Exhibit No.:

Issue: Low-Income Weatherization, DSM

Reporting

Witness: Nathaniel W. Hackney

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: Empire District Electric

Case No. ER-2016-0023

Date Testimony Prepared: May 2016

Before the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri

Surrebuttal Testimony

of

Nathaniel W. Hackney

May 2016



SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY ON BEHALF OF THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CASE NO. ER-2016-0023

1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

- 2 A. My name is Nathaniel W. Hackney. My business address is 602 S. Joplin Avenue, Joplin,
- 3 Missouri.

4 Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

- 5 A. I am employed by The Empire District Electric Company ("Empire", "EDE" or
- 6 "Company"). My title is Energy Efficiency Coordinator.
- 7 Q. ARE YOU THE SAME NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY THAT FILED DIRECT AND
- 8 REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS RATE CASE BEFORE THE MISSOURI
- 9 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ("COMMISSION") ON BEHALF OF EMPIRE?
- 10 A. Yes.

11 O. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

- 12 A. In my surrebuttal testimony, I will respond to the rebuttal testimony of Commission Staff
- 13 ("Staff") witness Kory Bousted on the issue of Empire's dispersal of funds to Community
- 14 Action Agencies ("CAP agencies" or "CAPs") for Empire's Low-income Weatherization
- Program. I will also respond to rebuttal testimony of Missouri Department of Economic
- Development Division of Energy ("DE") witness Sharlett E. Kroll, which alleges the
- presence of "frequent data errors" in quarterly presentations to Empire's Demand-Side
- 18 Management Stakeholder Advisory Group ("DSMAG").

1 Q. HAS EMPIRE PROPOSED ANY CHANGES TO THE BUDGET FOR ITS LOW

2 INCOME WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM?

- 3 A. Yes. In the direct testimony of Empire witness W. Scott Keith, Empire proposes increasing
- 4 the budget of the low-income weatherization program from the current level of \$225,000
- 5 per year to \$250,000 per year¹.

6 Q. WAS THIS REQUEST SUPPORTED BY STAFF?

7 A. No.

8 Q. WHY DOES STAFF OPPOSE EMPIRE'S PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE

9 BUDGET FOR THE LOW-INCOME WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM?

10 A. In her rebuttal testimony, Staff witness Bousted stated, "the Company is not currently spending the annual ratepayer-funded amount of \$225,000²."

12 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THIS IS A FAIR AND ACCURATE STATEMENT?

13 No. This is a timing issue, not a funding issue. Empire does not control the pace at which A. 14 the CAPs weatherize Empire customers' homes in their areas. This directly impacts the 15 pace at which Empire weatherization funds are used and disbursed. Empire distributes funds to CAP agencies for weatherization of homes—which the agencies often combine 16 17 with other funding sources—to complete weatherization jobs in accordance with the 18 standards set by the U.S. Department of Energy. Generally, Empire distributes its 19 weatherization funds in 25-percent installments, which are disbursed to the CAPs when 20 half of the previous Empire installment has been reported as spent. The pace at which the 21 CAP agency uses Empire disbursements to weatherize Empire's customers' homes directly 22 impacts the timing of Empire's disbursements to the CAP.

¹ See ER-2016-0023 Direct Testimony of W. Scott Keith, p. 11, 19-24.

² See ER-2016-0023 Rebuttal Testimony of Kory Bousted, p. 2, 6-7

- 1 O. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT EMPIRE'S CURRENT PROCESS FOR DISPERSAL
- 2 OF FUNDING HAS NEGATIVELY AFFECTED THE ABILITY OF THE CAP
- 3 AGENCIES TO SPEND THEIR ALLOCATIONS OF THE BUDGET?
- 4 A. No. For example, over the last three years, one of Empire's three CAP agencies has
- 5 consistently spent its entire allocation of the program budget, one has consistently spent
- 6 about half of its allocation, and one has consistently spent none of its allocation. The timing
- of program expenditures is directly affected by the pace of weatherization work at the CAP
- 8 agency, not the timing of the distribution of Empire's funds.
- 9 Q. PLEASE STATE WHICH PORTIONS OF THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DE
- 10 WITNESS SHARLET E. KROLL YOU WISH TO ADDRESS.
- 11 A. In her rebuttal testimony, Ms. Kroll indicates that DE has "concerns about the frequent data
- errors appearing in DSMAG reports.³"
- 13 Q. DOES MS. KROLL DESCRIBE THESE ALLEGED ERRORS IN HER REBUTTAL
- 14 **TESTIMONY?**
- 15 A. No. There is no further mention or description of these alleged errors in her rebuttal
- 16 testimony.
- 17 Q. DOES MS. KROLL SUGGEST HOW EMPIRE CAN IMPROVE THE
- 18 **REPORTING PROCESS?**
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE DSMAG MEETINGS THEMSELVES AND THE
- 21 STAKEHOLDER PROCESS ARE VALUABLE?

³ See ER-2016-0023 Rebuttal Testimony of Sharlet E. Kroll, p. 5, 20.

NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

- 1 A. Yes, they are a valuable channel by which stakeholders provide feedback and make
- 2 suggestions for ways Empire can potentially improve the processes, implementation, and
- 3 reporting related to its energy efficiency programs.
- 4 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
- 5 A. Yes.

AFFIDAVIT OF NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY

STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF JASPER)
On the <u>13th</u> day of May, 2016, before me appeared Nathaniel W. Hackney to me personally known, who, being by me first duly sworn, states that he is the Energy Efficiency Coordinator of The Empire District Electric Company and acknowledges that he has read the above and foregoing document and believes that the statements therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.
Nathaniel W. Hackney
u
Subscribed and sworn to before me this <u>13th</u> day of May, 2016.
ANGELA M. CLOVEN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Jasper County My Commission Expires: November 01, 2019 Commission Number: 15262659 Notary Public
My commission expires: 11/p1/15