

EXHIBIT NO. ___(CES-20)
DOCKET NO. UE-060266/UG-060267
2006 PSE GENERAL RATE CASE
WITNESS: CALVIN E. SHIRLEY

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

Docket No. UE-060266
Docket No. UG-060267

**ELEVENTH EXHIBIT (NONCONFIDENTIAL) TO THE
PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
CALVIN E. SHIRLEY
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.**

AUGUST 23, 2006

NWEC Response to PSE Data Request No. 16

(Ref.: N.L. Glaser Testimony, page 12, lines 4-6)

- Q.**
- a) Please list each agency that participated in the referenced "survey of agencies."
 - b) Please identify the date(s) on which the referenced "survey of agencies" was conducted.
 - c) Please provide a copy of all questions asked in the referenced "survey of agencies."
 - d) Please provide a copy of all responses provided to the referenced "survey of agencies."
 - e) Please provide a copy of all reports, notes, or other information collected with regards to the referenced "survey of agencies."
- A.**
- a) The agencies contacted regarding the need for additional energy efficiency funding in PSE's service territory were: Opportunity Council, Housing Authority of Skagit County, Snohomish County Human Services, City of Seattle Office of Housing – HomeWise Program, King County Housing Authority, Kitsap Community Resources, Metropolitan Development Council, Pierce County CAP, and CAC of Lewis, Mason, and Thurston Counties.
 - b) The information was gathered through telephone conversations with various agency staff conducted by the Energy Project on May 15-18, 2006.
 - c) No formal set of questions was submitted to the agencies. The Energy Project conducted the survey informally by telephone. The essential question was: If we were able to get PSE to increase the funding for low-income energy efficiency, how much additional funding would your agency really be able to put to use? Staff had to consider factors such as the increased cost of doing business, the ability to charge PSE more completely for program administration, as well as some number of potential additional units in coming up with their estimate of funding they would really use.
 - d) The agencies' answers were not submitted in writing, but were verbal estimates based on the experience of the coordinator being interviewed. The estimates were as follows:

King County Housing Authority	\$450,000-500,000
Opportunity Council	200,000

Snohomish County Human Services	75,000
Kitsap Community Resources	75,000
Metropolitan Development Council	30,000-50,000
Pierce County CAP	50,000
CAC of Lewis, Mason, Thurston	25,000
Housing Authority of Skagit County	at capacity
City of Seattle	not able to determine
Olympic CAP	not available
HopeSource	not available

- e) Notes from the phone conversations are attached as NWECE-PSE DR 16 ATTACH A.

Response prepared by Chuck Eberdt, 3690-265-2169; chuck_eberdt@oppco.org

- John - OC - all we could get - could do \$200,000
- RCHA - \$450,000 - 500,000 range - not sure of shifgs split but suspect mostly elec MF
- Serbonish - ~ 75 acrs for Gas mainly Gas weatherization is increasing because of greater # of repairs from HELP program

Increased costs - new info from recent bids Gas funding falls in comparison to elec. in Sub.

- Lewis Mason Thornton -

Current budget	100 770	Elec
	24 600	Gas
	<hr/>	
	70 500	Elec O&M
	34 400	Gas O&M
	<hr/>	

Inflation costs keep jumping Has had to subsidize Admin costs w/ C&S & Co removing \$350 Admin Exp will help. Even just a 10% increase in costs would be a \$25K ↑ in funding just to stay w/ current production. Suspect costs have gone up more

- Sherry - Pierce Co - capacity questions
could use an additional \$200K for gas -

- MDC - their estimates \$30-50K

- Skagit - doesn't think can do more
units. could use add'l fund to cover
cost increases - not sure how much

- City of Seattle - not doing gas homes -
Cost of doing SF gas home compared to
MF elec. focusing on MF - admits
probably a lot of SF gas to do
Asked if would consider KCR HA contract
to do gas - talked about before he transferred
in - never happened?
[Potentially big \$ of home here]

KCR - could use \$75,000 add'l.
Suggests two changes to PSE program
in re: mobiles - 1) allow them to do
whole parks - even if some over
income eligibility, probably not very
far over.

2) Current min achievable R value
for lid is R26 - can be hard to
get 7 or even to R26 in some mobiles -
4" of rigid on exterior with insulation
when have to do the EPDM anyway.
PSE lid would require blowing fluid

as well. Probably not worth cost
for the small add'l R that gets -
labor intensive for a small cavity fill
- get most bang from initial R
anyway -
[Exterior rigid also keeps cavity warmer
so V's chance of moisture condensation]

500 -
200
75
25
50
50
75

\$975,000

Don't include Kittitas
Oley CAB or City of
Seattle