

Stakeholder survey results: Supply-side data insights

Cael Warren
cael.warren@wilder.org



Maddie Hansen
madeleine.hansen@wilder.org

Study overview

- 25 participants representing:
 - Municipal utilities
 - Co-op utilities
 - Investor-owned utilities
 - Local government
 - Clean energy organizations
 - Consumer groups
 - Program implementers
- Utility representatives comprise about 60-75% of responses (varies by question)

Supply-side efficiency gains

55% said efficiency gains are moderately or extremely important in making a decision to implement a supply-side efficiency project

How important are efficiency gains in supply-side decision making?



N=22

Supply-side changes

Strongly agree

Agree

Infrastructure improvements should continue to count toward CIP savings goals.



The incremental difference between efficiency and standard infrastructure improvements should be paid for with CIP funds.



Infrastructure improvements should count toward CIP spending goals.



N=25-26

Utility representatives' recommendations

To help overcome the barriers to supply-side efficiency projects:

- Reconsider the 1% DSM rule
- Educate utilities on what exists, how to claim it
- Clarify rules and processes

Utility representatives' recommendations

“I think they need to get rid of that supply side limitation and open it up so that you can find the most effective place to create the savings and it doesn't really matter whether it's on the customer side of the meter or the utility side of the meter because the customer pays for both sides of the meter.”

“Developing some clarity. Easing the thresholds, looking at these projects as system improvements. I just generally don't think that from a system improvement standpoint, that they shouldn't be counted if some regulatory threshold isn't met. And that's kind of the framework we're in right now. I think if that were to change, it would open up some things. It would also probably ease conversations with people that may be easily turned off by that type of arbitrary regulation.”

Including current supply-side projects in CIP

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Builds awareness of systems and improvements• Allows more utilities to claim• Demonstrates the importance of energy efficiency• Considers that projects are complex and multi-year• Accounts for the energy savings occurring• Helps to meet 1.5% target despite future challenges• Breaks down arbitrary barriers between DSM and EUI	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Free ridership• Reduced DSM efforts• Uneven across years• Could inflate perception of energy efficiency potential• Projects are not counted if goal is not met• Harder to track• Double counting• Little utility benefit outside of fulfilling the statutory requirement• Customers may not see direct benefit

Questions?

Cael Warren

cael.warren@wilder.org

Maddie Hansen

madeleine.hansen@wilder.org

