

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Second Set of Data Requests**

- AG 2.03 Q. Regarding Nicor Ex. 1.1 at page 19.
- a) Please provide in excel format the following data for each program that will be implemented jointly with ComEd.
- i) Estimated number of participants per program per plan year
  - ii) Estimated number of electric measures
  - iii) Type of electric measure to be installed and deemed savings per measure
  - iv) Estimated number of gas measures
  - v) Type of gas measure to be installed and deemed savings per measure
  - vi) Total joint program costs
  - vii) Allocation of program costs to ComEd (please explain the methodology for allocating program costs)
  - viii) Allocation of program costs to Nicor (please explain the methodology for allocating program costs).

Please use the following table:

- AG 2.03 A. Please see the attached AG 2.03 Exhibit 1 for the information requested.
- i) AG 2.03 Exhibit 1 contains the number of Nicor Gas program participants for the three years. Nicor Gas does not have the number of ComEd participants in its filing.
  - ii) Electric measures are addressed in the ComEd plan. Nicor Gas did not address the electric measures for these programs.
  - iii) Nicor Gas did not address electric measures in its filing. Those measures were addressed by ComEd.
  - iv) The estimated number of gas measures is provided in the attached AG 2.03 Exhibit 1.
  - v) The type of gas measures to be installed and deemed savings per measure is included in the attached AG 2.03 Exhibit 1.

**OFFICIAL FILE**

I.C.C. DOCKET NO. 10-0562

AG CROSS Exhibit No. 1

Witness \_\_\_\_\_

Date 12/14/10 Reporter TD

vi) Nicor Gas has included its budget for each program, but ComEd's costs were not addressed in Nicor Gas' plan. ComEd's budget would be contained in its plan.

vii) The specific allocation of program costs is yet to be determined.

viii) The specific allocation of program costs is yet to be determined.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

Program Name	Single Family Retrofit				
	PY1	PY2	PY3		
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	1,600	3,200	4,800		
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A		
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$672,242	\$1,213,995	\$1,777,102		
				Deemed Savings	
Gas Measures	PY1	PY2	PY3	therms	
Air Infiltration Reduction	275	600	900	141	
Duct insulation and sealing (15% leakage base)	300	600	900	139	
Attic Insulation - open blown ceiling	76	150	250	112	
Basement/Sidewall Insulation	92	200	300	101	
Floor Insulation	76	150	250	149	
Pipe Insulation	275	600	900	34	
Faucet aerator	300	600	900	5	
Low-flow shower heads	300	600	900	27	
Thermostats	300	600	900	26	
Energy Audit	1,600	3,200	4,800	0	

**Joint Programs**

Program Name

**Multi-Family Retrofit**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>
Proposed Program Participation	30,000	45,000	55,000
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$4,022,261	\$5,461,246	\$6,629,651

<b>Gas Measures</b>	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	<b>Deemed Savings therms</b>
Energy Audit	30,000	45,000	55,000	0
Faucet aerator	30000	45,000	55,000	5
Low-flow shower heads	30000	45,000	55,000	27
Thermostats	10000	18,000	25,000	26
Water Heater Turn-down	10000	18,000	25,000	11

Program Name	Joint Programs			Deemed Savings therms
	Retro-Commissioning			
	PY1	PY2	PY3	
Proposed Program Participation	37	40	42	
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A	
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$936,540	\$823,000	\$842,673	
<b>Gas Measures</b>	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	
Retro-Commissioning Project	37	40	42	13,605

Program Name	Small Business Direct Install		
	PY1	PY2	PY3
Proposed Program Participation	1,140	2,800	3,750
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$503,209	\$721,130	\$856,569

Gas Measures	PY1	PY2	PY3	Deemed Savings
				therms
Steam Trap, Buy Down	150	618	927	203
Boiler Tune-up	150	356	535	303
HYDRONIC BOILERS <300 MBH, >85% AFUE	15	24	36	433
Boiler Reset Control	10	356	535	867
Furnace 0.9 AFUE Condensing	5	9	16	165
Infrared Heaters	15	27	47	451
CONDENSING UNIT HEATERS <300 MBH >90% TE w/ power venting	10	18	31	266
Water Heater (large), 88% TE	50	91	157	251
Programmable Thermostat	125	226	391	178
Pre Rinse Sprayers	260	471	814	527
Showerheads	100	181	313	27
Aerators	100	181	313	5
Furnace Tune-Up 110-250 Mbtu	50	91	157	63
Hot water reset	100	181	313	11
Infrared Upright Broiler	5	10	20	1,089
Infrared Charbroiler	5	10	20	661
Pasta Cooker	5	10	20	1,380
Infrared Rotisserie Oven	5	10	20	554
Infrared Salamander Broiler	5	10	20	239
Programmable Thermostat	200	400	800	178

**Joint Programs**

Program Name

**Business New Construction**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>
Proposed Program Participation	38	40	42
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$529,999	\$487,049	\$495,108

**Gas Measures**

Commercial New Construction Project

<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	<b>Deemed Savings therms</b>
38	40	42	6,250

**Joint Programs**

Program Name

**Building Performance with ENERGY STAR**

Proposed Program Participation  
 Total Joint Program Cost  
 ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs  
 Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs

PY1	PY2	PY3
2	10	20
N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A
\$96,362	\$223,888	\$380,076

**Gas Measures**  
 Building Performance with ENERGY STAR Project

PY1	PY2	PY3	Deemed Savings therms
2	10	20	12,500

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Second Set of Data Requests**

- AG 2.04      Q.      Regarding Nicor Ex. 1.1 at page 19.
- a) Please provide in excel format the following data for each program that will be implemented cooperatively with ComEd:
    - i) Estimated number of participants per program per plan year
    - ii) Estimated number of electric measures
    - iii) Type of electric measure to be installed and deemed savings per measure
    - iv) Estimated number of gas measures
    - v) Type of gas measure to be installed and deemed savings per measure
    - vi) Total joint program costs
    - vii) Allocation of program costs to ComEd (please explain the methodology for allocating program costs)
    - viii) Allocation of program costs to Nicor (please explain the methodology for allocating program costs).

Please use the following table:

- AG 2.04      A.      Please see the attached AG 2.04 Exhibit 1 for the information requested.
- i) AG 2.04 Exhibit 1 contains the number of Nicor Gas program participants for the three years. Nicor Gas does not have the number of ComEd participants in its filing.
  - ii) Electric measures are addressed in the ComEd plan. Nicor Gas did not address the electric measures for these programs.
  - iii) Nicor Gas did not address electric measures in its filing. Those measures were addressed by ComEd.
  - iv) The estimated number of gas measures is provided in the attached AG 2.04 Exhibit 1.
  - v) The type of gas measures to be installed and deemed savings per measure is included in the attached AG 2.04 Exhibit 1.

- vi) Nicor Gas has included its budget for each program, but ComEd's costs were not addressed in Nicor Gas' plan. ComEd's budget would be contained in its plan.
- vii) The specific allocation of program costs is yet to be determined.
- viii) The specific allocation of program costs is yet to be determined.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Cooperative Programs**

**Program Name**

**Heating & Appliance Incentive**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	13,875	23,025	22,875
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$5,192,646	\$7,397,588	\$6,994,315

**Gas Measures**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	<b>Deemed Savings therms</b>
Storage Water Heater, EF 0.67	1,500	2,500	2,500	37
High Efficiency Furnace, 92% AFUE	9,000	12,500	12,000	144
High Efficiency Furnace, 95% AFUE	3,000	6,000	6,000	178
High Efficiency Boiler, 90% AFUE	300	400	400	103
High Efficiency Boiler, 95% AFUE	75	125	175	161
Window, U = 0.2	0	1500	1800	72

Program Name	Cooperative Programs			Elementary Energy Education			Deemed Savings therms
	PY1	PY2	PY3	PY1	PY2	PY3	
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	5,000	10,000	15,000				
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A				
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$133,863	\$166,648	\$211,334				
<b>Gas Measures</b>	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>				
Energy Savings Kit	5,000	10,000	15,000				14

**Cooperative Programs**

Program Name

**Residential New Construction**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	200	392	500
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$413,132	\$600,567	\$725,458

**Gas Measures**

ENERGY STAR New Home, HERS Index <= 85

<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	<b>Deemed Savings therms</b>
200	392	500	143

**Cooperative Programs**

Program Name

Business Incentive

	PY1	PY2	PY3
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	1,690	4,753	7,439
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$1,105,247	\$2,223,125	\$3,084,894

Gas Measures	Deemed Savings			
	PY1	PY2	PY3	therms
FURNACES <=150 MBH, 92-94.9% AFUE	150	378	567	218
FURNACES <=150 MBH, 95%+AFUE	50	124	185	238
CONDENSING UNIT HEATERS <=300 MBH, 90% TE w/ power venting	10	24	36	266
HYDRONIC BOILERS <=300 MBH >=85% AFUE	20	48	71	433
HYDRONIC BOILERS 301-499 MBH >=85% AFUE	10	24	36	477
HYDRONIC BOILERS 500-999 MBH >=85% AFUE	8	19	29	580
HYDRONIC BOILERS 1000-1700 MBH >=85% AFUE	4	10	14	756
HYDRONIC BOILERS 1701-2000 MBH >=85% TE	2	5	7	904
CONDENSING BOILERS, <=300 MBH >=90% AFUE	4	10	14	709
CONDENSING BOILERS 301-499 MBH >=90% AFUE	3	7	11	882
CONDENSING BOILERS 500-999 MBH >=90% AFUE	2	5	7	1,288
CONDENSING BOILERS 1000-1700 MBH >=90% AFUE	1	2	4	1,982
CONDENSING BOILERS 1701-2000 MBH >=90% AFUE	1	2	4	2,561
INFRARED HEATERS (all sizes), Low intensity	15	22	30	451
Water Heater (large), 88% TE	40	75	125	251
Water Heater—Energy Star Free Standing, 0.67 EF	50	114	171	148
Combined High Efficiency Boiler & Water Htg. Unit, >=90%AFUE	3	21	32	246
Steam Trap, Buy Down	250	800	1,200	203
Boiler Reset Controls (after market new), Retrofit	250	941	1,411	867
Boiler Tune-up	250	600	900	303
HE Pre-Rinse Spray Valve, Low-Flow Pre-Rinse	200	741	1,112	527
Commercial Steamer, Energy Star Rated with E of >38%	50	119	178	2,084
Convection Oven, Energy Star Rated with E of >40%	10	20	30	323
H-E Combined Oven	12	24	36	644
H-E Rack Oven-Double Oven	10	20	30	2,064
H-E Conveyor Oven Large (>=25-in conveyor width)	20	50	100	733
Griddle, Energy Star Rated	20	50	100	184
Fryer, Energy Star Rated with E of >50%	20	50	100	505
Infrared Upright Broiler	5	10	20	1,089
Infrared Charbroiler	5	10	20	661
Pasta Cooker	5	10	20	1,380
Infrared Rotisserie Oven	5	10	20	554
Infrared Salamander Broiler	5	10	20	239
Programmable Thermostat	200	400	800	178

**Cooperative Programs**

Program Name

**Custom Business**

	<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>
Proposed Nicor Gas Program Participation	35	85	225
Total Joint Program Cost	N/A	N/A	N/A
ComEd Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nicor Proportional Share of Joint Program Costs	\$1,395,790	\$2,718,823	\$6,707,861

**Gas Measures**

Custom Business Project

<b>PY1</b>	<b>PY2</b>	<b>PY3</b>	<b>Deemed Savings therms</b>
35	85	225	20,938

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.05    Q.    Was the contract to hire Bass & Associates competitively bid? If so, please provide a copy of the RFP issued and the method of distribution of the RFP.

AG 2.05    A.    No. Bass & Associates ("Bass") was selected for a variety of reasons, including: 1) Nicor Gas had experience working with Bass in connection with its existing Rider 29 energy efficiency program, and is very familiar with its expertise with evaluating a utility's energy efficiency needs, and creating an appropriate program; 2) Bass is not an "implementing" entity, thus preserving the opportunity for implementing entities the ability to bid on implementation work; 3) Bass had experience to provide organizational design, market potential study and research, and business logistic needed to prepare our filing and 4) given the statutory time constraints imposed by Section 8-104 of the Act, Bass had the background and experience to provide immediate assistance. Consulting rates were benchmarked and negotiated by Nicor Gas Strategic Sourcing department.

*Witness:*    James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.08 Q. Will Nicor issue an open, RFP bidding process to solicit program providers of the programs identified in Nicor Exhibit 1.1? If so, will Nicor draft the RFP, Bass or some other entity? If not bidding the programs, why not?

AG 2.08 A. Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 describes for each program a sourcing strategy for implementation contractors (the section of each program was titled "Vendor Selection Process").

Nicor Gas is working currently with ComEd to begin RFP designs for the joint programs. The Company is also developing sourcing strategies for the other programs as appropriate. The Company may or may not select third party vendors to assist with some or all of this work.

As discussed in our filing – we provided the rationale as to which programs we likely would bid, and others where we would continue existing relationships.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.09 Q. What is the cost to Nicor incurred to date for the work provided by Bass & Associates for the plan presented in this docket? How much did Bass & Associates bill the Company for the development and performance of a market potential study?

AG 2.09 A. Nicor Gas conducted seven Scope of Work (SOW) contracts with Bass and Company Management Consulting (Bass). Costs incurred thru November 1, 2010 for each are as follows.

<u>SOW</u>	<u>SCOPE</u>	<u>Expenditure</u>
SOW1	Business Launch	\$ 183,451
SOW2	Business Model Design	\$ 326,642
SOW3	Market Potential Study	\$ 486,858
SOW4	Stakeholder Management	\$ 104,963
SOW5	EE Plan Development	\$ 613,169
SOW6	Operational and Technical Design	\$ 323,569
SOW7	Regulatory Support	\$ 156,980
		<u>\$ 2,195,632</u>

Descriptions of the seven SOW's are as follows:

- SOW1 – Business Launch – includes project planning, budgeting, governance, education and reporting across the entire project.
- SOW2 – Business Model Design – Assessment of Nicor Gas' current operational and technology capabilities including financial, audit, communication, procurement and customer care functions. Development of business model options and recommendations for Nicor Gas' future design.
- SOW3 – Market Potential Study – Survey of over 1000 customers and trade allies, analysis of available energy savings technologies, baseline development of appliance saturations and building stock in Nicor Gas' service territory, development of customer demographics, cost-benefit analyses and other territory specific information to support technology selection and design.
- SOW4 – Stakeholder Management – identification of strategic stakeholders, development of key issues for positioning and communicating to stakeholders.
- SOW5 – EE Plan Development – Program design portfolio goals and benefits, program and measure cost-effectiveness, integration with other parties, identification of support requirements.

- SOW6 - Operational and Technology Design – Process flows, technology architecture, support functions alignment.
- SOW7 – Regulatory Support – Data requests, expert testimony, and overall support during the regulatory approval process.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company  
Response to: Illinois Attorney General  
III.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562  
AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.10 Q. Is the Company willing to work with the Stakeholder Advisory Group to modify programs based on SAG input during the three-year plan cycle?

AG 2.10 A. Section 8-104 of the Public Utilities Act does not provide for the Stakeholder Advisory Group mechanism for gas utilities. Instead, a gas utility is responsible for preparing and implementing an energy efficiency program. Nicor Gas may seek input from a stakeholder group as circumstances warrant.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company  
Response to: Illinois Attorney General  
Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562  
AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.11 Q. Will Nicor agree to allow the SAG to help develop and review the RFP to be issued by Nicor for evaluation of the Rider 30 programs? If not, why not?

AG 2.11 A. Pursuant to Section 8-104 of the Act, Nicor Gas is responsible for developing and implementing its Energy Efficiency Program. It also is Nicor Gas responsibility, not third parties, to select the EM&V contractors to review its program.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company  
Response to: Illinois Attorney General  
Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562  
AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.12 Q. Will Nicor agree to allow the SAG to help develop and review the work plans of the program evaluator? If not, why not?

AG 2.12 A. Pursuant to Section 8-104 of the Act, Nicor Gas is responsible for developing and implementing its Energy Efficiency Program. It also is Nicor Gas responsibility, not third parties, to coordinate the EM&V contractors to review its program.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company  
Response to: Illinois Attorney General  
Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562  
AG Second Set of Data Requests**

AG 2.13 Q. Will Nicor agree to release at the same time it receive the reports the results of any program evaluation of the Rider 30 programs? If not, why not?

AG 2.13 A. Nicor Gas objects to this data request as being vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Company's objective is to comply with the requirements of Section 8-104 of the Act. The details of how that process will function, and the timing of reports and other evaluation matters will be finalized once the plan is approved. In any case, Nicor Gas will provide a copy of the final evaluation report to parties upon receipt from the contractor.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Third Set of Data Requests**

AG 3.01 Q. Please provide a breakdown of the percentage of Nicor's energy efficiency plan costs that constitute "administrative costs", including all workpapers and documents that support said percentage, assuming "administrative cost" is defined as follows:

**Administrative Cost.** An administrative cost is a cost that may be incurred by a Program Administrator, Contractor or Subcontractor that is not easily chargeable to a specific program, but benefits all functions of the Program Administrator, Contractor or Subcontractor. Administrative costs should be charged to different programs and/or functions using a consistent pre-defined basis. Examples of administrative costs include:

- Managerial and Clerical Labor
- Human Resources Support and Development
- Travel and Conference Fees
- Overhead (General and Administrative)
- Equipment (e.g., communications, computing, copying, general office, transportation, etc.)
- Food Service
- Office Supplies and Postage
- Labor (e.g., accounting, facilities management, procurement, administrative, communications, information technology, telecommunications, etc.)

AG 3.01 A. See Nicor Gas Exhibit 5.1 that was filed with the rebuttal testimony of James J. Jerozal, Jr. This is an Excel version of Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 revised to reflect the evidence presented in the rebuttal testimony.

In its Energy Efficiency Plan (EEP), Nicor Gas attributed all of its administrative costs to specific programs. These administrative costs include the categories listed above, but they are not specifically broken out by these categories. The administrative costs accounted for within the individual program budgets (Internal Admin in revised Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1) include estimates of the Company's internal labor and expenses to administer the EEP, the estimated participation and membership costs of energy efficiency associations, and, in PY1, the estimated cost of Nicor Gas labor and expenses during the period from approval of its EEP to June 1, 2011 (pre-launch costs).

For the internal labor costs, Nicor Gas estimated that it would need 12 FTEs in Program Year 1, 16 FTEs in Program Year 2, and 18 FTEs in Program Year 3. Using an estimated fully-loaded cost of \$150,000 per FTE, the labor and expense budgets for the three years are \$1.8 million, \$2.4 million, and \$2.7 million, respectively. As described above and in the EEP, these costs were allocated to the programs based on the percent of total savings delivered by each program.

For the costs of participation and membership in energy efficiency associations, Nicor Gas estimated \$100,000 per program year. These costs were allocated to the programs based on the percent of total savings delivered by each program.

For pre-launch costs, Nicor Gas estimated costs in Program Year 1 of \$300,000 for internal labor and expenses. These costs were allocated to the programs based on the percent of total savings delivered by each program.

In total, Nicor Gas proposed Internal Admin costs of \$2.2 million in PY1, \$2.5 million in PY2, and \$2.8 million in PY3. These budgets equate to approximately 10% of Nicor Gas' revised PY1 budget, 7% of its revised PY2 budget, and 6% of its revised PY3 budget.

Nicor Gas is enclosing an Excel version of the revised Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 and an Excel file containing calculations related to this data request. This Excel file comprises the workpapers for this and the remaining data requests in the third set of data requests from the People of the State of Illinois. There are no additional workpapers.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Third Set of Data Requests**

AG 3.02 Q. Please provide a breakdown of the percentage of Nicor's energy efficiency plan costs that constitute "marketing costs", including all workpapers and documents that support said percentage, assuming "marketing cost" is defined as follows:

**Marketing Cost.** The term marketing costs means the costs of marketing, outreach, customer service and business development. It includes the costs for:

- full-service marketing services, concepts and campaign strategy planning
- developing a marketing plan, timeline, budget and progress reports
- coordination of all marketing activities, including scheduling events, media buys, etc.
- program promotional materials, including education and training events
- web site
- developing a request for proposal for procuring contracts
- public relations, including community relations

AG 3.02 A. See Nicor Gas Exhibit 5.1 that was filed with the rebuttal testimony of James J. Jerozal, Jr. This is an Excel version of Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 revised to reflect the evidence presented in the rebuttal testimony.

Marketing Costs for Nicor Gas' Energy Efficiency Plan are provided in revised Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 under the heading Advertising and Promotion. The Company included a Communication Plan in Section 6 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 which describes the proposed marketing activities in further detail. The revised Marketing Cost for Nicor Gas' EEP is \$1,265,600 in PY1, \$1,750,770 in PY2, and \$2,044,999 in PY3. As a percent of the Nicor Gas EEP budget this represents 8% in PY1, 7% in PY2, and 6% in PY3.

There are no additional workpapers.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Third Set of Data Requests**

AG 3.03 Q. Please provide a breakdown of the percentage of ComEd's energy efficiency plan costs that constitute "evaluation costs", including all workpapers and documents that support said percentage, assuming "evaluation cost" is defined as follows:

**Evaluation Cost.** The term Evaluation costs means the costs incurred to aid the Evaluator in performing duties for the Program (e.g., verifying energy savings). It includes costs related to:

- Development of ongoing evaluation plan
- Evaluation of energy-efficiency programming efforts
- Reporting-related requirements
- Coordination with selected advisory groups
- Costs incurred to collect data for evaluation

AG 3.03 A. See Nicor Gas Exhibit 5.1 that was filed with the rebuttal testimony of James J. Jerozal, Jr. This is an Excel version of Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 revised to reflect the evidence presented in the rebuttal testimony.

To clarify, Nicor Gas assumes that the reference to ComEd in the question was in error. The Company will respond to this request with information regarding its own evaluation costs, not those of ComEd.

Nicor Gas' Evaluation Costs are provided in revised Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1 under the heading EM&V. The Evaluation Costs were calculated as 3% of the sum of the budget categories: Internal Admin, IT Costs, Vendor Implementation, Incentives, and Advertising and Promotion. Nicor Gas included a description of its Evaluation, Measurement and Verification plans in section 7 of its EEP.

There are no additional workpapers.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.

**Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company**  
**Response to: Illinois Attorney General**  
**Ill.C.C. Docket No. 10-0562**  
**AG Third Set of Data Requests**

AG 3.04 Q. At page 15 of Nicor Ex. 1.1, the Company states: "All costs for the PMT and associated infrastructure upgrades have been included within the internal administration budgets for the individual programs described in the plan." Please provide, along with any associated workpapers:

- a) the total cost of the PMT;
- b) the total cost of the "associated infrastructure upgrades"; and
- c) a breakdown that reflects the allocation of these costs to "the internal administration budgets for the individual programs described in the plan."

AG 3.04 A. This sentence at page 15 of Nicor Gas Ex. 1.1 should read, "All **ongoing** costs for the PMT and associated infrastructure upgrades have..."

- a) Nicor Gas estimated the ongoing cost of the PMT to be \$1 million per year throughout the three year plan.

Nicor Gas estimates that the purchase of the PMT and initial infrastructure upgrades will cost approximately \$2,000,000. This cost is included in Nicor Gas Exhibit 5.3 (revised Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.5) as part of the \$5,000,000 Program Year 1 Startup Costs.

- b) Nicor Gas did not separate out the cost of "associated infrastructure upgrades" from the initial cost of the PMT or the ongoing cost. These costs are included in the costs identified in part a) of this data request.

- c) The allocation of ongoing PMT costs to the internal administration budgets for the individual programs is provided in Exhibit 5.1 (revised Table 7 of Nicor Gas Exhibit 1.1) under the heading "IT Costs". The ongoing cost of the PMT in each year was allocated to the EEP programs in proportion to the net therm savings for that program compared to the total net therm savings for the EEP.

There are no additional workpapers.

*Witness:* James J. Jerozal Jr.