

Attachment 7



**Black Hills Power – South Dakota
Energy Efficiency Solutions Status Report
Docket No. EL14-038 - Program Year 1**

Prepared by:

Applied Energy Group
211 Broad Street, Suite 206 · Red Bank, NJ 07701
Tel (732) 945-9941 · Fax (732) 945-9942
www.appliedenergygroup.com

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents1**
- Executive Summary1**
- Residential Programs5**
 - Residential Lighting and Appliance.....5**
 - Residential Appliance Recycling7**
 - Residential High Efficiency HVAC.....8**
 - Whole House Efficiency Program10**
 - Residential Evaluation Program11**
 - School-Based Energy Education Program12**
 - Weatherization Program13**
 - Combined Residential Program Portfolio Cost-Effectiveness.....14**
- Commercial & Industrial Programs 15**
 - Small Business Direct Install Program15**
 - Commercial Prescriptive Rebate Program16**
 - Commercial Custom Rebate Program18**

Executive Summary

Black Hills Power (“BHP” or “Company”) is an investor-owned utility that provides electricity to approximately 70,000 customers in western South Dakota, northern Wyoming and southeastern Montana. Black Hills Power is part of Black Hills Corporation, which provides natural gas and electricity to more than 765,000 customers throughout the Midwest region of the United States.

BHP’s energy-efficiency portfolio is composed of residential and non-residential programs (i.e. commercial and industrial). Each program has been designed to address the needs of various customer types. The programs include:

Residential

- Residential Lighting and Appliances
- Appliance Recycling
- Residential High Efficiency HVAC
- Whole House Efficiency (Home Energy Audits/Evaluations)
- Residential Audits (On-line Audits)
- School-Based Education
- Weatherization

Commercial & Industrial (C&I)

- Small Business Direct Install
- Prescriptive
- Custom

This report presents a status report of Program Year 1 (“PY1”), which ran from September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2015, for BHP’s current Energy Efficiency Solution Plan. Residential and non-residential programs are discussed together throughout the status report. The following program groupings are presented to customers as one program. The program discussions within this status report provide detailed information for each program.

In PY1, BHP spent approximately 88 percent of the budget and achieved 95 percent of the energy savings goal.

Tables ES1 presents projected budgets and actual expenditures by sectors in PY1, including expenditures for incentives, marketing, and administration.

TABLE ES1: PY1 BUDGET BY SECTOR

Sector	PY1 Goal	PY1 Actual	% of Budget
Residential	\$300,132	\$101,584	34%
C&I Programs	\$378,666	\$305,474	81%
Cross Marketing & Training		\$86,853	
General Administration		\$103,345	
Total	\$678,798	\$597,256	88%

Table ES2 provides detailed goal and actual expenditures for PY1 by program.

TABLE ES2: PY1 UTILITY BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

	PY1 Budget	PY1 Expenditures	% of Budget
Residential Programs			
Residential Lighting and Appliance Program	\$62,858	\$15,788	25%
Appliance Recycling	\$59,916	\$11,827	20%
Residential High Efficiency HVAC	\$96,134	\$20,899	22%
Whole House Efficiency—Home Energy Audits	\$28,009	\$23,068	82%
Residential Evaluation – Online Audit	\$13,860	\$10,335	75%
School-Based Education	\$18,191	\$15,589	86%
Weatherization	\$21,164	\$4,079	19%
C&I Programs			
Small Business Direct Install	\$319,372		
Prescriptive	\$37,645	\$149,871	398%
Custom	\$21,649	\$155,603	719%
Cross Marketing & Training		\$86,853	
General Administration		\$103,345	
Total	\$678,798	\$597,256	88%

BHP has 26 separate accounting codes set up to track the costs by measure. Any costs that can be directly assignable to a measure are coded to the measure. Two additional accounting codes were also set to cover Cross Marketing & Training and General Administration costs that are shared and then allocated back to the Residential and C&I Programs. For Cross Marketing & Training – the allocation is 70% to Residential and 30% C&I. For General Administration – the allocation is 50% to Residential and 50% to C&I.

Tables ES3 presents PY1 goal and actual energy savings by sector.

TABLE ES3: PY1 ENERGY SAVINGS (kWh) BY SECTOR

	PY1 Goal	PY1 Actual	% of Goal
Residential Programs	1,338,545	387,913	29%
C&I Programs	1,916,733	2,752,880	144%
Total	3,255,278	3,140,794	96%

Table ES4 provides PY1 goal and actual energy savings by program.

TABLE ES4: PY1 ENERGY SAVINGS (kWh) BY PROGRAM

	PY1 Goal	PY1 Actual	% of Budget
Residential Programs			
Residential Lighting and Appliance Program	407,497	46,665	11%
Appliance Recycling	340,675	90,415	27%
Residential High Efficiency HVAC	339,245	84,867	25%
Whole House Efficiency–Home Energy Audits	85,147	22,245	26%
Residential Evaluation – Online Audit	37,787	19,649	52%
School-Based Education	100,088	108,429	108%
Weatherization	28,106	15,643	56%
C&I Programs			
Small Business Direct Install	893,129	0	0%
Prescriptive	420,586	1,415,298	337%
Custom	603,018	1,337,582	222%
Total	3,255,278	3,140,794	96%

Table ES5 presents PY1 goal and actual demand savings by sector.

TABLE ES5: PY1 DEMAND SAVINGS (kW) BY SECTOR

	PY1 Goal	PY1 Actual	% of Goal
Residential Programs	210.3	60.4	29%
C&I Programs	283.3	648.5	229%
Total	493.6	708.9	144%

Table ES6 presents PY1 goal and actual demand savings by program.

TABLE ES6: PY1 DEMAND SAVINGS (kW) BY PROGRAM

	PY1 Goal	PY1 Actual	% of Budget
Residential Programs			
Residential Lighting and Appliance Program	36.0	3.5	10%
Appliance Recycling	39.0	10.3	26%
Residential High Efficiency HVAC	95.6	26.3	28%
Whole House Efficiency–Home Energy Audits	22.0	5.8	26%
Residential Evaluation – Online Audit	4.3	2.2	52%
School-Based Education	8.8	9.5	108%
Weatherization	4.6	2.8	61%
Non-Residential Programs			
Small Business Direct Install	139.0		
Prescriptive	54.3	318.4	586%
Custom	90.0	330.0	367%
Total	493.6	708.9	144%

Table ES7 provides PY1 overall portfolio cost-effectiveness results.

TABLE ES7: TOTAL PORTFOLIO COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	2.33
Utility Cost Test	2.31
Societal Cost Test	2.89
Participant Test	11.46
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.34

Residential Programs

BHP’s residential energy efficiency programs serve residential customers, encouraging investment in energy efficient measures such as lighting, cooling equipment and whole house efficiency.

Residential Lighting and Appliance

The program’s primary objective is to secure energy savings by incentivizing the purchase of ENERGY STAR qualified lighting and appliances. Mail-in rebates are available to residential customers that purchase efficient appliances including:

- ENERGY STAR Lighting Fixtures
- ENERGY STAR Refrigerators
- Advanced Power Strips

Rebates are mailed to the customer upon receipt and approval of the rebate application.

BHP set up an On-line Store for residential customers to purchase CFL and LED bulbs at a reduced price. Customers pick up their bulbs at their local BHP’s Customer Service Office after placing an order. Each customer is eligible to purchase the following:

- 13Watt CFL bulb (60Watt incandescent equivalent) for \$0.75
- 6Watt LED bulb (40Watt incandescent equivalent) for \$4.95
- 11Watt LED bulb (60Watt incandescent equivalent) for \$5.30
- 9.5Watt LED Flood/Recessed bulb (65Watt incandescent equivalent) for \$12.35

Limitations were set on the number of bulbs that can be purchased at the reduced price in order to allow more customers to participate. The customer can purchase additional bulbs at BHP’s volume price. BHP’s sales did not begin immediately; residential customers began purchases in January 2015.

Tables 1 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 1: RESIDENTIAL LIGHTING AND APPLIANCE PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation			
CFL	10,000	166	2%
LED	500	683	137%
ES Refrigerator	400	44	11%
ES Light Fixture	300	115	38%
Advance Power Strip	185		
Expenditures	\$62,858	\$15,788	25%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	407,497	46,665	11%
Demand Impacts (kW)	36.00	3.47	10%

In PY1, BHP achieved 9 percent of the participation goal and less than 12 percent of the energy and demand savings goals while spending 25 percent of the budget. The low numbers are primarily due to the high goals set for CFLs. BHP is recommending dropping CFL bulbs from the Program and increasing the LED bulb sales goals. Residential customers are much more interested in making the move to LEDs.

Table 2 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 2: RESIDENTIAL WATER HEATING PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.32
Utility Cost Test	0.48
Societal Cost Test	0.40
Participant Test	2.77
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.19

Residential Appliance Recycling

The Refrigerator Recycling Program encourages customers to turn in old inefficient refrigerators and freezers. The program’s goal is to remove inefficient refrigerators/freezers from the electric system and dispose of them in an environmentally safe and responsible manner. Refrigerators/freezers must be between 10 and 30 cubic feet in size and in operating condition. Customers receive a \$50 rebate per qualifying unit recycled.

Tables 3 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 3: RESIDENTIAL REFRIGERATOR RECYCLING PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	275	71	26%
Expenditures	\$59,916	\$11,827	20%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	340,675	90,415	27%
Demand Impacts (kW)	39.00	10.31	26%

In PY1, BHP achieved 26 percent of the participation goal and 27 percent of the energy savings goal. Advertising and promotion to residential customers is a challenge. BHP is recommending modifying the program by offering an incentive to appliance dealers to pick up old refrigerators/freezers when delivering new refrigerators/freezers.

Table 4 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 4: RESIDENTIAL REFRIGERATOR RECYCLING PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.61
Utility Cost Test	0.66
Societal Cost Test	0.77
Participant Test	12.75
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.21

Residential High Efficiency HVAC

The objective of the program is to encourage residential customers to purchase and install energy – efficient HVAC equipment and water heaters. Customers are eligible to receive the following:

Measure	Rebate
Air Source Heat Pump (1-5 tons, SEER ≥15 & HSPF ≥8.5)	\$75 per ton
Early Replacement Air Source Heat Pump (1-5 tons, SEER ≥15 & HSPF ≥8.5)	\$200 per ton
Heat Pump Water Heater (EF≥2.0)	\$5/tank gallon
Electric Storage Water Heater (EF≥0.95)	\$1.50/tank gallon
ENERGY STAR Geothermal Heat Pump (1-5tons)	\$200 per ton
Early Replacement ENERGY STAR Geothermal Heat Pump (1-5tons)	\$300 per ton
Electric Furnace to Heat Pump Replacement (1-5 tons, SEER ≥15 & HSPF ≥8.5)	\$1,500 per system

The tables below compare program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 5: RESIDENTIAL HIGH EFFICIENCY HVAC BUDGET VERSUS TO EXPENDITURES

	Goal	PY1	
		Actual	% of Budget
Air Source Heat Pump	\$30,594	\$7,121	23%
ER Air Source Heat Pump	\$16,317	\$1,000	6%
Heat Pump Water Heater	\$19,037	\$1,000	5%
Water Heater	\$4,079	\$1,490	37%
ES Geothermal Heat Pump	\$9,790	\$6,400	65%
ER ES Geothermal Heat Pump	\$6,119	\$1,300	21%
Electric Furnace to Heat Pump	\$10,198	\$2,588	25%
Total:	\$96,134	\$20,899	22%

TABLE 6: RESIDENTIAL HIGH EFFICIENCY HVAC ENERGY SAVINGS GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	PY1	
		Actual	% of Goal
Air Source Heat Pump	47,880	12,928	27%
ER Air Source Heat Pump	9,576	3,289	34%
Heat Pump Water Heater	121,360	6,935	6%
Water Heater	6,371	1,911	30%
ES Geothermal Heat Pump	59,461	29,731	50%
ER ES Geothermal Heat Pump	24,776	11,193	45%
Electric Furnace to Heat Pump	69,821	27,928	40%
Total:	339,245	93,915	28%

TABLE 7: RESIDENTIAL HIGH EFFICIENCY HVAC DEMAND SAVINGS GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	PY1	
		Actual	% of Goal
Air Source Heat Pump	50.11	13.53	27%
ER Air Source Heat Pump	10.02	1.91	19%
Heat Pump Water Heater	5.75	0.33	6%
Water Heater	0.76	0.23	30%
ES Geothermal Heat Pump	9.30	4.65	50%
ER ES Geothermal Heat Pump	3.87	1.63	42%
Electric Furnace to Heat Pump	15.75	6.30	40%
Total:	95.56	28.58	30%

TABLE 8: RESIDENTIAL HIGH EFFICIENCY HVAC PARTICIPATION GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	PY1	
		Actual	% of Goal
Air Source Heat Pump	100	27	27%
ER Air Source Heat Pump	20	1	5%
Heat Pump Water Heater	70	4	6%
Water Heater	50	15	30%
ES Geothermal Heat Pump	12	6	50%
ER ES Geothermal Heat Pump	5	1	20%
Electric Furnace to Heat Pump	5	2	40%
Total:	262	56	21%

In PY1, BHP achieved about 21 percent of participation goal and 28 percent of the energy savings goal while spending 22 percent of the program budget.

Table 9 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 9: RESIDENTIAL HIGH EFFICIENCY HVAC PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.79
Utility Cost Test	0.96
Societal Cost Test	0.98
Participant Test	4.97
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.25

Whole House Efficiency Program

The Whole House Efficiency Program is to encourage whole-house improvements to existing homes by offering comprehensive home energy audits. Initially, a \$50 fee is charged to the customer to participate for this service which the value is actually between \$400 and \$600. A certified-auditor spends between 2 and 3 hours at each site. Tests include blower door and infrared camera to identify the air infiltration into the home and locations where insulation is needed. BHP and Montana-Dakota Utilities (MDU) will jointly share the costs in common service areas and where natural gas is the primary space heating source.

Tables 10 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 10: WHOLE HOUSE EFFICIENCY AUDIT PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	100	26	26%
Expenditures	\$28,009	\$23,068	82%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	85,147	22,245	26%
Demand Impacts (kW)	22.00	5.78	26%

In PY1, BHP achieved 26 percent of participation and similar energy savings of goals. About 82 percent of budget was spent. There has been a delay in offering audits in joint areas served by BHP and MDU. MDU has not begun offering audits in BHP’s service area. A third-party contractor has now been selected to provide jointly offered audits (BHP/MDU) and is scheduled to begin January 2016. To take care of requests - one of BHP’s Service Technicians received training and is a certified Home Auditor. The expenditures were higher due to the training costs.

Table 11 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 11: WHOLE HOUSE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.25
Utility Cost Test	0.25
Societal Cost Test	0.31
Participant Test	n/a
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.14

Residential Evaluation Program

The Residential Evaluation Program is composed of the Residential Online Energy Audit Tool and on-site customer audits. Customers receive a free energy audit to identify ways they can reduce the energy consumption in their homes. As part of the audit, auditors install low-cost energy saving measures and provide educational information.

Tables 12 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 12: RESIDENTIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	400	208	52%
Expenditures	\$13,860	\$10,335	75%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	37,787	19,649	52%
Demand Impacts (kW)	4.30	2.24	52%

In PY1, BHP achieved 52 percent of participation, energy savings of 52 percent of goal, and 52 percent of demand goals. About 75 percent of budget was spent. BHP is looking to modify this program and encourage more customers to participate by offering a free Energy Kit with every completed Online Audit.

Table 13 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 13: RESIDENTIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.23
Utility Cost Test	0.23
Societal Cost Test	0.30
Participant Test	n/a
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.13

School-Based Energy Education Program

The School-Based Energy Education Program seeks long-term energy savings through enhanced education and awareness of energy efficiency among students. The program is promoted to school districts and teachers throughout education associations and targets middle school children and their households. The program includes a kit which consists of a set of low-cost measures for installation in the home. The program will target middle school-aged children and their households.

Tables 14 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 14: SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	300	325	108%
Expenditures	\$18,191	\$15,589	86%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	100,088	108,429	108%
Demand Impacts (kW)	8.8	9.49	108%

The School-Based Energy Education Program continues to be very popular among schools within BHP’s service territory. The PY1 program participation was 108 percent and expenditures was 86 percent of goals. The savings were 108 percent of energy and demand savings goals.

Table 15 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 15: SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.43
Utility Cost Test	0.43
Societal Cost Test	0.55
Participant Test	n/a
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.18

Weatherization Program

Qualifying low-income customers receive help with managing their energy use and utility bills through the Weatherization Program. This program is offered to any low-income residential customer receiving service from BHP, including senior citizens and disabled customers. Eligible customers receive free installation of energy savings measures in their residence.

Tables 16 compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 16: WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	25	19	76%
Expenditures	\$21,164	\$4,079	19%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	28,106	15,643	56%
Demand Impacts (kW)	4.6	2.81	61%

The program was successful in PY1, spending most of the entire budget and achieving most of the participation goals. The program is offered to eligible low-income customers, therefore energy and demand savings associated with the program are secondary to the program goal of helping customers manage their energy use.

Table 17 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 17: WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.72
Utility Cost Test	0.72
Societal Cost Test	0.89
Participant Test	n/a
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.22

Combined Residential Program Portfolio Cost-Effectiveness

Table 18 shows the cost-effectiveness of the residential programs.

TABLE 18: COMBINED RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	0.50
Utility Cost Test	0.56
Societal Cost Test	0.62
Participant Test	7.39
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.20

Commercial & Industrial Programs

BHP’s Commercial & Industrial (C&I) energy efficiency programs encourage investment in energy efficient measures such as lighting, cooling and heating equipment, motors and refrigerator recycling.

Small Business Direct Install Program

The Small Business Direct Install Program offers rebates to small commercial and industrial customers to install lighting equipment. An implementation contractor would be set up to provide a complete turn-key service: perform audits, provide a proposal, and install the lights. The Program was designed to assist customers in upgrading fluorescent lighting from T12 to T8, converting incandescent lights to LED and change out Exit Signage to LEDs.

TABLE 19: COMMERCIAL CUSTOM PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	100		
Expenditures	\$319,372		
Energy Impacts (kWh)	893,129		
Demand Impacts (kW)	139		

BHP set up a local contractor to provide the service to customers. After initially promoting this service to customers – BHP learned that the costs of LED conversion kits for fluorescent bulbs have come down so customers were more interested in making the conversion to LEDs. BHP also received many customized LED lighting proposals. It appears that the trend seen with Residential customers is similar – C&I customers are also more interested in all of the benefits of LED lighting. The LED lifetimes also benefit C&I customers since maintenance and replacement costs play a bigger role. Therefore, the budgeted amounts for this program were never used and instead redirected to Prescriptive and Custom Rebates.

Table 20 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 20: COMMERCIAL CUSTOM PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	
Utility Cost Test	
Societal Cost Test	
Participant Test	
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	

Commercial Prescriptive Rebate Program

The Commercial Prescriptive Rebate Program provides standardized prescriptive rebates to commercial and industrial customers that install, replace or retrofit electric savings measures. These measures, including lighting, cooling and heating equipment, electric motors and variable frequency drives, are proven technologies that are readily available with known performance characteristics. All C&I customers are eligible to participate in this program. The same customer can participate in more than one measure in the same year.

The tables below compare the program goals to actual program performance.

TABLE 21: COMMERCIAL PRESCRIPTIVE BUDGET VERSUS TO EXPENDITURES

	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
C&I Lighting	\$4,045	\$148,041	3,660%
C&I Motors	\$1,680	\$135	8%
C&I VFDs	\$10,080	\$1,545	15%
C&I Air Source Heat Pumps	\$6,300	\$150	2%
C&I Split Package Heat Pumps	\$6,300	\$0	0%
C&I Ground Source Heat Pumps	\$5,880	\$0	0%
C&I Water Heaters	\$3,360	\$0	0%
Total:	\$37,645	\$149,871	398%

TABLE 22: COMMERCIAL PRESCRIPTIVE ENERGY SAVINGS GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
C&I Lighting	57,450	1,293,935	2,252%
C&I Motors	6,029	58,553	971%
C&I VFDs	185,397	60,997	33%
C&I Air Source Heat Pumps	13,601	1,813	13%
C&I Split Package Heat Pumps	29,708	0	0%
C&I Ground Source Heat Pumps	111,064	0	0%
C&I Water Heaters	17,337	0	0%
Total:	420,586	1,415,298	337%

TABLE 23: COMMERCIAL PRESCRIPTIVE DEMAND SAVINGS GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
C&I Lighting	9.0	294.8	3,275%
C&I Motors	1.0	13.0	1,303%
C&I VFDs	24.0	10.1	42%
C&I Air Source Heat Pumps	4.5	0.6	13%
C&I Split Package Heat Pumps	4.5	0.0	0%
C&I Ground Source Heat Pumps	10.5	0.0	0%
C&I Water Heaters	0.8	0.0	0%
Total:	54.3	318.4	586%

TABLE 24: COMMERCIAL PRESCRIPTIVE PARTICIPATION GOAL VERSUS ACTUAL

	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
C&I Lighting	204	47	23%
C&I Motors	41	2	5%
C&I VFDs	24	4	17%
C&I Air Source Heat Pumps	40	2	5%
C&I Ground Source Heat Pumps	9	0	0%
C&I Water Heaters	10	0	0%
C&I Refrigerator Recycling	7	0	0%
Total:	335	55	16%

In PY1, BHP spent approximately 8 percent of the budget and achieved 19 percent of the energy savings goal and 36 percent of the demand savings goal.

Table 25 presents results from the cost-effectiveness analysis, based on program activity.

TABLE 25: COMMERCIAL PRESCRIPTIVE PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	2.88
Utility Cost Test	3.58
Societal Cost Test	3.59
Participant Test	9.16
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.37

Commercial Custom Rebate Program

The Commercial Custom Rebate Program offers rebates to commercial and industrial customers that plan to install equipment that does not qualify for a prescriptive rebate. Custom rebates are determined individually for each project based upon the equipment energy savings and the cost difference between standard and high efficiency equipment (i.e. the incremental cost of the equipment).

Custom rebates, up to \$25,000 per year per facility, are the lesser of the following:

- 50% of the incremental cost
- \$0.30 per kWh savings

TABLE 26: COMMERCIAL CUSTOM PROGRAM PY1 SUMMARY

	Goal	Actual	% Goal Achieved
Participation	20	30	150%
Expenditures	\$21,649	\$155,603	719%
Energy Impacts (kWh)	603,018	1,337,582	222%
Demand Impacts (kW)	90	330	367%

The program spent approximately 150 percent of the budget in PY1. The program achieved 222 percent of the PY1 energy savings goal. In PY1, BHP provided reduced rebates for LED lighting projects that did not pass the TRC test. The rebates typically covered 5 to 10 percent of the incremental cost of the lighting project.

Table 27 presents cost-effectiveness analysis results, based on program activity.

TABLE 27: COMMERCIAL CUSTOM PROGRAM COST-EFFECTIVENESS RESULTS

Test	PY1
Total Resource Cost Test	4.98
Utility Cost Test	3.00
Societal Cost Test	6.18
Participant Test	20.10
Ratepayer Impact Measure Test	0.37