

# RECEIVED <br> MAY 172007 <br> PUBLIC SERVICE <br> COMMISSION 

## HAND DELIVERED

## Ms. Elizabeth O'Donnell

Executive Director
Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, KY 40602
Re: PSC Case No. 2006-00547
Dear Ms. O'Donnell:
Please find enclosed for filing with the Commission in the above-referenced case, an original and seven copies of the Responses of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. to the Commission Staff Second Data Request dated May 9, 2007.

Very truly yours,


Charles A. Lile
Senior Corporate Counsel

## Enclosures

Cc: Dennis G. Howard, II, Esq.- Attorney General
Lawrence W. Cook, Esq.- Attorney General

4775 Lexington Road 40391
P.O. Box 707, Winchester, Kentucky 40392-0707

Tel. (859) 744-4812
Fax: (859) 744-6008
http://www.ekpc.coop

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## RECEDED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION $\begin{gathered}\text { PUBLIC SERVICE } \\ \text { COMMISSION }\end{gathered}$
IN THE MATTER OF:
THE APPLICATION OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER ) COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR CONTINUATION OF ) CASE NO. THE TOUCHSTONE ENERGY HOME PROGRAM REBATE) 2006-00547

## CERTIFICATE

## STATE OF KENTUCKY )

)
COUNTY OF CLARK )
William A. Bosta, being duly sworn, states that he has supervised the preparation of the responses of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. to the Public Service Commission Staff Data Requests in the above-referenced case dated May 9, 2007, and that the matters and things set forth therein are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, formed after reasonable inquiry.


Subscribed and sworn before me on this $16=$ day of May, 2007.


My Commission expires:
Deventer 8,2009

# RECEIVED <br> Ma4 172007 <br> PUBLIC SERVICE COMIMISSION 

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:
THE APPLICATION OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER ) COOPERATIVE FOR CONTINUATION OF ) TOUCHSTONE ENERGY HOME REBATE ) CASE NO. PROGRAM
) 2006-00547

RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S SECOND DATA REQUEST TO EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.

DATED MAY 9, 2007

PSC CASE NO. 2006-00547

## CONTINUATION OF TOUCHSTONE ENERGY HOME REBATE PROGRAM COMMISSION STAFF'S SECOND DATA REQUEST DATED 5/09/07

East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (EKPC) hereby submits responses to the Commission Staff's Second Data Request dated May 9, 2007. Each response with its associated supportive reference materials is individually tabbed.

EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.

PSC CASE NO. 2006-00547

## CONTINUATION OF TOUCHSTONE ENERGY HOME REBATE PROGRAM RESPONSE TO SECOND DATA REQUEST

## COMMISSION STAFF'S SECOND DATA REQUEST DATED 5/09/07 REQUEST 1 <br> RESPONSIBLE PERSON: <br> William Bosta COMPANY: <br> East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.

REQUEST 1. Has EKPC performed "California Tests" (ratepayer participant test, utility cost test, ratepayer impact measure test, total resource cost test) to determine the cost effectiveness of this program?
a. If the answer to Item 1 above is yes, provide all available workpapers including the results of these tests.
b. If the answer to Item 1 above is no, perform these tests and provide the results including all workpapers and explaining all assumptions.

RESPONSE 1 a-b. Yes. EKPC performed the "California Tests" and submitted the results in support of its original filing for approval of the Touchstone Energy Home program, Case No. 2003-00481. The results of those tests and the associated assumptions and workpapers are included herein as PSC-1, Attachment 1 to this request. In addition, EKPC performed "California Tests" in its 2006 IRP for the Touchstone Energy Home program and such information is provided in PSC-1, Attachment 2.

# CALIFORNIA TEST INFORMATION FROM ORIGINAL APPLICATION IN CASE 2003-00481 

## SECTION III

## KEY ASSUMPTIONS

(1) The benefits and costs for this program are expressed in terms of the Standard California cost effectiveness tests. EKPC utilized the software package DSManager that was developed by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). These tests are: (1) Ratepayer Impact Test; (2) Participant Test; and (3) Total Resource Cost Test.
(2) EKPC's generation capacity credit is based on the difference in the heating/cooling load shape for a "Standard Home" versus a new home constructed to "Touchstone Energy Home" standards. EKPC has estimated that the expected peak winter reduction is 2.4 kW per participant and the peak summer reduction is 1.6 kW per participant. Avoided capacity costs were determined using EKPC's forecasted base load capacity capital cost.
(3) EKPC's production cost savings are based on the estimated reduction in fuel and variable operating and maintenance expenses due to the decrease in kWh generated as a result of the program.
(4) EKPC estimates that incremental administrative costs will average $\$ 44,000$ per year for the first five years of the program. In addition, EKPC will pay $\$ 250$ for a blowerdoor test on each new home. The Member Systems' variable costs are $\$ 182$ per new Participant.
(5) Wholesale demand and energy rates are based on EKPC wholesale tariff Schedule E2.
(6) Retail rates are based on South Kentucky's RECC's residential rate. This rate serves as a proxy for EKPC's sixteen Member Systems' residential rates..
(7) As a result of the positive benefit / cost ratio resulting from the EKPC Ratepayer Impact Test of 1.42 and the ratio from the Total Resource Cost Test of 1.84, EKPC and its Member Systems have included a rebate to participants of up to $\$ 1,000$. Inclusion of the rebate will still keep the EKPC Ratepayer Impact Test benefit/cost ratio above 1.0 and at the same time improve the Participant Test benefit/cost ratio. This rebate is based upon EKPC's assessment of the rebate level required to achieve market penetration expectations. EKPC will match the rebate provided to each Participant from Member Systems in an amount up to $\$ 500$. Therefore, if the Member System provides a maximum rebate of $\$ 500$, EKPC will match the rebate with $\$ 500$, resulting in the Participant experiencing a rebate of $\$ 1,000$.
(8) The number of new participants is estimated to be 325 per year for five years. These estimates are based on EKPC's estimate of customer growth and the likelihood of Touchstone Energy Home purchases.
(9) EKPC has used a reduction of $30 \%$ in kWh consumption, or about $5,100 \mathrm{kWh}$ per participant per year based on DOE/EPA assessment of energy consumption for Energy Star Homes.
(10) The participant's average incremental investment for the Touchstone Energy Home is estimated to be around $\$ 2,125$. This investment is based on (a) the difference between a SEER 12 air source heat pump and a SEER 10 air source heat pump; (b) the incremental cost of the insulation and air sealing associated with bringing the home from Standard to Touchstone levels; and (c) the incremental cost of a highly efficient water heater.
(11) For purposes of determining the present value of future benefits and costs of the program, a discount rate of $6.5 \%$ was used for both the Rate Impact Tests and Total Resource Test and $13 \%$ for the Participant Test.
(12) The program assesses the addition of new participants over five years. No additional participants are evaluated after year five. Demand and energy savings are evaluated an additional fifteen years, for a total time horizon of twenty years. This approach is standard in DSM program analysis.

| Touchstone Energy Home Program: Standard California Tests Summary of Benefits and Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ratepayer Impact Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line |  |  | Total Benefits | Total Costs |  | Net <br> Benefits | B/C Ratio |
|  | Distribution System | \$ | 4,176,209 | \$4,961,347 | \$ | $(785,138)$ | 0.84 |
|  | EKPC |  | 6,681,233 | \$4,696,708 | \$ | 1,984,525 | 1.42 |
| Participant Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Benefits | Total Costs |  | Net <br> Benefits | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C} \\ & \text { Ratio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Participant | \$ | 2,772,569 | \$2,429,088 | \$ | 343,481 | 1.14 |
|  | Total Resource Cost Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total Benefits | Total Costs |  | Net <br> Benefits | $B / C$ Ratio |
| 4 | Total Resouce Cost Test |  | 6,681,233 | \$3,636,323 | \$ | 3,044,909 | 1.84 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ \quad 245,808 \\
& \hline \$ \quad 4,961,347
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & 4,961,347 \\
\$ & (785,138)
\end{array}
$$


Avoided supply costs (e.g.productions.
Decrease in Distribution Systems' wholesale power expense paid to EKPC.
Based on EKPC's Wholesale Tariff Schedule E-2.
3 PV of $\$ 0$ per participant rebate paid by EKPC to DS evaluated over 5 years.

$$
\text { Line } 2 \text { plus Line } 3
$$

5 Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues
caused by reduced sales. average residential retail rates of EKPC Distribution Systems. PV of Fuel Adjustment Clause evaluated over 20 years.
PV of $\$ 182$ per new Participant evaluated over 5 years.

$$
\text { Line } 6 \text { plus Line } 7 \text { plus Line } 8 \text {. }
$$

11 Line 4 divided by Line 9


$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\$ & 4,439,536 \\
\$ & 276,003 \\
\$ & 245,808 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

$\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{Z}}-$
Benefits D. S. Electric Acquisition Decrease 3 Rebates Received from EKPC Costs
6 D. S. Base Electric Revenue Decrease
6 D. S. Base Electric Revenue Decrease Adjusted Revenue Decrease 8 Distribution System Variable Cost
Total Costs ..... Net Benefits
11 Benefit / Cost Ratio

$$
\text { Line } 4 \text { minus Line } 9
$$

|  |  | LINE | EXPLANATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | Avoided supply costs (production, transmission, and distribution) based on energy and load reductions. |
| \$ | 320,051 | 2 | Avoided distribution capacity. |
| \$ | 2,514,149 | 3 | PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease over 20 years. Includes fuel and variable operating and maintenance expense. |
| \$ | $3,767,811$ | 4 | PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation over evaluated over 20 years. |
| \$ | 79,222 | 5 | Avoided transmission capacity. |
| \$ | 6,681,233 | 6 | Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5 |
|  |  | 7 | Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues caused by reduced sales. |
| \$ | 3,884,451 | 8 | PV of EKPC's reduction in base revenues; based on EKPC's Wholesale Tariff Schedule E-2. |
| \$ | 291,758 | 9 | PV of EKPC's Fuel Adjustment Clause evaluated evaluated over 20 years. |
| \$ | 182,850 | 10 | PV of the EKPC's incremental admininstrative costs of $\$ 44,000$ per year evaluated over 5 years |
| \$ | 337,649 | 11 | PV of \$250 for blower door test per new Participant evaluated over 5 years. |
| \$ | 4,696,708 | 12 | Line $8+$ Line $9+$ Line $10+$ Line 11. |
| \$ | 1,984,525 | 13 | Line 6 minus Line 12. |
|  | 1.42 | 14 | Line 6 divided by Line 12. |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3 \text { Avoided distribution capacity. } \\
& 4 \text { PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease over } 20 \text { years. Includes fuel } \\
& \text { and variable operating and maintenance expense. }
\end{aligned}
$$ and variable operating and maintenance expense.

PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
118^{\circ} \angle 9 L^{\prime} \varepsilon & \$ \\
67 \vdash^{\prime} \downarrow\left\llcorner S^{\prime} Z\right. & \$ \\
190^{\circ} 0 Z \varepsilon & \$ \\
60 Z^{\prime} 9 \angle L^{\prime} \downarrow & \$
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lrll}
\$ & 79,222 & 6 & \text { Avoided transmission capacity. } \\
\cline { 1 - 1 } \$ 10,857,441 & 7 & \text { Line } 2+\text { Line } 3+\text { Line 4 + Line } 5+\text { Line } 6
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
\$ & 2,429,088 \\
\$ & 343,481
\end{array}
$$

$$
1.14
$$


2 PV of reduction in Participants' retail electric bill due to decrease in Systems. rate of 16 D . -
3 Line 2
4 Participants' direct cost of participation.
5 PV of Participants' incremental $\$ 2,125$ investment in the T.E. home evaluated over 5 years.
Line 5 .
$\begin{array}{ll}7 & \text { Line } 3 \text { minus Line } 5 . \\ 8 & \text { Line } 3 \text { divided by Line } 5 .\end{array}$
$\frac{699^{\prime} Z L L ' Z ~ \$ ~}{699^{\prime} Z L L ' Z ~ \$ ~}$

$$
\$ 2,429,088
$$

| LINE |  |  | LINE | EXPLANATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Benefits |  | 1 | Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution) based on energy and load reductions. |
| 2 | Distribution Capacity Credit | \$ 320,051 | 2 | Avoided distribution capacity. |
| 3 | EKPC Electric Prod Cost Decrease | \$2,514,149 | 3 | PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease evaluated over 20 years. Includes fuel and variable operating and maintenance expense. |
| 4 | EKPC Generation Capacity Credit | \$ 3,767,811 | 4 | PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation. |
| 5 | Transmission Capacity Credit | \$ 79,222 | 5 | Avoided transmission capacity. |
| 6 | Total Benefits | \$6,681,233 | 6 | Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5 |
| 7 | Costs |  | 7 | Total program costs to participants, the Distribution Systems, and EKPC (excluding incentives). |
| 8 | Participants' Investment | \$ 2,870,016 | 8 | PV of Customers' incremental investment in Touchstone Energy Home of $\$ 2,125$ per new Participant, evaluated over 5 years. |
| 9 | Distribution System Variable Cost | \$ 245,808 | 9 | PV of $\$ 182$ per new participant evaluated over 5 years. |
| 10 | EKPC Fixed Admin Cost | \$ 182,850 | 10 | PV of the EKPC's incremental admininstrative costs of $\$ 44,000$ per year. evaluated over 5 years. |
| 11 | EKPC Variable Cost | \$ 337,649 | 11 | PV of $\$ 250$ per new Participant blower door test, evaluated over 5 years. |
| 12 | Total Costs | \$ 3,636,323 | 12 | Line $8+$ Line $9+$ Line $10+$ Line 11 |
| 13 | Net Benefits | \$ 3,044,909 | 13 | Line 6 minus Line 12 |
| 14 | Benefit / Cost Ratio | 1.84 | 14 | Line 6 divided by Line 12 |



## PSC Request 1 <br> Attachment 2 <br> Page 1 of 9

Key differences between the 2003 analysis (original filing) and the 2006 IRP analysis:

1. The kWh and kW savings are lower in 2006 than in 2003. This is a result of the new Federal efficiency standards for heat pumps, whereby the baseline is now SEER 13 versus SEER 10.
2. Administrative costs are lower in 2006 than in 2003 . We have the benefit of 3 years of actual experience. EKPC and Member Cooperatives have found ways to be more efficient in administering the program.
3. Rebate levels in 2006 are $\$ 500$ to customer versus the assumption of $\$ 1,000$ in 2003. This matches actual program experience to date.
4. Avoided production and capacity costs have been updated to reflect costs prevailing in 2006.
5. Retail and wholesale rates have been updated to 2006 values.
6. The number of participants has changed from 2003 and 10 years of new participants are being modeled instead of 5 years.

## SECTION III

## KEY ASSUMPTIONS <br> From TE Home 2006 IRP

(1) The benefits and costs for this program are expressed in terms of the Standard Califomia cost effectiveness tests. EKPC utilized the software package DSManager that was developed by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). These tests are: (1)
Ratepayer Impact Test; (2) Participant Test; and (3) Total Resource Cost Test.
(2) EKPC's generation capacity credit is based on the difference in the heating/cooling load shape for a "Standard Home" versus a new home constructed to "Touchstone Energy Home" standards. EKPC has estimated that the expected peak winter reduction is 1.29 kW per participant and the peak summer reduction is 0.59 kW per participant. Avoided capacity costs were determined using EKPC's forecasted base load capacity capital cost.
(3) EKPC's production cost savings are based on the estimated reduction in fuel and variable operating and maintenance expenses due to the decrease in kWh generated as a result of the program.
(4) EKPC estimates that incremental fixed administrative costs will average $\$ 13,535$ per year for the next ten years of the program. In addition, EKPC will pay an average of $\$ 99$ per new participant for variable administrative costs. The Member Systems' variable costs are $\$ 182$ per new participant.
(5) Wholesale demand and energy rates are based on EKPC wholesale tariff Schedule E-2.
(6) Retail rates are based on South Kentucky's RECC's residential rate. This rate serves as a proxy for EKPC's sixteen Member Systems' residential rates.
(7) Rebates are modeled with the customer receiving a $\$ 500$ rebate, of which $\$ 250$ is provided by EKPC as its match, with the Member System also providing \$250. These values closely match the average rebates paid in the program to date.
(8) The number of new air source heat pump home participants is estimated to be 100 per year for the next ten years. This estimate is based on actual participation in 2005.
(9) EKPC has used a reduction of $2,182 \mathrm{kWh}$ per participant per year for new participants in the program. This estimate is based on the difference in electricity consumption between (a) a home with a SEER 13 air source heat pump and a standard efficiency water heater built to Standard construction standards, and (b) a home with a SEER 15 air source heat pump and a high efficiency water heater built to Touchstone Energy Home standards.
(10) The participant's average incremental investment for the Touchstone Energy Home is estimated to be $\$ 2,125$. This investment is based on (a) the difference between a SEER 15 air source heat pump and a SEER 13 air source heat pump, due to changes in Federal efficiency standards; (b) the incremental cost of the insulation and air sealing associated with bringing the home from Standard to Touchstone levels; and (c) the incremental cost of a highly efficient water heater.
(11) For purposes of determining the present value of future benefits and costs of the program, a discount rate of $6.5 \%$ was used for both the Rate Impact Tests and Total Resource Test and $13 \%$ for the Participant Test.
(12) The program assesses the addition of new participants over ten years. No additional participants are evaluated after year ten. Demand and energy savings are evaluated an additional ten years, for a total time horizon of twenty years. This approach is standard in DSM program analysis.
$\left.\begin{array}{llllll|}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { Touchstone Energy Home Program: } \\ \text { Standard California Tests }\end{array} \\ \text { 2006 Summary of Benefits and Costs }\end{array}\right]$
Distribution System Ratepayer Impact Test

| LINE | Benefits | $\frac{\text { LINE }}{1}$ |  |  | EXPLANATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Rebates received plus reduced wholesale bill. |
| 2 | D. S. Electric Acquisition Decrease | \$ | 1,226,948 | 2 | Decrease in Distribution Systems' wholesale power expense paid to EKPC. Based on EKPC's Wholesale Tariff Schedule E-2. |
| 3 | Rebates Received from EKPC | \$ | 191,403 | 3 | PV of $\$ 250$ per participant rebate paid by EKPC to D.S. evaluated over 10 years. |
| 4 | Total Benefits | \$ | 1,418,351 | 4 | Line 2 plus Line 3 |
| 5 | Costs |  |  | 5 | Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues caused by reduced sales. |
| 6 | D. S. Base Electric Revenue Decrease | \$ | 1,368,169 | 6 | D.S. reduction in electric revenues from decrease in kWh sales. Based on average residential retail rates of EKPC Distribution Systems. |
| 7 | Adjusted Revenue Decrease | \$ | 15,032 | 7 | PV of Fuel Adjustment Clause evaluated over 20 years. |
| 8 | Distribution System Variable Cost | \$ | 139,341 | 8 | PV of \$182 per new Participant evaluated over 10 years. |
| 9 | Rebates Paid to Consumers | \$ | 382,805 | 9 | PV of $\$ 500$ per participant paid by D. S. evaluated over 10 years. |
| 10 | Total Costs | \$ | 1,905,347 | 10 | Line 6 plus Line 7 plus Line 8 plus Line 9 . |
| 11 | Net Benefits | \$ | $(486,996)$ | 11 | Line 4 minus Line 10 |
|  | Benefit / Cost Ratio |  | 0.74 | 12 | Line 4 divided by Line 10 |


|  |  | LINE | EXPLANATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | , | Avoided supply costs (production, transmission, and distribution) based on energy and load reductions. |
| \$ | 385,534 | 2 | Avoided distribution capacity. |
| \$ | 1,002,702 | 3 | PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease over 20 years. Includes fuel and variable operating and maintenance expense. |
| \$ | 1,642,618 | 4 | PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation requirements evaluated over 20 years. |
| \$ | 176,797 | 5 | Avoided transmission capacity. |
| \$ | 3,207,651 | 6 | Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5 |
|  |  | 7 | Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues caused by reduced sales. |
| \$ | 1,211,890 | 8 | PV of EKPC's reduction in base revenues; based on EKPC's Wholesaie Tariff Schedule E-2. |
| \$ | 15,058 | 9 | PV of EKPC's Fuel Adjustment Clause evaluated over 20 years. |
| \$ | 103,625 | 10 | PV of the EKPC's incremental admininstrative costs of $\$ 13,535$ per year evaluated over 10 years. |
| \$ | 75,795 | 11 | PV of $\$ 99$ per new Participant evaluated over 10 years. |
| \$ | 191,403 | 12 | PV of $\$ 250$ to D.S. evaluated over 10 years. |
| \$ | 1,597,771 | 13 | Line $8+$ Line $9+$ Line $10+$ Line $11+$ Line 12. |
| \$ | 1,609,880 | 14 | Line 6 minus Line 13. |
|  | 2.0 |  | Line 6 divided by Line 13. |

15 Line 6 divided by Line 13 .

$\square$ Combined Ratepayer Impact Test
$\frac{\text { EXPLANATION }}{1}$ Avoided supply costs (production, transmission, and distribution)
Avoided supply costs (production, trans.
Decrease in Distribution Systems' wholesale power expense paid to EKPC.
Decrease in Distribution Systems wholesale power expense paid to EKPC.
Avoided distribution capacity.
PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease over 20 years. Includes fuel
and variable operating and maintenance expense.
PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation requirements
$\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { Avoided transmission capacity. } \\
& 7 \text { Line } 2+\text { Line } 3+\text { Line } 4+\text { Line } 5+\text { Line } 6 \\
& 8 \text { Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues }\end{aligned}$
Utility program costs (including incentives) plus net lost revenues
9 D.S. reduction in electric revenues from decrease in kWh sales. Based on
average residential retail rates of EKPC Distribution Systems.
PV of Fuel Adjustment Clause over 20 years.
PV of the Distribution Systems' program variable costs of $\$ 182$ per new
Participant over 10 years.
Tariff Schedule E-2.
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Tariff Schedule E-2. } \\
& \text { PV of Fuel Adjustment Clause over } 20 \text { years. }\end{aligned}$
14 PV of the EKPC's incremental admininstrative costs over 10 years.
12 PV of EKPC's reduction in base revenues; based on EKPC's Wholesale
13 PV of Fuel Adjustment Clause over 20 years.
15 PV of $\$ 99$ per new participant over 10 years.
PV of $\$ 500$ per new participant over 10 years.
Line $9+$ Line $10+$ Line $11+$ Line $12+$ Line $13+$ Line $14+$ Line $15+$ Line 16
$\begin{aligned} & 18 \text { Line } 7 \text { minus Line } 17 \\
& 19 \text { Line } 7 \text { divided by Line } 17\end{aligned}$
$\begin{array}{lr}\$ & 1,226,948 \\
\$ & 385,534\end{array}$
\$ 1,002,702
\$ 1,642,618
$\$ \quad 176,797$
\$ 4,434.599
\$ 1.368,169

| N |
| :---: |
|  |
| 15 |
| 5 |

$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \underset{\sim}{m} \\
& \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{F} \\
& \infty\end{aligned}$
$\begin{aligned} & \circ \\
& \stackrel{8}{\infty} \\
& \stackrel{N}{N} \\
& \stackrel{N}{N} \\
& -\end{aligned}$
$\begin{gathered}\infty \\
\stackrel{\infty}{0} \\
\stackrel{0}{\circ} \\
\infty\end{gathered}$
103,625
75,795
\$ 3,311,715
$\$ 1,122,884$
$\frac{\text { LINE }}{1} \quad$ Benefits
2 Distribution System Electric Acq Dec
3 Distribution Capacity Credit
4 EKPC Electric Prod Cost Decrease
มрәлว К! !
7 Total Benefits

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11 \text { D. S. Part Based admin cost inc }
\end{aligned}
$$

> 15 EKPC Variable Costs
> 16 D.S. Rebates Paid
> 17 Total Costs Net Benefits
> 19 Benefit / Cost Ratio

| Participant Test |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINE |  |  |  | LINE | EXPLANATION |
| LiNE | Benefits |  |  | 1 | Incentive from Distribution System, plus a reduction in electric bill. |
| 2 | Customer Electric Bill Decrease | \$ | 789,706 | 2 | PV of reduction in Participants' retail electric bill due to decrease in energy consumption. Based on typicai residential retail rate of 16 D . Systems. |
| 3 | Rebates from D. S. | \$ | 306,583 | 3 | PV of rebate received from D. S. |
| 4 | Total Benefits | \$ | 1,096,289 | 4 | Line $2+$ Line 3. |
| 5 | Costs |  |  | 5 | Participants' direct cost of participation. |
| 6 | Customer Investment | \$ | 1,302,977 | 6 | PV of Participants' incremental $\$ 2,125$ investment in the T.E. home evaluated over 10 years. |
| 7 | Total Costs | \$ | 1,302,977 | 7 | Line 6. |
| 8 | Net Benefits | \$ | $(206,688)$ | 8 | Line 4 minus Line 7. |
|  | Benefits / Cost Ratio |  | 0.84 | 9 | Line 4 divided by Line 7 . |

$\frac{\text { EXPLANATION }}{1}$ Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution)
$\frac{1}{1}$ Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution) based on energy and load reductions.
Avoided distribution capacity
PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease evaluated over 20 years.


Avoided transmission capacity.
Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5
Total program costs to participants, the Distribution Systems, and EKPC
(excluding incentives).
PV of Customers' incremental investment in Touchstone Energy Home of $\$ 2,125$ per new Participant, evaluated over 10 years.
$\begin{array}{ll} \\ \$ & 385,534\end{array}$

$\infty$
Line 2 Line 3 Line + Line
Avoided transmission capacity.
Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5

$$
\text { PV of } \$ 182 \text { per new participant evaluated over } 10 \text { years. }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \text { PV of } \$ 182 \text { per new participant evaluated over } 10 \text { years. } \\
& 10 \text { PV of the EKPC's incremental fixed administrative costs of } \$ 13.535 \text { per year, } \\
& \text { evaluated over } 10 \text { years. } \\
& 11 \text { PV of } \$ 99 \text { per new Participant, evaluated over } 10 \text { years. } \\
& 12 \text { Line } 8 \text { + Line } 9+\text { Line } 10 \text { + Line } 11 \\
& 13 \text { Line } 6 \text { minus Line } 12 \\
& 14 \text { Line } 6 \text { divided by Line } 12
\end{aligned}
$$

# EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. 

PSC CASE NO. 2006-00547
CONTINUATION OF TOUCHSTONE ENERGY HOME REBATE PROGRAM RESPONSE TO SECOND DATA REQUEST

## COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 5/09/07 REQUEST 2

RESPONSIBLE PERSON:
COMPANY:

William Bosta
East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.

REQUEST 2. Refer to EKPC's response to Item 7 of Commission Staff's First Data Request dated February 14, 2007.
a. Calculate the associated dollar value of estimated savings to date.
b. Calculate the dollar value of expected future savings associated with the program for 2007-2025.
c. Using the expected savings in the future calculate the net present value of the Touchstone Program, showing all calculations and assumptions.

RESPONSE 2. In order to respond to this request, EKPC prepared a new DSManager run using the historic (2004-2006) actual values for 1) number of participants, 2) rebates, 3) administrative costs, 4) Estimated MWH savings shown in response to Item 7 of the First Staff Request, and 5) Estimated avoided energy and capacity cost taken from the Company's 2003 IRP. That IRP was in effect during the 2004-2006 timeframe.

RESPONSE 2a. The present value of the estimated savings to date is $\$ 196,774$. Please see the information contained in PSC - 2, Attachment 1, Page 1 for that computation and Page 2 for the number of participants

RESPONSE 2b. The estimated future savings under the Total Resource Cost test for 2007 through 2021 (the last year for which avoided capacity and avoided production cost were available in the 2003 IRP) on a present value basis equals $\$ 1,422,115$. PSC -2 , Attachment 1 provides the computation.

RESPONSE 2c. The present value of all savings, both for the 2004 through 2006 time period and for the estimated future savings of 2007 through 2021, equals $\$ 1,618,893$. This present value savings amount is based on the production cost savings and avoided generation, transmission and distribution capacity costs for the 2004 through 2006 period and the savings for those same components for the 2007-2021 projected time period. The net present value, including both benefits and costs, under the Total Resource Cost Test, equals $\$ 778,549$. PSC-2, Attachment 2, includes the results and explanations for the Total Resource Cost Test, the Power Supplier Utility Test and the Participant Test.
Value of Savings associated with Touchstone Energy Home Program

| (\$ thousands) |  |  | \$915.81 | \$77.90 | \$19.28 | \$1.618.89 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004-2006 |  | \$673.79 | \$111.49 | \$9.21 | \$2.28 | \$196.77 |  |
|  |  | \$532.10 | \$804.32 | \$68.68 | \$17.00 | \$1,422.11 |  |
|  |  | \$532.10 | \$804.32 | \$68.68 |  | Total |  |
| 2a. |  | Production | Generation | Distribution | Transmission | Production |  |
|  |  | Cost | Capacity | Capacity | Capacity | \& Capacity |  |
|  |  | Savings | Savings | Savings | Savings | Savings |  |
|  |  | \$ thousands | \$ thousands | \$ thousands | \$ thousands | \$ thousands |  |
|  | 2004 | 6.92 | 9.35 | 0.77 | 0.19 | 17.23 | \$196,774 |
|  | 2005 | 24.63 | 38.20 | 3.15 | 0.78 | 66.76 |  |
|  | 2006 | 60.85 | 92.14 | 7.62 | 1.88 | 162.50 |  |
| 2 b . | 2007 | 63.91 | 94.64 | 7.86 | 1.94 | 168.35 | \$1,422,115 |
|  | 2008 | 62.88 | 97.20 | 8.09 | 2.01 | 170.17 |  |
|  | 2009 | 68.09 | 99.82 | 8.33 | 2.07 | 178.31 |  |
|  | 2010 | 68.22 | 100.75 | 8.58 | 2.13 | 179.68 |  |
|  | 2011 | 75.16 | 103.48 | 8.84 | 2.19 | 189.67 |  |
|  | 2012 | 70.86 | 106.28 | 9.11 | 2.26 | 188.51 |  |
|  | 2013 | 75.12 | 109.15 | 9.38 | 2.33 | 195.97 |  |
|  | 2014 | 78.59 | 112.10 | 9.66 | 2.39 | 202.75 |  |
|  | 2015 | 78.59 | 115.14 | 9.95 | 2.46 | 206.14 |  |
|  | 2016 | 78.59 | 118.99 | 10.25 | 2.53 | 210.36 |  |
|  | 2017 | 78.59 | 122.20 | 10.55 | 2.61 | 213.95 |  |
|  | 2018 | 78.59 | 125.51 | 10.87 | 2.69 | 217.66 |  |
|  | 2019 | 78.59 | 128.91 | 11.20 | 2.77 | 221.47 |  |
|  | 2020 | 78.59 | 132.40 | 11.54 | 2.85 | 225.38 |  |
|  | 2021 | 78.59 | 134.81 | 11.60 | 2.87 | 227.87 |  |

Note: All present value calculations use 2004
Discount rate:

กั่

Historic Cost information for Touchstone Energy Home program


$\frac{\text { EXPLANATION }}{1}$ Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution) based on energy and load reductions.
Avoided distribution capacity.
3 PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease evaluated over 20 years.
PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation requirements. Avoided transmission capacity.
Line $2+$ Line $3+$ Line $4+$ Line 5
Total program costs to participants, the Distribution Systems, and EKPC
(excluding incentives).
PV of Customers' incremental investment in Touchstone Energy Home of $\$ 2,125$ per new Participant, evaluated over 3 years.

$$
\text { PV of } \$ 182 \text { per new participant evaluated over } 3 \text { years. }
$$

PV of EKPC's incremental fixed administrative costs for 3 program years:

Line $8+$ Line $9+$ Line $10+$ Line 11
13 Line 6 minus Line 12



$$
\begin{array}{lc}
\frac{\operatorname{lNE}}{1} & \underline{\text { Benefits }} \\
2 & \text { Distribution Capacity Credit } \\
3 & \text { EKPC Electric Prod Cost Decrease }
\end{array}
$$

3 EKPC Electric Prod Cost Decrease
4 EKPC Generation Capacity Credit 5 Transmission Capacity Credit 5 Transmission Capacity Credit
6 Total Benefits Costs
8 Participants' Investment
9 Distribution System Variable Cost
10 EKPC Fixed Admin Cost
11 EKPC Variable Cost
11 EKPC Variable Cost
 Net Benefits
14 Benefit / Cost Ratio
.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & 605,895 \\
\$ & 915,820
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\$ & 77,897 \\
\$ & 605,895
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & 915,820 \\
\$ & 19,281
\end{array}
$$

$$
\$ 1,618,893
$$

$$
\$ \quad 78,872
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\$ & 78,872 \\
\$ & 27,400
\end{array}
$$

$$
\$ \quad 50,044
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
156,316 \\
462,577 \\
10.36
\end{array}
$$

$$
\frac{\text { LINE }}{1} \text { Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution) }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \text { Avoided supply costs (e.g.production, transmission, and/or distribution) } \\
& \text { based on energy and load reductions. } \\
& 2 \text { Avoided distribution capacity. }
\end{aligned}
$$

PV of EKPC's electric production cost decrease evaluated over 20 years.
Includes fuel and variable operating and maintenance expense.
4 PV of EKPC's avoided capacity costs due to reduction in generation requirements.
Ayoidadtranomin :
Avoided transmission capacity.

$$
6 \text { Line } 2+\text { Line } 3+\text { Line } 4+\text { Line } 5
$$

$$
7 \text { Total program costs to EKPC including incentives. }
$$

2004-2006.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \text { PV of EKPC's incremental fixed administrative costs for } 3 \text { program years: } \\
& \text { 2004-2006. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
10 \text { PV of EKPC's variable administrative costs for } 3 \text { program years: 2004-2006. }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11 \text { Line } 8+\text { Line } 9+\text { Line } 10 \\
& 12 \text { Line } 6 \text { minus Line } 12 \\
& 13 \text { Line } 6 \text { divided by Line } 12
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\frac{\text { LINE }}{1}
$$

$\frac{\text { LINE }}{1}$ EXPLANATION
2 PV of reduction in Participants' retail electric bill due to decrease in energy consumption. Based on typical residential retail rate for the D. Systems.
PV of rebates received from D. S.

## Line $2+$ Line 3.

Participants' direct cost of participation.
PV of Participants' incremental $\$ 2,125$ investment per customer in the T.E. home evaluated over 3 years.
Line 4 minus Line 7.
9 Line 4 divided by Line 7.

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{+}} \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{N} \\ & \underset{N}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{N}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{¢}{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\theta$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $\leftrightarrow$ |  |

Customer Electric Bill Decrease

Rebates from D. S.

Total Benefits

Costs

Customer Investment

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad \text { Net Benefits } \\
& \text { Benefit / Cost Ratio }
\end{aligned}
$$$\frac{\text { LINE }}{1}$

2
3

## 4

5
6
$\infty$

