CORI/IING NATURAL GAS CORPORATION 330 W WILLIAM STREET CORNING, NY 14830

VIAE-MAIL

Hon. Jac1yn A. Brilling Secretary New York Public Service Commission Three Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223-1350

RE: Case08-G-1010-Petition of Corning Natural Gas Corporation for Approval of an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) "Fast Track" Utility Administered Gas Energy Efficiency Program

Case 07-M-0548 -Proceeding on Motion of the Commission Regarding an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard

October, 2010 Scorecard Report

Dear Secretary Brilling:

Pursuant to the Public Service Commission's orders in the above-captioned proceedings, please find enclosed the August 2010 Scorecard Report for Corning Natural Gas Corporation's gas energy efficiency program.

If you have any questions regarding this Report, please contact me.

Marie Husted Gas Supply Analyst

Enclosure

13139905.1

| 2010 Monthly Program Reporting | Oct-10 |
|--|---|
| Program Administrator (PA) and Program ID ¹ | Corning Natural Gas Corp. |
| Program Name | Residential Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) Program |
| Program Type ² | Residential |
| Total Acquired First-Year Impacts This Month ³ | |
| Net first-year annual kWh acquired this month ⁴ | N/A |
| Monthly Net kWh Goal (based on net first-year annual ⁵ kWh Goal | N/A |
| Percent of Monthly Net kWh Goal Acquired | N/A |
| | |
| Net Peak ⁶ kW acquired this month | N/A |
| Monthly Utility Net Peak kW Goal | N/A |
| Percent of Monthly Peak kW Goal Acquired | N/A |
| | |

| Net First-year annual therms acquired this month | 3175.25 |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Monthly Net Therm Goal (Revised per June 21, 2010 order) | 73500/12=6125 therms per month |
| Percent of Monthly Therm Goal Acquired | 5023/6125 = 84% |
| | |
| Net Lifecycle kWh acquired this month | N/A |
| | |
| Net Lifecycle therms acquired this month | N/A |
| | |
| Net Other Quarterly Savings (MMBTUs) | N/A |
| Coal | N/A |
| Kerosene | N/A |
| Oil | N/A |
| Propane | N/A |
| | |
| Total Acquired Net First-Year Impacts To Date | |
| Net first-year annual kWh acquired to date | N/A |

| Net first-year annual kWh acquired to date as a percent of annual g | N/A |
|---|-------------------|
| Net first-year annual kWh acquired to date as a percent of 8-year go | N/A |
| Net cumulative kWh acquired to date | N/A |
| | |
| Net utility peak kW reductions acquired to date | N/A |
| Net utility peak kW reductions acquired to date as a percent of utility annual goal | N/A |
| Net utility peak kW reductions acquired to date as a percent of 8-ye | ear goal |
| Net NYISO peak kW reductions acquired to date | N/A |
| | |
| Net first-year annual therms acquired to date | 56497 |
| Net first-year annual therms acquired to date as a percent of annual goal | 56497/73000=76.9% |
| Net first-year annual therms acquired to date as a percent of 8-year goal | |
| Net cumulative therms acquired to date | 100,577 |
| | |
| Total Acquired Lifecycle Impacts To Date ⁷ | |
| Net Lifecycle kWh acquired to date | N/A |

| Net Lifecycle therms acquired to date | N/A |
|--|-----|
| | |
| Committed ⁸ Impacts (not yet acquired) This Month | |
| Net First-year annual kWh committed this month | N/A |
| Net Lifecycle kWh committed this month | N/A |
| Net Utility Peak kW committed this month | N/A |
| Net first-year annual therms committed this month | \$0 |
| Net Lifecycle therms committed this month | N/A |
| Funds committed at this point in time | \$0 |
| | |
| Overall Impacts (Acquired & Committed) | |
| Net first-year annual kWh acquired & committed this month | N/A |
| Net utility peak kW acquired & committed this month | N/A |
| Net First-year annual therms acquired & committed this month | N/A |
| | |

| Costs ⁹ | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total program budget (\$123,544 x 22% = 27,180) | \$27,180 | | | | |
| General Administration | \$1,200 | | | | |
| Program Planning | \$0 | | | | |
| Program Marketing | \$0 Bill Inserts \$0 Website Changes \$1500 Contractor Meeting | | | | |

| Trade Ally Training | \$0 |
|--|---------|
| Incentives and Services | N/A |
| Direct Program Implementation | \$0 |
| Program Evaluation | N/A |
| Total expenditures to date (excludes incentives/rebates) | \$6,700 |
| Percent of total budget spent to date (\$16,038 budget) | 25% |
| | |

| Participation | |
|--|------|
| Number of program applications received to date (2010) | 262 |
| Number of program applications <i>processed</i> to date ¹⁰ | 262 |
| Number of processed applications <i>approved</i> to date ¹¹ | 254 |
| Percent of applications received to date that have been processed | 100% |
| Quarterly Carbon Emission Reductions (in tons) | N/A |
| Total Acquired Net First-Year Carbon Emission Reductions To Date ¹² | N/A |
| Total Acquired Cumulative Net Carbon Emission Reductions To Date | N/A |
| | |
| NOTES: | |

¹DPS Staff needs to work with utilities and NYSERDA to develop a Program ID naming convention. However, a Program ID number is not required for the first report. Note that when developing program ID naming conventions, utilities would like to minimize computer programming/reporting costs that they might incur if the proposed naming conventions are complex or the utility's current naming conventions require modification to Staff's proposed format.

²There is not currently a consistent list of program type but individual categories for common use by administrators could be developed

³First-year savings are defined as the annual savings expected from a given measure in the first year after installation. The annual savings are sometimes the result of annualizing estimated savings that are based on data that cover less than one year. *Acquired* kWh savings are defined as those savings that reported by the program administrator in program tracking databases and for which a rebate check has been sent to the participant on a specific date.

⁴Regardless of the month in which a measure is installed within a given calendar year, the program is credited with the associated savings for the entire year.

⁵Program Administrators should make best a estimate of the annual goal even though the goal might in some cases cover two calendar years. Also, Staff wants administrators to try to be as accurate as possible in determining the monthly goals but does not want to mandate monthly goals, at least initially.

⁵ Peak is defined uniquely for each utility.

⁷The lifecycle savings are tracked beginning in the year in which a given measure was installed. Over the period 2008-2015, PA's must take into account the fact that savings from measures installed early in the period will vanish at the end of their useful life before the end of 2015. Thus, the lifecycle impacts acquired to date will differ for each month as a function of adding savings from measures installed in a given month and savings from measures installed earlier in the funding cycle that have reached the end of thier useful life are no longer accumulated.

⁸ Committed savings are defined as those for which funds have been encumbered by not yet spent. When the funds are spent (i.e., a rebate check has been sent to the participant on a specific date), the savings are then considered "acquired." Staff would like to see the program administrator's best *estimate* of what they have committed. There should be some assumptions on how the administrator does that. Program administrators should forecast as accurately as possible and forecasts should get more precise with program experience, i.e., the difference between achieved and committed should narrow over time.

⁹These are the budget categories to be used by companies when submitting the required energy efficiency program implementation plans. In its January 16, 2009 Order, the Commission directed Staff to provide definitions for the budget categories to be used in the preparation of these plans (See Order Approving "Fast Track" Utility-Administered Electric Energy Efficiency Program With Modification, at page 11). These categories are provided to promote consistency in budget construction and reporting among the utility plans.

Companies should identify whether each cost item is to be recovered through the SBC surcharge, base rates, or other recovery mechanism (e.g., monthly adjustment charges).

¹⁰An application is *processed* once the PA has reviewed the application and made a decision whether to approve the incentive payment to the customer. Once the decision has been made to pay the incentive to the customer, these funds and their associated energy and demand impacts become "Committed."

¹¹The application is *approved* once the decision has been made to pay the incentive to the customer. Note that these funds and their associated energy and demand impacts become "Committed" once this decision is made. Also note that for for programs in which there are ases in which an application could be received, processed, and approved all in one day, then a "1" would be counted for each step in the tracking lifecycle.

¹² See CO₂ Reduction Values tab.

| AFUE RATING | APPROXIMATE AGE | Measure | 2AFUE RATING | BTU Rating | Amount Credited |
|-------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| 64 | 38 | HOT AIR | 96 | 60000 | 420 |
| 56 | 40 | HOT AIR | 95 | 80000 | 420 |
| 56 | 40 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 80000 | 18 |
| 90 | 13 | HOT AIR | 95 | 60000 | 420 |
| 90 | 13 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 60000 | 18 |
| 80 | 20 | HOT AIR | 95 | 80000 | 420 |
| 80 | 20 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 80000 | 18 |
| 80 | 10 | HOT AIR | 90 | 80000 | 150 |
| 80 | 10 | THERMOSTAT | 90 | 80000 | 18 |
| 59 | 50 | HOT AIR | 95 | 60000 | 420 |
| 59 | 50 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 60000 | 18 |
| 72 | 35 | HOT AIR | 95 | 80000 | 420 |
| 72 | 35 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 80000 | 18 |
| 54 | 30 | HOT AIR | 95 | 80000 | 700 |
| 54 | 30 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 80000 | 18 |
| 75 | 20 | HOT AIR | 95 | 80000 | 420 |
| 75 | 20 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 80000 | 18 |
| 75 | 28 | HOT AIR | 95 | 90000 | 420 |
| 75 | 28 | THERMOSTAT | 95 | 90000 | 18 |
| 55 | 23 | HOT AIR | 95 | 100000 | 420 |
| 55 | 23 | HOT AIR | 95 | 100000 | 18 |
| 55 | 35 | HOT WATER | 98 | 80000 | 1000 |
| 87 | 16 | HOT AIR | 95 | 60000 | 420 |

Comment [MH1]:

 Program Administrator:
 Corning Natural Gas Corporation

 Program/Project:
 Residential Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standards (EEPS)

 Program
 Program

 Reporting period:
 October, 2010

 Report Contact person:
 Marie Husted

1. Program Status

Program Performance Goals

(a) After a very slow summer the program application have increased. A potential benefit of the program comes from the fact that there are a significant number of older, rural homes in the Corning Natural Gas (Corning) service territory. Many homes in the city of Corning and surrounding communities were impacted by a major flood in June 1972 and many homes in the immediate area had their heating system replaced due to flooding. It appears that many homeowners have participated in this program to replace these obsolete units. Along with tax credits currently available, there is a significant benefit to property owners who participate now, though the benefits has been reduced since the rebate levels were reduced in the latest commission order on Residential EEPS Programs. (b) Our residential budget has been increased for 2011 and Corning intends to increase customer awareness of the program. Corning is working to make the most effective use of these budgets through website, customer bill inserts and other less labor intensive efforts to advertise the Program. Corning also benefits from being adjacent to the NYSEG territory and inclusive in the NYSEG electric territory, which helps customers to hear duplicate messages from the utilities. It is possible this will enhance participation over the long term.

2. Program Implementation Activities

(a) Marketing Activities

Corning has conducted a contractor meeting and posted information on our website to announce program changes.

(b) Evaluation Activities

No evaluation activities have been conducted. Corning will be sending out an RFP in hopes of selecting a contractor to conduct evaluation on quality assurance mandated work for both the residential and commercial programs. (c) Other Activities None, during this period.

3. Customer Complaints and/or Disputes

The Company has no disputed applications at this point.

4. Changes to Subcontractors or Staffing

No changes. Corning has no funds available for additional staff in the Program. Any work on Program Administration is completed in addition to already assigned staff duties of existing employees

5. Additional Issues NONE

High Efficiency Furnace 90%



High Efficiency Furnace 95%

| AFUE of existing furnace AFUE of new furnace Furnace Rating btu (per hour) | Inputs 59% 95% 60,000 | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) Therm Savings = | 1,618 kBtuh Unit 60 | RLF 59% | 1 Nbase 1.69 | 1 Neebase 1.04 | HLH 100 16.18 | = | Therm savings | x | 2009 Number of Units 0 |
| AFUE of existing furnace AFUE of new furnace Furnace Rating btu (per hour) Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | Inputs 59% 95% 60,000 1,618 kBtuh | _ | 1 | 1 | НЦН | | Therm savings | | 2009 Number of Units |
| Therm Savings = | Unit 60 | RLF 59% | Nbase 1.69 | Neebase 1.04 | 100 16.18 | = | 372 | x | 0 |
| AFUE of existing furnace AFUE of new furnace Furnace Rating btu (per hour) Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | Inputs 80% 95% 80,000 1,618 | | | | | | | | 2009 |
| | kBtuh | _ | 1 | 1 | HLH | | Therm savings | | Number of Units |
| | Unit | RLF | Nbase | Neebase | 100 | | | | |
| Therm Savings = | 80 | 80% | 1.25 | 1.04 | 16.18 | = | 217 | х | 0 |

| | 2010 | | 2011 | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| 0 | 1 | 93 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 2010 | | 2011 | |
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | | | | |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 1388 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2010 | 1388 | 2011 | 0 |
| 0 Annual Savings | 2 2010 Number of Units | 1388 Annual Savings | 0 2011 Number of Units | 0 Annual Savings |

| | 2010 | | 2011 | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | | | | |
| 0 | 1 | 227 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 2010 | | 2011 | |
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | | | | |
| 0 | 2 | 744 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | 2010 | | 2011 | |
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | | | | |
| 0 | 2 | 434 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | TOTAL | 3520 | | |
| | | | | |

High Efficiency Boiler 95%

| | Inputs | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-------|---|---------------|---|
| AFUE of existing boiler | 55% | | | | | | | |
| AFUE of new boiler | 98% | | | | | | | |
| Boiler Rating btu (per hour) | 80,000 | | | | | | | |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | 1,618 | | | | | | | |
| | kBtuh | | 1 | 1 | HLH | | Therm savings | |
| | Unit | RLF | Nbase | Neebase | 100 | | | |
| Therm Savings = | 80 | 55% | 1.82 | 1.01 | 16.18 | = | 577 | х |

High Efficiency Boiler 90%

| | Inputs | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-----|---------------|
| AFUE of existing boiler | 54% | | | | | |
| AFUE of new boiler | 95% | | | | | |
| Boiler Rating btu (per hour) | 80,000 | | | | | |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | 1,618 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | kBtuh | | 1 | 1 | HLH | Therm savings |
| | Unit | RLF | Nbase | Neebase | 100 | |

1.85

54%

16.18

=

1.04

566

х

Therm Savings =

Steam Boiler 82%

Inputs

| AFUE of existing boiler | 72% |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| AFUE of new boiler | 95% |
| Boiler Rating btu (per hour) | 80,000 |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | 1,618 |
| | kBtuh |

| | kBtuh | | 1 | 1 | HLH | Therm savings | |
|-----------------|-------|-----|-------|---------|-------|---------------|-------|
| _ | Unit | RLF | Nbase | Neebase | 100 | | |
| Therm Savings = | 80 | 72% | 1.39 | 1.04 | 16.18 | = | 326 x |

| Number of Units | | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
|-----------------|---|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 577 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2009 | | | 2010 | | 2011 | |
| Number of Units | | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 566 | 0 | 0 |

| 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 326 | 0 | 0 | |

Boiler Reset Controls

| | Inputs | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|------|
| AFUE of existing Boiler | 50% | | | | |
| Number of Controls | 1 | | | | |
| Furnace Rating btu (per hour) | 80,000 | | | | |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | 1,618 | | | | |
| Energy Savings Factor | 0.05 | | | | |
| | kBtuh | | 1 | HLH | ESF |
| | Unit | RLF | Nbase | 100 | |
| Therm Savings = | 80 | 50% | 2 | 16.18 | 0.05 |



| | 2011 | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Programmable Thermostat

| | Inputs | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-----|--------|-------|-------|---|-----------------|---|
| AFUE of existing furnace | 80% | | | | | | | |
| RLF | 95% | | | | | | | |
| Duct Leak Usage 8% | 97.8% | | | | | | | |
| Furnace Rating btu (per hour) | 80,000 | | | | | | | |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | 1,618 | | | | | | | |
| | kBtuh | | 1 | ESF | HLH | | Therm savings | |
| | Unit | RLF | Nbase | | 100 | | | |
| Therm Savings = | 80 | 80% | 1.2225 | 0.036 | 16.18 | = | <mark>46</mark> | х |

| 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings | Number of Units | Annual Savings |
| | | | | | |
| | 0 | 10 | 460 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |

Duct Sealing

| AFUE of existing boiler | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| AFUE of new boiler | |
| Duct Leak Usage 8% | |
| Boiler Rating btu (per hour) | 8 |
| Binghamton Heating Load Hours (HLH) | |
| | |

| Inputs | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 90% | | | | | |
| 90% | | | | | |
| 97.8% | | | | | |
| 80,000 | | | | | |
| 1,618 | | | | | |

Assumptions: Two improvements taking place. 1. No Upgrad to the furnace from 90% AFUE. I installing insulation around the ducts and sealing them so that the total efficiency is increased from New Install .0928 (uninsulated, 25% leakage) to .978 (insulated Existing BTU Base Multiplier Multiplier to R-6 with only 8% leakage.) Rating RLF (1/.90 x .928) (1/.90 x .978) HLH Savin ٥n 000/ 1 107 1 1 1 16 10

| Savings = | 80 90% | 1.197 | 1.14 16.18 | |
|-----------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------|
| or | 72 x | 0.06 x | 16.18 | Therm savings |
| Savings = | 71 therms | | | |
| | | | | |

Corning Natural Gas Corporation Energy Efficiency Therms Saved

| OCTOBER | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|---------|------|---------|
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Total |
| Furnace AFUE > 90 | - | - | - | - |
| Furnace AFUE > 92 | - | - | - | - |
| Furnace AFUE > 90 w ECM | - | 155.0 | - | 155.0 |
| Furnace AFUE> 92 w ECM | - | - | - | - |
| Furnace AFUE > 95 w ECM | | - | - | - |
| Water Boiler AFUE > 85 | | 3,801.0 | - | 3,801.0 |
| Water Boiler AFUE > 90 | | - | - | - |
| Steam Boiler AFUE > 82 | | 577.0 | - | 577.0 |
| Boiler Reset Control | | - | - | - |
| Indirect Water Heater | | - | - | - |
| Programmable Thermostat | | 490.0 | - | 490.0 |
| Duct and Air Sealing | - | - | - | - |
| | - | 5,023.0 | - | 5,023.0 |