



“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 9, 2020
Pages 898 to 1154

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 (np)) Assembly of

22 Emily Gugliemin) Manitoba Chiefs

23

24 William Haight (np)) For Independent

25 William Gardner) Expert Consultants

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		Page No.
3	List of Exhibits	901
4	List of Undertakings	902
5		
6	CONTINUED EFFICIENCY MANITOBA PANEL NO. 1:	
7	COLLEEN KURULUK, SWORN	
8	MICHAEL STOCKI, AFFIRMED	
9	KYLA KRAMPS, SWORN	
10	ROBERTO MONTANINO, AFFIRMED	
11	AMY TUCK, AFFIRMED	
12	TRACY STERDAN, AFFIRMED	
13	CHERYL PILEK, SWORN	
14		
15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Antoine Hacault	904
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Jared Wheeler	1047
17		
18		
19	Certificate of Transcript	1154
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	LIST OF EXHIBITS	
2	EXHIBIT NO.	PAGE NO.
3	EM-22	Correspondence from Ms. Merrick to Dr.
4		Christle and Ms. McMullin relating to
5		the Board's correspondence to the
6		office of Efficiency Manitoba on
7		January 7th. 1152
8	EM-23	Response to Undertaking 2 and 3 made
9		to Boards' counsel. 1152
10	EM-24	Response to Undertaking 4 made to
11		Coalition's counsel 1152
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS	
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	7	Efficiency Manitoba to produce a	
4		document that outlines for during the	
5		three (3) plan years, how variances in	
6		the budget contained within the plan	
7		will be addressed, including on a step-	
8		by-step basis.	990
9	8	At page 353 of the Board Book of	
10		Documents, there is IR PUB- EM1-22,	
11		there is question a). Efficiency	
12		Manitoba to ask Manitoba Hydro whether	
13		it can now answer question a), so ask.	
14		And if Manitoba Hydro provides that	
15		information, to provide that	
16		information as requested in the	
17		question.	1040
18	9	For Efficiency Manitoba to recreate the	
19		table, adding an additional line using	
20		the four point five (4.5) cents per	
21		kilowatt hour both for the ten (10)	
22		year time period and the five (5) year	
23		time period	1047
24			
25			

1	LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS (cont'd)		
2	No.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
3	10	Efficiency Manitoba to provide the data to show how the numbers were reached for the average annual energy savings per home.	1151
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 --- Upon commencing at 9:02 a.m.

2

3 CONTINUED EFFICIENCY MANITOBA PANEL NO. 1:

4 COLLEEN KURULUK, SWORN

5 MICHAEL STOCKI, AFFIRMED

6 KYLA KRAMPS, SWORN

7 ROBERTO MONTANINO, AFFIRMED

8 AMY TUCK, AFFIRMED

9 TRACY STERDAN, AFFIRMED

10 CHERYL PILEK, SWORN

11

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning,

13 everyone. Ms. Hart...?

14 MS. KATE HART: So on the schedule for

15 today, MIPUG will begin its cross-examination of the

16 Efficiency Manitoba witness panel, and then in the

17 afternoon MKO will also commence its cross-examination

18 of Efficiency Manitoba.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Monsieur

20 Hacault...?

21

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ANTOINE HACAULT:

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Yes. Good

24 morning all. On behalf of our clients, we again wish

25 to thank Efficiency Manitoba and its executive for the

1 tremendous effort it made to prepare the application
2 and respond to all the IRs.

3 I, as Board counsel has indicated also,
4 don't intend to solicit CSI at all. Sometimes when
5 I'm dealing with industrial clients, we have that
6 information, but I'm not trying to get into any of
7 that. And if my questions are not clear, please do
8 not hesitate to ask me to repeat or reformulate them.

9 The first subject area that I want to
10 address is the Minister's mandate letter. That's in
11 scope under Board Order 162/19 as item 6. It's
12 described as follows:

13 "Compliance of Efficiency Manitoba
14 with directions from government
15 through mandate and framework
16 letters."

17 You should have before you the April
18 24, 2019, letter, which is at page 4 of the AMC Book
19 of Documents. I had circulated it before, but I don't
20 need to re-enter it as an exhibit, I don't think.

21 So if you go to the first page, and in
22 particular paragraph 3, the letter of direction to
23 Efficiency Manitoba indicates:

24 "First and foremost, Manitoba Crown
25 corporations are part of our

1 government family and must align
2 with our government mandate to fix
3 our finances, repair our services,
4 and rebuild our economy."

5 I'm going to ask some questions with
6 respect to this primary objective, which is set out in
7 this letter. There's finances, repair our services,
8 but in particular rebuild our economy.

9 Does Efficiency Manitoba acknowledge
10 that one (1) of the three (3) priorities set out in
11 this paragraph is in fact to rebuild our economy?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, we indeed
13 do. We -- we do feel that as a Crown corporation, we
14 will have a role in improving Manitoba's economy.

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I suggest to
16 you that having a healthy industrial sector in this
17 province as well as a healthy agricultural and
18 commercial sector plays a role in rebuilding the
19 province's economy.

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree
21 that healthy sectors, as the ones mentioned by Mr.
22 Hacault, would certainly assist in that objective.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I would also
24 suggest that one (1) way Efficiency Manitoba can
25 assist in rebuilding the province's economy is to

1 assist the commercial, industrial, and agricultural
2 sectors as being cost competitive by lowering that
3 sector's energy costs through the DSM initiatives.

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, we
5 certainly do agree with that, and feel that we've done
6 a very good job of balancing our portfolio and have
7 many initiatives for commercial, industrial, and new
8 to our portfolio as well is the agricultural sector of
9 the economy.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So I'm also
11 suggesting that maintaining or enhancing
12 competitiveness of those three (3) sectors can simu --
13 stimulate production and employment. Do you agree?

14 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would
15 generally agree with that as well.

16 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. Now I'll
17 go to page 2 of the letter. There is a series of
18 bullets which has a preamble which reads as follows:

19 "We also ask that you assume
20 ownership and leadership in respect
21 of our following priorities for
22 you."

23 And there's four (4) that are listed.
24 And you've talked about the first bullet and how your
25 corporation attempts to be a leaner, more streamlined

1 organization, correct?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Correct. We've,
3 I believe, covered that both in the opening statement,
4 as well as in several aspects of our testimony.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Yes. And where
6 I'd like to have a bit of discussion is on the second
7 bullet.

8 "Develop and submit for review and
9 approval your initial three (3) year
10 plan for demand side management
11 initiatives to meet your mandated
12 savings targets, while optimizing
13 value for money."

14 And I want to focus on the last part of
15 that sentence, "while optimizing value for money."

16 And to start that discussion, I'd like
17 to go to page 87 of the Board Book of Documents.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And at this page
22 we have electric program cost-effectiveness met --
23 metrics.

24 Would you agree that having more cost-
25 effective programs is one (1) way of optimizing value

1 for money?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I would
3 agree cost-effective programs is something that would
4 meet our objective of optimizing value for money.

5 Again, as Mr. Stocki testified to
6 yesterday, we certainly have multiple objectives and
7 we certainly recognize that some of those objectives
8 are also -- could be conflicting as well, and in
9 particular I'm speaking to inclusiveness and diverse
10 portfolio and cost-effectiveness, and I think I
11 mentioned that in -- in the opening statement. We
12 recognize the complexity of that.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: But if we flip
14 back to the mandate letter, all of these objectives
15 that you've just mentioned, while you can take them
16 into consideration, none of those objectives are
17 listed as specific priorities which the government is
18 directing you to implement, correct?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I apologize.
20 Can you repeat the question? I was just having an --

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Yeah.

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: -- aside.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: You have
24 mentioned and Mr. Stocki has mentioned a number of
25 occasions that there are multiple factors that were

1 taken into consideration. And what I'm suggesting to
2 you is that although there are multiple factors that
3 you've taken into consideration, this mandate letter
4 asks Efficiency Manitoba to -- to prioritize one (1)
5 specific item in bullet number 2, actually two (2) of
6 them, meet your mandated savings targets, while
7 optimizing value for money.

8 I'm suggesting to you that all of these
9 other factors that you've said you've put into the mix
10 is not a priority which is listed in this letter -- or
11 -- or not, rather.

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I -- I would
13 certainly agree that the Minister's mandate letter is
14 distinct and different from the -- the Efficiency
15 Manitoba Act and the regulation, but of course, the
16 Efficiency Manitoba Act and the regulation were
17 documents that were produced by Government that also
18 guided our activities.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I'll -- I
20 don't intend to get into a legal argument, but I -- I
21 will probably address some of those, because some of
22 the priority -- the prioritizing optimizing value for
23 money aligns with the required mandate, whether --
24 whereas some of the other items that you've listed are
25 discretionary items.

1 Do you accept that?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That sounded
3 like -- I'll -- I'll accept you're going to go there,
4 if that's what --

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. So if we
6 flip back to page 87 of the Book of Documents, we'll
7 see, for example, and I'll get into this at a -- in a
8 little bit more detail in another line of questioning.
9 If we go to, for example, the top line, residential
10 programs direct install, then go all the way to the
11 right, under levelized cost, we have a levelized cost
12 for that program of over four (4) cents per kilowatt
13 hour, correct?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we had --
16 and go under the heading 'Commercial, Industrial, and
17 Agricultural Programs'. The second last heading says
18 custom. So those would be custom programs, correct?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, different
20 offers within the custom program bundle, correct.

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we go all
22 the way to the right, we see that those programs have
23 a levelized cost of a bit over a cent per kilowatt
24 hour, being one point one-seven (1.17), correct?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So if we were
2 giving a priority of optimizing value for money, I
3 would suggest to you that you're getting more value
4 for your money in investing in the custom programs
5 versus investing in the direct install programs for
6 residential programs.

7 Do you agree?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Using that
9 levelized costs metric, for example, as that sole
10 comparative -- comparator, that's reasonable. It's
11 probably worthwhile to put that into some context,
12 since we're comparing the direct install and the
13 custom program to also flip to attachment 3 of our
14 submission. I'll get the page reference in a second,
15 here.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So it's page 513
20 in our submission, and I -- just for comparison, we'll
21 just look at the 2022/'23 values. And basically, what
22 I'll just do, for a comparison, I'll compare the
23 energy savings that Efficiency Manitoba's proposing in
24 those same two (2) programs.

25 So, for example, direct install is 2.6

1 gigawatt hours, and in the Commercial, Industrial,
2 Agricultural Program, the energy savings projected
3 there in that same year is twenty-eight point six
4 (28.6).

5 And if we go to page 515 of the
6 submission, I'll also do the same for the costs. So
7 comparative costs, again, these are not cost-
8 effectiveness, but these are actually the -- the
9 capital cost that were req -- be required to offer
10 those programs.

11 So again, looking at '22/'23 values,
12 the direct install under residential, the projected
13 cost there is seven hundred and fifty-three thousand
14 dollars (\$753,000) versus the custom under Commercial,
15 Industrial, Agricultural Program is \$3.749 million.

16 So I think, yes, it's worthwhile to
17 compare the cost-effectiveness, but it also has to be
18 put in context with the savings that we're getting,
19 and also the -- the capital cost comparison.

20 So yes, it is -- has a lower load --
21 levelized cost, and we're also spending more dollars
22 in that area for that specific program, and we're
23 achieving more savings as a result of that.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: You may recall,
25 and I had started that I was going to get into more

1 detail. Thank you for doing that, because you've
2 scratched off a couple of my questions that would have
3 happened in about an hour from now.

4 But I -- I guess your point is that
5 we're spending a bit less in direct install, about
6 three quarters (3/4) of a million dollars. But if we
7 flip back to the previous page, we are only getting
8 2.6 gigawatt hours of savings with that three-quarter
9 (3/4) million dollars investment, correct?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
11 There's the savings component, there's the capital
12 cost component, and then, of course, there's the cost-
13 effectiveness of achieving those savings.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the cost-
15 effectiveness that we started with is a mathematical
16 calculation, saying it's -- you're going to need to
17 spend over four (4) cents for each kilowatt to achieve
18 an equivalent amount of savings in the residential
19 sector direct install versus spending one point one
20 (1.1) cents for that same measure of savings when you
21 spend a dollar on the custom programs, correct?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct,
23 and it's probably also -- instead of just speaking in
24 levelized cost terms, it's probably also mostly been
25 talking about the ratio, the PACT ratio benefits over

1 costs. So for comparison, the direct install ratio is
2 one point five three (1.53). So again, the -- the
3 ratio is above one (1) for that residential direct
4 install, meaning the benefits outweigh the costs.

5 And for comparison, the custom program
6 is five point one-eight (5.18). So again, very cost-
7 effective for that Com -- Commercial, Industrial,
8 Agricultural Program, but the direct install is also -
9 - has a ratio above one (1).

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And next leading
11 into one (1) of the statements I made a bit before, if
12 we go to the statute itself, Section 4(1), which sets
13 out the mandate...

14

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: We'll see that
19 there are a number of required things that are need --
20 needed to be done. So 4(1) starts, "The mandate of
21 efficiency Manitoba is two (2)."

22 And then there's a list. And in that
23 list, there is an item (c), which reads: "mitigate the
24 impact of rate increases." So that parallels closely
25 the Minister's direction.

1 And the second one, and it'll be a
2 theme that I'm going through in this cross-
3 examination:

4 "And delay the point at which
5 capital investments in major new
6 generation and transmission projects
7 will be required by Manitoba to
8 serve the needs of Manitobans."

9 I'm going to suggest to you that
10 consistent with the mandate letter, one (1) of the
11 ways to mitigate the impact of rate increases is to
12 optimize the cost-effectiveness of the DSM programming
13 that you're doing.

14 Do you agree?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Could you perhaps
16 reframe that question for me?

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. I'm
18 suggesting you -- to you, taking the wording from
19 section 4 of the mandatory focus, being mitigate the
20 impact of rate increases is consistent with the
21 Minister's direction that you're to optimize value for
22 money. You'll agree?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I'd agree
2 with that and I think that's further -- to kind of put
3 it into practical terms -- with the Efficiency
4 Manitoba Regulations, under section 12(1), determining
5 cost effectiveness, whereas the prescribed cost
6 effectiveness test is exactly the marginal value to
7 Manitoba Hydro, divided by the costs of Efficiency
8 Manitoba that's meant to reflect that cost
9 effectiveness.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. Now,
11 if we go to 4(3) of the same legislation, and others
12 have referred to that, section 4, and then open
13 parenthesis, 3.

14 There are a series of items which I
15 would suggest to you are considerations or
16 discretionary items. They do not have to be
17 implemented, because the word -- wording starts "In
18 fulfilling its mandate, Efficiency Manitoba may," it
19 doesn't say you have to.

20 So I'm suggesting to you that the
21 initiatives in section 4(3), which you've indicated
22 you've balanced, are discretionary things.

23 Do you agree?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I -- I agree
25 that in the Act it does -- it does say "may." These

1 are items we may consider when fulfilling our mandate.
2 But I would disagree that they're discretionary, as
3 they are mandatory considerations for the P -- PUB
4 review, under the Efficiency Manitoba Regulation,
5 section 11(b), which states whether the plan
6 adequately considers the interests of residential,
7 commercial, and industrial customers.

8 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I won't pursue
9 this more because it's probably more a question of
10 statutory interpretation, which will be the subject of
11 argument.

12 But I'm suggesting that, as you did the
13 items in 4(3) were things that you balanced in trying
14 to come up with your portfolio, but they're not
15 specific items in your mandate. Do you agree?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree
20 that those are considerations that were not
21 specifically or explicitly outlined in section 4(1) of
22 the Efficiency Manitoba Act.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you.

24 Now I'll move to a document which I
25 also circulated a couple days ago electronically, and

1 I -- we're putting it up on the screen.

2 I don't know if any of you had a chance
3 to look at it, but I intend to refer to some of the
4 highlighted parts. This document was referenced in
5 your application, and then was the subject of further
6 interrogatories, so I have a couple questions with
7 respect to it.

8 Firstly, what we're seeing on the
9 screen is a Regulatory Accountability Impact Analysis,
10 which is a document that gets produced in conjunction
11 with a regulation. Is that your understanding?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, correct,
13 that is my understanding. But I would also if -- if I
14 could request the reference page in our application
15 that refers to this document?

16 Or maybe -- maybe a general sense and I
17 can get the people behind here to look at -- I don't
18 mean to put you on the spot.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I had just -- I
20 had done a word search on my PDF, I could do that for
21 you. I think -- and then it was the subject of
22 interrogatories by MIPUG.

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I -- I
24 recall that MIPUG had brought this up in their
25 interrogatories for certain. I was just looking for -

1 - Mr. Hacault had mentioned that it was referenced in
2 our application and I --

3 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Sorry, I didn't
4 put that in my cross-examination notes.

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I think we can -
7 - I can get some positions of Efficiency Manitoba on -
8 - with respect to some statements here, because it
9 relates to the document itself.

10 So under the heading Public Policy
11 Objectives of the Regulatory Project, in the second
12 line of the first paragraph, and I'm reading:

13 "The overall purpose is to support
14 Manitobans in saving energy and the
15 regulation will further this goal.
16 Programs and services delivered by
17 the corporation will reduce the
18 impact of future electricity rate
19 increases on Manitoba ratepayers,
20 defer costly new generation, foster
21 private sector involvement in the
22 program delivery, and contribute to
23 the reduction of greenhouse gases
24 within Manitoba. The Efficiency
25 Plan will help Manitoba Hydro

1 counter growing demand for
2 electricity and defer the need for
3 Keeyask-like generation developments
4 far off into the future."

5 Do you agree that this was one (1) of
6 the stated public policy objectives?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would just
8 confirm that Efficiency Manitoba was not a party to
9 this document. We -- we haven't been able to locate
10 in our submission, and I don't know if that's relevant
11 to -- to your questioning.

12 But I would definitely say that as Mr.
13 Hacaault has just read that passage of that specific
14 policy objectives and justification, I do see that in
15 front of me on the screen.

16 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. And I'll
17 be getting into the subject matter later, but there
18 are two (2) items which are the focus of a theme
19 that's going to go through my cross-examination.

20 Firstly, one (1) of the policy
21 objectives is to reduce the impact of future
22 electricity rate increases on Manitoba ratepayers.
23 And that, I would suggest, is consistent with what's
24 in the legislation and the regulations. Do you agree?

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree.

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the second
2 thing that also comes up again in the regulations, is
3 the whole issue of the contribution that DSM should
4 have to defer the need for Keeyask-like generation
5 develops -- developments far into the future.

6 Do you agree?

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree
8 and -- and both of those items are covered in the
9 mandate section 4(1) part C.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you.

11 And I'm going to suggest to you and get
12 into it in more detail later, that the second
13 objective of deferring the need for Keeyask-like
14 generation developments as being one of the important
15 public policy objectives is really an integrated
16 resource planning objective.

17 Do you agree?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I'm sorry, could
22 you please re-frame that question?

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I suggested to
24 you that the stated policy objective of deferring the
25 need for Keeyask-like generation developments far into

1 the future through DSM is an integrated resource
2 planning objective.

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Although I do
4 not profess to be an expert in -- in integrated
5 resource planning, I am aware that demand side
6 management is treated as a resource and an integrated
7 resource planning process.

8 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. I'll
9 go to page 2 of this document under the heading,
10 "Implications." And the document in the first
11 sentence indicates that:

12 "The following beneficial impacts
13 are expected: If efficiency targets
14 are met, the estimated annual
15 electricity load growth for the
16 foreseeable future will be kept
17 neutral through energy savings,
18 thereby deferring the need for
19 costly new generation into the
20 future."

21 Again, I'm suggesting that this is an
22 integrating -- integrated resource planning objective?

23

24

(BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: At -- at this pa
2 -- point, the way that's phrased, I'm -- I'm not
3 certain I am in a position to agree with that.

4 Demand side management certainly can
5 assist with electric growth and keeping -- keeping
6 load growth down, but I would understand that there
7 would be multiple elements to -- contributing to what
8 happens to load growth in Manitoba.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And a second
13 objection -- I wouldn't pursue that question anymore.
14 There's some context to that which I'll follow up
15 later. Just to put it into context, we had the NFAT
16 report. The NFAT report said that DSM should be a sta
17 -- standalone resource. It should be treated as a
18 resource in integrated planning.

19 And what I was trying to do is see
20 whether you had a sense or an understanding of how
21 these objectives aligned with those recommendations
22 that were made in the NFAT report; that's where I was
23 going with the questions. But if you don't have that
24 knowledge, I'll just move on.

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Thanks for that

1 clarification.

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Another
3 beneficial impact that's expected is the fourth
4 bullet. And it states:

5 "The impact of electricity --
6 electricity rate increases expected
7 as a result of Manitoba Hydro's
8 growing ret -- debt will be
9 mitigated through energy savings."

10 I would suggest to you that this sets
11 out a concern about the impact of electricity rates
12 and how Efficiency Manitoba is going to help deal with
13 those increases through DSM benefits and its
14 programming.

15 Do you agree?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree
17 with that interpretation.

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And finally, on
19 the last page of this particular policy objective, it
20 sets out the policy objective with respect to the
21 Utility's Board role. And the second bullet
22 indicates, "Assess the cost effectiveness," which
23 we've been talking a lot about.

24 If I go to the next one, it would be,
25 "Assess the rate and bill impacts," which we have not

1 talked too much about. And lastly, "Assess compliance
2 with meeting energy savings targets."

3 Do you agree that this was a policy
4 objective for the legislation?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Based on the
6 fact that that's -- that exact statement exists in the
7 supporting documentation to the legislation and the
8 regulation, I -- I would agree that that seemed to be
9 something they were looking to have as an objective.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And lastly, in
11 this document I'll refer to the impact portion of it.
12 That'll be in page 4 of the document under the
13 heading, "Impact."

14 Just by way of general information,
15 these documents had to be produced distinctly as
16 separate documents because under the website that you
17 gave us, and I'll -- I'll find it in a minute, or I
18 can find it over break, the -- there's dropdown menus,
19 so they represent two (2) separate printings.

20 This impact statement again has a
21 highlight in the first full paragraph. And I'm
22 reading:

23 "Programs and services delivered by
24 the Corporation will reduce the
25 impact of future electricity rate

1 increases on Manitoba ratepayers,
2 defer costly new generation."

3 And it continues basically repeating
4 the same policy thing. Do you see that?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I do see that.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. Thank
7 you. I'll move on to another subject, codes and
8 standards.

9 There's been some discussion in -- in
10 this Hearing about the credits, the efforts of
11 Manitoba Hydro, and -- and the test of materiality.
12 And I -- I'm going to explore some of those issues
13 with you if I might.

14 So, again, I'm going to -- we don't
15 need this slide anymore, Ms. Schubert. The -- if DSM
16 is, I -- as I suggest, a standalone resource and a
17 resource planning tool, I'm going to suggest to you
18 that we should be viewing codes and standards as a
19 long-term exercise as to how that DSM resource is
20 going to compete with alternate resources.

21 Do you agree?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Let me put a

1 little bit of context to that. If we have a sto --
2 code and standard gets implemented today and today it
3 provides a hundred megawatts of capacity, if that
4 continues going forward because codes don't change,
5 we're going to lock in that capacity savings for the
6 next thirty (30) years. People are not going to go
7 backwards.

8 So, let me repeat the question again.
9 In a resource planning exercise we would generally
10 take a long-term view in the utility wor -- world, so
11 DSM, if it's viewed as a standalone resource, would be
12 considered as an alternate resource towards that goal?

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, we would
17 agree that codes and standards are certainly an
18 important component of a DSM efficiency plan.

19 Energy efficiency, in general, is a
20 market transformation effort that takes many years at
21 times with the programming serving to improve the
22 uptake of products and building construction types and
23 appliances in the market, making the code or the
24 regulation for a minimum energy performance standard
25 much more viable for the industry and consumers.

1 So, we certainly would agree that, in
2 the long-term perspective, codes and standards have a
3 significant role.

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So that there
5 would be another view that could be taken of codes and
6 standards, and it might be an incentive view, is that
7 we're not supposed to count codes and standards as DSM
8 savings unless there's a material contribution by an
9 efficiency corporation in creating that standard.

10 That would be more an incentive view, I
11 would suggest, because if there's no incentive, the
12 corporation will say, Well, I can benefit from all
13 these codes and standards just sitting in the
14 background. That would be a different view. Do you
15 agree?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Can -- can you
17 reframe that in a question?

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Sure.

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I think I agree,
20 but I would like to --

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. So --

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: -- get a better
23 sense of what you're asking.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: If we were
25 concerned only about how codes and standards help DSM

1 be an alternate resource, we would simply look at how
2 codes and standards reduce energy and capacity
3 requirements in the long run. Do you agree?

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I apologize.
8 Can you repeat that question?

9 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I'll -- maybe
10 to try and put a bit of context to it, if we were only
11 looking at the objective from a resource-planning
12 objective and saying in twenty (20) years from now,
13 we're going to need 'X' amount of energy and 'X'
14 amount of capacity, and the codes have contributed 'X'
15 amount for that, we wouldn't be discounting codes and
16 saying, Well, listen. You can only count 10 percent
17 of it. You can only count 15 percent.

18 We'd be saying, You can count 100
19 percent of it because it really helps me achieve the
20 goal in the long run. We shouldn't be discounting the
21 contributions that are made by codes and standards.

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay, I -- I
23 think I see where you're -- where you're asking now.
24 So -- so absolutely. I mean, codes and standards is a
25 real impact on the actual load in Manitoba, so I think

1 what Mr. Hacault is -- is -- is asking is, Wouldn't
2 100 percent of that activity result in an impact to
3 the -- to the load? And to the extent that he's
4 saying that, I would agree. Those -- those -- that is
5 true.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And what the
7 legislation appears to be saying, however, is,
8 Efficiency Manitoba, you need to show that -- you send
9 somebody to a committee, you need to show that you had
10 a causal connection.

11 And once we -- somebody's thinking that
12 that causal connection is enough or not enough, you
13 get to count it, but that would be counterintuitive to
14 the whole planning process because you're only
15 counting maybe 50 percent of it or 10 -- 10 percent of
16 it. Do you agree with that concept?

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I agree
18 with that concept. And codes and standards in
19 attribution towards program administrators and
20 utilities is certainly an evolving field.

21 I, certainly, I believe, mentioned,
22 whether it was yesterday or the day before, there's
23 different jurisdictions in Canada that -- that claim
24 100 percent of that code and standard because they are
25 feeding into a load forecast, as Mr. Hacault has

1 mentioned. And there's other utilities, primarily in
2 Unite -- the United States, that have attribution
3 models that speak to materiality such as what's in our
4 -- in our regulation.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And while that
6 incentive or that kind of -- you don't get to count it
7 unless you spend money or you send people to
8 committees might be a valid objective, I would
9 suggest, for private corporations.

10 I'm suggesting to you that for a Crown
11 corporation that has public accountability in what it
12 does, that objective might be less important of
13 pushing somebody to spend a lot of money and pushing
14 somebody to spend -- to show that they had a material
15 contribution. Do you agree?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So I -- I would
17 disagree with the characterization that we're spending
18 a lot of money. We are actually -- codes and
19 standards are a very cost-effective strategy. The
20 fact that materiality exists there certainly keeps our
21 eye on that budget.

22 It -- it's something that we want to be
23 involved with, and we feel strongly that without
24 Manitoba represented at the table at the national
25 level, codes and standards will not proceed and they

1 will not proceed in a way that represents Manitobans
2 and Manitoba climate.

3 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. So
4 as you said, the PACT ratio for codes and standards,
5 if it was computed, would be multiples of any other
6 PACT ratios provided for in the Efficiency Manitoba
7 plan, correct?

8 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's certainly
9 true conceptually. The -- all the costs are accounted
10 for, and we recognize that we have not claimed all of
11 the energy savings that -- that occur as a result of a
12 code or standard in Manitoba.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: But even with
14 the ones -- if you created -- if I go to Mr. Stocki's
15 answer that I think he said somewhere between four (4)
16 and five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) is spent,
17 and you get over 80 -- 80 gigawatt hours for that
18 spend, that's a huge PACT -- P-A-C-T, for the court
19 reporter.

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's -- that
21 would be correct. Very cost effective.

22 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now, I'm
23 suggesting to you that no one (1) organization can
24 facilitate the entire spectrum of activities that are
25 required for implementing codes and standards through

1 efficiency regulation. Do you agree?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would
3 certainly agree with that.

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I don't
5 know if this is CSI, but I'm informed that Manitoba's
6 direct financial contribution in the last calendar
7 year represented nearly 20 percent of total funding
8 for standards and code development at the CSA group.

9 Is that something you can comment on?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Subject to
14 check, I -- I would say that might be around the
15 contribution of Manitoba relative to other Canadian
16 provinces.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I would
18 suggest that the total resource cost test would be a
19 very good test for evaluating codes and standards and
20 whether they are reasonable and cost-effective, as the
21 TRC test includes costs incurred by consumers as well
22 as Efficiency Manitoba. Do you agree?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would suspect
2 TRC on a codes and standards initiative would -- would
3 be very positive.

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now, we had some
5 discussion in the questioning about federal
6 regulations. I'm going to suggest to you that the
7 coverage provided by feg -- federal regulations is
8 broad and comprehensive, covering many product
9 categories for both electric and fuel-burning devices.
10 Do you agree?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would
12 certainly agree with that.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And there are
14 very few technologies used by consumers that are not
15 being influenced by codes and standards that specify
16 minimum energy performance le -- levels, both in
17 residential and commercial markets. Do you agree?

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would agree
19 that there are multiple appliances and products that
20 consumers use that are impacted by a code or a
21 standard.

22 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I don't know if
23 it was yesterday or the day before, but I believe one
24 (1) of the members of the panel commented that you
25 hadn't really dug into the codes and standards

1 benefits in -- in the commercial and industrial sector
2 in a fulsome way. Did I get that evidence correct?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I -- I can't
7 recall that specific testimony, but I would concur
8 that a lot of the standards -- not necessarily the
9 code side, but on the standards side -- most of our
10 standards that we're aiming to claim energy savings on
11 come from residential products. The majority would
12 come from residential products.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the reason
14 I'm bringing that subject up is I understand that over
15 the years -- including, again, around 2015 -- there's
16 a standard called the CSA standard, and then space
17 C390 standard. It's standard related to three (3)
18 phase induction motors, which has had a fairly
19 significant impact on reducing energy consumption with
20 respect to those motors used by the commercial and
21 industrial sector.

22 Do you have any -- does anybody on the
23 panel have any knowledge of that initiative?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We are aware of
25 -- of that standard.

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I would
2 suggest that the industry perspective -- persistency
3 level is high for these types of technologies because
4 they would almost always replace like with like or
5 better as far as efficiency goes.

6 Do you agree?

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I'm neither an
11 industrial customer or entirely familiar with
12 motors, but I would accept that assertion.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I -- I thought
14 Mr. Stocki might know, because I had some interactions
15 with him at Manitoba Hydro and the industrial sector.

16 Anyways, thank you.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So just to be
21 clear, although future codes and standards continually
22 raise the bar as more energy-efficient products and
23 technologies become proven in the market, this does
24 not, as a general rule, decrease or delete past
25 savings.

1 Do you agree?

2

3 (BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Can you please
6 restate that question?

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Future codes and
8 standards continually raise the bar as new, more
9 efficient products and technologies become proven in
10 the market. This does not, however, generally
11 decrease or delete past savings?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, I would
13 agree that that would not decrease past savings.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Because the
15 market always is incrementally adding, you always
16 continue to benefit from the savings that started
17 before the new increment, correct?

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And then the
20 last area in codes and standards which hasn't really
21 been talked about is a new area, which I understand
22 Manitoba Hydro is being coming involved in. It
23 relates to standards that are designed for use by
24 industry for measuring and value -- validating in situ
25 for the court reporter, I-N dash S-I-T-U, energy

1 performance so that accurate and relevant decisions
2 about energy consumption and equipment operation and
3 selection can be made.

4 Is anyone on the panel aware of this?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I've checked to
6 the left with my engineer, and we are not aware of
7 this particular development.

8 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So...

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Then you
13 wouldn't be able to comment on whether or not with
14 this tool, owners and managers will be able to further
15 analyze their performance and increase their ener --
16 energy efficiency?

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Conceptually,
18 that sounds like a benefit of an in situ testing of
19 energy.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I'm going to
24 move on to another related subject, which relates to
25 the tables as Mr. Stocki had referred to in comparing

1 custom programs in the commercial, agricultural, and
2 industrial sector versus the residential direct
3 install.

4 If we go to page 87 of the Book of
5 Documents, there's another formulation of the data
6 that Mr. Stocki had looked at. It, again, was the
7 gigawatt -- or sorry, the levelized cost difference
8 between those two (2) programs. We reviewed that, the
9 custom programs at one point one-seven (1.17) cents
10 per kilowatt hour versus four point one-five (4.15)
11 cents per kilowatt hour for the residential sector on
12 direct installs.

13 If we go back to page 85, this is where
14 we see some of the same information Mr. Stocki had
15 referred to us. And the top heading, 'Residential
16 Programs', first line indicating direct install. If
17 we go to the complete right, we see the various
18 gigawatt hour savings that are projected from 2022 and
19 including the March of 2023.

20 Do you see that?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I do.

22 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So that if we go
23 to that line, we see that Efficiency Manitoba in --
24 expects that the savings will be ramped up from 1.2
25 gigawatt hours, up to two point six (2.6), which is

1 the number you had referred to, Mr. Stocki, correct?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

3 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we go
4 down to the custom program for commercial, industrial,
5 and agricultural programs, we see that there's some
6 variation starting in 2020, at 24.2 gigawatt hours.

7 The next fiscal year, 17.9 gigawatt
8 hours, and finally, the last year at 28.6 gigawatt
9 hours, correct?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the same
12 type of contrast exists in the gas sector. If we go
13 to page 90 of the Book of Documents.

14 This again is another table produced by
15 Efficiency Manitoba, correct?

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.
17 It was in response to PUB EM-I-4.

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we go to
19 residential programs direct install for the gas
20 sector, we see that in the extreme right hand side,
21 the levelized cost is twenty-three point one-nine
22 (23.19) cents, correct?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we go to
25 the commercial, industrial, agricultural programs,

1 under the custom heading, and we go to the extreme
2 right on that column, we see that the cost per cubic
3 metre of savings is down to two point seven-two (2.72)
4 cents, correct?

5 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the one (1)
7 thing you had brought us to last time, Mr. Stocki, is
8 to get some sense of if we're spending in the
9 residential programs direct install a certain amount
10 of money for the gas, or what are we getting for our
11 money. And that would be found at page 88 of the Book
12 of Documents. It's another table produced.

13 So on the direct install, when we're
14 spending twenty-three point one-nine (23.19) cents per
15 cubic metre, you're expecting the last year of plan
16 that it's ramping up to .23 million cubic metres,
17 correct?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct,
19 and just while we're on the same page, so the dollars
20 associated with that are three hundred and twenty-
21 seven thousand dollars (\$327,000).

22 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
23 that additional piece of information. And then if we
24 go into a commercial, industrial, agricultural
25 programs, we see that the amounts vary in the years

1 that they don't ramp up. That starts in 2020/'21, at
2 5.29 million cubic metres, correct?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And then finally
5 in the 2022/2023 year, we would ramp up to four (4) --
6 or not ramp up, ramp down, I guess, to 4.13 million
7 cubic metres for the investments of about one-tenth
8 (1/10) of the investment at two points seven-two
9 (2.72) cents per cubic metre, correct?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

11 And the dollar value associated with that is \$1.702
12 million in that '22/'23 fiscal year.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So for every
14 dollar we're spending in the gas sector for the custom
15 program, we're nearly getting ten (10) times bang for
16 our buck, correct?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So using the PACT
21 test, the comparative metrics for those two (2)
22 programs are 23.19 cents per kilowatt -- or cents per
23 cubic metre versus the 2.72 for the custom program.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So
25 mathematically we're nearly getting ten (10) times

1 bang for our buck in spending in the custom program
2 under the commercial, industrial, and agricultural
3 programs, is my suggestion to you, sir.

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So those are the
8 levelized PACT measures, so that is the -- the cost
9 per cubic metre. So if you look at, for example, the
10 ratio -- the PACT ratio for direct install, it's .78,
11 so it is less than one (1), and compare the PACT ratio
12 for the custom program, is 6.51, so it's certainly
13 well above one (1), and there's a difference in that.

14 It depends on the comparison of which
15 metric you're looking at, so I don't want to
16 necessarily say it's -- it's a -- it's a ten (10) to
17 one (1) because that's -- it kind of misconstrues the
18 -- the difference between those. You have to consider
19 the cost-effectiveness but you also have to consider
20 the savings and the actual capital cost as well.

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you, sir.
22 And just -- I'm not good at all these acronyms and
23 ratios, but when we're under one (1), which you
24 actually said the residential direct program is -- I
25 think you said .73, that's not a good thing. We want

1 it to be above one (1), don't we?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As per the
3 Efficiency Manitoba regulations, we want the portfolio
4 to be assessed by the PUB to be cost-effective, and so
5 we put forward a natural gas portfolio that, if you
6 include interactive effects, is 0.99, so effectively
7 unity, balancing again multiple objectives and trying
8 to provide comprehensive offerings to residential
9 income qualified Indigenous and commercial,
10 industrial, and agricultural customer segments. But
11 again we're -- we're using the -- the regulations at
12 the portfolio level.

13 If you take out the interactive effects
14 in the natural gas, the overall PACT score is 1.24.
15 That's -- yeah, 1.24 for the overall portfolio without
16 interactive effects, so again, a cost effect of
17 natural gas portfolio, which again pointed back to the
18 regulations, is what the PUB has been asked to assess.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I think that was
20 a long way of saying that you agreed with me that if
21 the PACT ratio is less than one (1), it's not a good
22 thing, because you're using all the really good PACT
23 ratios of the commercial programs to bring your entire
24 portfolio up to one (1). Am I getting that right?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Actually, I don't

1 necessarily agree that that's not a good thing.
2 There's multiple perspectives there. Because we're
3 able to include this direct install with specific
4 measures, there might be longer-term objectives that
5 we're achieving by doing that, so more broadly, like,
6 working towards culture of conservation or prepping
7 the market for longer-term adoption of codes and
8 standards, which we've previously said are extremely
9 cost-effective.

10 So, yes, there might be some money up
11 front and it might be not as cost effective to go
12 after these measures in the near term, but there might
13 be some long-term strategic or even cost-effective
14 advantages of doing so presently.

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. Let me
16 put it another way. If we were just looking at the
17 PACT ratio and all your portfolio was at .73,
18 including the commercial portfolio, you wouldn't be
19 able to meet your objectives, would you?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'd agree with
21 that if we had an overall natural gas portfolio that
22 was a lot less than one (1). We would be struggling
23 to bring that forward to -- to the PUB, that's
24 correct.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now, I'm going

1 to go to MIPUG/Efficiency Manitoba 1-H, the attachment
2 at the bottom.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So this was a
7 response that was provided for, and my eyes are really
8 bad, so you have to bring it down to the -- I'm going
9 to focus on -- I've got some questions with respect to
10 the custom program, so if we can scroll down, it's
11 nearly at the bottom of the big table here.

12 Custom offers, yeah, I see it now, Ms.
13 Schubert. And if we go across -- maybe if you bring
14 it -- we'll see that there's a description -- actually
15 you can keep it in the larger font so I can still read
16 it. My eyes are bad.

17 And that starts with total of .3 or 30
18 -- it'd be 30 cents per cubic metre.

19 What does this description, where it
20 starts with "total of 30 cents per cubic metre" mean?,
21 Mr. Stocki?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So the -- the
23 column heading under that is the incentives --
24 customer incentives that are available under each of
25 the different -- are available under each specific

1 measure. So this request took many different
2 iterations, so it was built off a previous Daymark
3 response, but in this specific one we added a couple
4 of extra columns.

5 But specifically to this column, this
6 is the incentive value under the custom program bundle
7 for commercial, industrial, and agricultural
8 customers. So this represents -- 30 cents is
9 basically the starting point for determining the
10 incentive value on natural gas offers that qualify
11 under the custom program.

12 For electric measures it is 10 cents
13 per kilowatt hour, and two hundred dollars (\$200) per
14 kilowatt for summer demand reduction, plus two hundred
15 dollars (\$200) per kilowatt for winter demand
16 reduction. And of course there's some caveats
17 associated with that and I have the feeling we're
18 going there in a second.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So for the two
20 (2) sets of programs that we've been talking about in
21 custom, and I realize this is just one (1) example,
22 and I don't have the time to go through all of the
23 other ones, you said there's a caveat. So we're
24 getting some very low cost to achieve results in this
25 sector, but the caveat is in the next column, which

1 you're going to describe, sir -- the incentive is
2 capped, correct? And what's the formula for the cap?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah. So there -
4 - there are some program criteria that we've put in
5 place that -- essentially when we're determining the -
6 - the incentives, and maybe to take a step back, the -
7 - the custom offer is for commercial, industrial, and
8 agricultural projects that don't necessarily neatly
9 fit into any specific -- specific category or measure.
10 It's to capture all those projects that may be process
11 specific or industry or that we don't have another
12 program specifically designed for.

13 So it's kind of meant a bit of as a
14 catchall to be flexible and making sure we're able to
15 capture some of those opportunities that customers
16 bring forward to us, or in working collaboratively
17 with customers, identify.

18 And so what that cap really is talking
19 about, it's basically -- once we do that calculation
20 of 30 cents per cubic metre, and -- and that's based
21 on first-year savings -- I should -- I should clarify
22 that as well -- once those incentive values are
23 determined, we also try to look at it from the
24 customer's perspective.

25 And so if we know that the project

1 costs with this incentive are going to be buying it
2 down to less than, say, a one (1) year payback from
3 the customer's perspective, or if the Efficiency
4 Manitoba contribution is going to be over 50 percent
5 of the capital cost, by default that would be a
6 restriction and we'd actually limit the incentive to
7 those caps.

8 It does come into play in -- in select
9 cases but, in general, the intent of that cap is so
10 that we are able to spread those incentive dollars and
11 achieve a greater participation, and we're not over-
12 incenting individual customers for a specific program.

13 Now that said, I believe -- I've talked
14 briefly about this before -- there's always exceptions
15 to the rules. So these are -- these are the program
16 criteria and by default we -- we would always follow
17 these.

18 In the event that a customer project
19 came forward, for example, a larger project, where
20 we're looking at a custom process and there were other
21 unique circumstances, Efficiency Manitoba does have
22 the -- the potential to do a separate cost-
23 effectiveness analysis and perhaps bring this forward,
24 for example, for executive review or even potentially
25 if the incentive was of significant magnitude, to

1 bring it forward to a Board review in order to
2 consider modifying in single one-off scenarios.

3 But by default we'd want these -- these
4 caps in place for a pretty practical reason of
5 maximizing customer participation and making the
6 administration of these programs smooth.

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. I have
8 one (1) or two (2) questions.

9 So, how did you come up with 50 percent
10 of the total project costs? Because I don't need to
11 go through the list, but there's a lot of them that
12 you pay 100 percent of the project costs.

13 How did you come up with the 50
14 percent?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, could
19 you repeat that question for me?

20 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I'm just curious
21 how you came up with the 50 percent of project costs.

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So that is
23 actually a legacy for Manitoba Hydro that we've chosen
24 to continue. Over time we've found that it is
25 reasonable, that it doesn't come up very often where

1 customers are -- of course, customers would like
2 larger incentives, but this hasn't prevented customers
3 from moving on energy efficiency projects.

4 Again, with the caveat that perhaps we
5 could, in very unique circumstances, look at those
6 individual projects. But in general, once a customer
7 payback is below one (1) year, it's a very attractive
8 investment for a commercial or industrial or
9 agricultural customer, and in general they're --
10 they're going after that opportunity.

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. I have to
12 understand the formula, because in -- in my world if I
13 come -- if I start a list and the list says "the
14 lesser of," if I hit the lesser amount at number 1, I
15 hit the lesser amount at number 2, or I hit the lesser
16 amount at number 3, I'm out.

17 Is it different in your world?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I -- I definitely
19 don't think you're out, meaning that you don't get an
20 incentive. It's just that you have to do the energy
21 savings calculation to determine an incentive value.

22 If that was contributing over 50
23 percent, we would cap it at 50 percent by default, or
24 if it was -- if that -- if it was further capped
25 because of that one-year payback, then we would

1 further reduce it.

2 To provide some context, these are very
3 typically large incentives for -- for commercial or
4 industrial customers. So for example, they may be on
5 the order of a hundred thousand (100,000) or two
6 hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) for a single
7 project.

8 And so without those caps, there is
9 some risk with respect to an overall budget. If -- if
10 we don't go in knowing that we're going to have those
11 caps in place, so there's some practical reasons why
12 we've got -- got those in place. And also it enables
13 us to reach more customers.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you.

15 Just to be clear, it's -- the 50
16 percent cap is on the total project costs, not on the
17 incremental amount from a standard product to a more
18 efficient product?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, so those
20 are separate cost tests, so it's either 50 percent of
21 the total project cost or the 100 percent of the
22 incremental product cost to -- to that one-year
23 payback.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. If we go
25 to book -- Board book page 184, and we go to the

1 custom line again. This table that's been produced by
2 Efficiency Manitoba shows the customer cost in one
3 column for custom applications.

4 What does the number 9,154 represent,
5 sir?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: You might want
10 to ask also with respect to the direct install,
11 because there's numbers there also.

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Sorry, we just
16 need an extra minute here, because we based our cost
17 effective analysis on the program administrator cost
18 test, but subsequently we got a number of IRs that
19 we're just looking at and different perspectives, TRC,
20 and in this case the -- the participant cost metrics.

21 And so we're just trying to refresh our
22 memories here for a second.

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So the customer
2 cost is represented by the incremental cost to the
3 customer for installing that measure, minus the
4 incentive.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And it probably
6 isn't important, but it's probably -- is it an average
7 number probably for all the -- the programs?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: It's actually a
9 sum of all the programs within that cust -- custom
10 bundle, so it would include multiple industrial,
11 agricultural and cust -- custom projects, energy
12 manager initiatives, for example, are under that.
13 Strategic energy management cohorts are under that as
14 well. And then as mentioned, commercial custom is
15 another offer under that.

16 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay, and that -
17 - so let's just follow that line then, based on that
18 description of the customer cost then, if I'm reading
19 this table correctly, the first year bill reduction in
20 this case would be one thousand six hundred and
21 ninety-two (1,692), correct?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
23 So that's the first year bill savings.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So in this
25 sector the next line is a mathematical calculation, am

1 I correct, indicating it would take 5.41 years to get
2 a payback?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
4 That's an overall blended average for the -- the
5 custom program. So it does also include initiatives
6 such as the energy manager initiative, where there is
7 -- you know, we're -- it's not a direct incentive, but
8 we're actually supporting a person to work within a
9 facility.

10 So it's -- it's a blend of all those
11 offers within the custom initiative.

12 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now, let's
13 compare that, because you said you didn't want to
14 over-incent people with the residential programs
15 direct install.

16 We go there, the customer cost is one
17 sixty-one (161), correct?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes. And for
19 some detail in what's included in there, it's a
20 combination. Again, there is multiple offers under
21 that direct install, so there's a combination of audit
22 costs that are included for that, and the -- the co-
23 pay for items that customers choose to -- to install.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: But in contrast
25 to the custom example that we used, the customer cost

1 is less than the customer's first year bill reduction.

2 Is that what the table is telling us
3 for direct installs?

4 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah. And this
5 gets into some of the details of the specific cost
6 effectiveness test. It's not just energy bill
7 reductions in this case, it's water, as well.

8 And so, with the direct install program
9 there's a lot of, for example, faucet aerators,
10 showerheads, other water saving measures that are
11 included within that.

12 And so, certainly, the first year bill
13 reductions are energy plus a significant portion are -
14 - also included the -- the water savings, and so it's
15 not -- it's difficult to do an apples-to-apples
16 comparison with that.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So, what you're
18 telling me is that, in a direct install, not only does
19 the client have two hundred eight dollars (\$208)
20 reduction in his electric bill, he gets other
21 reductions in water bills so that his payback is even
22 greater in proportion to what's shown on this table,
23 correct?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: No. Actually,
25 that's not what I meant. I meant that the two hundred

1 eight dollars (\$208) would include all the utility
2 benefits, not just energy. So, it would include
3 electric, gas, and water savings in that two hundred
4 eight (208).

5 So, actually, if you were doing a more
6 comparison -- equitable comparison to the in --
7 commercial, industrial, and agricultural, you'll have
8 to reduce those water amounts out of there.

9 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: That's if --
10 okay. Thank you for that view. Now, sir, have you,
11 and I'm not going to fault you at all if you haven't
12 because you just started, as an organization, and this
13 is not directly to you, sir, done a study of the
14 potential that exists in the custom sector that we've
15 been talking about?

16 And then that'll end my questioning in
17 this sector.

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: In general --
19 well, no, specifically, we haven't done a conservation
20 potential analysis or study for any of the customer
21 segments.

22 What we have proposed in section 7 of
23 our filing is to use the innovation fund. And,
24 specifically, we've allocated dollars within year 1
25 and year 2 of that inefficient -- innovation fund

1 budget specifically to do a conservation potential
2 study within Manitoba.

3 We realize that, not only for the
4 industrial customer segment, but within residential,
5 commercial, agricultural income qualified and First --
6 First Nations or other Indigenous customer segments,
7 it's a potentially insightful exercise, and so that's
8 why we've actually budgeted specifically for that
9 initiative in years 1 and 2.

10 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, Me.
11 Hacault. Could I just ask a question of
12 clarification?

13 Mr. Stocki, on this table you said that
14 the two hundred and eight dollars (\$208) includes all
15 utility benefits, so not just electric, but water and
16 natural gas, as well, but there is another table for
17 natural gas?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah. I'm sorry,
19 I missed that. It -- this is the electric only table,
20 so it would be electric and water savings only.

21 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Electric and
22 water. Thank you.

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes. Thank you
24 for that catch.

25

1 CONTINUED BY MR. ANTOINE HACAULT:

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
3 that clarification. The next subject area which I
4 want to get a little of cro -- clarification on is
5 I'll call it the budget flexibility.

6 I'm not so sure I understand the
7 evidence of Efficiency Manitoba in this area. Let me
8 start with the statutory reference that you made as a
9 group to section 12 in the legislation.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And 12(5) was
14 the section you referred us to as a panel for the
15 statutory authority to adjust in the plan once it's
16 been approved.

17 And there's two (2) criteria in
18 exercise that discretion. And that's what I want to
19 explore, whether you're saying that you're not going
20 to exercise that discretion.

21 So, I believe I heard evidence
22 yesterday -- and maybe going through an actual table
23 would be useful for that.

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Maybe not.
2 We'll try and see where we go without looking at a
3 table. But the budget in your tables segregates items
4 into residential sector, and then we'll say First
5 Nation sector, and then commercial, industrial,
6 agricultural sectors.

7 And within those budgets sometimes we
8 have the same types of initiatives. And, for example,
9 if there's an emerging technology in the plan and
10 you've got a budget allocated to an emerging
11 technology, are you saying that, for example, if
12 there's no budget allocated to the industrial sector
13 and the industrial sector comes to you and says I've
14 got this emerging technology idea, can you move some
15 of your emerging technology budget which is spread
16 across the different sectors to my project, can you do
17 that or will you do that?

18 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, for example,
19 for emerging technology in -- using that specific
20 example, although that's a separate category that
21 we've outlined, we do have projected participation
22 within the commercial and agricultural segments --

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Do you know what
24 page --

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: -- and was --

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: -- or document
2 you're looking at, sir?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Sorry, yes. I'm
4 just looking at -- I was just trying -- trying to find
5 a good reference that shows the -- the budget for
6 that. But I was looking at say, for example, page 250
7 of our submission, just on the electric energy savings
8 summary, for example.

9 So, what we have there is the electric
10 energy savings summary by program bundle but also
11 divided out by customer segment. So -- so, for
12 example, you'll see emerging technology as a separate
13 bundle under that, but you'll see it appears with some
14 anticipated savings under, for example, commercial,
15 residential and agricultural to illustrate that.

16 So, there's specific participation
17 that's expected within those customer segments for the
18 emerging technology programs.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: But you see what
20 my question is -- and, actually, the table you've
21 referenced has been broken down into numbers in an IR.
22 So, perhaps if you're referring to this graph, we
23 could better understand it by looking at one (1) of
24 the responses to IRs that you provided.

25 And that is found in -- the numbers

1 with respect to this table is found in MIPUG EM, so
2 Efficiency Manitoba, 1-6. I believe, Kristen, that
3 was on one (1) of the lists I gave you. I have it at
4 page 4 of 7.

5 So, you see at the top we were -- you
6 had brought us to figure 3.2, which was the graphical
7 depiction of the numbers that are shown on the page
8 before you now, sir.

9 Is that correct?

10 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That is correct.

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So, when you
12 were explaining that under the industrial sector there
13 is no budget allocated to emerging technology, we see
14 that in the first line at the top of this table,
15 correct?

16 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, these are
17 savings. But that's again the expected participation
18 for emerging technology within the industrial customer
19 segment. And so, the specific offers under the
20 emerging technology offer include things like small
21 scale bioenergy for space heating, for example.

22 And the residential or commercial,
23 agricultural, industrial solar PV offering we do not
24 anticipate any participation in the industrial -- from
25 the industrial customer segment in the solar PV, but

1 certainly, if there was participation, the -- the
2 emerging technology's an overall offering available to
3 all those customer segments.

4 And so although we've tried to allocate
5 that to industrial, agricultural, and commercial, we
6 don't know exactly what industry, although we wouldn't
7 anticipate, based on typically our experience with
8 industrial customers and their payback requirement to
9 move on energy efficiency projects, that they would
10 necessarily be looking at the emerging technologies.

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay, so for
12 completeness of the record, because you've correctly
13 indicated that the table you're pointing us to is a
14 savings table -- if we go to page 6 of this same
15 interrogatory, we see the numbers being the costs,
16 which was Table 3.5 in your material, correct?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
18 And again, we've allocated the budget at the emerging-
19 technology level, and then we've tried to do our best
20 to allocate those to the expected participation within
21 the -- the industrial, agricultural, or commercial
22 customer segments.

23 Again, those are projections, but if an
24 industrial customer was interested in participating in
25 an emerging-technology program, they wouldn't be

1 prevented from doing so.

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So help me
3 understand, then, if, for example, I go to the
4 renovation budget line. There is a renovation budget
5 line for each of the sectors -- being industrial,
6 agricultural, commercial, and residential -- if we
7 move down.

8 Is your budget flexibility intended
9 that if you don't spend all the renovation budget in
10 the industrial sector and there's a demand in the
11 residential sector, that you'll move from the '20/'21
12 budget on renovation from the induc -- industrial
13 sector down into the residential sector, if you have a
14 demand for that in the residential sector?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So those are
16 separate cust -- customer offers. So the renovation
17 offer under commercial, industrial, and agricultural
18 is available to those customers. The home renovation
19 offer is available to residential customers, so those
20 are -- are distinct, and we're not looking to -- to
21 mix and match there.

22 What I was -- what maybe I was poorly
23 alluding to was within that renovation budget for
24 commercial, industrial, and agricultural, we have an
25 overall budget. And what we've done is we've looked

1 at past participation and we've looked at where those
2 customers have come from, and then we've tried to do
3 some projections from that of where we can reasonably
4 forecast a projection within those specific
5 commercial, industrial, or agricultural.

6 It is just a forecast, and so we don't
7 expect it to materialize perfectly. So as there is an
8 overall renovation -- this is one (1) of the benefits
9 of grouping this customer segment and creating a
10 bundle, is that it creates this -- this offer
11 available for commercial, industrial, agricultural,
12 but it doesn't prevent any of them from participating.

13 So it is quite possible in one (1)
14 year, we may see an uptake in industrial, with
15 slightly lower commercial participation, and the next
16 year it might be the inverse. It's just based on the
17 forecasted participation.

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
19 that. And I want to try and better understand that,
20 because when we're going to be asking -- when I say,
21 Efficiency Manitoba's asking the PUB to approve the
22 plan, if -- I want to understand what your view as
23 Efficiency Manitoba is of what the Board's approving,
24 so that, say, for example -- and you alluded to that -
25 - there's construction delays for whatever reason in a

1 commercial sector, and for that reason you've got
2 unspent money in '20/'21, what happens?

3 Do you allocate it elsewhere if
4 industrial needs it, or do you carry it forward to
5 '21/'22?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So I think
10 probably to address your concern as directly as
11 possible, it's whether or not if, for example, there
12 were economic conditions that prevented a cust -- a
13 commercial customer or a cus -- an industry such as
14 new buildings from participating in the program for,
15 say, a year 1, what would we do with that budget?
16 Would we shift it to a different customer segment in
17 particular? And no, we wouldn't look to do that.

18 Instead, what I would anticipate would
19 happen would be there would be -- because we've got a
20 large customer segment with commercial, industrial,
21 and agricultural, we're using forecasted participation
22 within each of those, but there are going to be gives
23 and takes between those -- commercial, industrial, and
24 agricultural, in particular. And so for example, if
25 there was a slowdown in new builds of commercial,

1 there might be other activities in that same year that
2 in -- an increase, for example, in the agricultural
3 sector or potentially in industrial that could
4 potentially make up within that same year.

5 If it was under in all categories
6 within that commercial, industrial, and agricultural,
7 there would, I guess, be the potential to carry that
8 budget forward to the next year, potentially. But
9 again, there's that -- kind of that three (3) year
10 overall cost. So as long as -- I suppose if it was
11 under budget over that three (3) years, that would be
12 fine.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. So does
14 Efficiency Manitoba, in asking for the approval of the
15 PUB of its plan and budget, view that it can -- it has
16 -- it can move money, if I'm looking at this table in
17 '20/'21, from the industrial budget down to the
18 agricultural budget in any line, by way of example?

19 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Essentially, yes.
20 I mean, we're basing on expected participation. I
21 wouldn't expect there to be no participation all of a
22 sudden from the industrial seg -- segment. That would
23 be a highly unusual situation.

24 What I would anticipate in one (1)
25 year, you may see, you know, on the order of, say, 5

1 or maybe 10 percent increase, say, in the industrial
2 customer segment, and that would have to be made up
3 maybe in the commercial or agricultural. That's a
4 more likely scenario.

5 So there are going to be these minor
6 gives and takes. I -- again, because we're basing it
7 on an overall customer segment of commercial,
8 industrial, and agricultural, and we've done our best
9 to project perj -- participation within those specific
10 segments within that bun -- customer segment, but we
11 fully anticipate and would expect there to be
12 deviations from our proj -- projected -- the specific
13 values of that participation.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. And the
15 next clarification I'm trying to get -- and that's why
16 I started with Section 12(5) -- you can put it on the
17 screen again.

18 If you're not hitting your target
19 because there's not the take-up you think there's
20 going to be -- and I'll give an example. In the
21 residential sector, and I've used the direct install -
22 - and you're short on your savings target.

23 Are you following me so far?

24 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, I am so far.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And you know

1 that the budget for the agricultural industrial sector
2 and commercial sector is depleted. So you're not
3 meeting your savings target. The budget for those
4 three (3) sectors is depleted. I thought I understood
5 you to say and the evidence to be that if you needed,
6 you'd spend in an area where you could get the
7 additional savings to meet your targets.

8 Am I understanding now that you will
9 not touch the budgets in all the other sectors, even
10 if that means you're not going to meet your target?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Let me take a crack
15 at this. So yeah, we've discussed, I think over the
16 last few days, the budgets and -- and what we would do
17 with -- with budgeted dollars and how they might be
18 allocated if -- if they don't -- if the actual spend
19 doesn't correlate with what we've -- we've planned.

20 And the way I would describe that, that
21 methodology for moving budget dollars, would be based
22 on a hierarchy.

23 So -- so the first layer would be that
24 if we can move budgets within customer segments with
25 the -- the commercial, industrial, agricultural being

1 -- being one (1) segment, we would look to do that.

2 Should -- and I should back up a little
3 bit. In terms of our -- our budgets or actual spend,
4 this is something that we're going to be monitoring
5 very, very closely on a monthly basis. And our
6 finance department will be discussing any kind of
7 variances that we see in the actual spend, compared
8 with our budget, and understanding why that is.

9 Is it because there is a delay? Is it
10 because the participation isn't where we think it's
11 going to be? We really need to understand what is
12 driving the differences, the variances in our budget
13 before we start moving budgets around.

14 But should we determine that whatever
15 the reason be, that there isn't going to be the
16 participation that we'd like or that the timing of
17 that participation is different, then we will look to
18 reallocate monies so that they are still spent with
19 the overall objective of meeting our savings targets.

20 So now to go back to what I was talking
21 about in the hierarchy, it would be to look at moving
22 funds potentially between -- between customer
23 industrial and agriculture, and within that customer
24 segment between the years.

25 A second hierarchy would be to look at

1 some of our spend that is not allocated to --
2 specifically to customer segments.

3 So, like our enabling strategies
4 budget, if we needed to move that budget to more of a
5 customer-focused spend, we could do that.

6 And then lastly, we've talked a little
7 bit about the contingency fund, which is available to
8 us should we determine that there are opportunities
9 within the market.

10 And that contingency fund at this point
11 is not allocated to any specific customer segment,
12 because we don't know how we might potentially spend
13 those funds.

14 So that's another area that's available
15 to us should we see opportunity within -- with any --
16 within any of the customer segments.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
18 that answer. Now, going back to the table that I had,
19 this is where I'm having a bit of difficulty and I
20 tried to follow this testimony during the first line
21 of questioning by Ms. Steinfeld.

22 When I look at the tables that have
23 been produced, I don't see a separate item for a
24 contingency fund of \$7 million. I thought I heard the
25 evidence to be, and I'd have to pull up the

1 transcripts, that the \$7 million was not, for example
2 in 2021, if we go to the bottom of that table, we see
3 a grand total of 44,545,000.

4 Am I correct in understanding the \$7
5 million is not included in that grand total?

6 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: You're correct. The
7 contingency fund does not form a part of our budget
8 today.

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And if I could
10 just add, there -- there's a good reason for that.

11 First of all, the contingency fund, the
12 requirement of having a contingency fund was outlined
13 in the Act and it's meant to be a flexibility budget
14 for Efficiency Manitoba.

15 However, when we were looking at what
16 kind of savings would we attribute, how would that
17 impact the cost effectiveness of the portfolio, it was
18 impossible to include that because we -- we don't yet
19 know what the energy savings component of that
20 contingency fund spend would be, which is why we also
21 outlined a process that would -- would have a -- a
22 rigorous set of assessment in terms of what is the
23 cost effectiveness of what we're trying to pursue with
24 that contingency fund.

25 So including it as a \$7 million cost

1 with no corresponding savings would have been an
2 unfair burden to the portfolio cost effectiveness. So
3 that, in combination with the methodology that we're
4 going to use to ensure the spend is cost effective
5 allows us that flexibility.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. I need a
7 little bit more clarification then, because if I look,
8 and we go back to the Statute, it's section 9,
9 paragraph L, as in Larry, and then small 3. So it's
10 on page 12 of the Statute.

11 Sorry, I guess it's not 12 of the PDF.
12 There we go. There, we're getting to it.

13 L says, and it starts:

14 "A budget that sets out, for the
15 three-year period."

16 And then if we go to 3(I) it says:

17 "The amount reasonably required as a
18 contingency fund to enable
19 Efficiency Manitoba to take
20 advantage of -- "

21 So it seems to be pretty restrictive.

22 "emerging opportunities that are not
23 otherwise addressed in the plan."

24 So am I understanding what you're
25 telling this Board is that you believe that there's \$7

1 million of projects that you haven't been able to
2 identify in the plan, so \$7 million of not only
3 opportunities, emerging opportunities, and that's what
4 you would use?

5 I'm trying to understand, because we
6 just talked, okay, well there's a problem, just like
7 we've overspent on a sector, renovations.

8 Well, is that an emerging opportunity,
9 or is it something we've already identified but under-
10 budgeted for?

11 So is this \$7 million, what you're
12 saying is your best estimate of what you need for
13 emerging opportunities in each year?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So the
18 requirement as -- as pointed out by Mr. Hacault on --
19 in section 9(1)(iii) was requesting that our
20 Efficiency Plan include what we thought was a
21 reasonable amount to enable us to take advantage of
22 emerging opportunities.

23 And I would like to clarify at that
24 point -- at this point that emerging opportunities
25 does not mean emerging technologies. We -- an

1 emerging opportunity could -- could occur, as well.
2 Industrial segment in particular would -- might have
3 an opportunity that we have not predicted that is
4 happening because we don't have as much historical
5 participation with industrial customers.

6 So, it was difficult for us to
7 determine. And I think -- I believe there was
8 testimony a few days back that -- that suggested that
9 we were looking to this Board to determine whether
10 they thought 7 million was a reasonable amount.

11 And that is included in our plan on PDF
12 page 190, the discussion of the contingency fund. I'd
13 also like to state that, obviously, we're not going to
14 access contingency fund if -- if we're under budget;
15 we'll -- we'll use our budget first.

16 And to address some of the comments
17 that Mr. Hacault was bringing up earlier, we also have
18 a section of our legislation that talks about
19 shortfalls and surpluses. And I'll just get the
20 reference for that.

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, in section
25 7(2) of the Act there's also a discussion on

1 shortfalls or surpluses in annual net savings. So, if
2 we do not meet our savings target in -- in one (1)
3 year, that that requirement would go to the following
4 year. And, obviously, we'd have to set budget aside
5 to -- to find those energy savings.

6 And this particular section of the
7 legislation was -- certainly had industrial customers
8 in mind. The projects that they have can be quite
9 large and have large budgets and large energy savings.

10 And we wanted to make sure that, you
11 know, if we had one (1) that got delayed for any
12 particular reason, that it could still be accounted
13 for in future years and made up, in a sense.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you very
15 much. I just wanted to get some clarity on -- on
16 that. I don't know whether the Board --

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr. Hacault,
18 Ms. Hamilton has a question.

19 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Excuse me for
20 interrupting on that. Just a further question along
21 that line.

22 If you are anticipating being overspent
23 in the industrial -- commercial, industrial,
24 agricultural sector and underspent in residential,
25 will you move budget funds from residential to that

1 industrial, commercial, agricultural sector within
2 that year?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yeah, so -- so going
7 back to what I talked about in terms of -- of
8 hierarchy, that -- that is a potential situation that
9 we would find ourselves in, in which case, that --
10 that is a potential solution, but it would be one (1)
11 further down the list of possibilities in terms of the
12 -- the hierarchies, meaning that we would first
13 endeavour to keep the budgets within the original
14 customer segments.

15 If we couldn't do that, then we would
16 start to look at some allocations between.

17 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Thank you.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: My colleagues have
22 reminded me that an exception would be the budgets
23 that we have in place for our low income and hard to
24 reach, we would not look to move those budgets.

25 BOARD MEMBER HAMILTON: Thank you.

1

2 CONTINUED BY MR. ANTOINE HACAULT:

3

MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now, the -- the
4 question of Board Member Hamilton was, would you move
5 between sectors if you had fully spent, and that was
6 my initial question, in the agricultural, commercial,
7 and industrial sector.

8

I have a further refinement of that.
9 If Efficiency Manitoba in a particular year is coming
10 to a conclusion that it can't reach its target savings
11 because of the composition and the take-up, will it
12 also then look at move dollars in areas which would
13 help it reach its target savings?

14

And to put that question into context,
15 I went through a lot of detail on the bang for buck in
16 the custom sector. Spending one dollar (\$1) in that
17 sector could achieve nearly ten (10) times the results
18 of some other programs.

19

So, if you're short, there seems to be
20 the possibility to reallocate in another sector to
21 meet your targets. So, will you move money from one
22 (1) sector to the other if that means it can help you
23 mo -- meet your target?

24

MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yeah. So, I think
25 the answer to that is -- is yes. I think that's a

1 response we've provided. And I'll just remind that
2 one (1) of the other options is -- within the three
3 (3) years is to move budgets say from a future year to
4 a current year should there be the opportunity for
5 that spend to achieve the savings targets required.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
7 those clarifications. I -- I've covered that subject.
8 It was a labourious, but I wanted to get a better
9 understanding of, when we're asking this Board to
10 approve budgets, where we're going.

11 And I think that we were supposed to
12 try and break around this time, so it would be a
13 convenient time if that's the Board's wish.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's fine. We'll
15 -- we'll break for fifteen (15) minutes. Thank you.

16

17 --- Upon recessing at 10:56 a.m.

18 --- Upon resuming at 11:17 a.m.

19

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Hacault, before
21 you start, the panel has some questions in -- on the
22 issues that were just raised.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Yes, Mr.
24 Chairman, and I -- and I welcome -- that was the thing
25 that I was going to try and address too. I didn't

1 anticipate that section lasting as long, and I would
2 have probably had more questions in this budget and --
3 and things.

4 So I'm looking -- just letting the
5 Board know, I think it's useful information for us to
6 know in approving the Plan, and I welcome the
7 questions, but I'm just letting you know that it
8 probably put me a bit behind on what I thought my
9 schedule was going to be, and I might have had more
10 questions, but I would move on to another sector
11 probably.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Ms.
13 Kapitany...?

14 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Ms.
15 Kramps, I believe this is for you, but it might not
16 be. Just -- when we -- just before the break, we were
17 speaking about the targets being cumulative, and
18 referring to Section 72 of your Act. And I understand
19 that it's over a period of time that you're to achieve
20 the savings.

21 My question regards how the budgets
22 line up with the various years to achieve the savings,
23 and in particular, if you fall behind in one (1) year,
24 so you're not able to spend all your budget, so you
25 have explicit approval from the Government to move

1 those funds into the next year and a year after that
2 in order for you to achieve the savings over time?

3 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Sure. So I -- I'll
4 try to -- the opportunity here to sort of clarify some
5 of the concepts with regards to the budgets.

6 In -- in relation to your specific
7 question, we are following the Efficiency Manitoba Act
8 with regards to what it says about our budgets, and it
9 doesn't say -- it -- it's silent in terms of moving
10 budgets from year to year.

11 So our interpretation of -- of the
12 budget that we've provided within our plan is that
13 it's a three (3) year budget, and that we can, should
14 we need to, move the -- move budgets from -- from year
15 to year, should we see participation, for example,
16 increase in year 1.

17 And as it relates to our targets,
18 should we be able to achieve, for example, higher
19 savings targets in year 1, so it may afford the
20 ability to -- if we don't have the budget, then in
21 year 2, we have lower targets -- achievements, it
22 would be -- on average, we would have achieved the
23 budgets over the two (2) or three (3) year period.

24 So to -- to address that question
25 specifically, does that -- does that help?

1 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: It answers my
2 question. Thank you.

3 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Good. It -- may I
4 have just a few moments just to try to clarify some
5 other comments with regards to the budget?

6 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

7 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Thank you. So I
8 want to be very clear that with regards to the budgets
9 that are allocated to the Indigenous programs, as well
10 as the income qualified programs, those budgets will -
11 - will not be moved. And that is consistent with the
12 testimony that Mr. Stocki provided yesterday.

13 With regards to the other customer
14 segments, which would be mainly the residential, and
15 the commercial, industrial, and agricultural programs,
16 the -- the Plan was designed to allow for flexibility
17 within those customer segments. There are many, many
18 programs and bundle offers within those customer
19 segments.

20 So we don't expect that -- or we do
21 expect that there should be ample budget within those
22 customer segments to account, for example, one (1)
23 area, perhaps having higher participation will be
24 offset by another area having lower participation.
25 And so we would expect that we could maintain those

1 budgets within those customer segments, because that's
2 the way the -- the Plan in the budget was prepared.

3 Each segment is -- is very important to
4 us, and ideally, all of our budget would be spent by
5 the customers and the organizations represented by
6 those segments. We started to get into a bit of a
7 discussion around some hypothetical what if scenarios.

8 And so as a last resort, if we found
9 that the actual results, the actual spend in those
10 areas was materially different than what we would
11 budget, that's where we would start to look at some of
12 those shifting opportunities, first within -- staying
13 within the customer segment and looking at moving
14 budget dollars in from different years into, you know,
15 into the -- the current year, where we see the
16 opportunity. As a last -- last resort would be moving
17 within our -- moving budgets from one (1) customer
18 segment to another.

19 Again, I want to reiterate that the
20 Indigenous budgets and hard-to-reach budgets would not
21 be affected. We would not touch those budgets.

22 I hope that -- that clarifies. If it
23 doesn't, I'm -- I'm open to further questions.

24 THE VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Can I just ask
25 one (1) follow-up on that last point? So the

1 legislation says that you're meant to keep 5 percent
2 of the budget for low income and hard-to-reach.

3 Would you maintain that customer
4 category, even if it was above the 5 percent?

5 MS. KYLA KRAMPS: Yes.

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: And if I could
7 actually add a -- maybe a example of that,
8 specifically for the Indi -- Indigenous customer
9 segment, because I -- I suspect some of our discussion
10 yesterday with AMC in particular may have led to this
11 line of questioning.

12 So, yes, we -- we were talking about a
13 specific example of where there might be a opportunity
14 to realize increased participation in the indust -- in
15 the Indigenous customer segment, First Nation in
16 particular. So what we gave is, you know, we were
17 talking I think maybe a bit too casually in that if
18 there was increased participation, yeah, we could
19 shift budget.

20 But what we didn't do a very good job
21 of, to be honest, is provide some context of those
22 magnitudes of what -- how we would actually do that.
23 So, for example, the Indigenous customer segment
24 overall has a budget of \$1.4 million on average. And
25 so for -- just for illustration purposes, if we were

1 able to start exceeding our projected participation,
2 say, on the order of about 20 percent, that would be
3 around two hundred and eighty thousand dollars
4 (\$280,000).

5 And so again, using Mrs. Kramps's
6 hierarchy, Efficiency Manitoba would then be placed in
7 the position of trying to decide where to draw those
8 funds from. Because of the magnitude of that dollars
9 only being two hundred and eighty thousand dollars
10 (\$280,000) in particular, we've got some flexibly
11 where we can draw those funds from.

12 So, for example, certainly, Efficiency
13 Manitoba's going to be pursuing things like the
14 Innovation Fund, our other studies to -- to look at,
15 for example, socio-ec -- perhaps, as we mentioned
16 yesterday, starting to explore things like a
17 socioeconomic study.

18 And so there's opportunities to
19 redirect those enabling strategies dollars, for
20 example, on that order of magnitude of two hundred and
21 eighty thousand dollars (\$280,000) to instead
22 prioritize customer participation.

23 And so that's more of a real life kind
24 of example of where -- how we would physically apply
25 that. I think one (1) other clarification to -- we

1 were talking yesterday about the First Nation off-
2 reserve income qualified. And I think we may have
3 mischaracterized that as a brand-new program bundle.

4 Just to clarify, the income qualified
5 customer segment would include First Nation off-
6 reserve. So when we were talking about offering it to
7 First Nation off -- income qualified First Nation off-
8 reserve, that's already included within that customer
9 segment.

10 If we identified additional
11 opportunities, we would certainly be allocating
12 additional marketing, or working with AMC, for
13 example, to identify those particular off-reserve
14 customers, but we would have already intended to
15 capture that participation within the overall income
16 qualified budget. So it would be more of a subset of
17 that existing budget instead of new budget dollars.

18 I hope that helps a bit.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: So I -- I'm going to
20 preface my comment with -- sorry, my question with a
21 comment, which is: I understand this is at an early
22 stage in -- in that you need to go through the
23 experience of the programs. Okay?

24 The problem I have is that you use this
25 concept of the hierarchy that, quite frankly, we kept

1 getting different stories. So the first time, there
2 was the introduction of the use of the Contingency
3 Fund. This last time, Ms. Kramps, you didn't raise
4 the issue of the Contingency Fund.

5 On the first discussion, there was the
6 movement of funds. You were going to try keep it in
7 the segment of industrial as one (1), commercial as
8 another, and then agriculture. And then if you
9 couldn't, you -- you would use it to shift monies
10 between those -- between those categories, but as I
11 understood it, there would not be movement from
12 residential to that.

13 When Ms. Hamilton asked the question,
14 then as a final resort, you would -- you would shift
15 if necessary between it.

16 So the question I have is: Do you
17 actually have a document that says, here is the way
18 the hierarchy goes, because I'm concerned that every
19 time we get -- ask a question, it's -- we're into
20 shifting sands, and we need to have sort of something
21 we can look at it and say, as of now, not having gone
22 through our first year, here is how we anticipate the
23 funds adjusting, based on what is coming forward to
24 us.

25 So do you have a document like that,

1 can you create a document like that, because I think
2 that the Panel needs a little more certainty in terms
3 of what the evidences is?

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No. That --
5 that's a fair concern, and we -- we do not presently
6 have a document. We could certainly create one, if
7 that would be helpful, and it sounds like it would.

8 One (1) thing I will say, though, is in
9 terms of where we budgeted from, we looked at history
10 of -- of, you know, thirty (30) years of DSM, so we've
11 -- we've done -- we feel we've done a decent job of
12 basically forecasting where this participation is
13 going to occur, but of course, you know, the science
14 of -- of human behaviour is actually very complicated,
15 so how much participation we will get is certainly --
16 is a forecast as much as -- as it -- so was the budget
17 to get -- to reach these customers.

18 So we're hoping that we've done a
19 pretty good job of it, but we can certainly appreciate
20 that maybe having that outline so that there's
21 certainty is -- is certainly helpful, and we will
22 undertake to do that.

23 Is that considered an undertaking?

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, it is.

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay.

1 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Would you like
2 me to state the undertaking on the record?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I would really
4 appreciate it, Ms. Steinfeld.

5 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I believe the
6 undertaking is for Efficiency Manitoba to produce a
7 document that outlines for during the three (3) plan
8 years, how variances in the budget contained within
9 the plan will be addressed, including on a step-by-
10 step basis.

11 Have I captured that, Mr. Chair?

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Ms. Steinfeld.
13 Thank you.

14 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: Can we have that
15 undertaking?

16 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes, thank
17 you.

18

19 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 7: Efficiency Manitoba to
20 produce a document that
21 outlines for during the
22 three (3) plan years, how
23 variances in the budget
24 contained within the plan
25 will be addressed,

1 including on a step-by-
2 step basis.

3

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr.
5 Hacaault...?

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Just some
7 preliminary comments. It gets back to my introductory
8 comments, Mr. Chair. That information is useful but
9 it as well as the \$7 million contingency fund.

10 We really didn't have anything in the
11 application, and my concern is we're going down a path
12 where if I had had that document, and a lot of these
13 answers before, we could have asked interrogatories.
14 Could have been tested, could have been dealt with.
15 Now we're going to get a document. My cross-
16 examination is going to be finished. I won't be able
17 to -- and all other parties are going to be in that
18 same boat.

19 So I want the information; it's useful
20 information. I just want to put my concern on the
21 record, that's all.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's fine, and you
23 can use -- certainly use the document in your closing
24 submission to -- to raise the questions.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chair.

2

3 CONTINUED BY MR. ANTOINE HACAULT:

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Just on the
5 issue of no or little information, when I reviewed the
6 application, I didn't really see an in-depth analysis
7 as to why the number of \$7 million was arrived at for
8 emerging opportunities. Did I miss something?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'll bring the
13 Panel's attention to page 189 of our submission, where
14 we talk about the contingency fund in particular. So
15 I believe it is on the next page, page 190, sorry,
16 about halfway down. Yeah, just a little bit up.
17 Perfect.

18 And right there we've got Efficiency
19 Manitoba has assumed that assigning 10 percent of the
20 overall annual budget or an overall cap of 7 million
21 across all three (3) plan years will sufficiently
22 address this risk. And so the risk there was the
23 unanticipated DSM opportunity arising during the three
24 (3) plan years.

25 And below that we've provided some

1 context over what is the -- the definition of what an
2 unanticipated DSM opportunity would look like, so
3 we've included some definition there of, for example,
4 -- adding a new energy efficiency measure program
5 that's not included within the plan would be an
6 example of that.

7 The second example, on the following
8 page, would be to pursue an energy efficiency
9 opportunity through an unanticipated large commercial,
10 industrial, or agricultural facility expansion,
11 upgrade, or economic development project.

12 So we've outlined a couple of criteria
13 that we've used to consider it. We've used it as a 10
14 percent of the overall budget, certainly subject to
15 discussion of course.

16 A little bit down, we've also outlined
17 within the same section of our submission the process
18 that we proo -- propose to actually get approval from
19 and discuss, for example, with our Energy Efficiency
20 Advisory Group, get Board approval from the Efficiency
21 Manitoba Board to use this, discussions with Manitoba
22 Hydro. That process is -- is outlined at a high level
23 of how we would seek approval for using that
24 contingency fund.

25 And the last two (2) bullets are, of

1 course, the reporting -- subsequent reporting that we
2 propose within the Crown corporation's Governance and
3 Accountability Act, basically within our annual
4 reporting of how we'd report the use of that
5 contingency funds. So I just wanted to make sure that
6 the Panel is aware of that document in our submission.

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you, but
8 you have no specific data from Manitoba Hydro's
9 experience that when it set budgets it needed a 10
10 percent contingency fund in each and every year.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: To the best of my
15 knowledge, Manitoba Hydro didn't apply a contingency
16 fund or contingency funding to their DSM plans. If
17 there were overages in any given year, they would
18 simply fund those. Our legislation regulation
19 required a little bit more of a rigorous approach.

20 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And I don't need
21 an answer right away because you're going to give
22 considered thought to this in a document, but part of
23 the questioning and what has led to some confusion on
24 my part with respect to budget movement is my
25 understanding of the testimony that Efficiency

1 Manitoba might, if it deemed necessary, move funds out
2 of the agricultural, industrial, and commercial sector
3 into the low income and into First Nation funds if
4 there was underspending.

5 So if you can deal with that in your
6 document. I'm not going to put to you the question
7 now.

8 And the other thing that I'd like you
9 to deal with in your document, not -- because I think
10 I've heard some inconsistent answers on this, what
11 happens if in each and every of the three (3) years,
12 there is underspending in those two (2) categories,
13 being the low income and the First Nation, and we've
14 got a unspent amount of, say, five hundred thousand
15 dollars (\$500,000)?

16 Could you make sure you address that in
17 your document?

18 I think that's all within the
19 undertaking, because it was a question of priorities
20 and how you would move budgets, but rather than try to
21 do that on the fly, I think it might be more -- just
22 like -- just clarifying what I would say is the
23 intention of the undertaking. Some other people might
24 have further questions on that, but I suggest it's
25 probably best to deal with in -- in the document.

1 That leads me to a question, or one (1)
2 or two (2) questions on how Efficiency Manitoba
3 decided to create sectors and the weightings in that
4 sector. In a very general way, when I looked at the
5 numbers, and there is about 70 percent in that range
6 allocated to industrial, agricultural, and commercial,
7 and in the range of 30 percent to the residential
8 group, low-income group, and First Nation group --
9 largely residential, some commercial an -- in some of
10 those sectors.

11 Could you give me some insight as to
12 how those allocations or sectors were chosen, because
13 there must have been some thought process in that?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think I'd ask
15 for some clarification on -- on that question. When
16 you say the -- "the allocation," are you talking about
17 allocation by customer segment or allocation of
18 customer and programming within a customer segment?

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Well, it may be
20 that it was a buildup, but when I look at the plan, I
21 see, oh, about 70 percent is allocat -- of the budget,
22 apart from the contingency fund, is allocated to
23 agricultural, commercial, and industrial and about 30
24 percent allocated to the residential sector.

25 Now, I could speculate all day. I

1 could say, Well, listen. You know, there's -- in the
2 sectors, from my hydro experience, you know, the --
3 the residential sector consumes this much energy. The
4 industrial sector consumes this suc -- much energy.

5 Or another metric I might have applied
6 is, well, you know, they spend so much -- the
7 residential spend so much on hydro. I've got no idea
8 how you came up with what you did as -- as far as a
9 general overriding allocation.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So we've talked
14 about the multiple criteria that were used to develop
15 the portfolio in general. Certainly, when we're
16 looking at the full range of opportunities that are
17 available to -- to Manitobans who want to make sure
18 that we're including all of those, to be honest, that
19 weren't screened out in the initial pre-screening --
20 so once we had that full list and building up, I mean,
21 again, there's -- there's plenty of different
22 considerations with respect to, for example, continuit
23 -- offering continuity of programs.

24

25 That was certainly one (1) of the
considerations that was front and centre that we

1 weren't -- we weren't wanting to pull and decrease
2 incentives, for example, from existing Manitoba Hydro
3 offers, because again, then that would potentially
4 create problems for Manitoba Hydro in the near terms
5 if we were dropping incentives, for example, that
6 Manitoba Hydro may actually -- people may start gaming
7 that system. But that was part of the engagement and
8 feedback they received, that continuity of programs
9 was one of the factors.

10 Building up the overall portfolio from
11 a bottom-up basis, essentially, with some of those
12 considerations like continuity, equity, and access for
13 -- for programs within all customer segments -- that
14 developed our preliminary portfolio.

15 Once we had that preliminary portfolio,
16 that was the -- the basis, and I think we've outlined
17 that in -- I'll get the PUB reference here -- PUB/EM-
18 I-4, where we kind of compare that preliminary
19 portfolio to the pi -- final portfolio that we
20 developed. And that IR outlined some of those
21 considerations and adjustments we did.

22 And so some of those considerations
23 were certainly overall budget in making sure that we
24 were meeting some of our mandate with respect to
25 budget reductions, in overall DSM planning, making

1 sure the portfolio overall was cost-effective, and
2 achievement of our energy savings targets. And when
3 we're looking at the energy savings targets, that
4 certainly includes not only electric and natural gas
5 in isolation, but certainly, the -- the interactive
6 effect of that.

7 We also, of course -- and we presented
8 this within our submission on page 164 of our
9 submission -- you know, just to -- to make sure that
10 things were in line as well, this compares the -- the
11 budget, and I think you were referencing 70 percent of
12 the budget.

13 How does that align to the actual
14 energy consumption used by those individual customer
15 segments? And so this shows that, yes, we're spending
16 around 70 percent of the budget on the industrial,
17 agricultural, and commercial segment, and they're also
18 comprised about 66.1 percent of the energy consumption
19 using a 2017/'18. So that's an example on the -- the
20 electric side.

21 Again, not -- that wasn't the decision
22 point where we were trying to make sure that was
23 perfectly aligned. It was more making sure that it
24 was -- it was generally consistent and reasonable.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Am I fair in

1 suggesting to you or to the panel, then, that the --
2 the primary test and the overriding consideration
3 wasn't optimizing value for money, it was -- the
4 overriding consideration was all of the things that
5 you've just described and further elaborated in your
6 materials? Is that right?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I -- I think that
8 would be a fairly difficult statement to make. Say,
9 for example, if we were not achieving our energy
10 savings targets, if we were well below, that would
11 have indicated deficiencies within our portfolio, and
12 we would have had to -- to correct those.

13 Likewise, if our cost-effectiveness
14 tests -- say, for example, in both the electric and
15 natural gas portfolios -- were well below one (1),
16 again, I don't think we would have been comfortable
17 bringing those portfolios before -- before the PUB.

18 But given that our electric portfolio
19 is -- has a PACT ratio of 3.27 -- so benefits over
20 costs, extremely cost effective -- and our natural
21 gas portfolio, without interactive effects, is 1.24,
22 we feel we've achieved those objectives. So we do
23 feel that we are getting -- providing the benefits
24 versus the cost to Manitobans.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. Next

1 area I'm going to move into is DSM as a resource, and
2 if I can go to Board Book of Documents, page 33. I've
3 tried to use the Book of Documents as much as
4 possible. Thank you very much to Ms. Steinfeld and
5 Ms. Hart to have prepared it.

6 In Question F, there was a question.
7 It was if Efficiency Manitoba made the calculation
8 where the LIR (sic) -- so -- must be maintained at the
9 rate impact of zero at worst, what redesign would be
10 necessary to a three (3) year plan, and what savings
11 targets would be achieved? And then would the result
12 be the same if the RIM test was required to meet the
13 same conclusion, renewal adverse rate impact arising
14 from the three (3) year program?

15 One (1) of the reasons that question
16 was asked is that this Board will be required to rule
17 on whether or not the target should be lower or
18 higher. And if we can flip to the response to the
19 Question F, the response firstly notes that the target
20 would require amendment, and we're all agreed on that
21 because it would be the issue of a recommendation by the
22 PUB.

23 But the response was that this
24 Information Request requires a scenario analysis that
25 cannot be completed by Efficiency Manitoba with

1 reasonable effort in the time available. Am I getting
2 that right?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.
4 And so for the lifecycle revenue impact, as per the --
5 the regulations, we'd have to show the impact. I
6 think it's Section 11(g), where it states the im --
7 for the additional factors to be considered by the
8 PUB, whether the efficien -- whether the impact of the
9 ef -- or, what is the impact of the efficiency plan on
10 rates and average customer bill amounts? So we've
11 calculated the lifecycle revenue impact based on the
12 overall portfolio results.

13 So again, I think I've provided
14 previous testimony on this. This was done after the
15 overall portfolio was -- was developed. There was the
16 potential that we were -- if the LRI results
17 determined that something was other than what would
18 have been expected, that we could have gone back and
19 revised the portfolio. But because after the LRI was
20 determined, it seemed perfectly in line with what was
21 basically expected -- it showed a very modest or a low
22 rate impact on both the electric and natural gas
23 portfolios -- and so we didn't go back and revise the
24 portfolio based on that.

25 It's very similar to, actually, the

1 scenario analysis that was requested for, for example,
2 removing all non-cost effective por -- programs based
3 on a PACT test result so that, if you start doing
4 scenarios like that, then certainly you have to start
5 looking at things like not achieving your savings
6 targets, not satisfying hard -- perhaps not satisfying
7 the hard to reach customer segment, not being able to
8 provide continuity of programs to Manitobans.

9 And so, some of the other objectives
10 that were also considered would have to be sacrificed
11 if you went down that road.

12 There's also, of course, as we pointed
13 to this in this example, the physical time required to
14 actually create a scenario which yielded a zero
15 percent LRI result.

16 And again, just for clarity, what the
17 LRI metric is really doing, it's just looking at the
18 net present value, trying to balance the lost revenue
19 to Manitoba Hydro, the cost in -- that Efficiency
20 Manitoba will incur as a result of this three (3) year
21 plan and balance that by the benefits realized by
22 Manitoba Hydro through the marginal values.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
24 that answer, but I've got a time limit, and I need to
25 try and focus. So, I -- I just wanted to confirm that

1 you didn't have the time to do that analysis. That
2 was my question.

3 And if you would have just said, yes,
4 we didn't have the time, I would have been satisfied
5 with the answer.

6 The -- your answer would normally lead
7 me to ask a whole bunch of questions. Without doing
8 the analysis, I would suggest to you, sir, that you
9 really don't know what the results of the analysis
10 would be and how you would have to reorganize the
11 offerings in your plan.

12 Until you do that analysis, you don't
13 really know what the results are, sir, correct?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I guess I'm
15 probably going to upset you a little bit because this
16 answer may be a little longer than you're looking for,
17 but I think it's important context for the panel to
18 hear.

19 Certainly, from a purely academic
20 perspective, if we don't do the analysis, we don't
21 know the result. That makes perfect sense. I think,
22 directionally, we do. I think if we looked at the
23 PACT results for the program bundles and started
24 stripping out the highest PACT results -- or -- or the
25 highest cost programs from a levelized cost

1 perspective, or those with the lowest PACT ratio, we'd
2 directionally know what would happen.

3 We would be reducing residential
4 programming. We would perhaps be reducing income
5 qualified or Indigenous programming. Our targets
6 would go down. We would no longer be providing
7 continuity of programs. We wouldn't be reaching all
8 customer segments.

9 So -- so, directionally, I think we do
10 have a fairly good -- or conceptually, we have an idea
11 of what would happen if we ran that scenario.

12 I think it's probably worth spending a
13 bit of time, too, just to -- to understand what -- if
14 we, for example, were to put forward multiple
15 scenarios wi -- within our plan, that actually per --
16 would actually prevent so -- would pro -- pro -- would
17 create some challenges for Efficiency Manitoba.

18 I know there's been a lot of interest
19 in that. But one (1) of the advantages that
20 Efficiency Manitoba's approach has been is to take a
21 single portfolio approach, put that forward, and then
22 build in within the organization and within that plan
23 the flexibility and nimbleness.

24 And what that allows us to do is to
25 really have a specific target in mind of what we're --

1 we're trying to deliver. And the advantage of that
2 is, because we're trying to become operational in a
3 fairly short time line, it makes the decision making,
4 it makes the direction a lot clearer.

5 So, for example, if we had multiple
6 different portfolios that we were looking at and all
7 subject to the PUB Board approval, we would perhaps be
8 having three (3) separate portfolio scenarios or two
9 (2) different portfolio scenarios that we would be
10 trying to, for example, develop program materials for,
11 program marketing materials for.

12 When we are putting out RFPs, for
13 example, we'd have to build in contingencies. If, for
14 example, certain programs are not going to be approved
15 when we're doing organizational planning, certainly
16 for a staffing perspective, if there were different
17 scenarios or different portfolios that were put
18 forward in alternate port -- different portfolios and
19 some of those didn't include certain programs, there
20 could be staffing implications of all that.

21 And so, when you look at that different
22 optionality, it would also create a lot of potential
23 confusion and actually put a lot of risk on Efficiency
24 Manitoba if we didn't have a singular direction.

25 What I think we proposed instead is to

1 go in the direction of -- that we put forward in the
2 plan, basically take that action to deliver on that
3 portfolio but recognize that there's going to be
4 challenges and obstacles in the way.

5 And if we need to adjust, we have to be
6 ready to adjust so that, if the end outcome is a
7 little bit different than we're anticipating, we have
8 to be ready to adjust.

9 But I would suggest that, if we had
10 multiple scenarios or multiple alternative portfolios
11 in front of us at this point in time and we had to
12 wait until we received Board approval on one (1) of
13 those, that could potentially create an analysis
14 paralysis type of situation where it'd be very
15 difficult for us to start preparing to become
16 operational by April 1st, 2020.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I'll try to get
21 through my cross-examination by focussing a little bit
22 more. Just to -- and thank you for that answer, but
23 the purpose of the question is a bit different.

24 In integrated resource planning, we
25 look at standalone options and just decide what makes

1 sense, so that's why I was asking the question.

2 In (h) on page 33, again, the question
3 related to comparing plans or integrated resource.

4 (h) re -- requested:

5 "Please provide the date of the next
6 needed generation for energy
7 purposes reach of Manitoba per
8 latest resource planning reviews in
9 each jurisdiction."

10 Because there were different efficiency
11 targets. And if we could go to the answer...

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Please confirm
16 that that answer is still correct, that Efficiency
17 Manitoba does not possess information to analyse
18 resource planning in Manitoba.

19 Does that answer continue to be
20 correct?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Although I agree
22 that we're not able to analyse different res -- supply
23 resource options, again, we're just looking at the de
24 -- demand side management through our portfolio.

25 I think, because the question asked,

1 "Provide the dates of the next needed generation," I
2 guess I am now aware of what Manitoba Hydro has put
3 forward for -- in Manitoba Hydro 2017/'18, 2018/'19
4 General Rate Application under PUB MH I-57, the
5 revised version.

6 And I'll just point the Board to -- to
7 that. I'll -- I'll read it quickly. But in that IR,
8 Manitoba has responded that:

9 "Manitoba Hydro's current base
10 development sequence includes
11 significant projected DSM savings
12 and indicates a need date for new
13 resources in the 2039 to '40 time
14 frame."

15 But it also indicates that there's a
16 generation capacity marginal value as based on a
17 deferral of a peaking-type natural gas combustion
18 turbine built in 2031 -- or 20 -- 2030/2031.

19 And the 2030/'31 time frame corresponds
20 with the need date for new resources in Manitoba when
21 projected savings from new DSM beyond 2017 are removed
22 from the base planning sequence.

23 And so, my interpretation of that is
24 essentially that, without the forecasted DSM that
25 Manitoba Hydro is projecting, that their need date for

1 next resources would be 2030/'31.

2 With DSM included at that point in
3 time, their need date was moved out to 2039/2040. So,
4 I'd to provide that revised response to that IR then.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. And
6 that's new information that wasn't considered at that
7 time. If we go to (1), page 33, "Please provide a
8 copy of Manitoba Hydro's" -- sorry, it's re-deferring
9 Keeyask, and that's part of the regulatory analysis
10 questions.

11 If we go:

12 "Please indicate whether EM plan
13 supports or is necessary to achieve
14 deferral of need for Keelask --
15 Keeyask-like generation, noting when
16 the next development is needed
17 absent the three (3) year plan."

18 And you've answered that now. But as
19 of November 30, 2019, we see that the answer on the
20 next page for L was that:

21 "Efficiency Manitoba did not possess
22 the information to analyse resource
23 planning and is unable to answer
24 this Information Request."

25 Was that correct?

1 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

2 That was our response at the time and so the -- the
3 benefits that Manitoba Hydro realized from the
4 Efficiency Plan are all reflected within the marginal
5 values that were received by Manitoba Hydro.

6 And so that would be their valuation of
7 any deferral, of either generation distribution,
8 transmission, or however they determined their --
9 their marginal values.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we can
11 now go to MIPUG-EM, round 1, 16A to G. So 16, I'm not
12 -- I thought I had given that list to you, Ms.
13 Schubert. Maybe not. It's a series of questions on
14 the marginal value and timing for on peak and off peak
15 energy and capacity.

16 In designing its plan, did Efficiency
17 Manitoba look at each initiative to decide how it
18 helped meet the marginal value and timing of these
19 various factors shown as A through and including G on
20 the screen before you, which is part of that IR MIPUG
21 EM, first round 16 A to G.

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, could
23 you repeat the specific question there?

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Did Efficiency
25 Manitoba look at each initiative and its plan and

1 determine how it would help meet one or more of these
2 marginal value challenges?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So as -- as
4 stated in the rationale for the question, MIPUG was
5 seeking to understand how the marginal values provided
6 by Manitoba Hydro have evolved over time.

7 So that certainly is -- is outside the
8 knowledge and scope of -- of Efficiency Manitoba.

9 What I can confirm, and we went through
10 this yesterday in that same marginal value PUB IR from
11 the 2017/18 and 18/19 GRA, I can confirm that we
12 received a table that had the same column headings and
13 that was populated full of values.

14 I think it's on the next page, perhaps.
15 Yes.

16 And so we've -- we -- I can confirm
17 we've received a table of values that has the same
18 categories as this, and that every single measure
19 would have been run through base -- based on that --
20 the unique characteristics of each measure, basically
21 when it specifically saves energy, when it
22 specifically saves capacity.

23 The marginal values and the margin --
24 and the benefit to Manitoba Hydro would be done on a
25 measure-by-measure basis, and it would vary by

1 measure.

2 So I can confirm that we've certainly
3 considered all the values within this table and have
4 used that within our analysis.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. I
6 wasn't too sure how you could use it if you didn't
7 have knowledge of the tables, but you've clarified
8 that.

9 So you have this table before even
10 looking at your initiative?

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct,
12 we had the -- the value tables, that's correct. I
13 guess the most recent marginal value tables that again
14 has the same categories of benefits to Manitoba Hydro.

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So when did you
16 get this table?

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Prior -- prior
18 and during or during plan development. So before we
19 needed to, obviously, calculate all the cost
20 effectiveness tests, it was already built into our
21 spreadsheets.

22 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay.

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: And just to
24 clarify as well, that that is included within the
25 electronic work papers that have been provided to

1 Daymark.

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. I'm
3 moving on to energy efficiency potential studies.

4 Would you agree that these studies get
5 a formal estimate of the technical economic and
6 achievable energy savings for one or more program
7 measures by customer class over a specified number of
8 years in the future?

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We would agree
13 with that benefit of a potential study, and -- and
14 also add with significant input from local people and
15 local experts that have knowledge of the markets in
16 question.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And would you
18 also agree that these studies are done to assist in
19 program design, so as to include more efficient
20 equipment options and adjust incentives to maximize
21 cost effective participation?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would suggest

1 that market potential studies are a good -- give
2 Efficiency Manitoba a good indicator of where the
3 opportunities lie, and whether they have a technical
4 potential and -- and further, an economic potential,
5 and then finally an achievable potential.

6 I'm not sure or in past potential
7 studies I've been involved with whether incentive
8 levels get a -- as a scenario analysis that's provided
9 in the potential study.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay, thank you.
11 I -- do you agree that having these studies may assist
12 the boards that review them to establish annual and
13 cumulative regular tory -- targets or suggest
14 different targets should be considered?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Not completely.
16 I think I would say that a potential study is a -- is
17 a good study that will allow a refresh of where the
18 opportunities exist in the market.

19 It would also potentially give a level
20 of confidence in terms of the economics of different
21 levels of -- of potential opportunities in -- in
22 individual and aggregate.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So would I be
24 correct in framing it this way, a potential study
25 could inform new program choices, or the de --

1 redesign of programs or bundles? Is that what you're
2 getting to?

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I -- I think
4 that would be an accurate statement.

5 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. Maybe
6 I missed it, but I -- when I did word searches and I
7 looked -- read the material, I was paying particular
8 attention to see if there was any reference to
9 integrated resource planning, or IRP.

10 And in all the application materials
11 that I've seen, except for what has been raised by
12 advisory groups or other people, it was not shown as a
13 metric, which was guiding the creation of this plan,
14 that is integrated resource planning.

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I would
16 suggest that the 1.5 percent savings target was the
17 primary guide for creation of our plan.

18 We do recognize that demand side
19 management, as a resource, is a component that's
20 considered in an integrated resource plan, and clearly
21 Efficiency Manitoba is not in a position to be
22 assessing the other key components that are in
23 integrated resource plans, such as, you know, hydro
24 generating stations, gas combustion turbines, solar
25 wind, et cetera.

1 So, certainly not our expertise to
2 assess those other resource options.

3 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. Now,
4 I -- I don't know if it was yesterday or the day
5 before you referenced section 27(3) of the Act, and
6 including the role of the advisory group was to
7 provide advice about the development of the plan which
8 Efficiency Manitoba would put to this Board.

9 Did -- I -- I'm going to suggest to you
10 that at the Advisory Group meetings, the advice that
11 was being provided and the concerns that were being
12 raised is that there was a lack of alternative
13 portfolios to position Efficiency Manitoba for a move
14 to a more integrated resource planning process.

15 Do you agree?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Kristen, if you
20 -- Ms. Schubert, if you can go to page 491, I think,
21 of the filing.

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I maybe have my

1 reference wrong. Yeah. If you go to the bottom of
2 the screen, these are minutes of meetings of the
3 Advisory Groups that I'm showing to you. And at the
4 bottom, I'm quoting CAC, that would be the Coal --
5 Consumers' Coalition, correct?

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we went
8 back to page 488, we'd see it's the fifth meeting,
9 which was held in August. Maybe that's on page 4 --
10 yeah.

11 Is that correct?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So if we go back
14 to the page 491 at the bottom, and the concern
15 expressed by the Consumers' Group was that there was a
16 lack of alternative portfolios to position Efficiency
17 Manitoba to move to a more integrated resource
18 planning process, and further, that there hadn't been
19 public engagement on this matter.

20 So this integrated resource issue was
21 brought up by the Advisory Group participants,
22 correct?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'll absolutely
24 confirm that this was one (1) of the topics of
25 interest that was brought up by the EEAG. I -- when -

1 - when this group was struck up, we did hire a
2 facilitator to help with the -- the organization, the
3 structure of this group, develop -- and work with us
4 and the members to develop a terms of reference.

5 And one (1) of our objectives was in
6 order to conduct this group in an effective manner,
7 was that specifically, Efficiency Manitoba wasn't
8 always driving the agenda, but we were working
9 collaboratively in trying to meet the representat --
10 representatives within this group in the time and
11 space, and the -- and try to address the topics that
12 were of interest.

13 And -- and certainly I can confirm that
14 there were many topics of interest, including -- such
15 -- such as the IRP, integrated resource planning.
16 There were other topics such as climate change,
17 electrification.

18 Of course, those were all things that
19 were brought up through the EEAG about -- with respect
20 to our specific submission. We did have to rely on
21 the regulations in the Act, and the scope of what was
22 specifically required, kind of as a practical matter
23 in order to provide a -- a plan to the -- the PUB.

24 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you. And
25 -- and that's why it surprised me that this was, I'm

1 going to say, just dealt with as one (1) of the things
2 that was brought up, because I started this process by
3 looking at Section 41(c) of the legislation, which
4 requires as part of a mandate that Efficiency Manitoba
5 is to delay the point at which capital investments and
6 major new generation transmission projects will be
7 required by Manitoba Hydro.

8 And one (1) way to do that is this
9 integrated resource options. So it was just
10 considered by EM, as I understand your testimony, as
11 something that was brought up, correct?

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We did discuss it
13 at several meetings there, and certainly with respect
14 to mitigating the impact of rate increases due to
15 capital investment and major new transmission or -- or
16 generation. That's reflected directly within the
17 program administrator cost test and the use of the
18 Manitoba Hydro marginal values. That is the intent of
19 the use of those values.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: But no portfolio
24 alternatives, as was suggested, correct?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

4 And I've spent some time discussing the practical
5 nature and the benefits of only providing one (1)
6 portfolio.

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. If I go -
8 - sorry, Ms. Schubert, I'm going to go to -- because
9 I'm looking at the time -- Board Book of Documents,
10 page 132.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So here, the
15 explanation that was provided in an IR, on this same
16 kind of questioning was at number 2 that's highlighted
17 by Board counsel:

18 "Alternative DSM portfolio designs
19 were not possible due to the time
20 available for Plan development."

21 That was the response, correct?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That's correct.

23 And I believe in my response to PUB counsel, I believe
24 I was -- qualified this response in that my -- our
25 interpretation of that was it was alternative DSM

1 portfolio designs to hit different DSM targets, such
2 as 1 percent of energy on electric slide, or 2
3 percent. That was our interpretation of that question
4 based on I think the overall context that was
5 provided.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Would the same
7 answer hold true for different portfolio designs
8 keeping the same target?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Essentially, yes.
10 And as I've mentioned before, there's actually some
11 more strategic or risk mitigation advantage to having
12 a single portfolio, but willing to -- to adjust to a
13 single target.

14 So for example, if we are targeting one
15 point five (1.5) and need to make some adjustments
16 along the way, that is much easier to -- to handle
17 from implementation -- practical implementation
18 perspective rather than having three (3) very
19 different portfolios that essentially achieve a one
20 point five (1.5), our equivalent savings target.

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And don't get me
22 wrong, EM panel, I'm not criticizing this panel for
23 the fact that it didn't provide them because you had
24 limited staff, and limited time, and limited
25 resources, but one (1) of the things as Board's going

1 to have to consider is if we didn't have enough time
2 to do it in this hearing, whether it wants it for the
3 next hearing.

4 Now -- so you wouldn't have been able
5 to provide a different portfolio that met the same
6 targets, but at a lower cost by redistributing funds?

7 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As we've
8 mentioned before, certainly reallocating funds within
9 -- to create a new portfolio, I -- we don't feel would
10 have met some of our other criteria, like overall
11 inclusiveness, or maintaining continuity of the
12 programs, or other consideration such as those.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if I'm -- go
14 to...

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Now a couple
19 quick contact -- context questions. I think it was
20 acknowledged -- so I'm getting into the resource
21 planning issue again -- that the PUB had made
22 recommendations in its NFAT report that DSM must be
23 evaluated as a stand-alone resource in an integrated
24 resource planning process.

25 That was some of the things that we had

1 looked at prior to -- or in prior questions, correct?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Actually, no, I
3 don't believe that's correct. In looking at the NFAT
4 recommendations, it would app -- appear that the
5 recommendations were completely separate.

6 So their DSM recommendations related to
7 the establishment of a separate DSM entity. There
8 were DS -- demand-side management plans and programs
9 that also talked about the -- both the target, and
10 that separate entity.

11 And then there was a separate section,
12 I believe, that was titled Energy Policy, and that
13 gave some details on that section -- within that
14 section, framing an integrated resource planning
15 process for new generation in particular within
16 Manitoba. That was -- that was separate.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. You're
18 perhaps thinking of the end of the report. Sir, I was
19 speaking to the conclusions of the Panel which are in
20 front of you and follow on pages 91 and 92.

21 The first -- one (1) of the first
22 things on the bottom of the first paragraph:

23 "...the Panel's view, there are
24 ample reasons for playing -- placing
25 DSM measures on an equal footing

1 with supply resource options."

2 Do you see that?

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that's
4 correct. And I was referring to page 251 of that same
5 document.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if I could
7 refer you to further down, next paragraph, second
8 sentence:

9 "The purpose of an integrated
10 resource plan is to determine ana --
11 analytically what resource is in the
12 best interest of customers -- or
13 consumers, by examining the full
14 spectrum of supply side -- possible
15 supply side."

16 And this is where it's applicable to
17 us.

18 "And demand side options and
19 measuring them against a collective
20 set of objectives and criteria."

21 So what we don't have, I would suggest
22 to you, sir, is a full spectrum of possible demand
23 side options for this Board to consider, which what
24 (sic) it would take. Do you agree?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah. This --
4 this is specifically talking about the integrated
5 resource planning process, and I -- the -- the
6 legislation, the regulation, is fairly separate from
7 that.

8 If we go to page 251 for -- for a
9 second here to provide some context. So these were
10 some of the recommendations that were provided with
11 respect to demand side management plans and programs.

12 So if we scroll down, I think to number
13 6 down there. Yeah. So these are some of the
14 recommendations with respect specifically to DSM. So
15 as I mentioned, the divestment of Manitoba Hydro of
16 its responsibilities for demand side management, the
17 establishment of the 1.5 percent target, including
18 codes and standards.

19 And if we scroll down a bit further to
20 the next section, we see rates and ratepayer impacts.
21 And if we continue down from that -- I believe it's on
22 the next page. Yes. Actions in support of a clean
23 energy future.

24 And so these are some more energy
25 policy type recommendations that were put forward by

1 the Board at that time, and certainly the first
2 recommendation there, number 15, is:

3 "The Panel recommends that
4 integrated resource planning become
5 a cornerstone of a new clean energy
6 strategy for the Province of
7 Manitoba."

8 So to provide some context on
9 Efficiency Manitoba's perspective, we don't disagree
10 with any of these recommendations. I think what we're
11 struggling with a little bit is the assertion that our
12 submission of the DSM plan is equivalent to an
13 integrated resource plan.

14 I think the -- certainly if there was a
15 desire for the province to undertake an integrated
16 resource planning process, and that it was included
17 within our -- either legislation or regulation, for
18 example, that prescribed -- that are prescribed to
19 Efficiency Manitoba, we'd be a more than willing
20 participate within that process.

21 There would certainly be some practical
22 concerns with respect to the timing of those and how
23 it coincided with specifically the submission of our
24 separate DSM plan, but certainly we feel that it could
25 -- we welcome that opportunity to participate in it,

1 but we would see that as a distinct effort, requiring
2 a separate reco -- a separate -- either regulations --
3 within our regulations, directing us to -- to do that,
4 and a separate energy policy. And we would only be a
5 participant within that process. It would have to be
6 in concert with Manitoba Hydro of course.

7 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you for
8 that answer, sir. I wasn't suggesting that this would
9 be an integrated resource planning process. What I
10 was going to refer you to is page 92 of the PUB
11 Reasons for Decision and the NFAT decision -- so page
12 92, where this Board indicates that DSM has to be
13 evaluated as a stand-alone resource.

14 And the Panel agreed that Hydro did not
15 treat it that way, so later on in that same page it
16 concludes that it should be dealt with as a stand-
17 alone resource -- in a separate paragraph:

18 "It is clear: And DSM must be
19 evaluated as a stand-alone
20 resource."

21 So with that introduction, I would
22 then, sir, ask you the following question: If we are
23 dealing with it as a stand-alone resource, would we
24 not need to ask how much we need to invest?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm sorry, could

1 you restate that?

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: If we are
3 dealing with DSM as a stand-alone resource, would we
4 not have to ask ourselves the question, how much do we
5 invest?

6

7 (BRIEF PAUSE)

8

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think certainly
10 with respect to an integrated resource planning
11 process that was conducted by Manitoba Hydro or
12 facilitated by another group, yes, within that
13 framework DSM should be evaluated. Within that
14 framework, that seems reasonable.

15 Again, within these recommendations,
16 the PUB put forward a specific DSM target that then
17 made its way into our legislation, regulation, that
18 being the 1.5 percent.

19 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And if we treat
20 DSM as a stand-alone resource, would we not ask
21 ourself in what type of asset -- in this case, what
22 type of programs do we invest? You agree?

23 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I'm not sure if
24 that's necessarily true. My understanding of this is
25 a stand-alone resource in an integrated resource

1 planning process would be more the evaluation of
2 different targets perhaps, the evaluation of that, and
3 the cost of the DSM initiatives to -- to acquire those
4 different targets. So there'd be, for example, a 2
5 percent target.

6 For example, what would a portfolio of
7 programs look like, but it wouldn't necessarily be --
8 it would -- again, it would be the cost to achieve
9 that 2 percent and it would be analysed presumably
10 within that integrated resource planning process,
11 again a separate process led by or certainly
12 facilitated by other parties, most notably Manitoba
13 Hydro.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: For example,
15 sir, and I'll get back to the question in what type of
16 asset do we invest, you've told us that some programs
17 have bigger energy components, some have bigger
18 capacity components, and some of them deal with peaks
19 in different ways.

20 Don't we have to ask, if we're going to
21 do a stand-alone resource lens and we invest in a
22 particular program, is it going to help us deal with
23 the alternative resource, which is building a dam or
24 building a turbine?

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I think
4 Efficiency Manitoba would be certainly willing to
5 consider different definitions and interpretations if
6 a separate integration -- integrated resource planning
7 process was developed, and I would assume we'd be an
8 active participant in how those different targets or
9 scenarios were defined.

10 And so I'm struggling with how to
11 qualify that, but certainly again, if there was a
12 separate integrated resource planning process, I would
13 assume that how those different scenarios were
14 developed would be somehow defined through that
15 process.

16 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. I don't
17 think you're understanding my question. My question
18 is, in a stand-alone resource analysis, wouldn't we
19 ask the question what type of asset -- what kind of
20 asset do we invest? Wouldn't we ask that? I would
21 think the answer is "yes," but...

22 Because you need to know how you're
23 going to meet the load, so you have to ask the
24 question are we investing in assets that are going to
25 help us meet the load, both capacity and energy.

1 Isn't that right?

2 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Right, correct.

3 So that you would have to define within the integrated
4 resource planning process presumably what energy
5 savings you're targeting, what capacity savings you're
6 targeting, the date of those, for example, and then
7 you would develop a portfolio to achieve those.

8 I think I've -- may have finally
9 understood your question.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Yes. And -- and
11 so the same question, if you're dealing with DSM as a
12 stand-alone investment, you'd ask your question
13 exactly as you said. When do we make the investment,
14 as we do for a generating station? We think we're
15 going to need energy and capacity at a particular
16 time, when is the best time to make that investment?

17 Isn't that a question we ask ourselves?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I -- I think for
22 -- I think DSM is slightly different resource than a -
23 - a separate generation piece of resource, for
24 example, because it's not like a resource you can
25 simply install and then it's -- it's on or you can

1 ramp up and down. You need to make a -- a longer-term
2 investment.

3 And so again -- I -- I'm struggling
4 with your question a little bit because it needs to be
5 part of a longer-term strategy and I think the -- the
6 way the recommendations later on in energy policy
7 section of this have come across is -- it is --
8 integrating resource planning is contemplated in those
9 sections as being part of a longer-term energy
10 strategy.

11 And I think certainly with respect to -
12 - to DSM it's not about necessarily hitting an energy
13 or savings target in a given year, but it's that
14 longer-term perspective as well and not -- and there's
15 risks associated with if you were to, for example, not
16 do DSM in one year, but then assume in the next year
17 you could do 1.5 or 2 percent and then go back down to
18 1 percent.

19 DSM is a -- a different type of
20 resource, you can't readily do that. It has to be a -
21 - a smoothed out so that you -- you're not sending
22 mixed signals to -- to the market.

23 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: I'll move on.
24 Wouldn't you also be interested in knowing if it's
25 treated as a stand-alone resource, that's DSM, the

1 expected duration of that resource?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Can you repeat
3 the question, or reframe it, please? I'm --

4 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: If DSM is a
5 stand-alone resource, it's going to compete with other
6 resources, don't you need to know the expected
7 duration of the program in that resource?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that makes
9 sense.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. And if
11 you're doing a stand-alone resource and you're going
12 to put it into the mix, you need to be aware of the
13 other resources currently in the system, so that it
14 can mesh with that other resource, correct?

15 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, absolutely.
16 Manitoba Hydro would have to consider that within
17 their resource planning process.

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And you're
19 saying Efficiency Manitoba is not interested in being
20 aware of the other resources which it's going to have
21 to compete with?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As I've already
23 stated, Efficiency Manitoba would welcome the
24 opportunity to par -- participate in a separate
25 integrated resource planning process.

1 So to that effect, we're of course
2 interested in it, but from a resource planning
3 perspective I think Manitoba Hydro would obviously
4 have more of a vested interest in the supply side
5 measures in particular.

6 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And the last
7 question in this area. Wouldn't you be interested, if
8 you're doing DSM as a stand-alone resource, to know
9 the load and the chara -- characteristics of that
10 load?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Can you clarify
15 if you're talking about the -- the overall Manitoba
16 Hydro load or are you talking about specific load
17 profiles of, like, a DSM portfolio, for example?

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: The overall
19 Manitoba Hydro load that needs to be dealt with.
20 Don't you need to know that if you're going to deal
21 with DSM as a stand-alone resource?

22 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So certainly
23 Manitoba Hydro would consider DSM potentially as a
24 stand-alone resource when they're doing resource
25 planning.

1 With respect to the timing of load, I
2 think if -- if what you're getting at is when there's
3 most value to Manitoba Hydro for, say winter peaking
4 requirements, those -- that value to Manitoba Hydro
5 would actually be reflected to the marginal values
6 that have been provided by Manitoba Hydro to
7 Efficiency Manitoba and used in the program
8 administrator cost test.

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And if I could
10 just add, I believe the instructions here, with DSM
11 being treated as a stand-alone resource, were -- were
12 made to Manitoba Hydro, knowing obviously that
13 Manitoba Hydro would be the one that would be doing
14 the integrated resource planning process.

15 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So I'm trying to
16 see how you think this would work then. I didn't
17 think I was going to ask another question, but --

18 Efficiency Manitoba does things on its
19 own without considering all the other resources and
20 without considering all the load characteristics and
21 how those need to be met.

22 And then it's going to hand over,
23 here's my DSM package, make it fit.

24 Is that how it's supposed to work?

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So certainly the

1 benefits to Manitoba Hydro are again reflected in the
2 marginal values.

3 With respect to our prescribed energy
4 savings targets, we've got a mandated savings target,
5 so certainly we'll have -- we've endeavoured and put
6 forward a plan that achieves those and -- and achieves
7 other, many other objectives that we've -- we've
8 talked about.

9 We will, of course, be handing that
10 information, as you said, over to Manitoba Hydro, and
11 they'll be incorporating that as they're aware of our
12 savings target. They'll be aware of our portfolio and
13 the impact of that.

14 If there was a separate process led by,
15 for example, Manitoba Hydro, for an integrated
16 resource planning process, again Efficiency Manitoba
17 would welcome the opportunity to participate in that
18 with the caveat that it would be important to make
19 sure that coincided with the planned development cycle
20 so that it wasn't, for example, happening at the exact
21 same time, so that we weren't trying to develop, for
22 example, other savings target portfolios in any IRP-
23 type context, and at the same time trying to put
24 forward a 1.5 percent savings plan to the PUB.

25 So the timing of those would have to be

1 carefully coordinated so that there wasn't a situation
2 where we couldn't put forward a plan forward.

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And if I could
4 just add further about what we are aware of that's
5 happening in other jurisdictions in -- in Nova Scotia,
6 for example.

7 The DSM entity there produces a market
8 potential or a conservation potential study, which
9 gives varying levels of efficiency options at varying
10 levels of costs. And that component actually feeds
11 into the integrated resource planning process of the
12 utility.

13 So there's an option of where Man -- or
14 Efficiency Manitoba could feed into that process in
15 the future and as Mr. Stocki has testified to, we --
16 we do plan on having a conservation potential study
17 completed in the next two years.

18 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Mr. Chairperson,
19 I probably am about another ten minutes, depend -- I
20 have a couple questions on bill impact. I don't know
21 how long it's going to -- when I ask the question how
22 long it's going to take for the answers.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, we'll give you
24 ten (10) minutes, Mr. Hacault.

25 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay, thank you.

1 Page 353 of the Book of Documents.
2 There was a question a) asked by PUB of Efficiency
3 Manitoba to calculate residential bill impacts with
4 the types of schedules that are usually used in
5 Manitoba Hydro and Centra and their GRA filings.

6 And could we go to the response?

7 The response indicated that Efficiency
8 Manitoba was advised by Hydro that the information
9 required was not currently available.

10 My question would be whether you're
11 willing to undertake to ask Manitoba Hydro again, and
12 if the information is available, to provide it. The
13 answer to question number a), asked by the PUB
14 advisors.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We will
19 undertake to inquire with Manitoba Hydro to see if
20 there's an update to that.

21 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And -- and to
22 provide the answer, if the answer is available?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: So if I could
2 put my request maybe a bit clearer, I'm not too sure
3 whether it was clear.

4 At the -- at page 353 of the Board Book
5 of Documents, there is IR PUB EM1-22, there is
6 question a). I am asking an undertaking that
7 Efficiency Manitoba ask Manitoba Hydro whether it can
8 now answer question a), so ask.

9 And if Manitoba Hydro provides that
10 information, to provide that information as requested
11 in the question.

12 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes, I can
13 confirm we'll take that undertaking.

14

15 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 8: At page 353 of the Board
16 Book of Documents, there is IR PUB-
17 EM1-22, there is question a).
18 Efficiency Manitoba to ask Manitoba
19 Hydro whether it can now answer
20 question a), so ask.

21 And if Manitoba Hydro provides that
22 information, to provide that
23 information as requested in the
24 question.

25

1 CONTINUED BY MR. ANTOINE HACAULT:

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. Now, a
3 couple questions on understanding marginal benefits.

4 As Mr. Stocki indicated, Keeyask will
5 create an -- or deal with energy until 2039/2040, and
6 capacity until 2040/41, based on some DSM being
7 provided.

8 I would suggest that the general effect
9 -- or the effect of a general system surplus means
10 that the marginal benefits are likely arising from
11 changes in export transactions, not from serving new
12 customers and not from avoiding capital costs.

13 Do you agree?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Again referring
18 back to the table that Manitoba Hydro provide, there's
19 also components of the transmission and distribution
20 deferral value under winter peak capacity conditions
21 in particular.

22 And so, I wouldn't agree with that
23 statement because those are additional considerations
24 within those values, and they do impact the -- the
25 benefit stream in the PACT test in particular.

1 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. So, your
2 qualification to my question is that the marginal
3 benefits don't exclusively arise from changes in
4 export transactions because we also have to look at
5 the transmission and distribution components?

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We consider all
7 the -- the column headings in the marginal values that
8 were provided, so those also include generation
9 capacity as well.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Would you agree
11 the main benefit from Manitoba Hydro's perspective in
12 energy savings is that it is the revenue it gets from
13 the freed up energy on the export market?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I can't provide a
15 comment on Manitoba Hydro's perspective.

16 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. Thank
17 you. Do you agree that Efficiency Manitoba has
18 described its life cycle revenue metric as a
19 directional estimate?

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes. I think
21 we've qualified it as a proxy or a directional
22 estimate. Again, because we're unable to complete the
23 complex financial modelling that's required to do a
24 full General Rate Application, the proper cost
25 allocation between customer classes, we've instead

1 provided the lifecycle revenue impact.

2 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. And do
3 you agree that revenue loss calculations include
4 revenue loss from programs but do not include the
5 impacts of revenue losses from codes and standards?
6 That's at page 403 of the Board Book of Documents.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: It's at the
11 bottom, answer (h).

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, that's
13 correct.

14 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And do you agree
15 that codes and standard savings are mostly in the
16 residential sector? That's the heavy -- the heavier
17 weighting for that?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, for a
22 specific reference, there's MIPUG EM I-6 that has the
23 breakdown of commercial and residential -- well, also
24 industrial, agricultural Indigenous energy savings.

25 And so, in that, if you look at the

1 commercial, there's the -- it's on the savings, so
2 it's on page 4 of that IR. Perfect.

3 So, there's the codes and standards
4 savings under the commercial sector. And so, there,
5 for example, in year -- let's just take year 1, for
6 example, it's 33.79. And if we scroll down under the
7 residential sector, that is listed as 54.19, so it's -
8 - no, I would not agree that it's mostly in the
9 residential.

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Okay. The
11 numbers are -- the numbers are what they are. In any
12 event, whatever energy is freed would then be
13 available for sale on the export market, correct?

14 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: As we understand
15 that as one (1) outcome of our energy savings,
16 correct.

17 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And
18 directionally, excluding the revenue loss from codes
19 and standards, whether it's in commercial or
20 residential, I would suggest, causes an under
21 estimation of the extent of the rate impact?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, if you

1 recall, the LRI calculation considered the balance
2 between the loss revenue, cost to EM, and the -- the
3 marginal benefits to Manitoba Hydro.

4 So, although it's true that it would
5 potentially increase the lost revenue, it would also
6 increase the benefits to Manitoba Hydro if we
7 accounted for that in the benefits, so it wouldn't be
8 just all lost revenue changes there.

9 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And we've -- I
10 don't have much time, but we've seen in prior hydro
11 hearings that, if we're losing eight (8) cents from
12 the residential sector and you're getting two (2) to
13 three (3) cents on your export market, you've got a
14 six (6) cent differential.

15 So, any analysis we've done at DSM
16 means that, apart from the benefits on bill
17 reductions, is always costing. It's not a -- you
18 don't get as much on the export revenue as you're
19 losing on the domestic market.

20 Do you -- do you know that?

21 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: I agree with that
22 directionally, although I wouldn't agree with the
23 magnitude of the numbers. I think it would depend on
24 the exact load provide of the specific codes and
25 standards savings and when their marginal values

1 actually aligned with the marginal values provided by
2 Manitoba Hydro.

3 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: And there's one
4 (1) undertaking I'd like to ask for, and then end my
5 questioning. If I go to page 402 of the Book of
6 Documents.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: There were two
11 (2) -- there were tables that were provided by
12 Efficiency Manitoba both respect to gas and electric.
13 And the -- for the electric side, I would ask if the
14 table could be updated for both the five (5) year and
15 ten (10) year metric using four point five (4.5) cents
16 per kilowatt hour.

17 So, in addition to the ten (10) cent,
18 eight (8) cent, and six (6) cent number, I'd ask if
19 you could undertake to produce -- recreate the table,
20 adding an additional line using the four point five
21 (4.5) cents per kilowatt hour both for the ten (10)
22 year time period and the five (5) year time period.

23 Can you do that?

24 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes, we can do
25 that. Thank you.

1

2 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 9: For Efficiency Manitoba to
3 recreate the table, adding
4 an additional line using
5 the four point five (4.5)
6 cents per kilowatt hour
7 both for the ten (10) year
8 time period and the five
9 (5) year time period

10

11 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Thank you very
12 much, members of the Board.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.
14 Hacaault. So, we will break for lunch until 1:50.
15 Thank you.

16

17 --- Upon recessing at 12:48 p.m.

18 --- Upon resuming at 1:54 p.m.

19

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Mr.
21 Wheeler...?

22

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JARED WHEELER:

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chair.

1 Once again, by way of brief
2 introduction, my name is Jared Wheeler. With me is
3 Mr. Markus Bucharth. As you know, we are legal counsel
4 to MKO in this hearing.

5 Before we begin, on behalf of our
6 client, we would say good day to the Board and to
7 everyone in the room with us this morning, as well as
8 good morn -- or, good day to everyone monitoring this
9 hearing online. And we would like to also thank the
10 Board for granting our client this opportunity today
11 to test the evidence of Efficiency Manitoba on the
12 record today through cross-examination.

13 Thank you to the panel from Efficiency
14 Manitoba for joining us so we can ask some questions,
15 with our intention to hopefully further everyone's
16 understanding of -- of Efficiency Manitoba's initial
17 three (3) year Efficiency plan.

18 We've been paying careful attention to
19 the questions asked by Board counsel and our fellow
20 Interveners already. We are going to certainly try
21 our best to ensure we don't duplicate any questions.
22 We don't intend to overlap, but there maybe some
23 foundational similarities with a different anticipated
24 trajectory.

25 I will also preface our questions this

1 afternoon by saying we're not 100 percent sure which
2 member or members of the panel will be answering our
3 questions. Please forgive me if I direct a question
4 to an incorrect person. For this reason, some of our
5 questions will be posed to the panel generally, as
6 we've seen other Interveners have done, and we're
7 hoping the most appropriate person will answer.

8 With that, we'd like to dive right in
9 to the -- what I'll call the deep end here and start
10 with some questions on the broad topic of engagement,
11 specifically engagement with northern First Nations.
12 Again, please forgive the derivative foundational
13 questions. I'm sure we can move through them fairly
14 quickly.

15 So first, would you agree that it is
16 Efficiency Manitoba's position that the plan, as
17 presented, achieves the savings targets through a new
18 approach to customer segment programming and
19 comprehensive engagement?

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, we would
21 agree with that assertion.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: And you would
23 agree that Efficiency Manitoba plans to customize
24 marketing, engagement, and delivery efforts based on
25 unique and diverse customer segment needs.

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is our
2 intention.

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: And of course,
4 then one of the customer segments in the plan is the
5 Indigenous customer segment, and encompassed within
6 the Indigenous customer segment, among others, are
7 First Nation on-reserve residential customers.

8 Is that correct?

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is one (1)
10 of the segments in the Indigenous segment.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: And you would
12 agree that that includes First Nation customers in
13 both southern and northern Manitoba.

14 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That would be
15 how we understand it.

16 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so please bear
17 with me. I'm going to review some of the record with
18 you as it pertains to Efficiency Manitoba's engagement
19 to date specifically with Northern First Nations.

20 Ms. Schubert, if we can please bring up
21 on the screens MKO IR number 9, 1-9, please.

22 And here we had asked Efficiency
23 Manitoba to:

24 "Please prepare and provide a table
25 showing the public engagement that

1 Manitoba Hydro staff conducted at
2 the request of Efficiency Manitoba
3 with each of the MKO member First
4 Nations."

5 I assume we had probably provided a
6 list of the MKO member First Nations to make it a
7 little easier in the preamble. We don't really need
8 to go there, but we had asked Efficiency Manitoba to:
9 "Please include the type of
10 engagement, the number of community
11 participants, topics discussed, et
12 cetera.

13 Now, can you please confirm that I've -
14 - I've set out our ask appropriately today?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Sorry, in -- do
16 you mean your ask in this IR, or --

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: Yes.

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: -- you asked a
19 subsequent question?

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: No, no, just --
21 I'm -- I'm paraphrasing that properly.

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay, yeah. So
23 the -- one of the -- I'd just like to preface this
24 particular IR. I believe this was pertaining
25 specifically to the stakeholder survey that we had

1 conducted that was done with our delivery partners and
2 channel -- channelled suppliers and installers, to
3 which, I believe, if -- if I -- I don't want to guess
4 at what's in AMC/EM-1-9, but I believe that we said we
5 weren't -- did not have the ability to break down
6 which of those suppliers -- because it is an anonymous
7 survey -- which of those suppliers would have been
8 First Nation suppliers, if I have that --

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: We will certainly
10 be going to AMC 1-9 in -- in a moment.

11 I'm just going to ask you again, this -
12 - this IR doesn't specify anything about stakeholder
13 survey. It doesn't specify anything about EEAG.

14 If we can roll up a little bit, Ms.
15 Schubert.

16 It specifically asks to:

17 "Prepare and provide a table showing
18 the public engagement with each of
19 the MKO member First Nations."

20 Full stop. Is that correct?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, and then
22 the pre -- the first part of that sentence seems to be
23 quoting an aspect of our filing which was the public
24 engagement that Manitoba Hydro staff conducted at the
25 request of Efficiency Manitoba through the spring of

1 2019, which -- I'm not sure if that was intentional or
2 -- but that -- that's exactly how we word it in our
3 submission, and it was pertaining to that stakeholder
4 survey. Unless, of course, that was not intended to
5 replicate how our filing was submitted.

6 MR. JARED WHEELER: It was a reference
7 to the filing. That is true.

8 Maybe now can we go to AMC number 9?

9 As our client feels we didn't really
10 receive an answer to this IR request, we were directed
11 to -- to IR number 9 from AMC, and then we see that
12 AMC had asked:

13 "Can Efficiency Manitoba confirm
14 that --"

15 Oh, no, pardon me. For the engagement
16 conducted my -- by Manitoba Hydro staff, if we're
17 looking at 'B':

18 "How many engagement activities did
19 Efficiency Manitoba conduct as part
20 of its stakeholder engagement?"

21 And so if we go to the answer of 'B',
22 and we're directed to Coalition/EM-1-29 for a list of
23 engagement activities.

24 You would agree with me that this,
25 then, says that this list is not exhaustive of all

1 engagement but id -- identifies many examples,
2 correct?

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: It's correct
4 that it says that, but I -- I apologize. I think I
5 lost you in the preamble. I -- I missed the preamble
6 to this, so I'm -- I just want to make sure I'm
7 contexting this correctly. So I missed the preamble
8 to this AMC/EM-1-9.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Ms.
10 Schubert. So we were referred to this in response to
11 our question of please provide us a table of the
12 engagement with northern First Nations. We were
13 referred to -- in a respon -- in that -- in the
14 response to that, to this IR.

15 This IR, I would suggest, then, points
16 us to Coalition IR 1-29. Is that -- is that correct?

17 MS. AMY TUCK: That's correct.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. Now,
19 if we also see here, we see in c):

20 "Engagement activities such as
21 emails, meetings, and phone
22 conversations are part of the
23 regular work and are not tracked on
24 a daily basis, and therefore, an
25 exhaustive list cannot be produced."

1 Is that correct?

2 MS. AMY TUCK: That's correct.

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Tuck, I'm
4 going to be asking you some further question about
5 this in a bit. For now, after listing that off, then,
6 we see references to the Indigenous Housing Capacity
7 Enhancement and Mobilization Initiative Working Group,
8 correct?

9 MS. AMY TUCK: That's what it says,
10 yes.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Okay. Now, I'm
12 going to ask very specifically, would you agree with
13 me that in this IR response that we do not actually
14 have information about engagement that has taken place
15 with MKO member First Nations directly?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. AMY TUCK: Sorry, Mr. Wheeler.
20 Could you please repeat that question?

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Certainly. My
22 question is can you confirm that neither the response
23 to MKO RI -- IR number 9 or the response to AMC IR
24 number 9 -- neither of those provides any information
25 about engagement with MKO member First Nations

1 directly?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. AMY TUCK: Sorry, this is my -- my
6 confusion from -- from the onset is -- if I can go to
7 the top of AMC 9.

8

9 Yeah, so -- so the preamble for this
10 particular question -- and I apologize if -- if -- if
11 you don't feel that Efficiency Manitoba responded
12 accordingly -- but this particular preamble was
13 pertaining specifically to the supplier, stakeholder
14 survey.

14

15 So I think maybe that's why we're
16 getting tripped up between suppliers versus individual
17 First Nations communities, I'm presuming.

17

And I --

18

MR. JARED WHEELER: Can --

19

MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Sorry.

20

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you possibly
22 tell me why this was what we referred to in response
23 to MKO IR Number 9, when we were asking specifically
24 about direct engagement with MKO member First Nations?

24

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Right. And I
think that's because I -- I had noticed that the

1 sentence that you had referred to at the front end of
2 the MKO question pertained specifically to the aspect
3 of our filing, that was the direction that we were
4 given to Manitoba Hydro, and I'll ask my colleagues to
5 find the PDF page on that, that we were given to our
6 colleagues to track some of the engagement results was
7 pertaining specifically to the stakeholder survey,
8 which was the suppliers and delivery and channel
9 partners.

10 And if you give me a moment, we'll
11 check that PDF reference.

12 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, we have
13 that PDF reference. So if you scroll up to the
14 preamble there, I think this is the -- the point of
15 confusion. Even right there, yes. At PDF pages 100
16 to 101 of the plan, Efficiency Manitoba states, and
17 then it -- it talks about the stakeholder engagement
18 surv -- or summary.

19 And if you go to that PDF, the first
20 item in that section 3.32 on page 100 is the
21 stakeholder engagement survey.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Schubert, if
23 we could scroll a bit further down here now to the
24 actual question.

25 Now, coming right back to "with each of

1 the MKO member First Nations", okay this.

2 "Please prepare and provide a table
3 showing the public engagement that
4 Manitoba Hydro staff conducted at
5 the request of Efficiency Manitoba
6 throughout spring of 2019 with each
7 of the MKO member First Nations."

8 Now, do we see that in the response to
9 AMC 9?

10 MS. AMY TUCK: No, we don't. So, to
11 be clear, this question, MKO 1 -- or I-9, Manitoba
12 Hydro had not been directed by Efficiency Manitoba to
13 conduct public engagement with MKO member First
14 Nations, because it was understood that MKO was being
15 represented during the EEAG and that is why outside
16 individual engagement with each individual First
17 Nation did not occur.

18 It was understood that, or hoped, that
19 the representation would be covered during the EEAG
20 with MKO's representation there.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: So then, Ms. Tuck,
22 I would take your answer very specifically to mean
23 that Efficiency Manitoba did not engage directly with
24 the MKO member First Nations individually, correct?

25 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. And
2 Ms. Tuck you had testified yesterday in response to
3 AMC's counsel that a lot of the information about
4 engagement activities outside of the EEAG was
5 anecdotal and not documented.

6 Is that correct?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: That is what I said,
8 yes.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, we're not
10 looking for an exhaustive list, but in -- in -- in
11 preparing the three (3) year plan, between the -- the
12 outside of Efficiency Manitoba's work and -- and
13 sitting here today, has there been even one time
14 direct contact with each MKO member First Nation?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. AMY TUCK: Without going through
19 all of my emails, records, and everything that I have,
20 I can probably say off the top of my head that in the
21 time frame -- can you again, Mr. Wheeler, tell me the
22 time frame that you're referring to?

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: I'm referring to
24 the time when Efficiency Manitoba has been essentially
25 created to today.

1 MS. AMY TUCK: There have been
2 instances, yes. There has been occurrences where I
3 have been in contact with MKO member communities to
4 discuss initiatives and what we were doing in the plan
5 and energy efficiency initiatives.

6 Yes, there have been instances.
7 They've not been ignored.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: Would you suggest
9 that that's been with each individual MKO member First
10 Nation?

11 MS. AMY TUCK: I don't believe that it
12 has been with every single MKO member community, no.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: And now I -- I
14 have a question that is going to feel like I'm going
15 off track, but I assure you I'm not.

16 You recall, Ms. Tuck, in response to
17 AMD counsel yesterday that you had referred to a
18 dedicated First Nation energy advisor?

19 MS. AMY TUCK: That's correct, yes.

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: And you'll confirm
21 that the plan right now is that this will be one
22 position?

23 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: Do you know if
25 that would be an employee or a contractor?

1 MS. AMY TUCK: At this current time it
2 is planned to be an Efficiency Manitoba employee.

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you say at
4 this time whether that employee will be required to
5 document all interactions with each First Nation?

6 MS. AMY TUCK: I can say that that
7 will be a requirement going forward for all employees
8 at Efficiency Manitoba.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, I'm -- I'm
10 going to ask a little bit about this -- the Manitoba
11 Indigenous housing capacity enhancement and
12 mobilization initiative working group. Long title.
13 Bit of a mouthful.

14 MS. AMY TUCK: You can just refer to
15 it as the housing working group.

16 MR. JARED WHEELER: That's so much
17 easier. The housing working group.

18 On Tuesday Ms. Steinfeld had asked some
19 questions about this housing working group. I
20 believe, if you can confirm for me, Ms. Tuck, I
21 believe it was you that had said that -- you stated
22 that the last meeting of that working group was in
23 November. Is that right?

24 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct, with
25 the next meeting slated for February. So next month,

1 like I said in my testimony yesterday.

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in IR
3 responses, it was referred to that Efficiency Manitoba
4 has requested to be a part of that working group.

5 Can you tell me if that request has
6 been approved?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: Sorry, I -- I missed
8 the beginning. Can you please repeat that?

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: So the working
10 group, in IR responses, specifically Coalition IR 129,
11 but I believe it's in other IR responses as well, it
12 says one (1) particular engagement activity to note is
13 the request of Efficiency Manitoba to be a part of the
14 housing working group.

15 So I'm just looking to find out now has
16 that request to be a part of that working group, has
17 that been approved? Is Efficiency Manitoba an
18 official part of that working group?

19 MS. AMY TUCK: We are a part of that
20 working group, and the request didn't become -- the
21 request wasn't a request from Efficiency Manitoba to
22 be a part of it. The request was from the First
23 Nation working group that Efficiency Manitoba, or
24 previously Manitoba Hydro, be a part of the working
25 group.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you tell me
2 what capacity Efficiency Manitoba is as a part of that
3 working group? Is Efficiency Manitoba a presenter, an
4 equal partner?

5 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes. So in that
6 working group we sit in on the working group meetings,
7 we present, we talk about potential opportunities, it
8 is -- yes, we -- it is -- we are a -- a working member
9 of the group, I would say.

10 MR. JARED WHEELER: In response to one
11 of our IRs about this working group, I don't know if
12 we need to bring it up on the screen, probably not.
13 But MKO IR 12, Efficiency Manitoba had referred to --
14 well, we had asked whether Efficiency Manitoba plans
15 to develop and implement programs to improve building
16 designs, building techniques and building technologies
17 to increase energy efficiency of buildings on First
18 Nation reserves, including those in Northern Manitoba.

19 In the response, Efficiency Manitoba
20 referred to the working group and the working group's
21 objective of creating a First Nations building code.

22 So we're looking in -- probably the
23 response to B on the next page. I'm wrong. If we
24 could scroll up a bit, Ms. Schubert. Thank you.
25 Right towards the end of A, working group to support

1 their objective of creating a First Nations building
2 code.

3 Really, my question is just is there
4 anything -- has that building code been created
5 already? What's the status of the building code?

6 MS. AMY TUCK: It has not been created
7 and it -- my understanding is it will be something we
8 discuss at the next working group housing meeting, in
9 February.

10 So I -- I cannot provide an update.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Okay, thank you.
12 Maybe I'm going to turn to some questions about the --
13 the Energy Efficiency Advisory Group, the EEAG. As
14 Mr. Hacault pointed out, there's a lot of acronyms, so
15 I'll try to use them as best as we can.

16 Of course now you would agree that on
17 the EEAG there -- there was First Nation
18 representation, correct?

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: First off now, I'm
21 -- I'm interested in how this working group or
22 advisory group, pardon me, was -- was struck.

23 In response to questions from Ms. Dilay
24 yesterday, Efficiency Manitoba mentioned a public
25 participation expert to assist with the EEAG.

1 Is that correct?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.
3 We contracted with a third party contractor to
4 facilitate those sessions on our behalf.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so that public
6 participation expert facilitated the sessions as well
7 as assisted with striking and populating the EEAG, is
8 that correct?

9 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is not
10 correct.

11 The selection of who was to be part of
12 the EEAG was Efficiency Manitoba's responsibility.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Kuruluk, can
14 you tell me if the consultant, the public
15 participation expert, is -- is that person referred to
16 anywhere in the plan?

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: My apologies,
21 I'm back.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, welcome
23 back.

24 All -- all I'm asking, really, is
25 whether the public participation expert is -- was that

1 person referred to anywhere in the plan?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Well, I do
3 believe that we had an appendices to our plan that
4 provided all the meeting notes, et cetera.

5 So, you'll see from there it's one, --
6 I'll just get the PDF page reference.

7

8 (BRIEF PAUSE)

9

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So the PDF page
11 reference starts with the terms of reference for group
12 on page 449. And page 451 is where the -- we have
13 filed the meeting notes from that particular set of
14 meetings that we had in the spring/summer of 2019.

15 MR. JARED WHEELER: Yes, I --

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Unless I've
17 missed your question. I'm sorry.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: To a certain
19 extent, yes, I -- I am going to be asking about the
20 terms of reference, as well as these very meeting
21 notes on the screen.

22 But I would like to know if the public
23 participation expert is referred to anywhere in the
24 plan. That consultant.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So we're trying
4 to find the page reference where the specific
5 facilitator, I guess, is mentioned. Obviously the
6 company we have found, but apparently in the meeting
7 minutes -- oh, I can see on page 461, PDF page, as an
8 example. I think meeting attendees were part of the -
9 - the meeting minutes, and so items number 2 and 3 on
10 that particular page reference the individuals that
11 were responsible for the facilitation of these
12 meetings.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: I see. And that -
14 - those facilitators, those are the public
15 participation experts? That's correct?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Number 3,
17 Michelle Kuly, is the one that's certified in the IAP2
18 facilitation.

19 Etoile Stewart was the meeting minute
20 taker, so I -- I don't know for certain she was, but
21 Michelle was the one that led the sessions.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: So would you --
23 would you agree with me that there is nowhere on the -
24 - in the Plan itself where somebody reading the Plan
25 would know that those are public participation

1 experts?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I suspect that
3 could be a detail that we did not include in the plan.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you tell me of
5 Blueprint Inc., or any other public participation
6 experts have been engaged by Efficiency Manitoba for
7 any other project?

8 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I can say that
9 Blueprint, this is the only engagement they've had
10 with Efficiency Manitoba at this point.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: And has Efficiency
12 Manitoba engaged any other public participation
13 experts since this project or before this project?

14 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, not since
15 this project. This -- this particular engagement was
16 occurring between May and September of this past year.
17 So, understandably, by the time September rolled
18 around, there -- we were fully engaged in our
19 finalization of our Plan and the PUB review process.

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: Well, maybe since
21 we're right here in these meeting notes, Ms. Schubert,
22 can we put on the screen PDF page 454?

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: And now, if you
2 can go just a little bit further down, I want to see
3 this bullet where it says there are twenty-six (26)
4 communities represented by MKO. And now you -- you'd
5 agree with me that it says here in this bullet --
6 first off, these are meeting notes from the first
7 meeting of the EEAG.

8 Would you agree with me on that, Ms.
9 Kuruluk?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: From May 31st,
14 2019?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I would
16 agree. May 31st is the first meeting.

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. And
18 would you agree with me that MKO noted in the first
19 meeting that:

20 "There was interest in seeing how
21 First Nations get engaged in a
22 meaningful, not token way"?

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, I see that
24 there.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: So you would agree

1 with me, then, that Efficiency Manitoba has been aware
2 since May 31st, 2019 that meaningful engagement with
3 First Nations is a concern of MKO?

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. That's
5 correct. And that's why we felt that MKO was a
6 critical member to have on our EEAG, and subsequent
7 meetings that we had in person with the leadership of
8 SCO, as well as the MKO representative on the EEAG
9 served to facilitate additional ways that Efficiency
10 Manitoba can engage with the -- these communities once
11 we get to the point of implementing our Plan.

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Ms.
13 Kuruluk. Ms. Schubert, can we please bring up PDF
14 page 481.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: And Ms. Kuruluk,
19 you would agree that on the screen are notes from
20 another meeting of the EEAG?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I would.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: And -- and Ms.
23 Schubert, if we go right to the bottom of this page,
24 we see here that:

25 "MKO raised the question of

1 community engagement specifically on
2 reservations across Manitoba.
3 Relationship building must be a key
4 consideration when engaging First
5 Nations, along with an understanding
6 of the current barriers. EM is
7 encouraged to invest in engaging
8 with these communities."

9 This excerpt -- it -- it goes a bit
10 further but that I've read that out correctly?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes, you have.

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: With this in mind,
13 is it Efficiency Manitoba's position that in preparing
14 the Plan, Efficiency Manitoba meaningfully engaged
15 with First Nations in Northern Manitoba?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So when
17 preparing the Efficiency Plan, again, as -- as we've
18 mentioned quite a few times in our testimony for the
19 EEAG, we selected Indigenous representation on our
20 committee, and it included MKO Southern Chief's
21 Organization.

22 AMC was invited and had attended one
23 (1) meeting, but had not complete -- attended all the
24 meetings, as well as the Manitoba Metis Federation.
25 The MKO certainly provides a collective voice for more

1 than sixty-five thousand (65,000) Treaty First Nations
2 citizens in North Amer -- in Northern Manitoba.

3 So we thought that this was a good
4 start, and based on the member's contributions during
5 that EEAG meeting and the subsequent separate
6 meetings, we learned a lot about how to meaningful --
7 having a meaningful two (2) way communication with
8 First Nations communities in particular in the North
9 for future engagements to start determining how we're
10 implementing the Plan.

11 And I think I testified the other day
12 to the fact that I believe it was MKO's representative
13 that talked about, for example, having a gathering
14 would be a good way to get input in how we're going to
15 be implementing our Efficiency Plan in those First
16 Nations.

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: I -- I was going
18 to ask you about that reference to a gathering in a
19 few minutes, but maybe I'll do that now.

20 Can you tell me if that suggestion --
21 does that show up in the Plan anywhere, or the meeting
22 notes, meeting minutes? Do we see that reference to
23 the MKO members' suggestion that Efficiency Manitoba
24 host a gathering?

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No. That

1 particular meeting minute was a -- a separate meeting,
2 an individual meeting that was requested by MKO and
3 SCO. So it was not one that was part of the greater
4 group, where the minutes were filed with this
5 submission.

6 But it's certainly an idea that we're -
7 - we're considering, so no, it does not show up in the
8 Plan itself, but is certainly an idea that we're
9 considering, along with the other continuous
10 engagement with customers that I mentioned in my
11 direct evidence.

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Ms.
13 Kuruluk. I'm -- I'm going to ask another question
14 that's going to sound the same, but I assure you it is
15 different.

16 Excluding the important work of the
17 EEAG, would Efficiency Manitoba say that in preparing
18 the Plan, Efficiency Manitoba meaningfully engaged
19 with First Nations in Northern Manitoba?

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, if you -- if
24 you take out the MKO representative from the EEAG, I
25 would say there was not consultation with each

1 individual community member. However, that is our in
2 -- intent going forward, is to engage these
3 communities.

4 And as Ms. Tuck has testified to,
5 certainly, there's been a lot of feedback that would
6 have come from these First Nations that have made
7 their way into our considerations for program design,
8 as we do have found several years of delivering
9 programs to First Nations in our history with our
10 delivering DSM at Manitoba Hydro.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Schubert, I
12 wonder if we can bring up on the screen PDF page 7 of
13 Dr. Fitzpatrick's evidence. And I realize this is not
14 the evidence of Efficiency Manitoba. I will -- I do
15 want to ask a question about this here, though.

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, right at the
20 top of this, and maybe Ms. Schubert, if we can scroll
21 just a little bit up so we can see the whole -- that
22 whole paragraph, if possible, with -- with the
23 footnotes. Maybe not, but I'll read it up.

24 The last sentence on this page -- and
25 again, this is Dr. Fitzpatrick. She says:

1 "While inclusivity is an important
2 principle, there is a need for
3 Efficiency Manitib -- Manitoba to
4 engage members of different
5 economic, social, demographic, and
6 cultural backgrounds in a meaningful
7 way. This should not be delegated
8 to the advisory body."

9 Now again, I understand that this is a
10 -- a expert report that there will be cross-
11 examination on. I'm not asking about that.

12 I am asking if it is Efficiency
13 Manitoba's view that it has delegated engagement with
14 Northern First Nations to the EEAG?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No. It is my
16 view that we have not fully engaged yet with First
17 Nations. So there was the preparation of the Plan
18 that we did look to the EEAG to inform our decision-
19 making and our processes.

20 There was subsequent meetings with
21 members of the EEAG, and in particular, MKO, where
22 further ideas were provided to us on how we can do
23 meaningful two (2) way engagement, and that is our
24 intention to go forward in the future.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now yesterday, Mr.

1 -- Mr. Stocki testified that in preparing next year's
2 -- next -- the next three (3) year plan, there's going
3 to be lessons learned. There's going to be engagement
4 through the EEAG with customers.

5 Does that sound right, Mr. Stocki? We
6 can bring up a reference on the transcript, if you
7 like.

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: That does sound
9 correct. Yes, there'll certainly be lessons learned
10 throughout the way. There's going to be engagement
11 with customers certainly beyond the EEAG.

12 But the -- we -- I think the point I
13 was trying to make there was that we were not going to
14 stop using the EEAG as a potential way of getting
15 these important customer segments represented and
16 having executive meeting directly with them on an
17 ongoing basis.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: And yesterday, Mr.
19 Chair had asked about consultation with the public
20 other than the stakeholder group. I'm going to ask
21 about this -- this concept of the EEAG group as a
22 stakeholder group, but I'll get to that in a minute.

23 For right now, the response to Mr.
24 Chair I believe from yourself, Ms. Kuruluk, was that
25 there will be public accountability meetings pursuant

1 to the Crown Corporations Governance and
2 Accountability Act.

3 Now, my question is: Will any of those
4 meetings be in northern Manitoba or would that --
5 those public sessions likely be in Winnipeg?

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I can only go on
7 past experience with respect to public accountability
8 meetings. And in the past, I know Manitoba Hydro
9 would have one (1) in Winnipeg, one (1) in western
10 Manitoba, and a third one (1) in northern Manitoba.

11 And I would suspect we would likely be
12 following something similar, although I don't believe
13 that's the requirement in the Crown Corporations and
14 Governance Act, but that would be our intention.

15 And if -- actually, if I can just add
16 one (1) more thing. That specific response that I had
17 given the Chairman Gabor was, I think, in -- in
18 specific response to a question about public --
19 general public engagement.

20 And we certainly see our Indigenous
21 stakeholders as being very specific with unique
22 characteristics that we'd have a different set of
23 engagement other than public accountability meetings
24 for that particular segment.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: Has any of those

1 different engagement sessions -- do we have them
2 scheduled? Are they are already set up, and, if so,
3 are -- is -- is that schedule documented anywhere?

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No. At this
5 point, we do not. We don't yet have an approved
6 efficiency plan, but I do have Ms. Tuck sitting at my
7 left here who's already trying to get these things in
8 order so that we can pursue them quicker as soon as we
9 have an approved plan, and we're looking forward to
10 it.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Ms.
12 Kuruluk. Ms. Schubert, can we bring up on the screen
13 PUB-EM I-4? I -- I don't want to go too far into the
14 -- the -- much of this on here, but I'm -- I'm -- what
15 I'm looking at here is -- I'm not delving into the --
16 the pre-screening process for -- for the portfolio.
17 Other Interveners have already covered that.

18 One (1) of the beauties of batting
19 cleanup on this is picking up some of the table
20 scraps, I guess. In the IR on the screen, the Board
21 asked Efficiency Manitoba for:

22 "Each program bundle to provide a
23 table comparing the budgeted cost
24 and savings as per the plan versus
25 as per the preliminary plan prior to

1 adjustments based on the multi-
2 criteria decision analysis and to
3 provide details of the specific
4 programs that were increased and
5 decreased with the reasons for the
6 changes."

7 Can you confirm that I've read that out
8 properly?

9 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yes, you've read
10 that correctly.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Mr.
12 Stocki. When we look at Efficiency Manitoba's
13 response, specifically at PDF page 3 is what I'm most
14 interested in under, "Indigenous programs" -- now,
15 this following the mi -- multi-criteria decision
16 analysis.

17 This says that:

18 "There was no change between the
19 preliminary and planned portfolios
20 for either the insulation and direct
21 install program or the community
22 geothermal program."

23 Is that correct?

24 MS. AMY TUCK: That's -- I'm a little
25 shorter. That's correct.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: And there are
2 changes to the Indigenous Small Business Program. And
3 you would agree with me that that change was as a
4 result of the added inclusive of the Metis small
5 businesses. Is that correct, as well?

6 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct, yes.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: So, is it fair to
8 say then that with respect to First Nations
9 specifically, the Indigenous programs did not change
10 from the preliminary plan to the three (3) year plan
11 that's submitted?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct. The
16 plan did not change because we felt, at the time, the
17 plan that was put forward was a good plan to address
18 the needs of First Nations.

19 And like we -- I have said before, and
20 Ms. Kuruluk and Mr. Stocki, we're going to take the
21 opportunity of the three (3) year plan to continuously
22 improve on the information that we have and, moving
23 forward, de -- design and develop programs that can
24 fit needs if our initial assessment has
25 mischaracterized the needs in First Nations.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you tell me,
2 did the meetings with the EEAG result in any changes
3 to First Nation programs under the plan, from the
4 preliminary plan to the plan before the Board today?

5

6 (BRIEF PAUSE)

7

8 MS. AMY TUCK: Could you just re-ask
9 that question, please, Mr. Wheeler?

10 MR. JARED WHEELER: I can certainly
11 try. My question is whether the feedback received in
12 the meetings of the EEAG resulted in any changes to
13 First Nation programs specifically under the plan as
14 to the preliminary plan.

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, we presented
19 the Indigenous program bundle. And I -- I can't
20 recall the specific date that it was presented on.
21 I'm presuming, if it's relevant, Ms. Tuck can provide
22 that.

23 But we didn't receive any comments for
24 changes from the First Nations members that were
25 present that -- to make changes to that plan. They

1 were happy with what they had seen.

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: Did those First
3 Nation members know that they had the opportunity to
4 suggest changes to the -- to the preliminary plan?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I believe they
6 did. That -- we ended up having several presentations
7 by customer segment on separate days, and they were
8 meetings that were dedicated specifically to the
9 specific customer segment.

10 So, there would have been facilitate
11 question and answer, please provide your feedback,
12 that would have occurred at the conclusion of the
13 presentation.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can you tell me
18 whether Efficiency Manitoba adopted an issues tracking
19 table or some other systematic approach with respi --
20 with respect to the advice and perspectives of the
21 EEAG?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So, through the

1 EEAG, one (1) thing that -- concept that we tested out
2 at the advice of our facilitator and that we
3 communicated to EEAG members, that we actually set up
4 a share point site.

5 And we use that share point site to
6 provide some information, presentations, and documents
7 and things like that. And so, that -- on that share
8 point site we also provided a way of -- a space, a
9 document, that members could provide ongoing feedback
10 if they wanted to.

11 And certainly, during every single
12 meeting we had the opportunity where any -- at any
13 time, we had notes available at the table, that they
14 could -- any member could write down a note and they
15 could post it onto the -- for future action or for
16 future discussion and it would have been posted and
17 recorded in the meeting minutes at that point.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Please excuse my
19 ignorance. I don't know what a SharePoint site is.

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Yeah, I'm sorry.
21 It was -- it was a way to -- it was a request from EAG
22 members that instead of emailing documents with
23 respect to presentations and things like that, that we
24 would just provide a link so that members could more
25 readily access the information. And so it's just a

1 link where we would host all the materials and they
2 would just be able to access them at any time.

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: When Mr. Stocki
4 says access, they could access and edit, so they could
5 actually put their -- type their feedback into shared
6 documents. It's essentially an electronic file
7 sharing type of system.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you.
9 Apparently I did know exactly what it was but I didn't
10 know the term, so thank you for that. I appreciate
11 that.

12 Is that -- is that -- going forward, is
13 that SharePoint site -- is that still accessible to
14 EEAG members, is it accessible to anybody else at all?

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: At present to
16 that particular aspect, the SharePoint site was for
17 EEAG members, not for the public at large.

18 I think with -- with participation of -
19 - of different members, I know that some -- some
20 members were concerned about not sharing necessarily
21 what their thoughts and issues were, so that's why we
22 also had separate meetings and I'm not certain we
23 would make those EE -- EEAG thoughts and issues lists
24 something that would be public unless we had their
25 permission.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: So then for -- for
2 future meetings of the EEAG, however that's
3 constituted, whoever the members may be going forward,
4 the idea is to still keep the SharePoint site? Would
5 it be the same one? Would it be a different version?

6 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: So as with the --
7 as the EAG evolved, there were some members that
8 requested printed copies of the materials as well, so
9 certainly if the group continued to find use in that
10 SharePoint site, we'd continue its use. If the
11 members prefer printed copies, we could accommodate
12 that.

13 Again, it's part of the engagement to -
14 - to meet those members in the time and space that
15 they see fit and how they can best participate, so
16 we're most accommodating, trying to meet them in that
17 space.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. Ms.
19 Schubert, can we please bring up Coalition IR Number
20 125?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, the -- the
25 Coalition had asked for, to please indicate feedback

1 received from the public as distinct from
2 stakeholders. We -- we have canvassed this a little
3 bit already on this -- this oral part of this hearing,
4 so I'm not going to go to the same places, but if we
5 can scroll down to the response to (a) where we see:

6 "Outside of the feedback received
7 through EEAG members, who
8 collectively represented all
9 customer segments in the plan, there
10 was no feedback received from the
11 general public in advance of this
12 first three (3) year Efficiency
13 Plan, the Plan, being submitted to
14 the Public Utilities Board (PUB)."

15 Have I read that out correctly?

16 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: You have read
17 that out correctly, and as I stated, I believe it was
18 in yester -- yesterday's testimony, we do receive
19 feedback from the public on a regular basis, we talk
20 to thousands of customers every year from Manitoba
21 Hydro's efficiency offerings, and so there certainly
22 is the public represented in some of the offerings
23 that we have in our plan.

24 Again, as I had mentioned, the
25 requirements of the Efficiency Plan were numerous and

1 certainly were new additions to what we typically
2 include in the Efficiency Plan and that -- that public
3 input documentation was another one of those things
4 that were very new.

5 So documentation of every conversation
6 that fed into some of the improvements that we made
7 certainly had not been done, but to give you an
8 example of the type of improvements that were made,
9 and -- and I might see if Ms. Tuck can recall someone
10 specific to First Nations, but I had testified to
11 changes that were made, such as some income qualified
12 docume -- documentation that was required to
13 participate in the income qualified program.

14 Many customers had said they don't have
15 access to tax forms or they were difficult to find,
16 and so we made alternate requirements available as --
17 as alternates to the tax forms, as an example.

18 MS. AMY TUCK: I can also add to that
19 from an Indigenous and First Nation perspective.

20 Previously under Manitoba Hydro's
21 plans, there was no program to address First Nation
22 small businesses, and this is why in this plan going
23 forward that was included, as well as an education
24 initiative. So that was something that also was
25 incorporated into this plan that had not previously

1 existed at Manitoba Hydro.

2 So for Mr. Wheeler's question, we have
3 taken feedback from our customer segments and it has
4 been incorporated into the plan.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: I would suggest my
6 question was just if I had read this correctly, but I
7 do appreciate all of the answers. Thank you for that.

8 My next question is: That you would
9 confirm that Efficiency Manitoba views this PUB
10 hearing process as a way of gathering public input in
11 the plan. Is that correct?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: You would also
14 agree then that at this particular point in time,
15 Efficiency Manitoba's initial three (3) year plan has
16 -- has not yet been approved, correct?

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: And given then
19 that this hearing is part of the process for public
20 input into the plan, does Efficiency Manitoba envision
21 revising its plan based on the PUB recommendations?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I think that's
23 the purpose of the PUB recommendations. I -- I could
24 be wrong, but there are going to be potential
25 revisions to the plan.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you for
2 that. Now I want to ask also about if we can go a
3 little bit further up to the question here year on the
4 IR on the screen. No, pardon me, pardon me. It was
5 at the right spot.

6 I want to know about -- we've got --
7 the EEAG members collectively represented all customer
8 segments.

9 Can you tell me, were the participants
10 on the EEAG informed that their participation on the
11 EEAG represented a customer segment?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So as provided
16 for in my testimony, I believe it was yesterday, one
17 (1) of the requirements of the EEAG, and I believe
18 this was communicated in my first presentation to the
19 committee on May 31st, was that we were looking for
20 representatives that would -- that would represent the
21 customer segments included in our plan, and part of
22 the intent and composition -- this is from our terms
23 of reference, if you wanted to call it up. PDF page
24 449.

25 We were looking for groups that had

1 experienced acting for a cust -- customer group whose
2 interest Efficiency Manitoba would like to ensure is
3 represented in the Crown corporation's plan. So -- so
4 my answer would be yes.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. Now if
6 we can bring up Daymark IR Number 5. And actually I'm
7 looking for an attachment. Sorry, Ms. Schubert, that
8 wasn't the most eloquent way of asking that.

9 So you would agree with me that this
10 was a document that was provided to the EEAG, correct?

11 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That's correct.

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, Ms. Schubert,
13 if we can go to PDF page 58. That may be wrong. No.
14 I'm looking for page 15 of the attachment itself. I'm
15 sure my notes say 15. Thank you, Ms. Schubert.
16 That's exactly what I'm looking for.

17 Now, you see on the screen here, this
18 says:

19 "Stakeholder Advisory Committee,
20 defined in the Efficiency Manitoba
21 Act, may exist separate from the
22 EEAG."

23 You'd agree I'm reading that correctly?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yeah, you are --
25 you are reading that correctly, and I would also know

1 that that specific attachment is stamped with:

2 "Material within current as of May
3 31st, 2019. More recent versions
4 supercede data and analysis
5 contained within."

6 MR. JARED WHEELER: And -- and you
7 would agree that Efficiency Manitoba establishing a
8 stakeholder advisory committee is a requirement under
9 Section 27 of the Efficiency Manitoba Act, correct?

10 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Since this May
12 31st EEAG meeting, has Efficiency Manitoba determined
13 whether the Stakeholder Advisory Committee will exist
14 separately from the EEAG?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: No, this was
19 just contemplated in the earlier -- early parts of the
20 EEAG due to some of the language regar -- in the
21 legislation requiring expertise in energy efficiency.

22 And we have subsequently determined
23 that the members on EEAG were good representations of
24 the customer segments that we wanted representation in
25 our plans. So this will be the Stakeholder Advisory

1 Committee as -- as defined in the Act.

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: Would that mean
3 also that customer segments are the stakeholders?

4

5 (BRIEF PAUSE)

6

7 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Can you reframe
8 that question, please?

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Certainly. You
10 had just said that the customer segments, as
11 represented in the EEAG, fit for the Stakeholder
12 Advisory Committee.

13 So does that mean, then, that the
14 customer segments are analogous to stakeholders?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: I'm -- I'm
19 certainly not looking for a legal opinion, if that's
20 what we're -- we're discussing. Not to cut you off in
21 any way, but...

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Out of the few
23 people here, I am not the lawyer, so it's sometimes
24 nice to have one beside you.

25

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And maybe
4 because I'm not a lawyer, I'm not just quite
5 understanding your question yet, if you could possibly
6 re-ask it.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: I think I can do
8 you one better, and let's move off of this, and that's
9 quite all right.

10 I'd like to canvass some questions
11 about programs in the plan directed to Indigenous
12 businesses specifically, so changing tracks. You'll
13 recall, of course, that yesterday, AMC counsel posed
14 some questions about the specifics of the plan as
15 related to Indigenous businesses that related -- ended
16 in a lot of my question being crossed out.

17 Ms. Tuck, we've heard in IR responses
18 as well as your response to AMC's counsel yesterday
19 that Efficiency Manitoba has not yet determined who is
20 an Indigenous business. Is that correct?

21

22 (BRIEF PAUSE)

23

24 MS. AMY TUCK: That -- that is
25 correct. We're looking to do that in coordination and

1 in conjunction with MKO, the AMC, and MMF, and SCO.

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5 MS. AMY TUCK: But to be clear, sorry,
6 I think we have a clear understanding that businesses
7 residing on -- on reserve would clearly follow to be
8 an Indigenous business that would fit under the
9 Indigenous small business program.

10 MR. JARED WHEELER: Would you agree
11 with me that there are some estimates in the plan with
12 respect to the participation of Indigenous businesses
13 in specific programs under the plan? There are some
14 estimates.

15 MS. AMY TUCK: I would agree that they
16 are estimates.

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: And there are
18 participation estimates.

19 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, they are
20 participation estimates.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Tuck, you had
22 also said yesterday that Efficiency Manitoba's
23 considering what you had referred to as a cap on
24 participation of Indigenous businesses in programs.
25 Is that correct? Only considering, not yet

1 determined. I understand that.

2 MS. AMY TUCK: Yeah, correct. We are
3 considering that there would be a cap in that
4 particular Indigenous program.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: So without knowing
6 who Indigenous businesses are, it's already a
7 possibility under the plan that there could be a cap
8 on how many of these unknown businesses could
9 participate in programs. Is that right?

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MS. AMY TUCK: I guess I will agree.

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so once the
15 criteria for who is an Indigenous business has been
16 determined, the numbers for who is an Indigenous
17 business could be higher than Efficiency Manitoba
18 anticipates, correct?

19 MS. AMY TUCK: That's correct.

20

21 (BRIEF PAUSE)

22

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: Maybe let's bring
24 up Daymark-2-EM-I-13. Just changing tracks a bit, but
25 it's a incremental shift at -- at most.

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, I'm looking
4 for Indigenous small business program, and there's a
5 number twenty-three (23) beside what I have written,
6 so I would suggest if -- if we can scroll down a few
7 pages here, Ms. Schubert, please. Okay, on this
8 table, if we can go down probably three (3) more
9 pages. I'm looking for Indigenous small business
10 program.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: Here we are. I
15 knew it was there.

16 Now, we see here that this says that:

17 "Delivery provider - a service
18 provider will be required to go door
19 to door offering the small business
20 program to eligible customers;
21 installed direct install items such
22 as aerators, spray valves,
23 showerheads, and A-line LED bulbs;
24 conduct a lighting assessment of the
25 business; and coordinate the product

1 and scheduling of deeper retrofits
2 with local electricians."

3 So in -- in this statement here, it
4 starts out with a service provider. Is a service
5 provider, right now -- is that a -- is that a third-
6 party contractor?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: It is, yes.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: And I'll certainly
9 have more questions about contractors in a bit. For
10 now, what I'm looking for is confirmation that the
11 plan is for a third-party contractor to go door to
12 door offering the small business program to eligible
13 customers.

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. AMY TUCK: So I -- I -- just to
18 clarify, although it does say 'door to door,' how the
19 process would work wouldn't be a door-to-door.

20 So to clarify, we would be working with
21 a community, and we would identify which buildings or
22 which businesses that the service provider would go to
23 to perform the upgrades.

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: That answers my
25 next three (3) questions. I appreciate that very

1 much.

2 The last part of this say that it will
3 -- following the not exactly door-to-door, the
4 contractor will coordinate the "scheduling of deeper
5 retrofits with local electricians." My question is:
6 What would be considered a deeper retrofit?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: So a deeper retrofit
8 would be a deeper lighting retrofit than what would
9 have been in -- outlined here, than the just screw-in
10 LED bulbs. And so we have seen this.

11 As a pilot, we did work with Opaswayak
12 Cree Nation, an MKO member community, to pilot this
13 particular program, and we saw that it was successful.
14 And so we worked with them, and this is something we
15 saw that was very helpful for First Nation small
16 business.

17 And it's -- we think that the way that
18 it's rolled out has -- doesn't -- has been successful,
19 and that's why we're going to continue to do it that
20 way.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Very good. Thank
22 you for that. Did you have something more you wanted
23 to add, Ms. Tuck?

24 MS. AMY TUCK: (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE).

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: No. Okay. So,

1 moving on from this line of questions a little bit,
2 I'm still interested then in who fits under the
3 Indigenous customer segment. Can we please bring up
4 Daymark IR number 95?

5 And in this question, Daymark asked to:
6 "Please provide the customer count
7 and annual energy consumption and
8 annual peak demand for the latest
9 year available for each customer
10 segment served by Manitoba Hydro."

11 So, I'm specifically focussing on this
12 customer count part. In the response to 'A', if we
13 can go down there, Ms. Schubert, Efficiency Manitoba
14 tells us that there are seventeen thousand nine
15 hundred seventy eight (17,978) First Nation on reserve
16 homes. Is that correct? Do you see that there?

17 MS. AMY TUCK: I see that, yes.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, can we please
19 bring up on the screen -- again, seventeen thousand
20 nine hundred seventy eight (17,978). Can we please
21 bring up on the screen page 1 of Appendix 12 from
22 Manitoba Hydro's 2019/'20 GRA?

23 And I had sent a copy of this to
24 Efficiency Manitoba's legal counsel by email and
25 informed you I may refer to this, correct, and I

1 confirmed it was received?

2 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: That's
3 correct.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. Would
5 you agree that we see here for -- the highlighted
6 number there, for residential First Nation on reserve
7 customers, Manitoba Hydro's forecast in the 2019/'20
8 GRA was eighteen thousand four hundred seventy-eight
9 (18,478) customers. Am I reading that correct?

10 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: And would you
12 agree then that in the 1920 GRA, Manitoba Hydro
13 forecast five hundred (500) more First Nation on
14 reserve homes than in the value provided in Efficiency
15 Manitoba's response to Daymark 95, eighteen thousand
16 four seventy-eight (18,478), as to seventeen thousand
17 nine seventy-eight (17,978)?

18 I'm not a mathematician.

19

20 (BRIEF PAUSE)

21

22 MS. AMY TUCK: Can I get you to repeat
23 that last part, all of it, please, actually.

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: All of... In the
25 19 -- in -- in the -- in the 2019/2020 Manitoba Hydro

1 GRA, Manitoba Hydro forecast five hundred (500) more
2 First Nation on reserves home -- homes than in the
3 value provided in response to Daymark 95.

4 So, on the screen we see eighteen four
5 seventy-eight (18,478) First Nations on reserve
6 residential. Maybe, Ms. Schubert, if we can go back
7 to Daymark 95 where we've got First Nation on reserve
8 homes is seventeen thousand nine seventy-eight
9 (17,978).

10 MS. AMY TUCK: I can see that, yes.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: And would you
12 agree with me that that's a difference of five hundred
13 (500)? We're looking at five hundred (500) less today
14 than we did a year ago?

15 MS. AMY TUCK: I -- I would agree.
16 But I believe, and this is subject to check, that this
17 number, seventeen nine seven eight (17,978), I think
18 is in -- is referring to single detached homes.

19 And the other one -- the other document
20 I think might be looking at -- again, I'm not entirely
21 sure because it's not Efficiency Manitoba's document,
22 but all residential accounts within Manitoba Hydro.

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: Can we go back
24 then to the -- the Appendix 12 from Hydro's '19/'20
25 GRA?

1 (BRIEF PAUSE)

2

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, if we can
4 scroll down just a little bit. On here, we've also
5 got -- I wasn't trying to hide the numbers here. We
6 should have showed both of them. I apologize for
7 that. But we also see residential diesel were
8 forecast five hundred and ninety-six (596) forecast
9 customers, again, residential only.

10 So, now, it seems to me that we've lost
11 about a eleven hundred (1,100) people and -- or -- or
12 homes. And I understand what you're saying, that
13 Manitoba Hydro provided these numbers.

14 I simply want to highlight that we may
15 have -- we may be looking at different numbers today
16 than we were looking at a year ago for First Nation on
17 reserve residential customers.

18 And I'm curious if there's any way that
19 Efficiency Manitoba can help us to reconcile these
20 different numbers. Maybe it's easiest to ask, for
21 Efficiency Manitoba's purposes, what number are you
22 using for how many on reserve homes there are in
23 Manitoba?

24

25 (BRIEF PAUSE)

1 MS. AMY TUCK: So, in the plan --
2 Efficiency Manitoba, in the plan that we put forward,
3 used a number that is in the re -- is Manitoba Hydro's
4 residential energy use survey, which is about fifteen
5 thousand five hundred (15,500), an approximate of
6 fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500) on reserve
7 homes.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: So, Efficiency
12 Manitoba is not using the seventeen thousand nine
13 seventy-eight (17,978) First Nation homes.

14 That was the number provided in
15 response to Daymark's question?

16

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18

19 MS. AMY TUCK: So, to be clear, that -
20 - the seventeen thousand (17,000) was pulled out of a
21 database where -- that lists First Nation accounts,
22 all -- all Manitoba Hydro accounts.

23

24 And that number can change month to
25 month, week -- my understanding is that number can
change month to month, which is why we went with, in

1 the plan, fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500).

2 But, as stated previously, the number
3 of homes -- the -- if we've overstated or understated,
4 it's about the opportunity that exists within a home
5 and not necessarily whether there are fifteen thousand
6 five hundred (15,500) homes on a First Nation or
7 sixteen thousand (16,000) or seventeen thousand
8 (17,000), it will be the opportunity that exists for
9 each home for energy efficiency upgrades.

10

11 (BRIEF PAUSE)

12

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you for
14 that, Ms. Tuck. Maybe I'll move on from this a bit,
15 still on the topic of -- I guess this is still on the
16 same topic, estimated participation numbers for offers
17 targeted to First Nations on reserve customers within
18 the Indigenous customer segment.

19 Ms. Schubert, can we please bring up
20 AMC IR number 18? I'm looking for page 2 of that IR
21 and the table at the bottom of page 2.

22 Now, I'm trying to reconcile some of
23 the numbers here, as well. This table shows the
24 number of participants, total budgets, and the
25 anticipated annual energy savings by participant for

1 the community geothermal program.

2 Is that correct?

3 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so, for the
5 first year of the program, 2020/2021, Efficiency
6 Manitoba estimates that fifty (50) homes will take
7 advantage of this program, correct?

8 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: And you would
10 confirm then that this specifically refers to fifty
11 (50) homes on reserve will take advantage of this
12 program?

13 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in years 2 and
15 3 of the plan, Efficiency Manitoba estimates that
16 ninety (90) homes on reserve will take advantage of
17 this program, correct?

18 MS. AMY TUCK: That is anticipated
19 participation, yes.

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: And -- and the
21 estimate is that more folks will start using this
22 program. We covered this a little bit yesterday. I'm
23 -- I'm not intending to rehash that.

24 Will the community geothermal program
25 be the same program for each of the three (3) years of

1 the plan or is it anticipated that the program itself
2 will change?

3 MS. AMY TUCK: At this point in time,
4 I'm not anticipating a change in the program, but I
5 can't predict the future, but I -- the antic -- it is
6 anticipated that it should stay the same, yes.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: How about the --
8 the plan -- the -- the three (3) year plan doesn't
9 contemplate that the program is going to change?

10 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct.

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. Please
12 confirm that in the first year of the program the
13 average annual energy savings per home is estimated to
14 be fifteen thousand four hundred (15,400) kilowatt
15 hours. Is that correct?

16 MS. AMY TUCK: That's what it says
17 there, yes.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in years 2 and
19 3 of the plan, it is estimated that the annual energy
20 savings per home is estimated to be 13,777 kilowatt
21 hours.

22 Is that correct as well?

23 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct, yes.
24 That's what I see there.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: So can you help me

1 out with this, then? If it's the same Community
2 Geothermal Program in each of these three (3) years,
3 to what does Efficiency Manitoba attribute the dropoff
4 in energy savings per home?

5 It seems to me this should be the same
6 number, but it's not, and I'm not sure what I'm
7 missing.

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MS. AMY TUCK: So part of the process
12 for this program is that -- for the community
13 geothermal program, is that we target their homes with
14 the highest energy first. And so as we target the
15 higher energy users, once they have the systems
16 installed, it stands to reason that there will be less
17 and less opportunity for energy savings as you go to a
18 home that is consuming less energy.

19 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So as part of
20 the Community Geothermal Program, we worked with the
21 housing managers to identify the highest -- highest-
22 using consumers, representing likely the home heating.

23 So obviously, within the first year,
24 it's the highest home heating users. So they stand to
25 save more kilowatt hours than some of the lower

1 heating users in the future. And that was -- again,
2 that was a methodology that was used, and it was done
3 in conjunction with the community. And that's why
4 it's intended to follow that same path.

5 And of course, we will always be
6 deferring to the community to assist us in identifying
7 which homes should have the geothermal installed in a
8 priority basis.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so because the
10 -- the -- I just want to make sure I'm wrapping my
11 head around this right -- because the highest
12 consumers are -- are targeted first, so maybe we would
13 suggest that the -- the fifty (50), the number of
14 homes -- fifty (50), 2020 to 2000 -- or -- yeah, to
15 2021, that those fifty (50) homes are likely to be the
16 -- to have been identified by the -- the First Nation
17 themselves as the highest energy consumers.

18 Is that right? I just want to make
19 sure I have this right.

20 MS. AMY TUCK: The identification is
21 done with -- in a -- in coordination or assistance
22 with the energy you stated that would come from
23 Manitoba Hydro.

24 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. If we
25 can go to the next page of this IR response, I'm sure

1 the answers will probably be about the same, but it
2 may be different, though.

3 If -- if you look at plan participation
4 Indigenous small business, we see the same kind of
5 anomaly, average annual energy savings per building, a
6 high ener -- a high energy savings per building in the
7 first year, less in the third year.

8 Is that the same reason? So the -- the
9 second table here, plan participation Indigenous small
10 business, number of buildings, thirty (30) for the
11 first year of the Plan. Average annual energy savings
12 per building, twelve thousand three hundred thirty-
13 three (12,333).

14 If we look to the third year of the
15 plan, average annual energy savings per building,
16 eleven thousand (11,000). I'm just trying to figure
17 out these numbers.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So in the
22 interests of time, we're -- we're actually pulling up
23 some detailed information for -- to -- in order to
24 answer your question. So I don't know if you want to
25 keep proceeding, and then we'll come back to you on

1 that one?

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: Yeah. In the
3 interests of time, that's probably for the best. I --
4 I am going to be looking for information -- the --
5 almost the exact same information, then, for the first
6 table on this page here as well, planned participation
7 First Nation insulation and direct install, but now
8 the numbers go the other way. Per participant, we
9 start out lower and then get higher, and I can't quite
10 figure out why that would be.

11 So I will absolutely gladly wait for
12 that data, and maybe we can still do that today. If
13 not, maybe I'll ask for an undertaking at some point,
14 but --

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Wheeler, I'm just
16 wondering -- we're going to need an afternoon break.
17 Would you like to take the -- the break now, give them
18 an opportunity to pull the information, and then after
19 that...

20 MR. JARED WHEELER: Mr. Chair, this
21 would actually be an ideal time to take a break --

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: -- on where I'm
24 going next. Thank you so much for that.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We'll take

1 fifteen (15) minutes. Thank you.

2

3 --- Upon recessing at 3:15 p.m.

4 --- Upon resuming at 3:35 p.m.

5

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, Mr. Wheeler.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you, Mr.

8 Chair. I'll get right back into it.

9

10 CONTINUED BY MR. JARED WHEELER:

11 MR. JARED WHEELER: I'm -- I'm going

12 to switch tracks a bit here now. I have some

13 questions about the plan as it specifically pertains

14 to First Nations in the diesel zone. I feel we -- we

15 haven't canvassed this really to a great extent yet.

16 To set the foundation here, Efficiency

17 Manitoba is aware that there are four (4) First Nation

18 communities not connected to the Manitoba Hydro grid,

19 all of which are serviced by diesel for their

20 electricity and heating needs.

21 Is that correct?

22 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: That is correct.

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in hearings

24 before this Board, these First Nations are often

25 referred to as being in the diesel zone. You're

1 familiar with that term?

2 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I am familiar
3 with that term.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: So, when I refer
5 to the diesel zone, I am referring to Barren Lands
6 First Nation, Northlands Denesuline First Nation,
7 Sayisi Dene First Nation, and Shamattawa First Nation,
8 all of whom are MKO member First Nations. I'm just
9 setting the foundation there.

10 Ms. Schubert, can we please bring up on
11 the screen MKO EM 1-6?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. In
16 question 'C' of this IR we asked Efficiency Manitoba
17 to please explain whether fuel switching with First
18 Nations in the diesel zone was discussed and, if so,
19 what came of those discussions.

20 Do you see that on the screen there?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I do.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Schubert, if
23 we can please go down to the response to 'C'. It says
24 here that:

25 "Although Efficiency Manitoba did

1 not discuss fuel switching as it
2 pertains to grid electricity, as per
3 an earlier IR response, the
4 Efficiency Manitoba regulation,
5 section 14, provides for the use of
6 the affordable energy fund to
7 realize improvements in home heat --
8 home heating fuels other than
9 electric energy and natural gas.
10 Therefore, a fuel switch to an
11 alternative, such as biomass, would
12 be a -- would -- a bit of a typo --
13 would be a retrofit option that
14 would be within the mandate of
15 Efficiency Manitoba."

16 First, I've read that correctly, I
17 assume?

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: You have.

19 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. And
20 Efficiency Manitoba would agree with that still today?

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We would still
22 agree with that today, yes.

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: And Efficiency
24 Manitoba would agree that diesel is a home heating
25 fuel other than electric energy and natural gas,

1 correct?

2

3

(BRIEF PAUSE)

4

5

MR. JARED WHEELER: I don't want to
6 cut off the discussions, but I feel like maybe you
7 think I'm asking something I'm not. I just want to
8 know that diesel is a home heating fuel, can be used
9 as a home heating fuel. Is that correct?

10

MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, I'm familiar
11 with the term 'fuel oil' is a home heating fuel, and
12 I'm not sure if that's something I've distinguished
13 incorrectly in your mind.

14

MR. JARED WHEELER: Are you aware that
15 some folks, specifically in the diesel zone, use
16 diesel to heat their homes?

17

MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: is diesel the
18 same as fuel oil in your...? So --

19

MR. JARED WHEELER: I would suggest
20 that -- that fu -- diesel is a fuel oil, yes, and
21 there are others -- other fuel oils that could be a
22 fuel oil that are not diesel.

23

So, yes, it's sort of -- under the
24 umbrella term of 'fuel oil', I would suggest that
25 diesel is encompassed there.

1 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay. Then I
2 guess I would concur. I guess I'm getting tripped up
3 on the fact that diesel communities have electricity
4 that diesel generated to serve their electrical needs.
5 And there is some distinction about using electric
6 heating systems fuelled by diesel to heat the home.

7 So, that's where I thought maybe we
8 were going to get tripped up.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thankfully, that
10 is not the road I was going down. I'm more interested
11 in some questions about the potential uses of the
12 affordable energy fund.

13 So, Ms. Tuck, you had stated on Tuesday
14 that it is too early to tell how Efficiency Manitoba
15 may utilize the affordable energy fund. Is that
16 correct?

17 MS. AMY TUCK: I think that's a fair
18 characterization, yes.

19 MR. JARED WHEELER: And thankfully,
20 Ms. Kuruluk, you then provided us with a very helpful
21 explanation of the affordable energy fund as a
22 notional spend. It's not a pot of money.

23 Have I paraphrased that correctly, Ms.
24 Kuruluk?

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Yes. I believe

1 my testimony said that it was not money that had been
2 collected from ratepayers, similar to how the gas
3 furnace replacement fund is -- is collected.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: And, Ms. Tuck, I
5 believe you had also said on Tuesday that Efficiency
6 Manitoba has had some discussions with First Nations
7 in the diesel zone, general discussions with First
8 Nations in the diesel zone.

9 Efficiency Manitoba has had some
10 discussions with them. Is that correct?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MS. AMY TUCK: Just to correct that,
15 if there's any misunderstanding, it was, as a Manitoba
16 Hydro employee, I had had some discussions with diesel
17 communities, First Nation diesel communities.

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Would that suggest
19 then that, as an Efficiency Manitoba employee, you
20 have not had any discussions with First Nations in the
21 diesel zone?

22 MS. AMY TUCK: Not since November,
23 since I started working with Efficiency Manitoba.

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And I'd just
25 like to add at this point that, as part of the

1 transitional provisions of the Efficiency Manitoba
2 Act, Manitoba Hydro is supporting Efficiency Manitoba,
3 and that includes delivery of ongoing programs that
4 exist today in -- in order to ensure continuity as
5 well informing -- assisting and informing Efficiency
6 Manitoba's development of their plan.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: Do you know if
8 Manitoba Hydro has had discussions with First Nations
9 in the diesel zone about energy efficiency since
10 Efficiency Manitoba has been an entity?

11 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, there has been
12 discussions with First Nation diesel communities about
13 energy efficiency initiatives.

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: Have there been
15 conversations with First Nations in the diesel zone
16 about the possibility of using the affordable energy
17 fund?

18 MS. AMY TUCK: At this time, no, there
19 has not.

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: And I -- I would
21 just like to add that through the EEAG discussions, I
22 know that the affordable energy fund was certainly one
23 (1) of the areas of interest from the MKO member on
24 that committee, so they're aware of the possibility of
25 its use.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: Yes. And we see
2 on the screen here:

3 "Section 14 provides for the use of
4 the affordable energy fund to
5 realize improvements in home heating
6 fuels other than electric energy and
7 natural gas; therefore, a fuel
8 switch to an alternative, such as
9 biomass, may be a possibility."

10 Has the -- has Efficiency Manitoba --
11 or actually, I guess, Manitoba Hydro at some point,
12 discussed the use of biomass as a potential home
13 heating fuel with First Nations in the diesel zone?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. AMY TUCK: No, we haven't had
18 those conversha -- conversations yet.

19 MR. JARED WHEELER: I suppose a
20 follow-up question: Does Efficiency Manitoba plan to
21 have those conversations with First Nations in the
22 diesel zone about the potential use of biomass as a
23 home heating fuel?

24 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, we do.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: You know, can --

1 Ms. Schubert, can we bring up MKO IR number 39,
2 please?

3 And now this question -- this is asking
4 about the community geothermal program, and we had
5 asked whether the community geothermal is expected to
6 be available specifically to the four (4) diesel
7 communities.

8 Ms. Schubert, can you scroll down to
9 a).

10 "With respect to the diesel
11 communities, Efficiency Manitoba
12 notes that any conversion of
13 residential heating load from fuel
14 oil to geothermal heating systems
15 increases the load on Manitoba
16 Hydro's diesel power generating
17 system and may have significant
18 implications on generation and
19 distribution capacity requirements
20 in that diesel community. So any
21 consideration of implementing a
22 community geothermal program in
23 diesel communities will therefore
24 need to be reviewed in coordination
25 with Manitoba Hydro and the

1 respective community."

2 My question now being: Have there been
3 any discussions further to this about a --
4 potentially, a community geothermal program in diesel
5 communities, specifically First Nation communities,
6 since this response?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: No, there has not.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: And realizing that
9 those discussion still need to take place, with
10 respect to the community geothermal program, could a
11 First Nation switching from diesel to geothermal for
12 home heating utilize the affordable energy fund to
13 make that switch?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Apologies for
18 the long pause there. We understand there are
19 restrictions in diesel communities with respect to
20 heating sources used from electricity generated from
21 diesel, so again, this is -- this is where there's a -
22 - the coordination impact that has to happen with
23 Manitoba Hydro. The last thing we'd want is to
24 increase the load of the community such that the
25 diesel generating stations couldn't support that load

1 and -- and customers would be without heat in the most
2 critical times.

3 And I'm -- we're trying to think of a
4 theoretical answer, if that was not an issue. I would
5 suspect that a switch to geothermal from fuel oil
6 would fit the definition of the affordable energy
7 fund, but clearly, there's quite a few more technical
8 considerations that would have to be involved prior to
9 a community looking to -- to do that kind of retrofit,
10 just so that we wouldn't, again, threaten the ability
11 to have heat in the middle of winter.

12 MS. AMY TUCK: And if I could just add
13 to that, so the partner that we work with on this,
14 which is Aki Energy, has currently been doing some
15 work in the -- in Lac Brochet as part of a overall
16 remediation and energy efficiency project. And so
17 part of their interest that we have had conversations
18 about is potentially looking at a community-driven
19 outcomes model in other diesel communities is
20 something that they would be interested in.

21 It might not necessarily be geothermal,
22 and the conversation has been preliminary, but there
23 are options and there are things that we want to
24 potentially pursue if the diesel communities want to
25 participate or have other options available.

1 We're open to other possibilities and
2 looking at ways that we can help diesel communities
3 with energy efficiency.

4 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you so much
5 for a well-thought-out and -- and very thorough
6 answer. It was very informative. I appreciate that
7 very much.

8 Can we bring up Coalition IR number 28?

9 The Coalition had asked about the
10 programming costs associated with the use of the
11 affordable energy fund. I'm going to, at some point,
12 read out part of Efficiency Manitoba's response to
13 Part B of this IR from the Coalition.

14 And I'm sure we're going to get there
15 in just a minute, Ms. Schubert, please.

16 "The plan does not specifically
17 include any affordable energy fund
18 funding or forecasts for
19 conservation --"

20 I see it starts the second sentence of
21 that response --

22 "-- in the use of other home heating
23 fuels, given the limited market
24 information regarding homes with
25 fuel oil and propane heat combined

1 with the historically low activity
2 for retrofits."

3 This goes on. There's a lot of
4 information in this, and I'll probably ask some
5 questions about some of the other parts. But for
6 right now, what I'd like to know most about is this --
7 the limited market information regarding homes with
8 fuel oil.

9 Can you tell me, has Efficiency
10 Manitoba, or possibly Manitoba Hydro before, conducted
11 any research specific to the prevalence of the use of
12 fuel oil and propane heating in First Nations outside
13 of the diesel zone?

14

15 (BRIEF PAUSE)

16

17 MS. AMY TUCK: Not that we're aware
18 of.

19 MR. JARED WHEELER: Perhaps as a -- as
20 a line of future research, would Efficiency Manitoba
21 be interested in conducting research specific to the
22 prevalence of the use of fuel oil and propane heating
23 in First Nations outside of the diesel zone?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We would be
25 certainly interested in data such as that.

1 MR. JARED WHEELER: And perhaps that
2 would fill this gap of the limited market information
3 referred to in this IR response.

4 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: It certainly
5 would.

6 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, I believe Ms.
7 Tuck, it was yourself that had said that Manitoba
8 Hydro had informed Efficiency Manitoba that almost all
9 of the homes that use diesel for heating had been
10 retrofitted with insulation upgrades, but that -- that
11 information had been found to perhaps not have been
12 accurate. Is that correct?

13 MS. AMY TUCK: I wouldn't say that
14 it's inaccurate, and if that was the word that I used,
15 I -- I would like to correct that.

16 That we want to take the opportunity to
17 see if there are more opportunities for energy
18 efficiency upgrades such as insulation within the
19 diesel communities, then what Manitoba Hydro said, in
20 coordination with First Nation housing managers, what
21 would be remaining left in the market.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: Ms. Schubert, if
23 we can go a little further down here.

24 You can see that the -- it says:

25 "As per the response to PUB-EM-I-48,

1 Efficiency Manitoba will confirm
2 opportunities remaining with the
3 communities, as historic
4 participation data from Manitoba
5 Hydro has indicated that most homes
6 have been retrofitted with
7 insulation upgrades."

8 Now, this is in response to question --
9 give me one (1) second. Is -- you know what, I'm
10 going to leave that there for right now.

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: Okay. Is it safe
15 to assume that insulation -- any upgrades that -- in
16 any insulation upgrades that are still needed in the
17 diesel zone, can you confirm that that would likely be
18 contractors that would be doing that work?

19 MS. AMY TUCK: No. As part of the
20 Plan, the work that we anticipate being done would be
21 done by local community members that would have been
22 trained to do the insulation.

23 MR. JARED WHEELER: And who would
24 train those local community members?

25 MS. AMY TUCK: That is a great

1 question. The First Nation part of -- the job of the
2 First Nation energy advisor would be to work with
3 First Nations to train them to do the insulation work.
4 That is something that had been a legacy program at
5 Hydro, and that was something that we thought was good
6 value, as it added opportunity for jobs within the
7 communities.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: Sorry, do we know
9 who would be training the local community members?

10 MS. AMY TUCK: The First Nation energy
11 advisor from Efficiency Manitoba.

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: And can you tell
13 me, assuming that Efficiency Manitoba becomes aware
14 that insulation upgrades are needed in homes using
15 alternative heating sources such as fuel oil in First
16 Nations other than those in the diesel zone, can you
17 confirm that Efficiency Mani -- Manitoba might utilize
18 the Affordable Energy Fund to complete those
19 insulation upgrades?

20 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Maybe this is a
22 bit of a one-off question. For a First Nation family
23 living in a home on reserve, in a home that does not
24 use any Manitoba Hydro product, literally off the
25 grid, heating with fuel oil, or a wood burning stove,

1 can those folks asset -- access programs from
2 Efficiency Manitoba?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. AMY TUCK: The answer is yes.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. I'd

8 like to move on to some other questions about the

9 accessibility to all Manitobans of the proposed

10 Efficiency Plan, including consideration of the

11 interests of hard-to-reach First Nation customers.

12 Some of these questions are focusing on

13 -- on the who, the -- who Efficiency Manitoba plans

14 will deliver energy-efficient products and services to

15 hard-to-reach customers.

16 Ms. Schubert, can we please bring up on

17 the screen MKO/EM-I-20.

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so we see here

22 that Efficiency Manitoba has stated at PDF page 213 of

23 the Plan -- you had it right. If we can start right

24 at the beginning, I'm going to go from the Plan.

25 Thank you.

1 "A developed network of retail
2 locations is essential to ensure
3 energy-efficient products and offers
4 are accessible throughout the
5 Province."

6 Actually, can you confirm that, that in
7 Efficiency Manitoba's view, a develop network of
8 retail locations is essential to ensure energy-
9 efficient products and offers are accessible
10 throughout the Province?

11 MS. AMY TUCK: Not in all products.
12 No.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: And yet that's
14 what it says in the Plan. Can you confirm that I've
15 read that properly:

16 "A developed network of retail
17 locations is essential to ensure
18 energy-efficient products and offers
19 are accessible throughout the
20 Province."

21 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So I'm going to
22 -- I -- I will cross-reference PDF page 213 of the
23 Plan, just to see the context of this particular
24 statement, but I'm presuming it's talking about the
25 public in general. So some of the products that are

1 offered through the retail rebate campaign, where the
2 network of contractors and retailers are -- are
3 essential, I -- I believe are items that would be
4 offered for free in the direct install.

5 Although we do recognize, of course,
6 that contractor networks for things such as insulation
7 can be critical to delivering services, but again, as
8 Ms. Tuck has testified, we are looking to train the
9 local community members to -- to do those types of
10 services.

11 Same with doing lighting retrofits,
12 say, for example, in commercial buildings. Obviously,
13 we're going to try to work with local electricians
14 versus electricians from Winnipeg, and we understand
15 that not all communities have local electricians, so
16 that would certainly be a -- a barrier.

17 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in some cases,
18 you would agree that -- especially if there's no
19 retail locations, perhaps, that contractors may, in
20 fact, be used by Efficiency Manitoba to deliver
21 products or services?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Sorry, can you

1 repeat the question?

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: Sure. Can you
3 confirm that in some instances, contractors will be
4 relied upon to deliver some of Efficiency Manitoba's
5 energy-efficient products or services?

6 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: I suspect that
7 could be a potential, yes.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: And is it possible
9 that some contractors may be relied upon in at least
10 some instances to deliver energy-efficient products to
11 remote, isolated Northern First Nations?

12 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: There is that
13 potential, yes.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr. Wheeler.
15 You've got about fifteen (15) minutes.

16

17 CONTINUED BY MR. JARED WHEELER:

18 MR. JARED WHEELER: Very good. Thank
19 you, Mr. Chair.

20 So I would like to know if -- if we can
21 maybe go to MKO IR number 10. And we had asked:

22 "When contractors are deployed to
23 remote Northern First Nations, how
24 will Efficiency Manitoba ensure the
25 safety of residents?"

1 And we understand from Efficiency
2 Manitoba's response to other IRs from other
3 Interveners that contractors will be required to have
4 mandatory sensitivity and cultural awareness training.

5 Is that correct?

6 MS. AMY TUCK: Contractors or third
7 parties that are required to do work in First Nations,
8 correct. That is what we had responded to, yes.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: And there's also
10 now all contractors, regardless of their intended work
11 location or assignment, will undergo a personnel risk
12 assessment, which includes a criminal record check.

13 Is that correct as well, as it says on
14 the screen?

15

16 (BRIEF PAUSE)

17

18 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So I'll just --
19 I'll clarify. This -- this question here was intended
20 to address contractors that are specifically
21 contracted by Efficiency Manitoba to do work on our
22 behalf.

23 So there will be situations where
24 customers will be picking their contractor
25 independently, and -- and obviously, we -- we don't

1 have any requirements that we would have for those
2 contractors outside of the supplier agreement that we
3 are asking contractors to sign in order to ensure that
4 they're doing quality work and dealing with customer
5 service issues when they're delivering services that
6 Manitoba -- that Efficiency Manitoba is offering.

7 MR. JARED WHEELER: My question is:
8 Will First Nations, specifically those in remote
9 northern areas, be able to access the results of the
10 personnel risk assessments of those coming into their
11 communities?

12

13 (BRIEF PAUSE)

14

15 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So historically,
16 it -- Manitoba Hydro, that would be a pass or fail on
17 a PRA. And so the results get destroyed after the
18 pass or fail, so I would have to seek a legal opinion
19 on whether someone should be able to access PRA,
20 Passing Risk Assessment, to a community where they're
21 going to be doing work.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so it would be
23 safe to assume that if somebody failed the PRA, they
24 wouldn't be --

25 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: They wouldn't be

1 there.

2 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you for
3 that. Given the time, I think I'm probably going to
4 skip ahead a bit.

5 Ms. Schubert, can we please pull up
6 Daymark IR No. 13, and I'm looking for Attachment DE,
7 which is a very large table, very hard to read. I've
8 put it to 400; whatever works for everybody else. And
9 there's a lot of information here. This is -- this
10 was -- my understanding was in -- in -- prepared in
11 response to a number of different IRs.

12 One (1) thing this table shows us is
13 the total estimated number of participants for measure
14 by customer class and by year over the life of each
15 measure.

16 If we scroll across here, we see
17 bundles, measures, customer segment, delivery
18 partners. I assume NG, is that estimated? Is that
19 what NG stands for? No, natural gas.

20 MS. AMY TUCK: That's natural gas.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Okay, thank you.
22 And how participation is determined.

23 Now, what I'd like to see here is, if
24 we scroll all the way over to the left, Ms. Schubert,
25 -- and you'll confirm for me that products available

1 to residential customers are all available to
2 residential Indigenous customers, correct?

3 MS. AMY TUCK: More or less, yes, that
4 is correct. Yes, that is correct.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: So we can take out
6 the "more or less" or is there still a "more or less"?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: They are available. We
8 can take out the "more or less."

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. If we
10 scroll down to Indigenous Businesses, I believe it's
11 Small Businesses it says on here, we see a number of
12 different offers here.

13 Now, this is going to be tricky. So --
14 actually if we go up just a little bit, Ms. Schubert,
15 you see direct -- First Nation Insulation and Direct
16 Install Offers, and we see that partners -- trust me,
17 this column is Partners -- says:

18 "Participating First Nations."

19 Can you explain what that means that a
20 participating First Nation is a partner in the
21 insulation and direct install offers?

22

23 (BRIEF PAUSE)

24

25 MS. AMY TUCK: I think you're

1 referring to the column heading that says "Delivery
2 Partners."

3 MR. JARED WHEELER: Correct.

4 MS. AMY TUCK: Okay. So, yes. So
5 partnering First Nations in there would mean the First
6 Nation that we are working with to do the energy
7 efficiency upgrade.

8 MR. JARED WHEELER: So that would be -
9 - I believe this was canvassed with the AMC a little
10 bit yesterday. That would be partnering with the
11 First Nation themselves, the government leadership who
12 -- whoever may be speaking for the First Nation.

13 Is that right?

14 MS. AMY TUCK: The Housing Manager,
15 correct, yes.

16 MR. JARED WHEELER: If we look at --
17 actually, can you explain, if -- do offers for
18 Indigenous small businesses work the same way as for
19 residential?

20 Is it analogous, meaning if a
21 residential Indigenous customer can access all
22 residential programs, can an Indigenous small business
23 customer access all small business offers?

24 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, they can.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: And for small

1 business offers, I just want to make sure I have this
2 right -- Ms. Schubert, can you scroll up a little bit
3 here to Small Business specifically? There's a column
4 under -- maybe a row -- row under small -- okay, under
5 Small Business. I assure you there is a row that
6 says, yeah, Small Business and Appliance Offers.

7 Do appliance offers also -- can -- can
8 an Indigenous small business access the appliance
9 offers as well?

10 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, they can. So an
11 Indigenous business can access the non-Indigenous
12 small business and a -- and appliance offers.

13 MR. JARED WHEELER: And so Indigenous
14 small businesses have some -- let's call them
15 additional incentives. Some of the costs are -- are
16 borne more by Efficiency Manitoba, is that correct,
17 more than a non-Indigenous small business?

18 MS. AMY TUCK: That is correct. In
19 the Indigenous Small Business Program, Efficiency
20 Manitoba would bear the entire cost.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: Now, I note that
22 the appliance offers are not listed under Indigenous
23 Small Businesses.

24 So would that apply the same way or
25 would it apply that an Indigenous small business

1 accessing appliance offers would bear some costs, as a
2 small business, not as an Indigenous small business?

3 MS. AMY TUCK: Yes, they would bear
4 some cost.

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you. I
6 wanted to clarify that.

7 Given the time, maybe what we'll do is
8 -- give me just one (1) second, please.

9

10 (BRIEF PAUSE)

11

12 MR. JARED WHEELER: Very quick
13 question, Ms. Tuck. Yesterday you told us in response
14 to questions from AMC counsel that increased
15 participation in First Nations will likely lead to
16 more employment for First Nation citizens, is that
17 right? If more First Nation customers access
18 programs, there will likely be an up -- an increase in
19 employment on reserve.

20 MS. AMY TUCK: There would be an
21 increase of -- in the number of jobs, I would -- I
22 would say, the number of opportunities to do energy
23 efficiency jobs, in a coordinated approach with the
24 band.

25 MR. JARED WHEELER: So would those

1 employees -- if there's more jobs arising from more
2 participation in First Nations, would those employees
3 be included in the estimated seventy-five (75)
4 employees of Efficiency Manitoba or would that be in
5 addition to those numbers, if there's increased First
6 Nation participation?

7 MS. AMY TUCK: Sorry, they wouldn't be
8 Efficiency Manitoba employees.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: They would --
10 whose employees would they be?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MS. AMY TUCK: I think we were
15 discussing that more energy efficiency initiatives
16 that are taken -- taken within a community, provides
17 more opportunities for community members to access
18 those jobs as part of the programs of -- that the
19 insulation and direct install are performed by local
20 community members, and so that would be what I was --
21 I believe is what I would have been referring to.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: I'll take that,
23 Ms. Tuck. The last line of questions then, given the
24 time -- I'm curious about the barriers to
25 participation in DSM initiatives that have been

1 identified by Efficiency Manitoba.

2 What I would specifically like to know
3 is, how have those barriers been identified? We have
4 them listed in IRs, we have them listed in the plan.
5 We can pull up references, though we're short on time.
6 Efficiency Manitoba has listed a number of barriers to
7 DSM participation.

8 I just want to know how was that list
9 created. Did Efficiency Manitoba create that list?
10 Did the EEAG create it? Where did -- where did this
11 come from?

12 MS. AMY TUCK: The list of barriers
13 were detailed or were borne out of conversations and
14 historic issues that we have seen happen while we've
15 been working in DSM with First Nations.

16 MR. JARED WHEELER: And in further
17 engagement with First Nations, would you agree that
18 there could be other barriers identified by First
19 Nations themselves?

20 MS. AMY TUCK: I believe that's what I
21 said previously, so, yes, I would agree.

22 MR. JARED WHEELER: And when those
23 additional barriers to participation, if they are
24 identified, does Efficiency Manitoba anticipate having
25 to change the plan in any way to address those

1 additional barriers to participation, if they are
2 identified?

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 MS. AMY TUCK: I don't anticipate that
7 there needs to be a change in the plan but there could
8 potentially be a change in our approach.

9 MR. JARED WHEELER: Thank you very
10 much, Ms. Tuck, and thank you very much to this panel.
11 I think we'll leave it there. Thank you for your very
12 thoughtful responses to our questions.

13 And again, thank you to the Board for
14 granting our client this opportunity today to test the
15 evidence. Good day.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr.
17 Wheeler. Before we get to re-examination, I'm going
18 to ask the Panel if they have any questions. Mr.
19 Grant -- Dr. Grant...?

20 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Can I sneak a
21 couple of questions in?

22 First one will be a general one either
23 for Ms. Kuruluk or Mr. Stocki, and it's really to ask
24 your reflection on the targets that have been set and
25 the ability to achieve them.

1 And I just wanted to go back to the
2 NFAT which -- where I think this 1.5 figure may have
3 gained some currency. Mr. Dunsky appeared as an
4 expert called by the Coalition and Green Action
5 Committee. And he ex -- I think the term he used was
6 1.5 was an aggressive target and 1.3 was a cautious
7 one.

8 Whichever case, I'm not going to -- I'm
9 not asking you to comment on the legislation. In both
10 cases, he talked about a ramp-up period of five (5) to
11 six (6) years. And so, this was at the time, you
12 know, Hydro was probably achieving a .5 kind of
13 increase.

14 But I guess my question is: With your
15 experience either with hindsight, looking at Manitoba
16 Hydro with foresight, where are we on that ramp or is
17 there in fact a ramp, is there kind of a learning
18 curve that goes, and -- and where are we with it?

19 Because if -- if you were starting, you
20 know, cold turkey, are we supposed to expect to
21 achieve this 1.5 percent five (5) years out or can --
22 are we building on some of these mature programs
23 you're inheriting?

24 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: So, I'll start
25 that off and allow Mr. Stocki to elaborate if -- if

1 he'd like. But certainly where we are at post-NFAT
2 with the efficiency plans that were developed after --
3 after that recommendation came out, there was a period
4 where the -- the plan was achieving targets much
5 higher than .5.

6 And I think I'm going to state the
7 '19/'20 plan is .3 percent of load, subject to check.
8 Ms. Pilek could probably confirm that for me. So --
9 so, there is certainly -- it's an aggressive target,
10 especially in the context that's been provided through
11 the legislation.

12 There's obviously some extra
13 requirements that have to be achieved, but we do think
14 it's achievable. At Manitoba Hydro, Dun -- Philippe
15 Dunsky had also been contracted to basically take what
16 was existing as the plan of the day, which I believe
17 would have been the 2017/'18 plan, and -- and give
18 some recommendations on what could be done in order to
19 hit the 1.5 target which he also deemed was
20 aggressive.

21 And that specific report has been filed
22 in response to one (1) of the IRs from one (1) of the
23 Interveners, so that's certainly at your disposal.

24 So, I think that we can meet 1.5 with
25 the plan that we've outlined. There's been a few

1 points in our testimony where we've talked about codes
2 and standards, for example, and -- and it being
3 conservative.

4 And I think we've outlined a better
5 approach to the market that can -- that can basically
6 garnish more savings out of even existing ta --
7 technologies that exist today.

8 In addition to that, certainly we
9 haven't tapped the full potential of emerging
10 technologies, and that's a space where we want to work
11 in, as well.

12 So, as much as it -- as it's
13 aggressive, and there's certainly some challenges that
14 have been outlined with respect to how we should be
15 achieving those savings, we -- we do believe strongly
16 that it can -- it can be accomplished.

17 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Thank you. My
18 second question that I think -- just to get Mr. Stocki
19 to speak here. And I'm not trying to trick you on
20 commenting on integrated resource planning, but I
21 would like to talk a little bit about the interaction
22 between rates and DSM programs and that a GRA a little
23 while ago -- I think Dr. Yatchew referred to a rate
24 increase is the greatest of all DSM programs because
25 the PACT was zero, the -- the cost was zero,

1 essentially.

2 But -- so, my question would be: When
3 you lay out targets and participation rates, how does
4 that interact with rates? Would your -- would a high
5 increase -- this is not -- I'm not advocating this,
6 but would a high rate increase support the take-up of
7 DSM programs?

8 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Certainly, with
9 respect to where customers are considering the
10 economics of installing an energy efficiency measure
11 it can make an impact because, if they're going to
12 realize say, for example, a 2.5 percent rate increase
13 and they know that's coming and that -- that factors
14 into their consideration with respect to payback
15 periods or things like that, then that could affect a
16 customer's decision.

17 But, typically, economics are one (1)
18 of the multiple decision points that a customer makes,
19 so there might be other non-economic decisions that is
20 leading that customer to make an energy efficiency
21 decision for environmental reasons or other no --
22 other reasons.

23 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: So, just to
24 follow up then because I think our professions may
25 lead us to different answers on this question. If the

1 take-up -- if the -- if there was a 10 percent rate
2 increase and you saw your take-up very high in a DSM
3 program, would you credit all of that to your DSM
4 program?

5 Is it -- when -- when you sat down to
6 record the ene -- the savings, would that all be
7 attributed to DSM?

8

9 (BRIEF PAUSE)

10

11 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: Well, a couple
12 points to that. So, if -- if there's a rate increase,
13 for example, and that -- that price elasticity effect
14 affects our gross Manitoba load, for example, then
15 that will actually drive down our number of gigawatt
16 hours that we need to achieve that 1.5, for example.

17

18 (BRIEF PAUSE)

19

20 MR. MICHAEL STOCKI: We also have
21 within our regulations the ability to look at things
22 like conservation rates or time of use rates in
23 coordination with Manitoba Hydro.

24 And so, if there's specific rate
25 mechanisms that are available, although we didn't look

1 at that within the plan, it is a potential in future
2 plans that we undertake an effort with Manitoba Hydro
3 to look at those such rates.

4 And if we make a material contribution
5 and they're shown to reduce consumption, then we could
6 also potentially count those towards our energy
7 savings targets.

8 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: If I could just
9 add. So, if you're talking about price elasticity in
10 and of itself and what kind of impact it has in the
11 market -- is that what you're --

12 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: No. I'm thinking
13 of a case where prices spike up, I rush out, take your
14 incentive and go upgrade my furnace. How do you
15 record those savings?

16 And I -- I guess the question is: Is
17 the energy reduction -- the energy savings, is it
18 attributable to the DSM program or is it attributable
19 to higher rate?

20 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Okay. So -- so
21 -- right, okay. So -- so, the furnace -- cost of gas
22 goes up and we want to know whether it's attributable
23 to the incentive that we might have in the market or
24 was it the price of gas that -- that drove that
25 decision.

1 And so, we do have follow-up surveys
2 with every customer. That's a requirement as per our
3 evaluation in the past at Manitoba Hydro, but even
4 more so now with a third-party assessor, so that would
5 be the type of question we'd try and get at.

6 And I think -- you know, I'm sure the
7 panel has heard terms such as 'free riders', so
8 someone that would have done it anyways in the absence
9 of our incentive and done it just because gas rates
10 had spiked, and -- and they indicate that in their
11 survey.

12 That technically would be a free rider
13 and we would have had to pay that incentive, but we
14 would not be able to claim the savings.

15 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Then just one (1)
16 last point on that issue because I'm always curious
17 how you measure some of these things. In -- in a
18 rebound effect, I think the language now is about
19 partial equilibrium and general equilibrium effects.

20 I don't know if this sounds familiar,
21 but I put in a new furnace, my electricity bill goes
22 down, and so then I turned up the thermostat would be
23 the partial equilibrium effect.

24 The general equilibrium effect is my --
25 my bill goes down, so I saved some money. And so then

1 I go out and buy a bigger TV set which becomes a -- do
2 -- do you measure things of that nature, as well?
3 Does it -- do -- does your surveys -- do they drill
4 down to that extent?

5 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: We're going to
6 the back row for this one.

7 MS. CHERYL PILEK: We haven't at
8 Manitoba Hydro done those types of measurements in the
9 past, but we would be looking at bringing in the
10 third-party evaluator and exploring more in-depth
11 evaluations like the rebound effect.

12 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Okay. Thank you.

13

14 (BRIEF PAUSE)

15

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. So, Ms.
17 Schofield or Ms. Merrick, is there any re-examination?

18

19 (BRIEF PAUSE)

20

21 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Mr. Chair, may
22 I just ask for maybe a three (3) minute --

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

24 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: -- break?

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Certainly.

1 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry. Ms.

7 Schofield...?

8 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Thank you, Mr.

9 Chair. I can advise that we don't have any re-
10 examination. I do, however, have three (3) exhibits
11 to mark, if I may do so.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is she back? Okay.

13 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: And --

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Certainly.

15 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: -- Mr. Chair,
16 perhaps before Ms. Schofield does that, I understand
17 that Mr. Wheeler may want to close the loop on an
18 answer or a -- if possible, an undertaking if the
19 answer is not available.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

21 MR. JARED WHEELER: I do want to close
22 the loop. We had asked for some information about the
23 per-home average annual energy savings, per building
24 annual energy savings. We were told we would -- we
25 went on a break right after that, and we didn't come

1 back around to it, so I wonder if that information for
2 how those numbers were derived may be available.

3 MS. COLLEEN KURULUK: Would you be
4 willing to accept those in an undertaking?

5 MR. JARED WHEELER: I absolutely
6 would, assuming that that information, then, is not
7 available off the top of anyone's head.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can somebody
9 put the undertaking on the record so the reporter
10 knows exactly what it is?

11

12 (BRIEF PAUSE)

13

14 MR. JARED WHEELER: So the specific
15 reference, then -- it was in reference to a response
16 to AMC IR 18. There were three (3) tables, and the
17 three (3) tables had annual average energy savings
18 figures.

19 So the undertaking would be for
20 Efficiency Manitoba to please provide the data to show
21 how the average annual energy savings per home -- how
22 those numbers were reached.

23

24 (BRIEF PAUSE)

25

1 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Sorry, Mr.
2 Chair. Thank you --

3 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Sorry, I just
4 want to confirm --

5 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes.

6 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: -- that the
7 wording for the undertaking's okay. Is that --

8 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes, I
9 apologize. I was having trouble with my microphone.

10 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Yes, okay.

11 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: It is.

12 BOARD MEMBER GRANT: Thank you.

13

14 --- UNDERTAKING NO. 10:

15 Efficiency Manitoba to
16 provide the data to show
17 how the numbers were
18 reached for the average
19 annual energy savings per
20 home.

21

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Exhibit
23 numbers, I believe?

24 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: Yes. So the
25 first exhibit is Exhibit 22, and that is

1 correspondence from Ms. Merrick to Dr. Christle and
2 Ms. McMullin relating to the Board's correspondence to
3 our office on January 7th.

4

5 --- EXHIBIT NO. EM-22: Correspondence from Ms.
6 Merrick to Dr. Christle
7 and Ms. McMullin relating
8 to the Board's
9 correspondence to the
10 office of Efficiency
11 Manitoba on January 7th.

12

13 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: And then we
14 will also ask to mark as Exhibit 23 the response to
15 Undertaking 2 and 3 made to the Boards' counsel.

16

17 --- EXHIBIT NO. EM-23: Response to Undertaking 2
18 and 3 made to Boards'
19 counsel.

20

21 MS. JESSICA SCHOFIELD: And as
22 Undertaking (sic) 24, the response to Undertaking
23 number 4 made to Coalition's counsel.

24

25 --- EXHIBIT NO. EM-24: Response to Undertaking 4

1 made to Coalition's
2 counsel.

3

4 (BRIEF PAUSE)

5

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Okay, thank
7 you. So subject to the undertakings and the -- the
8 right of parties to cross-examine this panel on those
9 undertakings, I'd like to thank the panel very much
10 for appearing here today.

11 We'll adjourn today and resume at nine
12 o'clock tomorrow morning. Thank you.

13 MR. ANTOINE HACAULT: Mr. Chair, sorry
14 to interject. We -- a couple days ago, Ms. Steinfeld
15 and I had discussion with the panel wondering whether
16 some calculations or some modelling might be possible.
17 I don't know if we can have an update as to where
18 Efficiency Manitoba is in that process and when we can
19 expect to receive a response.

20 MS. DAYNA STEINFELD: I have received
21 a suggestion for what Efficiency Manitoba can provide
22 from Ms. Merrick and Ms. Schofield. If possible, I
23 might suggest that that suggestion also be shared with
24 Mr. Hacault. The Board counsel and Board advisors
25 will review that, and if satisfactory, we will confirm

1 it as an undertaking on the record.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. We're
3 adjourned. Thank you very much.

4

5 --- Upon adjourning at 4:31 p.m.

6

7 Certified Correct,

8

9

10

11

12 _____
Donna Whitehouse, Ms.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25