

From: Springer, Darren [Darren.Springer@state.vt.us]
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2015 7:37 PM
To: Rebecca Ellis
Subject: RE: H-40 and Efficiency Vermont

Some italics responses below

From: Rebecca Ellis [rellis@leg.state.vt.us]
Sent: Friday, March 06, 2015 2:37 PM
To: Springer, Darren
Subject: Fw: H-40 and Efficiency Vermont

Sent using OWA for iPhone

From: Willem Post
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 11:09:09 AM
To: Tim Ashe; Claire Ayer; Becca Balint; Philip Baruth; Joe Benning; Christopher Bray; John Campbell; Brian Collamore; Ann Cummings; Dustin Degree; William Doyle; Peg Flory; Jane Kitchel; Virginia Lyons; Mark MacDonald; Norman Mcallister; Richard McCormack; Alice Nitka; Anthony Pollina; John Rodgers; Richard Sears; Michael Sirotkin; Diane Snelling; Robert Starr; Jeanette White; David Zuckerman; Aaron Rosenbluth; preservethewellfleetilove@gmail.com
Subject: H-40 and Efficiency Vermont

All,

Rep. Adam Greshin, House Ways and Means, is finally questioning the EV gravy train boondoggle. I just cannot believe how long it took legislators to wise up to this expensive, inefficient scheme. It looks like the EV boondoggle is finally meeting the wall of fiscal reality.

Legislators and the public have been bamboozled by EVs reports of glowing energy savings (reports that most of them did not read or understood), that have been known to be excessive, as proven by subsequent audits.

Remember, I called EV an inefficient boondoggle from day one. I'll say it again:

- EV SHOULD BE ABOLISHED ASAP
- LEFTOVER BUDGET MONEY SHOULD BE USED ELSEWHERE

– THE ONEROUS CHARGE ON HOUSEHOLD AND BUSINESS ELECTRIC BILLS SHOULD BE REMOVED

DS - We acquire efficiency at a cost of 4 cents per kilowatt hour. Current New England grid power annual average cost is 7.5 cents per kilowatt hour, plus utility capacity obligation, distribution and transmission costs. If we want to help save money for ratepayers, abolishing EVT and pursuing no efficiency is a bad idea that will drive up our bills. We are using 13 percent less electricity today thanks to the efficiency efforts since the year 2000. If we had not done efficiency, the retail cost of purchasing that power would be over \$100 million just in 2013 alone (far exceeding the EVT annual budget).

The budget went from \$14.0 million in 2003 to \$52.2 million in 2015, about 3.729 times greater, for a growth rate of 11.6% per year over 12 years.

No state agency has 11.6%/yr. budget increases for each of 12 years!!!!

DS- He says EVT budgets growing 11.6% per year, but that is not accurate for current budget, I think growth is closer to 7 or 8%, pre-Greshin amendment.

The charge on the electric bill went from 0.00317 c/kWh in 2003 to 0.01179 c/kWh in 2015, about 3.72 times greater over 12 years.

Were there 11.6 %/yr. increases in the energy savings for that 12-year period due to EV activities? Not even close, based on EVs own, self-serving, glowing annual reports. That means EV is becoming LESS and LESS efficient over the years.

According to Klein committee members, DPS wrote H-40; "it is their bill". To rely of DPS to come up with H-40 long-term "energy savings" is beyond rational, like having the fox select the lock on the hen house.

Klein's "team" rapidly passed H-40 (which will have revolutionary impact of Vermont's energy) 10 to 1. Klein agreed to the EV budget freeze to get a better deal for H-40!!

The House Ways and Means Committee is making VERY MINOR amendments to H-40.

Springer of DPS, is throwing out scare-mongering "savings lost" numbers, due to EVs budget freeze, WITHOUT ANY BACK-UP.

DS - here are our numbers on the Greshin amendment -

If the resource acquisition budgets were reduced such that the total EVT electric budget were flat for 2016 and 17 at its 2015 level, here is what the impacts would be:

- \$9.86 million less in EEC payments (a 6.5% or 7 %reduction in the 3-year budget depending on how allocated)
- If the Resource Acquisition budget takes the full hit, it's a 7% reduction in that budget

- **7% less resource acquisition would have the following costs:**
 - o Between 19,000 and 23,000 first-year MWhs not acquired**
 - **This would create an additional cost to VT ratepayers of \$1.1-1.4 million per year for energy, for the next 10 years**
 - o Between 2.4 and 2.9 MW of summer peak not reduced**
 - o Between 3.2 and 3.8 MW of winter peak not reduced**
 - **This capacity savings reduction would cost VT ratepayers between \$290,000 and \$350,000 per year for capacity, for the next ten years. It would also reduce the ability of EVT to bid savings into the FCM, which would capture about that money again (per year) for thermal energy and process fuel efficiency**
 - o Between \$20 and \$24 million in total resource benefit (present value) not acquired. TRB includes the values of all avoided commodities (energy, fossil fuel, water, etc).**

Is this how energy policy is made in Vermont?

Is this how the expensive, dysfunctional SPEED program/boondoggle came about 5 years ago?