

**AVISTA CORP.**  
**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

JURISDICTION:	WASHINGTON	DATE PREPARED:	09/16/2009
CASE NO:	UE-090134 & UG-090135	WITNESS:	Jon Powell
REQUESTER:	Public Counsel	RESPONDER:	Lori Hermanson
TYPE:	Data Request	DEPT:	Energy Solutions
REQUEST NO.:	PC - 515	TELEPHONE:	(509) 495-4658
		EMAIL:	lori.hermanson@avistacorp.com

**REQUEST:**

**Re: Avista's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 498.**

- a. Please explain why the multi-family direct install program "is tracked in [Avista's] non-residential database."
- b. Please provide a general description of the "multi-family direct install program" referenced in Avista's response to part (a) of the above data request. Please also provide any information Avista has regarding the size of the buildings that receive DSM measures as part of this program, in terms of the number of units in the buildings and total square feet. In addition, please explain whether this program is administered by Avista directly, or by a subcontractor. Lastly, please explain who is responsible for installing the DSM measures (e.g. tenant, building owner, contractor, program administrator.)
- c. Please clarify and explain whether the "multi-family direct install program" referenced in the response referenced above is the same as the multi-family direct install program described in the program specifications document provided as Attachment B to Avista's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 388.
- d. Please provide a description of any and all measures included in Avista's multi-family direct install program. For each such measure, please provide an explanation of the savings estimate (kwh or therms) used by Avista to calculate savings for this program.
- e. Please provide an explanation regarding the type(s) of furnaces, boilers, or HVAC equipment installed as part of the "multi-family direct install program" referenced in Avista's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 498.
- f. Please provide the total savings (therms and kwh) attributed to the "multi-family direct install program" for each year, 2001 through 2008, for Washington, Idaho, and Oregon (if applicable) and total. In addition, for each year, please provide savings data (by state) for each measure included in this program (e.g. CFLs, showerheads, aerators, water pipe wrap).
- g. For each year, 2006 through 2008, please provide an explanation as to where the savings amounts referenced above in response to part (f) of this request, are shown in Tables H3A through H3F in the Titus Report (Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (BJH-2), at pp. 54-59.

**RESPONSE:**

- a) In response to Public Counsel Data Request 498, the terminology "multi-family direct install program" was not correct and should have been "site-specific". The multi-family direct install program is actually a third-party vendor program that was offered to Avista customers in late 2007, not in 2006. This program provides the actual, direct installation of small efficiency measures (insulation wraps, CFL, low flow showerheads) to multi-family buildings individual tenant units or common areas by a third party vendor.

The answer to DR 498 should only reference the residential programs that happened to include efficiency measures (HVAC, water heating, insulation, windows) to both single family and multi-family units. To clarify the savings claimed in 2006 - a total of 144,642 therms were recorded as part of the Idaho residential program. Of those therms, 31,464 were tracked in our residential database and consisted of typical residential rebates that the customer installed in single-family homes (furnaces, water heaters, insulation, etc.). The remaining 113,178 therms were tracked in our non-residential database. These projects all happened to be installed in multi-family structures and were analyzed as a site specific project due to the size of the installation. If a residential or multi-family project is analyzed site-specifically, the final results are tracked in our non-residential database.

- b) During the year referenced, there were three multi-family projects that were individually contracted and handled site-specifically through Avista's account executives. As with other site specific programs, the owner/property manager is responsible for the installation of the DSM measures either by themselves or through the retention of a contractor/vendor. The multi-family direct install program was not available during the timeframe in question.
- c) As mentioned in the response to (a) above, it is not the same program. For the year in question, these multifamily projects were handled site-specifically and occurred prior to and separate from the multi-family direct install program described in the program specifications document provided as Attachment B to Avista's Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 388.
- d) A description of any and all measures included in Avista's multi-family direct install program through UCONS is included in Attachment B to Public Counsel Data Request No. 388.
- 
- e) HVAC measures are not included in the multi-family direct install program administered through UCONS that is provided as Attachment B to Avista's response to Public Counsel Data Request 388. HVAC measures are considered if they are evaluated site-specifically as referenced in answers A, B and D.
- f) For 2001-2006 there were no savings claimed through a multi-family direct install program only through site-specific projects as referenced in answers A, B and D above. For 2007-2008 the following savings were claimed through the multi-family direct install program handled through UCONS. This direct install program can have natural gas savings, however, it is predominantly an electric program. Savings by state and end use are shown below.

Washington (2007):

Appliances – 111,060 kwh (no therms)  
 Common Area Lighting – 70,119 kwh (no therms)  
 Tenant Lighting – 496,768 kwh (no therms)

Idaho (2007):

UCONS no Idaho activity in 2007

Washington (2008):

Appliances – 451,925 kwh (no therms)  
 Common Area Lighting – 716,606 (no therms)  
 Tenant Lighting – 3,147,612 (no therms)  
 Shell – 811,947 kwh (no therms)

Idaho (2008):

Appliances – 98,690 kwh (no therms)  
 Common Area Lighting – 657,766 kwh (no therms)  
 Tenant Lighting – 3,147,612 kwh (no therms)  
 Shell – 811,947 kwh (no therms)

- g) For each year, 2006 through 2008, any project classified as residential (i.e. multi-family direct install program through UCONS, multi-family site-specific projects, and other site specific residential projects such as renewables, etc.), were included in the residential summary shown in Tables H3A through H3F in the Titus Report.