

1 REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ROBERT T. JACKSON

2 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

3 A. My name is Robert T. Jackson. My business address is Department of Neighborhoods  
4 and Community Services, 4th Floor, City Hall, 414 East 12th Street, Kansas City,  
5 Missouri 64106.

6  
7 Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

8 A. I am employed by the City of Kansas City as Weatherization Program Administrator  
9 within the Department of Neighborhoods and Community Services.

10  
11 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

12 A. I want to add my comments to observations made by Ms. Anita Randolph in her direct  
13 testimony filed on August 8, 2006 respecting Kansas City Power & Light's (KCPL)  
14 compliance with the stipulation and Regulatory Plan approved in Case No. ER-2005-  
15 0329, particularly Appendix C. Ms. Randolph refers to the Affordability, Energy  
16 Efficiency and Demand Response Programs ("Customer Programs") which KCPL  
17 committed to as part of its Regulatory Plan.

18  
19 Q. IN GENERAL, IS THE CITY SATISFIED WITH KCPL'S IMPLEMENTATION OF  
20 THE CUSTOMER PROGRAMS?

21 A. Yes. The City is also pleased to be a partner with KCPL in its efforts to assure energy  
22 affordability for its low-income customers. The City is active in the low income  
23 weatherization program described on page C-1 of Appendix C. The City is one, if not the

1 largest, of the Community Action Agencies referred to in that portion of the appendix. I  
2 will add that while the City/KCPL partnership is moving in the right direction, there are  
3 some minor adjustments that I believe will enhance the process.

4  
5 Q. WHAT ADJUSTMENTS TO THE WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM DO YOU  
6 SUGGEST?

7 A. Historically, the City has been securing weatherization applicants to participate in the  
8 program and then refers those applicants to KCPL for approval based on the applicant's  
9 record of energy consumption. Following those steps, KCPL must then return the  
10 approved applicant list to the City for further processing.

11  
12 Q. IS THERE A WAY TO IMPROVE THIS PROCESS?

13 A. Given the broad concern about energy costs for low-income households, I would propose  
14 that KCPL have its call center refer applicants to the program. This would be very  
15 appropriate for a particular class of applicant who would be eligible for low income  
16 weatherization assistance.

17  
18 Annually, fuel assistance is made available through the Missouri Department of Social  
19 Services with the federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program funds  
20 (LIHEAP). The recipients of these funds must work directly with the utility that  
21 provides them service, and that would be the case with LIHEAP recipients who are also  
22 KCPL customers.

1           The LIHEAP recipients from the previous year are mailed a new application for the  
2           upcoming year. That application is sent about the time when the state receives its  
3           LIHEAP allocation. Largely the same recipients apply for and are granted the limited  
4           federal dollars which severely limits the number of “new” applicants who may participate  
5           in the program. If LIHEAP recipients were directed to the City/KCPL weatherization  
6           program the pressure on the LIHEAP program would reduce and furthermore, new  
7           applicants for those dollars could become recipients.

8  
9           I am confident that KCPL’s call center visits with the same LIHEAP applicants on at  
10          least an annual basis, if not throughout the calendar year, and by means of that contact,  
11          KCPL can be the coordinator in sending those customers for weatherization services  
12          through the City/KCPL partnership. I believe there can be improved benefits to the  
13          ratepayer funded weatherization program by means of KCPL referring its known  
14          customers that stand to benefit through the weatherization program. In the end, this effort  
15          allows KCPL to better target weatherization funds.

16  
17       Q.     HAS THIS MATTER BEEN CONSIDERED BY THE MISSOURI ENERGY TASK  
18               FORCE?

19       A.     The Task Force is aware of the issue and in its report of August 13, 2006, recommends  
20               that

21               [Department of Social Services] should modify its rules to require  
22               that individuals living in owner occupied dwellings who receive  
23               utility assistance shall be referred to the appropriate weatherization  
24               agency for weatherization of their residence, and that any  
25               individuals who refuses to participate, if services are available and  
26               offered, in the weatherization program after that referral shall be

1                   denied future utility assistance.

2  
3           If this recommendation were accepted along with the added coordination of KCPL's call  
4           center as I have outlined it in this testimony, it is my opinion that the benefits of the  
5           weatherization program can be much better utilized.

6  
7   Q.     DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

8   A.     Yes, it does.

Exhibit No.:	_____
Issue:	Energy Efficiency Programs, Weatherization Program
Witness:	Robert T. Jackson
Sponsoring Party:	City of Kansas City, Missouri
Case No.:	Case No. ER-2006-0314

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Case No. ER-2006-0314

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ROBERT T. JACKSON

Kansas City, Missouri  
September, 2006