

# **ATTACHMENT A**

**Incremental Impacts of Energy Efficiency  
Policy Initiatives Relative to the 2009  
Integrated Energy Policy Report Adopted  
Demand Forecast**

**ATTACHMENT A:  
TECHNICAL REPORT**

*Prepared For:*  
**California Energy Commission**

*Prepared By:*  
**ITRON, Inc.**

**CONSULTANT REPORT**

January 2010  
CEC-200-2010-001-ATA

**Table ES-4: Summary of Incremental Uncommitted Peak Demand Savings (MW) across All Goals Cases**

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
<b>Low Goals Case</b>								
IOU programs	189	373	554	723	895	1,063	1,230	1,396
AB 1109 lighting standards	102	110	93	172	307	445	504	498
Title 24 & Fed Standards	16	35	66	162	260	368	477	588
BBEES	132	271	455	647	849	1,073	1,308	1,552
<b>Total MW</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>1,705</b>	<b>2,312</b>	<b>2,949</b>	<b>3,518</b>	<b>4,034</b>
<b>Mid Goals Case</b>								
IOU programs	284	560	830	1,081	1,336	1,583	1,830	2,075
AB 1109 lighting standards	49	46	29	67	137	210	240	234
Title 24 & Fed Standards	36	76	143	294	448	623	803	987
BBEES	175	358	602	857	1,123	1,421	1,732	2,056
<b>Total MW</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>1,604</b>	<b>2,298</b>	<b>3,045</b>	<b>3,839</b>	<b>4,605</b>	<b>5,352</b>
<b>High Goals Case</b>								
IOU programs	284	560	830	1,081	1,336	1,583	1,830	2,075
AB 1109 lighting standards	72	74	57	112	211	312	355	349
Title 24 & Fed Standards	43	92	173	365	560	782	1,009	1,241
BBEES	241	492	827	1,177	1,543	1,951	2,377	2,820
<b>Total MW</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>1,217</b>	<b>1,887</b>	<b>2,735</b>	<b>3,651</b>	<b>4,629</b>	<b>5,570</b>	<b>6,484</b>

Table ES-3 and Table ES-4 also summarize the estimated trends of cumulative incremental uncommitted energy and peak demand savings over time. As both tables show, estimated savings from expanded IOU programs and future revisions to Title 24 and federal appliances standards grow fairly steadily over time. Indeed, savings from IOU programs grow more slowly towards the end of the period reflecting market saturation effects for some key measures, as well as interactions with the AB 1109 lighting standards that effectively eliminate CFL measures from utility program offerings by 2018. Savings from the AB 1109 lighting standards follow a slight “S” shape over time, with cumulative savings being fairly flat through 2016 and then increasing significantly through first two years of the new standards starting in 2018. In contrast to the temporal trends for IOU programs and new codes and standards, savings from the BBEES initiatives grow at increasingly higher rates over the entire uncommitted program period, reflecting steadily higher penetration rates of ZNE homes and buildings within the new construction segment, as specified in the targets established by the CPUC.

As with any study of this nature, there are inherent uncertainties in trying to reasonably predict outcomes from future actions. This particular study also faced the unique challenge of trying to interact the inputs and outputs from two different modeling platforms in a way that avoided systematic bias and ensured a reasonable level of internal consistency. Given the time and resources available for this effort, however, identifying and reconciling all of the differences between the Energy Commission’s 2009 IEPR forecast and the 2008 CPUC Goals Study was determined early on to be an unreasonable expectation and beyond the scope of this study. Rather, we focused our analytic efforts and priorities on identifying and reconciling as many of the most important differences in