

BLACK HILLS POWER, INC.  
d/b/a BLACK HILLS ENERGY  
EL17-026

REQUEST DATE : 06/29/17

RESPONSE DATE : 07/18/17

REQUESTING PARTY: Staff

---

**SDPUC Request No. 1.4:**

Refer to Exhibit A. Regarding the Whole House Efficiency Program on page 7:

- a) Explain the change from the program being provided at no cost to the customer to a cost of \$50 to the customer.
- b) Explain why BHP expects higher participation levels with a cost of \$50 to the customer versus the previous participation levels when it was provided at no cost to the customer.
- c) Explain the decrease in estimated savings compared to the PY2016 estimate.

**Response to SDPUC Request No. 1.4:**

- a) The current plan does state that there is no charge for the audit. However, when BHP transitioned to a joint sponsored program with MDU, a \$50 fee was implemented to remain consistent with MDU's current fee structure.
- b) The previous program did include a \$50 charge and the goal was 125 per year (goal was very aggressive). The current model actually used a new participation level of 30 per year and this is in line with the current level of 33 completed in the current Plan Year. Unfortunately, the written report for the Plan shows 150 participants (the report used the number of LEDs installed per audit of 5 per household). The goal of 30 per year should be met with BHP and MDU promoting the measure. BHP also offers home site audits at all outreach efforts such as annual HomeShow Events.
- c) The participation amount in the PY2016 estimate was 125 compared to 30 in the new Plan. The decrease in participation results in a decrease in estimated savings.

**Attachments:**

None

**Responder:**

Don Martinez