

In the early and mid 1990s The Results Center produced 126 case studies of the most successful energy efficiency and renewable energy programs in the United States and around the world. With the support of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Ted Flanigan directed a research team at Colorado-based IRT Environment to produce and distribute these exceptional examples.

#18 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION (BPA) – ENERGY SAVINGS PLAN

The Energy Savings Plan provides energy reviews of industrial facilities, payments for conservation acquisitions, and rebates for the purchase of energy-efficient motors. One of the E\$P's most unique features is its adaptability to many areas. It is not a formally defined program but rather a collection of principles which define conservation acquisitions that the Bonneville Power Administration would like to make in its industrial sector. The program is implemented by BPA's area offices and by utilities that receive firm power service from BPA. Each implementing agency interprets the E\$P principles to create a DSM program that best suits its service territory.

Customers wishing to participate in the E\$P can receive funding to conduct energy reviews of their facilities in order to locate potentially cost-effective areas for energy-efficiency improvements. Customers can then submit proposals to BPA for partial funding of these projects, based upon their levels of energy savings. Rebates for the purchase of energy-efficient motors are also available through the E\$P. These rebates are based on the purchase price of the motor and are very simply calculated.

The E\$P was first offered in 1987 as a pilot program and has been growing and evolving since then. BPA currently employs an annual review process to continually improve the program. This process seeks input from participants, non-participants, advocates, BPA headquarters staff, area office staff, and staff of implementing utilities. Most agree that the program is a good one that has yet to mature. Areas of the program most debated include: the acquisition payment (some feel it is not large enough); the number of appropriate post-installation verifications (some advocate multiple verifications others feel that one post-installation verification is adequate); and methodologies for determining free ridership and if screening for free ridership is even worthwhile.

Projects which receive funding through the E\$P are generally large and often complex. It is not uncommon for three years to pass between a project proposal being submitted to BPA and that project's completion. Between October 1, 1988, and July 10, 1992, 55 E\$P projects were completed. These projects' average annual energy savings is 1.8 GWh each. BPA paid an average of \$81,000 to each of these projects. The cost of saved energy for these projects, computed at a 5% discount rate and assuming a 15.18 year measure lifetime, is a very inexpensive 0.38 ¢/kWh.

Download entire 24 page profile:

<https://ecomotion.us/results-center-profiles/18/bpa-energy-savings-plan.pdf>

Print this page:

<https://ecomotion.us/results-center-profiles/18/bpa-energy-savings-plan-summary.pdf>

All Results Center Profiles:

<https://ecomotion.us/consulting/case-studies/>

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION Energy Savings Plan

Sector: Industrial

Measures: Variable

Mechanism: Rebates based on energy saved and measure lifetime

History: Pilot in 1987, full program 1988-1992 (ongoing)

FY 1991 Program Data

Energy savings: 50,136,945 kWh

Lifecycle energy savings: 785 GWh

Peak capacity savings: 5.72 aMW

Cost: \$1,748,665

10/1/88 - 7/10/92 Data

Cumulative energy savings: 260,932,092 kWh

Lifecycle energy savings: 1,535 GWh

Capacity savings: 11.54 aMW

Cost: \$4,010,570

Participation rate: 2.75%

CONVENTIONS

For the entire 1992 profile series all dollar values have been adjusted to 1990 U.S. dollar levels unless otherwise specified. Inflation and exchange rates were derived from the U.S. Dept of Labor's Consumer Price Index and the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics Yearbook: 1991.

The Results Center uses three conventions for presenting program savings. Annual savings refer to the annualized value of increments of energy and capacity installed in a given year, or what might be best described as the first full-year effect of the measures installed in a given year. Cumulative savings represent the savings in a given year for all measures installed to date. Lifecycle savings are calculated by multiplying the annual savings by the assumed average measure lifetime. Caution: cumulative and lifecycle savings are theoretical values that usually represent only the technical measure lifetimes and are not adjusted for attrition unless specifically stated.