DCSEU FY2013 Evaluation Results Summary

SEU ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MAY 20, 2014

Teri Lutz, Tetra Tech





Outline

- FY13 Performance Benchmark Verified Results
 - FY12 Comparison
- FY13 Portfolio Verified Results
- Key Findings
 - Strengths
 - Improvement opportunities
- Recommendations
- Evaluation Strategies for FY14
- Questions

FY2013 Performance Benchmark Verified Results

				To be designed in the second of the second o							
ltem	Benchmark	Performance Target	Minimum <u>Target</u>	FY13 Reported	FY13 Verified	Performance Target Achieved	Minimum Target				
1a	Reduce per-capita energy consumption - electricity (MWh)	103,690	51,845	50,361	52,303	Not achieved	Achieved Achieved				
1b	Reduce per-capita energy consumption - natural gas (mcf)	273,428	136,714	52,717	50,608	Not achieved	Not achieved				
2	Increase renewable energy generating capacity: Cost per MMBtu reduction from FY12	20%	10%	80%	83%	Achieved	Achieved				
3	Reduce growth in peak demand (kW)	20,000	2,000	7,468	8,016	Not achieved	Achieved				
4	Improve energy efficiency in low-income housing: 30 percent spend (\$)	\$4,620,000	\$3,080,000	\$5,689,466	\$3,617,225	Not achieved	Achieved				
5	Reduce growth in energy demand of largest users	not defined	not defined	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a				
6	Increase number of green-collar jobs: green- job hours directly worked by District residents (FTE)	77	62	45	32	Not achieved	Not achieved				
-	3					complex					

FY2012 Performance Benchmark Verified Results

						med results		
Item		Performance Target	Minimum Target	FY13 Reported	FY13 Verified	Performance Target	Target	
1a	Reduce per-capita energy consumption - electricity (MWh)	91,491	45,746	23,260	21,448	Achieved Not achieved	Achieved Not achieved	
1b	Reduce per-capita energy consumption - natural gas (mcf)	241,260	120,000	(10,471) All inclusive of WHF	(11,284) All inclusive of WHF	Not achieved	Not achieved	
2	Increase renewable energy generating capacity: cost-effective replacement program	SCT ≥ 1.0	SCT ≥ 1.0	0.82	0.81	Not achieved	Not achieved	
3	Reduce growth in peak demand (kW)	20,000	2,000	3,593	3,216	Not achieved	Achieved	
4	Improve energy efficiency in low-income housing: 30 percent spend (\$)	\$3,960,000	\$2,640,000	\$4,680,751	\$4,465,639	Achieved	Achieved	
5	Reduce growth in energy demand of largest users	A minimum perfo benchmark	ormance target	was not establi	shed for this	n/a	n/a	
6	Increase number of green-collar jobs: green- job hours directly worked by District residents (FTE)	66	53	48	ished for this		Not achieved	



Reduce per-capita energy consumption

- Additional analysis to understand the performance benchmarks and other contractual obligation interactions (quantify and qualify)
- Measure the progress towards the mcf targets without inclusion of the interactive effects for the installation of more energy efficient lighting
- District potential study calibrated with a District baseline study



Increase renewable energy generating capacity

Cost assessment study

Reduce growth in peak demand

- Continue to calculate peak demand reduction
- Engage PJM in direct discussions to better understand the PJM RPM capacity market participation requirements
- Business case for participation



Improve energy efficiency in low-income housing

 Assess this benchmark in conjunction with the energy savings benchmark given acquisition cost differences

Reduce growth in energy demand of largest users

- Concur with Paige report: report on two tracking indicators
 - i. Tracking indicator 1: nature and scope of engagement
 - ii. Tracking indicator 2: yield of energy savings, or acquisition cost



Increase number of green-collar jobs

- Market-based programmatic approach =
 less of the green job creation within control of DC
 SEU but also may =
 lower acquisition costs
- Paige report recommendations to restructure this benchmark
 - i. expenditures/jobs value based on the experience of the DC SEU and national studies
 - ii. methodology to take full account of the split of jobs between District and non-District residents
- Inclusion of indirect and induced jobs

FY2013 Portfolio Verified Results

	Description		kWh							1 1/C3U1C3		
						kW			MMBtu - Gas Savings			
110SHOT 120PV 420FHLB 420HPES 510BLTZ 510CIRX 510MTV 520CUST 520MARO 620NEWC 610BLTZ fi 610ICDI 620LICP 6110ICDI			Ex-ante Gross	Ex-post Gross	RR	Ex-ante Gross	Ex-post Gross		Ex-ante	THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE		
	Solar Hot Water		-	-	n/a	-	_					
	Solar Photovoltaic		192,877	196,735	1.02	31.6	32.3	1.02	1,020.0	4,020.		
7420FHLB	Forgivable Loan for Efficiency Improve	r Home ments	30,531	30,579	1.00	3.2	3.2	1.00		· ' 119,	- n 2 1.0	
7420HPES	Home Performanc	e with ENERGY	171,098	158,549	0.93	16.9	15.3	0.91	606.2	616.9	9 1.0	
7510BLTZ	T12 Lighting Repla	cement	3,644,922	4,212,011	1.16	826.9	1,029.7	1.25	2 270 4	0.000		
7510CIRX	Business Energy F	Rebates	2,194,303	2,119,264	0.97	372.9	397.3	1.07				
7510MTV	T12 Market Transf	ormation Value	1,079,285	1,460,503	1.35	237.9	353.6		-435.9			
520CUST	Custom Services		19,751,948	20,793,168	1.05	2,858.8	3,031.2	1.49	-717.9			
520MARO	Custom Market Op	portunity	636,671	566,420	0.89	55.1	56.7	1.06	63,209.1	62,149.4		
520NEWC	Custom New Cons	truction	88,749	88,749	1.00	8.8	8.8	1.03			- n/	
610BLTZ	LI MF T12 Lighting for Low-income	Replacement	471,730	388,781	0.82	151.4	143.5	1.00 0.95	-322.5	-247.2	0.7	
610ICDI	LI MF Implementati Direct Install	on Contractor	1,187,537	1,231,956	1.04	124.0	122.9	0.99	417.6	298.8	0.7	
620LICP	LI MF Comprehens Improvements	ive Efficiency	1,959,041	1,921,321	0.98	184.3	181.8	0.99	5,864.7	5,880.0	1.00	
710APPL	Retail Efficient App	liances	99,569	99,569	1.00	14.3	40.0	0.00				
710FBNK	Efficient Products a	t Food Banks	2,416,513	2,418,361	1.00	269.6	13.8	0.96	162.0	251.2		
710LITE	Retail Efficient Ligh	ting	12,699,881	12,713,227	1.00	1,895.3	269.6 1,897.8	1.00	-3,989.5 -17,317.3	-3,842.9 -16,806.4	0.96	
Y13 Po	rtfolio RRs	46,624,655	48,399,	192 1.04	7,0				49,827	49,616	0.97 1.00	
Y12 Po	rtfolio RRs	21,514,769	19,875,0	0.92	3,3	86 3,22	27 0.9	95	-10,471	-11,284	0.99	

Key Findings—Strengths

- The movement toward a market-based portfolio gaining momentum
 - Participants and contractors in the custom and commercial lighting tracks are very satisfied
- II. Cost effective and DC SEU cost effective results are accurate
- III.Acquisition costs are declining

Key Findings—Opportunity for Improvement

- I. DC SEU Technical Reference Manual (TRM) expansion: C&I load shapes
- II. Complete and accurate project files, better file organization = more efficient evaluation efforts: data and information requested was made available as requested throughout evaluation effort, but resulted in more costly evaluation
- III. Recruitment of onsite verification participants for the evaluation effort was challenging

Recommendations

- I. Complete a baseline study to identify and validate and/or update the potential study results
- II. Revise the TRM and tracking system to accommodate additional load-shapes more reflective of the projects completed
- III. Establish a "Final Project Documentation" folder within each project file that contains consistently named files critical for the evaluation effort

Evaluation Strategies for FY14

- I. Complete DC SEU cost study
- II. Establish dynamic sampling protocols, coordinate third-party onsite evaluation with the DC SEU QA for C&I complex projects
- III.FY14 summer baseline opportunity assessment
- IV.Conduct evaluations of Food Bank lighting giveaway events
 - Intercept surveys
 - Postcard option
 - Follow-up phone surveys

Questions





complex world CLEAR SOLUTIONS*





