

ICC Docket No. 09-0263

Commonwealth Edison Company's Response to  
MC Squared Energy Services and Constellation New Energy ("MC-CNE") Data Request  
MC-CNE 1.01 - 1.13  
Dated: July 2, 2009

REQUEST NO. MC-CNE 1.08:

Reference: Direct Panel Testimony of Jensen/Eber lines 283-284.

Reference that "this research has not be conducted .... In the Midwest."

- a. Please explain where this research has been conducted.
- b. Please explain why ComEd considers it necessary to repeat the research in the MidWest.
- c. Please explain the cost benefit of conducting this research in duplicate in the MidWest.
- d. Did ComEd conduct any analysis of the level of energy efficiency (kwh), demand response (kw) or load shifting that would need to be achieved in the pilot for an expansion of the various customer application technologies to pass a total resource cost test similar to the tests required under ComEd's Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Rider? If not, why not? If not, please explain the basis for the conclusion on lines 640-643 "that there is great benefit to taking this opportunity to look at customer applications in connection with the deployment of AMI meters in ComEd's pilot.

RESPONSE:

**OFFICIAL FILE**  
I.C.C. DOCKET NO. 09-0263  
~~ICEA X~~ Exhibit No. 3  
Witness \_\_\_\_\_  
Date 8/19/09 Reporter CC

- d. No, this kind of analysis was not conducted. This is due to the nature of the customer applications as a pilot. The results of the pilot may allow for such an analysis to be completed in the future as an ultimate AMI deployment may be contemplated. The conclusion is based upon the Direct Testimony of Ross C. Hemphill, Ph.D. (ComEd Ex. 1.0) and the Direct Testimony of James C. Eber (ComEd Ex. 4.0).