Utility Demand-Side Management (DSM) Programs Are on the Rise

- Total budget for electric and gas utility DSM programs in U.S. reached $3.1 billion in 2007; budget up 20% compared to 2006 alone
- Low-income programs - $438 million (14% of total)
- Leading states (CA, CT, VT, RI, IA) are spending ≥ $20 per capita on DSM programs; national average is around $10.50 per capita
Results of Utility Demand-Side Management (DSM) Programs

- Leading states/utilities are cutting energy use by 1% per year or more, significantly reducing load growth
- Avg. cost of saved energy = 2-3 cents per kWh, far less than the cost for any form of new electricity supply
- Many utilities are cutting peak demand more than energy consumption in % terms
- DSM programs provide environmental as well as economic benefits, including reduction in GHG emissions
Electric Utility DSM Funding in the Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008 (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SWEEP data

Energy Savings Are Growing Too
- Xcel Energy (CO) reducing electricity use by ~0.5% per year, planning to save 0.75% per year by 2010
- Rocky Mountain Power (UT) reducing electricity use by ~0.7% per year
- Nevada Power Co. (southern NV) reducing electricity use by ~0.8% per year
- Sierra Pacific Power Co. (northern NV) planning to reduce electricity use by ~0.9% per year starting in 2008
- All much greater than savings 2-3 yrs ago
New DSM Policies Just Adopted for Xcel Energy – Colorado

- Energy savings goal of 0.75%/yr by 2010, ramping up to 1%/yr by 2015 and 1.2%/yr by 2019
- Incentive for utility tied to savings achieved and net economic benefits of the DSM programs; incentive starts at achieving 80% of savings goal and reaches max at 150% of savings goal, but capped at 20% of DSM expenditures
- DSM programs for low-income customers not required to have BCR > 1.0

Energy Savings Goals for 2009-2020 DSM Programs (cumulative)

![Cumulative energy savings goals (2009-2020)](chart.png)
**Peak Reduction Goals for 2009-2020 DSM Programs (cumulative)**

![Cumulative peak demand reduction goals (2009-2020)]

**Exemplary Low-Income DSM Programs – National Grid (MA, RI, NH)**

- Partnership with CAP agencies, served over 40,000 households (25% of those eligible) since 1996; budget ~$7 million per year
- Appliance audits and replacement where justified; CFL distribution; weatherization of electric and oil-heated homes
- All EE measures must be cost effective
- Education and training component
- Average electricity savings of 1,050 kWh/yr

*Source: ACEEE*
Exemplary Low-Income DSM Programs – EmPower New York

- Implemented through network of well-trained contractors; budget ~$17 million per year; ~17,000 homes served per year
- Appliance replacement and CFL distribution (ENERGY STAR models); weatherization services coordinated with WAP; third party inspections and quality assurance
- Average cost of $1,070 and energy bill savings of $253 per home (~10%); cost effective based on energy savings alone

Source: ACEEE

Exemplary Low-Income DSM Programs – PG&E Energy Partners

- Utility program implemented through contractors, served nearly 1 million households (54% of those eligible) since 1983; budget ~$90 million per year
- Home energy analysis, consumer education; free energy efficiency services including weatherization, appliance and HVAC system repair or replacement, and CFL distribution
- Strong community outreach component
- Program has average cost of about $1,300 and life-cycle energy savings of about $650 per home; i.e., program is not cost effective based on energy benefits alone

Source: ACEEE
Exemplary Low-Income DSM Programs – PECO LIUR Program

- Targeted to high usage electric and gas customers
- Utility program implemented through a contractor, served around 60,000 households since 1999; budget ~$6.5 million per year
- Instrumented audits; weatherization services; refrigerator, water heater or AC replacement, and CFL distribution
- Energy education component
- Achieving about 10% energy savings at average cost of under $1,000 per home including program administration; cost-effective based on energy savings alone

Source: ACEEE

Conclusion Regarding Exemplary Low-Income DSM Programs

- Programs can be successfully implemented either through trained contractors or WAP agencies
- Focus on building envelope, appliance and HVAC equipment, and lighting measures, targeting largest energy savings opportunities
- Include energy education
- Programs can be cost-effective based on energy savings alone in regions with substantial heating load; may not be cost effective without valuing non-energy benefits in other regions
- Utility programs can achieve high penetration if implemented for a decade or more, with 10-15% energy savings per household on average
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