IV. Program Budgets

Table 6 presents total projected budget allocations require to achieve the projected demand and energy savings for calendar years 2014 and 2015. The budget allocations are a result of the projected demand and energy savings presented in Table 5. The budget allocations presented in Table 6 include incentive and administration costs for each program and customer class.

Table 6: Pro	posed Annua	l Budget Br	oken Out by	Program	for Each	Customer	Class
--------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	----------------	----------	----------	-------

Program Estimated Budget by		2014			2015	
Customer Class for 2014 and 2015	Incentives	Admin	Total Budget	Incentives	Admin	Total Budget
Large Commercial	\$16,330,000	\$2,043,100	\$18,373,100	\$17,225,000	\$1,972,800	\$19,197,800
Large Commercial SOP	\$7,000,000	\$1,034,100	\$8,034,100	\$7,000,000	\$1,031,000	\$8,031,000
Texas SCORE MTP (Commercial	AA AAAAAAAAAAAAA	1111111111111				
MIP)	\$3,400,000	\$366,400	\$3,766,400	\$4,000,000	\$422,200	\$4,422,200
Management SOP	\$3,500,000	\$351 600	\$3 851 600	\$3.500.000	\$261.500	\$3 761 500
Retro-Commissioning MTP	\$1,100,000	\$141,600	\$1,241,600	\$950,000	\$115,800	\$1,065,800
Advanced Lighting Commercial	\$600,000	\$91,100	\$691,100	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sustainable Schools Pilot	\$375,000	\$21,300	\$396,300	\$375.000	\$32,500	\$407,500
Retail Electric Provider MTP	\$355,000	\$37,000	\$392,000	\$400,000	\$45,800	\$445,800
Data Centers Pilot	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$64,000	\$1,064,000
Residential and Small Commercial	\$11,550,000	\$1,294,400	\$12,844,400	\$12,000,000	\$1,387,500	\$13,387,500
ENERGY STAR [®] Homes MTP	\$4,000,000	\$494,500	\$4,494,500	\$3,500,000	\$478,000	\$3,978,000
Residential & SC SOP	\$500,000	\$83,400	\$583,400	\$500,000	\$86,300	\$586,300
Advanced Lighting Residential	\$600,000	\$64,100	\$664,100	\$600,000	\$65,700	\$665,700
A/C Distributor MTP	\$1,700,000	\$254,700	\$1,954,700	\$1,700,000	\$250,800	\$1,950,800
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR [®] MTP	\$500,000	\$32,500	\$532,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Retail Electric Provider MTP	\$2,500,000	\$172,700	\$2,672,700	\$3,500,000	\$302,600	\$3,802,600
Multi-Family MTP (RES)	\$600,000	\$64,600	\$664,600	\$800,000	\$70,200	\$870.200
Pool Pump Pilot	\$500,000	\$54,900	\$554,900	\$750,000	\$69,400	\$819,400
Energy Wise Resource Action MTP	\$650,000	\$73,000	\$723,000	\$650,000	\$64,500	\$714,500
Hard-to-Reach	\$7,000,000	\$787,600	\$7,787,600	\$5,500,000	\$684,700	\$6,184,700
Hard-to-Reach SOP	\$1,750,000	\$260,500	\$2,010,500	\$1,000,000	\$173,600	\$1,173,600
Multi-Family MTP (HTR)	\$600,000	\$63,600	\$663,600	\$800,000	\$72,200	\$872,200
Agencies in Action MTP	\$4,650,000	\$463,500	\$5,113,500	\$3,700,000	\$438,900	\$4,138,900
SUB TOTAL	\$34,880,000	\$4,125,100	\$39,005,100	\$34,725,000	\$4,045,000	\$38,770,000
R&D	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0	\$350,000	\$350,000
PROGRAM TOTAL	\$34,880,000	\$4,425,100	\$39,305,100	\$34,725,000	\$4,395,000	\$39,120,000
FM&VD			61.704.700		Ymperson (* San Y	
						<u> </u>
EECRF PROGRAM TOTAL			\$40,589,800			\$39,120,000

¹² 2013 allocated EM&V Costs are being used as an estimate for 2014, actual EM&V costs will be specified by PUC Staff prior to the EECRF filing.

Energy Efficiency Report

V. Historical Demand Savings Goals and Energy Targets for Previous Five Years

Table 7 documents CenterPoint Houston's actual demand goals and energy targets for the previous five years (2009 - 2013). Each value was calculated using the methods outlined in Substantive Rule § 25.181.

Table 7: Historical Demand and Energy Savings Goals (at Meter)

Calendar Year	Actual Weather Adjusted Demand Goal at Meter (MW)	Actual Weather Adjusted Energy Goals at Meter (MWh)	Actual Demand Savings at Meter (MW)	Actual Weather Adjusted Energy Savings at Meter (MWh)
2013	54.85	96,088.00	195.97	160,106.74
2012	39.20	68,693.82	175.40	130,617.00
2011	39.21	68,694.00	110.24	146,092.00
2010	39.21	68,694.00	120.98	139,665.00
2009	34.09	59,732.00	76.11	125,427.00

VI. Projected Savings, Reported and Verified Demand and Energy Savings

Table 8 breaks out the projected savings, verified savings, and reported and verified savings by customer class for each program. The projected savings were reported in the Energy Efficiency Plan filed in April of 2013. The reported and verified savings are those savings that have been achieved and verified in 2013 calendar year.

Table 8: Projected Savings versus Reported and Verified Savings for 2012 (at Meter)

			2	013		
					Rej	oorted /
Programs by Customer Class for 2013	Projec	ted Savings	Verifi	ed Savings	V	erified
	MW	MWh	MW	MWh	MW	MWh
Large Commercial	185.30	100,407.03	172.44	104,615.15	172.44	104,615.15
Large Commercial SOP	11.17	58,726.00	12.58	68,705.00	12.58	68,705.00
Texas SCORE MTP (Commercial MTP)	9.14	30,431.00	3.27	16,101.97	3.27	16,101.97
Large Commercial Load Management SOP	162.86	651.43	153.04	459.12	153.04	459.12
Retro-Commissioning MTP	1.52	6,658.00	2.06	14,793.66	2.06	14,793.66
Advanced Lighting Commercial	0.19	2,100.60	0.36	2,556.42	0.36	2,556.42
Sustainable Schools Pilot ¹⁸	0.42	1,840.00	0.16	392.34	0.16	392.34
Retail Electric Provider Pilot MTP	N/A	N/A	0.96	1,606.62	0.96	1,606.62
Residential and Small Commercial	14.44	36,909.75	16.65	47,028.13	16.65	47,028.13
ENERGY STAR [®] Homes MTP	6.54	17,195.00	10.80	27,260.05	10.80	27,260.05
Residential & SC SOP	0.69	1,200.00	0.76	1,535.24	0.76	1,535.24
Advanced Lighting Residential	0.13	1,400.40	0.22	2,394.15	0.22	2,394.15
A/C Distributor MTP	1.58	4,988.00	1.90	6,055.49	1.90	6,055.49
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR [®] MTP	0.50	876.00	0.09	199.90	0.09	199.90
Retail Electric Provider Pilot MTP	4.05	7,984.62	2.01	5,192.29	2.01	5,192.29
Multi-Family MTP (RES)	0.30	1,436.73	0.52	1,229.57	0.52	1,229.57
Energy Wise Resource Action MTP	0.65	1,829.00	0.35	3,161.45	0.35	3,161.45
Hard-to-Reach	2.69	7,410.27	6.46	8,854.13	6.46	8,854.13
Hard-to-Reach SOP	1.66	3,391.00	1.50	2,807.86	1.50	2,807.86
Multi-Family MTP (HTR)	0.06	294.27	0.06	147.17	0.06	147.17
Agencies in Action MTP	0.97	3,725.00	4.90	5,899.09	4.90	5,899.09
TOTAL	202.43	144,727.05	195.54	160,497.41	195.54	160,497.41

			2	012		
Programs by Customer Class for 2012	Projec	ted Savings	Verifi	ed Savings	Report	ed / Verified
	MW	MWh	MW	MWh	MW	MWh
Large Commercial	235.02	97,284.80	157.59	84,300.12	157.63	84,386.55
Large Commercial SOP	12.76	61,251.00	12.02	63,738.84	12.06	63,825.27
Texas SCORE MTP (Commercial MTP)	6.94	16,657.00	3.36	11,206.86	3.36	11,206.86
Large Commercial Load Management SOP	212.50	850.00	140.54	421.62	140.54	421.62
Retro-Commissioning MTP	2.00	10,572.00	1.61	6,403.98	1.61	6,403.98
Advanced Lighting Commercial	0.82	7,954.80	0.06	2,528.82	0.06	2,528.82
Sustainable Schools Pilot	N/A	N/A	.0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Residential and Small Commercial	18.99	43,816.20	14.49	37,357.94	14.49	37,357.94
ENERGY STAR [®] Homes MTP	10.35	22,435.00	10.14	26,565.60	10.14	26,565.60
Residential & SC SOP	0.94	2,355.00	0.84	1,495.55	0.84	1,495.55
Advanced Lighting Residential	0.55	5,303.20	0.14	1,554.28	0.14	1,554.28
A/C Distributor MTP	1.99	6,366.00	1.98	6,326.55	1.98	6,326.55
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR [®] MTP	1.54	4,043.00	0.00	2.96	0.00	2.96
Retail Electric Provider Pilot MTP	3.44	1,506.00	0.88	1.76	0.88	1.76
Energy Wise Resource Action MTP	0.19	1,808.00	0.51	1,411.24	0.51	1,411.24
Hard-to-Reach	3.59	13,501.00	3.13	8,888.80	3.13	8,888.80
Hard-to-Reach SOP	1.90	5,018.00	1.97	4,018.91	1.97	4,018.91
Multi-Family MTP	0.44	4,454.00	0.46	2,197.51	0.46	2,197.51
Agencies in Action MTP	1.25	4,029.00	0.70	2,672.38	0.70	2,672.38
TOTAL	257.60	154,602.00	175.22	130,546.87	175.26	130,633.30

Table 9: Projected Savings versus Reported and Verified Savings for 2012 (at Meter)

VII. Historical Program Expenditures

.

This section documents CenterPoint Houston's incentive and administration expenditures for the previous five years (2009 - 2013) broken out by program for each customer class.

Energy Efficiency Report

			moden of		07 - 000	(c1				
Historical Statutory Program Funding by Customer Class	201	Ð	201	2	201	1	201	0	200	6
	Incentives	Admin	Incentives	Admin	Incentives	Admin	Incentives	Admin	Incentives	Admin
Large Commercial	\$17,014,058	\$1,818,911	\$15,322,812	\$1,840,794	\$13,470,138	\$1,371,096	\$11,343,328	\$1,196,594	\$8,287,710	\$1,074,257
Large Commercial SOP	\$6,597,644	\$954,748	\$6,118,676	\$1,113,955	\$7,135,658	\$827,522	\$5,134,285	\$650,943	\$4,643,677	\$658,909
Retro-Commissioning MTP	\$924,415	\$98,467	\$728,186	\$98,953	\$911,694	\$197,955	\$940,596	\$110,454	\$912,365	\$126,804
Texas SCORE MTP (Commercial MTP)	\$2,933,764	\$230,852	\$2,175,141	\$248,361	\$2,573,968	\$173,145	\$2,328,447	\$232,255	\$1,408,282	\$134,974
Large Commercial Load Management SOP	\$5,221,196	\$350,800	\$5,625,000	\$303,369	\$2,848,818	\$172,474	\$2,940,000	\$202,942	\$1,323,386	\$153,570
Sustainable Schools	\$209,070	\$31,015	\$74,196	\$10,803						
Advanced Lighting Program	\$632,539	\$111,449	\$601,613	\$65,353	N/N	N/A	A/A	NA	N/A	N/A
REP Pilot Program	\$495,429	\$41,581								
Residential and Small Commercial	\$9,173,682	\$960,688	\$8,991,307	\$1,094,181	\$6,987,624	\$1,323,648	\$6,326,842	\$576,141	\$4.875.287	\$532,318
ENERGY STAR® Homes MTP	\$3,474,935	318,973	\$3,513,219	\$354,435	\$4,291,355	\$253,960	\$3,475,535	\$315,323	\$3,332,636	\$293,626
CCET Residential Demand Response Pilot	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Residential SOP	\$387,886	\$70,664	\$500,874	\$83,866	\$492,083	\$208,782	\$355,817	\$55,643	\$364,490	\$92,261
Advanced Lighting Program	\$440,152	\$37,808	\$415,568	\$43,568	\$565,282	\$89,277	\$506,617	\$64,903	\$490,095	\$56,180
Multi-Family MTP (RES)	\$252,600	\$46,153	\$347,050	\$50,050	\$15,200	\$2,825	\$18,600	\$2,552	\$175,200	\$21,367
A/C Distributor Program	\$1,548,290	\$171,697	\$1,642,142	\$191,096	\$1,586,152	\$151,498	\$1,780,779	\$116,152	\$345,952	\$42,211
Energy Wise Resource Action MTP	\$749,997	\$47,823	\$538,740	\$47,476	\$0	\$602,370				
Retail Electric Provider Pilot MTP	\$1,568,860	\$131,673	\$1,384,156	\$254,125						
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR®	\$750,962	\$135,897	\$649,558	\$69,565	N/A	NA A	N/A	N/A	A/A	N/A
Community Weatherization (RES)	VIV	A 11 A	444		\$6,664	\$3,975				
City of Houston Weatherization (RES)	W MT	W N	A/N	N/N	\$30,888	\$10,961	\$189,494	\$21,567	\$166,914	\$26,673
Hard-to-Reach	\$7,492,187	\$627,394	\$5,551,440	\$535,801	\$6,411,548	\$699.293	\$7,383,333	S771.337	S9.184.238	\$875.066
Hard-To-Reach SOP	\$933,114	\$173,248	\$1,702,481	\$195,053	\$1,714,238	\$278,988	\$1,647,077	\$200,539	\$2,341,131	\$208,718
Multi-Family MTP (HTR)	\$50,400	\$9,435	\$63,200	\$9,114	\$341,650	\$63,507	\$181,200	\$24,865	\$284,850	\$34,740
Res HTR - Afford. Home	\$62,400	\$13,040	\$49,985	\$5,727	\$41,248	\$0	\$56,153	\$8,781	\$31,607	\$8,000
Agencies in Action MTP	\$6,446,273	\$431,671	\$3,735,774	\$325,907	\$3,612,188	\$146,179	\$3,282,998	\$284,018	\$4,240,000	\$287,758
TDHCA Low-Income Weatherization (SB-712)					\$360,440	\$74,381	\$364,098	\$49,228	\$360,000	\$47,241
Rebuilding Together Houston			N/A	NI/A	N/A	N/A	\$957,927	\$102,171	\$1,052,339	\$148,895
Community Weatherization (HTR)			W M	AN	\$61,890	\$36,915	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
City of Houston Weatherization (HTR)	2				\$279,895	\$99,322	\$893,880	\$101,735	\$874,311	\$139,714
						-				
R&D	\$0	\$1,196,274	\$ 0	\$1,422,482	\$0	\$1,402,351	\$0	\$1,282,626	\$0	\$516,596
	1 T T T T T T T.		and and the statements of the	1999 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	and the second	2000 - 100 -				
TOTAL	\$33,679,927	\$4,603,267	\$29,865,559	\$4,893,258	\$26,869,310	\$4,796,388	\$25,053,503	\$3,826,698	\$22,347,235	\$2,998,238

2012113 Table 10: Historical Prooram Incentive and Administrative Exnenditures (2008

.

¹³ 2013 actual spending taken from Table 11 in the current EEPR; 2012 actual spending from the 2013 EEPR filed under Project No. 41196; 2011 actual spending from the 2012 EEPR filed under Project No. 40194; 2010 actual spending from Energy Efficiency Report (EER) filed under Project No. 39105; 2009 actual spending from the EER filed under Project. No. 37982.

CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC

Exhibit JES-1 Page 41 of 67

41

2014 Energy Efficiency Plan and Report

VIII. Program Funding for Calendar Year 2013

As shown on Table 11, CenterPoint Houston spent a total of \$38,283,194 on energy efficiency programs in 2013. This was \$4,573,806 less than the Company's adjusted budget of \$42,857,000. Changes to individual program budgets that resulted in greater than 10% increases or decreases are described below.

The SCORE MTP spending decreased 46% as a result of \$2.5 million in City of Houston projects being delayed or canceled due to a federal spending freeze. Retro-Commissioning MTP spending decreased 18% due to the identified measures exceeding customer budgets, which delayed project implementation. The ENERGY STAR® MTP spending increased 12% due to reallocation of funds from residential programs that were not meeting target projections and increased builder participation. The Home Performance with ENERGY STAR[®] Pilot MTP showed a decrease of 46% primarily due to lack of customer participation and inability of contractors to identify potential customers. The REP Pilot Program spending decreased 10% due to a delay of REP marketing and a delay in implementation due to cooler weather. The Hard-to-Reach SOP decreased spending by 40% due to project sponsors difficulties with the new leakage-to-outside testing requirements. This also affected the Residential SOP resulting in a 19% decrease in spending. The Multifamily MTP spending decreased by 21% in residential and 23% in hard to reach due to a delay in construction projects. The Agencies in Action MTP spending increased by19% due to additional multi-family weatherization opportunities and additional funds reallocated from other low-income programs.

Table 11: Program Funding for Calendar Year 2013

Program Funding for Calendar Year 2013	Number of Customers ¹⁴	Forecasted Budget	Actuals Funds Expended (Incentives)	Actuals Funds Expended (Admin)	Total Funds Expended	Funds Committed (Not Expended)	Funds Remaining (Not Committed)	Percentage Change From Budgeted/ Actual
Large Commercial	1,125	\$23,016,300	\$16,057,624	\$1,818,912	\$17,876,536	\$956,433	-\$4,183,331	82%
Large Commercial SOP	266	\$7,833,500	\$6,388,069	\$954,748	\$7,342,817	\$209,575	-\$281,108	96%
Texas SCORE MTP (Commercial MTP)	34	\$5,848,000	\$2,544,406	\$230,852	\$2,775,258	\$389,358	-\$2,683,384	54%
Large Commercial Load Management SOP	552	\$6,109,000	\$5,221,196	\$350,800	\$5,571,996	\$0	-\$537,004	91%
Retro-Commissioning MTP	25	\$1,243,000	\$566,915	\$98,467	\$665,382	\$357,500	-\$220,118	82%
Advanced Lighting	19	\$682,800	\$632,539	\$111,449	\$743,988	\$0	\$61,188	109%
Sustainable Schools	3	\$697,000	\$209,070	\$31,015	\$240,085	\$0	-\$456,915	N/A
Retail Electric Provider Pilot	226	\$603,000	\$495,429	\$41,581	\$537,010	\$0	-\$65,990	89%
Residential and Small Commercial	13,460	\$10,811,340	\$9,173,682	\$960,688	\$10,134,370	\$0	-\$676,970	94%
ENERGY STAR® Homes MTP	9,828	\$3,376,000	\$3,474,935	\$318,973	\$3,793,908	\$0	\$417,908	112%
Residential SOP	19	\$563,000	\$387,886	\$70,664	\$458,550	\$0	-\$104,450	81%
Advanced Lighting	n/a	\$455,200	\$440,152	\$37,808	\$477,960	\$0	\$22,760	105%
A/C Distributor Program	9	\$1,681,000	\$1,548,290	\$171,697	\$1,719,987	\$0	\$38,987	102%
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR®	49	\$1,629,500	\$750,962	\$135,897	\$886,859	\$0	-\$742,641	54%
Retail Electric Provider Pilot MTP	3,382	\$1,909,500	\$1,568,860	\$131,673	\$1,700,533	\$0	-\$208,967	89%
Energy Wise Resource Action Program	168	\$817,000	\$749,997	\$47,823	\$797,820	\$0	-\$19,180	98%
Multi-Family Water & Space Htg MTP (RES)	5	\$380,140	\$252,600	\$46,153	\$298,753	\$0	-\$81,387	79%
Hard-to-Reach	1,568	\$7,859,360	\$7,492,187	\$627,394	\$8,119,581	\$0	\$260,221	103%
Hard-to-Reach SOP Program	21	\$1,981,000	\$995,514	\$186,288	\$1,181,802	\$0	-\$799,198	60%
Multi-Family Water & Space Htg MTP (HTR)	1	\$77,860	\$50,400	\$9,435	\$59,835	\$0	-\$18,025	77%
Agencies in Action MTP	1,546	\$5,800,500	\$6,446,273	\$431,671	\$6,877,944	\$0	\$1,077,444	119%
SUB TOTAL	16,153	\$41,687,000	\$32,723,493	\$3,406,994	\$36,130,487	\$0	-\$5,556,513	87%
R&D	0	\$1,170,000	\$0	\$1,196,274	\$1,196,274	\$0	\$26,274	102%
IOTAL	16,153	\$42,857,000	\$32,723,493	\$4,603,268	\$37,326,761	\$956,433	-\$4,573,806	87%

¹⁴ Customer count definitions have changed during the EM&V process, so number of customers for some programs may not be comparable to 2012 program results.

IX. Market Transformation Program Results

The Commercial MTP

The primary objective of the SCORE/CitySmart MTP is achieve peak demand and energy savings by providing K-12, higher education, cities and counties and state governmental agencies a way help to reduce energy costs, offset project costs to move to more efficiency equipment, provide infrastructure improvements, and optimize work environments in their buildings.

In 2013, participation was spread among various entities throughout the CenterPoint Houston footprint; including 20 school districts, 2 private schools, 3 higher education facilities, 5 cities, one county, and one state agency. In 2013, CenterPoint Houston and the program implementer have identified a list of current participants who could possibly take advantage of the higher incentives that the SCORE MTP Lite has to offer to help continue to transition the market. We plan to hold meetings with these participants in 2014.

The 2013 Healthcare Energy Efficiency Program (HEEP) was created to help healthcare providers identify energy efficiency opportunities in existing and newly planned facilities. The HEEP program is designed for healthcare facilities including clinics, small hospitals (< 300 beds), assisted living/nursing care and medical offices within CenterPoint Houston's Service territory. In addition, the program provides monetary incentives to participants who implement eligible energy conservation measures. The program is implemented by Willdan Energy Solutions who provides various technical services including benchmarking, savings calculations, energy assessments and recommendations for operational improvements.

Twenty-two healthcare facilities participated in 2013 which included 13 hospitals, 6 dialysis clinics, 1 hospice and 2 senior care facilities. Numerous energy conservation measures were identified including lighting retrofits, chiller replacements, variable frequency drives (VFD's), energy efficient roofing and operational recommendations. During the first year of the program, only two healthcare facilities were completed. The remaining 20 healthcare facilities plan to implement the recommended energy conservation measures in 2014. As a result, the 2014 HEEP program will benefit from impacts identified in 2013 but implemented and or installed in 2014.

Retro-Commissioning MTP (RCx)

The RCx program offers commercial customers the opportunity to make operational performance improvements in their facilities based on low cost / no cost measures identified by engineering analysis.

In 2013, the RCx program continued to evolve. The existing contract with Nexant Inc as the program implementer was scheduled to expire at the end of 2013, prompting a request for competitive bids. Numerous proposals were reviewed in late summer/early fall, with the final selection going to Nexant Inc. The bidding process and new contract presented an opportunity to introduce new concepts including a performance based fee structure for the program implementer and the RCx Agents, a software based screening process to reduce the cost and time to evaluate potential projects, and the elimination of customer incentives. The program changes also allowed commercial customers with smaller facilities (100,000 square feet and larger) to now participate in the program.

The interest in RCx continues to increase each year as several new firms have been added to the list of qualified RCx Agents, bringing the total to over 30 by the end of 2013. The substantial increase in attendance at the 2012 and 2013 annual kick-off meetings by building owners, management companies, and potential new RCx Agents points to a growing interest in this program. With the newly adjusted program requirements, it is expected that many more facilities will participate in the future.

ENERGY STAR[®] New Homes MTP

The primary objective of this program is to achieve peak demand reductions and energy savings through increased sales of ENERGY STAR[®] homes. Additionally, the program is designed to condition the market so that consumers are aware of and request ENERGY STAR[®] homes and products. Many additional "high performance" home programs have been created that directly compete with the ENERGY STAR[®] brand and many program participants have recently moved to building homes to these requirements instead of ENERGY STAR[®]. CenterPoint Houston has continued to market and support the ENERGY STAR[®] brand and help builders with extra

incentives and program support in order to offset the costs of building an ENERGY STAR[®] home.

In 2013, the number of homes certified, labeled and incentivized through CenterPoint Houston's ENERGY STAR[®] New Home MTP rose from 9,652 in 2012 to 9,828 in 2013, while the program requirements moved away from a minimum HERS index. Also, in 2013 homes had to be ENERGY STAR[®] certified or meet minimum eligibility requirements (0.27 SHGC or below, 14.5 SEER or above and 50% high efficacy lighting or above) to qualify for incentives in the program. If the home met these requirements, incentives were paid based on all measures installed in the home. In order to continue transforming the market while helping builders control costs, an additional incentive was given to homes that were built according to ENERGY STAR[®] Version 3 requirements. CenterPoint Houston and the program implementer also offered sales training to builders to help educate them on the new Version 3 requirements, as well as to offer tips and pointers on how best to sell an ENERGY STAR[®] home.

The Predictive Savings Tool (PST) used to determine the savings achieved in the ENERGY STAR[®] homes was updated to reflect the following:

- City of Houston energy code updates, and expected statewide changes.
- Position the CenterPoint Houston ENERGY STAR[®] New Homes MTP for continued high performance should local builders end their affiliation with the EPA ENERGY STAR[®] New Homes MTP.
- Decouple the PST analysis from the Residential Energy Services Network (RESNET) HERS Index as the primary evaluation driver.
- Reflect improving baseline standards throughout the local market area.
- Redesign incentives structure to pay for performance by focusing on the higher impact efficiency measures.

These updates do not fundamentally alter the methodology used to calculate estimated energy and demand savings for new homes.

A/C Distributor MTP

The A/C Distributor MTP provides incentives to air conditioning distributors who agree to facilitate the installation of high-efficiency (>16 SEER/12 EER) air conditioners and heat pumps in single-family and multi-family homes within CenterPoint Houston's service territory.

CenterPoint Houston and a third party implementer held A/C dealer training sessions with each distributor in order to educate various A/C dealers on how to participate with their distributors. The A/C system baseline is currently a 13 SEER and A/C dealers who try to sell a higher efficiency product (>16 SEER), have trouble upselling when the baseline product is much cheaper. The dealer training sessions provide a separate presentation on marketing high efficiency units and how to find the best market segment for potential buyers to help participating dealers sell units above the current baseline. CenterPoint Houston began the 2013 program year with the same requirements for the 2012 program year (>16 SEER/12 EER). Each distributor was asked for their sales history in 2012 and their sales prediction for 2013 broken out by SEER level in order to accurately distribute funds throughout the program. Once the results were in, the same requirements for the 2012 program year were still viable for the 2013 program year.

The 2013 program had nine participating A/C Distributors and six of the nine distributors exceeded their original contract amount. This verified the decision to keep the 2012 requirements in place and continue to aid in transforming the market to higher efficiency A/C units.

Home Performance with ENERGY STAR[®] MTP

The Home Performance with ENERGY STAR[®] program (HPwES) offers residential customers a comprehensive whole house approach to improve energy efficiency and comfort in their home. Third party contractors are recruited and trained to utilize diagnostic equipment to assess a home's condition and identify potential improvements. Energy analysis software combines the results of the consultation and inspection to provide the homeowner with a detailed report that includes recommended improvements, implementation costs, expected utility savings and expected rebates if measures are completed. The program implementer pays the contractor

incentives, up to \$5,000, which is then used to assist the homeowner with the total installation cost of selected measures.

Although nearly 50 homes benefited from the HPwES program in 2013, the savings achieved did not justify continuing the program. Therefore, the program will end in the first quarter of 2014.

Multifamily MTP Program

The Multifamily Water & Space Heating MTP promotes the installation of energy efficient nonelectric water heating and space heating in multi-family housing projects.

In 2013, the Multifamily Water and Space Heating MTP paid incentives on five apartment complexes with a total of 1,407 units in the CenterPoint Houston service area. Of these units, 144 were classified as Hard-To-Reach and 1,263 units were classified as Market Rate residential complexes. All five of these complexes installed gas boiler systems.

Interest in the program continues to be favorable. There are several potential projects for the 2015 year. To plan more effectively for the 18 month multifamily development timeline, developers, architects and builders will be invited to attend a Multi-family Water & Space Heating 2016 Program kickoff meeting in 2014.

To further enhance the participation of multifamily developers, CenterPoint Houston implemented a new multifamily ENERGY STAR[®] program that offers incentives to developers for the construction of Version 3 ENERGY STAR[®] certified multifamily homes. In 2013, the Multifamily ENERGY STAR[®] program paid incentives to one of the first ENERGY STAR[®] Multifamily complexes in the nation.

Agencies in Action MTP

The Agencies in Action program involves partnerships with a number of community action agencies in the CenterPoint Houston service area that can provide energy efficiency services to low-income customers. This program is designed to reduce the energy consumption and energy costs of CenterPoint Houston's low-income customers. Appropriate weatherization measures and basic on-site energy education will be provided to income eligible residential consumers. Funds are made available annually to non-profit community agencies that can provide or arrange to provide energy efficiency measures such as attic and wall insulation, energy-efficient lighting, ENERGY STAR[®] appliances and other home improvements that can have a significant impact on energy bills.

In 2013, the program implementer contracted with six different agencies throughout the CenterPoint Houston service area. These agencies are Chinese Community Center, Vietnamese Teamwork, Neighborhood Centers Inc., Fort Bend CORPS, Antioch Baptist Church, and City of Houston. The 2013 program required that all single-family homes weatherized must have a National Energy Audit Tool (NEAT) audit conducted by a qualified assessor in order to comply with federal weatherization programs. The program looks to extend the 2013 performance into 2014 by seeking energy efficiency retrofit opportunities in the low-income multi-family residential sector. Collaboratively, CenterPoint Houston and the Program Implementer will continue to conduct workshops to provide the participating agencies training and to establish best practices.

Advanced Lighting Residential MTP

The residential program provides a point-of-sale discount applied to the purchase of qualified LED products at all Houston area Home Depots, Lowe's, Costco, and Sam's Club stores. Discounts were up to \$10 off the retail price per item purchased. Sales data is provided by the manufacturers, so the customer is not required to fill out any rebate forms. Only selected ENERGY STAR[®] products are eligible, available in numerous sizes, styles and manufacturers. In 2013 over 43,000 LED units were sold in over 70 stores. The residential program will continue in 2014 and will offer a larger selection of LED product, as the technology continues to improve and spread into more applications.

Advanced Lighting Commercial MTP

The commercial program provides customer incentives based on energy and demand savings from the installation of outdoor LED lighting fixtures in parking garages, parking lots, and other outdoor locations. All LED products in the program must be certified by Design Lights Consortium (DLC). The DLC is an industry standard used by manufacturers to list those products that have passed the rigorous tests necessary to be considered high efficiency bulbs. For 2013, program participation was excellent; the program was sold out as early as March, with 19 commercial sites installing LEDs. Also, to take advantage of the revised energy efficiency rule, the incentive budget was restructured in an effort to incorporate more projects. Revisions to the new rule created a Winter On-Peak and opened the door for outdoor lighting demand savings that did not exist prior to January 1, 2013. The commercial program will continue in 2014, and will look to expand on the success of 2013.

Sustainable Schools MTP

The Sustainable Schools pilot MT program is a comprehensive energy education and conservation program that targets physical science high school students and teachers. The program was launched in late 2012 to determine if behavioral type programs can provide peak demand and energy savings. In 2013, the third party implementer conducted outreach and provided technical assistance to identified public and private schools. The technical assistance included training teachers and students on energy conservation, the use of energy auditing tools and instructions on monitoring the school's energy consumption. The implementer was also able to meet with new potential schools that have already committed to participate in the 2014 program year.

Energy Wise Resource Action MTP

The EnergyWise MT Program utilizes a take-home kit that contains energy efficiency devices which encourage families to adopt new resource usage habits. A third-party implementer recruits sixth grade teachers in various targeted school districts in the CenterPoint Houston footprint. Results from a take home survey provide projected savings for the installation of CFL's and A/C filter alarms. The incentive budget covers the implementer costs as well as the cost of the kits. In 2012, over 16,208 students received kits and in 2013, 20,593 kits went out to eighteen school districts.

REP Pilot MTP

In 2012, CenterPoint Houston introduced a pilot program for REPs that allowed them to choose from a menu of methods on how they would like to provide verified demand and energy savings to the program. The concept of the program was to allow REPs to engage in energy efficiency with their customers in various ways, such as:

- Residential load management via:
 - Direct load control,
 - o Smart thermostats, or
 - Gas generator
- Residential feedback via:
 - o IHD installation
- Weatherization measures
- LED light bulbs

In 2012, two REPs participated in a demand response program that yielded an average savings of 0.86 kW per home. Subsequently, using the data gathered during that program year, as well as data gathered in a 2011 research and development project around residential demand response, CenterPoint Houston was able to successfully petition a deemed savings value of 0.86 kW per home for residential demand response.

In 2013, the program moved away from residential demand response and instead offered residential A/C tune-up to REP's. The Coolsaver MTP program provided free air conditioning and heat-pump tune-ups to residential and small commercial customers in the CenterPoint Houston service territory. The program was marketed through nine participating retail electric providers and tune-ups were performed by 13 specially trained A/C contractors. The participating Retail Electric Providers included Ambit Energy, Brilliant Energy, Champion Energy, Clearview Energy, Gexa Energy, Green Mountain Energy, Just Energy, and Reliant Energy. The program was implemented by CLEAResult Consulting Inc. who provided technical training, marketing materials and REP recruitment. Consequently, 6,151 A/C tune-ups were performed in 2013. The program will continue in 2014 with a goal of 7,000 tune-ups.

X. Research and Development Results

In 2013, CenterPoint Houston implemented the following R&D projects:

Program: Electric Power Research Institute EPRI End-Use Efficiency and Demand Response Program (EPRI Project 170)

The End-Use Energy Efficiency and Demand Response project was focused on the assessment, testing, and demonstration of energy-efficient and smart end-use devices to accelerate market adoption, which can influence the progress of codes and standards and ultimately lead to market transformation. The program also developed analytical frameworks essential to industry application of energy efficiency, including assessment of resource potential, characterization of end-use load profiles, calculation of environmental impacts, and integration into utility resource planning.

This EPRI program provided the following:

- Objective, independent technical assessment, testing, and demonstration of emerging end-use technologies for energy efficiency and the enablement of demand response.
- A framework to evaluate the readiness of emerging end-use technologies for utility programs, along a continuum spanning technology scouting, assessment and lab testing, R&D field testing and demonstration, coordinated early deployment, and full program rollout.
- Multilevel assessment of enabling technologies for demand response: components and devices, home and building premise application, and program integration into retail and wholesale markets.
- Facilitates the use of behavioral programs to tap into new sources of savings potential by assessing the appropriateness of using a deemed savings approach for estimating savings.
- Evaluates new approaches to understanding customer diversity by building robust and reliable customer groupings and associations.

EPRI published a final report on March 22, 2013 which documented the extent to which interval energy data from smart meters might be used to detect, or even quantify, participation in demand response programs for individual participants. The report concluded that verifying loads at the

interval meter is possible for larger loads but not to the degree of accuracy if direct monitoring was used. Interference from other internal premise loads, size of load, baseline development and meter resolution were factors affecting this ability. Although interval smart meter data provided a practical source of data that can be used to establish baselines and determine demand response participation at the whole home level, the study showed that for larger loads (HVAC, water heaters) participating with simpler behaviors (on/off or fixed cycling), whole home interval data can serve as a useful indicator of demand response participation given a sufficient number of events over which to average. The report noted that traditional smart meter data, which includes only kWh data, typically on hourly or 15 minute intervals, is not useful for assessing participation in fast ancillary services such as up/down regulation or charge/discharge responses. The ability to directly measure and verify the receipt of and response to a demand response signal is lost if the end-use load is not metered. Under such conditions, directly measured demand response impacts for individual participants cannot be determined. However, implied verification can be made through measured data using correlational estimates for cases where smart meter and end-use load impacts for demand response events have been directly measured on a sampling basis.

Program: Residential Feedback Demonstration Program (EPRI Project 182)

This project was designed determine the feasibility of utilizing energy consumption feedback mechanisms to implement a residential energy efficiency program. CenterPoint Houston partnered with EPRI to develop the program. The program was segmented into two phases. In the initial phase, protocols were developed to design an experiment that measures the behavioral impact of energy feedback for residential consumers, along with analysis methods for data collected. CenterPoint Houston collaborated with EPRI, Freeman & Sullivan, and other electric utilities to complete the research protocols and establish standards for data comparison. Key issues addressed in these protocols are methods of feedback, research gaps, and costs of studying feedback mechanisms. The second phase consisted of CenterPoint Houston and EPRI using the results of Phase 1 to conduct an actual feedback research project in CenterPoint Houston's service territory with the goal of evaluating the effectiveness of feedback for residential customers. The CenterPoint Houston project was focused on providing energy consumption

feedback to through the deployment of in-home display (IHD) devices that utilize the Advanced Metering System. The objectives of the CenterPoint Houston research pilot were as follows:

- Evaluate impacts upon which deemed savings estimates can be made.
- Test the IHD as a feedback mechanism, and assess how the technology works with the Advanced Metering System.
- Determine the scalability of an IHD pilot to a large energy efficiency program.
- Understand customer opinions of IHDs.
- Understand the specific behavior changes that occur as a result of the IHD deployment.

EPRI completed their draft report on December 21, 2013. Although 1,600 participants were initially identified for the pilot sample, 800 treatment customers received and possibly installed the IHD device. A control group of 800 customers with no IHD devices were included in the study to derive a baseline, but no energy savings could be definitively derived primarily due to the uncertainty that IHD device connectivity may have not been maintained through the pilot. As a future project, EPRI recommended that CenterPoint Houston capture and provide IHD connectivity data with the smart meter, and based on the rate of connectivity, an impact analysis would be conducted to assess whether there was an energy savings impact attributable to the devices, as well as gaining insight into the persistence of any impacts.

Program: Residential Energy Efficiency and Demand Response (e5) Project

This project, in collaboration with an energy service provider integrated programmable controllable thermostats (PCT) equipped with Wi-Fi technology with weather and load forecasting models to develop predictable demand savings from residential demand response. The program utilized weather data, along with a residential home's thermal envelope to attempt to limit the temperature rise in a home during a demand response event.

The energy service provider conducted a marketing campaign through the spring and summer months of 2012 to the targeted 1,500 home owners who had purchased PCTs with Wi-Fi technology. Weather forecasts were closely monitored during 2012 on-peak months to simulate when an actual demand response would occur. The program initiated four curtailment events

with 145 residents and a total of 205 thermostats. The average peak demand saving was 1.2044 kW.

This pilot was extended into 2013 to continue the study of forecasting and managing summer cooling load that is driven by weather conditions and cooling system technologies. The pilot also merged with the ERCOT Weather Sensitive Emergency Response Service Pilot. To differentiate the previous e5 project from the ERCOT Pilot, the e5 project was renamed as the "SmartHome by WeatherBug." A final report was completed on November 15, 2013 providing the following results:

- The 2013 pilot included 359 participants with 217 activating the Optimization feature which enabled customer thermostat setpoint adjustment using three mechanisms: (1) smart setback gives customers the ability to set what temperature they want it to be at a particular time, as opposed to just the setpoint to end the curtailment period, (2) setpoint smoothing starts a more efficient setback period earlier if it will not result in more than 2 °F higher temperatures, and (3) precooling (not used in this pilot)- decreases home temperature by a few degrees in the early afternoon to cool the air.
- Earth Networks reported that the pilot homes saved 5.24% of whole house energy consumption (kWh) per ft² over the control group of which 3.85% was directly attributable to the Optimization feature.
- Demand response was also part of the Earth Network pilot by including CenterPoint Houston pilot participants in ERCOT's Weather Sensitive Load (WSL) pilot. The WSL pilot included a significant number of houses outside the CNP territory and used a rotating control group from the participant population. The WSL pilot called eight tests events in the summer of 2013 resulting in an average demand reduction of 1.283 kW per home.

Program: Renewable Energy Integration with Smart Grid Project

CenterPoint Houston's involvement in the Discovery at Spring Trails project ended in March 2013, due to the slow housing market for ultra-high efficiency homes.

Program: Green Proving Ground - Collaborative Study with General Services Administration (GSA) and Oncor

The Green Proving Ground Program (GPG) partnership with utilities began in 2013. The basis of the program is to leverage the GSA's real estate portfolio and utility R&D fund to evaluate innovative sustainable building technologies. Evaluations, performed in association with independent researchers and the Department of Energy (DOE), are used to support the development of GSA performance specification and inform decision making within GSA, other federal agencies, and the real estate industry. Only those parts of the GPG program that align with utility goals will be funded from utility R&D funds.

Due to the mid-year government sequester, which directly impacted the GSA, one technology was implemented in 2013. That technology measurement and verification study will be complete in 2014. In the meantime, strides are being taken to gather more technologies and execute additional studies during the 2014 review.

XI. Current Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor (EECRF)

CenterPoint Houston's 2014 EECRF was approved by the Public Utility Commission of Texas in Docket No. 41540 in November 2013 for the amount of \$46,182,789.

.

.

•

XII. Revenue Collected Through EECRF

In 2013, CenterPoint Houston collected a total of \$46,710,051 in energy efficiency program costs through the EECRF Rider.

XIII. Over or Under-recovery of Energy Efficiency Program Costs

In Docket No. 40356, the PUC approved energy efficiency costs to be recovered in 2013 of \$46,182,789 consisting of:

\$ 42,857,000	Program Costs
\$ 4,999,806	Bonus
-\$1,788,119	Under-Recovery 2010 Costs
\$114,102	2011 Rate Case Expenses
\$ 46,182,789	Total

In 2013, actual program costs were \$38,283,194 for total energy efficiency related costs of \$41,608,983. Total revenues collected through the EECRF Rider were \$46,710,051, resulting in overall over-recovery of \$5,101,068.

XIV. Under-served Counties

There were no counties within the CenterPoint Houston service territory that were under-served by the Company's energy efficiency programs in 2013. All of the CenterPoint Houston's energy efficiency programs were accessible to all counties within the Company's electric service area. Appendix C lists the counties served by CenterPoint Houston and the amount of savings each county experienced in 2013 through the company's energy efficiency programs.

XV. Performance Bonus Calculation

In 2013, CenterPoint Houston's total spending on the implementation of Energy Efficiency Programs was \$38,283,194.

Per Substantive Rule § 25.181, the calculation of performance bonus is 10% of Net Benefits. Therefore, CenterPoint Houston will request a performance bonus of \$16,189,299 as part of the 2014 EECRF filing.

Table 12 shows the performance bonus calculation for CenterPoint Houston for 2013.

Table 12: Performance Incentive Calculation ¹⁶

Performance Incentive for Calendar Year 2013	kW	kWh
2013 Program Goals	54,850	96,088,000
2013 Program Savings	195,546	160,497,400
Reported/Verified Total (including HTR, measures with 10yr EUL, and measures with EULs < or > 10 years)	195,546	160,497,400
Reported/Verified Hard-to-Reach	6,462	8,854,122
Avoided Cost	,	
per kW		\$80
per kWh		\$0.104
Inflation Rate		2.0%
Discount Rate		8.21%
Total Avoided Cost ¹⁵	<u>S</u>	201,439,362
2013 Total Program Costs ¹⁶	S	39,546,377
Net Benefits = Total Avoided Cost - Total Program Cost		
Net Benefits	\$	161,892,986
Bonus Based on 10% Net Benefits	S	16,189,299

 ¹⁵ Complete avoided cost savings table will be provided in the June 1 filing of the EECRF.
 ¹⁶ Total Program Costs is inclusive of 2013 total spending for implementation of Energy Efficiency Programs, 2013 EM&V Expenses, and 2013 Rate Case Expenses.

Appendix A: Acronyms

.

.

Acronyms

CCET	Center for the Commercialization of Electric Technologies
DR	Demand Response
DSM	Demand Side Management
EECRF	Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor
EEP	Energy Efficiency Plan, which was filed as a separate document prior to April
	2008
EEPR	Energy Efficiency Plan and Report
EER	Energy Efficiency Report, which was filed as a separate document prior to April 2008
ERCOT	Electric Reliability Council of Texas
HERS	Home Energy Ratings
HTR	Hard-To-Reach
МТР	Market Transformation Program
PUCT	Public Utility Commission of Texas
RCx	Retro-Commissioning
REP	Retail Electrical Provider
RES	Residential
RESNET	Residential Energy Services Network
SCORE	Schools Conserving Resources
SOP	Standard Offer Program

Appendix B: Glossary

Please refer to the glossary defined in Substantive Rule § 25.181.

CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC

Appendix C: Reported Demand and Energy Reduction by County

.

Energy Efficiency Report

Appendix C CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC Efficiency Programs Energy Efficiency Programs 2013 Demand (kW) and Energy (kWh) Savings at Meter By County

.

C. S. M. C. C. C. L. C. L. C. S. C.	地で調整でいた。	ST 748 22 1 1878.	adoration have been	West Strate States	Ashillari Shikanaa	12. Sudder 1. 1 2.0.35	AND OF OF AN	THE SWEET	Color State 1 Sales	17572 "EBS5-326613	出版的差面。"我说我说的"		Marked Shiked
	明治主任。如此	Austin	Brazoria	Chambers	Ft Bend	Galveston	Barris	Liberty	Matagorda	Montgomery	Waller	Wharton	Total
I arge Commercial SOP	kW	0.0	241.2	0.0	1,326.2	386.1	10,450.7	0.0	0.0	37.0	141.6	0.0	12,582.7
	kWh	0.0	1,551,388.0	0.0	9,426,071.0	2,538,476.0	53,683,454.9	0.0	0.0	155,564.0	1,350,050.0	. 0.0	68,705,004.0
	kW	0.0	63.6	0.0	354.5	87.3	2,717.5	0.0	0.0	42.9	0.0	4.4	3.270.1
	kWh	0.0	236,511.0	0.0	1,303,203.0	389,955.0	13,891,949.4	0.0	0.0	229,178.0	0.0	51,175.0	16,101,971,4
Large Commercial Load	kW	1,074.0	1,236,0	0.0	6,860.0	1,312.0	142,452.0	0.0	0.0	107.0	0.0	0.0	153,041.0
Management SOP	kWh	3,222.0	3,708.0	0.0	20,580.0	3,936.0	427,356.0	0.0	0.0	321.0	0.0	. 0.0	459,123.0
Retro-Comnissioning	kW		82.0		167.2	91.0	1,719.0						2,059.2
	kWh		414,132.0		1,826,078.0	604,692.0	11,948,761.0						14.793.663.0
Advanced Lighting Program	kW				141.1		220.8				1		361.9
Commercial	kWh				924,185.0		1,632,235.0						2.556.420.0
Sue taine Na Schoole	kW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	160.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	160.6
	kWh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	392,342.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	392,342.0
RFP Commercial	kW	0.0	10.1	0.0	30.2	4.4	883.7	0.0	0.0	33.9	0.0	0.0	962.2
	kWh	0.0	17,506.0	0.0	62,854.0	11,679.0	1,468,917.0	0.0	0.0	45,666.0	0.0	0.0	1,606,622.0
Finerov Star MTP	kW	1.7	490.5	18.1	5,313.4	32.2	4,364.4	0.0	0.0	580.7	0.8	1.6	10,803.7
	kWh	4,07.1.7	1,240,389.8	49,427.8	13,357,549.2	90,638.2	11,068,723.2	0.0	0.0	1,445,204.3	405.1	3,640.5	27,260,049.7
Recidential SOP	kW	8.4	20.7	1.5	48.8	24.6	650.3	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.5	0.3	758.3
	kWh	31,504.0	49,247.0	3,408.0	102,207.0	56,416.0	1,286,970.0	0.0	0.0	3,689.0	1,504.0	294.0	1,535,239.0
Advanced Lighting Program	kW		7.36		18.34	5.92	173.22			13.65			218.5
(Residential)	kWh		80,695.41		200,953.98	64,826.76	1,898,104.17			149,565.49			2,394,145.8
A/C Distributor Program	kW	4.1	117.6	4.7	489.3	14.4	1,214.9	1.0	1.6	39.9	6.3	3.6	1,897.2
	kWh	13,642.0	377,546.0	15,448.0	1,564,863.0	48,369.0	3,868,328.0	4,434.0	5,047.0	127,685.0	17,143.0	12,984.0	6,055,489.0
Home Performance w/ Faerov Star	kw	0.0	7.6	0.0	10.9	2.3	64.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	85.7
	kWh	0.0	14,717.4	0.0	28,646.0	4,421.6	152,115.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	199,900.7
Retail Electric Provider Pilot	kW	1.3	97.3	2.0	364.4	33.2	1,481.4	0.0	0.0	23.4	5.3	5.3	2,013.6
Program	kWh	3,083.0	238,352.0	5,749.0	877,963.0	91,813.0	3,891,690.0	0.0	0.0	56,150.0	12,827.0	14,661.0	5,192,288.0
Multi-Family Water & Space	kW .	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	. 0.0	518.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	518.9
Heating MIP (RES)	kWh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,229,571.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1,229,571.0
Energy Wise Resource Action	kW		70.4		65.5	34.7	178.9						349.5
Program	kWh		442,006.3		239,038.9	319,716.6	2,160,688.2						3,161,450.0
Hard-To-Reach SOP	kW	0.0	1.9	0.0	72.9	20.0	1,311.6	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	1,411.5
	kWh	0.0	6,253.0	0.0	148,291.0	41,483.0	2,518,572.0	0.0	0.0	9,530.0	0.0	0.0	2,724,129.0
Multi-Family Water & Space	kW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.9
Heating MIP (HIR)	kWh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	147,165.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	147,165.0
Affordable Single Family Homes	kW	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.3
	kWh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83,735.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83,735.0
Agencies in Action	kW		0.0		47.9		4,848.1			0.7			4,896.7
Þ	kWh		0.0		139,199.3		5,758,022.5			1,870.7			5,899,092.5
Programs - TOTAL		Sector Cost	and the second of the second		dortheast build di		adre de superior de la contraction	A STATISTICS AND A STATISTICS	a standard a Standard a standard a st	10.12 Provide Line	计选择的 1 4		in and in the second
Total kW Savings		1,089.5	2,446.2	262	15,310.7	2,048.1	173,565.2	0.1.193.2.2.1	9.1 (1) (1)	£7488	1545	15.2	195,545.6
Total kWh Savings		55,522.7	4,672,452.0	74.032.8	30.221.682.3	4.266.422.2	117.508.700.1	24 434.0 V	5.047.0	2.224.423.5	1.381.020.1	82.754.5	1K0.497 400

CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC

67

2014 Energy Efficiency Plan and Report

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF HARRIS

AFFIDAVIT OF KAREN C. DOMINGUEZ

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Karen C.

Dominguez, who, having been placed under oath by me, did depose as follows:

§ § §

- 1. "My name is Karen C. Dominguez. I am over the age of eighteen and fully competent to make this affidavit. I am the Director of Financial Planning and Performance Management for CenterPoint Energy Service Company ("Service Company").
- 2. I am responsible for ensuring that the costs incurred by Service Company are properly billed to each of the CenterPoint Energy, Inc. ("CNP") business units, including CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC ("CenterPoint Houston"). I am also responsible for providing Service Company information to the Regulatory Reporting Department to support regulatory filing requirements. I am familiar with the affiliate billings included in the Company's application in this proceeding, including Service Company's practices and billing methodologies and how other affiliate costs are charged to CenterPoint Houston.
- 3. Service Company provides a number of services to the various operating units within CNP, such as CenterPoint Houston or the Gas Operations regions within CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp. Service Company costs are billed to affiliates, including CenterPoint Houston, through either direct billings or by allocation. Direct billings represent costs for services incurred directly on behalf of a business unit. These costs are billed directly to the business unit automatically through the SAP accounting system.
- 4. During the 2013 energy efficiency program year, Service Company billed directly to CenterPoint Houston's energy efficiency department a total of \$49K in affiliate expense related to information technology and legal services necessary to operate CenterPoint Houston's energy efficiency program and meet the requirements of PURA § 39.905 and P.U.C. Subst. R. 25.181. No adjustments have been made to these costs.
- 5. The Company's application does not include any affiliate costs that are deemed unrecoverable or prohibited by PURA or the Commission's rules, including contributions to political organizations or causes or legislative advocacy.
- 6. CenterPoint Houston would require the same types of services provided by its Service Company if it were a stand-alone business entity. Service Company services provided to CenterPoint Houston are necessary for CenterPoint Houston's operations regardless of whether the service is performed centrally, as is done at CNP, or on a decentralized basis and residing at the business unit level. These services are not duplicative of any of the services provided by CenterPoint Houston.
- 7. Affiliate costs directly billed to CenterPoint Houston are priced exactly the same as those provided to other affiliates. Each business unit is charged costs based on the same terms.

Such equal treatment is necessary to ensure that all affiliates bear their appropriate costs. For services billed on the basis of time spent, each affiliate is charged the same rate per billable hour for the same service. To ensure all costs are billed each month, any residual unassigned amounts after billing service or billable hour units are billed to the affiliates based on planned activities. In addition, all transactions between Service Company and its affiliated business units are governed by the Service Level Agreements that are executed each year.

- 8. In preparing this case, the Company employed the same methods that it used to prepare its affiliate billing information in the Company's last general rate case, Docket No. 38339, *Application of CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC for Authority to Change Rates.* The nature of the directly billed costs and the methodologies by which those costs are determined have not changed since the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("Commission") approved them for CenterPoint Houston in Docket No. 38339.
- 9. For all of these reasons, CenterPoint Houston has complied with the statutory and regulatory standards used by the Commission to determine the reasonableness and necessity of expenses associated with affiliate transactions and their inclusion in rates. The affiliate costs charged to CenterPoint Houston are of the type enumerated in the definition of Substantive Rule §25.272(c)(4) of 'corporate support services.' These costs are fully direct billed and otherwise comport with the applicable requirements of Substantive Rule §25.272 and PURA §36.058. The affiliate costs charged to CenterPoint Houston are reasonable and necessary and have been priced no higher than Service Company charges other affiliates for the same service. There is no preferential treatment among, or cross-subsidization of, affiliates.

Further affiant sayeth not.

C. Dominguez

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME on this 3 14 day of May 2014.



Notary Public in and for the State of Texas

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF HARRIS

AFFIDAVIT OF MARY A. KIRK

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Mary A. Kirk,

who having been placed under oath by me did depose as follows:

§ §

§

- 1. "My name is Mary A. Kirk. I am of sound mind and capable of making this affidavit. The facts stated herein are true and correct based on my personal knowledge.
- 2. I am Director of Financial Accounting for CenterPoint Energy, Inc. ("CNP"), which is the parent company of the applicant in this proceeding, CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC ("CenterPoint Houston" or the "Company"). I assumed this position effective July 16, 2012.
- 3. As Director of Financial Accounting for CNP, I am responsible for the accounting books and records of CNP's regulated gas and electric businesses, including financial accounting for these business units, regulatory accounting and reporting, property accounting, gas cost accounting, and revenue accounting. More specifically, I am responsible for the books and records that support the schedules used to develop CenterPoint Houston's Application for Approval of an Adjustment to its Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Factor ("Application") in this proceeding. I am also responsible for ensuring that CNP has adequate staff, processes and systems in place to meet the Company's financial and regulatory accounting and reporting requirements as required by the Public Utility Commission of Texas.
- 4. The schedules supporting the Company's Application were prepared from the books and records of the Company and are accurate summaries of the business records upon which they are based.
- 5. The Company's books, accounts and records are kept in compliance with the FERC Uniform System of Accounts, as prescribed by Section 14.151 of the Public Utility Regulatory Act, and meet all applicable requirements of P.U.C. SUBST. R. 25.72."

Further affiant sayeth not.

Mary A. Kirk/

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME on this 22 day of May, 2014.

Alie



Notary Public in and for the State of Texas

STATE OF TEXAS § SCOUNTY OF HARRIS §

AFFIDAVIT OF IRA L. WINSTEN

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Ira L. Winsten

who having been placed under oath by me did depose as follows:

- 1. "My name is Ira L. Winsten. I am of sound mind and capable of making this affidavit. The facts stated herein are true and correct based upon my personal knowledge.
- 2. I am the Director of Compensation and Benefits at CenterPoint Energy Service Company, LLC ("Service Company"), which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of CenterPoint Energy Inc. ("CNP") that provides centralized support services to CNP's operating units, including CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC ("CenterPoint Houston" or the "Company"). In my current role, I oversee a staff of approximately 26 employees comprised of compensation and benefits employees who provide a variety of services on a company-wide basis.
- 3. CNP's compensation philosophy is to maintain the competitiveness as measured from a "total compensation" perspective. This means that we will measure all of the components that make up total compensation and benchmark against competitor companies to ensure that our compensation program is sufficient to recruit, retain and motivate the workforce needed to serve our customers.
- 4. By providing compensation opportunities comparable to those an employee could find in other companies, CNP is able to ensure its customers that experienced and capable employees will be on the job to provide the reliable and reasonably priced energy services they rely on.
- 5. The components of total compensation are base pay, short-term incentives, long-term incentives and benefits.
- 6. In order to monitor and determine market-based pay for its employees, CNP uses a variety of national, regional and local survey data. CNP relies on these types of surveys to establish pay levels that represent pay levels our peers and competitors provide for the positions we staff, and to ensure that we are receiving objective, confidential data reflective of a broad representation of the market.
- 7. The Short Term Incentive Plan ("STI") provides for annual incentive pay based on the attainment of annual financial and operational performance targets, including operating income, efficiency of operations, customer service and safety. Efficiency, customer service and safety provide direct benefits to customers. The corporate and financial goals encourage expense management and operational efficiency, which are critical to limiting cost increases that would otherwise need to be recovered in rates.

- 8. The Company is not requesting any long-term compensation as part of this filing.
- 9. CNP's benefits philosophy is to provide a comprehensive set of benefits to meet employees' welfare and financial security needs in an affordable and efficient manner with the overall value targeted at the midpoint of the marketplace, which is similar to its compensation philosophy.
- CNP offers the following types of benefits as part of its comprehensive benefits plan: (1) Health and welfare plans; (2) Qualified and Non-qualified Retirement Plans; (3) Qualified and Non-qualified Savings Plans; (4) Postretirement Welfare Plans; (5) Postemployment Welfare Plans; and (6) Deferred Compensation Plan.
- 11. CNP leverages its size and the expertise of its HR staff to get the best value for its 9 benefits expenditures. For instance, for all insured plans, CNP uses brokers to ensure that administrative services are competitively priced and periodically solicits third-party bids on all of its insured plans to ensure that its premiums are reasonable.
- 12. The compensation and benefits costs included in the Company's application are reasonable and necessary expenses to operate the Company's energy efficiency programs necessary to comply with the requirements of Rule 25.181. They are also necessary to provide safe, reliable and cost-effective service to the Company's customers.
- 13. The Company's compensation plan and levels have been approved in previous dockets before this Commission, most recently in PUC Docket No. 38339, and they have not changed substantively since they were last approved.

Further affiant sayeth not.

Winsten

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME on this 4/ day of May, 2014.

Public in and for the State of Texas



Exhibit JES-5 Page 1 of 86

DOCKET	NO.	

APPLICATION OF CENTERPOINT ENERGY HOUSTON ELECTRIC, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF AN ADJUSTMENT TO ITS ENERGY EFFICIENCY COST RECOVERY FACTOR

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

OF TEXAS

AFFIDAVIT OF JASON M. RYAN

STATE OF TEXAS	§
	§
COUNTY OF HARRIS	§

Before me, the undersigned authority, on this day personally appeared Jason M. Ryan, who, having been placed under oath by me, did depose as follows:

- 1. My name is Jason M. Ryan. I am over the age of 18 and fully competent to make this affidavit.
- 2. I am employed by CenterPoint Energy Service Company, LLC as Assistant General Counsel.
- 3. I have a BBA in Business Honors from The University of Texas at Austin and a JD from The University of Texas School of Law. Before accepting my current position, I was in private practice, first at a large international law firm and later as managing partner of my own 6-lawyer firm.
- 4. Over the course of my career I have represented utility and non-utility companies as lead counsel in contested cases, rulemakings, investigations and routine matters before the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, the Arkansas Public Service Commission, the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("PUCT"), the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I have represented clients in appeals from decisions from certain of those agencies. I have also represented utility and non-utility companies in state and federal courts throughout Texas and in Arkansas. And I have provided general counsel to several municipal utilities.
- 5. I have been licensed to practice in Texas for more than 12 years. I have also been licensed to practice in the Southern and Eastern federal districts of Texas, the United States Courts of Appeals for the Fifth and Eleventh Circuits, the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and United States Tax Court.

- 6. I have served on the Houston subcommittee of the Texas Supreme Court's Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee, as president of the 1200-member Houston Young Lawyers Association, as a board member for the Houston Young Lawyers Foundation, as a board member for the Houston Volunteer Lawyers Program, as a board member of the Houston Bar Association, as a fellow of the Houston and Texas bar foundations, and as a member of the^bState Bar of Texas' Pro Bono College. I currently serve on the board of trustees for the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society Texas Gulf Coast Chapter and on the board of the Houston Urban Debate League. I also serve as a governor-appointee on the Texas Diabetes Council.
- 7. In 2005 I was commissioned by President George W. Bush as an intelligence officer in the United States Navy and currently serve in the United States Navy Reserve.
- 8. I have both served as outside counsel and hired and managed outside counsel, and have hired and managed testifying and consulting experts.
- 9. As outside counsel competing in the marketplace for about a decade with other law firms for work, I gained general knowledge of the rates charged by attorneys in Texas for utility and other energy clients, and was aware of the rates charged by my prior firms for such work. As managing partner for my own firm, I was responsible for setting rates for all partners and associates, which required general knowledge of the market for legal services.
- 10. As Assistant General Counsel for CenterPoint Energy Service Company, LLC, which is responsible for providing legal services to all business units of CenterPoint Energy, Inc., a Fortune 500 corporation, I am familiar with the rates of a broad range of lawyers, both those at small and large firms and solo practitioners. In particular, I have practiced before the PUCT for more than a dozen years and now am responsible for regulatory matters before the PUCT for CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC ("CEHE") and am therefore familiar with rates charged by attorneys for such matters.
- 11. But perhaps more important than knowing the range of reasonable rates charged in utility proceedings and appeals, I am familiar with how much work is required to perform the services. As outside counsel and in particular as managing partner of a law firm, I was in charge of reviewing millions of dollars in legal fees before the invoices were sent to my clients, making downward adjustments for time

entries that exceeded my expectations, and answering questions raised by clients. As Assistant General Counsel for CenterPoint Energy Service Company, LLC, I am responsible for hiring lawyers and consultants and reviewing, adjusting, and approving invoices from outside lawyers and consultants, as well as budgeting. In recent years I have reviewed and approved invoices totaling more than \$10 million, but only after a rigorous review process. In reviewing invoices from our outside lawyers, I have disallowed amounts as small as a few dollars related to copy charges in excess of \$0.10 per page, to amounts in excess of \$150,000 for work I did not feel was necessary.

- 12. Based on the above experience, I have provided testimony in court, in arbitrations and before the Railroad Commission of Texas and the PUCT regarding the reasonableness of legal fees.
- 13. In Docket No. 41540 I represented CEHE assisted by the Parsley Coffin Renner LLP law firm.
- 14. The primary lawyer at Parsley Coffin Renner LLP working on Docket No. 41540 was Mark Santos. Mr. Santos has been one of CEHE's outside counsel in PUCT proceedings for approximately 6 years. And CEHE is not the only client he represents before the PUCT. Mr. Santos is therefore knowledgeable of and skilled in PUCT practice and procedure.
- 15. Mr. Santos was the lead outside lawyer for CEHE in its 2010, 2011 and 2012 EECRF proceedings. Mr. Santos also was responsible for energy efficiency matters in CEHE's 2010 rate case, Docket No. 38339. Of CEHE's outside counsel, he is the most knowledgeable concerning energy efficiency projects, the matters that will be at issue in EECRF proceedings, and what matters have been addressed in the various previous dockets concerning energy efficiency. Mr. Santos was assisted in Docket No. 41540 by his partner Julie Parsley and associate Evan Johnson.
- 16. The invoices to CEHE from Parsley Coffin Renner LLP for work in Docket No. 41540 total \$199,763.06 and are attached. I personally reviewed the invoices on behalf of CEHE and approved them for payment.
- 17. In addition to outside legal representation, I engaged Jess Totten of Stratus Energy Group to provide outside expert testimony to support the reasonableness and necessity of the cost of CEHE's 2010, 2011 and 2012 programs. Mr. Totten served 23 years with the Commission, including as Director of the Competitive

Markets Division. While at the Commission, Mr. Totten was involved in energy efficiency rulemakings and policy decisions, which made for an efficient review of CEHE's energy efficiency programs.

- 18. The invoices to CEHE from Stratus Energy Group for work in Docket No. 41540 total \$23,394.49 and are also attached. I personally reviewed the invoices on behalf of CEHE and approved them for payment.
- 19. The total of the rate case expenses incurred in Docket No. 41540 is \$223,157.55.
- 20. For this testimony I reviewed the above-referenced invoices taking into consideration the eight factors listed in Rule 1.04(b) of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct:
 - (1) the time and labor required, novelty and difficulty of the questions involved and the skill requisite to perform the legal services properly;
 - (2) the likelihood that acceptance of employment will preclude other employment by the attorney;
 - (3) the customary fee charged in the locality for similar legal services;
 - (4) the amount of time involved and result achieved;
 - (5) time limitation imposed by the client or circumstances;
 - (6) the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client;
 - (7) the experience, reputation and ability of the lawyers involved; and
 - (8) whether the fee is fixed or contingent or uncertain of collection before the legal services are rendered.
- 21. I also considered the factors delineated by the Third Court of Appeals in City of El Paso v. Public Utility Comm'n of Texas, 916 S.W.2d 515 (Tex. App.—Austin 1995, writ dism'd by agr.):
 - (1) time and labor required;
 - (2) nature and complexity of the case;
 - (3) amount of money or value of property or interest at stake;
 - (4) extent of responsibilities the attorney assumes;
 - (5) whether the attorney loses other employment because of the undertaking; and
 - (6) benefits to the client from the services.
- 22. As noted above, I am very familiar with the rates for utility regulatory work (including appeals of agency decisions) in Texas and elsewhere. Generally speaking, the rates charged by any individual lawyer typically vary based on the level of experience possessed by the lawyer performing the work, the size and reputation of the law firm in which the lawyer works, and the technical nature of

the work performed. While I address below the hourly rate charged by the law firms for work in this case, the rate paid is only one of many factors to be considered. Equally important are factors such as the number of hours worked, the complexity of the issues involved, and the experience of the lawyers involved. That is, an experienced lawyer in a complex case with an hourly rate at the high end of the range may be able to more efficiently do the work than a less experienced lawyer with an hourly rate at the low- or mid-point of the hourly rate range, such that the total amount paid at the end of the day is reasonable, even if the hourly rates are at the high end of the range. Similarly, a lawyer working at an hourly rate at the low- or mid-point of the hourly rate on a matter that the total amount paid is not reasonable, even though the hourly rate is low.

- 23. I am familiar with the regulatory and appellate lawyers in the Texas bar, and the lawyers at Parsley Coffin Renner LLP enjoy excellent reputations for providing a high level of quality work on both complex and routine appellate matters. Parsley Coffin Renner LLP works on matters of significant importance to Fortune 500 clients. In my experience, the hourly rates of Parsley Coffin Renner LLP for work done in Docket No. 41540 are consistent with other Texas lawyers performing similar work in Texas. Rates for lawyers at the PUCT, in my experience, have recently ranged, depending on the experience of the lawyer between just under \$300 to more than \$700 (and sometimes more for very specialized subject matters, like tax regulatory work). The rates for work in Docket No. 41540 are in the expected range.
- 24. The rates charged by Parsley Coffin Renner LLP for Docket No. 41540 were the same hourly rates the law firm charged CEHE and its affiliates for other matters I oversaw, including matters for which rate case expense reimbursement was not available.
- 25. In my opinion, the hourly rates charged by Parsley Coffin Renner LLP in Docket No. 41540 are reasonable and in the range of rates charged in Texas by firms with the same level of depth and expertise. Similarly, in my opinion, the other expenses charged by the law firms (i.e. copying, delivery service, etc.) are also reasonable and in line with costs incurred by other law firms providing these types of legal services.
- 26. With respect to factors other than the hourly rate, Docket No. 41540 involved not only a request for approval of 2014 energy efficiency programs, but also a prudence review of CEHE's historical energy efficiency expenditures from 2010

to 2012. This was the first time the Commission had conducted such a prudence review and, for CEHE, the amount under review was significant. The expanded scope of the proceeding, compared to prior EECRF cases, required CEHE and its outside professionals to present evidence not only the coming year's energy efficiency costs, but to also conduct an exhaustive review of CEHE's spend on energy efficiency programs for the prior three years.

- 27. A number of parties intervened and both the Commission Staff and an intervenor requested a hearing. CEHE responded to multiple rounds of discovery from the Commission Staff and intervenors before the parties were able to settle the proceeding without a hearing.
- 28. Based on my experience and after considering the factors listed in paragraphs 20 and 21 above, the \$223,157.55 in rate case expenses incurred by CEHE in Docket No. 41540 were reasonable and necessary for the work performed.

Jason M. Ryan

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME by the said Jason M. Ryan the of May, 2014.

Olice A Hart Notary Public, State of Texas



Invoices received to-date for: 2012 9295 2013 EEPR & EECRF - CAP

Vendor	Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Period From	Period To	Manual Amount	Net Total	Amount Paid	Process Date
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3162	01/17/2013	12/12/2012	12/31/2012	\$2,178.00	\$2,178.00	\$2,178.00	01/28/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3210	02/28/2013	01/02/2013	01/31/2013	\$10,654.50	\$10,654.50	\$10,654.50	33/06/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3222	03/19/2013	02/01/2013	02/28/2013	\$7,135.00	\$7,135.00	\$7,135.00	3/25/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3255	04/19/2013	03/08/2013	03/31/2013	\$5,561.00	\$5,561.00	\$5,561.00	04/24/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3294	04/30/2013	04/02/2013	04/30/2013	\$39,305.70	\$39,305.70	\$39,305.70	5/30/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3326	06/20/2013	05/01/2013	05/31/2013	\$70,763.84	\$70,763.84	\$70,763.84	6/25/2013
Darsley Coffin Renner LLP	3359	07/23/2013	06/02/2013	06/30/2013	\$21,312.77	\$21,312.77	\$21,312.77	7/29/2013
arsley Coffin Renner LLP	3386	08/21/2013	06/06/2013	07/31/2013	\$18,790.95	\$18,790.95	\$18,790.95	8/23/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3419	09/20/2013	08/01/2013	08/31/2013	\$16,349.30	\$16,349.30	\$16,349.30)9/24/2013
Parsley Coffin Renner LLP	3453	10/28/2013	09/03/2013	09/30/2013	\$7,377.00	\$7,377.00	100-775,78	0/30/2013
arsley Coffin Renner LLP	3486	11/14/2013	10/25/2013	10/31/2013	\$335.00	\$335.00	\$335.00	1/19/2013
Stratus Energy Group	CNP-2013-1	05/06/2013	02/01/2013	04/30/2013	\$7,693.62	\$7,693.62	\$7,693.62	5/23/2013
					\$207,456.68	\$207,456.68	\$207,456.68	

05/15/2014

Parsley Coffin Renner LLP P O Box 13366 Austin, TX 78711

Taxpayer I.D. # 27-0934461

Invoice Description: 2013 CEHE EEPR and EECRF

Invoice #:	3162	Matter #:	2012 9295
Invoice Date:	01/17/2013	Matter Desc:	2013 EEPR & EECRF - CAP
Invoice Total:	\$2,178.00	Main Assignee:	Ryan, Jason

Invoice Detail

Fees

.

Performe	ed By	Date	Hours	Rate	Total	Description
Parsiey, Ju	ulie	12/12/2012	0.90	\$475.00	\$427.50	Communicate with client J. Ryan, et al. re EECRF proceeding
Santos, Ma	ark	12/12/2012	0.90	\$335.00	\$301.50	Communicate with client J. Ryan, et al. re EECRF proceeding
Santos, M	ark	12/12/2012	1.60	\$335.00	\$536.00	Research experts/EM&V tests for filing package
Santos, Ma	ark	12/12/2012	2.30	\$335.00	\$770.50	Review/Analyze Staff request for proposal for EM&V expert and options for Company expert re EM&V
Parsley, Ju	ulie	12/27/2012	0.30	\$475.00	\$142.50	Review/Analyze issues re EECRF proceeding
N	Natter Total:	-	6.00		\$2,178.00	

Lawyer Summary

Performed By	Rate	Hours	Total Fees
Parsley, Julie	\$475.00	1.20	\$570.00
Santos, Mark	\$335.00	4.80	\$1,608.00
	Sum:	6.00	\$2,178.00

Expenses

Date

Description

Amount

Total Expenses:

Fees / Expense Summary

Fees:

\$2,178.00

Expenses:

Total Amt Due:

\$2,178.00