

BEFORE THE
STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of
ORANGE AND ROCKLAND UTILITIES, INC.

Case 07-E-0949

December 18, 2007

Prepared Testimony of:

Karen Tuczinski
Utility Consumer Assistance
Specialist 4
Office of Energy Efficiency and
Environment
State of New York
Department of Public Service
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223-1350

TUCZINSKI

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. Karen Tuczinski, 3 Empire State Plaza, Albany,
3 NY.

4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

5 A. I am employed by the Department of Public
6 Service (DPS) as a Utility Consumer Assistance
7 Specialist 4 of the Energy Efficiency Unit in
8 the Office of Energy Efficiency and the
9 Environment.

10 Q. Please summarize your educational and
11 professional background.

12 A. I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English
13 Literature and Composition from Providence
14 College in Providence Rhode Island in 1993. I
15 have been employed with the DPS since 1995. I
16 have held progressive technical positions with
17 the Office of Public Information and the Office
18 of Retail Market Development and its
19 predecessors. My responsibilities have included
20 the promotion of 'green power' or renewable
21 energy, energy efficiency, retail access,
22 economic development, and low income initiatives
23 by Central Hudson Gas and Electric Corporation,

TUCZINSKI

1 Rochester Telephone Corporation, Niagara Mohawk
2 Power Corporation, New York State Electric and
3 Gas Corporation, Rochester Gas and Electric
4 Corporation and Orange and Rockland Utilities,
5 Incorporated. I filed testimony in the Frontier
6 Telephone of Rochester rate proceeding (Case 93-
7 C-0103) regarding outreach and education and
8 low-income issues.

9 Q. Have you previously testified before the
10 Commission?

11 A. Yes. I testified as part of staff panels in the
12 recent New York State Electric and Gas
13 Corporation (NYSEG) electric rate proceeding
14 (Case 01-E-0359) and the NYSEG gas rate
15 proceeding (Case 01-G-1668) regarding economic
16 development, Energy Services Company (ESCO) and
17 gas marketer satisfaction, and retail access
18 issues. As a Staff team member, I negotiated
19 and advocated the above issues in the Central
20 Hudson Gas and Electric Corporation rate
21 proceeding (Case 00-E-1273 and 00-G-1274), the
22 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation/National Grid
23 merger proceeding (Case 01-M-0075), and the

TUCZINSKI

1 NYSEG rate proceedings listed above. In
2 addition, I testified in the Rochester Gas and
3 Electric Corporation rate proceeding (Case 02-E-
4 0198 and 02-E-0199).

5 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

6 A. To address Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.'s
7 ("Orange and Rockland" or the "Company") energy
8 efficiency efforts and its proposal to implement
9 an energy efficiency surcharge as described in
10 the testimony of Company Witness Jane Quin.

11 Q. The Company has an open rate proceeding -- Case
12 06-E-1433. Is it a factor in your consideration
13 of Orange and Rockland's recommendations in this
14 proceeding?

15 A. Yes. In Case 06-E-1433, Staff recommended using
16 the originally identified unexpended funds
17 totaling \$1.3M for an energy efficiency program
18 for the rate year ending June 30, 2008. The plan
19 relies and expands upon existing cost-effective
20 state-wide programs, with proven track records,
21 which target under-served customers or
22 undersubscribed programs in the Company's
23 service territory. The plan also calls for

TUCZINSKI

1 Orange and Rockland to expend \$350,000 to
2 perform a market potential study and develop a
3 longer-term portfolio of efficiency programs, in
4 collaboration with all interested parties.
5 Concurrently, parties in the Energy Efficiency
6 Portfolio Standard Proceeding (EPS) in Case 07-
7 M-0548 are developing energy efficiency programs
8 and cost recovery mechanisms, including "fast
9 track" programs that are expected to be approved
10 by the Commission in the first quarter of 2008.

11 Q. In light of the status of the ongoing
12 proceedings, what is your recommendation in this
13 proceeding?

14 A. Orange and Rockland should implement energy
15 efficiency programs developed as an outcome of
16 Case 06-E-1433 or the EPS proceeding.

17 Q. Do you recommend that Orange and Rockland
18 implement its proposal collect an energy
19 efficiency surcharge at this time?

20 A. No. There are two ongoing proceedings that have
21 established the appropriate forum for
22 determining the status of Orange and Rockland's
23 energy efficiency programs and subsequent cost

TUCZINSKI

1 recovery. Therefore, I recommend that Orange and
2 Rockland defer any costs incurred for energy
3 efficiency programs during the 2008 rate year
4 until such time as a more permanent recovery
5 mechanism is established through either
6 proceeding.

7 Q. Witness Quinn's testimony recommends the
8 addition of two new staff positions in the
9 energy services/retail access department, in
10 addition to two new positions proposed in the
11 06-E-1433 proceeding. What is your position on
12 this request?

13 A. Since the outcome of both the EPS and 06-E-1433
14 proceedings are yet to be determined and
15 programs are not yet developed, it is premature
16 to determine whether an additional two positions
17 will be needed as a result of this proceeding.
18 This is particularly true since its prior
19 request for two positions in Case 06-E-1433 is
20 being considered by the Commission.

21 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

22 A. Yes, it does.