



“When You Talk - We Listen!”



MANITOBA PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD

re:

MANITOBA EFFICIENCY
3-YEAR ENERGY EFFICIENCY PLAN
(2020/21 - 2022/23)

Before Board Panel:

Robert Gabor	- Board Chairperson
Marilyn Kapitany	- Board Vice Chair
Hugh Grant	- Board Member
Irene Hamilton	- Board Member

HELD AT:

Public Utilities Board
400, 330 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
January 6, 2020
Pages 1 to 360

1 APPEARANCES

2

3 Bob Peters (np)) Board Counsel

4 Dayna Steinfeld)

5 Kate Hart)

6

7 Jessica Schofield) Efficiency Manitoba

8 Nicole Merrick)

9

10 Byron Williams (np)) Consumer

11 Katrine Dilay) Association of

12) Canada (Manitoba)

13) and Winnipeg

14) Harvest

15

16 Antoine Hacault) MIPUG

17

18 Jared Wheeler) MKO

19 Markus Buchart)

20

21 Carly Fox) Assembly of

22 Emily Gugliemin) Manitoba Chiefs

23

24 William Haight) For Independent

25 William Gardner) Expert Consultants

	Page No.
1	
2	
3 List of Exhibits	4
4 List of Undertakings	100
5	
6 Opening Comments by The Chairperson	101
7 Opening Comments by Board Counsel	103
8 Opening Comments by Efficiency Manitoba	108
9 Opening Comments by AMC	116
10 Opening Comments by CAC and Harvest Manitoba	120
11 Opening Comments by MIPUG	132
12 Opening Comments by MKO	142
13	
14 EFFICIENCY MANITOBA PANEL NO. 1:	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 Examination-in-Chief by Ms. Jessica Schofield	154
24 Cross-Examination by Ms. Dayna Steinfeld	189
25 Certificate of Transcript	360

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS	
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
3	EM-1	Efficiency Manitoba Application -
4		October 25, 2019
5	EM-2	New Release re: EM files first three-
6		year Efficiency Plan - October
7		25, 2019
8	EM-3	EM letter to PUB re: Comments on
9		timeline, issues list and Intervener
10		applications - November 4, 2019
11	EM-4	EM letter response to CoC Intervener
12		application letter - November 5, 2019
13	EM-5	EM email response to CC motion for
14		extension - December 6, 2019
15	EM-6	EM email response to MIPUG request for
16		extension - December 6, 2019
17	EM-7	EM email response to DAY request for
18		extension - December 6, 2019
19	EM-8	EM-AMC Intervener Information Requests
20		(1-4) - December 13, 2019
21	EM-8-1	EM-AMC Intervener Information Requests
22		(1-4) - December 13, 2019 Flexibility
23		to EM to make adjustments to program
24		offerings.
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	EM-8-2	EM-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
4		(1-4) - December 13, 2019 Figure 5-15	
5		worksheets and working papers.	
6	EM-8-3	EM-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
7		(1-4) - December 13, 2019 Evaluation	
8		frameworks	
9	EM-8-4	EM-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
10		(1-4) - December 13, 2019 Data showing	
11		First Nation population is	
12		approximately 80 percent of the LICO-	
13		125 population	
14	EM-9	EM-COALITION Intervener Information	
15		Requests (1-12) - December 13, 2019	
16	EM-9-1	(J. Grevatt) Flexibility to EM to make	
17		adjustments to program offerings.	
18	EM-9-2	(J. Grevatt) Project Management Plan	
19	EM-9-3	(J. Grevatt) Residential and income-	
20		eligible program budget	
21	EM-9-4	(J. Grevatt) Measure level v. portfolio	
22		level.	
23	EM-9-5	(C. Neme) Heat pumps electric	
24		efficiency measure - home renovations	
25		program	

1	
2	LIST OF EXHIBITS
3	EM-9-6 (C. Neme) Heat pumps electric
4	efficiency measure low-income customers
5	in income qualified program.
6	EM-9-7 (C. Neme) "Power Smart" program
7	directive.
8	EM-9-8 (C. Neme) Recommendation 5 - aligns
9	with Mr. Dunsky
10	EM-9-9 (P. Fitzpatrick) Pubic engagement
11	EM-9-10 (Harper) - December 18, 2019.
12	Integrated resource planning.
13	EM-9-11 (Harper) - December 18, 2019 Weighting
14	of objectives to be considered.
15	EM-9-12 (Harper) - December 18, 2019 Table 9 -
16	transposed between electricity and
17	natural gas.
18	EM-10 EM-DAY Intervener Information Requests
19	(1-2) - December 13, 2019
20	EM-10-1 EM-DAY Intervener Information Requests
21	(1-2) - December 13, 2019 Load
22	displacement energy savings (Table 17,
23	34, and 40)
24	EM-10-2 EM-DAY Intervener Information Requests
25	(1-2) - December 13, 2019 Load

1		displacement energy savings (Table 42)
2		LIST OF EXHIBITS
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
4	EM-11	EM-MIPUG Intervener Information
5		Requests (1-4) - December 13, 2019
6	EM-11-1	EM-MIPUG Intervener Information
7		Requests (1-4) - December 13, 2019 D.
8		Friesen - flexibility to EM to make
9		adjustments to program offerings.
10	EM-11-2	EM-MIPUG Intervener Information
11		Requests (1-4) - December 13, 2019 P.
12		Bowman - DSM programming
13	EM-11-3	EM-MIPUG Intervener Information
14		Requests (1-4) - December 13, 2019 P.
15		Bowman - relevant metrics used to
16		evaluate inclusion of Income Qualified
17		and Indigenous programs.
18	EM-11-4	EM-MIPUG Intervener Information
19		Requests (1-4) - December 13, 2019 P.
20		Bowman - applicability of RIM test
21	EM-12	EM letter to PUB re: PUB-EM Round I
22		Information Requests containing CSI -
23		December 23, 2019
24	PUB-1-1	PUB letter to EM re public notice -
25		September 10, 2019

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
PUB-1-2	PUB letter to EM re public notice re Efficiency Manitoba	
PUB-2	Public Utilities Board rules of practice and procedures	
PUB-3	Board Order 162-19 - procedural Order in respect of Efficiency Manitoba's 2020/23 Efficiency Plan submission - November 5, 2019	
PUB-4	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019	
PUB-4-1	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 programs and initiatives considered - confidential	
PUB-4-2	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 optimizing Power Smart: options to achieve Manitoba's new energy savings targets, 2017 - Dunsky Energy Consulting and supporting reports and memos	
PUB-4-3	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 hard to reach and First Nations customers	

1		
2		LIST OF EXHIBITS
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
4	PUB-4-4	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
5		November 7, 2019 comparison of budget
6		costs and savings per plan v.
7		Preliminary plan prior to adjustment
8		based on multi-criteria decisions
9		analysis
10	PUB-4-5	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
11		November 7, 2019 affordability of gas
12		space heat compared to electric space
13		heat for hard-to-reach and income
14		qualified customers
15	PUB-4-6	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
16		November 7, 2019 Community Driven
17		Outcomes Contract model (CDOC) in
18		Community Geothermal Program
19	PUB-4-7	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
20		November 7, 2019 Bill Affordability
21		Collaborative Process reports
22	PUB-4-8	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
23		November 7, 2019 cost-effective savings
24		targets of demand-side management
25		

1		
2		LIST OF EXHIBITS
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION
		PAGE NO.
4	PUB-4-9	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
5		November 7, 2019 benchmarking of
6		levelized costs with other
7		jurisdictions
8	PUB-4-10	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
9		November 7, 2019 furnace replacement
10		programs - confidential
11	PUB-4-11	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
12		November 7, 2019 Cost breakdowns for
13		each initiative in the plan
14	PUB-4-12	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
15		November 7, 2019 quantitative screen
16	PUB-4-13	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
17		November 7, 2019 cost-effectiveness
18		analysis
19	PUB-4-14	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
20		November 7, 2019 PACT energy benefits
21	PUB-4-15	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
22		November 7, 2019 discount rates
23	PUB-4-16	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
24		November 7, 2019 administration budget
25		reasonableness compared to similar

1 organizations

2

3 LIST OF EXHIBITS

4	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
5	PUB-4-17	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 payment schedule with MH	
6	PUB-4-18	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 innovation and research fund	
7	PUB-4-19	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 evaluation, measurement and verification activities annual budget	
8	PUB-4-20	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 revenue loss related to downstream costs	
9	PUB-4-21	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 impact of Plan on rates and average customer bill amounts - filed November 8, 2019	
10	PUB-4-22	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 bill impact per portfolio/lifecycle revenue impact/EfficiencyOne analysis - filed	

1 November eight, 2019

2

3

4 LIST OF EXHIBITS

5 PUB-4-23 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
6 November 7, 2019 legislated targets for
7 electric and gas savings

8 PUB-4-24 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
9 November 7, 2019 participation and
10 achieved savings

11 PUB-4-25 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
12 November 7, 2019 program achievements
13 and reaching saving goals

14 PUB-4-26 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
15 November 7, 2019 MH Power Smart annual
16 review and DSM reports (2015-current).

17 PUB-4-27 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
18 November 7, 2019 MH Power Smart annual
19 review and DSM reports (2015-current).

20 PUB-4-28 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
21 November 7, 2019 tables showing
22 spending totals for programs -
23 electricity and gas programs by
24 customer segment

25 PUB-4-29 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -

1 November 7, 2019 differences between
 2 Efficiency Plan and MH DMS 2015/16
 3 Power Smart Plan

4 LIST OF EXHIBITS

5	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
6	PUB-4-30	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 summary of MH's non- utility generation policy for connecting solar PV or generating systems	
11	PUB-4-31	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 details of load displacement and alternative energy projects - confidential	
15	PUB-4-32	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 DAY-EM 1-65-76 details and formulas at individual initiative levels	
19	PUB-4-33	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 new approaches or continuation of existing programs effective in Manitoba	
23	PUB-4-34	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 budget categories - breakdown of dollars and percentage of	

1 total budget

2

3

4

5

LIST OF EXHIBITS

6 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.

7 PUB-4-35 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 8 November 7, 2019 emerging technologies
 9 - solar thermal, cold climate air
 10 source heat pumps and variable
 11 frequency drivers

12 PUB-4-36 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 13 November 7, 2019 Independent assessor

14 PUB-4-37 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 15 November 7, 2019 April 24, 2019 mandate
 16 letter from Minister

17 PUB-4-38 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 18 November 7, 2019 appointed members of
 19 Energy Efficiency Advisory Group
 20 qualifications

21 PUB-4-39 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 22 November 7, 2019 code and standards
 23 that savings will count from

24 PUB-4-40 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 25 November 7, 2019 interactive effects

1 from electrically heated homes and
 2 businesses

3
 4
 5

6 LIST OF EXHIBITS

7	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
8	PUB-4-41	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 interactive effects from Codes and Standards	
11	PUB-4-42	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 definition of normal weather and weather normalization methodologies	
15	PUB-4-43	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 date for filing independent Assessor's Report to the Board	
19	PUB-4-44	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 electric load growth impact on EM's savings targets	
22	PUB-4-45	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests - November 7, 2019 savings targets - revised November 8, 2019 - confidential	
25	PUB-4-46	PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -	

1 November 7, 2019 removal of impact of
 2 Codes and Standards from load and
 3 volume forecasts - revised November 8,
 4 2019

5

6

7

LIST OF EXHIBITS

8 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.

9 PUB-4-47 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 10 November 7, 2019 2018 electric load
 11 forecast and gas volume forecast -
 12 confidential

13 PUB-4-48 PUB-EM Round I Information Requests -
 14 November 7, 2019 natural gas savings
 15 under Indigenous Program

16 PUB-5 Board Order 166-19 - an Order in
 17 respect of the review of confidential
 18 information in Efficiency Manitoba's
 19 2020/23 efficiency submission -
 20 November 12th, 2012

21 PUB-6 PUB email response to CC motion for
 22 extension - December 6, 2019

23 PUB-7 PUB email response to MIPUG request for
 24 extension - December 9, 2019

25 PUB-8 PUB email response to DAY request for

1 extension - December 9, 2019
 2 PUB-9 PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests
 3 (1-6) - December 13, 2019

4

5

6

7

8

LIST OF EXHIBITS

9	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
10	PUB-9-1	PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests (1-6) - December 13, 2019 First Nation reference includes on-reserve, or on- reserve and off-reserve account holders.	
15	PUB-9-2	PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests (1-6) - December 13, 2019 Residential per person energy savings.	
18	PUB-9-3	PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests (1-6) - December 13, 2019 First Nations opportunities	
21	PUB-9-4	PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests (1-6) - December 13, 2019 On-reserve dwellings compared to income-qualified dwelling.	
25	PUB-9-5	PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests	

1 (1-6) - December 13, 2019 ICO-125
 2 dwellings.
 3 PUB-9-6 PUB-AMC Intervener Information Requests
 4 (1-6) - December 13, 2019 Decline in
 5 participation in insulation and Direct
 6 Install Programs.

7
 8
 9 LIST OF EXHIBITS

10 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
11 PUB-10	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	
12	(1-21) - December 13, 2019	
13 PUB-10-1	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	
14	(1-21) - December 13, 2019 GHG	
15	emissions	
16 PUB-10-2	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	
17	(1-21) - December 13, 2019 EM mandate	
18 PUB-10-3	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	
19	(1-21) - December 13, 2019 Cold climate	
20	air source heat pumps	
21 PUB-10-4	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	
22	(1-21) - December 13, 2019 Counting	
23	savings by switching from gas to	
24	electricity.	
25 PUB-10-5	PUB-CC Intervener Information Requests	

1 (1-21) - December 13, 2019 PACT
 2 levelized cost of providing air source
 3 heat pumps
 4 PUB-10-6 PUB-CC (Grevatt) Measure level detail.
 5 PUB-10-7 PUB-CC (Grevatt) Measure level data and
 6 program information
 7 PUB-10-8 PUB-CC (Grevatt) Mitigating risks

8
 9

10 LIST OF EXHIBITS

11 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
12 PUB-10-9	PUB-CC (Grevatt) Recommendations to mitigate risks.	
14 PUB-10-10	PUB-CC (Grevatt) achieving targets	
15 PUB-10-11	PUB-CC (Grevatt) Codes of Standards	
16 PUB-10-12	PUB-CC (Grevatt) Recommendations	
17 PUB-10-13	PUB-CC (Fitzpatrick) EEAG mandate - clarifications and recommendations.	
19 PUB-10-14	PUB-CC (Fitzpatrick) voluntary committee	
21 PUB-10-15	PUB-CC (Fitzpatrick) limited interactions and best practices.	
23 PUB-10-16	PUB-CC (Fitzpatrick) List of recommendations.	
25 PUB-10-17	PUB-CC (Harper) savings target	

1 PUB-10-18 PUB-CC (Harper) load forecast
 2 PUB-10-19 PUB-CC (Harper) electric consumption
 3 baseline.
 4 PUB-10-20 PUB-CC (Harper) Enabling strategies and
 5 corporate overhead - electric and gas
 6 portfolios.
 7 PUB-10-21 PUB-CC (Harper) gas and electric PACT
 8 evaluation - discount rate.

9
 10

11 LIST OF EXHIBITS

12 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
13 PUB-10-22	PUB-CC (Harper) - December 18, 2019. Evaluation criteria factors.	
15 PUB-10-23	PUB-CC (Harper) - December 18, 2019. Refiling 2020-23 plan after analysis	
17 PUB-10-24	PUB-CC (Harper) - December 18, 2019. Central repository established for next Plan (2023-26) or refile 2020-23 plan.	
20 PUB-10-25	PUB-CC (Harper) - December 18, 2019. Target savings values	
22 PUB-11	PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests (1-19) - December 13, 2019.	
24 PUB-11-1	PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests (1-19) - December 13, 2019.	

25

1 Flexibility to achieve electric savings
2 target

3 PUB-11-2 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
4 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. 15 year
5 period.

6 PUB-11-3 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
7 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Cost
8 effectiveness - initiatives.

9
10

11

12

LIST OF EXHIBITS

13 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.

14 PUB-11-4 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
15 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Compare to
16 MH DSM plan/results

17 PUB-11-5 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
18 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Membership
19 in customer categories - targeted
20 programs.

21 PUB-11-6 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
22 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. High or low
23 factors - free rider, free driver and
24 persistence factors.

25 PUB-11-7 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests

1 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Table 17 -
 2 without load displacement projects
 3 PUB-11-8 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 4 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Cost
 5 effectiveness test.
 6 PUB-11-9 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 7 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. DSM
 8 measures - levelized resource costs and
 9 levelized utility costs.

10
 11
 12

13 LIST OF EXHIBITS

14 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
15 PUB-11-10	16 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests 17 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. 5 Electric 18 measures and 5 gas measures - lowest scores PMVT	
19 PUB-11-11	20 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests 21 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Sensitivity case of achievement.	
22 PUB-11-12	23 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests 24 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Evaluation 25 framework - Econoler v. Uniform Methods Project (UMP)	

- 1 PUB-11-13 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 2 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Challenges
 3 verifying savings from Codes and
 4 Standards
 5 PUB-11-14 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 6 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Measure
 7 life.
 8 PUB-11-15 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 9 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Savings at
 10 risk

11
 12
 13
 14 LIST OF EXHIBITS

15 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
16 PUB-11-16	17 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Codes and 18 Standards savings - sunset periods.	
19 PUB-11-17	20 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Gas 21 Savings - other residential equipment - 22 high efficiency furnace standard.	
23 PUB-11-18	24 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Load 25 displacement projects.	

- 1 PUB-11-19 PUB-DAY Intervener Information Requests
 2 (1-19) - December 13, 2019. Under
 3 estimates and over estimates.
- 4 PUB-12 PUB-MIPUG Intervener Information
 5 Requests (1-17) - December 16, 2019.
- 6 PUB-12-1 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Load
 7 displacement.
- 8 PUB-12-2 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) PACT - Life-for-
 9 life replacement at end of life.
- 10 PUB-12-3 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Update potential
 11 study - industrial sector.
- 12 PUB-12-4 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Additional
 13 flexibility.

14
 15 LIST OF EXHIBITS

16 EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
17 PUB-12-5	18 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Acquisition costs.	
19 PUB-12-6	20 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Total Resource Costs (TRC) and Societal Cost Test (SCT) - instead of or in addition to 21 PACT. 22	
23 PUB-12-7	24 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Industrial gas portfolio - NPV percentages.	
25 PUB-12-8	PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Table 3.9 -	

1 removing codes and standards and
2 separating industrial and load
3 displacement savings
4 PUB-12-9 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) Table 3.15 -
5 removing load displacement projects.
6 PUB-12-10 PUB-MIPUG (D. Friesen) incentive
7 levels.
8 PUB-12-11 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) short-term
9 marginal value
10 PUB-12-12 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) Recommendations -
11 DSM
12 PUB-12-13 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) Recommendations -
13 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).
14
15
16 LIST OF EXHIBITS
17 PUB-12-14 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) Recommendation 6
18 - recognize savings from agencies and
19 government efforts
20 PUB-12-15 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) Recommendation 7
21 Elasticity efforts/factors.
22 PUB-12-16 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) Recommendation 8
23 - efficient technologies
24 PUB-12-17 PUB-MIPUG (P. Bowman) short-term rate
25 impacts.

1	PUB-13	Board Order 191-19 - Second procedural
2		Order in respect of Efficiency
3		Manitoba's 2020/21 to 2022/23
4		Efficiency Plan submission - December
5		17, 2019.
6	AMC-1	Intervener Application - October 31,
7		2019
8	AMC-2	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
9		30) - November 11, 2019
10	AMC-2-1	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
11		30) - November 11, 2019 reconciliation
12		weighted against other priorities
13	AMC-2-2	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
14		30) - November 11, 2019 guiding
15		principles - equity

LIST OF EXHIBITS

18	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
19	AMC-2-3	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
20		30) - November 11, 2019 consumer needs	
21		and barriers and delivery strategies	
22		for on-reserve First Nation customers	
23	AMC-2-4	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
24		30) - November 11, 2019 mandatory First	
25		Nations sensitivity and cultural	

1 awareness training
2 AMC-2-5 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
3 30) - November 11, 2019 breakdown of
4 budget related to First Nation
5 companies
6 AMC-2-6 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7 30) - November 11, 2019 target for
8 First Nation staff hires
9 AMC-2-7 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
10 30) - November 11, 2019 breakdown of
11 budget for Indigenous programs and the
12 Indigenous small business programs

13
14
15
16
17

18 LIST OF EXHIBITS

19 AMC-2-8 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
20 30) - November 11, 2019 electric v.
21 natural gas budgets for hard-to-reach
22 segment and Indigenous natural gas
23 program available for off-reserve First
24 Nation customers
25 AMC-2-9 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-

1 30) - November 11, 2019 stakeholder
 2 engagement survey - engagement
 3 activities and level of engagement with
 4 First Nations
 5 AMC-2-10 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 6 30) - November 11, 2019 average bill
 7 impact of one-time rate increase for
 8 First Nation residential and commercial
 9 customers
 10 AMC-2-11 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 11 30) - November 11, 2019 estimated
 12 acquisition costs for programs within
 13 the Indigenous segment
 14 AMC-2-12 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 15 30) - November 11, 2019 further
 16 breakdown of 33.9 percent energy
 17 consumption

18
 19 LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
21 AMC-2-13	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-30) - November 11, 2019 program delivery approaches for the First Nation businesses	
25 AMC-2-14	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	

1 30) - November 11, 2019 non-energy
2 benefits
3 AMC-2-15 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
4 30) - November 11, 2019 2017
5 residential energy use survey (REUS)
6 AMC-2-16 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7 30) - November 11, 2019 indigenous
8 population - supplementary positive
9 impacts
10 AMC-2-17 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
11 30) - November 11, 2019 funding and
12 coverage of community energy plans,
13 community-led DSM initiatives and
14 education strategies and outputs for
15 on-reserve First Nations

16
17
18
19
20 LIST OF EXHIBITS

21 AMC-2-18 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
22 30) - November 11, 2019 existing
23 Efficiency Programs compared to
24 proposed Efficiency Programs for First
25 Nations

1	AMC-2-19	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
2		30) - November 11, 2019 average cost
3		for Indigenous insulation and direct
4		install program
5	AMC-2-20	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
6		30) - November 11, 2019 Metis Income
7		Qualified Program (MIQP) and Indigenous
8		Small Business (ISB) offers for off-
9		reserve First Nation customers
10	AMC-2-21	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
11		30) - November 11, 2019 commercial
12		offerings for off-reserve The first
13		Nation businesses
14	AMC-2-22	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
15		30) - November 11, 2019 solar energy
16		program
17	AMC-2-23	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
18		30) - November 11, 2019 socio-economic
19		study to assess non-energy benefits

LIST OF EXHIBITS

22	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
23	AMC-2-24	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
24		30) - November 11, 2019 Indigenous	
25		bundle comparing budgeted costs and	

1 savings for each program prior to
 2 adjustments based on Multi-Criteria
 3 Decision Analysis (MCDA)
 4 AMC-2-25 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 5 30) - November 11, 2019 Bill
 6 affordability collaborative process
 7 AMC-2-26 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 8 30) - November 11, 2019 funding from
 9 Federal Government or Indigenous
 10 Services Canada
 11 AMC-2-27 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 12 30) - November 11, 2019 programs,
 13 budgets and energy use data for First
 14 Nation community buildings
 15 AMC-2-28 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 16 30) - November 11, 2019 Markey
 17 saturation rates for high-performing
 18 technologies for First Nations
 19 customers
 20
 21

22 LIST OF EXHIBITS

23	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
24	AMC-2-29	AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
25		30) - November 11, 2019 customer	

1 support services provided to First
 2 Nation customers
 3 AMC-2-30 AMC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 4 30) - November 11, 2019 alternative
 5 documents used for income verification
 6 AMC-3 AMC Intervener evidence - review of
 7 Efficiency Plan - December 9, 2019 -
 8 Revised December 20, 2019
 9 AMC-3-1 AMC Intervener Evidence - review of
 10 Efficiency Plan - December 9, 2019 -
 11 Revised December 20, 2019. AMC letter
 12 re: Revised Intervener Expert Report -
 13 December 20, 2019.
 14 CC-1-1 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
 15 Application - October 31, 2019
 16 CC-1-2 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
 17 Application - October 31, 2019
 18 Intervener application
 19 CC-1-3 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
 20 Application - October 31, 2019
 21 attachment A

22
 23 LIST OF EXHIBITS

24 EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
 25 CC-1-4 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener

- 1 Application - October 31, 2019
2 attachment B
3 CC-1-5 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
4 Application - October 31, 2019 CV of
5 William Harper
6 CC-1-6 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
7 Application - October 31, 2019 CV of
8 Patricia Fitzpatrick
9 CC-1-7 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
10 Application - October 31, 2019 CV of
11 Chris Neme
12 CC-1-8 CC letter to PUB re: Intervener
13 Application - October 31, 2019 CV of
14 Jim Grevatt
15 CC-2 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
16 131) - November 12, 2019
17 CC-2-1 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
18 131) - November 12, 2019 Determination
19 of savings targets - reasonableness of
20 net savings to meet savings targets
21
22
23
24 LIST OF EXHIBITS
25 CC-2-3 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-

- 1 131) - November 12, 2019 determination
2 of savings targets - adjustments made
3 for prior DSM activity
- 4 CC-2-4 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
5 131) - November 12, 2019 achieving
6 savings targets - electricity -
7 achievement of annual and cumulative
8 targets
- 9 CC-2-5 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
10 131) - November 12, 2019 achieving
11 savings targets - natural gas -
12 achievement of annual and cumulative
13 targets
- 14 CC-2-6 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
15 131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio
16 targets - treatment of interactive
17 effects
- 18 CC-2-7 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
19 131) - November 12, 2019 forecasted
20 energy savings - Codes and Standards
- 21 CC-2-8 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
22 131) - November 12, 2019 consumer
23 segments - hard to reach - definition

24

25

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1 CC-2-9 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 2 131) - November 12, 2019 consumer
 3 segments - industrial, commercial and
 4 agricultural customers

5 CC-2-10 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 6 131) - November 12, 2019 DSM program
 7 opportunities - identification -
 8 approaches used - Revised

9 CC-2-11 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 10 131) - November 12, 2019 DSM program
 11 opportunities - identification - DSM
 12 aligned with the Act

13 CC-2-12 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 14 131) - November 12, 2019 DSM program
 15 opportunities - initial screening -
 16 cost-benefit analyses used - Revised

17 CC-2-13 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 18 131) - November 12, 2019 program
 19 bundles considered - development of
 20 program bundles

21 CC-2-14 CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
 22 131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio
 23 development - quantitative analysis -
 24 Revised.
 25

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-15	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
5		development - benefits for Manitobans	
6		and Manitoba economy	
7	CC-2-16	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
9		development - value for money	
10	CC-2-17	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
12		development process - cost	
13		effectiveness - program bundles	
14	CC-2-18	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
16		development - customer segment	
17		considerations	
18	CC-2-19	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
19		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
20		development process - cost	
21		effectiveness	
22	CC-2-20	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
23		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
24		development process - hard to reach	
25		natural gas segments	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-21	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
5		development process - electric	
6		portfolio savings	
7	CC-2-22	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 cost-	
9		effectiveness - PACT - common	
10		assumptions	
11	CC-2-23	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT - costs	
13		included - CRM/DSM system	
14	CC-2-24	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT - costs	
16		included - evaluation costs	
17	CC-2-25	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
18		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT -	
19		electric energy benefits - Manitoba	
20		Hydro's marginal values	
21	CC-2-26	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT -	
23		levelized cost - basis for values	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-27	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT -	
5		electric energy benefits -	
6		representative values - Revised	
7	CC-2-28	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT - natural	
9		gas - costs included - Furnace	
10		Replacement Program (FRP)	
11	CC-2-29	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT -	
13		levelized cost - natural gas -- bases	
14		for values	
15	CC-2-30	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
16		131) - November 12, 2019 PACT -	
17		Indigenous customer segment - treatment	
18		of diesel communities	
19	CC-2-31	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
20		131) - November 12, 2019 rate impact	
21		calculations - formula used - system	
22		energy values used	
23	CC-2-32	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
24		131) - November 12, 2019 rate impacts -	
25		formula used - discount rate used	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-33	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 rate impacts -	
5		LRI formula used - revenue loss -	
6		Revised	
7	CC-2-34	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 rate impacts -	
9		LRI - natural gas - costs included	
10	CC-2-35	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		131) - November 12, 2019 Customer bill	
12		impact - basis for calculation -	
13		average annual electric bill savings	
14	CC-2-36	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		131) - November 12, 2019 customer bill	
16		impact - basis for calculation -	
17		Participation	
18	CC-2-37	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
19		131) - November 12, 2019 performance	
20		monitoring - scorecard	
21	CC-2-38	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
23		budget - private sector v. Staff costs	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-39	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
5		budget - program delivery/program	
6		design/advertising/program	
7		administration/incentives/enabling	
8		strategies and corporate overhead	
9	CC-2-40	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
10		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
11		budget - program costs - incentives -	
12		attribution to natural gas v. Electric	
13		and to individual program bundles	
14	CC-2-41	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
16		budget - program costs - program	
17		delivery - attribution to natural gas	
18		v. Electric and to individual program	
19		bundles	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-42	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
5		budget - program costs - program	
6		design, modelling, management,	
7		administration, technical support and	
8		customer support - attribution to	
9		natural gas v. Electric and two	
10		industrial program bundles	
11	CC-2-43	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
13		budget - program costs - program	
14		advertising - attribution to natural	
15		gas v. Electric and to individual	
16		program bundles	
17	CC-2-44	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
18		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
19		budget - treatment and allocation of	
20		enabling strategies	
21	CC-2-45	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
23		budget - enabling strategies - status	
24		and costs of CRM/DSM system	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-46	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 portfolio	
5		budget - corporate overhead budgets	
6	CC-2-47	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
7		131) - November 12, 2019 contingency	
8		funds	
9	CC-2-48	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
10		131) - November 12, 2019 enabling	
11		strategies	
12	CC-2-49	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
13		131) - November 12, 2019 assumptions	
14		and calculations used to develop	
15		electric targets	
16	CC-2-50	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		131) - November 12, 2019 net savings -	
18		savings projections	
19	CC-2-51	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
20		131) - November 12, 2019 value of	
21		electric system benefits	
22	CC-2-52	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
23		131) - November 12, 2019 avoided	
24		natural gas purchasing costs	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-53	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 annual program	
5		electric savings - gross or net savings	
6	CC-2-54	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
7		131) - November 12, 2019 annual program	
8		natural gas savings	
9	CC-2-55	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
10		131) - November 12, 2019 calculations	
11		underpinning the levelized cost for	
12		electric programs from figure A3.7	
13	CC-2-56	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
14		131) - November 12, 2019 calculations	
15		underpinning the levelized cost for gas	
16		programs from figure A3.10	
17	CC-2-57	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
18		131) - November 12, 2019 participation	
19		levels and market penetration - MH's	
20		program	
21	CC-2-58	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		131) - November 12, 2019 financial	
23		incentives or rebates offered -	
24		participation in program costs	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-59	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 electrically-	
5		heated homes	
6	CC-2-60	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
7		131) - November 12, 2019 efficient	
8		furnaces	
9	CC-2-61	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
10		131) - November 12, 2019 financial	
11		incentives/rebates	
12	CC-2-62	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
13		131) - November 12, 2019 energy	
14		consumption among Indigenous	
15		communities on-reserve - DSM	
16	CC-2-63	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		131) - November 12, 2019 community	
18		geothermal program - community driven	
19		outcomes contract model	
20	CC-2-64	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		131) - November 12, 2019 LED lamps and	
22		fixtures	
23	CC-2-65	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
24		131) - November 12, 2019 low	
25		displacement program - CHP system	

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	CC-2-66	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
3		131) - November 12, 2019 projected
4		savings associated with changes to
5		codes and standards
6	CC-2-67	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7		131) - November 12, 2019 projected
8		savings - programs
9	CC-2-68	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
10		131) - November 12, 2019 role of EAG
11		related to evaluations
12	CC-2-69	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
13		131) - November 12, 2019 first year
14		evaluation for programs
15	CC-2-70	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
16		131) - November 12, 2019 evaluation
17		impacts of codes and standards
18	CC-2-71	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
19		131) - November 12, 2019 savings
20		achieved through codes and standards
21	CC-2-72	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
22		131) - November 12, 2019 residential
23		general service lighting - high saving
24		potential from codes and standards
25		changes

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	CC-2-73	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
3		131) - November 12, 2019 evaluation
4		framework and planning report - impact
5		on gross and net savings
6	CC-2-74	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7		131) - November 12, 2019 evaluation
8		framework and planning report - net-to-
9		gross adjustments
10	CC-2-75	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
11		131) - November 12, 2019 new and
12		emerging technologies - savings
13		opportunities where addressed
14	CC-2-76	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
15		131) - November 12, 2019 DRM/DSM system
16		- timeline
17	CC-2-77	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
18		131) - November 12, 2019 continuation
19		or elimination of existing MH programs
20		- criteria
21	CC-2-78	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
22		131) - November 12, 2019 continuation
23		or elimination of existing MH programs
24		- programs not included/new programs
25		included

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS	
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION
		PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-79	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
4		131) - November 12, 2019 inclusion of
5		measures or technologies with higher
6		acquisition costs
7	CC-2-80	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
8		131) - November 12, 2019 existing
9		efficiency programs with high
10		participation in energy savings
11	CC-2-81	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
12		131) - November 12, 2019 third-party
13		service providers
14	CC-2-82	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
15		131) - November 12, 2019 rejection of
16		individual technologies
17	CC-2-83	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
18		131) - November 12, 2019 customer
19		segment offer summary - home energy
20		check-up and energy efficiency kits
21		programs
22	CC-2-84	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
23		131) - November 12, 2019 direct install
24		offers - participation
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-85	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 direct install	
5		offers - online home energy	
6		questionnaire - online customer portal	
7		- timeline	
8	CC-2-86	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
9		131) - November 12, 2019 direct install	
10		offers - online home energy	
11		questionnaire	
12	CC-2-87	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
13		131) - November 12, 2019 direct install	
14		offers - home energy check-up -	
15		eligibility criteria	
16	CC-2-88	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		131) - November 12, 2019 Technologies -	
18		home energy check-up - HRV	
19		controls/Smart thermostats	
20	CC-2-89	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		131) - November 12, 2019 product rebate	
22		offers - reasonableness of programs	
23		selected and projections	
24			
25			

	LIST OF EXHIBITS
1	
2	CC-2-90
3	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
4	131) - November 12, 2019 product rebate
5	offers - retail rebates - online v.
6	Instant rebates
7	CC-2-91
8	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
9	131) - November 12, 2019 home
10	renovation program - home renovation
11	offers
12	CC-2-92
13	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
14	131) - November 12, 2019 home
15	renovation program - individual
16	projects track
17	CC-2-93
18	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
19	131) - November 12, 2019 home
20	renovation program - home energy
21	efficiency loan - interest rate
22	CC-2-94
23	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
24	131) - November 12, 2019 home
25	renovation program - home energy
	efficiency loan - emerging technologies
	CC-2-95
	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
	131) - November 12, 2019 home
	renovation program - home energy
	efficiency loan - products and measures

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-96	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 new home and	
5		major renovation - proposed	
6		participation	
7	CC-2-97	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 new home and	
9		major renovation - savings 20 percent	
10		better than code	
11	CC-2-98	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 new home and	
13		major renovation - technologies	
14	CC-2-99	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		131) - November 12, 2019 home energy	
16		efficiency kits and education -	
17		participation	
18	CC-2-100	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
19		131) - November 12, 2019 home energy	
20		efficiency kits and education -	
21		overview and objectives	
22	CC-2-101	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
23		131) - November 12, 2019 home energy	
24		efficiency kits and education -	
25		technologies	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-102	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 income	
5		qualified offers - customer segment	
6		description and residential income	
7		qualified offers	
8	CC-2-103	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
9		131) - November 12, 2019 income	
10		qualified offers - residential income	
11		qualified offers	
12	CC-2-104	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
13		131) - November 12, 2019 income	
14		qualified offers - technologies - two	
15		different payment structures	
16	CC-2-105	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		131) - November 12, 2019 income	
18		qualified offers - technologies -	
19		demographics	
20	CC-2-106	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		131) - November 12, 2019 Indigenous	
22		programs - development of community	
23		energy efficiency plans	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-107	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 Indigenous	
5		programs - insulation and direct	
6		install offer	
7	CC-2-108	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 Indigenous	
9		programs - small business offers	
10	CC-2-109	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		131) - November 12, 2019 Indigenous	
12		programs - community geothermal program	
13	CC-2-110	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
14		131) - November 12, 2019 Metis income	
15		qualified - Metis income qualified	
16		energy program	
17	CC-2-111	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
18		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
19		industrial and agricultural programs -	
20		small business and appliance offers	
21	CC-2-112	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
23		industrial and agricultural programs -	
24		technologies - Energy Star certified	
25		appliances	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-113	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
5		industrial and agricultural programs -	
6		in-suite efficiency	
7	CC-2-114	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
9		industrial and agricultural programs -	
10		renovation offers	
11	CC-2-115	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
13		industrial and agricultural programs -	
14		technologies - lighting controls	
15	CC-2-116	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
16		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
17		industrial and agricultural programs -	
18		HVAC and controls offers	
19	CC-2-117	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
20		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,	
21		industrial and agricultural programs -	
22		new construction and high-performance	
23		building offers	
24			
25			

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	CC-2-118	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
4		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,
5		industrial and agricultural programs -
6		implementation - energy scoping audits
7	CC-2-119	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
8		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,
9		industrial and agricultural programs -
10		custom offers
11	CC-2-120	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
12		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,
13		industrial and agricultural programs -
14		implementation - participation
15		numbers/energy manager
16	CC-2-121	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
17		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,
18		industrial and agricultural programs -
19		implementation - customer
20		participation/engagement
21	CC-2-122	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
22		131) - November 12, 2019 commercial,
23		industrial and agricultural programs -
24		implementation - smaller customers
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-123	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 savings	
5		acquisition costs - comparability with	
6		other jurisdictions	
7	CC-2-124	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		131) - November 12, 2019 stakeholder	
9		engagement - missing figure	
10	CC-2-125	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		131) - November 12, 2019 feedback and	
12		input received from public	
13	CC-2-126	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
14		131) - November 12, 2019 Energy	
15		Efficiency Advisory Group (EEAG) - the	
16		back	
17	CC-2-127	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
18		131) - November 12, 2019 EEAG -	
19		methodology	
20	CC-2-128	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		131) - November 12, 2019 stakeholder	
22		engagement survey - methodology	
23			
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-2-129	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		131) - November 12, 2019 stakeholder	
5		summary engagement - information	
6		prepared by MH for public engagement	
7		activities in 2019 - Revised	
8	CC-2-130	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
9		131) - November 12, 2019 monitoring,	
10		evaluation and continuous improvement	
11	CC-2-131	CC-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		131) - November 12, 2019 EEAG - support	
13		provided to members	
14	CC-3	CC - motion for extension of time for	
15		Bill Harper evidence - December 5, 2019	
16	CC-4	CC letter to PUB re: Intervener expert	
17		evidence - December 9, 2019	
18	CC-5	expert evidence prepared by Dr.	
19		Patricia Fitzpatrick - December 9, 2019	
20	CC-6-1	expert evidence prepared by Mr. William	
21		Harper - December 9, 2019 - Revised	
22		December 13, 2019.	
23	CC-6-2	Letter re: Revised expert evidence	
24		prepared by Mr. William Harper -	
25		December 13, 2019.	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-7	Expert evidence prepared by Mr. James	
4		(Jim) Grevatt, Energy Futures Group,	
5		Inc. - December 9, 2019	
6	CC-8	expert evidence prepared by Mr. Chris	
7		Neme, Energy Futures Group, Inc. -	
8		December 9, 2019	
9	CC-9	CC & MKO letter to PUB re: Request for	
10		ratepayer panel - December 13, 2019	
11	CC-10	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
12		(1-5) - December 13, 2019	
13	CC-10-1	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
14		(1-5) - December 13, 2019 First Nation	
15		Initiatives - energy savings.	
16	CC-10-2	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
17		(1-5) - December 13, 2019 Cost-	
18		effective program costs	
19	CC-10-3	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
20		(1-5) - December 13, 2019 Horizontal	
21		equity test.	
22	CC-10-4	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
23		(1-5) - December 13, 2019 Work papers	
24		of Figure 8-12	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-10-5	CC-AMC Intervener Information Requests	
4		(1-5) - December 13, 2019 LICO-125	
5		First Nations numbers	
6	CC-11	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
7		(1-16) - December 13, 2019	
8	CC-11-1	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
9		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Ratios of	
10		incentives to other costs.	
11	CC-11-2	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
12		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Program	
13		delivery risks.	
14	CC-11-3	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
15		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 LI/hard to	
16		reach customers budget.	
17	CC-11-4	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
18		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Retrofit	
19		projects	
20	CC-11-5	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
21		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Mandate of	
22		the Act.	
23	CC-11-6	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
24		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 MISO	
25		customers	

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
4	(1-16) - December 13, 2019	
5	Appropriateness of methodologies.	
6	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
7	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Non-	
8	participating customers bill impacts	
9	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
10	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Peak and off	
11	peak marginal values	
12	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
13	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Weighted	
14	average measure life - savings -	
15	natural gas and electric portfolios.	
16	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
17	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Discount	
18	rate.	
19	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
20	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Cost-	
21	effectiveness test.	
22	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
23	(1-16) - December 13, 2019 LRI	
24	Sensitivity analysis.	
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-11-14	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
4		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Inflation to	
5		adjust natural gas and electricity	
6		rates in LRI analyses	
7	CC-11-15	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
8		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Load	
9		displacement energy savings.	
10	CC-11-16	CC-DAY Intervener Information Requests	
11		(1-16) - December 13, 2019 Authors of	
12		report	
13	CC-12	CC Pre-hearing Conference No. 2 -	
14		issues list - December 16, 2019	
15	CC-13	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
16		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019	
17	CC-13-1	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
18		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019 P.	
19		Bowman - cumulative savings.	
20	CC-13-2	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
21		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019 P.	
22		Bowman - marginal values	
23	CC-13-3	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
24		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019 P.	
25		Bowman - cost effective	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	CC-13-4	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
4		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019 P.	
5		Bowman - Forum for testing resource	
6		plans, supply options and marginal	
7		values.	
8	CC-13-5	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
9		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019	
10		Savings - EM targets	
11	CC-13-6	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
12		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019	BC
13		DSM plans.	
14	CC-13-7	CC-MIPUG Intervener Information	
15		Requests (1-7) - December 16, 2019 DSM	
16		programs - lowest cost	
17	MIPUG-1	MIPUG comments on timeline and scope of	
18		hearing - October 16, 2019	
19	MIPUG-2-1	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
20		31, 2019	
21	MIPUG-2-2	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
22		31, 2019	
23	MIPUG-2-3	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
24		31, 2019 MIPUG comments on timeline and	
25		scope	

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
4	31, 2019 CV of Melissa Davies	
5	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
6	31, 2019 CV of Patrick Bowman	
7	MIPUG Intervener application - October	
8	31, 2019 CV of Dale Friesen	
9	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
10	(1-18) - November 12, 2019.	
11	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
12	(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Economic	
13	evaluations for programming choices -	
14	underlying inputs and supporting	
15	analysis to assess cost-effectiveness -	
16	Revised - Confidential	
17	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
18	(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Level of	
19	participation, cost and benefits for	
20	commercial and industrial programs -	
21	Revised.	
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	MIPUG-3-3	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests
3		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Cost-
4		effectiveness of portfolio and programs
5		- marginal values and benefits of
6		capital investment deferrals
7	MIPUG-3-4	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests
8		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Impact on
9		ratepayers - targeted savings and
10		impacts on deferral capital
11		expenditures and energy supply
12		competitiveness
13	MIPUG-3-5	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests
14		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Market
15		changes - adjustments for savings
16		persistence to product lifetime
17	MIPUG-3-6	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests
18		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Cost-
19		effectiveness and impacts - electrical
20		savings
21	MIPUG-3-7	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests
22		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Impacts
23		for industrial, commercial and
24		agricultural segments - plan to savings
25		- electric

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-3-8	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
4		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Cost-	
5		effectiveness and impacts - natural gas	
6		savings	
7	MIPUG-3-9	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
8		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Impacts	
9		for industrial, commercial and	
10		agricultural segments - planned savings	
11		- natural gas	
12	MIPUG-3-10	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
13		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Cost	
14		effectiveness of electric program	
15		bundles	
16	MIPUG-3-11	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
17		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Cost	
18		effectiveness of natural gas program	
19		bundles	
20	MIPUG-3-12	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
21		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Composition	
22		and consumption characteristics of the	
23		Manitoba commercial, industrial and	
24		agricultural customer segments	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-3-13	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
4		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Annual and	
5		cumulative energy (i.e. Electric and	
6		natural gas) and capacity (i.e.	
7		Electric only) savings	
8	MIPUG-3-14	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
9		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Process	
10		and framework for identification of	
11		emerging technologies	
12	MIPUG-3-15	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
13		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Savings	
14		load profiles are developed and applied	
15		to the marginal values provided by	
16		Manitoba Hydro for the purpose of	
17		determining marginal benefits	
18	MIPUG-3-16	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
19		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Marginal	
20		values provided by Manitoba Hydro have	
21		evolved since the last review of a DSM	
22		plan	
23			
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-3-17	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
4		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Levelized	
5		marginal value obtained when	
6		multiplying the levelized cost of the	
7		PACT ratio is consistent with how	
8		Manitoba Hydro intends for its marginal	
9		values to be applied	
10	MIPUG-3-18	MIPUG-EM Round I Information Requests	
11		(1-18) - November 12, 2019. Sensitivity	
12		to program uptake on cost-effectiveness	
13	MIPUG-4	MIPUG letter re: request for extension	
14		for Intervener evidence - December 6,	
15		2019	
16	MIPUG-5-1	MIPUG Intervener evidence prepared by	
17		Patrick Bowman - December 10, 2019	
18	MIPUG-5-2	MIPUG Intervener evidence prepared by	
19		Patrick Bowman - December 10, 2019. CV	
20		of Patrick Bowman	
21	MIPUG-6-1	MIPUG Intervener evidence prepared by	
22		Dale Friesen - December 10, 2019	
23	MIPUG-6-2	MIPUG Intervener evidence prepared by	
24		Dale Friesen - December 10, 2019. CV of	
25		Dale Friesen	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-7	MIPUG-COALITION (GREVATT) Intervener	
4		Information Requests (1) - December 13,	
5		2019.	
6	MIPUG-7-1	MIPUG-COALITION (GREVATT) Intervener	
7		Information Requests (1) - December 13,	
8		2019. Benefits and needs of energy of	
9		efficiency potential study	
10	MIPUG-8	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
11		Information Requests (1-5) - December	
12		13, 2019.	
13	MIPUG-8-1	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
14		Information Requests (1-5) - December	
15		13, 2019. Derivation of electric	
16		target values	
17	MIPUG-8-2	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
18		Information Requests (1-5) - December	
19		13, 2019. Measurement to calculate	
20		energy savings, natural gas load,	
21		weather normalized load.	
22	MIPUG-8-3	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
23		Information Requests (1-5) - December	
24		13, 2019. IRP goals	
25			

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
4	Information Requests (1-5) - December	
5	13, 2019. Savings mandate	
6	MIPUG-COALITION (HARPER) Intervener	
7	Information Requests (1-5) - December	
8	13, 2019. Marginal values - peak and	
9	off peak	
10	MIPUG-COALITION (NEME) Intervener	
11	Information Requests (1) - December 13,	
12	2019.	
13	MIPUG-COALITION (NEME) Intervener	
14	Information Requests (1) - December 13,	
15	2019. Costs and impacts of geothermal	
16	heat pump recommendation.	
17	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
18	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
19	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
20	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
21	Energy Efficiency potential study.	
22	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
23	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
24	Life cycle methodology.	
25		

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
4	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
5	Cumulative three-year spending and	
6	savings - electric and natural gas	
7	portfolios.	
8	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
9	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
10	Incremental annual savings.	
11	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
12	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
13	Industrial segments in electric	
14	portfolio budget	
15	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
16	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
17	Portfolio budget - industrial segment -	
18	electric and natural gas spending.	
19	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
20	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
21	Electric portfolio metrics -	
22	commercial, industrial and agricultural	
23	segments.	
24		
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-10-8	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
4		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
5		Electric portfolio budget - industrial	
6		segment	
7	MIPUG-10-9	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
8		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
9		Cumulative electric portfolio savings.	
10	MIPUG-10-10	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
11		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
12		Free ridership levels.	
13	MIPUG-10-11	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
14		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
15		Measures targeting commercial,	
16		industrial and residential sectors.	
17	MIPUG-10-12	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
18		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
19		Industrial custom program savings.	
20	MIPUG-10-13	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
21		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
22		PACT NPV relates to measure life.	
23	MIPUG-10-14	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
24		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
25		Interactive effects on PACT NPV.	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-10-15	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
4		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
5		Lifecycle Revenue Impact (LRI) Measure	
6		and Rate Impact Measure (RIM) test.	
7	MIPUG-10-16	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
8		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
9		Impact of interactive effects on	
10		electrically heated buildings.	
11	MIPUG-10-17	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
12		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
13		Collection and procurement of fuel for	
14		self-generating activities.	
15	MIPUG-10-18	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
16		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
17		Revised Table 33 - results of PMVT	
18		measure analysis for natural gas	
19		programs.	
20	MIPUG-10-19	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
21		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
22		Use of Lifecycle methodology has on	
23		program metrics.	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MIPUG-10-20	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
4		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
5		Adjusting Codes and Standards savings	
6		based on date of enactment.	
7	MIPUG-10-21	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
8		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
9		Extending the life of measure savings -	
10		sustainability of savings.	
11	MIPUG-10-22	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
12		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
13		Changes in marginal values	
14	MIPUG-10-23	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
15		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
16		Rate impacts for large industrial	
17		customers - services at higher voltage	
18		transmission rates.	
19	MIPUG-10-24	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
20		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
21		15-year saving target	
22	MIPUG-10-25	MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information	
23		Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.	
24		Levelized costs used to support Table 1	
25			

	LIST OF EXHIBITS
1	
2	MIPUG-10-26 MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information
3	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.
4	Load displacement
5	MIPUG-10-27 MIPUG-DAY Intervener Information
6	Requests (1-27) - December 13, 2019.
7	PACT benefits of residential New Homes
8	and MR, and Home Renovation programs.
9	MKO-1 MKO comments on preliminary issues list
10	- October 17, 2019
11	MKO-2-1 MKO Intervener application - October
12	31, 2019
13	MKO-2-2 MKO Intervener application - October
14	31, 2019. Comments on timeline and
15	scope
16	MKO-3 MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
17	48) - November 12, 2019.
18	MKO-3-1 MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
19	48) - November 12, 2019. Indigenous
20	customer segment - calculation of
21	customer numbers
22	MKO-3-2 MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
23	48) - November 12, 2019.
24	Reconciliation - mandate and framework
25	letters

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4	48) - November 12, 2019. Cost-	
5	effectiveness of electric DSM program	
6	bundles and portfolio	
7	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8	48) - November 12, 2019. Electric	
9	portfolio budget - allocation and	
10	calculation of DSM budget - percentage	
11	of DSM budget for income qualified and	
12	hard-to-reach customers	
13	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
14	48) - November 12, 2019. Electrical	
15	energy savings - DSM initiatives	
16	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17	48) - November 12, 2019. Fuel switching	
18	- conversion from diesel to electric -	
19	diesel zone	
20	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21	48) - November 12, 2019. DSM programs	
22	accessible to residential customers - -	
23	First Nation's residential on-reserve	
24	customers	
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-3-8	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		48) - November 12, 2019. Stakeholder	
5		engagement survey - low income and	
6		hard-to-reach customers including First	
7		Nations customers	
8	MKO-3-9	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
9		48) - November 12, 2019. Engagement	
10		strategy for low income and hard-to-	
11		reach customers - public engagement	
12	MKO-3-10	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
13		48) - November 12, 2019. Third-party	
14		service providers - safety and	
15		inclusion of northern First Nations	
16	MKO-3-11	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		48) - November 12, 2019. Calculation of	
18		estimated bill savings - Indigenous	
19		customer segment annual bill savings	
20	MKO-3-12	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		48) - November 12, 2019. Improvements	
22		to housing on-reserve - building	
23		designs, techniques and technology	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-3-13	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		48) - November 12, 2019. Energy	
5		consumption patterns for Indigenous	
6		customer segment	
7	MKO-3-14	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		48) - November 12, 2019. Solar	
9		photovoltaic system - Indigenous	
10		customer segment	
11	MKO-3-15	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		48) - November 12, 2019. Targeted areas	
13		in plan Northern Manitoba and First	
14		Nation in Northern Manitoba	
15	MKO-3-16	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
16		48) - November 12, 2019. Modifications	
17		to Plan - customer engagement - First	
18		Nations Customers	
19	MKO-3-17	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
20		48) - November 12, 2019. Customer	
21		relationship management interface -	
22		poor internet connection for First	
23		Nation customers.	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-3-18	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		48) - November 12, 2019. Evaluation,	
5		measurement and verification framework.	
6	MKO-3-19	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
7		48) - November 12, 2019. Contingency	
8		budget - allocation of unallocated	
9		budget items.	
10	MKO-3-20	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		48) - November 12, 2019. Accessibility	
12		of energy-efficient products to	
13		northern Alberta First Nations	
14	MKO-3-21	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		48) - November 12, 2019. Timely,	
16		efficient and safety of independent	
17		third-party contractor services	
18		provided to hard-to-reach locations	
19		including four First Nations in diesel	
20		zone	
21	MKO-3-22	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
22		48) - November 12, 2019. Program design	
23		- customer support - DSM program	
24		bundles and portfolio	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-3-23	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		48) - November 12, 2019. PACT levelized	
5		cost of emerging technology -	
6		Indigenous customer segment	
7	MKO-3-24	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		48) - November 12, 2019. Residential	
9		programs - Indigenous customer segment	
10	MKO-3-25	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
11		48) - November 12, 2019. Rebate	
12		programs - cost to reach customers who	
13		have not yet participated	
14	MKO-3-26	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
15		48) - November 12, 2019. Product	
16		eligibility - building codes applicable	
17		to Indigenous customer segments	
18	MKO-3-27	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
19		48) - November 12, 2019. Direct install	
20		offers for homeowners - Indigenous	
21		customer segment - ban-owned housing on	
22		reserve	
23	MKO-3-28	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
24		48) - November 12, 2019. Retail	
25		rebates - lack of Internet availability	

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	MKO-3-29	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
3		48) - November 12, 2019. Barriers to
4		DSM uptake on First Nations - program
5		design and delivery
6	MKO-3-30	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7		48) - November 12, 2019. Data driven
8		approach - energy consumption data
9	MKO-3-31	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
10		48) - November 12, 2019. Community-led
11		DSM - energy efficient education on
12		First Nations
13	MKO-3-32	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
14		48) - November 12, 2019. Ongoing First
15		Nation and Metis working group -
16		volunteer v. remunerated position
17	MKO-3-33	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
18		48) - November 12, 2019. Energy
19		efficiency impacts - resiliency to
20		climate change - First Nations in
21		northern Manitoba
22	MKO-3-34	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
23		48) - November 12, 2019. Installation
24		and direct install offer for Indigenous
25		customer segment

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-3-35	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
4		48) - November 12, 2019. First Nation	
5		insulation and direct install program -	
6		residential direct install program	
7	MKO-3-36	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
8		48) - November 12, 2019. Federal	
9		funding of Indigenous customer segment	
10		- cost-sharing models	
11	MKO-3-37	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
12		48) - November 12, 2019. Identifying	
13		homes on reserve with high energy	
14		consumption - engagement with First	
15		Nations	
16	MKO-3-38	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
17		48) - November 12, 2019. Small	
18		business offers under Indigenous	
19		customers segment.	
20	MKO-3-39	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-	
21		48) - November 12, 2019. Community	
22		geothermal program - MKO member First	
23		Nations including diesel communities	
24			
25			

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	MKO-3-40	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
3		48) - November 12, 2019. Wood pellet
4		and wood chip hearing systems - diesel
5		zones.
6	MKO-3-41	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
7		48) - November 12, 2019. Solar energy
8		program - diesel zones.
9	MKO-3-42	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
10		48) - November 12, 2019. Solar
11		photovoltaic program incentive.
12	MKO-3-47	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
13		48) - November 12, 2019. Codes and
14		standards - Indigenous customer segment
15	MKO-3-48	MKO-EM Round I Information Requests (1-
16		48) - November 12, 2019. Measurement
17		of electric savings by customer
18		segment.
19	MKO-4	MKO-COALITION Intervener Information
20		Requests (1-2) - December 13, 2019.
21	MKO-4-1	MKO-COALITION Intervener Information
22		Requests (1-2) - December 13, 2019.
23		Dr. P. Fitzpatrick evidence -
24		engagement survey - engagement with
25		First Nation customers

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	MKO-4-2	MKO-COALITION Intervener Information	
4		Requests (1-2) - December 13, 2019. C.	
5		Neme evidence - heat pumps - potential	
6		DSM initiatives - methods to select or	
7		reject.	
8	DAY-1	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
9		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
10	DAY-1-1	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
11		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
12		Sensitivity analyses workpapers	
13	DAY-1-2	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
14		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
15		Metrics for programs and services	
16	DAY-1-3	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
17		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
18		Segmentation analysis	
19	DAY-1-4	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
20		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
21		Programs offered by Manitoba Hydro	
22	DAY-1-5	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
24		Materials associated with EEAG	
25			

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	DAY-1-6	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Plan
5		budget pie chart
6	DAY-1-7	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
7		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
8		Composition of Energy Savings by
9		customer segment - confidential
10	DAY-1-8	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
11		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Codes
12		and standards
13	DAY-1-9	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
14		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
15		Improve building designs, techniques
16		and technologies for energy efficiency
17	DAY-1-10	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
18		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
19		Measure-level savings and budget
20		information
21	DAY-1-11	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
22		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Cost-
23		effectiveness analysis methodology -
24		DSM initiatives by MH
25		

	LIST OF EXHIBITS
1	
2	DAY-1-12 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
4	Centra Gas offering existing DSM and
5	Energy Efficiency Programs
6	DAY-1-13 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
7	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
8	Critical service providers and delivery
9	partners
10	DAY-1-14 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
11	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Jump
12	in electric annual budget for 2021/22,
13	but drop in 2022/23
14	DAY-1-15 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
15	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
16	Enabling strategies for electric v.
17	Natural gas programs
18	DAY-1-16 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. 75
20	percent electric portfolio v. 25
21	percent natural gas portfolio rationale
22	DAY-1-17 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
24	Methodology of cost allocation between
25	rate classes

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-18	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	30
5		year timeframe analysis - measures	
6		considered	
7	DAY-1-19	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Annual cost components and value for	
10		program administration and corporate	
11		overhead for electric and natural gas	
12	DAY-1-20	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
13		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
14		Determination of marginal values	
15	DAY-1-21	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
16		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
17		Annual or seasonal marginal cost value	
18		for evaluating each program bundle	
19	DAY-1-22	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
20		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table	
21		documenting marginal values annually	
22		for natural gas purchasing and	
23		transportation costs	
24			
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-23	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Program administration cost test (PACT)	
6		- estimated values	
7	DAY-1-24	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Expected natural gas program benefits	
10		are expected to be distributed in each	
11		year	
12	DAY-1-25	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
13		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
14		Program administration cost test (PACT)	
15		for cost-effectiveness testing -	
16		formulas used to estimate values	
17	DAY-1-26	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
18		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
19		Analysis of its electric and/or natural	
20		gas efficiency measures, programs or	
21		plan using the Total Resource Cost Test	
22	DAY-1-27	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
24		Sensitivity analysis in PACT by varying	
25		discount rate and NPV time horizon	

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-28	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Mathematical formulae and calculation	
6		parameters that were used to determine	
7		the measure-level PACT ratio, PACT NPV	
8		and PACT levelized cost in both the	
9		electric and natural gas portfolio	
10		cost-effectiveness	
11	DAY-1-29	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
12		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. FRP	
13		benefits captured in other areas of	
14		Efficiency Manitoba was cost benefit or	
15		rate impact analyses	
16	DAY-1-30	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
17		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
18		Consideration of their measures besides	
19		LRI as it applies the standard DSM rate	
20		impact measure test components and is	
21		consistent with the PACT	
22	DAY-1-31	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
24		Additional information as to how the	
25		rate increases were determined	

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	DAY-1-32	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Bill
4		savings calculations
5	DAY-1-33	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
6		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table
7		5.8 customer electric bill savings
8	DAY-1-34	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
9		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table
10		5.9 customer natural gas bill savings
11	DAY-1-35	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
12		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table
13		5.10 - acquisition costs by fiscal year
14	DAY-1-36	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
15		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
16		Support the proposed time span of 30
17		years for benefit calculation
18	DAY-1-37	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Net
20		energy savings at DSM program bundle
21		level
22	DAY-1-38	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Free-
24		ridership and spillover effect in
25		estimating the net energy savings

	LIST OF EXHIBITS
1	
2	DAY-1-39 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Other
4	commonly used cost-effectiveness test
5	(such as Total Resource Cost Test and
6	Participant Cost Test)
7	DAY-1-40 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
8	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Why
9	the interactive effects were
10	considered.
11	DAY-1-41 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
12	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
13	Justification of remove the enabling
14	strategies and corporate overhead costs
15	from the PACT calculation for the
16	program only metrics
17	DAY-1-42 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
18	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. 15
19	year time span in the sensitivity
20	analysis
21	DAY-1-43 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
22	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
23	Reasonableness of the assumptions and
24	input parameters that were considered
25	in the calculation of these metrics

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-44	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Differences between its Plan and prior	
6		Manitoba Hydro DSM plans in order to	
7		provide the best available information	
8		to the P you be, based on four	
9		parameters - incentive costs, program	
10		costs, staff costs, and overhead costs	
11	DAY-1-45	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
12		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
13		measure-level data for the proposed	
14		2020/23 Efficiency Plan with Manitoba	
15		Hydro's 2015/16 Efficiency Plan	
16		comparing key parameters	
17	DAY-1-46	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
18		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
19		Natural gas EE budget for income-	
20		qualified customers is significantly	
21		higher in terms to total EE budget	
22	DAY-1-47	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Non-	
24		energy benefits (NEBs)	
25			

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	DAY-1-48	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Plan
5		adjustments
6	DAY-1-49	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
7		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Pace
8		at which Efficiency Manitoba will be
9		able to show that savings have been
10		achieved, so that progress towards
11		annual goals can be measured
12	DAY-1-50	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
13		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
14		CRM/DSM system
15	DAY-1-51	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
16		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. DSM
17		scorecard
18	DAY-1-52	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
20		Comparing proposed EM&V methodology
21		with industry standards
22	DAY-1-53	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
24		Multi-criteria decision analysis for
25		each technology

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	DAY-1-54	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table
4		A3.1 program bundles and individual
5		measures
6	DAY-1-55	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
7		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Table
8		A3.2 program bundles and individual
9		measures
10	DAY-1-56	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
11		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
12		Electric portfolio budget by program
13		bundle
14	DAY-1-57	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
15		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
16		Natural gas portfolio budget by program
17		bundle
18	DAY-1-58	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
20		Monthly electric funding schedules for
21		2020-2023 period.
22	DAY-1-59	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
24		Monthly natural gas funding schedules
25		for 2020-23 period.

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	DAY-1-60	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
4		Electric portfolio PACT results
5	DAY-1-61	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
6		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
7		Natural gas portfolio PACT results.
8	DAY-1-62	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
9		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
10		Changes to codes and standards -
11		national energy efficiency building
12		codes and performance standard
13		committees
14	DAY-1-63	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
15		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
16		Annual savings related with codes and
17		standards during 2020/23 period.
18	DAY-1-64	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
20		Attachment 3 - tables in excel format
21	DAY-1-65	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
22		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
23		Annual natural gas energy savings
24		(million m3) at the program-bundle
25		level

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-66	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Annual natural gas costs (000's \$) at	
6		the program-bundle level	
7	DAY-1-67	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Annual natural gas GHG savings (tonnes	
10		CO2eq) at the program-bundle level	
11	DAY-1-68	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
12		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
13		Annual bill reduction per program	
14		bundle (all participants) for natural	
15		gas portfolio	
16	DAY-1-69	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
17		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
18		Natural gas program cost-effectiveness	
19		metrics at the program-bundle level	
20	DAY-1-70	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
21		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
22		Annual natural gas participation	
23		estimates at the program-bundle level	
24			
25			

	LIST OF EXHIBITS
1	
2	DAY-1-71 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
4	Annual electric energy savings (GWh) at
5	the program-bundle level
6	DAY-1-72 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
7	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
8	Annual electric capacity savings (MW)
9	at the program-bundle level
10	DAY-1-73 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
11	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
12	Annual electric costs (000's \$) at the
13	program-bundle level
14	DAY-1-74 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
15	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
16	Electric program cost-effectiveness
17	metrics at the program-bundle level
18	DAY-1-75 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
19	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
20	Annual bill reduction of the program-
21	bundle level
22	DAY-1-76 DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23	Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
24	Annual electric participation at the
25	program-bundle level

1		LIST OF EXHIBITS
2	DAY-1-77	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
3		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
4		Incentive setting methodology
5	DAY-1-78	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
6		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. DSM
7		potential studies for designing the
8		Plan
9	DAY-1-79	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
10		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
11		Managing under spent energy efficiency
12		budget
13	DAY-1-80	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
14		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. GHG
15		reduction objective
16	DAY-1-81	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
17		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Full-
18		time equivalent staff
19	DAY-1-82	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
20		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
21		Annual reporting of Efficiency Manitoba
22	DAY-1-83	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.
24		Cumulative total annual percentage
25		savings targets

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-84	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Natural gas target savings over long	
6		horizon	
7	DAY-1-85	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Measure-level savings and impact of	
10		measures not being able to realize full	
11		useful life	
12	DAY-1-86	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
13		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
14		Evaluation framework and planning	
15		report	
16	DAY-1-87	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
17		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
18		Evaluation framework and planning	
19		report for evaluations of natural gas	
20		energy and electric energy efficiency	
21		programs	
22	DAY-1-88	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Codes	
24		and standards programs	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-89	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Customer cited load displacement	
6		program	
7	DAY-1-90	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Continuation and augmentation of	
10		existing energy efficiency programs and	
11		initiatives	
12	DAY-1-91	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
13		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
14		Manitoba Hydro DSM optimization report	
15	DAY-1-92	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
16		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
17		Program bundles - savings targets	
18	DAY-1-93	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
19		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
20		Impact of the Plan at the measure	
21		versus the program level	
22	DAY-1-94	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
23		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019. Hard-	
24		to-reach customers	
25			

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS		
2	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	DAY-1-95	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
4		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
5		Breakdown of customer types and rate	
6		classes of Manitoba Hydro	
7	DAY-1-96	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
8		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
9		Breakdown of customer types and rate	
10		classes of Centra Gas - confidential	
11	DAY-1-97	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
12		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
13		Electric annual program bundle savings	
14		by customers segment.	
15	DAY-1-98	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
16		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
17		Natural annual program bundle savings	
18		by customer segment	
19	DAY-1-99	DEA-EM Round I Information Requests -	
20		Set I (1-79) - November 7, 2019.	
21		Electric portfolio summary and NG	
22		portfolio summary - program bundles -	
23		bundle summary	
24	DAY-2	DAY email request re: extension of time	
25		to file report - December 6, 2019	

LIST OF EXHIBITS		
EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3	DAY-3	
4	Daymark independent expert report:	
5	demand side management and energy	
6	efficiency - December 10, 2019 -	
7	Revised December 11 & 12, 2019	
8	DAY-3-1	
9	Daymark independent expert report:	
10	demand side management and energy	
11	efficiency - December 10, 2019 -	
12	Revised December 11 & 12, 2019 DAY	
13	letter to PUB re: Revised report -	
14	December 11, 2019.	
15	DAY-3-2	
16	Daymark independent expert report:	
17	demand side management and energy	
18	efficiency - December 10, 2019 -	
19	Revised December 11 & 12, 2019 DAY	
20	letter to PUB re: Revised Report -	
21	December 12, 2019	
22	CC-14	
23	Opening statement of the Consumers	
24	Coalition	154
25	EM-21	
	Presentation of Efficiency Manitoba	188

1	LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS		
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	1	Efficiency Manitoba to pick one of the	
4		LED lighting programs, and advise how	
5		Efficiency Manitoba accounts for the	
6		electric interactive effects and the	
7		savings for that measure.	229
8	2	CSI	
9		EM to file this chart but using the	
10		forecast gas numbers. CSI	267
11	3	EM to continue using the 2017 actual	
12		numbers and re-file this table with the	
13		adjustments just discussed, so to put	
14		back in the savings that were taken out	
15		for the 2019/'20 DSM plan and the	
16		efficiency plan savings and provide a	
17		new public consumption baseline number	
18		and savings achieved	267
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 --- Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

2

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning,
4 everyone, and welcome to the Public Utilities Board's
5 oral evidentiary hearing for Efficiency Manitoba's
6 2020/2023 Efficiency Plan Submission.

7 My name is Robert Gabor. I serve as
8 the Chair of the Public Utilities Board, and I'll be
9 acting as the Chair for this meeting.

10 Joining me on the Panel of Board
11 members to review the Efficiency Plan Submission are,
12 to my right, Marilyn Kapitany, your left, the Vice-
13 Chair of the Public Utilities Board; to my far left,
14 Dr. Hugh Grant; and beside me, Irene Hamilton.

15 The Panel is assisted in this hearing
16 by Board Secretary, Dr. Darren Christle, and Judicial
17 Hearing Assistant, Kristen Schubert. We will also be
18 assisted by Rachel McMillin.

19 Dayna Steinfeld and Kate Hart will act
20 as Board counsel, and Donna Whitehouse from Digi-Tran
21 will be our hearing reporter. As in pri -- prior
22 hearings, the Board is also assisted by technical
23 advisors from Ryall Engineering, as well in this
24 hearing by John Todd of Elenchus.

25 On behalf of the Panel, I would like to

1 welcome Efficiency Manitoba and the Interveners who
2 were approved and granted Intervener status in Board
3 Order 162/19.

4 I will remind all parties that these
5 proceedings are being live-streamed from the Board's
6 website, so we also welcome those viewers.

7 At this time, and on behalf of all in
8 attendance, the Board would like to acknowledge that
9 the Treaty land -- Treaty 1 lands on which we now
10 gather for this hearing and the Treaty lands which are
11 the territories on which Efficiency Manitoba proposes
12 to provide services are the traditional territories of
13 the Anishinaabe, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene
14 peoples, as well as the homeland of the Metis Nation.

15 Efficiency Manitoba filed its 2020/2023
16 Efficiency Plan Submission on October 25th, 2019.
17 Following a written prehearing conference, the Board
18 approved Intervener status for the Assembly of
19 Manitoba Chiefs, Consumers Coalition, MIPUG, and MKO
20 in Order 162/19. The Board also determined the issues
21 and scope for the review of the Plan, which are
22 enumerated on the Issues List attached to Order 162/19
23 as Appendix A.

24 Efficiency Manitoba responded to one
25 (1) round of written Information Requests posed on

1 behalf of the Board, Interveners, and the independent
2 expert consultant, Daymark Energy Advisors.

3 Interveners and Daymark filed expert
4 evidence and responded to one (1) round of written
5 Information Requests on behalf of the Board,
6 Efficiency Manitoba, and other Interveners.

7 Efficiency Manitoba's rebuttal evidence
8 was filed with the Board on January 2nd, 2020.

9 Following a second prehearing
10 conference, the Board determined that it would hold an
11 oral evidentiary hearing on all issues enumerated on
12 the Issues List in Order 162/19 except for Issue 11.
13 The details of that decision are set out in Order
14 191/19.

15 Order 191/19 also established the dates
16 for the oral evidence, as well as the dates for oral
17 closing submissions.

18 I will now turn the microphone over to
19 Board counsel, Ms. Hart, for her opening comments,
20 together with her outline of the procedures for the
21 balance of this hearing.

22 Ms. Hart...?

23

24 OPENING COMMENTS BY BOARD COUNSEL:

25 MS. KATE HART: Thank you and good

1 morning, Panel Chair Gabor, Board Vice-Chair Kapitany,
2 Board members Grant and Hamilton, and good morning to
3 all counsel and members of the public present in the
4 hearing room, as well as those members of the public
5 who are viewing this proceeding on the live stream.

6 For the record, my name is Kate Hart,
7 and together with my colleague Dayna Steinfeld, we
8 will act as Board counsel in the review of Efficiency
9 Manitoba's Efficiency Plan Submission.

10 Also assisting the Board in this
11 hearing is Brady Ryall and David Bonin from Ryall
12 Engineering and John Todd from Elenchus.

13 As mentioned by the Panel Chair, the
14 Interveners in this hearing were approved in Board
15 Order 162/19. The four (4) approved Interveners are
16 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Consumers Coalition,
17 MIPUG, and MKO.

18 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs is
19 represented by its counsel, Ms. Fox; Consumers
20 Coalition is represented by its counsel, Ms. Dilay;
21 MIPUG is represented by Ms. -- Mr. Hacault; MKO is
22 represented by Mr. Wheeler; and Efficiency Manitoba is
23 represented by Ms. Merrick and Ms. Schofield.

24 I will momentarily ask the Panel Chair
25 to call on Efficiency Manitoba, AMC, Consumers

1 Coalition, MIPUG, and MKO for introductions and brief
2 comments -- brief opening comments, but before I do
3 that, it may be informative to review the outline of
4 procedures that have previously been circulated to
5 counsel and outline how we envision this week and the
6 next couple of weeks unfolding.

7 Following opening comments this
8 morning, the oral evidentiary portion of this
9 proceeding will commence with Efficiency Manitoba's
10 witness panel. Cross-examination of the Efficiency
11 Manitoba witness panel will continue until Thursday,
12 January 9th. Efficiency Manitoba will have the
13 opportunity to re-examine the witness panel on January
14 9th.

15 Please note that on January 7th, one
16 (1) hour in the afternoon has been reserved for an in
17 camera cross-examination of the Efficiency Manitoba
18 witness panel by Board counsel.

19 On Friday, January 10th, the expert for
20 AMC, Dr. Timothy David Clark, is scheduled to give
21 evidence and be cross-examined in the morning.

22 On Monday, January 13th, the
23 independent expert consultant, Daymark Energy
24 Advisors, is scheduled to give evidence and be cross-
25 examined. The cross-examination of Daymark will

1 continue on January 14th.

2 Time has been reserved in the afternoon
3 of January 14th for an in camera hearing to address
4 questions involving confidential information for
5 Daymark.

6 The Consumers Coalition witness panel
7 is then scheduled to give evidence during the latter
8 half of the afternoon on January 14th. Cross-
9 examination of the Consumers Coalition witness panel
10 will begin the morning of January 15th and continue
11 until January 16th.

12 On Monday, January 20th, the MIPUG
13 witness panel is scheduled to give evidence and be
14 cross-examined.

15 The Coalition, MKO ratepayer panel, and
16 MIPUG members panel are scheduled for the morning of
17 Friday, January 24th.

18 During the afternoon of January 24th,
19 the Board will hear public presentations by members of
20 the public who preregistered with the Board.

21 Closing submissions are currently
22 scheduled to commence with Efficiency Manitoba on
23 January 27th, with the closing submissions of
24 Interveners and any reply submission of Efficiency
25 Manitoba on January 27th and 28th.

1 Parties are reminded that subject to
2 travel plans and restrictions, should portions of the
3 hearing conclude ahead of schedule, parties should be
4 prepared to proceed to the next item on the hearing
5 schedule without delay.

6 Regardless of the times indicated in
7 the circulated outline of procedures, parties should
8 be prepared to sit into the late afternoon or early
9 evening as required on any of the days set for hearing
10 and to continue to hold the days currently indicated
11 as overflow in their calendars.

12 We would also like to remind the
13 parties that while there has been confidential
14 information filed, this oral hearing is on the public
15 record. The oral hearing process does not seek to
16 elicit information that Efficiency Manitoba or any
17 party has filed as confidential.

18 Should any witness believe that to
19 fully respond to a question, the witness needs provide
20 confidential information, the witness -- the witness
21 should immediately alert their legal counsel, who will
22 be requested to pro -- propose a process to provide
23 that confidential information to the Board. All
24 parties are urged to use caution in the information
25 conveyed through their questions in cross-examination.

1 Parties are also aware that the Board
2 had circulated an exhibit list to record the exhibits
3 in this proceeding. Should any party wish to file any
4 additional exhibits, they are to send a PDF copy to
5 the Board, and please copy all other parties.

6 Additionally, should any party wish to
7 file any additional exhibits, they should also propose
8 the exhibit number that is to be applied to their
9 exhibit.

10 The Board members should be aware that
11 they should feel free to interrupt at any time with
12 any questions or clarifications that they may have of
13 the witnesses.

14 Thank you, panel Chair and Board
15 members, those are our opening comments. Please call
16 on us should there be procedural questions throughout
17 the hearing. We suggest you call on Efficiency
18 Manitoba first, followed by the Interveners for their
19 introductions and brief opening comments.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Hart.
21 Ms. Merrick? Oh, sorry. Ms. Schofield...?

22

23 OPENING COMMENTS BY EFFICIENCY MANITOBA:

24 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Good morning,
25 Mr. Chair, Madam Vice-Chair, Board member Hamilton,

1 and Board member Grant.

2 My name is Jessica Schofield, and I'm
3 here with my colleague, Nicole Merrick. Together we
4 will be representing Efficiency Manitoba in this
5 hearing process.

6 Also sitting to my left is Colleen
7 Kuruluk, the chief executive officer of Efficiency
8 Manitoba, who will be leading the direct evidence for
9 Efficiency Manitoba this morning.

10 We also have a panel of witnesses that
11 will be joining her, based on their area of expertise,
12 which include Michael Stocki, Vice-President of
13 Efficiency Programs, Kyla Kramps, Vice-President of
14 Finance and Corporate Performance, Roberto Montanino,
15 Commercial Programs Lead, Cheryl Pilek, Energy
16 Efficiency Lead Evaluation and Planning, Amy Tuck,
17 Indigenous Programs Lead, and Tracy Sterdan,
18 Residential and Income Qualified Programs lead.

19 Ms. Kuruluk will highlight some of the
20 key components of the plan, and she and her team will
21 also be ready to answer questions from the panel and
22 counsel.

23 The development of a separate entity to
24 administer energy efficiency measures arose from the
25 recommendations from the needs for and alternative to

1 review of Manitoba Hydro's preferred development plan,
2 which concluded in 2014.

3 As a result of the PUB's
4 recommendation, the Government passed the Efficiency
5 Manitoba Act, establishing Efficiency Manitoba to
6 implement and support demand side management
7 initiatives in Manitoba as part of its mandate,
8 transferring responsibility from the Manitoba Hydro
9 Power Smart program.

10 You will hear evidence today from our
11 panel, detailing the mandate of Efficiency Manitoba,
12 as outlined at section 4 of the Act, and corresponding
13 regulations.

14 You will also hear evidence, as
15 outlined -- sorry. You will also hear evidence in
16 regards to the initiatives that Efficiency Manitoba
17 intends to undertake in the implementation of the plan
18 and the achievement of the net savings mandated by
19 section 7 of the Act, namely, 1.5 percent for
20 electrical savings, and 0.75 percent for natural gas.

21 Efficiency Manitoba filed its first
22 efficiency plan on October 25th, 2019. The submission
23 included each of the requirements outlined at section
24 9 of the Act.

25 Over the next several days, Ms. Kuruluk

1 and her team will highlight a number of the components
2 of the submission. We bring to your attention, for
3 ease of reference, a summary of the relevant sections
4 of the Act, outlining content requirements, along with
5 the corresponding pages of the submission, which can
6 be found at table 2.2 on page 11 of section 2 of the
7 submission, or PDF page 56.

8 The purpose of this hearing is to
9 facilitate the panel's review of the efficiency plan.
10 At the end of this hearing we will be asking the panel
11 to recommend the plan should be approved by the
12 Minister in accordance with section 11.1 of the Act.

13 In completing this review, you will
14 hear evidence as each of the relevant factors to be
15 considered at section 11.4 of the Act and section 11
16 of the Regulations.

17 These will include the net savings
18 required to meet the savings targets in accordance
19 with section 7 of the Act, the benefits of the cost-
20 effective initiatives proposed by the plan, which
21 include initiatives accessible to all Manitobans.

22 The appropriateness of the selection
23 process used by Efficiency Manitoba to select and
24 reject DSM initiatives. The fact that Efficiency
25 Manitoba has crafted their budget to allocate over 5

1 percent of DSM initiatives for hard-to-reach
2 customers, namely, the income qualified and Indigenous
3 customer segments.

4 The reduction in administrative costs
5 compared to those incurred under the Power Smart
6 regime and in comparison to Efficiency Manitoba costs
7 for other similar organizations.

8 The cost effectiveness of the plan and
9 the impact of the plan and its initiatives on rates
10 and customer bill amounts.

11 The reasonableness of the projected
12 savings targets annually and cumulatively over the
13 next fifteen (15) years.

14 The use of private sector organizations
15 by Efficiency Manitoba to deliver on its mandate, and
16 this will include third-party contractors to provide
17 implementation and program delivery services.

18 Efficiency Manitoba's consideration of
19 new and emerging technologies in the plan and in
20 future plans.

21 And finally, Efficiency Manitoba's
22 compliance with the director -- directions of the
23 Minister. A table outlining the mandatory
24 considerations has been provided at table 2.5 of the
25 submission, which can be found at page 26 of section

1 2, or PDF page 71.

2 Efficiency Manitoba has and intends to
3 continue to be open and transparent in regards to its
4 plan.

5 As you know, Efficiency Manitoba
6 received the benefit of inheriting valuable
7 established program from Manitoba Hydro which continue
8 to be part of the Efficiency Manitoba plan, because
9 they are beneficial to Manitobans.

10 You will hear evidence that Efficiency
11 Manitoba received and continues to receive the benefit
12 of Manitoba Hydro's knowledge, expertise, and support
13 through the transition of DSM to Efficiency Manitoba.
14 This, together with Efficiency Manitoba's own
15 activities, has helped po -- position Efficiency
16 Manitoba to hit the ground running on April 1st, 2020.

17 Efficiency Manitoba has created a plan
18 that carries out its mandate. It's cost-effective and
19 it works. The plan sets the foundation for Efficiency
20 Manitoba to make a real impact in terms of energy
21 efficiency, and to achieve the aggressive long-term
22 savings targets set for both electrical and natural
23 gas energy savings: namely 22.5 percent for electrical
24 consumption savings and 11.25 percent for natural gas
25 consumption savings.

1 Efficiency Manitoba understands that
2 its plan is not just about the numbers. The plan
3 recognizes that energy efficiency and savings have
4 real world impacts for Manitobans across residential,
5 Indigenous, commercial, industrial, and agricultural
6 sectors.

7 The plan was submitted for the panel's
8 review and reflects a balanced approach to energy
9 efficiency. We intend to show that the programming
10 selected as part of the plan allows Efficiency
11 Manitoba to meet the mandate, and those savings can
12 make a real difference for ratepayers and drive
13 development and innovation in community and business
14 sectors.

15 There are further details outlining the
16 portfolio design decision-making process outlined at
17 appendix A, section A2.3.4 and specific details
18 relating to each customer segment at appendix A,
19 sections 4 through 7, respectively.

20 Efficiency Manitoba is proud to present
21 its plan to the panel for review. This plan too into
22 account the interests of stakeholders, and we believe
23 it meets the needs of Manitobans.

24 You will hear evidence and -- regards
25 to the important work of the Energy Efficiency

1 Advisory Group, commonly referred to as the EEAG, and
2 the role this group and their stakeholders played in
3 providing advice to Efficiency Manitoba about the
4 development and implementation of its efficiency plan.

5 You will also have seen from your
6 review of the plan, and you will hear further today,
7 that Efficiency Manitoba is committed to continuously
8 improving on the delivery of programs identified in
9 the plan and has recognized the benefit of
10 incorporating flexibility into its plan.

11 Efficiency Manitoba recognizes the
12 importance of this process, as the review of its first
13 efficiency plan and values the voice of the people in
14 this room and the stakeholders that they represent
15 across the province.

16 Through the course of this hearing, we
17 expect you will hear evidence from Interveners as to
18 the numerous options that Efficiency Manitoba could
19 have included in its plan. And Efficiency Manitoba
20 values that feedback.

21 However, the goal of this proceeding is
22 to review Efficiency Manitoba's plan as presented, and
23 to determine whether the legislative requirements have
24 been met.

25 The plan presented to the panel was

1 carefully considered, and Efficiency Manitoba looks
2 forward to continuing to work with Interveners and the
3 panel to implement the best efficiency plan for
4 Manitoba and Manitobans.

5 Subject to any questions from the
6 panel, those are our comments.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.
8 Schofield. Ms. Fox...?

9

10 OPENING COMMENTS BY AMC:

11 MS. CARLY FOX: Thank you. Good
12 morning Board Chair, Vice-Chair, Board members. My
13 name is Carly Fox and I'm here today with my co-
14 counsel, Ms. Emily Gugliemin, and we represent the
15 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, which we'll also refer to
16 as the AMC throughout the Hearing.

17 The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs is an
18 umbrella organization that represents sixty-two (62)
19 of the sixty-three (63) First Nations in the Province
20 of Manitoba, this includes approximately a hundred and
21 fifty-one thousand (151,000) First Nation citizens,
22 which accounts for approximately 12 percent of the
23 population of the Province of Manitoba.

24 The Assembly of Manitoba Chief --
25 Chiefs provides a mechanism that aims to balance

1 respect for local and regional First Nations autonomy
2 with the need for collective positions and decisions.
3 It is within that scope that we come before you today.

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair, for your
5 acknowledgement of our presence on the Treaty 1 lands
6 and on the Territories of the Anishinaabe, Ojibwa,
7 Oji-Cree, Cree, Dene, and Dakota peoples. We also
8 acknowledge all the treaties that cover the land and
9 waters in the Province of Manitoba.

10 It is the hope of the Assembly of
11 Manitoba Chiefs that the ongoing treaty relationship
12 and the intent of reconciliation will ground this
13 Hearing and the deliberations of the Board.

14 Some of the evidence that will be
15 spoken to over the next few weeks has come before the
16 Board in the past. This includes evidence that
17 treaties have not been lived up to in Manitoba,
18 evidence of the longstanding disparities between First
19 Nations and the rest of the Manitoba population.

20 Most importantly for this Hearing is
21 the evidence that higher levels of equid -- or sorry,
22 energy poverty faced by First Nations in part due to
23 the lower quality housing stock and more populated
24 houses and significantly higher rate burdens even
25 compared with other vulnerable or hard to reach

1 groups.

2 You'll hear of these disparities and
3 conditions that have been exacerbated and continuing
4 for well over a century and without solid steps
5 towards wi -- reconciliation, will continue into the
6 future.

7 Well, you'll hear of these longstanding
8 issues. We will also show that energy efficiency
9 programming can directly address some of these
10 inequalities that First Nations face when programming
11 is created with equity as a core objective instead of
12 an afterthought.

13 The AMC will lead the evidence of Dr.
14 Timothy Clark who will speak to the under
15 representation of First Nations ratepayers within
16 energy -- or within Efficiency Manitoba's plan.

17 This includes both the addressed First
18 Nation's on-reserve residential ratepayers as well as
19 off-reserve First Nation customers, a population which
20 was not addressed by the plan.

21 The AMC acknowledges that cost-
22 effectiveness is important and necessary; however,
23 it's not the only mandated consideration under the
24 Efficiency Manitoba Act.

25 Other factors, such as reconciliation,

1 equity non-energy benefits can and should be re --
2 considered when reviewing the plan to ensure that a
3 more balanced, equitable, and accessible approach
4 prevails.

5 There are many important and positive
6 aspects of the plan which -- or the proposed plan
7 which the AMC agrees are likely to have positive
8 impacts on successive energy efficiency programming
9 for First Nations.

10 The AMC will illustrate that by
11 addressing the barriers to accessibility for First
12 Nations, the positive effect aspects of the plan are
13 strengthened and that the successes of previous
14 Manitoba Hydro energy efficiency programs for First
15 Nations are continued.

16 The approach and guidance that is taken
17 with this plan now will set the groundwork for the
18 foreseeable future. And it is important that concrete
19 steps are taken to ensure that the plan not only is
20 accessible and equitable for First Nations but also
21 does not further exacerbate existing disparities.

22 Thank you.

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Fox.
2 Ms. Dilay...?

3

4 OPENING COMMENTS BY CAC AND WINNIPEG HARVEST:

5 MS. KATRINE DILAY: Thank you, Mr.
6 Chair. Good morning, Board members. My name is
7 Katrine Dilay. I'm a lawyer with the Public Interest
8 Law Centre, and I represent the Consumers Coalition in
9 this proceeding.

10 To my right is Ms. Gloria Desorcy,
11 executive director of the Consumers Association of
12 Canada Manitoba branch. Megan Urbas, who is community
13 impact manager with Winnipeg Harvest, cannot be here
14 today, but I do expect that she will be here at
15 different days throughout the proceeding.

16 I'll also mention in the audience we
17 have Mr. Nigel D'Souza, who is a legal assistant with
18 the Public Interest Law Centre.

19 If we could go to slide 2, please.
20 We've titled this presentation: "Missed opportunities
21 and too much risk or a credible path forward." This
22 title was chosen because of the main questions that
23 our clients are asking in this proceeding.

24 Our clients are asking: Do the
25 legislature intend to get a carbon copy of Manitoba

1 Hydro's prior energy efficiency plan which asserts
2 that it can achieve higher savings at a lower cost or
3 did the legislature intend for Efficiency Manitoba to
4 file a plan that reflects cost-effective innovation,
5 includes a credible risk assessment and appropriate
6 mitigation where necessary and which can be reasonably
7 achieved.

8 To our clients, this hearing is a
9 crucial one. The 2020/2023 efficiency plan is
10 important to all Manitobans. It will be in place for
11 three (3) years before it is publically reviewed by
12 the Public Utilities Board next. And a well-designed
13 cost-effective energy efficiency plan can have
14 positive implications for residential ratepayers, who
15 our clients represent, as well as for our environment.

16 Our clients see this in three (3) main
17 ways. First, consumers can have more control over
18 their energy bills, allowing them to save money over
19 the short and long term.

20 It can allow for reduced or delayed
21 capital expenditures and development as well as
22 increased energy available for export which can lead
23 to lower rates overall for hydro customers and it can
24 also assist in developing the market for emerging
25 technologies and clean energy and energy conservation

1 which can have important implications for future
2 efficiency plans as well as future generations.

3 On this cli -- slide our clients do
4 want to note some concerns relating to the challenges
5 that have been paced -- faced in this proceeding to
6 date.

7 From their perspective, a poor filing
8 and a poor process combined with the importance of
9 this inaugural three (3) year efficiency plan has left
10 parties and the Public Utilities Board in a difficult
11 position with respect to the outcome of this
12 proceeding.

13 And they say this for four (4) main
14 reasons. The efficiency plan, as we know, was delayed
15 from October 1st, 2019, to October 25th, 2019,
16 resulting in additional compressions to an already
17 compressed time frame.

18 There were -- there was no Second Round
19 of Information requests in this proceeding. From our
20 clients' perspective, significant detail was missing
21 in the efficiency plan that was submitted.

22 And finally, the combination of the end
23 of the hearing with the April 1st implementation date
24 for the plan does not leave much time for amendments
25 to be made to the plan if the PUB and the minister

1 recommend that improvements should be made.

2 While some of these factors were
3 outside of anyone's control in this room, our clients
4 do wish to highlight these concerns in the hopes that
5 future proceedings can be improved.

6 On this slide we've highlighted some
7 information about our clients who have regularly come
8 before this Board in past regulatory proceedings.
9 Winnipeg Harvest is a nonprofit, community-based
10 organization committed to providing food to people who
11 struggle to fe -- to feed themselves and their
12 families.

13 CAC Manitoba is volunteer, nonprofit,
14 independent organization working to inform and empower
15 consumers, and to represent the consumer interest in
16 Manitoba.

17 Both clients have significant
18 regulatory experience both before this Board in
19 Manitoba as well as at the federal level, including on
20 issues with respect to energy efficiency specifically.

21 Developing the Consumers Coalition
22 position in this proceeding included and will include
23 reviewing the written record, ongoing and regular
24 consumer contact, consumer engagement, attendance at
25 the hearings, as well as ex -- advise from expert

1 advisors.

2 Given the importance of this Hearing
3 for residential ratepayers, our clients retained a
4 highly qualified interdisciplinary team of experts who
5 were asked to look at four (4) main questions in their
6 analysis of the plan, was the methodology to develop
7 the plan and to select initiatives reasonable, is the
8 plan credible, cost-effective, and accessible to all
9 Manitobans, were climate change implications
10 considered in the development of the plan, and was
11 engagement with stakeholders and the public
12 appropriate.

13 And at the bottom of this slide we've
14 highlighted that the experts retained by our clients
15 are independent and that they understand their duty is
16 to assist the Public Utilities Board by providing
17 objective and nonpartisan evidence.

18 The next few slides include specific
19 excerpts from the Efficiency Manitoba Act as well as
20 the regulations. We've included these because these
21 are the main provisions that have guided our clients -
22 - the way that our clients, pardon me, have approached
23 this proceeding to date.

24 On slide 8, we've included the mandate
25 of Efficiency Manitoba as set out in a portion of the

1 Act under Section 4(1). The mandate includes
2 implementing and supporting demand side management
3 initiatives to meet the savings targets and achieve
4 any resulting reductions in greenhouse gas emissions
5 in Manitoba. It also includes achieving additional
6 reducti -- reductions, if the reductions can be
7 achieved in a cost-effective manner. And it also
8 includes mitigating the impact of rate increases and
9 delaying the point at which capital investments may
10 need to be made by Manitoba Hydro.

11 On the next slide, we've included these
12 provisions simply because they're why we're -- we're
13 all here. The plan prepared by Efficiency Manitoba
14 must be submitted to the Public Utilities Board, and
15 the Public Utilities Board must make a recommendation
16 and a report to the minister recommending whether the
17 plan should be approved, approved with suggested
18 amendments, or whether it should be rejected.

19 On slides 10 and 11 are listed the
20 mandatory considerations both under the Act and the
21 regulations that the Public Utilities Board must look
22 like -- must look at, pardon me, and which our clients
23 have used to guide their intervention in this
24 proceeding. Under the Act, some of the mandatory
25 considerations include: The net savings required to

1 meet the savings target and the plans to address any
2 existing shortfalls; the benefits and cost-
3 effectiveness of the initiatives proposed in the plan;
4 and whether Efficiency Manitoba is reas -- reasonably
5 achieving the aim of providing initiatives that are
6 accessible to all Manitobans.

7 On slide 11 are additional factors to
8 be considered by the PUB, and we've reproduced the
9 ones that our clients have really focussed on when
10 they -- when they were looking at the plan filed by
11 Efficiency Manitoba.

12 Starting on side -- on slide 12, this
13 is where we outline the main issues that our clients
14 will be looking at throughout the course of this
15 proceeding. As previously mentioned, the main theme
16 of this presentation is whether the 2020/2023
17 efficiency plan represents missed opportunities and
18 too much risk.

19 While our clients see that the types of
20 programs that are included in the plan are typical of
21 comprehensive energy efficiency portfolios, and if
22 budget appropriately and implemented effectively, they
23 provide significant opportunities to increase the
24 energy efficiency of homes and business throughout the
25 province, our clients are asking, Is this sufficient?

1 Or does Efficiency Manitoba's plan miss
2 significant opportunities in light of good-practice
3 public and stakeholder engagement; previous Public
4 Utilities Board findings regarding the importance of
5 energy efficiency for low-income consumers and
6 findings that the PUB has made in the context of
7 integrated resource planning; good practice in leading
8 energy efficiency jurisdictions with respect to
9 residential programming and risk management; and
10 finally, the climate change crisis, the issue of
11 electrification, as well as emerging technologies? So
12 over the -- over the -- the last part of this
13 presentation, I'll go into more detail in those -- on
14 those issues.

15 In terms of how the plan was developed,
16 the Public Utilities Board has previously found that
17 demand side management must be evaluated as a
18 standalone resource in an integrated resource planning
19 process by Manitoba Hydro.

20 So our clients are asking, In
21 developing its plan, did Efficiency Manitoba
22 appropriate apply principles that arise when we look
23 at integrated resource planning? If Efficiency
24 Manitoba did not appropriately apply these principles,
25 would applying such principles have led to a more

1 robust and transparent consideration, evaluation, and
2 selection of options and alternatives? And finally,
3 should Efficiency Manitoba be directed to demonstrate
4 how it has applied principles of integrated resource
5 planning in the development of future efficiency
6 plans?

7 As we will be aware in this room,
8 Section 9(h) of the Efficiency Manitoba Act requires
9 Efficiency Manitoba to include in its plan a
10 description of the input that it has received from
11 stakeholders and from the public in preparing the
12 plan, as well as the process established for receiving
13 the input.

14 In light of this legislative
15 requirement, our clients are asking, Was there
16 sufficient public and stakeholder engagement conducted
17 in developing this plan? If not, what does this mean
18 for the 2020/2023 efficiency plan? Given that
19 meaningful participation is a cornerstone of the
20 development of good policy, can significant
21 improvements be made to Efficiency Manitoba's
22 methodology for public and stakeholder engagement?

23 With respect to risks and risk
24 management, our clients are asking, Are there
25 significant risks to the implementation of the

1 efficiency plan that are not being -- being
2 acknowledged or addressed by Efficiency Manitoba? Do
3 potential risks to the implementation of the plan
4 include whether the required staff transition from
5 Manitoba Hydro will be successful and accomplished in
6 a timely manner; whether procurement for third-party
7 implementers will be successful and accomplished in a
8 timely manner; whether all the programs will ramp up
9 according to plan and meet participation and savings
10 targets within the proposed budgets; whether the
11 proposed customer relationship management tool and
12 proposed online home energy questionnaire will be
13 fully deployed and operational according to the
14 expected timelines; and whether the significant
15 savings that are projected to come from codes and
16 standards will, in fact, be verified by the
17 independent assessor?

18 And relating to these potential risks,
19 are adequate contingency plans being contemplated to
20 address implementation risks, or is there significant
21 uncertainty with respect to Efficiency Manitoba's
22 potential for successfully implementing the plan?
23 Should Efficiency Manitoba develop a risk management
24 or project management framework which would identify
25 potential risks as well as mitigation strategies?

1 From the perspective of the
2 accessibility of programs to all Manitobans, which is
3 very -- very important to our clients, in light of
4 Section 4(3)(c) of the Act, as well as previous
5 findings by this Board regarding low-income customers
6 and the importance of energy efficiency programming
7 for low-income customers, is Efficiency Manitoba
8 unreasonably conservative in the scope and scale of
9 its proposed residential sector programs?

10 And on the next slide, regarding cost-
11 effectiveness, our clients are asking whether there
12 are shortcomings associated with Efficiency Manitoba's
13 calculation of the program administrator cost test and
14 the life cycle revenue impact analysis, specifically
15 in relation to the marginal values and the discount
16 rate that were used, as well as the rate increase
17 assumption that were used for the life cycle revenue
18 impact analysis.

19 Our clients, of course, recognize that
20 cos -- cost effectiveness is an important factor to be
21 considered in developing and approving an energy
22 efficiency portfolio, but they wonder, Is it the most
23 important factor, or should consumer choice,
24 accessibility of programs to all Manitobans, long-term
25 savings goals, emerging technologies, and

1 environmental considerations also be weighed in the
2 development and approval of the energy efficiency
3 portfolio? And if so, what is the relative importance
4 of the various factors in relation to cost-
5 effectiveness?

6 Again, from the perspective of
7 Efficiency Manitoba's methodology to select or reject
8 initiatives, and so how -- how it has developed its
9 plan, our clients have looked at the impacts of
10 climate change, electrification, and the relations to
11 -- the relationship to energy efficiency.

12 In light of the climate crisis and the
13 importance of building electrification as one of the
14 critical pathways to achieve the kind of substantial
15 reductions in greenhouse gas emissions necessary to
16 stabilize the global climate, our clients are asking
17 whether Efficiency Manitoba's plan has significant
18 shortcomings in the way that it plans to address
19 electrification opportunities over the next three (3)
20 years. And they're also asking whether Efficiency
21 Manitoba's proposed mix of measures and programs do
22 enough to enable future elec -- electrification, if we
23 look beyond the three-year plan.

24 And does the structure of Efficiency
25 Manitoba's savings goals, as well as how the

1 organization is proposing to treat the impacts of
2 electrification on those goals, have the potential to
3 create a perverse disincentive to pursuing
4 electrification efforts.

5 And finally, this brings us to two (2)
6 summative questions, a -- as well as the end of our
7 presentation this morning.

8 Is Efficiency Manitoba's plan
9 innovative? Is it cost-effective, and is it
10 accessible to all Manitobans, or is it simply business
11 as usual?

12 And has Efficiency -- Efficiency Manitoba
13 appropriately recognized, acknowledged, and addressed
14 the risks to implementing its plan and meeting the
15 savings targets? Or are there -- do there remain
16 credibility concerns with the successful
17 implementation of the plan?

18 Subject to any questions the Board may
19 have, those are our submissions for this morning.
20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.
22 Dilay. Mr. Hacault...?

23

24 OPENING COMMENTS BY MIPUG:

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Good morning,

1 Mr. Chairperson, Board members, Board council,
2 advisors, all parties and their counsel.

3 My name is Antoine Hacault for the
4 record. We act on behalf of Manitoba Industrial -- or
5 Power Industrial Users Group and we thank the Board
6 for the opportunity to participate in this hearing.

7 We will have two experts who will be
8 testifying on January 20, and some members who will be
9 making presentations on January 24.

10 We also take this opportunity to thank
11 Efficiency Manitoba for its momentous efforts to-date,
12 including ensuring that the Board has information on
13 which to base its decisions and recommendations. My
14 comments which follow are not meant -- are meant to be
15 constructive.

16 The first subject I wish to address
17 repeats some of the concerns of the consumer's group,
18 is the view of Manitoba Industrial Power User's Group,
19 that the record is not robust.

20 First, although Manitoba Hydro is
21 entitled to be heard pursuant to section 11(2) of the
22 Efficiency Manitoba Act, it has chosen not to file
23 evidence and not to participate, thereby eliminating
24 the possibility of getting relevant information from
25 it.

1 Second, although parties in general
2 rate application hearings, both on the electric and
3 gas side, have the option of accessing commercially
4 sensitive information through the signing of Board-
5 approved undertakings and non-disclosure agreements,
6 no such opportunity was available in this process.

7 Thirdly, it appears that the
8 independent expert consultants had limited access to
9 relevant information. For example, under section
10 12(1) of the regulation 1 of the -- part of the cost-
11 effectiveness test, is the levelized marginal value to
12 Manitoba Hydro based on a methodology consistent with
13 its -- and I emphasize this -- resource planning
14 process, taking into account the -- and I emphasize
15 this -- timing and duration of savings.

16 It's not apparent that any meaningful
17 information was received from Manitoba Hydro on the
18 levelized value at different times of the year, and at
19 each year for the 30-year timeframe used by Efficiency
20 Manitoba.

21 There's no discussion of this important
22 issue in Daymark's public report, and no indication
23 that a CSI version of the Daymark report fully
24 analyses this issue.

25 We know that generally gas and electric

1 systems are winter-peaking. We know Keeyask is coming
2 online and there's expected to be decades of surplus
3 energy and capacity relative to domestic energy
4 requirements.

5 One would expect that marginal values
6 would increase as we get closer to needing new
7 generating resources. How can one decide whether one
8 or more of the programs are cost effective from a
9 resource planning perspective without at least having
10 Hydro's view on the resource planning perspective?

11 Fourth, there's very little information
12 about the full spec -- spectrum of possible demand
13 side options, so we have very little information about
14 the impact of seeking a lower or higher target than
15 the regulatory targets at 1.5 percent for electric,
16 and .75 percent for gas.

17 This leads me to identifying and
18 important discussion which we feel needs to happen in
19 this hearing on the approach to selecting programs and
20 DSM plan development.

21 We will be -- and there is evidence on
22 the record that there should be a goal of analysing
23 and treating DSM as part of an integrated resource
24 plan.

25 The genesis for Efficiency Manitoba

1 legislation in this hearing was the June 2014 NFAT
2 hearing, where it was suggested by some experts at
3 that NFAT hearing that Manitoba Hydro pursue an
4 integrated resource planning approach to evaluate
5 supply and demand side resources on an equal footing.

6 The Board accepted that view. And the
7 intent was to ensure that the least cost -- cost
8 options are fully considered.

9 For example, at page 34 of its report,
10 the PUB made the following findings: an integrated
11 resource plan determines what supply side and demand
12 side resource mix is the best -- is in the best
13 interest of electricity customers. And the
14 effectiveness of integrated resource planning and
15 determining least cost combinations of resources
16 cannot be overestimated.

17 The Board also described at page 91 the
18 purpose of an integrated resource plan as being to
19 determine analytically what resource is in supply side
20 and demand side options and measuring them against the
21 collective set of objectives and criteria.

22 And finally, that that should be ident
23 -- analysed as an independent stand-alone resource.

24 We note that the regulations a -- or
25 sorry, the Act also at section 41(c), one of the

1 sections put on the CAC screens, refers to one (1) of
2 the stated purposes to -- is to mitigate the impact of
3 rate increases and delay the point at which capital
4 investments and major new generation and transmission
5 projects will be required.

6 The Board in the NFAT hearing had also
7 expressed concern for the vulnerable and low income
8 customers. And we see that social policy concern and
9 objective is also specifically identified in the
10 regulations and legislation.

11 If DSM is to be treated as an
12 independent stand-alone resource, we suggest that one
13 needs to think about the same types of questions. We
14 asked ourselves of the supply side resources. How
15 much do we invest, and what type of asset, or in this
16 case in what type of programs do we invest?

17 When do we make the investment? Do we
18 need and invest in programs which are the most
19 effective in reducing the seasonal peaks which drive
20 capacity needs?

21 What is the expected duration of the
22 resource? Are there regionally specific marginal
23 benefits for electric transmission and distribution
24 that may not match the general assumption regarding
25 winter peaking? For example, urban loads in gas-

1 served areas.

2 So we expect there to be a wholesome
3 debate about these issues, maybe the record isn't
4 robust, but again repeating some of the comments by
5 Ms. Dilay, we view this hearing not only as analysing
6 what we have, but if we're going to be charting a path
7 for future analysis after the Board has the
8 opportunity to look at all the information it has and
9 look at all the objectives that the legislation wants
10 and the Minister wants in its mandate directed --
11 directives, to make some suggestions as to how to
12 improve the process and the information that comes in
13 front of this Board.

14 Now that we have the benefit of this
15 first filing, as we said, we expect that there will be
16 recommendations which we believe are in scope and
17 within the jurisdiction of the PUB to make on
18 questions such as the way the PUB will receive and
19 analyse DSM as a stand-alone resource, the minimum
20 filings for the proper testing of DSM as one of the
21 resource options, what impacts are if we vary either
22 the amount of savings, because we're supposed to make
23 recommendations as to whether 1.5 percent is enough or
24 not enough on the electrical side.

25 So for example, what if we went down to

1 .5 a percent now, to ramp it up later, or what if we
2 go to 2 percent now and change it?

3 How do we make an educated decision
4 unless we have the information to compare those things
5 and decide whether our investment at this point in
6 time on specific types of programs, which either
7 address energy or capacity, are the ones we should be
8 making at this point?

9 What happens if we remove uneconomic
10 DSM to the extent that a DSM program is not targeted
11 to low income or hard -- hard to reach customers,
12 because those are special policy issues?

13 On the supply side, evidence would
14 normally include information on various sizes of
15 generating options, and the timing of those options.

16 Is it appropriate to have the same
17 information when analysing DSM as a resource to make
18 recommendations to the Government as to whether
19 current targets are in the public interest?

20 Finally we get into what gets counted
21 in DSM from the perspective of one -- of it being one
22 resource in an integrated resource plan.

23 Whether savings targets should be
24 achieved on average over a 15-year period. In other
25 words, should DSM targets necessarily need to be

1 achieved every year?

2 Can DSM be more lumpy at times, when it
3 makes sense to invest in that resource?

4 In that regard, with respect to serving
5 industrial customers, is the concept of lost
6 opportunity that does not exist in the same manner,
7 with conventional supply side resources? So if you
8 had a major plant and the time in which to achieve
9 those significant savings is now, instead of
10 renovations in five (5) or six (6) years, should we
11 make that investment now?

12 So we expect to pursue the lowest cost
13 demand side alternatives, both as it applies to gas
14 and electricity. Should it make a difference whether
15 lowest cost demand side alternatives for electricity
16 come from a particular class, setting aside the social
17 policy objectives.

18 We will canvass whether it's
19 appropriate to remove some barriers and caps from
20 accessing more cost-effective demand side
21 alternatives. We will also note the spin-off effects
22 of investments in the industrial sector on the economy
23 and related jobs.

24 And there is a live issue which appears
25 to be developing in this hearing: what counts in the

1 targets and how should they be calculated?

2 There are varying views expressed on
3 what should or should not be included in targets, and
4 how they should be calculated.

5 The evidence on this issue has used
6 different lenses. We will canvas whether an
7 integrated resource plan lens is appropriate. This is
8 a broad lens that considers efforts by complimentary
9 agencies and government on a consolidated basis
10 regardless as to Manitoba -- or Efficiency Manitoba's
11 specific and measurable contribution.

12 With respect to standards and codes,
13 it's the expectation that the evidence will confirm a
14 contribution by Manitoba which meets the test in the
15 regulations. But also from a resource plan
16 perspective, it should be irrelevant as to the extent
17 of the contribution as long as Efficiency Manitoba or
18 Manitoba Hydro participated in the relevant committees
19 and made a financial contribution.

20 They have a specific effect that is
21 standard in -- standards and codes, because they are
22 expected to be followed in the construction of
23 buildings and structures and they are lasting.

24 And if you take an integrated resource
25 approach, you want to know how it's going to have that

1 effect in 20, 30 years.

2 So industrial will have a per --
3 industrials will have a perspective to share on the
4 duration of energy efficiency investments in their
5 facilities, replacement at end of life is usually with
6 equipment that is as efficient or more efficient, and
7 various recommendations will flow from the analysis
8 and perspective --

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Hacault, you've
10 got two (2) minutes.

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: My concluding
12 sentence, thank you for allowing me to make these
13 opening comments. We look forward to participating in
14 this hearing with a view of assisting the Board in its
15 consideration of evidence and the recommendations it
16 will make.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Great response.
18 Thank you. Mr. Wheeler...?

19

20 OPENING COMMENTS BY MKO:

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Good morning. My
22 name is Jared Wheeler. With me is my colleague and
23 co-counsel, Mr. Markus Buchart.

24 Mr. Buchart and I are counsel to
25 Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak Inc. or MKO at this

1 hearing.

2 On behalf of MKO we wish good morning
3 to you, Mr. Chair, as well as Madam Vice-Chair and
4 Board members, Board council and staff. Good morning
5 to Efficiency Manitoba representatives and legal
6 counsel, and good morning to legal counsel and
7 representatives of other Interveners in this hearing.

8 MKO would also like to thank and
9 acknowledge members of the public who may be joining
10 us this morning and monitoring this important hearing
11 online.

12 Thank you for welcoming us here to
13 participate in this review of Efficiency Manitoba's
14 initial three-year efficiency plan. MKO recognizes
15 this proceeding as an important opportunity to set the
16 parameters for the beginning of the relationship
17 between Efficiency Manitoba and First Nations in
18 Northern Manitoba.

19 MKO is a no-profit advocacy
20 organization that has been in existence for more than
21 35 years, and provides a collective voice for more
22 than 65,000 Treaty First Nations citizens in the
23 northern part of the province, now called Manitoba.

24 MKO is governed by the elected chiefs
25 of 26 sovereign First Nations in Northern Manitoba and

1 receives its mandate by resolution of the MKO Chiefs
2 and General Assembly.

3 We would like to acknowledge, as we
4 have heard already today, that we are on Treaty 1
5 territory, recognized as the traditional territory of
6 the Anishinaabe, Cree, Oji-Cree, and Dakota peoples in
7 the homeland of the Metis Nation.

8 This is very important to always
9 acknowledge the traditional territories and treaty
10 lands on which we sit, as the treaties, including
11 Treaty 1, set out a recognition of some of the
12 reciprocal responsibilities involved in an ongoing
13 relationship between multiple nations and peoples.

14 Those treaties have not always been
15 upheld, and those relationships are not always easy.
16 Specifically, the relationships between the provincial
17 government and Crown corporations, such as Manitoba
18 Hydro on one hand, and Indigenous peoples and Manitoba
19 on the other hand have not always been smooth. There
20 are challenges with respect to acknowledging the
21 shared history in these lands, while striving to move
22 forward together in a good way.

23 Helping us to address these challenges,
24 the Manitoba Provincial Government took a bold move a
25 few years back and passed the Path to Reconciliation

1 Act. That Act sets out that reconciliation refers to
2 the ongoing process of establishing and maintaining
3 mutually respectful relationships between Indigenous
4 and non-Indigenous peoples in order to build trust,
5 affirm historical agreements, address healing, and
6 create a more equitable and inclusive society.

7 There are varying definitions of
8 reconciliation out there, but for the purposes of this
9 hearing, MKO will rely on the definition provided in
10 the Act.

11 You may ask what does reconciliation
12 have to do with this hearing? And the flip side of
13 that, what does this hearing have to do with
14 reconciliation?

15 The answer to both of these questions
16 is simply this hearing has everything to do with
17 reconciliation. This is about establishing a good
18 relationship between First Nations in Manitoba and a
19 new Crown corporation.

20 A new Crown corporation that, by its
21 legislation, is an agent of the Crown. This is about
22 building trust, this is about equity and
23 inclusiveness.

24 The Manitoba Government has also
25 provided us with some guidance in the Path to

1 Reconciliation Act as well, setting out guiding
2 principles in section 2 of the Act, and these
3 principles are to advance reconciliation, the
4 Government must have regard for the following:
5 respect, engagement, understanding, and action.

6 This also sets out that reconciliation
7 is found in -- on engagement with Indigenous Nations
8 and Indigenous peoples.

9 It is with regard to these four (4)
10 principles that Efficiency Manitoba, as an agent of
11 the Crown, must act. And it is within the framework
12 of these principles that MKO has considered the plan
13 and the materials on the record in this hearing to-
14 date, and will continue to consider the evidence yet
15 to come in the following days and weeks.

16 The question then is: Has Efficiency
17 Manitoba demonstrated that it has operated within the
18 principles of respect, engagement, understanding and
19 action, as the Provincial Government has mandated? Is
20 the plan accessible to all Manitobans?

21 We intend to show that Efficiency
22 Manitoba has failed to incorporate reconciliation into
23 the process of preparing the plan. While the ongoing
24 engagement strategy going forward may be a good step
25 if it is carried out well, we intend to show that

1 Efficiency Manitoba's poor engagement to date with the
2 twenty-six (26) independent and sovereign First
3 Nations in Northern Manitoba could be seen as
4 disrespectful.

5 We intend to show that poor engagement
6 has led to a lack of understanding on Efficiency
7 Manitoba's part of issues specific to First Nations in
8 Ma -- in Northern Manitoba which has in turn resulted
9 in Efficiency Manitoba's actions in preparing the
10 electric DSM programs, the electric DSM portfolio, as
11 well as the initial three (3) year efficiency plan as
12 presented, all of which fail to specifically address
13 issues specific to First Nations in Northern Manitoba.

14 We acknowledge that Efficiency
15 Manitoba's plan to figure out a plan for ongoing two
16 (2) way engagement with First Nations going forward is
17 a good idea, but we also have to acknowledge that
18 opportunities for engagement have been missed in the
19 steps taken already.

20 In contract law, an agreement to agree
21 is no agreement at all. We suggest that, similarly, a
22 plan to plan is not a plan at all and is instead an
23 idea more than an action.

24 There are many instances in the three-
25 year plan before this Board in which Efficiency

1 Manitoba states that a plan will be developed.
2 Reconciliation and reciprocal relationships require
3 action.

4 MKO is approaching this Hearing from
5 the position that this is about establishing and
6 maintaining mutually respectful and mutually
7 beneficial relationships.

8 It's common knowledge that the
9 relationships between Manitoba Hydro and First Nations
10 in Manitoba have been fraught with challenges. First
11 Nations in Northern Manitoba have borne the brunt of
12 the impacts of hydro development during construction,
13 also throughout the ongoing operation of hydro
14 electric facilities while at the same time, those same
15 people have suffered and continue to suffer
16 disproportionately from energy poverty.

17 The relationship between Manitoba Hydro
18 and First Nations in Manitoba is one that can often be
19 characterized as a relationship of mistrust. First
20 Nations in Northern Manitoba often see broken promises
21 and unilateral decision making that has often excluded
22 them either by forgetting them or ignoring them.

23 There's a very real danger that the
24 relationship between Efficiency Manitoba and First
25 Nations in Northern Manico -- Manitoba could be just

1 as contentious and challenging as the relationship
2 between Hydro and First Nations in Northern Manitoba.
3 That relationship already exists.

4 And Efficiency Manitoba could be viewed
5 as only an extension of Manitoba Hydro. But we can
6 look at the example of the relationship between
7 Manitoba Hydro and Northern First Nations as a
8 cautionary tale of what can occur when a relationship
9 between a provincial Crown corporation and Northern
10 First Nations is simply not good.

11 The relationship between Efficiency
12 Manitoba and Northern First Nations can be different.
13 The relationship between Efficiency Manitoba and
14 Northern First Nations can be better. We have an
15 opportunity in this Hearing to strive to make sure
16 that relationship is better than what we have seen in
17 separate but similar instances.

18 Rather than trying to heal a damaged
19 relationship, this relationship can start in a good
20 way. This relationship can be one based on mutual
21 respect and understanding right from the outset. This
22 is the goal of our client.

23 In the interest of fostering
24 understanding, MKO has sought and will continue to
25 seek to understand the position of Efficiency Manitoba

1 and the Interveners in this process. And MKO will
2 seek to enhance the understanding of the Board and all
3 parties.

4 MKO will also seek to ensure that the
5 citizens, businesses, and governments of MKO member
6 First Nations are neither forgotten, nor ignored, in
7 this Hearing and Efficiency Manitoba's initial plan.

8 Families and businesses operating on
9 First Nations in Northern Manitoba face extreme
10 weather conditions. And those families and businesses
11 are faced with higher prices. It costs more to live
12 in the North; this is simply reality.

13 This makes difficult spending decisions
14 a constant necessity. There are many reasons for
15 those high costs in the North, one (1) of which, the
16 high pri -- high price of accessing energy; another is
17 challenging housing conditions on reserve. And this
18 has been acknowledged by this Board many times.

19 Efficiency Manitoba's electric DSM
20 portfolio could help to address some of those issues.
21 In addition, we specifically note that four (4) of the
22 MKO member First Nations are not connected to the
23 Manitoba Hydro grid but are serviced entirely by
24 diesel supplied by Manitoba Hydro for electricity and
25 for heat.

1 This brings a whole host of other
2 issues. And MKO wants to ensure that we do not forget
3 or ignore the fact that the folks living in those
4 diesel service communities are impacted by the
5 decisions made here in this room, the decisions made
6 by Efficiency Manitoba and can be positively addressed
7 -- or par -- pardon me -- and can be positively
8 impacted by Efficiency Manitoba's operations.

9 With respect to the initial three (3)
10 year plan Efficiency Manitoba has presented, MKO
11 recognizes that the onus is on Efficiency Manitoba to
12 demonstrate that the initial three (3) year efficiency
13 plan is an appropriate plan and the onus is on
14 Efficiency Manitoba to show that Board approval of the
15 plan would be just and reasonable.

16 We intend to show that Efficiency
17 Manitoba has not discharged that onus. We intend to
18 show that the process of preparing the plan was
19 deficient and, as a result, the plan itself is
20 deficient.

21 We intend to show that Efficiency
22 Manitoba has not met the onus of justifying the plan
23 because Efficiency Manitoba does not yet have the
24 requisite information that might justify the plan.

25 We intend to show that one (1) of the

1 reasons Efficiency Manitoba does not have information
2 that might justify the plan is because Efficiency
3 Manitoba has failed to meaningfully en -- meaningfully
4 engage with the twenty-six (26) independent and
5 sovereign First Nations in Northern Manitoba.

6 We intended to show that, by Efficiency
7 Manitoba having failed to meaningfully engage with
8 First Nations in Northern Manitoba to date, the plan
9 fails to consider and incorporate many concerns
10 relevant to those First Nations. Again, a plan to
11 plan is no plan at all.

12 So, in this Hearing, with a specific
13 focus on First Nation customers in Northern Manitoba,
14 MKO will focus on the issues that the Board has
15 determined to be within the scope of this review of
16 the plan, including specifically but not limited to
17 the appropriateness of Efficiency Manitoba's methods
18 to select or reject DSM initiatives, rate impacts and
19 customer bill impacts for both participants and
20 nonparticipants arising from the DSM bundles and
21 portfolio and whether those bill impacts are
22 reasonable, accessibility of the proposed efficiency
23 plan to all Manitobans, including consideration of the
24 interests of hard to reach First Nation customers,
25 barriers to demand side management uptake for First

1 Nation customers, the engagement strategy for First
2 Nations customers, as well as compliance of Efficiency
3 Manitoba with directions from government through
4 mandate and framework letters.

5 And with that, on behalf of our client,
6 MKO, we thank you again for welcoming us here today.
7 And we look forward to the days and weeks to come.
8 Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.
10 Wheeler. Thank you, Counsel. We're a little early,
11 but I think we're going -- we'll break now, have our
12 morning break. We'll return at 10:20. And then we'll
13 have the panel for Efficiency Manitoba.

14 Sorry, Ms. Steinfeld...?

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Mr. Chair, if I
16 might, I believe the Consumers Coalition has an
17 exhibit to mark. And we might --

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: -- do that now.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, if we could.

21 MS. KATRINE DILAY: Thank you, Ms.
22 Steinfeld. I neglected to enter the opening statement
23 of the Consumers Coalition as Exhibit CC-14 in this
24 proceeding. Thank you very much.

25

1 --- EXHIBIT NO. CC-14: Opening statement of the
2 Consumers Coalition

3

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. We'll
5 adjourn until 10:20. Thank you.

6

7 --- Upon recessing at 10:07 a.m.

8 --- Upon resuming at 10:25 a.m.

9

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Schofield...?

11 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chair. We'd ask that our panel be sworn in now.

13

14 EFFICIENCY MANITOBA PANEL NO. 1:

15 COLLEEN KURULUK, SWORN

16 MICHAEL STOCKI, AFFIRMED

17 KYLA KRAMPS, SWORN

18 ROBERTO MONTANINO, AFFIRMED

19 AMY TUCK, AFFIRMED

20 TRACY STERDAN, AFFIRMED

21 CHERYL PILEK, SWORN

22

23 EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD:

24 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Thank you, and
25 I will now turn it over to Ms. Kuruluk.

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Good morning,
2 Chairman Gabor, Vice-chairman Kapitany, Board members
3 Grant and Board member Hamilton. My name is Colleen
4 Kuruluk, and I have been the CEO of Efficiency
5 Manitoba since January 2019. Prior to this position,
6 I was employed at Manitoba Hydro for over twenty-three
7 (23) years, with approximately twenty-one (21) of
8 these years working directly in demand side
9 management. My last position was the manager of the
10 Power Smart programs department, responsible for the
11 design and delivery of efficiency programs to
12 residential, commercial, and industrial customers.

13 I'm a graduate of the University of
14 Manitoba, with a bachelor's degree in commerce in the
15 pattern areas of market and finance. I have been
16 involved in several of Manitoba Hydro's past electric
17 and Centra Gas rate applications, as well as the Needs
18 For An Alternatives To hearing to review Manitoba
19 Hydro's preferred development plan, but this will be
20 my first time testifying.

21 As part of the Efficiency Manitoba
22 panel, I will be speaking to policy-related issues,
23 the Efficiency Manitoba Act and the Efficiency
24 Manitoba regulation, stakeholder engagement, as well
25 as codes and standards. And at this point, I'll pass

1 it over to my left.

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Good morning, Mr.
3 Chairman, members of the Board, and all others
4 present. My name is Michael Stocki, and I'm the vice-
5 president of efficiency programs at Efficiency
6 Manitoba. I'm a professional engineer, and I have a
7 master of science degree and a bachelor of science
8 degree, both in mechanical engineering. I've been
9 employed by Efficiency Manitoba since March of 2019.

10 Prior to this, I worked at Manitoba
11 Hydro for the previous eleven (11) years. Most
12 recently, I was the dir -- department manager of the
13 customer energy services department at Manitoba Hydro.
14 This will be my first time testifying before the
15 Public Utilities Board, and I'll be speaking to the
16 overall design of the portfolio, both electric and
17 natural gas, within the 2020/2023 efficiency plan;
18 cost-effectiveness test, including the life cycle
19 revenue impact; and the derivation of savings targets.
20 Thank you.

21 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Good morning, Chair,
22 Vice-chair, Board, advisors, and all present. My name
23 is Kyla Kramps. I am the vice-president of finance
24 and corporate performance at Efficiency Manitoba,
25 where I've been employed for the last seven (7)

1 months. I'm a chartered professional accountant, a
2 chartered business valuator, and I have a degree in
3 commerce from the University of Manitoba.

4 At Efficiency Manitoba, I'm responsible
5 for all things finance related, including forecasting,
6 budgeting, financial statement pres -- presentation,
7 and the corporate support functions. This is the
8 first time that I'll be testifying for Efficiency
9 Manitoba. I'll be testifying in the areas of our
10 budget, contingency fund, as well as any questions
11 about the corporate operational supports for
12 Efficiency Manitoba. Thank you.

13 MR. ROBERTO MONTANINO: Good morning,
14 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Interveners, and
15 all others present. My name is Roberto Montanino, and
16 I hold the position of energy efficiency lead,
17 commercial demand side management at Efficiency
18 Manitoba. I'm a graduate from the University of
19 Manitoba, earning a bachelor of commerce honours. I
20 have fifteen (15) years of experience working in
21 energy efficiency programming across both Efficiency
22 Manitoba as well as Manitoba Hydro.

23 My responsibilities as energy
24 efficiency lead entail providing strategic oversight
25 throughout the development of the Efficiency Manitoba

1 three (3) year plan as it relates specifically to
2 programming for the commercial sector in Manitoba. I
3 also serve as the business lead for the integrated
4 customer relationship management and demand side
5 management database system, which is referenced
6 throughout the three (3) year plan, and this will be
7 my first time testifying before a regulatory
8 proceeding. Thank you very much.

9 MS. AMY TUCK: Thank you. Good
10 morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board,
11 Interveners, and all in attendance. My name is Amy
12 Tuck, and I am the efficiency lead, Indigenous
13 programs, at Efficiency Manitoba since November 2019.
14 Prior to, I worked at Manitoba Hydro for nine (9)
15 years, all in demand side management.

16 My last position was the Indigenous
17 energy efficiency specialist, which I held for four
18 (4) years. Prior to that, I was the DSM affordable
19 energy specialist for three (3) years, and previous to
20 that, I was a marketing analyst on various residential
21 and commercial DSM programs.

22 I am a graduate of the University of
23 Manitoba, Faculty of Commerce. This will be my first
24 time testifying in a regulatory proceeding, but I've
25 been involved in previous proceedings related to

1 Manitoba Hydro's electric and Centra gas rate
2 applications. My roles consisted of answering IRs
3 regarding DSM. As part of the Efficiency Manitoba
4 panel, I will be responsible for progr -- for speaking
5 to Indigenous programs. Thank you.

6 MS. TRACY STERDAN: Good morning. My
7 name is Tracy Sterdan, and I'm the residential and
8 income qualified programs lead at Efficiency Manitoba.
9 I have a bachelor of commerce degree from the
10 University of Manitoba, and I was employed at Manitoba
11 Hydro for approximately seventeen (17) years. I
12 worked in various roles within the marketing and
13 customer service areas, most recently as the
14 supervisor of residential energy efficiency programs
15 for the last six (6) years.

16 I'm responsible for overseeing the
17 development and implementation of energy efficiency
18 initiatives for the residential sector. I was
19 involved in drafting the three (3) year plan and IRs,
20 and I've been working on the transition of programs
21 from Manitoba Hydro to Efficiency Manitoba.

22 I've been involved in previous
23 regulatory hearings with Manitoba Hydro, but this is
24 my first time testifying. As part of the Efficiency
25 Manitoba panel, I will be speaking to residential

1 programs and income qualified offers. Thank you.

2 MS. CHERYL PILEK: Good morning, Mr.
3 Chairman, members of the Board, Interveners, and all
4 others present. My name is Cheryl Pilek, and I'm the
5 energy efficiency lead, valuation and planning, at
6 Efficiency Manitoba, where I've been since November
7 2019. In this role, I was responsible for drafting
8 the valuation portion of Section 7 of the application
9 and responding to related IRs.

10 Prior to this position, I was employed
11 at Manitoba Hydro for over twenty-three (23) years,
12 with approximately twenty (20) of these working in the
13 area of DSM. My last position was the manager of DSM
14 planning and evaluation, which I held for thirteen
15 (13) years. Prior to that, I was the Commercial DSM
16 Lighting Specialist for over six (6) years.

17 I hold a Chartered Professional
18 Accounting designation, and I'm a graduate of the
19 University of Manitoba with a Bachelor of Commerce
20 Degree and a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Economics.

21 I've been involved in several of
22 Manitoba Hydro's electric and Centra Gas rate
23 applications, as well as the Needs to and Alternate --
24 Needs For and Alternatives To review.

25 This will be my first time testifying,

1 but I have participated in preparing Manitoba Hydro's
2 applications, answering IRs, and supporting the Panel
3 in the back row.

4 As part of the Efficiency Manitoba
5 panel, I'll be speaking to the evaluation of the
6 programs in the Energy Efficiency Plan. Thank you.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Thank you. So I
11 would like to, on behalf of Efficiency Manitoba, once
12 again acknowledge that we are on the Treaty 1 lands on
13 which we now gather for this hearing, and the Treaty
14 2, 3, 4, and 5 lands included in Efficiency Manitoba's
15 service territories are the traditional territories of
16 the Anishinaabe, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene
17 peoples, as well as the homeland of the Metis Nation.

18 Today we are here to open a long-
19 awaited new chapter for energy efficiency in Manitoba.
20 We sit before you today as a new organization with an
21 independent and focused mandate and a new plan to
22 create a foundation of energy efficiency for
23 Manitobans.

24 It was a great honour to be selected to
25 lead this new and critically important organization in

1 Manitoba. One (1) year ago just last week, I started
2 as the first employee of Efficiency Manitoba,
3 following the appointment of our board approximately
4 six (6) months prior.

5 With the support of the Efficiency
6 Manitoba Board, I have recruited and hired a core
7 management team of capable and committed individuals
8 to prepare Efficiency Manitoba for its commitment on
9 April 1st, and it has been a journey, and an
10 exhausting one at times, but we couldn't be more
11 excited to be here in front of the PUB and our
12 Interveners today to help us reflect on our plan,
13 ensure -- and ensure it delivers all it can for
14 Manitobans.

15 But before I begin my direct evidence
16 presentation on behalf of Efficiency Manitoba, I would
17 like to make a few additional acknowledgments. First
18 I would like to thank the PUB staff and their counsel
19 who provided their guidance in my early days with
20 Efficiency Manitoba.

21 As I mentioned, I had not been a
22 witness and had not had regulatory experience beyond
23 being support personnel in past filings. We had many
24 conversations and discussions leading up to the
25 formulation of our submission, and their information

1 and guidance on the regulatory process for a new
2 regula -- regulated entity like Efficiency Manitoba
3 was truly welcomed and appreciated. And although the
4 last few months have been extremely intense, we
5 definitely do not claim that we're regulatory experts,
6 so please bear with us as -- as we get through this
7 process.

8 I would also like to thank the
9 Interveners, their legal counsel, and their experts.
10 We appreciated the turnaround on your work product.
11 It was at a time of year that is typically more suited
12 for celebrating both US Thanksgiving and pre-Christmas
13 holiday festivities, so we thank you for that.

14 And finally, in advance, thank you to
15 the Panel for the tremendous amount of information
16 that you've already seen and that you'll be hearing
17 and reviewing over the next few weeks, as well as
18 coming into your deliberations through the month of
19 February.

20 Our aim has been to be open and
21 transparent throughout the process thus far, and our
22 intent is to continue to do so through the oral
23 portions of these proceedings.

24 For my opening presentation, I would
25 like to provide some context in the following areas:

1 first, I want to speak to the regulatory framework,
2 and specifically the PUB review, as -- as we
3 understand it; then I'll talk about how Efficiency
4 Manitoba will be taking a new approach to delivering
5 DSM in Manitoba; and then I will talk briefly about
6 and highlight some areas that -- from our mandate,
7 that will be accomplished through our Efficiency Plan
8 that's before you today; and then finally I'll briefly
9 discuss implementation of the Plan at a very high
10 level.

11 As Ms. Schofield mentioned in her
12 opening remarks, the Efficiency Manitoba Act and the
13 Efficiency Manitoba regulation have provided us with
14 our ground rules, if you will, for operation, and I
15 have a well worn and flagged version of the Act and
16 the regulation that serves to testament that we use
17 these documents daily.

18 A critic -- a critical part of this
19 legislation is the PUB review of our Efficiency Plan.
20 Our aim has been and continues to be, to be open,
21 transparent, and as helpful as possible. This is the
22 first time in a thirty (30) year history of DSM in
23 Manitoba that a plan has been reviewed in this
24 detailed fashion.

25 The team that sits before you today, as

1 well as an extended team of additional DSM
2 professionals, some of whom have been sworn in, along
3 with the primary panel for Efficiency Manitoba, have
4 put forth enormous and admirable efforts,
5 demonstrating their full -- full commitment to this
6 review while also aiming to maintain service levels
7 for Manitobans that are still wishing to improve upon
8 their energy efficiency during this transition period.

9 It was vital for Efficiency Manitoba's
10 success that we didn't lose the energy efficiency
11 momentum in our market.

12 In addition to the plan preparation and
13 the responding to over nine hundred and fifty (950)
14 IRs, we worked closely with the independent expert
15 consultant selected by the PUB, Daymark, by providing
16 them full access to our DSM models and work papers,
17 which contained the commercially sensitive information
18 that we held on behalf of Manitoba Hydro.

19 We also held several follow-up
20 conference calls and information clarif --
21 clarifications in order to ensure the level of detail
22 was made available and understood so that there would
23 be comfort by all parties in this proceeding that we
24 had accomplished a full and -- and open review of our
25 plan.

1 We defined our organization's mission,
2 vision, and strategic goals as you see on the slide in
3 front of you. Knowing what we are responsible for and
4 where are we heading, we are intent on building
5 excellent programs and services; creating a lean
6 performance driven organization; building meaningful
7 partnership -- ships, all with a customer focus; and
8 transforming attitudes towards energy efficiency and
9 creating a culture of conservation in Manitoba.

10 We have an opportunity here that is
11 actually quite rare. We are able to build a new
12 framework for an energy efficiency in Manitoba under a
13 new organization and a fresh new culture, while at the
14 same time building on an established and robust local
15 energy efficiency legacy based on many years of
16 experience, expertise, and knowledge, and not only in
17 the staff that deliver the programs but also in the
18 local market and industry that supports energy
19 efficiency delivery to homes and businesses.

20 While Efficiency Manitoba is new, it
21 may be surprising to note that many energy efficiency
22 technologies have been with us for years and are
23 certainly not new.

24 We acknowledge that an entirely new set
25 of technologies to save energy have not been

1 externally developed simply to help us meet our
2 targets. In the absence of an entirely new set of
3 technologies, a new approach is essential to get
4 deeper savings than ever seen in the province.

5 So first we will be using private
6 sector companies to implement and deliver specific
7 programs to the market, and we will also source other
8 corporate support functions from the private sector as
9 well.

10 When factoring in incentives that are
11 provided to customers to assist them in buying down
12 the costs for installing or purchasing energy
13 efficiency products, approximate 87 percent of our
14 budget will be delivered back to the economy and much
15 of it for services that are delivered right here in
16 Manitoba.

17 We recognize that not only are there
18 private sector companies that specialize in services
19 that need not be duplicated by a small Crown
20 corporation like Efficiency Manitoba, but there is
21 also opportunity to partner with the private sector in
22 building brand new green jobs to support the delivery
23 of programs and services to Manitobans.

24 Next slide. Our engagement to attain
25 feedback on our initiatives will be continuous and

1 multifaceted. We have already worked with our energy
2 efficiency advisory group for the development of the
3 efficiency plan that we have presented for these
4 proceedings and plan to formalize the operations of
5 the group post plan approval to ensure that we have
6 ongoing access to diverse perspectives to informed
7 aspects of the more detailed design and implementation
8 activities of Efficiency Manitoba.

9 We also plan to interact more directly
10 with our customers and out potential customers by
11 engaging them in a conversation about their energy
12 versus the typical one (1) way communication of
13 program offerings.

14 This will be done through either social
15 channels or through more direct means as requested --
16 as was requested -- as was requested by some of the
17 Indigenous members of our EEAG.

18 As a Crown corporation, Efficiency
19 Manitoba is required to hold annual public
20 accountability meetings which will serve as a forum
21 for the public at large to hear about and provide
22 their own perspectives on not only our efficiency
23 plan, but Efficiency Manitoba's operations overall.

24 And finally, private contractors,
25 whether they're installers, service providers, are

1 often the eyes and ears of our programs. They are in
2 the homes and the business of our customers. And we
3 gain insight into both the challenges with
4 participating customers as well as the sales that were
5 perhaps lost for various reasons.

6 Given that an insulation contractor,
7 for example, is performing this service nearly every
8 day, they have incredible insight in po -- into
9 potential issues that are current and relevant to our
10 activities.

11 We used advice from this group to guide
12 specific aspects of the plan. And we will be
13 continuing to seek perspectives to inform design
14 implementation and delivery strategies going forward.

15 We will also take the opportunity of
16 being a new Crown with a singular focus to communicate
17 and market to our customers in an entirely new and
18 different way.

19 The cornerstone of our customer-
20 focussed delivery strategy will be the bundled
21 approach for program offerings which allows for much
22 more simplified communications with our customers, and
23 also fatil -- facilitates cross-promo -- promotion of
24 additional measures while also ensuring that we're
25 able to administer customer applications efficiently

1 and quickly to meet service expectations.

2 Bundling also allows us to achieve even
3 deeper savings by enabling the inclusion of additional
4 measures that otherwise may not stand on their own for
5 cost-effectiveness.

6 An example of this is within our
7 program offerings for restaurants in the commercial
8 market where many of the technologies were screened in
9 the past and monitored but have only been able to be
10 offered to the market now through a bundled approach.

11 We will also be leveraging technology
12 in a way that hasn't been done in the past. With the
13 rise of mobile technology and ecommerce, customers
14 have increasingly high expectations for realtime
15 information and feedback.

16 Applying for our programs will be made
17 easy for those customers by being available on
18 multiple platforms, including mobile devices. Social
19 media marketing provides realtime analytics which can
20 reveal valuable both demographic and geotargeted
21 information so we can make data driven adjustments to
22 our outreach strategies as well as enable a two (2)
23 way communication with our customers to gain insight
24 into their needs.

25 And this latter point will be important

1 to our overarching corporate goal of transforming
2 attitudes towards energy con -- conservation.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Not quite yet.

7 Our embracing of new technology also presents many
8 cost advantages -- advantages to traditional
9 marketing, outreach, and data analysis, all of which
10 help us implement better decisions while keeping costs
11 lower than they otherwise would be.

12 Our plan also recognizes that not all
13 the customers that we're aiming to reach have access
14 to or perhaps the desire to conduct their interactions
15 with Efficiency Manitoba online or through their
16 mobile devices.

17 Our tailored approach to customer
18 interaction essentially means meeting customers where
19 they're at. An in-person, telephone, or written
20 interaction will be employed wherever the customers
21 prefer.

22 While we are specifically reviewing our
23 plan here for the upcoming three (3) years, we
24 acknowledge that we have fifteen (15) years of targets
25 to achieve. What we do in the upcoming three (3)

1 years impacts our opportunities and performance in the
2 three (3) years that follow and the three (3) years
3 that follow after that.

4 Like most industries, the energy
5 efficiency industry is changing rapidly. To maintain
6 our ability to achieve savings targets over the long-
7 term, we need to have a disciplined -- disciplined
8 focus on innovation.

9 This approach will allow us to
10 capitalize on opportunities that we are already
11 anticipating but also those that are yet to emerge.

12 Our budget for the innovation fund
13 that's proposed under the plan represents nearly 1 1/2
14 percent of our overall budget on average. Thus far,
15 we have earmarked dollars specifically for a market
16 potential study that will be required to provide a
17 refreshed scan on the Manitoba market with respect to
18 remaining as well as new efficiency opportunities that
19 have technical and economic potential for increasing
20 energy savings in homes and businesses.

21 But we also anticipate using the
22 funding to conduct pilots for emerging energy
23 efficiency technologies, especially given that our
24 cold climate provides the ultimate test market to
25 verify both performance and energy savings potential.

1 We would also like to see a portion of
2 the innovation fund supporting research and
3 development at Manitoba's post-secondary institutions
4 to provide the opportunity for more innovative ideas
5 to reach their full potential.

6 The details of how this fund will be
7 structured will be discussed in the next phase of our
8 engagement with the EEAG. And we will be open to
9 hearing from local research experts to help us inform
10 and finalize a formal strategy.

11 We are establishing a foundation that
12 will allow us to be continuously reviewing our
13 performance and taking immediate action to implement
14 improvement strategies.

15 Our balance scorecard allows us to
16 benchmark both DSM corporate metrics -- DSM and
17 corporate metrics against other program
18 administrators, ensuring that we are constantly
19 seeking improving op -- improvement opportunities both
20 corporately and with respect to our programs and
21 services.

22 Efficiency Canada, a national
23 organization for advocacy and policy supporting energy
24 efficiency, recently released a national scorecard
25 that demonstrates that the Province of Manitoba has

1 room to improve, and Efficiency Manitoba will be a key
2 factor in that effort.

3 Our customer relationship management
4 and DSM database system, as well as our third-party
5 independent DSM evaluation will give us both realtime
6 and critically assessed and independent feedback and
7 metrics that will provide us with information to
8 inform our immediate and longer term decision making
9 in the interests of both cost-effective energy and
10 savings for Manitobans.

11 The key to our continuous improvement
12 strategy will be the ability to be both nimble and
13 flexible. Flexibility is crucial to Efficiency
14 Manitoba to deliver on its mandate.

15 In taking a new approach to interacting
16 with customers, we will learn and gain more knowledge
17 and insight with every interaction, which means we may
18 need to change and adapt the way we are going about
19 our business.

20 In response -- oh, to do so in a cost-
21 effective manner means that Efficiency Manitoba needs
22 the flexibility to most effectively deliver its
23 programs and to adapt to changing customer needs and
24 the emergence of new and improved energy efficiency
25 products and technologies that may be identified.

1 The contingency fund outlined in our
2 plan will be of utmost importance for the Efficiency
3 Manitoba to act on the key changes to the plan, so
4 critical in fact that it is a requirement that has
5 been established in our enabling legislation.

6 Efficiency Manitoba was given a
7 difficult challenge. Beyond achieving aggressive
8 savings targets, additional requirements were
9 articulated to Efficiency Manitoba through the Act,
10 the regulation, and ministerial direction.

11 Cost-effectiveness programming to
12 permit participation for as many Manitobans as
13 possible and doing so at a lower budget than under
14 previous plans were all considerations as we prepared
15 our first three (3) year efficiency plan.

16 The targets for energy savings
17 articulated in our Act are ne -- are levels that have
18 never been targeted in Manitoba in the past, and they
19 represent a 30 percent increase in electricity savings
20 and an over 40 percent increase in natural ca --
21 natural gas savings over the DSM plan from 2015/'16.

22 And this is needed to be accomplished
23 in a market where energy efficiency programs have
24 existed for nearly thirty (30) years, meaning that we
25 don't necessarily have all of the low hanging fruit at

1 our disposal to reach those targets.

2 We have created a plan to achieve this
3 level of savings, while accounting for adjustments and
4 consumption that will be attributable to our efforts.

5 As a dual fuel integrated DSM program
6 administrator, Efficiency Manitoba will count the
7 increase in energy that occurs when efficient electric
8 measures are installed. Essentially, a more efficient
9 product produces less waste heat, which has to be made
10 up by the heating system during the winter months. We
11 call this interactive effects.

12 Now, this is true to the definition of
13 net savings, as provided for in the Act, and is true
14 to the actual energy impacts that will occur in the
15 province as a result of our activities.

16 As this slide demonstrates, we had to
17 over-achieve our natural gas savings in order to
18 account for interactive effects.

19 We are also achieving our targets while
20 delivering a cost-effective portfolio. The program
21 administrator cost test, which was prescribed by
22 regulation, essentially measures the marginal benefits
23 to Manitoba Hydro that are derived from the achieved
24 energy savings, against the cost that Efficiency
25 Manitoba expends to get those savings.

1 On the electric side, these benefits
2 are based on the value of the electric energy, as well
3 as the capacity. Whereas on the natural gas side, we
4 have the same category of costs, but the benefits come
5 from re -- the reduction and the need to purchase and
6 transport the natural gas commodity.

7 Overall, our integrated portfolio has a
8 pa -- has positive PACT test results on both the
9 electric and gas portfolios.

10 While it's true that the gas portfolio
11 has a PACT ratio that is just slightly less than one
12 (1), it is nearly balanced. The lower performance is
13 due in part that in order to meet the target we had to
14 accept certain energy conservation measures that were
15 more marginal than others.

16 And, if you were to look at the gas
17 portfolio prior to considering the interactive effects
18 that I just discussed, the PACT ratio would rise to
19 1.42 and the PACT levelized cost would decrease to 13
20 cents per metre cubed. So interactive effects
21 definitely represent a challenge for our plan.

22 The plan also achieves our targets
23 while being as clusive -- as inclusive as possible.
24 We are focused on all customer segments: residential,
25 income qualified, Indigenous, commercial, industrial,

1 and agricultural customers are the major customer
2 segments in Manitoba and they can see themselves in
3 our plan.

4 The geography of our province adds to
5 the challenge of designing programs that meet the
6 needs of our diverse customer segments in every corner
7 of the province, including very remote communities, as
8 was discussed in Mr. Wheeler's opening presentation.

9 This can mean some customer segments
10 are more expensive to serve than others, and this is
11 not unique to Efficiency Manitoba. Virtually all
12 program administrators have a similar portfolio
13 makeup, where the scale of cost-effectiveness improves
14 as the customer moves -- moves from the residential at
15 one end of the spectrum, to industrial at the other.

16 Efficiency Manitoba clearly has strived
17 to manage a balance between the important but
18 inevitably conflicting goals of cost-effectiveness
19 with the goal of inclusiveness of all customer groups
20 in all regions of the province.

21 We have also met the ministerial
22 mandate expectation of the same or better outcomes, as
23 formally obtained under the Power Smart program, but
24 at significantly smaller percentage of the cost and
25 materially less labour costs.

1 As demonstrated through this slide,
2 Efficiency Manitoba will see lower overall costs by
3 approximately 9 percent, as compared to the 2015/16
4 DSM plan, as well as internal staff cost reductions of
5 nearly 40 percent.

6 And the bottom line, of course, and why
7 many of us are here today, from our Intervener side,
8 is this means customer bill savings. Our plan will
9 begin to save Manitobans 14.9 million on electricity
10 bills and 3 million on natural gas bills immediately
11 and on an annual basis.

12 Over the long-term, the investment we
13 will be making in partnership with our customers will
14 save Manitoba homes and businesses over half a billion
15 dollars.

16 In terms of our ability to deliver, the
17 plan we have built is very reasonable and has
18 accounted for the fact that existing successful
19 programs that have a robust delivery channel will
20 carry the weight in the first months of our
21 commencement, while newer programs that may need more
22 technical or market details fleshed out, or that may
23 be relying on the functionality from our new CRM and
24 DSM system have had our launch dates pushed back into
25 our three-year plan timelines.

1 We also recognize that additional areas
2 of interest of both Interveners and the PUB may become
3 evident during this proceeding. We respect the
4 position of other parties and the constructive
5 criticisms they have offered of our plan. And this
6 process does provide us with mean of -- meaningful
7 feedback and the feedback is important to Efficiency
8 Manitoba in order for us to deliver a more robust plan
9 to Manitobans.

10 In terms of implementation, it's
11 important to note that as much as we are a new
12 company, we have the backing of Manitoba Hydro as both
13 organizations have a vested interest in a successful
14 transfer of DSM responsibilities.

15 In the very first month of my
16 employment, the CEO of -- the then CEO of Manitoba
17 Hydro, Kelvin Shepherd, signed a letter of
18 understanding with me to ensure that Efficiency
19 Manitoba had access to all of the operational support
20 functions that exist in a long-standing Crown
21 corporation.

22 The spirit of support has continued
23 with the new CEO, Jay Grewal, and I extend my
24 heartfelt appreciation to the many departments of my
25 former organization that have extended the effort to

1 support Efficiency Manitoba during this past year of
2 transition.

3 In anticipation of Efficiency
4 Manitoba's eventual assumption of the DSM programming
5 in Manitoba, transferability clauses have been built
6 into third party implementor contracts when new
7 requests for proposals have been issued, or when
8 renewals have been exercised.

9 The plan calls for several third party
10 implementors and several of those are already underway
11 to have renewals.

12 We have experience with years of
13 training and development and people who know the
14 technologies, the market, and demand-side management
15 industry metrics and modelling, just a few of whom are
16 sitting in front of you today.

17 We are not starting wi -- on -- from
18 square one, trying to understand how to get efficiency
19 in this market, and we've been doing it collectively
20 for many years.

21 As someone with over twenty (20) years
22 of experience in the industry, and specifically in the
23 Manitoba market, I can tell you that we had a tall
24 order with preparing this plan, meeting all the
25 requirements assigned to us. In the words of our DSM

1 consultant, we had to square the circle and we had to
2 do it in record time. But we feel we've done it.

3 Given the foundation of energy
4 efficiency that I mentioned earlier in the
5 presentation, we have a very unique opportunity to
6 build on the local knowledge and the history,
7 including what works, and to improve and change and
8 innovate where doing so will provide better results,
9 because we will be needing the better results.

10 This review process has provided
11 extensive and a thorough review of our preparation,
12 and we look forward to further demonstrating our
13 expertise and our readiness to implement this plan
14 that we will -- that will achieve signif --
15 significantly improved results for Manitobans.

16 We are not professing that this plan is
17 perfect, rather that it's thoroughly prepared to allow
18 us to meet the mandate and requirements that we have
19 been given.

20 With the combination of a committed and
21 -- committed management, enormous passion and
22 dedication from the Efficiency Manitoba team, and an
23 open and disciplined culture of listening to our
24 stakeholders, we will continuously improve our
25 offerings over the coming years.

1 This plan is serving as a foundation
2 for a long-term future of commitment to energy
3 efficiency as a cornerstone in Manitoba.

4 I believe wholeheartedly that we can
5 and we will deliver this plan. Thank you very much.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Do you
7 have any questions? Go ahead.

8 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms.
9 Kuruluk.

10 I have a question on your slide 10, the
11 innovation approach. Actually, I have two questions.

12 So, it's around the budget for the
13 innovation fund, and I think I heard you say it would
14 be about 1.5 percent --

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

16 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: -- so around a
17 million dollars?

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, 881,000.

19 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And the
20 other thing was you had said that details on this
21 would come post-further discussion with your advisory
22 group.

23 Do you have any timeframe in mind?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Well, I would
25 say that we would be convening the Energy Efficiency

1 Advisory Group fairly soon after plan approval,
2 because there's a few things actually that we're
3 counting on them for their assistance.

4 They will also be assisting us with
5 hiring our third party assessor. So I would suspect
6 it's going to be an April, May timeline to start that
7 -- those discussions.

8 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: And then
9 innovation implementation --

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: In terms of
11 technologies themselves, or --

12 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: -- the fund?

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah. So, I
14 guess once we have that formally structured, and I --
15 I don't want to presuppose what that'll look like at
16 this point, but there -- there'll be some
17 communication, obviously, that we have to -- to
18 deliver out to potential participation -- participants
19 in an innovation fund.

20 So, I'm not sure if that addresses the
21 question. But I -- I honestly can tell you that I'm
22 not exactly sure when that'll be communicated to the
23 market overall but clearly one (1) of the first orders
24 of business when we convene with the EEAG.

25 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay.

2 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Thank you, Ms.
3 Kuruluk. I have some questions with regard to
4 customer interaction you've spoken of very positively.

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

6 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: I wondered if
7 you had an estimate of the number of staff that will
8 be required in order to achieve the level of customer
9 interaction that you're hoping for and when those
10 staff might be hired?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Sure. Yeah.
12 So, our plan has accounted for a budget that includes
13 up to seventy-five (75) staff. So, obviously, some of
14 the more specific DSM expertise that we'll be looking
15 for currently exists at Manitoba Hydro, so it's not --
16 not a skill set that is going to be hard for us to
17 find.

18 Obviously, there'll be other support
19 functions that we'll have to hire as well. But
20 specifically as it relates to the DSM components, we
21 would be hoping to have those people in place very
22 soon after we get approval of the plan.

23 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Thank you.
24 And one (1) other question with regard to slide 14 and
25 the DSM targets from Hydro compared with Efficiency

1 Manitoba.

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

3 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: I note that
4 the years there are 2015/'16.

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

6 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Do you have
7 updated targets from Hydro for 2019/'20, for example?

8 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah. We -- as
9 part of the IR process, we filed I believe all the
10 plans leading up to 1920. We selected this one (1) as
11 our -- as our benchmark year because this was the plan
12 that was -- was implemented after the NFAT review and
13 it -- and it represented what is possible with a new
14 revised focussed and -- and under the Manitoba Hydro
15 regime that was present at the time.

16 But we-- we do have access to those.
17 And I don't have that number off the top of my head if
18 you were looking for a specific target number. Yeah.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Kuruluk, at one
23 point, you mentioned that you're looking at saving
24 Manitoba customers \$500 million, over what time frame?

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That was over a

1 thirty (30) year time frame.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thirty (30).

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. I
5 think those are our questions. Ms. Steinfeld, did you
6 want to...?

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I'm in your
8 hands, Mr. Chair. I can get started now if...

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. You know
10 what? We might as well start.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I have an area
12 that I can cover before lunch, I believe.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. And then just
14 determine a good break in your questions. Thank you.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And perhaps
19 before I get started, I believe Efficiency Manitoba
20 needs to mark their direct evidence presentation as an
21 exhibit.

22 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Sorry, I
23 believe it's number 21. Thank you.

24

25 --- EXHIBIT NO. EM-21: Presentation of Efficiency

1 Manitoba

2

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
5 Schofield. Good morning to the Efficiency Manitoba
6 witnesses. I'd like to welcome many of you for the
7 first time to the Hearing room and, if not for the
8 first time in the Hearing room, many of your first
9 time testifying.

10 I'll just echo some of the comments Ms.
11 Hart made in her opening comments. First and -- and
12 perhaps most importantly, none of our questions in the
13 open public sessions are intended to elicit
14 information the Board has accepted as commercially
15 sensitive information.

16 If at any time you feel you can only
17 answer a question with reference to commercially
18 sensitive information, please speak with your counsel
19 first before responding to Board counsel's questions.

20 As well, I may address questions to a
21 particular witness, but if somebody else is best to
22 answer it, please proceed as you think best. As well,
23 if I ask a question generally, I'll trust that you'll
24 identify amongst yourselves who should speak up.

25 You're also new witnesses to me, so I

1 might presume wrongly who's going to be responding to
2 certain questions.

3 I think perhaps to start, it might
4 assist certainly myself and perhaps others if we can
5 just get on the same page with some of the terminology
6 that we're going to be using and that's used in the
7 plan. So, let's start with the term 'portfolio'.

8 Mr. Kuruluk, do I have it right that
9 when we use that term, we're referring to the entire
10 electric or the entire natural gas programming,
11 including all customer segment bundles for each of
12 those respective energy sources?

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, that's
14 correct.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Whereas a
16 program is a single specific energy-efficiency --
17 efficiency technology or measure that will be offered
18 to customers?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And sometimes we
21 see the words 'initiative' or 'measure' or 'offering'.
22 Are those words all synonymous with the term
23 'program'?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I believe so.
25 You know, sometimes an initiative might be a codes and

1 standards initiative, so -- which isn't necessarily a
2 program, so there would be maybe some areas where that
3 might be a little bit different.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. So, with
5 that caveat, on initiative that it may also refer to
6 codes and standards?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And then also in
12 the plan we see reference to, "program bundles." Am I
13 right that those are group of indivi -- groupings of
14 individual demand side management programs?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Are there any
17 other terms that I've missed that we think we should
18 cover off at this point?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, I think
20 we'll cover them as we go.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. And if at
22 any time, I would emphasize, the panel is unsure, if
23 we're starting to use a term, please do jump in and --
24 and make sure that we've clarified it.

25 With that background, perhaps we can

1 start with discussing some of the savings targets.
2 So, at a -- at a high level, Ms. Kuruluk, Efficiency
3 Manitoba's mandate under the Efficiency Manitoba Act
4 includes implementing and supporting DSM initiatives
5 to meet legislated savings targets.

6 Is that correct?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: and the
9 legislation provides for a total fifteen (15) year
10 period for meeting the required cumulative targets?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And when we talk
13 about that fifteen (15) year period, we're talking
14 about a period that starts on the commencement date
15 which has been prescribed to be April 1st, 2020?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But then within
18 that fifteen (15) year period, the legislation
19 requires Efficiency Manitoba to prepare efficiency
20 plans for individual three (3) year periods, correct?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, I don't
23 think this contentious that the -- the purpose of this
24 Hearing is to review Efficiency Manitoba's first three
25 (3) year plan?

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is my
2 understanding.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, that
4 plan is intended to cover the period beginning on the
5 April 1st, 2020, commencement date and concluding
6 March 31st, 2023?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And when we look
9 at the Act, and we can turn to Board council's book of
10 documents which has been marked as PUB Exhibit 14, and
11 we turn to page 5, we can see that the Act sets
12 savings targets for each year of each three (3) year
13 period, including the first three (3) year period.

14 Is that right, Ms. Kuruluk?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, when we
17 look at section 7(1) of the legislation, we can see
18 that the annual savings targets for electrical energy
19 are 1.5 percent?

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. Correct.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And if scroll
22 down, we can see that the annual savings targets for
23 natural gas are 0.75 percent, correct?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But as I -- I

1 referenced earlier, if we continue over the page to
2 page 6, at section 7(2), this is the cumulative
3 savings targets for the entire fifteen (15) year
4 period, correct?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's right.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we see here
7 in this section that, if Efficiency Manitoba has
8 shortfalls or surpluses in those annual targets, those
9 shortfalls or surpluses can carry forward for the
10 fifteen (15) year period?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: If I could also
13 add a little bit of context. I think one (1) point
14 that's probably worth pointing out for the benefit of
15 the panel is going back to section 7(1) with respect
16 to both the electrical and natural gas savings targets
17 definition.

18 There's a couple terms in there that
19 are probably worth discussing for a moment, in
20 particular, the net savings with respect to both
21 electrical energy and natural gas.

22 So, when we see net savings, particular
23 in the natural gas side, that's inclusive of the
24 interactive effects that Ms. Kuruluk mentioned in her
25 direct.

1 Also of note is that the consumption of
2 electrical energy, for example, in the preceding year.
3 So the targets are based on the preceding year energy
4 consumption.

5 So for example, and this is somewhat
6 fundamental concept in drafting this, so it's
7 important to spend a bit of time, but for example
8 then, the 2021, the first year target of 1.5 percent
9 is actually based off the consumption of electric
10 energy in 19/20, the pre or prior fiscal year.

11 So again, as another example, in the
12 final year of the plan, the 22/23 fiscal year, I would
13 actually be based on the prior year, the 21/22 actual
14 energy consumption. And those values aren't known at
15 this point in time. They're just forecasts.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And not to
17 worry, Mr. Stocki, I can assure you we're going to
18 spend lots of time on all of those concepts, but thank
19 you for making sure the basic principles are
20 understood, and we'll have more chats as we go along
21 about those matters.

22 If we turn then to the book of
23 documents, PUB exhibit 14 at page 17, we can see here
24 in this IR response that the plan average savings
25 target achievement is 1.46 percent.

1 Do I have that right, Ms. Kuruluk?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And this IR
4 response was actually correcting the original average
5 plan achievement of the savings targets, which before
6 the correction and as filed in the original submission
7 was 1.15 percent over the three (3) years?

8 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But if we stay
10 on this page 17, we can see that in the first year of
11 the plan, your 2020/21, the savings targets to be
12 achieved are 1.43 percent?

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct,
14 and that reflects my comments earlier about a
15 realistic plan given the fact that the organization is
16 still in development.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So if I can put
18 that another way, Ms. Kuruluk, what you're telling the
19 Board is that Efficiency Manitoba isn't intending and
20 didn't from the get-go, intend to meet the 1.5 percent
21 in the first year because you're recognizing that
22 you're transitioning, you may not end up having a full
23 12 months. Is that a fair summary?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Almost, but not
25 quite. I would say that we were being realistic in

1 what we could achieve in that year and that there
2 would likely be a shortfall that would have to be made
3 up in subsequent years.

4 Hence why we had a -- an average of
5 1.51 originally prior to the correction. So as you
6 can see on the exhibit in front of you, that we had
7 savings of 1.55 percent and 1.56 percent originally
8 when we filed, and that was basically exercising our
9 ability to make up the shortfall from year one.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we're going
11 to get into year two (2) and year three (3) shortly,
12 but just so I can understand when you say you were
13 aware that it might not be realistic to meet 1.5
14 percent in the first year, what factors or
15 considerations exactly made it so that you thought it
16 would not be realistic?

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Well, some of --
18 you know, as I mentioned in my -- my opening
19 statement, many of the technologies that are built in
20 our plan are -- are not new. But they aren't
21 achieving in and of themselves 1.5 percent of -- of
22 load now.

23 So we were having to add new
24 technologies and new measures in order to get those
25 savings.

1 So recognizing that some of those
2 initiatives are relying on things such as our customer
3 relationship management system, that we are
4 anticipating to be ready in the fall of 2020. We
5 didn't want to include savings from initiatives that
6 were going to be delayed due to that.

7 So, that's just one example of -- of --
8 of a reason why we knew that it wouldn't be realistic.
9 And I'll look to my colleague to the left to add to
10 that.

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Thanks, Ms.
12 Kuruluk.

13 I think there's probably a bit of
14 context here also that is worthwhile talking about.
15 With respect to -- and as I mentioned in 7(1) of the
16 Act, using the preceding year of energy consumption,
17 in the derivation of the -- the savings target is
18 pretty critical, and there's multiple approaches that
19 you can actually take in how you use that value.

20 So specifically actually referring to
21 our rebuttal evidence, throughout this evidence
22 gathering process there's been a few different
23 methodologies put forward. But what we did in our
24 rebuttal is essentially recreated this table that is
25 on page 17, and below that provided two other

1 alternatives, again using that different derivation
2 methodologies of how you get to that, in this case,
3 1.43 percent.

4 But using different approaches it can
5 be 1.46 in 2021 or 1.48 in -- in 2021. The exact
6 values aren't actually really the critical point. The
7 point is that we don't necessarily know what the
8 actual load will be and the -- and the piece that we
9 have to validate our savings targets is to that actual
10 weather adjusted electrical load, once that's known.

11 The timing of that won't actually
12 happen until we're well into their first year,
13 probably at least six (6) months in.

14 Further to that, the actual savings,
15 the energy savings, we won't actually know the -- the
16 verified or evaluated value of those energy savings
17 probably until six (6) months or so after our full
18 completed first year.

19 So those are kind of pieces of context
20 that are important to consider too, that although
21 directionally and within a reasonable zone, for
22 example, absolutely targeting, our mandated targets,
23 there's also kind of the reasonable expectation that
24 we won't know until probably six (6) months after the
25 fact where exactly we sit.

1 And then the key part with the delivery
2 of our plan is having the flexibility and nimbleness,
3 as an organization, to then adjust on the fly and
4 maybe in subsequent years, or in subsequent plans,
5 make up any shortfall.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Mr. Stocki,
7 I'm going to have a lot of questions for you about --
8 there was a lot of information in that answer and I do
9 intend on getting into all of it in a lot of detail.

10 Maybe for the time being, one of the
11 things you're essentially explaining to the Board is
12 that when we talk about 1.5 percent as a savings
13 target, we're actually talking about 1.5 percent of
14 something, and that something is the load of energy
15 that is consumed.

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
17 and it can -- you can evaluate that at generation, you
18 can gener -- evaluate that at the meter, for example.
19 There's different approaches. Consistency, of course,
20 is the key in that, but it's a percent of some value.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so we will -
22 - I -- I promise you, get into a lot of detail about
23 the different ways of deriving that. But really, we
24 have to look at what the starting point is, what the
25 Manitoba load is, and then decide is Efficiency

1 Manitoba's plan achieving the 1.5 percent targeted
2 reduction in that load.

3 Am I getting that basically right?

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that's
5 correct. And within the rebuttal it shows on average
6 it's somewhere between 1.46 and 1.51.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. And one
8 of the other things that you've mentioned, and again
9 we'll get into this in more detail, but just to make
10 sure we're all on the same page, is that you won't
11 know if you've actually achieved that until you have
12 actual numbers to work with.

13 So for example, if we're starting with
14 2019/20 as the year proceeding the first year of the
15 plan, we don't have actual numbers yet for 2019/20.

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
17 On the load forecast we won't know the actual load --
18 actual weather -- the normalized load until probably
19 six (6) months after 19/20 fiscal is complete.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that's
21 because that fiscal year is still ongoing and won't
22 come to a conclusion until March 31st of 2020?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
24 And we won't know the actual verified energy savings
25 until probably six (6) months after the completion of

1 April -- or March 30th, 2021.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so I'm
3 probably going to take the next, I don't know, three
4 (3) hours of my cross-examination over the course of
5 the day to get into all of the detail that you
6 referenced in your earlier answer.

7 But taking it in small bites, as Mr.
8 Hacault might say, if we stay on this page 17 of Board
9 council's book of documents, we see here the revision
10 in the IR response to the second and third year of the
11 plan.

12 And just to confirm, Ms. Kuruluk, these
13 revisions came about as a result of Efficiency
14 Manitoba's work in responding to information requests
15 from the Board, the need for the correction was
16 identified.

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.
18 We identified a corr -- a carry through error in
19 residential general service lighting standards that
20 was treating those savings as cumulative versus in
21 year savings, which has been a change from past plans
22 dealing with the in year savings only.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so when we
24 look at the second year of the plan, we can see that
25 it's now targeted to hit 1.48 percent reduction?

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And the third
3 year of the plan is now targeted as a 1.45 percent
4 reduction, correct?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So, what you
7 were just referencing in your answer, Ms. Kuruluk, if
8 we just scroll down on this same page, and we stop
9 there, thank you Ms. Schubert. We see here the
10 revisions that were made to the residential general
11 service lighting standards that you were just
12 referencing.

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's right.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so this is a
15 -- just so I'm clear -- a codes and standards savings?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, those are
17 specifically standards, yeah.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. And what
19 you just explained is that the error that was
20 identified was that in the original plan, the savings
21 from this standard were counted as cumulative and not
22 incremental?

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, with --
24 when plans were developed at Manitoba Hydro, savings
25 were reported on a cumulative basis.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. And so
2 the difference being that the incremental savings are
3 just the new year-over-year savings achieved as a
4 result of new instalments that meet this standard.

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And this is
7 maybe a slight digression, but just to confirm the
8 correction to the residential general service lighting
9 standards would not have any resulting changes in
10 Efficiency Manitoba's budget?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, there would
12 be no changes to budget.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so even
14 though any one (1) of these measures, these lighting
15 standards that are installed in a particular year,
16 would continue to have savings that persist,
17 Efficiency Manitoba isn't counting those persisting
18 savings. It's just the new year-over-year, right?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct,
20 and that's with both codes and standard as well as --
21 as program savings.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And why is it
23 that the fact that the cumulative savings were being
24 counted was an error that needed to be corrected?

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Well, I think it

1 was just -- we're still using the spreadsheets and the
2 cost-benefit analysis runs that were developed at
3 Manitoba Hydro, and that was the way that Manitoba
4 Hydro reported on those savings, and it was just one
5 (1) line item out of hundreds that just -- just
6 slipped and got missed.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so maybe at
8 -- at a principled level, why was it okay for Manitoba
9 Hydro to count things that way but Efficiency Manitoba
10 cannot? And maybe to help you out, if we put PUB-14
11 page 5 back up on the screen. Is the issue that the
12 savings targets require incremental savings?

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Yeah. And so
15 because of the way that the savings targets are framed
16 in the legislation, Efficiency Manitoba had to change
17 things from the way Manitoba Hydro had been counting
18 those particular standards savings.

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's
20 essentially the issue, yeah.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
22 Kuruluk. And back on page 17 of the book of documents
23 -- and you referenced this in your direct evidence
24 that codes and standards savings have resulting
25 interactive effects on natural gas savings. Do I have

1 that right?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
4 Stocki. And I am not an engineer, as the person to my
5 left likes to remind me, but maybe if we use a simple
6 example to help me understand interactive effects.
7 One (1) example might be is if you switch out an old
8 lightbulb and exchange it with an LED lightbulb, the
9 LED lightbulb is more efficient. Also means it throws
10 less heat. Your house is colder. You have to run
11 your furnace a little more. Is that a decent summary?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. I
14 may not have come up with it myself. So when we look
15 at the table that Ms. Schubert has put on the screen
16 in front of us on page 17, in that residential general
17 service lighting standards line, if we go past where
18 the electric savings have been corrected, we see the
19 natural gas savings, and they're shown as negative
20 here. Can you explain why those are negative numbers?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, so the
22 negative numbers mean that's basically -- that
23 resulting increase in natural gas consumption in that
24 hypothetical home that you were speaking of.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So even though

1 there are savings resulting on the electric side as a
2 result of the lighting, you're actually having the
3 opposite effect on the natural gas side, and people
4 are needing to consume a little bit more.

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we don't see
7 those numbers being corrected in this IR response, so
8 I take it that the correction to the residential
9 general service lighting standards savings did not
10 affect the natural gas interactive effects?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: When we were
12 looking at the -- the details behind that error,
13 basically, what we found was that the interactive
14 effects had correctly used the incremental savings to
15 determine the interactive effects, so there was no
16 error there.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And again,
18 because it's the -- the first morning, and I'm still
19 getting my legs under me, I'm going to have another
20 brief digression. We've been discussing natural gas
21 interactive effects.

22 I take it from the Information Request
23 response that's actually at page 29 of Board counsel's
24 book of documents that Efficiency Manitoba is telling
25 the Board in the response here that electric

1 interactive effects are addressed in Efficiency
2 Manitoba's work papers?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
4 It's -- those net effects kind of are directly input
5 because they're just looking at electric on electric.
6 So for -- in your hypothetical example, if you had an
7 electric furnace, for example, we would just discount
8 the heatings directly from that LEG change-out to
9 directly affect those increasing electric heating. On
10 the natural gas side, we have to account for it
11 slightly separately and document that separately, so.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so what
13 you're explaining is if one (1) of the panel members
14 was to pull up one (1) of the work papers, if they
15 were looking at the natural gas work papers, they
16 would see a separate column that deals with
17 interactive effects on the natural gas side?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Typically, we
19 actually would have a separate spreadsheet that deals
20 independently with the -- all the interactive effects.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you for
22 that correction, Mr. Stocki. And if the panel pulled
23 up the electric work papers, they wouldn't see that
24 separate spreadsheet. What you're saying is the
25 interactive effects have been embedded within the

1 information.

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
3 It's discounted right in the net energy savings for
4 electric.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Ms. Kuruluk,
6 we have discussed already that -- and maybe just for
7 reference, we can put page 17 of this exhibit back on
8 the screen, and maybe just scroll back up to the first
9 chart, Ms. Schubert; thank you -- that the correction
10 that's indicated here for the year two (2) and year
11 three (3) planned savings was only discovered in the
12 course of responding to IRs, so these numbers are not
13 what was filed in the original plan submissions.

14 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But I
16 understand, both from your evidence today and also in
17 responses you've given to Information Requests, that
18 your plan for addressing what we now know to be a
19 shortfall in those years is flexibility at Efficiency
20 Manitoba. Is that right?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.
22 We -- we haven't given -- the timing in which we
23 discovered this area, we didn't have an actual
24 physical plan that -- which technology was going to
25 make up the savings, but we're confident that there's

1 lots of opportunities for us to -- to find savings in
2 other areas.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in your
4 direct evidence this morning, I don't -- we don't need
5 to go there, but I believe it was slide 11 -- you
6 referenced the importance of Efficiency Manitoba being
7 nimble and -- and flexible. So is this one of the
8 examples of the areas where -- where that's required?

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, sure.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But I --
11 understanding the -- the timing that you've just
12 mentioned, how is that flexibility actually achieved?
13 What -- what does Efficiency Manitoba do in order to
14 be flexible to make up these shortfalls?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So first -- if we
16 could actually just, for a bit of context, flip first
17 to page 11 of our rebuttal evidence. I think that
18 might help to -- to start. So the top table there is
19 basically the same table that appears on page 17 of
20 the Board book of documents, and so there we have the
21 one point four three (1.43), one point four eight
22 (1.48), and one point four five (1.45) that we've been
23 discussing. Again, because we're basing it on prior-
24 year electric loads, there's some -- multiple
25 derivations of what you include when you're actually

1 trying to predict what that future electric load will
2 -- will be, and there's pluses and minuses in there.

3 And so what we've tried to do in the
4 table right there below in Part B to demonstrate an
5 alternate meth -- methodology that incorporates some
6 of the recommendations and suggestions that we've
7 heard through various independent experts -- and so
8 for example, here, using some revised methodologies of
9 trying to predict what that reference electric load
10 will be, in each of those fiscal years, we have one
11 point four six (1.46); one point five one (1.51),
12 which actually exceeds the target; and one point four
13 eight (1.48).

14 If we scroll down to the next section
15 on Part C, again, there's another methodology, and
16 this one, in particular, is using at-meter instead of
17 at-generation values. And so you'll see some
18 differences in the actual gigawatt hour values, and
19 that's because they're being measured at the point of
20 meter, at the point where they're being saved, instead
21 of being brought back to the point of generation. In
22 that case, we have 1.48, 1.53, 1.51 percent, with an
23 average of 1.51.

24 So we are, effectively, again, trying
25 to provide a -- kind of a zone of reasonableness and

1 comfort that we are, in fact, targeting 1.5 percent of
2 savings. I -- I think that certainly demonstrates
3 that. With respect to the nimbleness and flexibility,
4 it also somewhat demonstrates that the amount of
5 flexibility and nimbleness that's actually required is
6 pretty minimal in this case in order to meet the --
7 the prescribed targets.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so Mr.
9 Stocki, we -- I -- I do want to spend some time with
10 these tables in more detail to make sure we all
11 understand them but at a -- at a high level, in his
12 evidence Mr. Harper provided some recommendations in
13 terms of adjustments that he feels need to be made to
14 the way that -- that -- of what that baseline that you
15 have to have in order to calculate as your 1.5 percent
16 being met, he provided recommendations for adjustments
17 to that baseline. Is that fair?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's fair.
19 And, I mean, essentially what we're trying to do in
20 the Plan is trying to make some, I guess, conservative
21 assumptions, keep everything at the point of
22 generation, but Mr. Harper's recommendations was to
23 bring it at the point of metre, which is fine. It
24 doesn't materially alter any of the results.

25 I think the importance here is to

1 develop a standardized methodology and of course
2 Efficiency Manitoba looks forward to -- to working
3 with the Panel and trying to figure out what that
4 appropriate methodology is, again recognizing that we
5 won't know the actual percent of achievements until
6 probably six (6) months after the end of the first
7 fiscal year.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so I take it
9 from that answer that Efficiency Manitoba isn't set on
10 the methodology that it used in the Plan and is open
11 to the recommendations that have been presented,
12 including by Mr. Harper?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Essentially,
14 yeah. I mean, that's why we provided a few other
15 examples, because we -- we are open. We understand
16 there's different interpretations, but all of them are
17 trying to predict that reference electric load on
18 which to base your -- your energy savings targets and,
19 yeah, absolutely.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And do I also
21 understand you to be saying that with respect to the
22 shortfall that was identified in that Information
23 Request response on page 17 of PUB-14, that the plan
24 for addressing it may well be looking at the
25 derivation differently along the lines that Mr. Harper

1 has?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's not quite
6 right. We're not trying to hit our savings targets by
7 changing the way we derive the targets. Again, it's
8 going to -- the actual achievement of targets is going
9 to be based on actual weather adjusted, electric load,
10 and actual verified savings achieved. So those are
11 not negotiable. There's no derivation associated with
12 that.

13 Our -- our actual achievement, once we
14 see those values, that's where we'll have to look at
15 things like pilot programs, other initiatives,
16 potentially that can yield energy savings to help us
17 if there is, for example, a shortfall.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In your earlier
19 answer, Mr. Stocki, you -- you said that the -- the
20 difference in the -- in the methodologies doesn't
21 necessarily make a -- a big difference, which I don't
22 think were your exact words, but that it's small
23 changes. But in fact when we look at what's in the
24 revised IR response here and the rebuttal table, it is
25 a difference between achieving average savings that

1 hits the savings target and not hitting it.

2 Is that correct?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think the
4 important point is, it's within a very tight zone of
5 reasonableness, if we're talking about an average of
6 predicting a 1.46 percent or 1.49 or 1.51.

7 Again, once we have those verified
8 energy savings and see where -- where we're at, there
9 might be some adjustment in future plan years that we
10 need to -- to make in terms of looking at additional
11 achievement of energy savings in order to make up for
12 any shortfalls, but that would be -- that would be it.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So Mr. Stocki,
14 are there -- if we stay with the 1.46 percent, which
15 uses the derivation methodology that Efficiency
16 Manitoba used in the Plan, are there specific areas
17 where Efficiency Manitoba has identified additional
18 savings that could be achieved?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So one (1) of the
23 key concepts to, and with respect to the nimbleness
24 and flexibility, is the ability to shift in --
25 incentives to perhaps underperforming programs or to

1 shift them to -- to ones that will achieve higher
2 savings within the customer segment or within the
3 program bundle itself. That's one (1) of the
4 advantages of the program bundling approach.

5 So if, for example, within a
6 residential program bundle there is a measure that is
7 not seeing the participation that was -- was being
8 targeted, we would look at reasons perhaps why and if
9 the incentive dollars there aren't being spent,
10 perhaps we could reallocate those to higher performing
11 measures which would yield additional energy savings
12 potentially.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So what you're
14 envisioning there is that you might be able to shift
15 dollars from a program where incentive money is being
16 underspent, not meeting the forecast, to programs
17 where things are maybe overshooting, and shift things
18 around so that you're focusing on the programs that
19 are best achieving savings?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's part of
21 it. The other part is just recognition that this is a
22 plan. It's very dependent on what -- how the market
23 responds, how individual consumers, how the industrial
24 customer segment, how continued work with First
25 Nations goes in future years, and so within that

1 particular customer segment there is room for that.
2 We need that room for flexibility to -- to approximate
3 some of those adjustments.

4 I think the contingency fund -- if
5 there are, for example, unique opportunities that
6 emerge during this three (3) years, that is another
7 mechanism we would have to make up any potential
8 shortfalls or perhaps create surplus for future years.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so you're
10 not saying that Efficiency Manitoba is going to have
11 to spend more dollars in order to make up any
12 shortfalls from this plan -- in the course of this
13 plan?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If we can turn
16 to Book of Documents page 32 -- and it'll be right at
17 the bottom, please, Ms. Schubert.

18 Just for context, Ms. Kuruluk, Mr.
19 Stocki -- don't worry, Ms. Kramps, I'll get to you
20 eventually. This IR response from the Manitoba
21 Industrial Power Users Group, asks Efficiency Manitoba
22 about "flexibility per the Act, Section 7," and
23 references the first fifteen (15) year period.

24 If we turn to Efficiency Manitoba's
25 response, which is on page 35 of PUB-14, here

1 Efficiency Manitoba is saying:

2 "Efficiency Manitoba does not agree
3 with the supposition within this
4 question, that the Section 7 of the
5 Efficiency Manitoba Act implies
6 flexibility with regards to the
7 achievement of the annual savings
8 target."

9 So, Mr. Stocki, perhaps if you can help
10 me understand, how does this IR response reconcile
11 with what you've been telling the Board about
12 flexibility and the need to be nimble?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's a
14 fantastic question. And part of the context for that,
15 Part D of the question is actually looking back at
16 Part C from the MIPUG question which asks questions
17 with regards to hitting a 1 percent energy savings
18 target, and so this question was on the follow-up
19 right after that.

20 So what it was suggesting, at least my
21 interpretation of the question, was asking whether or
22 not Efficiency Manitoba would put forward a plan that
23 only achieved 1 percent energy savings, and then if
24 that was the intent of the legislation, then to meet
25 that in -- in further subsequent years, and that --

1 that's not the case.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so what I
3 understand you to be saying is that Efficiency
4 Manitoba is not intending on using that fifteen (15)
5 year period to target underachievement from particular
6 three (3) year plans that you would make up later.
7 You're intending on coming at least close to meeting
8 the 1.5 percent over the three (3) plan years.

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Essentially,
10 yeah. That specific answer was targeted to --
11 intended to answer the question of should we achieve
12 only one per -- 1 percent or less, for example, and
13 only target that within the first three (3) years and
14 then make it up in later years.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And just to
16 confirm, Ms. Kuruluk, we've been discussing this
17 morning the revision that Efficiency Manitoba
18 identified needing to make to those codes and
19 standards savings.

20 Has Efficiency Manitoba verified that
21 for all programs and measures, savings are accounted
22 for on an incremental basis?

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I believe
24 that was the only spot where an error was detected.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in preparing

1 for the hearing, has Efficiency Manitoba discovered
2 any other data entry error or calculation errors
3 within the work papers?

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Any errors that
5 were found throughout the portfolio development
6 process were corrected before that final version
7 released.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Mr. Stocki, when
9 electricity consumption is reduced in Manitoba, would
10 you agree at least conceptually that more hydro
11 electric power that is produced in Manitoba is
12 available to be exported to other jurisdictions?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Conceptually,
17 sure.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And again,
19 conceptually, if those jurisdictions are predominantly
20 fossil fuel energy users, the -- those imports of
21 additional hydro electric energy from Manitoba would
22 reduce greenhouse gas emissions in those
23 jurisdictions.

24 Do you accept that?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I do.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in the
2 legislation which we can put up for reference if you
3 need, but it's at section 9, Efficiency Manitoba is
4 required to analyse the reductions of greenhouse gas
5 emissions in Manitoba that are expected to result from
6 the DSM initiatives in the plan.

7 Is -- is that agreed?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is agreed.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I
10 understand, and you'll correct me if I'm wrong, that
11 Efficiency Manitoba does not count greenhouse gas
12 emission savings achieved in those jurisdictions
13 receiving exports as a result of DSM programming in
14 Manitoba?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
16 It's the resulting GHG emissions within Manitoba.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so not the
18 extra jurisdictional greenhouse gas emissions, but the
19 ones in Manitoba you are tracking?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
21 And really, they're -- they're a dire -- direct result
22 of the natural gas portfolio.

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
2 Stocki. And maybe just a few more questions. And
3 then I might suggest we take the lunchbreak.

4 At book of documents page 15, near the
5 bottom of the page, on the natural gas portfolio, we
6 see here that in the first year, 2020/'21, that the
7 savings are .72 percent.

8 Am I reading that correctly?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
10 And again, there is a little bit of context there.
11 Because of commercially sensitive information related
12 to natural gas consumption in Manitoba, we've chosen
13 to use a baseline year of publically available
14 information of natural gas consumption that was made
15 available by Centra Gas in their -- or Manitoba Hydro
16 in their annual plan.

17 And so, we're using actual 2017/'18
18 natural gas consumption to derive that target.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. And we
20 are going to spend some time there. But my -- my
21 point at this stage is just that, like with the first
22 year of the electric portfolio,

23 Efficiency Manitoba is not intending on
24 meeting the year one .75 percent savings target on the
25 natural gas side either?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
2 We're looking at the -- more focussed on the average
3 of the three (3) years being over .75 in that case.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Ms. Kuruluk,
5 with some assistance from you, Mr. Stocki, explained
6 earlier why that was the case on the electric side.

7 Are -- are the reasons the same on the
8 natural gas side?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We've conferred,
13 and it's a me question. But, yes, I would say it
14 would be very similar to the response that I gave with
15 respect to the electric savings targets not quite
16 meeting the target in the Act; it would be due to our
17 being realistic in -- in building our efficiency
18 programs in the future.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And on the
20 natural gas side, there haven't been any corrections
21 to the year 2 or year 3 savings, correct?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, there has
23 not.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, in year
25 2 and year 3 you're actually doing more than the .75

1 percent target, so you still wind up above the target
2 over the three (3) years?

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So, the three
5 (3) year average is .78 percent?

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
8 Kuruluk.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I have
13 conferred, Mr. Chair, and this would probably be a
14 good place to take a break. And perhaps we can start
15 up again after lunch.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We'll break
17 until one o'clock. Thank you.

18

19 --- Upon recessing at 11:50 a.m.

20 --- Upon resuming at 1:02 p.m.

21

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Steinfeld...?

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
24 Chair. I think before I get into my questions, Ms.
25 Kuruluk had an answer to the question that Board

1 Member Hamilton asked earlier today, and can give her
2 an opportunity now to provide that answer, if she
3 would like.

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Thanks, Ms.
5 Steinfeld. Board Member Hamilton had asked before the
6 break what the targets were for the 2019/2020 DMS
7 Plan, and that the electric targets were 350 gigawatt
8 hours, so Efficiency Manitoba's plan represents an 8.3
9 percent increase over those, and the natural gas
10 targets were eight million metres cubed, so the
11 Efficiency Manitoba targets of 12.6 million metres
12 cubed represents a 52 percent increase over the
13 2019/2020 gas savings.

14 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Thank you very
15 much.

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: You're welcome.
17

18 CONTINUED BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe, Ms.
20 Kuruluk, if I can just follow up on that. Ms.
21 Schubert, the slide that you just had up on the
22 screen.

23 So you were explaining, Ms. Kuruluk,
24 that if we use the Manitoba Hydro DSM plan for the
25 year '19/20, it's a difference of 8.3 percent.

1 Is that what you said?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. 8.3
3 percent on the electric gigawatts hours.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that's using
8 the number on the screen for the Efficiency Manitoba
9 plan, which is the three (3) year average?

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so maybe --
12 I wasn't intending on doing this now, but since we're
13 discussing it, Madam Schubert, if we could please put
14 up PUB-14, Board counsel's Book of Documents at page
15 288.

16 Ms. Kuruluk, this is an excerpt from
17 the Manitoba Hydro '19/20 Demand Side Management Plan.

18 Are you willing to accept that? I'll
19 give you a moment to look at it.

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. I see it
21 references the same 350 gigawatt hour target.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And do you know
23 if we use just the year one (1) savings rather than
24 the three (3) year average, what the percentage
25 increase in savings is between the 350 gigawatt hours

1 for '19/20 and the year one (1) Efficiency Manitoba
2 Plan?

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: If you can give
4 us a moment, we'll calculate that for you.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Sure.

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That represents
10 a 6.6 increase in gigawatt hours.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
12 Kuruluk.

13 And I would also just like to loop back
14 to a matter I was discussing with Mr. Stocki in terms
15 of the interactive effects.

16 You'll recall that this morning we were
17 talking about both natural gas and electric
18 interactive effects and how those are accounted for by
19 Efficiency Manitoba. You recall that discussion?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I do.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we were
22 using the example of LED light bulbs. I'd like to
23 stay on that -- so let -- that example.

24 When dealing with interactive effects,
25 how does Efficiency Manitoba determine whether the

1 bulbs are being installed in an electrically or
2 natural gas heated household?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So it depends on
7 the type of program. So, for example, if it's a
8 product rebate type program, then we would get an
9 approximation of the split, electric versus natural
10 gas, based on surveys, so for data collected after the
11 fact from that product -- product rebate offering.

12 If it is a direct install offering, for
13 example, then the contractor who's actually installing
14 the LED light bulbs would know and that'd be one (1)
15 of the things they'd that have to report back on,
16 whether it was electric heat or gas heat.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And for the
18 current plan, since you wouldn't have survey feedback
19 from your programs, are you using that feedback from
20 measures that Manitoba Hydro has promoted?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
22 We're using average data from prior years of Manitoba
23 Hydro.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I'll ask
25 this as an undertaking and you can discuss with your

1 counsel. It may be a CSI undertaking to be filed.
2 But I'm wondering if you'll take an undertaking for
3 the electric interactive effects, to provide the
4 detail of how, for -- pick an LED lighting program. I
5 don't want you to do all of the measures, but one (1)
6 of the LED lighting programs, how Efficiency Manitoba
7 accounts for the electric interactive effects and the
8 savings for that measure.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, I'll agree
13 to undertake to do that.

14

15 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 1: Efficiency Manitoba to
16 pick one of the LED
17 lighting programs, and
18 advise how Efficiency
19 Manitoba accounts for the
20 electric interactive
21 effects and the savings
22 for that measure.

23

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. I'd
25 like to spend some time on a matter that we --

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Steinfeld, is
2 the response an open session or is the response CSI?
3 I just want to make sure. What -- what I don't want
4 to see is, have the response and then all of a sudden
5 the declaration later on, after it's an open session,
6 so.

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'll clarify
8 that, I don't anticipate that the response will be
9 CSI.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.

11

12 CONTINUED BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. So
14 spending a bit more time on a matter that we started
15 discussing this morning, Mr. Stocki, and I -- I do
16 want to take this in --in fairly small bits to make
17 sure that I understand it as well as -- as you do, so
18 bear with me as I go through things that seem probably
19 fairly rudimentary to you.

20 But I want to go back to that of what
21 question, the 1.5 percent of what and the 7.5 percent
22 of what, and maybe to give a foundation to that
23 question, we'll turn back to Book of Documents, page
24 5, at Section 7(1).

25 And so we looked at this earlier. We

1 discussed that under the Act, Efficiency Manitoba must
2 achieve a level of savings that is calculated as a
3 percentage of the energy consumption in the preceding
4 year. That's what we discussed earlier?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So in order to
7 determine the amount of savings that are actually
8 required, Efficiency Manitoba has to first determine
9 the starting point for that calculation. Is that
10 fair?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that's
12 correct, and as I stated earlier, we don't until --
13 that fiscal year is completed, we won't know that
14 actual value.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we're going
16 to get into the methodology for how -- how you do
17 that, but when we're talking about the starting point
18 for the calculation, that's the of what that I keep
19 referencing. That's the baseline.

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in
22 determining what the starting point or baseline is,
23 we're able to measure how much energy consumption
24 needs to be reduced in order to meet the savings
25 targets that are in the Act.

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Again, that's
2 correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so I think
4 as you've already explained, Mr. Stocki, when
5 Efficiency Manitoba is looking at the targets for the
6 first plan year, it has to look back to consumption in
7 the preceding year, which for the first plan year
8 would be '19/20.

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Again, correct.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we discussed
11 this morning we happened to still be in the 2019/20
12 fiscal year.

13 So am I right in thinking that the best
14 numbers that we have available are the Manitoba Hydro
15 2019/20 load forecast, on the electric side?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We use the 2018.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. Thank
21 you, Mr. Stocki.

22 And so sticking for now with the
23 methodology that Efficiency Manitoba used in
24 developing the plan, we can bring up Book of Documents
25 page 40 for reference, but I don't think we need to

1 look at that page in detail. But, Mr. Stocki, if
2 you'll go with me, I just want to walk through the
3 process step by step.

4 So, as a first step to figure out that
5 consumption baseline, Efficiency Manitoba takes the
6 consumption for 2019/20 that is in Manitoba Hydro's
7 load forecast. Do I have that part right?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
9 I'd just like to point out that for the initial
10 development of the plan, we used the gross load
11 forecast at generation.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we're going
13 to get into those details, but I do really want to
14 take it in very small steps because again I am not an
15 engineer, so it'll help me understand it as we go
16 along.

17 But the forecast -- that starting point
18 forecast is the -- is that 26,237 gigawatt hours will
19 be consumed in 2019/20.

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
21 That's on the following page in that IR.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But that's not
23 the end of it for the steps Efficiency Manitoba has to
24 take because that forecast already incorporates
25 savings that will be achieved as a result of codes and

1 standards initiatives, correct?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But even though
4 it incorporates those initiatives, Efficiency Manitoba
5 still needs to make some adjustments before it can use
6 that number as the baseline, right?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
8 and this is what we're trying to predict what the act
9 -- weather-adjusted actuals will be for 2019, and so
10 we're trying to use information from the Manitoba
11 Hydro load forecast and then trying to make several
12 adjustments to try to predict what that weather-
13 adjusted actual will be in 2019/'20.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And to do that,
15 to get at what those actuals might be, one of the
16 things that Efficiency Manitoba has to do is adjust
17 for reductions in consumption that will be achieved as
18 a result of incentive-based DSM programming that is in
19 place in 2019/'20.

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
21 That's one (1) of the adjustments we chose to make,
22 yes.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that's
24 because the load forecast number that you get from
25 Manitoba Hydro, although it includes codes and

1 standards, it doesn't have built into it reductions as
2 a result of those incentive-based DSM programs.

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
4 That growth load forecast is before DSM.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And to arrive at
6 an accurate picture of the actual 2019/'20 consumption
7 numbers, you need to take into account energy
8 efficiency measures that help reduce load.

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Correct.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so for
11 incentive-based demand side management program, you
12 take that initial twenty-six thousand two thirty-seven
13 (26,237) and reduce it by a further 189 gigawatt
14 hours, correct?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, could
19 you point to where you're getting the 189 gigawatt
20 hours?

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: That might be me
22 doing some math to avoid the taking out and adding
23 back in of codes and standards, that you end up
24 ultimately reducing your starting number by 189
25 gigawatt hours.

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So you've done
2 the math. Yes, correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I know it's
4 surprising, but I did do the math. And what that gets
5 you to is a starting baseline for Efficiency Manitoba
6 of 26,047 gigawatt hours.

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
8 That's our estimate of that projected first-year --
9 or, prior-year load to compare against.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so really,
11 that's a long-winded way of explaining that in order
12 to achieve the '20/'21 savings target, Efficiency
13 Manitoba would need to reduce consumption by 1 1/2
14 percent of 26,047 gigawatt hours.

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And if I can put
17 that another way, what you're really saying is that
18 you want to reduce the actual 2019/'20 load by 1 1/2
19 percent in '20/'21.

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: With one (1)
21 correction. It's not the actual 2019/2020 load; it
22 would be the weather-adjusted actual load, but
23 correct.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you for
25 that correction, Mr. Stocki. And we did discuss

1 earlier that Efficiency Manitoba's rebuttal goes
2 through some of the different methodologies for
3 getting to that -- of what starting point.

4 And so just to explain where I'm going,
5 I'm going to turn to the charts that are in the
6 rebuttal in a moment, but I just want to walk through
7 some of the adjusted -- adjustment recommendations
8 that have been made, again to make sure that I
9 understand them.

10 Will you -- will you go there with me,
11 Mr. Stocki?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Absolutely. I'll
13 try not to jump ahead.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. I know
15 it's a bit painful, but it does help me very much, so
16 I appreciate it.

17 So one of the things that has been
18 recommended, and I think particularly by Mr. Harper,
19 deals with the fact that the load forecast that we're
20 working with -- the last actual number in that load
21 forecast is from 2017/'18. Is that your
22 understanding?

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so we've
3 already discussed the fact that Efficiency Manitoba is
4 already calculating the baseline by reducing the
5 amount of incentive-based DSM programs for 2019/'20,
6 correct?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But 2018/'19 is
9 also not an actual number in the load forecast that
10 you're using, correct?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

12 That was a simplifying assumption that we made to not
13 include that.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so what that
15 really means is that the load forecast for 2018/'19
16 also does not incorporate reductions in consumption
17 achieved as a result of incentive-based DSM programs
18 in that year.

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so with the
21 simplifying assumption that you've made, one of the
22 potential issues -- or you could call it an issue --
23 is that in only reducing by the 2019/'20 incentive-
24 based DSMs, you're not accounting for programs from
25 2018/'19 that may have persisting savings.

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
2 and I'm sure you're taking us to rebuttal soon, so.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Yes, we're going
4 to walk through all of it. So -- but really, what
5 we're saying there is that the 2019/'20 load forecast
6 would not reflect incentive-based DSM from 2018/'19
7 that would continue to reduce consumption in 2019/'20.

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
9 and the impact of that would be to make the targets
10 marginally easier to -- to hit, so again, a
11 conservative assumption on our part.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that's
13 because what you would be doing is reducing your
14 starting number, your starting baseline.

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Because your
17 load is less because of DSM programs that have already
18 achieved savings.

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Exactly.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I'm told
21 it's just simple math that a percentage of a smaller
22 number is easier to hit than a percentage of a bigger
23 number.

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Precisely.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And continuing

1 to walk through some of these recommendations, at --
2 maybe we'll go to book of documents page 7, and just
3 scrolling down a little bit, please, Ms. Schubert.
4 Right there is perfect.

5 So on the screen in front of you, Mr.
6 Stocki, we have the definition of consumption from the
7 legislation, and it provides for electrical energy
8 consumption on a weather-adjusted basis, electrical
9 energy that is metered and sold to a customer in
10 Manitoba. You see that there?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that's
12 correct.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I think
14 you've already explained to us that Efficiency
15 Manitoba is determining the consumption baseline using
16 gross firm energy, or you may have also called it 'at
17 generation'?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yup, that's
19 correct.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And why is it,
21 from Efficiency Manitoba's view, that gross firm
22 energy, or energy at generation, is energy that is
23 sold in Manitoba?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So the important
25 part, when we're trying to determine the savings

1 targets that we'll have to hit -- it effectively
2 doesn't make too much of a difference whether we're
3 calculating that estimate energy savings at generation
4 versus at meter. The important part is whether or not
5 we're being consistent, and as we'll eventually see in
6 the rebuttal, we are being consistent, because the
7 savings targets and derivation that don't really
8 materially change by any -- any amount, depending on
9 whether you do it at genera -- do those calculations
10 at generation or at meter.

11 The important part will be that when
12 we're actually verifying our actual performance,
13 again, within that first six (6) months or so after
14 the end of the first fiscal year, those -- that
15 verification will be done using the definition within
16 the Act of weather-adjusted actual consumption in
17 2019/'20 for our first-year performance at meter.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so in using,
19 in that verification, the actual numbers, it will
20 inclu -- it will account for, for example, line losses
21 that occur between, say, the Keeyask generating
22 station and the energy that ultimately reaches a
23 customer.

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
25 It'll be done at meter.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so just to
2 make sure I'm clear, what you're saying is the
3 independent assessor will be directed to use, in
4 establishing the consumption baseline, at-meter
5 numbers.

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We've got the
7 energy savings values that we've calculated both at
8 meter and at generation, but for consistency purposes,
9 throughout the efficiency plan, we've reported at
10 generation.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But is that
12 going to be what you ask the independent assessor to
13 do, or are you going to ask the independent assessor
14 to use at-meter numbers?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Independent
16 assessment will be done at meter values, but again,
17 we've -- it's just an adjustment factor that's
18 applied. It's the same savings. We're not changing -
19 - there are no other changes in between. It's just a
20 -- a calculation methodology.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in addition
22 to things like line losses, which are energy that are
23 not sold to a customer in Manitoba, we're also talking
24 about metered. So as an example of energy that is
25 metered -- or, sorry, that is not metered -- let me

1 restart.

2 Would you agree that energy that is
3 metered would not include the construction power
4 station service?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I would
6 agree with that.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And things like
8 unmetered sales, like area and roadway lighting and
9 flat-rate water heating?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
11 That would be unmetered energy.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so again, if
13 you were to include in your consumption baseline, as
14 Efficiency Manitoba did in the plan, your starting
15 point for consumption is, again, too high. It
16 includes sales that are unmetered.

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: When you account
18 for those adjustments there, they're extremely minor.
19 So, again, we were being maybe a touch conservative,
20 but I agree, correct.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And these
22 suggestions, which I -- I think are all from Mr.
23 Harper, Efficiency Manitoba has discussed in its
24 rebuttal. But before we turn to the rebuttal, perhaps
25 if we could put up book of documents, page 56.

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I believe,
4 Mr. Stocki, that this is a table that was prepared by
5 Mr. Harper in response to a PUB Information request.

6 Have you reviewed this table?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I have, yes.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we are going
9 to turn to your rebuttal shortly. But in terms of Mr.
10 Harper's table, did you have any concerns or
11 corrections that you would make in particular to this
12 table?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I believe there
14 were a couple minor changes, but, I mean, for the --
15 not -- nonmaterial changes, no.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And perhaps just
17 for completeness sake, perhaps we'll just take an
18 undertaking that Efficiency Manitoba will file the
19 minor corrections that it would suggest be made to Mr.
20 Harper's table?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We've done that
22 within the rebuttal evidence within the table found on
23 page 12.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Okay. Perfect.
25 Then we'll do it that way. So, let's turn then to

1 Efficiency Manitoba Exhibit 13, the rebuttal evidence
2 at table -- or at page 12.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, I have
7 the point, Mr. Stocki, that Efficiency Manitoba says
8 in the rebuttal that the adjustments result in minimal
9 variability. But if you'll go with me, I'd like to
10 just walk through what is done in this table.

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Sounds good.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: All right. So,
13 let's stick to the 2020/'21 year, that column, and
14 starting at the previous year's forecast row.

15 That row is taking energy sold in
16 Manitoba and not energy at generation?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
18 So, it wouldn't include things like station service
19 construction power, for example.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And does it also
21 remove line losses?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Are you able to
24 confirm what percentage is used for the line losses?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I can. In -- on

1 page 50, actually, of the PUB Board book of
2 documents... So, there's two (2) factors outlined in
3 the Manitoba Hydro load forecast.

4 So, there's the -- if you'd go to the
5 bottom paragraph there, there's the distribution
6 losses and transmission losses totalling almost 14
7 percent. So, that's the loss factor, basically, from
8 a distribution-based customer to generation.

9 And if you look at the very last
10 sentence in that final paragraph, you'll see the
11 exception is for large general service customers who
12 own their own transformation and incur minimal
13 distribution losses. For these customers, a 10
14 percent value should be used.

15 So, that's the adjustment factor that's
16 used for customers that are directly connected to the
17 transmission system at those higher voltages.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
19 Stocki. You completely covered off everything I was
20 going to ask about that, so I can move on.

21 We can go back to the rebuttal table at
22 page 12.

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, we see
2 here that Efficiency Manitoba is then removing energy
3 that it sold but not metred. So, that's the area and
4 roadway lighting and flat wa -- rate water heating?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, that
7 gives us another 91-gigawatt hour reduction?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And what we see
10 in the next few rows are those adjustments we
11 discussed earlier for DSM savings achieved in the year
12 since 2017/'18?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
14 And that's where there's a very minor difference
15 between those values that was determined by Mr. Harper
16 again.

17 So, in the less 2018/'19 DSM row you'll
18 see we produced values of three sixteen (316). And if
19 you go back to the values produced by Mr. Harper,
20 you'll see three fifteen point five (315.5), so
21 effectively, with rounding, the same.

22 Similarly, on the next row you'll see
23 we have that as three ten (310) and Mr. Harper has
24 those as three ten point six (310.6), but, again, very
25 minor differences at that point.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And then the
2 next row after that is less Efficiency Manitoba plan
3 cumulative savings. And we see that in 2020/'21
4 that's zero?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
6 because there's no prior year savings.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Right. So,
8 that's why we don't see any in 2021 but we do see
9 numbers in that row in the year 2 and year 3 columns?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Exactly.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And then the row
12 below that, the plus 2018/'19 cumulative codes and
13 standards, this is an adjustment for the codes and
14 standard savings that are accounted for in the DSM
15 plan and the load forecast and you need to avoid
16 double counting?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
18 That's the same adjustments we've made prior.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, that
20 then gets you to a reference electric load of twenty-
21 two thousand three hundred and forty (22,340) gigawatt
22 hours?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
24 And the -- the key difference being there, that that's
25 at meter, not at generation, so it doesn't account for

1 that difference in all the -- the line losses
2 particularly.

3

4

(BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Mr. Stocki,
7 though, you wouldn't need to account for line losses
8 because in using numbers that are at meter, it's
9 already accounted for?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: And my apologies.
11 I shouldn't say it doesn't account for it. You're
12 correct. You don't need to account for it, but it
13 wouldn't include that. It would be at meter versus
14 the more conservative Efficiency Manitoba values that
15 was done at generation which actually would include
16 those -- that consumption.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so the
18 twenty-two thousand three hundred and forty (22,340)
19 gigawatt hours in this table compare to the
20 consumption baseline used in the plan, which is
21 twenty-six thousand and forty-seven (26,047) gigawatt,
22 as we've already discussed?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Well, again, so
24 you have to be a bit careful here because now you're
25 talking at generation versus at metre. So, the basis

1 of the actual energy savings values also have to be
2 adjusted by the same factor because -- so, the energy
3 savings in this table have to be consistently done at
4 meter versus the prior derivation which used all at
5 general both load and energy savings.

6 So, as long as you're consistent, you
7 can kind of comparatively go back and forth to
8 generation versus at meter, but consistency is key
9 there.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, just to
11 confirm, in this table, the plan annual savings using
12 this method, Efficiency Manitoba has calculated those
13 at meter?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
15 So, those values will look different than tho -- the
16 generation values.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I take it
21 from your earlier answer that Efficiency Manitoba
22 accepts this methodology as valid as long as what
23 you're doing throughout is consistent?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And if we can

1 turn to Book of Documents page 42. I'd like to
2 similarly go through the gas consumption baseline.
3 That's perfect right there, Ms. Schubert. Thank you.

4 And so, here, Mr. Stocki, in the -- all
5 of the columns, we see the starting baseline
6 consumption used for the natural gas portfolio,
7 correct?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
9 So, in this case, we did not use forecasted natural
10 gas values, but, instead, we used 2017/'18 actual
11 consumption, not weather adjusted, from Manitoba
12 Hydro.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And this is
14 explained in the filing, but that's because, to use
15 forecast, you'd have to be putting commercially
16 sensitive information on the record?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Well, we have
19 already discussed that the Act requires use of the
20 preceding year and the regulation requires the
21 previous fiscal year, correct?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
23 So, similar to the electric savings verification, once
24 we have the actual consumption on weather-adjusted
25 basis for natural gas consumption from Manitoba Hydro,

1 and we also have the verified natural gas energy
2 savings, we'll be able to do the -- the comparison of
3 how we actually performed and achieved our targets.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, in other
5 words, you intend to have the independent assessor
6 look at the actual numbers for gas consumption and
7 determine after the fact if the savings targets have
8 been achieved?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
10 Similar to on the electric side, this is a proxy for
11 and directionally where we're heading, but it
12 absolutely has to be verified by the independent
13 assessors.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I think you
15 mentioned this, but just to confirm, that in using the
16 2017 actual natural gas consumption, you wouldn't be
17 using the weather normalized consumption.

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
19 to avoid use of commercially sensitive information,
20 we're just -- for the purpose of this illustration --
21 just using actuals, non-weather adjusted.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But when the
23 independent assessor comes in because the definition
24 of consumption requires whether normalized, that is
25 something that the independent assessor will look at?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
2 We did try to -- what we did do for
3 response to a coalition EM I-3, we did -- the question
4 was to do the same analysis using actual consumption
5 for 2018/19, and so that was another data point, that
6 we provided the same analysis but did the derivation
7 of the energy savings for a different fiscal year,
8 essentially, and it came up with a slightly different
9 savings target.

10 So for example, from the original
11 derivation using 2017/'18, natural gas actual volumes,
12 you come up with an average savings of 0.78, and using
13 the 2018/'19 values, you came up with an average
14 energy savings of 0.73 percent.

15 And so again, it gives an indication
16 that we're targeting -- our target setting is
17 effectively what the -- what the intent of the
18 regulations and Act are, and it's to be verified with
19 actuals.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Mr. Stocki,
21 in using the 2017/'18 number in the plan, the actual
22 number, was that a -- a cold year, a warm year, or a
23 roughly normal weather year, do you know?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I can say based
25 on the comparison with the 2018/'19 values, it was a

1 warmer year than 2018/'19.

2

3 (BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Is Efficiency
6 Manitoba able today to tell the Board whether the plan
7 will achieve .75 percent savings of the '19/'20
8 consumption?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Technically, no.
10 Directionally, yes.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And would you be
12 able to get closer to being able to determine if it
13 will achieve .75 percent if you calculated it the same
14 way you do on the electric side? That is embedding
15 the more recent forecasts?

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No, I don't
17 believe so.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And why is that?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: It's similar to
20 on the electric, using electric as an example, we --
21 it's using forecast values and so you don't
22 necessarily know exactly where the actual weather,
23 just the consumption is going to land.

24 You can use the forecast values, you
25 can do certain pluses and minuses, as we've just kind

1 of walked through, both using evidence from Mr. Harper
2 and the rebuttal evidence.

3 But until you have the actual values,
4 it's -- there's going to be a -- a small margin of
5 error, so you're not going to be able to have that
6 precise data point.

7 Again, if you're within -- on the
8 electric side, within the 1.46 to 1.51, directionally
9 you're right on target, and I feel on the same -- very
10 same -- on the natural gas, if directionally we're
11 seeing a .78 ranging to .73 and a -- in a slightly
12 colder year in 2018/19 using actual values, again
13 there -- there's a certain degree of confidence that
14 we've got from that, that directionally we're right on
15 track.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But Efficiency
17 Manitoba isn't using the 2017 actual numbers only on
18 the electric side?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, can
20 you repeat that question?

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: On the electric
22 portfolio, Efficiency Manitoba is also using the
23 forecast numbers for 2018/19 and 2019/20?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, I acknowledge
2 that it was a simplifying assumption to use actual
3 values from the actual gas forecast, again we were
4 trying to avoid using commercially sensitive
5 information to communicate our targets.

6 I'm really unable to comment on whether
7 or not there would be increased accuracy by using a
8 forecast natural gas values, because again it really
9 depends on how the actuals materialize in Manitoba,
10 and I can't necessarily comment whether it would be
11 more or less accurate than the -- using the electric
12 load forecasts approach.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. And
14 one (1) of the things you've explained a few times now
15 is that what Efficiency Manitoba will do is review
16 actual performance through the independent assessment.

17 When will this Board review whether the
18 first three-year plan is achieving the savings
19 targets?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I believe it's
21 outlined in the regulations that future sub --
22 submissions of our efficiency plan will require retro-
23 perspective performance assessment, so that will
24 include the details of the actual weather adjusted
25 loads, and the actual performance for the years that

1 are available when we submit our next efficiency plan.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And sorry, Mr.
3 Stocki, you're -- you're advising that the Board will
4 receive the independent assessment at the time the
5 next efficiency plan is filed?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So a couple of
10 points. So, yes, next submission of the -- our -- in
11 our three-year plan will include the comprehensive
12 retrospective performance evaluation. Not for all
13 three (3) years, of course, because by the time we
14 file the next plan will be somewhere mid year two (2),
15 so we won't of course -- we'll have for sure verified
16 results for year one (1), we'll probably be in the
17 process of receiving those verified energy saving
18 results for year two (2), and we definitely will not
19 have the verified results for year three (3).

20 In the interim, we'll also be -- of
21 course, as a Crown corporation we have reporting --
22 annual reporting requirements under the Crown
23 Corporations Governance Act and we'll be submitting an
24 annual report under that.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe for

1 context, Ms. Schubert, if we could put up the Act at
2 section 16(3).

3 This section of the Act refers to the
4 requirement for Efficiency Manitoba to submit the
5 assessment report to the PUB.

6 Ms. Schubert is just putting it on the
7 screen.

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I see that.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And it's my
10 understanding that there is not yet a time prescribed
11 in the regulations for the submitting of that report.

12 Is that also your understanding?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
17 there's no timeline outlined there.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so does
19 Efficiency Manitoba have a plan for providing that
20 report to the Board if the timing is not prescribed?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We'd look to the
25 Board for recommendations with respect to that timing,

1 recognizing that at the end of a fiscal year, it will
2 take several months to actually get -- do -- finalize
3 all the even -- evaluation results, and so it could
4 take potentially six (6) months following the end of a
5 fiscal year until we have those verified measurement
6 results.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But potentially,
8 you could provide the rep -- the Board with a filing
9 once you have the fiscal year results in terms of an
10 assessment on a year-to-year basis?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So a -- a couple
15 points. It will definitely be a public report, so we
16 -- we can certainly file that. As a point of
17 clarification, we haven't secured yet the independent
18 expert about what we've laid out in our Efficiency
19 Plan with respect to those evaluation activities.

20 The intent is that we would do a full
21 evaluation, all -- all the programs over the course of
22 the three (3) years, but in the interim years, there'd
23 be roughly a third (1/3) of the programs that we
24 receive the full evaluation, with the remainder being
25 verified by the independent assessor, so that at the

1 end of the three (3) years would be the -- really, the
2 first time that there was a full evaluation of every
3 single program under the Plan. And we've done that to
4 effectively reduce some costs on the evaluation side.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
6 Stocki. I appreciate that clarification. Staying on
7 the independent assessor for a moment, and this is a
8 bit of a digression from the gas consumption, but how
9 will the assessor address annualized versus realized
10 savings?

11 Are you able to advise?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Just as a point
16 of clarification, can you explain what you mean by
17 realized versus annualized savings?

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Really hoping
19 you weren't going to ask that, but yes, I'll do my
20 best.

21 So I believe the Coalition EM response
22 2F might assist. But essentially, the idea that
23 Efficiency Manitoba is not prorating savings over the
24 course of a twelve (12) month period, for
25 administrative simplicity, but the realized savings

1 will embed what actually ends up happening in terms of
2 when those savings occurred during the period.

3 I think I've --

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think I've -- I
5 think I understand where you're going with that
6 reference to that. I --

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: You may want to
8 reframe it in your own words so that it's a little
9 more accurate on the record.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. CHERYL PILEK: Typically, in
14 evaluations for programs, there isn't an adjustment
15 to, say, an installation went in in the second month
16 out of the twelve (12) months. It would be assumed
17 that all twelve (12) months, the savings would be
18 occurring. And that would be across industry.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you for
20 that. So I'd very happily like to leave that and go
21 back to the gas consumption baseline. So back to Book
22 of Documents, page 42.

23 And so Mr. Stocki what -- am I
24 understanding that in using the 2017 actual numbers in
25 each year of the plan, and the baseline consumption

1 was not determined accounting for any load growth from
2 year to year?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
4 We've used a -- a flat baseline in this case.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But do I see in
6 this chart that here, with the gas consumption
7 baseline, Efficiency Manitoba has adjusted the
8 baseline to incorporate reductions in consumption
9 achieved as a result of the 2019/'20 DSM plan?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: For consistency
11 purposes, we did make a few adjustments based on, yes,
12 DSM and EM plan savings.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And just so I'm
14 clear, consistency with -- with what?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's a good --
16 that's a fair question. Somewhat consistent with the
17 -- the methodology we used on the electric, even
18 though we weren't using forecasted values, we're using
19 actual values here on the gas side.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But the -- the
21 two (2) are different, though, because in -- in using
22 2017/'18 on the gas side you're using an actual number
23 which would already incorporate DSM reductions that
24 were achieved in that year?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

1 I mean, effectively, what we're doing is we're saying
2 the 2017/'18 is basically kind of the -- the same as a
3 forecasted value, but we've kept that flat. So we've
4 treated it same way, recognizing that it -- it really
5 isn't the -- the same because we're using an actual
6 value there as an approximation.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But if we're
8 thinking of it in terms of load, 2017/18, we have an
9 actual number for the amount of the gas load in that
10 year, and Efficiency Manitoba has further reduced it
11 based on forecast DSM savings in a forecast year?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: By a -- a small
16 val -- amount, yes, correct.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And because
18 you're using '17 and '18 in each year, that adjustment
19 is also made in each year?

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we see here
25 as well that other than in the first year, Efficiency

1 Manitoba incorporates savings from each year of its
2 plan as well?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so why would
5 you incorporate those savings when you are using as a
6 baseline actual numbers that already incorporate DSM
7 savings that were achieved in that actual year?

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

12 So those would be new additional DSM savings that
13 we're discounting from the actual load from 2017/'18
14 load.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so really,
16 you're starting with a lower baseline number on the
17 gas side by taking actual numbers and reducing them
18 further by additional DSM savings from that achieved
19 in 2017/'18?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah.

21 Effectively, yes. For example, in 2019/'20, from
22 twent -- two thousand forty-eight (2,048), we're
23 subtracting 8 million cubic metres.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And if we
25 adjusted the starting baseline for the gas portfolio

1 to put back in the reductions that Efficiency Manitoba
2 has made, would that make the .75 percent savings
3 target more difficult to meet?

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: The natural gas
8 savings targets would be higher by, I guess, eight (8)
9 -- say, for example, in 2019/'20, by eight (8) times
10 point seven-five (.75)? Yes, that's correct.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So you'd need to
12 achieve more savings from your programs in order to
13 hit the point seven-five (.75) consumption using the
14 adjusted consumption baseline?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm just doing a
16 quick bit of math here to see if it's -- would change
17 the value of twelve point two (12.2). It -- it may
18 bump it up based on rounding to 12.3 million cubic
19 metres, but yeah, it might be twelve point two (12.2),
20 or it might be twelve point three (12.3), or to the
21 third -- or the second decimal place there. Correct.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And as an
23 undertaking, can Efficiency Manitoba file with the
24 Board the forecast gas numbers, making the adjustments
25 for the '19/'20 and '18/'19 DSM savings that have been

1 included, as well as the Efficiency Plan savings that
2 have been included to arrive at the new baseline
3 consumption number and advise what savings will be
4 achieved through the Plan?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Can I just ask
6 for -- just unclear -- is the request, then, that we
7 do not remove the 2019/'20 DSM Plan or the Cumulative
8 EM Plan savings from that baseline and redo the
9 savings calculation?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So, I think
14 that's what I was asking for, but I'm going to ask for
15 something different instead. So, the undertaking
16 would be to file this chart but using the forecast gas
17 numbers. And it would be filed, I believe, as a CSI
18 undertaking then.

19 So, essentially, to do what you did on
20 the electric side using the load forecast numbers for
21 the years after the last actual years, and then arrive
22 at the consumption baseline?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, we can do
2 that under CSI.

3

4 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 2 CSI: EM to file this chart but
5 using the forecast gas
6 numbers. CSI

7

8 CONTINUED BY MS DAYNA STEINFELD:

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. And
10 then I'm -- I'm going to ask for what I think will be
11 a public undertaking, which will be to continue using
12 the 2017 actual numbers and re-file this table with
13 the adjustments that we just discussed, so to take out
14 -- or to, I guess, put back in the savings that were
15 taken out for the 2019/'20 DSM plan and the efficiency
16 plan savings and provide us with a new public
17 consumption baseline number and savings achieved.

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, we can
19 provide that on the public record.

20

21 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 3: EM to continue using the
22 2017 actual numbers and
23 re-file this table with
24 the adjustments just
25 discussed, so to put back

1 in the savings that were
2 taken out for the
3 2019/'20 DSM plan and the
4 efficiency plan savings
5 and provide a new public
6 consumption baseline
7 number and savings
8 achieved

9

10 CONTINUED BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I'm going to
12 move on to another area, but has Efficiency Manitoba
13 given any thought to whether there might be any kind
14 of post-report filing with this Board following
15 ministerial approval?

16 And maybe I'll -- I'll frame that
17 another way, Ms. Kuruluk. If, for example, the
18 minister approved the plan with a revision and
19 Efficiency Manitoba was directed to go off and make
20 provisions, would Efficiency Manitoba file the revised
21 plan with the Board in those circumstances?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I wouldn't see a
23 problem with that. That would be something that would
24 be on the public record.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you.

1 Okay, Ms. Kramps, I think we're going to bring you off
2 the bench and give the others, hopefully, a bit of a
3 break.

4 I'd like to spend a little bit of time
5 on -- on budgets. And we heard Mr. Kuruluk this
6 morning reference in her direct evidence that
7 Efficiency Manitoba is committed to creating a lean
8 organization.

9 Are you familiar with that testimony?

10 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I am.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And perhaps
12 we'll use Book of Documents page 228, although I
13 believe this was also a slide you produced. This page
14 is an excerpt from the plan, Ms. Kramps.

15 And this gives us the annual average
16 budget summary for the plan?

17 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right, it
18 does.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, maybe
20 just to start, at a high level, again, to make sure
21 we're all on the same page and using the same
22 terminology, we see here there's a small, orange slice
23 of the pie labelled, "Overhead costs."

24 Can you explain what overhead costs
25 consist of, at least at a high level?

1 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Sure, I can do that.
2 So, in the case of this pie chart, the overhead costs
3 include sort of those corporate -- corporate support
4 functions that Efficiency Manitoba will require but
5 does not include any staff that would be included in
6 overhead.

7 So, in this case, it includes such
8 things as our accommodation expense, our regulatory
9 expense, the cost associated with our Board and any
10 other consultants we might need, for example, legal.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in blue we
12 see, "Program costs." So, at a high level, what do
13 program costs include?

14 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: So, the program
15 costs would include the costs that -- that we will
16 incur to deliver all of the efficiency programs that
17 are in our plan.

18 Those costs would be with -- with third
19 parties, so that does not include any internal
20 Efficiency Manitoba staff.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And staff costs
25 in green. And that's where all of Efficiency Manitoba

1 staff costs fall?

2 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So, including
4 Efficiency Manitoba work -- staff working on
5 efficiency programming, their costs would all be
6 included in the green?

7 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And then we also
9 have customer incentives in the -- the larger part.
10 And those are moneys that are provided as a way to
11 incent customers to participate in programming?

12 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's correct.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, what we
14 have here -- and we have the average portfolio number
15 at top, \$69.9 million, let's say. So, that's the
16 total budget regardless of whether the costs internal
17 or external to Efficiency Manitoba?

18 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right. Those
19 include all of our costs.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And you've told
21 us already, I believe, this morning, that you are
22 planning on spending less money than it costs Manitoba
23 Hydro to administer DSM programming?

24 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's our plan,
25 yes.

1

2

(BRIEF PAUSE)

3

4

MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If we'd turn to,

5

I believe it's book of documents, page 228, please.

6

Oh, sorry, we were just there. So, turning to pages

7

235 and 236.

8

And I've already discussed with Ms.

9

Kuruluk what's on page 235. And if we turn over to

10

page 236, we see those numbers we discussed earlier

11

but broken down by cost component.

12

Is -- is that a good description, Ms.

13

Kramps?

14

MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yes, it is.

15

MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, what we

16

see here is a comparison between the annual average

17

budget for Efficiency Manitoba in those cost

18

components as compared to the Manitoba Hydro 2015/'16

19

numbers?

20

MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

21

MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And are you able

22

to tell me, Ms. Kramps, if the program costs we see

23

under Manitoba Hydro, the \$9.9 million, is their

24

definition of 'program costs' the same as Efficiency

25

Manitoba's definition?

1

2

(BRIEF PAUSE)

3

4

MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe for
5 context I'll just explain. If we -- if we also look
6 at book of documents, page 239. I'm having a hard
7 time reconciling the numbers that are shown here which
8 give the Manitoba Hydro forecast and actual costs with
9 the numbers that are on page 236.

10

11

(BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13

MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I might be able
14 to help out here a touch because there was a detailed
15 IR response that was prepared outlining -- basically,
16 trying to ex -- explain and reconcile this -- this
17 table.

18

For Daymark, it was Daymark EM 1-44, it
19 looks like, part B. And so, at the top of page 2,
20 essentially what it describes there is the -- just the
21 details of the Efficiency Manitoba column.

22

And so, probably of more interest is
23 the -- the bottom half of that first page that starts
24 to describe the -- the analysis of the Manitoba Hydro
25 2015/'16 plan.

1 So, overall, if you look at that line
2 that begins right above that first bullet, you see
3 2015/'16 PowerSmart plan total cost of 76.4 million.

4 Now, if you flip back to the Board book
5 of documents, page 239, and you look at the two (2)
6 highlighted values there, the 4.9 million -- sorry,
7 right below the 4.9 million, it's the 63.3 million,
8 and you scroll down to the bottom of the page, you
9 have 15.6 million there. And so you -- if you add
10 those two (2) values up you get 78.9 million.

11 So now if you go back to the Power
12 Smart plan, costs of 76.4, so there were some
13 adjustments that needed to -- to be made. And what
14 this IR tries to do is reconcile those.

15 So, at the very highest level there are
16 a couple things, like the Curtailable Rate Program,
17 that was offered through Manitoba Hydro that
18 Efficiency Manitoba is not adopting, so there's costs
19 associated with that that were removed from this
20 analysis.

21 So you see right there in the first
22 bullet that the -- the 2015/16 Curtailable Rate
23 Program budget of \$6 million was removed.

24 There is also a -- a 3.4 million
25 corporate overhead that was provided to Efficiency

1 Manitoba and estimated by Manitoba Hydro for that same
2 fiscal year, so that would not have appeared in the
3 Manitoba Hydro 2015/16 plan.

4 So that's an example of a couple of the
5 -- the adjustments that were needed in order to do an
6 apples to apples as much as possible comparison with
7 Manitoba Hydro.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And -- and Mr.
9 Stocki, if you can't answer this in the room, we can
10 certainly do it by way of undertaking, but I'm still
11 not following how we get to the 9.9 million in program
12 costs that is shown on page 236 of Board counsel Book
13 of Documents.

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So if we go to
15 page 3 of 4 of that same Daymark IR, and we scroll
16 down the 2015/'16, if you scroll up a little bit.
17 Perfect.

18 You see the 2015/'16 Power Smart plan,
19 program costs of 9.9 million. So there's a breakdown
20 of what that includes. So essentially it includes the
21 total administration costs for DSM of 18.1 that was
22 from the Power Smart plan page 87 of 115. Plus the
23 total natural gas, DSM administration costs, plus an
24 estimated -- we have to do some proportion from the
25 FRP and an additional administration of the AEF funds

1 of 2.3 million, again within the 2015/'16 Power Smart
2 plan.

3 And there were -- total administration
4 costs were determined to be 23.6. What we did at that
5 point was somewhat of a split. We took 42 percent of
6 the program administration costs and were taken as the
7 program costs, versus the staff costs, which was --
8 was the remainder.

9 And again, that was somewhat of an
10 approximation, but based on that -- that historical
11 split in order to do that comparison with -- with
12 Efficiency Manitoba.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe just
14 to wrap that line of questioning up. If we go back to
15 page 235 of the book of documents at the bottom, this
16 is essentially what you've just been explaining in
17 more detail, Ms. Stocki, that there are differences
18 between Manitoba Hydro and Efficiency Manitoba that
19 make it challenging to directly compare.

20 So certain assumptions and adjustments
21 are made in the numbers that are shown on page 236.

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's exactly
23 correct. And what we've tried to do in that Daymark
24 is really reconcile the two (2) so that we were
25 transparent on that.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. And
2 if we scroll back up here, or actually maybe go back
3 to page 236, please, Ms. Schubert. Right there is
4 perfect.

5 What is Efficiency Manitoba's
6 confidence level for achieving the approximately \$14
7 million budget for program costs?

8 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I mean, we're --
9 we're confident that's the our -- our best estimate of
10 the budget for the programs that we've laid out.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And is the
12 answer the same if we're looking at the overall \$69.8
13 million budget, Ms. Kramps?

14 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: It is.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And on page 239,
16 if we scroll down, this is the comparison for the
17 natural gas portfolio costs.

18 Am I right that the Efficiency Manitoba
19 costs for gas are higher than what Manitoba Hydro was
20 spending?

21 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: They are.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And why is that?

23 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: It's really because
24 the -- we've been given a target for natural gas and
25 that -- that target is higher than those that were

1 achieved by Manitoba Hydro in -- in previous years.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So in other
3 words, you're having to do more and so sometimes that
4 involves spending more money?

5 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: You are though,
7 you've told us, also doing more on the electric side,
8 but you were spending less money on the electric side,
9 is that correct?

10 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And is it
12 presumed that there are cost savings that are
13 resulting from using a greater proportion of private
14 sector or non-governmental organizations than Manitoba
15 Hydro?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Do you mind
20 repeating the question?

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I can try.

22 Perhaps more on the electric side,
23 you're -- you're planning on doing more with less, is
24 that because you're presuming cost savings will be
25 achieved by using more private sector or non-

1 governmental organizations than Manitoba Hydro did?

2 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: So that would be one
3 (1) component. There are a few components, and as I'm
4 sure you're aware, we were given a mandate basically
5 to do more with less. And so there are a few ways
6 that we're looking at doing that.

7 As far as outsourcing some of the
8 functions that Manitoba Hydro might have done in-
9 house, we are doing that.

10 So a perfect example is -- is that we
11 don't intend to have a permanent staff member in -- in
12 our regulatory department because we only anticipate
13 coming back to the Public Utilities Board every three
14 (3) years.

15 And so for this hearing, and likely for
16 future hearings, we will -- we will outsource a lot of
17 that expertise and that will be more cost-efficient.

18 We also -- some of the programs, just
19 the programming mix has changed from some of the
20 historical offerings of Manitoba Hydro, and I'll let
21 Mr. Stocki give an example there as well. And then if
22 you notice in our -- in our budget there is a bit of
23 an inverse relationship between the program costs and
24 staff costs, versus what Manitoba -- the Manitoba
25 Hydro numbers from 2015/16. And so we will have a

1 lower staff compliment.

2 And -- and some of that will be -- some
3 of the required work that historically was done by
4 Manitoba Hydro staff we will outsource to independent
5 third parties.

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So for those
7 couple of program examples, I'd like to draw your
8 attention to our submission, the '20/'23 efficiency
9 plan section 5, page 150 of the PDF. Or within
10 section 5 it's page 25 of 28, I don't know if that
11 helps.

12 So with -- from the program perspective
13 this is -- shows the acquisition cost comparison, so
14 this is actually a good point to introduce maybe a
15 defined term. Acquisition costs is a -- it's a very
16 simplified metric, it basically just represents first
17 year savings divided by first year costs.

18 So it's -- it's not a long-term cost
19 effectiveness metric. But may -- it's something
20 that's relatively easy to understand that basically
21 first cost of savings versus the cost of achieving
22 those savings.

23 And so you'll see the efficiency plan,
24 both on the electric and natural gas side, proposes to
25 achieve quite a bit of reduction on the program side.

1 The subsequent pages, if we scroll to
2 page 27 of 28 -- this actually gives the -- the
3 specific program details of what's changing. So the
4 first bullet is the -- the increased energy savings
5 outcomes that Efficiency Manitoba is targeting, and
6 the next bullet down the page halfway is the increased
7 energy savings achieved through lower-acquisition-cost
8 programming. And so a couple examples showing here
9 are the LED roadway lighting conversion program that's
10 not included in the efficiency plan.

11 So for comparison, Manitoba Hydro was
12 planning on spending, within that '15/'16 year -- was
13 \$11 million, at an acquisition cost of \$1.17 per
14 kilowatt hour. And if you recall Efficiency
15 Manitoba's acquisition cost, it was on the order of 12
16 cents per kilowatt hour in comparison.

17 Similarly on the gas side, there's
18 increased programming for commercial, industrial, and
19 agricultural customer segment, and that's being
20 achieved at an acquisition cost of about \$1 per cubic
21 metre. Again, compared to -- scroll down just a touch
22 there -- yes, so that's where you see the \$1 per cubic
23 metre value, and again that's compared to the \$1.87
24 per cubic metre savings achieved by Manitoba Hydro.
25 So a couple examples there.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Ms. Kramps,
2 I -- I understood you saying earlier that in terms of
3 the Efficiency Manitoba budget, all of the \$13.7
4 million average budget over the three (3) years for
5 program costs are for private-sector and non-
6 governmental organizations. Is that correct?

7 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Turning to book
9 of documents page 233, if we can scroll down to the
10 bottom of that page, please.

11 It says here:

12 "The Efficiency Manitoba budget did
13 not contemplate which type of
14 company would be related to the
15 program costs."

16 Do you see that there, Ms. Kramps?

17 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I do.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so I
19 understand that to mean that while you've budgeted --
20 let's call it, rounding up -- 14 million for program
21 costs, you haven't yet identified which types of
22 companies will be contracted with within that budget
23 area.

24 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Right. We -- we
25 couldn't provide -- we couldn't break down our budget

1 as it was indicated in the -- in the question by these
2 -- these various different types of organizations, but
3 we -- we know that there'll be -- there'll be all
4 kinds of different organizations that we'll -- that
5 we'll be turning to to deliver the programs.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe, Ms.
7 Schubert, if we can just scroll up just to see what
8 Ms. Kramps was just referencing. The -- the question
9 asked for a breakdown of dollars and percentage of
10 total budget related to Manitoba-based private
11 companies, non-Manitoba-based private companies,
12 Manitoba-based NGOs, non-Manitoba-based NGOs,
13 Manitoba-based Crown corps, and non-Manitoba-based
14 Crown corps. That's what you were just referring to?

15 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I was.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so in terms
17 of building up the budget for program costs, how was
18 Efficiency Manitoba able to arrive at that \$13.7
19 million number without knowing what types of companies
20 would be used to contract with for delivering
21 programming?

22 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yeah, the -- the
23 buildup of the budget for the program costs was done
24 from a bottom-up approach, so we -- we looked at all
25 of the -- the resources we would need to deliver the

1 programs.

2 I -- I wouldn't say that the budget is
3 dependent on who necessarily provides the service, so
4 that wouldn't impede our ability to budget, knowing
5 who is going to respond to either the various RFPs
6 that we issue or the -- I mean, some of the
7 organizations, we could probably guess who they're
8 going to be because we work with them -- or, Manitoba
9 Hydro works with them today, and we do have clauses in
10 a number of our contracts that will allow for the
11 portability of those contracts to Efficiency Manitoba.

12 But it didn't -- it wasn't a factor,
13 necessarily, in building the budget.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so if we go
15 back to pages 230 and 231 of the book of documents,
16 and we don't need to look at this in detail, but this
17 IR response provides the budget breakdown for the
18 portfolio budgets by year but doesn't give us the next
19 level of detail, which would be how much would be
20 going to the different contracts. Is that correct?

21 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's correct.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And am I
23 understanding that that's not a level of detail that
24 Efficiency Manitoba has at this point?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I'm going to draw
4 your attention to Coalition-EM-1-39, which I believe
5 is also somewhere in your Book of Documents. And if
6 it's helpful, we have broken down on page 5 of 14 of
7 that IR -- it's called the annual electric program
8 delivery, so this -- this is a further breakdown of --
9 of where we plan to spend those -- those budgeted
10 numbers, and that's for the annual electric.

11 And then we should have a corresponding
12 one for natural gas as well, and that's on page 11 of
13 14 of that same IR.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I appreciate
15 that, Ms. Kramps -- thank you -- but the IR that
16 you've pointed us to doesn't take these numbers and
17 break them down further in terms of how much will be
18 going to the various third-party contracts.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yeah, that's right.
23 This is by program bundle and not by contract.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So there might
25 be multiple contractors within those totals, and

1 likely are.

2 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Ms. Kuruluk
4 referenced this morning that Efficiency Manitoba --
5 and you just referenced it as well, Ms. Kramps -- will
6 be transferring existing contracts.

7 But am I right in understanding that
8 not all of the contracts that Efficiency Manitoba will
9 enter into are transfers? Some will be new?

10 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: We will require some
11 new contracts, yes.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And perhaps
13 we'll put up your rebuttal, Efficiency Manitoba 13, at
14 page 8. And just scrolling down to -- beginning at
15 line 14.

16 This is responding to Mr. Grevatt
17 noting that twenty-one (21) of thirty-two (32)
18 contracts still need to be executed. You've noted
19 that seven (7) of those remaining twenty-one (21) are
20 transfers, correct?

21 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's correct.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And the
23 remainder fit within -- they -- they will be new
24 contracts, but they're not going formally out for a --
25 a Request For Proposal, that you may be able to cover

1 off additional of the remaining contracts under one
2 (1) service provider, et cetera. Do I have that
3 generally right?

4 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Generally.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we can read
6 the -- the rest of the list, but would you agree that
7 other than the seven (7) contracts that remain to be
8 transferred, that the other fourteen (14) will all
9 need to be executed as new contracts?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. TRACY STERDAN: I can provide some
14 context on this one. So the four (4) contracts that
15 don't require RFPs are basically a pre-qualification
16 list that we require of contractors who are in the
17 open market who would just like to participate in
18 programs. A formal tender isn't required. They
19 basically just need to sign up to deliver our
20 programs.

21 Again, of the six (6) contracts that
22 are identified that may be covered under one (1)
23 service provi -- provider, there are a number a
24 initiatives that we envision -- six (6) of those
25 initiatives, specifically, that may be delivered under

1 one (1) RFP, which could -- which could potentially be
2 one (1) service provider and therefore one (1)
3 contract.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In terms of the
5 ones that do not require formal requests for
6 proposals, would Efficiency Manitoba not have some
7 sort of terms and conditions sheet that those third
8 parties have to enter into with Efficiency Manitoba?

9 MS. TRACY STERDAN: Yes, that is the
10 case, and it's basically a contract where they sign as
11 per our terms and conditions, and they basically have
12 to apply to prove to us that they can adhere to those
13 terms and conditions and then they would be
14 automatically signed up to do so.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And earlier this
16 morning, Ms. Kuruluk mentioned that the third-party
17 contractors, regardless of the type of company, are
18 important because they're the eyes and the ears of the
19 program, and that you'll gain insight into the
20 programs from those contractors.

21 Is that a fair summary of -- of what
22 you told us this morning, Ms. Kuruluk?

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would just
24 clar -- it's a fair summary. I'd just clarify it
25 being that they're not necessarily third-party

1 contracted contractors. It could be insulation
2 contractors that don't have a contract with Efficiency
3 Manitoba. It's basically the open contractor and
4 service provider market that I was referring to.

5 So an insulation contractor installing
6 attic insulation in a residential household doesn't
7 necessarily have to bid and be awarded work under
8 Manitoba Hydro -- or under Efficiency Manitoba. They
9 would be essentially, you know, trained in our
10 delivery of our programs, and -- and those contractors
11 still have lots of conversations with Efficiency
12 Manitoba, and Manitoba Hydro in the past.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But they will
14 have to enter into some sort of term sheet that sets
15 out the terms of their engagement through Efficiency
16 Manitoba.

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah. So what
18 Ms. Sterdan was referring to, I think with the -- the
19 furnace and insulation contractors specifically, would
20 have probably been for our income qualify program, so
21 they have very specific standards that they're --
22 they're following. Other contractors have signed up
23 for supplier agreements in the past.

24 This would be anyone eligible to do --
25 install in any residential household, gets into a

1 supplier agreement with Efficiency Manitoba, which is
2 -- is -- is more open in nature than an actual pre-
3 qualified service arrangement.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
5 Kuruluk. For the contracts that are contracts that
6 remain to be executed, does Efficiency Manitoba accept
7 that there are some risks as long as those contracts
8 remain unexecuted, at least as it relates to budget?

9 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: I don't think
10 there's risk involved with those contracts that we
11 still need to go to RFP for. We have a plan to issue
12 those RFPs.

13 We're also -- this is one (1) of the
14 areas where we have historically been, and to the
15 extent we need to be, we will continue to be supported
16 by Manitoba Hydro and their Procurement Department.
17 So I believe there's very little risk in executing
18 those RFPs and those contracts.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And on what
20 basis does Efficiency Manitoba conclude that those
21 contracts can be executed at the budget level
22 necessary to remain on budget?

23 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: So I guess there's a
24 few things with relation to our -- our budget and
25 going on to RFP. One is that, as been -- as has been

1 mentioned a few times this morning, a lot of these
2 programs are not necessarily completely new programs,
3 and so based on historical Manitoba Hydro data that's
4 available, that gives us a certain level of comfort as
5 to what the -- the cost will be on a go-forward basis,
6 and then just the nature of going out into the market,
7 using the RFP process, should drive the -- the lowest
8 cost options for us to obtain those resources.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in terms of
10 the contracts that are going to be transferred, have
11 any risks been identified in terms of -- of those
12 contracts or is it anticipated that it will be a
13 simple transfer and will -- will carry on without
14 delay or -- or risks materializing?

15 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: We don't anticipate
16 any risks with those transferred contracts. Those
17 contractors are aware of our existence and there's
18 been nothing that's been brought to our attention or
19 nothing that -- anything that we're concerned about.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Mr. Chair, I
21 have maybe ten (10) or fifteen (15) minutes left in
22 this particular area, but we could also take a break
23 now if that's your preference.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. Why don't we
25 take a break now for ten (10) minutes? Thank you.

1 --- Upon recessing at 2:29 p.m.

2 --- Upon resuming at 2:49 p.m.

3

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Steinfeld...?

5 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Just quickly--

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

7 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: -- my client's
8 just going to provide a very quick clarification with
9 respect to one (1) of our earlier responses on annual
10 reporting.

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, just to
12 correct the testimony of Mr. Stocki, I had handed him
13 a copy of the Efficiency Manitoba Act which specifies
14 that our annual report is due six (6) months of the
15 conclusion of the fiscal period.

16 However, Efficiency Manitoba, as a
17 Crown corporation, is actually accountable to the
18 Crown Corporations Governance and Accountability Act
19 which supercedes ours and requests that we have an
20 annual report tabled by four (4) months post -- post
21 fiscal period end.

22 So, we lost on that one, so that's --
23 that's to clarify the record. And I don't know if
24 that changes Ms. Steinfeld's line of questioning, if
25 you wanted to ask more questions, but in the annual

1 report we'll report back on what we include in our
2 annual business.

3 And our annual business plan, for the
4 record, is due, I believe, in February, so it's
5 questionable as to how much of this proceeding will be
6 included in our annual business plan as well, so it's
7 more of a corporate annual report.

8

9 CONTINUED BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you for
11 the clarification and correction, Ms. Kuruluk. I
12 don't have any follow-up on that.

13 Ms. Kuruluk, on Book of Documents page
14 250 in a response to a Daymark Information Request...

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Right there is
19 perfect. Thanks, Ms. Schubert. So, on November 8th,
20 2019, Efficiency Manitoba had five (5) full-time
21 equivalent staff.

22 Just by the number of people in the
23 room, I'm guessing that you may have an update on
24 that. So, how many as of today, employees, does
25 Efficiency Manitoba have?

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We have the five
2 (5) full-time staff. And, in addition, we have the
3 five (5) additional folks behind us that Manitoba
4 Hydro was gracious to second to us to support the
5 hearing process.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So, I
7 misunderstood that you still have five (5) full-time
8 staff within Efficiency Manitoba and the others that
9 are working with you are still technically employed
10 with Manitoba Hydro?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Well, they're --
12 they're full-time staff, not tem -- term staff,
13 they're full-time staff, but they're on a secondment
14 full-time with Efficiency Manitoba.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And you
16 mentioned earlier that your plan is to have up to
17 seventy-five (75) staff.

18 So, by and large, other than some
19 support functions, the remainder of Efficiency
20 Manitoba staff are employed with Manitoba Hydro
21 currently?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And there's a
24 reference in this IR response that we can see on the
25 screen about the implementation plan for organization

1 structure.

2 What is the plan for transitioning
3 employees to Efficiency Manitoba? Do you have a
4 formal plan in terms of timing and how that's going to
5 roll out?

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, the
7 transition component is -- is actually a complicated
8 manner in that there's labour relations
9 considerations. There's two (2) bargaining units --
10 units that represent staff that are currently employed
11 at Manitoba Hydro.

12 I currently have a director of HR and
13 government relations who's working through those
14 issues as we speak.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, are --
16 are you able at this point in time to advise of the
17 timing for when Manitoba Hydro employees will
18 transition over to Efficiency Manitoba?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We were hoping
20 to have offers that could be made to required staff at
21 the conclusion of this Hearing. And, again, there's a
22 lot of awkwardness in -- in timing with not having an
23 approved plan and -- and needing to commence on April
24 1st.

25 But our intention was to aim to have

1 offers to the staff that are required by March of this
2 year.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And have you
4 identified the employees that will be transferred?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is in
6 process right now.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And in terms of
8 the implementation plan or -- or the status of what's
9 in process, is there an actual document that could be
10 filed with the Board or is this a day-to-day
11 developing matter?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, we don't
13 currently have a document for that at this point.
14 We've been working on an org chart, but, again, given
15 the awkwardness of not having an approved plan, that's
16 -- that's still in progress.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And does
18 Efficiency Manitoba accept that there are risks
19 associated with transferring sixty (60) to seventy
20 (70) employees to a new organization?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I guess there
22 potentially could be a risk that staff may not want to
23 be employed by Efficiency Manitoba when it comes to
24 what our offer looks like. However, the staff that do
25 remain at Manitoba Hydro are -- are staff that are

1 very passionate and dedicated about energy efficiency
2 in this province, so it -- it is very likely that they
3 would be willing to move to Efficiency Manitoba.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe just
5 picking up on that, Ms. Kuruluk, in your rebuttal
6 evidence you state that you understand that the
7 majority of the Manitoba Hydro workforce is interested
8 with employment with Efficiency Manitoba.

9 Were does Efficiencies Manitoba --
10 Efficiency Manitoba's understanding of that come from?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, I only have
15 somewhat of an intangible answer. It's -- it's
16 actually -- it feels notional, but based on our
17 knowledge of the staff, a lot of the staff at Manitoba
18 Hydro were actually involved in the preparation of the
19 plan and are, you know, experts in the fields that
20 they were designing programs around.

21 I can also notionally talk about the
22 fact that over the past five (5) years since the NFAT
23 recommendation came out, there were staff that -- that
24 did bid out of the efficiency program in Manitoba
25 Hydro and the ones that are remaining did not.

1 So, again, it -- it's somewhat
2 notional, but it is also staff and people that I -- I
3 know fairly well.

4 And -- and Mr. Stocki, as the -- in his
5 position as VP of efficiency programs, goes to weekly
6 meetings with those staff to keep them up to date on
7 our progress.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And the
9 reference to staff who are still there not bidding
10 out, are you referencing the voluntary departure
11 program at Manitoba Hydro?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Partially. But,
13 actually, we had more staff leave just to -- to bid
14 out of the uncertainty of -- of our new organization.
15 So, voluntary departure lost a few efficiency staff,
16 but I think more would have left to other areas of
17 Manitoba Hydro.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Is there a risk,
19 from your perspective, that Efficiency Manitoba may
20 not be able to fill the anticipated staffing
21 requirements from existing Manitoba Hydro staff?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: There's
23 definitely a potential that not all staff will want to
24 -- to come over. What I can tell you is I have a
25 stack of resumes that have been received by myself

1 from interested parties outside of Manitoba Hydro that
2 have been interested in what Efficiency Manitoba's
3 doing and would love to have employment with
4 Efficiency Manitoba. There's a lot of interest in
5 what we're doing.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, in terms
7 of filling any remaining positions externally, if
8 offers are going to be going out to the Manitoba Hydro
9 folks sometime in March, would the remaining positions
10 be filled externally after the plan has been
11 implemented?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I -- I -- you
13 know what? I don't have an answer for that. I think
14 that our -- our thought was for all the efficiency
15 staff that were required, we would -- we would get the
16 Hydro -- the Manitoba Hydro staff.

17 So, you know, there will be positions
18 related to efficiency that are perhaps a little bit
19 different that we'll need to bid out to the open
20 market. But, again, with the level of interest I've
21 received thus far, I don't anticipate having a problem
22 with interested candidates.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And this
24 Information Request here on the screen references
25 having adequate staffing levels in place by April 1st,

1 2020.

2 So, is there a sense of what adequate
3 staffing levels are? Is there a number that you need
4 to have brought in to have adequate staffing levels by
5 April 1st, 2020?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And can you just
10 repeat the question so I have it fresh?

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I'm going to
12 try. In terms of adequate staffing levels and -- and
13 required staff becoming employees of Efficiency
14 Manitoba by April 1st, 2020, is there a number that
15 you require to be in place in order to have adequate
16 staffing levels?

17 Is it all seventy-five (75)? Is it a
18 lesser number?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, we -- in our
20 efficiency plan we had speculated that we'd need up to
21 seventy-five (75). And, as I mentioned earlier, we
22 are still building out the actual requirements.

23 And, you know, given the awkwardness of
24 not quite having an approved efficiency plan, we are -
25 - we are doing -- endeavouring to have that number as

1 -- as solid as we can in terms of what would be deemed
2 as adequate, whether that's 100 percent of what we
3 decide we end up needing or -- or some portion of,
4 that it's -- I -- I -- I don't have an answer to
5 what's adequate per se other than with the transfer of
6 responsibilities of Manitoba Hydro.

7 There is a continued support coming
8 from the staff at -- at Manitoba Hydro, whether it's
9 in support functions for procurement or IT or creative
10 services.

11 So, we feel that in combination of our
12 transitional support from Manitoba Hydro, that we'll
13 be fully ready to deliver on what we need to deliver
14 on.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And if the
16 transition isn't complete as of April 1st, 2020, does
17 that, I'll call it symbiotic relationship with
18 Manitoba Hydro continue? Are they continuing to pri -
19 - provide support after April 1st, 2020?

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, that's
21 correct. Until such time as -- as the transition is
22 complete we expect to have that support.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And you
24 referenced the labour and employee relations
25 dimensions. And I believe there's discussion of it on

1 the -- on the next page over, as well.

2 Ms. Kuruluk, I'm not asking for a legal
3 opinion from you or to -- for you to divulge any legal
4 opinion you've been given, but has Efficiency Manitoba
5 assessed the potential for any legal impedimenta with
6 regards to transferring Efficiency Manitoba -- or
7 transferring to Efficiency Manitoba employees who are
8 members of Manitoba Hydro bargaining units?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We are currently
13 not aware of any specific legal impediments to the
14 transfer of staff.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Has Efficiency
16 Manitoba included in the budget a contingency or plan
17 for any labour relations costs that might arise from
18 any disputes regarding the transition of employees to
19 Efficiency Manitoba?

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We've in --
21 incorporated in our ongoing budget some contracted
22 dollars for legal services, and that would include any
23 specific labour relation services that we would need.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you.
25 Earlier this morning, Ms. Kuruluk, you spoke about the

1 innovation budget. It was, I believe, in regards to
2 your slide 10 and the eight hundred and eighty-one
3 thousand dollars (\$881,000) that you are budgeting on
4 spending for information. Do I have that --
5 innovation. Do I have that number right?

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. That was -
7 - the eight hundred and eighty-one thousand (881,000)
8 was the average of three (3) years.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And, in general,
13 as you say on this slide, the innovation budget is to
14 go to external research and innovation?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.
16 And also for -- well, if -- if external research would
17 also include a market potential study, then, yes, I
18 would say that's correct.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Efficiency
20 Manitoba, in terms of the budget that we were looking
21 at on Book of Documents page 236, is not able to
22 identify which cost category the innovation budget is
23 in. Is that correct?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: The innovation
2 budget is one (1) of our enabling strategies, and it'd
3 be located in the program costs category.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I take it
5 from the evidence that you provided this morning that
6 the use of the innovation fund will be discussed in
7 your next phase with the EEAG.

8 So is it fair to say that you do not
9 currently have a strategy for the use of the
10 innovation budget funds?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We have -- we
12 have ideas, but no -- ideas as presented in -- in my
13 opening presentation, but no, we do not have a
14 specific formalized strategy.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Has Efficiency
16 Manitoba identified in what circumstances it will
17 decide that it funds particular research?

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That will be
19 part of the discussions with the EEAG.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I'd like to turn
24 to the discussion about the contingency fund, and you
25 did discuss this this morning, Ms. Kuruluk.

1 Am I right in understanding that the
2 purpose of that fund is to address any unplanned DSM
3 opportunities that arise during the plan years?

4 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: So yes, the
5 contingency fund is available to us in the event that
6 there are new technologies, new initiatives that we
7 want to pursue that we're just not aware of today
8 because of the -- the changing landscape in energy
9 efficiency initiatives.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so maybe Mr.
11 Stocki might be able to help with this. Would an
12 example be something like an unexpected load
13 displacement opportunity that would have costs
14 associated with it? You could draw on the contingency
15 fund for that?

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Potentially, yes.
17 For example, the load displacement program in
18 particular, those are typically longer lead time
19 projects that may take a year or more to fully develop
20 and negotiate the terms. So with respect to those,
21 those would be, for the most part, ones that would be
22 more anticipated.

23 But certainly, other economic-
24 development-type projects, for example, for a large
25 industrial customer announcing a new location in

1 Manitoba. That is the type of activity that could
2 potentially be covered. Other activities under that
3 would be related to technologies that just aren't
4 included within -- within the efficiency plan but that
5 require a rapid response in order to -- to claim those
6 savings.

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Turning to page
8 227 of the Book of Documents, Ms. Kramps, this gives
9 us the budget on a year-by-year basis.

10 Am I right that the budget depicted
11 here does not include the contingency fund?

12 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's correct. The
13 contingency fund is not included in our budget.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so the
15 contingency fund is in addition to the total budget
16 numbers that we see here?

17 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: It would be in
18 addition, should we end up spending any of it.

19 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And the amount
20 for the contingency fund is capped at \$7 million over
21 the three (3) years?

22 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Correct.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Why is that the
24 appropriate level for the contingency?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's somewhat
4 of an approximation based on past experience with --
5 with large unexpected projects or, for example, the
6 example we point to within the plan of the -- coming
7 up and rolling out a LED lighting program through
8 Manitoba Hydro in -- in a short period of time. It is
9 a suggestion. We don't necessarily -- it was kind of
10 a -- a point that we felt was -- we were comfortable
11 with, but certainly, it's definitely worth discussing
12 whether that value should be higher or lower.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And is
14 Efficiency Manitoba asking that this Board recommend
15 approval of both the budget and the contingency
16 amount?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So to clarify,
21 the contingency fund would be used to pursue energy
22 savings that are not accounted for in the efficiency
23 plan, so again, it's for those opportunities where a
24 unique situation presents itself.

25 So with respect to the specific dollar

1 amount, we'd look to the panel to make a
2 recommendation of whether that 7 million was
3 appropriate or not.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I think both
5 yourself -- Mr. Stocki -- and Ms. Kramps have -- have
6 just explained well that the contingency is for
7 unplanned DSM opportunities, so I take it that it
8 cannot be used to address any need to spend more for
9 shortfalls within the plan itself.

10 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.
11 That's not the intention of the contingency fund.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I believe it
13 was Ms. Kuruluk who told me this morning, or perhaps
14 Mr. Stocki, that no extra money will be needed to
15 address the shortfall on the electric side, for
16 example.

17 And Mr. Stocki, I think you'll recall,
18 we talked about shifting money from underperforming
19 programs to programs that are achieving more savings
20 than anticipated. Is that a -- a fair summary of our
21 discussion?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's fair,
23 correct.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: What if it is
25 not possible to identify programs that can be part of

1 that shift of funds? What if all programs are
2 performing, let's say, at a mediocre level?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So in that type
7 of situation, if all programs were simultaneously, for
8 some reason, underperforming, I mean, there would be
9 some flexibility that we could look at initiatives
10 proposed in later years within the plan.

11 And insomuch as the plan is
12 underperforming, then we're not providing those
13 incentives, so that there would be budget available to
14 again look at that portfolio and say, Well, can we
15 advance some of those programs in later years and
16 bring them to, you know -- say, for example, if we had
17 a plan coming out in 2022, could we advance that to
18 2021 if the entire portfolio was, hypothetically,
19 underperforming, in that case.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In terms of the
21 shifting between an underachieving program and a
22 program that's achieving more, is there a risk that
23 Efficiency Manitoba might shift money away from, say,
24 low-income or Indigenous programs, which may be less
25 cost-effective to deliver?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No, we wouldn't
2 be looking to shift dol -- budget dollars between
3 customer segments. We'd be looking to keep it within
4 a customer segment and just re-optimize the -- the
5 program offers or specific measures within that same
6 customer segment -- or program bundle, for that
7 matter.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And does the
9 discussion that we've had about flexibility mean that
10 Efficiency Manitoba should have within the plan budget
11 a contingency fund to address areas where there are
12 savings shortfalls?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I -- I think the
17 key there, if there's under performance within a
18 specific program bundle or within a customer segment,
19 then we're not spending those incentive dollars.

20 And so if you remember the pie chart
21 from earlier, the incentive dollars were approximately
22 65 percent on the annual basis of our budget, so that
23 then would mean that those incentive dollars are
24 available to do that flexibility or shift dollar --
25 those incentive dollars within a program bundle,

1 within a customer segment. So we wouldn't anticipate
2 using the contingency fund to make up any saving
3 shortfall.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In those
5 circumstances, though, Mr. Stocki, wouldn't you have
6 to spend more than planned in terms of marketing of
7 those better-pachievin -- achieving programs or
8 incentives for those programs, potentially going abud
9 -- above -- bug -- budget?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So that's one (1)
11 of the key differences that Efficiency Manitoba is
12 putting -- put forward in the plan. The use of the
13 program bundles actually combines multiple measures or
14 multiple programs within an overall offering.

15 So for example, within a residential
16 major construction program bundle, to use that as an
17 example, there could be multiple individual
18 technologies or measures or programs within that
19 bundle. So that would be marketed as a bundle, so
20 those costs would be reflective of marketing that
21 bundle again.

22 So if we're shifting incentive dollars
23 within that, effectively, there would be very little
24 or no change within the marketing budget for that
25 specific program bundle.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But if you
2 needed to shift dollars between bundles, for example -
3 - if there was a bundle that was underperforming and
4 you needed to shift money away from that bundle to
5 another bundle -- that wouldn't be addressed with
6 those same marketing dollars.

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Again, I -- I
8 think you're technically correct, although the
9 incentive dollars are the -- the major budget
10 component there that would be the key driver of --
11 driving those additional energy savings in a different
12 program bundle.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And on the, I
14 guess, positive side of the equation that we're taking
15 about, there's a -- a program that is having greater
16 uptake than anticipate. It's -- it's overperforming.
17 Would you agree, Mr. Stocki, that then
18 the costs for that program are greater than
19 anticipated?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That would be
21 true, correct.

22 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: And -- and just to
23 add to that, there would be also the increased energy
24 savings from that as well.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But your budget

1 wouldn't be addressing the increased costs, Ms.
2 Kramps.

3 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: But there might be
4 an opportunity to shift budget from -- like, we
5 wouldn't need to spend as much, perhaps, in the -- in
6 the following year because we had achieved higher
7 savings in the current year.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Does Efficiency
9 Manitoba plan to put caps or -- or limits on programs
10 if participation is greater than expected, perhaps, in
11 a particular year?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We don't have any
16 plans to put caps on the participation within our
17 programs. One (1) exception may be if we decide to
18 offer through, for example, the innovation fund, if
19 there's a specific pilot program or pilot projects
20 that we are targeting. In that case, we would have a
21 cap on that.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In terms of the
23 shifting of budget dollars that we're discussing, that
24 has the potential to change cost-effectiveness
25 metrics, potentially, of the portfolio?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

2 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Steinfeld,
3 I don't know if you're leaving this area, but I have a
4 question about contingency.

5 Would -- is this a good time to ask it?

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Absolutely.

7 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Actually, I
8 have two (2) questions. I'm confused now about
9 contingency. I heard you speak about a contingency
10 fund, I think you said, that would be for
11 unanticipated opportunities, that you were looking at
12 being approximately \$7 million over three (3) years.

13 But then I thought I heard you say that
14 you wanted this panel to recommend what the level of
15 that should be. So that's my first question. And
16 that is not part of your budget at this time.

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So that's
18 correct. The \$7 million is put forward as a
19 suggestion within our plan as a contingency budget
20 exactly for what you said: unanticipated
21 opportunities. What we'd looked for the panel to
22 recommend is -- and review, is that \$7 million
23 reasonable amount spread out over -- over seven (7)
24 years.

25 We've put forward a process within our

1 plan document of how we would seek EEAG input on the
2 use of that, of course, go through our board,
3 demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of -- and the
4 timing of that spend. But again, we'd look for
5 recommendations on that \$7 million.

6 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: But that's over
7 3 million, not over seven (7) years.

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Three (3) years.

9 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Oh, three (3)
10 years, not over --

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Three (3) years,
12 correct.

13 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: -- seven (7).
14 Yeah, okay.

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

16 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: So -- and
17 that's not part of your budget at this point.

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

19 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: So then, I
20 believe, Ms. Steinfeld was asking you about
21 contingency, should there be a contingency built in in
22 case you run into a shortfall and there's no
23 contingency built into your budget either?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1

2 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: So there isn't a
3 contingency built into, let's say, like, our operating
4 costs or some -- the -- the actual costs that we've
5 built into our budget. I've been budgeting and
6 forecasting for a long time. I -- I know that -- I
7 know that it's not going to be 63 million, \$189
8 million. That's what I know for sure.

9

And so I've had discussions with
10 Manitoba Hydro about that, and -- and what would
11 happen if we were -- if -- if we were over.
12 Certainly, the under scenario is a lot easier to deal
13 with. We won't spend it. They won't fund us.

14

But I do plan to be in regular contact
15 with our funder, Manitoba Hydro. And to the extent
16 that we see, you know, an area where we feel like
17 we're going to go over budget, we will have those
18 discussions with Manitoba Hydro and what the
19 consequences may be to -- for example, achieving our
20 savings targets. And in those scenarios, we'll have
21 to determine whether Manitoba Hydro is incented to
22 provide us with a higher budget in order to achieve
23 those targets or higher targets, but those would be
24 ongoing discussions.

25

And -- and Manitoba Hydro's -- is fully

1 aware of -- of that potential as well. They -- they
2 don't seem to be concerned about it, so long as we
3 keep the -- those -- the communication open on -- on
4 where we're trending.

5 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: So then there
6 are, in fact, two (2) contingencies. One (1) is a
7 contingency fund that you're looking for a
8 recommendation from this panel, and the other is a
9 budget contingency that is not currently included in
10 your budget.

11 It -- have I got that right?

12 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yeah. I think you
13 could put it that way. We haven't specifically
14 addressed, I think, the -- the operating contingency,
15 that second contingency that you were talking about.
16 But I'm -- I would certainly be open, if -- if the --
17 if the panel wanted to recommend, you know, an
18 additional contingency on our operations, we -- we'd
19 certainly be open to that.

20 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: But the
21 innovation fund that we spoke of previously is
22 included in your budget, correct?

23 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's right.

24 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

25

1 CONTINUED BY MS. DAYNA STEINFELD:

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Ms. Kramps,
3 maybe to follow up on that question from Vice Chair
4 Kapitany, the operating contingency that you're
5 speaking about, that's essentially a contingency plan
6 where Efficiency Manitoba would go to Manitoba Hydro
7 to adjust the dollars that it's -- it's getting for
8 the Plan?

9 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: That's how we
10 describe it, yes.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I won't ask
12 you to deal with this, because I think it may be
13 getting into the area of a legal opinion, but I would
14 suggest that your counsel may want to, in closing
15 arguments, address how that plan would fit within the
16 requirements of Section 12(5) of the plan -- or -- or
17 sorry, of the Act.

18 And maybe, Ms. Schubert, if we can just
19 put that section up, 12(5) of the Efficiency Manitoba
20 Act. And I'll just read it for the purposes of the
21 record, Ms. Kramps, that:

22 "In implementing an improved
23 Efficiency Plan..."

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I think it's --
2 yeah, right there. Thank you.

3 "Efficiency -- in implementing an
4 improved Efficiency Plan, Efficiency
5 Manitoba may adjust activities to be
6 undertaken during the three (3) year
7 period of the Efficiency Plan,
8 provided the adjustments a) are
9 reasonably required to maximize the
10 amount or cost effectiveness of the
11 net savings to be achieved under the
12 approved plan; and b) do not result
13 in Efficiency Manitoba's total costs
14 exceeding the total cost specified
15 in the improved Efficiency Plan."

16 Have I read that correctly, Ms. Kramps?

17 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: You have, yeah.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. At
19 Board counsel Book of Documents page 262, and I -- I
20 don't think we need to look at this in detail, but is
21 the Efficiency Manitoba panel familiar with the
22 evidence from Mr. Friesen regarding the need for
23 industrial programs to have flexibility in terms of
24 timing and delivery?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I'm familiar

1 with that evidence.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I take it
3 from the discussion we just had that the contingency
4 fund that we've been discussing could not be used to
5 address the matter that's specifically raised by Mr.
6 Friesen?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, did
11 you state that -- that contingency fund could not be
12 used to fund --

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Right. It would
14 not be available if, for example, a project for an
15 industrial customer was planned for a particular year,
16 but the customer was not able to take it up in that
17 year, and it shifted to another year that it wasn't
18 budgeted for, that's not some -- that's not the
19 purpose of the contingency fund?

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: It's not an
24 unplanned opportunity?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

1 In that case, it's highly likely, if it was a large
2 project, that Efficiency Manitoba would have already
3 been engaged with the customer at that point, so it
4 wouldn't have been a -- an unplanned activity.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that might
6 be an example of that flexibility, that shifting we've
7 been discussing, where you might then be able to shift
8 money around within the budget.

9 Underperforming projects in one (1)
10 year would maybe get some of the budget that was
11 planned for that industrial project?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah. And
13 certainly within the industrial sector, with respect
14 to the design of our programs, there's certainly
15 accommodations for a number of large projects coming
16 into the Province already within the plan throughout
17 the duration of the three (3) year plan. So and --
18 insomuch as they're shifting with respect to the
19 customer timelines, we feel we can accommodate that
20 flexibility that Mr. Friesen is pointing to.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
22 Stocki.

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If we can maybe
2 just briefly put the Efficiency Manitoba direct
3 evidence presentation, slide 16, up.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: This is a
8 graphic that I love, because it helps me understand
9 the concepts, so we'll spend some time on it.

10 So Ms. Kuruluk, this is a slide that's
11 graphically depicting the Program Administration Costs
12 Test, or the -- the PACT?

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct,
14 and you and I both. This is good. I'm not an
15 engineer either.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Perfect. I'll
17 keep asking you questions. Then we can stay on the
18 same level.

19 And the PACT is a -- a measure or a
20 test of cost-effectiveness, correct?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And what we're
23 seeing here on this slide is that in looking at the
24 cost side of the equation, they are costs to
25 Efficiency Manitoba, whether we're doing the PACT for

1 a -- a bundle, or the overall program -- or the
2 overall portfolio, rather?

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we also see
5 here that the benefits are the -- let's call them
6 avoided costs to Manitoba Hydro or Centra Gas?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. We've been
8 calling them marginal values.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Yes. And so I'd
10 like to just have this background in mind as -- as I
11 walk through some of my next questions, where my
12 intention is to, again, go piece by piece through the
13 portfolio design process.

14 So at Book of Documents page 74.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If we can just
19 scroll down a bit, Ms. Schubert, to centre those three
20 (3) bullets.

21 So Ms. Kuruluk, what we have here is a
22 -- a page from Mr. Harper's evidence, where he
23 summarizes his understanding of the portfolio design
24 process. So he in -- he indicates that first, there
25 is a -- a high level screen, then the preliminary

1 portfolio design, and then final portfolio design.

2 Does Mr. Harper have that at a high
3 level, correct?

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: At a high level,
5 that is correct.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Mr. Stocki,
7 I'm at -- would I be right in understanding that
8 before even getting into the prescreening process,
9 Efficiency Manitoba would have created an in --
10 inventory of sorts of -- of possible measures that
11 might be out there?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so from the
17 inventory of possible measures, Efficiency Manitoba
18 then went through and applied sequentially these three
19 (3) screens, correct?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Advancing to
22 page 76 of the Book of Documents, the response at the
23 bottom -- we see here, Mr. Stocki, a list of measures
24 that Efficiency Manitoba rejected in the course of
25 applying the initial screen, correct?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
2 with some of the reasons in the bullets right below.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So we see that
4 at this first screen, Efficiency Manitoba rejected
5 small-scale wind, dynamic glazing, real-time energy
6 management, energy storage, residential behaviour,
7 personal comfort systems, advanced rooftop units,
8 solar air preheating, HVAC maintenance, and variable
9 refrigerant flow systems.

10 So I have that right?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
12 And if you give me a second, there might be a more
13 comprehensive list that we've already provided so I'll
14 try to find that.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I -- in
19 Coalition-EM I-10(a), we've provided a more extensive
20 list of those rejected technologies.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And maybe, Ms.
22 Schubert, if we can just stay on that page 76 of the
23 book of documents.

24 As you referenced, Mr. Stocki, that IR
25 response, if we keep scrolling from the bottom of page

1 1 over to page 2, we see the list of the reasons for
2 the rejection, correct?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 And just to give the -- the Board a sense of those --
5 those criteria, so it's those types of measures that
6 may have not had any par -- take up yet, or have not
7 been proven within a Manitoba market, or the energy
8 savings claims haven't been verified either internally
9 or externally.

10 So it's issues such as those that would
11 cause a measure to be prescreened out.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And based on
13 that answer and the -- the list in front of us, Mr.
14 Stocki, Efficiency Manitoba did not apply any cost-
15 effectiveness tests as a screen at this first high-
16 level stage.

17 Is that correct?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: There is an
22 exception, of course, but generally, that's true.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And -- and what
24 is the exception?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: The except --

1 exception is actually on the next page of the Book of
2 Documents on page 78. The values aren't necessarily
3 important, but both solar domestic water heaters and
4 solar thermal pool heaters passed the initial screen,
5 and they were technologies that were looked at, but
6 there were several subsequent reasons that they --
7 they were rejected.

8 Basically, they're -- we've outlined
9 that in a separate IR, but essentially, there was very
10 low participation that was projected from that, with
11 very low savings. Essentially, those -- those are a
12 couple of the criteria that were used at that point.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Those two (2)
14 measures, though, as you said, did pass that initial
15 high level screen, the solar water heaters and solar
16 thermal pool heaters?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
18 because they are technologies that have been used
19 prior in Manitoba, and the -- there are verified
20 energy savings that could be yielded from those. It's
21 just there are other technologies that have been more
22 readily adopted in Manitoba is one (1) of the reasons
23 for -- for not moving forward with those two (2).

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But staying on
25 the high level screen, the -- the first stage of the

1 portfolio design process, there weren't any measures
2 that were rejected because of cost-effectiveness?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And then at the
5 second screen, the port -- preliminary portfolio
6 review, Mr. Harper describes three (3) evaluation
7 criteria: level of energy savings, program costs, and
8 program cost-effectiveness.

9 Does Efficiency Manitoba agree with
10 those three (3) criteria used at the second screen?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry. Could
12 you point me to what you're referring to?

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Yes. If we go
14 to Book of Documents page 80, and down to the middle
15 of the page -- right there, Ms. Schubert. Thank you.

16 So here, it's -- it's discussing after
17 the high level screen evaluation screen, the key
18 criteria used to determine the initiatives are the
19 level of energy savings, the program costs, and
20 program cost-effectiveness.

21 Would you agree that's a description of
22 the criteria applied by Efficiency Manitoba at the
23 preliminary portfolio review stage?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I would say
25 that's indicative of some of the criteria that were

1 considered. Certainly during the portfolio
2 development, we were already in engagement with the
3 EAG, so we were already getting feedback there, which
4 would include making sure we were inclusive of all the
5 customer segments, and identify new customer segments
6 as well, such as the agri -- agricultural customer
7 segment, that we were developing programming for hard-
8 to-reach customers would be another consideration that
9 would have been in place at that time.

10 And of course, other requirements
11 within the Act and directives of government would have
12 also been the additional criteria as well.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Mr. Harper
14 mentions here program cost-effectiveness. But if we
15 look at Book of Documents, page 71 to 72, in
16 describing the preliminary portfolio development, and
17 I can give you some time to read through the list,
18 nothing in this list indicates that a cost-
19 effectiveness screen was applied at the second stage.

20 Would you accept that?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So a couple of
25 clarifications then. That's correct that we didn't

1 screen out, I guess with exception to the solar
2 thermal. Again, that wasn't necessarily just for --
3 for the cost-effectiveness, but we -- there are
4 multiple criteria, multiple factors, as -- as I've
5 kind of already listed, with respect to those
6 resulting from engagement, regulations, tar -- savings
7 targets, that we used to develop that initial
8 portfolio.

9 With respect to the cost-effectiveness
10 screening, our regulations require that we look at the
11 cost-effectiveness at a portfolio level, so we were
12 not looking to pre-screen out measures, individual
13 measures or programs along the way. We wanted to see
14 what the overall portfolio cost-effectiveness was.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And to maybe put
16 a finer point on that, Mr. Stocki, at Book of
17 Documents, page 82, and this might be an example of
18 what you were just referring to, when the preliminary
19 portfolio was reviewed, Efficiency Manitoba made a
20 change, at least in part for cost-effectiveness
21 reasons, and that was to reduce the incentives for
22 windows within the home renovation bundle, correct?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I would say that
24 was part of it. It wasn't just to improve the cost-
25 effectiveness. Again, there are multiple criteria,

1 including just overall budget dollars, and so overall
2 budget, which it would impact cost-effectiveness, is
3 also a consideration in some of those changes from our
4 initial preliminary portfolio to the final portfolio
5 that we put forward.

6 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And because you
7 weren't approaching things this way, you didn't reject
8 any measures at this stage because the measures were
9 not cost-effective?

10

11

(BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So again, this is
a stage where the two (2) solar thermal pool heater
and solar thermal water heater measures were rejected,
but I think at this stage was actually where we added
some additional measures, mostly due to our engagement
efforts.

For example, the Metis Income Qualify
Program was one (1) of the key changes that emerged
between the preliminary portfolio and the final
portfolio, and that was due to engagement, not cost-
effectiveness.

MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And similarly
with the Solar Pool Heaters and -- and Solar Water

1 Heater Programs, the primary reason for rejecting
2 these measures was the projected participation and not
3 necessarily cost-effectiveness?

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And other than
6 the windows incentive we just discussed, at this stage
7 no other adjustments were made to the programs or the
8 incentives, with the specific intention of improving
9 cost-effectiveness.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: There were
14 several other changes that are outlined that would
15 have affected the cost-effectiveness of those
16 measures, such as the energy savings and budget were
17 changed for the new homes and major renovation, and
18 there -- for example, the Small Business and Appliance
19 Program under the commercial, industrial, agricultural
20 programs also saw changes to the participation values,
21 energy savings, and budget for that program bundle as
22 well.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And those
24 changes had the consequence of changing the cost-
25 effectiveness matrix but they weren't made for the

1 purpose of the cost-effectiveness matrix.

2 Do I have that right?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 There's multiple factors that were considered in
5 development of the portfolio on cost-effectiveness.
6 The overall portfolio was certainly one (1) of them,
7 but by no means the only consideration.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: At Book of
9 Documents, page 92, if we can -- this page is for the
10 electric measures. If we can use the Community Ger --
11 Geothermal Program as an example, and it's closer to
12 the left axis and it has the biggest blue -- dark blue
13 bar.

14 I see here that the dark blue is for
15 utility contribution over resource cost. Is that
16 correct, Mr. Stocki?

17 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you. And
19 are you able to explain, even better if it can be a
20 level that I understand, what utility contribution
21 over resource cost means?

22 MS. AMY TUCK: Well, I think in this,
23 it is intended to show that the Utility contribution
24 would be more than what the cost of the system would
25 be to install, however, I think it -- we should

1 clarify that there is limitation in how we put the
2 plan together in that we are not actually -- the
3 Utility is not contributing over the resource costs
4 for this particular program.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I'm not sure
6 I understand that. So is any one (1) contributing
7 over resource costs for this particular program?

8 MS. AMY TUCK: So the limitation in
9 the way that our cost benefit analysis is designed is
10 that there is -- in this particular program, the model
11 that this Community Geothermal Program is, is that it
12 is a community-driven outcomes model where our
13 incentive, we are buying energy saved, so it's not a
14 straight incentive and there is no incremental product
15 cost to the First Nation, and so that's where the
16 limitation lies in the CEA, is that there is no
17 incremental product cost because this is an investment
18 model that we are working with with the First Nations.

19 So that -- I believe it's PUB-I-4 where
20 there is a outline of what the Community Geothermal
21 Program is.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And we -- we
23 don't need to go there. For the -- for the time being
24 I want to make sure we understand this particular
25 chart. So other than the Community Geothermal

1 Program, which has some unique aspects, other places
2 where we see that dark blue bar, we're seeing where
3 the Utility is having to pay an additional
4 contribution over and above what the actual resource
5 cost is. Is that correct?

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So I can provide
7 a little bit of clarification on that. So in those
8 cases -- again, this is a Daymark graph based on data
9 extracted from the Efficiency Manitoba electronic work
10 papers, and so in those cases where there's a small
11 blue additional cost, those are cases typically where
12 Efficiency Manitoba will be providing the incentive
13 for the -- say, for example, the full installed cost,
14 but where there's only -- within a certain cost test,
15 only the incremental product cost considered. So it
16 shows up as an additional over-contribution where in
17 reality it's -- it's just a function of the program.

18 So maybe an example of that would be,
19 actually on the natural gas side, the Furnace
20 Replacement Program, where Efficiency Manitoba would
21 be providing the full incentive to replace a furnace,
22 so we'd be providing the full incentive for a high-
23 efficiency in furnace, where the incremental product
24 cost that would be considered would only be the
25 difference between a mid-efficiency to a high-

1 efficiency furnace. So when you add those two (2)
2 together, it looks like there's a slight over-
3 contribution, but again we're just providing the cost
4 of the entire furnace install.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you.
6 That's helpful, Mr. Stocki.

7 Just staying on this chart for a
8 moment, the green -- the bright green line that we see
9 running across the chart, it's labelled as "Portfolio
10 LUC," are you able to just briefly explain what that
11 green line is showing us?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: My understanding
16 of Daymark's analysis is that would be equivalent to
17 the levelized utility cost, or the packed levelized
18 cost that we put forward in our Efficiency Plan, so
19 that is roughly 2.24 cents per kilowatt hour.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And above that
21 line, we see a bright blue line that's labelled
22 "Portfolio LRC." Similarly, are you able to briefly
23 explain what that means?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So that is the
2 levelized resource cost, so that would include costs
3 incurred by the customer in addition to Efficiency
4 Manitoba incentives.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So any up-front
6 costs that the customer has to put in in order to
7 install the measure would be included in that bright
8 blue line?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah.
10 Essentially it's the -- the total cost of -- of
11 installation regardless of who's paying for it.

12 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And still
13 staying on that second step of the portfolio design,
14 the preliminary portfolio design stage, does
15 Efficiency Manitoba have a measures selection
16 criterion at this stage that favours longer or
17 shorter-lived measures?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No. I do want to
19 provide some clarification to this Daymark analysis
20 though, however, because in some cases it may be
21 misrepresenting the Efficiency Manitoba data.

22 Because Daymark chose to provide this
23 data on a program-by-program basis instead of program
24 bundle basis, there may be some specific programs, for
25 example -- or technologies within an overall program

1 bundle that may have been allocated administration
2 costs for the overall program bundle, because the way
3 Efficiency Manitoba's developed models, the intent was
4 all along to develop them as program bundles, but when
5 Daymark was splitting it -- these down into individual
6 technologies or programs, they may have not allocated
7 those administration costs correctly.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And is that an
9 analysis that Efficiency Manitoba did to allocate the
10 program administration costs on a program-by-program
11 level?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: It was allocated
13 on a program bundle basis, that's -- as we presented
14 in our plan.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so you don't
16 have an analysis that splits that out and allocates
17 the costs measure by measure. Am I understanding
18 that?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: So in preparing
24 this, Daymark used the information that you provided
25 in the work papers, and -- and I think we're

1 understanding more about the work papers through your
2 answer, Mr. Stocki -- are there additional program
3 administration costs that are not reflected in the
4 work papers?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No. All the
6 administration costs would be reflected. It's just
7 that, for example, they would not have been allocated,
8 say, on an gigajoule basis based on the actual energy
9 savings across the multiple measures or programs
10 within a program bundle. For simplicity, they just
11 would have been allocated to one specific technology -
12 - for simplicity sake.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And back to the
14 preference for longer or shorter-lived measures,
15 you've indicated that at the preliminary portfolio
16 design stage that Efficiency Manitoba does not apply a
17 criterion that favours one (1) or the other.

18 Does Efficiency Manitoba have a
19 preference generally?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So there's a
21 couple of different competing factors that should be
22 considered. One, with respect to our savings targets,
23 those are annual savings targets, so those really just
24 reflect first-year energy savings. So there's really
25 -- within the savings target derivation or eventual

1 verification, there is -- you know, with a measure
2 life of one (1) years -- if the same savings in year
3 one (1) was a ten (10) year measure life, there would
4 be no difference from the respect of the energy
5 savings targets.

6 Now, that's balanced off by the program
7 administra -- strator cost test, whereas longer
8 measure life have more long-term benefits and actually
9 would help res -- raise the benefits to Manitoba
10 Hydro. And so that would boost the overall portfolio
11 PACT, so that has a natural balancing effect.

12 So, with respect to achieving our near-
13 term energy savings targets, I guess you could say the
14 preference would be for may shorter term measures, but
15 that's balanced by the PACT test that would have more
16 of a weighting to our benefit -- see more benefits
17 from longer term measures.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And one (1) of
19 those benefits in terms of a longer term measure might
20 be to -- for an electric measure, let's say, help
21 defer the need for capital investment for major new
22 general and transmission?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, that -- that
24 component, as we understand it, is within the marginal
25 values that's received by Efficiency Manitoba from

1 Manitoba Hydro.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that's
3 something that, as you just indicated, a longer life
4 measure would be more weighted towards those benefits
5 whereas a shorter lived measure helps on the annual
6 savings targets level. They're...

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: In general, the
8 margin values, as far as I understand them, take that
9 longer term approach. So, the saving stream, if it's
10 a one (1) year measure, would only capture one (1)
11 year of the -- those benefits.

12 But, again, those benefits kind of take
13 a longer term perspective inasmuch as those benefit
14 stream -- Manitoba Hydro projects changes to those
15 benefit streams, the longer term measure life would
16 fully capture some of those later benefits, as well.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
18 Stocki. Turning to the last step of the three (3)
19 stage process, the final portfolio design, at page 69
20 of the book of the documents, the response to 'G'.
21 Thank you.

22 Here Efficiency Manitoba states:

23 "Although the life cycle revenue
24 impact, LRI, and customer bill
25 impacts were part of the

1 quantitative analysis and intended
2 to be considered within the multi-
3 criteria decision analysis, these
4 factors did not ultimately lead to
5 any changes to the proposed program
6 bundles or overall portfolio."

7 Are you with me there?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I am.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And where
10 Efficiency Manitoba says, "Intended to be considered,"
11 does this mean that Efficiency Manitoba did not at the
12 final stage consider customer rate and bill impacts?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, what we found
14 certainly as we have outlined in our plan, the multi-
15 critil -- criteria decision analysis, the intent was
16 to include the rate impacts and customer bill impacts.

17 When that analysis was completed on the
18 preliminary portfolio, the result was very minor rate
19 impacts based on the life cycle revenue impact test
20 that was done. And the bill savings impacts did not
21 reveal any irregularities.

22 So, effectively, it didn't alter the
23 portfolio design at that point.

24 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And Book of
25 Documents page 87.

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: My understanding
4 is, is that this Information Request response shows us
5 the differences between the preliminary portfolio and
6 what ultimately ended up in the plan.

7 Is that correct?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: At a very high
9 level, that's correct. There's plenty of details
10 behind that, but correct.

11 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And this is
12 showing the various bundles?

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Why, Mr. Stocki,
15 when we look at this, between the preliminary
16 portfolio and the final portfolio, or the plan, do we
17 see electric residential and income qualified PACTs
18 improve with most commercial, industrial, agricultural
19 bundles showing a decline in cost effectiveness?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, that's
21 explained on page 84 of the PUB Book of Documents. If
22 we can go back there for a second, and the last
23 paragraph there. This is an important point, so I'll
24 just read this out.

25 "Differences within the PACT results

1 show in the tables below are due to
2 methodology change."

3 And so really, what happened at the
4 initial portfolio, it was done on a same thirty (30)
5 year net present value basis. But within that initial
6 view, we were looking at fifteen (15) time horizon for
7 programming, so we were including activities beyond.
8 That was -- that was just included three (3) year
9 plan.

10 Subsequent to that, we took a step back
11 and said, well, let's focus only on those activities
12 that are clearly influenced by these three (3) years,
13 and so we've stripped out all those future activities
14 from year 4 through 15.

15 So, without that, that reduced the
16 overall PACT. It was --

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And just --

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: It was a me --
19 sorry, it was a methodological change that resulted
20 that change in PACT.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And just to be
22 clear on the record, at page 90 of the Book of
23 Documents we have the same kind of chart for the
24 natural gas programs.

25 So, is the explanation that you just

1 gave the same for the gas portfolio and bundles?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

3 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And at the final
4 stage of the portfolio devi -- design process were any
5 programs or measures adjusted or eliminated due to
6 cost effectiveness for that reason?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: What is the
8 reason you're referring to?

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Cost
10 effectiveness.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As documented in
15 that IR PUB-EM-I-4, we've listed all the different cri
16 -- different changes we made between the portfolio --
17 preliminary portfolio and the final portfolio, but
18 cost effectiveness didn't result in any material
19 changes there.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If we turn to
24 Book of Documents page 96. The answer at 'C'
25 indicates:

1 "Efficiency Manitoba agrees that the
2 PACT is one (1) of the factors to
3 consider in developing the portfolio
4 of programs. Efficiency Manitoba
5 does not agree it should consider
6 other cost effectiveness screens
7 when determining what programs to
8 include in the portfolio.
9 The Efficiency Manitoba regulation
10 has prescribed the PACT as the cost
11 effectiveness test that should be
12 applied at the portfolio level.
13 In considering the mandated electric
14 and natural gas targets, applying
15 additional non-prescribed cost
16 effective screens to eliminate or
17 reduce programming to customer
18 segments may restrict Efficiency
19 Manitoba's ability to satisfy the
20 energy savings targets or to provide
21 equitable and accessible
22 programming."

23 Have I read that correctly, Mr. Stocki?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

25 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so, I take

1 that to mean that the only cost effectiveness test
2 that was used in designing the portfolio was the PACT?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 In some instances where Interveners have asked for
5 additional cost effectiveness, we've strived our best
6 to provide those additional cost effectiveness
7 metrics.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Would it be fair
9 to say that cost ineffective measures are needed to
10 meet the savings targets?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: In general, cost
12 ineffective measures could have multiple benefits to
13 Efficiency Manitoba. And reasons they might be
14 included within the plan, again, some of them I
15 mentioned already, but making sure we're providing
16 programs for all Manitobans; that we're reaching hard-
17 to-reach customer segments; that we're reflecting all
18 customer segments within Manitoba and that we're
19 listening to our customers and EAG in the design of
20 our portfolio.

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: In other words,
22 Efficiency Manitoba has multiple objectives that it
23 needs to achieve, and cost effectiveness is not the --
24 the primary objective that is applied?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, certainly we
4 need to achieve our energy savings targets. We have
5 direct government mandates to reduce operating --
6 reduce program costs. And we have to demonstrate as
7 well that our overall portfolio is cost effective.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: The only
9 mandatory target that's in the legislative framework
10 is the savings target. Is that fair?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Maybe I'll put
15 it this way, Mr. Stocki. Is Efficiency Manitoba of
16 the view that there is a particular prescribed target
17 other than the savings target for electric and gas
18 programming that it needs to meet with its plan?

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As an example of
23 another -- another target that would be prescribed would
24 be the spending 5 percent on hard-to-reach customer
25 segments, so that would be another consideration

1 that's within the Act.

2 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: But what I'm --
3 what I'm getting at, Mr. Stocki, is that you don't
4 have a particular prescribed level of cost-
5 effectiveness, for example, that you have to achieve.
6 Cost-effectiveness is one (1) consideration that is
7 built into the program design process.

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's fair.
9 That's correct.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Taking your
11 earlier answer that there may need to be cost-
12 ineffective measures to achieve the savings targets,
13 does that indicate that the savings targets are too
14 high, in Efficiency Manitoba's view?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think the ask
19 of Efficiency Manitoba with respect to balancing the
20 needs of -- and reaching all of Manitoba with
21 programming; achieving the mandated energy savings
22 targets; doing so in a cost-effective way at a
23 portfolio level; achieving the objectives set out for
24 hard-to-reach customer segments; listening to our
25 stakeholders with respect to some of the things we

1 heard; specifically, ensuring that there's continuity
2 of programs, no loss of programming from Manitoba
3 Hydro, for example; that -- there's an interest in
4 customers to ease the -- the burdens and the red tape
5 associated with applying for our programs. I think
6 what we've put forward achieves an appropriate balance
7 when all those are considered.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Could Efficiency
9 Manitoba achieve the savings target using only
10 programs that would pass the PACT at a program level?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I believe,
16 actually, Daymark did that analysis, and off the top
17 of my head, my recollection was that Efficiency
18 Manitoba could not complete or reach this energy
19 savings targets if they eliminated non-cost-effective
20 measures using a test that Daymark came up with. I
21 think it was the pure value measure test.

22 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And I don't
23 expect you to -- to speak to what Daymark says in
24 their evidence. We'll have time to ask questions of
25 them. But I -- I take it that's not something that

1 Efficiency Manitoba analyzed or assessed itself.

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

3 If -- say, for example, if cost-effectiveness was the
4 only criteria, that would certainly change the -- the
5 look of the portfolio with respect to the offering,
6 say, for different customer segments. I think it
7 would restrict -- greatly restrict the scope of our
8 offerings.

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And you've
10 confirmed that only the PACT was used in the portfolio
11 design process as the prescribed cost-effectiveness
12 test. Were any other cost-effectiveness tests used in
13 -- in other ways as you designed or refined the
14 portfolio?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No, we stuck with
16 the cost-effectiveness test that was prescribed
17 through regulation.

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And that
19 calculation that we looked at earlier on that slide 16
20 -- that PACT calculation does not include quantifiable
21 non-energy benefits? And we can put up, if it's
22 helpful, Efficiency Manitoba 21, at slide 16, the
23 direct evidence presentation.

24 Thank you, Ms. Schubert.

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

1 So examples of non-energy benefits that would not be
2 included within the program administrator cost test,
3 or the PACT test, would include water savings, for
4 example, that would be associated with a -- some of
5 the electric or natural gas energy savings measures.
6 Or another example would be the greenhouse gas
7 emission cost savings to a customer associated with
8 natural gas programming. Those would not be included
9 within the PACT test.

10 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And -- and why
11 not, Mr. Stocki? Are you able to explain that?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: If the answer is
16 that it's your understanding of the legislation, I --
17 I don't need you to give a -- a legal opinion, if --
18 if that's the answer.

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, it's not
20 only a legal opinion. I would say that the program
21 administrator cost test is a test that's defined in
22 the industry as well, and so what we're including in
23 the -- the -- the denominator and the numerator is --
24 is prescribed not necessarily just by legislation, but
25 by nature of what the cost test is supposed to be.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
2 Kuruluk. Those kinds of benefits may be looked at in
3 other cost-effectiveness measures, correct?

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, other
5 tests.

6
7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8
9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: At Book of
10 Documents, page 99, at the very bottom of that page,
11 in response to this Information Request, Efficiency
12 Manitoba says:

13 "Given the mandated energy savings
14 targets, Efficiency Manitoba
15 approached program design by
16 identifying new measure that can
17 contribute savings and considering
18 how to get more savings from
19 measures already part of Manitoba
20 Hydro's DSM portfolio."

21 Have I read that correctly?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: You have.

23 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And so
24 ultimately, the -- the level of savings needed to be
25 achieved was the overriding factor in developing the

1 final plan.

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: It was one (1) of
3 the factors, correct. I've spoken at some length
4 about all the additional considerations, but it was
5 certainly one of the key factors.

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: We've talked at
10 some length about the possibilities to -- to shift
11 things around from a budget level, but could
12 Efficiency Manitoba delete less-cost-effective
13 measures from the plan and then make up savings by
14 increasing participation in more-cost-effective
15 measures?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, could
20 you repeat the question?

21 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Absolutely.
22 Could Efficiency Manitoba delete less a cost -- less-
23 cost-effective measures from the plan but make up the
24 lost savings by increasing participation in more-cost-
25 effective measures?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Not necessarily.
2 Theoretically, it may be possible if there were
3 specific programs within an individual customer
4 segment that were not cost-effective that you could
5 pursue additional programming in a different cos --
6 customer segment that produced more-cost-effective
7 results. But it wouldn't necessarily -- it -- it's
8 easy to say that, but there actually has to be
9 customers willing to install the energy efficiency
10 products.

11 And so with respect to participation,
12 it's not a slam dunk that that would actually be
13 implemented by customers and we'd get that
14 participation.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And would
16 another downside of -- of that approach that I've just
17 suggested be that you might reduce accessibility to,
18 perhaps, hard-to-reach or lower-income Manitobans
19 through -- through making those kinds of changes?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
21 There's a long list of potential negative impacts from
22 doing that, for example, market transformation, making
23 future codes and standards more easily accepted within
24 the market. And again, codes and standards are
25 extremely cost-effective energy savings component that

1 we've included within our plan.

2 So and insomuch as that a non-cost-
3 effective or less-cost-effective measure today may
4 help further market transformation down the road in,
5 say five (5) or ten (10) years, you may be pushing
6 those future very-cost-effective savings even further
7 down the time horizon.

8 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Is there any
9 concern that in not screening at a measure level for
10 cost-effectiveness that Efficiency Manitoba could end
11 up having in its plan unattractive measures and
12 thereby reduced participation rates?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry. Could
17 you repeat that question?

18 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Oh, dear. It's
19 getting late in the day.

20 In not screening at a measure level for
21 cost-effectiveness, is there a concern that you might
22 have reduced uptake that customers might not want to
23 participate in those programs?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Sorry, it took me
2 a second to wrap my head around the negative at the
3 beginning of that sentence, but -- but I -- I think
4 what we're getting at is if -- if a measure is less
5 cost-effective, would that actually drive down
6 participation, whereas I think, actually, if -- if a
7 measure is less cost-effective, it may actually drive
8 up participation.

9 For example, if you've got an income
10 qualified measure where the cost-effectiveness is
11 poor, the reason -- the reason the cost-effectiveness
12 test might be poor is because Efficiency Manitoba
13 proposes -- proposes to pay for a higher percentage of
14 the energy efficiency upgrade. And so in that case,
15 we would actually be driving higher participation by
16 adopting those lower cost-effective measures.

17 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And does that
18 hold true, Mr. Stocki, if you use a different cost-
19 effectiveness test that incorporates the customer
20 contribution into the costs?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So I'll use an
25 example of perhaps the -- the total resource costs

1 test. So in the example of the same kind of situation
2 where you would have a -- a lower TRC, or Total
3 Resource Cost test measure driving lower
4 participation, that's not necessarily the case,
5 because again, depending on what Efficiency Manitoba
6 would actually be contributing with the respect to the
7 incentive, if it's -- if Efficiency Manitoba is
8 contributing a high percentage of the total resource
9 cost, it won't necessarily change the result of that,
10 and actually would, again, drive higher participation
11 using the same income qualified type example.

12 The only difference with the total
13 resource cost might be on the benefit side, where you
14 have additional benefits that you'd be counting for,
15 say, water savings, or natural gas GHC (sic) savings.

16 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr.
17 Stocki. Sorry, Ms. Kuruluk, please proceed.

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I was just going
19 to add to that just with a real-life example. You
20 know, the levelized resource cost test doesn't always
21 necessarily drive participation. We -- we saw
22 Manitoba Hydro participation in a -- in a very high
23 levelized resource cost program in the solar energy
24 program.

25 So it -- it doesn't necessarily -- it's

1 really about the market factors and the technology
2 factors versus necessarily the levelized resour --
3 resource cost.

4 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Thank you, Ms.
5 Kuruluk. I think, Mr. Chair, that would be a good
6 place for me to conclude today, if that's acceptable,
7 and we could reconvene tomorrow.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. We'll
9 reconvene at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Thank you.

10

11 --- Upon adjourning at 4:14 p.m.

12

13

14 Certified Correct

15

16

17 _____

18 Donna Whitehouse, Ms.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25