



**IOWA
ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL
UTILITIES**

19 October 2010

Ms. Joan Conrad, Executive Secretary
Iowa Utilities Board
350 Maple Street
Des Moines, IA 50319-0069

Dear Ms. Conrad:

The Iowa Association of Municipal Utilities is submitting this amendment to Docket EEP-2009-0001, "Iowa's Municipal Electric and Gas Utilities Report on Energy Efficiency Goals". This amendment provides supplemental information to Docket EEP-2009-0001.

Docket EEP-2009-0001 included the projected spending on energy efficiency for 2010, 2011, and 2012 for all Iowa municipal electric and gas utilities, as well as four non municipal utilities. The four non municipal utilities included in the filing are: Amana Society Service Company, Farmers Electric Cooperative (Kalona), Allerton Gas Company, and the gas system operated by Consumers Energy. The projected spending levels are the best estimates by the utilities of the cost to achieve the energy savings and peak demand reduction levels outlined in the filing. The cost estimates were based on the results of the energy efficiency assessment of potential contained in Appendices 1 and 2 of Docket EEP-2009-0001. The projected spending as a percentage of the 2008 revenue from sales to ultimate customers is presented below. IAMU has not projected spending beyond 2012 for the municipal utilities for two broad reasons: 1) the current slump in energy sales due to the ongoing economic downturn coupled with uncertain but increasing wholesale energy costs, especially for those electric utilities in the Midwest System Operator (MISO) market, make any revenue projections very uncertain, since the majority of municipals purchase, rather than generate, most of their power supply. The uncertainty municipal utilities face in the MISO market is spurring energy efficiency as risk management. 2) Most municipal utilities are small: 75% serve fewer than 1,200 customers. In these communities simply increasing spending on rebate programs (for example) may not achieve the cost-effective progress we seek in a community with a high number of elderly and/or low income residents. These communities may choose to emphasize blitz energy efficiency events and de-emphasize rebates, which could lead to "lumpy" spending levels and results. Similarly, a small community could choose to spend significantly in one year on a

custom industrial rebate program for one big manufacturing customer, leading to significantly greater utility costs and energy savings in that year.

Table 1 shows the projected spending levels in absolute numbers and percentages of 2008 revenue from sales to ultimate customers for the municipal electric utilities. Table 2 shows the projected spending levels in absolute numbers and a percentages of 2008 revenue from sales to ultimate customers for the Amana Society Service Company and Farmers Electric Cooperative (Kalona). Table 3 shows the projected spending levels in absolute numbers and percentages of 2008 revenue from sales to ultimate customers for the municipal gas utilities. Finally, Table 4 shows the projected spending levels in absolute numbers and percentages of 2008 revenue from sales to ultimate customers for Allerton Gas Company, and the gas department of Consumers Energy.

Table 1. Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Afton	\$630,799	\$ 3,928	\$ 4,410	\$ 8,035	0.6%	0.7%	1.3%
Akron	\$1,179,961	\$ 57,979	\$ 70,780	\$ 74,590	4.9%	6.0%	6.3%
Algona	\$6,486,546	\$ 249,688	\$ 214,613	\$ 142,191	3.8%	3.3%	2.2%
Alta	\$1,079,496	\$ 43,292	\$ 29,397	\$ 98,512	4.0%	2.7%	9.1%
Alta Vista	\$150,578	\$ 1,037	\$ 1,851	\$ 2,630	0.7%	1.2%	1.7%
Alton	\$738,999	\$ 4,782	\$ 7,914	\$ 12,701	0.6%	1.1%	1.7%
Ames	\$46,689,947	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,000,000	1.7%	1.7%	2.1%
Anita	\$775,178	\$ 5,680	\$ 8,374	\$ 12,724	0.7%	1.1%	1.6%
Anthon	\$342,802	\$ 7,582	\$ 8,284	\$ 10,918	2.2%	2.4%	3.2%
Aplington	\$634,515	\$ 6,755	\$ 8,933	\$ 12,133	1.1%	1.4%	1.9%
Atlantic	\$5,798,285	\$ 97,377	\$ 82,355	\$ 110,881	1.7%	1.4%	1.9%
Auburn	\$206,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,474	\$ 2,316	0.5%	0.7%	1.1%
Aurelia	\$564,817	\$ 4,533	\$ 8,711	\$ 11,418	0.8%	1.5%	2.0%
Bancroft	\$1,056,963	\$ 15,486	\$ 15,910	\$ 17,029	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
Bellevue	\$1,664,651	\$ 15,530	\$ 23,571	\$ 30,697	0.9%	1.4%	1.8%
Bloomfield	\$2,459,445	\$ 19,588	\$ 27,952	\$ 38,933	0.8%	1.1%	1.6%
Breda	\$338,837	\$ 2,859	\$ 4,221	\$ 6,221	0.8%	1.2%	1.8%
Brooklyn	\$1,171,251	\$ 9,198	\$ 13,710	\$ 19,278	0.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Buffalo	\$388,058	\$ 1,743	\$ 2,568	\$ 5,989	0.4%	0.7%	1.5%
Burt	\$362,757	\$ 2,937	\$ 3,368	\$ 6,551	0.8%	0.9%	1.8%
Callender	\$199,239	\$ 2,489	\$ 2,789	\$ 3,203	1.2%	1.4%	1.6%
Carlisle	\$1,416,235	\$ 14,846	\$ 21,728	\$ 29,054	1.0%	1.5%	2.1%
Cascade	\$1,503,063	\$ 13,161	\$ 17,526	\$ 24,004	0.9%	1.2%	1.6%
Cedar Falls	\$30,469,149	\$ 910,550	\$ 956,078	\$ 1,003,881	3.0%	3.1%	3.3%

Table 1 continued. Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Coggon	\$372,121	\$ 1,645	\$ 2,440	\$ 4,008	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%
Coon Rapids	\$1,450,064	\$ 14,507	\$ 18,745	\$ 24,622	1.0%	1.3%	1.7%
Corning	\$1,413,841	\$ 15,875	\$ 20,339	\$ 29,951	1.1%	1.4%	2.1%
Corwith	\$287,780	\$ 1,838	\$ 2,109	\$ 2,999	0.6%	0.7%	1.0%
Danville	\$581,964	\$ 2,578	\$ 4,471	\$ 9,015	0.4%	0.8%	1.5%
Dayton	\$571,475	2500	\$ 3,732	\$ 7,556	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%
Denison	\$7,460,421	\$ 65,725	\$ 108,765	\$ 174,558	0.9%	1.5%	2.3%
Denver	\$996,960	\$ 7,953	\$ 12,140	\$ 15,597	0.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Dike	\$538,901	\$ 3,171	\$ 3,281	\$ 5,163	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%
Durant	\$1,627,975	\$ 12,272	\$ 16,945	\$ 23,175	0.8%	1.0%	1.4%
Dysart	\$1,003,076	\$ 4,840	\$ 5,536	\$ 9,583	0.5%	0.6%	1.0%
Earlville	\$478,902	\$ 4,270	\$ 6,401	\$ 9,963	0.9%	1.3%	2.1%
Eldridge	\$4,117,075	\$ 22,781	\$ 29,942	\$ 43,912	0.6%	0.7%	1.1%
Ellsworth	\$444,437	\$ 3,267	\$ 4,594	\$ 7,125	0.7%	1.0%	1.6%
Estherville	\$5,075,690	\$ 45,024	\$ 59,235	\$ 80,826	0.9%	1.2%	1.6%
Fairbank	\$642,342	\$ 7,501	\$ 8,962	\$ 11,194	1.2%	1.4%	1.7%
Farnhamville	\$437,557	\$ 2,936	\$ 4,457	\$ 6,903	0.7%	1.0%	1.6%
Fonda	\$369,324	\$ 3,043	\$ 4,489	\$ 6,632	0.8%	1.2%	1.8%
Fontanelle	\$484,390	\$ 8,801	\$ 11,912	\$ 17,248	1.8%	2.5%	3.6%
Forest City	\$3,914,002	\$ 20,690	\$ 32,901	\$ 45,936	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%
Fredericksburg	\$1,330,111	\$ 14,054	\$ 17,593	\$ 23,125	1.1%	1.3%	1.7%
Glidden	\$713,742	\$ 9,171	\$ 13,242	\$ 15,803	1.3%	1.9%	2.2%
Gowrie	\$704,218	\$ 6,473	\$ 10,629	\$ 11,820	0.9%	1.5%	1.7%
Graettinger	\$645,650	\$ 14,092	\$ 14,503	\$ 18,884	2.2%	2.2%	2.9%
Grafton	\$147,221	\$ 2,500	\$ 3,104	\$ 3,482	1.7%	2.1%	2.4%
Grand Junction	\$569,975	\$ 2,261	\$ 3,933	\$ 6,139	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%
Greenfield	\$3,293,182	\$ 23,724	\$ 30,190	\$ 39,814	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%
Grundy Center	\$2,417,554	\$ 20,243	\$ 39,929	\$ 66,216	0.8%	1.7%	2.7%
Guttenberg	\$1,670,001	\$ 22,613	\$ 27,096	\$ 34,477	1.4%	1.6%	2.1%
Harlan	\$5,134,424	\$ 50,000	\$ 63,700	\$ 75,880	1.0%	1.2%	1.5%
Hartley	\$1,311,095	\$ 8,049	\$ 13,321	\$ 21,378	0.6%	1.0%	1.6%
Hawarden	\$2,157,754	\$ 12,885	\$ 21,323	\$ 34,221	0.6%	1.0%	1.6%
Hinton	\$556,347	\$ 7,101	\$ 9,143	\$ 14,945	1.3%	1.6%	2.7%
Hopkinton	\$433,680	\$ 1,953	\$ 3,575	\$ 5,238	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%
Hudson	\$1,195,844	\$ 8,196	\$ 10,939	\$ 17,884	0.7%	0.9%	1.5%
Independence	\$6,495,835	\$ 50,534	\$ 59,909	\$ 83,222	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%
Indianola	\$7,926,793	\$ 87,111	\$ 115,424	\$ 127,638	1.1%	1.5%	1.6%

Table 1 continued. Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Keosauqua	\$1,068,926	\$ 12,073	\$ 11,315	\$ 19,082	1.1%	1.1%	1.8%
Kimballton	\$168,906	\$ 1,036	\$ 1,714	\$ 2,751	0.6%	1.0%	1.6%
La Porte City	\$1,359,143	\$ 6,959	\$ 9,651	\$ 15,911	0.5%	0.7%	1.2%
Lake Mills	\$2,656,571	\$ 27,450	\$ 39,336	\$ 43,075	1.0%	1.5%	1.6%
Lake Park	\$848,132	\$ 4,913	\$ 8,131	\$ 13,049	0.6%	1.0%	1.5%
Lake View	\$1,418,363	\$ 13,148	\$ 17,660	\$ 23,617	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%
Lamoni	\$1,919,710	\$ 11,510	\$ 15,282	\$ 23,177	0.6%	0.8%	1.2%
Larchwood	\$564,454	\$ 3,999	\$ 6,329	\$ 9,410	0.7%	1.1%	1.7%
Laurens	\$1,580,672	\$ 31,048	\$ 31,608	\$ 46,458	2.0%	2.0%	2.9%
Lawler	\$282,113	\$ 3,544	\$ 4,074	\$ 5,345	1.3%	1.4%	1.9%
Lehigh	\$201,261	\$ 1,018	\$ 1,270	\$ 1,736	0.5%	0.6%	0.9%
Lenox	\$1,193,890	\$ 13,906	\$ 18,120	\$ 24,253	1.2%	1.5%	2.0%
Livermore	\$323,565	\$ 6,758	\$ 1,807	\$ 1,906	2.1%	0.6%	0.6%
Long Grove	\$323,814	\$ 2,891	\$ 3,040	\$ 4,249	0.9%	0.9%	1.3%
Manilla	\$601,110	\$ 3,196	\$ 5,290	\$ 8,490	0.5%	0.9%	1.4%
Manning	\$1,701,269	\$ 23,522	\$ 28,773	\$ 36,103	1.4%	1.7%	2.1%
Mapleton	\$951,681	\$ 12,628	\$ 16,205	\$ 21,865	1.3%	1.7%	2.3%
Maquoketa	\$7,461,262	\$ 59,408	\$ 76,311	\$ 117,086	0.8%	1.0%	1.6%
Marathon	\$165,054	\$ 4,423	\$ 5,868	\$ 7,884	2.7%	3.6%	4.8%
McGregor	\$737,966	\$ 4,174	\$ 5,627	\$ 6,952	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%
Milford	\$2,231,838	\$ 166,572	\$ 40,654	\$ 40,654	7.5%	1.8%	1.8%
Montezuma	\$2,784,084	\$ 13,470	\$ 16,735	\$ 21,696	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%
Mount Pleasant	\$6,981,791	\$ 43,948	\$ 70,418	\$ 94,746	0.6%	1.0%	1.4%
Muscatine	\$43,057,101	\$ 897,606	\$ 499,780	\$ 645,005	2.1%	1.2%	1.5%
Neola	\$296,997	\$ 2,912	\$ 3,899	\$ 5,794	1.0%	1.3%	2.0%
New Hampton	\$3,157,144	\$ 41,784	\$ 46,243	\$ 68,731	1.3%	1.5%	2.2%
New London	\$1,471,512	\$ 10,354	\$ 12,766	\$ 15,478	0.7%	0.9%	1.1%
Ogden	\$1,430,934	\$ 14,583	\$ 14,583	\$ 18,164	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%
Onawa	\$1,720,851	\$ 22,385	\$ 29,534	\$ 40,817	1.3%	1.7%	2.4%
Orange City	\$6,010,532	\$ 40,821	\$ 67,553	\$ 108,416	0.7%	1.1%	1.8%
Orient	\$225,082	\$ 2,030	\$ 2,586	\$ 3,880	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Osage	\$4,154,083	\$ 37,474	\$ 47,858	\$ 55,437	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%
Panora	\$1,192,706	\$ 10,022	\$ 14,592	\$ 19,265	0.8%	1.2%	1.6%
Paton	\$190,879	\$ 1,735	\$ 2,090	\$ 2,650	0.9%	1.1%	1.4%
Paullina	\$938,117	\$ 4,393	\$ 7,269	\$ 11,666	0.5%	0.8%	1.2%
Pella	\$16,586,412	\$ 87,459	\$ 112,352	\$ 137,370	0.5%	0.7%	0.8%
Pocahontas	\$1,406,717	\$ 24,113	\$ 24,399	\$ 25,180	1.7%	1.7%	1.8%

Table 1 continued. Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Preston	\$899,927	\$ 8,230	\$ 13,110	\$ 16,393	0.9%	1.5%	1.8%
Primghar	\$785,847	\$ 3,843	\$ 6,359	\$ 10,206	0.5%	0.8%	1.3%
Readlyn	\$447,104	\$ 6,077	\$ 6,822	\$ 8,642	1.4%	1.5%	1.9%
Remsen	\$997,394	\$ 7,047	\$ 11,663	\$ 18,717	0.7%	1.2%	1.9%
Renwick	\$323,390	\$ 1,231	\$ 1,720	\$ 2,706	0.4%	0.5%	0.8%
Rock Rapids	\$1,597,178	\$ 12,703	\$ 21,022	\$ 33,739	0.8%	1.3%	2.1%
Rockford	\$690,199	\$ 4,654	\$ 6,199	\$ 9,659	0.7%	0.9%	1.4%
Sabula	\$428,963	\$ 2,149	\$ 3,403	\$ 6,661	0.5%	0.8%	1.6%
Sanborn	\$1,610,241	\$ 9,222	\$ 15,261	\$ 24,493	0.6%	0.9%	1.5%
Sergeant Bluff	\$2,350,827	\$ 29,363	\$ 43,824	\$ 57,923	1.2%	1.9%	2.5%
Shelby	\$412,897	\$ 2,156	\$ 3,568	\$ 5,726	0.5%	0.9%	1.4%
Sibley	\$2,428,156	\$ 17,649	\$ 31,273	\$ 37,242	0.7%	1.3%	1.5%
Sioux Center	\$7,043,738	\$ 47,655	\$ 78,863	\$ 126,568	0.7%	1.1%	1.8%
Spencer	\$9,031,561	\$ 285,300	\$ 322,059	\$ 487,988	3.2%	3.6%	5.4%
Stanhope	\$280,082	\$ 3,255	\$ 2,147	\$ 2,193	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Stanton	\$552,979	\$ 4,567	\$ 6,736	\$ 9,335	0.8%	1.2%	1.7%
State Center	\$1,590,157	\$ 9,904	\$ 13,453	\$ 17,177	0.6%	0.8%	1.1%
Story City	\$4,257,732	\$ 36,967	\$ 37,873	\$ 44,018	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%
Stratford	\$596,111	\$ 7,497	\$ 7,417	\$ 9,536	1.3%	1.2%	1.6%
Point	\$858,628	\$ 16,098	\$ 15,330	\$ 17,511	1.9%	1.8%	2.0%
Stuart	\$1,293,385	\$ 12,119	\$ 14,608	\$ 21,268	0.9%	1.1%	1.6%
Sumner	\$1,372,026	\$ 17,208	\$ 38,816	\$ 20,546	1.3%	2.8%	1.5%
Tipton	\$3,061,380	\$ 23,285	\$ 33,702	\$ 47,955	0.8%	1.1%	1.6%
Traer	\$1,738,694	\$ 11,033	\$ 18,020	\$ 32,638	0.6%	1.0%	1.9%
Villisca	\$730,191	\$ 12,013	\$ 15,230	\$ 15,513	1.6%	2.1%	2.1%
Vinton	\$2,951,636	\$ 22,676	\$ 25,017	\$ 43,895	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%
Wall Lake	\$745,917	\$ 5,349	\$ 8,553	\$ 9,278	0.7%	1.1%	1.2%
Waverly	\$11,466,065	\$ 197,973	\$ 203,078	\$ 208,459	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%
Webster City	\$11,372,289	\$ 58,863	\$ 81,322	\$ 111,204	0.5%	0.7%	1.0%
West Bend	\$1,070,817	\$ 11,680	\$ 13,540	\$ 11,889	1.1%	1.3%	1.1%
West Liberty	\$3,952,367	\$ 10,597	\$ 12,632	\$ 23,900	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%
West Point	\$1,345,584	\$ 11,768	\$ 14,135	\$ 20,622	0.9%	1.1%	1.5%
Westfield	\$75,696	\$ 790	\$ 939	\$ 1,468	1.0%	1.2%	1.9%

Table 1 continued. Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Whittemore	\$380,743	\$ 1,408	\$ 1,731	\$ 4,353	0.4%	0.5%	1.1%
Wilton	\$2,124,655	\$ 14,764	\$ 22,011	\$ 29,294	0.7%	1.0%	1.4%
Winterset	\$3,824,008	\$ 36,029	\$ 47,960	\$ 64,328	0.9%	1.3%	1.7%
Woodbine	\$1,054,318	\$ 6,588	\$ 10,903	\$ 17,498	0.6%	1.0%	1.7%
Woolstock	\$221,446	\$ 593	\$ 1,658	\$ 2,350	0.3%	0.7%	1.1%
Total	\$380,608,264	\$5,523,763	\$5,688,143	\$7,200,259	1.5%	1.5%	1.9%

Table 2. Non-Municipal Electric Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Amana Society Service Co.	\$7,446,227	\$ 8,232	\$ 9,233	\$ 21,253	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Farmers Electric Cooperative (Kalona)	\$2,141,464	\$ 33,329	\$ 54,499	\$ 62,138	1.6%	2.5%	2.9%

Table 3. Municipal Gas Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Alton*	N/A	\$ 3,892	\$ 7,364	\$ 10,747	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bedford	\$842,193	\$ 7,169	\$ 11,378	\$ 11,703	0.9%	1.4%	1.4%
Bloomfield	\$1,838,527	\$ 11,786	\$ 17,285	\$ 20,386	0.6%	0.9%	1.1%
Brighton	\$355,819	\$ 5,876	\$ 7,219	\$ 7,384	1.7%	2.0%	2.1%
Brooklyn	\$968,933	\$ 6,523	\$ 9,740	\$ 12,700	0.7%	1.0%	1.3%
Cascade	\$1,233,968	\$ 9,411	\$ 14,770	\$ 17,192	0.8%	1.2%	1.4%
Cedar Falls	\$20,415,953	\$ 379,435	\$ 398,407	\$ 418,327	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Clearfield	\$216,305	\$ 1,709	\$ 2,471	\$ 2,754	0.8%	1.1%	1.3%
Coon Rapids	\$1,172,036	\$ 10,469	\$ 12,182	\$ 13,899	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%
Corning	\$1,228,425	\$ 9,953	\$ 15,247	\$ 18,476	0.8%	1.2%	1.5%

Table 3 continued. Municipal Gas Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Emmetsburg	\$3,155,235	\$ 22,815	\$ 36,700	\$ 42,886	0.7%	1.2%	1.4%
Everly	\$608,087	\$ 4,058	\$ 5,226	\$ 5,981	0.7%	0.9%	1.0%
Fairbank	\$540,771	\$ 4,668	\$ 7,149	\$ 9,274	0.9%	1.3%	1.7%
Gilmore City	\$1,559,221	\$ 5,538	\$ 7,061	\$ 7,179	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%
Graettinger	\$548,751	\$ 3,753	\$ 5,089	\$ 6,560	0.7%	0.9%	1.2%
Guthrie Center	\$1,789,382	\$ 8,812	\$ 13,281	\$ 15,811	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%
Harlan	\$3,752,467	\$ 30,000	\$ 41,196	\$ 46,931	0.8%	1.1%	1.3%
Hartley	\$1,007,780	\$ 8,044	\$ 11,800	\$ 13,689	0.8%	1.2%	1.4%
Hawarden	\$1,693,328	\$ 8,733	\$ 13,945	\$ 16,443	0.5%	0.8%	1.0%
Lake Park	\$1,160,217	\$ 5,380	\$ 8,883	\$ 11,239	0.5%	0.8%	1.0%
Lamoni	\$1,002,071	\$ 6,694	\$ 11,153	\$ 13,871	0.7%	1.1%	1.4%
Lenox	\$1,633,621	\$ 4,936	\$ 7,105	\$ 8,971	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Lineville	\$135,471	\$ 585	\$ 977	\$ 1,794	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%
Lorimor	\$196,616	\$ 1,800	\$ 2,509	\$ 3,485	0.9%	1.3%	1.8%
Manilla	\$578,733	\$ 5,568	\$ 8,227	\$ 9,308	1.0%	1.4%	1.6%
Manning	\$1,285,317	\$ 8,981	\$ 10,418	\$ 12,420	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%
Mapleton*	N/A	\$ 2,752	\$ 6,190	\$ 12,429	N/A	N/A	N/A
Montezuma	\$1,298,173	\$ 13,620	\$ 19,894	\$ 22,117	1.0%	1.5%	1.7%
Morning Sun	\$468,813	\$ 2,714	\$ 4,416	\$ 6,173	0.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Moulton	\$260,702	\$ 2,847	\$ 3,795	\$ 4,478	1.1%	1.5%	1.7%
Orange City	\$4,658,269	\$ 28,352	\$ 44,481	\$ 56,393	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%
Osage	\$3,570,129	\$ 25,101	\$ 36,602	\$ 44,335	0.7%	1.0%	1.2%
Prescott	\$118,343	\$ 1,089	\$ 1,332	\$ 1,442	0.9%	1.1%	1.2%
Preston	\$640,607	\$ 5,834	\$ 6,643	\$ 8,144	0.9%	1.0%	1.3%
Remsen	\$991,060	\$ 6,102	\$ 10,117	\$ 11,422	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%
Rock Rapids	\$1,525,271	\$ 17,788	\$ 28,069	\$ 33,201	1.2%	1.8%	2.2%
Rolfe	\$496,614	\$ 5,212	\$ 6,707	\$ 6,956	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%
Sabula	\$442,237	\$ 5,207	\$ 6,515	\$ 6,852	1.2%	1.5%	1.5%
Sac City	\$1,838,103	\$ 11,773	\$ 18,078	\$ 21,525	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%
Sanborn	\$1,873,415	\$ 6,202	\$ 9,975	\$ 13,222	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%
Sioux Center	\$16,989,780	\$ 32,011	\$ 45,511	\$ 54,015	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Tipton	\$2,071,891	\$ 12,516	\$ 19,236	\$ 27,102	0.6%	0.9%	1.3%
Titonka	\$455,783	\$ 2,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 4,000	0.4%	0.7%	0.9%
Wall Lake	\$1,383,722	\$ 2,115	\$ 3,583	\$ 4,363	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Waukee	\$5,556,181	\$ 46,685	\$ 75,579	\$ 97,733	0.8%	1.4%	1.8%
Wayland	\$650,145	\$ 7,123	\$ 7,639	\$ 9,309	1.1%	1.2%	1.4%
Wellman	\$820,954	\$ 9,672	\$ 13,936	\$ 14,445	1.2%	1.7%	1.8%

Table 3 continued. Municipal Gas Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Municipal Utility	2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as Percentage of 2008 Revenue from Sales to Ultimate Customers		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
West Bend	\$1,028,402	\$ 10,129	\$ 13,467	\$ 16,069	1.0%	1.3%	1.6%
Whittemore	\$739,073	\$ 3,479	\$ 4,658	\$ 5,273	0.5%	0.6%	0.7%
Winfield	\$631,349	\$ 4,101	\$ 5,742	\$ 6,702	0.6%	0.9%	1.1%
Woodbine	\$800,898	\$ 5,105	\$ 6,672	\$ 8,162	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%
Total**	\$98,229,142	\$ 839,474	\$1,075,065	\$1,232,099	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%

*Alton and Mapleton began operating municipal gas utilities in 2009, therefore 2008 revenue is not available.

**Totals exclude Alton and Mapleton since 2008 revenue is not available for these utilities.

Table 4. Non-Municipal Gas Utility Projected Spending Levels on Energy Efficiency.

Utility	2008 Revenue	Projected Energy Efficiency Spending			Projected Spending as		
		2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Allerton	\$ 1,953,482	\$ 6,982	\$ 7,603	\$ 7,775	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Consumers Energy	\$ 759,750	\$ 1,605	\$ 1,681	\$ 1,681	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%

IAMU has calculated the levelized cost of achieving the 2012 achievable potential levels of energy efficiency described in the assessment of potential, contained in Appendices 1 and 2 of Docket EEP-2009-0001. The levelized cost for each sector, residential, commercial, and industrial and agricultural are shown in Table 5. The levelized cost was calculated as the cost of the efficiency measures to the utilities, incentive and administrative costs, divided by the life time energy savings of the measures. The levelized costs were calculated at two incentive levels, the low end assumes that the utility incentives pay 50 percent of the incremental cost of the energy efficiency measures, and the high end assumes the utility incentives pay 75 percent of the incremental cost of the energy efficiency measures. The incremental costs of the efficiency measures and administrative costs for calculating the levelized cost are the same as those assumed in the assessment of potential model.

Table 5. Municipal utility levelized energy efficiency cost.

Utility Levelized Energy Efficiency Cost				
Sector	Electric: Incentive covers 50% of incremental Cost (\$/kWh)	Electric: Incentive covers 75% of incremental Cost (\$/kWh)	Gas: Incentive covers 50% of incremental Cost (\$/Therm)	Gas: Incentive covers 75% of incremental Cost (\$/Therm)
Residential	0.012	0.015	0.22	0.31
Commercial	0.017	0.024	0.09	0.11
Industrial and Agricultural	0.010	0.013	0.08	0.11

These levelized costs are applicable for all utilities included in IAMU's energy efficiency assessment of potential conducted by the Energy Center of Wisconsin. The overall levelized cost for an individual municipal utility will depend on the amount of energy savings that is obtained from each sector (residential, commercial, and industrial/agricultural).

The projected energy savings and peak demand reduction goal reported Docket EEP-2009-0001 are based solely on utility programs that encourage customers, including municipal departments, to use energy more efficiently. The energy savings and demand reduction goals do not include any savings from any load management programs or supply side efficiency projects the utilities may undertake. Any load management programs or supply side efficiency projects would result in additional energy savings and peak demand reduction.

WHOLE TOWN AUDIT SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Small communities face barriers to adopting energy efficiency, such as higher percentages of low- and fixed-income residents, few housing starts, and fewer industries.¹ For example, a review of 2006 MidAmerican program results shows that 33.7% of their total expenditures for residential energy efficiency programs were for their new construction programs.²

MidAmerican serves some of the most populous and rapidly growing areas in Iowa, such as Des Moines, the Quad Cities, and Iowa City. Nearly 20 percent of all homes in Iowa City were built during the 1990s. Meanwhile, many smaller communities show percentages of new home construction that are 5% or lower. Adopting the same programs used by the largest utilities may not be as cost-effective or target the same level of customers. Other factors that may affect energy efficiency success rates in small communities include distances to trade allies and professionals with advanced energy management training, limited access to retailers with Energy Star-rated appliances, or other energy efficient equipment, size and composition of the customer base, and inadequate staff resources or high staff turnover rates. For example, IAMU has recommended that member electric utilities join the *Change A Light, Change The World* campaign, which is offered through participating retailers in many states. In some cases the nearest participating retailer is located over 30 miles away, but there are local, nonparticipating retailers selling compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFLs). This is just one example of a limiting factor that makes Change A Light harder to adopt in some of Iowa's smallest communities.

The goal of Whole Town Audit is to assist small communities, in developing and implementing comprehensive/strategic energy plans, by inventorying and mobilizing community resources, and identifying and overcoming barriers for implementing energy efficiency.

Seventeen communities in Iowa have received community grants from the Power Fund of the Office of Energy Independence to undertake these tasks in the Whole Town Audit Project. Six of these communities, Brighton, Gilmore City, Graettinger, Lineville, Moulton, Woodbine,

¹ Much of the savings from energy efficiency programs are captured in programs for new construction and high volume industrial users.

² Filing to the Iowa Utilities Board, Docket No. NOI-07-2, July 27, 2007.

received grants to work with their gas utilities on energy efficiency. Ten of these communities, Anthon, Auburn, Breda, Buffalo, Earlville, Glidden, Rockford, Stratford, Villisca, and Westfield received grants to work with their electric utilities, and Sabula is working with both the electric and gas utility. The communities working with their electric utilities also received a DEED grant from the American Public Power Association.

The seventeen communities in the project range in size from under 200 residents to just over 1500 residents. Median age in these communities ranges from 35 years to 45 years old, reflecting an aging population. Median household income ranges from \$29,000 to \$56,000, while median house value ranges from \$42,000 to \$110,000. Five of these communities have greater than 10% of their population below the poverty rate.

PROCESS

Initially, communities were asked to form a committee to advise the development of their energy efficiency plans. Committee members might include council members, city clerks, and engaged citizens. The process of forming these committees was determined by the individual city. IAMU staff met with these committees throughout the month of April 2010 to gain input into each city's priorities, objectives, resources, and limitations. Each city provided IAMU with recent community energy use. Information on rates, energy suppliers, local retail suppliers and HVAC contractors was also provided. Restaurants, grocery stores, and schools, were among the common threads connecting the seventeen communities. While not all of the communities contained each of these facilities, all were identified as desirable or vital to the community. Based on the output of these meetings and the data collected, IAMU, in conjunction with each city, identified facilities to undergo energy audits. These facilities were audited by IAMU and The Energy Group throughout the summer of 2010. In total, 196 audits were conducted on commercial and municipal facilities. In addition, communities hired auditors to conduct residential audits for a portion of their customer base. The collected data was analyzed and recommendations were made based on the conditions observed, implementation costs, and the payback period for proposed measures.

In addition to identifying audit priorities, community energy efficiency events were organized. Events included educational displays and booths at other organized community events, where energy efficiency measures such as low-flow showerheads or compact fluorescent light bulbs were distributed to community residents. Some communities instead chose to put on a school education event targeted to elementary science students, and one community implemented a weatherization project, where a portion of residences were weatherized with the assistance of the local community action agency.

Interim meetings were set up for city clerks and interested council people and superintendents to attend a joint meeting at IAMU's facility. This meeting was intended as a forum for each community to provide input and share advice on both problems and successes towns were having with the grant. Communities found this interaction particularly beneficial for the planning of future community energy events, and implementing energy efficiency programs.

OUTCOMES

Outcomes of Whole Town Audit will include a community energy plan for each community involved in the project. The plans, which will be delivered to the communities in November 2010, contain audit recommendations for municipal buildings and a portion of the commercial and residential sectors. Plans also contain information on community demographics, local resources for energy efficiency, and identified barriers. The project has also provided education for residents on energy efficiency. In addition, Whole Town Audit has helped each town with meeting the energy efficiency goals that they filed with the Iowa Utilities Board on December 31, 2009, through delivery of energy efficiency measures to customers, as well as improvements at municipal facilities.