Baseline 1 Annual Saving
Baseline 2 Annual Savings
Average Annual Savings over EUL
EUL (Years)
Baseline 1 (Years)
Discount Rate
Assume Constant Avoided Cost / Energy Unit Saved

| Year | 1. Dual Baseline | 2. Baseline 1 <br> Only / Full EUL | 3. Average <br> Annual Saving / / <br> Full EUL | 4. Baseline 1 <br> only / RUL |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 500 | 500 | 396 | 500 |
| 2 | 463 | 463 | 367 | 463 |
| 3 | 429 | 429 | 339 | 429 |
| 4 | 397 | 397 | 314 | 397 |
| 5 | 184 | 368 | 291 |  |
| 6 | 170 | 340 | 269 |  |
| 7 | 158 | 315 | 249 |  |
| 8 | 146 | 292 | 231 |  |
| 9 | 135 | 270 | 214 |  |
| 10 | 125 | 250 | 198 |  |
| 11 | 116 | 232 | 183 |  |
| 12 | 107 | 214 | 170 |  |
| 13 | 99 | 199 | 157 |  |
| 14 | 92 | 184 | 146 |  |
| 15 | 85 | 170 | 135 |  |
| NPV Lifetime Benefits | 3,205 | 4,622 | 3,659 | 1,789 |

Different Methods of Handling Dual Baselines in Calculating Net Present Value of Lifetime Benefits

1. Using a dual baseline approach; 4 years at full savings, 11 years with reduced savings.
2. Inappropriately using the first year savings for each year of the EUL.
3. For each year of the EUL, using the average savings over the course of the EUL.
4. Use the first year savings for the remaining usefullife ( 4 years), 11 years with zero savings.
Analytically, method 1 is definitely most appropriate, and method 2 is not appropriate. Method 3 would possibly serve as a shortcut to approximate the result that would have been generated by method 1. Method 3 results in
