consortium)” (Application at 8). It is
18 not clear what benefits would result from this coordination, or whether those
19 benefits would flow to NS Power ratepayers, the ratepayers of the other
20 utilities, or Emera shareholders.

21 **Q: What are NS Power’s claimed costs and savings from the AMI program?**

22 A: Table 1 summarizes NS Power’s claimed costs and savings, from Application
23 Figure 11. NS Power says that its Figure 11 was taken from Appendix B02,

options for defining the threshold (e.g., average daily usage, weekly usage, monthly usage to date; compared to a fixed value, the previous month, the same month last year, the average over this season).

1 but the values in Appendix B02 differ slightly from those in Figure 11 (NSPI
2 (CA) IR-194 Attachment 1).

3 **Table 1: NS Power Claimed Benefits of AMI (\$M, 2017 PV)**

Deployment Capital	125.3	
IT Hardware and Software Maintenance	23.4	
Operations	11	
Refresh Capital	10.1	
Subtotal Project Costs		169.8
Meter Reading and Field Work Reduction	-56.8	
Avoided Meter Replacement Costs	-24.1	
Savings from Load Balancing	-18.7	
Avoided Line Sensors	-14.6	
Reduced Storm Restoration Costs	-11.5	
Reduced Unbilled kWh	-10.1	
Reduced Write offs	-7.3	
Reduced Single Customer Truck Rolls	-4.7	
Avoided Future DG Meters Operating Costs	-4.4	
Billing and Customer Care Efficiencies	-4.4	
Improved Cash Flow	-4.6	
Avoided Operational Costs in Meter Reading	-1	
Reduced Bill Processing Expense	-2.5	
Subtotal Operational and Grid Modernization Benefits		-164.8
Critical Peak Pricing Program to Shift Load	-27	
Increased Energy Conservation -Bill Alerts	-13.6	
Third Party Meter Reading Revenues	-2.5	
Subtotal Behavioural Change Driven Benefits		-43.1
Subtotal All Benefits	-207.9	
Net Project Benefits	-38.1	

4 **Q: Do you agree with NS Power's conclusion?**

5 A: No. As I explain in the following sections, NS Power appears to have
6 overstated several of the benefits and understated an important cost category.

7 **Q: How have you organized the remainder of this testimony?**

8 A: Each of the next three sections discusses one of the areas in which NS Power
9 has overstated the benefits of AMI, specifically load balancing, critical peak
10 pricing, and avoided net meters for behind-the-meter solar. Section VI

1 describes some accounting changes that NS Power inappropriately counts as
 2 benefits. Section VII discusses some claimed benefits that simply shift costs
 3 from utility revenue requirements to customers, without reducing costs.
 4 Section VIII discusses NS Power’s understating of the costs of replacing the
 5 AMI meters as they wear out. Section IX deals with NS Power’s proposed
 6 surcharge for customers who opt out of the AMI program. Finally, Section X
 7 summarizes my conclusions and recommendations.

8 **III. Load balancing**

9 **Q: What is load balancing?**

10 A: As NS Power uses the term in this proceeding, load balancing is the process
 11 of shifting some single-phase feeder branches from a heavily-loaded feeder
 12 phase to a lightly-loaded phase of the same feeder. Since resistive line losses
 13 are proportional to the square of the amperage flowing through a line, a
 14 feeder with equally-loaded phases will experience lower losses than one with
 15 unbalanced phases. Table 2 provides an extreme example, in which a badly
 16 unbalanced 12 kV feeder, with each phase having 1% losses for a load of 100
 17 amps, is perfectly rebalanced.

18 **Table 2: Losses in Balanced and Unbalanced Phases**

Case	Phase			Total		
	1	2	3			
Unbalanced	Load	Amps	100	100	250	450
	Losses	kW	12	12	75	99
Balanced	Load	Amps	150	150	150	450
	Losses	kW	27	27	27	81

19 Losses increase on the previously lightly-loaded phases, while losses on
 20 the heavily-loaded phase 3 fall. Total losses decrease several percent in this
 21 extremely unbalanced example.

1 **Q: How does NS Power balance loads on its feeders?**

2 A: Load balancing starts with NS Power measuring loads on each phase of a
3 distribution circuit. Once heavily-loaded phases are identified, NS Power can
4 send a line crew out to disconnect a single-phase feeder branch from the
5 feeder and reconnect it to a different phase, disconnecting customers on that
6 branch for 5 to 10 minutes (NSPI (CA) IR-120).²

7 **Q: Does NS Power currently balance loads on its feeders?**

8 A: NS Power indicates that it currently balances loads on an unspecified portion
9 of its feeders that originate at substations with “communications” (NSPI
10 (CA) IR-130).³ NS Power does not specify the portion of feeders (let alone
11 load) that can be balanced without AMI, or the cost of adding equipment to
12 measure feeder loads at the substations without communications. While NS
13 Power claims not to have data on substation capacity and loads (NSPI (CA)
14 IR-18), data that NSPI provided in other proceedings indicates that it knows
15 the time of the peak load on 52 substations (with total peak loads of 4,392
16 MW out of a total of 5,279 MW loads at all substations), suggesting that
17 those substations have communications and/or load-recording equipment. CA
18 IR-191 Attachment 3 shows that a large proportion of feeders originate at
19 substations with SCADA and hence communications.

² In principle, the same action could be undertaken for individual single-phase transformers fed by the heavily-loaded phase of a three-phase feeder, but that would have higher labour costs, since many times as many changes would be required to switch the same amount of load.

³ It is not clear why communications (whatever NS Power means by that) are necessary to determine feeder peak loads, since the data can be stored and retrieved on site.

1 It is not clear that AMI is required for load balancing. Most of the load
2 balancing can be achieved with existing equipment; it is not clear how much
3 balancing the remaining lower-load feeders would cost without AMI.

4 **Q: How does NS Power estimate the savings from load balancing?**

5 A: NS Power relies on CYME modeling of the effects of load balancing at three
6 substations (113H Dartmouth East, 62N Bridge Avenue in Stellarton and 81S
7 Reserve Street in Sydney). NS Power says that these substations “are
8 considered [by NSP] representative of typical substations on the NS Power
9 system, representing urban, suburban and rural load types, with a variety of
10 transformer sizes and customer counts” (NSPI (CA) IR-118a).⁴ NS Power
11 assumed that the average estimated balancing savings of 1.5 kW for every
12 MVA of substation transformer capacity at these substations could be
13 replicated for all substations.

14 **Q: Is this a reasonable assumption?**

15 A: No, for at least four reasons.

- 16 • It is not clear that the other feeders are as unbalanced, on average, as the
17 three substations that NS Power included in its analysis. NS Power may
18 have found the data for these substations to be readily available because
19 it had noticed that they were unbalanced and had conducted the CYME
20 analysis. That analysis recommended the rebalancing of all seven
21 feeders on station 81S, both the feeders on station 113H, and four of the
22 six feeders on station 62N. That may not be typical for the remaining
23 feeders.

⁴ NS Power acknowledges that it also chose these substations because the data were readily available (NSPI (CA) IR-118a).

- 1 • Even if loads are not balanced among the phases of a feeder, lower
2 loads on all phases would result in lower losses and less opportunity for
3 savings. It is not clear that the other feeders are as heavily loaded, on
4 average, as those of the three substations that NS Power included in its
5 analysis. NS Power says that it does not have load by feeder (NSPI
6 (CA) IR-18), so it is not clear how it could determine that the loading of
7 the feeder for the three study substations would be typical of all
8 feeders.⁵
- 9 • NS Power assumes that the loss reduction will be as large in every hour
10 as in the peak hour. Since line losses vary in proportion to the square of
11 load, the losses would be 25% of peak losses when load is half of peak.
12 Thus, NS Power estimate of energy savings from load balancing would
13 be overstated substantially, even if the loads on the phases varied
14 proportionally through the year.
- 15 • In reality, phase loads probably do not change in lockstep. Balancing the
16 phase peak loads on a feeder for a peak driven by space-heating load
17 may result in less-balanced loads in mild weather or in the summer. The
18 rebalancing may thus decrease losses in some hours and increase losses
19 in other hours.

20 **Q: What are the benefits NS Power claims from load balancing and how**
21 **were those computed?**

⁵ The three substations had 2012–2013 peaks of 74%, 93% and 101% of their transformer capacity. It is not clear whether the feeders are as heavily loaded as the transformers. Many NS Power substations had loads below 50% of capacity.

1 A: NS Power claims benefits with the present values of \$5.2 million for avoided
2 capacity, \$13.2 million for fuel savings and \$0.4 million in generation fixed
3 operating costs.

4 **Q: Has NS Power demonstrated that AMI is required for load balancing?**

5 A: No. NS Power has completed load balancing evaluations for the three
6 substations without AMI, as described in response to NSUARB IR-13. The
7 measurements are taken at the substation where the circuit originates.
8 Currently load balancing is done when needed, rather than on a system-wide
9 basis (NSUARB IR-13). Since AMI is not needed for load balancing, the
10 possible savings should not be included as AMI benefits.⁶

11 **IV. Critical Peak Pricing**

12 **Q: What is the Critical Peak Pricing program for which NS Power claims**
13 **\$33.7 million in present-value benefits?**

14 A: A Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) program typically charges a much higher rate
15 for a period of a few hours on a small number of days with high loads, high
16 energy costs and/or high generation outages. NS Power does not yet have a
17 proposal for the CPP price, the length of the CPP periods, the amount of
18 notice that NS Power will provide, the number of peak-day declarations per
19 winter, or the conditions under which NS Power would declare a peak day.

20 **Q: How does NS Power estimate its savings from the CPP program?**

⁶ Without AMI, NS Power might want to add some sensors to some feeders to facilitate balancing. Those sensors would appear to be covered by the Future Line Sensor Program whose avoidance NS Power already counts as a \$14.6 million benefit.

1 A: NS Power includes generation capital and OM&G savings based on
2 assumptions of peak load reduction from its hypothetical CPP program. NS
3 Power assumes that its customers will respond to the totally undefined
4 program in the winter in the same manner that peak winter conditions to the
5 same extent as the customers of Southern California Edison respond to price
6 signals at summer peak conditions.

7 NS Power assumes that the CPP program will reduce consumption of
8 participating customers by 12.5% on the winter peak, avoiding [REDACTED] MW of
9 new peaking capacity in the winter of 2022/23. NS Power treats that cost as
10 being avoided in 2022, even though NS Power does not anticipate any
11 capacity deficiency until January 2023.

12 **Q: What concerns do you have with the estimated savings NS Power has**
13 **developed from the CPP program?**

14 A: NS Power assumes that Nova Scotia customers will respond to unknown CPP
15 price signals under peak winter conditions to the same extent as southern
16 California customers respond to price signals at summer peak conditions.
17 This is not a reasonable assumption. In the summer, customers have
18 considerable freedom to go outside (to the pool, for example) and allow the
19 temperature of the home to rise. Summer peak conditions typically occur on
20 sunny afternoons, when many customers are out of their homes and relatively
21 indifferent to the thermostat setting; many people who would normally be at
22 home have the option to leave the house (e.g., to go shopping), perhaps with
23 children in tow. Winter peaks, in contrast, tend to occur on cold evenings,
24 when outdoor activities are not attractive, dinner needs to be cooked and
25 eaten, and children may need to be at home in bed. Turning down the
26 thermostat and leaving home for four hours is likely to be an option for many
27 fewer people for NS Power winter peak than a California summer peak.

1 Furthermore, customers may worry about reducing the indoor
2 temperature during extremely cold outdoor weather, out of fear that pipes
3 will freeze in the coldest corners of the house. Some customers turn up their
4 thermostats in very cold weather, for exactly this reason.

5 In addition to the significant uncertainty regarding customer response, it
6 is not clear how long a winter CPP period would need to be. Some of the
7 energy reduction in the high-priced period would be recovered in the
8 following hours (deferred laundry, dishwashing, showering and rebound at
9 the home returns to the desired temperature), so to be effective the CPP
10 period would have to last until load drops much further. It is not clear how
11 much response a five or six hour peak period would achieve, especially in the
12 winter.

13 There does not appear to be any experience with the use of CPP during
14 winter peaks. NS Power should operate a pilot program to determine
15 customer response before using CPP savings to justify a full-scale AMI
16 deployment.

17 **Q: Is NS Power able to bill for CPP tariffs?**

18 A: It is unclear whether or not NS Power is able to bill for time-varying rate
19 programs, including CPP. While NS Power claims that the current customer
20 information system (CIS) “does have the technical capability of
21 implementing time-variable pricing; NS Power intends to begin developing a
22 strategy for replacement of the CIS in 2018. Full replacement is likely
23 several years away.” (Synapse IR-20) Depending on the meaning of
24 “technical capability,” this response may indicate that the effort to bill for the
25 CPP would require extensive reprogramming, additional hardware, and/or

1 manual support. NS Power has not included any costs for improving billing
2 capability in the current cost analysis.

3 **Q: Should benefits from the proposed CPP program be included in NS**
4 **Power's cost-benefit analysis?**

5 A: No, not until the claimed savings are demonstrated by a pilot program and
6 NS Power determines the costs of billing for CPP.

7 **Q: Aside from concerns about whether NS Power's assumptions about**
8 **CPP-induced load reductions are reasonable, would those load**
9 **reductions produce the benefits that NS Power assumes?**

10 A: Probably not. NS Power's current 10-Year Monthly Load and Capacity
11 Tables show a deficiency of only 15 MW in January 2023; it is unlikely that
12 NS Power would need to add a new unit in that year, given the option of
13 purchases over its new and improved transmission interconnections with
14 Newfoundland and New Brunswick. This shortfall may be delayed well past
15 2027 by the reclassification of 160 MW of wind plants that have energy
16 resource interconnection service, but would only be constrained during off-
17 peak hours, as providing firm capacity during peak hours (which would add
18 25 to 50 MW of capacity) and the increasing the capacity credit for other
19 wind from NS Power's practice of 17% (which could add as much as 68
20 MW, at the 32% capacity credit used in certain NS Power rates). This issue is
21 part of the Generation Utilization and Optimization review (Matter No.
22 M09059).

23 NS Power also assumes 4 MW of capacity benefits from load balancing
24 (which can be achieved without AMI) and 5.6 MW of capacity benefits from
25 the bill alerts (which I include in 2022, following NS Power's practice).

1 **V. Avoided Net Meters**

2 **Q: What benefit has NS Power included for avoiding net metering**
3 **equipment?**

4 A: NS Power has included a NPV benefit of \$4.4 million in operational savings
5 from the avoided addition or upgrade of meters for net metering customers
6 with onsite distributed generation. NS Power estimated the number of net
7 meters that would be needed based on rapid acceleration of rooftop solar
8 installations, increasing the cumulative 349 residential and commercial solar
9 installations through 2017 by [REDACTED]

10

11 **Q: What concerns have you identified with proposed level of benefits?**

12 A: It appears that NS Power has overestimated the customer installation rate of
13 onsite rooftop solar. NS Power bases its proposed annual adoption rate on the
14 growth rates experienced in Massachusetts (Synapse IR-30e). The estimates
15 NS Power provides are not supported by its own 2017 load forecast, which
16 does not include any forecasted generation from rooftop solar. NS Power is
17 not even sure that it will include any rooftop solar in the 2018 forecast (CA
18 IR-181).

19 **Q: What specific concerns do you have with NS Power applying the**
20 **adoption rate for rooftop solar found in Massachusetts?**

21 A: The solar market in Massachusetts is an advanced market, much more so than
22 that found in Nova Scotia. Massachusetts has a history of offering solar
23 incentives, including very valuable solar renewable energy credits (currently
24 trading for about \$300/MWh for the projects completed in 2008–2013,
25 \$200/MWh for later projects), tax credits and net metering at rates higher
26 than NS Power's. Incentives for solar in Nova Scotia are much smaller.

1 While the economics of behind-the-meter solar will continue to improve, the
2 buildout of solar may occur much slower than NS Power assumes for the
3 purposes of this proceeding.

4 **Q: What level of benefit do you recommend counting for the AMI-enabled
5 avoided net metering cost?**

6 A: I recommend reducing NS Power's estimate by 50%. Applying the
7 experience in MA is not appropriate for the current solar market in Nova
8 Scotia. This reduces the savings to \$2.2 million from \$4.4 million.

9 **VI. Accounting Credits**

10 **Q: What accounting credits does NS Power treat as benefits in its analysis of
11 the AMI costs?**

12 A: NS Power includes a \$1.4 million credit for AFUDC and another \$0.9 million
13 for Administrative Overhead (AO) (NSPI (CA) IR-194 Attachment 2).

14 **Q: Are these credits justified?**

15 A: No. NS Power treats the capital required to finance the \$135 million AMI
16 project through the development and construction period (AFUDC) as a
17 reduction in the capital charged to customers for other projects, and the AO
18 on the project as a reduction in the administrative costs included in the
19 revenue requirements for current operations. Neither of these treatments is
20 correct. As I have explained in a series of ACE proceedings, NS Power needs
21 to raise funds to pay for construction projects (especially one this large) and
22 major investments increase administrative costs. These are real costs and
23 should be included as incremental costs in the AMI project. Instead, NS

1 Power includes them in the project cost but zeroes them out by subtracting
2 them from the revenue requirements computation.

3 **VII. Shifting Costs to Customers**

4 **A. *Unbilled Revenue due to Under-metering***

5 **Q: What reduction in unbilled revenue does NS Power count as a benefit in**
6 **its analysis?**

7 A: The NS Power assumes that 0.333% of residential and commercial sales are
8 unbilled, due to a combination of meter tampering (a portion of energy theft)
9 and metering errors, and that all those sales can be captured by AMI and
10 associated administrative efforts.⁷ NS Power counts only the fuel portion of
11 the unbilled energy.

12 **Q: What concerns do you have with NSPs claimed NPV \$12 million benefit**
13 **from eliminating unbilled fuel cost?**

14 A: NS Power claims as a benefit the entire fuel savings associated with reducing
15 the unbilled sales. These are not necessarily reductions in the total costs to
16 NS Power ratepayers, since the effect of the programs would be to get
17 customers to pay for the energy they use, rather than reduce costs. The
18 Avangrid report that NS Power provided as NSUARB IR-9 Attachment 1
19 describes these savings as improvements in fairness and excludes them from
20 the cost-benefit analysis (pp. 209–210 of the attachment).

⁷ It is not clear that the AMI system can do anything to reduce theft upstream from the meter.

1 To the extent that NS Power can reduce theft, there is an argument for
2 including that effect as a benefit to honest customers of Nova Scotians. In
3 contrast, the correction of billing errors simply increases bills to a small
4 number of customers with faulty meters and reduces bills to the other
5 customers. While that is a desirable outcome, the increased bills to the first
6 group of customers cannot be included as a benefit in the type of analysis that
7 NS Power conducts.

8 **Q: What portion of the unbilled energy is due to theft, as opposed to**
9 **malfunctioning meters?**

10 A: This is a difficult value to determine. Even for total unbilled energy, NS
11 Power has no local data and relies on “industry benchmarks.”⁸ The Avangrid
12 study assumes a larger total potential reduction in unbilled energy than NS
13 Power does, and estimates that over half of the savings would be from
14 eliminating under-registering meters (NSUARB IR-9 Attachment 1, p. 210).
15 Hence, it seems generous to use half of NS Power’s claimed savings.

16 ***B. Reduced Write-offs for Abandoned Accounts***

17 **Q: What write-offs does NS Power expect to avoid with the AMI system?**

18 A: NS Power expects that it would be able to turn off supply to closed accounts
19 more quickly, reducing the amount of energy used by the empty units.⁹ In

⁸ Asked for the source of the industry benchmarks, NS Power referred to CA IR-192 Attachment 1, which contains many industry estimates of non-technical losses, but does not appear to contain the 0.33% value or any breakdown of non-technical losses.

⁹ This may result in damage to the facilities, from frozen pipes in the winter to flooding from deactivated sump pumps. NS Power will need to develop mechanisms to avoid these adverse effects between the time that one occupant leaves a space and the next occupant moves in. NS Power has not included costs for coordination with building owners and buyers to ensure power supply where needed.

1 addition, NS Power plans to more quickly shut off customers with overdue
2 bills.

3 **Q: Is NS Power’s estimate of the benefits reasonable?**

4 A: No. Shutting off a meter on an unused space reduces the amount of fuel NS
5 Power burns, and that is a savings to all customers. Unfortunately, shutting
6 off a meter for customers who do not pay their bills (and are probably in no
7 financial condition to do so) can impose large costs on those customers.¹⁰

8 In contrast to fuel costs, NS Power customers are no better off in terms
9 of the non-fuel portion of rates for energy that is never metered (because the
10 meter was shut off) as opposed to energy that is delivered, metered, and
11 written off because there is no active account at the premises.¹¹ Similarly, the
12 reduction in non-fuel billings by more promptly disconnecting customers
13 who do not pay their bills (and are probably in no financial condition to do
14 so) does not change the costs paid by other customers. The accounting would
15 change, with lower sales, lower bad debt, but the same required revenues.

16 Therefore, I accept NS Power’s estimate of reduced fuel costs (\$2
17 million in present value), while rejecting its claimed benefits from reduced
18 non-fuel write-offs (\$5.3 million).

19 **C. Improved Cash Flow**

20 **Q: What cash flow benefits does NS Power claim?**

¹⁰ I hope that NS Power would increase its provisions for assisting customers in this situation, but I have not seen any such commitment in this proceeding.

¹¹ The Avangrid study treats reduced bill write-offs as an improvement in fairness, but not a benefit to customers as a whole.

1 A: In Figure 11 of the Application, NS Power estimates a present value benefit
2 of \$4.6 million in present value, reflecting the earlier billing and payment for
3 usage that is possible with remote metering.¹²

4 **Q: Is it appropriate for NS Power to claim these cash flow savings as**
5 **benefits?**

6 A: No. The benefit that NS Power claims from earlier receipt of customer
7 payments is entirely offset by the higher cost to customers for paying earlier.
8 Customers who pay off their credit-card bills later because they paid their
9 electric bills earlier will bear a much higher carrying-charge burden than NS
10 Power would. I recommend these benefits not be counted as part of the AMI
11 benefits.

12 **VIII. Understated Costs of AMI**

13 **Q: How does NS Power understate the cost of the AMI program?**

14 A: NS Power greatly understates the costs of replacement of the AMI meters as
15 they wear out. When asked whether “the calculation of costs and benefits of
16 AMI accounts for the cost of replacing AMI meters at the end of their
17 assumed useful life,” NS Power simply answers “no.” (NSPI (Synapse) IR-
18 8b) NS Power has included replacement of a small portion of AMI meters,
19 just 0.5% of the initial meters each year (CA IR-178), for a total of 10% over
20 20 years.

¹² In CA IR-194 Attachment 1, NS Power attributes this value to “Row 8 on the FinancialCalculations tab” of Appendix B02. The present value of that row in Appendix B02 is actually \$3.7 million; this is also shown in the “Equity Return SavingsRevReq” and “Debt Service SavingsRevReq” rows of the AnnualCashFlows tab of Appendix B02. I remove this \$0.9 million overstatement in Table 3, along with the rest of the working capital benefits.

1 **Q: What would be a reasonable estimate of the rate at which the AMI**
2 **meters would be replaced?**

3 A: The utilities whose depreciation studies I have reviewed assume a useful life
4 of 15 to 20 years for AMI meters. Most utilities appear to use a 6.67%
5 depreciation rate for these meters. I estimate the costs of AMI meter
6 replacement using a 5% replacement rate.

7 **IX. Opt-out Charges**

8 **Q: What does NS Power propose for the customers who choose not to have**
9 **an AMI meter?**

10 A: NS Power estimates that customers declining to participate in the AMI
11 conversion would impose an additional cost of \$9.42/month (Appendix G)
12 and suggests that these costs should be recovered from the customers who
13 opt out (Application at 88). While NS Power proposes to “solicit input from
14 Intervenors on the preferred method to recover these costs” and make a
15 subsequent filing to recover the costs, NS Power appears to view a
16 substantial surcharge for opt-out customers as desirable.

17 **Q: How did NS Power come up with the \$9.42/month cost estimate?**

18 A: That value is derived in Application Appendix G, for opt-out rates of 1%,
19 2%, 3% and 4%. For the case in which 2% of customers opt out, meter-
20 reading labour is 91% of NS Power’s estimated \$9.42/month incremental
21 costs, with another 7% representing the capital costs of meter-reading
22 vehicles. The composition of the costs is similar for other opt-out rates.

23 **Q: Are these reasonable estimates?**

24 A: No, for several reasons:

- 1 • Perhaps most importantly, NS Power simply ignores the costs of the
2 AMI meter equipment and installation (along with the removal of the
3 existing meter) avoided by the opt-out customer.
- 4 • NS Power also assumes very high meter-reader time requirements, by
5 assuming that travel time from one urban opt-out customer to the next
6 would take 15 minutes, in addition to the 5 minutes assumed for the
7 meter read.¹³ This is highly implausible. If the opt-out rate is 2%, the
8 next closest opt-out customer will be within the 50 closest customers,
9 on average; if the opt-out customers cluster for social reasons, the travel
10 distances will be even shorter.
- 11 • In large multi-family buildings, that would mean that the meter
12 reader could read a few readers in the same meter room.
- 13 • In an area with medium-sized multi-family buildings, the next opt-
14 out would likely be down the block.
- 15 • In a suburban development, with about 20 metres of frontage per
16 home, and homes on both sides of the street, the meter reader
17 would drive by a house every 10 metres.¹⁴ At 30 km/hour (below
18 the minimum speed limit, but allowing for other traffic and
19 obstructions), the meter reader would drive by 50 houses every
20 minute. Traveling to the next opt-out home would take only a
21 minute or two.
- 22 • Rural travel times are more difficult to estimate, given the variety
23 of customer density. Travel times in many towns (e.g., Sydney,

¹³ “For the purposes of Appendix G, NS Power defined urban as the Halifax Regional Municipality.” (NSPI (CA) IR-161)

¹⁴ For example, in the Fairview or Clayton Park neighborhoods.

1 Bridgewater, Yarmouth, and Truro) would be similar to those in the
2 HRM. It appears to me that the average travel time for the “rural”
3 (non-HRM) customers would average much less than 25 minutes.

- 4 • NS Power’s computations of labour requirements separately round up
5 the urban full-time equivalents and the rural full-time equivalents to the
6 next higher integer, as if urban meter readers cannot venture into the
7 countryside (or vice versa) and each meter reader is entirely dedicated
8 to reading meters.¹⁵ This results, for example, in the rural meter readers
9 for the 2% opt-out case being rounded up from 8.1 to 9, an 11%
10 increase.

11 **Q: How did NS Power estimate the 15 minute urban travel time and 15**
12 **minute rural travel time?**

13 A: NS Power explanation is not very enlightening in this regard. On discovery,
14 NS Power said:

15 For planning purposes, NS Power uses 15 minutes for travel time
16 between appointments in urban locations. This is based on historical
17 analysis. (NSPI (CA) IR-148b)

18 For planning purposes, NS Power uses 25 minutes for travel time
19 between appointments in rural locations. This is based on historical
20 analysis. (NSPI (CA) IR-148c)

21 The historical analysis was not provided in response to the multiple
22 questions the CA asked regarding travel time. Since NS Power has no
23 experience with opt-out meter reading, the “historical analysis” probably
24 refers to service calls or a repeat meter reading. On any particular day, and

¹⁵ I hope that NS Power’s work rules are not that rigid. Indeed, NS Power reports that the meter readers “perform other meters services field work (e.g. changing meters on residential premises)” (NSPI (CA) IR-173). Hence, there is no justification for charging opt-out customers for rounding up the number of meter readers.

1 meter reader would be reading opt-out meters on about 2% of the customers
2 in a given area; it is unlikely that 2% of NS Power customers have service
3 calls scheduled on any particular day. Hence, the travel time between
4 consecutive meter reads is likely to be much less than the travel time between
5 consecutive service calls.¹⁶

6 **Q: What do you conclude about NS Power's estimate of the incremental**
7 **costs of serving opt-out customers?**

8 A: NS Power has grossly overestimated the incremental cost. It is not clear that
9 the incremental cost is positive, since NS Power has not estimated the costs
10 avoided by not requiring installation of an AMI meter.

11 In addition, I believe that policy considerations argue against a
12 surcharge for customers who do not adopt AMI or any other administrative
13 innovative that NS Power may implement in the future.

14 **X. Conclusion**

15 **Q: Please summarize your suggested corrections to NS Power's cost-benefit**
16 **analysis.**

17 A: Table 3 summarizes my corrections. With those corrections, the net benefit
18 falls from the present value benefit of \$38 million claimed by NS Power to a
19 present value net cost of \$60 million. Due to the inconsistency between the
20 values in the public Application Figure 11 and the confidential (but more

¹⁶ Since we only had one round of discovery, I have not been able to explore this issue further. The scheduling of service calls may be conservative, to minimize the risk of not reaching all scheduled customers on the promised day; there is no similar concern with meter reading, since customers do not generally care which day their meters are read.

1 detailed) Appendix B02, I reconciled my results to be consistent in
 2 Application Figure 11.

3 **Table 3: Summary of Corrections to NS Power Analysis**

	NSPower	Corrected	Change
Critical Peak Pricing	\$27.0	\$0.0	-\$27.0
Load Balancing	\$18.7	\$0.0	-\$18.7
Unbilled Fuel	\$11.9	\$6.0	-\$6.0
Non-Fuel Write-offs	\$5.3	\$0.0	-\$5.3
Avoided Net Meters	\$4.4	\$2.2	-\$2.2
Cash Flow	\$4.6	\$0.0	-\$4.6
AFUDC Credit	\$1.4	\$0.0	-\$1.4
AO Credit	\$0.9	\$0.0	-\$0.9
Total Subset Benefit	\$74.2	\$8.2	-\$66.1
Refresh Capital ¹⁷ Costs	\$10.1	\$42.3	\$32.2
Net Subset Benefit	\$64.1	-\$34.1	-\$98.3
NSP Net Benefit Estimate			\$38.1
Corrected Net Benefit			-\$60.2

4 Table 4 shows the net benefits and benefit-cost ratios from NS Power’s
 5 filing and with the adjustments I recommend.

6 **Table 4: Summary of Benefit-Cost Results**

	Benefits	Costs	Net Benefit	Benefit- Cost Ratio	Result
NSP Filing	\$207.9	\$169.8	\$38.1	1.23	Pass
Adjusted	\$141.8	\$202.0	(\$60.2)	0.70	Fail

7 **Q: How do you recommend that the Board dispose of NS Power’s AMI**
 8 **proposal?**

9 **A:** The Board should deny NS Power’s request for approval of the expenditure.
 10 The Board should also suggest that NS Power:

- 11 • Correct its analysis, with more realistic treatment of the incremental
 12 AMI-related benefit of load balancing, reflecting realistic modeling of

¹⁷ Refresh Capital includes meter replacement costs. NS Power has not provided the present value of the meter replacement costs separately in a public document.

1 losses at a variety of load levels and feeder loading, as well as any other
2 improvements NS Power can identify.

- 3 • If a reasonable case can be made that full deployment might be cost-
4 effective with high (but plausible) savings from the CPP program,
5 design and propose a pilot program to determine the extent to which
6 customers will respond to CPP.

7 The Board should also make clear that, if it does approve a future AMI
8 deployment, it does not expect to impose a surcharge on customers whose
9 choose to continue on conventional metering.

10 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 A: Yes.

PAUL L. CHERNICK

Resource Insight, Inc.
5 Water Street
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 1986–Present* **President, Resource Insight, Inc.** Consults and testifies in utility and insurance economics. Reviews utility supply-planning processes and outcomes: assesses prudence of prior power planning investment decisions, identifies excess generating capacity, analyzes effects of power-pool-pricing rules on equity and utility incentives. Reviews electric-utility rate design. Estimates magnitude and cost of future load growth. Designs and evaluates conservation programs for electric, natural-gas, and water utilities, including hook-up charges and conservation cost recovery mechanisms. Determines avoided costs due to cogenerators. Evaluates cogeneration rate risk. Negotiates cogeneration contracts. Reviews management and pricing of district heating systems. Determines fair profit margins for automobile and workers' compensation insurance lines, incorporating reward for risk, return on investments, and tax effects. Determines profitability of transportation services. Advises regulatory commissions in least-cost planning, rate design, and cost allocation.
- 1981–86* **Research Associate, Analysis and Inference, Inc.** (Consultant, 1980–81). Researched, advised, and testified in various aspects of utility and insurance regulation. Designed self-insurance pool for nuclear decommissioning; estimated probability and cost of insurable events, and rate levels; assessed alternative rate designs. Projected nuclear power plant construction, operation, and decommissioning costs. Assessed reasonableness of earlier estimates of nuclear power plant construction schedules and costs. Reviewed prudence of utility construction decisions. Consulted on utility rate-design issues, including small-power-producer rates; retail natural-gas rates; public-agency electric rates, and comprehensive electric-rate design for a regional power agency. Developed electricity cost allocations between customer classes. Reviewed district-heating-system efficiency. Proposed power-plant performance standards. Analyzed auto-insurance profit requirements. Designed utility-financed, decentralized conservation program. Analyzed cost-effectiveness of transmission lines.
- 1977–81* **Utility Rate Analyst, Massachusetts Attorney General.** Analyzed utility filings and prepared alternative proposals. Participated in rate negotiations, discovery, cross-examination, and briefing. Provided extensive expert testimony before various regulatory agencies. Topics included demand forecasting, rate design, marginal costs, time-of-use rates, reliability issues, power-pool operations, nuclear-power cost projections, power-plant cost-benefit analysis, energy conservation, and alternative-energy development.

EDUCATION

SM, Technology and Policy Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, February 1978.

SB, Civil Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 1974.

HONORS

Chi Epsilon (Civil Engineering)

Tau Beta Pi (Engineering)

Sigma Xi (Research)

Institute Award, Institute of Public Utilities, 1981.

PUBLICATIONS

“Price Effects as a Benefit of Energy-Efficiency Programs” (with John Plunkett), *2014 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings* (5) 57–5-69. 2014.

“Environmental Regulation in the Changing Electric-Utility Industry” (with Rachel Brailove), *International Association for Energy Economics Seventeenth Annual North American Conference* (96–105). Cleveland, Ohio: USAEE. 1996.

“The Price is Right: Restructuring Gain from Market Valuation of Utility Generating Assets” (with Jonathan Wallach), *International Association for Energy Economics Seventeenth Annual North American Conference* (345–352). Cleveland, Ohio: USAEE. 1996.

“The Future of Utility Resource Planning: Delivering Energy Efficiency through Distributed Utilities” (with Jonathan Wallach), *International Association for Energy Economics Seventeenth Annual North American Conference* (460–469). Cleveland, Ohio: USAEE. 1996.

“The Future of Utility Resource Planning: Delivering Energy Efficiency through Distribution Utilities” (with Jonathan Wallach), *1996 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, Washington: American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy 7(7.47–7.55). 1996.

“The Allocation of DSM Costs to Rate Classes,” *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference on Integrated Resource Planning*. Washington: National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. May 1994.

“Environmental Externalities: Highways and Byways” (with Bruce Biewald and William Steinhurst), *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference on Integrated Resource Planning*. Washington: National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. May 1994.

“The Transfer Loss is All Transfer, No Loss” (with Jonathan Wallach), *The Electricity Journal* 6:6 (July 1993).

“Benefit-Cost Ratios Ignore Interclass Equity” (with others), *DSM Quarterly*, Spring 1992.

“ESCOs or Utility Programs: Which Are More Likely to Succeed?” (with Sabrina Birner), *The Electricity Journal* 5:2, March 1992.

“Determining the Marginal Value of Greenhouse Gas Emissions” (with Jill Schoenberg), *Energy Developments in the 1990s: Challenges Facing Global/Pacific Markets, Vol. II*, July 1991.

“Monetizing Environmental Externalities for Inclusion in Demand-Side Management Programs” (with Emily Caverhill), *Proceedings from the Demand-Side Management and the Global Environment Conference*, April 1991.

“Accounting for Externalities” (with Emily Caverhill). *Public Utilities Fortnightly* 127(5), March 1 1991.

“Methods of Valuing Environmental Externalities” (with Emily Caverhill), *The Electricity Journal* 4(2), March 1991.

“The Valuation of Environmental Externalities in Energy Conservation Planning” (with Emily Caverhill), *Energy Efficiency and the Environment: Forging the Link*. American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy; Washington: 1991.

“The Valuation of Environmental Externalities in Utility Regulation” (with Emily Caverhill), *External Environmental Costs of Electric Power: Analysis and Internalization*. Springer-Verlag; Berlin: 1991.

“Analysis of Residential Fuel Switching as an Electric Conservation Option” (with Eric Espenhorst and Ian Goodman), *Gas Energy Review*, December 1990.

“Externalities and Your Electric Bill,” *The Electricity Journal*, October 1990, p. 64.

“Monetizing Externalities in Utility Regulations: The Role of Control Costs” (with Emily Caverhill) *Proceedings from the NARUC National Conference on Environmental Externalities*, October 1990.

“Monetizing Environmental Externalities in Utility Planning” (with Emily Caverhill), in *Proceedings from the NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, September 1990.

“Analysis of Residential Fuel Switching as an Electric Conservation Option” (with Eric Espenhorst and Ian Goodman), in *Proceedings from the NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, September 1990.

“A Utility Planner’s Checklist for Least-Cost Efficiency Investment” (with John Plunkett) in *Proceedings from the NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, September 1990.

Environmental Costs of Electricity (with Richard Ottinger et al.). Oceana; Dobbs Ferry, New York: September 1990.

“Demand-Side Bidding: A Viable Least-Cost Resource Strategy” (with John Plunkett and Jonathan Wallach), in *Proceedings from the NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, September 1990.

“Incorporating Environmental Externalities in Evaluation of District Heating Options” (with Emily Caverhill), *Proceedings from the International District Heating and Cooling Association 81st Annual Conference*, June 1990.

“A Utility Planner’s Checklist for Least-Cost Efficiency Investment,” (with John Plunkett), *Proceedings from the Canadian Electrical Association Demand-Side Management Conference*, June 1990.

“Incorporating Environmental Externalities in Utility Planning” (with Emily Caverhill), *Canadian Electrical Association Demand Side Management Conference*, May 1990.

“Is Least-Cost Planning for Gas Utilities the Same as Least-Cost Planning for Electric Utilities?” in *Proceedings of the NARUC Second Annual Conference on Least-Cost Planning*, September 10–13 1989.

“Conservation and Cost-Benefit Issues Involved in Least-Cost Planning for Gas Utilities,” in *Least Cost Planning and Gas Utilities: Balancing Theories with Realities*, Seminar proceedings from the District of Columbia Natural Gas Seminar, May 23 1989.

“The Role of Revenue Losses in Evaluating Demand-Side Resources: An Economic Re-Appraisal” (with John Plunkett), *Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings, 1988*, American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, 1988.

“Quantifying the Economic Benefits of Risk Reduction: Solar Energy Supply Versus Fossil Fuels,” in *Proceedings of the 1988 Annual Meeting of the American Solar Energy Society*, American Solar Energy Society, Inc., 1988, pp. 553–557.

“Capital Minimization: Salvation or Suicide?,” in I. C. Bupp, ed., *The New Electric Power Business*, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, 1987, pp. 63–72.

“The Relevance of Regulatory Review of Utility Planning Prudence in Major Power Supply Decisions,” in *Current Issues Challenging the Regulatory Process*, Center for Public Utilities, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 1987, pp. 36–42.

“Power Plant Phase-In Methodologies: Alternatives to Rate Shock,” in *Proceedings of the Fifth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, National Regulatory Research Institute, Columbus, Ohio, September 1986, pp. 547–562.

“Assessing Conservation Program Cost-Effectiveness: Participants, Non-participants, and the Utility System” (with A. Bachman), *Proceedings of the Fifth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, National Regulatory Research Institute, Columbus, Ohio, September 1986, pp. 2093–2110.

“Forensic Economics and Statistics: An Introduction to the Current State of the Art” (with Eden, P., Fairley, W., Aller, C., Vencill, C., and Meyer, M.), *The Practical Lawyer*, June 1 1985, pp. 25–36.

“Power Plant Performance Standards: Some Introductory Principles,” *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, April 18 1985, pp. 29–33.

“Opening the Utility Market to Conservation: A Competitive Approach,” *Energy Industries in Transition, 1985–2000*, Proceedings of the Sixth Annual North American Meeting of the International Association of Energy Economists, San Francisco, California, November 1984, pp. 1133–1145.

“Insurance Market Assessment of Technological Risks” (with Meyer, M., and Fairley, W) *Risk Analysis in the Private Sector*, pp. 401–416, Plenum Press, New York 1985.

“Revenue Stability Target Ratemaking,” *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, February 17 1983, pp. 35–39.

“Capacity/Energy Classifications and Allocations for Generation and Transmission Plant” (with M. Meyer), *Award Papers in Public Utility Economics and Regulation*, Institute for Public Utilities, Michigan State University 1982.

Design, Costs and Acceptability of an Electric Utility Self-Insurance Pool for Assuring the Adequacy of Funds for Nuclear Power Plant Decommissioning Expense, (with Fairley, W., Meyer, M., and Scharff, L.) (NUREG/CR-2370), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, December 1981.

Optimal Pricing for Peak Loads and Joint Production: Theory and Applications to Diverse Conditions (Report 77-1), Technology and Policy Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, September 1977.

REPORTS

“Charge Without a Cause? Assessing Electric Utility Demand Charges on Small Consumers” (with John T. Colgan, Rick Gilliam, Douglas Jester and Mark LeBel). Electricity Rate Design Review No. 1, July 2016.

“Implications of the Proposed Clean Power Plan for Arkansas: Review of Stakeholder Concerns and Assessment of Feasibility.” 2014. Report to Arkansas Audubon, Arkansas Public Policy Panel, and Arkansas Sierra Club.

“Comments on Nova Scotia Power Inc.’s Proposed Capital Expenditure Justification Criteria.” 2013. Filed by the Nova Scotia Small Business Advocate in N.S. UARB Matter No. 05355.

“Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England: 2013 Report” (with Rick Hornby, David White, John Rosenkranz, Ron Denhardt, Elizabeth Stanton, Jason Gifford, Bob Grace, Max Chang, Patrick Luckow, Thomas Vitolo, Patrick Knight, Ben Griffiths, and Bruce Biewald). 2011. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o National Grid Company.

“Affordability of Pollution Control on the Apache Coal Units: Review of Arizona Electric Power Cooperative’s Comments on Behalf of the Sierra Club” (with Ben Griffiths). 2012. Filed as part of comments in Docket EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0021 by National Parks Conservation Association, Sierra Club, et al.

“Audubon Arkansas Comments on Entergy’s 2012 IRP.” 2012. Prepared for and filed by Audubon Arkansas in Arkansas PUC Docket No. 07-016-U.

“Economic Benefits from Early Retirement of Reid Gardner” (with Jonathan Wallach). 2012. Prepared for and filed by the Sierra Club in PUC of Nevada Docket No. 11-08019.

“Analysis of Via Verde Need and Economics.” 2012. Appendix V-4 of public comments of the Sierra Club et al. in response to November 30 2011 draft of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers environmental assessment in Department of the Army Environmental Assessment and Statement of Finding for Permit Application SAJ-2010-02881.

“Comments for The Alliance for Affordable Energy on Staff’s ‘Proposed Integrated Resource Planning Rules for Electric Utilities in Louisiana.’” 2011. Filed by the Alliance for Affordable Energy in Louisiana PSC Docket R-30021.

“Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England: 2011 Report” (with Rick Hornby, Carl Swanson, David White, Jason Gifford, Max Chang, Nicole Hughes, Matthew Wittenstein, Rachel Wilson, and Bruce Biewald). 2011. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o National Grid Company.

“State of Ohio Energy-Efficiency Technical-Reference Manual Including Predetermined Savings Values and Protocols for Determining Energy and Demand Savings” (with others). 2010. Burlington, Vt.: Vermont Energy Investment Corporation.

“Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England: 2011 Report” (with Rick Hornby, Carl Swanson, David White, Ian Goodman, Bob Grace, Bruce Biewald, Ben Warfield, Jason Gifford, and Max Chang). 2009. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o National Grid Company.

“Green Resource Portfolios: Development, Integration, and Evaluation” (with Jonathan Wallach and Richard Mazzini). 2008. Report to the Green Energy Coalition presented as evidence in Ont. Energy Board EB 2007-0707.

“Risk Analysis of Procurement Strategies for Residential Standard Offer Service” (with Jonathan Wallach, David White, and Rick Hornby) report to Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. 2008. Baltimore: Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.

“Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England: 2007 Final Report” (with Rick Hornby, Carl Swanson, Michael Drunsic, David White, Bruce Biewald, and Jenifer Callay). 2007. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o National Grid Company.

“Integrated Portfolio Management in a Restructured Supply Market” (with Jonathan Wallach, William Steinhurst, Tim Woolf, Anna Sommers, and Kenji Takahashi). 2006. Columbus, Ohio: Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel.

“Natural Gas Efficiency Resource Development Potential in New York” (with Phillip Mosenthal, R. Neal Elliott, Dan York, Chris Neme, and Kevin Petak). 2006. Albany, N.Y.; New York State Energy Research and Development Authority.

“Natural Gas Efficiency Resource Development Potential in Con Edison Service Territory” (with Phillip Mosenthal, Jonathan Kleinman, R. Neal Elliott, Dan York, Chris Neme, and Kevin Petak). 2006. Albany, N.Y.; New York State Energy Research and Development Authority.

“Evaluation and Cost Effectiveness” (principal author), Ch. 14 of “California Evaluation Framework” Prepared for California utilities as required by the California Public Utilities Commission. 2004.

“Energy Plan for the City of New York” (with Jonathan Wallach, Susan Geller, Brian Tracey, Adam Auster, and Peter Lanzalotta). 2003. New York: New York City Economic Development Corporation.

“Updated Avoided Energy Supply Costs for Demand-Side Screening in New England” (with Susan Geller, Bruce Biewald, and David White). 2001. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o New England Power Supply Company.

“Review and Critique of the Western Division Load-Pocket Study of Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.” (with John Plunkett, Philip Mosenthal, Robert Wichert, and Robert Rose). 1999. White Plains, N.Y.: Pace University School of Law Center for Environmental Studies.

“Avoided Energy Supply Costs for Demand-Side Management in Massachusetts” (with Rachel Brailove, Susan Geller, Bruce Biewald, and David White). 1999. Northborough, Mass.: Avoided-Energy-Supply-Component Study Group, c/o New England Power Supply Company.

“Performance-based Regulation in a Restructured Utility Industry” (with Bruce Biewald, Tim Woolf, Peter Bradford, Susan Geller, and Jerrold Oppenheim). 1997. Washington: NARUC.

“Distributed Integrated-Resource-Planning Guidelines.” 1997. Appendix 4 of “The Power to Save: A Plan to Transform Vermont’s Energy-Efficiency Markets,” submitted to the Vt. PSB in Docket No. 5854. Montpelier: Vermont DPS.

“Restructuring the Electric Utilities of Maryland: Protecting and Advancing Consumer Interests” (with Jonathan Wallach, Susan Geller, John Plunkett, Roger Colton, Peter Bradford, Bruce Biewald, and David Wise). 1997. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.

“Comments of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate on Restructuring New Hampshire’s Electric-Utility Industry” (with Bruce Biewald and Jonathan Wallach). 1996. Concord, N.H.: NH OCA.

“Estimation of Market Value, Stranded Investment, and Restructuring Gains for Major Massachusetts Utilities” (with Susan Geller, Rachel Brailove, Jonathan Wallach, and Adam Auster). 1996. On behalf of the Massachusetts Attorney General (Boston).

From Here to Efficiency: Securing Demand-Management Resources (with Emily Caverhill, James Peters, John Plunkett, and Jonathan Wallach). 1993. 5 vols. Harrisburg, Penn: Pennsylvania Energy Office.

“Analysis Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations,” vol. 1 of “Correcting the Imbalance of Power: Report on Integrated Resource Planning for Ontario Hydro” (with Plunkett, John, and Jonathan Wallach), December 1992.

“Estimation of the Costs Avoided by Potential Demand-Management Activities of Ontario Hydro,” December 1992.

“Review of the Elizabethtown Gas Company’s 1992 DSM Plan and the Demand-Side Management Rules” (with Jonathan Wallach, John Plunkett, James Peters, Susan Geller, Blair Hamilton, and Andrew Shapiro). 1992. Report to the New Jersey Department of Public Advocate.

Environmental Externalities Valuation and Ontario Hydro’s Resource Planning (with E. Caverhill and R. Brailove), 3 vols.; prepared for the Coalition of Environmental Groups for a Sustainable Energy Future, October 1992.

“Review of Jersey Central Power & Light’s 1992 DSM Plan and the Demand-Side Management Rules” (with Jonathan Wallach et al.); Report to the New Jersey Department of Public Advocate, June 1992.

“The AGREIA Project Critique of Externality Valuation: A Brief Rebuttal,” March 1992.

“The Potential Economic Benefits of Regulatory NO_x Valuation for Clean Air Act Ozone Compliance in Massachusetts,” March 1992.

“Initial Review of Ontario Hydro’s Demand-Supply Plan Update” (with David Argue et al.), February 1992.

“Report on the Adequacy of Ontario Hydro’s Estimates of Externality Costs Associated with Electricity Exports” (with Emily Caverhill), January 1991.

“Comments on the 1991–1992 Annual and Long Range Demand-Side-Management Plans of the Major Electric Utilities,” (with John Plunkett et al.), September 1990. Filed in NY PSC Case No. 28223 in re New York utilities’ DSM plans.

“Power by Efficiency: An Assessment of Improving Electrical Efficiency to Meet Jamaica’s Power Needs,” (with Conservation Law Foundation, et al.), June 1990.

“Analysis of Fuel Substitution as an Electric Conservation Option,” (with Ian Goodman and Eric Espenhorst), Boston Gas Company, December 22 1989.

“The Development of Consistent Estimates of Avoided Costs for Boston Gas Company, Boston Edison Company, and Massachusetts Electric Company” (with Eric Espenhorst), Boston Gas Company, December 22 1989.

“The Valuation of Externalities from Energy Production, Delivery, and Use: Fall 1989 Update” (with Emily Caverhill), Boston Gas Company, December 22 1989.

“Conservation Potential in the State of Minnesota,” (with Ian Goodman) Minnesota Department of Public Service, June 16 1988.

“Review of NEPOOL Performance Incentive Program,” Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council, April 12 1988.

“Application of the DPU’s Used-and-Useful Standard to Pilgrim 1” (With C. Wills and M. Meyer), Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy Resources, October 1987.

“Constructing a Supply Curve for Conservation: An Initial Examination of Issues and Methods,” Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council, June 1985.

“Final Report: Rate Design Analysis,” Pacific Northwest Electric Power and Conservation Planning Council, December 18 1981.

PRESENTATIONS

“Rethinking Utility Rate Design—Retail Demand and Energy Charges,” Solar Power PV Conference, Boston MA, February 24, 2016.

“Residential Demand Charges - Load Effects, Fairness & Rate Design Implications.” Web seminar sponsored by the NixTheFix Forum. September 2015.

“The Value of Demand Reduction Induced Price Effects.” With Chris Neme. Web seminar sponsored by the Regulatory Assistance Project. March 2015.

“Adding Transmission into New York City: Needs, Benefits, and Obstacles.” Presentation to FERC and the New York ISO on behalf of the City of New York. October 2004.

“Plugging Into a Municipal Light Plant.” With Peter Enrich and Ken Barna. Panel presentation as part of the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Municipal Association. January 2004.

“Distributed Utility Planning.” With Steve Litkovitz. Presentation to the Vermont Distributed-Utility-Planning Collaborative. November 1999.

“The Economic and Environmental Benefits of Gas IRP: FERC 636 and Beyond.” Presentation as part of the Ohio Office of Energy Efficiency’s seminar, “Gas Utility Integrated Resource Planning,” April 1994.

“Cost Recovery and Utility Incentives.” Day-long presentation as part of the Demand-Side-Management Training Institute’s workshop, “DSM for Public Interest Groups,” October 1993.

“Cost Allocation for Utility Ratemaking.” With Susan Geller. Day-long workshop for the staff of the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, October 1993.

“Comparing and Integrating DSM with Supply.” Day-long presentation as part of the Demand-Side-Management Training Institute’s workshop, “DSM for Public Interest Groups,” October 1993.

“DSM Cost Recovery and Rate Impacts.” Presentation as part of “Effective DSM Collaborative Processes,” a week-long training session for Ohio DSM advocates sponsored by the Ohio Office of Energy Efficiency, August 1993.

“Cost-Effectiveness Analysis.” Presentation as part of “Effective DSM Collaborative Processes,” a week-long training session for Ohio DSM advocates sponsored by the Ohio Office of Energy Efficiency, August 1993.

“Environmental Externalities: Current Approaches and Potential Implications for District Heating and Cooling” (with R. Brailove), International District Heating and Cooling Association 84th Annual Conference. June 1993.

“Using the Costs of Required Controls to Incorporate the Costs of Environmental Externalities in Non-Environmental Decision-Making.” Presentation at the American Planning Association 1992 National Planning Conference; presentation cosponsored by the Edison Electric Institute. May 1992.

“Cost Recovery and Decoupling” and “The Clean Air Act and Externalities in Utility Resource Planning” panels (session leader), DSM Advocacy Workshop. April 15 1992.

“Overview of Integrated Resources Planning Procedures in South Carolina and Critique of South Carolina Demand Side Management Programs,” Energy Planning Workshops; Columbia, S.C. October 21 1991.

“Least Cost Planning and Gas Utilities.” Demand-Side Management and the Global Environment Conference; Washington, D.C. April 22 1991.

Conservation Law Foundation Utility Energy Efficiency Advocacy Workshop; Boston, February 28 1991.

“Least-Cost Planning in a Multi-Fuel Context.” NARUC Forum on Gas Integrated Resource Planning; Washington, D.C., February 24 1991.

“Accounting for Externalities: Why, Which and How?” Understanding Massachusetts’ New Integrated Resource Management Rules. Needham, Massachusetts, November 9 1990.

New England Gas Association Gas Utility Managers’ Conference. Woodstock, Vermont, September 10 1990.

“Quantifying and Valuing Environmental Externalities.” Presentation at the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Training Program for Regulatory Staff, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Energy’s Least-Cost Utility Planning Program; Berkeley, California, February 2 1990;

“Conservation in the Future of Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies.” District of Columbia Natural Gas Seminar; Washington, D.C. May 23 1989.

“Conservation and Load Management for Natural Gas Utilities,” Massachusetts Natural Gas Council; Newton, Massachusetts. April 3 1989.

New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners, Environmental Externalities Workshop. Portsmouth, New Hampshire, January 22–23 1989.

“Assessment and Valuation of External Environmental Damages.” New England Utility Rate Forum. Plymouth, Massachusetts, October 11 1985; “Lessons from Massachusetts on Long Term Rates for QFs”.

“Reviewing Utility Supply Plans.” Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council; Boston, Massachusetts. May 30 1985.

“Power Plant Performance,” National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates; Williamstown, Massachusetts. August 13 1984.

“Utility Rate Shock,” National Conference of State Legislatures; Boston, Massachusetts, August 6 1984.

“Review and Modification of Regulatory and Rate Making Policy,” National Governors’ Association Working Group on Nuclear Power Cost Overruns; Washington, D.C., June 20 1984.

“Review and Modification of Regulatory and Rate Making Policy,” Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Session on Monitoring for Risk Management; Detroit, Michigan, May 27 1983.

ADVISORY ASSIGNMENTS TO REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Docket No. 834, Phase II; Least-cost planning procedures and goals. August 1987 to March 1988.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 87-07-01, Phase 2; Rate design and cost allocations. March 1988 to June 1989.

Austin City Council, Austin Energy Rates, March to June 2012.

Puerto Rico Energy Commission, Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority, rate design issues, September 2015 to present.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

1. **Mass. EFSC 78-12/MDPU 19494**, Phase I; Boston Edison 1978 forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. June 12 1978.

Appliance penetration projections, price elasticity, econometric commercial forecast, peak demand forecast. Joint testimony with Susan C. Geller.

2. **Mass. EFSC 78-17**, Northeast Utilities 1978 forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. September 29 1978.

Specification of economic/demographic and industrial models, appliance efficiency, commercial model structure and estimation.

3. **Mass. EFSC 78-33**, Eastern Utilities Associates 1978 forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. November 27 1978.

Household size, appliance efficiency, appliance penetration, price elasticity, commercial forecast, industrial trending, peak demand forecast.

4. **Mass. DPU 19494**, Phase II; Boston Edison Company construction program; Massachusetts Attorney General. April 1 1979.

Review of numerous aspects of the 1978 demand forecasts of nine New England electric utilities, constituting 92% of projected regional demand growth, and of the NEPOOL demand forecast. Joint testimony with Susan Geller.

5. **Mass. DPU 19494**, Phase II; Boston Edison Company construction program; Massachusetts Attorney General. April 1 1979.

Reliability, capacity planning, capability responsibility allocation, customer generation, co-generation rates, reserve margins, operating reserve allocation. Joint testimony with S. Finger.

6. **U.S. ASLB NRC 50-471**, Pilgrim Unit 2; Commonwealth of Massachusetts. June 29 1979.

Review of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and NEPOOL demand forecast models; cost-effectiveness of oil displacement; nuclear economics. Joint testimony with Susan Geller.

7. **Mass. DPU 19845**, Boston Edison time-of-use-rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. December 4 1979. (Not presented)

Critique of utility marginal cost study and proposed rates; principles of marginal cost principles, cost derivation, and rate design; options for reconciling costs and revenues. Joint testimony with Susan Geller.

8. **Mass. DPU 20055**, petition of Eastern Utilities Associates, New Bedford G. & E., and Fitchburg G. & E. to purchase additional shares of Seabrook Nuclear Plant; Massachusetts Attorney General. January 23 1980.

Review of demand forecasts of three utilities purchasing Seabrook shares; Seabrook power costs, including construction cost, completion date, capacity factor, O&M expenses, interim replacements, reserves and uncertainties; alternative energy sources, including conservation, cogeneration, rate reform, solar, wood and coal conversion.

9. **Mass. DPU 20248**, petition of Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company to purchase additional share of Seabrook Nuclear Plant; Massachusetts Attorney General. June 2 1980.

Nuclear power costs; update and extension of MDPU 20055 testimony.

10. **Mass. DPU 200**, Massachusetts Electric Company rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. June 16 1980.

Rate design; declining blocks, promotional rates, alternative energy, demand charges, demand ratchets; conservation: master metering, storage heating, efficiency standards, restricting resistance heating.

11. **Mass. EFSC 79-33**, Eastern Utilities Associates 1979 forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. July 16 1980.

Customer projections, consistency issues, appliance efficiency, new appliance types, commercial specifications, industrial data manipulation and trending, sales and resale.

- 12. Mass. DPU 243**, Eastern Edison Company rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. August 19 1980.

Rate design: declining blocks, promotional rates, alternative energy, master metering.

- 13. Texas PUC 3298**, Gulf States Utilities rate case; East Texas Legal Services. August 25 1980.

Inter-class revenue allocations, including production plant in-service, O&M, CWIP, nuclear fuel in progress, amortization of canceled plant residential rate design; interruptible rates; off-peak rates. Joint testimony with M. B. Meyer.

- 14. Mass. EFSC 79-1**, Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company Forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. November 5 1980.

Cost comparison methodology; nuclear cost estimates; cost of conservation, cogeneration, and solar.

- 15. Mass. DPU 472**, recovery of residential conservation-service expenses; Massachusetts Attorney General. December 12 1980.

Conservation as an energy source; advantages of per-kWh allocation over per-customer-month allocation.

- 16. Mass. DPU 535**; regulations to carry out Section 210 of PURPA; Massachusetts Attorney General. January 26 1981 and February 13 1981.

Filing requirements, certification, qualifying-facility status, extent of coverage, review of contracts; energy rates; capacity rates; extra benefits of qualifying facilities in specific areas; wheeling; standardization of fees and charges.

- 17. Mass. EFSC 80-17**, Northeast Utilities 1980 forecast; Massachusetts Attorney General. March 12 1981 (not presented).

Specification process, employment, electric heating promotion and penetration, commercial sales model, industrial model specification, documentation of price forecasts and wholesale forecast.

- 18. Mass. DPU 558**, Western Massachusetts Electric Company rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. May 1981.

Rate design including declining blocks, marginal cost conservation impacts, and promotional rates. Conservation, including terms and conditions limiting renewable, cogeneration, small power production; scope of current conservation program; efficient insulation levels; additional conservation opportunities.

19. **Mass. DPU 1048**, Boston Edison plant performance standards; Massachusetts Attorney General. May 7 1982.

Critique of company approach, data, and statistical analysis; description of comparative and absolute approaches to standard-setting; proposals for standards and reporting requirements.

20. **D.C. PSC FC785**, Potomac Electric Power rate case; D.C. People's Counsel. July 29 1982.

Inter-class revenue allocations, including generation, transmission, and distribution plant classification; fuel and O&M classification; distribution and service allocators. Marginal cost estimation, including losses.

21. **N.H. PSC DE 81-312**, Public Service of New Hampshire supply and demand; Conservation Law Foundation et al. October 8 1982.

Conservation program design, ratemaking, and effectiveness. Cost of power from Seabrook nuclear plant, including construction cost and duration, capacity factor, O&M, replacements, insurance, and decommissioning.

22. **Mass. Division of Insurance**, hearing to fix and establish 1983 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General. October 1982.

Profit margin calculations, including methodology, interest rates, surplus flow, tax flows, tax rates, and risk premium.

23. **Ill. CC 82-0026**, Commonwealth Edison rate case; Illinois Attorney General. October 15 1982.

Review of Cost-Benefit Analysis for nuclear plant. Nuclear cost parameters (construction cost, O&M, capital additions, useful life, capacity factor), risks, discount rates, evaluation techniques.

24. **N.M. PSC 1794**, Public Service of New Mexico application for certification; New Mexico Attorney General. May 10 1983.

Review of Cost-Benefit Analysis for transmission line. Review of electricity price forecast, nuclear capacity factors, load forecast. Critique of company ratemaking proposals; development of alternative ratemaking proposal.

25. **Conn. DPUC 830301**, United Illuminating rate case; Connecticut Consumers Counsel. June 17 1983.

Cost of Seabrook nuclear power plants, including construction cost and duration, capacity factor, O&M, capital additions, insurance and decommissioning.

26. **Mass. DPU 1509**, Boston Edison plant performance standards; Massachusetts Attorney General. July 15 1983.

Critique of company approach and statistical analysis; regression model of nuclear capacity factor; proposals for standards and for standard-setting methodologies.

- 27. Mass. Division of Insurance**, hearing to fix and establish 1984 automobile-insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General. October 1983.

Profit margin calculations, including methodology, interest rates.

- 28. Conn. DPUC 83-07-15**, Connecticut Light and Power rate case; Alloy Foundry. October 3 1983.

Industrial rate design. Marginal and embedded costs; classification of generation, transmission, and distribution expenses; demand versus energy charges.

- 29. Mass. EFSC 83-24**, New England Electric System forecast of electric resources and requirements; Massachusetts Attorney General. November 14 1983, Rebuttal, February 2 1984.

Need for transmission line. Status of supply plan, especially Seabrook 2. Review of interconnection requirements. Analysis of cost-effectiveness for power transfer, line losses, generation assumptions.

- 30. Mich. PSC U-7775**, Detroit Edison Fuel Cost Recovery Plan; Public Interest Research Group in Michigan. February 21 1984.

Review of proposed performance target for new nuclear power plant. Formulation of alternative proposals.

- 31. Mass. DPU 84-25**, Western Massachusetts Electric Company rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. April 6 1984.

Need for Millstone 3. Cost of completing and operating unit, cost-effectiveness compared to alternatives, and its effect on rates. Equity and incentive problems created by CWIP. Design of Millstone 3 phase-in proposals to protect ratepayers: limitation of base-rate treatment to fuel savings benefit of unit.

- 32. Mass. DPU 84-49 and 84-50**, Fitchburg Gas & Electric financing case; Massachusetts Attorney General. April 13 1984.

Cost of completing and operating Seabrook nuclear units. Probability of completing Seabrook 2. Recommendations regarding FG&E and MDPU actions with respect to Seabrook.

- 33. Mich. PSC U-7785**, Consumers Power fuel-cost-recovery plan; Public Interest Research Group in Michigan. April 16 1984.

Review of proposed performance targets for two existing and two new nuclear power plants. Formulation of alternative policy.

- 34. FERC ER81-749-000 and ER82-325-000**, Montaup Electric rate cases; Massachusetts Attorney General. April 27 1984.

Prudence of Montaup and Boston Edison in decisions regarding Pilgrim 2 construction: Montaup's decision to participate, the Utilities' failure to review their earlier analyses and assumptions, Montaup's failure to question Edison's decisions, and the utilities' delay in canceling the unit.

- 35. Maine PUC 84-113**, Seabrook-1 investigation; Maine Public Advocate. September 13 1984.

Cost of completing and operating Seabrook Unit 1. Probability of completing Seabrook 1. Comparison of Seabrook to alternatives. Rate effects. Recommendations regarding utility and PUC actions with respect to Seabrook.

- 36. Mass. DPU 84-145**, Fitchburg Gas and Electric rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. November 6 1984.

Prudence of Fitchburg and Public Service of New Hampshire in decision regarding Seabrook 2 construction: FGE's decision to participate, the utilities' failure to review their earlier analyses and assumptions, FGE's failure to question PSNH's decisions, and utilities' delay in halting construction and canceling the unit. Review of literature, cost and schedule estimate histories, cost-benefit analyses, and financial feasibility.

- 37. Penn. PUC R-842651**, Pennsylvania Power and Light rate case; Pennsylvania Consumer Advocate. November 1984.

Need for Susquehanna 2. Cost of operating unit, power output, cost-effectiveness compared to alternatives, and its effect on rates. Design of phase-in and excess capacity proposals to protect ratepayers: limitation of base-rate treatment to fuel savings benefit of unit.

- 38. N.H. PSC 84-200**, Seabrook Unit-1 investigation; New Hampshire Consumer Advocate. November 15 1984.

Cost of completing and operating Seabrook Unit 1. Probability of completing Seabrook 1. Comparison of Seabrook to alternatives. Rate and financial effects.

- 39. Mass. Division of Insurance**, hearing to fix and establish 1986 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General. November 1984.

Profit-margin calculations, including methodology and implementation.

- 40. Mass. DPU 84-152**, Seabrook Unit 1 investigation; Massachusetts Attorney General. December 12 1984.

Cost of completing and operating Seabrook. Probability of completing Seabrook 1. Seabrook capacity factors.

- 41. Maine PUC 84-120; Central Maine Power rate case; Maine PUC Staff. December 11 1984.**

Prudence of Central Maine Power and Boston Edison in decisions regarding Pilgrim 2 construction: CMP's decision to participate, the utilities' failure to review their earlier analyses and assumptions, CMP's failure to question Edison's decisions, and the utilities' delay in canceling the unit. Prudence of CMP in the planning and investment in Sears Island nuclear and coal plants. Review of literature, cost and schedule estimate histories, cost-benefit analyses, and financial feasibility.

- 42. Maine PUC 84-113, Seabrook 2 investigation; Maine PUC Staff. December 14 1984.**

Prudence of Maine utilities and Public Service of New Hampshire in decisions regarding Seabrook 2 construction: decisions to participate and to increase ownership share, the utilities' failure to review their earlier analyses and assumptions, failure to question PSNH's decisions, and the utilities' delay in halting construction and canceling the unit. Review of literature, cost and schedule estimate histories, cost-benefit analyses, and financial feasibility.

- 43. Mass. DPU 1627, Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company financing case; Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy Resources. January 14 1985.**

Cost of completing and operating Seabrook nuclear unit 1. Cost of conservation and other alternatives to completing Seabrook. Comparison of Seabrook to alternatives.

- 44. Vt. PSB 4936, Millstone 3 costs and in-service date; Vermont Department of Public Service. January 21 1985.**

Construction schedule and cost of completing Millstone Unit 3.

- 45. Mass. DPU 84-276, rules governing rates for utility purchases of power from qualifying facilities; Massachusetts Attorney General. March 25 1985 and October 18 1985.**

Institutional and technological advantages of Qualifying Facilities. Potential for QF development. Goals of QF rate design. Parity with other power sources. Security requirements. Projecting avoided costs. Capacity credits. Pricing options. Line loss corrections.

- 46. Mass. DPU 85-121, investigation of the Reading Municipal Light Department; Wilmington (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce. November 12 1985.**

Calculation on return on investment for municipal utility. Treatment of depreciation and debt for ratemaking. Geographical discrimination in street-lighting rates. Relative size of voluntary payments to Reading and other towns. Surplus and disinvestment. Revenue allocation.

- 47. Mass. Division of Insurance**, hearing to fix and establish 1986 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General and State Rating Bureau. November 1985.

Profit margin calculations, including methodology, implementation, modeling of investment balances, income, and return to shareholders.

- 48. N.M. PSC 1833, Phase II**; El Paso Electric rate case; New Mexico Attorney General. December 23 1985.

Nuclear decommissioning fund design. Internal and external funds; risk and return; fund accumulation, recommendations. Interim performance standard for Palo Verde nuclear plant.

- 49. Penn. PUC R-850152**, Philadelphia Electric rate case; Utility Users Committee and University of Pennsylvania. January 14 1986.

Limerick-1 rate effects. Capacity benefits, fuel savings, operating costs, capacity factors, and net benefits to ratepayers. Design of phase-in proposals.

- 50. Mass. DPU 85-270**;; Western Massachusetts Electric rate case; Massachusetts Attorney General. March 19 1986.

Prudence of Northeast Utilities in generation planning related to Millstone 3 construction: decisions to start and continue construction, failure to reduce ownership share, failure to pursue alternatives. Review of industry literature, cost and schedule histories, and retrospective cost-benefit analyses.

- 51. Penn. PUC R-850290**, Philadelphia Electric auxiliary service rates; Albert Einstein Medical Center, University of Pennsylvania, and Amtrak. March 24 1986.

Review of utility proposals for supplementary and backup rates for small power producers and cogenerators. Load diversity, cost of peaking capacity, value of generation, price signals, and incentives. Formulation of alternative supplementary rate.

- 52. N.M. PSC 2004**, Public Service of New Mexico Palo Verde issues; New Mexico Attorney General. May 7 1986.

Recommendations for power-plant performance standards for Palo Verde nuclear units 1, 2, and 3.

- 53. Ill. CC 86-0325**, Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric Co. rate investigation; Illinois Office of Public Counsel. August 13 1986.

Determination of excess capacity based on reliability and economic concerns. Identification of specific units associated with excess capacity. Required reserve margins.

- 54. N.M. PSC 2009**, El Paso Electric rate moderation program; New Mexico Attorney General. August 18 1986. (Not presented).

Prudence of EPE in generation planning related to Palo Verde nuclear construction, including failure to reduce ownership share and failure to pursue alternatives. Review of industry literature, cost and schedule histories, and retrospective cost-benefit analyses.

Recommendation for rate-base treatment; proposal of power plant performance standards.

- 55. City of Boston Public Improvements Commission**, transfer of Boston Edison district heating steam system to Boston Thermal Corporation; Boston Housing Authority. December 18 1986.

History and economics of steam system; possible motives of Boston Edison in seeking sale; problems facing Boston Thermal; information and assurances required prior to Commission approval of transfer.

- 56. Mass. Division of Insurance**, hearing to fix and establish 1987 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General and State Rating Bureau. December 1986 and January 1987.

Profit margin calculations, including methodology, implementation, derivation of cash flows, installment income, income tax status, and return to shareholders.

- 57. Mass. DPU 87-19**, petition for adjudication of development facilitation program; Hull (Mass.) Municipal Light Plant. January 21 1987.

Estimation of potential load growth; cost of generation, transmission, and distribution additions. Determination of hook-up charges. Development of residential load estimation procedure reflecting appliance ownership, dwelling size.

- 58. N.M. PSC 2004**, Public Service of New Mexico nuclear decommissioning fund; New Mexico Attorney General. February 19 1987.

Decommissioning cost and likely operating life of nuclear plants. Review of utility funding proposal. Development of alternative proposal. Ratemaking treatment.

- 59. Mass. DPU 86-280**, Western Massachusetts Electric rate case; Massachusetts Energy Office. March 9 1987.

Marginal cost rate design issues. Superiority of long-run marginal cost over short-run marginal cost as basis for rate design. Relationship of Consumer reaction, utility planning process, and regulatory structure to rate design approach. Implementation of short-run and long-run rate designs. Demand versus energy charges, economic development rates, spot pricing.

- 60. Mass. Division of Insurance** 87-9, 1987 Workers' Compensation rate filing; State Rating Bureau. May 1987.

Profit-margin calculations, including methodology, implementation, surplus requirements, investment income, and effects of 1986 Tax Reform Act.

- 61. Texas PUC** 6184, economic viability of South Texas Nuclear Plant #2; Committee for Consumer Rate Relief. August 17 1987.

Nuclear plant operating parameter projections; capacity factor, O&M, capital additions, decommissioning, useful life. STNP-2 cost and schedule projections. Potential for conservation.

- 62. Minn. PUC** ER-015/GR-87-223, Minnesota Power rate case; Minnesota Department of Public Service. August 17 1987.

Excess capacity on MP system; historical, current, and projected. Review of MP planning prudence prior to and during excess; efforts to sell capacity. Cost of excess capacity. Recommendations for ratemaking treatment.

- 63. Mass. Division of Insurance** 87-27, 1988 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General and State Rating Bureau. September 2 1987. Rebuttal October 8 1987.

Underwriting profit margins. Effect of 1986 Tax Reform Act. Biases in calculation of average margins.

- 64. Mass. DPU** 88-19, power Sales Contract from Riverside Steam and Electric to Western Massachusetts Electric; Riverside Steam and Electric. November 4 1987.

Comparison of risk from QF contract and utility avoided-cost sources. Risk of oil dependence. Discounting cash flows to reflect risk.

- 65. Mass. Division of Insurance** 87-53, 1987 Workers' Compensation rate refiling; State Rating Bureau. December 14 1987.

Profit-margin calculations including updating of data, compliance with Commissioner's order, treatment of surplus and risk, interest rate calculation, and investment tax rate calculation.

- 66. Mass. Division of Insurance**, 1987 and 1988 automobile insurance remand rates; Massachusetts Attorney General and State Rating Bureau. February 5 1988.

Underwriting profit margins. Provisions for income taxes on finance charges. Relationships between allowed and achieved margins, between statewide and nationwide data, and between profit allowances and cost projections.

- 67. Mass. DPU 86-36**, investigation into the pricing and ratemaking treatment to be afforded new electric generating facilities which are not qualifying facilities; Conservation Law Foundation. May 2 1988.

Cost recovery for utility conservation programs. Compensating for lost revenues. Utility incentive structures.

- 68. Mass. DPU 88-123**, petition of Riverside Steam & Electric Company; Riverside Steam and Electric Company. May 18 1988 and November 8 1988.

Estimation of avoided costs of Western Massachusetts Electric Company. Nuclear capacity factor projections and effects on avoided costs. Avoided cost of energy interchange and power plant life extensions. Differences between median and expected oil prices. Salvage value of cogeneration facility. Off-system energy purchase projections. Reconciliation of avoided cost projection.

- 69. Mass. DPU 88-67**, Boston Gas Company; Boston Housing Authority. June 17 1988.

Estimation of annual avoidable costs, 1988 to 2005, and levelized avoided costs. Determination of cost recovery and carrying costs for conservation investments. Standards for assessing conservation cost-effectiveness. Evaluation of cost-effectiveness of utility funding of proposed natural gas conservation measures.

- 70. R.I. PUC 1900**, Providence Water Supply Board tariff filing; Conservation Law Foundation, Audubon Society of Rhode Island, and League of Women Voters of Rhode Island. June 24 1988.

Estimation of avoidable water supply costs. Determination of costs of water conservation. Conservation cost-benefit analysis.

- 71. Mass. Division of Insurance 88-22**, 1989 automobile insurance rates; Massachusetts Attorney General and State Rating Bureau; Profit Issues, August 12 1988, supplemented August 19 1988; Losses and Expenses, September 16 1988.

Underwriting profit margins. Effects of 1986 Tax Reform Act. Taxation of common stocks. Lag in tax payments. Modeling risk and return over time. Treatment of finance charges. Comparison of projected and achieved investment returns.

- 72. Vt. PSB 5270 Module 6**, investigation into least-cost investments, energy efficiency, conservation, and the management of demand for energy; Conservation Law Foundation, Vermont Natural Resources Council, and Vermont Public Interest Research Group. September 26 1988.

Cost recovery for utility conservation programs. Compensation of utilities for revenue losses and timing differences. Incentive for utility participation.

- 73. Vt. House of Representatives, Natural Resources Committee**, House Act 130; “Economic Analysis of Vermont Yankee Retirement”; Vermont Public Interest Research Group. February 21 1989.

Projection of capacity factors, operating and maintenance expense, capital additions, overhead, replacement power costs, and net costs of Vermont Yankee.

- 74. Mass. DPU 88-67 Phase II**, Boston Gas company conservation program and rate design; Boston Gas Company. March 6 1989.

Estimation of avoided gas cost; treatment of non-price factors; estimation of externalities; identification of cost-effective conservation.

- 75. Vt. PSB 5270**, status conference on conservation and load management policy settlement; Central Vermont Public Service, Conservation Law Foundation, Vermont Natural Resources Council, Vermont Public Interest Research Group, and Vermont Department of Public Service. May 1 1989.

Cost-benefit test for utility conservation programs. Role of externalities. Cost recovery concepts and mechanisms. Resource allocations, cost allocations, and equity considerations. Guidelines for conservation preapproval mechanisms. Incentive mechanisms and recovery of lost revenues.

- 76. Boston Housing Authority Court 05099**, Gallivan Boulevard Task Force vs. Boston Housing Authority, et al.; Boston Housing Authority. June 16 1989.

Effect of master-metering on consumption of natural gas and electricity. Legislative and regulatory mandates regarding conservation.

- 77. Mass. DPU 89-100**, Boston Edison rate case; Massachusetts Energy Office. June 30 1989.

Prudence of BECo’s decision to spend \$400 million from 1986–88 on returning the Pilgrim nuclear power plant to service. Projections of nuclear capacity factors, O&M, capital additions, and overhead. Review of decommissioning cost, tax effect of abandonment, replacement power cost, and plant useful life estimates. Requirements for prudence and used-and-useful analyses.

- 78. Mass. DPU 88-123**, petition of Riverside Steam and Electric Company; Riverside Steam and Electric. July 24 1989. Rebuttal, October 3 1989.

Reasonableness of Northeast Utilities’ 1987 avoided cost estimates. Projections of nuclear capacity factors, economy purchases, and power plant operating life. Treatment of avoidable energy and capacity costs and of off-system sales. Expected versus reference fuel prices.

- 79. Mass. DPU 89-72**, Statewide Towing Association police-ordered towing rates; Massachusetts Automobile Rating Bureau. September 13 1989.

Review of study supporting proposed increase in towing rates. Critique of study sample and methodology. Comparison to competitive rates. Supply of towing services. Effects of joint products and joint sales on profitability of police-ordered towing. Joint testimony with I. Goodman.

- 80. Vt. PSB 5330**, application of Vermont utilities for approval of a firm power and energy contract with Hydro-Quebec; Conservation Law Foundation, Vermont Natural Resources Council, Vermont Public Interest Research Group. December 19 1989. Surrebuttal February 6 1990.

Analysis of a proposed 450-MW, 20-year purchase of Hydro-Quebec power by twenty-four Vermont utilities. Comparison to efficiency investment in Vermont, including potential for efficiency savings. Analysis of Vermont electric energy supply. Identification of possible improvements to proposed contract.

Critique of conservation potential analysis. Planning risk of large supply additions. Valuation of environmental externalities.

- 81. Mass. DPU 89-239**, inclusion of externalities in energy-supply planning, acquisition, and dispatch for Massachusetts utilities. December 1989; April 1990; May 1990.

Critique of Division of Energy Resources report on externalities. Methodology for evaluating external costs. Proposed values for environmental and economic externalities of fuel supply and use.

- 82. California PUC**, incorporation of environmental externalities in utility planning and pricing; Coalition of Energy Efficient and Renewable Technologies. February 21 1990.

Approaches for valuing externalities for inclusion in setting power purchase rates. Effect of uncertainty on assessing externality values.

- 83. Ill. CC 90-0038**, proceeding to adopt a least-cost electric-energy plan for Commonwealth Edison Company; City of Chicago. May 25 1990. Joint rebuttal testimony with David Birr, August 14 1990.

Problems in Commonwealth Edison's approach to demand-side management. Potential for cost-effective conservation. Valuing externalities in least-cost planning.

- 84. Md. PSC 8278**, adequacy of Baltimore Gas & Electric's integrated resource plan; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. September 18 1990.

Rationale for demand-side management. BG&E's problems in approach to DSM planning. Potential for cost-effective conservation. Valuation of environmental externalities. Recommendations for short-term DSM program priorities.

- 85. Ind. URC**, integrated-resource-planning docket; Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor. November 1 1990.

Integrated resource planning process and methodology, including externalities and screening tools. Incentives, screening, and evaluation of demand-side management. Potential of resource bidding in Indiana.

- 86. Mass. DPU 89-141, 90-73, 90-141, 90-194, 90-270**; preliminary review of utility treatment of environmental externalities in October qualifying-facilities filings; Boston Gas Company. November 5 1990.

Generic and specific problems in Massachusetts utilities' RFPs with regard to externality valuation requirements. Recommendations for corrections.

- 87. Mass. EFSC 90-12/90-12A**, adequacy of Boston Edison proposal to build combined-cycle plant; Conservation Law Foundation. December 14 1990.

Problems in Boston Edison's treatment of demand-side management, supply option analysis, and resource planning. Recommendations of mitigation options.

- 88. Maine PUC 90-286**, adequacy of conservation program of Bangor Hydro Electric; Penobscot River Coalition. February 19 1991.

Role of utility-sponsored DSM in least-cost planning. Bangor Hydro's potential for cost-effective conservation. Problems with Bangor Hydro's assumptions about customer investment in energy efficiency measures.

- 89. Va. SCC PUE900070**, Order establishing commission investigation; Southern Environmental Law Center. March 6 1991.

Role of utilities in promoting energy efficiency. Least-cost planning objectives of and resource acquisition guidelines for DSM. Ratemaking considerations for DSM investments.

- 90. Mass. DPU 90-261-A**, economics and role of fuel-switching in the DSM program of the Massachusetts Electric Company; Boston Gas Company. April 17 1991.

Role of fuel-switching in utility DSM programs and specifically in Massachusetts Electric's. Establishing comparable avoided costs and comparison of electric and gas system costs. Updated externality values.

- 91. Private arbitration**, Massachusetts Refusetech Contractual Request for Adjustment to Service Fee; Massachusetts Refusetech. May 13 1991.

NEPCo rates for power purchases from the New England Solid Waste Compact plant. Fuel price and avoided cost projections vs. realities.

- 92. Vt. PSB 5491**, cost-effectiveness of Central Vermont's commitment to Hydro Quebec purchases; Conservation Law Foundation. July 19 1991.
- Changes in load forecasts and resale markets since approval of HQ purchases. Effect of HQ purchase on DSM.
- 93. S.C. PSC 91-216-E**, cost recovery of Duke Power's DSM expenditures; South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs. Direct, September 13 1991; Surrebuttal October 2 1991.
- Problems with conservation plans of Duke Power, including load building, cream skimming, and inappropriate rate designs.
- 94. Md. PSC 8241 Phase II**, review of Baltimore Gas & Electric's avoided costs; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. September 19 1991.
- Development of direct avoided costs for DSM. Problems with BG&E's avoided costs and DSM screening. Incorporation of environmental externalities.
- 95. Bucksport (Maine) Planning Board**, AES/Harriman Cove shoreland zoning application; Conservation Law Foundation and Natural Resources Council of Maine. October 1 1991.
- New England's power surplus. Costs of bringing AES/Harriman Cove on line to back out existing generation. Alternatives to AES.
- 96. Mass. DPU 91-131**, update of externalities values adopted in Docket 89-239; Boston Gas Company. October 4 1991. Rebuttal, December 13 1991.
- Updates on pollutant externality values. Addition of values for chlorofluorocarbons, air toxics, thermal pollution, and oil import premium. Review of state regulatory actions regarding externalities.
- 97. Fla. PSC 910759**, petition of Florida Power Corporation for determination of need for proposed electrical power plant and related facilities; Floridians for Responsible Utility Growth. October 21 1991.
- Florida Power's obligation to pursue integrated resource planning and failure to establish need for proposed facility. Methods to increase scope and scale of demand-side investment.
- 98. Fla. PSC 910833-EI**, petition of Tampa Electric Company for a determination of need for proposed electrical power plant and related facilities; Floridians for Responsible Utility Growth. October 31 1991.
- Tampa Electric's obligation to pursue integrated resource planning and failure to establish need for proposed facility. Methods to increase scope and scale of demand-side investment.

- 99. Penn. PUC I-900005, R-901880;** investigation into demand-side management by electric utilities; Pennsylvania Energy Office. January 10 1992.

Appropriate cost recovery mechanism for Pennsylvania utilities. Purpose and scope of direct cost recovery, lost revenue recovery, and incentives.

- 100. S.C. PSC 91-606-E,** petition of South Carolina Electric and Gas for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a coal-fired plant; South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs. January 20 1992.

Justification of plant certification under integrated resource planning. Failures in SCE&G's DSM planning and company potential for demand-side savings.

- 101. Mass. DPU 92-92,** adequacy of Boston Edison's street-lighting options; Town of Lexington. June 22 1992.

Efficiency and quality of street-lighting options. Boston Edison's treatment of high-quality street lighting. Corrected rate proposal for the Daylux lamp. Ownership of public street lighting.

- 102. S.C. PSC 92-208-E,** integrated-resource plan of Duke Power Company; South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs. August 4 1992.

Problems with Duke Power's DSM screening process, estimation of avoided cost, DSM program design, and integration of demand-side and supply-side planning.

- 103. N.C. UC E-100 Sub 64,** integrated-resource-planning docket; Southern Environmental Law Center. September 29 1992.

General principles of integrated resource planning, DSM screening, and program design. Review of the IRPs of Duke Power Company, Carolina Power & Light Company, and North Carolina Power.

- 104. Ont. EAB Ontario Hydro Demand/Supply Plan Hearings, *Environmental Externalities Valuation and Ontario Hydro's Resource Planning* (3 vols.);** Coalition of Environmental Groups. October 1992.

Valuation of environmental externalities from fossil fuel combustion and the nuclear fuel cycle. Application to Ontario Hydro's supply and demand planning.

- 105. Texas PUC 110000,** application of Houston Lighting and Power company for a certificate of convenience and necessity for the DuPont Project; Destec Energy, Inc. September 28 1992.

Valuation of environmental externalities from fossil fuel combustion and the application to the evaluation of proposed cogeneration facility.

- 106. Maine BEP**, in the matter of the Basin Mills Hydroelectric Project application; Conservation Intervenors. November 16 1992.
- Economic and environmental effects of generation by proposed hydro-electric project.
- 107. Md. PSC 8473**, review of the power sales agreement of Baltimore Gas and Electric with AES Northside; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. November 16 1992.
- Non-price scoring and unquantified benefits; DSM potential as alternative; environmental costs; cost and benefit estimates.
- 108. N.C. UC E-100 Sub 64**, analysis and investigation of least cost integrated resource planning in North Carolina; Southern Environmental Law Center. November 18 1992.
- Demand-side management cost recovery and incentive mechanisms.
- 109. S.C. PSC 92-209-E**, in re Carolina Power & Light Company; South Carolina Department of Consumer Affairs. November 24 1992.
- Demand-side-management planning: objectives, process, cost-effectiveness test, comprehensiveness, lost opportunities. Deficiencies in CP&L's portfolio. Need for economic evaluation of load building.
- 110 Fla. DER** hearings on the Power Plant Siting Act; Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation. December 1992.
- Externality valuation and application in power-plant siting. DSM potential, cost-benefit test, and program designs.
- 111. Md. PSC 8487**, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company electric rate case. Direct, January 13 1993; rebuttal, February 4 1993.
- Class allocation of production plant and O&M; transmission, distribution, and general plant; administrative and general expenses. Marginal cost and rate design.
- 112. Md. PSC 8179**, Approval of amendment no. 2 to Potomac Edison purchase agreement with AES Warrior Run; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. January 29 1993.
- Economic analysis of proposed coal-fired cogeneration facility.
- 113. Mich. PSC U-10102**, Detroit Edison rate case; Michigan United Conservation Clubs. February 17 1993.
- Least-cost planning; energy efficiency planning, potential, screening, avoided costs, cost recovery, and shareholder incentives.

- 114. Ohio PUC** 91-635-EL-FOR, 92-312-EL-FOR, 92-1172-EL-ECP; Cincinnati Gas and Electric demand-management programs; City of Cincinnati. April 1993.
- Demand-side-management planning, program designs, potential savings, and avoided costs.
- 115. Mich. PSC** U-10335, Consumers Power rate case; Michigan United Conservation Clubs. October 1993.
- Least-cost planning; energy efficiency planning, potential, screening, avoided costs, cost recovery, and shareholder incentives.
- 116. Ill. CC** 92-0268, electric-energy plan for Commonwealth Edison; City of Chicago. Direct, February 1 1994; rebuttal, September 1994.
- Cost-effectiveness screening of demand-side management programs and measures; estimates by Commonwealth Edison of costs avoided by DSM and of future cost, capacity, and performance of supply resources.
- 117. FERC** 2422 et al., application of James River–New Hampshire Electric, Public Service of New Hampshire, for licensing of hydro power; Conservation Law Foundation; 1993.
- Cost-effective energy conservation available to the Public Service of New Hampshire; power-supply options; affidavit.
- 118. Vt. PSB** 5270-CV-1,-3, and 5686; Central Vermont Public Service fuel-switching and DSM program design, on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, April 1994; rebuttal, June 1994.
- Avoided costs and screening of controlled water-heating measures; risk, rate impacts, participant costs, externalities, space- and water-heating load, benefit-cost tests.
- 119. Fla. PSC** 930548-EG–930551-EG, conservation goals for Florida electric utilities; Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. April 1994.
- Integrated resource planning, avoided costs, rate impacts, analysis of conservation goals of Florida electric utilities.
- 120. Vt. PSB** 5724, Central Vermont Public Service Corporation rate request; Vermont Department of Public Service. Joint surrebuttal testimony with John Plunkett. August 1994.
- Costs avoided by DSM programs; Costs and benefits of deferring DSM programs.
- 121. Mass. DPU** 94-49, Boston Edison integrated-resource-management plan; Massachusetts Attorney General. August 1994.
- Least-cost planning, modeling, and treatment of risk.

- 122. Mich. PSC U-10554**, Consumers Power Company DSM program and incentive; Michigan Conservation Clubs. November 1994.

Critique of proposed reductions in DSM programs; discussion of appropriate measurements of cost-effectiveness, role of DSM in competitive power markets.

- 123. Mich. PSC U-10702**, Detroit Edison Company cost recovery, on behalf of the Residential Ratepayers Consortium. December 1994.

Impact of proposed changes to DSM plan on energy costs and power-supply-cost-recovery charges. Critique of proposed DSM changes; discussion of appropriate measurements of cost-effectiveness, role of DSM in competitive power markets.

- 124. N.J. BRC EM92030359**, environmental costs of proposed cogeneration; Freehold Cogeneration Associates. November 1994.

Comparison of potential externalities from the Freehold cogeneration project with that from three coal technologies; support for the study “The Externalities of Four Power Plants.”

- 125. Mich. PSC U-10671**, Detroit Edison Company DSM programs; Michigan United Conservation Clubs. January 1995.

Critique of proposal to scale back DSM efforts in light of potential for competition. Loss of savings, increase of customer costs, and decrease of competitiveness. Discussion of appropriate measurements of cost-effectiveness, role of DSM in competitive power markets.

- 126. Mich. PSC U-10710**, power-supply-cost-recovery plan of Consumers Power Company; Residential Ratepayers Consortium. January 1995.

Impact of proposed changes to DSM plan on energy costs and power-supply-cost-recovery charges. Critique of proposed DSM changes; discussion of appropriate measurements of cost-effectiveness, role of DSM in competitive power markets.

- 127. FERC 2458 and 2572**, Bowater–Great Northern Paper hydropower licensing; Conservation Law Foundation. February 1995.

Comments on draft environmental impact statement relating to new licenses for two hydropower projects in Maine. Applicant has not adequately considered how energy conservation can replace energy lost due to habitat-protection or -enhancement measures.

- 128. N.C. UC E-100 Sub 74**, Duke Power and Carolina Power & Light avoided costs; Hydro-Electric–Power Producer’s Group. February 1995.

Critique and proposed revision of avoided costs offered to small hydro-power producers by Duke Power and Carolina Power and Light.

- 129. New Orleans City Council** UD-92-2A and -2B, least-cost IRP for New Orleans Public Service and Louisiana Power & Light; Alliance for Affordable Energy. Direct, February 1995; rebuttal, April 1995.
- Critique of proposal to scale back DSM efforts in light of potential competition.
- 130. D.C. PSC** FC917 II, prudence of DSM expenditures of Potomac Electric Power Company; Potomac Electric Power Company. Rebuttal testimony, February 1995.
- Prudence of utility DSM investment; prudence standards for DSM programs of the Potomac Electric Power Company.
- 131. Ont. Energy Board** EBRO 490, DSM cost recovery and lost-revenue–adjustment mechanism for Consumers Gas Company; Green Energy Coalition. April 1995.
- Demand-side-management cost recovery. Lost-revenue–adjustment mechanism for Consumers Gas Company.
- 132. New Orleans City Council** CD-85-1, New Orleans Public Service rate increase; Alliance for Affordable Energy. Rebuttal, May 1995.
- Allocation of costs and benefits to rate classes.
- 133. Mass. DPU** Docket DPU-95-40, Mass. Electric cost-allocation; Massachusetts Attorney General. June 1995.
- Allocation of costs to rate classes. Critique of cost-of-service study. Implications for industry restructuring.
- 134. Md. PSC** 8697, Baltimore Gas & Electric gas rate increase; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. July 1995.
- Rate design, cost-of-service study, and revenue allocation.
- 135. N.C. UC** E-2 Sub 669. December 1995.
- Need for new capacity. Energy-conservation potential and model programs.
- 136. Arizona CC** U-1933-95-317, Tucson Electric Power rate increase; Residential Utility Consumer Office. January 1996.
- Review of proposed rate settlement. Used-and-usefulness of plant. Rate design. DSM potential.
- 137. Ohio PUC** 95-203-EL-FOR; Campaign for an Energy-Efficient Ohio. February 1996
- Long-term forecast of Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company, especially its DSM portfolio. Opportunities for further cost-effective DSM savings. Tests of cost effectiveness. Role of DSM in light of industry restructuring; alternatives to traditional utility DSM.

- 138 Vt. PSB 5835**, Central Vermont Public Service Company rates; Vermont Department of Public Service. February 1996.
- Design of load-management rates of Central Vermont Public Service Company.
- 139. Md. PSC 8720**, Washington Gas Light DSM; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. May 1996.
- Avoided costs of Washington Gas Light Company; integrated least-cost planning.
- 140. Mass. DPU 96-100**, Massachusetts Utilities’ Stranded Costs; Massachusetts Attorney General. Oral testimony in support of “estimation of Market Value, Stranded Investment, and Restructuring Gains for Major Massachusetts Utilities,” July 1996.
- Stranded costs. Calculation of loss or gain. Valuation of utility assets.
- 141. Mass. DPU 96-70**, Essex County Gas Company rates; Massachusetts Attorney General. July 1996.
- Market-based allocation of gas-supply costs of Essex County Gas Company.
- 142. Mass. DPU 96-60**, Fall River Gas Company rates; Massachusetts Attorney General. Direct, July 1996; surrebuttal, August 1996.
- Market-based allocation of gas-supply costs of Fall River Gas Company.
- 143. Md. PSC 8725**, Maryland electric-utilities merger; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. July 1996.
- Proposed merger of Baltimore Gas & Electric Company, Potomac Electric Power Company, and Constellation Energy. Cost allocation of merger benefits and rate reductions.
- 144. N.H. PUC DR 96-150**, Public Service Company of New Hampshire stranded costs; New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate. December 1996.
- Market price of capacity and energy; value of generation plant; restructuring gain and stranded investment; legal status of PSNH acquisition premium; interim stranded-cost charges.
- 145. Ont. Energy Board EBRO 495**, LRAM and shared-savings incentive for DSM performance of Consumers Gas; Green Energy Coalition. March 1997.
- LRAM and shared-savings incentive mechanisms in rates for the Consumers Gas Company Ltd.
- 146. New York PSC 96-E-0897**, Consolidated Edison restructuring plan; City of New York. April 1997.
- Electric-utility competition and restructuring; critique of proposed settlement of Consolidated Edison Company; stranded costs; market power; rates; market access.

- 147. Vt. PSB 5980**, proposed statewide energy plan; Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, August 1997; rebuttal, December 1997.
- Justification for and estimation of statewide avoided costs; guidelines for distributed IRP.
- 148. Mass. DPU 96-23**, Boston Edison restructuring settlement; Utility Workers Union of America. September 1997.
- Performance incentives proposed for the Boston Edison company.
- 149. Vt. PSB 5983**, Green Mountain Power rate increase; Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, October 1997; rebuttal, December 1997.
- In three separate pieces of prefiled testimony, addressed the Green Mountain Power Corporation's (1) distributed-utility-planning efforts, (2) avoided costs, and (3) prudence of decisions relating to a power purchase from Hydro-Quebec.
- 150. Mass. DPU 97-63**, Boston Edison proposed reorganization; Utility Workers Union of America. October 1997.
- Increased costs and risks to ratepayers and shareholders from proposed reorganization; risks of diversification; diversion of capital from regulated to unregulated affiliates; reduction in Commission authority.
- 151. Mass. DTE 97-111**, Commonwealth Energy proposed restructuring; Cape Cod Light Compact. Joint testimony with Jonathan Wallach, January 1998.
- Critique of proposed restructuring plan filed to satisfy requirements of the electric-utility restructuring act of 1997. Failure of the plan to foster competition and promote the public interest.
- 152. N.H. PUC Docket DR 97-241**, Connecticut Valley Electric fuel and purchased-power adjustments; City of Claremont, N.H. February 1998.
- Prudence of continued power purchase from affiliate; market cost of power; prudence disallowances and cost-of-service ratemaking.
- 153. Md. PSC 8774**, APS-DQE merger; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. February 1998.
- Proposed power-supply arrangements between APS's potential operating subsidiaries; power-supply savings; market power.
- 154. Vt. PSB 6018**, Central Vermont Public Service Co. rate increase; Vermont Department of Public Service. February 1998.
- Prudence of decisions relating to a power purchase from Hydro-Quebec. Reasonableness of avoided-cost estimates. Quality of DU planning.

- 155. Maine PUC 97-580**, Central Maine Power restructuring and rates; Maine Office of Public Advocate. May 1998; Surrebuttal, August 1998.

Determination of stranded costs; gains from sales of fossil, hydro, and biomass plant; treatment of deferred taxes; incentives for stranded-cost mitigation; rate design.

- 156. Mass. DTE 98-89**, purchase of Boston Edison municipal street lighting; Towns of Lexington and Acton. Affidavit, August 1998.

Valuation of municipal streetlighting; depreciation; applicability of unbundled rate.

- 157. Vt. PSB 6107**, Green Mountain Power rate increase; Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, September 1998; Surrebuttal drafted but not filed, November 2000.

Prudence of decisions relating to a power purchase from Hydro-Quebec. Least-cost planning and prudence. Quality of DU planning.

- 158. Mass. DTE 97-120**, Western Massachusetts Electric Company proposed restructuring; Massachusetts Attorney General. Joint testimony with Jonathan Wallach, October 1998. Joint surrebuttal with Jonathan Wallach, January 1999.

Market value of the three Millstone nuclear units under varying assumptions of plant performance and market prices. Independent forecast of wholesale market prices. Value of Pilgrim and TMI-1 asset sales.

- 159. Md. PSC 8794 and 8804**, BG&E restructuring and rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, December 1998; rebuttal, March 1999.

Implementation of restructuring. Valuation of generation assets from comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses. Determination of stranded cost or gain.

- 160. Md. PSC 8795**; Delmarva Power & Light restructuring and rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. December 1998.

Implementation of restructuring. Valuation of generation assets and purchases from comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses. Determination of stranded cost or gain.

- 161. Md. PSC 8797**, Potomac Edison Company restructuring and rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, January 1999; rebuttal, March 1999.

Implementation of restructuring. Valuation of generation assets and purchases from comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses. Determination of stranded cost or gain.

- 162. Conn. DPUC 99-02-05**, Connecticut Light and Power Company stranded costs; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. April 1999.

Projections of market price. Valuation of purchase agreements and nuclear and non-nuclear assets from comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses.

- 163. Conn. DPUC 99-03-04**, United Illuminating Company stranded costs; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. April 1999.

Projections of market price. Valuation of purchase agreements and nuclear assets from comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses.

- 164. Wash. UTC UE-981627**, PacifiCorp–Scottish Power merger, Office of the Attorney General. June 1999.

Review of proposed performance standards and valuation of performance. Review of proposed low-income assistance.

- 165. Utah PSC 98-2035-04**, PacifiCorp–Scottish Power merger, Utah Committee of Consumer Services. June 1999.

Review of proposed performance standards and valuation of performance.

- 166. Conn. DPUC 99-03-35**, United Illuminating Company proposed standard offer; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. July 1999.

Design of standard offer by rate class. Design of price adjustments to preserve rate decrease. Market valuations of nuclear plants. Short-term stranded cost

- 167. Conn. DPUC 99-03-36**, Connecticut Light and Power Company proposed standard offer; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct, July 1999; supplemental, July 1999.

Design of standard offer by rate class. Design of price adjustments to preserve rate decrease. Market valuations of nuclear plants. Short-term stranded cost.

- 168. W. Va. PSC 98-0452-E-GI**, electric-industry restructuring, West Virginia Consumer Advocate. July 1999.

Market value of generating assets of, and restructuring gain for, Potomac Edison, Monongahela Power, and Appalachian Power. Comparable-sales and cash-flow analyses.

- 169. Ont. Energy Board RP-1999-0034**, Ontario performance-based rates; Green Energy Coalition. September 1999.

Rate design. Recovery of demand-side-management costs under PBR. Incremental costs.

- 170. Conn. DPUC 99-08-01**, standards for utility restructuring; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct, November 1999; supplemental, January 2000.

Appropriate role of regulation. T&D reliability and service quality. Performance standards and customer guarantees. Assessing generation adequacy in a competitive market.

- 171. Conn. Superior Court** CV 99-049-7239, Connecticut Light and Power Company stranded costs; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Affidavit, December 1999.

Errors of the Conn. DPUC in deriving discounted-cash-flow valuations for Millstone and Seabrook, and in setting minimum bid price.

- 172. Conn. Superior Court** CV 99-049-7597, United Illuminating Company stranded costs; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. December 1999.

Errors of the Conn. DPUC, in its discounted-cash-flow computations, in selecting performance assumptions for Seabrook, and in setting minimum bid price.

- 173. Ont. Energy Board** RP-1999-0044, Ontario Hydro transmission-cost allocation and rate design; Green Energy Coalition. January 2000.

Cost allocation and rate design. Net vs. gross load billing. Export and wheeling-through transactions. Environmental implications of utility proposals.

- 174. Utah PSC** 99-2035-03, PacifiCorp Sale of Centralia plant, mine, and related facilities; Utah Committee of Consumer Services. January 2000.

Prudence of sale and management of auction. Benefits to ratepayers. Allocation and rate treatment of gain.

- 175. Conn. DPUC** 99-09-12, Nuclear Divestiture by Connecticut Light & Power and United Illuminating; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. January 2000.

Market for nuclear assets. Optimal structure of auctions. Value of minority rights. Timing of divestiture.

- 176. Ont. Energy Board** RP-1999-0017, Union Gas PBR proposal; Green Energy Coalition. March 2000.

Lost-revenue-adjustment and shared-savings incentive mechanisms for Union Gas DSM programs. Standards for review of targets and achievements, computation of lost revenues. Need for DSM expenditure true-up mechanism.

- 177. N.Y. PSC** 99-S-1621, Consolidated Edison steam rates; City of New York. April 2000.

Allocation of costs of former cogeneration plants, and of net proceeds of asset sale. Economic justification for steam-supply plans. Depreciation rates. Weather normalization and other rate adjustments.

- 178. Maine PUC** 99-666, Central Maine Power alternative rate plan; Maine Public Advocate. Direct, May 2000; Surrebuttal, August 2000.

Likely merger savings. Savings and rate reductions from recent mergers. Implications for rates.

- 179. Mass. EFSB 97-4**, Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company gas-pipeline proposal; Town of Wilbraham, Mass. June 2000.
- Economic justification for natural-gas pipeline. Role and jurisdiction of EFSB.
- 180. Conn. DPUC 99-09-03**; Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation merger and rate plan; Connecticut office of Consumer Counsel. September 2000.
- Performance-based ratemaking in light of mergers. Allocation of savings from merger. Earnings-sharing mechanism.
- 181. Conn. DPUC 99-09-12RE01**, Proposed Millstone sale; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. November 2000.
- Requirements for review of auction of generation assets. Allocation of proceeds between units.
- 182. Mass. DTE 01-25**, Purchase of streetlights from Commonwealth Electric; Cape Light Compact. January 2001
- Municipal purchase of streetlights; Calculation of purchase price under state law; Determination of accumulated depreciation by asset.
- 183. Conn. DPUC 00-12-01 and 99-09-12RE03**, Connecticut Light & Power rate design and standard offer; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. March 2001.
- Rate design and standard offer under restructuring law; Future rate impacts; Transition to restructured regime; Comparison of Connecticut and California restructuring challenges.
- 184. Vt. PSB 6460 & 6120**, Central Vermont Public Service rates; Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, March 2001; Surrebuttal, April 2001.
- Review of decision in early 1990s to commit to long-term uneconomic purchase from Hydro Québec. Calculation of present damages from imprudence.
- 185. N.J. BPU EM00020106**, Atlantic City Electric Company sale of fossil plants; New Jersey Ratepayer Advocate. Affidavit, May 2001.
- Comparison of power-supply contracts. Comparison of plant costs to replacement power cost. Allocation of sales proceeds between subsidiaries.
- 186. N.J. BPU GM00080564**, Public Service Electric and Gas transfer of gas supply contracts; New Jersey Ratepayer Advocate. Direct, May 2001.
- Transfer of gas transportation contracts to unregulated affiliate. Potential for market power in wholesale gas supply and electric generation. Importance of reliable gas supply. Valuation of contracts. Effect of proposed requirements contract on rates. Regulation and design of standard-offer service.

- 187. Conn. DPUC 99-04-18 Phase 3, 99-09-03 Phase 2; Southern Connecticut Natural Gas and Connecticut Natural Gas rates and charges; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct, June 2001; supplemental, July 2001.**
- Identifying, quantifying, and allocating merger-related gas-supply savings between ratepayers and shareholders. Establishing baselines. Allocations between affiliates. Unaccounted-for gas.
- 188. N.J. BPU EX01050303, New Jersey electric companies' procurement of basic supply; New Jersey Ratepayer Advocate. August 2001.**
- Review of proposed statewide auction for purchase of power requirements. Market power. Risks to ratepayers of proposed auction.
- 189. N.Y. PSC 00-E-1208, Consolidated Edison rates; City of New York. October 2001.**
- Geographic allocation of stranded costs. Locational and postage-stamp rates. Causation of stranded costs. Relationship between market prices for power and stranded costs.
- 190. Mass. DTE 01-56, Berkshire Gas Company; Massachusetts Attorney General. October 2001.**
- Allocation of gas costs by load shape and season. Competition and cost allocation.
- 191. N.J. BPU EM00020106, Atlantic City Electric proposed sale of fossil plants; New Jersey Ratepayer Advocate. December 2001.**
- Current market value of generating plants vs. proposed purchase price.
- 192. Vt. PSB 6545, Vermont Yankee proposed sale; Vermont Department of Public Service. January 2002.**
- Comparison of sales price to other nuclear sales. Evaluation of auction design and implementation. Review of auction manager's valuation of bids.
- 193. Conn. Siting Council 217, Connecticut Light & Power proposed transmission line from Plumtree to Norwalk; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. March 2002.**
- Nature of transmission problems. Potential for conservation and distributed resources to defer, reduce or avoid transmission investment. CL&P transmission planning process. Joint testimony with John Plunkett.
- 194. Vt. PSB 6596, Citizens Utilities rates; Vermont Department of Public Service. Direct, March 2002; rebuttal, May 2002.**
- Review of 1991 decision to commit to long-term uneconomic purchase from Hydro Québec. Alternatives; role of transmission constraints. Calculation of present damages from imprudence.

- 195. Conn. DPUC 01-10-10, United Illuminating rate plan; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. April 2002**
- Allocation of excess earnings between shareholders and ratepayers. Asymmetry in treatment of over- and under-earning. Accelerated amortization of stranded costs. Effects of power-supply developments on ratepayer risks. Effect of proposed rate plan on utility risks and required return.
- 196. Conn. DPUC 01-12-13RE01, Seabrook proposed sale; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. July 2002**
- Comparison of sales price to other nuclear sales. Evaluation of auction design and implementation. Assessment of valuation of purchased-power contracts.
- 197. Ont. Energy Board RP-2002-0120, review of transmission-system code; Green Energy Coalition. October 2002.**
- Cost allocation. Transmission charges. Societal cost-effectiveness. Environmental externalities.
- 198. N.J. BPU ER02080507, Jersey Central Power & Light rates; N.J. Division of the Ratepayer Advocate. Phase I December 2002; Phase II (oral) July 2003.**
- Prudence of procurement of electrical supply. Documentation of procurement decisions. Comparison of costs for subsidiaries with fixed versus flow-through cost recovery.
- 199. Conn. DPUC 03-07-02, CL&P rates; AARP. October 2003**
- Proposed distribution investments, including prudence of prior management of distribution system and utility's failure to make investments previously funded in rates. Cost controls. Application of rate cap. Legislative intent.
- 200. Conn. DPUC 03-07-01, CL&P transitional standard offer; AARP. November 2003.**
- Application of rate cap. Legislative intent.
- 201. Vt. PSB 6596, Vermont Electric Power Company and Green Mountain Power Northwest Reliability transmission plan; Conservation Law Foundation. December 2003.**
- Inadequacies of proposed transmission plan. Failure of to perform least-cost planning. Distributed resources.
- 202. Ohio PUC 03-2144-EL-ATA, Ohio Edison, Cleveland Electric, and Toledo Edison Cos. rates and transition charges; Green Mountain Energy Co. February 2004.**
- Pricing of standard-offer service in competitive markets. Critique of anticompetitive features of proposed standard-offer supply, including non-bypassable charges.

- 203. N.Y. PSC 03-G-1671 & 03-S-1672**, Consolidated Edison company steam and gas rates; City of New York. Direct March 2004; rebuttal April 2004; settlement June 2004.

Prudence and cost allocation for the East River Repowering Project. Gas and steam energy conservation. Opportunities for cogeneration at existing steam plants.

- 204. N.Y. PSC 04-E-0572**, Consolidated Edison rates and performance; City of New York. Direct, September 2004; rebuttal, October 2004.

Consolidated Edison's role in promoting adequate supply and demand resources. Integrated resource and T&D planning. Performance-based ratemaking and streetlighting.

- 205. Ont. Energy Board RP 2004-0188**, cost recovery and DSM for Ontario electric-distribution utilities; Green Energy Coalition. Exhibit, December 2004.

Differences in ratemaking requirements for customer-side conservation and demand management versus utility-side efficiency improvements. Recovery of lost revenues or incentives. Reconciliation mechanism.

- 206. Mass. DTE 04-65**, Cambridge Electric Light Co. streetlighting; City of Cambridge. Direct, October 2004; supplemental, January 2005.

Calculation of purchase price of street lights by the City of Cambridge.

- 207. N.Y. PSC 04-W-1221**, rates, rules, charges, and regulations of United Water New Rochelle; Town of Eastchester and City of New Rochelle. Direct, February 2005.

Size and financing of proposed interconnection. Rate design. Water-mains replacement and related cost recovery. Lost and unaccounted-for water.

- 208. N.Y. PSC 05-M-0090**, system-benefits charge; City of New York. Comments, March 2005.

Assessment and scope of, and potential for, New York system-benefits charges.

- 209. Md. PSC 9036**, Baltimore Gas & Electric rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, August 2005.

Allocation of costs. Design of rates. Interruptible and firm rates.

- 210. B.C. UC 3698388**, British Columbia Hydro resource-acquisition plan; British Columbia Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of Canada BC Chapter. September 2005.

Renewable energy and DSM. Economic tests of cost-effectiveness. Costs avoided by DSM.

- 211. Conn. DPUC 05-07-18**, financial effect of long-term power contracts; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. September 2005.

Assessment of effect of DSM, distributed generation, and capacity purchases on financial condition of utilities.

- 212. Conn. DPUC 03-07-01RE03 & 03-07-15RE02**, incentives for power procurement; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct, September 2005; Additional, April 2006.

Utility obligations for generation procurement. Application of standards for utility incentives. Identification and quantification of effects of timing, load characteristics, and product definition.

- 213. Conn. DPUC Docket 05-10-03**, Connecticut L&P; time-of-use, interruptible, and seasonal rates; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct and Supplemental Testimony February 2006.

Seasonal and time-of-use differentiation of generation, congestion, transmission and distribution costs; fixed and variable peak-period timing; identification of pricing seasons and seasonal peak periods; cost-effectiveness of time-of-use rates.

- 214. Ont. Energy Board Case EB-2005-0520**, Union Gas rates; School Energy Coalition. Evidence, April 2006.

Rate design related to splitting commercial rate class into two classes. New break point, cost allocation, customer charges, commodity rate blocks.

- 215. Ont. Energy Board EB-2006-0021**, Natural-gas demand-side-management generic issues proceeding; School Energy Coalition. Evidence, June 2006.

Multi-year planning and budgeting; lost-revenue adjustment mechanism; determining savings for incentives; oversight; program screening.

- 216. Ind. URC 42943 and 43046**, Vectren Energy DSM proceedings; Citizens Action Coalition. Direct, June 2006.

Rate decoupling and energy-efficiency goals.

- 217. Penn. PUC 00061346**, Duquesne Lighting; Real-time pricing; PennFuture. Direct, July 2006; surrebuttal August 2006.

Real-time and time-dependent pricing; benefits of time-dependent pricing; appropriate metering technology; real-time rate design and customer information

- 218. Penn. PUC R-00061366 et al.**, rate-transition-plan proceedings of Metropolitan Edison and Pennsylvania Electric; Real-time pricing; PennFuture. Direct, July 2006; surrebuttal August 2006.

Real-time and time-dependent pricing; appropriate metering technology; real-time rate design and customer information.

- 219. Conn. DPUC 06-01-08**, Connecticut L&P procurement of power for standard service and last-resort service; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Reports and technical hearings quarterly since September 2006 to October 2013.
- Conduct of auction; review of bids; comparison to market prices; selection of winning bidders.
- 220. Conn. DPUC 06-01-08**, United Illuminating procurement of power for standard service and last-resort service; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Reports and technical hearings quarterly August 2006 to October 2013.
- Conduct of auction; review of bids; comparison to market prices; selection of winning bidders.
- 221. N.Y. PSC Case No. 06-M-1017**, policies, practices, and procedures for utility commodity supply service; City of New York. Comments, November and December 2006.
- Multi-year contracts, long-term planning, new resources, procurement by utilities and other entities, cost recovery.
- 222. Conn. DPUC 06-01-08**, procurement of power for standard service and last-resort service, lessons learned; Connecticut Office Of Consumer Counsel. Comments and Technical Conferences December 2006 and January 2007.
- Sharing of data and sources; benchmark prices; need for predictability, transparency and adequate review; utility-owned resources; long-term firm contracts.
- 223. Ohio PUC PUCO 05-1444-GA-UNC**, recovery of conservation costs, decoupling, and rate-adjustment mechanisms for Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio; Ohio Consumers' Counsel. February 2007.
- Assessing cost-effectiveness of natural-gas energy-efficiency programs. Calculation of avoided costs. Impact on rates. System benefits of DSM.
- 224. N.Y. PSC 06-G-1332**, Consolidated Edison Rates and Regulations; City of New York. March 2007.
- Gas energy efficiency: benefits to customers, scope of cost-effective programs, revenue decoupling, shareholder incentives.
- 225. Alb. EUB 1500878**, ATCo Electric rates; Association of Municipal Districts & Counties and Alberta Federation of Rural Electrical Associations. May 2007.
- Direct assignment of distribution costs to street lighting. Cost causation and cost allocation. Minimum-system and zero-intercept classification.

- 226. Conn. DPUC 07-04-24**, review of capacity contracts under Energy Independence Act; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct (with Jonathan Wallach), June 2007.

Assessment of proposed capacity contracts for new combined-cycle, peakers and DSM. Evaluation of contracts for differences, modeling of energy, capacity and forward-reserve markets. Corrections of errors in computation of costs, valuation of energy-price effects of peakers, market-driven expansion plans and retirements, market response to contracted resource additions, DSM proposal evaluation.

- 227. N.Y. PSC 07-E-0524**, Consolidated Edison electric rates; City of New York. September 2007.

Energy-efficiency planning. Recovery of DSM costs. Decoupling of rates from sales. Company incentives for DSM. Advanced metering. Resource planning.

- 228. Man. PUB 136-07**, Manitoba Hydro rates; Resource Conservation Manitoba and Time to Respect Earth's Ecosystem. February 2008.

Revenue allocation, rate design, and demand-side management. Estimation of marginal costs and export revenues.

- 229. Mass. EFSB 07-7**, DPU 07-58 & -59; proposed Brockton Power Company plant; Alliance Against Power Plant Location. March 2008

Regional supply and demand conditions. Effects of plant construction and operation on regional power supply and emissions.

- 230. Conn. DPUC 08-01-01**, peaking generation projects; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct (with Jonathan Wallach), April 2008.

Assessment of proposed peaking projects. Valuation of peaking capacity. Modeling of energy margin, forward reserves, other project benefits.

- 231. Ont. Energy Board 2007-0905**, Ontario Power Generation payments; Green Energy Coalition. April 2008.

Cost of capital for Hydro and nuclear investments. Financial risks of nuclear power.

- 232. Utah PSC 07-035-93**, Rocky Mountain Power Rates; Utah Committee of Consumer Services. July 2008

Cost allocation and rate design. Cost of service. Correct classification of generation, transmission, and purchases.

- 233. Ont. Energy Board 2007-0707**, Ontario Power Authority integrated system plan; Green Energy Coalition, Penimba Institute, and Ontario Sustainable Energy Association. Evidence (with Jonathan Wallach and Richard Mazzini), August 2008.

Critique of integrated system plan. Resource cost and characteristics; finance cost. Development of least-cost green-energy portfolio.

- 234. N.Y. PSC 08-E-0596**, Consolidated Edison electric rates; City of New York. September 2008.
- Estimated bills, automated meter reading, and advanced metering. Aggregation of building data. Targeted DSM program design. Using distributed generation to defer T&D investments.
- 235. Conn. DPUC 08-07-01**, Integrated resource plan; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. September 2008.
- Integrated resource planning scope and purpose. Review of modeling and assumptions. Review of energy efficiency, peakers, demand response, nuclear, and renewables. Structuring of procurement contracts.
- 236. Man. PUB 2008 MH EIR**, Manitoba Hydro intensive industrial rates; Resource Conservation Manitoba and Time to Respect Earth's Ecosystem. November 2008.
- Marginal costs. Rate design. Time-of-use rates.
- 237. Md. PSC 9036**, Columbia Gas rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. January 2009.
- Cost allocation and rate design. Critique of cost-of-service studies.
- 238. Vt. PSB 7440**, extension of authority to operate Vermont Yankee; Conservation Law Foundation and Vermont Public Interest Research Group. Direct, February 2009; Surrebuttal, May 2009.
- Adequacy of decommissioning funding. Potential benefits to Vermont of revenue-sharing provision. Risks to Vermont of underfunding decommissioning fund.
- 239. N.S. UARB M01439**, Nova Scotia Power DSM and cost recovery; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. May 2009.
- Recovery of demand-side-management costs and lost revenue.
- 240. N.S. UARB M01496**, proposed biomass project; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. June 2009.
- Procedural, planning, and risk issues with proposed power-purchase contract. Biomass price index. Nova Scotia Power's management of other renewable contracts.
- 241. Conn. Siting Council 370A**, Connecticut Light & Power transmission projects; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. July 2009. Also filed and presented in **MA EFSB 08-02**, February 2010.
- Need for transmission projects. Modeling of transmission system. Realistic modeling of operator responses to contingencies

- 242. Mass. DPU 09-39**, NGrid rates; Mass. Department of Energy Resources. August 2009.
- Revenue-decoupling mechanism. Automatic rate adjustments.
- 243. Utah PSC 09-035-23**, Rocky Mountain Power rates; Utah Office of Consumer Services. Direct, October 2009; rebuttal, November 2009.
- Cost-of-service study. Cost allocators for generation, transmission, and substation.
- 244. Utah PSC 09-035-15**, Rocky Mountain Power energy-cost-adjustment mechanism; Utah Office of Consumer Services. Direct, November 2009; surrebuttal, January 2010.
- Automatic cost-adjustment mechanisms. Net power costs and related risks. Effects of energy-cost-adjustment mechanisms on utility performance.
- 245. Penn. PUC R-2009-2139884**, Philadelphia Gas Works energy efficiency and cost recovery; Philadelphia Gas Works. December 2009.
- Avoided gas costs. Recovery of efficiency-program costs and lost revenues. Rate impacts of DSM.
- 246. B.C. UC 3698573**, British Columbia Hydro rates; British Columbia Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club British Columbia. February 2010.
- Rate design and energy efficiency.
- 247. Ark. PSC 09-084-U**, Entergy Arkansas rates; National Audubon Society and Audubon Arkansas. Direct, February 2010; surrebuttal, April 2010.
- Recovery of revenues lost to efficiency programs. Determination of lost revenues. Incentive and recovery mechanisms.
- 248. Ark. PSC 10-010-U**, Energy efficiency; National Audubon Society and Audubon Arkansas. Direct, March 2010; reply, April 2010.
- Regulatory framework for utility energy-efficiency programs. Fuel-switching programs. Program administration, oversight, and coordination. Rationale for commercial and industrial efficiency programs. Benefit of energy efficiency.
- 249. Ark. PSC 08-137-U**, Generic rate-making; National Audubon Society and Audubon Arkansas. Direct, March 2010; supplemental, October 2010; reply, October 2010.
- Calculation of avoided costs. Recovery of utility energy-efficiency-program costs and lost revenues. Shareholder incentives for efficiency-program performance.

250. Plymouth, Mass., Superior Court Civil Action No. PLCV2006-00651-B (Hingham Municipal Lighting Plant v. Gas Recovery Systems LLC et al.), Breach of agreement; defendants. Affidavit, May 2010.

Contract interpretation. Meaning of capacity measures. Standard practices in capacity agreements. Power-pool rules and practices. Power planning and procurement.

251. N.S. UARB M02961, Port Hawkesbury biomass project; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. June 2010.

Least-cost planning and renewable-energy requirements. Feasibility versus alternatives. Unknown or poorly estimated costs.

252. Mass. DPU 10-54, NGrid purchase of long-term power from Cape Wind; Natural Resources Defense Council et al. July 2010.

Effects of renewable-energy projects on gas and electric market prices. Impacts on system reliability and peak loads. Importance of PPAs to renewable development. Effectiveness of proposed contracts as price edges.

253. Md. PSC 9230, Baltimore Gas & Electric rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, July 2010; rebuttal, surrebuttal, August 2010.

Allocation of gas- and electric-distribution costs. Critique of minimum-system analyses and direct assignment of shared plant. Allocation of environmental compliance costs. Allocation of revenue increases among rate classes.

254. Ont. Energy Board 2010-0008, Ontario Power Generation facilities charges; Green Energy Coalition. Evidence, August 2010.

Critique of including a return on CWIP in current rates. Setting cost of capital by business segment.

255. N.S. UARB Matter No. 03454, Heritage Gas rates; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. October 2010.

Cost allocation. Cost of capital. Effect on rates of growth in sales.

256. Man. PUB 17/10, Manitoba Hydro rates; Resource Conservation Manitoba and Time to Respect Earth's Ecosystem. December 2010.

Revenue-allocation and rate design. DSM program.

257. N.S. UARB M03665, Nova Scotia Power depreciation rates; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. February 2011.

Depreciation and rates.

258. New Orleans City Council UD-08-02, Entergy IRP rules; Alliance for Affordable Energy. December 2010.

Integrated resource planning: Purpose, screening, cost recovery, and generation planning.

259. N.S. UARB M03665, depreciation Rates of Nova Scotia Power; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. February 2011.

Steam-plant retirement dates, post-retirement use, timing of decommissioning and removal costs.

260. N.S. UARB M03632, renewable-energy community-based feed-in tariffs; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. March 2011.

Adjustments to estimate of cost-based feed-in tariffs. Rate effects of feed-in tariffs.

261. Mass. EFSB 10-2/DPU 10-131, 10-132; NStar transmission; Town of Sandwich, Mass. Direct, May 2011; Surrebuttal, June 2011.

Need for new transmission; errors in load forecasting; probability of power outages.

262. Utah PSC 10-035-124, Rocky Mountain Power rate case; Utah Office of Consumer Services. June 2011.

Load data, allocation of generation plants, scrubbers, power purchases, and service drops. Marginal cost study: inclusion of all load-related transmission projects, critique of minimum- and zero-intercept methods for distribution. Residential rate design.

263. N.S. UARB M04104; Nova Scotia Power general rate application; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. August 2011.

Cost allocation: allocation of costs of wind power and substations. Rate design: marginal-cost-based rates, demand charges, time-of-use rates.

264. N.S. UARB M04175, Load-retention tariff; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. August 2011.

Marginal cost of serving very large industrial electric loads; risk, incentives and rate design.

265. Ark. PSC 10-101-R, Rulemaking re self-directed energy efficiency for large customers; National Audubon Society and Audubon Arkansas. July 2011.

Structuring energy-efficiency programs for large customers.

- 266. Okla.** CC PUD 201100077, current and pending federal regulations and legislation affecting Oklahoma utilities; Sierra Club. Comments July, October 2011; presentation July 2011.

Challenges facing Oklahoma coal plants; efficiency, renewable and conventional resources available to replace existing coal plants; integrated environmental compliance planning.

- 267. Nevada** PUC 11-08019, integrated analysis of resource acquisition, Sierra Club. Comments, September 2011; hearing, October 2011.

Scoping of integrated review of cost-effectiveness of continued operation of Reid Gardner 1–3 coal units.

- 268. La.** PSC R-30021, Louisiana integrated-resource-planning rules; Alliance for Affordable Energy. Comments, October 2011.

Scoping of integrated review of cost-effectiveness of continued operation of Reid Gardner 1–3 coal units.

- 269. Okla.** CC PUD 201100087, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company electric rates; Sierra Club. November 2011.

Resource monitoring and acquisition. Benefits to ratepayers of energy conservation and renewables. Supply planning

- 270. Ky.** PSC 2011-00375, Kentucky utilities' purchase and construction of power plants; Sierra Club and National Resources Defense Council. December 2011.

Assessment of resources, especially renewables. Treatment of risk. Treatment of future environmental costs.

- 271. N.S.** UARB M04819, demand-side-management plan of Efficiency Nova Scotia; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. May 2012.

Avoided costs. Allocation of costs. Reporting of bill effects.

- 272. Kansas** CC 12-GIMX-337-GIV, utility energy-efficiency programs; The Climate and Energy Project. June 2012.

Cost-benefit tests for energy-efficiency programs. Collaborative program design.

- 273. N.S.** UARB M04862, Port Hawksbury load-retention mechanism; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. June 2012.

Effect on ratepayers of proposed load-retention tariff. Incremental capital costs, renewable-energy costs, and costs of operating biomass cogeneration plant.

- 274. Utah** PSC 11-035-200, Rocky Mountain Power Rates; Utah Office of Consumer Council. June 2012.

Cost allocation. Estimation of marginal customer costs.

- 275. Ark. PSC 12-008-U**, environmental controls at Southwestern Electric Power Company's Flint Creek plant; Sierra Club. Direct, June 2012; rebuttal, August 2012; further, March 2013.

Costs and benefits of environmental retrofit to permit continued operation of coal plant, versus other options including purchased gas generation, efficiency, and wind. Fuel-price projections. Need for transmission upgrades.

- 276. U.S. EPA EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0021**, air-quality implementation plan; Sierra Club. September 2012.

Costs, financing, and rate effects of Apache coal-plant scrubbers. Relative incomes in service territories of Arizona Coop and other utilities.

- 277. Arkansas PSC Docket No. 07-016-U**; Entergy Arkansas' integrated resource plan; Audubon Arkansas. Comments, September 2012.

Estimation of future gas prices. Estimation of energy-efficiency potential. Screening of resource decisions. Wind costs.

- 278. Vt. PSB 7862**, Entergy Nuclear Vermont and Entergy Nuclear Operations petition to operate Vermont Yankee; Conservation Law Foundation. October 2012.

Effect of continued operation on market prices. Value of revenue-sharing agreement. Risks of underfunding decommissioning fund.

- 279. Man. PUB 2012-13 GRA**, Manitoba Hydro rates; Green Action Centre. November 2012.

Estimation of marginal costs. Fuel switching.

- 280. N.S. UARB M05339**, Capital Plan of Nova Scotia Power; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. January 2013.

Economic and financial modeling of investment. Treatment of AFUDC.

- 281. N.S. UARB M05416**, South Canoe wind project of Nova Scotia Power; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. January 2013.

Revenue requirements. Allocation of tax benefits. Ratemaking.

- 282. N.S. UARB 05419**; Maritime Link transmission project and related contracts, Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate and Small Business Advocate. Direct, April 2013; supplemental (with Seth Parker), November 2013.

Load forecast, including treatment of economy energy sales. Wind power cost forecasts. Cost effectiveness and risk of proposed project. Opportunities for improving economics of project.

- 283. Ont. Energy Board** 2012-0451/0433/0074, Enbridge Gas Greater Toronto Area project; Green Energy Coalition. June 2013, revised August 2013.
- Estimating gas pipeline and distribution costs avoidable through gas DSM and curtailment of electric generation. Integrating DSM and pipeline planning.
- 284. N.S. UARB** 05092, tidal-energy feed-in-tariff rate; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. August 2013.
- Purchase rate for test and demonstration projects. Maximizing benefits under rate-impact caps. Pricing to maximize provincial advantage as a hub for emerging tidal-power industry.
- 285. N.S. UARB** 05473, Nova Scotia Power 2013 cost-of-service study; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. October 2013.
- Cost-allocation and rate design.
- 286. B.C. UC** 3698715 & 3698719; performance-based ratemaking plan for FortisBC companies; British Columbia Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club British Columbia. Direct (with John Plunkett), December 2013.
- Rationale for enhanced gas and electric DSM portfolios. Correction of utility estimates of electric avoided costs. Errors in program screening. Program potential. Recommended program ramp-up rates.
- 287. Conn. PURA** Docket No. 14-01-01, Connecticut Light and Power Procurement of Standard Service and Last-Resort Service. July and October 2014.
- Proxy for review of bids. Oversight of procurement and selection process.
- 288. Conn. PURA** Docket No. 14-01-02, United Illuminating Procurement of Standard Service and Last-Resort Service. January, April, July, and October 2014.
- Proxy for review of bids. Oversight of procurement and selection process.
- 289. Man. PUB** 2014, need for and alternatives to proposed hydro-electric facilities; Green Action Centre. Evidence (with Wesley Stevens) February 2014.
- Potential for fuel switching, DSM, and wind to meet future demand.
- 290. Utah PSC** 13-035-184, Rocky Mountain Power Rates; Utah Office of Consumer Services. May 2014.
- Class cost allocation. Classification and allocation of generation plant and purchased power. Principles of cost-causation. Design of backup rates.
- 291. Minn. PSC** E002/GR-13-868, Northern States Power rates; Clean Energy Intervenors. Direct, June 2014; rebuttal, July 2014; surrebuttal, August 2014.
- Inclining-block residential rate design. Rationale for minimizing customer charges.

- 292. Cal. PUC** Rulemaking 12-06-013, electric rates and rate structures; Natural Resources Defense Council. September 2014.

Redesigning residential rates to simplify tier structure while maintaining efficiency and conservation incentives. Effect of marginal price on energy consumption. Realistic modeling of consumer price response. Benefits of minimizing customer charges.

- 293. Md. PSC** 9361, proposed merger of PEPCo Holdings into Exelon; Sierra Club and Chesapeake Climate Action Network. Direct, December 2014; surrebuttal, January 2015.

Effect of proposed merger on Consumer bills, renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate goals.

- 294. N.S. UARB** M06514, 2015 capital-expenditure plan of Nova Scotia Power; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. January 2015.

Economic evaluation of proposed projects. Treatment of AFUDC, overheads, and replacement costs of lost generation. Computation of rate effects of spending plan.

- 295. Md. PSC** 9153 et al., Maryland energy-efficiency programs; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. January 2015.

Costs avoided by demand-side management. Demand-reduction-induced price effects.

- 296. Québec Régie de L'énergie** R-3876-2013 phase 1, Gaz Métro cost allocation and rate structure; Regroupement des organismes environnementaux en énergie and Union des consommateurs. February 2015

Classification of the area-spanning system; minimum system and more realistic approaches. Allocation of overhead, energy-efficiency, gas-supply, engineering-and-planning, and billing costs.

- 297. Conn. PURA** Docket No. 15-01-01, Connecticut Light and Power Procurement of Standard Service and Last-Resort Service. February and July 2015.

Proxy for review of bids. Oversight of procurement and selection process.

- 298. Conn. PURA** Docket No. 15-01-02, United Illuminating Procurement of Standard Service and Last-Resort Service. February, July, and October 2015.

Proxy for review of bids. Oversight of procurement and selection process.

- 299. Ky. PSC** 2014-00371, Kentucky Utilities electric rates; Sierra Club. March 2015.

Review basis for higher customer charges, including cost allocation. Design of time-of-day rates.

- 300. Ky. PSC 2014-00372**, Louisville Gas and Electric electric rates; Sierra Club. March 2015.
- Review basis for higher customer charges, including cost allocation. Design of time-of-day rates.
- 301. Mich. PSC U-17767**, DTE Electric Company rates; Michigan Environmental Council, Sierra Club, and Natural Resource Defense Council. May 2015.
- Cost effectiveness of pollution-control retrofits versus retirements. Market prices. Costs of alternatives.
- 302. N.S. UARB M06733**, supply agreement between Efficiency One and Nova Scotia Power; Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. June 2015.
- Avoided costs. Cost-effectiveness screening of DSM. Portfolio design. Affordability and bill effects.
- 303. Penn. PUC P-2014-2459362**, Philadelphia Gas Works DSM, universal-service, and energy-conservation plans; Philadelphia Gas Works. Direct, May 2015; Rebuttal, July 2015.
- Avoided costs. Recovery of lost margin.
- 304. Ont. Energy Board EB-2015-0029/0049**, 2015–2020 DSM Plans Of Enbridge Gas Distribution and Union Gas, Green Energy Coalition. Evidence July 31, 2015, Corrected August 12, 2015.
- Avoided costs: price mitigation, carbon prices, marginal gas supply costs, avoidable distribution costs, avoidable upstream costs (including utility-owned pipeline facilities).
- 305. PUC Ohio Case No. 14-1693-EL-RDR**, AEP Ohio Affiliate purchased-power agreement, Sierra Club. September 2015.
- Economics of proposed PPA, market energy and capacity projections. Risk shifting. Lack of price stability and reliability benefits. Market viability of PPA units.
- 306. N.S. UARB Matter No. M06214**, NS Power Renewable-to-Retail rate, Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. November 2015.
- Review of proposed design of rate for third-party sales of renewable energy to retail customers. Distribution, transmission and generation charges.
- 307. PUC Texas Docket No. 44941**, El Paso Electric rates; Energy Freedom Coalition of America. December 2015.
- Cost allocation and rate design. Effect of proposed DG rate on solar customers. Load shapes of residential customers with and without solar. Problems with demand charges.

- 308. N.S. UARB** Matter No. M07176, NS Power 2016 Capital Expenditures Plan, Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. February 2016.

Economic evaluation of proposed projects, including replacement energy costs and modeling of equipment failures. Treatment of capitalized overheads and depreciation cash flow in computation of rate effects of spending plan.

- 309. Md. PSC** Case No. 9406, BGE Application for recovery of Smart Meter costs, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct February 2016, Rebuttal March 2016, Surrebuttal March 2016.

Assessment of benefits of Smart Meter programs for energy revenue, load reductions and price mitigation; capacity load reductions and price mitigation; free riders and load shifting in peak-time rebate (PTR) program; cost of PTR participation; effect of load reductions on PJM capacity obligations, capacity prices and T&D costs.

- 310. City of Austin TX**, Austin Energy 2016 Rate Review, Sierra Club and Public Citizen. May 2016

Allocation of generation costs. Residential rate design. Geographical rate differentials. Recognition of coal-plant retirement costs.

- 311. Manitoba PUB**, Manitoba Hydro Cost of Service Methodology Review, Green Action Centre. June 2016, reply August 2016.

Allocation of generation costs. Identifying generation-related transmission assets. Treatment of subtransmission. Classification of distribution lines. Allocation of distribution substations and lines. Customer allocators. Shared service drops.

- 312. Md. PSC** Case No. 9418, PEPCo Application for recovery of Smart Meter costs, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct July 2016, Rebuttal August 2016, Surrebuttal September 2016.

Assessment of benefits of Smart Meter programs for energy revenue, load reductions and price mitigation; load reductions in dynamic-pricing (DP) program; cost of DP participation; effect of load reductions on PJM capacity obligations, capacity prices and T&D costs.

- 313. Md. PSC** Case No. 9424, Delmarva P&L Application for recovery of Smart Meter costs, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct September 2016, Rebuttal October 2016, Surrebuttal October 2016.

Estimation of effects of Smart Meter programs—dynamic pricing (DP), conservation voltage reduction and an informational program—on wholesale revenues, wholesale prices and avoided costs; estimating load reductions from the DP program; cost of DP participation; effect of load reductions on PJM capacity obligations, capacity prices and T&D costs.

- 314. N.H. PUC** Docket No. DE 16-576, Alternative Net Metering Tariffs, Conservation Law Foundation. Direct October 2016, Reply December 2016.

Framework for evaluating rates for distributed generation. Costs avoided and imposed by distributed solar. Rate design for distributed generation.

- 315. Puerto Rico Energy Commission** CEPR-AP-2015-0001, Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority rate proceeding, PR Energy Commission. Report December 2016.

Comprehensive review of structure of electric utility, cost causation, load data, cost allocation, revenue allocation, marginal costs, retail rate designs, identification and treatment of customer subsidies, structuring rate riders, and rates for distributed generation and net metering.

- 316. N.S. UARB** Matter No. M07745, NS Power 2017 Capital Expenditures Plan, Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate. January 2017.

Economic evaluation of proposed projects, including replacement energy costs and overall level of investment in information technology (“IT”). Treatment of capitalized overheads and depreciation cash flow in computation of rate effects of spending plan.

ACRONYMS AND INITIALISMS

APS	Alleghany Power System	LRAM	Lost-Revenue-Adjustment Mechanism
ASLB	Atomic Safety and Licensing Board	NARUC	National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
BEP	Board of Environmental Protection	NEPOOL	New England Power Pool
BPU	Board of Public Utilities	NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
BRC	Board of Regulatory Commissioners	OCA	Office of Consumer Advocate
CC	Corporation Commission	PSB	Public Service Board
CMP	Central Maine Power	PBR	Performance-based Regulation
DER	Department of Environmental Regulation	PSC	Public Service Commission
DPS	Department of Public Service	PUC	Public Utility Commission
DQE	Duquesne Light	PUB	Public Utilities Board
DPUC	Department of Public Utilities Control	PURA	Public Utility Regulatory Authority
DSM	Demand-Side Management	PURPA	Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act
DTE	Department of Telecommunications and Energy	SCC	State Corporation Commission
EAB	Environmental Assessment Board	UARB	Utility and Review Board
EFSB	Energy Facilities Siting Board	USAEE	U.S. Association of Energy Economists
EFSC	Energy Facilities Siting Council	UC	Utilities Commission
EUB	Energy and Utilities Board	URC	Utility Regulatory Commission
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	UTC	Utilities and Transportation Commission
ISO	Independent System Operator		