



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Low Income Consumer Advisory Task Force

**FROM:** Denise Kuehn and Liz Jambor, Customer Energy Solutions

**DATE:** September 23, 2015

**SUBJECT:** Response to Task Force Information Requests

The following data and information requests were made during the September 18 Low Income Consumer Advisory Task Force meeting. Staff responses follow each specific request.

1. **Question:** Provide number of customers in 2014, not population, broken out by residential, commercial, and industrial.

**AE Response:**

*FY14 – 391,410 residential  
45,436 commercial  
151 industrial*

2. **Question:** Review p. 3 of Lanetta's handout – numbers should be based on burden study. Please provide updates if necessary.

**AE Response:**

*The numbers should be:  
0-200% = \$4,516,186  
201-300% = \$2,445,312  
301-400% = \$2,059,411  
Total = \$9,020,909*

*Based on percentages from the burden study and the current energy efficiency portion of the CBC (0.4 cents) and the quoted average kwh of 955.2 kwh annually.*

3. **Question:** Ask Ronnie how many payment arrangements are in apartments

**AE Response:** *Request has been made for updated data.*

4. **Question:** Reviews numbers for Carol on p. 13 re: survey

**AE Response:** Annual household income for the weatherization survey participants ranged from under \$10,000 to over \$100,000 with 20% of the 86 survey respondents refusing to answer. Based on the answers provided, the average income was shown to be \$31,100, under the median income for Austin. The average number of people in the home was 3.79. If we compared the two averages, we would find that the average reported income for a family of 3-4 was below 200% of poverty.

Annual household income for the residential rebate survey participants ranged from under \$10,000 to over \$100,000 with 23% of the 465 survey respondents refusing to answer. Based on the answers provided, the average income was shown to be \$94,000. The average number of people in the home was not collected for this survey but only 25% had children less than 18 years of age living in the home. This income is appropriate for these programs as the residential programs do not use income as a qualification for participation.

5. **Question:** Chris and Richard asked for the status on any bill analysis we have panned.

**AE Response:** Bill analysis requires at a minimum 18 months of data to cover 2 summers, pre and post. Bill analysis also requires consistency in residency due to the behavioral impacts on energy savings. It is a planned activity that occurs every 2-5 years, based on program changes and updates. We will be scheduling bill analysis per program with the FY16 programs.

6. **Question:** Carol would like the link to ECAD MF data on city's web site.

**AE Response:**

<https://data.austintexas.gov/browse?q=ecad&sortBy=relevance&utf8=%E2%9C%93>

7. **Question:** Could AE answers the questions posed on P.. 9 of version 8?

**AE Response:** As Austin Energy started the program over thirty years ago; these files are beyond record retention and not available regarding any further detail than low income.

8. **Question:** Provide the amount per measure over cost per home – based on data provided by Denise

**AE Response:** AE has provided the Austin Energy Weatherization Program Average Cost Per Home (2005-2015).

9. **Question:** Provide table of cost per measure

**AE Response:** AE has provided the Austin Energy Weatherization Measure and Labor Cost (2005-2015).

10. **Question:** P. 17 – Lanetta wants the history.

**AE Response:** In 1986, the Austin Energy Multi-Family Program performed energy audits for 145 properties to identify potential improvement measures to be included in an official program. Over the next three years, various efforts were made and in 1989, the Multi-Family Incentive

*Pilot Program launched. The pilot was successful and the Multi-Family Program soon became a standard rebate offering, helping residents of multi-family communities in Austin save on their energy bills while enjoying more comfortable apartment homes.*

11. **Question:** They want before and after savings by measure.

**AE Response:** *Many of our programs include more than one measure per project. Savings per measure is not feasible due to the interactive effects of the various measures on one another. While this is possible within a single measure program, it is not accurate to show the same individual measure savings when doing integrated energy efficiency such as in the weatherization program.*

12. **Question:** Tim noted that ECAD increases the rebates by 150% and wanted clarification.

**AE Response:** *There was a resolution implemented in 2009 to 'kick-start' the ECAD compliance rate by offering additional MF incentives for solar screens, duct seal and attic insulation for those MF property owners that complied with the Ordinance. This resulted in an additional 50% to the standard rebate in 2009-2011 and reduced to only an additional 25% above the standard rebate from 2011-2013. These additional rebates resulted in projects in which up to 100% of the installation cost was incentivized. Council suggested reducing the incentive cap from 100% to what is currently 80%. Since, AE has required all MF customers that receive a rebate to be in ECAD compliance.*

13. **Question:** P. 49 - They want to create new EE program, not change ECAD

**AE Response:** *ECAD staff is currently looking at a case study for properties that have improved their EUI through the multifamily rebate program and a recognition program for properties with higher energy efficient levels.*

14. **Question:** Confirm compliance language in ECAD ordinance (p. 50).

**AE Response:** *The ECAD ordinance stipulates enforcement as noted in the ECAD Ordinance ARTICLE 6. ENFORCEMENT § 6-7-41 PRESUMPTION OF VIOLATION:*

*"The record owner of property is presumed to be responsible for a violation of this chapter that occurs at a facility on the property. Source: Ord. 20081106-047; Ord. 20090827-021. § 6-7-42 PENALTY. (A) A person commits a criminal offense if the person performs an act prohibited by this chapter or fails to perform an act required by this chapter. Each instance of a violation of this chapter is a separate offense. (B) Each offense under this chapter is subject to a fine. (1) Proof of culpable mental state is not required for a fine of up to \$500. (2) If the person acts with criminal negligence, a fine of up to \$2,000.00 may be assessed. (C) Proof of a higher degree of culpability than criminal negligence constitutes proof of criminal negligence. (D) Prosecution of an offense and enforcement of other remedies under this chapter are cumulative. Source: Ord. 20081106-047; Ord. 20090827-021."*