The Community Energy Challenge: Bringing Energy Conservation to Local Independent Businesses

Emily Reisman, Alex Ramel, and Martin Selch, Sustainable Connections

ABSTRACT

The Community Energy Challenge (CEC) administered by Sustainable Connections in Bellingham, Washington is a pilot program bringing resource conservation and energy efficiency to local independent businesses, a historically underserved market sector. For large organizations with over $1,500,000 in energy costs each year, Resource Conservation Managers (RCM) have been funded by the electric utility with demonstrated savings of between five and fifteen percent (Puget Sound Energy 2010). The CEC brings these services to smaller businesses by aggregating multiple accounts, providing a shared RCM who audits each facility and produces a customized Facility Action Plan with support staff to ensure continued feedback with each client. This program differs from existing services for small businesses in that it includes a fuel-neutral audit, emphasizes soft conservation, supplies ongoing monitoring and technical support, provides enhanced financial incentives and low-interest loans, and establishes a platform for community-wide recognition of energy conscious practices. The CEC simultaneously addresses multiple barriers within the small business energy efficiency market, maximizing access to energy efficiency resources and improving energy performance community-wide. The novelty of this approach has resulted in an evolution of the program over its first year with several lessons learned. The program has navigated challenges including establishing an initial level of commitment for participants, developing a meaningful benchmarking procedure across a diversity of industries, accurately representing potential savings, and ensuring implementation of recommended efficiency measures. This paper details some of the opportunities, obstacles and answers to making a successful business model for energy efficiency in the small businesses sector.

An Introduction

The Community Energy Challenge (CEC) is a multifaceted initiative to advance energy efficiency throughout Bellingham and Whatcom County in Northwest Washington. A joint program between the Opportunity Council and Sustainable Connections, the CEC seeks to motivate residents and businesses to improve energy performance by providing a comprehensive suite of services from a single source. As a pilot program, this start-to-finish energy efficiency program will serve 150 businesses and 900 homes over three years, providing expert energy assessments, Facility Action Plans, cost-effectiveness analysis, and attractive financing. This pilot program was made possible by support from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in order to push the boundaries of existing models and test out new strategies for energy efficiency programming. Though broad in scale, the program originally began with a specific target in mind: bringing resource conservation and energy efficiency to local independent businesses. The Commercial Conservation Services program within the larger CEC initiative

addresses multiple barriers within the small business energy efficiency market simultaneously, maximizing access to energy efficiency resources and improving energy performance in a historically underserved market sector. This new program differs from existing services for small businesses in that it includes a fuel-neutral audit, emphasizes soft conservation,[1] supplies ongoing monitoring and technical support, provides enhanced financial incentives and low-interest loans, and establishes a platform for community-wide recognition of energy conscious practices. The novelty of this approach has resulted in an evolution of the program over its first year with several lessons learned. This paper details some of the opportunities, obstacles and answers to making a successful model for energy efficiency in the small businesses sector.

Opportunities

The small business sector has been provided few opportunities to harness its energy efficiency potential. Recently a network of local businesses in Northwest Washington found itself in a unique position to address these opportunities in an effort to help small businesses save money and reduce their environmental impacts. Sustainable Connections is a non-profit membership network of over 650 businesses working towards sustainable economic development in Whatcom County. By design, the organization supports businesses which are locally owned and operated, defined as maintaining more than 50 percent of the controlling interest in Whatcom County and the 3 neighboring counties. These business members are also independent and not affiliated with a corporate headquarters. Subject to these criteria, the vast majority of Sustainable Connections members are small to mid-sized, with more than half reporting an annual operating budget of less than $250,000 and nearly three quarters reporting an annual operating budget of less that $500,000. Small businesses are a dominant feature of the American landscape, representing 99.7 percent of all US firms and employing the majority of private sector workers (US Small Business Administration 2010). Unfortunately for businesses of this scale, opportunities to obtain professional assistance with energy efficiency improvements are practically non-existent.

Historically, performance contracting through Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) has served organizations with larger or multiple facilities and with higher budgets. According to the EPA, 80 percent of ESCO projects are in the federal or MUSH market (municipalities, universities, schools, and hospitals). “Within [the commercial] market, nearly all ESCOs have targeted performance contracting offerings to larger customers. In part, this is because the transaction costs in developing and implementing performance contracts are relatively high” (US Environmental Protection Agency 2007). The Energy Services Coalition suggests that facilities occupying less than 50,000 square feet or spending under $60,000 annually on energy will be unlikely to benefit from performance contracting (Energy Services Coalition 2010). In Washington, the state-wide Energy Service Performance Contracting program questionnaire indicates that businesses with less than 50,000 square feet or under $50,000 in annual energy costs have a low potential for participation in the program (General Administration Energy Program, Washington State 2010). Small businesses are also less likely to own their property and tend to expect a shorter payback time on investments than large institutions which can be

[1] Soft conservation refers to changes in a facility’s equipment operation and behavioral changes by building occupants which reduce energy consumption without substantial financial investment.

additional barriers to efficiency improvements. According to a report by McKinsey & Co, nationwide the commercial sector has the potential to reduce end-use energy consumption by 29 percent, the vast majority of which would come from improved buildings; existing private buildings are predicted to be the most difficult group to reach (McKinsey 2009). When it comes to providing individualized guidance on energy efficiency, the small business sector has thus far been left largely untouched.

Sustainable Connections (SC) helps its over 650 locally owned member-businesses to achieve more sustainable business practices. Energy efficiency is the most recent addition to a list of dynamic programs. Over the past eight years the organization has boosted public awareness of and assisted local businesses in pursuing sustainable practices including local purchasing, green building, sustainable food systems, waste reduction and renewable energy. The first campaign on the topic of energy came in 2006 when Sustainable Connections sponsored the Bellingham Green Power Community Challenge urging electric customers to purchase renewable energy credits through their utility, Puget Sound Energy. Within 6 months the percentage of total power coming from renewable sources shifted from 0.5 percent to 12 percent, earning Bellingham the title of the #1 EPA Certified Green Power Community in America in 2007. Much of the success of this program is attributed to Sustainable Connections' effective branding and messaging strategies. SC states its goals as creating a strong community through a healthy environment, meaningful employment, and buying local first. After noticeable interest from business members, SC began making plans for a program which would help its members take the next steps toward energy efficiency.

To create an energy efficiency program for small businesses, Sustainable Connections drew inspiration from the Resource Conservation Manager program of the regional utility company Puget Sound Energy (PSE). PSE provides funding and support for organizations spending more than $2,000,000 on energy annually to hire a full-time Resource Conservation Manager (RCM). The RCM works to reduce all resource use, with the goal of cutting costs by 10 to 15 percent over a three year period (Puget Sound Energy 2010). SC applied this approach by hiring a Commercial Conservation Specialist (CCS) to act as a shared RCM for multiple small businesses. The program is designed to serve 150 businesses over 3 years in a wide array of industries, from restaurants to faith organizations to commercial printers to non-profits and everything in-between. The CCS provides similar services to a typical RCM, focusing on optimizing occupant behavioral practices and operations and maintenance, as well as assessing potential improvements to building envelope, mechanical systems, controls, and lighting. Before visiting a site for an audit the CCS gathers historical utility data to establish an energy use benchmark for comparison to similar businesses and to identify anomalous energy use patterns. The CCS also receives a completed questionnaire which provides a sense of the business's energy needs and usage patterns. After the energy assessment and further analysis, a Facility Action Plan is produced which outlines recommendations for efficiency improvements. These recommendations are prioritized by cost-effectiveness, identifying each measure as no-cost, low-cost, or a capital investment. After the action plan is reviewed by the client, the CCS meets with him/her to discuss which recommendations are deemed feasible, and assigns to each a responsible person and completion date. Each participating business receives quarterly updates on energy usage with recommendations for continued success. To engage in this thorough approach to energy conservation, the CCS is not only an experienced engineer but also an

excellent communicator and it was important to have both qualities highly valued in the hiring process. Each audit requires 3-6 hours of on-site examination followed by 8-20 hours developing the Facility Action Plan, 2 hours for follow-up and roughly 1 hour each quarter for ongoing monitoring. To make the best use of the CCS's time, a part-time program assistant was hired to support data management and the non-technical elements of assembling Facility Action Plans. The Community Energy Challenge piloted the program with 20 businesses in its first year and plans to assist 130 additional small businesses in saving energy over the next two years with a projected $178, 726 in annual energy dollars saved.

The CEC program differs from traditional energy auditing services for small businesses in several distinct ways. The program includes a fuel-neutral assessment, emphasizes soft conservation, supplies technical support and ongoing monitoring of utility bills, provides enhanced financial incentives and low-interest loans, and establishes a platform for community-wide recognition of energy conscious practices.

- **Fuel neutral energy assessment.** In contrast to some programs which focus on a specific energy source such as either electricity or natural gas, the CEC assessment is comprehensive and evaluates electricity, natural gas, propane and any other fuel use. This allows the CCS to provide holistic energy-saving recommendations regardless of fuel types in use.

- **Soft conservation.** Because the CEC program is not sponsored by any product vendors, the recommendations provided are motivated solely by the intention to save the participating business money and frequently emphasize low-cost measures such as equipment maintenance, operational improvements, and behavioral changes by building occupants. Each Facility Action Plan includes a draft Resource Conservation Policy (detailed in Appendix A) to be adopted by the business as a guideline for codifying soft conservation.

- **Ongoing monitoring and support.** The CEC program also enhances the persistence of soft conservation measures by providing a follow-up meeting and quarterly reports, acknowledging that small-business owners often wear many hats and a single report can easily be forgotten or ignored. Additionally, this ongoing monitoring allows the CCS to identify anomalies in energy usage and troubleshoot problems as they arise.

- **Enhanced financing.** The Community Energy Challenge goes beyond energy efficiency consulting services and aligns opportunities for reduced costs, preferential-term financing, and public recognition. In the initial phase of the program, the CEC has obtained funding made available by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) to provide enhanced financial incentives. These incentives buy down project costs for businesses and mirror the applicable utility rebates. This ensures that investments meet existing high standards for energy efficiency without duplicating verification efforts. As cash-flow can frequently be a barrier for implementing energy efficiency, a low-interest loan program has been provided through the use of a loan loss reserve fund also funded through ARRA and administered by a partnering bank. This

financing opportunity allows businesses to pay for improvements gradually over time as energy savings are being realized, rather than bearing the entire cost upfront.

- **Community-wide recognition.** The final distinctive feature of the CEC program for small businesses is community-wide recognition for energy efficiency success. All participants are provided with the Community Energy Challenge logo and branded materials such as in-store displays and window stickers acknowledging their energy efficiency efforts. Sustainable Connections acknowledges participants through community events and widely-circulated promotional materials, creating a significant marketing and public relations value. This type of recognition has been utilized in other SC sponsored sustainable practice programs and is reported by business owners to hold importance for their customers. Businesses participating in the CEC are also challenged to compete with their peers and are rewarded based upon their success. In essence the CEC works as a small business's one-stop-shop for energy efficiency; coordinating everything from a quality energy assessment, to monitoring and technical support, to financing, to community-wide recognition.

Lessons Learned

In its first year, the Community Energy Challenge Commercial Conservation Services program has encountered a number of obstacles resulting in important lessons learned. Initial recruitment was more difficult than anticipated. Establishing a benchmark from which to assess a facility's efficiency relative to similar businesses proved complex. Providing savings estimates introduced questions of customer confidence and informational accuracy. Encouraging recommended measures to be implemented required renewed effort. And providing services for both home-based and house-based businesses necessitated strategizing. The following section details how the Community Energy Challenge has approached these obstacles.

Reworking Recruitment

The first major difficulty encountered was recruiting program participants. Initially the program charged a fee based on 1.5 percent of annual energy expenditures. This was based on an assumption that businesses would save at least 3 percent in the first year of participation. As a comparison, the Resource Conservation Manager Program through PSE typically achieves 5 percent energy cost savings in the first year, up to 15 percent over three years, and guarantees that the salary of a full time RCM will be more than paid for by the savings realized (Puget Sound Energy 2010). Yet even as businesses stood to yield a net savings of at least 1.5 percent of their energy costs, often hundreds or even thousands of dollars per year, few were eager to join the program. Many had apprehensions about the initial cost, the staff time required to accompany an auditor and the potential costs of implementing the recommendations. Others felt that their operations were already quite efficient, and were thus concerned that their upfront investment would not yield an acceptable return. Additionally, recruitment began in the spring when many businesses had already established a budget for the year and were reluctant or unable to add a new line item. Nonetheless, seven participants signed up and paid the full program fee, providing

an opportunity to fine-tune the program, and a track record to help secure additional program funding. These early advocates are now rewarded as Founding Partners. After several months, funding was secured to eliminate the first year participation fee for participants, leaving only an annual fee for monitoring and technical support services in subsequent years. This pricing scheme was much more appealing as participants could begin paying once savings had already been realized and the value of the program had been proven. It should be noted that 2009 was also an exceptionally difficult year financially for small businesses, and aversion to new costs was extremely high. Marketing energy efficiency services in springtime in Washington may also have affected reception of the program as most often energy costs are at the forefront of people's minds during the heating season in the fall and winter. The primary lessons learned in participant recruitment included reducing upfront costs as much as possible and launching marketing in the fall to be incorporated into the following year's budget. Another key to successful recruitment was using early program adopters as case studies to ease the concerns of prospective participants.

Setting Meaningful Benchmarks

A second obstacle presented itself in the effort to benchmark a business by comparing its energy use to other similar facilities. Three years of historical data were acquired from the utility companies for each participating business through a utility data transfer following a data release form. Ideally each business's energy use would be compared to industry averages as an indicator of their overall energy performance. The industry-standard metric, the Energy Use Index (EUI)[2], was utilized, and average EUIs were drawn from the Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS). The CBECS data set categorizes businesses by type, however many of the small businesses in the Community Energy Challenge program did not fit cleanly into a category. For example, a small-scale brewery and restaurant did not seem appropriate to compare to regional averages for restaurants that do not account for a production component. Additional independent variables such as patient-care-days in a medical facility or customers-served at a food service location greatly impacted a facility's energy usage and could change substantially year to year.[3] Some businesses had very specific facility uses that do not align with CBECS categories at all such as a local printing company, a funeral home and crematory, or a commercial plant nursery. The majority of small businesses working with the Community Energy Challenge had unique components which made comparisons to industry averages misleading or irrelevant. It was therefore decided that for the majority of participants, the only truly meaningful comparison would be to compare the facility to itself over time. A new benchmarking format was created displaying a summary of current usage data, along with carbon emissions and carbon emissions equivalents in terms of gallons of gasoline, cars on the road, and homes powered.[4] This initial benchmark allows participants to understand their current usage and then watch over time as their energy costs and emissions fall in comparison to the baseline

[2] Representing average BTU per square foot

[3] For example, concern over the H1N1 flu virus in 2009 was suggested to have raised patient-care-days by nearly a third at a local clinic. In another case, a restaurant noted significantly fewer customers served and thus reduced use of pizza ovens due to the 2008 economic downturn.

[4] Using EPA Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator from November 2009. http://www.epa.gov/RDEE/energy-resources/calculator.html

year. In order to glean the motivational benefits from comparing a business to its peers, comparisons to CBECS averages were used when an industry category was available and appropriate. In addition, more focus was placed on developing a friendly competition between businesses participating in the challenge. Rather than motivate businesses by comparing them to anonymous averages, they are pressed to demonstrate progress by comparing their energy efficiency achievements to those of their local peers.

Creating Competition

A friendly local competition allows for a representation of comparisons and progress over time, and adds incentive for businesses to continue to save energy. Rooted in the principles of community-based social marketing, the Community Energy Challenge uses feedback and positive peer pressure to engage businesses and create avenues of social diffusion to spread the message of energy efficiency. As a high-profile county-wide publicity campaign, the CEC recognizes participating businesses publically in local media, print materials, on the web, on social networking websites, and on in-store displays. Businesses are ranked based on three criteria; reduced energy use, investment in energy efficiency, and culture of conservation. The highest achievers are awarded status as an "Energy Champion," receiving special media attention and a higher public profile. Businesses making significant progress are deemed "Energy Leaders," and all beginning participants are named as "Energy Savers." When each business begins the program, they are provided with an in-store display which indicates their status and the potential to progress toward the level of an Energy Champion. When a business moves to the next level, it is supplied with an updated sticker for the in-store display and a press release for the company newsletter or other publications. The scoring rubric may be altered in future years to increase competitiveness. The local competition mechanism creates an incentive not only for businesses to participate, but to persistently pursue energy efficiency excellence.

Revealing the Savings Potential

The central product placed into the hands of the business participant is the Facility Action Plan, which acts as a guide to implementing energy efficiency improvements. In piloting the program, small business owners asked to see numbers on estimated savings, simple payback time and return on investment for each recommendation. Though not typical of the traditional Resource Conservation Manager program, the CEC action plan includes as many estimates of cost savings as possible. Quantifying the savings of each recommendation reliably however can be difficult. Behavioral changes are nearly impossible to quantify as the consistency and extent of the change cannot be predicted. Additionally independent variables can be difficult to know or measure, leading to considerable uncertainty. Rough estimates are risky as overestimating savings can lead to disappointment and frustration in the future if savings projections are not realized. The CEC Facility Action Plan includes any savings that are readily calculable. Where there are statistical data available from other sources, a range of savings based on average usage patterns is quoted. Though these calculations may take several hours per report, it is worth the

confidence raised among clients and provides a frame of reference in considering the potential effect of the recommended measure. The table below demonstrates how this information is succinctly summarized.

Table 1 Savings Estimates for Quick-Fix and Low-Cost Measures (sample)

No.	Description	Annual Savings kWh	Therms	Dollars	Implem. Cost	Annual CO2 Reduction (lb)	Simple Payback (yr)	Notes
1	Install programmable thermostats, program night setback	0	691	**$ 714**	$ 80	8,780	0.1	[1]
2	Implement power management on all PCs	1,816	0	**$ 158**	$ -	1,670	0.0	
3	Selection room occupancy sensor	1,758	0	**$ 153**	$ 150	1,620	1.0	[2]
4	Clean heat pump condenser coil	860	0	**$ 75**	$ 25	790	0.3	[3]
5	Install daylight sensor on outside security lights (office/chapel)	396	0	**$ 34**	$ 45	360	1.3	[4]
	Savings Totals (Annual)	**4,830**	**691**	**$ 1,133**	**$ 300**	**13,220**	**0.3**	
	Consumption Totals (2008)	**130,105**	**26,622**	**$ 38,787**	**Savings Expressed as EUI**		**7 kBtu/sqft/yr**	
	Savings Fraction	**4%**	**3%**	**3%**				

[1] Impl cost includes PSE rebate ($80), self-install
[2] Using post-retrofit CFL wattage, $230 cost less $80 PSE rebate
[3] Assumes 5% efficiency degredation
[4] Self-install, 3 new sensors, based on efficient retrofit lamps

Ensuring Implementation

One often cited problem with energy efficiency evaluation services has been the difficulty with ensuring implementation. After a full energy assessment has been conducted and a detailed report created, it is not easy to know whether the recipient will follow through with the recommendations. Because the Community Energy Challenge seeks to guide participants through energy efficiency improvements from start to finish, it was important to develop a mechanism for encouraging implementation. To this end, the CEC has built in a follow-up meeting on implementation and quarterly customized progress reports. All Facility Action Plan reports are considered to be in draft form until confirmed by a follow-up meeting. At this meeting each recommended efficiency measure is discussed with the opportunity for questions to be answered. A to-do list is created, and each recommended measure is assigned to an employee responsible for implementation, with the date of expected completion, and a place to check off when the measure is done. This meeting has been useful in providing the space for participants to voice concerns about certain recommendations, and to find collaborative solutions. Both the participant and the CEC staff keep a copy of the goals set out at this meeting. Each quarter participants are provided a report which displays progress towards their energy reduction target and the measures they have agreed to take by that time. This CEC quarterly report recognizes successes over time and helps businesses understand what actions have allowed energy usage to drop. The CEC program also allows participants to call in for additional support as needed. Continued communication between the Commercial Conservation Specialist and the business owner or facility manager creates a relationship which reinforces the commitment to follow through with energy saving opportunities.

Serving Home-Based and House-Based Businesses

A final unexpected challenge arose in providing the Commercial Conservation Services program for small businesses in all types of structures. Many small businesses in Whatcom County are either home-based or occupy a former residential structure. These residential structures require a different set of auditing tests and skills than for commercial buildings. For example, a blower door test would need to be conducted to assess air leakage, which is not a typical feature of a commercial audit. In addition, home-based businesses are subject to residential utility incentives and loan programs, meaning that much of the financial guidance provided by the Commercial Conservation Services program could be inapplicable. A distinction was drawn between *home-based* businesses, in which the primary function of the structure was residential, and *house-based* businesses, in which the primary function was commercial. In order to correctly align financial resources, this determination was made based upon whether the facility was on a residential or commercial rate schedule with the utilities. After some deliberation, it was decided that home-based business would be referred to the residential portion of the Community Energy Challenge but would retain all the promotional benefits of a business participant. To assess house-based businesses, a residential auditor would be borrowed from the residential portion of the CEC, but the remainder of services (including monitoring, technical support, and financial guidance) would be provided through the commercial program. Though this problem only applies to a portion of the businesses served, it was important to the Community Energy Challenge that no business be excluded from the opportunity to receive assistance saving energy.

Conclusion

Local independent businesses can benefit greatly from increased access to energy efficiency. If energy performance is to be improved on a broad scale, small businesses must be provided services adapted to their unique needs. The Community Energy Challenge is a pilot program aggregating numerous small businesses to receive guidance from a shared Commercial Conservation Specialist. Lessons learned from this first year include synchronizing recruitment timing with budgetary and seasonal schedules, making sure energy use comparisons are meaningful and motivating, estimating savings whenever possible, pursuing continued contact with businesses to encourage implementation and savings persistence, and understanding the particular needs of home-based and house-based businesses. So far all participating businesses in the CEC have adopted low-cost measures to save energy, with an average 5 percent in anticipated energy savings and an average $1000 in expected savings per facility from low-cost measures alone. Uptake of capital measures to increase savings thus far has been slow (only 1 out of 16 participants); however this is likely due to the delayed availability of the low-interest loan product, which was not yet issuing loans at the time of writing this paper.

With each new business participating, the Community Energy Challenge gains momentum; the concerns of small businesses become more familiar, Facility Action Plans can be compiled faster, and awareness grows with local businesses projecting the message of energy efficiency to staff, customers, and the wider community. By grouping local independent businesses together the Commercial Conservation Services program is uncovering significant

potential savings that would otherwise remain unknown. In the future the program will look to identify common problems for small businesses and hold workshops to find solutions and share best practices for achieving energy efficiency success. The Community Energy Challenge has also reviewed several options piloted elsewhere for overcoming the rental split-incentive problem including green lease addendums, setting a utility cap, and energy performance certification (William 2008, Abbot et al 2009, US Environmental Protection Agency 1994). After one year of demonstrated savings, the CEC plans to meet with local landlords to present a variety of arrangements for improving the energy efficiency of rental properties. The Community Energy Challenge will continue to address barriers and meet the needs of small businesses by providing a shared resource that is accessible and affordable. In energy efficiency work, it takes many small changes to amount to major improvements; this same principal applies on a community scale, with each local business pushing the whole community one step closer to greater efficiency, a strengthened economy, and improved environmental health.

References

Abbot, Jamie , Guy Dauncey, and Blaine Juchau. 2009. "**Green Landlords: Solving the Rubik's Cube of Energy Efficiency in Rental Housing**." Vancouver, Canada: BC Sustainable Energy Association.

Energy Services Coalition. 2010. "**5 Steps to Successful Energy Performance Contracting**". (online) http://www.energyservicescoalition.org/espc/tools/practice08/5steps.htm.

General Administration Energy Program, Washington State. 2010. Engineering and Architectural Services. "**Could Your Facilities Benefit From Using Energy Savings Performance Contracting** (ESPC)?" (online) http://www.ga.wa.gov/eas/epc/ESPC-test.doc

McKinsey and Company. 2009. Granade, HC and J Creyts, A Derkach, P Farese, S Nyquist. K Ostrowski. "**Unlocking Energy Efficiency in the US Economy**".

Puget Sound Energy. 2010 "**Energy Efficiency Programs and Rebates: Resource Conservation Manager Program**." (online) http://www.pse.com/solutions/forbusiness/

US Environmental Protection Agency. 1994. "**Upgrading Tenant Spaces**." Air and Radiation 6202J. EPA 430-B-94-001B.

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2007. "**Energy Star Buildings: Introduction to Energy Performance Contracting**." (online) http://www.energystar.gov/

US Small Business Administration. 2010. Office of Advocacy: Frequently Asked Questions. September 2009. (online) http://www.sba.gov/advo/stats/sbfaq.pdf .

Williams, Beth E. 2008. "**Overcoming Barriers to Energy Efficiency for Rental Housing**." Boston, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Appendix A:

RESOURCE CONSERVATION POLICY

We at _____ are committed to resource conservation.
This commitment is demonstrated through employee awareness, active conservation, optimal equipment operation, and an appliance replacement plan.

Awareness

All staff employed by our organization understand that resource conservation is a business priority. We routinely review and evolve our internal business practices in order to realize greater resource use efficiency. Employees are made aware of our resource conservation strategies as part of their initial training and through routine reminders. All employees are encouraged to look for new ways to advance conservation efforts in the workplace and are rewarded for success.

Active Conservation

We avoid any unnecessary use of electricity, natural gas, fuel, and water, as well as minimize our production of waste. We take the time to turn off equipment when not in use. We utilize power saving modes when we can. We maintain and properly utilize equipment designed to conserve resources. Through active conservation, we continually look for unnecessary resource use and take action to develop improved practices.

Optimal Equipment Operation

We work with our internal staff, equipment vendors, and service providers to maintain our mechanical and electrical equipment for optimum operating efficiency. We utilize available data and resources to schedule and use our equipment as efficiently as possible. Equipment scheduling and routine operating procedures are reviewed regularly.

Mechanical and Electrical Equipment Replacement Plan

In anticipation of future equipment replacement and acquisition needs, we identify efficient replacement options and review available energy efficiency grant and rebate opportunities. Efficiency is a top priority when specifying any new equipment. We will purchase Energy Star® qualified equipment whenever practical.

X _____ _____
Signature Date

_____ _____
Printed Name of Signatory Title

_____
Name of Company/Organization