

RECEIVED

FEB 03 2012 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

February 2, 2012

Mr. Jeff Derouen, Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard Frankfort, KY 40601

RE: Case No. 2011-00395

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Atmos Energy Corporation (Company) herewith submits an original and six (6) copies of the Company's responses to Staff's requests for information during the Informal Conference on January 25, 2012 in the above referenced case.

Please contact myself at 270.685.8024 if the Commission or Staff has any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Mark A. Martin

Vice President, Rates & Regulatory Affairs

Enclosures

cc: Collaborative Board Members

Mr. Mark R. Hutchinson

Atmos Energy Corporation Kentucky

Case No. 2011-00395

RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S INFORMAL CONFERENCE DATA REQUESTS

VERIFICATION

I, Mark A. Martin, being duly sworn under oath, state that I am Vice President of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for Atmos Energy Corporation, Kentucky/Mid-States Division, and that the statements contained in the following Responses are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Mark A. Martin

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 2nd day of February, 2012, the original of the Company's attached Responses, together with six (6) copies were filed with the Kentucky Public Service Commission, 211 Sower Blvd, P.O. Box 615, Frankfort, Kentucky 40206 and a copy was also served on Dennis Howard, Office of the Attorney General, 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

Mel R. Hutchinson MAPL

Atmos Energy Corporation Staff's Informal Conference Data Request Dated January 25, 2012 Case No. 2011-00395 Question No. 1

Witness: Mark A. Martin

REQUEST:

Atmos Energy used DOE's Annual Energy Outlook delivered cost to customers to determine program benefits and the incentive adjustment. Should the cost analysis have used gas commodity cost and not delivered gas costs? a.) If so, please redo the cost analysis using gas costs only. b.) Did the Company use a 25 year useful life for calculating program benefits as opposed to the 10 year life specified in Atmos' tariff? c.) Also, why were rebates excluded in the calculations on Tab 2, Page 4 of the application?

RESPONSE:

- a) Atmos Energy in consultation with the Cadmus Group used the gas costs in effect for Atmos Energy at the time of the filing of this application (September 2011 GCA). NYMEX futures prices on the cost of gas at Henry Hub were used to determine the escalation factor for the future years. Schedule C has been updated using this data and the entire workbook has been updated and attached hereto. We also inserted an additional tab entitled "NYMEX Escalators." The Cadmus Group uses this methodology for their natural gas energy efficiency filings throughout the country. These changes necessitated amending our tariff to reflect this process. (See Tariff Sheet No. 40, second sentence of second paragraph.)
- b) No. The Company used the life of each measure as identified in the DEER (Database for Energy Efficiency Resources), EnergyStar or NEEP (New England Economic Partnership). All sources are recognized organizations providing objective data for energy efficiency. The individual measure life ranges between eight and twenty-five years. Of the eighteen measures fourteen came from DEER, three from EnergyStar and one from NEEP. The only measure with a useful life of 25 years is weatherization. All other measures range between 8 and 20 nears with an average life of 17 years.
- c) It appears that the cell reference in the spreadsheet was simply incorrect (F19 and G19 should have been F18 and G18). The reference should have been to the Total DCRC costs (Program Costs) and not the Excluding Rebates cells. The correction has been made, as indicated in the attached workbook.

Table of Contents

Sheet Name	 Page #
TOC	i
Summary	1
Atmos Variable Data	2
Deemed Savings	3
Billing Factor 2012	4
Schedule A	 5
Annual Savings	 6
EFI	 7
Eguipment Cost	 8
Schedule B	 9
Schedule C	 10
Participant Test Summary	 11
Participant Test B	 12
	 13
Participant Test BR	 14
Participant Test TC	 15
Participant Test INC	
Participant Test C	 16
Participant Test PC	 17
<u>Program Admin Summary</u>	 18
<u>Program Admin B</u>	19
<u>Program Admin C</u>	 20
RIM Test Summary	 21
RIM Test B	 22
RIM Test UAC	 23
RIM Test C	24
TRC Test Summary	25
TRC Test B	26
TRC Test C	 27

Program Summary

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	.				
•	-		Yea	ar 1	
		G-1	Residential	G-1	Commercial
Total DSM Cost for recovery	California Tests	\$	644,629	\$	399,918
Program Costs	<u>DCRC</u>	\$	996,103	\$	329,121
Lost Sales	DLSA	\$	44,588	\$	15,797
Program Incentive	DIA	\$	16,300	\$	55,000
Program Balancing Adjustment	DBA	\$	(412,363)	i	0
Annual Average Recovery Cost per Customer	DSMRC	\$	4.21	\$	23.19

_	Benefit/ Cost Ratio
<u>Participant Test</u>	1.71
<u>Program Admin Test</u>	2.14
Ratepayer Impact Test (RIM)	0.62
Total Resource Cost Test (TRC)	1.13

Summary Page 1 of 27

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Atmos Energy Variable Data

	Atmos Data	based on 12 months	s fro	om Mav 2010	thru April 2011	
1.		# Kentucky Residential Customers		153,261		
2.		Residential Sales Volumes (Ccf)		105,470,435		
1a.		# Kentucky Commercial Customers		17,245		
2a.		Commercial Sales Volumes (Ccf)		47,754,931		
3.	Fst	imated Participants		Total	Residential	Commercial
٠	a)	Furnace AFUE 90 - 93		900	600	300
	b)	Furnace AFUE 94 - 95		600	400	200
	c)	Furnace AFUE 96 or >		300	200	100
	d)	Boiler AFUE 85 -89		15	10	5
	f)	Tank Water Heater EF .6266		100	75	25
		Tank Water Heater EF .67 or >		200	75 150	50
	g) h) Tankles	s/Condensing Water Heater EF >.82		200	150	50
		Programmable Thermostat (manual)		900	600	
		Weatherization				300
	l)			125	125	0
	m)	Commercial Fryer		25	0	25
	n)	Commercial Griddle		25	0	25
	0)	Commercial Oven		25	0	25
4	p)	Commercial Steamer	ф	25	0	25
4.	,	Atmos Distribution Charge	Ф	0.110		
5.		Average Heat use (ccf) per customer		466.00		
6. 7	Average	water heating use (ccf) per customer		196.00		
7		Proposed Rebates		050	-	
		Furnace AFUE 90 -	•	250		
		Furnace AFUE 94 -		325		
		Furnace AFUE 96 (400		
		Boiler AFUE > 85	\$	250		
		Tank Water Heater		200		
		Tank Water Heater		300		
		Tankless/Condensi		400		
		Programmable The		25		
		Commercial Fryer E		500		
		Commercial Griddle		500		
		Commercial Oven I		500		
0		Commercial Steam		500		
8.	la ana	Weatherization Pro	,	3,000		
9.		emental Cost of 90-93 AFUE furnace		654		
		emental Cost of 94-95 AFUE furnace	Ф	973		
		nental Cost of 96 or > AFUE furnace	Þ	1,467		
		cremental Cost of 85-89 AFUE boiler	\$	1,000		
		Cost of Programmable Thermostat		14		
		ncremental Cost of .62 EF tank W/H	\$	71		
		ncremental Cost of .67 EF tank W/H	\$	634		
	Increme	ntal Cost of .8290 EF tankless W/H	\$	836		
		Incremental Cost for Gas Fryer	\$	50		
		Incremental Cost for Gas Griddle	\$	60		
		Incremental Cost for Gas Oven	\$	50		
40	D'	Incremental Cost for Gas Steamer	\$	420		
10.	Discount Rate			8.81%		

Atmos Variable Data Page 2 of 27

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Deemed Savings for Measures

		Kentuc	ky
Measure	Efficiency Level	Savings (CCF)	Savings (Therm)
Forced Air Furnace	92% AFUE	126.6	130.3
Forced Air Furnace	94% AFUE	141.6	145.8
Forced Air Furnace	96% AFUE	156.0	160.6
Boiler	85% AFUE	49.0	50.4
Boiler	90% AFUE	92.5	95.1
Tank Water Heater	0.62 EF or greater	8.7	8.9
Tank Water Heater	0.67 EF or greater	23.4	24.1
Tankless Water Heater	0.8290 EF	56.9	58.6
Tankless Water Heater	0.91 EF or greater	71.7	73.8
Condensing Water Heater	0.90 EF or greater	70.2	72.3
Programmable Thermostat	Manual	26.7	27.4
Weatherization	30% Savings	252.9	275.7
Fryer	EnergyStar	490.8	505.0
Griddle	EnergyStar	143.8	148.0
Oven	EnergyStar	297.4	306.0
Steamer	EnergyStar	1,036.0	1,066.0

Deemed Savings Page 3 of 27

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Billing Factor Calculation Program Begins: Program Year End: January 1, 2012 December 31, 2012 Rate Effective: January 1, 2012 DCRC = DSM Cost Recovery-Current Program Costs G-1 Residential G-1 Commercial 278,750 497,500 Rehates Program Costs (Weatherization & Education) 395,000 Customer Awareness Program Administration 25,000 50.000 22,071 46,903 6,700 3,300 Supplies Program Overhead TOTAL DCRC 996,103 G-1 Commercial 329,121 G-1 Residential **Excluding Rebates** 498,603 50,371 DLSA = DSM Lost Sales Adjustment Current Year Program Participation (Schedule A) CCF Distribution Lost Charge 0 1100 Rate # of Participants Conserved G-1 Residential Customers 2,310 224,660 24,713 143.605 G-1 Commercial Customers Total Current Year Lost Sales 1 130 0.1100 15.797 1,756 0.1100 S Cumulative Prior Years Participation (Schedule B) 180,685 \$ 19,875 5,196 548,950 60,400 TOTAL DLSC s DIA = DSM Incentive Adjustment G-1 Residential G-1 Commercial Program Benefits (Schedule C) 1,104,795 \$ 695,923 (996.103) \$ (329,121) Less: Program Costs 366,802 Net Resource Savings s 108,692 \$ Incentive Percentage 15% 15% DIA \$ 16,300 \$ 55,000 DBA = DSM Balance Adjustment G-1 Residential G-1 Commercial Estimated Balancing Under/(Over) Recovery (412,362.61) Residential Sales 105,470,435 \$ Adjustment (0 00391) New program; hence no balancing adjustment DSMRC = DSM Cost Recovery Component G-1 Residential Estimated Residential Sales 105,470,435 Ccf 153,261 Estimated Residential Customers Recovery Amount Rate, per Ccf 0.0094 996.103 DCRC S DLSA \$ 44,588 0 0004 16,300 0 0002 DBA (412, 363)(0.0039)644,629 \$ 0.00609 TOTAL DSMRC \$ 4 21 Annual Cost Recovery per G-1 Residential Customers G-1 Commercial Estimated Commercial Sales 47,754,931 Ccf Estimated Commercial Customers 17,245 Recovery Amount per Ccf

0.0069

0 0003

0 0012

0.0084

23 19

DCRC

DLSA

DIA

TOTAL DSMRC \$

s

S

Annual Cost Recovery per G-1 Commercial Customers S

329 121

15,797

55,000

399,918 \$

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Schedule A - Current Year Participation Detail

Program

	Program	CCF Conser	rvation		Rel	bate		Measure			
G-1 Residential Efficiency Heating Savings	Participants	Per Participant	Total	Α	mount		Total	Life	Source		
Furnace AFUE 92 - 93	600	126.64	75,983	\$	250	\$	150,000	18	DEER		
Furnace AFUE 94 - 95	400	141 65	56,660	\$	325		130,000	18	DEER		
Furnace AFUE 96 or >	200	156.04	31,207	\$	400	\$	80.000	18	DEER		
Boiler AFUE > 85	10	48.95	490	\$	250	\$	2,500	18	DEER		
Programmable Thermostat	600	26.67	16,004	\$	25	\$	15.000	15	DEER		
Totals		NA	180,343		NA ZS	\$	377,500	10	DLLIN		
C. d. Communicat Efficiency Honding Continue	Program	CCF Conse			Re mount	bate	Total		easure Source		
G-1 Commercial Efficiency Heating Savings	Participants	Per Participant	Total	-		_		Life			
Furnace AFUE 92 - 93	300	126 64	37,991	\$	250	\$	75,000	18	DEER		
Furnace AFUE 94 - 95	200	141.65	28,330	\$	325	\$	65,000	18	DEER		
Furnace AFUE 96 or >	100	156.04	15,604	\$	400	\$	40,000	18	DEER		
Boiler AFUE >85	5	48 95	245	\$	250	\$	1,250	18	DEER		
Programmable Thermostat	300	26.67	8,002	\$	25	\$	7,500	15	DEER		
Totals	905	NA	90,171		NA	\$	188,750				
	Program	CCF Conse	rvation		Re	bate	,	M	easure		
G-1 Residential Water Heating Savings	Participants	Per Participant	Total	Α	mount		Total	Life	Source		
Tank Water Heater EF 62 - 66	75	8.66	650	\$	200	\$	15,000	13	DEER		
Tank Water Heater EF 67 or >	150	23.43	3,515	\$	300		45,000	13	DEER		
Tankless/Condensing Water Heater EF > 82	150	56,94	8,541	\$	400	\$	60,000	20	DEER		
Totals		NA	12,705		NA	\$	120,000				
	_							**			
G-1 Commercial Water Heating Savings	Program Participants	CCF Conse Per Participant	rvation Total		.mount	bate	Total	Life	easure Source		
Tank Water Heater EF 62 - 66	25	8 66	217	\$	200	\$	5,000	13	DEER		
Tank Water Heater EF 62 - 66	50	23.43	1,172	\$	300	S.	15,000	13	DEER		
	50		2,847	\$	400	\$	20,000	20	DEER		
Tankless/Condensing Water Heater EF > 82 Totals		56.94 NA	4,235	Ψ	NA 400	\$	40,000		DLER		
			·								
	Program				Measure						
G-1 Commercial Cooking Equipment Savings	Participants	Per Participant	Total	-	mount		Total	Life	Source		
Fryer EnergyStar Rated	25	490 77	12,269	\$	500	\$	12,500	8	Energy St		
Griddle EnergyStar Rated	25	143.83	3,596	\$	500	\$	12,500	12	Energy St		
Oven EnergyStar Rated	25	297.38	7,434	\$	500	\$	12,500	10	NEEP		
Steamer EnergyStar Rated	25	1,035.96	25,899	\$	500	\$	12,500	10	Energy St		
Totals	100	NA	49,198		NA	\$	50,000				
	Program	CCF Conse	rvation		Re	bate	,	M	easure		
	Participants		Total		mount		Total	Life	Source		
Weatherization			31,613	\$	3,000	\$	375,000	25	DEER		
Weatherization	125	252.9	31,013								
		252.9	31,010			\$	20,000				
	125				_	·	•				
Education Program	125 Program	CCF Conse	rvation			\$ bate	•				
Education Program tals by Customer Class	125 Program Participants	CCF Conse Per Participant	rvation Total		mount	bate	Total				
Education Program tals by Customer Class G-1 Residential Totals	Program Participants 2,310	CCF Conse Per Participant Varies see above	rvation Total 224,660	Vari	mount es see abov	bate \$	Total 892,500				
Education Program stals by Customer Class	125 Program Participants	CCF Conse Per Participant	rvation Total	Vari	mount	bate \$	Total				
Education Program tals by Customer Class G-1 Residential Totals	Program Participants 2,310	CCF Conse Per Participant Varies see above	rvation Total 224,660	Vari	mount es see abov	bate \$	Total 892,500				

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Annual Savings

SAVINGS

<u> </u>	***************************************	<u> </u>		G-1	G-1 Comm.	l			
}	G-1 Res.	G-1 Comm.	G-1 Res.		Cooking	Weather-		Comm.	
Year	Heating	Heating	Water	Water	Equipment	ization	Res. Total		Total
1	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
2	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
3	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
4	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
5	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
6	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660		368,265
7	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
8	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	49,198	31,613	224,660	143,605	368,265
9	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	36,929	31,613	224,660	131,335	355,996
10	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	36,929	31,613	224,660	131,335	355,996
11	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	3,596	31,613	224,660	98,002	322,663
12	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	3,596	31,613	224,660	98,002	322,663
13	180,343	90,171	12,705	4,235	-	31,613	224,660	94,406	319,067
14	180,343	90,171	8,541	2,847		31,613	220,496	93,018	313,514
15	180,343	90,171	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	220,496	93,018	313,514
16	164,339	82,170	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	204,492	85,016	289,508
17	164,339	82,170	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	204,492	85,016	289,508
18	164,339	82,170	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	204,492	85,016	289,508
19	-	-	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	40,153	2,847	43,000
20	-	-	8,541	2,847	-	31,613	40,153	2,847	43,000
21	-	-	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-	-	31,613	31,613	-	31,613
22	-	-	-	-	<u> </u>	31,613	31,613	-	31,613
23	,	-	-	-	i ! ~	31,613	31,613	-	31,613
24	-	! !	-	-	-	31,613	31,613	-	31,613
25	-	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	-	31,613	31,613		31,613

Annual Savings Page 6 of 27

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Energy Federation, Inc. Administrative Costs

EFI Budget Estimates for Administration of Kentucky DSM Appliance Rebate Program

Annual Budget

	Ur	nit Cost	R	esidential Costs	mmercial Costs	Т	otal Cost
Estimated Rebates				2,185	1,130		
Processing fee	\$	9.00	\$	19,665	\$ 10,170	\$	29,835
"Cost of Money" Charge		1%	\$	8,925	\$ 2,788	\$	11,713
Reservation Fee	\$	4.00	\$	9,240	\$ 4,520	\$	13,760
Customer e-mails (EFI to cust.)	\$	2.50	\$	1,093	\$ 565	\$	1,658
Customer Service Phone Chg (hours)	\$	39.00	\$	1,775	\$ 918	\$	2,693
Program Management fee	\$	1,500	\$	4,020	\$ 1,980	\$	6,000
Totals		***************************************	\$	46,903	\$ 22,071	\$	65,658

EFI

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
DSM APPLIANCE INFORMATION

DSM APPLIANC					
5-1-1	FURNACES			A 000/	•
Contractor Location	Brand	Unit Sizing	Avg. 80% Efficiency	Avg. 90% Efficiency	Incremental Cost
Bowling Green	York	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,155	\$ 1,598	\$ 443
Danville	Carrier	2,000 sq ft	\$ 2,300	\$ 3,000	\$ 700
Danville	Trane	2,000 sq ft.	\$ 1,700	\$ 2,500	\$ 800
Owensboro	York	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 500	\$ 1,000	\$ 500
Owensboro Owensboro	Rheem Carrier	2,000 sq. ft 2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 740 \$ 800	\$ 964 \$ 1,500	\$ 224 \$ 700
OWENSDOIO	Carrier		Incremental Cos		\$ 561
Contractor	Drand	Unit Ciaina	Avg. 80% Efficiency	Avg. 92%	Incremental Cost
Location Danville	Brand Carrier	Unit Sizing 2,000 sq ft	\$ 2,300	# 3,200	\$ 900
Danville	Trane	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 1,700	\$ 2,500	\$ 800
Owensboro	Heil	2,000 sq. ft	\$ 800	\$ 1,376	\$ 576
Owensboro	Carrier	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 800	\$ 1,700	\$ 900
			Average	Incremental Cost	\$ 794
		Ave	rage Incremental	Cost 90-92 AFUE	\$ 654
Combunatas			Aug 000/-	Aug. 040/-	Tuescomental
Contractor Location	Brand	Unit Sizing	Avg. 80% Efficiency	Avg. 94% Efficiency	Incremental Cost
Danville	Carrier	2,000 sq ft.	\$ 2,300	\$ 3,400	\$ 1,100
Danville	Trane	2,000 sq. ft	\$ 1,700	\$ 2,900	\$ 1,200
Owensboro	Heil	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 800	\$ 1,418	\$ 618
			Average	Incremental Cost	\$ 973
Contractor Location	Brand	Unit Sizing	Avg. 80% Efficiency	Avg. 96% Efficiency	Incremental Cost
Danville	Carrier	2,000 sq ft	\$ 2,300	\$ 3,900	\$ 1,600
Danville	Trane	2,000 sq ft	\$ 1,700		\$ 1,300
Owensboro	Carrier	2,000 sq. ft.	\$ 800	\$ 2,300	\$ 1,500
			Average	Incremental Cost	\$ 1,467
	Boilers				
Contractor				050/	
Location	Brand	Unit Sizing	Avg. 80% Efficiency	Avg. 85% Efficiency	Incremental Cost
Location	Diana	Oinc Diking	Lincichey	Ellionalicy.	COSE
Danville	Weil-McLain	2.000 sq. ft.	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,000	\$ 1,000
Danville	Weil-McLain	2,000 sq. ft. Average	\$ 8,000 Incremental Cos	\$ 9,000 t	\$ 1,000 \$ 1,000
	Weil-McLain	Average	Incremental Cos	į	
WATER Contractor	HEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE	Incremental Cos Avg. 58%	Avg. 62%	\$ 1,000 Incremental
WATER Contractor Location	HEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE Unit Sizing	Incremental Cos	į	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost
WATER Contractor Location	HEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE Unit Sizing	Incremental Cos Avg. 58%	Avg. 62%	\$ 1,000 Incremental
WATER Contractor Location	HEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE Unit Sizing	Incremental Cos Avg. 58% Efficiency	Avg. 62%	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71
Contractor Location Consortium for I	HEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE Unit Sizing	Incremental Cos Avg. 58% Efficiency Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71
Contractor Consortium for the	R HEATERS - TANK Brand Energy Efficiency Stu	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008	Incremental Cos Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58%	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67%	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 \$ 11 Incremental
Contractor Location Consortium for i	Brand Energy Efficiency Students	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 \$ 71 Incremental Cost
Contractor Location Consortium for to Contractor Location Lowes	Brand Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency 394	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720
Contractor Location Consortium for i	Brand Energy Efficiency Students	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547
Contractor Location Consortium for the Contractor Location Lowes Lowes	Brand Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547
Contractor Location Consortium for to Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEL Contractor	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem RHEATERS - TANK	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATER Contractor Location	Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Rheem Rheaters - TANK Brand Comparison	Average IYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average 58% Eff Tank Type	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost
Contractor Location Consortium for the Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Location Location	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem RHEATERS - TANKI Brand Comparison Bosch	Average TYPE Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average 58% Eff Tank Type \$ 379	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 720 \$ 720 \$ 720 \$ 720
Contractor Location Consortium for the Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATER Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem RHEATERS - TANKI Brand Comparison Bosch Rheem	Unit Sizing 40 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,900 Btu	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average 58% Eff Tank Type \$ 379 \$ 388	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,199	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811
Contractor Location Consortium for in Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem RHEATERS - TANKI Brand Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz	Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 379 Average 58% Eff Tank Type \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,199 \$ 1,400	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978
Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEN Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEN Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,199 \$ 1,400	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 1,210
Contractor Location Consortium for the Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATER Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 1,210
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEL Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 1,210 \$ 816 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEL Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 1,210 \$ 816 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836
Contractor Location Consortium for the Contractor Location Lowes Lowes Lowes Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green Comme Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith ERCIAL GAS EQUIP/ Iculator for EnergyStar Equipn	### Average TYPE	Average Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60 \$ 50
Contractor Location Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green Taken from Savings Ce Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith ERCIAL GAS EQUIP	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average 58% Eff Tank Type \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,490 \$ 1,400 Incremental Cost ed January 2011	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 420
Contractor Location Consortium for I Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green Comme Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Rheem Brand Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith ERCIAL GAS EQUIP/Idealor for EnergyStar Equipn THERMOSTATS Brand	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average S EPA & DOE - Update	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost ed January 2011	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 420 Incremental
Contractor Location Consortium for I Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATEI Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer Contractor Location	Brand Energy Efficiency Students Brand Rheem Rheem Rheem Rheem Brand Comparison Bosch Rheem Bradford White/Noritz A.O. Smith ERCIAL GAS EQUIPA Iculator for EnergyStar Equipm THERMOSTATS Brand Comparison	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu MENT ment developed by U	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average S EPA & DOE - Update Non- Programmable	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,199 \$ 1,490 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost ed January 2011	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 420 Incremental Cost
Contractor Location Consortium for I Consortium for I Consortium for I Contractor Lowes Lowes Lowes WATEL Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer Contractor Location Home Depot Home Depot Home Depot	Brand Energy Efficiency Students of Studen	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average S EPA & DOE - Update Non- Programmable	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,199 \$ 1,490 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost ed January 2011 Programmabl e \$ 62	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 420 Incremental
Contractor Location Consortium for I Consortium for I Contractor Location Lowes Lowes WATE Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer Contractor Location Home Depot Home Depot Home Depot Home Depot	Brand Energy Efficiency Students of the series of the seri	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon 40 gallon EESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,900 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu 199,000 Btu Thent developed by U MENT ment developed by U Model Number RTH7600 D7 Da 4238978 TH 110U1003	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average S EPA & DOE - Updal Non- Programmable \$ 40 \$ 40 \$ 40 \$ 40	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,499 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost ed January 2011 Programmable \$ 62 \$ 40 \$ 53	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 420 Incremental Cost Incremental Cost \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,210 \$ 1,21
Contractor Location Consortium for I Consortium for I Consortium for I Contractor Lowes Lowes Lowes WATEL Contractor Location Lowes Home Depot Owensboro Bowling Green COMME Taken from Savings Ca Gas Fryer Gas Griddle Gas Oven Gas Steamer Contractor Location Home Depot Home Depot Home Depot	Brand Energy Efficiency Students of the series of the seri	Unit Sizing dy 2008 Unit Sizing 50 gallon 40 gallon 40 gallon LESS Unit Sizing 175,000 Btu 199,000 Btu	Average Avg. 58% Efficiency Average Avg. 58% Efficiency \$ 394 \$ 379 Average \$ 379 \$ 388 \$ 422 \$ 390 Average S EPA & DOE - Update Non- Programmable \$ 40 \$ 40 \$ 40 \$ 40 \$ 40	Avg. 62% Efficiency Incremental Cost Avg. 67% Efficiency \$ 1,114 \$ 926 Incremental Cost 82% Eff. Tankless \$ 1,099 \$ 1,499 \$ 1,400 \$ 1,600 Incremental Cost ed January 2011 Programmable \$ 62 \$ 40 \$ 53	\$ 1,000 Incremental Cost \$ 71 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 547 \$ 634 Incremental Cost \$ 720 \$ 811 \$ 978 \$ 1,210 \$ 836 \$ 50 \$ 420 Incremental Cost \$ 50 \$ 50 \$ 50 \$ 22 \$ 60 \$ 50 \$ 20 \$ 20 \$ 20 \$ 20 \$ 20 \$ 20 \$ 30 \$ 20

Program Year End: December 31, 2012

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Cumulative Total
Program Participants											
A. High Efficiency Appliances B. Weatherization Program	20	1,071	401								1,492
Total Participants	125	1,207	424								1,756
Total Conservation in Ccf											
A. High Efficiency Appliance Savings	2,187	780,66	35,711								136,985
	17,381	22,512	3,807								43,700
otal Ccf Savings	19,568	121,599	39,518								180,685
Total Lost Sales	\$ 2,152	2,152 \$ 13,376 \$ 4,347	\$ 4,347								\$ 19,875

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Schedule C - Calculation of Program Benefits

Program Year End: December 31, 2012

Current Year Conservation (Ccf)

		G	-1 Reside	ntia	1		G	-1 Comme	rcia	ıl	N	IYMEX Fut	tures Prices
	Pr	ojected	Annual	Co	mmodity	Pr	ojected	Annual	Co	mmodity		Average	
Year	Ga	s Cost*	Savings	•	Savings	Ga	s Cost*	Savings	\$	Savings	Year	Cost	Escalation
2012	\$	0.570	224,660	\$	128,128	\$	0.570	143,605	\$	81,901	2012	3.97	
2013	\$	0.651	224,660	\$	146,162	\$	0.651	143,605	\$	93,428	2013	4.53	114.1%
2014	\$	0.701	224,660	\$	157,584	\$	0.701	143,605	\$	100,729	2014	4.89	107.8%
2015	\$	0.741	224,660	\$	166,571	\$	0.741	143,605	\$	106,473	2015	5.16	105.7%
2016	\$	0.780	224,660	\$	175,171	\$	0.780	143,605	\$	111,971	2016	5.43	105.2%
2017	\$	0.820	224,660	\$	184,193	\$	0.820	143,605	\$	117,738	2017	5.71	105.2%
2018	\$	0.857	224,660	\$	192,575	\$	0.857	143,605	\$	123,096	2018	5.97	104.6%
2019	\$	0.891	224,660	\$	200,184	\$	0.891	143,605	\$	127,959	2019	6.21	104.0%
2020	\$	0.924	224,660	\$	207,569	\$	0.924	131,335	\$	121,344	2020	6.44	103.7%
2021	\$	0.942	224,660	\$	211,721	\$	0.942	131,335	\$	123,771			
2022	\$	0.961	224,660	\$	215,955	\$	0.961	98,002	\$	94,205			Deemed Escalation
2023	\$	0.980	224,660	\$	220,274	\$	0.980	98,002	\$	96,089	Current A	tmos CGA	Rate After 2020
2024	\$	1.000	224,660	\$	224,680	\$	1.000	94,406	\$	94,414	\$ 0.570		2%
2025	\$	1.020	220,496	\$	224,925	\$	1.020	93,018	\$	94,887			
2026	\$	1.040	220,496	\$	229,423	\$	1.040	93,018	\$	96,784			
2027	\$	1.061	204,492	\$	217,027	\$	1.061	85,016	\$	90,228			
2028	\$	1.083	204,492	\$	221,368	\$	1.083	85,016	\$	92,032			
2029	\$	1.104	204,492	\$	225,795	\$	1.104	85,016	\$	93,873			
2030	\$	1.126	40,153	\$	45,223	\$	1.126	2,847	\$	3,206			
2031	\$	1.149	40,153	\$	46,127	\$	1.149	2,847	\$	3,270			
2032	\$	1.172	31,613	\$	37,042	\$	1.172	-	\$	-			
2033	\$	1.195	31,613	\$	37,783	\$	1.195	-	\$	-			
2034	\$	1.219	31,613	\$	38,539	\$	1.219	-	\$	-			
2035	\$	1.243	31,613	\$	39,310	\$	1.243	-	\$				
2036	\$	1.268	31,613	\$	40,096	\$	1.268	-	\$	-			
Total Co	mm	odity Sa	vings	\$:	3,833,425				\$	1,867,398			
Discount	Rat	е			8.81%					8.81%			
Program					1,104,795					\$695,923			
(present	valu	e of com	modity say	/ing	s)								

^{*}Atmos GCA, escalated using NYMEX futures prices at Henry Hub

Schedule C Page 10 of 27

NYMEX Escalators

Daily Settlements for Henry Hub Natural Gas Futures (PRELIMINARY)Trade | from: <a href="http://www.cmegroup.com/trading/energy/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas/natural-gas

							quotes set	
Month	Open	High	Low	Last	Change	Settle	Estimated Volume	Prior Day Open Interest
Dec-11	3.704	3.767	3.656	_	0.049	3.745	94,572	130,322
Jan-12	3.809	3.864	3.76	-	0.04	3.843	50,432	246,423
Feb-12	3.819	3.878	3.78	-	0.043	3.859	19,390	72,502
Mar-12	3.792	3.852	3.748	-	0.04	3.832	17,039	101,998
Apr-12	3.791	3.851	3.753	-	0.04	3.832	20,061	94,701
May-12	3.828	3.886B	3.794	1	0.039	3.869	9,998	35,266
Jun-12	3.86	3.926B	3.831	-	0.039	3.909	3,323	17,634
Jul-12	3.907	3.970B	3.881		0.039	3.955	1,461	18,468
Aug-12	3.925	3.997B	3.908	-	0.039	3.983	775	12,539
Sep-12	3.938	3.998B	3.911A	-	0.038	3.984	1,165	10,184
Oct-12	3.976	4.034	3.941	-	0.038	4.02	10,990	53,227
Nov-12	4.111	4.174B	4.092A	-	0.035	4.162	1,106	18,241
Dec-12	4.376	4.438	4.362A	-	0.032	4.427	1,169	19,676
Jan-13	4.499	4.563	4.489		0.028	4.55	2,445	29,236
Feb-13	4.51	4.55	4.48	-	0.028	4.538	47	5,159
Mar-13	4.462	4.504	4.431A	-	0.027	4.489	885	12,874
Apr-13	4.35	4.41	4.344A		0.026	4.398	1,925	23,123
May-13	4.383	4.44	4.382A	-	0.026	4.413	12	3,001
Jun-13	-	4.441B	4.388A	_	0.026	4.441	-	1,584
Jul-13	4.447	4.479B	4.431A	-	0.026	4.479	1	1,646
Aug-13	4.451	4.501B	4.448		0.025	4.498	10	1,701
Sep-13	4.451	4.502B	4.45		0.024	4.501	14	1,349
Oct-13	4.506	4.541B	4.485A	<u> </u>	0.024	4.537	192	7,096
Nov-13	4.608	4.645B	4.595	-	0.022	4.651	41	1,164
Dec-13	4.83	4.881B	4.83		0.02	4.89	14	6,529
Jan-14	5	5 4 007D	4.952A	<u>"</u>	0.018	5.006 4.979	1	3,649
Feb-14		4.967B	4.930A	<u> </u>	0.017	4.901	1	477 995
Mar-14 Apr-14	-	4.898B	4.857A	 -	0.016 0.006	4.731	1	3,404
	4.7	4.715B	4.7	 -	0.006	4.741	2	590
May-14 Jun-14	4.1	4.7135	7./	┝┋	0.006	4.769	-	287
Jul-14	4.79	4.79	4.79	<u> </u>	0.006	4.805	2	540
Aug-14	4.75	4.79	7./3	-	0.006	4.825	-	322
Sep-14				-	0.005	4.831		390
Oct-14			<u> </u>	 _	0.005	4.861		782
Nov-14		_		- -	0.003	4.978		315
Dec-14				 	0.002	5.208		585
Jan-15	5.32	5.32	5.310A	 -	UNCH	5.323	5	602
Feb-15		 	-	_	-0.001	5.29		185
Mar-15			-	f -	-0.004	5.207	-	391

NYMEX Escalators

Apr-15		+	-	,	-0.012	4.999	-	1,918
May-15	-	-	-	-	-0.012	5.009		485
Jun-15	-	-	-	,	-0.012	5.037	·	1,200
Jul-15	-		_	-	-0.012	5.072	-	238
Aug-15	~	-	_	-	-0.012	5.092	_	597
Sep-15	**	-	-	-	-0.012	5.099	_	159
Oct-15	5.108	5.108	5.108	-	-0.012	5.129	3	221
Nov-15	5.23	5.23	5.23	-	-0.014	5.247	1	113
Dec-15	•	*	-	_	-0.014	5.475	-	6,374
Jan-16	5.58	5.58	5.58	-	-0.016	5.59	1	64
Feb-16	~	-	_	-	-0.018	5.558	-	50
Mar-16	-	_	-	-	-0.021	5.475	-	156
Apr-16	~	-	-	-	-0.031	5.26	-	183
May-16	-	-	-	-	-0.031	5.27	-	102
Jun-16	-	-	-	-	-0.031	5.298	l -	221
Jul-16	-	-	-	-	-0.031	5.333	-	102
Aug-16	-	-	-	-	-0.031	5.358	-	102
Sep-16		_	-		-0.031	5.366	_	73
Oct-16	-	-	·	_	-0.031	5.396		43
Nov-16		_		-	-0.031	5.521	_	19
Dec-16		_	-		-0.033	5.754	_	350
Jan-17	5.88	5.88	5.88	#	-0.033	5.876	5	24
Feb-17		_			-0.033	5.844		6
Mar-17	-	-		_	-0.034	5.761	_	19
Apr-17	5.53	5.53	5.53		-0.037	5.531	1	17
May-17				-	-0.037	5.541		6
Jun-17	_			-	-0.037	5.569		39
Jul-17	5.6	5.62	5.6	#	-0.037	5.604	5	60
Aug-17	_			-	-0.037	5.637	_	58
Sep-17	_		<u>-</u>		-0.037	5.647		76
Oct-17	_	-	-	-	-0.037	5.681		14
Nov-17	-	_		-	-0.037	5.809	-	14
Dec-17	_	-	-		-0.037	6.036	_	23
Jan-18	-	_		-	-0.037	6.156		50
Feb-18	-	_	-	-	-0.037	6.124		33
Mar-18	-	-		-	-0.037	6.041	-	35
Apr-18	-		-	-	-0.037	5.781	 	40
May-18	-	-	-	-	-0.037	5.789	_	59
Jun-18	-		-	-	-0.037	5.817	_	35
Jul-18		_	_	_	-0.037	5.852		30
Aug-18	~	-			-0.037	5.885	_	34
Sep-18	_	_	-	_	-0.037	5.895	_	34
Oct-18			-	-	-0.037	5.941	-	66
Nov-18	_	-		-	-0.04	6.073	-	33
Dec-18	-	_	-		-0.042	6.301		38
Jan-19		-		-	-0.042	6.426	-	-
Feb-19	-	-	-	-	-0.042	6.396	_	-
Mar-19	74	-		-	-0.042	6.316		_
Apr-19				_	-0.042	6.006	-	20
May-19	-	-		-	-0.042	6.011	_	20
Jun-19		-	-	-	-0.042	6.036		17
Jul-19	-	_		-	-0.042	6.071	_	10
Aug-19	_	-	-	-	-0.042	6.108	-	10
			·				·	·

NYMEX Escalators

Sep-19				_	-0.042	6.118		10
Oct-19			_		-0.042	6.166		75
Nov-19					-0.042	6.301		7.5
Dec-19	-	- 1			-0.042	6.531		
Jan-20					-0.042	6.656		50
Feb-20					-0.042	6.626	-	
Mar-20			<u></u>	ļ	-0.042	6.546		
Apr-20	-	-	-	-	-0.042	6.236		
May-20	-		-		-0.042	6.231	-	
Jun-20		-			-0.042	6.253		-
Jul-20	-		-		-0.042	6.291	-	
Aug-20					-0.042	6.331	-	
Sep-20	-	-			-0.042	6.346		
Oct-20		-	-	-	-0.042	6.406		
Nov-20					-0.042	6.541		
Dec-20	-		_		-0.042	6.771		246
	-			-				246
Jan-21		-	-	-	-0.042	6.896	-	30
Feb-21	-	-	-		-0.042	6.866	-	30
Mar-21	•	-			-0.042	6.786	-	30
Apr-21				-	-0.042	6.476		30
May-21		-	-	-	-0.042	6.471		30
Jun-21	-	-	-		-0.042	6.491		30
Jul-21	-		_	-	-0.042	6.533	-	30
Aug-21		-	-	-	-0.042	6.573	-	30
Sep-21	-		-		-0.042	6.59		30
Oct-21		-	-		-0.042	6.65	-	30
Nov-21		-			-0.042	6.786	-	30
Dec-21		-	-		-0.042	7.018	-	30
Jan-22	-	-		-	-0.042	7.15		
Feb-22	-	-		-	-0.042	7.12	-	
Mar-22		-			-0.042	7.04	_	-
Apr-22	-	_	-		-0.042	6.73	-	
May-22	*	-	-	-	-0.042	6.715		
Jun-22	-	-	-		-0.042	6.753	-	-
Jul-22	-	-			-0.042	6.801		-
Aug-22	-	-	-		-0.042	6.846	-	
Sep-22		-		-	-0.042	6.861	_	
Oct-22	-				-0.042	6.926	-	-
Nov-22	-	-	-	-	-0.042	7.062	-	-
Dec-22		_	-		-0.042	7.294	-	-
Jan-23	_	-	**		-0.042	7.426		_
Feb-23		-	-		-0.042	7.396		-
Mar-23	_	-	-	-	-0.042	7.316	-	
Apr-23	-				-0.042	7.006	~	-
May-23		-	-	-	-0.042	6.991	_	-
Jun-23		-		-	-0.042	7.031	-	-
Jul-23		-	_	-	-0.042	7.081		-
Aug-23		-		-	-0.042	7.126	-	_
Sep-23		-	-	-	-0.042	7.141	-	-
Oct-23			_	-	-0.042	7.206	-	-
Nov-23		_	-	-	-0.042	7.342	-	-
Dec-23	-	-	-	-	-0.042	7.574	-	-

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Participant Test

 $NPV_P = B_P - C_P$

$$B_P = $3,072,922$$
 $C_P = 1,797,386$
 $NPV_P = $1,275,536$

Benefit-Cost Ratio

1.71

Conclusion:

Since the net present value is greater than zero, the program will benefit the participants

Where:

 NPV_P = Net present value to all participants B_P = NPV of benefit to all participants C_P = NPV of cost to all participants

$$B_P = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{BR_t + TC_t + INC_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

$$C_P = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PC_t + BI_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

BR_t = Bill reductions in year t (not accounted for in participant cost test).

BI_t = Bill increases in year t TC_t = Tax credits in year t

INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the Utility PC_t = Participant costs in year t, which include

incremental captial costs

The following calculations are based on the budgeted participation levels for year one of the program.

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Participant Test

$$B_{P} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{BR_{t} + TC_{t} + INC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	BR_t	TC _t	INC _t	B_{P}
1	250,538	-	776,250	1,026,788
2	280,098	-	-	280,098
3	298,821	-	-	298,821
4	313,554	-	-	313,554
5	327,651	-	-	327,651
6	342,440	~	-	342,440
7	356,180	-	-	356,180
8	368,653	-	-	368,653
9	368,073	-	-	368,073
10	374,651	-	-	374,651
11	0	-	-	0
12	0	_	-	0
13	1	-	-	1
14	1	-	-	1
15	1	170	-	1
16	339,101	-	_	339,101
17	345,246	-	-	345,246
18	351,514	-	-	351,514
19	53,158	-	-	53,158
20	54,128	-	-	54,128
21	40,520	-	-	40,520
22	41,260	-	-	41,260
23	42,016	-	-	42,016
24	42,787	_	*	42,787
25	43,573	-	-	43,573
-	4,633,964	-	776,250	5,410,214

8.810% Discount Rate

\$3,072,922 NPV

BR_t = Bill reductions in year t
TC_t = Tax credits in year t

INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the Utility

Participant Test B Page 12 of 27

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Participant Test

BR_t = Bill reductions in year t

	G·1 Residential							
							(4)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	(2) + (3)	(1) x (4)
	Ccf	Pr	ojected		Demand	Co	mbined	
t	Conserved	Ga	s Cost*		Charge		Rate	BRt
1	224,660	\$	0.570	\$	0.1100	\$	0.68	\$ 152,841
2	224,660	\$	0.651		0.1100		0.76	170,874
3	224,660	\$	0.701		0.1100		0.81	182,296
4	224,660	\$	0.741		0.1100		0.85	191,284
5	224,660	\$	0.780		0.1100		0.89	199,884
6	224,660	\$	0.820		0.1100		0.93	208,906
7	224,660	\$	0.857		0.1100		0.97	217,288
8	224,660	\$	0.891		0.1100		1.00	224,897
9	224,660	\$	0.924		0.1100		1.03	232,282
10	224,660	\$	0.942		0.1100		1.05	236,433
11	224,660	\$	0.961		0.1100		1.07	240,668
12	224,660	\$	0.980		0.1100		1.09	244,987
13	224,660	\$	1.000		0.1100		1.11	249,392
14	220,496	\$	1.020		0.1100		1.13	249,179
15	220,496	\$	1.040		0.1100		1.15	253,678
16	204,492	\$	1.061		0.1100		1.17	239,521
17	204,492	\$	1.083		0.1100		1.19	243,862
18	204,492	\$	1.104		0.1100		1.21	248,289
19	40,153	\$	1.126		0.1100		1.24	49,639
20	40,153	\$	1.149		0.1100		1.26	50,544
21	31,613	\$	1.172		0.1100		1.28	40,520
22	31,613	\$	1.195		0.1100		1.31	41,260
23	31,613	\$	1.219		0.1100		1.33	42,016
24	31,613	\$	1.243		0.1100		1.35	42,787
25	31,613	\$	1.268		0.1100		1.38	 43,573
								\$ 4,296,900

G-1 Commercial

			0.,	90	ininciolai			
	(1)		(2)		(3)	(2	(4)) + (3)	(1) x (4)
	Ccf	Pre	ojected		Demand	Cor	nbined	
t	Conserved	Ga	s Cost*		Charge	F	Rate	BRt
1	143,605	\$	0.570	\$	0.1100	\$	0.68	\$ 97,697
2	143,605	\$	0 651	\$	0.1100	\$	0.76	\$ 109,224
3	143,605	\$	0.701	\$	0.1100	\$	0.81	\$ 116,525
4	143,605	\$	0.741	\$	0.1100	\$	0.85	\$ 122,270
5	143,605	\$	0.780	\$	0.1100	\$	0.89	\$ 127,767
6	143,605	\$	0.820	\$	0.1100	\$	0.93	\$ 133,534
7	143,605	\$	0.857	\$	0.1100	\$	0.97	\$ 138,892
8	143,605	\$	0.891	\$	0.1100	\$	1.00	\$ 143,756
9	131,335	\$	0.924	\$	0.1100	\$	1.03	\$ 135,791
10	131,335	\$	0.942	\$	0.1100	\$	1.05	\$ 138,218
11	98,002	\$	0.961	\$	0.1100	\$	1.07	\$ 104,985
12	98,002	\$	0.980	\$	0.1100	\$	1.09	\$ 106,869
12	94,406	\$	1.000	\$	0.1100	\$	1.11	\$ 104,799
12	93,018	\$	1.020	\$	0.1100	\$	1.13	\$ 105,119
12	93,018	\$	1.040	\$	0.1100	\$	1.15	\$ 107,016
12	85,016	\$	1.061	\$	0.1100	\$	1.17	\$ 99,580
12	85,016	\$	1.083	\$	0.1100	\$	1.19	\$ 101,384
12	85,016	\$	1.104	\$	0.1100	\$	1.21	\$ 103,225
12	2,847	\$	1.126	\$	0.1100	\$	1.24	\$ 3,519
12	2,847	\$	1.149	\$	0.1100	\$	1.26	\$ 3,584
12	-	\$	1.172	\$	0.1100	\$	1.28	\$ -
12	-	\$	1.195	\$	0.1100	\$	1.31	\$ -
12	-	\$	1.219	\$	0.1100	\$	1.33	\$ -
12	-	\$	1.243	\$	0.1100	\$	1.35	\$ -
12	-	\$	1.268	\$	0.1100	\$	1.38	\$ -
								\$ 2.103.754

Total projected Ccf savings, based on budgeted participation levels in year one of the program.
 Based on Department of Energy "Annual Energy Outlook", converted to per ccf residential cost; where t = 1 = 2012
 Volumetric charge for residential customers per Sheet No. 8 of the Company's tariff.

Deman	Energy d Side Management (DSM) Program pant Test			
TC _t =	Tax credits in year t (presently no federal tax	c credits are available	e in 2012)	
	A. High Efficiency Heating Savings	(1) Program Participants	(2) Residential Energy Credits	(1) x (2)
		EMOCRATION TO THE CONTRACT OF		
	B. High Efficiency Water Heating Savings			
	Total	-		\$

Note: participants are eligible for tax credits in the year they incur expenditures for high-efficiency appliances, since this is an analysis of participation in a single year, the tax credit is applicable only where t = 1

Participant Test TC Page 14 of 27

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Participant Test

 INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the Utility, for t = 1

Energy Savings by Customer Class	INC _t
G-1 Residential Customers	\$ 497,500
G-1 Commercial Customers	 278,750
Total	\$ 776,250

Note: rebates are given to participant in the year they elect to participate, since this is an analysis of participation in a single year, the rebate is applicable only where t = 1

Participant Test INC Page 15 of 27

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Participant Test

$$C_{P} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PC_{t} + BI_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	(1) Bl _t	(2) PC _t	(1) + (2) C _P
1		1,955,735	1,955,735
2		-	-
3	₩.	-	-
4	-	-	-
5	-	-	
6	-	-	-
7	-	-	*
8	-	-	-
9	-	-	-
10	-	-	-
		1,955,735	1,955,735

8.810% Discount Rate

\$1,797,386 NPV

 Bl_t = Bill increases in year t (not accounted for in participant cost test).

PC_t = Participant costs in year t, which include incremental capital costs

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Participant Test

PC_t = Participant costs for t = 1

	(1)		(2)		(1) x (2)
	Program	1	Incremental		
A. High Efficiency Heating Savings	Participants		Cost		PC_t
Furnace AFUE 90 - 93	900	\$	654	\$	588,870
Furnace AFUE 94 - 95	600		973		583,600
Furnace AFUE 96 or >	300		1,467		440,000
Boiler AFUE 85 -89	15		1,000		15,000
Programmable Thermostat	900		14		12,668
Total	2,715				1,640,138
B. High Efficiency Water Heating Savings Tank W/H .6266 EF	100	\$	71	\$	7,100
Tank W/H .67 or > EF	200	Ψ	634	Ψ	126,731
Tankless W/H .82 - 90 EF	200		836		167,267
Total	500			\$	301,098
C. High Efficiency Commercial Kitchen Equipme	<u>ent</u>				
Gas Fryer	25	\$	50	\$	1,250
Gas Griddle	25		60		1,500
Gas Oven	25		50		1,250
Gas Steamer	25		420		10,500
Total	100			\$	14,500

IC = Incremental Costs for purchasing high-efficiency unit

Participant Test PC Page 17 of 27

⁽¹⁾ Based on budgeted participation levels in year one of the CEP.

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Program Administrator Cost Test

 $NPV_{pa} = B_{pa} - C_{pa}$

$$B_{pa} = $ 2,605,293$$

 $C_{pa} = 1,217,924$
 $NPV_{pa} = $ 1,387,369$

Benefit-Cost Ratio

2.14

Conclusion:

Since the net present value is greater than zero, the program would decrease costs to the utility

Where:

 NPV_{pa} = Net present value of total cost of the resource

 B_{pa} = NPV of benefits of the program C_{pa} = NPV of costs of the programs

$$B_{pa} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

$$C_{pa} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PRC_{t} + INC_{t} + UIC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{UAC}_t & = & \text{Utility avoided supply costs in year t} \\ \text{PRC}_t & = & \text{Program Administrator Costs in year t} \\ \text{INC}_t & = & \text{Incentives paid to the participant by the Utility} \\ \text{UIC}_t & = & \text{Utility increased supply costs in year t} \\ \end{array}$

The following calculations are based on the budgeted participation levels for year one of the program.

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Program Administrator Cost Test

$$B_{pa} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

(1) UAC, t 1 210,029 2 \$ 239,590 3 \$ 258,313 4 \$ 273,044 5 \$ 287,142 6 \$ 301,931 7 \$ 315,671 8 \$ 328,143 9 \$ 328,913 10 \$ 335,492 11 \$ 310,160 12 \$ 316,363 \$ 13 319,094 \$ 319,812 14 \$ 326,207 15 \$ 307,255 16 17 \$ 313,400 \$ 319,668 18 19 \$ 48,429 20 \$ 49,397 21 \$ 37,042 22 \$ 37,783 38,539 23 \$ 24 \$ 39,310 25 40,096

8.810% Discount Rate

\$2,605,293 NPV

(1) UAC_t scheduled per calculation performed for RIM test

5,700,823

 $UAC_t = Utility$ avoided supply costs in year t

Program Admin B Page 19 of 27

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Program Administrator Cost Test

$$C_{pa} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PRC_{t} + INC_{t} + UIC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	(1) PRC _t	(2) INC _t	(3) UIC _t	C_pa
1	548,973	776,250	-	1,325,223
2	-	-	=	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	-	-	-
5	=	-	-	-
6	-	•	-	**
7	~	-	•	-
8	-	-	-	-
9	-	-	-	-
10	-	•	-	p.v.
	548,973	776,250	-	1,325,223

8.810% Discount Rate

\$1,217,924 NPV

 PRC_t = Program Administrator Costs in year t

INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the Utility

UIC_t = Utility increased supply costs in year t

- (1) Program costs scheduled from PRC_t which was calculated for the RIM Test
- (2) Incentives scheduled from INC_t which was calculated for the Participant test
- (3) No known increased supply costs as a result of operating the CEP

Atmos Energy

Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) Test

 $NPV_{RIM} = B_{RIM} - C_{RIM}$

$$B_{RIM} = $2,605,293$$
 $C_{RIM} = 4,170,210$
 $NPV_{RIM} = $(1,564,917)$

Benefit-Cost Ratio

0.62

Conclusion:

Since the net present value is negative, the program will cause an increase customer rates.

Where:

NPV_{RIM} = Net present value levels

 B_{RIM} = Benefits to rate levels or customer bills C_{RIM} = Costs to rate levels or customer bills

$$B_{RIM} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

$$C_{RIM} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UIC_{t} + RL_{t} + PRC_{t} + INC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

 $\begin{array}{lll} \text{UAC}_t & = & \text{Utility avoided supply costs in year t} \\ \text{UIC}_t & = & \text{Utility increased supply costs in year t} \\ \text{RL}_t & = & \text{Revenue loss from reduced sales in year t} \\ \text{PRC}_t & = & \text{Program administrator costs in year t} \\ \end{array}$

 INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the sponsoring utility in year t

The following calculations are based on the budgeted participation levels for year one of the program.

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) Test

$$B_{RIM} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	UACt
1	210,029
2	239,590
3	258,313
4	273,044
5	287,142
6	301,931
7	315,671
8	328,143
9	328,913
10	335,492
11	310,160
12	316,363
13	319,094
14	319,812
15	326,207
16	307,255
17	313,400
18	319,668
19	48,429
20	49,397
21	37,042
22	37,783
23	38,539
24	39,310
25	40,096
	5,700,823

8.810% Discount Rate

\$2,605,293 NPV

UAC_t = Utility avoided supply costs in year t

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) Test

UAC_t = Utility avoided supply costs in year t

			G-1 Residential				G-	1 Commerci	al		
	Pi	rojected	Annual	(Commodity	Pi	ojected	Annual	Со	mmodity	
t	Ga	as Cost*	Savings		Savings	Ga	as Cost*	Savings	5	Savings	UACt
1	\$	0.570	224,660	\$	128,128	\$	0.570	143,605	\$	81,901	\$ 210,029
2	\$	0.651	224,660	\$	146,162	\$	0.651	143,605	\$	93,428	\$ 239,590
3	\$	0.701	224,660	\$	157,584	\$	0.701	143,605	\$	100,729	\$ 258,313
4	\$	0.741	224,660	\$	166,571	\$	0.741	143,605	\$	106,473	\$ 273,044
5	\$	0.780	224,660	\$	175,171	\$	0.780	143,605	\$	111,971	\$ 287,142
6	\$	0.820	224,660	\$	184,193	\$	0.820	143,605	\$	117,738	\$ 301,931
7	\$	0.857	224,660	\$	192,575	\$	0.857	143,605	\$	123,096	\$ 315,671
8	\$	0.891	224,660	\$	200,184	\$	0.891	143,605	\$	127,959	\$ 328,143
9	\$	0.924	224,660	\$	207,569	\$	0.924	131,335	\$	121,344	\$ 328,913
10	\$	0.942	224,660	\$	211,721	\$	0.942	131,335	\$	123,771	\$ 335,492
11	\$	0.961	224,660	\$	215,955	\$	0.961	98,002	\$	94,205	\$ 310,160
12	\$	0.980	224,660	\$	220,274	\$	0.980	98,002	\$	96,089	\$ 316,363
13	\$	1.000	224,660	\$	224,680	\$	1.000	94,406	\$	94,414	\$ 319,094
14	\$	1.020	220,496	\$	224,925	\$	1.020	93,018	\$	94,887	\$ 319,812
15	\$	1.040	220,496	\$	229,423	\$	1.040	93,018	\$	96,784	\$ 326,207
16	\$	1.061	204,492	\$	217,027	\$	1.061	85,016	\$	90,228	\$ 307,255
17	\$	1.083	204,492	\$	221,368	\$	1.083	85,016	\$	92,032	\$ 313,400
18	\$	1.104	204,492	\$	225,795	\$	1.104	85,016	\$	93,873	\$ 319,668
19	\$	1.126	40,153	\$	45,223	\$	1.126	2,847	\$	3,206	\$ 48,429
20	\$	1.149	40,153	\$	46,127	\$	1.149	2,847	\$	3,270	\$ 49,397
21	\$	1.172	31,613	\$	37,042	\$	1.172	-	\$	•	\$ 37,042
22	\$	1.195	31,613	\$	37,783	\$	1.195	-	\$	-	\$ 37,783
23	\$	1.219	31,613	\$	38,539	\$	1.219	-	\$	-	\$ 38,539
24	\$	1.243	31,613	\$	39,310	\$	1.243	-	\$	-	\$ 39,310
25	\$	1.268	31,613	\$	40,096	\$	1.268	-	\$	-	\$ 40,096
Total Con	nmodit	y Savings		\$	3,833,425				\$	1,867,398	\$ 5,700,823

Note: the above analysis is based on the CCF conserved from a single year of participation in the CEP

⁽¹⁾ Total projected Ccf savings, based on budgeted participation levels in year one of the program. These amounts continue to be saved year after year.

⁽²⁾ Based on Department of Energy 2011 "Annual Energy Outlook", converted to per ccf residential cost; where t = 1 = 2012

Atmos Energy

Demand Side Management (DSM) Program Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) Test

$$C_{RIM}$$
 Σ $UIC_t + RL_t + PRC_t + INC_t$
 $(1+d)^{t-1}$

	(1) UIC _t	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1) + (2)
t	UIC _t	ŔĹţ	PŘĆ _t	INC _t	C _{RIM}
1	-	250,538	548,973	776,250	1,575,762
2	-	280,098		-	280,098
3	-	298,821		-	298,821
4	-	313,554		-	313,554
5	-	327,651		-	327,651
6	-	342,440		=	342,440
7	-	356,180		-	356,180
8	-	368,653			368,653
9	-	368,073		-	368,073
10	-	374,651		-	374,651
11	-	345,653		-	345,653
12	-	351,856		-	351,856
13	-	354,191		-	354,191
14	-	354,298		-	354,298
15	-	360,694		-	360,694
16	-	339,101		-	339,101
17	•	345,246		-	345,246
18	-	351,514		•	351,514
19	-	53,158		-	53,158
20	-	54,128		-	54,128
21	-	40,520		₩.	40,520
22	-	41,260		-	41,260
23	-	42,016		-	42,016
24	-	42,787		•••	42,787
25	<u>-</u>	43,573		•	43,573
	-	6,400,654	548,973	776,250	7,725,877

8.810% Discount Rate

\$4,170,210 NPV

 $\begin{array}{lcl} UIC_t & = & Utility \ increased \ supply \ costs \ in \ year \ t \\ RL_t & = & Revenue \ loss \ from \ reduced \ sales \ in \ year \ t \\ PRC_t & = & Program \ administrator \ costs \ in \ year \ t \\ \end{array}$

INC_t = Incentives paid to the participant by the sponsoring utility in year t

(1) No known increased supply costs

- (2) see RIM Test RG; column (2)
- (3) see RIM Test RG; column (3)
- (4) Scheduled per calculation performed for Participant Test

RIM Test C Page 24 of 27

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test

 $NPV_{TRC} = B_{TRC} - C_{TRC}$

$$B_{TRC} = $ 2,605,293$$
 $C_{TRC} = 2,301,910$
 $NPV_{TRC} = $ 303,383$

Benefit-Cost Ratio

1.13

Conclusion:

Since the net present value is greater than zero, the program is a less expensive resource than the supply option upon which the marginal costs are based.

Where:

 NPV_{TRC} = Net present value of total cost of the resource

B_{TRC} = NPV of benefits of the program C_{TRC} = NPV of costs of the programs

$$B_{TRC} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_t + TC}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

$$C_{TRC} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PRC_t + PCN_t + UIC_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

UAC_t = Utility avoided supply costs in year t

 TC_t = Tax credits in year t

UIC_t = Utility increased supply costs in year t PRC_t = Program administrator costs in year t

PCN_t = Net participant costs

The following calculations are based on the budgeted participation levels for year one of the program.

Atmos Energy Demand Side Management (DSM) Program **Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test**

$$B_{TRC} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{UAC_t + TC_t}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	(1) UAC _t	(2) TC _t	B _{TRC}
1	\$ 210,029	***	\$ 210,029
2	239,590	-	239,590
3	258,313	-	258,313
4	273,044	-	273,044
5	287,142	-	287,142
6	301,931	-	301,931
7	315,671	-	315,671
8	328,143	-	328,143
9	328,913	•••	328,913
10	335,492	-	335,492
11	310,160	-	310,160
12	316,363	-	316,363
13	319,094	_	319,094
14	319,812	_	319,812
15	326,207	_	326,207
16	307,255	78	307,255
17	313,400	_	313,400
18	319,668	-	319,668
19	48,429	-	48,429
20	49,397	-	49,397
21	37,042	-	37,042
22	37,783	-	37,783
23	38,539	•	38,539
24	39,310	-	39,310
25	40,096	-	40,096
	\$ 5,700,823	-	\$ 5,700,823

8.810% Discount Rate

\$2,605,293 NPV

UAC_t Utility avoided supply costs in year t

TC_t Tax Credits in year t =

> (1) Scheduled per calculation performed for RIM Test

(2) Scheduled per calculation performed for Participant Test

TRC Test B

Atmos Energy
Demand Side Management (DSM) Program
Total Resource Cost (TRC) Test

$$C_{TRC} = \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{PRC_{t} + PCN_{t} + UIC_{t}}{(1+d)^{t-1}}$$

t	(1) PRC _t	(2) PCN _t	(3) UIC _t	\mathbf{C}_{TRC}
1	548,973	1,955,735	~	2,504,709
2	=	-	-	-
3	-	••	-	-
4	=	-	-	-
5	-		-	-
6	-	=	=	-
7	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-
9	-	-	-	-
10	-	-	_	-
	548,973	1,955,735	-	2,504,709

8.810% Discount Rate

\$2,301,910 NPV

 PRC_t = Program administrator costs in year t

PCN_t = Net participant costs

UIC_t = Utility increased supply costs in year t

(1) Scheduled per calculation performed for RIM Test

(2) Represents net participant costs which is the incremental cost to the participant of purchasing a high-efficiency appliance versus one with standard efficiency. Amount scheduled from PC_t from the Participant Test.

(3) No known increased supply costs as a result of operating the CEP

Atmos Energy Corporation Staff's Informal Conference Data Request Dated January 25, 2012 Case No. 2011-00395 Question No. 2

Witness: Mark A. Martin

REQUEST:

Is the discount rate used in your Application, consistent with Atmos' filed tariff?

RESPONSE:

No, attached is the revised tariff indicating that the weighted average cost of capital is used for the present value calculation for the DIA. (Specifically, see Tariff Sheet No. 40, last sentence of second paragraph.) The changes to the cost analysis also resulted in the need to update Tariff Sheet No. 41; therefor the appropriate changes have been made to this tariff sheet.

FOR ENTIRE SERVICE AREA

P.S.C. NO. 1

Fourth Revised SHEET No. 39 Canceling

Third Revised SHEET No. 39

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

Demand-Side Management Cost Recovery Mechanism DSM

1. Applicable

Applicable to Rate G-1 Sales Service, residential and commercial classes only.

(T)

(T)

The Distribution Charge under Residential and Commercial Rate G-1 Sales Service, shall be increased or decreased for nine annual periods beginning January 2012 and continuing through December 31, 2016 by the DSM Cost Recovery Component (DSMRC) at a rate per Mcf in accordance with the following formula:

DSMRC = DCRC + DLSA + DIA + DBA

(T)

Where:

DCRC =

(T)

DSM Cost Recovery-Current. The DCRC shall include all actual costs, direct and indirect, under this program which has been approved by the Commission. This includes all direct costs associated with the program including rebates paid under the program, the cost of educational supplies, and customer awareness related to conservation/efficiency. In addition, indirect costs shall include the costs of planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating DSM programs. In addition, all costs incurred by or on behalf of the program, including but not limited to costs for consultants, employees and administrative expenses, will be recovered through the DCRC.

(N)

DLSA = DSM Lost Sales Adjustment. To effectively promote and execute the program, the Company shall recover the annual lost sales attributable to customer conservation/efficiency created as a result of the Program. This aligns the Company's interest with that of its customers by reducing the correlation between volume and revenue for those customers who elect to participate in the program. The lost sales are the estimated conservation, per participant, times the base rate for the applicable customer. The goal is to make the Company whole for promoting the program. Lost sales are based on the cumulative lost sales since the program inception and will reset when the Company completes a general rate case

ISSUED: September 26, 2011 EFFECTIVE: January 1, 2012

FOR ENTIRE SERVICE AREA

P.S.C. NO. 1
First Revised SHEET No. 40
Canceling
Original SHEET No. 40

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

	Demand-Side Management Cost Recovery Mechanism DSM	
DIA =	DSM Incentive Adjustment. As a result of the program, the customers who participate in the program will save on their gas bills due to decreased usage, which results in decreased commodity charges. As an incentive for the Company to devote the necessary monetary and physical resources to promote and administer the program, the Company will earn a fifteen percent (15%) incentive based on the net resource savings of the Program participants.	
	Net resource savings are defined as Program benefits less utility Program costs and participant costs where Program benefits will be calculated on the basis of the present value of Atmos' avoided commodity costs over the expected life of the Program. For the purpose of calculating the Program benefits, a specific measure's life as defined in DEER (Database for Energy Efficient Resources), EnergyStar or NEEP is assumed with future gas costs over a corresponding period based on projection of the Company's Gas Cost Adjustment (GCA) at the time of filing with escalation factors determined by NYMEX futures prices on the cost of gas at Henry Hub. The present value is the weighted average cost of capital as stated in the Company's most recent rate case.	
DBA =	DSM Balance Adjustment. The DBA shall be calculated on a calendar year basis and be used to reconcile the difference between the amount of revenues actually billed through the DSMRC and the revenues which should have been billed.	
	The DBA for the upcoming twelve-month period shall be calculated as the sum of the balance adjustments for the DCRC, DLSA and DIA. For the DCRC, DLSA and DIA, the balance adjustment shall be the difference between the amount billed in a twelve-month period and the actual cost of the DSM Program during the same twelve-month period.	
	The balance adjustment amounts calculated will include interest to be calculated at a rate equal to the average of "3-month Commercial Paper Rate" for the immediately preceding twelve-month period.	
prior to t	pany will file modifications to the DSMRC on an annual basis at least two months he beginning of the effective upcoming twelve-month period for billing. This ing shall include detailed calculations of the DCRC, DLSA, DIA and the DBA, as	

ISSUED: December 1, 2008 **EFFECTIVE:** September 2, 2009 (Issued by Authority of an Order by the Public Service in Case No. 2008-00499 dated September 2, 2009).

twelve-month period to determine the DSMRC.

well as data on the total cost of the DSM Program over the twelve-month period. The calculations plus interest shall be divided by the expected Mcf sales for the upcoming

FOR ENTIRE SERVICE AREA

P.S.C. NO. 1 Twelfth Revised Sheet No. 41 Canceling

Eleventh Revised Sheet No. 41

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

Demand-Side Management Co DSM		
DSM Cost Recovery Component (DSMRC-R):		
DSM Cost Recovery – Current:	\$0.0940 per Mcf	
DSM Lost Sales Adjustment	\$0.0040 per Mcf	
DSM Incentive Adjustment	\$0.0150 per Mcf	
DSM Balance Adjustment:	(<u>\$0.0391</u>) per Mcf	
DSMRC Residential Rate G-1	\$0.0609 per Mcf	
DSM Cost Recovery Component (DSMRC-C):		
DSM Cost Recovery – Current:	\$0.0690 per Mcf	
DSM Lost Sales Adjustment	\$0.0030 per Mcf	
DSM Incentive Adjustment	\$0.0120 per Mcf	
DSM Balance Adjustment:	(<u>\$0.0000</u>) per Mcf	
DSMRC Commercial Rate G-1	\$0.0840 per Mcf	

ISSUED: September 26, 2011 **EFFECTIVE:** January 1, 2012

Atmos Energy Corporation Staff's Informal Conference Data Request Dated January 25, 2012 Case No. 2011-00395 Question No. 3

Witness: Mark A. Martin

REQUEST:

Review residential participation estimates on Tab 2, Page 5 and amend if appropriate.

RESPONSE:

Our review indicates that the estimates are reasonable. Part of the confusion may be that in the 2008 application we estimated 2,400 participants and in this application 2,310. A closer examination of the estimates reveals that two measures have been added (thermostat rebates – 600, tank water heater EF .67 or > -150). Additionally, the estimated total number of furnaces and water heaters rebates actually declined significantly from our 2008 application (1,800 furnaces in 2008 vs. 1,210 and 500 water heaters in 2008 vs. 375 in this application). These facts, along with the tiering of the rebates so that a greater incentive is offered for more efficient equipment leads us to believe that the residential participation estimates are reasonable and appropriate.

Atmos Energy Corporation Staff's Informal Conference Data Request Dated January 25, 2012 Case No. 2011-00395 Question No. 4

Witness: Mark A. Martin

REQUEST:

Should any portion of employee wages who work on the DSM Program be included in program costs?

RESPONSE:

The Company has removed all employee salary costs from the DSM program costs. (See Tab 2, Page 4 - the Program Overhead line has been zeroed out.)