

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**IN RE: ENERGY EFFICIENCY & RESOURCE :
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL’S RECOMMENDED : DOCKET 23-21-EE
TARGETS FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND ACTIVE :
PEAK DEMAND REDUCTION SAVINGS FOR 2024-2026 :**

**COMMISSION’S FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS
DIRECTED TO THE EERMC**

**Issued July 3, 2023
Response Due August 1, 2023**

1. On page 8 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “for energy efficiency, the achievable scenario sets incentives at the midpoint between the Mid and Max scenarios of the original study for most modeled programs.” Regarding the incentive levels that Dunksy modeled in its Study Refresh, please provide a table comparing modeled incentive levels to Rhode Island Energy’s budgeted incentive levels from the 2023 Plan for both the gas and electric programs.
2. On page 10 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “greater proportional reduction in economic potential [of the Gas Energy Efficiency Program] due to additional measures failed cost-effectiveness criteria.” Please provide a list of the gas measures (or groups of measures) that Dunksy identified as not cost-effective.
3. On page 11 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “updated net-to-gross assumptions generally reduced claimable gas savings. Original Study: 7% reduction in gross savings. Study Refresh: 19% reduction in gross savings.” Regarding this statement, please explain the following:
 - a. What is the 19% reduction in gross savings relative to (i.e. 19% less than what)?
 - b. Is the 19% reduction in gross savings an average across the entire gas portfolio? If yes, please provide a list of the specific measures for which gross savings have decreased since the Original Study and the measure-specific decreases.
4. On page 17 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “slightly less [electric] technical savings pass the TRC screening threshold with updated AESC values.” Please provide a list of the electric measures (or groups of measures) that Dunksy identified as not cost-effective.
5. On page 21 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “nearly 50% of the [electric] HVAC opportunity is from displacing electric resistance heating with ductless heat pumps.”

For the low, mid, and max scenarios for 2024, 2025, and 2026, please provide the number of heat pump replacements of electric resistance heating systems that Dunksy's referenced savings correspond to.

6. On page 23 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes “relative to the original study, the Study Refresh scenario savings [for delivered fuels savings] fall below the Mid scenario despite higher incentive levels. Reduction almost entirely driven by updated net-to-gross assumptions. Original Study: 5% reduction in gross savings. Study Refresh: 22% reduction in gross savings. Technical and economic potential largely unchanged.” Regarding this statement about delivered fuel savings, please explain the following:
 - a. What is the 22% reduction in gross savings relative to (i.e. 22% less than what)?
 - b. How did the technical and economic potential of delivered fuel savings remain “largely unchanged” from the original study if gross savings declined by more than 22%?

7. On page 29 of Appendix A, Dunksy writes the “reduction in incremental telemetry costs with the rollout of AMI improve the cost-effectiveness [of active demand response.” Please explain how AMI improves the cost-effectiveness of active demand response. In your response, specifically address how Dunksy's cost-benefit analysis treated the cost of metering and telemetry and whether that treatment is consistent with how Rhode Island Energy currently treats those costs in the ConnectedSolutions program.