

Energy Technologies Area Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Energy Efficiency Reporting Tool for Public Power Utilities

Alex Hoffman, ¹ Greg Rybka, ² David Shephard-Gaw, ³ Ian Hoffman, ² Charles Goldman, ² and Lisa Schwartz²



American
 Public Power
 Association

Webinar March 14, 2016

¹American Public Power Association



²Electricity Markets and Policy Group

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

³Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County, WA (Cowlitz PUD)

Project funded by DOE Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, National Electricity Delivery Division

Public Power Utilities – Innovative and Diverse





APPA's Efforts in Energy Efficiency

- DSMBenchmarker
 - Currently being updated
- APPA's Demonstration of Energy & Efficiency Developments (DEED) program
 - Grant funding for energy efficiency research by member utilities
- APPA Energy Efficiency Resource Central (EERC)
- Energy Efficiency/Demand-Side Management Survey
 - Will be released this year!



EE Reporting: Background

- Public power utilities regularly report what they spend and save to their city council or board.
- These reports typically include:
 - a narrative that highlights achievements of the utility's portfolio of efficiency programs
 - tables and charts that quantify spending, savings, and achievement of other objectives
- Issues:
 - Energy efficiency reporting practices vary widely among utilities and other program administrators and states.
 - Many studies of reporting practices for efficiency programs have identified issues of <u>consistency</u>, rigor and <u>completeness</u>
 - Challenging to determine whether a program administrator is achieving its energy efficiency goals

EE Reporting: Current Situation

Spending/Costs

- > 1/2 of states don't report total costs (i.e. program administrator costs and participant costs)
- < 1/2 of states report program cost breakdowns, although cost categories often differ

Energy savings

- Only ~ 1/3 of states report lifetime savings.
- "Net savings" often not defined in annual filings, and baselines are rarely defined







Issues in EE Reporting – Standardized Program Typology



See LBNL Policy Brief: Energy Efficiency Program Typology and Data Metrics: Enabling Multi-State Analyses Through the Use of Common Terminology – at http://emp.lbl.gov



EE Reporting Project Objectives

- Encourage more transparency and consistency in reporting EE program impacts and costs
 - Particularly for utilities that do not currently provide annual reports
 - Elevate the quality of reporting by utilities that are new to EE or just ramping up
 - Greater consistency: classification of spending and resource costs (administrative costs, incentives) and estimation of program impacts (e.g., net savings)

Encourage comprehensiveness

 More program-level reporting by utilities on total costs, cost effectiveness, customer participation, market penetration

Uses of Reported Energy Efficiency Data

Utilities

- Benchmark to local, regional and state values for similar markets
- Identify opportunities for performance improvements and cost efficiencies

Utility Overseers

- Weigh cost and performance among efficiency resources
- Compare demand and supply resources
- Ensure prudent spending of funds

Spending, Savings, Cost-Effectiveness, and Participation

System Operators and Resource Planners

- Make better load forecasts and thus enable better GT&D planning
- Aid in integrated resource planning

Efficiency Industry Actors and Other Stakeholders

Assess market dynamics, trends and opportunities

How well are demand-side resources performing?

- Are demand-side resources producing more benefits than they cost and returning good value to ratepayers and other stakeholders?
- Are energy savings reasonably available to all customers?

LBNL-APPA EE Reporting Tool

Flexible and Consistent Reporting for EE Programs

Spreadsheet-based reporting tool

Approach taken



Potential benefits of Reporting Tool:

- Reduced time for staff to assess reporting compliance
- Improved benchmarking of programs over time and different geographic regions
- Diagnostic for identifying higher/lower
 performing programs

LBNL Energy Efficiency Reporting Tool

- Simple and straightforward
- Consistent format
- Core data collection
- Raises the bar

Features

- Program category (sector, type)
- Program implementer
- Program description
- Claimed annual savings
- Claimed lifetime savings
- Measure life
- Number of participants/units
- Program expenditures by category

Program Data Glossary N	otes Program	Administrator (PA) Information
Program Administrator Name State	ABC Utility WA]
Headquarters Address Street (Line 1) City Zip Code Contact information Last Name First Name Title	123 Main St.	<u>Utility Information</u> Name Contact information Discount rate Line losses
Phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx) Email Discount rate Cost of Capital (i.e., generally the weighted average of the cost of funds that otherwise would be used to purchase the energy and capacity avoided by the efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds, municipal bonds, USDA/Treasury loans, etc.)		
Line losses		1

			1		I
•	Progra	im Data Glossary	Notes Program	Administrator	(PA) Information
		gram Administrator Namo	APC Litility]	
	-7	State	ABC Othinty		
		State	VVA		
	Heado lar	ters Address			
		Street (Line 1)	123 Main St.		
		Street (Line 2)			
		City			
		Zip Code			
	C ntact in	formation			
		Last Name			
Navigatio	n	First Name			
naviganc		Title			
Duttono		Phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx)			
DULLONS		Email			
	Discount	l rate			
	Cost of Ca	pital (i.e., generally the			
	weighted	average of the cost of funds that	t		
	otherwise	e would be used to purchase the			
	energy an	d capacity avoided by the			
	efficiency	investment.)			
	Source of	Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,			

weighted average of the cost of funds that otherwise would be used to purchase the energy and capacity avoided by the efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,
otherwise would be used to purchase the energy and capacity avoided by the efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,
energy and capacity avoided by the efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,
efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,
Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds,
municipal bonds, USDA/Treasury loans,
etc.)

Line losses

Line losses (% of retails sales)

	Program Data Glossary No	otes Program	Administrator	(PA) Information
	Program Adminetrator Name	ABC Utility		
	s ate	WA		
	Headquarters Audress			
	street (Line 1)	123 Main St.		
	Street (Line 2)			
	City			
	Zip Code			
	Contact information			
	Last Name			
Glassar	First Name			
<u> </u>	Title			
D	Phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx)			
Buiit in	Email			
	Discount rate			
	Cost of Capital (i.e., generally the			
	weighted average of the cost of funds that			
	otherwise would be used to purchase the			
	energy and capacity avoided by the			
	10 x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x			

efficiency investment.) Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds, municipal bonds, USDA/Treasury loans,

etc.)

Line losses

Line losses (% of retails sales)

Glossary – Excel & Word Versions

Main Menu	Glossary	
Term	Definition	Instruction: Click the icon to open the
# Participants	Total number of consumers participating in the subject program. For new construction programs, we classify "number of homes or buildings" as the number of participants. In some programs, the number of participants will be the number of structures or multifamily units that received efficiency measures through a program.	glossary as a separate file. Double-click attached document:
# Units	Total number of measures installed or credited with savings in the subject program (e.g., number of CFLs for which savings are claimed in a lighting program). If the number of units reported for a new construction or retrofit program is defined as structures built or retrofitted to a higher level of energy performance, then these are not counted as units but as participants.	Tool Glossary
Administration Costs (\$)	Actual spending by the program administrator (PA) on costs associated with planning, designing and implementing an energy efficiency program in a defined geographic area, unless some of those costs are specifically accounted for elsewhere. In general, these costs pay for the salaries, training and equipping of internal PA staff to administer and implement a program or oversee the work of an outside contract implementer. If evaluation, compliance and marketing, outreach & education costs are not reported separately, then they typically are included under program administration costs. When a program is being terminated, shut-down costs also should be included in administration costs.	<u>Glossary</u> <u>available as a</u> <u>separate Word</u>
Air Quality Impacts	To some degree, power plants generally control emissions of some pollutants to the atmosphere; the balance goes up the stack. Some emissions are harmful to human health and welfare as they are emitted; others contribute to chemical reactions in the atmosphere, creating harmful contaminants while airborne.	<u>tile too</u>

	Program Data Glossary N	otes Program	Administrator	(PA) Information
	Program Administrator Nam	ABC Utility		
	State	WA		
	Headquarters Address		l	
	Street Line 1)	123 Main St.		
	City Zip Code			
	Corract information			
	Last Name			
Notos	First Name			
<u>NULES</u>	Title			
	Phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx)			
	Email			
	Discount rate			
	Cost of Capital (i.e., generally the			
	weighted average of the cost of funds that			

Line losses

etc.)

efficiency investment.)

Line losses (% of retails sales)

otherwise would be used to purchase the energy and capacity avoided by the

Source of Capital (e.g., ratepayer funds, municipal bonds, USDA/Treasury loans,

Notes Sheet

PA Information	Program Data	Notes	
Instructions: Provide Portfolio notes	information about any aspect of the portfolio, re	 Notes Portfolio notes Reporting notes Other notes 	
Reporting notes	<u>s</u>		
Other notes			

	Program Data ilossary M	lotes Progra	m Administrator	(PA) Information
	gram Administrator Name	ABC Utility		
	State	WA		
	Heado Jarters Address			
	Street (Line 1)	123 Main St.		
	Street (Line 2)			
	City			
	Zip Code			
	Contact information			
<u>Pro</u>	gram Data			
Program g	general information			
Program t	уре			
Savings				
Cost				
Participati	on		_	
	municipal bonds, USDA/Treasury loans, etc.)			
	Line losses			

Line losses (% of retails sales)

•

•

•

•

•

PA Informat	ion	Glossary Notes			Program Data
-	-	Program General Information		Pro	Program Type ogram Type Definitions Program Typology
Fuel	Program Year	Program Name	Resource Program	Market Sector	Program Category
Electricity	2014	New Construction	Yes	Residential	Res: New Construction
					 Program Data Shee Fuel Program Year Program Name Program Category
<u>Key</u> Essential Helpful					

ĺ	Average M (yr	easure life s)*	Cla	imed Lifetime	Savings*		C	aimed Annua	al Savings		
	Electricity	Gas	Lifetime Elect (MV	ricity Savings Vh)	Lifetime G (the	as Savings rms)	Annual Electricity Savings (MWh)		/ Savings Annual Gas Savings (therms)		
	Average Reported Electricity Measure Lifetime	Average Reported Gas Measure Lifetime	Claimed Lifetime Gross Electricity Savings	Claimed Lifetime Net Electricity Savings	Claimed Lifetime Gross Gas Savings	Claimed Lifetime Net Gas Savings	Claimed Annual Gross Electricity Savings	Claimed Annual Net Electricity Savings	Claimed Annual Gross Gas Savings	Claimed Annual Net Gas Savings	
	10		200,000	170,000			20,000	17,000			-
-							Pro	ogra	<u>m D</u>	ata	Shee
						•	Prog	ram N	Лeas	ure	life
						•	Ener	av sa	vinas	5	
							•	ifatim	ν	Δnni	
-							- L			~!!!!!	uai
-							•	/IVVh a	and t	herr	ns
-											
-											- -
-											-
											F
-											F
-											Ĺ
-											F
			1			1					1

	Expenditure Definitions Expenditures**										
	Electricity Efficiency Expenditures (\$)										
	Total Program Administrator Electricity Expenditures	Electricity Incentive Expenditures	Electricity Administration Expenditures	Electricity Delivery Expenditures	Electricity Marketing, Education & Outreach Expenditures	Electricity Evaluation Expenditures	Electricity Other Expenditures	Electricity Participant Expenditures	Electricity Total Resource Expenditures	Total Program Administrator Gas Expenditures	
-	\$ 400,000.00	\$ 160,000.00	\$ 160,000.00		\$ 60,000.00	\$ 20,000.00		\$ 400,000.00	\$ 800,000.00		
						• E	Prog xpend Ince Adn Deli Mar Out Eva Oth	ram [itures entive ninistra ivery keting, reach luation er	Data S	Sheet ation, ar	

	I	Participants a	nd Units			
	Participants		Units			
Number Participants Electricity	Number of Participants Gas	Participant Definition	Number of Units Electricity	Number of Units Gas	Unit Definition	
210		Homes				
				<u>P</u>	rog	ram Data Sheet
			•	Pa	rticipa	ant Count
			•	Pa	rticipa	ant Definition
			•	IJn	it Coi	unt
						finition

Cowlitz PUD

Cowlitz PUD and Energy Efficiency

Pacific Northwest electric utility

- NW Power Act NWPCC and regional targets (7th Plan)
 - Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) implementation and reporting framework
 - Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) market transformation
- Washington Energy Independence Act regulatory reporting requirement
 - Conservation Potential Assessment planning tool and guide

Regional and State Standardization of Energy Efficiency Information

Benefits Regionally

- Consistency in reporting data and information.
- Understanding of past, present and future.
- Guides and supports energy efficiency program development.
- Leverages bodies of knowledge.

Benefits Nationally

- Aggregation of national EE/DSM effort (big data)
- Strategically drives research and new technology/practice
- Program development decisions are more comprehensive
- Stronger understanding and alignment of energy efficiency

Assuming large participation

Challenges & Solutions

- Time and effort to support
- Internal infrastructure
- Agreement

- Leverage opportunities
- Database system deployment & process improvements
- Key data point consistencies

Bigger Picture

- Alignment of grid-based solutions: flexibility, resiliency and capacity
- Demand Response becomes viable
- Stronger connection to carbon
- Shift of business model

Questions/Comments



<u>http://emp.lbl.gov/</u>

https://emp.lbl.gov/what-it-costs-save-energy

Project funded by DOE Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, National Electricity Delivery Division

Contact information



Alex Hoffman ahofmann@publicp ower.org



Gregory Rybka (510) 486-5970 grybka@lbl.gov



q

David Shepherd-Gaw (360) 501-9505 <u>dshepherd-</u> <u>gaw@cowlitzpud.or</u>



Ian M. Hoffman (510) 495-2990 IHoffman@lbl.gov

<u>http://emp.lbl.gov/</u> <u>https://emp.lbl.gov/what-it-costs-save-energy</u>

Project funded by DOE Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, National Electricity Delivery Division