

MEEIA 2 Collaborative

Updates and Next Steps

September 30, 2016

Project Activities

- July 15th – Kick-off, Matrix Review, Proposals ✓
 - Joint Ameren Missouri/KCP&L
- Remainder of July – Refine/clarify proposals ✓
- August – Research proposals ✓
- September 7th – Share research findings ✓
- September 30th – Updates, Feedback, Next Steps ←
- Week of October 3rd – Submit utility reports to Commission

	Incremental for 2017/2018			Cost Effective?
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (MM\$)	
Significant Overlap with Approved Programs				
C&I Concierge	18,692	2.2	\$8.0	✗
Advanced Lighting Controls	0	0	\$0.0	✓
Education Program for Teachers	0	0	\$0.0	✓
Multifamily One-Stop-Shop	8,380	1.9	\$7.0	✗
Marketing/Delivery Opportunities for Approved Programs				
Up-Stream Residential Products	25,382	8.5	\$10.9	✗
C&I Mid-Stream Lighting	9,870	1.9	\$4.3	✓
C&I Benchmarking – EPA Tool	6,272	0.7	\$1.9	✓
Res. Large Employer Marketing	1,448	0.8	\$1.3	✓
New Programs/Budget Requiring Commission Approval				
Residential Bundling	292	0.1	\$0.9	✗
Low Income S.F. – Sweep	6,035	1.4	\$4.6	✓
Low Income S.F. – Weatherization	5,289	3.1	\$3.7	✓
Low Income S.F. – New Constr.	6,319	3	\$3.0	✓
Bulb Buyback – Incandescent	4,463	0.3	\$1.1	✓
Bulb Buyback – Halogen	2,948	0.2	\$1.1	✓
Bulb Buyback – CFL	447	0.03	\$1.1	✗
LED Street Lighting	34,442	0	\$14.0	✓
Water Heater Direct Load Control	0	4	\$4.5	✗
Circuit Rider	2,197	0.85	\$0.2	✗ / ✓
Financing	1,721	1.1	\$1.2	✓
Exterior Lighting	43,969	0.1	\$6.5	✓
Competitions (Gamification)	0.2	0.1	\$0.1	✗
Total	178,166	30.3	\$75.4	

C&I Benchmarking - EPA Portfolio Manager

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	6,272	0.7	\$1.9
Pct. Change	1.1%	0.5%	1.2%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 1.07
UCT – 1.75
PCT – 2.16
RIM – 0.61

Significant Research Observations

1. Lift assumed to be 2.4% of average Non-Opt-Out Customer annual usage (per eSource research)
2. Approximately \$1.4MM of budget is associated with the uplift in the Standard, Custom, and Retro-Commissioning programs.
3. Delivery cost varies from \$1K to \$2.6K per facility, depending on facility size

Other Factors	
●	Learning Opportunity
●	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
●	Consistency with PSC Priorities

Residential Large Employer Marketing

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	1,448	0.8	\$1.3
Pct. Change	0.3%	0.5%	0.84%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 1.36
UCT – 1.65
PCT – 5.30
RIM – 0.61

Significant Research Observations

1. Focused marketing where customers are encouraged to participate in existing programs.
2. Similar measures already offered in existing energy efficiency programs

Other Factors	
●	Learning Opportunity
●	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
●	Consistency with PSC Priorities

Low Income Single Family – Neighborhood Sweep

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	6,035	1.4	\$4.6
Pct. Change	1.1%	0.8%	3%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 1.02
UCT – 1.02
PCT – 4.40
RIM – 0.40

Significant Research Observations

1. Opportunity for efficient implementation of measures via a neighborhood blitz
2. Lighting measures account for significant savings in successful programs

Other Factors	
●	Learning Opportunity
●	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
●	Consistency with PSC Priorities




Low Income Single Family - Weatherization

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	5,289	3.1	\$3.7
Pct. Change	0.9%	1.9%	2.3%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 1.98
UCT – 2.28
PCT – 3.49
RIM – 0.70

Significant Research Observations

1. Program costs are significantly lower because weatherization agencies are providing labor costs
2. Opportunity to reach customers with all electric heat and customers with gas heat
3. Opportunity to upgrade the statewide tracking database

Other Factors	
	Learning Opportunity
	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
	Consistency with PSC Priorities




Low Income Single Family – New Construction

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	6,319	3.0	\$3.0
Pct. Change	1.1%	1.8%	1.9%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 3.14
UCT – 3.14
PCT – 6.39
RIM – 0.74

Significant Research Observations

1. Includes building rehabilitation
2. Lighting measures account for majority of savings in successful programs

Other Factors	
	Learning Opportunity
	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
	Consistency with PSC Priorities




Bulb Buyback – LED Replace Incandescent

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	4,466	0.35	\$1.1
Pct. Change	0.8%	0.2%	0.7%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 4.07
UCT – 4.07
PCT – N/A
RIM – 0.48

Significant Research Observations

1. Risk of poor evaluation results associated with incandescent bulbs
2. Potential to strengthen Community relations
3. Modeled on the Connecticut program

Other Factors	
	Learning Opportunity
	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
	Consistency with PSC Priorities




Bulb Buyback – LED Replace Halogen

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	2,948	0.23	\$1.1
Pct. Change	0.5%	0.1%	0.7%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 2.69
UCT – 2.69
PCT – N/A
RIM – 0.45

Significant Research Observations

1. Risk of poor evaluation results associated with halogen bulbs
2. Potential to strengthen Community relations
3. Modeled on the Connecticut program

Other Factors	
	Learning Opportunity
	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
	Consistency with PSC Priorities

Bulb Buyback – LED Replace CFL

Incremental Plan Increases (2017 & 2018)			
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (\$MM)
Incr. Change	447	0.03	\$1.1
Pct. Change	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%

<u>Cost Effectiveness</u>
TRC – 0.41
UCT – 0.41
PCT – N/A
RIM – 0.23

Significant Research Observations

1. Not Cost Effective
2. Risk of poor evaluation results associated with CFL bulbs
3. Potential to strengthen Community relations
4. Modeled on the Connecticut program

Other Factors	
●	Learning Opportunity
●	Disruption to Approved Portfolio
●	Consistency with PSC Priorities

	Incremental for 2017/2018			Cost Effective?
	Energy (MWh)	Demand (MW)	Budget (MM\$)	
Significant Overlap with Approved Programs				
C&I Concierge	18,692	2.2	\$8.0	✗
Advanced Lighting Controls	0	0	\$0.0	✓
Education Program for Teachers	0	0	\$0.0	✓
Multifamily One-Stop-Shop	8,380	1.9	\$7.0	✗
Marketing/Delivery Opportunities for Approved Programs				
Up-Stream Residential Products	25,382	8.5	\$10.9	✗
C&I Mid-Stream Lighting	9,870	1.9	\$4.3	✓
C&I Benchmarking – EPA Tool	6,272	0.7	\$1.9	✓
Res. Large Employer Marketing	1,448	0.8	\$1.3	✓
New Programs/Budget Requiring Commission Approval				
Residential Bundling	292	0.1	\$0.9	✗
Low Income S.F. – Sweep	6,035	1.4	\$4.6	✓
Low Income S.F. – Weatherization	5,289	3.1	\$3.7	✓
Low Income S.F. – New Constr.	6,319	3	\$3.0	✓
Bulb Buyback – Incandescent	4,463	0.3	\$1.1	✓
Bulb Buyback – Halogen	2,948	0.2	\$1.1	✓
Bulb Buyback – CFL	447	0.03	\$1.1	✗
LED Street Lighting	34,442	0	\$14.0	✓
Water Heater Direct Load Control	0	4	\$4.5	✗
Circuit Rider	2,197	0.85	\$0.2	✗ / ✓
Financing	1,721	1.1	\$1.2	✓
Exterior Lighting	43,969	0.1	\$6.5	✓
Competitions (Gamification)	0.2	0.1	\$0.1	✗
Total	178,166	30.3	\$75.4	

Next Steps

- Open Discussion
 - How can we prioritize?
 - Consensus on any proposals?
 - Key Concerns?
- Next steps
 - Week of October 3rd – Submit report to Commission
 - Basic report documenting the proposals, the Collaborative meetings, the matrix



FOCUSED ENERGY. For life.