

SBC Questionnaire.

1. Most families receiving SBC funded services have achieved the goals and objectives of electric energy reduction. Our role in the assisted home performance program demonstrates these outcomes on a regular basis. We replaced refrigerators, lights, etc.. and have helped hundreds of families reduce their electric bills.
2. SBC should be continued beyond the current expiration date of June 2006. It should be extended for at least 5 years which will allow time for developments in the retail market. The funding level should increase at least by the annual cost of living .
3. The war and the economy created a more challenging financial environment today compared to when the SBC was instituted. More funds are being diverted to support the war and more support programs for low-income families are being reduced. This clearly increases the need for SBC programs to reduce the energy burden on low income families.
4. Programs should be prioritized primarily by input and consensus of NYSERDA program managers.
5. Can't comment
6. Can't comment
7. Generally, this should be evaluated by an outcome audit. However, in the absence of data, the Weatherization and assisted home performance programs have the greatest immediate impact on low-income families. These programs should be expanded since they produce immediate results for the SBC target group.
8. SBC funded programs can be more responsive by focusing more efforts on outreach and education along with financing specific energy measures.
9. SBC programs can be marketed more effectively by including low-income consumers in the process of evaluating any public message. Technical staff tend to make energy related messages much more complex than they need to be.
10. Can't comment
11. Include sub-grantees as well as low income individuals in the evaluation process.
12. SBC should not be extended into these areas unless there is a guarantee that the retail and wholesale markets will devote resources for low income families.
13. SBC programs should be expanded to natural gas customers however, I am not able to suggest the specifics requested in the questionnaire.

14. No further suggestions.

C:/SBCquestionnaire

**Dennis Brunelle, CSW
Executive Director
Saratoga County Economic Opportunity Council, Inc.
40 New St., PO Box 5120
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866**

CASE 05-M-0090

1. To what extent have the goals and objectives established by the Commission been achieved?
2. Should the SBC program continue beyond its current expiration date of June 30, 2006? If so, for what duration should the SBC be extended and at what funding level?
3. Have conditions changed since the establishment of the SBC that would necessitate a change in the overall goals and objectives of the SBC? If so, what changes are recommended?
4. If assuming continuation of the SBC, how should programs be prioritized to meet those goals and objectives?
5. How might the SBC programs be adjusted given the Commission's order, issued September 24, 2004, regarding a Renewable Portfolio Standard (Case No. 03-E-0188)?
6. In what ways might the current SBC fund collection and allocation process be improved?
7. What specific program(s) should be eliminated, expanded or created?
8. How can future SBC funded programs be more responsive to the needs of New York's energy consumers?
9. How can SBC funded programs be marketed more effectively?
10. In what ways can NYSERDA improve its administration of the SBC?
11. Is the current NYSERDA program evaluation process adequate? How might it be improved?
12. Should SBC funds be extended to programs that encompass research and development into retail and/or wholesale electric market competitiveness issues, or transmission and/or distribution of the State's energy resources?
13. Should the scope of the SBC program be expanded to include programs for natural gas customers? If so:
 - a. What kinds of programs would benefit New York's gas consumers?
 - b. Which classes of customers would be served most effectively by a natural gas SBC program?

- c. How should a natural gas SBC program be **funded** and what annual level of funding might be considered reasonable? How might a natural gas SBC affect current electric SBC funding levels?
 - d. What should be the initial duration of a natural gas SBC, and should that term coincide with the extension of an electric SBC, if the electric SBC is extended?
 - e. How might a natural gas SBC be administered and evaluated and how should it differ **from** the administration of the electric SBC?
14. Do you have any other suggestions for improving the overall SBC program that are not addressed by the above questions?

Those persons who are interested in receiving the comments of other parties should submit their contact information, including an e-mail address, for an Active Parties list by notifying the Secretary (at secretary@dps.state.ny.us) and also submitting a hard copy letter addressed to Jaclyn A. Brillling, Secretary, New York State Public Service Commission, 3 Empire State Plaza, Albany, New York 12223-1350, by February 11, 2005. The list will be posted on the Commission's web site located at <http://www.dps.state.ny.us> after February 18, 2005. Electronic service to the parties is permitted provided that the original and 15 copies of the comments are filed with the Secretary on or before March 4, 2005. For ease of review, please respond by question number.

To facilitate distribution of the comments, an e-mail listserver has been set up. To subscribe, send an e-mail to sbc@dps.state.ny.us and type the word "subscribe" in the subject of the e-mail message. Full instructions on using the listserver will be provided in a response e-mail confirming your subscription.

(SIGNED)

JACLYN A. BRILLING
Secretary