

True Up 2013: Tracking estimate corrections and True Up of 2002-2012 savings and generation

December 20, 2013

Introduction

True Up is the annual process used to adjust and correct reported energy savings and renewable generation to reflect the best available information at the time of True Up. The 2013 True Up uses evaluation results as of June 30, 2013. In the True Up process, adjustments are made to past savings and generation data based on corrections to transaction errors, new data on measure assumptions, anticipated evaluation results (for years and programs where there is yet to be an evaluation completed) and actual evaluation results. The 2013 True Up updates reported energy savings and generation for Energy Trust of Oregon funded activities from 2002-2012.

The purpose of the “True Up 2013” report is to summarize these adjustments to Energy Trust savings and generation. The three parts of this report discuss (1) definitions for evaluation results by which savings and generation are adjusted, (2) updates made to Energy Trust data by program and (3) the difference between pre-True Up and post-True Up savings and generation estimates.

Summary

The 2013 True Up introduced significant adjustments to total annual electric and gas savings reported by Energy Trust. Total electric savings from 2002-2012 increased by 2.6% from 347.7 average megawatts to 356.8 aMW and total gas savings from 2003-2012 decreased by 1.6% from 28.2 million therms to 27.7 million therms as a result of the 2013 True Up. Renewable generation was also adjusted in the 2013 True Up and fell 0.03% from 109.52 aMW to 109.48 aMW.

For 2012, energy savings increased 9% from 52.9 aMW to 57.6 aMW, gas savings decreased 5.5% from 5.9 million therms to 5.6 million therms, and renewable generation decreased 3.4% from 5.5 aMW to 4.87 aMW compared to the values reported in Energy Trust’s 2011 Annual Report to the Oregon Public Utility Commission.

The largest factors underlying the changes in electric savings are (1) an improved realization rate for Existing Buildings in 2010¹, (2) lower free-ridership for Existing Buildings in 2012, (3)

¹ The three-year savings-weighted average realization rate is applied to savings in program years where an impact evaluation has not yet been completed. The improved realization rate for Existing Buildings in 2010 also improves the savings for 2011 and 2012 were a weighted average of past realization rates is currently being applied. The same is true for the Production Efficiency program.

corrections to free-ridership estimates for New Buildings from 2010-2012, (4) an improved realization rate for Production Efficiency in 2009, 2010, and 2011, and (5) adjustments to NEEA savings for 2011-2012.

On the gas side, the largest factors underlying changes to savings are (1) adjustments of savings for roof top tune-up measures, (2) adjustment of the assumed installation rate for showerheads and aerators, and (3) higher free-ridership for Existing Homes weatherization measures in 2012.

The 2013 True Up incorporated significant adjustments in savings to the following programs:

- 1) Existing Buildings: 2010-2012
- 2) New Buildings: 2010-2012
- 3) Production Efficiency: 2009-2012
- 4) Existing Homes: 2010-2012
- 5) NEEA: 2011-2012
- 6) Renewables Energy: 2003-2012

The annual changes to electric and gas savings are summarized by program in the Results section below. Additionally, there is a series of tables that represents overall changes by sector for each year. Lastly, results from True Up 2013 are shown for each funding utility within Energy Trust's service territory.

Definitions

Working Savings/Generation: The estimate of anticipated results which are practical for data entry by program personnel while approving individual projects. These savings are based upon estimates of typical savings or generation for prescriptive measures and site-specific engineering calculations for custom energy-efficiency measures. Transmission and distribution line loss savings are not included in working savings, and no adjustments are made for free riders (FR), who are customers that would have installed the measures absent program influence, or spillover, which represents customers who are influenced by the program but did not take the incentive for an efficiency measure. These are issues that are addressed when developing reportable savings/generation values.

The true-up process does not adjust working savings claimed in the past, but *does* incorporate new information used in true up adjustments by updating working savings on a forward looking basis. Reportable savings and generation only are adjusted through the true up process.

Reportable Savings/Generation: The estimate of savings and generation results that are used to report Energy Trust achievements. Several factors are applied to working savings in order to arrive at reportable savings. Reportable energy savings are adjusted and updated annually through the true-up process based on new information. Realization Rates (RR) are used to adjust the initial engineering estimate; a realization rate of 100% indicates that site savings were as expected, on average. Another adjustment is for market effects, also known as a Net-to-Gross (NTG) ratio. The NTG ratio adjusts for free riders and spillover. The final adjustment, which is applied only to electric savings, is for avoided line and transformer losses.

Free-rider rates are determined through Fast Feedback (FF) which is a short phone survey with a sample of recent program participants to assess satisfaction, understand customer decision making, and gather suggestions for program and process improvements. The survey is generally 10 or fewer questions and is customized for each program or measure of interest. The goal of Fast Feedback is to get accurate answers to important questions within two months of program participation and to minimize the burden on survey respondents.

True Up adjusts reportable savings and generation estimates in different programs for different reasons. These fall into the following categories:

1) *Corrections*: Occasionally, through Energy Trust's routine quality assurance processes, transaction errors are discovered in the database, which require corrections. Individual transaction errors (i.e. typos that affect savings) are usually adjusted immediately and generic transaction errors (i.e. wrong deemed savings value for a measure) are easily fixed once per year during True Up.

2) *New Data*: Projections are updated based upon improved measure simulations and new data on measure performance.

3) *Anticipated Evaluation Results*: Experience shows that evaluated estimates of savings and generation can be either lower or higher than reportable estimates. Reportable estimates are often based on typical savings for prescriptive measures or "as installed" engineering analysis for custom measures. Impact evaluation uses energy use data and/or improved data on post-installation operation to improve reportable estimates. However, impact evaluations cannot be completed until well after programs finish a year's activity. This is due to the need to utilize post-installation energy use data. Based upon Energy Trust Board of Directors direction in the July 2004 Strategic Work Session, staff is attempting to anticipate these effects in reportable savings for programs where there is not yet evaluation information available.

4) *Evaluation Results*: Once finalized, evaluations provide the most reliable representation of realized savings, and can replace the refined projections described above in (2) and (3). Evaluation results may change Energy Trust savings estimates for a single year or all prior years. This is dependent upon what other evaluations have already been performed for prior years and whether results seem applicable to prior years (e.g., similar measures, participants and circumstances.)

Results Summary, Impacts By Program

Existing Buildings

An impact evaluation of the Existing Buildings program for the 2010 program year was completed in 2013. The 2013 True Up incorporates the results of that analysis into evaluation factors for 2010, and also within anticipated evaluation factors for 2011-2012 by applying the average of 2008-2010 evaluated realization rates. In addition to the 2010 impact evaluation, savings for several roof-top HVAC tune-up measures (RTU) were adjusted to align with recent billing analysis results and updated measure assumptions. In total, adjustments to RTU

measures in the 2013 true up decreased gas savings by 147 thousand therms and decreased electric savings by 0.16 aMW, across the commercial and industrial sectors.

Table 1 summarizes which evaluations have been applied to each program year. Tables 2a and 2b show in detail the various components of the 2009-2012 evaluation factors for gas and electric. The total combined impact on savings for Exiting Buildings, by program year, is shown in Table 3.

Table 1: Existing Buildings Evaluations

Program	Year	Source	Type of Adjustment	Notes
BE	2003-2009	2003-2009 Evaluations	Evaluation Factor	Closed in Previous True Ups
BE	2010	2010 Impact Evaluation	Evaluation Factor	Closed in this True Up
BE	2011-2012	2008-2010 Impact Evaluations	Anticipated Evaluation Factor	RR Savings Weighted Average: 2008-2010
BE		2010-2012 FR, FF Evaluations		2010-2012 Free-rider Rates

Table 2a: 2009-2012 Existing Buildings Evaluation Factors—Electric

	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
Year	Engineering Adjustment	Free Riders	Participant Spillover	Non-Participant spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	85%	19%	1%	7%	76%
2010	107%	19%	1%	7%	95%
2011	99%	30%	1%	7%	78%
2012	99%	16%	1%	7%	92%

Table 2b: 2009-2012 Existing Buildings Evaluation Factors—Gas

	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
Year	Engineering Adjustment	Free Riders	Participant Spillover	Non-Participant spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	75%	19%	1%	7%	67%
2010	86%	11%	1%	7%	83%
2011	83%	27%	1%	7%	67%
2012	83%	18%	1%	7%	75%

Table 3: 2009-2012 Existing Buildings Combined Adjustment

Year	Old Electric Factor	New Electric Factor	Change in Savings (aMW)	Old Gas Factor	New Gas Factor	Change in Savings (mTherms)
2010	0.82	0.95	1.36	0.81	0.83	(0.02)
2011	0.72	0.78	0.66	0.68	0.67	(0.09)
2012	0.81	0.92	1.48	0.76	0.75	(0.03)
Total			3.50			(0.13)

2012 gas and electric savings for the Multifamily Existing Buildings program were also adjusted to reflect 2012 Fast Feedback free-rider rates. The total combined impact on savings for Multifamily Existing Buildings is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: 2012 Multifamily Existing Buildings Combined Adjustment

Year	Old Electric Factor	New Electric Factor	Change in Savings (aMW)	Old Gas Factor	New Gas Factor	Change in Savings (mTherms)
2012	0.80	0.84	0.07	0.70	0.64	(0.01)
Total			0.07			(0.01)

New Buildings

An impact evaluation of the New Buildings program for the 2010 program year was completed in 2013. The 2013 True Up incorporates the results of that analysis as evaluation factors for 2010, and also as anticipated evaluation factors for 2011-2012. Additionally, electric savings for a large custom data center project were corrected from the program wide realization rate to a 100% realization rate, since the program wide rate does not apply to large custom projects where the baseline efficiency is explicitly accounted for in savings calculations.

Table 5 summarizes which evaluations have been applied to each program year for the New Buildings program. Tables 6a and 6b show in detail the various components of the 2009-2012 evaluation factors for gas and electric. The total combined impact on savings for New Buildings, by program year, is shown in Table 7.

Table 5: New Building Evaluations

Program	Year	Source	Type of Adjustment	Notes
NBE	2003-2009	2003-2009 Evaluations	Evaluation Factor	Closed in Previous True Ups
NBE	2010	2010 Impact Evaluation	Evaluation Factor	Closed in this True Up
NBE	2011-2012	2008-2010 Impact Evaluations	Anticipated Evaluation Factor	RR Savings Weighted Average: 2008-2010
NBE		2010-2012 FR, FF Evaluations		2010-2012 Free-rider Rates

Table 6a: 2009-2012 New Buildings Evaluation Factors—Electric

Year	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
	Engineering Adjustment	2007 Code Free-riders	2010 Code Free-riders	Participant Spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	97%	34%	0%	1%	65%
2010	95%	34%	0%	1%	64%
2011	92%	34%	0%	1%	80%
2012	92%	34%	0%	1%	85%

Table 6b: 2009-2012 New Buildings Evaluation Factors—Gas

Year	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
	Engineering Adjustment	2007 Code Free-riders	2010 Code Free-riders	Participant Spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	95%	32%	0%	1%	66%
2010	98%	32%	0%	1%	68%
2011	95%	32%	0%	1%	69%
2012	95%	32%	0%	1%	83%

Table 7: 2009-2012 New Buildings Combined Adjustment

Year	Old Electric Factor	New Electric Factor	Change in Savings (aMW)	Old Gas Factor	New Gas Factor	Change in Savings (mTherms)
2010	0.62	0.64	0.06	0.68	0.68	0.00
2011	0.66	0.80	0.46	0.71	0.69	(0.01)
2012	0.77	0.85	1.20	0.90	0.83	(0.04)
Total			1.71			(0.04)

Production Efficiency

An impact evaluation of the Production Efficiency program for the 2009-2011 program years was completed in 2013. The 2013 True Up incorporates the results of that analysis as evaluation factors for 2009-2011, and also as anticipated evaluation factors for 2012. Adjustments to Production Efficiency savings relating to impact evaluation findings were made in conjunction with corrections to savings for Strategic Energy Management (SEM) and Custom O&M measures in the 2013 True Up, for the program years 2009-2012. From 2009-2012, the Production Efficiency program used only one “measure code” to book savings for both SEM and Custom O&M projects, and those savings therefore received the same evaluation factor adjustment. However, those different measures (SEM and Custom O&M) *should* have received unique evaluation factor adjustments, since SEM savings should not be discounted for free-riders, but O&M savings should be.

Table 8 summarizes which evaluations have been applied to each program year for the Production Efficiency program. Tables 9a and 9b show in detail the various components of the 2009-2012 evaluation factors for gas and electric. The total combined impact on savings for Production Efficiency, by program year, is shown in Table 10.

Table 8: Production Efficiency Evaluations

Program	Year	Source	Type of Adjustment	Notes
PE	2003-2008	2003-2009 Evaluations	Evaluation Factor	Closed in Previous True Ups
PE	2009-2011	2009-2011 Evaluations	Evaluation Factor	Closed in this True Up
PE	2012	2009-2011 Impact Evaluation	Anticipated Evaluation Factor	RR Savings Weighted Average: 2009-2011
PE		2012 FF Evaluation		2010-2012 Free-rider Rates

Table 9a: 2009-2012 Production Efficiency Evaluation Factors—Electric

Year	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
	Engineering Adjustment	Free Riders	Participant Spillover	Program Spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	94%	21%	1%	1%	76%
2010	94%	15%	1%	1%	82%
2011	94%	14%	1%	1%	83%
2012	94%	16%	1%	1%	81%

Table 9b: 2009-2012 Production Efficiency Evaluation Factors—Gas

	Realization Rate	Net to Gross Market Adjustment			Combined Adjustment
Year	Engineering Adjustment	Free Riders	Participant Spillover	Program Spillover	Evaluation Factor
2009	97%	21%	1%	1%	79%
2010	97%	4%	1%	1%	95%
2011	97%	20%	1%	1%	80%
2012	97%	26%	1%	1%	74%

Table 10: 2009-2012 Production Efficiency Combined Adjustment

Year	Old Electric Factor	New Electric Factor	Change in Savings (aMW)	Old Gas Factor	New Gas Factor	Change in Savings (mTherms)
2009	0.74	0.76	0.20	0.75	0.79	0.01
2010	0.79	0.82	0.64	0.91	0.95	0.01
2011	0.80	0.83	0.79	0.75	0.80	0.09
2012	0.77	0.81	0.87	0.91	0.74	(0.16)
Total			2.49			(0.05)

Existing Homes

The 2013 True Up revised savings for the Existing Homes program for the years 2010 through 2012. The adjustments and corrections made to Existing Homes savings include (1) an adjustment to the assumed installation rate of Energy Saver Kit (ESK) components, (2) an adjustment to free-ridership for select weatherization and HVAC measures and (3) the correction of other small reporting errors in the FastTrack database related to customizable ESKs and direct-install showerheads.

The 2010-2011 Existing Homes process evaluation provided updated estimates for the installation rates of ESK components, which include kitchen and bathroom faucet aerators, showerheads and CFLs. The updated installation rate for CFLs is higher than previously assumed, but the new install rate for aerators and showerheads is lower than the original savings assumption, resulting in an overall increase in electric savings, but a decrease in gas savings for ESKs. In addition to updated installation rates, data errors related to customizable ESKs and direct-install showerheads were also corrected, which slightly decreased both gas and electric savings.

The total impact on electric savings for Existing Homes is shown in Table 11 and the total impact on gas savings for Existing Homes is shown in Table 12.

Table 11: Existing Homes Electric Savings Adjustments

Year	Previous aMW	New aMW	aMW Change	% Change
2010	3.40	3.51	0.12	3.4%
2011	4.96	5.10	0.13	2.7%
2012	7.41	7.34	(0.07)	-1.0%
Total	15.77	15.94	0.17	1.1%

Table 12: Existing Homes Gas Savings Adjustments

Year	Previous mTherms	New mTherms	mTherm Change	% Change
2010	1.15	1.10	(0.05)	-4.5%
2011	1.28	1.20	(0.08)	-6.1%
2012	1.78	1.67	(0.10)	-5.9%
Total	4.21	3.98	(0.23)	-5.6%

Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA)

Electric savings for the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) for 2011 and 2012 were adjusted in the 2013 True Up to reflect updated savings estimates published in NEEA's 2012 Annual Report. Table 13 shows the total impact on NEEA savings for 2011 and 2012.

2011 savings related to NEEA activities increased for the commercial sector by 0.4 aMW, but decreased in the residential and industrial sectors by 0.26 aMW and 0.16 aMW, respectively. Several factors contributed to the updates to 2011 NEEA savings, including declines for the efficient TV and desktop power supply initiatives, and increases for health care and real estate initiatives.

2012 savings were adjusted upwards by 1.04 aMW and 0.28 aMW for the residential and industrial sectors, respectively, and downwards by 0.04 aMW for the commercial sector. Residential savings increased compared to prior estimates primarily due to improved residential lighting sales, high market share for efficient TVs and the ability to track non-incented ductless heat pump (DHP) sales. Industrial savings were increased from prior estimates as traction from the Drive Power Initiative improved. 2012 NEEA commercial savings fell in the commercial desktop power supply and real estate initiatives based on final 2012 market data. Overall, NEEA savings increased 1.24 aMW in 2011 and 2012.

Table 13: NEEA Savings Updates

Year	Residential Change (aMW)	Commercial Change (aMW)	Industrial Change (aMW)	Total Change (aMW)
2011	(0.26)	0.39	(0.16)	(0.03)
2012	1.04	(0.04)	0.28	1.27
Total	0.77	0.35	0.12	1.24

Renewable Energy

Reportable generation for several renewable energy projects from 2003-2012 were adjusted in the 2013 True Up in order to align more closely with actual line-loss savings, which were previously determined at the program level, regardless of the characteristics of the load being served. In reality, line-loss savings from distributed generation projects (renewable projects) depends on site-level characteristics; specifically, the distance between generation and load and the voltage level of the load being served. On-site renewable projects serving residential and small commercial loads avoid the most line losses at about 10%, while on-site projects serving industrial loads and large commercial loads avoid about 6% of line losses. Additionally off-site projects that are closer to the loads than central power-plant² also represent some avoided line-loss value to utilities, which we estimate to be about 3% of generation on average³. Table 14 shows the total impact on renewable generation, by program year, for 2003 through 2012.

Table 14: Renewable Generation Adjustments

Year	Previous Reportable Generation (kWh)	New Reportable Generation (kWh)	kWh Change	% Change
2003	125,206,071	125,213,749	7,678	0.01%
2004	785,637	802,299	16,662	2.12%
2005	4,053,292	4,054,567	1,275	0.03%
2006	17,463,940	17,468,904	4,964	0.03%
2007	411,080,725	411,085,675	4,950	0.00%
2008	291,727,946	291,807,973	80,027	0.03%
2009	23,108,516	23,314,115	205,599	0.89%
2010	28,842,438	29,592,903	750,465	2.60%
2011	12,924,815	13,020,755	95,940	0.74%
2012	44,196,668	42,697,995	(1,498,673)	-3.39%
Total	959,390,049	959,058,935	(331,114)	-0.03%

² The project has to be with 20 miles of load to be assigned this 3% value for off-site T&D savings.

³ PGE and Pacific Power average is 3.6%, but BPA's more conservative value is 3.0%

Results Summary, Impacts by Sector

The following summary tables present the change in reportable gas savings and electric savings and generation as a result of the 2013 True Up. In the following table, an average megawatt (aMW) means that loads are reduced by an average of one megawatt or 8,760 MWh during each year of a measure's life. The column "mTherms" reflects the annual therm savings achieved in each year of a measure's useful life, in millions of therms. In the summary, a change of 0% may not necessarily imply that there were no corrections, only that the corrections may not be significant enough to appear due to rounding⁴.

Table 15: Electric Savings Impact, 2002-2012

Sector	Old Reportable (aMW)	New Reportable (aMW)	Change (aMW)	% Change
Commercial	114.41	119.98	5.57	4.87%
Industrial	111.83	114.44	2.61	2.33%
Residential	121.43	122.38	0.95	0.78%
Renewables	109.52	109.48	(0.04)	-0.03%
Total	457.19	466.27	9.09	1.99%

Table 16: Gas Savings Impact, 2003-2012

Sector	Old Reportable (aMW)	New Reportable (aMW)	Change (aMW)	% Change
Commercial	12.02	11.85	(0.18)	-1.47%
Industrial	2.73	2.68	(0.05)	-1.76%
Residential	13.45	13.22	(0.23)	-1.74%
Total	28.20	27.74	(0.46)	-1.63%

Table 17: Electric Savings Impact by Year

Year	Commercial Change (aMW)	Industrial Change (aMW)	Residential Change (aMW)	Total Change (aMW)	% Change
2009		0.20		0.20	0.7%
2010	1.42	0.64	0.12	2.17	4.8%
2011	1.51	0.63	(0.13)	2.01	4.2%
2012	2.64	1.15	0.96	4.75	9.0%
Total	5.57	2.61	0.95	9.12	5.3%

⁴ It could also be the case that there were both positive and negative adjustments to savings within a sector, which cancelled each other out

Table 18: Gas Savings Impact by Year

Year	Commercial Change (mTherms)	Industrial Change (mtherms)	Residential Change (mTherms)	Total Change (mTherms)	% Change
2009		0.01			0.4%
2010	(0.02)	0.01	(0.05)	(0.06)	-1.3%
2011	(0.10)	0.09	(0.08)	(0.09)	-1.9%
2012	(0.06)	(0.16)	(0.10)	(0.32)	-5.5%
Total	(0.18)	(0.05)	(0.23)	(0.46)	-2.6%

Results Summary, Impacts by Utility

The following tables show the final, reportable annual savings and generation results from the 2013 True Up for each utility provider within Energy Trust service territory.

Table 19: Pacific Power Savings (aMW), 2002-2012

Sector	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Commercial	1.94	1.73	3.14	2.41	1.73	2.05	2.74	3.10	8.12	8.29	10.50
Industrial	1.62	2.68	8.66	5.96	4.98	4.00	3.83	3.51	7.06	6.55	5.69
Residential	2.11	2.64	3.61	3.36	4.60	6.31	5.51	3.57	5.29	5.33	6.53
Total	5.67	7.05	15.41	11.73	11.32	12.37	12.08	10.18	20.47	20.17	22.72

Table 20: Portland General Electric Savings (aMW), 2002-2012

Sector	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Commercial	3.95	4.03	4.24	5.18	4.05	3.78	5.57	7.11	10.47	11.63	14.21
Industrial	1.81	0.89	1.17	14.22	2.85	3.75	2.86	4.49	8.77	8.92	10.15
Residential	3.61	3.84	5.32	5.01	6.94	8.37	8.22	5.71	7.31	8.65	10.52
Total	9.37	8.76	10.74	24.42	13.83	15.90	16.66	17.31	26.54	29.19	34.88

Table 20: Cascade Natural Gas Savings (mTherms), 2005-2012

Sector	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Commercial	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.20	0.20	0.16
Industrial	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.10
Residential	0.00	0.02	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.07	0.11	0.15
Total	0.00	0.08	0.15	0.17	0.25	0.32	0.40	0.40

Table 21: NW Natural Savings (mTherms), 2003-2012

Sector	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Commercial	0.00	0.08	0.44	1.31	1.15	1.10	1.10	2.00	1.67	2.26
Industrial	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.19	0.54	1.03	0.62
Residential	0.61	0.92	0.95	0.95	1.13	1.34	1.20	1.39	1.65	2.31
Total	0.61	1.00	1.39	2.26	2.28	2.45	2.49	3.93	4.35	5.19

*Includes savings for both Firm and Interruptible customers, and Market Transformation

* Savings are for Oregon only

Table 22: Renewable Energy Generation (aMW), 2002-2012

Utility Provider	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Pacific Power	0.000	14.27	0.08	0.04	1.96	0.08	31.47	2.12	2.42	0.40	2.37
Portland General Electric	0.003	0.02	0.01	0.42	0.03	46.84	1.84	0.55	0.96	1.08	2.51
Total	0.00	14.29	0.09	0.46	1.99	46.93	33.31	2.66	3.38	1.49	4.87