
Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	IPL Has Not Met the Requirements of the IUB to Submit an Energy Efficiency Plan that Results in Achieving Energy Savings Levels of 1.5% by 2011	6
3.	Additional Energy, Economic, Environmental and Public Health Benefits of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	22
4.	IPL Has Not Adequately Considered The Current and Future Risk Of Coal-fired Combustion and How Energy Efficiency Would Mitigate These Risks	24
5.	IPL Can Achieve Annual Energy Savings of 1.5% or Greater Through Strategic and Sustained Program Planning, Combined Heat and Power (CHP), Demand Response and Clean Distributed Generation	29
6.	Recommendations.....	37

List of Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Resume of Christopher James
- Exhibit B: Sales Forecast, IPL's EE Plan, Economic and Achievable Potential (MWh) for 1.0% EE Scenario
- Exhibit C: The Sustainability and Costs of Increasing Efficiency Impacts: Evidence from Experience to Date; Kenji Takahashi, David Nichols, August 2008
- Exhibit D: Nuclear Power, Joint Fact Finding, the Keystone Foundation, July 2007
- Exhibit E: Energy Information Administration, Coal News and Markets, August 22, 2008
- Exhibit F: The public health benefits of insulation retrofits in existing housing in the United States; Jonathan Levy, et al, April 2003
- Exhibit G: Climate Change and Power: Carbon Dioxide Emissions Costs and Electricity Resource Planning; Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., March 2007
-

Public Version

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. What are your name, position and business address?**

3 A. My name is Christopher A. James. I am a Senior Associate at Synapse Energy
4 Economics, Inc., 22 Pearl Street, Cambridge, MA 02139.

5 **Q. Please describe Synapse Energy Economics.**

6 A. Synapse Energy Economics ("Synapse") is a research and consulting firm
7 specializing in energy and environmental issues, including electric generation,
8 transmission and distribution system reliability, market power, electricity market
9 prices, stranded costs, efficiency, renewable energy, environmental quality, and
10 nuclear power.

11 Synapse's clients include state consumer advocates, public utilities commission
12 staff, attorneys general, environmental organizations, federal government and
13 utilities. A complete description of Synapse is available at our website,
14 www.synapse-energy.com.

15 **Q. Please summarize your educational background and recent work experience.**

16 A. I graduated from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1978 with a Bachelor of
17 Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering. My undergraduate thesis focused on
18 design and construction of a low-cost hyperbolic solar collector. In 1988, I
19 received a Master of Arts Degree in Environmental Studies from Brown
20 University. My graduate thesis focused on criteria and toxic emission from
21 medical waste incineration. In addition, I have taken numerous EPA courses in air
22 pollution science, combustion, continuous emissions monitors and boiler
23 operation. I have taken two courses in negotiation and mediation, offered through
24 Harvard University and Willamette University, and one environmental law course
25 offered through the University of Hartford.

Public Version

1 From 1984 to 2007, I worked for, in chronological order, the Rhode Island
2 Department of Environmental Management; the US Environmental Protection
3 Agency, Seattle, Washington; and the Connecticut Department of Environmental
4 Protection. I was Manager of Climate Change and Energy Program for the CT
5 DEP, and also served as Director of Air Planning. From 1999 to 2007, I served as
6 the DEP representative to the Connecticut Energy Conservation Management
7 Board (ECMB), a statutorily created body responsible for the oversight, planning
8 and administration of the state's energy efficiency, conservation and load
9 management programs, currently funded at approximately \$87 million annually.
10 In my capacity on the ECMB, I was responsible for working with other Board
11 members to provide guidance, assistance and advice to the distribution companies
12 responsible for developing and implementing annual energy efficiency programs.
13 My experience on the Board included review and analysis of specific energy
14 efficiency program measures as well as strategic planning to better integrate
15 measures across sectors and customer classes, and critique and advice for ramping
16 up new programs.

17 I also served as co-chair of the National Association of Clean Air Agencies global
18 warming committee, co-chair of the New England Governors/ Eastern Canadian
19 Premiers global warming committee, co-chair of the Regulatory Assistance
20 Project's distributed resources collaborative, and co-chaired the NESCAUM
21 collaborative to develop a model rule for environmental performance standards. I
22 was the Connecticut staff lead for development of the Regional Greenhouse Gas
23 Initiative; DEP staff lead on the Governor's Climate Change Coordinating
24 Committee and the Connecticut DEP representative to the New England Demand
25 Response Initiative. I was also one of only two air regulators on the EPA/DOE
26 Leadership Group to develop and implement the National Action Plan for Energy
27 Efficiency.

Public Version

1 I joined Synapse in August 2007. My recent clients have included the Maine
2 Public Utilities Commission, the New Jersey Ratepayer Advocate, AARP, the
3 National Association of Clean Air Agencies, Environmental Defense, EPA and
4 the Regulatory Assistance Project.

5 I have testified before state regulatory commissions in Connecticut in dockets
6 related to the siting of a new power plant and emissions standards for new
7 distributed resources. I have also participated in and presented testimony before
8 state and Federal courts in cases involving violations of the Clean Air Act. These
9 include asphalt plants, wood products facilities, aerospace production facilities
10 and power plants. I was involved in the first nationally coordinated enforcement
11 actions of the Clean Air Act in 1991-92 against Louisiana-Pacific; in multimedia
12 enforcement actions against two pulp mills in Alaska; and in several actions
13 against power plants, including VEPCO, Ohio Edison and AEP. Each of the
14 power plant cases were settled prior to the remedy phase of the respective trials.

15 A copy of my current resume is attached as Exhibit A.

16 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?**

17 A. I am testifying on behalf of the Community Coalition.

18 **Q. Have you testified previously before this Commission?**

19 A. No.

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

21 A. Synapse was retained by the Community Coalition to assist in its evaluation of the
22 Application of Interstate Power and Light Company's ("IPL" or "the Company")
23 energy efficiency plan that was filed with the IUB on April 28, 2008.

24 This testimony presents the results of our analyses.

25 **Q. Please summarize your conclusions.**

26 A. My conclusions are as follows:

Public Version

- 1 1. Despite the fact that IPL says the 1.5% annual energy savings scenario
2 will be difficult to achieve, this scenario is very achievable and should be
3 pursued.

- 4 2. The projected costs of both IPL's 1.3% annual energy savings base case
5 ("base case") and their 1.5% annual energy savings scenario are too high
6 and not reasonable:
 - 7 a. IPL's cost estimates for the 1.3% base case and 1.5% savings scenario
8 are not reflective of what Iowa utilities have achieved in the past or
9 what other utilities are currently experiencing.
 - 10 b. Furthermore, IPL has not justified the significant cost differential
11 (almost \$200 million additional) between the 1.3% base case and the
12 1.5% savings scenario.

- 13 3. As a result, IPL overestimates the costs of energy efficiency, and
14 underestimates the amount of energy efficiency that can be achieved by
15 2013.

- 16 4. This flawed approach leads to IPL's conclusion that growth in electricity
17 demand will lead to a need for additional supply during the period from
18 2009 to 2013. The overestimation of the cost of energy efficiency also
19 enables IPL to favor adding a new coal-fired power plant in 2013.

- 20 5. In fact, IPL could even achieve more than 1.5% annual energy savings.
21 There are additional opportunities that IPL's plan does not recognize.
22 These include: combined heat and power, and demand response as a
23 resource in conjunction with energy efficiency.

Public Version

1 6. IPL has ignored some of the benefits of energy efficiency to Iowa's
2 consumers and businesses. These benefits include: deferring the need to
3 construct new or upgrade existing generation, deferring the need to
4 construct new or upgrade existing transmission lines and distribution
5 system, reducing ratepayer bills, reducing emissions of criteria air
6 pollutants (such as those which contribute to acid rain, smog and haze)
7 and greenhouse gas emissions, and reducing public health costs (from
8 reduced number of asthma cases, visits to emergency rooms, lost
9 productivity at work, etc.)

10 7. For these reasons, the Board should require IPL to revise, amend and
11 resubmit their energy efficiency plan. IPL can achieve higher annual
12 energy savings at lower costs than those the company is assuming in its
13 energy efficiency filing. I note that the IUB has already approved the
14 generating certificate for IPL's proposed new Marshalltown generating
15 unit. Requiring both increased expenditures for energy efficiency and the
16 simultaneous expenditure for construction of the new generating unit will
17 test the flexibility of Iowa's rate structure. The IUB should consider
18 delaying any further action on IPL's ratemaking principle request until the
19 IUB has reached a decision in this docket for IPL's energy efficiency
20 filing. Moving on the energy efficiency first would be the most prudent.

21 **Q. Please explain how you conducted your investigations in this proceeding.**

22 A. We have reviewed the application, testimony and exhibits filed by IPL in this
23 proceeding. We have reviewed the information and documents provided by IPL
24 in response to data requests submitted by the Community Coalition. We also
25 have reviewed public information related to the issues addressed in IPL's
26 application, testimony and exhibits and in our testimony and exhibits. We have
27 also included information from:

Public Version

1 Quantec et al. Assessment of Energy and Capacity Savings for Iowa; Prepared
2 for the Iowa Utility Association, February 2008.

3 Kenji Takahashi and David A. Nichols. The Sustainability and Costs of
4 Increasing Efficiency Impacts: Evidence from Experience to Date, ACEEE
5 Summer 2008 Conference, August 2008.

6 **2. IPL HAS NOT MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE IUB TO SUBMIT**
7 **AN ENERGY EFFICIENCY PLAN THAT RESULTS IN ACHIEVING**
8 **ENERGY SAVINGS LEVELS OF 1.5% BY 2011**

9 **Q. Describe the Iowa Utilities Board (IUB) order and IPL's response.**

10 A. On January 14, 2008, the IUB issued an order directing Iowa's utilities to submit
11 energy efficiency plans which, when implemented, would result in annual energy
12 savings equal to 1.5% from energy efficiency measures. The annual energy
13 savings of 1.5% was to be achieved by 2011, and continued through 2013.

14 **Q. What does "annual energy savings equal to 1.5%" mean?**

15 A. This quantity, 1.5% refers to the total energy savings that would be achieved
16 through energy efficiency, demand response and renewable energy measures as
17 compared to the company's electricity sales forecast for a given year, in this case,
18 IUB directed that the company plan to achieve 1.5% of annual savings by 2011.
19 The effect of energy efficiency measures is projected to be 1.2% of annual
20 savings by 2011.

21 **Q. What is the effect of this level of annual energy savings on a company's**
22 **proposed electricity sales?**

23 A. The level of annual savings reduces the estimated electricity sales. If a company
24 estimates that annual electricity growth in Iowa is 1.5%, then an energy efficiency
25 program that achieves annual energy savings of 1.5% will effectively reduce the
26 annual electricity growth to zero for that year. Energy efficiency savings are
27 cumulative with persistent performance, over the life of the measures that are

Public Version

1 installed. In this example, assuming Iowa's estimated electricity growth
2 continued to grow at 1.5% annually, energy efficiency programs that achieve
3 annual energy savings of 1.5% would maintain Iowa's electricity sales at a
4 constant level.

5 **Q. Does IPL's energy efficiency plan comply with the January 14, 2008 IUB**
6 **order directing the company to submit a plan that will achieve annual energy**
7 **savings of 1.5% by 2011?**

8 A. Not fully. The primary focus of the plan is still on their 1.3% base case with 1%
9 savings through efficiency in 2013, although IPL has included a 1.5% savings
10 scenario in the plan. Energy efficiency measures are proposed to achieve 1.2% of
11 the 1.5% annual energy savings under the 1.5% savings scenario.

12 **Q. Has IPL considered the findings and recommendations in the Quantec report**
13 **in the IPL EE plan?**

14 A. It appears the measures considered in IPL's energy efficiency plan are based on
15 Quantec report and the amount of savings assumed under the 1.5% plan is
16 consistent with the recommendations included in the Quantec report. However,
17 IPL's 1.5% annual energy savings scenario is at the lowest level of achievable
18 potential in the range of 30% to 85% identified by the study (per page 9 of the
19 Quantec report). At page 4 of her direct testimony, IPL witness King states that
20 IPL's plan will achieve 43 percent of the estimated energy efficiency potential
21 over the five-year period included in their plan. Synapse analyzed IPL's filing and
22 found that IPL would actually achieve only 29% and 32% of the estimated
23 economic energy efficiency potential over the five year period under the 1.3% and
24 1.5% scenarios respectively, as shown in Exhibit B.

25

Public Version

1 **Q. Please describe the terms technical potential and economic potential, as used**
2 **in the Quantec report.**

3 A. Technical potential means all measures considered to be implemented in an
4 energy efficiency program, regardless of the economics associated with the
5 measure. Economic potential means taking into consideration economic factors,
6 whether from the utility perspective, in terms of their avoided costs and discount
7 rates, or from a societal perspective, in terms of avoided costs and benefits
8 considered using societal rates. Economic potential is usually higher when
9 societal costs are used, and lower when utility costs are used. In a typical study
10 that considers the economic and technical potential of energy efficiency measures,
11 a range of what can be implemented, in terms of these two factors, through a
12 company's energy efficiency plan is provided. Based on my review of the
13 literature, the range of what measures are adopted to capture the economic
14 potential varies from about 30 to 70% over a five year period. This means that the
15 least performing program has either planned for or implemented energy efficiency
16 measures that are designed to achieve 30% of the economic potential of energy
17 efficiency measures for that state, and the best performing program has planned
18 for or implemented measures that are designed to achieved 70% of the economic
19 potential over five years.

20 **Q. Please describe IPL's 1.5% savings scenario.**

21 A. The Company proposes to achieve 1.5% savings in 2013 with 1.2% savings
22 through energy efficiency and the rest through demand response and renewable
23 energy. First, the Company states that this goal will be difficult to reach.
24 Additionally, IPL's estimate of the cost to achieve this level is unrealistically high
25 as compared to what we have seen for IPL in the past as well as for other utilities.

Public Version

1 **Q. Do you agree that this goal be difficult for IPL to reach?**

2 A. No. Many utilities are achieving these levels of savings. The table below reflects
3 examples of what some utilities have been achieving.

4 **Figure 1: Examples of High Annual Electric Energy Savings Realized**
5 **through Energy Efficiency Programs Since 2000**
6

Jurisdiction or Entity	Annual Savings (Percent)	Year(s)	Source
Interstate Power & Light (MN)	3.0	2001	Garvey, E. 2007. "Minnesota's Demand Efficiency Program."
San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) (CA)	2.1	2005	SDG&E 2006. Energy Efficiency Programs Annual Summary
Minnesota Power	1.9	2005	Garvey, E. 2007
Vermont	1.8	2007	Efficiency Vermont 2008. 2007 Preliminary Results and Savings Estimate Report
Southern California Edison (SCE)	1.7	2005	SCE 2006. Energy Efficiency Annual Report
Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) (CA)	1.5	2005	PG&E 2006. Energy Efficiency Programs Annual Summary
Massachusetts Electric Co.	1.3	2005	MECo 2006. 2005 Energy Efficiency Annual Report Revisions
Connecticut IOUs	1.3	2006	CT Energy Conservation Management Board (ECMB). 2007
Cambridge Electric (MA)	1.1	2000	MA DTE 2003.
Seattle City Light (WA)	1.0	2001	Seattle City Light 2006. Energy Conservation Accomplishments: 1977-2005
Western Mass. Electric Co. (MA)	1.0	2000	MA Dept. of Telecommunications & Energy (DTE) 2003. Electric Utility Energy Efficiency Database

7 Source: Synapse Energy Economics 2008

8 Additionally, the potential study states that this goal is reachable.

9 **Q. Do you agree with the Company's estimated costs to achieve these levels of**
10 **savings?**

11 A. No.

12 **Q. Is IPL's assumption on cost of saved energy for energy efficiency measures**
13 **under both 1.3% scenario and 1.5% scenario reasonable?**

14 A. No.

15

Public Version

1 **Q. Please explain in detail IPL's cost estimates for those scenarios.**

2 **A.** Table 1.1 of IPL's plan estimates that a program to achieve 1.3% annual energy
3 savings rate will cost \$410 million for the period from 2009 to 2013. Of this \$410
4 million, \$144 million is for a demand response portfolio, \$30 million is for
5 outreach and education; and \$34 million is for renewable energy. Total costs for
6 the energy efficiency portfolio alone are reflected in Table 3.1 of IPL's plan; these
7 are estimated to be \$211 million for the 2009 to 2013 period.

8 However, details of the estimated costs to achieve 1.5% annual energy savings
9 was not provided in IPL's April 23, 2008, filing. Section 1.4 of IPL's energy
10 efficiency plan reflects that based on IPL analysis, cumulative IPL costs to
11 implement a plan to achieve a 1.5% savings level would cost \$435 million over
12 the 2009 to 2013 period vs. \$236 million for IPL's base case of achieving 1.0%
13 by 2011 and 1.3% savings by 2013.


14 **Q. Describe the differences between the 1.3% base case and the 1.5% scenario**
15 **in terms of their effects on electricity demand.**

16 **A.** Two graphs are shown below. The first is for IPL's base case of 1.3% annual
17 energy savings (of which 1.0% is achieved from energy efficiency); the second
18 graph is for IPL's 1.5% annual energy savings (of which 1.2% is achieved from
19 energy efficiency). Data reflect IPL's electricity sales forecast, the net effects of
20 energy efficiency measures, a line representing the achievable potential as 43% of
21 economic potential and a line representing the full economic potential of all
22 energy efficiency measures. To create this chart, we assumed the level of savings
23 in 2006 sustained in the following two years (2007 to 2008) because savings data
24 for those years are not available. Assuming that Quantec study estimated
25 efficiency potential as of around 2007, we then estimated cumulative energy
26 savings starting in 2007 through 2013 so as to compare the cumulative savings to
27 the economic potential estimated by Quantec.

Public Version

1 The differences between the two graphs are shown through comparing electricity
2 sales for 1.0% annual energy savings v. 1.2%. Electricity sales for 1.2% annual
3 energy savings show a nearly flat line for the period. If IPL's 1.5% annual energy
4 savings actually included 1.5% from energy efficiency, the annual electricity sales
5 would likely be flat if not be decreasing over the period.
6
7

Figure 2: Energy Efficiency at 1% in 2013 vs. Economic and Achievable Potential




8
9

Public Version

1
2

Figure 3: Energy Efficiency at 1.2% in 2013 vs. Economic and Achievable Potential



3

4 Exhibit B provides the data used for the two graphs above.

4

5 **Q.**

6 **What do these two charts describe in terms of the level of energy savings that can be achieved?**

6

7 **A.**

8 Quantec conducted a literature of achievable potential studies as compared to
9 economic potential study and found out a wide range of achievable potential,
10 from 30% to 80%. Based on this finding, IPL stated that “attaining 50 percent of
11 economic potential to constitute reasonably achievable savings for a five to ten-
12 year resource acquisition effort” (page 24, first paragraph in IPL’s Energy
13 Efficiency Plan). IPL estimated their 1.0% efficiency target by 2013 in the 1.3%
14 base plan is equal to 43% of economic potential and called it aggressive.
15 However, we estimated that 1% and 1.2% annual savings would result in 29%
16 and 32% of economic potential in 2013 respectively, significantly lower than
17 what IPL claims it could achieve. We provide an explanation of these numbers
18 below as well as in the Exhibit B. Given these findings as well as our research
19 on leading energy efficiency programs elsewhere, we believe IPL could achieve
more at low costs.

19

Public Version

1 **Q. Why do you think IPL’s description of the costs to implement their energy**
2 **efficiency programs is not reasonable?**

3 A. These plans are not reasonable because: (1) while IPL explained barriers against
4 efficiency measures in general, it failed to explain the link between those barriers
5 and the difficulty to reach 1.2% from 1% and also it did not provide sufficient
6 reasoning and evidence for the cost increase under the 1.5% scenario (with 1.2%
7 efficiency goal); (2) the Company’s reported costs for past efficiency efforts; and
8 (3) the costs and savings other utilities are obtaining.

9 **Q. Please explain why IPL did not provide sufficient reason or evidence for the**
10 **cost increase and the link between barriers and reaching 1.5% annual energy**
11 **savings from energy efficiency.**

12 A. IPL has assumed certain factors to escalate the costs of implementing a program
13 that would achieve 1.5% annual energy savings, but has not provided adequate
14 justification. IPL’s response to Data Request No. 9 which simply repeats the
15 testimony of IPL witness King’s direct testimony at page 13 provided the
16 following cost escalation factors for each program cost category: 15% annually
17 for planning and design, administration, advertising and promotion; 20% annually
18 for incentives; and 5% annually for monitoring and evaluation. [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED] IPL has also not provided an analysis or
21 justification for any barriers that would need to be addressed or overcome to
22 achieve 1.5% annual energy savings. [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED]

Public Version

1 **Q. Please explain how IPL's past efficiency programs performed and compare**
2 **them to IPL's plan.**

3 A. [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED] IPL has not
6 provided the levelized costs for each year. We estimated and compared the
7 levelized cost of saved energy and first year energy savings as a percent of sales
8 for three historical years (2004 to 2006). We also estimated the levelized cost of
9 saved energy and first year energy savings for the two efficiency scenarios in the
10 plan based on the IPL's budget and first year savings data we obtained from IPL's
11 filing and Iowa Utilities Board's report on Iowa utilities' demand side
12 management programs.

13 This calculation is important in order to establish a basis for IPL's energy
14 efficiency program, and to compare these data with the budget estimates that IPL
15 has provided in the company's April 23, 2008, energy efficiency filing, and
16 compared with the experience with energy efficiency programs that have been
17 implemented elsewhere in the United States. The figure indicates that while
18 historically IPL has kept cost of energy efficiency lower as it increases its
19 efficiency program scale, IPL is assuming a totally different cost trend for its
20 future programs. The results are presented in the table and figure below. All the
21 dollar values are converted to the 2009 dollar value using a 2.5% inflation rate as
22 the benefit cost and cost levelization estimates by IPL are also expressed in the
23 2009 dollar value. To estimate the levelized cost of savings, we assumed a 12 year
24 measure life and a 2.3% real discount rate (which is estimated based on a 4.81%
25 nominal discount rate and a 2.5% nominal inflation rate). A 4.81% discount rate is
26 the value used by IPL for the societal cost test. We used a 12 year measure life
27 because it has been has been recognized as a rule of thumb estimate by industry
28 experts including U.S. Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Public Version

1 Agency¹ as well as the American Council for Energy Efficient Economy that the
2 cost of saved energy will be higher for the period from 2009-2013 than it was for
3 the period 2004-2006. IPL has also not provided justification for the escalation
4 factors it used (per IPL witness King at page 13 of her direct testimony). IPL’s
5 April 23, 2008 energy efficiency filing reflects a significant increase in the cost of
6 saved energy for its future energy efficiency program; IPL has not justified the
7 bases for this increase or the difference in trends for the cost of saved energy in
8 the past (2004-2006) v. that estimated for the future (2009-2013).

9 **Figure 4: IPL Historical EE Savings, Spending and Cost of Saved Energy**

IPL Historical EE Savings, Spending and Cost of Saved² Energy


	2004	2005	2006
First Year Savings (MWh)	82,625	103,634	120,542
Spending (nominal\$)	19,958,293	18,077,576	19,749,409
Spending (2009\$)	22,925,571	20,114,243	21,302,853
Sales (MWh)	14245634	15019361	14829537
Savings as % of Sales	0.58%	0.69%	0.8%
First Year Cost/Annual Savings (nominal\$/kWh)	0.24	0.17	0.16
Levelized Cost @ 12 year life (nominal\$/kWh)	\$0.026	\$0.019	\$0.017
First Year Cost/Annual Savings (2009\$/kWh)	\$0.28	\$0.19	\$0.18
Levelized Cost @ 12 year life (2009\$/kWh)	\$0.026	\$0.018	\$0.017

¹ [DOE and EPA] U.S. Department of Energy and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2006. *National Action Plan For Energy Efficiency*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Energy and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Kushler, M., D. York, and P. Witte. 2005. *Examining the Potential for Energy Efficiency to Help Address the Natural Gas Crisis in the Midwest*: Washington, DC: American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, 2005; Bender, S., M. Messenger, and C. Rogers. 2005. *Funding and Savings for Energy Efficiency Programs for Program Years 2000 through 2004*. Sacramento, CA: California Energy Commission.

² Historical sales data are obtained from U.S. EIA’s Form 861 database. Savings as % of sales for 2004 and 2005 are taken from Figure 1.1 in IPL’s Energy Efficiency Plan, and savings for 2006 are taken from Iowa Utilities Board 2008. The Status of Energy Efficiency Programs in Iowa and the 2007 Iowa Residential Energy Survey Report to the Iowa General Assembly January 1, 2008

1 **Figure 5: Historical and Projected Costs of Energy Efficiency Programs for**
2 **IPL L**

3



4


5

6 The x-axis reflects IPL's data on annual energy savings. The y-axis provides the
7 cost of saved energy. The green triangles on the left side of the graph show that
8 for 2004-06, IPL achieved annual energy savings of 0.58 to 0.8% with a cost of
9 saved energy that declined from \$0.026/kWh to \$0.017/kWh as the level of
10 annual savings increased. By comparison, IPL's April 23, 2008, cost estimates for
11 energy efficiency submitted to the IUB shown by the red triangles on the right
12 side of the graph, reflect a totally different set of costs and annual energy savings.
13 For 2009-2013, IPL's data reflects that its cost of saved energy would increase
14 each year, as annual energy savings increase.

Public Version

1 Even if we look at the historical cost trend for both IPL and MidAmerican for a
2 longer period of time, we identified a declining cost trend curve. Our analysis is
3 presented below. The data represents the aggregated cost and savings by IPL and
4 MidAmerican from 2001 to 2006, and obtained from Iowa Utilities Board 2008:
5 The Status of Energy Efficiency Programs in Iowa and the 2007 Iowa Residential
6 Energy Survey Report to the Iowa General Assembly January 1, 2008.

7 **Figure 6: Historical Costs of Energy Efficiency Programs for Iowa IOUs**



8


9 **Q. What is the experience with levelized cost of saved energy and program scale**
10 **for of other utilities' efficiency programs?**

11 A. Synapse has collected data on utility cost and savings for a large number of
12 utilities and states to examine the empirical relationship between cost of saved
13 energy and scale of efficiency programs. Figure 7 below is part of the results of

Public Version

1 the study, attached as Exhibit C. Each data point represents first year energy
2 savings and annual utility spending for one year by one utility, a group of utilities
3 or a program administrator. There are over 160 data points stretching from
4 the 1980s to 2007 grouped into 16 data sets, each of which represents a utility, a
5 group of a utility, or a program administrator. The study fit linear regression trend
6 curves for each dataset and found out that each dataset has a negative slope
7 coefficient, meaning that the costs were lower when the program scales are larger.
8 Further, the study found that programs that are achieving 1% or higher
9 experienced lower per unit cost as the program scale increased.

10 **Figure 7: Utility Cost of Saved Energy (2006\$/MWh) vs. Incremental Annual**
11 **Savings as % of Sales**



12

13 The study concluded that:

14

A key result is that, among all of the datasets that we have collected, all of
15 the slope coefficients of the linear trend lines are negative. This strongly
16 suggests that per-unit cost of energy efficiency (EE) decreases as the

Public Version

1 amount of EE savings increases. It is important to emphasize that this
2 finding contradicts the generally accepted theory that costs of EE increase
3 when EE savings amounts increase. The fact that the coefficient is
4 negative in every case is particularly striking. While there exists a
5 possibility that unit costs might begin to increase at much higher levels of
6 EE program savings, this evidence suggests that current program savings
7 levels have not yet approached any such point.

8
9 The study points out the following reasons for this negative cost trend in the past:
10 “(1) economies of scale are at work (e.g., allocating marketing and administration
11 costs over more EE savings, achieving lower unit costs for program inputs); (2)
12 economies of scope are at work (e.g., exploiting synergies among different
13 measures); (3) administrators become smarter and more organized in designing
14 and developing EE programs; or (4) administrators have more credibility or more
15 resources available for quality program design and development, etc.”

16 **Q. Why is information about the cost of saved energy and the levelized costs**
17 **important?**

18 A. The cost of saved energy is important to determine the efficacy of energy
19 efficiency programs, to compare these costs with the costs of building a new
20 generating plant or upgrading an existing plant and to compare with the costs of
21 operating an existing plant. The costs of saved energy are also useful to compare
22 with information on electricity rates by customer class. The levelized costs of
23 energy efficiency are also useful to compare against the levelized costs of a
24 proposed new generating plant.

25 **Q. What is the cost of saved energy for the economic potential for each customer**
26 **class in the Quantec report?**

27 A. The table below summarizes the results from the Quantec report. Note that “the
28 study was based solely on incremental costs of identified measures, including

Public Version

1 only direct capital and installation labor costs.” (Quantec et al. 2008, page 20) In
2 other words, while these estimates include participants’ contribution to purchasing
3 efficient measures, they do not include costs associated with program
4 administration, planning, marketing, and measurement and verification. The cost
5 of saved energy analysis we presented above includes all of the program costs
6 listed above, but does not include participants’ costs.

7 **Figure 8: Cost of Saved Energy from Quantec report**

8

Sector	Average Levelized Cost
Residential	\$0.04
Commercial	\$0.03
Industrial	\$0.01
Total	\$0.03

Public Version

1 **Q. How do these costs compared to the cost of new generation and existing**
2 **generation?**

3 A. New coal and natural gas fueled plant costs have been in a range of 8-11cents
4 /kWh (on a levelized basis). No new nuclear plants have been constructed in the
5 US, but a recent report by the Keystone Foundation (Exhibit D) estimates costs in
6 a similar range to those of new coal. Fuel costs have also escalated significantly in
7 the last three years, and remain much higher than 2005 in spite of the recent
8 decrease in oil prices. Natural gas fuel prices of \$10/ MMBtu equate to
9 approximately 10 cents/kWh just for the fuel costs. According to recently
10 published EIA data, Exhibit E, prices of Appalachian coal have more than
11 doubled since January 2007.

12 **<http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/coal/page/coalnews/coalmar.html#spot>**

13 EIA data does not reflect price increases for Powder River Basin (PRB) coal, but
14 the delivered cost for PRB coal has increased significantly due to increased fuel
15 costs. The factors contributing to these escalating costs are not expected to be
16 temporary.

17 **Q. What is the relevance of the cost of new and existing generation compared to**
18 **that for the cost of energy efficiency programs included in IPL's filing?**

19 A. IPL's filing reflects levelized costs for implementing energy efficiency programs
20 in their 1.3% base case of 5 cents/kWh for the residential portfolio and 4
21 cents/kWh for the non-residential portfolio. For the IPL 1.5% scenario, the
22 relevant levelized costs are 6 cents/kWh for the residential portfolio and 4
23 cents/kWh for the non-residential portfolio. As stated above, we believe IPL has
24 overestimated these costs because the company has not justified the bases for the
25 cost escalation factors it used to scale up the annual level of savings through
26 energy efficiency, and the bases for the company's high program administration
27 and marketing costs for some of their proposed measures. . Projected costs are

Public Version

1 also inconsistent with the costs of the programs that IPL has implemented
2 recently, IPL's 2004 to 2006 programs achieved energy efficiency savings at
3 levelized costs of less than 2 cents/kWh. The current and expected future
4 escalation in the cost of new plant construction, and the continued high and
5 volatile costs associated with the operation of existing plants creates significant
6 headroom to implement energy efficiency measures. We believe, based on
7 extensive data analysis of comparable programs, that IPL can achieve much
8 greater annual energy savings at lower costs than their filed plan. The high cost to
9 construct and operate generation creates even more opportunities to capture all
10 cost-effective energy efficiency.

11 **Q. What are your initial conclusions with respect to IPL's energy efficiency**
12 **plan?**

13 A. IPL has underestimated the amount of energy efficiency savings that can be
14 achieved, and has overstated the costs to achieve these savings. IPL has not
15 adequately addressed barriers to achieve annual energy savings of 1.5%. We
16 believe that IPL can achieve annual energy savings of 1.5% or more at lower
17 costs than IPL has estimated. IPL would likely also benefit from working with
18 other Iowa utilities, such as MidAmerican and Aquila to develop one
19 comprehensive state-wide program. This approach would take advantage of
20 economies of scale to implement energy efficiency measures, reduce advertising,
21 marketing and promotion budgets, implement a consistent program across the
22 state that minimizes consumer confusion, and provide greater opt-in opportunities
23 for municipal utilities and cooperatives.

Public Version

1 **3. ADDITIONAL ENERGY, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND**
2 **PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND**
3 **RENEWABLE ENERGY**

4 **Q. Does the IPL energy efficiency filing provide an estimate of the energy and**
5 **capacity benefits associated with implementation of IPL's proposed energy**
6 **efficiency program?**

7 A. Yes, table 1.1 of IPL's filing (page 4) provides estimates of energy and capacity
8 savings for the company's 1.3% base case. IPL's response to Data Request 12

9 

10 **Q. Are there other benefits associated with implementation of an energy**
11 **efficiency program?**

12 A. Yes.

13 **Q. Please describe them.**

14 A. Energy efficiency measures have direct and indirect benefits in the energy,
15 economic, environmental and public health components. For the energy
16 component, energy efficiency provides measurable and quantifiable energy and
17 capacity benefits. Energy efficiency can be procured as a resource at costs that are
18 one-third to one-half those associated with the construction of new generating
19 plants, and less than the costs of existing generating plants. Energy efficiency can
20 provide these benefits at peak and base load time periods depending upon the
21 measures being implemented.

22 Energy efficiency also defers and avoids the need to upgrade existing or install
23 new transmission capacity.

24 The economic benefits of energy efficiency, in addition to those embedded above
25 related to the cost of new generation and transmission systems, include reduction
26 in consumers' energy bills, and increasing local and regional economic growth
27 through jobs that are created to install, service and maintain energy efficiency

Public Version

1 measures. These jobs are skilled labor, and cannot be outsourced to another
2 country. Reducing consumers' energy bills puts more money in their pockets,
3 rather than exporting it outside of the US or outside the state to pay for the costs
4 of fossil fuels and the infrastructure needed to protect, secure and transport these
5 fuels.

6 Energy efficiency measures further provide several environmental benefits,
7 including reductions in criteria air pollutants, such as those that contribute to acid
8 rain and smog, mercury, and greenhouse gases. Energy efficiency also reduces
9 water consumption and improves water quality. By avoiding the need to construct
10 new power plants, energy efficiency also reduces the thermal discharge and water
11 consumption associated with the operation of fossil fuel and nuclear power plants.

12 The public health benefits from energy efficiency are beginning to be evaluated
13 and characterized. The US Environmental Protection Agency has developed a tool
14 called COBRA (for Co-Benefits Risk Assessment) that can calculate the
15 estimated public health benefits from reducing energy consumption. These
16 benefits include avoided asthma cases, reduced visits to hospital emergency
17 rooms, reduced number of sick days, etc. Exhibit F provides a paper by Jonathan
18 Levy, Yurika Nishioka and John Spengler (all Department of Environmental
19 Health, Harvard School of Public Health) "The Public Health Benefits of
20 Insulation Retrofits in Existing Housing in the United States", Environmental
21 Health: A Global Access Science Source, 2003, estimated that improved
22 insulation in the US would save significant quantity of energy, reduce air
23 emissions, and improve public health, including fewer deaths and asthma attacks.

Public Version

1 **4. IPL HAS NOT ADEQUATELY CONSIDERED THE CURRENT AND**
2 **FUTURE RISK OF COAL-FIRED COMBUSTION AND HOW ENERGY**
3 **EFFICIENCY WOULD MITIGATE THESE RISKS**

4 **Q. The IUB January 14, 2008 Order directed IPL to include the effect of a**
5 **national carbon dioxide cap and trade system or a carbon tax into the**
6 **company’s analysis of future supply options and avoided costs. Please**
7 **describe IPL’s approach to accounting for future regulation of greenhouse**
8 **gases.**

9 A. IPL witness Kimberly King, at page 10 of her direct testimony, stated that IPL
10 included a low carbon price of \$8/ton starting in 2010 and escalating 5.8%
11 annually, to reach a price of \$14/ton by 2020. A high carbon price of \$15/ton was
12 assumed for 2010, escalating at a rate of 8.5% annually, to reach a price of
13 \$34/ton in 2020. Witness King also indicated, at pages 12-13 of her direct
14 testimony, that implementation of a national program to reduce greenhouse gas
15 emissions would be expected to increase their avoided energy costs, would
16 modestly increase the economic potential of energy efficiency measures, but
17 would make no difference in the number of measures included in its energy
18 efficiency filing.

19 **Q. Has Synapse conducted any analysis of the price of carbon?**

20 A. Yes.

21 **Q. Please describe this analysis.**

22 A. Synapse’s “Climate Change and Power: Carbon Dioxide Costs and Electricity
23 Resource Planning” (Exhibit G) includes a price forecast for carbon based upon
24 our review of various Congressional legislation being considered and the
25 modeling that has been completed by EPA , MIT and others in support of that
26 legislation. Synapse’s report includes a low, medium and high price forecast for
27 carbon for the period from 2010 to 2030.

Public Version

1 **Q. How does IPL's carbon price compare with those in the Synapse report?**

2 A. IPL's low and high carbon price estimates are in the range of the Synapse price
3 forecast.

4 **Q. Do you agree with IPL's analysis regarding the effects of placing a price on**
5 **generation based on its greenhouse gas emissions?**

6 A. I agree in part, that the avoided energy costs will increase as a result, but I
7 disagree with IPL's assessment that the increase in avoided energy costs will not
8 increase the economic potential for energy efficiency measures, and thus not
9 increase the amount of annual energy savings that could be achieved.

10 **Q. Please explain.**

11 A. IPL's estimates that applying their high carbon price estimate will increase
12 avoided energy costs from 7.1 cents/kWh to 9.4 cents/kWh (see page 11 of IPL
13 witness King's direct testimony), or about 32% over the period from 2009 to
14 2018. This increase means that energy efficiency and renewable energy measures
15 that are not considered cost-effective today will likely to be much more cost-
16 effective when a price for carbon is included. As explained above, current energy
17 efficiency programs are achieving savings equal to 1-1.5% annually at a cost of
18 saved energy of 3-3.5 cents/kWh. As also noted, these costs are much less than
19 the costs of new generation, but may not be significantly less than the current cost
20 of avoided energy, depending upon what assumptions a particular utility is using.
21 Increasing the cost of avoided energy from 7.1 to 9.4 cents/kWh, as IPL notes,
22 will create significant headroom for additional and significant energy efficiency
23 measures to be deployed. For example, measures that today may be discarded due
24 to a cost of saved energy of 5 cents/kWh, such as many residential program
25 measures, become cost effective when the avoided energy costs are at the levels
26 IPL has included in their carbon price estimates. IPL's filing indicates that they
27 have included the future price of carbon into their analysis of potential energy

Public Version

1 efficiency measures that might become more cost-effective under a scenario
2 where greenhouse gas emissions are capped, and a price is associated with each
3 ton of greenhouse gases emitted. However, IPL has not provided information
4 about how a future price on carbon was factored into the company's analysis, and
5 their conclusion that placing a price on carbon will not affect the ability to capture
6 more cost-effective energy efficiency is not justified.

7 **Q. What are the effects of IPL's analysis of greenhouse gas regulations and**
8 **establishing a price for carbon on their energy efficiency filing?**

9 A. IPL and the Quantec report understate the amount of energy efficiency that could
10 be achieved when greenhouse gas emissions are regulated, at either a state or
11 national level. IPL has not adequately explained the basis for their conclusion that
12 no new energy efficiency measures would be revealed when the cost of avoided
13 energy increases 32%.

14 **Q. Describe the current and future risks of coal-fired combustion.**

15 A. Current risks from coal-fired combustion include air and water quality impacts.
16 Coal-fired combustion emits criteria air pollutants, such as those that contribute to
17 acid rain (oxides of nitrogen and sulfur oxides), regional haze and visibility
18 impairment (fine particulate, sulfates and nitrates), and greenhouse gases, that
19 contribute to global warming. The substantial quantity of cooling water needed
20 for plant operations often requires that coal plants are located along rivers and
21 water courses. The quantity of water needed for cooling and the temperature of
22 the water discharged back into the river can create impacts to local streams and
23 rivers. Additional current and future risks associated with coal-fired combustion
24 include:

Public Version

- 1 • Increased cost of construction due to escalations in materials used in the
2 construction of power plants, the energy required to extract and refine
3 those materials, and substantial increases in the labor rates to design and
4 construct these plants. The cost of the fuels used in power plants has also
5 increased significantly. While oil and natural gas prices have increased by
6 factors of two or three over the last few years, coal prices have not been
7 immune to these effects. Coal sourced from Appalachia has nearly
8 doubled since the beginning of 2007 (according to EIA data). Powder
9 River Basin coal prices have remained relatively constant, but the
10 transportation costs have increased significantly due to increased fuel
11 costs. Powder River Basin coal prices are also expected to increase due to
12 global demand for coal.
- 13 • State and Federal actions to reduce emissions that cause or contribute to
14 global warming will require significant reductions in greenhouse gas
15 emissions. The plans adopted and legislation enacted mean that the
16 intensity and quantity of greenhouse gases will place additional costs on
17 the operation of plants that emit such gases. Since coal plants emit higher
18 quantities per MWh than other fuels used for combustion, the effect will
19 be to make coal plant operation more expensive.

Public Version

- 1 • The effects of climate change are expected to include increased frequency
2 of extreme weather patterns, including higher intensity precipitation
3 events, as well as heat waves and droughts. Long-term planning based on
4 past historical climate records has become an imprecise and imprudent
5 means by which to consider future risks. Municipal, state and federal
6 agencies are realizing that terms such as “100 year floods” are
7 meaningless when such events occur once every decade, or even more
8 frequently.

9 **Q. Does IPL’s energy efficiency plan include an analysis of the current and**
10 **future risks discussed above?**

11 A. IPL’s plan includes a discussion related to the company’s expectation that
12 greenhouse gas emissions will be regulated in the future, and that this regulation
13 will result in a price, or adder, being placed on the combustion of fossil-fuels
14 related to its carbon intensity and/or quantity of emissions.

15 **Q. How can energy efficiency reduce the risks associated with coal-fired**
16 **generation?**

17 A. Energy efficiency is the most cost-effective resource today. We believe that IPL
18 can achieve annual energy savings levels of 1.5% or even greater, based upon
19 what we know they have achieved in the recent past, what is being achieved by
20 utilities in other parts of the United States, and what we know about the ability to
21 implement further energy efficiency measures in the future. Achieving this level
22 of annual energy savings will avoid the need to build and operate expensive new
23 generating capacity and to pay for the costs of the greenhouse gases emitted from
24 this plant. The high costs associated with construction and operation of new
25 generation, and those to pay for the price of carbon for each ton of emissions
26 would be borne by Iowa’s ratepayers. Also, implementing an effective energy

Public Version

1 efficiency program could make Iowa eligible for additional allowances under a
2 national program to cap and reduce greenhouse gases. The Lieberman-Warner bill
3 for example included a provision that would provide an additional 2% of
4 allowances to states that have implemented effective energy efficiency programs.
5 With each allowance estimated to have a value of \$11-20/ton initially, this
6 amount of funding could help Iowa to achieve even more annual energy savings
7 without requiring additional ratepayer funds. Energy efficiency therefore avoids
8 and mitigates the economic risks associated with new generation; helps to reduce
9 the risk of additional global warming from increased emissions of greenhouse
10 gases, and could make Iowa eligible for additional economic benefits when
11 national legislation to reduce greenhouse gases is enacted.

12 **5. IPL CAN ACHIEVE ANNUAL ENERGY SAVINGS OF 1.5% OR**
13 **GREATER THROUGH STRATEGIC AND SUSTAINED PROGRAM**
14 **PLANNING, COMBINED HEAT AND POWER (CHP), DEMAND**
15 **RESPONSE AND CLEAN DISTRIBUTED GENERATION**

16 **Q. Could IPL achieve more than 1.5% annual energy savings?**

17 A. Yes.

18 **Q. Please describe how these higher annual energy savings levels could be**
19 **achieved?**

20 A. IPL could achieve higher annual energy savings than is provided in their filing by:

21 1. Working with other Iowa utilities to develop a statewide energy efficiency
22 plan. This will reduce program, administration, marketing and
23 measurement and verification expenses and allow these dollars to be
24 transferred to incentives that can directly be invested to improving the
25 amount of annual energy savings.

Public Version

1 2. Move the demand response program to a utility funded effort. The chief
2 benefits of demand response are to reducing peak demand and hourly
3 energy prices. IPL has not justified why it needs to spend more on demand
4 response then it proposes to spend on residential or non-residential energy
5 efficiency programs, both of which provide for annual energy savings.

6 3. Complete a comprehensive plan that integrates energy efficiency measures
7 across customer classes and economic sectors. Many of IPL’s energy
8 efficiency measures appear to be disparate and not well connected with
9 other measures. The whole house program, explained in more detail
10 below, is one such example.

11 **Q. IPL witness Kimberly King described at pages 5 and 6 of her direct**
12 **testimony IPL’s plan to focus on what is referred to as a “whole house” or**
13 **“whole building” approach to energy efficiency. What are the benefits of this**
14 **approach?**

15 A. There are several benefits. For existing homes or buildings, an audit of a premises
16 and its components often reveals multiple components where the efficiency of the
17 energy used in the structure can be improved. These include not only traditional
18 measures to improve the efficiency of lighting and motors but also the HVAC
19 system, boilers, day lighting etc. If the program is able to evaluate the
20 performance of the entire building, a comprehensive approach can be
21 implemented to improve that buildings energy use. For example, during an audit,
22 the company may learn that the building has an older an inefficient boiler. A
23 whole building approach would identify this inefficient boiler as one item needing
24 attention, and would be part of the recommended measures that could be
25 implemented to reduce energy consumption. When the recommended energy
26 efficiency measures are completed, this will reduce the overall energy
27 consumption of the structure, and a smaller boiler can be installed to service to

Public Version

1 lower building consumption. This approach therefore amplifies the amount of
2 savings that can accrue. First, the direct reduction in consumption through the
3 improved energy efficiency measures. Second, the smaller boiler has a lower
4 capital cost than one that would have been a direct replacement. Third, the smaller
5 and new boiler is more efficient than the older one and has lower fuel costs.
6 Fourth, by sizing the boiler appropriately for the load, it operates more efficiently,
7 meaning less maintenance is required. Fifth, other benefits from this approach
8 include reduced air pollution. These increased benefits are additive and
9 cumulative, and provide energy savings at lower costs, thus increasing the overall
10 benefit/cost ratio of the portfolio.

11 Absent a whole building approach, the recommended measures to improve
12 electric efficiency at a building would be installed, but the boiler would now be
13 oversized for the new and lower load demanded. This mismatch can lead to
14 comfort problems (i.e. the building is too hot or too cool since the boiler has a
15 certain operating range at which it is most efficient), and to maintenance problems
16 for the boiler (if it is run to maintain the same level of comfort for the new lower
17 load, it will tend to operate at the lowest end of its range).

18 **Q. Does IPL’s energy efficiency filing indicate how IPL will implement the**
19 **“whole house” approach?**

20 A. No. While IPL witness King describes this new approach in her direct testimony,
21 there is no evidence in IPL’s filing that IPL has considered adopting and
22 implementing this approach in their 2009 to 2013 plan. Table 4.10 of IPL’s filing
23 includes a new program entitled “Home Performance with Energy Star.” This
24 program would begin with 25 homes in 2010 and increase to 100 by 2013. Half of
25 IPL’s budget for this program is for advertising and promotion, with less than 5%
26 of the budget for incentives. IPL has not adequately provided information about
27 the design and implementation of this program, nor provided justification for the

Public Version

1 high percentage of budget being spent on advertising, for what is a very modest
2 program design. Robert Denk, of the National Association of Homebuilders, was
3 quoted in the Des Moines Register in December 2006 that about 10,000 new
4 homes are built in Iowa each year. While IPL's service territory includes only a
5 portion of the entire state, IPL's proposed whole house program of 25 or 100
6 homes a year does not even begin to address the potential energy savings that
7 could be achieved if homes were designed and constructed as efficiently as
8 possible from the beginning. This is a very important point. Homes and buildings
9 are expensive assets, compared to automobiles for example. Homes are designed
10 to last for decades, if not longer. Designing and constructing homes and buildings
11 as efficiently as possible from the beginning ensures that their energy
12 performance will persist over the life of the structure. While the initial costs to
13 design and construct the most efficient home possible may be slightly higher than
14 a "conventional" home, the energy savings from the more efficient structure
15 accrue from the beginning and more than pay off any differential. Recent research
16 performed for the Green Building Institute also indicates that the differential
17 capital costs to build a highly efficient structure are modest, 2-3%. The second
18 important point related to "doing it right the first time" is that retrofitting energy
19 efficiency measures after the structure is completed are more expensive and
20 difficult, and may only be able to focus on incremental savings, such as lighting,
21 missing the opportunities to achieve significant savings. I attempted to learn
22 additional details about IPL's whole house program, its design and its
23 implementation. (See Community Coalition Data Request No. 43). IPL's response
24 to Data Request No. 43 refers back to IPL's filing and to IPL's response to Iowa
25 OCA Data Request No. 48. IPL's responses to these two separate data requests do
26 not provide an adequate explanation for the questions asked.

Public Version

1 **Q. Are there any other IPL programs that have design flaws?**

2 A. Each of the program areas IPL has included in its energy efficiency filing are
3 important parts of any energy efficiency program. However, IPL does not appear
4 to have adequately considered the synergistic effects of energy efficiency,
5 demand response and renewable energy. Applying all cost-effective energy
6 efficiency measures first for example reduces building energy consumption, such
7 that the scale and costs of a customer side wind turbine, solar thermal or solar PV
8 are appropriately aligned with the building load. Reducing building energy
9 demand also reduces base energy consumption and can amplify the benefits of a
10 demand response program. The benefits of IPL spending \$124 million on non-
11 residential demand response are uncertain, and IPL has not adequately explained
12 how their program would produce the anticipated level of energy and capacity
13 savings IPL's energy efficiency appears to be a collection of various disparate
14 measures whose sum total produces a certain level of annual energy savings rather
15 than a constructive thoughtful plan that rapidly ramps up penetration of cost-
16 effective measures, integrates lessons from other states and from pilot programs,
17 and captures the complementary benefits of demand response and renewable
18 generation .

19 **Q. What other programs are included in IPL's energy efficiency filing?**

20 A. IPL's filing includes a description of a demand response and a renewable energy
21 program.

22 **Q. Please describe the demand response program.**

23 A. IPL's filing, table 1.1, page 4, for their base case, proposes to spend \$144 million
24 from 2009 to 2013 on a two-component demand response portfolio. The first is a
25 residential, direct load control measure where customer's air conditioners are
26 remotely cycled on and off during periods of peak electricity demand. The second
27 is a load curtailment measure focused on non-residential customers that is linked
28 to locational marginal pricing criteria for Iowa load zones and coordinated with

Public Version

1 MISO. My review of IPL's budget reflects that the company is placing more
2 emphasis on demand response, i.e. reducing peak demand, than on energy
3 efficiency. The cost of IPL's proposed demand response program is \$33 million
4 greater than the amount IPL proposes to spend on non-residential energy
5 efficiency programs and \$44 million greater than the amount proposed to be spent
6 on residential programs. Demand response is an effective means to reduce peak
7 electric demand, but it does not help to defer the need to build new base-loaded
8 generation, and it does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Depending upon the
9 program, if customers who are interrupted (as proposed by IPL's program) turn
10 on their back-up generators to provide electricity, greenhouse gas and other
11 emissions can actually increase, since these back-up generators emit more
12 pollutants per MWh than large generators. One area that IPL could focus on in its
13 renewable energy program would be to apply incentives to increase the role of
14 renewable energy to provide for back up generation, including installation of
15 batteries for storage.


16 **Q. Could demand response play a role in conjunction with an energy efficiency**
17 **program?**

18 A. An effective demand response program can reduce electricity during peak demand
19 periods when prices are at their highest. In so doing, the hourly electricity prices
20 in a load zone can be decreased. Customers participating in demand response
21 program benefit directly by receiving payments for their participation, and
22 indirectly by the reduced hourly prices that benefit all customers. As
23 demonstrated by the New England Demand Response Initiative (NEDRI),
24 effective demand response programs operated in conjunction with good energy
25 efficiency programs can significantly reduce peak electricity demand, as shown in
26 the figure below, reflecting results from a commercial office building. Note that
27 the emphasis is to first reduce energy demand through energy efficiency, then to

Public Version

1 consider how a demand response program could provide additional economic
2 benefits at times of peak electricity demand:

3 **Figure 9: Combined Commercial Cooling and Lighting Loadshape with**
4 **Efficiency and Load Management**



5
6 Source NEDRI Framing Paper number 4, Energy Efficiency, May 2002, Jeff Schlegel.

7 **Q. Would IPL’s demand response program provide these same benefits?**

8 A. It is unlikely, and IPL does not indicate its filings how it would integrate energy
9 efficiency with a demand response program. IPL’s filing also does not provide
10 information on customer side responsibilities. For example, if a load is
11 interrupted, are customers allowed to switch to back-up generators. IPL’s
12 residential program cycles home air conditioners off and on every 15 minutes
13 over a period a several hours. The benefits of this are uncertain. Typical demand
14 response programs applied at the residential level remotely control customer air

Public Version

1 conditioners for several hours at a time. The amount of demand curtailed is
2 known, measurable and predictable. Cycling units on the frequency in IPL's plan
3 would not appear to achieve any peak benefits. Load would drop for 15 minutes,
4 then increase again, and during a period when electricity demand is already high
5 (otherwise, IPL would not be directly controlling customer air conditioners).
6 Likewise, for the non-residential program, it is unclear if IPL has completed any
7 strategic planning to guide effective implementation of a demand response
8 program.

9 **Q. Describe IPL's residential renewable energy program.**

10 A. IPL's filing proposes to implement a new renewable energy portfolio which
11 includes customer education and customer owned generation. IPL's proposed
12 renewable generation portfolio includes small scale wind, PV, hydro and
13 geothermal resources. In 2009, IPL's plan proposes one wind, two solar water
14 heaters and three solar PV installations, ramping up to 20, 75, and 75 such
15 installations respectively by 2013.

16 **Q. Describe the potential effectiveness of IPL's residential renewable energy**
17 **portfolio.**

18 A. IPL's program is timid at best. Solar water heater and solar PV technologies are
19 mature now, and more rapid deployment will lead to further economies of scale
20 and reduction of costs. Small scale wind technologies are also becoming cost
21 effective and competitive with the cost of conventional fossil-fuel generation
22 technologies. Table 8.2 of IPL's filing (page 153) reflects that IPL proposes to
23 spend \$2.4 million of the total \$8.847 million (or 27%) of direct utility costs on
24 planning, program administration and advertising. IPL has not provided adequate
25 justification for these costs. IPL could amplify the benefits of its renewable
26 energy program by ensuring that the customer first applies all cost-effective
27 energy efficiency measures. This will better align the size of the renewable energy
28 generators with the building's load. Including passive solar design elements in

Public Version

1 new and modified buildings can also reduce demand. Finally, incorporating
2 renewable energy elements into IPL's "whole house" program would help to
3 provide significant energy and capacity benefits.

4 **Q. Describe IPL's non-residential renewable energy portfolio and its**
5 **effectiveness.**

6 A. IPL's non-residential renewable energy portfolio includes the same elements as
7 the residential portfolio, but with an emphasis on geothermal heat pumps, and
8 inclusion of one biomass digester per year starting in 2012. The non-residential
9 portfolio is also timid, and would benefit from the same type of program planning
10 and integration as I described above for the residential portfolio.

11 **Q. What other programs should be included in IPL's filing?**

12 A. Combined heat and power (CHP) would make an excellent addition to IPL's
13 filing. CHP is an integrated approach to providing for energy and capacity at the
14 customer location. The customer's electricity demand is matched with that of
15 clean generation, and the waste heat from the generation is used on-site for
16 heating, cooling and process loads. A customer's electricity demand should first
17 be reduced by installing all cost-effective energy efficiency measures. This
18 approach will reduce the size of the generation needed, and help to better utilize
19 the thermal benefits from CHP on-site. IPL's filing indicates that the majority of
20 their expected load growth would be from the industrial and commercial sectors,
21 which are both prime applications for CHP.

22 **6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

23 **Q. Do you have particular recommendations for IPL that would improve their**
24 **energy efficiency plan?**

25 A. Yes. Overall, IPL's proposal appears to be simply a collection of different
26 measures without any indication of how various programs could be coordinated
27 and integrated with each other. IPL's filing does not provide any indication of a

Public Version

1 systemic, sustained and strategic plan that captures all cost-effective energy
2 efficiency and deliberately plans for the deployment of new measures and
3 technologies. IPL's own data reflects that they are currently achieving energy
4 savings at a cost of saved energy of less than 2 cents/kWh. This points to the
5 significant amount of energy savings available, at costs that are much less than the
6 cost of new and existing generation. IPL's plan should be one that is strategic,
7 sustained and includes a portfolio of demand side resources. While IPL's plan
8 contains a number of good elements, they don't appear to be well integrated and
9 coordinated. It's almost as if someone decided that, for example, IPL should have
10 a "whole house" program. And, decided that 25 houses was a good number
11 without first thinking about what a good business model might be, and developing
12 program measures organically through planning. There are many excellent
13 examples of energy efficiency programs operating in the United States today, and
14 IPL could learn from the lessons of these programs, build upon them, and achieve
15 the savings levels, and more, as ordered by the IUB. IPL's plan could provide
16 significant and cost-effective savings for Iowa's ratepayers. IPL should recognize
17 the benefits from a portfolio of integrated demand side resources, in conjunction
18 with deployment of clean distributed and renewable generation at the customer
19 level. The Quantec report found significant potential for energy efficiency in each
20 customer class. Per table 2.11 of IPL's filing, the quantity of the economic
21 potential, 678 MW, exceeds that of the proposed capacity of Sutherland
22 Generating Station #4. The levelized costs to achieve this quantity of energy
23 efficiency, at 5, 3 and 1 cents/kWh respectively for residential, commercial and
24 industrial customer classes, are much less than the costs of constructing new
25 generation. Based on Synapse's experience, as provided for in Exhibit C, we have
26 not yet seen a correlation between increasing levels of energy efficiency savings
27 and increasing costs. A prudent energy efficiency program should be capable of
28 achieving all cost-effective energy efficiency at levels much lower than the 5
29 cents/kWh residential costs included in IPL's filing. For example, many of the

Public Version

1 programs we reviewed are achieving savings in the range of 1-1.5% of sales at
2 costs of 3-3.5 cents/kWh. The benefits of energy efficiency are also cumulative
3 over time. IPL has not adequately provided an explanation of why the quantity of
4 energy efficiency included in the Quantec report cannot be achieved. IPL's
5 program cost estimates in their filing for the difference between achieving 1.3 and
6 1.5% of annual sales are not adequately explained, and appear to be overstated.

7 IPL's demand response program would benefit from the same level of sustained
8 strategic thinking recommended above for their energy efficiency program. IPL's
9 filing for this program maintains the same number of participants at 154
10 throughout the 2009-2013 period. A strategic and thoughtful program design,
11 coupled with effective implementation would be capable of increasing participant
12 levels and savings. IPL should be required to complete a demand response
13 potential study, and then implement the recommended findings, to better integrate
14 demand response into IPL's resource portfolio.

15 On the generation side, IPL's plan has not considered the benefits, both from on-
16 site generation and increased energy efficiency, from combined heat and power
17 (CHP). IPL's filing indicates that industrial and commercial loads are driving a
18 significant portion of load growth in their forecasts. These sectors are excellent
19 candidates for a focused effort to reduce energy consumption and to install CHP.
20 IPL's filing estimates that implementing energy efficiency programs for these
21 sectors would cost 3 cents/kWh for commercial and 1 cent/kWh for industrial
22 customer classes. Applying all cost-effective energy efficiency first, then
23 installing CHP where appropriate would offset this expected load growth,
24 increase the reliability of supply, and provide a cost-effective means for these
25 sectors to procure their energy independence. IPL should be required to complete
26 a study of the potential for CHP in Iowa, and then to implement the
27 recommendations of this study to take full advantage of the cost effective CHP
28 benefits.

Public Version

1 For renewables, IPL would again benefit from the same type of programmatic
2 planning that is recommended above for energy efficiency and demand response.
3 IPL's filing has established a basis on which improvements can occur. The level
4 of incentives IPL proposes is in the range of those implemented in other states.
5 But, IPL can improve upon the quantity of installations. Per IPL's table 8.2, one
6 wind turbine, two solar water heaters and three solar PV installations would be
7 completed in 2009, ramping up to five, ten and ten such installations, respectively
8 in 2010. These are mature technologies. IPL has not adequately justified or
9 explained barriers to more aggressive penetration that would be capable of
10 achieving much greater levels of generation. IPL should also look at other
11 business models that have been used to substantially increase the amount of
12 renewable generation without requiring additional ratepayer investments, such as
13 the Sun Edison model. This model links a PV developer with a business,
14 essentially leasing their rooftop to provide for long-term renewable generation.

15 In conclusion, my recommendations to the IUB are:

- 16 • Require IPL to revise, adjust and resubmit an energy efficiency plan that complies
17 with the IUB January 14, 2008, Order to achieve a level of 1.5% annual energy
18 savings through energy efficiency measures alone by 2011, continuing through
19 2013 (energy savings from demand response and renewable energy would be in
20 addition to these benefits.
- 21 • IUB should require IPL to revamp its "whole house" program, and submit a
22 revised program to the IUB to be implemented during 2009. Revisions should
23 include a strategic plan with input from home builders and potential home owners,
24 and from associations such as the Green Building Institute.

Public Version

- 1 • Require Iowa’s utilities to adopt a coordinated statewide energy efficiency
2 program with voluntary opt-in available for non-regulated utilities. This will
3 reduce administrative, program and marketing expenses, reduce consumer
4 confusion and inconvenience, and increase the quantity of energy efficiency
5 savings by ensuring that implemented measures will be deployed statewide (taking
6 advantage of economies of scale, working directly with manufacturers, etc.).

7 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

8 A. Yes, it does.

