COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

TARIFF APPLICATION OF COLUMBIA GAS OF)	
KENTUCKY, INC. TO CONTINUE ITS ENERGY)	CASE NO.
EFFICIENCY CONSERVATION RIDER AND)	2016-00107
ENERGY EFFICIENCY CONSERVATION)	
PROGRAM)	

COMMISSION STAFF'S THIRD REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO COLUMBIA GAS OF KENTUCKY

Columbia Gas of Kentucky ("Columbia"), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, is to file with the Commission the original and ten copies of the following information, with a copy to all parties of record. The information requested herein is due within 14 days from the date of this request. Responses to requests for information shall be appropriately bound, tabbed and indexed. Each response shall include the name of the witness responsible for responding to the questions related to the information provided.

Each response shall be answered under oath or, for representatives of a public or private corporation or a partnership or association or a governmental agency, be accompanied by a signed certification of the preparer or person supervising the preparation of the response on behalf of the entity that the response is true and accurate to the best of that person's knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Columbia shall make timely amendment to any prior response if it obtains information which indicates that the response was incorrect when made or, though correct when made, is now incorrect in any material respect. For any request to which

Columbia fails or refuses to furnish all or part of the requested information, Columbia shall provide a written explanation of the specific grounds for its failure to completely and precisely respond.

Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible. When the requested information has been previously provided in this proceeding in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in responding to this request. When filing a paper containing personal information, Columbia shall, in accordance with 807 KAR 5:001, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal information cannot be read.

- 1. Refer to Columbia's Amended and Supplemental Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information ("Staff's Second Request"), Item 1, Attachments 1, 2, and 3. Provide in Excel spreadsheet format all results and supporting calculations for each California Test for each individual DSM program and for the program as a whole. The response should be in sufficient detail that all inputs to the calculations can be seen, specifically the inputs to each test's benefits, avoided costs, costs, and lost revenue, if applicable.
- Refer to Columbia's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 2.d.
 Provide a breakdown of the rebates issued in the High Efficiency Rebate Program showing how many were issued for each appliance listed in Table 1 on page 9 of the Direct Testimony of William Steven Seelye.
 - 3. Refer to Columbia's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 3.
- a. The response to 3.b. indicates that the original estimate of cost per participant was \$150. Confirm that the original estimate of the cost per participant was

\$50, resulting in the original estimated budget of \$200,000 filed in Case No. 2009-

- b. State whether the California Test results provided in response to the Commission Staff's First Request for Information, Item 6 and Staff's Second Request, Item 1, were based on the original estimate of \$50 per customer for 4,000 projected participants.
- c. Explain whether Columbia is continuing to advertise the Home Energy Audit Program. If not, explain why not given the extreme drop-off in participation to earlier levels following 2013.
- d. According to the table, beginning in 2012 the estimated number of participants is 1,000 and the estimated cost per participant is \$150, which implies an annual budget of \$150,000 for the program years 2012 through 2015. Confirm that this is the annual budget for those years and if so, explain why this differs from the budget of \$200,000 filed in Case No. 2009-00141 and Case No. 2012-00016.²
- 4. Refer to Columbia's responses to Staff's Second Request, Items 2 through 4.
- a. Based on actual participants and cost per year for each of the three Demand-Side Management ("DSM") programs, and based on the requested increase from \$2,200 to \$2,800 for the Low Income Furnace Replacement Program, state

¹ Case No. 2009-00141, Application of Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. for an Adjustment in Rates (filed Oct. 26, 2009), Application, Volume 7, Attachment Seelye-2.

² Case No. 2012-00016, Filing of Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. to Amend Its Demand-side Management Energy Efficiency and Conservation Rider (filed Feb. 20, 2012), Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information, Item 2.

whether Columbia continues to project that its annual cost for DSM programs will be \$908,000. Explain the response.

- b. Provide the annual cost and participation levels per program that Columbia expects to experience for each year through June 30, 2021. Provide all assumptions for each projection, including support for any projected change from historical levels of cost and participation.
- c. Provide in Excel spreadsheet format results and supporting calculations for each California test for each individual program, and for the program as a whole, using costs and benefits based on projections provided in response to Item 3.b. Estimated annual MCF savings should be based on either actual savings experienced by participants in Columbia's programs or on updated engineering estimates.

Caron D. Grusswell

Aaron D. Greenwell
Acting Executive Director
Public Service Commission

P.O. Box 615

Frankfort, KY 40602

DATED JUN 0.9 2016

cc: Parties of Record

*Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. 2001 Mercer Road P. O. Box 14241 Lexington, KY 40512-4241

*Honorable Stephen B Seiple Attorney at Law Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. 290 W. Nationwide Blvd. Columbus, OHIO 43215