

Program Design: Best Practices of Multi-Fuel Programs

September 22, 2015

Greg Wassel Director, Energy Efficiency

Presented at the 2015 ACEEE National Conference on Energy Efficiency as a Resource





Agenda

Current Landscape

First Solution Attempt

Best Practice Solution Design

Case Study



The Issue



- Multiple programs vying for customer's attention
- Multiple visits / interactions required
- Declining savings values negatively impact cost effectiveness
- Confusion of participating Trade Ally Networks
- Lack of comprehensive approach desired by customer



 Create "Savings Bank" for other utilities to purchase accrued savings

Benefits:

- Additional funding for program
- More activity in marketplace

Cons:

- Program controlled by initial utility
- Does not deliver complete customer solution



First Solution Attempt

Best Practice Solution

- Jointly designed program MOU development
- Establish an oversight committee
- Joint marketing plan to encourage participation
- Measure inclusion and process design
- Implementation schedule
- Cost sharing
- Resolving Challenges





5

MOU Establishment

- Parties
 - Each utility
 - Program administrator
 - EM&V
- Framework
 - Goals and objectives
 - Roles and responsibilities
 - Program design(s)
 - Marketing
 - Evaluation





6

Program Oversight Committee





Decision making

- Each utility
- Program Administrator
- EM&V

Framework

- Goals and objectives
- Roles and responsibilities
- Program design(s)
- Marketing
- Evaluation

Marketing Approach

- Joint marketing approach
- Program driven
- Highlight overall benefits of programs from all utilities (electric, gas, water)
- Illustrate year round savings potential
- Use of single program name/brand awareness
- Target programs with analytics/behavioral research





Measure Design



9



Residential

- Building Envelope (electric and gas)
- HVAC (electric and gas)
- Water Measures (electric, gas, and water)
- Direct Install
- Point of Sale, Midstream, Rebates
- Commercial & Industrial
 - Building Envelope (electric and gas)
 - HVAC (electric and gas)
 - Water Measures (electric, gas, and water)
 - Direct Install
 - Systems (electric, gas, and water)
 - Midstream, Rebates



- Individual utility access
 - Permissions to view own savings and data
 - Permissions to view customized reporting and dashboards
- Oversight Committee access
 - Permissions to view total savings and all data
 - Permissions to view customized reporting and dashboards
- Billing Pay for Performance
 - Tied directly to savings reporting
 - Dynamically priced to remove true-up process

Cost Sharing Strategies





- Plan and budget based on fuel use percentage
- Process/administration costs
 - Allocated by level of effort required
 - Allocated by equivalent savings determination
- Measure costs
 - Cost bourn by beneficiary
 - Split measures based on equivalent savings

Resolving Challenges

- Design and process
 - Measure inclusion/program rules
 - Special events/promotions
- Change management process
 - Oversight Committee decision tree
 - Stakeholder feedback
 - Administrator feedback
- Customer issues
 - Administrator process
 - Individual utility (if necessary)
 - Oversight Committee (if necessary)





Customer Satisfaction





- Increased appreciation
 - Whole home/facility focus
 - Utilities banding together to save ratepayer dollars

Decreased time commitment

- Appointment based programs
- Confusion from multiple offerings and participation decisions
- Must be measured
 - Survey and feedback
 - Results reporting to Oversight Committee

Case Study – Energizing Indiana

- Statewide Efficiency Program
- Consisted of 5 energy programs
- Home Energy Audit
- Income Qualified Weatherization
- Additional 6,700 homes audited
- Singular marketing and messaging
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Increased cost effectiveness scores



Contact Information: Greg Wassel greg.wassel@goodcents.com



The power to perform.

