2010 Demand Side Resources RFP • Exhibit F

Conservation Cost Effectiveness Standard (CCES)

Conservation Cost Effectiveness Standard (CCES) shows the full "avoided cost" to PSE of the energy saved, for the Type of Savings (defined by end use load shape and customer class) and life of the energy savings, or Measure Life. The CCES is based on the market costs projected by a power costing model, which would otherwise be incurred to provide energy from a generation source either directly or by contract plus credits for transmission and distribution system benefits, environmental externalities, and line losses. This value is expressed as the levelized value per kWh saved of future energy savings over the life of the measure. The CCES is based on Aurora forecast power costs at Mid-Columbia, and adds 35% for a power planning adjustment, 10% for environmental credits, 7.6% Residential and 6.1% Commercial/Industrial for avoided transmission and distribution losses, a valuation for avoided peak capacity, and \$31.87/kW-year distribution benefit. Load factors from the analysis in PSE's 2009 IRP are used for enduse load shapes that define Type of Savings. Each Type of Savings has a CCES, or a value per kWh or Therm per Measure Life, up to 30 years. The values for the natural gas and electric CCES used to evaluate PSE's 2008 - 2009 programs are shown in Table F-1 and F-2.

Cost effectiveness of projects will allow for PSE administrative costs. PSE's costs are expected to vary, depending upon the proposal content. At a minimum, PSE costs include some project management activities, coordination with customer data, and conducting customer satisfaction surveys for the respondent's program activity.

1. Description of Tests

Puget Sound Energy will evaluate the cost effectiveness of proposals using a standard Utility Cost Test and a Total Resource Cost Test.

<u>Total Resource Cost Test (TRC Test)</u> measures the net value of energy efficiency programs to society as a whole. The TRC Test is a cost-effectiveness calculation which demonstrates if the total benefits, including electricity (defined by the <u>Conservation Cost</u> <u>Effectiveness Standard</u>) and other savings benefits, exceed total costs including those

2010 Demand Side Resources RFP • Exhibit F

incurred by PSE, the Respondent, the customer, and any other contributing party. The benefits and costs not directly associated with electrical energy efficiency in this calculation may be difficult to quantify.

<u>Utility Cost Test (UC Test)</u> measures the net value of energy efficiency programs to the sponsoring utility. The UC Test is a cost-effectiveness calculation which demonstrates that the utility electricity savings benefits (defined by the <u>Conservation Cost</u> <u>Effectiveness Standard</u>), exceed the costs incurred by the utility.

2. Calculation Methodology

Puget Sound Energy's determination that an energy efficiency project is cost-effective is a two-step process.

Step 1: The <u>Total Resource Cost test</u> determines that the value of all benefits of doing the project (energy savings plus other benefits like maintenance savings, improved productivity, etc.) is *greater than* the total projects costs. (Note: If the value of the energy benefits alone exceeds the total cost, the equation is satisfied without the need to quantify further benefits.)

Total benefits (\$) > Total costs (\$)

Step 2: IF Step 1 is satisfied, OR

IF: Total costs < 150% of value of energy benefits, AND there are documented additional benefits which cannot easily be quantified (e.g. improved indoor air quality), then the utility funding is limited by the Utility Cost Test

Utility benefits (\$) > Utility costs (\$),

also expressed as:

Value of kWh Savings (for measure life) > Utility funding (customer incentives + PSE administrative costs + Respondent costs.

Table F-1. Electric Conservation Cost Effectiveness Standard – 2009-2010 (Levelized \$/kWh) (Includes avoided energy and avoided capacity)

0.168 % 0.168 % 0.188 % 0.188 % 0.193 % 0.
\$ 0.168 \$ 0.095 \$ 0.085 \$ 0.061 \$ \$ 0.0171 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.087 \$ 0.087 \$ 0.062 \$ \$ 0.182 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.072 \$ \$ 0.188 \$ 0.113 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.077 \$ \$ 0.097 \$ 0.077 \$ \$ 0.193 \$ 0.117 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.081 \$ \$ 0.081 \$ \$ 0.195 \$ 0.197
\$ 0.171 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.087 \$ 0.062 \$ \$ \$ 0.182 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.072 \$ \$ \$ 0.188 \$ 0.113 \$ 0.103 \$ 0.077 \$ \$ \$ 0.193 \$ 0.117 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.081 \$ \$
\$ 0.182 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.097 \$ 0.072 \$ \$ \$ 0.188 \$ 0.113 \$ 0.103 \$ 0.077 \$ \$ 0.193 \$ 0.177 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.081 \$ \$ 0.107 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.1081 \$ \$ 0.107 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.1081 \$ \$ 0.1081
\$ 0.193 \$ 0.117 \$ 0.103 \$ 0.077 \$ 0.193 \$ 0.117 \$ 0.107 \$ 0.081
\$ 0.193 \$ 0.117 \$ 0.107 \$
0770
F
4 O.197
\$ 0.201
-
0.122
နာ မာ မ
0.142 \$
0.145 \$ 0.148 \$ 0.150 \$
0.171 \$ 0.175 \$

1. 2010 Start Year 2. Discount rate: 8.25%

Table F-2. Gas Conservation Cost Effectiveness Standard, 2006 – 2007 (Levelized \$/Therm)

Revised gas cost effectiveness standards will be included in the final document.

Measure	Space Heat	Space Heat	Water Heat	Process Heat
Life	Existing	New		
	Ŭ			
1	1.124	1.171	1.048	0.962
2	1.143	1.192	1.057	0.968
3	1.146	1.195	1.055	0.964
4	1.141	1.191	1.046	0.953
5	1.140	1.190	1.045	0.952
6	1.143	1.193	1.048	0.954
7	1.146	1.197	1.052	0.957
8	1.150	1.201	1.056	0.960
9	1.154	1.206	1.061	0.964
10	1.161	1.214	1.067	0.970
11	1.168	1.221	1.074	0.976
12	1.176	1.229	1.082	0.983
13	1.184	1.238	1.090	0.991
14	1.193	1.248	1.098	0.997
15	1.202	1.257	1.106	1.004
16	1.212	1.267	1.114	1.011
17	1.221	1.277	1.122	1.018
18	1.230	1.286	1.130	1.026
19	1.239	1.296	1.138	1.033
20	1.248	1.305	1.148	1.040
21	1.257	1.314	1.157	1.047
22	1.253	1.311	1.167	1.041
23	1.264	1.322	1.176	1.050
24	1.275	1.334	1.185	1.058
25	1.285	1.345	1.194	1.067
26	1.295	1.355	1.202	1.075
27	1.305	1.366	1.210	1.083
28	1.315	1.376	1.219	1.091
29	1.324	1.386	1.227	1.099
30	1.333	1.395	1.234	1.106