BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Commission review of numeric conservation goals (JEA)

DOCKET NO.: 20240016-EG FILED: April 2, 2024

JEA'S PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF NUMERIC CONSERVATION GOALS

JEA, by and through its undersigned attorneys, and pursuant to Sections 120.569, 120.57(1), and 366.82, Florida Statutes ("F.S."), and Rules 28-106.201 and 25-17.0021, Florida Administrative Code ("F .A.C''), petitions the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission") to approve JEA's proposed numeric conservation goals as set forth in the attached Exhibit No. [BP-8]. In accordance with the minimum testimony requirements set forth in the Order Consolidating Dockets and Establishing Procedure, JEA is contemporaneously submitting the direct testimony of Brian C. Pippin, Bradley E. Kushner, and James Herndon, which is incorporated by reference herein. In further support of this Petition, JEA states:

BACKGROUND

1. JEA is an electric utility subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act ("FEECA"), Section 366.82, F.S., which requires the Commission to adopt and periodically review goals to increase the efficiency of energy consumption, increase the development of demand side renewable energy systems, reduce and control the growth rates of electric consumption and weather sensitive peak demand, and encourage the development of demand side renewable energy resources.

2. JEA is the municipal electric utility provider for approximately 522,000 customers in the City of Jacksonville and portions of Clay, St. Johns, and Nassau Counties. JEA is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of four members appointed by the President of the City Council and three members appointed by the Mayor of the City of Jacksonville, all of whom are approved by the City Council. The Board of Directors sets the rates, operating budget, and policies governing JEA's operations. The establishment of JEA's FEECA numeric conservation goals will affect the JEA's operating budget and could affect JEA's rates. Therefore, this proceeding will determine JEA's substantial interests.

3. The affected agency is:

Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399

4. All notices, pleadings and other communications required to be served on JEA in

this docket should be directed to:

Gary V. Perko (FBN 855898) Primary: gperko@holtzmanvogel.com Mohammad O. Jazil (FBN 72556) Primary: mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com Valerie L. Chartier-Hogancamp (FBN 1011269) Primary: vhogancamp@holtzmanvogel.com Secondary: zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIAK PLLC 119 South Monroe Street, Suite 500 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 270-5938

5. As a utility subject to FEECA, JEA was aware that this proceeding would be held before this docket was opened.

6. JEA knows of no material facts in dispute in this proceeding. However, the Commission has set forth a tentative list of issues in the Order Consolidating Dockets and Establishing Procedure. Other parties to this proceeding may dispute JEA's position that consideration of all such issues supports approval of JEA's proposed goals.

7. This proceeding involves the formulation of agency action, rather than the reversal or modification of the agency's proposed action. Thus, subparagraphs (d) and (e) of Rule 28- 106.201(2), F.A.C., do not apply to this petition. Nevertheless, the ultimate facts entitling JEA approval of its proposed conservation goals are set forth in the testimony of Brian C. Pippin, Bradley E. Kushner, and James Herndon submitted contemporaneously with this Petition. The specific statutes and rules entitling JEA to such relief are Sections 120.569, 120.57(1), and 366.82, F.S, and Rules 28-106.201, and Rule 25-17.0021, F.A.C.

JEA'S PROPOSED NUMERIC CONSERVATION GOALS

8. Section 366.82, F.S., requires the Commission to consider, among other things, the costs and benefits to the participating ratepayers as well as the general body of ratepayers as a whole, including utility incentives and participant contributions. Further, Rule 25-17.0021(3), F.A.C, requires FEECA utilities to file demand-side management ("DSM") programs that pass the Participant and Rate Impact Measure ("RIM") Tests, as well as demand-side management programs that pass the Participant and Total Resource Cost ("TRC") Tests. However, neither the statute nor the rule dictates which cost-effectiveness test must be used to establish DSM goals.

9. JEA's current numeric conservation goals were established in the Commission's 2019 Goalsetting Order, which carried forward the goals established in 2014. See Order No. PSC-2019-0509-FOF-EG (Nov. 26, 2019). In the 2014 Goalsetting Order, the Commission incorporated by reference a Settlement Agreement which established JEA's current conservation goals based on existing DSM programs offered by JEA. That Commission-approved Settlement Agreement stated:

Because the RIM test ensures no impact to customers' rates, it is particularly appropriate in establishing DSM goals for municipal utilities, such as JEA. Local governing is a fundamental aspect of public power. It provides the necessary latitude to make local decisions regarding the community's investment in energy efficiency that best suit local needs and values. Local decisions are based on input from citizens who can speak out on electric power issues at governing board meetings. Accordingly, as the Commission has recognized in prior proceedings, it is appropriate to set goals based on RIM, but to defer to the municipal utilities' governing bodies to determine the level of investment in any non-RIM based measures.

Order No. PSC-2014-0696-FOF-EU, Attachment A, p.2 (Dec. 16, 2014). More recently, the

Commission has stated:

For municipal utilities such as JEA, local decisions fall within the jurisdiction of JEA's governing body regarding the investment in energy efficiency that best suits local needs and values. Accordingly, as we have recognized in prior proceedings, it is appropriate to defer to municipal utilities' governing bodies to determine the level of investment if measures are not cost-effective.

Order No. PSC-2020-0200-PAA-EG, p.5 (June 24, 2020) (citing Order No. PSC-2015-0324-PAA-

(August 11, 2015).

10. As discussed in the pre-filed testimony of Brian Pippin and James Herndon, the cost-effectiveness analysis of DSM programs shows that only one residential program (Home Efficiency Upgrades) is cost-effective under the RIM and Participants Test combined, and no commercial/industrial programs (other than demand response which, as discussed in Mr. Pippin's testimony, is not included in JEA's proposed goals) pass the RIM and Participants combined. Nevertheless, as Mr. Pippin's testimony explains, consistent with the approach previously approved by the Commission, JEA is proposing numeric conservation goals based on the DSM programs that JEA currently offers with some modifications. The net effect is an increase in JEA's Residential goals and a tripling of JEA's Commercial goals going forward.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, JEA respectfully requests that the Commission approve the proposed numeric conservation goals set forth in the attached Exhibit No. [BP-8].

Respectfully submitted this 2d day of April, 2024.

HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIAK PLLC

/s/ Gary V. Perko Gary V. Perko (FBN 855898) Primary: gperko@holtzmanvogel.com Mohammad O. Jazil (FBN 72556) Primary: mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com Valerie L. Chartier-Hogancamp (FBN 1011269) Primary: vhogancamp@holtzmanvogel.com Secondary: zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIAK PLLC 119 South Monroe Street, Suite 500 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 270-5938

Counsel for JEA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 2d, 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been

furnished by electronic mail to the following:

Jacob Imig Jonathan H. Rubottom Office of General Counsel 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 jrubotto@psc.state.fl.us discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us

Patricia A. Christensen christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us Walt Trierweiler trierweiler.walt@leg.state.fl.us Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

/s/ Gary V. Perko Attorney

Q. Please summarize your educational background and professional experience.

- A. I hold a Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a Masters in Business Administration from the University of Memphis. I've worked at JEA for 19 years, initially providing energy and water conservation education to customers and later developing and implementing energy and water efficiency programs, to now managing the overall electric DSM portfolio to achieve our external FEECA and internal DSM goals.
-

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss (1) how JEA is governed; (2) recent trends in JEA's system load growth; and (3) JEA's proposed DSM goals and the process used to develop them. My testimony includes discussion related to JEA's existing conservation and DSM programs, how supply-side efficiencies are incorporated into JEA's planning process, and how JEA's proposed goals encourage demand-side renewable energy systems.

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits to your testimony?

A. Yes. Exhibit No. [BP-1] is a copy of my resume. Exhibit No. [BP-2] presents JEA's existing Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA) goals. Exhibit No. [BP-3] presents a list of the DSM and conservation programs included in JEA's existing DSM Plan. Exhibit No. [BP-4] summarizes the historical participation in JEA's existing FEECA DSM programs. Exhibit No. [BP-5] presents a summary of JEA's marketing and educational activities. Exhibit No. [BP-6] presents the estimated bill impacts on residential 1,000 kWh/month bill. Exhibit No. [BP-7] presents a summary

than the Federal Poverty Level, but less than the basic cost of living. This breaks down

to 14% of households that live in poverty and 27% of households who live as ALICE.

For the past 10 years JEA has offered the Neighborhood Energy Efficiency Program, which is a neighborhood blitz-style program focused on the direct install of energy and water efficiency measures into the homes of our low-income Customers including efficiency and conservation behavioral best practices. JEA just recently embarked on a new low-income focused deep energy and water efficiency improvement program targeting our highest energy burden Customers across Jacksonville called the Restore, Repair and Resiliency (R3) Program. The end goal is to develop a sustainable program 11 through-out low-income neighborhoods in Jacksonville to help hard-working families reduce energy and water use, lower utility bills and remain in their homes. JEA began with an initial pilot program in late 2022 with a core group of community organizations to provide efficiency upgrades to 15 homes on the Eastside of Jacksonville and will continue to assist 76 homes through the Department of Energy's energy efficiency and conservation block grant.

Q. Please discuss how JEA's loads have changed since the last goal setting in 2019.

A. As reported in our 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, JEA's net energy load (NEL) has increased over the 2018-2022 period at an annual average growth-rate (AAGR) of approximately 0.23 percent. JEA experienced an annual average decrease of approximately 3.61 percent in net firm winter peak demand (mild winter weather experienced in 2022) but an AAGR of approximately 2.26 percent in net firm summer peak demand, since the last potential study was performed. JEA's AAGR over the

Q. What cost-effectiveness test or tests are appropriate for setting JEA's goals under FEECA?

A. Section 366.82, Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires the Commission to consider, among other things, the costs, and benefits to the participating ratepayers as well as the general body of ratepayers, including utility incentives and participant contributions. However, Section 366.82 does not dictate which cost-effectiveness test must be used to establish DSM goals. In the 2014 Goalsetting Order (Order No. PSC-14-0696-FOF-EU), the Commission determined that the Participant Test is appropriate for calculating the costs and benefits to the customers participating in the energy savings and demand reduction measures. The Commission further determined that consideration of both the Rate Impact Measure (RIM) and Total Resource Cost (TRC) tests is necessary to reflect the benefits and costs incurred by the general body of ratepayers, including utility incentives and participant contributions.

Because the RIM test ensures no impact to customers' rates, it is particularly appropriate in establishing DSM goals for municipal utilities, such as JEA. Local governing is a fundamental aspect of public power. It provides the necessary latitude to make local decisions regarding the community's investment in energy efficiency that best suit our local needs and values. Local decisions are based on input from citizens who can speak out on electric power issues at governing board meetings. Accordingly, as the Commission has recognized in prior proceedings, it is appropriate to set goals based on RIM, but to defer to the municipal utilities' governing bodies to determine the level of investment in any non-RIM based measures. See Order No. PSC-14-0696- FOF-EU (Attachment A, p.2 of 6).

Q. In general, how would JEA's lower income customers be affected by increases in utility rates due to the implementation of DSM programs that do not pass the RIM test?

A. Lower income customers, in general, spend a disproportionately higher percentage of 19 their disposable income on electric utility bills than higher income customers. As a result, any increases in electric utility rates resulting from the implementation of DSM measures that do not pass RIM would have a tangible negative impact on utility 22 affordability for the more than 40% of JEA's residential customers that earn less than the Federal Poverty Level or are considered ALICE households that are unable or choose not to participate in DSM programs that decrease their electric consumption sufficiently to offset the increased rates.

measure. In addition, we have removed our Solar Water Heating incentive due to lack of customer interest and participation.

For this FEECA goal-setting process, JEA proposes to fill the gap in savings resulting from the elimination of energy audits, by adding our existing Home Efficiency Upgrades Program, that includes incentives for HVAC, Heat Pump Water Heaters and Ceiling Insulation, and our Energy Efficient Products Program, that includes incentives for Energy Star Clothes Washer, Energy Star Room Air Conditioners and Smart Thermostats, to our FEECA portfolio. We will be continuing the NEE Program and Prescriptive Lighting incentives in the portfolio.

Q. Do JEA's proposed demand-side management goals reflect projected peak demand reductions associated with the demand response programs discussed in 14 Exhibit No [JH-15] to Mr. Herndon's direct testimony?

A. No. JEA offers interruptible load rates. However, JEA has not included projected peak demand reductions associated with demand response or interruptible load in our proposed goals as the current interruptible rate option for customers is considered behavioral in nature and historically JEA has not had to utilize interruptible load. As such, including peak demand reductions associated with the demand response potential 20 identified for large commercial customers in the RIM and TRC scenarios overlaps with our current interruptible load rate, and would inflate our proposed goals and jeopardize our ability to meet our goals regardless of our continuing efforts to offer demand-side management to our customers.

Q. What are JEA's proposed demand-side management goals?

Q. Please describe how free-ridership was addressed in developing JEA's proposed demand-side management goals.

A. Consistent with prior DSM analyses in Florida, free ridership was reflected by applying a two-year payback criterion, which eliminated measures having a simple payback of less than two years. Please refer to Exhibit No. [JH-12] for discussion on sensitivities (i.e. shorter and longer) to the two-year payback period.

Q. Please describe the efforts JEA has made to address customers who rent in program development, including a list of programs they would be eligible to participate in.

A. Renters are known to be a hard-to-reach customer segment because the types of measures the can be implemented by those who rent rather than own their dwellings are limited. However, measures such as Energy Star Clothes Washers and Room Air Conditioners, included in the Energy Efficient Products Program, are portable and may therefore be available to renters depending on their specific rental agreements. In addition, almost all the direct install measures in the Neighborhood Energy Efficiency Program are non-permanent and may be available to renters depending on their specific rental agreements. In general, all customers, including those customers who rent, may benefit from JEA's educational and community outreach initiatives related to demand-side management, conservation, and energy and water efficiency.

Q. How are supply-side efficiencies incorporated in JEA's most recent planning process and how do they impact demand-side management programs?

A. JEA continually monitors the operation of its generating units and determines methods to utilize and/or modify the system in the most efficient manner. A recent example of

Docket No. 20240016-EG JEA's Existing FEECA Goals Exhibit No. [BP-1], Page 1 of 2

Brian Pippin

PROFILE

Customer experience-oriented business leader and program manager with 20 years of utility knowledge in new product/program design, development and implementation that build customer loyalty. A natural collaborator, orator, and influencer who's successfully executed multiple cross-functional customer facing initiatives through effective team leadership, shared visioning and the continuous improvement of people, processes, and systems.

WORK EXPERIENCE – JEA (Jacksonville, FL)

2016 – Present

Specialist / Director, Customer Experience Insights & Solutions / Strategic Segment Manager

- Tasked with the long-term strategy and market development of JEA's demand side management (DSM), digital customer engagement and dynamic pricing offerings.
- Effectively manage JEA's energy and water DSM portfolio (25+ measures) for both residential and commercial customers with a budget more than \$15MM annually.
- Successfully implemented a year-long residential demand pilot with 3,000 customers by leading 30+ cross-functional employees, representing 12 different departments, from the customer call center to metering.
- Directly managed 4 Program Managers and 14 external contract employees.

2014 – 2016

Customer Solutions Manager

- Tasked with the growth and market development of JEA's billing and payment (ebill, autopay, prepaid, budget billing) solutions.
- Tripled enrollment numbers for all billing and payment programs through creative marketing, evolving the offering and call center sales strategy.

$2006 - 2014$

Conservation and Efficiency Specialist

 Authored 20+ residential and commercial customer targeted fact sheets centered on the technical and financial efficacy of energy and water saving practices and products.

Docket No. 20240016-EG Brian Pippin Resume Exhibit No. [BP-1], Page 2 of 2

• Delivered 100s of consultative presentations (one-on-one/one-on-many) to customers on JEA programs and service offerings most notably through a two-year stint as host of the "Q&A with JEA" FM radio show and co-host of the "JEA Efficiency Coach" TV show.

2005 – 2006

New Technology Analyst

• Focused on the business case development for all new technology projects from preplanning to implementation. Most notably helping to establish JEA's Technology Project Committee (TPC) which provides the Senior Leadership Team a vehicle to review and evaluate the business case of technology projects.

2004 – 2005

Operations Analyst

- Support the preplanning, planning, analysis, design, construction, testing and implementation of data processing and information systems.
- Reengineer process maps to improve efficiency and effectiveness of SDLC execution.
- Consult with cross-functional business units to identify and quantify the savings drivers in their current processes to analyze the financial metrics of the project.

EDUCATION

1992 - 1997 Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, GA Bachelor of Industrial Engineering (3.4/4.0 GPA)

CAREER RELATED CERTIFICATIONS

Building Analyst (BA) – Inactive

Building Performance Institute, Inc.

- Class 1 Home Efficiency Rating System (HERS) Energy Auditor Inactive Residential Energy Service Network
- Certified Energy Manager (CEM) Inactive Association of Energy Engineers
- Certified Green Professional (CGP) Inactive National Association of Home Builders

Commission-Approved Conservation Goals for JEA

Docket No. 20240016-EG Current JEA FEECA Programs Exhibit No. [BP-3], Page 1 of 1

Current JEA FEECA Programs

JEA's FEECA portfolio consists of three (3) residential and two (2) commercial programs as described below.

A. Residential FEECA Programs

- Residential Energy Audit Program uses in-person auditors and online software to examine homes, educate customers and make recommendations on low-cost or no-cost energy-saving practices and measures.
- Residential Solar Water Heating pays a financial incentive to customers to encourage the use of solar water heating technology.
- Neighborhood Efficiency Program offers education concerning the efficient use of energy & water as well as the direct installation of an array of energy & water efficient measures at no cost to income-qualified customers.

B. Commercial FEECA Programs

- Commercial Energy Audit Program uses in-person auditors to examine businesses, educate customers and make recommendations on low-cost or no-cost energy-saving practices and measures.
- Commercial Prescriptive Lighting Program pays a financial incentive to customers to install high efficiency lighting technology.

Historical Participation in Current JEA FEECA Programs

Docket No. 20240016-EG Historical Participation in Current JEA FEECA Programs Exhibit No. [BP-4] Page 2 of 3

Docket No. 20240016-EG Historical Participation in Current JEA FEECA Programs Exhibit No. [BP-4] Page 3 of 3

Customer Programs & Solutions

Conservation and Efficiency

GOALS

- Increase customer satisfaction, build brand loyalty.
- Increase customer awareness and adoption of conservation and efficiency programs and solutions.
- JEA viewed as an Environmental Steward in the community by customers.

Measuring Success

- JDP Survey
- Digital Analytics
- Focus Groups
- Brand Tracking Surveys
- Program Adoption

Estimated Bill Impacts –RIM Scenario, TRC Scenario, and JEA's Proposed Goals

Docket No. 20240016-EG JEA's Proposed Demand-Side Management Goals Exhibit No. [BP-7], Page 1 of 1

OVERVIEW

Mr. Kushner has nearly 25 years in the energy industry with a specialty in electric utility system resource planning. His expertise includes the following areas:

- Conservation / Demand-Side Management / Energy Efficiency
- **Expert Testimony**
- Regulatory Compliance and Support
- **Integrated Resource Plans**
- **Power Supply Studies**
- **Conventional Energy Technologies**
- **Renewable Energy Technologies**
- Economic Analysis
- **Production Cost Modeling**
- **Independent Engineering**
- **Project Management**
- **Power Supply Requests for Proposals (RFPs)**

Mr. Kushner has provided testimony in many conservation and energy efficiency dockets, power plant need determination proceedings, and integrated resource plans. Mr. Kushner has managed numerous integrated resource plans, need for power applications, power supply studies, demand-side management/energy efficiency/conservation evaluations and power supply request for proposals (RFPs), among other studies. Mr. Kushner has a demonstrated ability to manage internal and external project teams with diverse experience levels and areas of expertise, both in co-located and virtual environments. Mr. Kushner's experience in project management and expertise in the areas outlined above allow him to collaborate with clients to deliver outstanding services to his clients. His ability to effectively communicate in writing and verbally helps to keep stakeholders informed throughout project lifecycles and has contributed to his successful experiences as a witness and in formal presentations to clients' Board of Directors.

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Demand-Side Management / Energy Efficiency/ Conservation (DSM/EE/Conservation)

Mr. Kushner's experience with the evaluation of DSM/EE/Conservation is highlighted by his involvement in the development of conservation goals and demand-side management plans for Florida utilities as part of the 2009, 2014, and 2019 Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA) filings. Mr. Kushner led development of the filings and testified as to the appropriateness of the numeric goals and process utilized to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of DSM/EE/Conservation programs.

Expert Witness Support

Mr. Kushner has testified as a witness in numerous proceedings related to Determination of Need petitions and Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA) filings in the State of Florida and has been involved as a witness in integrated resource planning (IRP) proceedings elsewhere in the United States. Related experience includes coordinating/leading responses to hundreds of interrogatories and production of document requests.

Electric Utility System Resource Planning / Production Cost Modeling

With his extensive experience in Electric Utility System Resource Planning and production cost modeling, Mr. Kushner recognizes that while industry best practices provide effective guidelines, the unique nature of each client's situation require strategic thinking and the ability to develop plans that are specific to the client's needs. Mr. Kushner's expertise in generation (including conventional and renewable technologies), demand-side management, and fundamentals of production cost modeling allow Mr. Kushner to deliver comprehensive resource plans that clients can utilize for future decision making.

Integrated Resource Plans /Power Supply Studies

Mr. Kushner has been involved as the project manager, study manager, and lead analyst on several integrated resource plans (IRP) or power supply studies during his professional career. Mr. Kushner has been involved in such studies for clients in Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wisconsin, as well as other states and territories.

Power Supply Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

Power purchases are often an important component of electric utility system planning, and conducting a competitive power supply RFP process may be critical to the ensuring the most cost-effective, reliable, and environmentally responsible alternatives are being considered. Mr. Kushner has experience in the complete RFP lifecycle, including collaborating with clients to develop the RFP, supporting clients during issuance and subsequent management of the RFP process, screening and evaluating RFP responses, presenting the results of the RFP to clients and stakeholders, and supporting negotiations related to power purchase agreements. Mr. Kushner has managed or otherwise been involved in numerous RFP processes focused on both conventional and renewable generating technologies.

Independent Engineering / Project Financing Support

Mr. Kushner has managed projects in the area of independent engineering, related to merger and acquisition support as well as development of new power projects. Most recently, Mr. Kushner managed the independent engineering assessment of a new biomass facility in North America for which the developer was trying to obtain project financing. The independent engineering assessment included development of a due diligence report on behalf of the developer, supporting negotiations with potential investors, supporting development of the credit agreement with the eventual loan syndicate, and monthly construction monitoring activities.

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

Mr. Kushner began his career with Black & Veatch Corporation in 2000 and has been involved in electric

Docket No. 20240016-EG Resumé of Bradley E. Kushner Exhibit No. [BEK-1], Page 3 of 3

utility system resource planning and independent engineering engagements since that time in various roles at Black & Veatch. Most recently, Mr. Kushner was Department Head for Black & Veatch's Management Consulting group and was a Director for Black & Veatch Management Consulting LLC's electric system resource planning service offering before joining nFront Consulting LLC in 2016. Mr. Kushner is currently a Manager of nFront Consulting and the National Director of nFront Consulting's Energy practice.

EDUCATIONAL

Mr. Kushner's educational background includes a B.S. in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Missouri - Columbia and a Master of Business Administration from Emporia State University.

1 Act (FEECA) utilities in the DSM goals proceeding conducted in 2019 before 2 this Commission.

Q. Please summarize your experience with studies assessing DSM potential.

4 A. I have been involved in conducting or managing over 30 DSM potential studies 5 over the past 17 years. In addition to these studies, I have led the development 6 of numerous DSM programs and portfolios, managed implementation of 7 residential, commercial, and industrial DSM programs, and conducted third-8 party evaluations of utility DSM programs, providing extensive experience and 9 expertise regarding market analyses, DSM measures and technologies, and utility program structures and best practices that inform the assessment of DSM potential.

Q. Have you previously testified before the Florida Public Service Commission or in other state regulatory proceedings?

 A. Yes, I provided testimony in the 2019 DSM goals proceeding before this Commission in support of our market potential studies for each FEECA utility in that case. I have also submitted testimony before the Virginia State Corporation Commission, the North Carolina Utilities Commission, the South Carolina Public Service Commission, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, and the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

 A. The purpose of my testimony is to introduce and summarize the methodology and findings of the Technical Potential Study (TPS) we conducted for each of the six utilities subject to the requirements of FEECA, collectively the FEECA

Q. What reports have been produced in the scope of RI's work?

2 A.RI has produced six separate TPS reports, one for each FEECA Utility under 3 this scope of work.

Q. What were the major steps in the analytical work RI performed?

- 5 A.The two major steps in RI's scope of work included development of technical 6 potential and, for applicable utilities, creation of proposed DSM goals that 7 aligned with utility program concepts. These steps included the following 8 tasks:
- 9 Step 1: Technical Potential. The TP analysis established the basis for the development of proposed DSM goals. As summarized in Section 2 of each utility's TPS report, and illustrated in Figure 1 of each report, the key tasks in assessing the technical potential consisted of the following:
- *Load Forecast Disaggregation*. To disaggregate the load forecast, RI collected utility load forecast data, relevant customer segmentation and end-use consumption data, and supplemented this with existing secondary data to create a disaggregated utility load forecast broken out by customer sector and segment as well as by end-use and equipment type, and calibrated to the overall utility forecast.
- *Comprehensive Measure Development*. RI worked collaboratively with the FEECA Utilities, who also sought input from various external stakeholders, to develop a comprehensive list of DSM technologies that are currently commercially available in Florida.

1 suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study, as appropriate, as 2 detailed in Appendix D of each TPS report.

3 Through months of rigorous discussion with the FEECA Utilities, the 4 parameters for measures to be considered were established. The evaluation of 5 measures to include examined whether the measure was technically feasible and 6 currently commercially available in Florida; additionally, behavioral measures 7 without accompanying physical changes or utility-provided products and tools 8 were excluded, as were fuel-switching measures, other than in the context of 9 DSRE measures. The process to identify DSM measures is more fully described in Section 4 of each TPS report.

Q. Was the process of measure identification and selection appropriate for the objectives of the study?

 A. Yes. The measure identification process was robust, comprehensive, and appropriate for the objectives of the study. The final measure list was developed to account for DSM measures that had been considered in prior Florida studies and took full account of current Florida Building Code and federal equipment standards, current FEECA Utilities' program offerings, and the incorporation of DSM measures considered in other potential study reports and other utility DSM program offerings around the country.

Q. Did the process allow for the assessment of the full TP for FEECA Utilities?

 A. Yes. The thorough process for developing the list resulted in a comprehensive set of over 400 unique EE, DR, and DSRE measures that fully addressed DSM opportunities across all electric energy-consuming end-uses at residential,

1 contractor/vendor capacity, cost-effectiveness, normal equipment replacement 2 rates, or customer preferences).

3 Therefore, the TP does not reflect the MW and GWh savings that may 4 be potentially achievable through real-world voluntary utility programs, but 5 rather it establishes the theoretical upper bound for DSM potential.

- **Q. Do RI's TPS reports provide a detailed description of RI's methodology, data, and assumptions for estimating TP?**
- 8 A. Yes. As stated earlier, RI developed individual TPS reports for each of the six 9 FEECA Utilities. The reports described RI's overall methodology, data, and assumptions for disaggregating each utility's baseline load forecast, development of DSM measures, and determination of TP.
- **Q. Do these TPS reports identify the full TP for the FEECA Utilities?**
- A. Yes. Each utility report identifies the full TP for the DSM measures analyzed against the utility's baseline load forecast.

Q. Please summarize the methodology, source of data, and assumptions used to develop the TP for EE measures for the FEECA Utilities.

 A. As stated above, TP ignores all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE. RI's methodology for estimating EE TP begins with the disaggregated utility load forecast. For the current analysis, RI used the 2023 load forecast from each FEECA Utility, which, for all except FPUC, was based on the most recent Ten- Year Site Plan available at the time the MPS was initiated, which were the 2023 Ten-Year Site Plans.

1 Next, all technically feasible measures are assigned to the appropriate 2 customer segments and end-uses. The measure kW and kWh impact data 3 collected during DSM measure development are then applied to the baseline 4 forecast, as illustrated in the following equation for the residential sector:

7 The savings factor, or percentage reduction in electricity consumption 8 resulting from application of the efficient technology, is applied to the baseline 9 energy use intensity to determine the per-home impact, and the other factors listed in the equation above inform the total number of households where the measure is applicable, technically feasible, and has not already been installed. The result of this equation is the total TP for an EE measure or technology.

 The final component of estimating overall TP is to account for the interaction between measures. In some situations, measures compete with each other, such as a 16 SEER air source heat pump and an 18 SEER air source heat pump. For TP, the measure with the highest savings factor is prioritized. The other interaction is measure overlap, where the impacts of one measure may affect the savings for a subsequent measure. An example of measure overlap would be the installation of an 18 SEER air source heat pump as well as a smart thermostat that optimizes the operation of the heat pump. To account for overlapping impacts, RI's model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on 1 savings achieved by the preceding measure. For TP, interactive measures are 2 ranked based on the total end-use energy savings percentage, with the measures 3 having a greater savings treated as being implemented first.

Q. Please summarize the methodology, source of data, and assumptions used to develop TP for DR measures for the FEECA Utilities.

6 A. TP for DR is effectively the total of customer loads that could be curtailed 7 during conditions when utilities need capacity reductions. Therefore, RI's 8 approach to estimating DR TP focuses on the curtailable load available within 9 the time period of interest. In particular, the analysis focuses on end-uses available for curtailment during peak periods and the magnitude of load within each of these end-uses, beyond that of existing DR enrollment for each utility.

 Similar to the estimation of EE TP, the DR analysis begins with a disaggregation of the utility load forecast. RI's approach for load disaggregation to identify DR opportunities is more advanced than that used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, RI produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours of the year. This was needed because customer loads available at times when utility system needs arise can vary substantially. For this study, curtailable load opportunities, coincident with both the summer system peak and winter system peak, were analyzed. Additionally, instead of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study produced loads for several customer segments. RI examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four

1 different small commercial and industrial (C&I) segments, and four different 2 large C&I customer segments, for a total of 11 different customer segments. 3 Next, RI identified the available load for the appropriate end-uses that can be 4 curtailed. RI's approach assumed that large C&I customers would forego 5 virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive was large 6 enough. For residential and small C&I customers, TP for DR is limited by loads 7 that can be controlled remotely at scale. For this study, it was assumed that 8 summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air 9 conditioning (A/C), pool pumps, water heaters, and electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on A/C load and electric vehicle charging.

 For winter capacity, residential DR capacity was based on electric heating loads, pool pumps, water heaters, and electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on heating load and electric vehicle charging. For eligible loads within these end-uses, the TP was defined as the amount coincident with system peak hours for each season. System peak hours were identified using 2023 system load data. For DR TP, no measure breakout was necessary because all measures targeted the end-uses estimated for TP.

 Finally, RI accounted for existing DR by assuming that all customers currently enrolled in a DR program did not have additional load that could be curtailed. As a result, all currently-enrolled DR customers were excluded from the analysis.

- **Q. Please summarize the methodology, source of data, and assumptions used to develop TP for DSRE measures for the FEECA Utilities.**
- 3 A. TP for DSRE measures was developed using three separate models for each 4 category of DSRE: rooftop photovoltaic (PV); battery storage systems charged 5 from PV systems; and combined heat and power (CHP).
- 6 For PV systems, RI's approach estimated the square footage of residential and 7 commercial rooftops in the FEECA Utilities' service areas suitable for hosting 8 PV technology, and applied the following formula to estimate overall TP:

 Step 1: Building stock characterization: Output of data from the forecast disaggregation conducted for the EE and DR TP analysis were used to characterize residential, commercial, and industrial building stocks.

- Step 2: Estimate of feasible roof area: Total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated using relevant parameters, such as unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, shading from trees, and limitations of roof orientation.
- Step 3: Expected power density: A power density of 200 watts per square meter (W/m^2) was assumed for estimating technical potential, which corresponds to a panel with roughly 20 percent conversion efficiency, a typical value for current PV installations.

1 Step 4: Hourly PV generation profile: Hourly generation profiles were 2 estimated using the U.S. Department of Energy National Renewal 3 Energy Laboratory's solar estimation calculator, PVWatts©.

4 Step 5: Calculate total energy and coincident peak demand potential: 5 RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy 6 Resources (SPIDER) Model was used to estimate total annual energy 7 and summer and winter peak demand potential by sector.

8 For battery storage systems, the TP analysis considered the fact that battery 9 systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements; they simply store energy for use at different times. Therefore, battery systems energized directly from the grid do not produce additional energy savings, but may be used to shift or curtail load from one period for use in another. Because the DR potential analysis focused on curtailable load opportunities, RI concluded that no additional TP should be claimed. Similarly, battery systems connected to rooftop PV systems do not produce additional energy savings; they do, however, create the opportunity to store excess PV-generated energy during hours where the PV system generates more than the home or business consumes, then uses the stored power during peak periods.

 Therefore, to determine additional peak demand reduction available from PV-connected battery storage systems, RI used the following methodology:

 • Assumed that every PV system included in the PV TP analysis was installed with a paired storage system.

- Sized the storage system to peak PV generation and assumed energy 2 storage duration of three hours.
- Applied RI's hourly dispatch optimization model in SPIDER to create 4 an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattened the individual 5 customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible, accounting for 6 (a) a customer's hourly load profile; (b) hourly PV generation profile; 7 and (c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip 8 charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculated the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter).
- TP for CHP systems was based on identifying non-residential customer segments with thermal load profiles that allow for the application of CHP, where the waste heat generated can be fully utilized. First, minimum size thresholds were determined for each non-residential segment using a segment- specific thermal factor that considered the power-to-heat ratio of a typical facility in each segment. Next, utility customers were segmented into industry classifications and screened against the size thresholds. Premises with annual kWh consumption that met or exceeded the thresholds were retained in the analysis. Finally, facilities of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology. RI assigned CHP technologies to customers in a top-down fashion, starting with the largest CHP generators, which yielded the estimated quantity of CHP TP in each utility's service area.

Q. Did your TP analysis account for interaction among EE, DR, and DSRE technologies?

3 A. Yes. While TP was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE, 4 RI did recognize that interaction occurs among the TP for each, similar to the 5 interactions between EE measures applied to the same end-use. For example, 6 the installation of more efficient A/C would reduce the peak consumption 7 available for DR curtailment. Therefore, to account for this interaction, RI 8 incorporated the following assumptions and adjustments to the identified TP:

- EE TP was assumed to be implemented first, and therefore was not adjusted for interaction with DR and DSRE.
- DR TP was applied next, and to account for the impact of EE TP, the baseline load forecast for applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE TP, reducing the available load for curtailment.
- DSRE technologies were applied last and incorporated EE TP and DR TP. For PV systems, the EE potential and DR potential did not impact 16 the amount of PV TP. However, for PV-connected battery systems, the reduced baseline due to EE TP resulted in more PV-generated power available from storage and usable during peak periods. For CHP systems, the reduced baseline, as a result of EE, resulted in a reduction in the number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold for CHP. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as CHP system feasibility was determined based on the energy consumption and thermal parameters at the facility.

1 measure or program. The Total Resource Cost (TRC) test addresses a societal 2 perspective, which considers costs of a DSM measure or program relative to the 3 benefits of avoided utility supply costs. The Participant Cost Test (PCT) 4 addresses a participant perspective, which considers net benefits to those 5 participating in a DSM program.

6 The calculations were conducted consistent with the Cost Effectiveness 7 Manual for Demand Side Management and Self Service Wheeling Proposals; 8 Florida Public Service Commission, Tallahassee, FL; adopted June 11, 1991. 9 Specific costs and benefits allocated within each cost-effectiveness test (RIM, 10 TRC, and PCT), include the following:

11

3

4 **Q. What economic screening criteria were applied for this study?**

5 A. For this study, economic screening was conducted for two Base Case scenarios: 6 the RIM Scenario and TRC Scenario. In both scenarios, all measures that 7 achieved a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 or higher were considered cost-8 effective from that test's perspective.

- 9 For RI's cost-effectiveness screening for DEF, JEA, OUC, and FPUC, 10 additional considerations included the following:
- 11 Individual measures did not include any utility program costs (program 12 administrative or incentive costs), and therefore were evaluated on the 13 basis of measure cost-effectiveness without any utility intervention.

Q. What was the next step in the economic analysis?

5 A. Once the list of passing measures was identified under each Base Case scenario, 6 the measures were reanalyzed in RI's TEA-POT model to estimate demand and 7 energy savings for each utility. The updated modeling included updated 8 measure rankings to account for changes in measure interaction and overlap. 9 For the economic analysis, the ranking was based on the applicable test perspective in each scenario (RIM or TRC), with the more cost-effective measures being ranked first.

Q. Were any additional economic sensitivities considered?

A. Yes. As specified in Appendix B of the Order Consolidating Dockets and Establishing Procedure (Order No. PSC-2024-0022-PCO-EG) in this docket, economic sensitivities were performed as follows:

- Avoided fuel cost sensitivity, analyzing the number of measures passing 17 the economic screening based on higher and lower fuel prices.
- Payback period sensitivity, analyzing the number of measures passing the economic screening based on shorter (one year) and longer (three year) free ridership exclusion periods.
- For OUC, RI performed an additional sensitivity that reflected the number of measures passing the economic screening when including costs associated with carbon dioxide emissions.

1 criterion to estimate long-run market shares for measures as a function of 2 measure incremental costs and expected bill savings over the measures' 3 effective useful life (inclusive of utility incentives). Incremental adoption 4 estimates were based on the Bass Diffusion Model, which is a mathematical 5 description of how the rate of new product diffusion changes over time. For 6 this study, adoption curve input parameters were developed for each measure 7 based on specific criteria, including measure maturity in the market, overall 8 measure cost, and whether the measure was currently offered through a utility 9 program. RI's TEA-POT model then calculated demand and energy savings by applying these adoption curves to each cost-effective measure.

Q. Please explain the methodology used by RI to develop adoption forecast estimates for the cost-effective DR measures.

 A. Similar to EE measures, RI's methodology for DR included calculating market adoption as a function of the incentives offered to each customer group. For DR measures currently offered by each utility, RI used the current incentive level offered to estimate market adoption. For measures not currently offered by a utility, RI used representative incentive levels offered for similar measures in other markets to estimate market adoption. The utility-specific incentive rates for each DR measure, along with participation rates collected by RI for DR programs around the country, were used to calibrate DR market adoption curves for each technology and customer segment. The calibrated adoption rates were applied to the baseline load forecast to estimate the forecasted adoption estimates for cost-effective DR technologies.

1 Step 1: Program Review and Measure Bundling. For each scenario, 2 Resource Innovations identified cost-effective measures from the 3 economic analysis described above and reviewed existing utility 4 program offerings to identify and align measures included in the TP 5 study analysis with current programs. Measures included in existing 6 programs but not part of the TRC Scenario or RIM Scenario determined 7 in the economic analysis were identified. In addition, measures that 8 were cost-effective for the TRC Scenario or RIM Scenario but were not 9 currently offered in a utility program were also identified. Based on the program review and measure alignment, measures in each scenario were bundled into preliminary program concepts that might align with current programs or become new program offerings for the utility.

 Step 2: Program Refinement and Modeling. Preliminary program concepts and measure bundles were refined into proposed program offerings and incentive and non-incentive budgets, participation estimates, and impacts were developed using RI's TEA-POT model. The modeling results were exported into RI's Program Planner workbook that aggregated the program and portfolio impacts for each scenario. For the TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario no further refinements to the programs were made. For the Proposed Goals scenario, RI continued to work collaboratively with each utility to identify the measures and program concepts that comprise the proposed DSM goals.

Q. Was the DSM program development process limited to measures passing the economic screening?

3 A. No. In addition to measures that passed the TRC Scenario or RIM Scenario 4 screening, the measure bundling and program development process for the 5 Proposed Goals Scenario included additional measures, such as measures that 6 may be included in current programs or could be complementary additions to 7 current programs.

Q. For measures currently offered by each utility, was the analysis limited to the continuation of current programs?

- A. No. While continuity in program offerings is typically beneficial for customer and contractor awareness and education, RI and each utility (JEA, OUC, and FPUC) worked collaboratively to identify programs that are of interest to continue and those that may need refinement. RI also provided our expertise in utility program design from around the country to help guide the program development process.
-

VII. REASONABLENESS OF RI'S ANALYSES

 Q. Are the methodology and models RI employed to develop TP estimates, economic analysis, measure adoption forecasts, and proposed DSM goals for the FEECA Utilities analytically sound?

A**.** Yes. RI's approach is aligned with industry-standard methods and has been applied and externally reviewed in numerous regulated jurisdictions. RI's

1 TEA-POT and SPIDER modeling tools have been specifically developed to 2 accommodate and calibrate to individual utility load forecast data, and they 3 enable the application of individual DSM measures and analysis of market 4 potential at a high resolution—by segment, end-use, equipment type, measure, 5 vintage, and year for each scenario analyzed.

6 The methodology and rigor of the measure development, technical 7 potential, and economic analysis is also consistent with the analysis conducted 8 for the 2019 energy conservation goals proceedings before this Commission.

Q. Have these methodologies and models been relied upon by other commissions or governmental agencies?

 A. Yes. RI's methodology and the TEA-POT and SPIDER modeling tools have been used in numerous studies in the United States and Canada. RI's tools and results have undergone extensive regulatory review and have been used for the establishment of utility DSM targets in multiple jurisdictions, including North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, California, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Ontario.

Q. Are the estimates of the TP developed by RI analytically sound and reasonable?

 A. Yes. The TP was performed under my direction and resulted in a thorough and wide-ranging analysis of DSM opportunities technically feasible in the FEECA Utilities' service areas. The TP process aligned with industry standards and included a greater level of analytic detail than that of comparable models and methodologies.

A. Yes.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Herndon Background and Qualifications Exhibit JH-1, Page 1 of 4

Vice President

Jim Herndon is a Vice President in the Advisory Services group, focusing on strategic planning and program design to more effectively implement demand-side management (DSM) programs. His work is informed by 22 years of experience performing market assessments, planning portfolios, managing program design and implementation, conducting technical project reviews and analyses, and delivering third-party program evaluations across a variety of sectors. Jim leads potential and market characterization studies, program portfolio development and cost-effectiveness analyses, and provides regulatory support and expert witness testimony for program filings and integrated resource planning (IRP) activities. In these capacities, he serves many electric and natural gas utilities, including Duke Energy, Dominion Energy, Georgia Power Company, Florida Power and Light, Santee Cooper, Columbia Gas of Virginia, and Washington Gas. In each consulting engagement, Jim strives to understand his client's objectives and tailor his team's analyses to leverage best practices, while providing strategic insights with the client's specific needs in mind.

EXPERIENCE

Vice President | Principal Consultant, Resource Innovations / Nexant (2013 - Present)

As an account executive and team leader in the Advisory Services Group, Jim ensures compliance with regulatory and energy program rules and coordinates staff workload and budgets. He works directly with clients, service providers, and customers to provide quality assurance on projects. Jim also manages regional and national client planning and benchmarking studies, as well as third-party impact and process evaluations.

Sr. Project Manager | Project Manager, Resource Innovations / Nexant (2007 - 2012)

As a Senior Project Manager and Southeast regional lead, Jim oversaw design and implementation of utility-sponsored DSM programs, including management of program design, administration, engineering, trade ally, and marketing program teams in NC and SC.

Sr. Project Engineer | Project Engineer, Resource Innovations / Nexant (2002 - 2006)

As a Project Engineer, Jim performed energy audits and analyses on facilities to identify, provide implementation support for, and verify the effectiveness of energy efficiency improvements. He was a Certified Home Energy Report (HERS) rater and supported the implementation of publicly funded energy efficiency and load management programs, including due diligence reviews of energy efficiency projects installed in California, New York, and Utah.

EDUCATION, CERTIFICATIONS, AND LICENSING

M.S. in Engineering Management – Duke University

B.S. in Civil and Environmental Engineering – Duke University

AFFILIATIONS

Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) – Former Member of the Board of Directors (2014 - 2019)

AREAS OF EXPERTISE

Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) Support • Energy Analysis and Market Characterization • DSM & DER Market Potential Studies • Portfolio Planning, Program Design, and Evaluation • Regulatory Support and Expert Witness • Program Management

Jim Herndon, Vice President

REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS

Florida Power & Light Company – Florida Statewide DSM Technical Potential Study (2017 – 2019, and 2022 - Present)

Jim is leading the Resource Innovations team that was retained by Florida Power & Light in the state of Florida to complete technical potential studies of Demand Side Management (DSM) measures and renewable energy systems on behalf of six utilities. The six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA) include four Florida investor-owned utilities (IOUs): Florida Power & Light Company (FPL), Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF), Tampa Electric Company (TECO), and Florida Public Utilities Company (FPUC) that are regulated by the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) and two municipal utilities: JEA and Orlando Utilities Commission (OUC) that are not regulated by the FPSC. The FPSC establishes goals for the FEECA utilities to reduce the growth of Florida's peak electric demand and energy consumption and reviews the progress towards those goals frequently (every five years at a minimum). The scope of the studies includes Energy Efficiency (EE), Demand Response (DR), and Distributed Energy Resources (DER) opportunities across the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, including interaction between these categories of DSM to account for overlapping impacts. In addition to the technical potential analysis, Jim and his team are assessing the economic and achievable opportunities for a subset of the six utilities. The results of this study will be used as the basis of the utilities' DSM goal-setting process for 2025-2034 in the 2024 Florida Goals Proceeding. Following the completion of the studies, Jim will provide regulatory support for these proceedings, including the preparation of direct written testimony, deposition, and support for the discovery process by preparing required responses to data requests and regulatory interrogatories.

Jim also led Resource Innovations' team that conducted the technical potential study and provided regulatory support for the 2019 FEECA goalsetting proceedings.

Duke Energy – Market Potential Studies (2015 - Present)

Jim has directed multiple DSM market potential studies for Duke Energy's North Carolina, South Carolina, Indiana, and Ohio service territories. The studies for each service territory integrated both energy efficiency and demand response opportunities across Duke Energy's residential, commercial, and industrial customer classes; and determined the technical, economic, and program potential. Resource Innovations conducts the studies in close coordination with Duke Energy's IRP team, as well as program design and delivery teams, to provide an accurate assessment of market potential that can be directly applied to Duke Energy's current and future DSM planning efforts.

Duke Energy – Program Evaluations (2014 - Present)

Jim currently serves as the Project Manager for the evaluation, measurement, and verification (EM&V) of six DSM program offerings, which include Duke Energy's Residential HVAC program, MyHER program, EE Education program, Save Energy & Water Kits program, Non-Residential Custom program, and Power Manager program. The evaluation activities include separate impact and process evaluations across Duke Energy's five service territories to assess program performance, adherence to best practices, and opportunities for program improvements. Jim provides daily project management oversight of project staff, coordination of resources, and quality control oversight of project deliverables.

Santee Cooper – Market Assessment, DSM Program Design, and Implementation (2009 - Present)

Jim provides strategic program design support activities for Santee Cooper's suite of energy efficiency programs across the residential and commercial market segments, as well as strategic program advisory services for Santee Cooper's long-term energy reduction goals. Jim also led the market assessment and market potential study that Resource Innovations conducted for Santee Cooper's service territory in 2019 and updated in 2023. The study included primary data collection to

Jim Herndon, Vice President

benchmark equipment efficiency and saturation in the service territory and incorporate this data into the development of future market potential. Previously, Jim managed the initial development, rollout, and management of Santee Cooper's commercial energy efficiency programs.

Columbia Gas of Virginia (CVA) – DSM Program Design, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Implementation (2010 - Present)

Jim is the technical lead for the program design and regulatory support services team assisting CVA's WarmWise program offerings. This support includes portfolio planning and regulatory support for CVA's residential and commercial energy efficiency programs, as well as providing rebate processing and other support services to assist CVA in the implementation of their programs. Jim led portfolio planning efforts, including market characterization analysis, technical analysis of proposed programs and portfolio, development of annual program budgets and savings targets, and regulatory support of CVA's program filings with the Virginia State Corporation Commission, including providing written testimony supporting the analysis.

Dominion Energy – DSM Program Design and Implementation (2020 - Present)

Jim oversees DSM portfolio planning and program design projects for Dominion Energy's natural gas utilities in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Ohio. In each of these service territories, Jim and his team worked collaboratively with Dominion Energy to identify applicable DSM measures, quantify measure impacts, create logical program offerings, and analyze the cost-effectiveness of the offerings. Jim also supported the DSM regulatory process in each jurisdiction through the development of expert witness testimony and assistance with responses to regulatory data requests.

Virginia Natural Gas – DSM Program Design, Cost-Benefit Analysis, and Regulatory Support (2014 - Present)

On behalf of Virginia Natural Gas, Jim leads technical and regulatory support for the residential DSM portfolio. Support activities include program cost-effectiveness analysis and preparation of regulatory filings including annual status updates to the Virginia State Corporation Commission, and technical analysis and testimony for regulatory approval of program updates and modifications.

Georgia Power Company – DSM Program Analysis and IRP Support (2005 - 2019)

Jim provided technical and regulatory support for Georgia Power Company's DSM program analysis in the residential and commercial markets for their 2007, 2010, 2013, 2016, and 2019 IRP filings. The program analysis support included comprehensive compilation and assessment of applicable DSM measures and technologies across the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors, as well as the determination of the overall market potential through four separate technical potential studies (completed in 2007, 2012, 2015, and 2018). Jim also led the portfolio planning efforts that included developing preliminary program designs, savings targets, and budgets, along with supporting costeffectiveness analysis to determine the feasibility of individual measures and program offerings for implementation.

Elizabethtown Gas – DSM Program Design and Regulatory Support (2016 - 2018)

In support of Elizabethtown Gas, Jim led technical and regulatory support to develop updated DSM program offerings for residential and commercial customers. He worked collaboratively with Elizabethtown Gas to develop cost-beneficial programs for eligible customers. Activities included program cost-effectiveness analysis and testimony preparation for regulatory program filing with the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

Dominion Virginia Power – Program Development and Regulatory Support (2014 - 2016)

Jim served as the program design lead and expert witness in support of Dominion Virginia Power's regulatory filing for three proposed DSM program offerings. He provided input on the delivery structure, eligibility criteria, and cost-effectiveness analysis in the development of program offerings.

Jim Herndon, Vice President

Additionally, Jim provided written and oral testimony on behalf of Dominion Virginia Power in support of the technical analysis on the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the programs to the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) – Energy Efficiency Potential Study (2013 - 2015)

Jim managed the development of an energy efficiency potential study for the LADWP. Under his direction, his team quantified the energy efficiency potential for LADWP's service territory, including collection of primary data through facility auditing to determine the energy efficiency potential of facilities owned by the City of Los Angeles. The study followed industry best practices to determine energy efficiency potential and undertook unique approaches to aggregate and bundle measures into program delivery channels to identify all possible achievable savings. The study informed LADWP's short-term program planning, as well as updates to their 10-year program planning targets.

CPS Energy – Market Potential Study, DSM Program Design, and M&V (2008 - 2014)

Jim provided technical expertise and support for DSM services to CPS Energy, which included: developing an energy efficiency market potential study, designing, and implementing DSM programs, and performing program measurement and verification (M&V). The comprehensive market potential study analyzed the economic and achievable energy and demand impacts of cost-effective DSM measures across CPS Energy's residential, commercial, and industrial customer segments. The program design utilized the identified market potential to enhance CPS Energy's existing DSM programs and provided recommendations on new programs that target CPS Energy's long-term energy efficiency goals. Jim and his team also provided annual M&V of CPS Energy's DSM programs.

Danville Utilities – Residential Program Design and Implementation (2011 - 2013)

Jim led the initial development of Danville Utilities' Home\$ave program in Virginia. This residential program initiative included a suite of energy efficiency measures targeting Danville's residential customer base. Jim managed the rollout of the program offering that included rebate processing, trade ally outreach, marketing support, and verification of measure installation and achieved energy savings.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Herndon, J. (2023). "Foundations of Energy Efficiency: Program Planning & Delivery", Southeast Energy Summit, October 2023, Atlanta, GA.

Herndon, J.; Jacot, D. (2015). "LADWP EE Potential Study: Innovative Approach to Achievable Potential," International Energy Program Evaluation Conference (IEPEC), August 2015, Long Beach, CA.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 1 of 85

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management

Florida Power & Light Company

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 3 of 85

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 4 of 85

Executive Summary

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of Florida Power & Light Company's (FPL) service area.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for FPL.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 5 of 85

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in FPL's service area was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for FPL when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 7 of 85

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of FPL's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential2

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

• Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of FPL's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with FPL's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- x Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to FPL's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to FPL's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for FPL, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with FPL. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at account-level interval data for a sample of customers within each segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak.

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The FPL base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of FPL's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (*i.e.*, HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from FPL. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented FPL's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by FPL, primarily their 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, which was the most recent plan available at the time the studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized FPL's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with FPL's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on FPL's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o FPL rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying EIA RECS data, residential end-use study data received from other FEECA utilities, and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on FPL's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and FPL.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:

o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from FPL.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and FPL.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from FPL.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. FPL provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 17 of 85

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Figure 3. Commercial Customer Segmentation

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 19 of 85

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by FPL.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on FPL's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. 2025 Electricity Sales Forecast by Sector

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for FPL. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The utility summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For FPL the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 4:00-5:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 7:00-8:00 AM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 21 of 85

Figure 6. Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

Figure 8. Industrial Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 23 of 85

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- **ERE technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures** that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 24 of 85

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

• Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (*e.g.*, setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts, and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as FPL's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 400 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,683 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e.*, a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- Direct Load Control. Utility control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- Contractual DR. Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. Utility dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility.

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 27 of 85

for technical potential (*i.e.*, potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- \bullet Gas turbines
- Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 28 of 85

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 29 of 85

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Technical Potential

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per customer per year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- **Saturation Share** = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (*i.e*., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- \bullet Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a given building type (*e.g.*, square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 31 of 85

- \bullet Saturation Shares = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective *(i.e.*, it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- **Savings Factor** = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 32 of 85

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with FPL's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. For FPL, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using a sample of customer interval data provided by FPL. This sample included a customer breakout based on housing type for residential customers and size for small C&I customers. Resource Innovations then used the interval data from these customers to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 9 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 34 of 85

Technical Potential

Figure 9: Methodology for Estimating Cooling Loads

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the seven different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential water heater and pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing enduse load data from NREL's residential end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 4:00-5:00 PM for summer, and January from 7:00-8:00 AM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial, and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet] : Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- **Generation Factor:** Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 36 of 85

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 37 of 85

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

After determination of minimum kWh thresholds by segment, Resource Innovations used the utility-provided customer data with NAICS or SIC codes as well as annual consumption data. Non-residential customers were then categorized by segment and size. Customers with annual loads below the kWh thresholds are not expected to have the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were eliminated from consideration.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (*i.e.*, starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 10.

Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

• The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 40 of 85

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 41 of 85

Figure 12: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 13: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 42 of 85

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Commercial Segments

Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize the commercial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 14: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 15: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 16: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.2.3.2 Industrial Segments

Figure 17, Figure 18, and Figure 19 summarize the industrial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 17: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 45 of 85

Technical Potential

Figure 19: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- Residential & Small C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in FPL's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (*i.e.,* direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of enduses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (*i.e.*, that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

Table 10. DR Technical Potential

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 20.

Figure 20: Residential DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 21.

Figure 21: Small C&I DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 22 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

Figure 22: Large C&I DR Technical Potential by Segment

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

Table 11. DSRE Technical Potential⁷

 7 PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study 8 :

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-13W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-23W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	15 SEER Central AC	Space Cooling	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	15 SEER Air Source Heat Pump	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	14 SEER ASHP from base electric resistance heating	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard

 $\mathrm{^8}$ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS For Florida Power & Light Exhibit JH-2, Page 78 of 85

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix D External Measure Suggestions

Table 21: External Measure Suggestions and Actions

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS For Florida Power & Light
Exhibit JH-2, Page 85 of 85 Exhibit JH-2, Page 85 of 85 TPS For Florida Power & Light Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 1 of 84

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management

Duke Energy Florida

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 3 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 4 of 84

Executive Summary

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of Duke Energy Florida's (DEF) service territory.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for DEF.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 5 of 84

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in DEF's service territory was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for DEF when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of DEF's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential²

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

• Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of DEF's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with DEF's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- x Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to DEF's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to DEF's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for DEF, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Figure 1. Approach to Technical Potential Modeling

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with DEF. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at account-level interval data for a sample of customers within each segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak.

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The DEF base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of DEF's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (*i.e*., HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from DEF. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented DEF's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by DEF, primarily their 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, which was the most recent plan available at the time the studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized DEF's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with DEF's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on DEF's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o DEF rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying Duke Energy's 2022 Residential End-Use Appliance Study, EIA RECS data, and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on DEF's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and DEF.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:

o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from DEF.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and DEF.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from DEF.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. DEF provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 17 of 84

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Figure 3. Commercial Customer Segmentation

 9%

14%

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 19 of 84

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by DEF.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on DEF's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. 2025 Electricity Sales Forecast by Sector

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for DEF. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The utility summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For DEF the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 4:00-5:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 7:00-8:00 AM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Figure 6. Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

Figure 7. Commercial Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- **ERE 1** technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 24 of 84

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

• Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (*e.g*., setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as DEF's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 395 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,535 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e*., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- Direct Load Control. Utility control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- **Contractual DR.** Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. Utility dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility.

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 27 of 84

for technical potential (*i.e*., potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- \bullet Gas turbines
- Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 28 of 84

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 29 of 84

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Technical Potential

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per customer per year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- **Saturation Share** = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (*i.e*., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- \bullet Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a given building type (*e.g*., square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

- Technical Potential
- **Saturation Shares** = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective (*i.e*., it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- **Savings Factor** = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with DEF's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. For DEF, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using a sample of customer interval data provided by DEF. This sample included a customer breakout based on housing type for residential customers and size for small C&I customers. Resource Innovations then used the interval data from these customers to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 9 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the seven different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing utility-specific end-use load data provided by DEF. Profiles for residential water heater loads were estimated by using NREL's end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 4:00-5:00 PM for summer, and January from 7:00-8:00 AM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial, and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet] : Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- Generation Factor: Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 36 of 84

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 37 of 84

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

After determination of minimum kWh thresholds by segment, Resource Innovations used the utility-provided customer data with NAICS or SIC codes as well as annual consumption data. Non-residential customers were then categorized by segment and size. Customers with annual loads below the kWh thresholds are not expected to have the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were eliminated from consideration.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (*i.e*., starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 10.

Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

• The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

Technical Potential

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 40 of 84

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 11: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 41 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 12: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 13: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 42 of 84

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Commercial Segments

Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize the commercial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 14: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 15: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 16: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.2.3.2 Industrial Segments

Figure 17, Figure 18, and Figure 19 summarize the industrial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 17: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Technical Potential

Figure 19: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- Residential & Small C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in DEF's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (*i.e*., direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of enduses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (*i.e*., that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

Table 10. DR Technical Potential

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 20.

Figure 20: Residential DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 21.

Technical Potential

Figure 21: Small C&I DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 22 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

Figure 22: Large C&I DR Technical Potential by Segment

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

⁷ PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study⁸:

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL-15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-13W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-23W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available

⁸ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Duke Energy Florida Exhibit JH-3, Page 77 of 84

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix D External Measure Suggestions

Table 21: External Measure Suggestions and Actions

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS for Duke Energy Florida
Exhibit JH-3, Page 84 of 84 Exhibit JH-3, Page 84 of 84 TPS for Duke Energy Florida Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 1 of 84

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management

Tampa Electric Company

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 3 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 4 of 84

Executive Summary

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of Tampa Electric Company's (TECO) service territory.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for TECO.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 5 of 84

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in TECO's service territory was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for TECO when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 7 of 84

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of TECO's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential²

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of TECO's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with TECO's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to TECO's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to TECO's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for TECO, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Figure 1. Approach to Technical Potential Modeling

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with TECO. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at account-level interval data for a sample of customers within each segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak.

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The TECO base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of TECO's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (i.e., HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from TECO. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and \bullet evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented TECO's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by TECO, primarily their 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, which was the most recent plan available at the time the studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized TECO's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with TECO's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on TECO's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o TECO rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying TECO's customer audit & saturation survey, EIA RECS data, residential end-use study data received from other FEECA utilities, and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on TECO's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and TECO.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 16 of 84

- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from TECO.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and TECO.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from TECO.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. TECO provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 17 of 84

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Figure 3. Commercial Customer Segmentation

and Machinery 19%

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 19 of 84

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by TECO.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on TECO's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. 2025 Electricity Sales Forecast by Sector

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for TECO. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The utility summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For TECO the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 5:00-6:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 7:00-8:00 AM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Figure 6. Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

Figure 8. Industrial Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 23 of 84

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- EE technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 24 of 84

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (e.g., setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts, and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as TECO's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 395 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,535 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (i.e., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- Direct Load Control. Utility control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- Contractual DR. Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. Utility dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility. \bullet

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 27 of 84

for technical potential (i.e., potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- Gas turbines
- **•** Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 28 of 84

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 29 of 84

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Technical Potential

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per customer per \bullet year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- **Saturation Share** = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for \bullet the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- Percent Incomplete = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be \bullet energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to \bullet the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from \bullet the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a \bullet given building type (e.g., square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

- Saturation Shares = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 32 of 84

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with TECO's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. For TECO, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using a sample of customers' interval data provided by TECO. This sample included a customer breakout based on housing type for residential customers and size for small C&I customers. Resource Innovations then used the interval data from these customers to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 9 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

Figure 9: Methodology for Estimating Cooling Loads

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the seven different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential water heater and pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing enduse load data from NREL's residential end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 5:00-6:00 PM for summer, and January from 7:00-8:00 AM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial, and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet]: Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- Generation Factor: Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 36 of 84

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer \bullet and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 37 of 84

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

 Resource Innovations worked with the utility-provided customer data, focusing on annual consumption due to the absence of NAICS or SIC codes for this utility data. Non-residential customers were subsequently classified based on annual consumption and size. Since NAICS or SIC codes were unavailable, no formal segmentation occurred. Instead, the analysis focused exclusively on annual utility usage. Facilities with annual loads below the kWh thresholds were deemed unlikely to possess the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were consequently excluded from consideration. Conversely, those meeting the size criteria were aligned with the corresponding CHP technology.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 38 of 84

segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (i.e., starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 10.

Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR \bullet technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

Technical Potential

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the \bullet number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 40 of 84

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 12: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 13: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 42 of 84

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Commercial Segments

Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize the commercial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 14: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 15: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 16: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.2.3.2 Industrial Segments

Figure 17, Figure 18, and Figure 19 summarize the industrial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 17: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 18: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Technical Potential

Figure 19: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- \bullet Residential & Small C&I customers – Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in TECO's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (i.e., direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of end-uses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (i.e., that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 20.

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 21.

Technical Potential

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 22 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

Figure 22: Large C&I DR Technical Potential by Segment

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

Technical Potential

Table 11. DSRE Technical Potential⁷

⁷ PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study⁸:

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-13W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 23W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	15 SEER Central AC	Space Cooling	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	15 SEER Air Source Heat Pump	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	14 SEER ASHP from base electric resistance heating	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	Two Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Variable Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Storm Door	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Minimal/uncertain energy savings
Commercial	CFL - 15W Flood	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Commercial	High Efficiency HID Lighting	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available

⁸ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Tampa Electric Company Exhibit JH-4, Page 77 of 84

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Exhibit JH-4, Page 81 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS for Tampa Electric Company
Exhibit JH-4, Page 84 of 84 Exhibit JH-4, Page 84 of 84 TPS for Tampa Electric Company Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 1 of 84

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management

Florida Public Utilities Company

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 3 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 4 of 84

Executive Summary

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of Florida Public Utilities Company's (FPUC) service territory.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for FPUC.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 5 of 84

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in FPUC's service territory was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for FPUC when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 7 of 84

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of FPUC's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential²

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 8 of 84

2 Introduction

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of FPUC's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with FPUC's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

Introduction

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to FPUC's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to FPUC's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for FPUC, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Introduction

Figure 1. Approach to Technical Potential Modeling

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with FPUC. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at account-level interval data for each customer segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak. FPUC customer interval

Introduction

data was unavailable and therefore, a sample of FPL customers' load data was used as proxy to estimate peak load profiles and demand response potential.

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The FPUC base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of FPUC's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (i.e., HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from FPUC. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and \bullet evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented FPUC's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by FPUC, primarily their 2022 Long-Term Projections of Electricity Energy and Demand, which was the most recent plan available at the time the

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 15 of 84

studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized FPUC's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with FPUC's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on FPUC's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o FPUC rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying EIA RECS data, residential end-use study data from other FEECA utilities and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

The disaggregation was based on FPUC's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.

- Segment data from EIA and FPUC.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from FPUC.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and FPUC.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from FPUC.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. FPUC provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 17 of 84

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 18 of 84

Baseline Forecast Development

Figure 3. Commercial Customer Segmentation

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 19 of 84

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by FPUC.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on FPUC's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2022 Long-Term Projections of Electricity Energy and Demand, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for FPUC. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The utility summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For FPUC the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 4:00-5:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 7:00-8:00 AM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 21 of 84

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

Figure 6. Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Figure 7. Commercial Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- EE technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 24 of 84

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (e.g., setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts, and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 25 of 84

-
- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as FPUC's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 395 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,535 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (i.e., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- Direct Load Control. Utility control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- Contractual DR. Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. Utility dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility. \bullet

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 27 of 84

for technical potential (i.e., potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- Gas turbines
- Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 28 of 84

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 29 of 84

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 30 of 84

Technical Potential

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per customer per \bullet year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- **Saturation Share** = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for \bullet the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- Percent Incomplete = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be \bullet energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to \bullet the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from \bullet the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a \bullet given building type (e.g., square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 31 of 84

Technical Potential

- Saturation Shares = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 32 of 84

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with FPUC's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. Because customer-level load data was not available for FPUC, this process relied on interval load data from FPL's load research samples for each customer segment as best proxy. Using FPL's load data, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using a sample customer interval data provided by FPL. This sample included a customer breakout based on housing type for residential customers and size for small C&I customers. Resource Innovations then used the interval data from these customers to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 9 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 34 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 9: Methodology for Estimating Cooling Loads

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the seven different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential water heater and pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing enduse load data from NREL's residential end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 4:00-5:00 PM for summer, and January from 7:00-8:00 AM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial, and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet]: Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- **Generation Factor:** Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 36 of 84

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer \bullet and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 37 of 84

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

 Resource Innovations worked with the utility-provided customer data, focusing on annual consumption due to the absence of NAICS or SIC codes for this utility data. Non-residential customers were subsequently classified based on annual consumption and size. Since NAICS or SIC codes were unavailable, no formal segmentation occurred. Instead, the analysis focused exclusively on annual utility usage. Facilities with annual loads below the kWh thresholds were deemed unlikely to possess the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were consequently excluded from consideration. Conversely, those meeting the size criteria were aligned with the corresponding CHP technology.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 38 of 84

segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (i.e., starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 10.

 Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR \bullet technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

Technical Potential

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the \bullet number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 40 of 84

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 11: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 41 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 12: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 13: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 42 of 84

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Commercial Segments

Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize the commercial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 14: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 43 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 15: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 16: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.2.3.2 Industrial Segments

Figure 17, Figure 18, and Figure 19 summarize the industrial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 44 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 17: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 18: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 45 of 84

Technical Potential

Figure 19: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- Residential & Small C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in FPUC's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (i.e., direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of end-uses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (i.e., that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

Table 10. DR Technical Potential

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 20.

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 21.

Technical Potential

Figure 21: Small C&I DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 22 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

Figure 22: Large C&I DR Technical Potential by Segment

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

Technical Potential

Table 11. DSRE Technical Potential⁷

⁷ PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study⁸:

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	$CFI - 13W$	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 23W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	15 SEER Central AC	Space Cooling	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	15 SEER Air Source Heat Pump	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	14 SEER ASHP from base electric resistance heating	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	Two Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Variable Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Storm Door	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Minimal/uncertain energy savings
Commercial	CFL - 15W Flood	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Commercial	High Efficiency HID Lighting	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Commercial	LED Street Lights	Exterior Lighting	Market standard
Commercial	LED Traffic and Crosswalk Lighting	Exterior Lighting	Market standard

⁸ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Exhibit JH-5, Page 77 of 84

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Exhibit JH-5, Page 81 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company
Exhibit JH-5, Page 84 of 84 Exhibit JH-5, Page 84 of 84 TPS for Florida Public Utilities Company Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 1 of 84

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management **JEA**

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 3 of 84

Executive Summary

In October 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of JEA's service territory.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for JEA.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 5 of 84

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in JEA's service territory was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for JEA when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of JEA's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential²

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of JEA's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with JEA's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to JEA's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to JEA's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for JEA, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Figure 1. Approach to Technical Potential Modeling

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with JEA. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at segment-level interval data for each customer segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak.

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The JEA base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of JEA's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (i.e., HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from JEA. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented JEA's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by JEA, primarily their 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, which was the most recent plan available at the time the studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized JEA's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with JEA's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on JEA's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o JEA rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying JEA's 2020 Appliance Saturation Study (APSS) report, EIA RECS data, residential end-use study data from other FEECA utilities, and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on JEA's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and JEA.

- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from JEA.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and JEA.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from JEA.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. JEA provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Figure 3. Commercial Customer Segmentation

Figure 4. Industrial Customer Segmentation

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by JEA.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on JEA's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, which is illustrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5. 2025 Electricity Sales Forecast by Sector

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for JEA. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The utility summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For JEA the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 4:00-5:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 7:00-8:00 AM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

Figure 6. Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Figure 7. Commercial Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- EE technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (e.g., setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts, and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as JEA's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 395 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,535 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (i.e., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- Direct Load Control. Utility control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based \bullet on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- Contractual DR. Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. Utility dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility. \bullet

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

for technical potential (i.e., potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- Gas turbines
- Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 29 of 84

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per customer per \bullet year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- **Saturation Share** = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for \bullet the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- Percent Incomplete = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be \bullet energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to \bullet the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from \bullet the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a \bullet given building type (e.g., square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

- Technical Potential
- Saturation Shares = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with JEA's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. For JEA, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using a segment-level interval data provided by JEA. Resource Innovations then used the interval data to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 9 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

Figure 9: Methodology for Estimating Cooling Loads

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential water heater and pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing enduse load data from NREL's residential end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 4:00-5:00 PM for summer, and January from 7:00-8:00 AM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet] : Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- **Generation Factor:** Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 36 of 84

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer \bullet and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 37 of 84

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

Resource Innovations worked with the utility-provided customer data, focusing on annual consumption due to the absence of NAICS or SIC codes for this utility data. Non-residential customers were subsequently classified based on annual consumption and size. Since NAICS or SIC codes were unavailable, no formal segmentation occurred. Instead, the analysis focused exclusively on annual utility usage. Facilities with annual loads below the kWh thresholds were deemed unlikely to possess the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were consequently excluded from consideration. Conversely, those meeting the size criteria were aligned with the corresponding CHP technology.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 38 of 84

segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (i.e., starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 10.

Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR \bullet technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the \bullet number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 40 of 84

Technical Potential

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 11, Figure 12, and Figure 13 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 12: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 13: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 42 of 84

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Commercial Segments

Figure 14, Figure 15, and Figure 16 summarize the commercial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 14: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 15: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 16: Commercial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.2.3.2 Industrial Segments

Figure 17, Figure 18, and Figure 19 summarize the industrial sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 17: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Figure 18: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 19: Industrial EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- \bullet Residential & Small C&I customers – Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in JEA's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (i.e., direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of enduses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (i.e., that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

Table 10. DR Technical Potential

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 20.

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 21.

Figure 21: Small C&I DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 22 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

Technical Potential

Table 11. DSRE Technical Potential⁷

⁷ PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 50 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 52 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 53 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 54 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 55 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 56 of 84

EE Measure List

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 57 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 60 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 61 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 64 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 65 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 66 of 84

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 68 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 69 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 71 of 84

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 73 of 84

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study⁸:

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL-13W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 23W	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	15 SEER Central AC	Space Cooling	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	15 SEER Air Source Heat Pump	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	14 SEER ASHP from base electric resistance heating	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	Two Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Variable Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Storm Door	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Minimal/uncertain energy savings
Commercial	CFL - 15W Flood	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Commercial	High Efficiency HID Lighting	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available

⁸ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for JEA Exhibit JH-6, Page 77 of 84

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS for JEA
Exhibit JH-6, Page 84 of 84 Exhibit JH-6, Page 84 of 84 TPS for JEA Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 1 of 82

Technical Potential Study of Demand Side Management

Orlando Utilities Commission

Date: 03.07.2024

Table of Contents

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 3 of 82

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 4 of 82

Executive Summary

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems.

The main objective of the study was to assess the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of Orlando Utilities Commission's (OUC) service territory.

1.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations estimates DSM savings potential by applying an analytical framework that aligns baseline market conditions for energy consumption and demand with DSM opportunities. After describing the baseline condition, Resource Innovations applies estimated measure savings to disaggregated consumption and demand data. The approach varies slightly according to the type of DSM resources and available data; the specific approaches used for each type of DSM are described below.

1.1.1 EE Potential

This study utilized Resource Innovations' proprietary EE modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual program savings. The methodology for the EE potential assessment was based on a hybrid "top-down/bottom-up" approach, which started with the current utility load forecast, then disaggregated it into its constituent customer-class and end-use components. Our assessment examined the effect of the range of EE measures and practices on each end-use, taking into account current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the end-use, customer class, and system levels for OUC.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 5 of 82

1.1.2 DR Potential

The assessment of DR potential in OUC's service territory was an analysis of mass market direct load control programs for residential and small commercial and industrial (C&I) customers, and an analysis of DR programs for large C&I customers. The direct load control program assessment focused on the potential for demand reduction through heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), water heater, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pump load control. These end-uses were of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load. For this analysis, a range of direct load control measures were examined for each customer segment to highlight the range of potential. The assessment further accounted for existing DR programs for OUC when calculating the total DR potential.

1.1.3 DSRE Potential

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from customers' PV systems, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

1.2 Savings Potential

Technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE are as follows:

1.2.1 EE Potential

EE technical potential describes the savings potential when all technically feasible EE measures are fully implemented, ignoring all non-technical constraints on electricity savings, such as cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt EE.

The estimated EE technical potential results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. EE Technical Potential

1.2.2 DR Potential

DR technical potential describes the magnitude of loads that can be managed during conditions when grid operators need peak capacity. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale such as heating, cooling, water heaters, managed electric vehicle charging, and pool pumps. For large C&I customers, this included their entire electric demand during a utility's system peak, as many of these types of customers will forego virtually all electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough.

The estimated DR technical potential results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. DR Technical Potential

¹ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 7 of 82

1.2.3 DSRE Potential

DSRE technical potential estimates quantify all technically feasible distributed generation opportunities from PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and CHP technologies based on the customer characteristics of OUC's customer base.

The estimated DSRE technical potential results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. DSRE Technical Potential²

² PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 8 of 82

2 Introduction

In October, 2022, the six electric utilities subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act (FEECA Utilities) retained Resource Innovations, Inc. for the purpose of identifying and characterizing the market for demand-side management (DSM) opportunities, including energy efficiency (EE) improvement and building retrofits, peak load reductions from demand response (DR), and demand-side renewable energy (DSRE) systems. The main objective of the study was:

Assessing the technical potential of demand-side resources for reducing customer electric energy consumption and seasonal peak capacity demands.

This report provides the detailed methodology and results for the technical potential analysis of OUC's service territory.

The following deliverables were developed by Resource Innovations as part of the project and are addressed in this report:

- DSM measure list and detailed assumption workbooks
- Disaggregated baseline demand and energy use by year, sector, and end-use
- Baseline technology saturations, energy consumption, and demand
- Technical potential demand and energy savings
- Supporting calculation spreadsheets

2.1 Technical Potential Study Approach

Resource Innovations estimates technical potential according to the industry standard categorization, as follows:

Technical Potential is the theoretical maximum amount of energy and capacity that could be displaced by DSM, regardless of cost and other barriers that may prevent the installation or adoption of a DSM measure.

For this study, technical potential included full application of commercially available DSM technologies to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

Quantifying DSM technical potential is the result of an analytical process that refines DSM opportunities that align with OUC's customers' electric consumption patterns. Resource Innovations' general methodology for estimating technical potential is a hybrid "top-

Introduction

down/bottom-up" approach, which is described in detail in Sections 3 through 5 of this report and includes the following steps:

- Develop a baseline forecast: the study began with a disaggregation of the utility's official electric energy forecast to create a baseline electric energy forecast. This forecast does not include any utility-specific assumptions around DSM performance. Resource Innovations applied customer segmentation and consumption data from each utility and data from secondary sources to describe baseline customer-class and end-use components. Additional details on the forecast disaggregation are included in Section 3.
- Identify DSM opportunities: A comprehensive set of DSM opportunities applicable to OUC's climate and customers were analyzed to best depict DSM technical potential. Effects for a range of DSM technologies for each end-use could then be examined while accounting for current market saturations, technical feasibility, and impacts.
- Collect cost and impact data for measures: For those measures applicable to OUC's customers, Resource Innovations conducted primary and secondary research and estimated costs, energy savings, measure life, and demand savings. We differentiated between the type of cost (capital, installation labor, maintenance, etc.) to separately evaluate different implementation modes: retrofit (capital plus installation labor plus incremental maintenance); new construction (incremental capital and incremental maintenance); and burnout costs (incremental capital and incremental maintenance costs for replacement of appliances and equipment that has reached the end of its useful life). Additional details on measure development are included in Section 4.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the technical potential modeling process conducted for OUC, with the assessment starting with the current utility load forecast, disaggregated into its constituent customer-class and end-use components, and calibrated to ensure consistency with the overall forecast. Resource Innovations considered the range of DSM measures and practices application to each end-use, accounting for current market saturations, and technical feasibility. These unique impacts were aggregated to produce estimates of potential at the technology, end-use, customer class, and system levels.

Introduction

Figure 1. Approach to Technical Potential Modeling

Resource Innovations estimated DSM technical potential based on a combination of market research, utility load forecasts and customer data, and measure impact analysis, all in coordination with OUC. Resource Innovations examined the technical potential for EE, DR, and DSRE opportunities; this report is organized to offer detail on each DSM category, with additional details on technical potential methodology presented in Section 5.

2.2 EE Potential Overview

To estimate EE potential, this study utilized Resource Innovations' modeling tool, TEA-POT (Technical / Economic / Achievable POTential). This modeling tool was built on a platform that provides the ability to create and analyze multiple scenarios and recalculate potential savings based on variable inputs such as sales/load forecasts, electricity prices, discount rates, and actual utility program savings, as described in Section 5.1.1 below. While the analysis estimates the impacts of individual EE measures, the model accounts for interactions and overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type. The model provides transparency into the assumptions and calculations for estimating EE potential.

2.3 DR Potential Overview

To estimate DR market potential, Resource Innovations considered customer demand during utility peaking conditions and projected customer response to DR measures. Customer demand was determined by looking at account-level interval data for all OUC customers within each customer segment. For each segment, Resource Innovations determined the portion of a customer's load that could be curtailed during the system peak.

Introduction

2.4 DSRE Potential Overview

The DSRE technologies included in this study are rooftop solar photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery storage systems charged from PV, and combined heat and power (CHP) systems. The study leveraged the customer segmentation and load disaggregation data assembled for the EE and DR analyses, and applied our DSRE model, SPIDER™ (Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources), for economic and adoption analysis of solar and battery storage. This model dynamically responds to rapidly changing technologies and accounts for all key time-varying elements such as technology costs, incentives, tax credits, and electric rates. To estimate technical potential for CHP, the study utilized a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial), calculating the average building consumption, assigning minimum facility size thresholds, and estimating building energy savings share percentage for each CHP technology based on its generation capacity.

3 Baseline Forecast Development

3.1 Market Characterization

The OUC base year energy use and sales forecast provided the reference point to determine potential savings. The end-use market characterization of the base year energy use and reference case forecast included customer segmentation and load forecast disaggregation. The characterization is described in this section, while the subsequent section addresses the measures and market potential energy and demand savings scenarios.

3.1.1 Customer Segmentation

In order to estimate EE, DR, and DSRE potential, the sales forecast and peak load forecasts were segmented by customer characteristics. As electricity consumption patterns vary by customer type, Resource Innovations segmented customers into homogenous groups to identify which customer groups are eligible to adopt specific DSM technologies, have similar building characteristics and load profiles, or are able to provide DSM grid services.

Resource Innovations segmented customers according to the following:

- 1) By Sector how much of OUC's energy sales, summer and winter peak demand forecast is attributable to the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors?
- 2) By Customer how much electricity does each customer typically consume annually and during system peaking conditions?
- 3) By End-Use within a home or business, what equipment is using electricity during the system peak? How much energy does this end-use consume over the course of a year?

Table 4 summarizes the segmentation within each sector. In addition to the segmentation described here for the EE and DSRE analyses, the residential customer segments were further segmented by heating type (electric heat, gas heat, or unknown) and by annual consumption bins within each sub-segment for the DR analysis.

Table 4. Customer Segmentation

From an equipment and energy use perspective, each segment has variation within each building type or sub-sector. For example, the energy consuming equipment in a convenience store will vary significantly from the equipment found in a supermarket. To account for this variation, the selected end-uses describe energy consumption patterns that are consistent with those typically studied in national or regional surveys, such as the U.S. Energy Information Administration's (EIA) Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS), Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS) and Manufacturing Energy Consumption Survey (MECS), among others. The end-uses selected for this study are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. End-Uses

³ Includes the contribution of building envelope measures and efficiencies.

For DR, the end-uses targeted were those with controllable load for residential customers (i.e., HVAC, water heaters, pool pumps, and electric vehicles) and small C&I customers (HVAC and electric vehicles). For large C&I customers, all load during peak hours was included assuming these customers would potentially be willing to reduce electricity consumption for a limited time if offered a large enough incentive during temporary system peak demand conditions.

3.1.2 Forecast Disaggregation

A common understanding of the assumptions and granularity in the baseline load forecast was developed with input from OUC. Key discussion topics reviewed included:

- How current DSM offerings are reflected in the energy and demand forecast.
- Assumed weather conditions and hour(s) of the day when the system is projected to peak.
- Are there portions of the load forecast attributable to customers or equipment not eligible for DSM programs?
- How are projections of population increase, changes in appliance efficiency, and \bullet evolving distribution of end-use load shares accounted for in the peak demand forecast?

3.1.2.1 Electricity Consumption (kWh) Forecast

Resource Innovations segmented OUC's electricity consumption forecast into electricity consumption load shares by customer class and end-use. The baseline customer segmentation represents the electricity market by describing how electricity was consumed within the service territory. Resource Innovations developed the forecast for the year 2025, and based it on data provided by OUC, primarily their 2023 Ten-Year Site Plan, which was the most recent plan available at the time the studies were initiated. The data addressed current baseline consumption, system load, and sales forecasts.

3.1.2.2 Peak Demand (kW) Forecast

A fundamental component of DR potential was establishing a baseline forecast of what loads or operational requirements would be absent due to existing dispatchable DR or time varying rates. This baseline was necessary to assess how DR can assist in meeting specific planning and operational requirements. We utilized OUC's summer and winter peak demand forecast, which was developed for system planning purposes.

3.1.2.3 Estimating Consumption by End-Use Technology

As part of the forecast disaggregation, Resource Innovations developed a list of electricity end-uses by sector (Table 5). To develop this list, Resource Innovations began with OUC's estimates of average end-use consumption by customer and sector. Resource Innovations combined these data with other information, such as utility residential appliance saturation surveys, as available, to develop estimates of customers' baseline consumption. Resource Innovations calibrated the utility-provided data with data available from public sources, such as the EIA's recurring data-collection efforts that describe energy end-use consumption for the residential, commercial, and manufacturing sectors.

To develop estimates of end-use electricity consumption by customer segment and enduse, Resource Innovations applied estimates of end-use and equipment-type saturation to the average energy consumption for each sector. The following data sources and adjustments were used in developing the base year 2025 sales by end-use:

Residential Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on OUC's rate class load shares and intensities.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o OUC rate class load share is based on average per customer.
	- o Resource Innovations made conversions to usage estimates generated by applying EIA RECS data, residential end-use study data from other FEECA utilities, and EIA's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2023.

Commercial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on OUC's rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA CBECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and OUC.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel \bullet source, and equipment saturation as follows:

o Rate class load share based on EIA CBECS and end-use forecasts from OUC.

Industrial Sector:

- The disaggregation was based on rate class load shares, intensities, and EIA MECS data.
- Segment data from EIA and OUC.
- Baseline intensity was calibrated to account for differences in end-use saturation, fuel source, and equipment saturation as follows:
	- o Rate class load share based on EIA MECS and end-use forecasts from OUC.

3.2 Analysis of Customer Segmentation

Customer segmentation is important to ensuring that a MPS examines DSM measure savings potential in a manner that reflects the diversity of energy savings opportunities existing across the utility's customer base. OUC provided Resource Innovations with data concerning the premise type and loads characteristics for all customers for the MPS analysis. Resource Innovations examined the provided data from multiple perspectives to identify customer segments. Resource Innovations' approach to segmentation varied slightly for non-residential and residential accounts, but the overall logic was consistent with the concept of expressing the accounts in terms that were relevant to DSM opportunities.

3.2.1 Residential Customers (EE, DR, and DSRE Analysis)

Segmentation of residential customer accounts enabled Resource Innovations to align DSM opportunities with appropriate DSM measures. Resource Innovations used utility customer data, supplemented with EIA data, to segment the residential sector by customer dwelling type (single family, multi-family, or manufactured home). The resulting distribution of customers according to dwelling unit type is presented in Figure 2.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 17 of 82

Figure 2. Residential Customer Segmentation

3.2.2 Non-Residential (Commercial and Industrial) Customers (EE and DSRE Analysis)

For the EE and DSRE analysis, Resource Innovations segmented C&I accounts using the utility's North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) or Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes, supplemented by data produced by the EIA's CBECS and MECS. Resource Innovations classified the customers in this group as either commercial or industrial, on the basis of DSM measure information available and applicable to each. For example, agriculture and forestry DSM measures are commonly considered industrial savings opportunities. Resource Innovations based this classification on the types of DSM measures applicable by segment, rather than on the annual energy consumption or maximum instantaneous demand from the segment as a whole. The estimated energy sales distributions Resource Innovations applied are shown below in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Business Customer Segmentation

3.2.3 Commercial and Industrial Accounts (DR Analysis)

For the DR analysis, Resource Innovations divided the non-residential customers into the two customer classes of small C&I and large C&I using rate class and annual consumption. For the purposes of this analysis, small C&I customers are those on the General Service (GS) tariff. Large C&I customers are all customers on the General Service Demand (GSD) tariff or on the General Service Large Demand (GSLD) tariff. Resource Innovations further segmented these two groups based on customer size. For small C&I, segmentation was determined using annual customer consumption and for large C&I the customer's maximum demand was used. Both customer maximum demand and customer annual consumption were calculated using billing data provided by OUC.

Table 6 shows the account breakout between small C&I and large C&I.

Baseline Forecast Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 19 of 82

Table 6. Summary of Customer Classes for DR Analysis

3.3 Analysis of System Load

3.3.1 System Energy Sales

Technical potential is based on OUC's load forecast for the year 2025 from their 2023 Ten Year Site Plan, which is illustrated in Error! Reference source not found.

Figure 4: 2025 Electricity Sales Forecast by Sector

3.3.2 System Demand

To determine the technical potential for DR, Resource Innovations first established peaking conditions for each utility by looking at when each utility historically experienced its maximum demand. The primary data source used to determine when maximum DR impact was the historical system load for OUC. The data provided contained the system loads for all 8,760 hours of the most recent five years leading up to the study (2016-2021). The OUV summer and winter peaks were then identified within the utility-defined peaking conditions. For OUC the summer peaking conditions were defined as August from 5:00-6:00 PM and the winter peaking conditions were defined as January from 6:00-7:00 PM. The seasonal peaks were then selected as the maximum demand during utility peaking conditions.

3.3.3 Load Disaggregation

The disaggregated annual electric loads⁴ for the base year 2025 by sector and end-use are summarized in Figure 5 and Figure 6.

⁴ Full disaggregation of system demand by end-use was not conducted, as DR potential for residential and small C&I customers focused on specific end-uses of particular interest because of their large contribution to peak period system load, and was not end-use specific for large C&I customers. A description of the end-use analysis for residential and small C&I customers is included in Section 5.1.2

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 21 of 82

Baseline Forecast Development

Figure 5: Residential Baseline (2025) Energy Sales by End-Use

4 DSM Measure Development

DSM potential is described by comparing baseline market consumption with opportunities for savings. Describing these individual savings opportunities results in a list of DSM measures to analyze. This section presents the methodology to develop the EE, DR, and DSRE measure lists.

4.1 Methodology

Resource Innovations identified a comprehensive catalog of DSM measures for the study. The measure list is the same for all FEECA Utilities. The iterative vetting process with the utilities to develop the measure list began by initially examining the list of measures included in the 2019 Goals docket. This list was then adjusted based on proposed measure additions and revisions provided by the FEECA Utilities. Resource Innovations further refined the measure list based on reviews of Resource Innovations' DSM measure library, compiled from similar market potential studies conducted in recent years throughout the United States, as well as measures included in other utility programs where Resource Innovations is involved with program design, implementation, or evaluation. The FEECA Utilities also reached out to interested parties and received input with recommendations on measure additions to the 2019 measure list. Their measure suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the study as appropriate. External measure suggestions and actions are summarized in Appendix D. The extensive, iterative review process involving multiple parties has ensured that the study included a robust and comprehensive set of DSM measures.

See Appendix A for the list of EE measures, Appendix B for the list of DR measures, and Appendix C for the list of DSRE measures analyzed in the study.

4.2 EE Measures

EE measures represent technologies applicable to the residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the FEECA Utilities' service territories. The development of EE measures included consideration of:

- EE technologies that are applicable to Florida and commercially available: Measures that are not applicable due to climate or customer characteristics were excluded, as were "emerging" technologies that are not currently commercially available to FEECA utility customers.
- Current and planned Florida Building Codes and Federal equipment standards (Codes & Standards) for baseline equipment: Measures included from prior studies

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 23 of 82

were adjusted to reflect current Codes & Standards as well as updated efficiency tiers, as appropriate.

Eligibility for utility DSM offerings in Florida: For example, behavioral measures were excluded from consideration, as they historically have not been allowed to count towards utility DSM goals. Behavioral measures are intended to motivate customers to operate in a more energy-efficient manner (e.g., setting an air-conditioner thermostat to a higher temperature) without accompanying: a) physical changes to more efficient end-use equipment or to their building envelope, b) utility-provided products and tools to facilitate the efficiency improvements, or c) permanent operational changes that improve efficiency which are not easily revertible to prior conditions. These types of behavioral measures were excluded because of the variability in forecasting the magnitude and persistence of energy and demand savings from the utility's perspective. Additionally, decoupling behavioral measure savings from the installation of certain EE technologies like smart thermostats can be challenging and could result in overlapping potential with other EE measures included in the study.

Upon development of the final EE measure list, utility-specific measure details were developed. RI maintains a proprietary online database of energy efficiency measures for MPS studies, which was used as a starting point for measure development for this study. Measures are added or updated at the request of project stakeholders or because of changes to the EE marketplace (for example, new codes and standards, or current practice in the market). Measure data are refined as new data or algorithms are developed for estimating measure impacts, and updated for each study to incorporate inputs parameters specific to the service territory being analyzed. The database contains the following information for each of the measures:

- Measure description: measure classification by type, end-use, and subsector, and description of the base-case and the efficient-case scenarios.
- kWh savings: Energy savings associated with each measure were developed through engineering algorithms or building simulation modeling, taking climate data and customer segments into consideration as appropriate. Reference sources used for developing residential, commercial, and industrial measure savings included a variety of Florida-specific, as well as regional and national sources, such as utility-specific measurement & verification (M&V) data, technical reference manuals (TRM) from other jurisdictions, ENERGY STAR calculators, and manufacturer or retailer specifications for particular products.
- Energy savings were applied in RI's TEA-POT model as a percentage of total baseline consumption. Peak demand savings were determined using utility-specific load shapes or coincidence factors.

- Measure Expected Useful Lifetime: Sources included the Database for Energy Efficient Resources (DEER), the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Handbook, TRMs, and other regional and national measure databases and EE program evaluations.
- Measure Costs: Per-unit costs (full or incremental, depending on the application) associated with measure installations. Sources included: TRMs, ENERGY STAR calculator, online market research, FEECA utility program data, and other secondary sources.

The measure details from the online measure library are exported for use in RI's TEA-POT model, accompanied by utility-specific estimates of measure applicability. Measure applicability is a general term encompassing an array of factors, including technical feasibility of installation, and the measure's current saturation as well as factors to allocate savings associated with competing measures. Information used was primarily derived from data in current regional and national databases, as well as OUC's program tracking data. These factors are described in Table 7.

Table 7. Measure Applicability Factors

As shown in Table 8, the measure list includes 395 unique energy-efficiency measures. Expanding the measures to account for all appropriate installation scenarios resulted in

9,535 measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (i.e., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed).

Table 8. EE Measure Counts by Sector

4.3 DR Measures

The DR measures included in the measure list utilize the following DR strategies:

- **Direct Load Control.** OUC control of selected equipment at the customer's home or business, such as HVAC or water heaters.
- Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) with Technology. Electricity rate structures that vary based on time of day. Includes CPP when the rate is substantially higher for a limited number of hours or days per year (customers receive advance notification of CPP event) coupled with technology that enables customer to lower their usage in a specific end-use in response to the event (e.g., HVAC via smart thermostat).
- Contractual DR. Customers receive incentive payments or a rate discount for committing to reduce load by a pre-determined amount or to a pre-determined firm service level upon utility request.
- Automated DR. OUC dispatched control of specific end-uses at a customer facility. \bullet

DR initiatives that do not rely on the installation of a specific device or technology to implement (such as a voluntary curtailment program or time of use rates) were not included.

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the same measure inputs as previously described for the EE measures. In addition, the DR workbook included expected load reduction from the measure, based on utility technical potential, existing utility DR programs, and other nationwide DR programs if needed.

For technical potential, Resource Innovations did not break out results by specific measure or control technology because all of the developed measures target the end-uses estimated

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 26 of 82

for technical potential (i.e., potential is reported for space cooling end-use and not allocated to switches, smart thermostats, etc.).

4.4 DSRE Measures

The DSRE measure list includes rooftop PV systems, battery storage systems charged from PV systems, and CHP systems.

PV Systems

PV systems utilize solar panels (a packaged collection of PV cells) to convert sunlight into electricity. A system is constructed with multiple solar panels, a DC/AC inverter, a racking system to hold the panels, and electrical system interconnections. These systems are often roof-mounted systems that face south-west, south, and/or, south-east. The potential associated with roof-mounted systems installed on residential and commercial buildings was analyzed.

Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Distributed battery storage systems included in this study consist of behind-the-meter battery systems installed in conjunction with an appropriately-sized PV system at residential and commercial customer facilities. These battery systems typically consist of a DC-charged battery, a DC/AC inverter, and electrical system interconnections to a PV system. On their own battery storage systems do not generate or conserve energy, but can collect and store excess PV generation to provide power during particular time periods, which for DSM purposes would be to offset customer demand during the utility's system peak.

CHP Systems

In most CHP applications, a heat engine creates shaft power that drives an electrical generator (fuel cells can produce electrical power directly from electrochemical reactions). The waste heat from the engine is then recovered to provide other on-site needs. Common prime mover technologies used in CHP applications and explored in this study include:

- Steam turbines
- Gas turbines
- Micro turbines
- Fuel Cells
- Internal combustion engines

DSM Measure Development Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 27 of 82

A workbook was developed for each measure which included the inputs previously described for EE measures and prime mover operating parameters.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 28 of 82

5 Technical Potential

In the previous sections, the approach for DSM measure development was summarized, and the 2025 base year load shares and reference-case load forecast were described. The outputs from these tasks provided the input for estimating the technical potential scenario, which is discussed in this section.

The technical potential scenario estimates the potential energy and demand savings when all technically feasible and commercially available DSM measures are implemented without regard for cost-effectiveness and customer willingness to adopt the most impactful EE, DR, or DSRE technologies. Since the technical potential does not consider the costs or time required to achieve these savings, the estimates provide a theoretical upper limit on electricity savings potential. Technical potential is only constrained by factors such as technical feasibility and applicability of measures. For this study, technical potential included full application of the commercially available DSM measures to all residential, commercial, and industrial customers in the utility's service territory.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 EE Technical Potential

EE technical potential refers to delivering less electricity to the same end-uses. In other words, technical potential might be summarized as "doing the same thing with less energy, regardless of the cost."

DSM measures were applied to the disaggregated utility electricity sales forecasts to estimate technical potential. This involved applying estimated energy savings from equipment and non-equipment measures to all electricity end-uses and customers. Technical potential consists of the total energy and demand that can be saved in the market which Resource Innovations reported as single numerical values for each utility's service territory.

The core equation used in the residential sector EE technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 1 below, while the core equation used in the nonresidential sector technical potential analysis for each individual efficiency measure is shown in Equation 2.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 29 of 82

Technical Potential

Equation 1: Core Equation for Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** = the electricity used per customer per \bullet year by each baseline technology in each market segment. In other words, the baseline equipment energy-use intensity is the consumption of the electrical energy using equipment that the efficient technology replaces or affects.
- Saturation Share = the fraction of the end-use electrical energy that is applicable for \bullet the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for residential cooling, the saturation share would be the fraction of all residential electric customers that have central air conditioners in their household.
- Percent Incomplete = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be \bullet energy efficient. To extend the example above, the fraction of central air conditioners that is not already energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of units that is technically feasible for conversion to \bullet the most efficient available technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install LEDs in all light sockets in a home because the available styles may not fit in every socket).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from \bullet the application of the efficient technology.

Equation 2: Core Equation for Non-Residential Sector EE Technical Potential

Where:

- Total Stock Square Footage by Segment = the forecasted square footage level for a \bullet given building type (e.g., square feet of office buildings).
- **Baseline Equipment Energy Use Intensity** $=$ the electricity used per square foot per year by each baseline equipment type in each market segment.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 30 of 82

- Saturation Shares = the fraction of total end-use energy consumption associated with the efficient technology in a given market segment. For example, for packaged terminal air-conditioner (PTAC), the saturation share would be the fraction of all space cooling kWh in a given market segment that is associated with PTAC equipment.
- **Percent Incomplete** = the fraction of equipment that is not considered to already be energy efficient.
- **Feasibility Factor** = the fraction of the equipment or practice that is technically feasible for conversion to the efficient technology from an engineering perspective (i.e., it may not be possible to install Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) on all motors in a given market segment).
- Savings Factor = the percentage reduction in electricity consumption resulting from the application of the efficient technology.

It is important to note that the technical potential estimate represents electricity savings potential at a specific point in time. In other words, the technical potential estimate is based on data describing status quo customer electricity use and technologies known to exist today. As technology and electricity consumption patterns evolve over time, the baseline electricity consumption will also change accordingly. For this reason, technical potential is a discrete estimate of a dynamic market. Resource Innovations reported the technical potential for 2025, based on currently known DSM measures and observed electricity consumption patterns.

Measure Interaction and Competition (Overlap)

While the technical potential equations listed above focus on the technical potential of a single measure or technology, Resource Innovations' modeling approach does recognize the overlap of individual measure impacts within an end-use or equipment type, and accounts for the following interactive effects:

- Measure interaction: Installing high-efficiency equipment could reduce energy savings in absolute terms (kWh) associated with non-equipment measures that impact the same end-use. For example, installing a high-efficiency heat pump will reduce heating and cooling consumption which will reduce the baseline against which attic insulation would be applied, thus reducing savings associated with installing insulation. To account for this interaction, Resource Innovations' TEA-POT model ranks measures that interact with one another and reduces the baseline consumption for the subsequent measure based on the savings achieved by the preceding measure. For technical potential, interactive measures are ranked based on total end-use energy savings percentage.
- Measure competition (overlap): The "measure share"—as defined above—accounted for competing measures, ensuring savings were not double-counted. This interaction

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 31 of 82

occurred when two or more measures "competed" for the same end-use. For example, a T-12 lamp could be replaced with a T-8 or linear LED lamp.

Addressing Naturally-Occurring EE

Naturally occurring energy efficiency includes actions taken by customers to improve the efficiency of their homes and businesses in the absence of utility program intervention. For the analysis of technical potential, Resource Innovations verified with OUC's forecasting group that the baseline sales forecasts incorporated two known sources of naturallyoccurring efficiency:

- Codes and Standards: The sales forecasts already incorporated the impacts of known Code & standards changes.
- Baseline Measure Adoption: The sales forecast excluded the projected impacts of future DSM efforts but included already implemented DSM penetration.

By properly accounting for these factors, the technical potential analysis estimated the additional EE opportunities beyond what is already included in the utility sales forecast.

5.1.2 DR Technical Potential

The concept of technical potential applies differently to DR than for EE. Technical potential for DR is effectively the magnitude of loads that can be curtailed during conditions when utilities need peak capacity reductions. In evaluating this potential at peak capacity, the following were considered: which customers are consuming electricity at those times? What end-uses are in play? Can those end-use loads be managed? Large C&I accounts generally do not provide the utility with direct control over particular end-uses. Instead, many of these customers will forego electric demand temporarily if the financial incentive is large enough. For residential and small C&I customers where DR generally takes the form of direct utility control, technical potential for DR is limited by the loads that can be controlled remotely at scale.

This framework makes end-use disaggregation an important element for understanding DR potential, particularly in the residential and small C&I sectors. When done properly, end-use disaggregation not only provides insights into which loads are on and off when specific grid services are needed, it also provides insight concerning how key loads and end-uses, such as air conditioning use, vary across customers. Resource Innovations' approach used for load disaggregation is more advanced than what is used for most potential studies. Instead of disaggregating annual consumption or peak demand, Resource Innovations produced end-use load disaggregation for all 8,760 hours. This was needed because the loads available at times when different grid applications are needed can vary substantially. Instead

of producing disaggregated loads for the average customer, the study was produced for several customer segments. For OUC, Resource Innovations examined three residential segments based on customer housing type, four different small C&I segments based on customer size, and four different large C&I segments based on customer size, for a total of 11 different customer segments.

Technical potential, in the context of DR, is defined as the total amount of load available for reduction that is coincident with the period of interest; in this case, the system peak hour for the summer and winter seasons. Thus, two sets of capacity values are estimated: a summer capacity and a winter capacity.

As previously mentioned, for technical potential purposes, all coincident large C&I load is considered dispatchable, while residential and small C&I DR capacity is based on specific end-uses. Summer DR capacity for residential customers was comprised of air-conditioning (AC), pool pumps, water heaters, and managed electric vehicle charging. For small C&I customers, summer capacity was based on AC load. For winter DR capacity, residential was based on electric heating, pool pumps, and water heaters. For small C&I customers, winter capacity was based on electric heating.

AC and heating load profiles were generated for residential and small C&I customers using census-level customer interval data provided by OUC. This data included a customer breakout based on housing type for residential customers and size for small C&I customers. Resource Innovations then used the interval data from these customers to create an average load profile for each customer segment.

The average load profile for each customer segment was combined with historical weather data, and used to estimate hourly load as a function of weather conditions. AC and heating loads were estimated by first calculating the baseline load on days when cooling degree days (CDD) and heating degree days (HDD) were equal to zero, and then subtracting this baseline load. This methodology is illustrated by Figure 7 (a similar methodology was used to predict heating loads).

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 33 of 82

Figure 7: Methodology for Estimating Cooling Loads

This method was able to produce estimates for average AC/heating load profiles for the seven different customer segments within the residential and small C&I sectors.

Profiles for residential water heater and pool pump loads were estimated by utilizing enduse load data from NREL's residential end-use load profile database.

For all eligible loads, the technical potential was defined as the amount that was coincident with system peak hours for each season, which are August from 5:00-6:00 PM for summer, and January from 6:00-7:00 PM for winter. As mentioned in Section 4, for technical potential there was also no measure breakout needed, because all measures will target the end-uses' estimated total loads.

5.1.3 DSRE Technical Potential

5.1.3.1 PV Systems

To determine technical potential for PV systems, RI estimated the percentage of rooftop square footage in Florida that is suitable for hosting PV technology. Our estimate of technical potential for PV systems in this report is based in part on the available roof area and consisted of the following steps:

- Step 1: Outcomes from the forecast disaggregation analysis were used to characterize the existing and new residential, commercial and industrial building stocks.
	- o To calculate the total roof area for residential buildings, the average roof area per household is multiplied by the number of households.
	- o For commercial and industrial buildings, RI calculated the total roof area by first dividing the load forecast by the energy usage intensity, which provides an estimate of the total building square footage. This result is then divided by the average number of floors to derive the total roof area.
- Step 2: The total available roof area feasible for installing PV systems was calculated. Relevant parameters included unusable area due to other rooftop equipment and setback requirements, in addition to possible shading from trees and limitations of roof orientation (factored into a "technical suitability" multiplier).
- Step 3: Estimated the expected power density (kW per square foot of roof area).
- Step 4: Estimated the hourly PV generation profile using NREL's PV Watts Calculator
- Step 5: Calculated total energy and coincident peak demand potential by applying RI's Spatial Penetration and Integration of Distributed Energy Resources (SPIDER) Model.

The methodology presented in this report uses the following formula to estimate overall technical potential of PVs:

Equation 3: Core Equation for Solar DSRE Technical Energy Potential

Where:

- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Residential [Square Feet]: Number of Residential Buildings x Average Roof Area Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- Suitable Rooftop PV Area for Commercial [Square Feet]: Energy Consumption [kWh] / Energy Intensity [kWh / Square Feet] / Average No. of Stories Per Building x Technical Suitability Factor
- PV Power Density [kW-DC/Square Feet]: Maximum power generated in Watts per square foot of solar panel.
- **Generation Factor:** Annual Energy Generation Factor for PV, from PV Watts (dependent on local solar irradiance)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 35 of 82

5.1.3.2 Battery Storage Systems Charged from PV Systems

Battery storage systems on their own do not generate power or create efficiency improvements, but store power for use at different times. Therefore, in analyzing the technical potential for battery storage systems, the source of the stored power and overlap with technical potential identified in other categories was considered.

Battery storage systems that are powered directly from the grid do not produce annual energy savings but may be used to shift or curtail load during particular time periods. As the DR technical potential analyzes curtailment opportunities for the summer and winter peak period, and battery storage systems can be used as a DR technology, the study concluded that no additional technical potential should be claimed for grid-powered battery systems beyond that already attributed to DR.

Battery storage systems that are connected to on-site PV systems also do not produce additional energy savings beyond the energy produced from the PV system⁵. However, PVconnected battery systems do create the opportunity to store energy during period when the PV system is generating more than the home or business is consuming and use that stored power during utility system peak periods.

To determine the additional technical potential peak demand savings for "solar plus storage" systems, our methodology consisted of the following steps:

- Assume that every PV system included in PV Technical Potential is installed with a paired storage system.
- Size the storage system assuming peak storage power is equal to peak PV generation and energy storage duration is three hours.
- Apply RI's hourly dispatch optimization module in SPIDER to create an hourly storage dispatch profile that flattens the individual customer's load profile to the greatest extent possible accounting for a) customer hourly load profile, b) hourly PV generation profile, and c) battery peak demand, energy capacity, and roundtrip charge/discharge efficiency.
- Calculate the effective hourly impact for the utility using the above storage dispatch profile, aligned with the utility's peak hour (calculated separately for summer and winter)
- Report the output storage kW impact on utility coincident peak demand in summer and winter.

⁵ PV-connected battery systems experience some efficiency loss due to storage, charging, and discharging. However, for this study, these losses were not quantified.

Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 36 of 82

5.1.3.3 CHP Systems

The CHP analysis created a series of unique distributed generation potential models for each primary market sector (commercial and industrial).

Only non-residential customer segments whose electric and thermal load profiles allow for the application of CHP were considered. The technical potential analysis followed a threestep process. First, minimum facilities size thresholds were determined for each nonresidential customer segment. Next, the full population of non-residential customers were segmented and screened based on the size threshold established for that segment. Finally, the facilities that were of sufficient size were matched with the appropriately sized CHP technology.

To determine the minimum threshold for CHP suitability, a thermal factor was applied to potential candidate customer loads to reflect thermal load considerations in CHP sizing. In most cases, on-site thermal energy demand is smaller than electrical demand. Thus, CHP size is usually dictated by the thermal load in order to achieve improved efficiencies.

The study collected electric and thermal intensity data from other recent CHP studies. For industrial customers, Resource Innovations assumed that the thermal load would primarily be used for process operations and was not modified from the secondary data sources for Florida climate conditions. For commercial customers, the thermal load is more commonly made up of water heating, space heating, and space cooling (through the use of an absorption chiller). Therefore, to account for the hot and humid climate in Florida, which traditionally limits weather-dependent internal heating loads, commercial customers' thermal loads were adjusted to incorporate a higher proportion of space cooling to space heating as available opportunities for waste heat recovery.

 Resource Innovations worked with the utility-provided customer data, focusing on annual consumption due to the absence of NAICS or SIC codes for this utility data. Non-residential customers were subsequently classified based on annual consumption and size. Since NAICS or SIC codes were unavailable, no formal segmentation occurred. Instead, the analysis focused exclusively on annual utility usage. Facilities with annual loads below the kWh thresholds were deemed unlikely to possess the consistent electric and thermal loads necessary to support CHP and were consequently excluded from consideration. Conversely, those meeting the size criteria were aligned with the corresponding CHP technology.

In general, internal combustion engines are the prime mover for systems under 500kW with gas turbines becoming progressively more popular as system size increases above that. Based on the available load by customer, adjusted by the estimated thermal factor for each

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 37 of 82

segment, CHP technologies were assigned to utility customers in a top-down fashion (i.e., starting with the largest CHP generators).

Measure Interaction

PV systems and battery storage charged from PV systems were analyzed collectively due to their common power generation source; and therefore, the identified technical potential for these systems is additive. However, CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between DSRE technologies or customer preference for a particular DSRE system. Therefore, results for CHP technical potential should not be combined with PV systems or battery storage systems for overall DSRE potential but used as independent estimates.

5.1.4 Interaction of Technical Potential Impacts

As described above, the technical potential was estimated using separate models for EE, DR, and DSRE systems. However, there is interaction between these technologies; for example, a more efficient HVAC system would result in a reduced peak demand available for DR curtailment, as illustrated in Figure 8.

Therefore, after development of the independent models, the interaction between EE, DR, and DSRE was incorporated as follows:

 \bullet The EE technical potential was assumed to be implemented first, followed by DR technical potential and DSRE technical potential.

- To account for the impact of EE technical potential on DR, the baseline load forecast for the applicable end-uses was adjusted by the EE technical potential, resulting in a reduction in baseline load available for curtailment.
- For DSRE systems, the EE and DR technical potential was incorporated in a similar fashion, adjusting the baseline load used to estimate DSRE potential.
	- o For the PV analysis, this did not impact the results as the EE and DR technical potential did not affect the amount of PV that could be installed on available rooftops.
	- o For the battery storage charged from PV systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in additional PV-generated energy being available for the battery systems and for use during peak periods. The impact of DR events during the assumed curtailment hours was incorporated into the modeling of available battery storage and discharge loads.
- For CHP systems, the reduced baseline load from EE resulted in a reduction in the \bullet number of facilities that met the annual energy threshold needed for CHP installations. Installed DR capacity was assumed to not impact CHP potential as the CHP system feasibility was determined based on energy and thermal consumption at the facility. It should be noted that CHP systems not connected to the grid could impact the amount of load available for curtailment with utility-sponsored DR. Therefore, CHP technical potential should not be combined with DR potential but used as independent estimates.

5.2 EE Technical Potential

5.2.1 Summary

Table 9 summarizes the EE technical potential by sector:

Table 9. EE Technical Potential

⁶ Non-Residential results include all commercial and industrial customer segments.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 39 of 82

5.2.2 Residential

Figure 10, Figure 10 and Figure 11 summarize the residential sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 9: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 40 of 82

Technical Potential

Figure 10: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

Figure 11: Residential EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Energy Savings)

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 41 of 82

5.2.3 Non-Residential

5.2.3.1 Business Segments

Figure 13, Figure 13 and Figure 14 summarize the business sector EE technical potential by end-use.

Figure 12: Business EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Summer Peak Savings)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 42 of 82

Technical Potential

Figure 13: Business EE Technical Potential by End-Use (Winter Peak Savings)

5.3 DR Technical Potential

Technical potential for DR is defined for each class of customers as follows:

- Residential & Small C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the aggregate load for all end-uses that can participate in OUC's current programs plus DR measures not currently offered in which the utility uses specialized devices to control loads (i.e. direct load control programs). This includes cooling and heating loads for residential and small C&I customers and water heater and pool pump loads for residential customers. Not all demand reductions are delivered via direct load control of end-uses. The magnitude of demand reductions from non-direct load control such as time varying pricing, peak time rebates and targeted notifications is linked to cooling and heating loads.
- Large C&I customers Technical potential is equal to the total amount of load for each customer segment (i.e., that customers reduce their total load to zero when called upon).

Table 10 summarizes the seasonal DR technical potential by sector:

Table 10. DR Technical Potential

5.3.1 Residential

Residential technical potential is summarized in Figure 15.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 44 of 82

Technical Potential

Figure 15: Residential DR Technical Potential by End-Use

5.3.2 Non-Residential

5.3.2.1 Small C&I Customers

For small C&I technical potential, Resource Innovations looked at cooling and heating loads only. Small C&I technical potential is provided in Figure 16.

 Technical Potential Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 45 of 82

5.3.2.2 Large C&I Customers

Figure 17 provides the technical potential for large C&I customers, broken down by customer size.

Figure 17: Large C&I DR Technical Potential by Segment

5.4 DSRE Technical Potential

Table 11 provides the results of the DSRE technical potential for each customer segment:

Table 11. DSRE Technical Potential⁷

⁷ PV systems and CHP systems were independently analyzed for technical potential without consideration of the competition between technologies or customer preference for DSRE system.

Appendix A EE Measure List

For information on how Resource Innovations developed this list, please see Section 4.

Table 12: Residential EE Measures

Table 13: Commercial EE Measures

Table 14: Industrial EE Measures

EE Measure List

The following EE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study⁸:

Table 15: 2019 EE Measures Eliminated from Current Study

Sector	Measure	End-Use	Reason for Removal
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	CFL - 15W Flood (Exterior)	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	$CFI - 13W$	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	$CH - 23W$	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	Low Wattage T8 Fixture	Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Residential	15 SEER Central AC	Space Cooling	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	15 SEER Air Source Heat Pump	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	14 SEER ASHP from base electric resistance heating	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Updated Federal Standard
Residential	Two Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Variable Speed Pool Pump	Miscellaneous	Updated Florida Energy Code
Residential	Storm Door	Space Cooling, Space Heating	Minimal/uncertain energy savings
Commercial	$CFI - 15W$ Flood	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available
Commercial	High Efficiency HID Lighting	Exterior Lighting	Better technology (LED) available

⁸ Additional measures from the 2019 study were updated to reflect current vintage/technology for the current study.

EE Measure List

Appendix B DR Measure List

Table 16: Residential DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Exhibit JH-7, Page 75 of 82

DR Measure List

Table 17: Small C&I DR Measures

Table 18: Large C&I DR Measures

DR Measure List

No DR measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Appendix C DSRE Measure List

Table 19: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 20: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

No DSRE measures from the 2019 Technical Potential Study were eliminated from the current study.

Exhibit JH-7, Page 79 of 82

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

External Measure Suggestions

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG
TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission
Exhibit JH-7, Page 82 of 82 Exhibit JH-7, Page 82 of 82 TPS for Orlando Utilities Commission Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 1 of 24

Exhibit JH-8 2024 Measure Lists

EE Measure Lists

Table 1: Residential EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 2 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 3 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 4 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 5 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 6 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 7 of 24

Table 2: Commercial EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 8 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 9 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 10 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 11 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 12 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 13 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 14 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 15 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 16 of 24

Table 3: Industrial EE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 17 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 18 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 19 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 20 of 24

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 21 of 24

DR Measure Lists

Table 4: Residential DR Measures

Table 5: Small C&I DR Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG 2024 Measure Lists Exhibit JH-8, Page 23 of 24

Table 6: Large C&I DR Measures

DSRE Measure Lists

Table 7: Residential DSRE Measures

Table 8: Non-Residential DSRE Measures

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 1 of 8

Exhibit JH-9 Comparison of 2019 Measure List and 2024 Measure List

EE Measure Lists

EE Measures Added Since 2019 Study

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 2 of 8

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 3 of 8

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 4 of 8

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 5 of 8

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 6 of 8

EE Measures Eliminated Since 2019 Study

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 7 of 8

DR Measure Lists

DR Measures Added Since 2019 Study

DR Measures Eliminated Since 2019 Study

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG Comparison of Comprehensive 2019 Measure Lists to the 2024 Comprehensive Measure Lists Exhibit JH-9, Page 8 of 8

DSRE Measure Lists

DSRE Measures Added Since 2019 Study

DSRE Measures Eliminated Since 2019 Study

Exhibit JH-10 DEF Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities

Measure Screening

The program development process was initiated with 395 EE measures, 33 DR measures, and 9 DSRE measures contributing to the technical potential, which are detailed in Exhibit JH-8. [Table 1](#page-619-0) summarizes the number of measures by category and the number of measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e*., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed)

Table 1. TP Measure Counts

The subsequent program development process included the following steps that refined the measure lists for the RIM scenario and TRC scenario. The following tables summarize the count of measures and permutations excluded at each step:

Economic Analysis – Cost-effectiveness screening

Measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. Individual measures did not include any utility program costs (program administrative or incentive costs), and therefore were

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG DEF Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-10, Page 2 of 5

evaluated on the basis of measure cost-effectiveness without any utility intervention. [Table 2](#page-620-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Table 2: Measures Excluded – Economic Analysis, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

*Screening for the DR economic analysis was done at the measure level, not by permutation

Measure Adoption Forecast – Cost-effectiveness screening

All technical potential measures were re-screened in the development of the measure adoption forecasts. Associated program costs, including program administrative costs and customer incentives, were included in the economic analysis used for estimating measure adoption forecasts. Because this step occurred prior to each utility developing specific programs aligned with their proposed goals, representative administrative costs were developed using average FEECA Utility program cost data, where available from current programs, and supplemented with other utility program cost data where needed. In order to evenly apply these representative costs to measures with a variety of savings impacts, typical costs were estimated on a variable basis per kWh saved.

Measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. [Table 3](#page-621-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG DEF Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-10, Page 3 of 5

Table 3: Measures Excluded – Measure Adoption Forecast, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

Measure Adoption Forecast – Free ridership screening

Consistent with prior DSM analyses in Florida, free ridership was addressed by applying a two-year payback criterion, which eliminated measures having a simple payback of less than two years. In addition to the measures and permutations excluded based on the cost-effectiveness screening summarized in [Table 3](#page-621-0) above, [Table 4](#page-621-1) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG DEF Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-10, Page 4 of 5

Economic Sensitivities

As part of the economic analysis, the study included development of sensitivities related to free ridership, future fuel costs, as follows:

Sensitivity #1: Higher Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "high fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 5: Economic Sensitivity #1 – Passing Measures, Higher Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #2: Lower Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "low fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 6: Economic Sensitivity #2 – Passing Measures, Lower Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG DEF Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-10, Page 5 of 5

Sensitivity #3: Shorter free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was reduced to one year or longer:

Table 7: Economic Sensitivity #3 – Passing Measures, Shorter free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #4: Longer free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was increased to three years or longer:

Table 8: Economic Sensitivity #4 – Passing Measures, Longer free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

Exhibit JH-11 FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities

Measure Screening

The program development process was initiated with 395 EE measures, 29 DR measures, and 9 DSRE measures contributing to the technical potential, which are detailed in Exhibit JH-8. [Table 1](#page-624-0) summarizes the number of measures by category and the number of measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e*., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed)

Table 1. TP Measure Counts

The subsequent program development process included the following steps that refined the measure lists for the RIM scenario and TRC scenario. The following tables summarize the count of measures and permutations excluded at each step:

Economic Analysis – Cost-effectiveness screening

Technical potential measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. Individual measures did not include any utility program costs (program administrative or incentive costs), and therefore were evaluated on the basis of measure cost-effectiveness without any utility intervention. [Table 2](#page-625-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step: Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-11, Page 2 of 6

Table 2: Measures Excluded – Economic Analysis, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

*Screening for the DR economic analysis was done at the measure level, not by permutation

Measure Adoption Forecast – Cost-effectiveness screening

All technical potential measures were re-screened in the development of the measure adoption forecasts. Associated program costs, including program administrative costs and customer incentives, were included in the economic analysis used for estimating measure adoption forecasts. Because this step occurred prior to each utility developing specific programs aligned with their proposed goals, representative administrative costs were developed using average FEECA Utility program cost data, where available from current programs, and supplemented with other utility program cost data where needed. In order to evenly apply these representative costs to measures with a variety of savings impacts, typical costs were estimated on a variable basis per kWh saved.

Measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. [Table 3](#page-625-1) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-11, Page 3 of 6

Table 3: Measures Excluded – Measure Adoption Forecast, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

Measure Adoption Forecast – Free ridership screening

Consistent with prior DSM analyses in Florida, free ridership was addressed by applying a two-year payback criterion, which eliminated measures having a simple payback of less than two years. In addition to the measures and permutations excluded based on the cost-effectiveness screening summarized in [Table 3](#page-625-1) above, [Table 4](#page-626-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-11, Page 4 of 6

DSM Program Development – Cost-effectiveness screening

As described in Exhibit No. JH-14, RI worked collaboratively with FPUC on the DSM program development process, resulting in a Proposed Goals Scenario, a RIM Scenario, and a TRC Scenario. All technical potential measures were re-analyzed in the DSM program development process.

For the RIM Scenario and TRC Scenario program development, updated non-incentive costs specific to FPUC were developed and applied in the updated cost-effectiveness screening of technical potential measures, which included the following criteria for each scenario:

- RIM-scenario measures that failed the RIM-scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis
- TRC-scenario measures that failed the TRC-scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis

[Table 5](#page-627-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded for each scenario at this step:

Table 5: Measures Excluded – DSM Program Development, TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario

The development of the Proposed Goals Scenario started with assessment of technical potential measures study that passed, or were close to passing, the economic analysis, as well as measures included in current FPUC programs or that may be logical additions to current FPUC programs. Therefore, all individual EE measures were included in the initial analysis. Due to the DSM program development cost-effectiveness screening resulting in no DSRE measures or DR measures passing the RIM or TRC scenarios, these measures were excluded in the Proposed Goals Scenario analysis. Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-11, Page 5 of 6

Economic Sensitivities

As part of the economic analysis, the study included development of sensitivities related to future fuel costs and free ridership, as follows:

Sensitivity #1: Higher Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "high fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 6: Economic Sensitivity #1 – Passing Measures, Higher Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #2: Lower Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "low fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 7: Economic Sensitivity #2 – Passing Measures, Lower Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-11, Page 6 of 6

Sensitivity #3: Shorter free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was reduced to one year or longer:

Table 8: Economic Sensitivity #3 – Passing Measures, Shorter free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #4: Longer free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was increased to three years or longer:

Table 9: Economic Sensitivity #4 – Passing Measures, Longer free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

Exhibit JH-12 JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities

Measure Screening

The program development process was initiated with 395 EE measures, 33 DR measures, and 9 DSRE measures contributing to the technical potential, which are detailed in Exhibit JH-8. [Table 1](#page-630-0) summarizes the number of measures by category and the number of measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e*., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed)

Table 1. TP Measure Counts

The subsequent program development process included the following steps that refined the measure lists for the RIM scenario and TRC scenario. The following tables summarize the count of measures and permutations excluded at each step:

Economic Analysis – Cost-effectiveness screening

Technical potential measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. Individual measures did not include any utility program costs (program administrative or incentive costs), and Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-12, Page 2 of 6

therefore were evaluated on the basis of measure cost-effectiveness without any utility intervention. [Table 2](#page-631-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Table 2: Measures Excluded – Economic Analysis, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

*Screening for the DR economic analysis was done at the measure level, not by permutation

Measure Adoption Forecast – Cost-effectiveness screening

All technical potential measures were re-screened in the development of the measure adoption forecasts. Associated program costs, including program administrative costs and customer incentives, were included in the economic analysis used for estimating measure adoption forecasts. Because this step occurred prior to each utility developing specific programs aligned with their proposed goals, representative administrative costs were developed using average FEECA Utility program cost data, where available from current programs, and supplemented with other utility program cost data where needed. In order to evenly apply these representative costs to measures with a variety of savings impacts, typical costs were estimated on a variable basis per kWh saved.

Measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. [Table 3](#page-631-1) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-12, Page 3 of 6

Table 3: Measures Excluded – Measure Adoption Forecast, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

Measure Adoption Forecast – Free ridership screening

Consistent with prior DSM analyses in Florida, free ridership was addressed by applying a two-year payback criterion, which eliminated measures having a simple payback of less than two years. In addition to the measures and permutations excluded based on the cost-effectiveness screening summarized in [Table 3](#page-631-1) above, [Table 4](#page-632-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-12, Page 4 of 6

DSM Program Development – Cost-effectiveness screening

As described in Exhibit No. JH-15, RI worked collaboratively with JEA on the DSM program development process, resulting in a Proposed Goals Scenario, a RIM Scenario, and a TRC Scenario. All technical potential measures were re-analyzed in the DSM program development process.

For the RIM Scenario and TRC Scenario program development, updated non-incentive costs specific to JEA were developed and applied in the updated cost-effectiveness screening of technical potential measures, which included the following criteria for each scenario:

- RIM Scenario measures that failed the RIM Scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis
- TRC Scenario measures that failed the TRC Scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis

[Table 5](#page-633-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded for each scenario at this step:

Table 5: Measures Excluded – DSM Program Development, TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario

The development of the Proposed Goals Scenario started with assessment of technical potential measures study that passed, or were close to passing, the economic analysis, as well as measures included in current JEA programs or that may be logical additions to current JEA programs. Therefore, all individual EE measures were included in the initial analysis, as well as Large Commercial DR measures. Due to the DSM program development cost-effectiveness screening resulting in no DSRE measures or DR measures for Residential or Small-Medium Businesses passing the RIM or TRC scenarios, these measures were excluded in the Proposed Goals Scenario analysis.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-12, Page 5 of 6

Economic Sensitivities

As part of the economic analysis, the study included development of sensitivities related to future fuel costs and free ridership, as follows:

Sensitivity #1: Higher Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "high fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 6: Economic Sensitivity #1 – Passing Measures, Higher Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #2: Lower Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "low fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 7: Economic Sensitivity #2 – Passing Measures, Lower Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-12, Page 6 of 6

Sensitivity #3: Shorter free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was reduced to one year or longer:

Table 8: Economic Sensitivity #3 – Passing Measures, Shorter free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #4: Longer free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was increased to three years or longer:

Table 9: Economic Sensitivity #4 – Passing Measures, Longer free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

Exhibit JH-13 OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities

Measure Screening

The program development process was initiated with 395 EE measures, 33 DR measures, and 9 DSRE measures contributing to the technical potential, which are detailed in Exhibit JH-8. [Table 1](#page-636-0) summarizes the number of measures by category and the number of measure permutations, which are the application of individual measures to various customer segments, construction types, and end-uses (*i.e*., a single air-source heat pump "measure" can be installed in single family, multi-family, and manufactured homes, as well as new and existing vintages of each home type, and impacts both space cooling and space heating end-uses, resulting in twelve separate measure "permutations" analyzed)

Table 1. TP Measure Counts

The subsequent program development process included the following steps that refined the measure lists for the RIM scenario and TRC scenario. The following tables summarize the count of measures and permutations excluded at each step:

Economic Analysis – Cost-effectiveness screening

Technical potential measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. Individual measures did not include any utility program costs (program administrative or incentive costs), and Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 2 of 7

therefore were evaluated on the basis of measure cost-effectiveness without any utility intervention. [Table 2](#page-637-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Table 2: Measures Excluded – Economic Analysis, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

*Screening for the DR economic analysis was done at the measure level, not by permutation

Measure Adoption Forecast – Cost-effectiveness screening

All technical potential measures were re-screened in the development of the measure adoption forecasts. Associated program costs, including program administrative costs and customer incentives, were included in the economic analysis used for estimating measure adoption forecasts. Because this step occurred prior to each utility developing specific programs aligned with their proposed goals, representative administrative costs were developed using average FEECA Utility program cost data, where available from current programs, and supplemented with other utility program cost data where needed. In order to evenly apply these representative costs to measures with a variety of savings impacts, typical costs were estimated on a variable basis per kWh saved.

Measures that did not achieve a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.0 for the TRC test and PCT were excluded from the TRC scenario. Measures that did not achieve a ratio of 1.0 for the RIM test and PCT were excluded from the RIM scenario for the economic analysis. [Table 3](#page-638-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 3 of 7

Table 3: Measures Excluded – Measure Adoption Forecast, TRC scenario and RIM scenario

Measure Adoption Forecast – Free ridership screening

Consistent with prior DSM analyses in Florida, free ridership was addressed by applying a two-year payback criterion, which eliminated measures having a simple payback of less than two years. In addition to the measures and permutations excluded based on the cost-effectiveness screening summarized in [Table 3](#page-638-0) above, [Table 4](#page-638-1) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded at this step:

Table 4: Measures Excluded – Measure Adoption Forecast, 2-year payback screening (additional exclusions)

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 4 of 7

DSM Program Development – Cost-effectiveness screening

As described in Exhibit No. JH-16, RI worked collaboratively with OUC on the DSM program development process, resulting in a Proposed Goals Scenario, a RIM Scenario, and a TRC Scenario. All technical potential measures were re-analyzed in the DSM program development process.

For the RIM Scenario and TRC Scenario program development, updated non-incentive costs specific to OUC were developed and applied in the updated cost-effectiveness screening of technical potential measures, which included the following criteria for each scenario:

- RIM Scenario measures that failed the RIM Scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis
- TRC Scenario measures that failed the TRC Scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were excluded from the initial measure bundling analysis

[Table 5](#page-639-0) summarizes the count of unique measures and measure permutations excluded for each scenario at this step:

Table 5: Measures Excluded – DSM Program Development, TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario

The development of the Proposed Goals Scenario started with assessment of technical potential measures study that passed, or were close to passing, the economic analysis, as well as measures included in current OUC programs or that may be logical additions to current OUC programs. Therefore, all individual EE measures were included in the initial analysis, as well as Large Commercial DR measures. Due to the DSM program development cost-effectiveness screening resulting in no DSRE measures or DR measures for Residential or Small-Medium Businesses passing the RIM or TRC scenarios, these measures were excluded in the Proposed Goals Scenario analysis.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 5 of 7

Economic Sensitivities

As part of the economic analysis, the study included development of sensitivities related to free ridership, future fuel costs, and carbon cost scenarios, as follows:

Sensitivity #1: Higher Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "high fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 6: Economic Sensitivity #1 – Passing Measures, Higher Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #2: Lower Fuel Prices

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened using electric utility supply costs adjusted to a "low fuel" cost scenario. The following table summarizes the number of unique measures and measure permutations that are cost effective under each scenario:

Table 7: Economic Sensitivity #2 – Passing Measures, Lower Fuel Prices

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as fuel prices do not affect DR results.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 6 of 7

Sensitivity #3: Shorter free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was reduced to one year or longer:

Table 8: Economic Sensitivity #3 – Passing Measures, Shorter free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

*No DSRE measures passed the economic screening for this sensitivity.

Sensitivity #4: Longer free-ridership exclusion periods

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the simple payback screening criteria was increased to three years or longer:

Table 9: Economic Sensitivity #4 – Passing Measures, Longer free-ridership exclusion period

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as there is negligible customer incremental cost for DR measures and therefore differences in simple payback do not affect DR results.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Measure Screening and Economic Sensitivities Exhibit JH-13, Page 7 of 7

Sensitivity #5: Carbon dioxide (CO₂) costs

For this sensitivity, both the RIM and TRC scenarios were screened as described above for the Economic Analysis, but the avoided electric utility supply costs forecast was adjusted to include consideration of an additional impact for emissions assuming that there was an economic charge for carbon dioxide.

Table 10: Economic Sensitivity #5 – Passing Measures, Carbon dioxide costs

*DR measures were not included in the economic sensitivities as the estimated carbon dioxide costs do not affect DR results.

Exhibit JH-14 FPUC Program Development Summary

Overview

RI worked collaboratively with FPUC on the DSM program development process to develop impacts under three scenarios: 1) potential DSM programs that contribute to proposed DSM goals (Proposed Goals Scenario), 2) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Rate Impact Measure Tests (RIM Scenario), and 3) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Total Resource Cost Tests (TRC Scenario).

Methodology

The development of DSM programs for each scenario included incorporating the measures and measure impacts developed for the Technical Potential (TP) study, reviewing FPUC's current program offerings, collaboration with FPUC on program concepts that are beneficial for their customers, and analysis of economic impacts and market adoption to create potential DSM programs. This process included the following steps:

Program Review and Measure Bundling

The analysis began with the measures from the TP study. This measure list was initially refined for program development for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario measures that passed, or were close to passing, either the TRC or RIM tests were prioritized in the initial measure bundling analysis. Measures included in current FPUC programs were also identified and included in the initial measure bundling.
- 2. RIM Scenario measures that passed the RIM Scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis
- 3. TRC Scenario measures that passed the TRC Scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis

Resource Innovations then reviewed current FPUC programs and eligible measures, and mapped individual measures to the appropriate programs for each scenario. Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with FPUC to collect program information (e.g. program manuals, participation records, energy and demand savings, budgets) and review the existing programs to determine which measures should be included in the initial program portfolios. In addition, a gap analysis was conducted to identify measures included in each scenario that are not currently offered by FPUC. These measures were either included in existing programs where there was a logical fit, or included as a new program concept.

Program Refinement and Modeling

After identifying the preliminary measure bundles and programs, Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with FPUC to develop incentive amounts and non-incentive costs. Non-incentive costs, which include costs to manage, administer, and market the program, were developed based on current FPUC program costs as well as secondary data on similar programs offered by other utilities, and refined as needed based on the proposed program delivery structure. Incentive costs were developed for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario preliminary incentive rates were informed by current incentives offered by FPUC as well as typical incentive levels offered by similar programs regionally and nationally.
- 2. RIM Scenario incentive rates were developed based on the available net benefits for each measure, based on total RIM benefits minus RIM costs. Next, the incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure was calculated. The final incentive applied for the measure was based on the lower of these two values.
- 3. TRC Scenario the incentive amount required to result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure was used as the final incentive for the measure.

Measures included in the initial program concepts for each scenario were analyzed in RI's TEA-POT model to update the economic analysis based on the FPUC-specific non-incentive and incentive costs, and to estimate market adoption for each measure. The economic analysis included calculating updated RIM, TRC, and PCT costs and benefits for each measure and re-screening measures for each scenario.

RI's market adoption estimates use a payback acceptance criterion to estimate long-run market shares for measures as a function of measure incremental costs and expected bill savings over the measures' effective useful life (inclusive of utility incentives). Incremental adoption estimates are based on the Bass Diffusion Model, which is a mathematical description of how the rate of new product diffusion changes over time. For this study, adoption curve input parameters were developed for each measure based on specific criteria, including measure maturity in the market, overall measure cost, and whether the measure was currently offered through a utility program. RI's TEA-POT model then calculated demand and energy savings by applying estimated adoption rates to each cost-effective measure.

The TEA-POT modeling results were exported into RI's Program Planner workbook that aggregated the individual measure results into program and portfolio impacts for each scenario. For the TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario no further refinements to the programs were made. For the Proposed Goals scenario, RI continued to work collaboratively with FPUC to identify the measures and program concepts that comprise the proposed DSM goals. These impacts for each scenario are provided below.

Results

Proposed Goals Scenario

The Proposed Goals Scenario is described in more detail in Witness Craig's testimony. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Table 1. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual MWh Targets

Table 2. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual summer MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 4 of 9

Table 3. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual winter MW Targets

Table 4. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Participation Targets

Table 5. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 5 of 9

Table 6. Proposed DSM Goals – Cost-Effectiveness Results

RIM Scenario

The RIM Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and RIM test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives).

FPUC did not have any measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the RIM Scenario.

TRC Scenario

The TRC Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and TRC test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives). Incentive rates were based on the maximum incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.
Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 6 of 9

Table 7. TRC Scenario – Annual MWh Targets

Table 8. TRC Scenario – Annual summer MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 7 of 9

Table 9. TRC Scenario – Annual winter MW Targets

Table 10. TRC Scenario – Annual Participation Targets

Annual Participation

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 8 of 9

Table 12. TRC Scenario – Cost-Effectiveness Results

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG FPUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-14, Page 9 of 9

Exhibit JH-15 JEA Program Development Summary

Overview

RI worked collaboratively with JEA on the DSM program development process to develop impacts under three scenarios: 1) potential DSM programs that contribute to proposed DSM goals (Proposed Goals Scenario), 2) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Rate Impact Measure Tests (RIM Scenario), and 3) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Total Resource Cost Tests (TRC Scenario).

Methodology

The development of DSM programs for each scenario included incorporating the measures and measure impacts developed for the Technical Potential (TP) study, reviewing JEA's current program offerings, collaboration with JEA on program concepts that are beneficial for their customers, and analysis of economic impacts and market adoption to create potential DSM programs. This process included the following steps:

Program Review and Measure Bundling

The analysis began with the measures from the TP study. This measure list was initially refined for program development for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario measures that passed, or were close to passing, either the TRC or RIM tests were prioritized in the initial measure bundling analysis. Measures included in current JEA programs were also identified and included in the initial measure bundling.
- 2. RIM Scenario measures that passed the RIM Scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis
- 3. TRC Scenario measures that passed the TRC Scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis

Resource Innovations then reviewed current JEA programs and eligible measures, and mapped individual measures to the appropriate programs for each scenario. Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with JEA to collect program information (e.g. program manuals, participation records, energy and demand savings, budgets) and review the existing programs to determine which measures should be included in the initial program portfolios. In addition, a gap analysis was conducted to identify measures included in each scenario that are not currently offered by JEA. These measures were either included in existing programs where there was a logical fit, or included as a new program concept.

Program Refinement and Modeling

After identifying the preliminary measure bundles and programs, Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with JEA to develop incentive amounts and non-incentive costs. Non-incentive costs, which include costs to manage, administer, and market the program, were developed based on current JEA program costs as well as secondary data on similar programs offered by other utilities, and refined as needed based on the proposed program delivery structure. Incentive costs were developed for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario preliminary incentive rates were informed by current incentives offered by JEA as well as typical incentive levels offered by similar programs regionally and nationally.
- 2. RIM Scenario incentive rates were developed based on the available net benefits for each measure, based on total RIM benefits minus RIM costs. Next, the incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure was calculated. The final incentive applied for the measure was based on the lower of these two values.
- 3. TRC Scenario the incentive amount required to result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure was used as the final incentive for the measure.

Measures included in the initial program concepts for each scenario were analyzed in RI's TEA-POT model to update the economic analysis based on the JEA-specific non-incentive and incentive costs, and to estimate market adoption for each measure. The economic analysis included calculating updated RIM, TRC, and PCT costs and benefits for each measure and re-screening measures for each scenario.

RI's market adoption estimates use a payback acceptance criterion to estimate long-run market shares for measures as a function of measure incremental costs and expected bill savings over the measures' effective useful life (inclusive of utility incentives). Incremental adoption estimates are based on the Bass Diffusion Model, which is a mathematical description of how the rate of new product diffusion changes over time. For this study, adoption curve input parameters were developed for each measure based on specific criteria, including measure maturity in the market, overall measure cost, and whether the measure was currently offered through a utility program. RI's TEA-POT model then calculated demand and energy savings by applying estimated adoption rates to each cost-effective measure.

The TEA-POT modeling results were exported into RI's Program Planner workbook that aggregated the individual measure results into program and portfolio impacts for each scenario. For the TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario no further refinements to the programs were made. For the Proposed Goals scenario, RI continued to work collaboratively with JEA to identify the measures and program concepts that comprise the proposed DSM goals. These impacts for each scenario are provided below.

Results

Proposed Goals Scenario

The Proposed Goals Scenario is described in more detail in Witness Pippin's testimony. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Table 1. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual MWh Targets

Table 2. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual summer MW Targets

Table 3. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual winter MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 4 of 13

Table 4. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Participation Targets

Table 5. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Table 6. Proposed DSM Goals – Cost-Effectiveness Results

RIM Scenario

The RIM Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and RIM test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives). Incentive rates were calculated from the RIM net benefit available and the incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure. The maximum incentive was based on the lower of these two values. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Energy Efficiency Programs

Table 7. RIM Scenario – Annual MWh Targets

Table 8. RIM Scenario – Annual summer MW Targets

Table 9. RIM Scenario – Annual winter MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 6 of 13

Table 10. RIM Scenario – Annual Participation Targets

Table 11. RIM Scenario – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Table 12. RIM Scenario – Cost-Effectiveness Results

Demand Response Programs

The RIM Scenario analysis resulted in four cost-effective demand response measures for the largest commercial and industrial segment, which includes customers over 500 kW. The four DR measures are presented as individual potential program options in the following tables. Each's program's cost and impact estimates were developed independent of the other programs; therefore, because the measures apply to the same target population of large commercial and industrial customers, the savings and participation are not additive.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 7 of 13

Table 13. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response - Automated DR Program

Table 14. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) Program

Table 15. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Firm Service Level Program

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 8 of 13

Table 16. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Guaranteed Load Drop Program

Demand-Side Renewable Energy Programs

JEA did not have any DSRE measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the RIM Scenario.

TRC Scenario

The TRC Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and TRC test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives). Incentive rates were based on the maximum incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 9 of 13

Energy Efficiency Programs

Table 17. TRC Scenario – Annual MWh Targets

Table 18. TRC Scenario – Annual summer MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 10 of 13

Table 20. TRC Scenario – Annual Participation Targets

10

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 11 of 13

Table 21. TRC Scenario – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Table 22. TRC Scenario – Cost-Effectiveness Results

Demand Response Programs

The TRC Scenario analysis resulted in four cost-effective demand response measures for the largest commercial and industrial segment, which includes customers over 500 kW. The four DR measures are presented as individual potential program options in the following tables. Each's program's cost and impact estimates were developed independent of the other programs; therefore, because the measures apply to the same target population of large commercial and industrial customers, the savings and participation are not additive.

Table 23. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response - Automated DR Program

Table 24. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) Program

Table 25. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Firm Service Level Program

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG JEA Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-15, Page 13 of 13

Table 26. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Guaranteed Load Drop Program

Demand-Side Renewable Energy Programs

JEA did not have any DSRE measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the TRC Scenario.

Exhibit JH-16 OUC Program Development Summary

Overview

RI worked collaboratively with OUC on the DSM program development process to develop impacts under three scenarios: 1) potential DSM programs that contribute to proposed DSM goals (Proposed Goals scenario), 2) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Rate Impact Measure Tests (RIM Scenario), and 3) potential DSM programs that pass the Participant and Total Resource Cost Tests (TRC Scenario).

Methodology

The development of DSM programs for each scenario included incorporating the measures and measure impacts developed for the Technical Potential (TP) study, reviewing OUC's current program offerings, collaboration with OUC on program concepts that are beneficial for their customers, and analysis of economic impacts and market adoption to create potential DSM programs. This process included the following steps:

Program Review and Measure Bundling

The analysis began with the measures from the TP study. This measure list was initially refined for program development for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario measures that passed, or were close to passing, either the TRC or RIM tests were prioritized in the initial measure bundling analysis. Measures included in current OUC programs were also identified and included in the initial measure bundling.
- 2. RIM Scenario measures that passed the RIM Scenario criteria (RIM test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis
- 3. TRC Scenario measures that passed the TRC Scenario criteria (TRC test, PCT, and payback period of at least 2 years) were included in the initial measure bundling analysis

Resource Innovations then reviewed current OUC programs and eligible measures, and mapped individual measures to the appropriate programs for each scenario. Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with OUC to collect program information (e.g. program manuals, participation records, energy and demand savings, budgets) and review the existing programs to determine which measures should be included in the initial program portfolios. In addition, a gap analysis was conducted to identify measures included in each scenario that are not currently offered by OUC. These measures were either included in existing programs where there was a logical fit, or included as a new program concept.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 2 of 11

Program Refinement and Modeling

After identifying the preliminary measure bundles and programs, Resource Innovations worked collaboratively with OUC to develop incentive amounts and non-incentive costs. Non-incentive costs, which include costs to manage, administer, and market the program, were developed based on current OUC program costs as well as secondary data on similar programs offered by other utilities, and refined as needed based on the proposed program delivery structure. Incentive costs were developed for each scenario as follows:

- 1. Proposed Goals scenario preliminary incentive rates were informed by current incentives offered by OUC as well as typical incentive levels offered by similar programs regionally and nationally.
- 2. RIM Scenario incentive rates were developed based on the available net benefits for each measure, based on total RIM benefits minus RIM costs. Next, the incentive amount that would result in a simple payback of two years for each measure was calculated. The final incentive applied for the measure was based on the lower of these two values.
- 3. TRC Scenario the incentive amount required to result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure was used as the final incentive for the measure.

Measures included in the initial program concepts for each scenario were analyzed in RI's TEA-POT model to update the economic analysis based on the OUC-specific non-incentive and incentive costs, and to estimate market adoption for each measure. The economic analysis included calculating updated RIM, TRC, and PCT costs and benefits for each measure and re-screening measures for each scenario.

RI's market adoption estimates use a payback acceptance criterion to estimate long-run market shares for measures as a function of measure incremental costs and expected bill savings over the measures' effective useful life (inclusive of utility incentives). Incremental adoption estimates are based on the Bass Diffusion Model, which is a mathematical description of how the rate of new product diffusion changes over time. For this study, adoption curve input parameters were developed for each measure based on specific criteria, including measure maturity in the market, overall measure cost, and whether the measure was currently offered through a utility program. RI's TEA-POT model then calculated demand and energy savings by applying these estimated adoption rates to each cost-effective measure.

The TEA-POT modeling results were exported into RI's Program Planner workbook that aggregated the individual measure results into program and portfolio impacts for each scenario. For the TRC Scenario and RIM Scenario no further refinements to the programs were made. For the Proposed Goals scenario, RI continued to work collaboratively with OUC to identify the measures and program concepts that comprise the proposed DSM goals. These impacts for each scenario are provided below.

Results

Proposed Goals Scenario

The Proposed Goals Scenario is described in more detail in Witness Noonan's testimony. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Table 1. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual MWh Targets

Table 2. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual summer MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 4 of 11

Table 3. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual winter MW Targets

Table 4. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Participation Targets

Table 5. Proposed DSM Goals – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 5 of 11

Table 6. Proposed DSM Goals – Cost-Effectiveness Results

RIM Scenario

The RIM Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and RIM test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives).

Energy Efficiency Programs

OUC did not have any EE measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the RIM Scenario.

Demand Response Programs

The RIM Scenario analysis resulted in four cost-effective demand response measures for the largest commercial and industrial segment, which includes customers over 500 kW. The four DR measures are presented as individual potential program options in the following tables. Each's program's cost and impact estimates were developed independent of the other programs; therefore, because the measures apply to the same target population of large commercial and industrial customers, the savings and participation are not additive.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 6 of 11

Table 7. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response - Automated DR Program

Table 8. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) Program

Table 9. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Firm Service Level Program

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 7 of 11

Table 10. RIM Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Guaranteed Load Drop Program

Demand-Side Renewable Energy Programs

OUC did not have any DSRE measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the RIM Scenario.

TRC Scenario

The TRC Scenario is comprised of measures and programs that achieved a cost-effectivess ratio of 1.0 or higher for the PCT and TRC test, and measures that had a simple payback of two years or more (without consideration of incentives). Incentive rates were based on the maximum incentive amount that would result in a simple payback period of two years for each measure. The following tables include the program-level details for this scenario.

Energy Efficiency Programs

Table 11. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Annual MWh Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 8 of 11

Table 12. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Annual summer MW Targets

Table 13. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Annual winter MW Targets

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 9 of 11

Table 14. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Annual Participation Targets

Table 15. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Annual Program Budget Estimates

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 10 of 11

Table 16. TRC Scenario – Energy Efficiency – Cost-Effectiveness Results

Demand Response Programs

The TRC Scenario analysis resulted in four cost-effective demand response measures for the largest commercial and industrial segment, which includes customers over 500 kW. The four DR measures are presented as individual potential program options in the following tables. Each's program's cost and impact estimates were developed independent of the other programs; therefore, because the measures apply to the same target population of large commercial and industrial customers, the savings and participation are not additive.

Docket Nos. 20240012-EG to 20240017-EG OUC Program Development Summary Exhibit JH-16, Page 11 of 11

Table 18. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Critical Peak Pricing (CPP) Program

Table 19. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Firm Service Level Program

Table 20. TRC Scenario – Commercial Demand Response – Guaranteed Load Drop Program

Demand-Side Renewable Energy Programs

OUC did not have any DSRE measures or programs that passed the cost-effectiveness screening for the TRC Scenario.