


United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit	
In the Matter of:	Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Indian Point Nuclear Generating Units 2 and 3)
	ASLBP #: 07-858-03-LR-BD01
	Docket #: 05000247 05000286
	Exhibit #: NYS000063-00-BD01
	Admitted: 10/15/2012
	Rejected:
Other:	Identified: 10/15/2012 Withdrawn: Stricken:



**ACHIEVABLE ELECTRIC ENERGY EFFICIENCY
POTENTIAL IN NEW YORK STATE**

Prepared for
New York Department of Public Service

by:

Optimal Energy, Inc., Bristol, VT
Vermont Energy Investment Corporation, Burlington, VT
American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, Washington, DC

DRAFT

November 2008

Achievable Electric Energy Efficiency Potential in New York State

Appendix C provides detail on the codes and standards impacts, including the combined impacts projected by regional zone and by year. NYSERDA recently performed an analysis of codes and standards impacts as part of the States EEPS proceedings⁸. NYSERDA's analysis projected savings from codes and standards that were somewhat lower than those projected by the ACEEE analysis. A comparison of these two analyses is also provided in Appendix C (Table 16).

ACHIEVABLE PROGRAM POTENTIAL

The tables below provide a variety of summary-level outputs from the analysis. Note that all savings and forecast energy values are at the "point of purchase" as opposed to "at meter."⁹ Table 1 shows the overall Statewide and zonal results for 2015 in terms of energy and demand savings and economic effects.

Table 1. Statewide and Zonal Savings for 2015 and Program Lifetime Economic Effects

	2015 Cumulative Energy Savings (GWh)	2015 Forecast (GWh)	% of 2015 Forecast	2015 Cumulative Demand Savings (MW)	Benefits (PV) 2008\$, Millions	Costs (PV) 2008\$, Millions	Net Benefits (PV) 2008\$ Millions	BCR
Residential	4,414	59,844	7.4%	863	2,777	1,115	1,662	2.49
NYC	1,408	18,119	7.8%	206	\$787	\$279	\$508	2.82
Long Island	779	8,115	9.6%	149	\$557	\$264	\$293	2.11
Rest of State	2,227	33,610	6.6%	509	\$1,432	\$571	\$861	2.51
Commercial	18,205	108,896	16.7%	4,420	15,990	6,703	9,287	2.39
NYC	7,845	41,665	18.8%	2,037	\$7,886	\$3,197	\$4,689	2.47
Long Island	2,330	13,323	17.5%	590	\$2,146	\$849	\$1,297	2.53
Rest of State	8,030	53,908	14.9%	1,794	\$5,958	\$2,657	\$3,301	2.24
Industrial	3,381	16,443	20.6%	491	2,020	186	1,834	10.85
NYC	571	2,893	19.7%	83	\$378	\$37	\$341	10.17
Long Island	494	2,194	22.5%	72	\$303	\$33	\$270	9.16
Rest of State	2,316	11,356	20.4%	337	\$1,338	\$116	\$1,222	11.55
Total	26,000	185,183	14.0%	5,775	20,786	8,004	12,783	2.60
NYC	9,824	62,677	15.7%	2,326	\$9,051	\$3,514	\$5,538	2.58
Long Island	3,603	23,633	15.2%	810	\$3,007	\$1,146	\$1,860	2.62
Rest of State	12,573	98,874	12.7%	2,639	\$8,729	\$3,344	\$5,385	2.61

Table 2 shows the Statewide reference case forecast and efficiency savings by sector and year. Note that post-program market effect years are shaded (savings decrease in the market

⁸ XXX Add citation

⁹ Point-of-purchase level savings reflect the savings at the point of power purchase (corresponding to the avoided costs) and include savings in transmission and distribution line losses. Meter level savings would reflect end use savings at the customer meter and would be less because no line losses are considered.

Achievable Electric Energy Efficiency Potential in New York State

effect years due to lack of program spending and the loss of savings from measures installed in previous years at the end of those measures' lives). Table 3 shows Statewide efficiency savings as a percent of the total forecast, including codes and standards. Table 4 shows Statewide efficiency savings as a percent of the reference forecast, excluding the impact of codes & standards.

Table 5 and Table 6 show Statewide cumulative annual energy savings and summer peak demand reductions by program for each year, respectively.¹⁰

¹⁰ We use the term *cumulative annual* to refer to the total impacts resulting in a given year from the current year program and any savings still occurring from measures installed in prior program years. This is the reduction expected in that year's forecast load.