

## Comparison between Bonneville Power and Energy Trust Programs

This resource offers slides comparing basic program design and incentive structures for BPA and Energy Trust of Oregon. The information is a bit dated at this point, but still useful.

This resource downloaded from [www.cascadeenergy.com](http://www.cascadeenergy.com)

# Comparison of Regional Energy Management Pilot Programs

January 31, 2011



Figure 1. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Program Comparison

Category		BPA Track and Tune	Energy Trust Kaizen Blitz	Energy Trust Custom O&M
Target Site		>4,000,000 kWh/yr	>2,000,000 kWh/yr of refrigeration load	n/a
Target System		>1,000,000 kWh/yr		No official minimum (compressed air example: >200 hp)
Incentive	Action Item Cofunding	\$0.075/kWh, up to 70% of costs	\$0.080/kWh, up to 50% of costs	\$0.080/kWh, up to 50% of costs  (bonus offer → 90%)
	Sustained Savings	\$0.025/kWh for 5 annual cycles	\$0.020/kWh for one annual cycle	n/a
MT&R	Measure Life	10 years	3 years	3 years
	Monitoring	Continual, for 5 years	2 years of monitoring included	Per specific M&V plan
	Basis for First Savings	90 days, post Action Item Implementation	60~120 days, post Action Item	Measure dependent
	Baseline	Regression Model, 60 days~2 yrs baseline period	Regression Model, 1 year baseline period	Defined in scoping report or energy study

**Figure 2. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Program Comparison**

Category	BPA Track and Tune	Energy Trust Kaizen Blitz	Energy Trust Custom O&M
Scoping Assessment	Funded at 100% (ESIP or TSP)	Funded at 100% (PDC or ITSP)	Funded at 100% (PDC)
On-site Event	Funded at 100% (TSP)	Funded at 100% (ITSP)	Funded at 100% (ATAC)
First Year Follow-up	Funded at 100% (TSP)	Funded at 100% (ITSP)	n/a
PTS System – Hardware	Funded up to 100% (budget based on system baseline)	End user expense (meter upgrades)	Funded at 100% (e.g. data loggers)
PTS System – Energy Monitoring (Software)		Funded at 100%	n/a
Action Item Period	<12 months	< 12 months	Standard: no limit (Bonus Offer: <90 days)
Action Item Expense Eligibility	Direct Labor Eligible (>\$2K for single action item requires review)  Low Cost Hardware/Small Retrofits Eligible (>1 yr life, non-capital by end use accounting standards)	Direct Labor Eligible  Low Cost Hardware/Small Retrofits Eligible  Expenses with a long measure life directed to ETO capital project program	Direct Labor Eligible  Low Cost Hardware/Small Retrofits Eligible  Expenses with a long measure life directed to ETO capital project program

Figure 3. Industrial Cohort/Management System Training Program Comparison

Category		BPA High Performance Energy Management (HPEM)	ETO Industrial Energy Improvement (IEI)
Target Site		Minimum: 0.5 aMW <small>(individual site basis)</small> Actual Avg: 2.1 aMW (SW WA)	No official minimum Actual Avg: ~1.2 aMW
Incentive	Sustained Savings	\$0.025/kWh for 5 annual cycles	\$0.020/kWh for first year <i>New Option (Year 2 Maintenance Services)</i> \$0.010/kWh for second year
	Basis for Calculation	Actual energy use for the entire year	Months 10~12 extrapolated to an annual basis
MT&R	Measure Life	10 years	3 year
	Monitoring	5 years of monthly utility bill data, or continuous monitoring	1 year of monthly utility bill data, or continuous monitoring <small>(daily data typically available from PGE)</small>
	Baseline	Regression Model, 2 yrs baseline period	Regression Model, 1-2 yrs baseline period
Program Delivery		HPEM Coach assigned to each end user In Year 1, end users participate in eight peer group workshops, one webinar, and three on-site events at their facility, or a cohort member's facility.	IEI Coach assigned to each end user In Year 1, end users participate in eight peer group workshops, one webinar, and three on-site events at their facility, or a cohort member's facility.