

ORIGINAL



0000106847

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JAN 15 2010

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTIN K. MAYES - CHAIRMAN
GARY PIERCE
PAUL NEWMAN
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
BOB STUMP

JAN 15 P 12:48
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR)
APPROVAL OF ITS DEMAND-SIDE)
MANAGEMENT PROGRAM PORTFOLIO PLAN.)
_____)

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-07-0401

**REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
FUNDING FOR SMALL
BUSINESS PROGRAM**

Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP" or "Company"), through undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully requests the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to approve an increase in funding for TEP's Demand-Side Management ("DSM") Small Business Program ("Program") for 2010 through 2012. Additionally, TEP respectfully requests the Commission to approve recovery of all costs associated with the Program through the DSM Surcharge that will be effective June 1, 2010. Attached as Exhibit 1 is TEP's "Request for Additional Funding" for the Program.

In Decision No. 70457 (August 6, 2008), the Commission approved TEP's Program. Since TEP launched the program on November 1, 2008, TEP used none of the 2008 incentive budget before the end of 2008. TEP allowed the implementation contractor ("IC") to utilize the combined total incentive dollars for 2008 and 2009 of \$1,518,972. By December 31, 2009, TEP actually paid \$1,150,000 in customer incentives which was significantly greater than the single-year 2009 budget of \$778,332 and 76% of the combined 2008 and 2009 incentive budget of \$1,518,972.

Considering the successful participation in 2009, TEP believes that it has significantly underestimated the commercial market for energy efficiency ("EE") upgrades on lighting, motors, HVAC and refrigeration. TEP does not wish to stop participation or reservations in a program that shows tremendous success.

1 Therefore, TEP is proposing an enhanced budget and Program benefit as outlined in
2 Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 also compares the proposed enhanced budget and benefit to the original
3 budget and benefit approved in Decision No. 70457.

4 The incremental increase in the DSM Surcharge to recover the cost will be \$0.014 for
5 2010, as shown below. The DSM Adjustor related to this program would be similar to each
6 subsequent year through 2012.

7

Budget Increase Amounts	Projected kWh Sales (2009)	DSM Adjustor (incremental)
\$737,565	9,552,111,194	\$0.008

8
9
10

11 With Commission approval for the increased funding allowance, TEP anticipates MWH
12 savings to increase from 7,261 in 2010 to 11,212 in 2010. The weighted average Societal Cost
13 Test ("SC") for the Program with increased funding will range from 1.16 to 2.04.

14 WHEREFORE, TEP respectfully requests Commission to approve 1) increased funding for
15 the Program, and 2) recovery of all costs associated with the Program through the DSM Surcharge
16 that will be effective June 1, 2010.

17 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of January 2010.

18 Tucson Electric Power Company

19
20 By 
21 Philip J. Dion
22 UniSource Energy Services
23 One South Church Avenue, Suite 200
24 Tucson, Arizona 85701

25 and

26 Michael W. Patten
27 Jason Gellman
ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

1 Original and 13 copies of the foregoing
filed this 15th day of January 2010 with:

2 Docket Control
3 Arizona Corporation Commission
4 1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

5 Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed
this 15th day of January 2010 to:

6 C. Webb Crockett
7 Patrick J. Black
8 FENNEMORE CRAIG, PC
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913

9 Daniel Pozefsky, Esq.
10 RUCO
11 1110 West Washington, Suite 220
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

12 Timothy M. Hogan
13 Arizona Center for
Law in the Public Interest
202 E. McDowell Road, Suite 153
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

15 Jeff Schlegel
SWEEP Arizona Representative
1167 W. Samalayuca Drive
16 Tucson, Arizona 85704

17 David Berry
18 Western Resource Advocates
P. O. Box 1064
19 Scottsdale, Arizona 85252

20 Lyn Farmer, Esq.
Chief Administrative Law Judge
21 Hearing Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
22 1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

23 Janice M. Alward, Esq.
24 Chief Counsel, Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
25 1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

26
27

1 Steve Olea
2 Director, Utilities Division
3 Arizona Corporation Commission
4 1200 West Washington
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

4

5

6

By Mary Appolito

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Exhibit 1

Tucson Electric Power Company's

Request for Additional Funding

Small Business Program for Years 2010-2012

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Program Details	1
III.	Program Eligibility	2
IV.	Rationale for Increased Funding.....	2
V.	Budget Comparison	2
VI.	Demand and Energy Savings Comparison	3
VII.	Budget Allocation for 2010 - 2012	3
VIII.	Measurement, Evaluation and Research Plan.....	4
X.	Program Cost Effectiveness.....	4
IX.	Environmental Benefits	6

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

I. Introduction

In Decision No. 70457 (August 6, 2008), the Arizona Corporation Commission (“Commission”) approved Tucson Electric Power Company’s (“TEP” or “Company”) Small Business Program (“Program”) for 2008 through 2012. Since the program was actually launched to customers on November 1, 2008, TEP used very little of the 2008 incentive budget before the end of 2008. The decision was made to carry forward the 2008 incentive dollars to 2009 and allow the contractor to promote the program and attempt to gain enough participation in 2009 to provide the two year combined estimated MWH savings. TEP allowed the contractor (“IC”) to utilize the combined total incentive dollars of \$1,518,972 (\$731,640 from 2008 and \$787,332 from 2009).

Participation in this program during 2009 was overwhelming. By December 31, 2009 TEP paid out \$1,150,000 in customer incentives which was the majority of the combined 2008 and 2009 incentive budget of \$1,518,972. TEP certainly does not wish to stop participation or reservations in a program that shows tremendous success, so based on the successful participation in 2009, it is apparent that TEP underestimated the commercial market for energy efficiency (“EE”) upgrades on lighting, motors, HVAC and refrigeration. TEP is therefore proposing an enhanced budget for 2010 – 2012.

TEP respectfully requests Commission to approve 1) increased funding for the Program by a total of \$2,510,676 for the three years from 2010-2012, and 2) recovery of all costs associated with the Program through the DSM Surcharge that will be effective June 1, 2010. The incremental increase in the Demand-Side Management (“DSM”) Adjustor due to the funding increase in 2010 is shown in Table 1 below. Subsequent years would be similar since the budget is only increased by 3% in 2011 and then remains stable through 2012.

Table 1: Incremental Increase in Adjustor for 2010

Budget Increase Amount	Forecasted Total Sales (2010)	DSM Adjustor (incremental)
\$737,565	9,552,111,194	\$0.008

II. Program Details

The Program promotes installation of EE lighting, motors, HVAC and refrigeration. TEP selected KEMA as the IC to deliver the Program in the TEP service territory. In order to minimize the hassle factor for customers and encourage the market to provide EE services to the small business market segment, the program will be operated as an “up-stream” market program and offer incentives directly to installing contractors. In order to stimulate the market, incentives will be offered, which are intended to reduce the measure payback to one year or less. Decision 70457 allows TEP to cover up to 90% of the cost of an EE measure with incentives. The program was launched November 1, 2008 and, with so little time left during the year, there were no customer incentives paid prior to December 31, 2008. The entire spending in 2008 (\$91,109) was ramp-up costs in preparation for program delivery in 2009. The decision was made to carry forward the 2008 incentive dollars to 2009 and allow the contractor to promote the program and attempt to gain enough participation in 2009 to provide the two year combined estimated MWH savings.

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

III. Program Eligibility

Eligible customers for the Small Business Program are commercial customers and schools who qualify for TEP's pricing plan Rate 10 – Small General Service (typically an aggregate monthly demand of 200 kW or less).

IV. Rationale for Increased Funding

Not only did TEP spend 76% of the two year (2008 and 2009) incentive budget in a single year (2009), but TEP also received applications and reserved funding for an additional \$323,000. Because this is a direct install program and rebates are paid directly to contractors we estimate that at a minimum between 80-90% of these reservations will be paid in 2010. The original incentive budget for 2010 was \$822,537, however, total incentive commitments for 2009 was \$1,473,000. This level of activity provides clear indication of future participation based on past experience. TEP does not wish to stop participation or reservations in a program that shows tremendous success. It is important that available funding be increased for 2010-2012 to maintain level of activity anticipated in this program. The only other option will be to cancel program participation based on lack of funding as soon as our reservations hit the original 2010 budget amount.

Additional funding is required to maximize the ability for TEP to meet the following Program objectives.

- Reduce peak demand and energy consumption for small business customers and schools;
- Increase the purchase and installation of EE products; and
- Increase the awareness and knowledge of retailers and TEP customers of the benefits of EE products.

TEP believes customers will get the wrong signal about the importance of EE, if TEP promotes a program for only a few months each year then discontinues the promotion due to lack of funding. The request for additional funding shows TEP's commitment to achieving the maximum energy reduction possible by allowing a very successful program to continue with maximum efforts for success through out each year.

TEP wishes to increase funding availability to allow for unrestricted customer participation during the year. KEMA has provided a budget estimate they believe is reasonable to allow for full-scale operations consistently throughout the years 2010 - 2012.

V. Budget Comparison

The budget shown in Table 2, below, represents the original budget approved for this Program in Decision No. 70457. Table 3 shows the actual 2009 spending and the proposed budget request for 2010 – 2012. A breakdown of the proposed budget detail is shown in Table 6 in Section VII.

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

Table 2 - Original 2009-2012 Program Budget

Year	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total budget	\$1,339,000	\$1,379,170	\$1,420,545	\$1,463,161
Incentives	\$787,332	\$822,537	\$847,213	\$860,339
Administrative Costs	\$551,668	\$556,633	\$573,332	\$602,823
Incentives as % of budget	59%	60%	60%	59%

Table 3 - Proposed 2010-2012 Budget

Year	Actual 2009	2010	2011	2012
Total budget	\$1,719,581	\$2,116,735	\$2,328,409	\$2,328,409
Incentives	\$1,100,000	\$1,270,041	\$1,397,045	\$1,397,045
Administrative Costs	\$619,581	\$846,694	\$931,364	\$931,364
Incentives as % of budget	64%	60%	60%	60%

VI. Demand and Energy Savings Comparison

Information in Table 4, below, shows the original projection of energy savings for 2010-2012 for the Program approved in Decision No. 70457. Table 5, below, shows the new projection of energy savings for 2010-2012 for the Program based upon the requested additional funding.

Table 4 - 2010-2012 Sales, Demand and Energy Savings Projection with original budget

Year	2010	2011	2012
Non-Coincident peak (kW)	1,458	1,502	1,525
Coincident peak (kW)	1,315	1,354	1,375
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	7,261,562	7,479,409	7,595,287

Table 5 - 2010 - 2012 Sales, Demand and Energy Savings Projections with additional funding

Year	2010	2011	2012
Non-Coincident peak (kW)	2,252	2,477	2,477
Coincident peak (kW)	2,030	2,233	2,233
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	11,212,240	12,333,463	12,333,463

VII. Budget Allocation for 2010 - 2012

The annual budget for 2010 - 2012 will be allocated as shown in Table 6 below. TEP believes this budget will maximize the success of the Program.

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

Table 6 – 2010 Budget Allocation

2010 EOY Total Program Budget	\$2,116,735	(%)
Total Administrative Cost Allocation	\$105,639	4.0%
Internal Utility Managerial & Clerical	\$84,472	80.0%
Travel & Direct Expenses	\$12,677	12.0%
Overhead	\$8,490	8.0%
<i>Total Administrative Cost</i>	<i>\$105,639</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Total Marketing Allocation	\$90,000	4.0%
Internal Marketing Expense	\$45,000	50.0%
Subcontracted Marketing Expense	\$45,000	50.0%
<i>Total Marketing Cost</i>	<i>\$90,000</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Total Direct Implementation	\$1,864,041	89%
Financial Incentives	\$1,270,041	68.1%
Implementation Contractor Labor	\$550,000	29.5%
Hardware & Materials	\$44,000	2.4%
<i>Total Direct Installation Cost</i>	<i>\$1,864,041</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
Total EM&V Cost Allocation	\$57,055	3.0%
EM&V Activity	\$45,000	78.9%
EM&V Overhead	\$12,055	21.1%
<i>Total EM&V Cost</i>	<i>\$57,055</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
<i>Total Program Cost</i>	<i>\$2,116,735</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

VIII. Measurement, Evaluation and Research Plan

TEP selected Summit Blue Consulting to provide Measurement, Evaluation and Research (“MER”) work for all approved DSM programs. Summit Blue will provide TEP with ongoing feedback on Program progress and enable management to adjust or correct the Program measures to be more effective, provide a higher level of service, and be more cost effective. Integrated data collection will provide a high quality data resource for evaluation activities.

X. Program Cost Effectiveness

The cost effectiveness of each measure and each Program, as a whole, was assessed using the Total Resource Cost Test (“TRC”) test, the Societal Cost (“SC”) test and the Ratepayer Impact Measure (“RIM”) test. Measure analysis worksheets for each individual measure were provided to Commission Staff (“Staff”) during the original program filing. Since each measure was determined to be cost effective at that time, TEP did not re-do the individual sheets. Rather than repeat the analysis on approximately 50 different measures, this funding request utilizes the ‘weighted average’ numbers from the original analysis for each measure category and updates the information with the new 2009 avoided cost values and the new budget amounts. In addition, TEP and Staff met a number of times in 2009 in attempts to standardize the methodology to determine cost effectiveness. The analysis for this request for funding has been updated with methodologies for avoided cost of energy, avoided cost of capacity, discount rates and net-to-gross ratio’s approved by Staff. Program Cost Effectiveness and the SC Test for 2010 are shown below in Tables 8 and 9.

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

Table 8 Program Cost Effectiveness

Year	2010	2011	2012
Social PV Benefit -No Carbon(\$)	\$2,964,644	\$3,261,109	\$3,261,109
Social PV Benefit -Low Carbon(\$)	\$3,960,328	\$4,356,360	\$4,356,360
Social PV Benefit -Med Carbon(\$)	\$4,478,322	\$4,926,154	\$4,926,154
Social PV Benefit -High Carbon(\$)	\$5,211,803	\$5,732,983	\$5,732,983
PV Program Cost (\$)	\$2,556,434	\$2,812,077	\$2,812,077
NPV No Carbon (\$)	\$408,211	\$449,032	\$449,032

Table 9 Societal Cost Test Results for 2010

	SCT No Carbon	SCT Low Carbon	SCT Med Carbon	SCT High Carbon
Measure Weighted Societal Cost Test	1.16	1.55	1.75	2.04

The new methodology for determination of cost effectiveness is quite complex; the detailed files will be provided on CD for Staff's review. The cost effectiveness analysis requires estimation of:

- Net demand and energy savings attributable to the Program;
- Net incremental cost to the customer of purchasing qualifying products;
- TEP's Program administration costs;
- Present value of Program benefits including TEP's Avoided Costs ("AC") over the life of the measures; and
- TEP's lost revenues.

Although Commission Staff advised the Company to include a valuation of carbon dioxide ("CO2") in the benefit-cost calculations, Commission Staff and TEP also understand it is up to the Commissioners to accept or deny this value. Until the Commission provides a formal acceptance regarding inclusion of CO2 in the calculation of the Societal Cost test, TEP will continue to provide results of the TRC test for Commission review.

In addition to estimating the savings from each measure, this analysis relies on a range of other assumptions and financial data. Table 10, below, summarizes data used in the cost effectiveness analysis and the data sources.

Table 10. Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Assumptions

Conservation Life (yrs):	Varies
Program Life (yrs):	3
IRP Discount Rate per Staff	7.0%
Social Discount Rate per Staff	7.0%
NTG Ratio per Staff	100%

Tucson Electric Power Company
Small Business Program

IX. Environmental Benefits

Information in Table 11, below, outlines the significant impact in environmental benefits this Program will provide, if TEP is able to meet energy savings projections outlined in Table 5 in Section VI.

Table 11: Projected Environmental Benefits

Year	2010	2011	2012
Lifetime Energy Savings (Mwh)	111,648	122,813	122,813
Gallons Water	51,358,044	56,493,845	56,493,845
Tons CO2	213,784,558	235,162,997	235,162,997
Lbs. SOX	240,399	264,439	264,439
Lbs. NOX	290,059	319,064	319,064