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May 25, 2017

Ms. Tishekia E. Williams

Managing Counsel, Regulatory

Duquesne Light Company

411 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Re: Petition Duquesne Light Company Petition for Reconsideration Nunc Pro Tunc

of Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program Compliance Order

Docket Nos. M-2012-2289411, M-2012-2334399

Dear Ms. Tishekia:

On April 26, 2017, Duquesne Light Company (Duquesne) filed its Petition for Reconsideration Nunc Pro Tunc, or in the alternative, Petition Regarding Initial Determination (Petition), in the above-captioned proceeding.

In the Phase II Compliance Order, the Commission adopted the Statewide Evaluator (“SWE”) Phase II Final Report’s finding that Duquesne exceeded its Phase II required electric consumption reductions from low-income customers by 2,542 MWh. In its Petition, Duquesne submits that the correct measurement of its Phase II low-income excess savings is 3,266 MWh, and respectfully requests that the Commission reconsider the corresponding portion of the Phase II Compliance Order. In order for us to complete our analysis, the Bureau of Technical Utility Services requires additional information and answers to the attached questions.

Please forward the information to the Secretary of the Commission at the address listed below **within ten (10) working days** from the date of this letter. Please note that some responses may be e-filed to your case, <http://www.puc.pa.gov/efiling/default.aspx>. A list of document types allowed to be e-filed can be found at <http://www.puc.pa.gov/efiling/DocTypes.aspx>.

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

400 North Street

Harrisburg, PA 17120

**Your answers should be verified per 52 Pa Code § 1.36.** Accordingly, you must provide the following statement with your responses:

I, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, hereby state that the facts above set forth are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter.  I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

The blank should be filled in with the name of the appropriate company representative, and the signature of that representative should follow the statement.

In addition, to expedite review, please e-mail the information to Mr. Joseph M. Sherrick at josherrick@pa.gov. Please direct any questions to Joseph Sherrick, Bureau of Technical Utility Services, at (717) 787-5369.



Sincerely,

Rosemary Chiavetta

Secretary

Enclosure

Docket Nos. M-2012-2289411 and M-2012-2334399

Duquesne Light Company

Data Request

This Data Request is a follow-up to Duquesne Light Company’s Petition Duquesne Light Company Petition for Reconsideration Nunc Pro Tunc of Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program Compliance Order dated April 26, 2017. Specifically, the Bureau of Technical Utility Services seeks clarification of Duquesne Light Company’s calculation of Act 129 Phase II low-income excess savings of 3,266 MWh.

1. Please explain how Duquesne Light Company calculated or determined that 96 percent of the total Phase II multi-family kWh savings are attributable to the low income sector. Please provide all supporting worksheets and data used to perform this calculation.
2. Please provide, in an Excel worksheet, the breakout of common area kWh savings versus in-unit savings for each individual multi-family housing project in Phase II, with all supporting documentation.
3. Please provide a detailed explanation of how Duquesne Light Company verified that occupants of multi-family units meet the Act 129 definition of low income (annual income at or below 150% of the Federal Income Poverty Guidelines, as per the Act 129 Phase II Implementation Order).
4. Please also clarify if the multi-family rebates pay for the full cost of low income measures, or just the incremental cost of the measures.