



Addendum - #11-221

January 25, 2011

Addendum to the Final Report on the 2010 Stakeholder Perception Survey

Prepared by:
Market Strategies International
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 790
Portland, OR 97204

Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance
PHONE
503-688-5400
FAX
503-688-5447
EMAIL
info@neea.org

Addendum to the Final Report on the 2010 Stakeholder Perception Survey

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample Disposition and Respondent Profile

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Appendix C: Participating Companies

Appendix D: Verbatim Responses to Open End Questions

Appendix E: Data Tables

Appendix A: Sample Disposition and Respondent Profile

NEEA provided a list of 533 stakeholders from its program contact database to Market Strategies International (MSI), the firm conducting this research. Individuals were selected for the sample pool based on their connection to energy efficiency roles or responsibilities in their organization. Target individuals included senior-level executives, program staff and managers, evaluation and customer service staff, general managers, and engineers. After initial cleaning and de-duping, 517 of these records were deemed valid and contacted via email and / or phone to complete the survey.

Following notification from their NEEA contacts, stakeholders were first sent an email invitation to participate in a web based (online) survey. MSI then conducted a phone survey among those who did not complete the survey online. A total of 245 surveys were conducted between October 13 and December 2, 2010, with 144 of these completed via the web and 101 completed via phone.

Appendix Table 1. Sample Disposition Summary	
	Total (n)
Total Contacts	517
Completes	245
Resolved	
Disqualified: not familiar with NEEA	1
Refusal/against company policy	28
Do not contact	15
Incomplete web survey	27
Not contacted / Not available for call	
Callback	182
No answer/Answering machine	13
Email invitation sent, not completed	6

Appendix Table 2. Respondent Profile								
	2007			2010				
	Total Funders (a)	Direct Funders (b)	Other NW Utilities (c)	Total Sample	Total Funders (d)	Direct Funders (e)	Other NW Utilities (f)	Non-Utilities (g)
State								
Washington	47%	NA	NA	39%	53%	54%g	50%g	21%
Oregon	36%	NA	NA	36%	29%	32%	24%	43%f
Idaho	9%	NA	NA	9%	7%	5%	12%	11%
Montana	8%	NA	NA	7%	10%	8%	14%g	4%
Other	--	NA	NA	9%	--	--	--	21%
Region								
I-5	55%	NA	NA	60%	60%	74%f	29%	NA
East	34%	NA	NA	36%	36%	24%	62%e	NA
West	11%d	NA	NA	4%	4%	1%	10%e	NA
Job Responsibility								
EE program coordination or management	70%	71%	69%	58%	62%	62%	62%	54%
General management	12%	8%	18%	22%	24%a	19%	33%	19%
Evaluation or Planning	NA	NA	NA	19%	18%	22%f	7%	21%f
Customer Service	NA	NA	NA	8%	12%	7%	21%eg	4%
Account management	7%	10%	3%	4%	7%	7%	5%	2%
Other	11%	11%	10%	14%	8%	4%	17%	21%
Involvement with EE Programs								
All	28 %	36%c	18%	26%	33%	40%fg	17%	16%
Most	32%d	30%	34%	25%	21%	21%	19%	31%
Some	36%	30%	43%	37%	39%	31%	57%eg	35%
None	4%	4%	6%	12%	7%	7%	7%	17%e
Sector								
Residential	68%	54%	84%b	66%	75%	71%g	83%g	56%
Commercial	57%	59%	54%	72%	73%a	77%	62%	72%
Industrial	47%	58%c	34%	55%	59%a	64%	48%	50%
Agricultural	17%	19%	15%	27%	32%a	36%g	24%	20%
Base (n)	148	80	68	245	136	94	42	109

Letters indicate a number is significantly higher at 95 percent confidence than the corresponding group.

Appendix B: Questionnaire

MODE: SET SURVEY MODE

- 1 Phone
- 2 Web

break

SAMPTYPE. MOVE IN FROM SAMPLE

- 1 Direct Funders
- 2 Indirect Funders
- 3 Non-Funders

break

SCONT. MOVE IN FROM SAMPLE

- 1 Contractor
- 2 Non-Contractor

break

TITLE. MOVE IN FROM SAMPLE

[TITLE]

break

{SHOW INTRO1 IF MODE=1}

NOTE: THE ABBREVIATED NAME FOR NORTHWEST ENERGY EFFICIENCY ALLIANCE IS “NEEA”. THIS IS PRONOUNCED “NEE-ah”.

INTRO1. Hello, this is _____ with Market Strategies, calling on behalf of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, also referred to as NEEA. We’re conducting a short study today to help NEEA improve communication with its stakeholders and partners. {READ IF NECESSARY: This will take about 15 minutes and all answers will be strictly confidential.}

break

QA. Can I please speak to [firstname] [lastname]?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (NOT AVAILABLE, SCHEDULE CALLBACK)
- 3 No (OTHER REASON GIVEN) {THANK AND TERMINATE}
- DK
- REF

{IF QA = 3, DK, REF TERMINATE}

NOTE: REPEAT INTRODUCTION AS NECESSARY WITH SAMPLE LISTED RESPONDENT

break

{SHOW INTRO2 IF MODE=2}

INTRO2. Welcome to the NEEA (Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance) Stakeholder Perception Survey. This study is being conducted on behalf of NEEA by Market Strategies to help NEEA improve communication with its stakeholders and partners. This will take about 15 minutes to complete, and all answers will be strictly confidential.

break

SCREENER / BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

{SHOW IF MODE=1}

IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN QUALITY, THIS CALL MAY BE MONITORED.

break

S1. How familiar are you with NEEA and its initiatives? Would you say that you are... [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ LIST)]

- 1 Very familiar
- 2 Somewhat familiar
- 3 Not very familiar
- 4 Not at all familiar
- DK

{IF S1 = 4, DK, TERMINATE: 101}

break

S2. Which of the following best describes your job responsibilities? Please select all that apply. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ LIST)]
[RANDOMIZE CODES 1-6]

- 1 Energy efficiency or conservation program coordination or management
- 2 Account management
- 3 Customer service
- 4 Evaluation or planning
- 5 Operations (such as distribution voltage control)
- 6 General management
- 7 Or something else: [OTHER: S]
- DK

{IF S2 = DK, TERMINATE: 102}

break

S3. What is your job title?

[OPEN END: L]

break

S4. How much of your work involves implementing or coordinating energy efficiency programs? [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ LIST)]

- 1 All
- 2 Most
- 3 Some, or
- 4 None
- DK

break

S5. Which types of customers does most of your work relate to? Please select all that apply. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ LIST)]

- 1 Residential
- 2 Commercial
- 3 Industrial
- 4 Agricultural
- DK

break

S6. How long have you been with your current organization?

- 1 Less than 1 year
- 2 1 to less than 3 years
- 3 3 to less than 5 years
- 4 5 to less than 10 years
- 5 10 years or more
- DK

break

OVERALL FAVORABILITY

Q1. Please provide a rating of your overall general impression of NEEA using a one to seven scale, where one means you have a very unfavorable overall impression and seven means you have a very favorable overall impression of NEEA.

DESIGN: ROW GRID

[RECORD NUMBER 1-7]

1=Very Unfavorable

7=Very Favorable

DK

break

{IF Q1=1-7 ASK Q1A, OTHERWISE SKIP TO INTRO BEFORE Q2}

Q1A. Being as specific as possible, please explain your key reasons for rating your overall impression of NEEA as a [RESTORE Q1]. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]

[OPEN END: L]

break

BRAND ATTRIBUTES, VALUE TO REGION

Now, for each of the following statements pertaining to NEEA, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement using a one to seven scale, where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement. How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

DESIGN: ROW GRID, RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q2–Q4

[RECORD NUMBER 1–7]

1=Strongly Disagree

7=Strongly Agree

DK

Q2. You can trust the information that comes from NEEA

Q3. NEEA's staff is highly knowledgeable about energy efficiency issues

Q4. NEEA moves slowly on its initiatives

question separator

DESIGN: ROW GRID, RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q5–Q13

Q5. NEEA helps to fill the energy efficiency pipeline to ensure the future energy efficiency opportunities for the Northwest

Q6. NEEA helps to develop the market for new and emerging energy efficiency technologies in the Northwest

Q7. By working together through NEEA, energy efficiency organizations can achieve greater energy savings using fewer resources

Q8. NEEA accelerates market adoption of energy efficiency products, services and practices in the Northwest

Q9. NEEA helps mitigate investment risks associated with emerging energy efficiency opportunities

Q10. NEEA facilitates collaboration and knowledge sharing between Northwest energy efficiency organizations

Q11. NEEA facilitates regional energy efficiency planning and implementation

Q12. NEEA's work is critical to the region achieving its future energy efficiency goals

Q13. As a regional organization, NEEA is able to influence the market in ways that individual organizations could not do on their own

break

{ IF Q8=4 THRU 7 ASK Q14 OTHERWISE SKIP TO TEXT BEFORE Q15 }

Q14. Which energy efficiency products, services, or practices has NEEA recently been successful in accelerating the market adoption of? Please be as specific as possible. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]
[OPEN END: L]

break

RELATIONSHIP, VALUE TO INDIVIDUAL UTILITY / ORGANIZATION

Now, for each of the following statements pertaining to your organization's relationship with NEEA, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement using the same one to seven scale, where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement.

How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

DESIGN: ROW GRID, RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q15–Q25

[RECORD NUMBER 1–7]

1=Strongly Disagree

7=Strongly Agree

DK

{ ASK Q15 IF SAMPTYPE=1 OR 2, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q15. I regard NEEA as a partner in my organization's energy efficiency efforts

{ ASK Q16 IF SAMPTYPE=1 OR 2, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q16. NEEA has helped my organization achieve its energy efficiency goals

{ ASK Q17 IF SAMPTYPE=1 OR 2, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q17. NEEA will help my organization achieve its energy efficiency goals in the future

{ ASK Q18 IF SAMPTYPE=1 OR 2, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q18. NEEA understands my organization's energy efficiency goals and programs

{ ASK Q19 IF SAMPTYPE=1 OR 2, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q19. NEEA's work complements my organization's energy efficiency programs

{ ASK Q20 IF SAMPTYPE=1, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q20. My organization's investment in NEEA represents an important part of its energy efficiency portfolio

Q21. NEEA competes with my organization

Q22. NEEA offers me ample opportunity to provide meaningful input into its initiatives

Q23. NEEA values my input

Q24. I have access to sufficient information about NEEA's activities

Q25. NEEA does not understand market conditions in my local service territory

break

PAST YEAR CHANGE IN OPINION OF NEEA

Q26. Over the past year, would you say that your general opinion of NEEA has become more positive, less positive, or stayed about the same?

- 1 More positive
- 2 Less positive
- 3 About the same
- DK

break

{ IF Q26=1 OR 2 ASK Q26A, ELSE CONTINUE }

Q26A. What has occurred during the past year to cause your general opinion of NEEA to become [RESTORE Q26]? Please be as specific as possible. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]
[OPEN END: L]

break

EXPERIENCE WITH NEEA STAFF, CONTRACTORS

Q27. In the past 12 months, how many times have you interacted with a member of the NEEA staff?

- [RECORD NUMBER 0-99]
- 100 More than 99
 - DK

break

Q28. In the past 12 months, on how many programs have you partnered on or coordinated with NEEA?

- [RECORD NUMBER 0-99]
- 100 More than 99
 - DK

break

{ IF Q27=1 THRU 100 ASK Q29 OTHERWISE SKIP TO TEXT ABOVE Q35 }

Q29. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your interactions with NEEA, using a one to seven scale where one means you are very dissatisfied and seven means you are very satisfied.
How satisfied are you overall with your interactions with NEEA?

DESIGN: ROW GRID

- [RECORD NUMBER 1-7]
- 1=Very Dissatisfied
 - 7=Very Satisfied
 - DK

break

Continuing to think about the personal interactions you've had with NEEA over the past 12 months, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement, again using a one to seven scale where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement.

How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

DESIGN: ROW GRID, RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q30–Q34

[RECORD NUMBER 1–7]

1=Strongly Disagree

7=Strongly Agree

DK

Q30. NEEA staff treat you with respect

Q31. NEEA staff are respectful of your organization's relationships with key customers

Q32. NEEA staff are responsive to your input

Q33. NEEA seeks your input on their initiatives

Q34. NEEA keeps you well-informed about their work

break

COMMUNICATION AND EVENTS

Thanks for your input so far. We're nearly done.

Q35. How do you typically communicate with NEEA?

[OPEN END: L]

break

Q36. In addition to personal interactions, what other sources do you rely upon to stay informed about NEEA's work?

[OPEN END: L]

break

Q37. Thinking about both your personal interactions and other communications from NEEA like web sites, newsletters and reports, how satisfied are you overall with the way NEEA communicates with you about their work? Please use a one to seven scale, where one means you are very dissatisfied and seven means you are very satisfied.

[RECORD NUMBER 1–7]

1=Very dissatisfied

7=Very satisfied

DK

break

{ IF Q37=1 THRU 7 ASK Q37A OTHERWISE SKIP TO TEXT BEFORE Q38 }

Q37A. What aspects of NEEA's communications caused you to rate your satisfaction in this area a [RESTORE Q37]? Please be as specific as possible. [IF MODE=1

RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]

[OPEN END: L]

break

Again thinking about the communications you receive from NEEA, how satisfied are you with each of the following attributes using the same one to seven scale?

[RECORD NUMBER 1-7]

1=Very dissatisfied

7=Very satisfied

DK

SCREEN DESIGN: ROW GRID. RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q38-Q40

Q38. The amount of communication you have with NEEA

Q39. The frequency of which you receive communications from NEEA

Q40. The content of the communication you receive from NEEA

break

For each type of information that NEEA provides, please indicate how important that information is to you on a one to seven scale, where one means it is not at all important to you and seven means it is extremely important to you.

[RECORD NUMBER 1-7]

1=Not at all important

7=Extremely important

DK

SCREEN DESIGN: ROW GRID. RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q41-Q43

Q41. NEEA business results and outcomes

Q42. Information about the progress of NEEA initiatives

Q43. Information about emerging technologies

break

Q44. What other types of information would you consider extremely important for NEEA to provide to you and your organization? Please be as specific as possible.

[IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]

[OPEN END: L]

break

Q45. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA newsletter?

[RECORD NUMBER 0-99]

100 More than 99

DK

break

{ IF Q45=1 thru 100 ASK Q45A THRU Q45C, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q46 }

Q45A. When you receive a NEEA Newsletter, do you usually read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

- 1 All of it
- 2 Some of it
- 3 Just glance through it
- 4 Do not read it at all
- DK

break

Q45B. Did you find the NEEA Newsletters to be...?

- 1 Very useful
- 2 Somewhat useful
- 3 Not very useful, or
- 4 Not at all useful
- DK

break

Q45C. Would you say the frequency of the NEEA Newsletters is...? [IF MODE=1
RESTORE: (READ CODES 1-3)]

- 1 Too frequent
- 2 Not frequent enough, or
- 3 About right
- DK

break

Q46. NEEA Bulletins are subscription or opt-in based, on topics of interest such as job announcements, RFPs, market and evaluation reports, press releases, etc. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA Bulletin?

[RECORD NUMBER 0-99]

- 100 More than 99
- DK

break

{ IF Q46=1 thru 100 ASK Q46A THRU Q46C, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q47 }

Q46A. When you receive a NEEA Bulletin, do you usually read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

- 1 All of it
- 2 Some of it
- 3 Just glance through it
- 4 Do not read it at all
- DK

break

Q46B. Did you find the NEEA Bulletins to be...?

- 1 Very useful
- 2 Somewhat useful
- 3 Not very useful, or
- 4 Not at all useful
- DK

break

Q46C. Would you say the frequency of the NEEA Bulletins is...? [IF MODE=1
RESTORE: (READ CODES 1-3)]

- 1 Too frequent
- 2 Not frequent enough, or
- 3 About right
- DK

break

Q47. In the past 12 months, have you received the NEEA Annual Report, or accessed it online at NEEA's web site?

- 1 Yes, received
- 2 Yes, accessed online
- 3 No, did not receive or access online
- DK

break

{ IF Q47=1 OR 2 ASK Q47A AND Q47B, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q48 }

Q47A. When you received or accessed the Annual Report, did you read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

- 1 All of it
- 2 Some of it
- 3 Just glance through it
- 4 Do not read it at all
- DK

break

Q47B. Did you find the Annual Report to be.. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ
CODES 1-4)]

- 1 Very useful
- 2 Somewhat useful
- 3 Not very useful, or
- 4 Not at all useful
- DK

break

Q48. Is there anything NEEA could do to improve upon its communications with you and your organization? Please be as specific as possible. [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]

[OPEN END: L]

break

{ASK PROGSCREEN IF MODE=1 OTHERWISE CONTINUE TO TEXT ABOVE Q49A}

PROGSCREEN. NEEA facilitates several regional advisory committees and other regional groups. In the past year, have you participated in any NEEA advisory committees or group meetings? (IF NEEDED / DK: Examples of these groups include Residential, Commercial, or Industrial Advisory committees, Cost Effectiveness Committee, Regional Portfolio Committee, Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Committee, or Northwest Research Group.)

1 Yes

2 No

DK

break

{IF PROGSCREEN=1 OR MODE=2 ASK Q49A-Q49E OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q57}

[SHOW IF MODE=2: NEEA facilitates several regional advisory committees and other regional groups.] In the past year, how many times have you participated in each of the following advisory committees or group meetings...

[RECORD NUMBER 0-99]

100 More than 99

DK

SCREEN DESIGN: ROW GRID. RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q49A-Q49G

Q49A. The Residential Advisory Committee

Q49B. The Commercial Advisory Committee

Q49C. The Industrial Advisory Committee

Q49D. The aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee

Q49E. The Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee

Q49F. The Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC)

Q49G. The NW Research Group

break

{ IF ANY Q49A-Q49G=1 THRU 100 GO TO SETGRP, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q57}
SETGRP. SET BASED ON Q49A-Q49G HIGHEST VALUE. IN THE EVENT OF
A TIE SET BASED ON LEAST FILLED

- 1 Residential Advisory Committee
- 2 Commercial Advisory Committee
- 3 Industrial Advisory Committee
- 4 aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee
- 5 Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee
- 6 Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC)
- 7 NW Research Group

break

Q50. Did you find the {RESTORE SETGRP} meeting[s] to be:

- 1 Very useful
 - 2 Somewhat useful
 - 3 Not very useful, or
 - 4 Not at all useful
- DK

break

Q51. Thinking about your experience with the {RESTORE SETGRP}, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

[RECORD NUMBER 1-7]

1=Very dissatisfied

7=Very satisfied

DK

break

{ IF Q51=1-7 ASK Q51A, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q52 }

Q51A.What about your {RESTORE SETGRP} experience caused you to rate your satisfaction as a [RESTORE Q51]? Please be as specific as possible. [IF
MODE=1 RESTORE: (Probe for specifics)]

[OPEN END: L]

break

Using the same one to seven scale, how satisfied are you with...

[IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ AS NECESSARY: With one meaning you are very dissatisfied and seven meaning you are very satisfied)]

[RECORD NUMBER 1-7]

1=Very dissatisfied

7=Very satisfied

DK

SCREEN DESIGN: ROW GRID. RANDOMIZE QUESTIONS Q52-Q54

Q52. The format of Advisory Committee meetings

Q53. NEEA's efforts to keep you informed through Advisory Committee meetings

Q54. Your ability to influence NEEA's work through the Advisory Committee process

break

Q55. Would you say the frequency of NEEA Advisory Committee meetings is... [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ CODES 1-3)]

1 Too frequent

2 Not frequent enough, or

3 About right

DK

break

Q57. In the past year, how many times have you participated in other in-person meetings with NEEA staff?

[RECORD NUMBER 0-99]

100 More than 99

DK

break

{ IF Q57=1 thru 100 ASK Q57A, ELSE SKIP TO Q58 }

Q57A. Did you find the other in-person meetings with NEEA staff to be... [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ CODES 1-4)]

1 Very useful

2 Somewhat useful

3 Not very useful, or

4 Not at all useful

DK

break

Q58. In the past 12 months, approximately how many times have you accessed NEEA's website, NW Alliance.org?

[RECORD NUMBER 0-99]

100 More than 99

DK

break

{ IF Q58=1 thru 100 ASK Q58A, OTHERWISE SKIP TO Q59 }

Q58A. Did you find NEEA's website to be... [IF MODE=1 RESTORE: (READ CODES 1-4)]

- 1 Very useful
- 2 Somewhat useful
- 3 Not very useful, or
- 4 Not at all useful
- DK

break

Q59. Finally, please tell me what, if anything, NEEA could do to improve how it interacts with you and your organization. Please note that these comments are very important to improve NEEA's service to customers and will remain anonymous.

[OPEN END: L]

break

Appendix C: Participating Companies

Alder Mutual Light Company	Consumers Power (2)
Alliance to Save Energy (2)	Cowlitz County PUD – Longview (3)
American Institute of Architects (AIA)	Demand side Engineering, P.S. - Demand Side Engineering
Association of Oregon Counties	E2A Energy Analysis and Answers
Avista Utilities – Spokane (8)	Eco Edge
BC Hydro – Burnaby	ECONorthwest – Portland (2)
Benton Rural Electric Association – Prosser	Ecos Consulting (4)
Blachly-Lane Electric Cooperative (2)	Ecosphere Environmental Services
BOMA Portland	Ecotope (3)
BOMA Seattle & King County	Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) - Palo Alto
Bonniers Ferry Electric Department	Elmhurst Mutual Power & Light
Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) - Portland (HQ) (15)	Energy Market Innovations, Inc. (EMI) – Seattle
Canby Utility	Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO) – Portland (6)
Canon and Hutton	Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) – Eugene (8)
Cascade Energy Engineering (2)	Field Diagnostic Services, Inc. (FDSI)
Chelan County PUD – Wenatchee	Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Citizens Utility Board of Oregon	Fluid Market Strategies (3)
City of Coulee Dam Light Department	Global Energy Partners, LLC
City of Ellensburg (2)	Grant County PUD (2)
City of Port Angeles - Port Angeles	Grays Harbor County PUD
City of Seattle - Department of Planning and Development	Green Motors Practices
City of Sumas	Harrelson Group
Clark Public Utilities – Vancouver (3)	Heschong Mahone Group, Inc.
Coates Kokes (2)	Idaho Power Company - Boise (HQ) (5)
Colehour + Cohen – Seattle	Inland Power & Light Company – Spokane
Columbia Basin Electric Cooperative, Inc.	Idaho Office of Energy Resources
ConAgra- Lamb Weston Foods	Idaho Public Utilities Commission – Boise
Consortium For Energy Efficiency (CEE) (2)	

Integrated Design Lab (IDL) (2)
JC Williams Consulting, LLC – Canby
JDM Associates
KEMA, Inc.
Kenergy
Klein Partners
Klickitat County PUD
Konstrukt, Inc. – Portland
Kootenai Electric Cooperative
Lewis County PUD – Chehalis
Lighting Research Center, Rensselaer
Polytechnic Inst.
Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc. (2)
Marketshift Strategies
Mason County PUD No. 1
MetaResource Group
Microgrid - Portland (HQ)
Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance -
Chicago
Milton-Freewater Light & Power
Mission Valley Power
Modern Electric Water Company
Montana Department of Environmental
Quality – Helena
Montana Public Service Commission
National Center for Appropriate
Technology (NCAT) - Butte (HQ)
Natural Resources Defense Council
(NRDC)
Navigant (2)
NORPAC Foods, Inc.
Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships,
Inc. (NEEP) (2)
Northern Lights, Inc.

Northern Wasco County PUD
NorthWestern Energy (8)
Northwest Building Operators Association
Northwest Energy Education Institute
(NEEI)
Northwest Energy Consulting
Northwest Energy Efficiency Council
(NEEC)
Northwest Food Processors Association
(NWFPA)
Northwest Power and Conservation
Council (5)
Northwest Public Power Association
NW Energy Coalition (NVEC) (2)
Pacific County PUD No. 2
Pacific Northwest Generating
Cooperative- Portland
PacifiCorp – Portland (6)
Portland General Electric (PGE) (2)
Puget Sound Energy (PSE) - Corporate
Office (7)
Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE)
(2)
Oregon Public Utility Commission -
Salem
Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference
Committee (PNUCC)
Portland Energy Conservation, Inc. (PECI)
(3)
Public Power Council
QDI Strategies, Inc.
Raft River Rural Electric Cooperative -
Malta
Ravalli County Electric Cooperative –
Corvallis
Research Into Action – Portland

Salem Electric
Seattle City Light – Seattle (11)
Smart Buildings
Snohomish County PUD - Everett (HQ)
(12)
Strategic Energy Group (3)
Sustainable Design Services
Tacoma Power - Tacoma (HQ) (3)
Tanner Electric Cooperative
U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC)
United Electric Cooperative, Inc.
University of Idaho
University of Oregon - Department of
Architecture
US Department of Energy

US Department of Energy
Vera Water and Power – Veradale
Vigilante Electric Cooperative
WA Dept of Community, Trade &
Economic Dev (CTED)
WA Dept of Community, Trade &
Economic Dev (CTED) - Energy Site
Facility Evaluation Council
Washington State University Energy
Program – Olympia
Washington State Universtiy
Washington Utilities & Transportation
Commission – Olympia
WSU Extension Energy Program
WSU Extension Energy Program

Appendix D: Verbatim Responses to Open End Questions

Q1A. Being as specific as possible, please explain your key reasons for rating your overall impression of NEEA as a (RESTORE Q1 RESPONSE).

Positive Mentions (Rating of 5-7)

NEEA is working hard to provide value to all stakeholders, which is important to those of us on the "far east side." The programs complement our own efforts and provide a good return. (Direct Funder)

Mixed impressions of NEEA efforts by sector - the industry sector would be a 6, but I hear less favorable things about Commercial. (Direct Funder)

Sometimes it feels like things move very slowly through NEEA. (Direct Funder)

Our utility is in alignment with most of NEEA's efforts. However, there are some issues where we think they should be more involved or it is not in alignment with us. (Direct Funder)

Have seen strong leadership demonstrated by NEEA in energy codes and standards development. Have seen pioneering efforts by NEEA in coordinating with manufacturers on emerging technologies such as heat pump water heaters. (Direct Funder)

My organization and the people involved in NEEA hold it in high regard. (Direct Funder)

Generally impressed with quality of work. Not perfect. (Direct Funder)

I assigned a pretty high rating of "6" because I believe NEEA has done a very good job fulfilling its unique/niche role of region wide market transformation ... especially in the Residential and Commercial sectors. I did not give a "7" because, except for the valuable technical training provided by NEEA, I am otherwise having doubts on the cost-effectiveness of NEEA's role/involvement/impact in the Industrial sector, at least within the service territory of my utility. (Direct Funder)

Easy to work with. Always have open communications with NEEA staff. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is staffed with competent, professional people, and they carry out their Market Transformation mission with apparent success while walking a political tight rope among diverse stakeholders. (Direct Funder)

All of the dealings I have had with NEEA have been good. They provide good information. (Direct Funder)

NEEA seems to be out front on some of the more important efficiency initiatives. For example, heat pump, water heaters and the push for a northern tier specification. (Direct Funder)

My employer feels that NEEA sometimes does not represent its interests. However, I have been pretty please. My biggest beef is that NEEA sometimes makes up its mind before utilities are given the opportunity to affect decisions. This has been true in my observation when NEEA selects contractors to do work. I feel some of these decisions have not been made well. (Direct Funder)

I believe in NEEA's mission and believe the organization provides a valuable resource to the region. NEEA has expanded its role in the region and right now there are growing pains as new staff are on a learning curve and new initiatives are getting started. (Direct Funder)

I believe NEEA is well organized and thoughtful in their goals of achieving energy efficiency. They are in contact with utilities and welcome feedback and suggestions. (Direct Funder)

Business strategy. Renewed efforts to be responsive to funders. Greater need to convey learning through engaging all stakeholders. Greater transparency on reporting savings, increase flexibility to be able to efficiently support needs of funder programs across the region. Evolve NEEA responsibilities per recommendations of the NEEA process. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is one of few institutions that harness diverse interests to continuously make a meaningful difference -- in this case, to the energy interests of an entire region. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is well managed and is continuing to move forward with key initiatives. They have successfully filled a key role: aggregated energy efficiency services with demonstrated results over a long period of time. (Direct Funder)

NEEA and their program contractors are very responsive and helpful in providing me with requested information and support. (Direct Funder)

Overall NEEA is a great organization but often conflicts or causes issues with our internal programs. When we participate in a NEEA activity it often causes duplicating work and confusion when program requirements differ than ours. (Direct Funder)

Positive, informative and frequent communications about programs (i.e. electronics initiative, RBSA, DHP pilot). Would like to know more about upcoming pilots for 2011 and how to get involved. (Direct Funder)

Do a good job, but some of the initiatives do not apply to a more rural service territory. (Direct Funder)

Diligent workers, committed to the truth (even if it means decrementing savings AFTER the fact.) Good program management, and plays a crucial role coordinating the various utilities and stakeholders with one common voice. (Direct Funder)

To improve the score provide more concrete benefits for the cost. (Direct Funder)

NEEA may be growing too big, too quickly. This seems to result in inadequate attention to detail, and substandard organization, data management, and methodological competency. (Direct Funder)

The Alliance seems to be good at a high level for bringing attention to EE in the Northwest. (Direct Funder)

I consider NEEA to be a key partner in helping us achieve our energy efficiency goals. Providing a "rating of an overall impression of NEEA" asks me to consider how NEEA is doing to help us meet our energy efficiency goals. NEEA's strengths are in helping the region with market transformation. I think NEEA could be doing a better job in helping the region track and record market transformation through the pursuit of better data (both sales and installed equipment). The score of 5/7 is meant to indicate good progress toward this goal, with room for improvement. (Direct Funder)

Professional staff, skilled leadership, effective at making market transformation. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is still implementing its current plan and the results and process are still a work-in-progress. (Direct Funder)

I know what you do and the savings that are generated. (Direct Funder)

Provides resources and results for energy efficiency that would be difficult or impossible for an individual utility to achieve. The focus on the largest facilities/opportunities means it's more difficult to demonstrate value to smaller utilities and their customers that fund at same level as large utilities. (Direct Funder)

Important and necessary role, reasonably successful in achievements. (Direct Funder)

I think NEEA's omission is extremely important, a lot of the work they is really good. The way they communicate on the things they are working on could be better. I am not at the level where I can go to NEEA's meetings. (Direct Funder)

NEEA does an excellent job of complementing the efforts of local utilities in advancing conservation and energy efficiency. This is especially the case for market transformation opportunities. (Direct Funder)

The primary reason for NEEA to have been formed over 10 years ago remains as valid as ever today. However, NEEA has sizeable on-going challenges in its efforts to demonstrate value to the region given the ever increasing acquisition targets and rigorous oversight from stakeholders. (Direct Funder)

NEEA demonstrates a high level of professionalism at all times as is very committed towards accomplishing EE. (Direct Funder)

They fulfill and the need, help in the collaboration of energy efficiency. I think they do a great job. (Direct Funder)

Insufficient communication and coordination in long term initiative handoff. (Direct Funder)

Based on my past experience. (Direct Funder)

I'm thinking that NEEA has a ways to go in several areas: 1. Identify underserved markets and work to transform them. 2. Focus on outreach. 3. Focus on developing useful tools that can be applied to increase the knowledge of customers and market players, and to establish savings, define benefits and potential return from investments in efficiency. 4. Serve as a regional clearinghouse of information to bring together the myriad of published research, products and tools from a multitude of sources on a given focus area. If NEEA would do these things, the organization would be a shining star. (Direct Funder)

I don't work really closely with NEEA. My experiences with NEEA is that they provide good programs, and they have pretty strong support. My limited experiences are really effective on what we do. My interactions with NEEA is very low part of my job. (Direct Funder)

There are a lot of things they do well, always room for improvement. They've achieved allot of energy savings at a low cost. there are more opportunities to coordinate with local utilities programs. (Direct Funder)

I have fairly little direct interaction with NEEA. (Direct Funder)

There is a need for their mission, and their communication is good. (Direct Funder)

They do well; there are problems on some projects where there are no good options for resolution. (Direct Funder)

NEEA does a good job of promoting market transformation in the northwest. We include them in our targeting and we're confident in their reporting. Always been pleased with their work. (Direct Funder)

They do a good job of identifying new technologies, great staff, and have good leadership. (Direct Funder)

I base it on the difference in my interactions with the two principal parts of NEEA. Industrial and commercial. Industrial side is very productive, and commercial has still been undergoing a major program redesign. They aren't well defined yet, since they are improving at the moment. The codes and standards manager has been a great resource. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is fulfilling its charter and mission to provide market transformation, sometimes I think the communication gets a little muddy, and sometimes it feels like there is a little confusion and what our department is doing. (Direct Funder)

Always room for improvement, they good job. Waiting to see how they will do in the future. (Direct Funder)

Trying to evaluate where they need improvements. They need some improvement in their program and implementation, cost and budgeting. (Direct Funder)

They're a confident group of people, they run programs that are useful, and their research is great. I don't get a lot of very specific information from them that would be useful in my job. (Direct Funder)

They provide very high quality market transformation saving at a good price, and allow us to focus on efforts in our organization. Relatively easy to coordinate with in our efforts, and they need to a better job of reporting savings and forecast. (Direct Funder)

They're very good, but I'm only somewhat not as involved as NEEA as other people. (Direct Funder)

They deliver energy savings to identify or quantify. (Direct Funder)

I believe the organization in the past 3 yrs has aligned itself well with that the region needs in energy efficient,, strive3s to work with utility companies, there are improves for utilities on using to rate the 6 rather than a 7. (Direct Funder)

I appreciated their support, some of the issues in terms of efficient windows; I know there have been some concerns on how much NEEA gets into market transformations than actual program implementation. (Direct Funder)

Their objective or their goals and strategies that they want to complete, but the implementation could be more efficient and or better thought out. (Direct Funder)

Because they seem to have a good pulse on the state of the energy efficiency industry and the key issues, and have some initiatives that address coming trends or changes in the industry. (Direct Funder)

Well I think NEEA does a pretty good job of being a clearing house of Northwest issues around demand site management and supply site resources. They are definitely germane to my line of work. (Direct Funder)

They do good work but don't always communicate clearly what they are doing. /SPE/ No, I would just like to leave it at that. (Direct Funder)

Their participation in market transformation and the job that they do in that. Also sponsoring various studies like residential, RSPA building studies. They provide a lot of industrial training and they do a good job on the training. They have a number of committees where they get input from their members and funders. (Direct Funder)

NEEA consistently delivers results for energy efficiency. We are very close with them on all levels. They are currently in transition at the moment. Depending on the Compact Fluorescent Light bulbs to diversify where they get their savings from staffing Structural perspectives. Also until they fulfill their strategies I would not give them the maximum rating of a 7. (Direct Funder)

NEEA provides programs to acquire conservation resources, that are beyond e-webs capabilities, by that I mean they're engaged in regional promotion in the market and those efforts extend through retailers that operate in our community and specifically I am referring to national retailers [BUSINESS NAME], they have provided the information structure for product marketing for our customers that is beyond our capability for example I can't just walk into [BUSINESS NAME] and get them to order what I want them to order for our customers. I don't have that kind of leverage but they do. One other thing I am familiar with ductless heat pump promotion. I know they operate in a commercial environment but to work in residential, the only thing that I am familiar with is a program called 80 plus. (Direct Funder)

There is not enough executive level real time feedback in terms of where the organization is at any given time. There is a significant amount of data, but there isn't enough of a dashboard of their initiatives, where we can identify what's being made. Measurement and verification process has suffered a similar fate; it's too complicated and makes it difficult without completely emerging the process of how the process is done. Utility integration with NEEA supports services. Has to be able to be done more seamlessly effort. (Direct Funder)

They're the best in the country among regional market transformation entities, however they've had recent organizational issues, which they are trying to address. (Direct Funder)

Given their activities in the industry. I am a tough grader, nobody's perfect! (Other NW Utility)

Increasing awareness of EE potentials. Conducting studies to ascertain viability of technologies, etc. in the region. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA does a good job of providing energy savings on a regional basis using programs that are more efficient to be run regionally, rather than separately in individual service areas. (Other NW Utility)

They do a good job of transferring technology and moving the market in energy efficiency. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA is a great organization and has definitely moved the market for energy efficient products in the Pacific NW. Trouble is we have difficulty convincing management of the value of joining NEEA. (Other NW Utility)

I think NEEA is doing good work in the region. Perhaps the work product doesn't easily communicate to the sector. (Other NW Utility)

Pros are personal zeal on part of staff. Cons are they are not very deep in energy backgrounds. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA has been a leader in conservation strategies and is almost always receptive to trying new methods and approaches. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA has been a key player in the Northwest's conservation efforts. Their efforts have had a significant impact on the conservation efforts of the City including areas such as Energy Star New Construction, Cols, Energy Codes and Ductless Heat Pumps. I'm sure I'm missing some. I have found their staff to be very committed to providing the best information, programs and services that will help the region - and a willingness to change to keep pace with new technologies and the market. I appreciate their ongoing efforts to look for better and faster ways to meet the ever growing demand for power in the Northwest. (Other NW Utility)

I think NEEA does a very good job of aligning their interests with those of the BPA. I do not think there is a very good understanding of the challenges the utilities face in energy efficiency/conservation at either level. Often times there seem to be double standards set for the third party organizations. Incentive levels change, the utilities must have different documentation for recording installed measures and are held to stricter M&V protocol, to name a few. (Other NW Utility)

Have not had much experience with NEEA other than some phone contact and hearing about NEEA involvement from other utility personnel, which has been positive. (Other NW Utility)

Good guess. (Other NW Utility)

The way they communicate with us. (Other NW Utility)

They are instrumental in promoting energy efficiency which is key to attaining energy efficiency in the NW. (Other NW Utility)

I feel that the organization does a good job regionally, big picture, items that influence markets and options, and don't have direct dealings with direct programs they provide. Nothing negative, I am just familiar with the big picture items we provide. Not that familiar with specific activities. (Other NW Utility)

They send a lot of information my way, and emails, they're always telling us something new. (Other NW Utility)

I don't have much correspondence or connection. (Other NW Utility)

The people are easy to work with. (Other NW Utility)

Part of a bureaucracy. (Other NW Utility)

I think it's very good program they have given us a lot of very good data to work with. (Other NW Utility)

I appreciate the way they have learned to work with the local utilities, so everyone is on the same page, it allows their programs (education / training) to be more effective. I appreciate the programs they've developed in the training of energy management. (Other NW Utility)

We are a small utility, they are helpful for us I know they are very helpful on working on projects for the region. (Other NW Utility)

For market transformation activities, the awareness for energy efficiency and the need. (Other NW Utility)

Well I think they do a good job, they meet a niche in the Northwest of energy conservation they are a tie between manufacturers and NEEA. NEEA is an entity that works upstream to the manufacturers to the code people and they do good work that way. I would also like to see them work more downstream towards the end user and be more involved with utilities and or consumers. And I know they can't really be involved with the consumers, but how they could do it is through the utilities to get the information. I think they do a good job overall. And go upstream persuade the manufacturers to build more energy efficient appliances. They don't do much work downstream, more to the end user. (Other NW Utility)

Lack of understanding of them and what they do. (Other NW Utility)

Energy efficiency. (Other NW Utility)

Working closely with building operators and owners on low-cost and no-cost measures that produce immediate savings. (Non-Utility)

The strong regional presence that is leveraged by existing stakeholders. The only reason I didn't give a 7 is because I feel some work could be done with stakeholder management and increased personal communication at a program level. (Non-Utility)

To the extent I have interacted with NEEA, the people I have worked with are generally of high quality and the program elements seem reasonably well thought-out and have a reasonable chance of achieving the goals. (Non-Utility)

The NEEA team is very smart and well-intended. They are not perfect; as they often let their brains get in the way of their efforts. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has made a difference in the Northwest. (Non-Utility)

Great staff, good work, challenging structure and environment. (Non-Utility)

National leader. Superb programs. Real results. (Non-Utility)

On the right track to influence market transformation. (Non-Utility)

NEEA does not always seem to listen to their funders/stakeholders. This can be a barrier in managing a NEEA program. When funders/stakeholders feel unheard, we become their sounding boards and have to spend substantial time working with NEEA to navigate these situations in order to proceed with the program objectives. I want to believe that the recent rebrand will help remedy this. At the same time, I wonder how quickly this perception can change. Another key reason is that NEEA does not always leverage all avenues with which to promote their work in the region. It is a shame when NEEA funders and stakeholders are unaware of what NEEA funds, supports, etc. Similarly, there are missed opportunities in which NEEA could provide visibility of their work and processes to their funders/stakeholders. Given that NEEA came to be in a period of potential de-regulation that never came to full fruition, it would seem that NEEA has a vested interest in defining and promoting how they add value in the region. (Non-Utility)

I feel NEEA is trying to leverage their funder's contributions in the most effective and efficient way possible while being aware of the myriad of coordination issues that must take place with other stakeholders in the region. I feel NEEA does a very good job of leveraging the expertise of third parties rather than try and build a large staff to do the same (and incurring more overhead). (Non-Utility)

Good research and reports, good support of initiatives to further energy efficiency education. (Non-Utility)

Significant accomplishments, utility participation and funding maintained. Willingness to take on new responsibilities needed by the region. Fills an important niche in the efficiency acquisition strategy. (Non-Utility)

Knowledgeable staff, successful programs, forward-looking approach, influence in and beyond the Northwest. Commitment to reduction of energy use and transforming markets. (Non-Utility)

Doing great work to advance energy efficiency on behalf of the entire NW. (Non-Utility)

The caliber of the staff is outstanding. Mission of energy efficiency is impressive and single-minded. Initiatives are ambitious and usually forward-thinking. (Non-Utility)

Robust internal controls and external review. Good analytic skills. Forward looking. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has taken great steps in the last few years to become more effective. From hiring stronger management and employees to reducing its Board size to investing in a deliberate strategic planning process to focusing on process and operational improvements; all the while interacting professionally with many different and complex stakeholder relationships. The direction is good, the momentum is positive and it comes across that way when I reflect on NEEA. (Non-Utility)

Overall mission is impressive. Implementation leaves things to be desired. Leadership (management) is questionable. (Non-Utility)

NEEA plays an important leadership role in crafting new EE initiatives for the region. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has provided me with many of my key information needs. (Non-Utility)

I have worked with NEEA as a contractor for two years, and I am extremely impressed by the level of leadership demonstrated by the organization. I am also impressed with NEEA's ability as a visionary organization to successfully implement and execute EE programs. (Non-Utility)

NEEA plays an important role in the region, but sometimes seems a little slow and insular. (Non-Utility)

Good staff, clear mission, over-hauled the organization in recent past to ensure focus on products that are most important to its participants. (Non-Utility)

The leadership and management structure is better organized to understand the mission and build a plan to fulfill it than it has been in years past. The staff through the directors and the leadership of the ex-director in particular are focused and becoming results oriented. The staff has a commitment to success and they understand without it they will

not exist. They're looking to establish fair and honest criteria by which the successes of programs can be judged. The staff and a few of the board members still do not speak and act as if they are truly cognizant that the funders are not utilities of BPA but rather the ratepayers of the utilities. More evaluation should consider this fact and more effort should be spent engaging and building awareness among the true funders. (Non-Utility)

NEEA's ability to effect energy efficiency further up the pipeline gives the region a much bigger bang for their buck, so to speak. (Non-Utility)

High caliber people at NEEA have the perspective of a regional market place (rather than individual utility service territory). I appreciate how they work to leverage the region to enact change/progression in both standards and in the market place. (Non-Utility)

Success in market transformation in several sectors. (Non-Utility)

Quality of staff. New staff hires. Mission-driven staff. Strong and thoughtful executive director. (Non-Utility)

Excellent concept, well executed, cutting edge. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has a dedicated and talented staff who exhibit a genuine commitment to energy efficiency. They by and large take a market focused approach to their work, make reasonable attempts at regional equity, and are committed to on-going evaluation of their work. (Non-Utility)

Good programs but bureaucratic. (Non-Utility)

The organization should focus more on designing and supporting meaningful conservation programs that deliver savings and less on repeating nostrums such as "market transformation". (Non-Utility)

Experience with programmatic interactions in the commercial and industrial sectors over the years. Most of my interaction has been with NEEA's industrial team, which is quite favorable (especially recently). And unless otherwise specified, my answers will be based on this experience. (Non-Utility)

I don't think they always provide the service we need, and they always expect more from our company than the services we need. (Non-Utility)

I think NEEA does important work. The current definition of the market transformation approach needs revision. (Non-Utility)

The NEEA team that I interact with continually demonstrates clear objectives, knowledge and direction for projects and the organization. I see the teams I work with as flexible to meet market needs and dedicated to providing quality service to the market and

stakeholders. I find this approach to be valuable in this industry and thus have a very positive opinion and impression of NEEA. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has taken leadership in implementing great EE technologies. One such technology is the DHP technology in the Pacific NW. (Non-Utility)

Well informed and strategic leadership to move cutting edge initiatives forward, excellent collaboration with market interests as well as other NGOs working towards similar goals. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has been gradually moved toward a role as a regional coordinator and resource. This role is (in my view) substantively different than market transformation devotion that had been the role in the first 6 or 7 years of its existence. The current goals seem to be moving toward a regional organizer of research and support for both the planning and program design needed by the Council and the regions utilities. Implied is a somewhat different relationship with the region's utilities which has been evolving in the last few years but which has to develop further to provide the leadership that the region and its utilities need. I see this process as partially done moving in the right direction. (Non-Utility)

They are a leader in the energy efficiency field, very innovative, they have a strong passion for what they believe in. (Non-Utility)

I believe the people there are sincere in their efforts to create an atmosphere in the Northwest of energy efficiency through market excellent transformation efforts. (Non-Utility)

The help that we have been given in our continuous energy improvement programs. (Non-Utility)

They have been very supportive, very specific goal oriented, result oriented. Very businesslike without regards to personal feelings. (Non-Utility)

Focused on the objective. (Non-Utility)

Great leadership, planning, implementation, evaluation and improvement. (Non-Utility)

NEEA is doing good work. They are generally headed in the right direction, and it appears as though strategic thinking is involved. NEEA did not get a 7 because I have concerns about the growth and how it will impact our business as a contractor. Will NEEA begin competing for work against its contractors to feed the growth? This hurt WECC when they branched out and now respect for their work has gone away. I don't want to see that for NEEA. I also have heard a lot of rumors on the street about employee morale at NEEA that is concerning. Once the negative morale goes beyond the walls of operation it is harder to recover from, and that has happened to NEEA. (Non-Utility)

They execute a unique role for EE in the NW. (Non-Utility)

NEEA was instrumental in getting us funding and support in launching our energy program. (Non-Utility)

Large staff turnover, quality is staff is good. (Non-Utility)

They're great people. They're in alignment of many of our core objectives as a business. They provide great products for the industry. (Non-Utility)

Innovative market moving programs that are specific and based in understanding each market and technology targeted in depth. Strong experienced and creative staff. Sponsor interesting research. (Non-Utility)

Organized, trustworthy, excellent mission. (Non-Utility)

Effectiveness at achieving market transformation goals, cost effective, and effectively coordinating regional interest. (Non-Utility)

They do a great job in their evaluative process. They have been extremely good at implementing efficiency measures. I governance hasn't improved in any way. (Non-Utility)

I think they are very confident But I believe they could be better. I believe they are overall bureaucratic. Lack of clear understanding of their mission, and another way to say that, they try to do too much. (Non-Utility)

Everyone has been really helpful; communicate well on what they're working on. (Non-Utility)

Quality people, they have a focused mission. (Non-Utility)

They do a good job of putting conservation in this area. (Non-Utility)

I think they do a good job, I believe they have relationship issues in their region that they need to improve on. (Non-Utility)

It appears they do some good things; it isn't all useful to me. (Non-Utility)

Outreach in the commercial sector, technical assistance in the commercial building sector. (Non-Utility)

I feel that the organization has the same objectives as my company. (Non-Utility)

They just doubled their budget, and seem really focused on pushing high goals. It's a unique niche they're trying to occupy, that is market transformation, that has great potential, but is difficult to do, and I am pleased with their records so far. (Non-Utility)

Good programs, they could have better interaction with the states and local government doing some more work. (Non-Utility)

I don't have too much interaction with them. (Non-Utility)

It's primarily about the organizations principal design that they are filling a niche in the energy efficiency implementation that no one else covers, and they do a good job. (Non-Utility)

The BetterBricks program has been fantastic. They have supported many of our goals, with great ideas. Good Staff, knowledgeable staff. (Non-Utility)

I think they've done a good job transforming the energy efficiency market place and I think they've done a good job getting their plans and energy efficiency work plan together to meet the power council's 6th power plant. (Non-Utility)

Penetration and effectiveness. (Non-Utility)

I believe in its mission and believe that the staff is generally of very high caliber. (Non-Utility)

I think that NEEA has a real impact on the market transformation and getting energy efficiency out there. I think they should market themselves better to get the information out there. (Non-Utility)

Provides good information, encourager of energy conservation, positive force in that area. (Non-Utility)

They've been very effective for energy efficiency transformation, but they can still work a little better on who they serve. (Non-Utility)

They provide great services. (Non-Utility)

NEEA is charged with transforming the marketplace. NEEA is successful in that regard. The Pacific Northwest leads the nation in energy efficient building design. NEEA promotes integrated design and education for professionals. NEEA supports research to continue improvements in building energy efficiency. (Non-Utility)

From what I understand they run very efficient market transformations, they have well designed programs, they have a good collaborative approach and they get a fair amount done. (Non-Utility)

Proactive, innovative, non-bureaucratic, and motivated. (Non-Utility)

NEEA provides a great service in promoting the uptake of new products and services, but appears to be moving towards a mostly technology/widget solution, which has historically been a utility function. (Non-Utility)

The work that NEEA does in the energy codes arena is excellent, the work it has done in the commercial sector through the BBW is very good but I understand they are changing that. The work that NEEA has done in the Energy Star homes program from the point of view of this organization is pretty good, however the work the NEEA does in the industrial sector, I am not too impressed with it. BBW = BetterBricks Website. (Non-Utility)

It was because mainly getting the industrial side sometimes I have a little bit of a concern with their definition of what constitutes an industrial. They try to put the high-techs into the industrial and I have a little bit of a program with that. I would not consider the High Tech as industrial, they are more heavy commercial. (Non-Utility)

NEEA does a good job at running their program, good overall strategies, internal systems and accounting and budget management make some of their efforts difficult. (Non-Utility)

At this time, my experience with NEEA only relates to the program that I work on. I find this program to be highly beneficial to both the industrial sectors it targets and to the greater efforts of promoting energy efficiency. My only criticism is that it primarily focuses on the benefits to business and I would like to see energy savings framed in a more positive fashion outside of this. Green thinking for the benefit of the planet should not be seen as potentially off putting. These two concepts are not mutually exclusive, but can be better put together to strengthen the core of the program. (Non-Utility)

Their leadership and knowledge, expertise. Easy to work with, excellent staff. Willingness to go first and take chances. (Non-Utility)

I think NEEA has a history of being and having effective market transformation programs and that they have a good record of demonstrative efficiency achievements. (Non-Utility)

I associate NEEA with BetterBricks and the Lighting Design Labs in Boise and Portland. I have had excellent contact & support working with the IDL in Boise. In Portland, I have never been able to have meaningful contact even though I live, and mostly, work in Oregon. I subscribe to several e-newsletters. The course offerings supported by NEEA through BetterBricks look wonderful & enticing. Unfortunately, most occur away from my primary work area in Central Oregon. (Non-Utility)

Unique beneficial organization, but sometimes too reactionary rather than visionary. (Non-Utility)

I think that NEEA is playing an important role in the region. NEEA provides value to the region that would be difficult for individual utilities to achieve alone. It's only a six and not higher, because I think that NEEA is not as integrated internally as it could be. In addition, NEEA seems understaffed in some areas, so it can't always come through with its full potential. Many things that NEEA does are great, but some activities are superficial. (Non-Utility)

They're getting cheap energy savings, transforming the market. Effective at coordinating utilities and delivering programs. (Non-Utility)

Negative / Neutral Ratings (1-4)

Because of NEEA's growth, they are now in a position where the region relies more heavily on their savings and research activities. Despite this more prominent role, staff seems to not understand that they need to communicate more with utilities and understand better how utilities do business. Sometimes staff seems out of touch of how utilities operate. (Direct Funder)

Inconsistent or poor communication with stakeholders (utilities). (Direct Funder)

NEEA's reporting of details needed for utilities appears to be very ad hoc, without consistency, strategy or input from stakeholders of what they need. Savings has not been delivered as expected, i.e., CFL reductions in reported savings that were presented earlier this year. I believe NEEA is engaging in initiatives not where they are best suited to provide the most value to the region. (Direct Funder)

Too much money is spent on staffing, meetings and travel. They make promises they don't keep. They are constantly asking for more money. (Direct Funder)

NEEA initiatives are focused primarily on the urban rather than the rural service areas. (Direct Funder)

Dilution of information to stakeholders. The slower pace of "action". (Direct Funder)

From my interactions with NEEA there seems to very little involvement at the Utility level before the initiatives are released. (Direct Funder)

Follow through and customer contact without utility knowledge. (Direct Funder)

Program design the gets out to the field doesn't work sometimes and we try to explain but the answer back is that's the way NEEA's engineers have figured. We need a program for all customers to be able to weatherize their homes. We also need a more incentivized heat pump program we should be incenting. Closer to 30 percent instead of 1 percent or 2 percent. We are spending a lot of money in overhead to maintain some programs that add no value. (Direct Funder)

Duplicates other utility work. Counts savings in an inflated and over-optimistic way. Spends a lot of money for questionable results. Pays employees too much relative to public utility employees in the region. Mission is unclear. (Direct Funder)

NEEA appears more interested in taking credit for work done than doing the work. It seems the funders and their staff are many times left to do the heavy lifting on initiatives they have provided NEEA funding to deliver while NEEA is out looking to engage and take on additional tasks that might have more visibility. NEEA can be a hindrance rather than acting in support of allowing the funders to deliver on the funders mission and goals. NEEA has a great role to support their funders if it can stick to and deliver it. Many times now it seems NEEA thinks the funders are there to support it rather than NEEA existing to support the funders. (Direct Funder)

level of helpfulness, my work is to ensure energy conservation, the degree which they do to produce energy conservation. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is managing its resources to support higher levels of energy efficiency in the NW. That's great, but it is not always clear that NEEA understands its value-added role or that it needs to be accountable to NW rate payers. Why does it look that way? 1) It duplicates the work of existing utility funders or overlaps with them in a not particularly collaborative manner. 2) Some, though not the majority, of the staff can be arrogant and dismissive when the EE industry needs to be collaborative. 3) NEEA's funding increased, but where are the savings - even in the longer term? (Direct Funder)

It's mixed, because it seems some of things that they are funding aren't supporting the things that we're doing our customers. Sometimes the consultants they hire aren't the best quality, but that's just sometimes. They do a good job of getting out there supporting training. I don't actually know how much money we spend on them, they have actually been fairly supportive of my particular program but I have heard from higher management that that we may not be getting our money's worth. (Direct Funder)

They focus in the area that isn't my interest. They are doing a good job what they're working for example; they spend a lot resource on relating to industrial, food processing, and a lot of focus on this area. Need more on light manufacturing. " (Direct Funder)

I think the organization tries to serve; too many masters and individual utilities needs cannot be met. (Direct Funder)

How they claim they are energy efficient and achieve the amount of savings they take credit for, and how they distribute that within all the different people who contribute all the different organizations to NEEA. I think what they do is important. I think that they, a lot of people are so obsessed with taking credit for something, that it can kind of hurt the credibility sometimes, but I do think what they do (NEEA) is important. (Direct Funder)

They have been slow to respond to needs, there's been a lack of communication and lack of action on their part in their delay in ability to move forward. When you ask for something, for information or if you ask them to lead out on a collaborated approach it goes into a black hole, you don't hear anything. They have been going internal to design systems and processes and with that have become a shortcoming of dealing with external entities. (Direct Funder)

They do ok, I just use them occasionally, they're out there and that's it. (Direct Funder)

Questionable value, clarity of roles, high priced and lack of clarity for roles. (Direct Funder)

I don't know. (Direct Funder)

Big organization, not clear what it is doing. Seems to be trying to do everything. Not sure it's about market transformation, no attention to rural utilities. (Other NW Utility)

ROI being what it is. BPA pays you \$11 plus million a year and this is going to increase over the next several years. Prior to NEEA, this money went to utilities to fund programs, hire people to run programs, etc. Our utility managers were mindful that this was rate payer money. BPA had heavy oversight. NEEA in my view is simply overhead and duplication. NEEA doesn't have enough oversight with what you do with money. There is a need for some of the things you do, but you are basically another layer that we don't need. Show me the direct benefit you provide to the end user (excluding CFLs). (Other NW Utility)

NEEA serves fairly well as a regional coordinator in more urban areas but I feel is lacking in the ability to coordinate in more rural settings. (Other NW Utility)

Ineffective system deficient in initiative or results. (Other NW Utility)

Trainings are not reaching Montana. Circuit Rider has been vacant. Only representation in Montana has been Northwestern. Recently Bill Drummond has been added. (Other NW Utility)

That is just my impression. (Other NW Utility)

We are a small utility and their emphasis doesn't help our situation. (Other NW Utility)

I'm not sure how to answer that one. I guess generically I always have concerns with intellectual honesty. (Other NW Utility)

I believe that they have a very challenging task ahead of them. As they do it I believe one of the reason I gave them a 4, I believe they are trying to sell a product and they don't incur all of the costs in their calculations. (Other NW Utility)

Well as I said, I am not all that familiar with it, I have seen a lot of the communication that they have put out over the years and I get a general favorable communication of that and the work that they are doing. (Other NW Utility)

I don't a lot about them, and what I do know about their conservation and their environmental efforts, it is positive. (Other NW Utility)

Because I am not very familiar with it at all. (Other NW Utility)

1.) NEEA has changed/diluted its mission: 1.A)NEEA is more "reactive" to funder's short term needs and less of a long term leader. 1. B) Turnover of staff and addition of new staff has resulted in a loss of institutional knowledge, and staff that are less familiar with the energy efficiency industry in general -- and a clear understanding of the difference (and interactions) between market transformation and resource acquisition. 2.) NEEA's Industrial group has a goal of establishing more service providers in industrial energy management -- which is inappropriate. I understand an organization like NEEA developing the market by helping fund a new technology, or creating market demand for a service - which both enhances the market. However, explicitly creating new competitors in the market is too heavy of a hand in the market. On a more positive note -- NEEA has been a significant local, national, and international leader in energy efficiency and I look forward to seeing NEEA continue to be a strong leader. (Non-Utility)

The organizational model is not collaborative. While other service providers (utilities, states and local governments) are limited more and more with fiscal cuts, NEEA receives higher budgets, more staff and gets new brand identify every couple years. That's lots of public funds spent on NEEA that doesn't come back to the public. I just don't see NEEA doing much for the public. The programs are egocentric, Portland-centric, and have a national rather than regional intent. The region needs leadership that works with the other service providers to deliver a broad package of services to the public. (Non-Utility)

BOMA and NEEA have partnered on energy efficiency programs for close to 5 years. We have been very successful educating BOMA members on energy efficiency measures. A number of BOMA member buildings have received a 75 or higher in Energy Star. (Non-Utility)

Lack of commitment to respectful vendor engagement. (Non-Utility)

Hard to tell just what they do. (Non-Utility)

Unaware of how they fit in into the regional dab administration. (Non-Utility)

They do not seem to make a driven decision. (Non-Utility)

I am not sure that they are clear on their direction. I think they are moving away from commercial building sectors and that has been my relationship with them for many years. I understand that they are moving away from that, and I think that is a lost opportunity. I

think they are trying to understand where they are going in future, and there may be some sense of confusion. I am referring to the BetterBricks Program. (Non-Utility)

Lack of knowledge. I have a positive attitude towards the goal of energy efficiency. (Non-Utility)

Lack of implementing mission. (Non-Utility)

Q14. Which energy efficiency products, services, or practices has NEEA recently been successful in accelerating the market adoption of? Please be as specific as possible.

Direct Funders

Ductless heat pumps.

CEI. I have also heard a lot about CFLs.

DHP.

They have been highly successful with Consumer Electronics that took a nationwide effort to influence the market.

Heat pump, water heaters.

CFLs. Ductless Heat Pumps.

NEEA is doing an excellent job on the Conduit project and did a great job facilitating the Puget Sound lighting fixture study.

Residential CFLs.

Compact Fluorescents.

Ductless Heat Pumps.

Ductless Heat Pumps.

CFLs, Industrial O&M practices, consumer electronics.

CFLs.

Consumer electronics.

80+ power supplies ES TVs CFLs.

Ductless Heat Pumps Consumer Electronics (TV's).

Residential mass market - cal, clothes washers (and through retailers, other appliances), emerging with computers and TVs Commercial - training for the design community Industrial - Strategic energy management.

CFLs, front load washers, next gen heat pumps.

Historically, CFL and other lighting measures. Some industrial applications and programs have also been successful. Recently, more work on appliances and computer (80 Plus) measures.

ENERGY STAR Homes, CFLs, Cold Climate DHP, Building Operator Certification, Lighting Design. I am sure there are more, these are the ones I am most involved in.

Ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps, energy-efficient electronics.

I don't know specifically. Just a general impression.

Energy management systems.

DHP's.

CFLs.

Recently NEEA's contractor [BUSINESS NAME] provided excellent market adoption support for Ductless Heat Pumps. NEEA's continued support of Energy Star Homes has provided the consistency needed to keep the new homes market focused on ESTAR construction.

Efficient TVs, CFLs, ductless heat pumps.

CFLs, green motors, ductless heat pump training, building operator certification.

CFLs.

CFLs

Windows Industrial Energy management Clothes washers Power supplies CFLs Energy Star Homes and building code vfd's in controlled atmosphere warehouses CVR.

CFLs, 80 Plus, new code adoption, influence of federal standards, influence of manufacturers for higher efficiency TVs, Food Processors in NW, ductless heat pumps,

Ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps, compact florescent light bulbs and TVs

Energy efficiency designations for appliances and other commercial products, efficient lighting, etc.

Cols, ductless heat pumps, voltage management, efficient residential appliances, efficient computer power supplies, strategic energy management.

Ductless heat pumps. Ad plus transformers.

Compact florescent light bulbs. The BetterBricks program.

TV, high efficiency electronics.

Consumer electronics. Ductless heat pumps..

CFL, ductless heat pumps. NEEA helped in the analysis with the Washington State Energy code.

CFLs, that's the big one.

Ductless heat pump, residential lighting, electronics and plug loads, appliance rebates.

Ad plus, computer energy supply. Electronics. Excellent clearing house on information for energy code standards and policy. BetterBricks awards.

Consumer electronics, codes and standards.

CFL, ductless heat pumps, Televisions, integrated design. Architectural design, strategic energy management.

Electronics. Ductless heat pumps and water heaters.

Large commercial buildings, maintenance for efficiency.

The electronics adoption, flat screen TV. The code changes and updates to codes.

The promotion of energy conservation through lighting.

I think they're continuing energy improving project or industrial energy management that seems to have some impact in the region. That's the one most notable to me.

They're in the industrial programs and I don't recall the exact name- they've worked in concert with other platters in the industrial arenas, there was a training program they were involved in. They have been active and successful in the residential with home electronics; those are the primary ones that come to mind.

Compact Fluorescent Light bulbs or CFLS ductless heat pumps. ENERGY STAR HOMES.

Efficient windows, ductless heat pumps.

I would say industrial energy management. Advance design in commercial new construction and awareness of savings opportunities in building operations.

Ductless heat pumps, consumer electronics.

Their involvement in roof top unit improvements.

The ductless Heat pumps, I would say they had an impact on that. And I know they are trying to make an impact in other areas, but I haven't seen the results.

Ductless heat pumps.

The consumer electronics, ductless heat pumps.

They have Compact Fluorescent Light bulbs (CFLs), more recently Home Electronics and specifically within that is televisions. There is the BetterBricks Program, which has to do with commercial buildings. Agriculture, industry. One last one would be New Home Construction. No codes are in standard.

Compact fluorescent lamps, the ductless heat pump, 80plus power supply.

CFLs, horizontal washing machines, power supplies, hospital market.

Computers, a little with the building sectors, like hospitals, variable speed motors.

The CFLs, ductless heat pumps.

Compact fluorescents, television, washers, windows, building codes, industrial management practices.

Other NW Utilities

Ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps.

CFLs.

They accelerated the market for Energy Star appliances and compact fluorescent lights.

Ductless heat pumps.

Hi-efficiency home electronics, ductless heat pumps, heat pump water heaters.

DHPs are the most recent products that NEEA has helped bring to the NW. And the current regional pilot project for DHPs has brought the product to the consumers and contactors attention.

Ductless heat pump.

Lighting some codes building and specific equipment medical facilities some white goods.

NEEA, through Better bricks and their consultants, has taken a very active role in the evolution of the Seattle 2030 District, a collaboration of public and private sector working to reduce energy use over 50 percent in Seattle's central business district and surrounding neighborhoods.

New Energy Codes and the Energy Star program have just recently been implemented Ductless Heat Pumps are taking off across the Northwest. CFLs and LEDs are both ongoing success stories.

Ductless Heat Pumps, Duct Testing and Sealing, CFL lighting, Energy Efficient Appliances.

Ductless Heat Pumps. Energy Star Homes has been a failure in our area.

Compact florescent lighting, ductless heat pumps, those are the ones that most closely come to mind. Building codes/energy codes.

Ductless heat pumps.

Solar.

Ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps and any other programs they have been involved with.

Comprehensive energy management, ductless heat pumps. CEI program and trainings.

One off the top of my head is the "Ductless Heat Pumps."

The CFLs.

Wind and solar.

Well CFL here in the northwest, I give them a huge credit to that and I know it's been a decade but it is still huge. I would say appliances. Currently where I am lining here is, I am waiting to get more info on (HEAT PUMP WATER HEATERS), and it is a little bit of a slow process. I am not sure of their total involvement, however I am sure there are other players involved, and that is the one that I am waiting for.

I would say the white appliances. Refrigerators, stoves, washer, dryer etc.

Ductless heat pumps.

Non-Utilities

Kilowatt Crackdown program for O&M measures. Education of building operators who are responsible for persistence of energy savings.

Ductless heat pump.

CFLs, 80 Plus, Energy Star Home Products, Commercial building integrated design, Industrial energy management.

Ductless heat pumps washers' computer controls CFLs waste treatment bio option.

DHP

My involvement has been related to the FDSI Service Assistant. NEEA has been very helpful to us.

Strategic energy management.

Codes and standards. High performance building design.

Consumer electronics, commercial buildings, heat pump technologies.

Energy Star appliances, energy efficient windows, CFLs, 80+ computer power suppliers, building management certification, industrial pumps, motors and compressor training programs. Water treatment systems optimization, ES Homes (very slow to implement), hospital energy efficiency initiatives. KPIs in the industrial sector. BetterBricks support for the integrated design labs.

Integrated design approaches for commercial building target markets.

Continuous Energy Improvement in the industrial sector. The practice of developing and having an energy management system in the Industrial sector. 80 PLUS load solutions. Green motors and green pumps. ENERGY STAR New Homes. Ductless Heat Pumps.

Behavior based efficiency programs in both the commercial and industrial sectors (CEI-based programs). Also, consumer electronics is a new opportunity for the region that NEEA has introduced.

Northwest energy star, better bricks, IDL.

Efficient lighting washing machines.

CFLs, clothes washers, impact on improved codes and standards.

CFLs, DHPs, New Homes.

Residential products such as CFLs; commercial building services such as integrated design, natural ventilation and day lighting.

Strategic energy management practices collaborative energy reduction goal setting/planning.

Continuous Energy Improvement Consumer Electronics, DHP's.

Energy Star acceptance by commercial real estate market.

Ductless heat pumps.

Roof top equipment diagnostic tool and software. Commercial building. M&V software. Building tune-up philosophy.

CFLs.

I have worked directly with NEEA's E2C program which has accelerated adoption of EE practices in healthcare facility management. Currently 27.5 million square feet of the region's healthcare facilities are actively being benchmarked and targeted for 10 percent energy reduction in 2011.

PCs, lighting, Energy Star Homes.

Ductless heat pumps, work with food processors, efficient computers, home rating systems, codes.

Lighting, the Envinta one-to-five program for industrials, irrigation improvements from an electrical usage standpoint the front load washing machine.

A motor, codes and standards, building commissioning, the list goes on.

Energy efficient computers, power supplies, CFLs, new homes.

CFLs, computer power supplies, heat pumps, building codes

Specialty CFL and previously regular CFLs. DHP TV, home products (dishwasher, clothes washer), windows, industrial energy mgmt (CEI).

Awareness, energy policies, management plans, broad continuum of policy adoption & implementation throughout given organizations.

For the commercial sector, they have had success in developing market awareness of and adoption of improved business practices in a number of key markets including healthcare and commercial real estate. In industrial, there is evidence of market shifts for continuous energy improvement. For residential, their historical role with CFLs is well documented, but they also shown gains in a basket of appliance efficiency areas as well as ductless heat pumps. There has been a surge of progress in regional energy codes which is also at least partially attributable to NEEA.

Integrated design, life cycle costing, benchmarking, day lighting (through the IDL).

Industrial energy efficiency and management.

Hospital improvements.

Consumer electronics and ductless heat pumps.

Ductless heat pumps, CFLs, many other residential products.

Consumer electronics, ductless mini-splits, SSL and other high efficiency lighting products, motors, residential appliances (washers, refrigerators, etc.)

The DHP program is a great model. The HPWH shows promise.

Efficient electronics, like TV's and the heat pump water heater.

Commercial Building, adoption of efficiency in the commercial area, not familiar with the residential.

Training meetings for people directly involved with purchasing and servicing electrical equipment.

Without NEEA the green motors would not exist, wouldn't be able to move forward, they help us develop partially from their help and stake holders.

CEI.

This is a tough question. I believe market adoption and market transformation are separate issues and transformation should be what this question is about. If NEEA analyzed the market transformation of its programs post completion or exit I do not believe transformation has occurred on many. BetterBricks became competition in the eyes of the market and hindered transformation, however, adoption went well. Lighting has been adopted, but we are stagnant on transformation and NEEA's exit from this technology actually has influenced negative behavior for other technologies such as televisions using transaction based incentives to shift a market. Will CEI trainings have a viable market without NEEA? Will CEI have a viable market? Will ENERGY STAR Homes have a viable market without NEEA? Will ductless heat pumps have a viable market without NEEA? All three have achieved good adoption rates, but NEEA's politics with utilities and slow movement on innovation of methods hinders transformation.

CFL, Computer power supplies, hospital energy efficiency. Industrial energy efficiency alliance.

CFLs.

The ductless heat pumps.

Industrial energy efficiency.

Backend, ductless air conditioning.

Benchmarking - putting specific properties on multiple case studies.

CFLs, CVR, ductless heat pumps etc.

Increased focus on moisture and envelope issues, Energy Star promotion, promoting CFLs, AIA+2030 professional education

CFL light bulbs, commercial and industrial lighting.

(CFL) Compact fluorescent Lamps.

Integrated design process, heat pump technologies.

Heat pump water heaters, efficient electronics.

We work in a different way; we're not about the widget that transforms the market. We are about the architects, how the architects receive the tools and info through NEEA to design energy efficiency buildings. They are providing information and tools to assist the architects in designing energy efficiency buildings.

Federal appliance standards.

Operations and maintenance.

Compact Fluorescent Lights. T8 Lighting Products. That's about all that I can think of.

Energy efficiency in buildings, commercial construction. Lighting technology, building envelope and day lighting.

Probably new code implementation or working on a new rich code.

Heat pump water heaters, active in hospitals WE/ nothing else

CFLs, some industrial efforts,

Compact florescent light bulbs.

Ductless mini splits.

The BetterBricks program, the energy benchmarking assistance, cooperation with educational programs. BetterBricks award.

Refrigeration tune-ups in the grocery group.

Hospital energy efficiency and industrial energy efficiency in terms of practices.

Compact fluorescents are the best example.

CFLs.

Consumer electronics, commercial lighting.

The kilowatt crackdown and their partnership with us around the electricity. Their reports are quite good.

NEEA has accelerated the market adoption of the "Regulator" a day lighting system refined and improved by research and collaboration with the Energy Studies in Buildings Lab. Architects and engineers who use NEEA's IDL services are much more knowledgeable about energy efficient building design.

Ductless Heat Pumps, New construction practices. I think also the stuff on those guys with home electronics.

Day lighting, integrated design.

IEA.

Compact Fluorescent Light bulbs (CFLs) and Mini Split Ductless Heat Pumps; Those are the two big successes.

The ones I am most familiar with is the use of drive power initiative; using energy efficient motors.

Energy efficient motor rewind. Building operator certification.

Compact florescent, CFLs, residential clothes washer and television.

I think one of their biggest successes is their front loading washing machines. I think they are beginning to have success in ductless heat pump works. And those are the ones that I am most familiar with. Well they most likely have others, but those are the ones that I am most familiar with.

Do not know.

I guess I'm pretty ignorant on this one. As to services, the Boise Lighting Lab provides free and low-cost day lighting model analysis; they open their lab for designers & architects to get meaningful feedback on the energy needs of their projects. NEEA supports the Sustainable Building Advisor Course in several locations, including Bend, Oregon. In both these examples, direct education of leaders in the community will accelerate change.

Ductless heat pumps.

Horizontal access closed washers, variable speed motors. Good examples, I guess grocery refrigeration units.

Q26a. What has occurred during the past year to cause your general opinion of NEEA to become (more/less positive)? Please be as specific as possible.

More positive

Dave Krista's work with us on developing the Conduit web site. He's doing a great job getting and using our input. (Direct Funder)

[NAME] feedback has been very positive. (Direct Funder)

Regional portfolio council was a great idea. Also appreciated the field visits. (Direct Funder)

I started participating in conference calls. (Direct Funder)

More ability to offer input. Communication. (Direct Funder)

I have worked with the BetterBricks and Fluid Marketing most recently and they have provided excellent assistance and support for an Energy conference for our state and assistance with the Cold climate Ductless Heat Pumps. (Direct Funder)

As I got more involved in the programs, listening to conference calls about the programs and seeing the results, I am impressed. (Direct Funder)

More awareness. (Direct Funder)

NEEC (maybe that was two years ago...) NWRG - We needed someone to host meetings (set agendas, moderate meetings, etc.) and NEEA stepped into that role graciously. (Direct Funder)

NEEA is working with regional utilities toward a set of common standards for solid state lighting. (Direct Funder)

Our organization had been isolated from NEEA. As a direct investor, we are much more aware of what is underway. (Direct Funder)

Being on Board has given me greater knowledge and insights of activities and accomplishments. (Direct Funder)

NEEA has made significant governance changes, recruited a new CEO, and reached out to our industry in ways that are making our partnership more effective. (Direct Funder)

I have made more time to engage NEEA activities and participated in the annual Board meeting. (Direct Funder)

Coordination meeting on emerging technologies. Coordination in commercial new construction. (Direct Funder)

They increased their focus on training, and decided to spend less time with handpicked design teams. (Direct Funder)

Change of leadership in the C/I sector and a willingness to dialog and hopefully consider and respond. Time will tell. (Direct Funder)

Their efforts to seek input. (Direct Funder)

I've been working at the utility, and I've gotten to get more knowledge about them.
(Direct Funder)

I started working with them. (Direct Funder)

The value that NEEA brought in coordinating utility input into the Washington state process. (Direct Funder)

We rejoined as a direct funder, so we started getting some attention again, and our input was requested. The fact that they are trying to implement has given them a little clearer direction. (Direct Funder)

Their work in the ductless heat pump, heat pump water heaters, and electronics in the regional approach is good. (Direct Funder)

They've especially in the industry. and comm. they have more outreach to supporters of NEEA and they seem to be taking an approach that is more than previously looking to engage with their utility partners early in the development, and that is helping the programs be more adaptive to local conditions. (Direct Funder)

Research that I have been doing demand response automated meter infrastructure. Supply site resources and the six power plan. (Direct Funder)

They are improving their communication. Just improving their communication and outreach. (Direct Funder)

I was impressed with the caliber of the discussion and the staff I met; I've seen impact on several of the programs we run. (Direct Funder)

More interaction with utilities in the Northwest through e-mail, regular mail, and face-to-face with reports at meetings. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA's participation at our regional round tables and their program updates to our utilities. (Other NW Utility)

Somewhat better understanding of what NEEA is doing. (Other NW Utility)

I-937 begins and NEEA will be able to identify and allocate my utility's share of conservation NEEA has acquired on our behalf that will then be applied toward our conservation target requirements. (Other NW Utility)

[NAME] met with us twice in the last 3 years. [NAME] being added to the Board. (Other NW Utility)

We work with boa and all of their regulations, and I know NEEA is familiar with all that. They follow the same guidelines of the boa. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA's contacts with my organization. (Other NW Utility)

The feedback and reports I get the summaries that tell me what they have done in my territory. (Other NW Utility)

I know one of the board members. (Other NW Utility)

I see an increased engagement with stakeholders. It is apparent that NEEA has listened to feedback and now appears to have a renewed focus and organizational understanding of the mission. NEEA has a huge potential to increase its position as a leader in this region. (Non-Utility)

I have witnessed a great deal of growth within the Industrial team. The team seems much more cohesive and solution oriented. (Non-Utility)

Sponsorship of educational programs and non-profits dedicated to green building. (Non-Utility)

Taking on needed leadership on some critical NEEA recommendations. (Non-Utility)

NEEA is beginning to turn its strategic business plan into action. Many organizations do not follow through on their intended plans, but NEEA seems to be pursuing them more aggressively than in the past. (Non-Utility)

New ED bringing new approach and energy increased funding. (Non-Utility)

More focused on savings, interested in refining brand, interested in the interplay of all NEEA initiatives. (Non-Utility)

Greater familiarity with the staff and activities NEEA performs. (Non-Utility)

Executive leadership additions (some over a year; others under a year) that bring a different, more collaborative, business professionalism and execution expectation; renewed vision or deliberate discussion and work towards organizing and leveraging the assets of NEEA to have a greater impact in the region. There seems to be a buzz about the positive change that's coming from NEEA. (Non-Utility)

Increased activities in RBSA and CBSA. Longer term view of research needs involvement in Regional Research Group End-use Load shape research Greater integration with the NWPCC activities. (Non-Utility)

More knowledge of and communication from the organization. (Non-Utility)

The leadership of the Executive Director and the willingness to have a meaningful strategic plan. (Non-Utility)

I think Claire Fullenwider's down to earth and realistic approach has served NEEA well. I also think the restructuring of the board was a huge improvement. (Non-Utility)

General interactions with new executive director and staff. (Non-Utility)

Re-staffing Strategic Plan Portfolio Advisory Committee. (Non-Utility)

Broader awareness of organization & initiatives. (Non-Utility)

Top flight E&T head, IDL programs. (Non-Utility)

Mostly through interactions with your industrial team, who I think very highly of. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has increased coordination efforts with projects in my opinion and I find this to be viewed as a positive. (Non-Utility)

Collaboration on projects including- Top Ten USA, ORNL Technical Assistance Network, Design Lights Consortium Solid State Lighting, Consumer Electronics. (Non-Utility)

The DHP program success is very encouraging. (Non-Utility)

I've learned more about their organization and how it works. My relationship with NEEA is a more mature relationship. We've been working with them for a little over a year. (Non-Utility)

Working on emerging technologies. (Non-Utility)

The intense focus of the organization to advance its strategy and operational plan. (Non-Utility)

Better leadership on issues of importance to me. (Non-Utility)

They have really been working with us closely to assure success in our energy program. (Non-Utility)

I was afraid they wouldn't be able to get the funding that they were talking about. But they got their sponsors to double their budget and I was very pleased with that. (Non-Utility)

Well I think they've gone through a reorganization process and they have a new executive director and they've got some new focus and I think all those things are good. (Non-Utility)

Number One; I changed jobs and states so I got a different perspective. Number Two; they embarked on their project to demonstrate and research the performance of ductless heat pumps and their support for our energy code program has been fantastic both in Idaho and Washington. (Non-Utility)

The organization has become more organized and structured with greater concern and caring of the quality of the product and services. (Non-Utility)

Since I am new to this particular sector (fresh out of school), my opinion of NEEA has generally become more positive the more familiar I become with the organization, particularly when that familiarity comes from firsthand experience with NEEA programs. (Non-Utility)

I coordinate the Sust. Building Advisor course at Central Oregon Community College. The course is in its 5th year but we still struggled, mostly due to the economy locally, to get sufficient enrollment. This year, 2010, NEEA supported the program even though we are not just launching the program. I was surprised and pleased to garner that much needed support. It allows me to continue to bring highly qualified and experienced energy instructors to Bend. I also met [NAME] at Living Future in May 2010. We only spoke briefly but I was pleased to connect a face with a name with NEEA. He seems like an

energetic and optimistic person. And that reflects well on the organization. I've also worked with both [NAME] and [NAME]. And it's always been good. (Non-Utility)

Adopting the new business plan, adopting the policy explored gas conservation services, hiring a policy person, and having [NAME] engage in avista collaborative. (Non-Utility)

Less positive

NEEA staff doesn't seem to understand how utilities work, as far as how they book their savings, how they run their programs and what their relationships and barriers are. NEEA has tried to incorporate input through advisory committees, but NEEA staff seems to resent more than superficial input. NEEA seems to have a different agenda than their funders. NEEA also needs to take care of some large structural issues with their data systems. (Direct Funder)

Hiring [NAME] to do so much of your contracted work. (Direct Funder)

They are trying to expand their organization into areas that they don't really belong in like natural gas. (Direct Funder)

NEEA used to have a couple clear over-arching market transformation goals. Today, it seems like NEAA has a muddle of sketchy and tentative goals. It feels as if NEAA has become less relevant and more duplicative of what utilities in the region are doing and planning to do. NEAA was formed in the late 1990's to keep an infrastructure in place and an energy efficiency culture alive during a period when utilities in the region largely terminated their energy efficiency programs and budgets. Today, many utilities in the region have active programs due to state initiative requirements or high water mark power allocation incentives. The NEAA role seems less relevant today. Utilities are sustaining an energy efficiency culture and staff without NEAA. (Direct Funder)

Quality assurance of information passed to my organization needs improvement. (Direct Funder)

NEEA seems unaware of the economic, rate, budget, staff and other pressures facing the funders and their staff or that it could impact them. NEEA takes more staff time than it is delivering value or return on the investment. NEEA seems less responsive to input from their funders or ensuring engagement across the funders. When funders have travel restrictions NEEA should be aware of this when considering their own staff traveling to events and conferences. The expansion has highlighted internal disorganization. These are general trends. I have also seen some areas which have improved with some individual staff level coordination. (Direct Funder)

I have concerns about RBFA. I'm not convinced it will provide an accurate picture of the Northwest. (Direct Funder)

Change of their initiatives, less communication and understanding of their mission. (Direct Funder)

The reallocation of cost that dramatically raise our contribution to NEEA, and the associated decrease in savings contributed to fluorescents. (Direct Funder)

They've created too many organizations, they have too many management levels that have hindered the staff's ability to get stuff done, they are analyzing too much, processing too

much, and They are too internally focused and not externally focused on what their stakeholders want. (Direct Funder)

As I mentioned earlier they are in transition in the areas I described. Feedback from my staff, lack of capability in particular key areas namely evaluation data collection and analysis; those are the two main ones. Staff transitions would be another category. The building capability but they do not have that capability yet. And the last piece is that they are trying to please too many differing parties. (Direct Funder)

I think they did a better job in planning; the challenge is they are doubling funding and we are getting less resource than before. It's getting harder to justify the investment. (Direct Funder)

Questioning their values. Their fees have gone up dramatically, and there seems to be a reliance on costly consultants. It's not clear sometimes in terms of progress. (Direct Funder)

Unclear process for new portfolio, forecasting issues, evaluation difficulties regarding commercial programs. Chaotic personnel transitions, difficulty defining strategic focus. (Direct Funder)

Not much and that is problem just seems like hiring a lot of people and getting out of its core mission. (Other NW Utility)

I prefer not to answer this question. (Other NW Utility)

I learned a little more about what they do (or don't do). (Other NW Utility)

Change of management has caused a move from feasible energy practices to "deep retrofits" which no private owner/operator is going to pursue as feasible. Why spend possible millions on a single facility when you could assist a hundred buildings and operators to produce immediate and larger savings, with persistence? Buildings and integrated design do not save energy by themselves; it takes knowledgeable operators to make that happen. (Non-Utility)

The organization has changed significantly - in terms of the mission, the staff, the initiatives, etc. I get the sense that staff in the organization is much more focused on the politics and less focused on results. (Non-Utility)

Redesign. NEEA is making decisions that are not fully market aware. (Non-Utility)

BetterBricks leadership change. (Non-Utility)

I can't be specific here. (Non-Utility)

This was mentioned previously in the statements about growth and employee morale. (Non-Utility)

It would be that non data driven decisions are being made of funding of their various activities. The BetterBricks is where I've seen that. I don't know much about their other arms. (Non-Utility)

I think they are confused about their direction. (Non-Utility)

Changes in the funding of their initiatives. (Non-Utility)

Implementing their mission. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has reduced funding for the integrated design lab network. I feel that NEEA is losing an opportunity for increased energy savings in that less work will be done by the labs. The leading expertise in the Pacific Northwest in building energy efficiency comes from the labs and should be supported and budgets increased. Continued research is necessary in energy efficient building design to feed the pipeline. (Non-Utility)

Moving towards more tangible hardware specific actions really only works well in a mass market. And I see NEEA moving away from addressing both the supply and demand sides of the market outside of residential. (Non-Utility)

New leadership overreacting and making quick decisions on poor or incomplete data. (Non-Utility)

Q35. How do you typically communicate with NEEA?

Direct Funders

Email, phone, meetings

Personally, with the executive director. Our ongoing communication is between our EE program leaders and NEEA.

Phone, email, quarterly advisory committee meetings, other ad hoc meetings.

Email or in-person meetings.

Email, phone or attending meetings - about equally.

Email and conference calls

Phone or email.

Via phone or web conference.

I do not

Through key contacts depending on the topic.

Email and quarterly 'Advisory Committee' meetings.

Email.

Email 85 percent, Webinar 10 percent ,Phone 5 percent.

Email and web based meetings.

Conference calls.

Email and phone.

Email and phone.

Email

Email, Telephone, Quarterly Meetings.

Via phone, email or in person.

3rd party contractors.

Teleconference/webinar, in person conference, phone, email.

Email.

Directly through phone and email.

Via phone, email or conference call.

Phone and email.

Via phone or email. Would like more face to face opportunities.

I don't regularly, but find myself on committees and receiving emails.

Email, through other folks in the organization who have a direct working relationship with NEEA.

I don't, the program managers do the communicating not me.

Email, phone, webinar.

Teleconference.

By phone. Sometimes by email.

Email and phone, and occasional meeting.

This is my first communication.

Quarterly Advisory meetings, surveys.

Email, meetings, conference calls.

Varies: email, webinar, conference call, in-person, website, phone in descending order.

Email, phone and in-person.

Verbally.

Email, phone.

Phone or email.

Attendance at meetings, phone, email.

Email, phone calls, In person.

Via email and occasional contacts with senior staff.

Via personal meetings.

Email with GM.

Email, phone.

phone, emails and go to meetings

Phone, meetings, emails.

I don't.

Advisory committee, other Utility forum input, e-mail, dialog, survey responses.

Internet or email.

Email, phone or in person meetings.

I don't have any type of communication

Phone or in person.

Phone, email and in person.

Email or telephone.

In person meeting or on the phone.

By phone, email, in face to face meetings.

In person, or by phone.

Email, phone, meetings.

Phone or email.

Email news and announcements, website, talk over the phone.

By phone.

Phone, email.

By phone, email.

I'm actually on the committee, and I speak with them directory on the advisory committee meeting, Face to Face meetings. Phone and email.

Phone, some common meetings.

Phone conversations and if they host webinars and conferences and there is ongoing interaction with a program I have involvement.

Through email and telephone.

Email, phone, in person meetings.

Conference calls or coordination meetings. Limited communications one on one.

Emails, webinars, phone calls.

I would say through other entities here at EWEBB.

I've emailed some staff at NEEA. I have also done some looking around on their web sites. I have been to some meetings where NEEA has been there. In general I really don't have cripes about those guys, they seem good to me.

At workshops. I receive emails from NEEA.

Phones, face to face meeting and email.

By telephone and email.

In person, via email, and telephone. Occasionally other written communication.

Email or on the phone.

Regional meetings, website.

Phone, advisory groups.

Phone, email.

Phone and in person.

I am in multiple committees I have relationship with several staff, sometimes sit committee work, I'll call them or they'll call me about an issue.

Other NW Utilities

Email

Email and web meetings.

Email or phone.

Their newsletters

Through our member service employee.

By email and in person at meetings in Portland.

Either by email or sometimes by phone.

Email.

Email.

Email.

Phone, in person, email.

Phone, email and face to face.

Email, Phone, Meetings.

E-mails, utility roundtables and occasional phone contacts.

Phone contact.

Email

Online.

I receive their newsletter

Emails, newsletters.

Through email.

Email, going to seminars.

Usually email or web.

Email.

By phone, emails.

Internet or phone.

not applicable /ANY/ nope

Email.

Phone.

Telephone, or face to face meetings, emails.

Phone. Email.

Just emails that I receive.

Through staff.

Usually by phone. Email.

I don't.

I don't communicate with them.

Emails.

Email.

I don't.

Non-Utilities

Telephone and email.

Phone, email, and in person.

Through staff

I respond to surveys. I call when I have questions. I participate in meetings where NEEA staff is present. I visit the website.

Via e-mail, conference calls and in-person meetings.

Phone, email, in person.

Email, phone and in-person.

Through market managers.

Email and phone.

Email.

Telephone Through Board Members.

Phone or email contact with mid-level staff.

Phone, email, and in-person.

Email, phone, face to face.

Email.

Phone, email, in person.

Email.

In order of frequency: Email, telephone, in-person meetings.

Phone and email.

In person, email.

Via email and at meetings.

In person, email.

Email and phone.

Email or phone. Staff is very responsive.

Get emails from them.

One on one meetings and telephone.

Phone, personal interactions, conferences, responding to RFPs.

By phone, face-to-face and email.

Email, phone and in person meetings

Phone, email, personal meetings.

Phone and e-mail with staff; through the website for information.

Phone, email.

Email, phone, in person.

Usually by phone or in person.

Through established relationships with staff.

Phone.

Phone, e-mail & meetings.

Program staff communication by e-mail and in-person meetings. Serving on committees and boards in which NEEA staff has a presence.

Input through specific staff I know.

In person and via email.

Phone, email, in person.

Email, phone.

Newsletter, phone, meetings.

Openly and honestly in-person, via phone, and email.

Email, phone, etc.

By e-mail mainly. Sometimes by phone...

E-mail, teleconferences.

Telephone and email.

Email and phone.

Email and phone.

Email.

Meetings, emails, phone.

In person and email.

Email, face to face.

Various formats email, phone, face to face.

Email.

Email.

I don't.

On the phone, we have regular meetings with them, emails.

Direct personal discussion, email correspondence

Telephone and email.

Via email and RFP responses.

Email and phone.

Email, actual mail, occasionally face to face presentations.

In person, submitted comments to their plans, and public meetings.

On the phone and email and meetings.

In person.

Email, phone.

Through phone and email conversations as well face to face meetings.

I don't.

By phone or email.

Email, meetings, phone calls.

Email.

Mainly through email.

Phone calls and in person, email.

Phone.

Email updates, or request on input. Annual report or phone.

Email.

Email, attending meetings .

Phone.

Through key contact, website to look at reports.

Telephone, email, and in person.

By phone, in person.

Email and Phone.

By telephone and email.

By phone, email, reading the materials.

I don't contact them ever.

In large group meetings, email, phone.

Email and telephone.

Email, phone or face to face.

By telephone, email, and in person.

I do not communicate with them directly. We have other people that do that. I think that it is done by emails and going to meetings and all that stuff.

Phone, email.

In person.

Phone & Email. Occasionally Conferences.

Email, electronically.

Email and telephone.

Email and phone, occasionally in-person meetings.

Telephone, face to face, and internet.

Phone and in person. Email of course, who can't communicate without email.

I don't.

Through people connections if there is something I need. But I receive NEEA communications through BetterBricks & their e-newsletters & calendars.

Email, phone, in person.

Email, phone, in person.

Phone, email.

Q36. In addition to personal interactions, what other sources do you rely upon to stay informed about NEEA's work?

Direct Funders

Newsletter, webinars, web page, conference calls.

Our EE staff.

None.

Website to search for reports occasionally.

Their emails to us and updates on programs.

Emailed newsletters and announcements from NEEA.

Reports, presentations, Advisory committees.

E-newsletters, annual report.

Our employees who work with NEEA.

Emails. Have to admit I don't frequent the website.

Correspondence with other Advisory Committee members.

NEEA's website emails.

Annual Report (Mail).

Co-workers.

NEEA emails.

Word of mouth.

Committee meetings.

Conversations with a board member.

Website.

A hit and miss look at the email communication from NEEA.

Emails.

Email some reports; esp. exec summary Personal interactions with others/electric utility peers, incl. BPA Reference strategic and business plans (I confess to not using website though know it's available).

Web.

Annual report, emails from the organization, information from our program staff.

Internet and print publications.

Emails & website.

Web site, annual report, specific program reports/presentations.

Emails. I do read the annual report.

Educational materials, web.

Customer support.

Emails/Newsletters.

Email updates from NEEA on NEEA programs, projects, and initiatives.

Information from co-workers who have interacted with NEEA.

Email notices, website.

Website, web generated announcements, email updates.

Emails.

Emails.

Clearing Up.

Newsletter, Quarterly reports.

Online report library webinars.

Web, email, NEEA contractors.

Primarily personal interactions.

Written communications I receive from NEEA and feedback from my staffs who is more directly involved with NEEA.

Newsletter, annual report, co-workers.

Publications and updates from my Conservation Director.

Website.

Emails, website.

Web.

I don't.

Periodic emails from NEEA.

Fellow employees, internet, email.

Visiting their websites, reading their reports.

Website and emails.

Email, seminars, phone conferences.

Email announcements, reports.

Website.

The web site and email.

NEEA website.

Emails.

None.

Meetings, their website, and emails. General announcements, newsletters, staff communication.

Website, email broadcast newsletters.

Look at their reports. No that is it. I look at the website too.

Newsletters, annual report.

Whatever comes over the email that comes to me?

I check the website once and awhile.

Internet website, better bricks.

Occasional visits to their website, and their emails they send out periodic updates, hardcopy literature, and other staff managers that have more regular interaction with NEEA staff.

The website and the annual report.

Discussions with co workers.

Email, broadcast messages that come from NEEA

Websites or other websites they've developed.

Internet.

I don't. They bring stuff through the chain work. I deal with a lot of technical type things, and individual customer interactions. A lot of what they do I don't think it ends up affecting me as much as it does other people.

Talking to other people in the Industry.

Their newsletter, the electronic newsletter and word of mouth.

Market studies they email to me, newsletters, general manager who's on the board.

Their Website, feedback from my staff, interacting with their staff, board meetings, committed meetings, and conferences.

Web site

Website.

Email US website.

Printed materials like their annual report.

Website.

The E newsletter, quarterly reports, meetings.

Other NW Utilities

Other utility personnel, BPA

NEEA newsletter.

I don't. I'm a front line employee not a manager. Those managers don't do any work but my organization is busy working with our end-users. If I'm driving a car on an expressway doing 70MPH, why would I worry about what General Motors is doing with changing say headlights? Sorry, but I don't have NEEA on the radar screen on an everyday basis. We need to investigate products to determine if consumers want them & if there is a reason to promote them in the name of saving energy. Top Ten products - GREAT? Heat Pump Water Heaters - the tail wagging the dog. Ductless Heat pumps - Incredible technology. Energy Star Homes - what a disappointment.

Emailed updates (on list serve).

Internet.

Email and newsletters.

Information from BPA, Fluid Market Strategies, PECL, and ECOS staff.

BPA does a fairly good job of doing that.

Energy sites on web.

Other industry participants

List serve information from NEEA.

Primarily Email & their web site.

BPA and utility gossip.

Information shared by other utility personnel.

Email.

Emails.

BPA

Web Page.

None.

Generally email and somewhat the popular press.

Newsletters.

Website, and we work through Bonneville power

Bonneville Power Administration.

Internet.

Other utilities in the area.

Public power council.

Email and internet.

Email.

Connections through Bonneville power administration programs, consultants, and boa staff.

My people that work for me, and the internet. No that is everything.

The email is the only way at this point.

Through the regional organizations.

Other organizations mostly BPA, other utility partners, and literature that I might read through publications. Also on the internet.

None. Nothing comes to mind.

I see some industry publications and they may send me stuff on occasion.

Newsletters.

Nothing.

Through any emails, websites.

Non-Utilities

Email.

Listserv.

Word of mouth.

Co-worker's nwalliance.org meetings.

Colleagues, stakeholders and newsletter.

Published reports, word of mouth.

RFPs, MPERs, marketing materials.

Web site, newsletters, market reports.

n/a

NEEA web site, newsletters

Web-site Annual Report Occasionally by reviewing interim progress reports.

None

Email announcements and NEEA's website.

Board meetings, electronic newsletters, and website.

Email updates, website.

Staff interaction with NEEA, Newsletters, NEEA presentations

Website and newsletters.

E-newsletter and website.

Newsletter events.

Website, discussions with industry contacts, utilities.

Email blasts from NEEA - meetings with Jack Davis.

None

E-blasts (NEEA perspectives of NEEA work), and word of mouth from utility staff (their perspectives of NEEA work).

Visit the website.

BetterBricks.com and BB e-news.

Website.

Emails from NEEA and their website.

NEEA publications and meetings.

I visit NEEA's website often and read newsletters and press releases.

Website & industry news.

Web Site.

Board reports, email distribution newsletters/updates.

Newsletter, web site, conference papers

Web site emails.

Website.

Email listservs, word of mouth.

None

Newsletter.

Websites and webinars

Mailings from NEEA.

NEEA's Newsletter, announcements and website.

Occasional forays to the web site.

Read the power plan.

Emails, websites. The BetterBricks website. And I rely on getting updates through email. Personally I can talk to various staff members too; they are very accessible over there.

Email broadcast, website.

Internet.

E-email updates.

Newsletter.

Newsletter.

Email news releases and newsletters.

Emails.

Email.

Website. Annual report, newsletter.

Website, read their emails, press announcements.

Colleagues, conference presentations, website.

Website.

Their website and the utilities that partner with me.

Website.

None, nothing comes to mind.

The internet, their emails.

Website.

I would say through their press releases and their website, the better bricks website.

I am not aware of their work.

Newsletter. Their website.

Their email announcements and their websites.

Personal Interaction.

Basically it's through emails and personal phone calls.

Newsletter emails.

The occasional letter.

I talk to my colleagues, who go to their meetings, energy trust meetings who report on NEEA initiatives.

Email.

Board member.

Website.

Website.

Website and the things they send through email.

Well I think they send out an annual report. I know they've got an extensive web site

Their annual report.

Better Bricks newsletter, NEEA and Better Bricks website.

Website emails.

I just generally read trade papers.

Indirect organizations.

Trade associations, and electronic communication.

Email blasts, or website.

Website, DJC.

They have email, blast newsletters and things like that.

Conferences.

Email and phone.

I occasionally visit their website. They occasionally send me reports, which usually ignore the work the organization that I am with has done. This is in the industrial and the commercial areas.

Associations I guess, the different trade and professionals associations that I subscribe to, and participate to.

Emails distribution list, website.

NEEA.org

Email updates.

Their annual reports, websites and emails

None.

E-newsletters are a great source. Email blasts work for me too.

Email pushes and NEEA websites.

NEEA's website.

I get email.

Q37a. What aspects of NEEA's communications caused you to rate your satisfaction in this area a (RESTORE Q37RESPONSE)? Please be as specific as possible.

Positive Mentions (Rating of 5-7)

They are highly responsive to our requests. (Direct Funder)

Evaluation staff is very conscientious about informing other organizations about work, opportunity for comment and trying to reach a consensus. Sometimes overly so. (Direct Funder)

I receive many informational emails from NEEA; I don't read them all, but I keep folders for all those that reflect possible future interest (general, BetterBricks, kWh Crackdown, etc). I'm comfortable, familiar and accustomed browsing nwalliance.org whenever the need arises. (Direct Funder)

They are always sending communications on their training and information on their programs. The resources are first rate. (Direct Funder)

They communicate often and effectively by e mail updates. (Direct Funder)

I think their communication has been adequate for my needs. (Direct Funder)

Timeliness and accuracy, commitment to take what they hear and apply it. Fairness, those are the big ones. (Direct Funder)

Professional relationships and communications with NEEA staff very collaborative & cooperative. (Direct Funder)

I think I have good communications with several individuals at NEEA and they are responsive to my questions and comments. (Direct Funder)

Regular email updates are very helpful. (Direct Funder)

Media mix is very good, but I still live with questions from time to time. These are usually answered when I attend a meeting and speak face to face with NEEA staff. (Direct Funder)

I have had an occasion or two where I had asked for follow-up or additional information, and not received it. (Direct Funder)

High quality brochures and materials. Good information on the web. Great material pulled together by Lis and Susan when I need it. (Direct Funder)

Emails and website information. (Direct Funder)

In-depth reports, frequent communication, and updated web site. (Direct Funder)

Adequate levels of communication. (Direct Funder)

I find NEEA's communications to be targeted and effective. This is true for their annual report and occasional targeted messages I receive. (Direct Funder)

I get emails from them in appropriate frequency. (Direct Funder)

It's to the point and timely. (Direct Funder)

There is always room for improvement, volume of information, maybe have some summary. (Direct Funder)

They've realized they need to do some work on their communication, and I think they are doing everything possible to improve. Getting good opportunities at the level we really want and want to. There is a lot of information that gets pushed out by email. (Direct Funder)

They've been supportive of my interactions. The BetterBricks website has been useful for our customers. (Direct Funder)

Responsive to request for input on our quarterly reports, their newsletter to their various programs. (Direct Funder)

The emails, I get mostly everything through the emails such as newsletters etc.. (Direct Funder)

I believe they really reach out to us, in a way they have a good planning ahead of time and it makes it easier for me to participate in their meetings and things like that. They also seek input from us at the meetings and what not. They have a very good communication. (Direct Funder)

Well they are definitely improving with the level of interaction and communication response, the degree of improvement is the primary reason. (Direct Funder)

I get regular communications in various forms. (Direct Funder)

They try to communicate as often as possible, due to the volume of email, that I may not always get that information, not that it's their fault. Overall my impression with NEEA are very positive. (Direct Funder)

They do a good job of promoting and marketing of what they do. It's just digging into the details of what they do. (Direct Funder)

The newsletters can be a bit dry. (Direct Funder)

Unfair for me to rate at either extreme end as I honestly do not often go to NEEA's website or comb through lengthy reports in great detail. Therefore, I selected mid-range rating of 5. (Direct Funder)

There are some areas where NEEA communicates really well and some where there is a lack of transparency. (Direct Funder)

So much information, so little time! Recognize utility/funder objectives; Palletize info. to be most informative for the utility needs as well as for regional needs. (Direct Funder)

Applicability to rural setting. (Direct Funder)

More frequent shorter (briefer) communications about specific programs would be an improvement. I seem to get quarterly (?) reports covering entire sectors or all of NEEA

activities today. It would be more useful to get an every two month update just on what's going on with hospitals, or industrial motors, or irrigation pumps, etc.. (Direct Funder)

NEEA does a good job of providing information of successes via printed material. However, NEEA does a poor job of keeping funders informed when something has fallen behind schedule and what's being done to address it. News like when NEEA discounted savings retroactively came as quite a shock, not only because it seemed to happen without input but that it went against past precedence. I never feel like my contacts at NEEA really want our input. I don't feel that funders have enough of a vote on how you spend our money. Program decisions and changes in direction happen almost on a whim, from our perspective. (Direct Funder)

Personal interactions are good, but in other areas it's hard to break through the clutter. I get bombarded with information every day, and it is difficult for things that are not both fairly immediate and urgent to break through. (Direct Funder)

I'd like them to do more reviews. (Direct Funder)

NEEA staff often fails to demonstrate a deep understanding of the business philosophy of funding utilities. NEEA should position itself as an extension of the utility rather than establish itself as a separate entity or brand. (Direct Funder)

The newsletters are informative, but very high level. (Direct Funder)

I think there are periodic opportunities for input, but little evidence of what happens with it. Perhaps it is due to geographic location, but the I-5 utilities seem less engaged than their Oregon counterparts. (Direct Funder)

There's less proactive communication, they're good at reacting but it would be useful to have more proactive information. (Direct Funder)

I think they do a good job incorporating their strategies, but not a lot of information about status of execution. (Direct Funder)

NEEA could be more proactive in communication. The website is great resources, but periodic emails to keep me in front of the members would be more proactive. (Direct Funder)

The frequency is sporadic. Channels of communications are consistent. (Direct Funder)

The timing of the information.
(Direct Funder)

They send out a lot of stuff, and they refer us back to their website for details. They tend to spend too much time on their reports. (Direct Funder)

I find their webinars useful, and their websites are good resources. I get the sense they're doing more that I am not aware of and I am not sure how to find out about that. I've only been with my organization for only six months as well. (Direct Funder)

There is room for improvement other than just internet. (Direct Funder)

NEEA needs to improve communications. I would suggest monthly or quarterly general conference calls. (Direct Funder)

They layout of their newsletter isn't always the best, they can improve on it. (Direct Funder)

A lot of its tailored for the residential sector which I don't have time, it competes for my attention I don't have the time available. (Direct Funder)

Personal interactions and website. (Direct Funder)

They do not inform us sometimes being in our service territory. (Direct Funder)

They make a great effort, but in portfolio planning process, written materials were confusing and used oblique language and were too short to be effective at communication. New middle management appears to be on a learning curve about, the depth and complexity of relationships with program delivery entities. (Direct Funder)

Very pleased with their effort to involve us with their efforts. Unfortunately we rarely have the time. (Other NW Utility)

They keep me informed, and they send me emails all the time. (Other NW Utility)

They're always sending out emails. (Other NW Utility)

Email notifications, website. (Other NW Utility)

I think they are very thorough on their communications, I think they do a good job. (Other NW Utility)

They put out good resident communications. (Other NW Utility)

I enjoy reading about what's going on at NEEA through their newsletter. (Other NW Utility)

Newsletters are well written and e-mails are timely to the subjects covered. (Other NW Utility)

Communications are timely, informative and on the leading edge of work being done. (Other NW Utility)

They're not intrusive; they provide the information and access to what I am looking for. If I have a question I got to the website and usually get them answered. (Other NW Utility)

Information is forwarded to you regularly. (Other NW Utility)

Newsletter and web site are efficient ways to keep up to date. (Other NW Utility)

The personal communication by phone or face to face meetings, on the important issues to customers. They do a lot of good in their general newsletter, and conferences they have when they are investigating emerging technologies. (Other NW Utility)

The emails ask for input. (Other NW Utility)

They respond fairly quickly to e-mails and phone calls. (Other NW Utility)

I just think that more face time would be better - it doesn't seem like they spend much time on our side of the hill. (Other NW Utility)

Pro - good contact when working for their projects their contractors are less attentive. Con - not that good at keeping information flowing on projects with which I am not directly involved. (Other NW Utility)

Limited contacts. (Other NW Utility)

Most of the communication is one way, NEEA provides the information. We don't participate in program offerings. We are independent that way. We feel we don't have the need to seek assistance. (Other NW Utility)

Well they do a good job as far as they send out quarterly information. What I would like them to do is, when there is something new coming out is send out the information right away on it instead of waiting quarterly. Or send it out monthly instead of waiting quarterly on stuff. Most of the time as a utility, you have to be pro-active and go out and look for the information they don't necessarily send it out all the time. Like I said earlier being utility people we are used to being handset and getting the information ourselves. When they do send out their letter I can look at it and see whatever topic that interests me, and to also see which new project interests me and pursue those things individually. (Other NW Utility)

I get adequate emails from NEEA to inform me about what they are doing. (Other NW Utility)

My lack of knowledge. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA market managers communicate well. (Non-Utility)

Good frequency of e-communications. Easy to scan e-newsletter and get more info on stuff of interest. Pretty easy to find info (reports, RFPs etc.) on website. (Non-Utility)

Communication occurs on a regular basis and is pertinent to my work. (Non-Utility)

NEEA does a very good job of posting information on their website with links to as much or more information than you would ever want or need. So, I guess the website is the key aspect. (Non-Utility)

I find the vehicles of communication useful and straight forward. I find that these communication activities allow for real time feedback and dialogue. (Non-Utility)

Timely, friendly, informed responses; clear and interesting presentations of information - with the opportunity to get as little or as much detail as needed. (Non-Utility)

It's the email communications, the newsletters and so forth. They are very regular. (Non-Utility)

They give me enough information without overwhelming me. (Non-Utility)

Regular updates, annual report. (Non-Utility)

They have a constant stream of communication that goes out and they have an individual representative of NEEA. He's knowledgeable and smart. (Non-Utility)

Well the announcements through the better bricks website. (Non-Utility)

They reach out with information, invited to their events. They are easy to call if I think there is a need to. (Non-Utility)

They do regular communications, they are very open and sharing about their work. (Non-Utility)

They're sending out their evaluation though the web. (Non-Utility)

Emails are easily read and links are fast. (Non-Utility)

NEEA does a good job of sharing information about NEEA's successes. Usually, NEEA presents their role as leadership rather than collaboration. The NEEA goals are primary in NEEA communication, even when the project is co-sponsored or collaborative in nature (NEEA takes all the credit by activating the well-funded marketing machine). (Non-Utility)

High quality information, well presented, immediately useful. (Non-Utility)

For me, it's the total scope of communication from all the different sources, not just one element. (Non-Utility)

NEEA's communications are professional and informative. The rating would be higher if they were shorter and with more frequency. (Non-Utility)

I'm not sure what level of communication would garner a higher score but I rated at a 6 because I'm sure there are areas of improvement. Overall, I believe through my staff and relationships, the communication is fine. Communication is a two-way street and the important note is that NEEA has always been a communicative organization should I reach out. (Non-Utility)

Would be nice if emails pertaining to my industry only -- and not receive emails about everything NEEA is doing. That is only a tiny complaint. (Non-Utility)

Their research plans have been open to comment. They have been responsive to outside comments. They are coordinating their research activities with the NWPCC needs. (Non-Utility)

Solid communications by publications, meaningful dialogue at board meetings which re open meetings and follow up with the entities representing the ratepayer funders. (Non-Utility)

Frequent (but not too frequent) email. (Non-Utility)

Web site is comprehensive but well design to get to specific item of interest. (Non-Utility)

NEEA information is generally accessible. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has good e-mail communications. I am on the general mailing list. (Non-Utility)

Interactions have been positive with good information. (Non-Utility)

There is good proactive effort to communicate in a timely manner. (Non-Utility)

I don't really have a problem because I have regular communications with them. (Non-Utility)

They continually keep me informed through email about everything they're doing. They do a good job of keeping us in the loop. (Non-Utility)

Responsiveness to inquiries. (Non-Utility)

They clearly communicate with me. (Non-Utility)

The email updates I get. (Non-Utility)

They're very available, and if I wanted more information it would be easy to get. It's a fairly big piece of my job to deal with NEEA; hence I didn't give them a 7. (Non-Utility)

Their personal contact is very good. The newsletter is really good. (Non-Utility)

NEEA typically responds well to requests for information. The BetterBricks newsletter and the website are generally informative. (Non-Utility)

They have a substantial effort to keep their funders informed about what they are doing. They provide information through multiple channels. (Non-Utility)

Sometimes I feel information that affects me takes awhile to filter down to me. (Non-Utility)

The right frequency of emails. (Non-Utility)

I think NEEA does a fairly good job of communicating through all means available. (Non-Utility)

I think they are excellent communicators. I feel very comfortable, as does my staff as far as needing to contact them. I believe they have very good communicative tools. (Non-Utility)

As I said before, I've been disappointed that the Lighting Lab in Portland is so difficult to interact with, while the one in Boise is a delight. (Non-Utility)

I don't feel I am well informed but the information I do receive seems accurate and competent. (Non-Utility)

Good relations with staff, but not much value from other sources. (Non-Utility)

If NEEA's communications were more successful, then I think the market would not be so confused about NEEA's role and work. Perhaps it would benefit NEEA to provide personal updates to each of their funders/stakeholders - there is something about a personal update that just feels better than an automatically generated email. I understand that this could potentially be very work intensive. It might be appropriate to leverage NEEA contractors to help facilitate this kind of messaging. (Non-Utility)

I don't very often see reports on ongoing projects and their status. Not much specific about how NEEA programs operate. Haven't noticed any NEEA sponsorship notices in stores. I couldn't tell someone right now what initiatives NEEA is working on and what the progress is. Not aware of any measures of the NEEA effort on particular initiatives. (Non-Utility)

As I think about it, the communication is really quite one-directional... lots of information about NEEA coming from NEEA to me, but this is the first solicitation of input that I can recall since the strategic planning effort. (Non-Utility)

I am not sure if there is a NEEA newsletter for contractors. It would be helpful to know news in all sectors. Maybe quarterly? (Non-Utility)

Lack of communication on NEEA board determinations, issues faced by the board and guidance of the board. (Non-Utility)

NEEA outreach vehicles like newsletters and other announcements are routinely delivered and informative. The NEEA web site is accessible and searchable. The program web sites (e.g. BetterBricks) are informative. Information goes out from NEEA more readily than it goes in. (Non-Utility)

The residential programs we have been involved with have clear lines of communication with us. The commercial sector initiatives especially BetterBricks has been fairly opaque and not very usable. (Non-Utility)

I don't think we know enough about the thinking about design issues. I'm not quite sure what their driving logic is. (Non-Utility)

It's good, web site is generally good. (Non-Utility)

NEEA supports our program in ways that are sometimes unknown to us. With that support comes an expectation and if we are unaware of the level of support then we are surprised by the level of expectation. (Non-Utility)

They need better communication forms or avenues. I think a broader email list, and internet type of chat forms. (Non-Utility)

Besides the arm that I directly work with, I don't know what other work they do. I'd like a better big picture of their organization. (Non-Utility)

Timely inclusive information, sometimes not applicable to my profession, the better bricks website is absolutely applicable to my situation. (Non-Utility)

It's good, a 5 is good. (Non-Utility)

I have very little interaction with them. (Non-Utility)

I work very closely with NEEA with one or two contacts with specific issues we have in common. They have been very generous, their goals and missions are aligned with my office. (Non-Utility)

Limited outreach. The only thing I get from NEEA is their annual report. (Non-Utility)

Communications I get don't seem to reflect on what it would be going on. When they promote they can't say whose speaking. (Non-Utility)

They have attended meeting I have attended. Some of the help we get from others might originate from NEEA but I'm not sure. (Non-Utility)

Nothing comes to mind (Non-Utility)

Too many email blasts. (Non-Utility)

From my standpoint it's more directed at commercial residential and NOT industrial. Lighting, hand valves, and things like that. (Non-Utility)

Their annual report is good, they do a pretty good job of their email, their newsletters are good. (Non-Utility)

Negative / Neutral Mentions (Rating of 1-4)

I do not get any communications. (Non-Utility)

Their sector lead didn't communicate and I got surprised by 2 initiatives that they are doing that hadn't been discussed or shared, they decided to fund them without letting them with the advisory board. (Direct Funder)

Not much of real interest. (Other NW Utility)

Ridiculous surveys. (Other NW Utility)

Clarify what they are doing. Make the reports briefer. (Non-Utility)

Not crediting the efforts made by their partners, especially the state energy offices, also the areas in industrial efficiency & commercial efficiency. Until I see a report on the residential codes and sectors, I won't comment on that. Hoping it will improve in all sectors. (Non-Utility)

We don't really hear from them very often, except when they want more money. (Direct Funder)

Many communications with short lead times. Communications not reaching right staff level from the right person. Feedback at staff level with a couple individuals is positive. (Direct Funder)

NEEA's focus is on the Big 3 - Puget, Portland and Boise. What if our utility is NOT located in one of these areas? I'll let you answer that one. (Other NW Utility)

Lack of programs that work and are cost effective. (Other NW Utility)

I just think it is a newsletter. Obviously I don't know a lot about them. (Other NW Utility)

Since I don't know how they fit into the regional picture, I know they put out reports but they don't have an effect. (Non-Utility)

The fact that I never hear from them ever. (Non-Utility)

Very little communication actually occurred around the reorganization of the commercial sector, when it did it was uncoordinated, unclear, and the information given had little to do with what actually occurred. (Non-Utility)

NEEA has the structure for good communication with their newsletters and advisory committees, but individual staff has problems with communication. (Direct Funder)

I don't feel that I have a handle on all of the efforts that NEEA is involved in. For those I'm most involved in, I feel that I'm reasonably informed by NEEA. (Direct Funder)

Coverage is good. I understand details are important however, briefness in communication is also appreciated with today's work load. (Direct Funder)

I just don't have that much information about what they are doing. My overall impression is positive, but I don't know what they do. (Direct Funder)

Newsletters and website seem to be puff pieces. (Direct Funder)

There is a lot going on at NEEA that isn't broadcast. Unlike other organizations, it seems we have to be more proactive to learn about NEEA. (Direct Funder)

Lack of lead time to interact with their activities. Short notifications of their activities. (Direct Funder)

I think there are still additional opportunities for case studies and success stories that can be used to motivate additional customers to pursue energy efficiency. (Direct Funder)

I just don't end up seeing a whole lot of reports of what they are up to . (Direct Funder)

Too much work going on, not just at NEEA but individual organizations. NEEA needs more of a dashboard, and consolidate its source to utilities to pick up key items. (Direct Funder)

I find them average. Smaller utilities just don't get a lot of individual attention, except when a survey is wanted. (Other NW Utility)

NEEA communicates more with the BPA who then communicates to the utilities. Often times the utilities may have a question as to the direction to which BPA has committed absent utility input but by then the ship has already left the port, so to speak. (Other NW Utility)

Not easy to follow. (Other NW Utility)

Because we are a small utility and they don't really listen to us as small as we are. (Other NW Utility)

I have nothing to add to this. (Other NW Utility)

I think I am neutral. I think they do a good job on communicating but I believe they could do better. (Other NW Utility)

I don't rely on the website or reports - they tend to be stale and sanitized by the time they are written. (Non-Utility)

You can tell that NEEA is trying to communicate, but you can also tell that communication does not come natural to the people of NEEA. Webinars are somewhat forced, as if the NEEA team is "checking a box" and is not truly reaching out to their stakeholders. For the most part, NEEA is quite well-intentioned; they are just not natural communicators. For example, in a recent re-brand webinar they discussed the perception of NEEA being perceived as "Ivory Tower", but in that call the presentation itself was formal and somewhat theoretical (e.g. they had a contractor spent ~20 minutes in a very formal marketing presentation on branding, but didn't talk about how the local teams represent NEEA in practical terms, i.e. how to use the information of that call). (Non-Utility)

Reports are not comprehensive. Often the reviews on projects are written by consultants and they are not accessible. The last retrospective was not well done and the consultant was not forthcoming with a response. I feel I need to do much of the web searching to attempt to learn what initiatives NEEA is working on, what funding is being allocated to each project. I admit I have been rather passive and have not taken the initiative to find out what all NEEA is doing. (Non-Utility)

I don't understand how NEEA interacts with all the other regional efficiency programs, especially BPA. Programs (Non-Utility)

The reality of the situation. (Non-Utility)

It is too wordy at times. (Non-Utility)

I would appreciate more summaries of activities. Less detail more summary. Perspective, not just today's news, but context for today's news. (Non-Utility)

NEEA project managers do not provide consultants with up-to-date NEEA templates. NEEA templates and boilerplate marketing materials on the website are not kept up to date. The reports on the website are difficult to navigate. (Non-Utility)

Q44. What other types of information would you consider extremely important for NEEA to provide to you and your organization? Please be as specific as possible.

Direct Funders

None, it's good already.

NEEA is in a unique position to facilitate communication between utilities in the region and to gather support of the entire region to have more impact on promoting initiatives.

How the work they are doing relates specifically to my customers.

NEEA Conference.

I'd like to see more on Emerging Technologies - but not sure if ET is NEEA's core mission, interest or competency.

Details of savings, cost effectiveness.

I am looking forward to the new proposed website for utilities to share information on.

Strategies for how NEEA activities can be leveraged in utility planning and in current offerings. Incorporate market feedback from utility program activity. Represent specific PNW utility interests/utility perspective and impacts when working with manufacturers and other upstream or national players; engage utility staff to support these efforts.

Actual savings--as CFLs go out, it will be critical for us to have information on actual savings, plans for replacing the CFL savings and the cost metrics. We also still need to get a handle on location of savings.

Not sure...they provide quite a bit already.

Retail sales data for specific products, purchase behavior trend data, information about emerging technologies.

Sharing of other utilities and organizations campaigns and plans.

Case studies of rural initiatives.

Progress to date. Notice of any delays or changes with opportunity for input where useful. Reasons for delays/change and NEEA's plans to correct. A strategic planning timeline that allows us to know what NEEA will be working on in the years ahead. When you plan to sunset your support of certain technologies (DHP etc) so that we can plan for when we need to ramp up our support to step in and take that on.

Updates on what NEEA is doing to adjust their business and operations plans to meet their goals given changing circumstances.

Reporting specifically about the energy savings results in my service territory.

Evaluation results. Results of portfolio committee discussions, highlights of board discussions.

I don't have additional communications to add.

I would appreciate a quarterly financial and conservation achievement report.

I can't think of anything.

Informing when they're ending an initiative before they end it. Handing off that initiative to utility programs.

Nothing.

I can't speak for my organization, I can only speak for me, so I don't know.

The clearinghouse function mentioned earlier in this survey is something that NEEA is well-positioned for and which would be extremely valuable in any given focus area.

Consumer trans in the Northwest.

Planning information, year forecast of what activities are on the horizon.

None in particular.

Cost effectiveness by region and program. Saving by region.

Total portfolio of projects and technologies they are considering. I want to know what they're looking at and what they decided not to pursue.

I'd like to see development of online community tool for the region.

Results, average megawatts attributed to Clark county our service territory. They continue to have a good working relation with BOA, keep identifying and pursuing emerging technologies.

Periodic updates on the evolution of the new commercial program design. broader communication around the commercial program design.

Evaluation information.

Activities and business results specific to my organization.

Any information prior to implementation to their decisions.

Any market research is valuable, specific technology information is useful. References to reports not done by NEEA. Their information about what's going on in different parts in the country. taking leadership role in regional efforts.

Case studies Local, about specific technologies.

Quarterly financial and savings.

Technical advances in any conservation measures.

I believe NEEA has a good summary or report of what they have done.

Long range planning strategies.

More case studies or histories of successful work with customers/ utilities. Info about. en. efficiency. activities going on in the country that profile highlight.

Those are the main categories that you just mentioned.

I can't think of anything.

Their work, especially in my company's service area.

I don't have anything else to suggest.

They could think about a research branch, kind of like the way old Washington state office use to do.

Emerging technologies anything technical is helpful.

Updates and progress achieved.

I can't think of any.

Anything regarding industrial energy efficiency and residential programs.

Progress towards goals, expenditures and results. Changes in strategy, new partnerships, leverage in the market place.

I'm involved in program admin anymore, I'm not using that in the frontlines.

New technologies.

Work on utility coordination in the nation. More advanced calendar on meetings to make me plan a year in advanced.

Better communication about long term pipelines of technology and programs.

More emerging technology information.

Less brag, more fact. More updates on lesser initiatives. More specific information justifying new program strategies.

Other NW Utilities

Technical data.

Nothing I can think of at this time

BPA and IOU's are paying for your operation, would by my understanding. I feel that BPA and key IOU's should be grading your successes and targets. BPA and IOU's should have a big part in identifying Key Result Areas and setting goals and objectives. Not sure if this is being done but I know you have targets. The results of identifying missed targets as well as successes should be an important part of your future budget/funding. What grade have you received? I don't know. NEEA has done well with DHP's but how do the

numbers work out? Give me a couple of million and I can show results but would it be cost-effective? I'm extremely interested in how our rate payers money is spent and how it is quantified in terms of achieving realistic goals.

Our share of regional energy savings being reported to us on a yearly basis automatically (no need to request it).

Can't think of any.

Monitor data, product research out comes. Market demonstration information, new technologies.

If there is information that is specifically useful to our size or profile.

Standards for data collection and keeping showing of cost effectiveness bases and calculations of each program/measure/ etc. Show of inputs to cost effectiveness bases. e.g. avoided costs at trans, distribution etc.

No specific recommendations come to mind.

Nothing comes to mind

Again, provide us with data detailing our share of conservation in kWh's based on our utility's share of conservation \$\$ invested by the BPA.

More information on small utilities and how they are affected by what NEEA does.

Don't know.

None that I can think of.

Cannot think of anything right now. No nothing comes to mind.

Not having a whole book to read, but having it outlined (smaller outlines) so you can understand the contracts, or the initiatives.

Results of studies on efficiency savings, i.e. heat pump water heaters, DHP.

The information about moving the market and where they are at on the curve, so that I am aware of what the new technology is , where it is right now.

Just new programs and new technologies that become available to our customers.

For me I would say lighting technologies.

The real economic facts, not the bias facts. I think the facts are lacking.

Well they already do provide information. Being a non-profit organization, they do provide us with their business plan, they do this on an annual basis. They send emails other then quarterly. I can't think off the top of my head of what in addition to what I would want. No, Well being from the I-5 corridor maybe some of their work, they may look at breaking down the information and send that site specifics, that would be something of value to me.

I don't think we need anything from them.

New energy saving opportunities.

Nothing.

Non-Utilites

None.

Lessons learned, technologies independently evaluated, from initiatives and collaborative programs outside of the northwest.

More "real time" information about the specific goals, objectives, and activities on the specific initiatives.

I'm more concerned about the information that NEEA provides to my customers and partners.

A better idea about what is being planned and how we can help.

Decision making process for programmatic changes.

Forward-looking strategies and multi-regional collaboration.

Real results.

List of all current projects, their time lines, the allocated funding, projected savings, current status.

Given that my organization is a NEEA contractor, I think that we should be prepared to speak to what NEEA is doing. I do not think we should have the burden of speaking for NEEA and we should always defer to NEEA and keep NEEA informed of such conversations, but there is something to be said for a well informed contractor who can basically back NEEA up when NEEA funders/stakeholders are frustrated.

Progress towards savings goals, interaction/coordination with funders and other regional bodies such as the RTF and Coordinating Council.

Market research.

List of ongoing initiatives and status of each Measures of estimated impact on markets if possible

Information about energy efficiency trends/insights/research etc. on a regional and national level. What is working? How and where? Less NEEA focused and more energy efficiency focused. NEEA is in a unique position to play this role and provide this information to others in the region.

More on the collaboration with regional utilities highlighting the relationships, objectives and successes (or learning experiences) of what NEEA is doing.

Nothing

State level appliance saturation rates End use consumption levels. Research into new emerging end uses. End use load shapes. Customer characteristics information (RBSA, CBSA for example).

Information about how the organization is making improvements in the quality of its programs and services.

Continue with project updates and a few regional meetings to discuss the nexus of projects and their import.

I have thought for several years that it would be beneficial to NEEA and the NW Power and Conservation Council if NEEA would come to the full Council more often and update us in person on NEEA's activities and how some of those activities relate to the implementation of the Council's power plan.

Correcting misinformation (e.g., responding to erroneous news reports).

What is NEEA board thinking and why.

No thoughts.

None, I get more than enough.

Early evaluation results.

Perhaps some personal communication (like specific e-mails and phone calls)?

Who is involved in collaborative projects - particularly national projects; longer term plans for collaborations between our organizations (NEEP and NEEA).

Sharing of data and reports are the most important thing. It is not always clear when these are available. For some reports especially seminal evaluation an avenue for comment would be helpful even if it is a brief window when comment can be received and acted upon.

Areas they're looking at to expend opportunities. Vendor performance.

I can't think of any.

Nothing.

More concise information with details if requested would be good.

Nothing more to add.

Planning.

I don't have any.

Their focuses primarily are to commercial and residential, and they don't really communicate to our part of the industry.

Technical analysis for decision making. Clear independent basis for decisions.

I like to know more about their corporate structures, long term planning, and other programs.

None.

How things are measured, how results are measured.

Program evaluation results.

I think the information, about energy reduction in commercial buildings is important. The education tools, tools that the architects can access. Direction in new technologies that architects would specify.

Info about energy efficiency programs.

Status reports on initiatives or projects.

I don't have anything to add.

They're doing fine.

I don't really look to them for information.

More clarity about strategic objective and their programs/SPEC/ore specifics about implementations of their strategic objectives

I don't know at this point.

Reports on specific technologies, what's working or not working.

None comes to mind.

I don't know.

Their evaluation reports in particular things like building stock assessments are important.

Financing options in a difficult market, assistance on getting their supporters and government to understand the challenge that businesses make.

I think cost benefit to rate payers.

Opportunity to be involved as a contractor to NEEA.

Nothing in particular

Rational direction.

Information about what they are doing.

Anything that helps us execute industrial conservation, that is economic.

They could distribute information about the rtf decides in their views. They could do a better job to differentiate new technologies and their effectiveness.

Information about trends and funding opportunities related to energy efficiency.

It would be very helpful to understand various decisions that the Board makes.

There is nothing else that comes to mind. No, nothing at all.

Market impacts in Northwest, best practices in Northwest and prevalence.

I don't view NEEA as a clearing house of information really. I would like to know how NEEA is spending their money, how they account for the energy savings they claim vs. the energy savings utilities are responsible for and the other programs that are operated by states without NEEA's assistance. Because they tend to run into... they tend to conflate the savings from their activities with those of the states using federal resources in the industrial and commercial areas in particular. Nope NEEA needs to understand if they want us to play they need to let us be engaged.

More of specific projects items for the industrial area.

Nothing to offer.

Just more of the same thing.

I guess I would say information about barriers about conservation to implementation.

Don't know. I do like your graphics. The email blasts regarding BetterBricks are just luscious. Good color choices. It's nice to see energy-related info presented in a format that is dynamic. Not dry or just black & white. The fonts are easy to read; the colors work effectively; I can scan the info easily and locate what interests me. Well organized material speaks highly of the content of the material.

More specific collaborations with other utilities and policy makers.

Q48. Is there anything NEEA could do to improve upon its communications with you and your organization? Please be as specific as possible.

Direct Funders

Don't have to send out printed annual reports to all of us at this office. I would be happy with an electronic copy only.

I think they communicate very well and the only improvement may be to provide early information on initiatives and make sure they are in line with the utilities and that it would be priority.

Individual staff communication. The organization is successful with their bulletins, emails and advisory committees.

I know I have a rep at NEEA; it would be great to hear from her via a personal phone call or email.

Changes this year seem to be responsive to needs.

In quarterly "Advisory Committee" meetings, it would be helpful if, in addition to providing update on what NEEA has been working on recently, if NEEA would also lay out some alternatives for the near-term future work to the group for discussion and input so that we committee members could better fulfill our 'advisory' role.

I believe I am able to communicate with NEEA whenever I need to.

No, they are very good with communications.

We shouldn't need to tell them a report is due (or overdue).

Provide better road mapping and invite more meaningful input. Provide adequate time for input. I don't currently have a clear picture of what NEEA proposes for 2011, much less 2012. I don't know when, or if, I will be invited to provide input. It might be useful to provide choices: "Here are NEEA top six initiatives. From your feedback we believe these are our top priorities. Here are three-five additional initiatives that are a lower priority. We have the capacity to add two. Which two have the most value to your utility?"

I wonder if a monthly webinar or conference call to update folks at all levels would be beneficial.

Reports specifically designed to meet the requirements of our contract.

I believe the NEEA staff Account rep relationship will help our organization to better understand how NEEA initiatives can add value to our efficiency efforts and to help carry messages back to others at NEEA as to what the issues and needs of our organization and its customers for additional perspectives in the regional market transformation process. At the end of the day, NEEA's communications need to demonstrate to the audiences the value available through NEEA (it is not without utility/customer interaction) and the less tangible value of NEEA (upstream).

Essential information at a glance

Make the communication more specific to the work that I do. I do residential work. I don't need to see the rest of it.

Seek to understand the utilities business drivers and operating environment.

Not from my standpoint.

I don't need to communicate with them.

Ongoing two-way dialog would be ideal and responsiveness to input would be a good starting point.

I think the information is out there if or when I need it. The initiative would have to be mine.

Providing that look down the road, of what's coming.

It's status on projects, like summary status and efforts outside of the planning stage is helpful.

The work with the online community is very good.

Make communications more predictable. Combine the communications into one newsletter. Quarterly information is good.

More input in developing new initiatives from all partners.

The residential stake holder group meetings need to be electronic means, or messaging. Regional meetings with different parts, by state.

They're communicating fine with me.

The current setup or way works for me.

Make more effort to distribute communications to utilities, employees, or higher quantity of utility employees. Get the utilities on distribution lists.

Well yeah, if they could get me on the email list so I can see some of this stuff, and I guess that is kind of my own fault but I get so much stuff, I find it hard to read all of it. I would like it, if they could send me stuff directly.

More workshops.

Improve their bulletin- the layout of it needs to be reconfigured.

Well I have listed the areas that are most important to me, and that's where the emphasis should be, and less emphasis on the more newsy things. Also I have less interest in rfps, news releases and letters, because I am on their board.

Improvement not to send the annual report in hard copy. Not very useful. Online communication is preferable.

Be more organized.

Let us know when they will be in our service territory.

Don't talk down to expert community, ask more, tell less.

Other NW Utilities

Keep producing and sending out the correspondence.

I appreciate Stephanie Flemings outreach. I know you send out communications but there's not enough time in the day to read 100 emails, take 20-30 phone calls, and go in the field and meet with contractors and customers. I would hope that middle management would be able to comprehend and understand your achievements and announcements.

It's not how, but when and what about that's more important.

Keep doing what you are doing.

Broaden the topics to include things that you don't need from your contacts.

Keep up the good work.

Allow us to opt out instead of opting in.

Depth more into small utilities , and cost enhancing factors on energy efficiency.

I would say send out the stuff that they are asking about regarding the survey.

Listen to smaller customers and their needs better. A lot of their stuff doesn't pertain to us.

I guess in the communications they need to find out what kind of effect it is going to have on the utilities.

NEEA has changed and it is always changing, and it would be nice, if they would show up at our utilities meetings. They used to do that, not so much anymore, or maybe they do and I have been missing them because I go to other meetings. Anyway from my perspective I have not seen them at the trade stuff in the last year or so as much as I used to. I would encourage that they go to those, meetings as much as possible.

No, we don't really have a need for what they offer, we are small.

Non-Utilities

More contractor meetings to work as a group and better understand what everyone is doing.

Not in terms of website, bulletins, etc.

I believe NEEA could add great value to the region's efficiency goals (note this is not about NEEA) by initiating a consumer awareness campaign that would drive the market to energy efficient products and services.

I think it's just about right, that said I have a lot of direct interaction with NEEA staff that decreases my need for these types of communication.

Make the previously mentioned items available to be.

Ask locals about market needs.

I think that my personal communication with the NEEA Industrial team is fantastic, two-way, and beneficial. In terms of improvement, I do believe that NEEA communication with funders/stakeholders can improve. I think it should be funder/stakeholder specific so that is meaningful and all funders/stakeholders truly understand the value NEEA adds.

Other than what I suggested earlier I'm comfortable with the communication.

I need to pay more attention probably Maybe more frequent newsletters and receive selected reports.

Shorter, more interactive types of communications and updates. Looking forward to the partner services web portal so information can be shared among the community more easily.

Schedule updates with UTC commissioners in a timelier manner.

Targeted emails would be nice. I think you need to be conscious of the number of emails sent. Sometimes I receive multiple emails in one day. I tend to delete without reading -- or give the email a quick glance.

I am satisfied with the communication between our two organizations.

Continue to host or be on the agenda at local and regional meetings on energy conservation and efficiency Continue to publicize program results and whether good or bad results present them in the context of the strategic plan and what steps or directions the plans dictate NEEA take next.

See previous comment about NEEA visiting with NW Power and Conservation Council more often.

Commit to a two way dialogue.

I am extremely satisfied with the communication my organization obtains. It would be useful to have additional information regarding technical evaluations with more frequency.

Once a year mutual look at the focus of our collaboration to make sure that we are clear about that agenda and have the right people and goals in mind.

We'd like to have the semi-annual or annual planning review where NEEA shares what they are thinking with.

Be more concise.

Make it really brief in an email.

I don't think so, we're doing really well.

To see work plans for the coming year, see a longer term plan for 3-5 years.

I'd like to be included more in the input about long term programs.

Keep it short, clear and concise.

With our organization they're doing an ok job.

More communications by email. Less reliance on websites, in other words I want it to come to me, instead of me going to find it.

Emails are a good way to communicate.

Receiving the reports and evaluation (newsletters).

They could let me know what they are doing.

They do a pretty good job.

I think were at about the right level, I'm not looking for anything additional from them.

No improvements for communications

I don't know, since I'm not really in that loop.

The amount of information that comes in on a daily basis is overwhelming. The titling of what comes in is important.

More of a matter of timing and cluster. I really appreciate charts and graphs.

Contact me, send me stuff.

Give information that will involve industrial conservation issues.

They do a good job.

I think it would be beneficial for the Board to be more available for communications.

No, I think they do a very good job.

Good websites, easy to navigate provide searchable database of reports

NEEA funds two programs that my staff works on right now, energy codes and energy star new homes. Communication is excellent with the NEEA managers and my staff. (The experiences I mentioned earlier dealing with commercial and they industrial are organizational experiences that predate my coming here, I was general manager of the Idaho's offices of energy resources prior to coming here).

More of the same, I'm very satisfied.

No, I think I believe I am pretty satisfied.

Until taking this survey, I did not realize that NEEA sends bulletins regarding RFPs. I'll look on the website to find out about that. Maybe you do need to improve the communication by letting me, and others, know more about what you have to offer.

I think they had been doing the quarterly pushes to highlight the activity in each of the market sectors and either that stopped or I got dropped from the list.

This survey is oriented toward utility staff. You could get very useful information from consultants if you had a survey that was geared toward consultants. In many cases, an organization's relationships with its consultants/contractors can provide a lot of meaningful insight into the way the organization operates in general, as well as its effectiveness in the market.

I don't think so, get more engaged in policies.

Q51a. What about your (RESTORE SETGRP RESPONSE) experience caused you to rate your satisfaction as a (RESTORE Q51RESPONSE)? Please be as specific as possible.

Group Participated In: Residential Advisory Committee

Work with advisory committees to develop "cradle to grave" strategies for each key market area in which NEEA is working. NEEA needs to work with stakeholders to develop a road map showing how as a region we can most cost-effectively move a technology or market from 0+ percent penetrations to 85 percent penetration. This road map should identify who needs to do what when, when does NEEA step in, when do we need incentives to boost the market, when should we move to codes or standards, etc. (Q51: 3, Direct Funder)

I felt like NEEA was reaching out to hear what I was interested in say. They are trying to juggle a lot of input, so I don't think I had a lot say, but I tried. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

I am not sure how much influence that we actually have. (Q51: 5, Direct Funders)

I'm new, the meeting is jam packed. Subjects don't get covered, meetings are long, better meeting management. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

It was the only one I attended, hard to put it into context because it was my only interaction. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

I'm satisfied with my experience with the committee. (Q51: 5, Other NW Utility)

It's too big, too many people. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

Some information I receive is from other staff. Some information was great while other just caused more questions. The direct information received was good and understandable. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

Opportunity to interact with other similar managers at other utility run utilities. Well it is a focus discussion and I think that is good. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

The sharing of ideas and goals with NEEA and the other utility representatives. (Q51: 7, Direct Funder)

Group Participated In: Commercial Advisory Committee

Better focus on the horizon. Pace of action has been slow. Initiative changes, structure of feedback loop. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

Repeating the same agenda in every meeting, and not enough time for discussion and decision making. Mostly updating takes most of the time. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

I'm not sure I was really advised, or if I was part of a committee. I didn't see any results coming back. (Q51: 4, Non- Utility)

I think they NEEA sets their agenda and then looks for validation from the utilities, as opposed to developing an agenda based on input from utilities. (Q51: 5, S Direct Funder)

I don't have any input. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

A little scattered. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

Group Participated In: Industrial Advisory Committee

Too much tell in the meetings, - NEEA telling us and not allowing us to provide input in their process. (Q51: 3, Direct Funder)

They seemed to be more focus on utilities instead of the actual customer. (Q51: 3, Non-Utility)

Sometimes feels more like a one-way discussion ('information dump' from NEEA to Advisory Committee) without much prompting by NEEA for input/direction/advice from Committee members on best direction for future efforts. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

Applicability to our environment. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

The industrial advisory committee meeting was extremely helpful - it is great to hear where things are heading, and to hear the message presented to NEEA's stakeholders so that you understand what drivers are being addressed and how the stakeholders react to the information. Unfortunately, these committee meetings have since been closed to the public - apparently from feedback from industrial program managers at funding utilities. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

I think the opportunity to involve my input, and speak with other advisory committee members, and have knowledge sharing. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

The team's willingness to communicate and engage in an honest and transparent way is refreshing. I very much appreciate John Wallner's contribution to the industrial team. (Q51: 6, Non- Utility)

I think it's a good opportunity to understand its initiative, and to interact with other people in the community. It's important because they are the people I am trying to influence. (Q51: 7, Non- Utility)

Group Participated In: aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee

The aMW allows review of NEEA savings, and the staff try to listen and incorporate feedback. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

Group Participated In: Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee

The meetings have been sporadic. (Q51: 3, Direct Funder)

Information provided prior to the meeting was not sent far enough in advance and did not reflect adequate detail so that informed decisions could be rendered. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

Not clear where asking for input vs. informing about decisions already made or already intending to pursue. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

I believe that the RPAC is evolving and that as a new process and group, it's not yet clear as to how the sector and other advisory committees feed NEEA staff, how that interfaces with what the RPAC does, and how RPAC influences the staff's final recommendations to the board. It's too soon to rate the effectiveness of the process yet from my perspective. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

I missed a couple of the meetings due to schedule. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

A lot of that work was being developed as it went, the right people were there. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

They've chosen good members; the agenda and topics are good. The group is trying to come to decision points, so it's a combination of the people, the task, and drive for results. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

The interactions that were encouraged and accepted. (Q51: 6, Non- Utility)

Trying very hard to meet an important need. Scott, Dave and Kay are doing a good job. (Q51: 7, Direct Funder)

Group Participated In: Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC)

I haven't been able to get good communication for context. They are not very focus or detail oriented. (Q51: 3, Direct Funder)

Good NEEA process, too much time on DTA's specific issues. (Q51: 5, Direct Funder)

I believe the committee is successful meeting NEEA's goals. Whether the committee is achieving regional goals or goals for my customers, is less clear. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

The ability to collaborate with other with more interest. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

It's pretty clear. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

Group Participated In: NW Research Group

I think this question is wrong for this group - it's not meant to be a place for communicating NEEA's agenda, although the meetings have been a little too NEEA focused in the past and are expected to change to more peer-to-peer sharing. (Q51: 3, Direct Funder)

I wasn't aware the purpose of the group was to influence NEEA's work. In fact, I think it's too much about NEEA and not enough about all members sharing their work. I'm already aware of what NEEA is doing; I go to all the NEEA project meetings, so I would rather hear from others. (Q51: 4, Direct Funder)

Moderately positive because of the focus of the group, but satisfaction will depend, ultimately, on what the group is able to produce. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

This is a volunteering group gathering. NEEA and NEEA staff has done a good job of keeping the meeting's contents useful and relevant for my work. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

They certainly use our input and they made it as relevant to us as they could. (Q51: 5, Non- Utility)

Would be nice if other folks would present on results. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

I think it's just a very good collaborative process. (Q51: 6, Direct Funder)

Pro - NEEA is very good at incorporating ideas from disparate audience members. Con - Not as good at managing contractors to respond to direct inquiries or inclusion when requested. No response upon contact or request in several cases. It is clear that your audience is not their audience, which cools enthusiasm as a member. (Q51: 6, Other NW Utility)

The opportunity to rub elbows with my peers around the region. share ideas and talk about challenges (Q51: 7, Direct Funder)

Q59. Finally, please tell me what, if anything, NEEA could do to improve how it interacts with you and your organization. Please note that these comments are very important to improve NEEA's service to customers and will remain anonymous.

Direct Funders

There's a lot of pressure on NEEA to be everything to everyone in this field. Resist it! That's just people being too lazy to do some of their own work. Keep a focused role and don't be afraid to push back when others make unreasonable demands. So much of NEEA's work is to arrive at consensus, which is tough with this many players. Staff may need more training on negotiation and conflict management to get to consensus faster and more efficiently.

NEEA could train their staff on the region's utilities and their perspective and world view. NEEA could support a culture that is understanding of how utility culture operates, rather than a culture that can be dismissive of their funder's interests.

Get a personal phone call or email from my rep every once in awhile.

I won't hesitate to suggest things as they occur to me. We appreciate anything NEEA can do to keep dues low.

NEEA staff need all have basic information about the utilities and their inter-relationships and the policies that drive regional efficiency goals and programs. This understanding should then drive the communications with stakeholders. In some instances, it feels that our requests for information are seen as a burden to NEEA staff. Personally, the NEEA staff I work with frequently (planning and evaluation) are very responsive. But, there has been concern in our organization with the transparency and communication with the sectors over the past year.

This survey is too long. NEEA should shorten it.

I would like to be able to get the results of research sooner. If that is not possible, some type of on-going reporting, until the final results are available, would be helpful.

Shorter surveys.

Post all information, reports, and meetings, and make them easy to find.

The key going forward will be to demonstrate value. With the increasing budget, deteriorated economy, and more scrutiny from commissions and customers, we need to make sure the value message is real and the savings are delivered.

An org chart would be great. Including all the contractors and who to contact for what programs.

Most of what I get concerned about is caused from being too busy to follow up on. NEEA does a good job; I just do not have enough time to deal with it.

Host face to face opportunities for utilities to come together and discuss plans and opportunities to work together (i.e. Pilot programs, emerging technologies).

Find some relevancy between my group and NEEA.

Work with its advisory committees to develop "cradle to grave" strategies for each key market area in which NEEA is working. Work with stakeholders to develop a road map to move a technology or market from 0+ percent penetrations to 85 percent penetration. Identify who needs to do what when, when does NEEA step in, when do we need incentives to boost the market, when should we move to codes or standards, etc.

For NEEA to carry out their work in support of their funders and provide a meaningful return on investment.

Listen more.

In order for advisory committee meetings to be effective in reaching a diverse mix in the region, there must be good methods of phone participation. Each utility (even if not represented on the board or in an advisory committee) needs to understand the value NEEA provides. This past year has introduced many new processes and time will tell how effective those processes are in helping NEEA achieve the goals outlined in the strategic plan. Also, the landscape is changing. What was cost-effective and acceptable to utilities in 2009 may not be considered appropriate in 2011 or later as avoided costs plummet. Our organization needs to interact enough with NEEA to understand the changes (process, initiative, priorities) and how they impact the energy efficiency goals of our utility.

Again, something high level measuring critical organizational business outcome graphically displayed to allow a quick assessment at a glance. The "dashboard" concept, sent monthly.

They should do some more outreach and reviews. The information they share, go to a higher level of staff, and that information doesn't get distributed down. I am not aware of decisions that might affect my job.

Just that one issues with working with utilities before ending market transformation initiatives, and better equity for large metropolitans, and public territories.

I can't speak for my organization, and I have no need for contact or communication with NEEA.

Because I don't access a lot of the information because I don't need to, I think NEEA does a good job of putting information out there and making it available for me and my organization.

They could be in the field more often, knowing what utilities are doing. I feel like they are getting information from the same people over and over again. I feel they should get in the front line more, and know about our initiatives and our customers.

Identify the role for individual contributing utilities activities post 2011.

They could probably reach out to our upper management more effectively.

Be proactive in understanding our I-937 requirement in the state of Washington, timely reports of megawatts usage effort are already under way for this area which we appreciate, successfully work with the water heater industries to solve the venting issue.

Just more communication. There is good communication with regional, formal committees. More communications to the broader community would be good.

It's about the right level of communication. Logistics in meetings have been a little bit confusing. There could be some improvement in the logistics in phone meetings.

Having the opportunity to discuss more in their meetings, talking about the new technologies they are researching, talking about their future planning and initiatives ahead of time prior to implementation.

I think it would be great if they would do case studies on a regular basis on emerging technologies on commercials that could be use to promote efficiency.

Their sharing of saving information on a regular basis and forecast are of extreme value to our organization. I feel like that can improve.

They're not contacting me directly as much, but I get the information passed on to me through others in my organization.

I don't have anything really; I think the way they setup now for me, is really good. I don't think anything needs to be changed at this point.

Advance notifications of NEEA coordination events is key to integrate the companies long range goals.

Well, can't think of any specific ones. The main ones continue to improve in the last couple of years.

I think they reach out often enough that I need right now.

Right now what I'm doing is not interacting with NEEA. Continuing to support the ductless water heaters, and home electronics.

The communication is critical, that they inform us who and when they working and when they're working with our customers. And that they bring us to the table, so that it is a coordinated interaction.

I work in this arena day and day out, and I have one comment and I wish someone in this industry with authority like NEEA to push, so that energy savings is incentive on what you save instead of this cost effectiveness. That is the biggest killer to energy efficiency and nobody addresses it. I actually see a lot of value in what NEEA does, I don't agree in everything, but I do see a lot of value in what they are attempting to do.

More new technology workshops.

Their sector leads need to do more one on one-need to engage us sooner in their program plans.

They do an annual visit which is great, they can improve their newsletter.

Well I think I have covered them up above and the things I mentioned on previous questions. Continued collaboration, joint planning, delivery and continued emphasis in quantifying and achieving results.

I think they're planning efforts are very useful.

Non architect commercial buildings in our area - they have a focus with big commercial buildings, but most of territory is smaller, so they need to focus on smaller developers that don't involve architects. /WE/ Take a leadership role to evaluate and recommend measures on new construction, under the new energy code.

This survey was extremely long - please be more considerate in survey design or include estimates of time required to answer upfront so that choices could be made about when to do it. Also, a survey tool that tracks how far along you are as you progress through the screens can help.

It's important that NEEA work on how they work with utilities, sending out information and starting a research project at a utility is not effect. Come up with clear templates so utilities know how to interact with NEEA would be extremely helpful. Utilities like NEEA are very busy and they need to be an easy fit for utilities to work with.

Lower fees and showing more product, ability and value for their work.

Improve saving for casting and reporting. Create cycle for reporting updates.

Other NW Utilities

Try to involve utilities besides the ones that contribute outside of BPA.

I just erased what I really wanted to say. But I will say this. You have a reputation of self-serving. Your organization is very liberal and self-centered and maybe self serving. Our electric consumers want value. If you can, help fix the PTR system. Get the folks on the RTF into therapy - simplify our processes and reporting structures. Focus on getting the consumer information in order to make great buying decisions. Lost opportunity - how do we fix that?

Can't think of any ways to improve interaction.

As I indicated earlier, face to face contacts can be beneficial.

Individual staff are very good with their audiences, know their people and work very well in their areas of influence. NEEA org could clarify the brandable vision due to lots of recent change. Publications/website are thick-too many words/ideas vying for most important/too few diagrams/little internal relationship info. Org priorities should be clearer. W/good individual interactions, but unclear org priorities, it can feel that NEEA might do well in what you closely know of it. But not so the rest. Better ensure that new non-energy people are purposefully and uniformly trained about energy, the history of EE, and the prioritized purposes of NEEA (a test/a standard of knowledge) So partners can expect a basic knowledge, get fewer mixed messages and have to do less OJT for NEEA. Guard against decisions that might make it seem that doing the right thing could be less important than anything else. Be sure to define and reward actual effective performance vs. reputational improvement.

As before, keep up the good work.

Continue sending notices and information about products, services, meetings, etc. Due to my very hectic schedule this year, I've not been able to take advantage of the many opportunities NEEA offers.

More outreach to the utilities. While BPA has a large investment in NEEA, it is important to remember that these are not BPA \$\$ but the utilities' ratepayer \$\$ that are ultimately footing the bill.

With regards to small rural utilities, more information on how we can be of better service to our customers.

Have a meeting in Western Montana annually.

I see NEEA's more at a regional level than a local level. We have programs for both conservation levels. We keep our programs very active, and we don't have the time to do more than we're already doing.

I think they're doing fine, I can't think of any improvements.

They do a great job.

Understand the fact that how busy the smaller utilities are and be aware of time issues regarding the fact that this survey is nearly 20 minutes and I know you're just doing your job and you're good but this is ridiculous.

I think they should continue doing what they're doing. We do a lot of interactions through our contractors, so I think they're good the way they are.

Just listen to the smaller customers and their specific needs.

This is just not relative; until it becomes relevant I'm not going to invest time.

Maybe hold more sessions coordinated with BPA efficiency meetings.

Nothing, they're doing a good job.

They're are doing a good job, they need to key on the fact they are good and responsible with their contact in the way their project managers deal with key issues., always room for improvement though.

You know, I really don't have any suggestions for improvement. I think they do a really good job as it is.

Just keep doing the bulletins, so it's up to those who get the bulletins to fall through. .

Again they need to get the economic facts on how it affects the utilities and they don't do that, they need to get on with that.

As I mentioned earlier in the survey, I would like to see them more involved downstream with utilities and the ender users, also getting the information to us. I know it is accessible for me to go to the internet or to call them, but if they had a monthly newsletter, or something else as long as it's on a monthly basis I think that would be better and maybe they do send them out monthly, but I haven't been receiving them. Think that is the main thing from my perspective as to how they could be more useful to me.

I think were about right with NEEA.

I think what they do is fine. There is just not a need for us. No we're just small and our conservation, activities is through BPA.

Non-Utilities

Better coordination with contractors as to what is happening in their specific region.

I would like to see NEEA's approach be more supportive of other programs and projects. Rather than presenting the NEEA programs as the only viable options. Work more closely with stakeholders and service providers, and not just asking for input but integrating that input into NEEA plans. I give a lot of feedback and rarely see any change happen that looks like you heard my feedback. Help influence the consumer market by educating them about energy efficiency in general. Ask how you can support stakeholder programs instead of how NEEA programs can influence (or replace) the stakeholder programs. Your work on the national level is seen as supporting your organizational ego or fundraising but not bringing back tools that are useful to achieve the regional power plan goals. Use the website to show us how it is relevant.

We would like the opportunity to interact with NEEA more.

Market managers already communicate very well.

Again, I think that my and my organization's interactions with NEEA are great. I am most concerned about how the rest of the market perceives NEEA and think that NEEA should keep this perception in mind and continue to work toward it becoming more positive.

As a vendor I feel our interaction with NEEA is very good and better than most vendor-client relationships we have across the country.

My staff works very closely with NEEA and we have a good working relationship.

I do not participate in the advisory committee meetings. Other folks in our organization do. I am interested and use the data from NEEA research and have been involved in selection and forming the research questions. There is great need for updating the state level data on end-use load shapes and customer characteristics for emerging sectors such as elder care facilities and data centers.

To the extent NEEA can become a more efficient and responsive organization, I think this will improve how it interacts with my organization and others.

A follow up email just revisiting the subject and if any commitments were made.

My organization is not included in NEEA planning and development activities. We are informed of activities, but are not solicited for ideas or input. In essence, then, this isn't an interactive relationship but a reactive one.

Again, vendor management.

Keep up the good work! Partner with other complementary organizations.

I think that NEEA should be more active leading or organizing the technical evaluation and research required for regional programs and planning. This role has been batted between BPA, NPCC, and NEEA and in my view it is logically best organized by NEEA.

It would be very desirable if the regional need for data collection, research and program design could be supplied by NEEA since it is the one organization with the potential to relate and serve the regions entire utility sector. There are always laggards especially in the utilities of the region but by working with the main regional utilities, the NPCC and other stakeholders (e.g. ETO, the gas utilities, BEF, etc) NEEA could provide the leadership necessary to approach the regional needs for data, research, and program design support.

I would like a more proactive sharing of their planning, thinking around the programs that relate to our work.

Contractor's meetings, I thought those were very useful so that we could understand how were doing, and share information among the contractors and what were working on. NEEA has a keen approach of things, and have various contractors work on the same project together and it's nice to have those kinds of meetings. /WE/ I think that NEEA remains to be a force for energy efficiency in the northwest.

Everything is just fine.

Make reports brief in an email.

Be less insular and more collaborative outside the NW.

I don't have a problem; I just need to make a better effort of staying in touch.

Being clear on the basis for decision making.

More sharing of the long term plan, more sharing of the results from their activities. How they measure and verify their result. They should expend out into other programs such as retail. /WE/ We could have had the contractor's meetings in June, we didn't have one this year.

Overall be less bureaucratic, be more focused on the end user customer.

Better communication of how programs are going to be evaluated, especially up front before the program starts.

Continue collaboration efforts between the regions that would be helpful.

(BBW = Better bricks website) That do I find the BBW very useful, that we refer the BBW to our members and I am sure they would agree that it's very useful. I think that the unfortunate part is the decision to attempt to measure market transformations with everything that they do, it is very difficult and the way our organization is changing the market through the tools they receive from BBW which is about tools and education that they provide is hard to quantify. So when they put their money down on how to create energy efficient bulbs computers etc. Changing the commercial building sector is harder to quantify then how a Widget changes the market. When an architect specs a project, it's hard for NEEA to measure. It's not a consumer product on how it is performing, it's more of an educational project and a long term approach to energy production and that is where I feel they are missing the boat. Their plan for the future is missing a large component of energy reduction.

They could become a partner of our association and they could be a vendor at our conferences.

Targeting their communication to different audiences and tuning up what those different audiences need to hear (i.e. job positions).

I'm pretty happy.

Clarity of their strategic goals.

I'm happy with the current form of communication.

I really don't know. I have a feeling they're doing a good job with the other people who deal with them.

I'd like to see NEEA outside of Portland more, in the eastern part of the region.

I don't feel like I'm the right person to give feedback about this.

I'm satisfied with the communication with NEEA, if I need additional information I can contact them and know they will be responsive. I don't need them to push more information my way. I know when to seek out information.

I'm pleased with most of my interactions with the BetterBricks program. No constructive criticism.

I'd be happy to provide you but were not a utility so we do not have the same type of working relationship with them so I have nothing to comment.

The way they could be more beneficial to me is by inviting me or more of my colleagues to participate on their committees.

NEEA interacts well with my organization. No suggested improvements.

Having some understanding for the rationale of their decisions.

I would like them to contact us.

Point me to information that will help me execute industrial energy conservation, including full understanding of available incentives and how to apply them better.

NEEA staff could be more aware of local market and utility conditions. They do a better job of providing information than taking to heart the input that they receive.

You know I think they do a pretty good job; I really don't have any suggestions right now.

NEEA Program managers in the residential area are communicating just fine. If NEEA wants to improve communication as an organization, it needs to engage those entities that it wants to participate; for example when they are doing a conference and they want people to attend, they need to engage those constituencies, as far as industrial I hope they are doing different from what they were doing in the past, they hired general contractors who were abusive, ED BIRCH, NEEA hired as a contractor who was particularly difficult to work with, and I would recommend NEEA not deal with or hire him in the future. They have had a bad string of firing good people in the Better Bricks program. First it was [NAME]'s staff, then they got someone to replace [NAME], and he was let go fairly

recently. I don't know what NEEA is doing in this arena now. It seems to me, that they were being pretty effective, not sure to me why they dismantled an effective program.

Keep the projects, they undertake keep them more practical for the end user on the industrial side, we need something for the people who are operating the plants and not the suits.

Shorten your surveys, this was too long.

I am not sure that I have any recommendation. I am overall pretty satisfied.

This is a very minor suggestion, but when you request someone to participate in a survey, makes it very clear when the survey period ends. I received the first email asking me to take the survey. It came at a time when I was very busy. I was ready to completely dismiss it until the email came this week saying that someone would be calling. If the initial email and reminder emails had stated a 'please complete by' date, then I would have done it sooner. But not a big deal.

To recognize the value of the contractors that they have doing work for them and harness their input, for navigating change.

NEEA should prepare more for RFPs. NEEA should take a proactive role in leading its projects. NEEA should implement standard project management and project tracking procedures with consultants. NEEA should utilize project management/collaboration sites for facilitating regional collaboration on evaluation projects. NEEA should have its own project management plan and communication plan for its projects (which should be written before the project starts (and revised at the beginning of the project). NEEA should ensure its project managers are actively engaged in their projects and that they have the technical capacities to sign off on deliverables. In the event that the project manager doesn't have these capacities, NEEA should assign a specialist for these functions (with accountability attached). NEEA should have more statisticians and technical people (less lawyers and marketing people). NEEA should implement a team approach to managing large, complex projects and should not rely on one project manager.

Appendix E: Data Tables

Note: Letters after the percentages indicate significant differences between groups at the 95% Confidence Level.

Table 1: Mode of Data Collection

		Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)	
	Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
	Web	144	55	22	67
		58.8%	58.5%	52.4%	61.5%
Phone	101	39	20	42	
	41.2%	41.5%	47.6%	38.5%	

Table 2: Stakeholder Type

		Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)	
	Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
	Direct Funders	94	94	-	-
		38.4%	100.0%BC	-	-
	Other NW Utilities	42	-	42	-
		17.1%	-	100.0%AC	-
	Non-Utility	109	-	-	109
	44.5%	-	-	100.0%AB	

* small base

Table 3: Non-Contractor vs. Contractor

	Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B) Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*
Non-Contractor	225	94	42
	91.8%	100.0%^C	100.0%^C
Contractor	20	-	-
	8.2%	-	-
			18.3%^{AB}

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 4a: State

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
WA	95 38.8%	51 54.3%C	21 50.0%C	23 21.1%
OR	87 35.5%	30 31.9%	10 23.8%	47 43.1%B
ID	22 9.0%	5 5.3%	5 11.9%	12 11.0%
MT	18 7.3%	8 8.5%	6 14.3%C	4 3.7%
CA	5 2.0%	-	-	5 4.6%A
CO	4 1.6%	-	-	4 3.7%
MA	3 1.2%	-	-	3 2.8%
DC	3 1.2%	-	-	3 2.8%
IL	2 0.8%	-	-	2 1.8%
BC	1 0.4%	-	-	1 0.9%
NY	1 0.4%	-	-	1 0.9%
CT	1 0.4%	-	-	1 0.9%
PA	1 0.4%	-	-	1 0.9%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 4b: State continued

Base: Total Answering

MD

WI

	Stakeholder Type		
Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
245	94*	42*	109
1	-	-	1
0.4%	-	-	0.9%
1	-	-	1
0.4%	-	-	0.9%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 5: Rural Urban Classification

Base: Total Answering		Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)	
	239	94*	42*	103	
	129 54.0%	60 63.8%B	8 19.0%	61 59.2%B	
	2	48 20.1%	19 20.2%	6 14.3%	23 22.3%
	3	20 8.4%	4 4.3%	4 9.5%	12 11.7%
	5	15 6.3%	8 8.5%	3 7.1%	4 3.9%
	6	12 5.0%	1 1.1%	10 23.8%AC	1 1.0%
	4	8 3.3%	2 2.1%	4 9.5%C	2 1.9%
	7	7 2.9%	- -	7 16.7%AC	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 6: Region

		Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)	
	Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
	I-5	82 60.3%	70 74.5%B	12 28.6%	- -
	East	49 36.0%	23 24.5%	26 61.9%A	- -
West	5 3.7%	1 1.1%	4 9.5%A	- -	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 7: QS1. How familiar are you with NEEA and its initiatives? Would you say that you are...

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Very familiar	112 45.7%	45 47.9%B	9 21.4%	58 53.2%B
Somewhat familiar	119 48.6%	46 48.9%	25 59.5%	48 44.0%
Not very familiar	14 5.7%	3 3.2%	8 19.0%AC	3 2.8%
COLLAPSED CODE:				
Familiar	231 94.3%	91 96.8%B	34 81.0%	106 97.2%B
Not familiar	14 5.7%	3 3.2%	8 19.0%AC	3 2.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 8: QS2. Which of the following best describes your job responsibilities?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Energy efficiency or conservation program coordination or management	143 58.4%	58 61.7%	26 61.9%	59 54.1%
General management	53 21.6%	18 19.1%	14 33.3%	21 19.3%
Evaluation or planning	47 19.2%	21 22.3%B	3 7.1%	23 21.1%B
Customer service	20 8.2%	7 7.4%	9 21.4%AC	4 3.7%
Account management	11 4.5%	7 7.4%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
Operations (such as distribution voltage control)	8 3.3%	- -	5 11.9%AC	3 2.8%
Consulting	5 2.0%	- -	- -	5 4.6%A
Or something else	21 8.6%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	15 13.8%A

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 9: Q S3. What is your job title?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Executive / Vice President (includes General Managers, Executive Directors, CEOs and Vice Presidents)	54 22.0%	8 8.5%	10 23.8%A	36 33.0%A
Program Managers (includes Sector Program Managers, Evaluation and Planning Managers)	45 18.4%	27 28.7%C	7 16.7%	11 10.1%
Director (includes Directors and Senior Managers)	41 16.7%	11 11.7%	2 4.8%	28 25.7%AB
Other (includes evaluators, program staff, marketing, engineers and planners)	95 38.8%	42 44.7%C	23 54.8%C	30 27.5%
No/None/Not any/Nothing	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Refused	9 3.7%	6 6.4%	- -	3 2.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 10: QS4. How much of your work involves implementing or coordinating energy efficiency programs?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
All	63 25.7%	38 40.4%BC	7 16.7%	18 16.5%
Most	62 25.3%	20 21.3%	8 19.0%	34 31.2%
Some	91 37.1%	29 30.9%	24 57.1%AC	38 34.9%
None	29 11.8%	7 7.4%	3 7.1%	19 17.4%A

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 11: QS5. Which types of customers does most of your work relate to?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Commercial	177 72.2%	73 77.7%	26 61.9%	78 71.6%
Residential	163 66.5%	67 71.3%^C	35 83.3%^C	61 56.0%
Industrial	135 55.1%	60 63.8%	20 47.6%	55 50.5%
Agricultural	66 26.9%	34 36.2%^C	10 23.8%	22 20.2%
Don't Know	4 1.6%	1 1.1%	- -	3 2.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 12: QS6. How long have you been with your current organization?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Less than 1 year	10 4.1%	5 5.3%	- -	5 4.6%
1 to less than 3 years	33 13.5%	20 21.3% BC	1 2.4%	12 11.0%
3 to less than 5 years	32 13.1%	12 12.8%	1 2.4%	19 17.4% B
5 to less than 10 years	45 18.4%	16 17.0%	9 21.4%	20 18.3%
10 years or more	125 51.0%	41 43.6%	31 73.8% AC	53 48.6%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 13: Q1. Please provide a rating of your overall general impression of NEEA using a one to seven scale, where one means you have a very unfavorable overall impression and seven means you have a very favorable overall impression of NEEA.

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Favorable [5-7]	198 80.8%	71 75.5%	30 71.4%	97 89.0%AB
7	40 16.3%	6 6.4%	5 11.9%	29 26.6%A
6	76 31.0%	29 30.9%	10 23.8%	37 33.9%
5	82 33.5%	36 38.3%	15 35.7%	31 28.4%
4 - Neutral	27 11.0%	13 13.8%C	8 19.0%C	6 5.5%
3	17 6.9%	9 9.6%	4 9.5%	4 3.7%
2	1 0.4%	1 1.1%	- -	- -
1	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Total Unfavorable [1-3]	19 7.8%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	5 4.6%
Don't Know	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Mean	5.36	5.07	5.10	5.71AB
Std. Dev.	1.16	1.09	1.14	1.13

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 14a: Q1A. Being as specific as possible, please explain your key reasons for rating your overall impression of NEEA as a (Q1 RESPONSE).

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	244	94*	42*	108
Commitment to energy efficiency/programs	52 21.3%	15 16.0%	12 28.6%	25 23.1%
Good programs/services	43 17.6%	15 16.0%	10 23.8%	18 16.7%
Innovative/market transformation	40 16.4%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	26 24.1%AB
Effective/successful impact/accomplishments	33 13.5%	9 9.6%	2 4.8%	22 20.4%AB
Partnership/works with us	27 11.1%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	13 12.0%
Good mission concept	24 9.8%	5 5.3%	-	19 17.6%AB
Knowledgeable/quality staff	24 9.8%	5 5.3%	-	19 17.6%AB
Provide good information/resources	17 7.0%	7 7.4%	4 9.5%	6 5.6%
Support needs improvement	17 7.0%	8 8.5%	1 2.4%	8 7.4%
Need more/better communication of information	14 5.7%	9 9.6%	1 2.4%	4 3.7%
Strategic development	13 5.3%	3 3.2%	-	10 9.3%B
Little interaction with NEEA/don't know much about them	12 4.9%	4 4.3%	7 16.7%AC	1 0.9%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 14b: Q1A. Being as specific as possible, please explain your key reasons for rating your overall impression of NEEA as a (Q1 RESPONSE).

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	244	94*	42*	108
Leadership	12 4.9%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	8 7.4%
Increase flexibility/need to customize	12 4.9%	9 9.6% C	1 2.4%	2 1.9%
Good internal operations/management	12 4.9%	5 5.3%	- -	7 6.5%
Poor mission concept	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	6 5.6%
Need more opportunities to partner/work together	11 4.5%	6 6.4%	1 2.4%	4 3.7%
Concerned with development	11 4.5%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	5 4.6%
Need improvement in programs/services	10 4.1%	6 6.4%	2 4.8%	2 1.9%
Need to improve cost effective management	9 3.7%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Moving in the right direction/still in progress	9 3.7%	6 6.4%	- -	3 2.8%
Flexible/customized approach	8 3.3%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	4 3.7%
Supports research	8 3.3%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	4 3.7%
Not knowledgeable/poor quality staff	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 16: Q1A. Being as specific as possible, please explain your key reasons for rating your overall impression of NEEA as a (Q1 RESPONSE).

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	244	94*	42*	108
Always room for improvement/not perfect	6 2.5%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Supportive	4 1.6%	2 2.1%	-	2 1.9%
Need more attention to rural areas	4 1.6%	2 2.1%	2 4.8% C	-
Large staff turnover	3 1.2%	-	-	3 2.8%
Other	45 18.4%	20 21.3%	9 21.4%	16 14.8%
Don't know	2 0.8%	1 1.1%	-	1 0.9%
Refused	22 9.0%	7 7.4%	5 11.9%	10 9.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Now, for each of the following statements pertaining to NEEA, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement using a one to seven scale, where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement. How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

Table 17: Q2. You can trust the information that comes from NEEA

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	210 85.7%	76 80.9%	35 83.3%	99 90.8%A
7	63 25.7%	15 16.0%	6 14.3%	42 38.5%AB
6	92 37.6%	41 43.6%	14 33.3%	37 33.9%
5	55 22.4%	20 21.3%	15 35.7%C	20 18.3%
4 - Neutral	17 6.9%	10 10.6%	3 7.1%	4 3.7%
3	8 3.3%	5 5.3%	- -	3 2.8%
2	4 1.6%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
1	2 0.8%	- -	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	14 5.7%	7 7.4%	2 4.8%	5 4.6%
Don't Know	4 1.6%	1 1.1%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
Mean	5.68	5.48	5.40	5.96AB
Std. Dev.	1.20	1.18	1.24	1.17

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 18: Q3. NEEA's staff is highly knowledgeable about energy efficiency issues

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	204 83.3%	74 78.7%	34 81.0%	96 88.1%
7	65 26.5%	19 20.2%	5 11.9%	41 37.6%AB
6	89 36.3%	40 42.6%	14 33.3%	35 32.1%
5	50 20.4%	15 16.0%	15 35.7%AC	20 18.3%
4 - Neutral	22 9.0%	13 13.8%C	3 7.1%	6 5.5%
3	9 3.7%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	3 2.8%
2	2 0.8%	1 1.1%	- -	1 0.9%
1	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	12 4.9%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	5 4.6%
Don't Know	7 2.9%	2 2.1%	3 7.1%	2 1.8%
Mean	5.71	5.59	5.44	5.92B
Std. Dev.	1.16	1.16	0.99	1.20

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 19: Q4. NEEA moves slowly on its initiatives

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	92 37.6%	42 44.7%	12 28.6%	38 34.9%
7	12 4.9%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	6 5.5%
6	23 9.4%	9 9.6%	2 4.8%	12 11.0%
5	57 23.3%	28 29.8%	9 21.4%	20 18.3%
4 - Neutral	56 22.9%	20 21.3%	12 28.6%	24 22.0%
3	37 15.1%	16 17.0%	4 9.5%	17 15.6%
2	25 10.2%	7 7.4%	4 9.5%	14 12.8%
1	7 2.9%	- -	4 9.5%A	3 2.8%
Total Disagree [1-3]	69 28.2%	23 24.5%	12 28.6%	34 31.2%
Don't Know	28 11.4%	9 9.6%	6 14.3%	13 11.9%
Mean	4.14	4.36B	3.78	4.08
Std. Dev.	1.45	1.30	1.51	1.53

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 20: Q5. NEEA helps to fill the energy efficiency pipeline to ensure the future energy efficiency opportunities for the Northwest

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	165 67.3%	59 62.8%	28 66.7%	78 71.6%
7	33 13.5%	9 9.6%	4 9.5%	20 18.3%
6	67 27.3%	22 23.4%	11 26.2%	34 31.2%
5	65 26.5%	28 29.8%	13 31.0%	24 22.0%
4 - Neutral	35 14.3%	18 19.1%	4 9.5%	13 11.9%
3	19 7.8%	8 8.5%	5 11.9%	6 5.5%
2	10 4.1%	8 8.5%^C	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
1	1 0.4%	- -	1 2.4%	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	30 12.2%	16 17.0%^C	7 16.7%	7 6.4%
Don't Know	15 6.1%	1 1.1%	3 7.1%	11 10.1%^A
Mean	5.11	4.81	4.95	5.47 ^{AB}
Std. Dev.	1.34	1.39	1.41	1.19

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 21: Q6. NEEA helps to develop the market for new and emerging energy efficiency technologies in the Northwest

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	190 77.6%	69 73.4%	28 66.7%	93 85.3%AB
7	53 21.6%	13 13.8%	6 14.3%	34 31.2%AB
6	80 32.7%	35 37.2%	9 21.4%	36 33.0%
5	57 23.3%	21 22.3%	13 31.0%	23 21.1%
4 - Neutral	28 11.4%	14 14.9%	6 14.3%	8 7.3%
3	10 4.1%	7 7.4%C	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
2	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
Total Disagree [1-3]	17 6.9%	10 10.6%C	4 9.5%	3 2.8%
Don't Know	10 4.1%	1 1.1%	4 9.5%A	5 4.6%
Mean	5.50	5.26	5.13	5.85AB
Std. Dev.	1.25	1.28	1.32	1.11

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 22: Q7. By working together through NEEA, energy efficiency organizations can achieve greater energy savings using fewer resources

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	190 77.6%	66 70.2%	28 66.7%	96 88.1%AB
7	72 29.4%	22 23.4%	5 11.9%	45 41.3%AB
6	66 26.9%	24 25.5%	13 31.0%	29 26.6%
5	52 21.2%	20 21.3%	10 23.8%	22 20.2%
4 - Neutral	26 10.6%	12 12.8%	8 19.0%C	6 5.5%
3	13 5.3%	9 9.6%C	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
2	3 1.2%	2 2.1%	-	1 0.9%
1	7 2.9%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	23 9.4%	15 16.0%C	3 7.1%	5 4.6%
Don't Know	6 2.4%	1 1.1%	3 7.1%	2 1.8%
Mean	5.51	5.17	5.13	5.93AB
Std. Dev.	1.46	1.61	1.42	1.22

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 23: Q8. NEEA accelerates market adoption of energy efficiency products, services and practices in the Northwest

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	206 84.1%	73 77.7%	32 76.2%	101 92.7%AB
7	51 20.8%	16 17.0%	4 9.5%	31 28.4%B
6	89 36.3%	34 36.2%	14 33.3%	41 37.6%
5	66 26.9%	23 24.5%	14 33.3%	29 26.6%
4 - Neutral	23 9.4%	14 14.9%C	4 9.5%	5 4.6%
3	8 3.3%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
2	3 1.2%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	- -
1	1 0.4%	- -	1 2.4%	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	12 4.9%	7 7.4%C	4 9.5%C	1 0.9%
Don't Know	4 1.6%	- -	2 4.8%A	2 1.8%
Mean	5.58	5.38	5.18	5.90AB
Std. Dev.	1.14	1.21	1.30	0.91

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 24: Q9. NEEA helps mitigate investment risks associated with emerging energy efficiency opportunities * small base

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	135 55.1%	46 48.9%	19 45.2%	70 64.2% AB
7	27 11.0%	3 3.2%	3 7.1%	21 19.3% A
6	55 22.4%	25 26.6%	6 14.3%	24 22.0%
5	53 21.6%	18 19.1%	10 23.8%	25 22.9%
4 - Neutral	34 13.9%	17 18.1% C	9 21.4% C	8 7.3%
3	19 7.8%	8 8.5%	4 9.5%	7 6.4%
2	7 2.9%	7 7.4% C	- -	- -
1	7 2.9%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	33 13.5%	20 21.3% C	5 11.9%	8 7.3%
Don't Know	43 17.6%	11 11.7%	9 21.4%	23 21.1%
Mean	4.94	4.48	4.73	5.47 AB
Std. Dev.	1.49	1.59	1.33	1.29

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

energy e

Table 25: Q10. NEEA facilitates collaboration and knowledge sharing between Northwest energy efficiency organizations

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	172 70.2%	63 67.0%	32 76.2%	77 70.6%
7	42 17.1%	13 13.8%	5 11.9%	24 22.0%
6	73 29.8%	27 28.7%	14 33.3%	32 29.4%
5	57 23.3%	23 24.5%	13 31.0%	21 19.3%
4 - Neutral	34 13.9%	15 16.0%	4 9.5%	15 13.8%
3	18 7.3%	9 9.6%	4 9.5%	5 4.6%
2	7 2.9%	5 5.3%	-	2 1.8%
1	2 0.8%	1 1.1%	-	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	27 11.0%	15 16.0%	4 9.5%	8 7.3%
Don't Know	12 4.9%	1 1.1%	2 4.8%	9 8.3%A
Mean	5.25	5.01	5.30	5.45A
Std. Dev.	1.36	1.44	1.14	1.34

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 26: Q11. NEAA facilitates regional energy efficiency planning and implementation

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	158 64.5%	58 61.7%	26 61.9%	74 67.9%
7	31 12.7%	8 8.5%	5 11.9%	18 16.5%
6	72 29.4%	24 25.5%	11 26.2%	37 33.9%
5	55 22.4%	26 27.7%	10 23.8%	19 17.4%
4 - Neutral	40 16.3%	18 19.1%	7 16.7%	15 13.8%
3	19 7.8%	8 8.5%	2 4.8%	9 8.3%
2	6 2.4%	5 5.3%	- -	1 0.9%
1	7 2.9%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	32 13.1%	17 18.1%	4 9.5%	11 10.1%
Don't Know	15 6.1%	1 1.1%	5 11.9%A	9 8.3%A
Mean	5.04	4.73	5.05	5.33A
Std. Dev.	1.44	1.50	1.47	1.33

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 27: Q12. NEEA's work is critical to the region achieving its future energy efficiency goals

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	179	62	24	93
	73.1%	66.0%	57.1%	85.3%AB
7	67	21	4	42
	27.3%	22.3%	9.5%	38.5%AB
6	68	21	13	34
	27.8%	22.3%	31.0%	31.2%
5	44	20	7	17
	18.0%	21.3%	16.7%	15.6%
4 - Neutral	30	12	9	9
	12.2%	12.8%	21.4%C	8.3%
3	21	13	5	3
	8.6%	13.8%C	11.9%C	2.8%
2	4	4	-	-
	1.6%	4.3%C	-	-
1	4	2	1	1
	1.6%	2.1%	2.4%	0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	29	19	6	4
	11.8%	20.2%C	14.3%C	3.7%
Don't Know	7	1	3	3
	2.9%	1.1%	7.1%	2.8%
Mean	5.43	5.05	4.95	5.93AB
Std. Dev.	1.46	1.60	1.39	1.18

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 28: Q13. As a regional organization, NEEA is able to influence the market in ways that individual organizations could not do on their own

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	212 86.5%	75 79.8%	35 83.3%	102 93.6%A
7	97 39.6%	33 35.1%	10 23.8%	54 49.5%AB
6	83 33.9%	27 28.7%	20 47.6%A	36 33.0%
5	32 13.1%	15 16.0%	5 11.9%	12 11.0%
4 - Neutral	20 8.2%	10 10.6%	5 11.9%	5 4.6%
3	7 2.9%	6 6.4%C	-	1 0.9%
2	3 1.2%	3 3.2%	-	-
Total Disagree [1-3]	10 4.1%	9 9.6%BC	-	1 0.9%
Don't Know	3 1.2%	-	2 4.8%A	1 0.9%
Mean	5.97	5.66	5.88	6.27AB
Std. Dev.	1.15	1.39	0.94	0.90

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 29: Q14. Which energy efficiency products, services, or practices has NEEA recently been successful in accelerating the market adoption of?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	228	86*	36*	106
Ductless heat pumps/DHPs	72 31.6%	31 36.0% C	17 47.2% C	24 22.6%
CFLs/CFL light bulbs	64 28.1%	31 36.0%	7 19.4%	26 24.5%
Energy efficient electronics (computers, TV)	51 22.4%	29 33.7% BC	1 2.8%	21 19.8% B
Energy efficient appliances/Energy Star	31 13.6%	10 11.6%	5 13.9%	16 15.1%
Lighting designs	19 8.3%	5 5.8%	1 2.8%	13 12.3%
Industrial energy efficiency/professional education	16 7.0%	4 4.7%	1 2.8%	11 10.4%
Integrated building/architectural design approach	16 7.0%	4 4.7%	- -	12 11.3% B
New code adoption/building codes and standards	15 6.6%	6 7.0%	3 8.3%	6 5.7%
New Homes Program/ESTAR construction	14 6.1%	5 5.8%	1 2.8%	8 7.5%
Awareness/energy management practices	13 5.7%	5 5.8%	1 2.8%	7 6.6%
CEI-based programs	10 4.4%	2 2.3%	1 2.8%	7 6.6%
Collaborative/alliance initiatives and support	10 4.4%	1 1.2%	2 5.6%	7 6.6%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 30: Q14. Which energy efficiency products, services, or practices has NEEA recently the market adoption of?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	228	86*	36*	106
Hospital/healthcare energy efficiency initiatives	9 3.9%	2 2.3%	1 2.8%	6 5.7%
Energy efficient motors/drives	9 3.9%	2 2.3%	- -	7 6.6%
Heat pump water heater/HPWH	8 3.5%	2 2.3%	2 5.6%	4 3.8%
BetterBricks program/awards	6 2.6%	2 2.3%	1 2.8%	3 2.8%
Strategic energy management	5 2.2%	3 3.5%	- -	2 1.9%
Energy efficient windows	5 2.2%	3 3.5%	- -	2 1.9%
Performance indicators/benchmarking	4 1.8%	- -	- -	4 3.8%
Other	32 14.0%	11 12.8%	4 11.1%	17 16.0%
No/Not any/None/Nothing	3 1.3%	2 2.3%	1 2.8%	- -
Don't know	13 5.7%	6 7.0%	3 8.3%	4 3.8%
Refused	34 14.9%	13 15.1%	6 16.7%	15 14.2%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Now, for each of the following statements pertaining to your organization's relationship with NEEA, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement using the same one to seven scale, where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement.

How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

Table 31: Q15. I regard NEEA as a partner in my organization's energy efficiency efforts

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	87 64.0%	69 73.4%B	18 42.9%	- -
7	21 15.4%	19 20.2%B	2 4.8%	- -
6	31 22.8%	24 25.5%	7 16.7%	- -
5	35 25.7%	26 27.7%	9 21.4%	- -
4 - Neutral	17 12.5%	8 8.5%	9 21.4%A	- -
3	14 10.3%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	- -
2	7 5.1%	2 2.1%	5 11.9%A	- -
1	8 5.9%	3 3.2%	5 11.9%A	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	29 21.3%	15 16.0%	14 33.3%A	- -
Don't Know	3 2.2%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	- -
Mean	4.81	5.17B	4.00	-
Std. Dev.	1.68	1.52	1.76	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 32: Q16. NEEA has helped my organization achieve its energy efficiency goals

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	78 57.4%	59 62.8%	19 45.2%	- -
7	17 12.5%	17 18.1%B	- -	- -
6	34 25.0%	25 26.6%	9 21.4%	- -
5	27 19.9%	17 18.1%	10 23.8%	- -
4 - Neutral	23 16.9%	17 18.1%	6 14.3%	- -
3	18 13.2%	13 13.8%	5 11.9%	- -
2	5 3.7%	- -	5 11.9%A	- -
1	6 4.4%	1 1.1%	5 11.9%A	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	29 21.3%	14 14.9%	15 35.7%A	- -
Don't Know	6 4.4%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	- -
Mean	4.77	5.13B	3.95	-
Std. Dev.	1.60	1.41	1.72	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 33: Q17. NEEA will help my organization achieve its energy efficiency goals in the future

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	82 60.3%	60 63.8%	22 52.4%	-
7	15 11.0%	12 12.8%	3 7.1%	-
6	39 28.7%	30 31.9%	9 21.4%	-
5	28 20.6%	18 19.1%	10 23.8%	-
4 - Neutral	22 16.2%	16 17.0%	6 14.3%	-
3	16 11.8%	10 10.6%	6 14.3%	-
2	5 3.7%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	-
1	3 2.2%	-	3 7.1%A	-
Total Disagree [1-3]	24 17.6%	13 13.8%	11 26.2%	-
Don't Know	8 5.9%	5 5.3%	3 7.1%	-
Mean	4.91	5.10B	4.46	-
Std. Dev.	1.48	1.35	1.67	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 34: Q18. NEEA understands my organization's energy efficiency goals and programs

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	65 47.8%	51 54.3%B	14 33.3%	- -
7	7 5.1%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	- -
6	27 19.9%	22 23.4%	5 11.9%	- -
5	31 22.8%	24 25.5%	7 16.7%	- -
4 - Neutral	21 15.4%	15 16.0%	6 14.3%	- -
3	26 19.1%	14 14.9%	12 28.6%	- -
2	8 5.9%	4 4.3%	4 9.5%	- -
1	6 4.4%	3 3.2%	3 7.1%	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	40 29.4%	21 22.3%	19 45.2%A	- -
Don't Know	10 7.4%	7 7.4%	3 7.1%	- -
Mean	4.37	4.60B	3.85	-
Std. Dev.	1.54	1.46	1.61	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 35: Q19. NEEA's work complements my organization's energy efficiency

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	86 63.2%	65 69.1%B	21 50.0%	- -
7	17 12.5%	14 14.9%	3 7.1%	- -
6	36 26.5%	24 25.5%	12 28.6%	- -
5	33 24.3%	27 28.7%	6 14.3%	- -
4 - Neutral	25 18.4%	15 16.0%	10 23.8%	- -
3	13 9.6%	9 9.6%	4 9.5%	- -
2	4 2.9%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	- -
1	4 2.9%	1 1.1%	3 7.1%	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	21 15.4%	12 12.8%	9 21.4%	- -
Don't Know	4 2.9%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	- -
Mean	4.93	5.10B	4.55	-
Std. Dev.	1.46	1.34	1.66	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 36: Q20. My organization's investment in NEEA represents an important part of its energy efficiency portfolio

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	136	94*	42*	-**
Total Agree [5-7]	71 52.2%	57 60.6%B	14 33.3%	-
7	20 14.7%	18 19.1%B	2 4.8%	-
6	28 20.6%	23 24.5%	5 11.9%	-
5	23 16.9%	16 17.0%	7 16.7%	-
4 - Neutral	24 17.6%	17 18.1%	7 16.7%	-
3	18 13.2%	10 10.6%	8 19.0%	-
2	9 6.6%	4 4.3%	5 11.9%	-
1	6 4.4%	1 1.1%	5 11.9%A	-
Total Disagree [1-3]	33 24.3%	15 16.0%	18 42.9%A	-
Don't Know	8 5.9%	5 5.3%	3 7.1%	-
Mean	4.66	5.07B	3.74	-
Std. Dev.	1.70	1.52	1.74	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 37: Q21. NEEA competes with my organization

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	34 13.9%	23 24.5% BC	3 7.1%	8 7.3%
7	6 2.4%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
6	11 4.5%	8 8.5% C	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
5	17 6.9%	12 12.8% BC	- -	5 4.6%
4 - Neutral	26 10.6%	11 11.7%	8 19.0% C	7 6.4%
3	25 10.2%	16 17.0% C	6 14.3% C	3 2.8%
2	47 19.2%	19 20.2%	7 16.7%	21 19.3%
1	104 42.4%	22 23.4%	16 38.1%	66 60.6% AB
Total Disagree [1-3]	176 71.8%	57 60.6%	29 69.0%	90 82.6% A
Don't Know	9 3.7%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
Mean	2.42	3.09 C	2.50 C	1.80
Std. Dev.	1.69	1.78	1.68	1.37

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 38: Q22. NEEA offers me ample opportunity to provide meaningful input into its initiatives

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	129 52.7%	56 59.6%	20 47.6%	53 48.6%
7	23 9.4%	10 10.6%	2 4.8%	11 10.1%
6	62 25.3%	30 31.9%	9 21.4%	23 21.1%
5	44 18.0%	16 17.0%	9 21.4%	19 17.4%
4 - Neutral	45 18.4%	14 14.9%	10 23.8%	21 19.3%
3	30 12.2%	11 11.7%	4 9.5%	15 13.8%
2	17 6.9%	6 6.4%	3 7.1%	8 7.3%
1	9 3.7%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
Total Disagree [1-3]	56 22.9%	20 21.3%	9 21.4%	27 24.8%
Don't Know	15 6.1%	4 4.3%	3 7.1%	8 7.3%
Mean	4.63	4.82	4.44	4.54
Std. Dev.	1.60	1.60	1.54	1.62

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 39: Q23. NEEA values my input

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	144 58.8%	57 60.6%	18 42.9%	69 63.3%B
7	39 15.9%	16 17.0%	4 9.5%	19 17.4%
6	61 24.9%	26 27.7%	6 14.3%	29 26.6%
5	44 18.0%	15 16.0%	8 19.0%	21 19.3%
4 - Neutral	41 16.7%	15 16.0%	8 19.0%	18 16.5%
3	20 8.2%	8 8.5%	6 14.3%	6 5.5%
2	13 5.3%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	7 6.4%
1	5 2.0%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	1 0.9%
Total Disagree [1-3]	38 15.5%	14 14.9%	10 23.8%	14 12.8%
Don't Know	22 9.0%	8 8.5%	6 14.3%	8 7.3%
Mean	5.00	5.08B	4.44	5.12B
Std. Dev.	1.55	1.55	1.63	1.50

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 40: Q24. I have access to sufficient information about NEEA's activities

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	186 75.9%	70 74.5%	26 61.9%	90 82.6%B
7	48 19.6%	17 18.1%	5 11.9%	26 23.9%
6	87 35.5%	33 35.1%	11 26.2%	43 39.4%
5	51 20.8%	20 21.3%	10 23.8%	21 19.3%
4 - Neutral	26 10.6%	10 10.6%	6 14.3%	10 9.2%
3	16 6.5%	6 6.4%	6 14.3%C	4 3.7%
2	8 3.3%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
1	4 1.6%	- -	2 4.8%A	2 1.8%
Total Disagree [1-3]	28 11.4%	11 11.7%	9 21.4%C	8 7.3%
Don't Know	5 2.0%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Mean	5.35	5.33	4.80	5.58B
Std. Dev.	1.41	1.37	1.58	1.32

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 41: Q25. NEEA does not understand market conditions in my local service territory

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Agree [5-7]	67 27.3%	31 33.0%C	15 35.7%C	21 19.3%
7	9 3.7%	3 3.2%	4 9.5%C	2 1.8%
6	26 10.6%	12 12.8%	4 9.5%	10 9.2%
5	32 13.1%	16 17.0%	7 16.7%	9 8.3%
4 - Neutral	34 13.9%	12 12.8%	9 21.4%	13 11.9%
3	26 10.6%	9 9.6%	5 11.9%	12 11.0%
2	50 20.4%	29 30.9%BC	1 2.4%	20 18.3%B
1	32 13.1%	5 5.3%	8 19.0%A	19 17.4%A
Total Disagree [1-3]	108 44.1%	43 45.7%	14 33.3%	51 46.8%
Don't Know	36 14.7%	8 8.5%	4 9.5%	24 22.0%A
Mean	3.47	3.62	3.89C	3.13
Std. Dev.	1.80	1.71	1.94	1.78

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 42: Q26. Over the past year, would you say that your general opinion of NEEA has positive, or stayed about the same?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
More positive	74 30.2%	27 28.7%	11 26.2%	36 33.0%
Less positive	34 13.9%	18 19.1%	3 7.1%	13 11.9%
About the same	134 54.7%	48 51.1%	28 66.7%	58 53.2%
Don't know	3 1.2%	1 1.1%	- -	2 1.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 43: Q26A. What has occurred during the past year to cause your general opinion of NEEA to become more/less positive? Please be as specific as possible

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	108	45*	14**	49*
Changes in internal restructuring/ leadership	27 25.0%	8 17.8%	1 7.1%	18 36.7%A
Supportive of customer needs/partnership	22 20.4%	11 24.4%	1 7.1%	10 20.4%
Focus on mission/ strategic development	17 15.7%	2 4.4%	1 7.1%	14 28.6%A
I am more familiar/have a broader awareness of NEEA	15 13.9%	8 17.8%	2 14.3%	5 10.2%
Changes have had a negative impact	15 13.9%	8 17.8%	1 7.1%	6 12.2%
Improved communication/ welcoming input	12 11.1%	8 17.8%C	2 14.3%	2 4.1%
Concerned about direction	8 7.4%	7 15.6%C	- -	1 2.0%
Increased contact/ meetings/interactions	7 6.5%	- -	4 28.6%	3 6.1%
Other	2 1.9%	1 2.2%	1 7.1%	- -
No/Not any/None/Nothing	1 0.9%	- -	- -	1 2.0%
Refused	11 10.2%	4 8.9%	3 21.4%	4 8.2%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 44: Q27. In the past 12 months, how many times have you interacted with a member of the NEEA staff?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODE:I				
0	25 10.2%	7 7.4%	10 23.8% AC	8 7.3%
1	7 2.9%	1 1.1%	4 9.5% AC	2 1.8%
2	15 6.1%	4 4.3%	6 14.3% AC	5 4.6%
3	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
4	4 1.6%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
5	12 4.9%	6 6.4%	3 7.1%	3 2.8%
6	21 8.6%	7 7.4%	3 7.1%	11 10.1%
7 thru 10	15 6.1%	7 7.4%	- -	8 7.3%
11 thru 15	25 10.2%	14 14.9% C	5 11.9%	6 5.5%
16 thru 20	15 6.1%	5 5.3%	- -	10 9.2% B
21+	73 29.8%	24 25.5%	5 11.9%	44 40.4% AB
Don't Know	27 11.0%	15 16.0%	4 9.5%	8 7.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 45: Q27. In the past 12 months, how many times have you interacted with a member of the NEEA staff?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering COLLAPSED CODE:II	245	94*	42*	109
0	25 10.2%	7 7.4%	10 23.8%AC	8 7.3%
1-5	44 18.0%	15 16.0%	15 35.7%AC	14 12.8%
6-10	36 14.7%	14 14.9%	3 7.1%	19 17.4%
11+	113 46.1%	43 45.7%B	10 23.8%	60 55.0%B
Mean	26.01	20.90B	7.66	36.92AB
Std. Dev.	32.78	24.63	11.73	39.22

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 46: Q28. In the past 12 months, on how many programs have you partnered on or coordinated with NEEA?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODE:I				
0	66 26.9%	21 22.3%	17 40.5%A	28 25.7%
1	26 10.6%	8 8.5%	7 16.7%	11 10.1%
2	38 15.5%	12 12.8%	5 11.9%	21 19.3%
3	22 9.0%	16 17.0%BC	1 2.4%	5 4.6%
4	11 4.5%	3 3.2%	- -	8 7.3%
5	12 4.9%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	8 7.3%
6	7 2.9%	1 1.1%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
7 thru 10	5 2.0%	2 2.1%	- -	3 2.8%
11 thru 15	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	- -	4 3.7%
21+	2 0.8%	- -	- -	2 1.8%
Don't Know	50 20.4%	26 27.7%C	9 21.4%	15 13.8%
COLLAPSED CODE:II				
0	66 26.9%	21 22.3%	17 40.5%A	28 25.7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 47: Q28. In the past 12 months, on how many programs have you partnered on or coordinated with NEEA?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
1-5	109 44.5%	42 44.7%	14 33.3%	53 48.6%
6-10	12 4.9%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	7 6.4%
11+	8 3.3%	2 2.1%	- -	6 5.5%
Mean	3.00	2.35B	1.12	4.13
Std. Dev.	8.20	2.87	1.69	11.43

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 48: Q29. Please rate your overall satisfaction with your interactions with NEEA, using a one to seven scale where one means you are very dissatisfied and seven means you are very satisfied. How satisfied are you overall with your interactions with NEEA?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Satisfied [5-7]	150 77.7%	54 75.0%	16 57.1%	80 86.0%
7	33 17.1%	5 6.9%	2 7.1%	26 28.0%A
6	67 34.7%	28 38.9%	6 21.4%	33 35.5%
5	50 25.9%	21 29.2%	8 28.6%	21 22.6%
4 - Neutral	25 13.0%	10 13.9%	7 25.0%	8 8.6%
3	11 5.7%	5 6.9%	2 7.1%	4 4.3%
2	2 1.0%	1 1.4%	- -	1 1.1%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	13 6.7%	6 8.3%	2 7.1%	5 5.4%
Don't Know	5 2.6%	2 2.8%	3 10.7%	- -
Mean	5.43	5.21	4.96	5.71A
Std. Dev.	1.16	1.10	1.10	1.16

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Continuing to think about the personal interactions you've had with NEEA over the past 12 months, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement, again using a one to seven scale where one means you strongly disagree and seven means you strongly agree with that statement.

How much do you agree or disagree with the statement...

Table 49: Q30. NEEA staff treat you with respect

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Agree [5-7]	176 91.2%	66 91.7%	23 82.1%	87 93.5%
7	97 50.3%	40 55.6%	4 14.3%	53 57.0%
6	60 31.1%	19 26.4%	14 50.0%	27 29.0%
5	19 9.8%	7 9.7%	5 17.9%	7 7.5%
4 - Neutral	7 3.6%	3 4.2%	1 3.6%	3 3.2%
3	5 2.6%	2 2.8%	1 3.6%	2 2.2%
2	2 1.0%	1 1.4%	- -	1 1.1%
Total Disagree [1-3]	7 3.6%	3 4.2%	1 3.6%	3 3.2%
Don't Know	3 1.6%	- -	3 10.7%	- -
Mean	6.22	6.24	5.76	6.32
Std. Dev.	1.06	1.12	0.93	1.02

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 50: Q31. NEEA staff are respectful of your organization's relationships with key customers

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Agree [5-7]	135 69.9%	53 73.6%	18 64.3%	64 68.8%
7	61 31.6%	22 30.6%	4 14.3%	35 37.6%
6	52 26.9%	26 36.1%^C	6 21.4%	20 21.5%
5	22 11.4%	5 6.9%	8 28.6%	9 9.7%
4 - Neutral	19 9.8%	10 13.9%	2 7.1%	7 7.5%
3	6 3.1%	3 4.2%	1 3.6%	2 2.2%
2	6 3.1%	2 2.8%	1 3.6%	3 3.2%
Total Disagree [1-3]	12 6.2%	5 6.9%	2 7.1%	5 5.4%
Don't Know	27 14.0%	4 5.6%	6 21.4%	17 18.3%^A
Mean	5.75	5.71	5.32	5.92
Std. Dev.	1.35	1.34	1.29	1.35

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 51: Q32. NEEA staff are responsive to your input

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Agree [5-7]	139 72.0%	55 76.4%	14 50.0%	70 75.3%
7	38 19.7%	12 16.7%	4 14.3%	22 23.7%
6	64 33.2%	27 37.5%	7 25.0%	30 32.3%
5	37 19.2%	16 22.2%	3 10.7%	18 19.4%
4 - Neutral	27 14.0%	9 12.5%	7 25.0%	11 11.8%
3	12 6.2%	3 4.2%	2 7.1%	7 7.5%
2	8 4.1%	4 5.6%	1 3.6%	3 3.2%
Total Disagree [1-3]	20 10.4%	7 9.7%	3 10.7%	10 10.8%
Don't Know	7 3.6%	1 1.4%	4 14.3%	2 2.2%
Mean	5.35	5.34	5.04	5.44
Std. Dev.	1.36	1.33	1.43	1.36

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 52: Q33. NEEA seeks your input on their initiatives

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Agree [5-7]	119 61.7%	52 72.2%^C	15 53.6%	52 55.9%
7	31 16.1%	14 19.4%	3 10.7%	14 15.1%
6	50 25.9%	25 34.7%^C	6 21.4%	19 20.4%
5	38 19.7%	13 18.1%	6 21.4%	19 20.4%
4 - Neutral	37 19.2%	12 16.7%	5 17.9%	20 21.5%
3	15 7.8%	4 5.6%	1 3.6%	10 10.8%
2	11 5.7%	3 4.2%	4 14.3%	4 4.3%
1	5 2.6%	- -	1 3.6%	4 4.3%
Total Disagree [1-3]	31 16.1%	7 9.7%	6 21.4%	18 19.4%
Don't Know	6 3.1%	1 1.4%	2 7.1%	3 3.2%
Mean	4.96	5.34 ^C	4.58	4.77
Std. Dev.	1.55	1.35	1.72	1.61

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 53: Q34. NEEA keeps you well-informed about their work

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	193	72*	28**	93*
Total Agree [5-7]	138 71.5%	53 73.6%	17 60.7%	68 73.1%
7	33 17.1%	12 16.7%	4 14.3%	17 18.3%
6	59 30.6%	24 33.3%	5 17.9%	30 32.3%
5	46 23.8%	17 23.6%	8 28.6%	21 22.6%
4 - Neutral	26 13.5%	12 16.7%	3 10.7%	11 11.8%
3	18 9.3%	5 6.9%	4 14.3%	9 9.7%
2	5 2.6%	2 2.8%	1 3.6%	2 2.2%
1	1 0.5%	- -	1 3.6%	- -
Total Disagree [1-3]	24 12.4%	7 9.7%	6 21.4%	11 11.8%
Don't Know	5 2.6%	- -	2 7.1%	3 3.2%
Mean	5.23	5.28	4.81	5.32
Std. Dev.	1.35	1.28	1.60	1.31

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 54: Q35. How do you typically communicate with NEEA?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Email	164 66.9%	60 63.8%	26 61.9%	78 71.6%
Phone	134 54.7%	54 57.4%B	13 31.0%	67 61.5%B
In person	54 22.0%	14 14.9%	3 7.1%	37 33.9%AB
Attend meetings/ conferences	40 16.3%	21 22.3%	4 9.5%	15 13.8%
Internet/website	13 5.3%	5 5.3%	3 7.1%	5 4.6%
Conference calls	10 4.1%	8 8.5%C	- -	2 1.8%
Advisory committee/board members	10 4.1%	8 8.5%C	- -	2 1.8%
Web based meetings/ webinars	9 3.7%	8 8.5%C	1 2.4%	- -
Through staff in the organization who have a direct working relationship with NEEA	8 3.3%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	3 2.8%
Key contacts	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	- -	4 3.7%
Newsletter/enewsletter	5 2.0%	- -	3 7.1%A	2 1.8%
Other	15 6.1%	8 8.5%	- -	7 6.4%
No/Not any/None/Nothing	12 4.9%	5 5.3%	3 7.1%	4 3.7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 55: Q35. How do you typically communicate with NEEA?

Base: Total Answering
Refused

	Stakeholder Type		
Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
245	94*	42*	109
17 6.9%	8 8.5%	5 11.9%	4 3.7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 56: Q36. In addition to personal interactions, what other sources do you rely upon to stay informed about NEEA's work?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
NEEA web site	95 38.8%	36 38.3%	10 23.8%	49 45.0%B
Emails	75 30.6%	32 34.0%	11 26.2%	32 29.4%
NEEA Newsletter	31 12.7%	9 9.6%	4 9.5%	18 16.5%
Various other reports/ publications	31 12.7%	14 14.9%	3 7.1%	14 12.8%
Word of mouth/co-workers/ peers	26 10.6%	16 17.0%C	2 4.8%	8 7.3%
Annual Report	13 5.3%	8 8.5%	-	5 4.6%
Other in-person meetings	12 4.9%	4 4.3%	-	8 7.3%
Other industry partners/ trade associations	11 4.5%	-	7 16.7%AC	4 3.7%
BPA	10 4.1%	2 2.1%	8 19.0%AC	-
Communication with NEEA staff/representatives/ members	9 3.7%	7 7.4%	-	2 1.8%
eNewsletter	9 3.7%	4 4.3%	-	5 4.6%
Advisory Committee meetings	3 1.2%	2 2.1%	-	1 0.9%
Quarterly Report	2 0.8%	2 2.1%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 57: Q36. In addition to personal interactions, what other sources do you rely upon to stay informed about NEEA's work?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
NEEA Bulletins	1 0.4%	1 1.1%	- -	- -
Other	23 9.4%	10 10.6%	3 7.1%	10 9.2%
No/None/Not any/Nothing	11 4.5%	2 2.1%	3 7.1%	6 5.5%
Refused	26 10.6%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	12 11.0%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 58: Q37. Thinking about both your personal interactions and other communications from NEEA like web, sites, newsletters and reports, how satisfied are you overall with the way NEEA communicates with you about you about their work? Please use a one to seven scale, where one means you are very dissatisfied and seven means you are very satisfied.

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Satisfied [5-7]	190 77.6%	73 77.7%	27 64.3%	90 82.6%B
7	30 12.2%	7 7.4%	6 14.3%	17 15.6%
6	81 33.1%	32 34.0%	10 23.8%	39 35.8%
5	79 32.2%	34 36.2%	11 26.2%	34 31.2%
4 - Neutral	35 14.3%	16 17.0%	9 21.4%C	10 9.2%
3	9 3.7%	2 2.1%	4 9.5%	3 2.8%
2	5 2.0%	1 1.1%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
1	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	15 6.1%	3 3.2%	6 14.3%A	6 5.5%
Don't Know	5 2.0%	2 2.1%	- -	3 2.8%
Mean	5.29	5.25	4.98	5.44B
Std. Dev.	1.14	0.98	1.37	1.16

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 59: Q37A. What aspects of NEEA's communications caused you to rate your satisfaction in this area a (Q37 RESPONSE)?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	240	92*	42*	106
Timely/regular communication	31 12.9%	10 10.9%	6 14.3%	15 14.2%
Good communication/ interactions/responsive to requests for information	30 12.5%	12 13.0%	4 9.5%	14 13.2%
Need more frequent/ proactive communication	28 11.7%	15 16.3% C	6 14.3%	7 6.6%
Good communication/ information is useful/ relevant	26 10.8%	5 5.4%	6 14.3%	15 14.2% A
Good email communications	22 9.2%	8 8.7%	6 14.3%	8 7.5%
Website is a good resource	20 8.3%	7 7.6%	3 7.1%	10 9.4%
Need updates on current initiatives/programs/ issues	18 7.5%	6 6.5%	- -	12 11.3% B
Good access/adequate communication	14 5.8%	4 4.3%	- -	10 9.4% B
Newsletter/enewsletter provide good information	14 5.8%	4 4.3%	5 11.9%	5 4.7%
Information needs to be concise/summarized	12 5.0%	8 8.7%	- -	4 3.8%
Need customized information/relevant to needs	12 5.0%	3 3.3%	3 7.1%	6 5.7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 60: Q37A. What aspects of NEEA's communications caused you to rate your satisfaction in this area a (Q37 RESPONSE)?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	240	92*	42*	106
Variety of communication sources	9 3.8%	3 3.3%	- -	6 5.7%
Information is one sided/ need to include/partner with us	9 3.8%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	4 3.8%
Always room for improvement/good in some areas but lacking in others	9 3.8%	5 5.4%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Need more communication/ information	7 2.9%	4 4.3%	- -	3 2.8%
Opportunity to offer input/comments	7 2.9%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	2 1.9%
Effective/high quality information	6 2.5%	3 3.3%	- -	3 2.8%
Attend meetings/ opportunities to meet	6 2.5%	2 2.2%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Other	27 11.3%	14 15.2%	4 9.5%	9 8.5%
No/Not any/None/Nothing	4 1.7%	- -	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Don't know	1 0.4%	- -	- -	1 0.9%
Refused	54 22.5%	24 26.1%	9 21.4%	21 19.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Again thinking about the communications you receive from NEEA, how satisfied are you with each of the following attributes using the same one to seven scale?

Table 61: Q38. The amount of communication you have with NEEA

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Satisfied [5-7]	172 70.2%	75 79.8%B	21 50.0%	76 69.7%B
7	33 13.5%	8 8.5%	4 9.5%	21 19.3%A
6	79 32.2%	34 36.2%	9 21.4%	36 33.0%
5	60 24.5%	33 35.1%C	8 19.0%	19 17.4%
4 - Neutral	43 17.6%	11 11.7%	12 28.6%A	20 18.3%
3	11 4.5%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
2	3 1.2%	-	3 7.1%AC	-
1	2 0.8%	-	-	2 1.8%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	16 6.5%	5 5.3%	5 11.9%	6 5.5%
Don't Know	14 5.7%	3 3.2%	4 9.5%	7 6.4%
Mean	5.27	5.32B	4.79	5.41B
Std. Dev.	1.22	0.99	1.38	1.30

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 62: Q39. The frequency of which you receive communications from NEEA

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Satisfied [5-7]	174 71.0%	70 74.5%B	24 57.1%	80 73.4%
7	35 14.3%	8 8.5%	5 11.9%	22 20.2%A
6	92 37.6%	38 40.4%	12 28.6%	42 38.5%
5	47 19.2%	24 25.5%	7 16.7%	16 14.7%
4 - Neutral	39 15.9%	16 17.0%	9 21.4%	14 12.8%
3	13 5.3%	4 4.3%	3 7.1%	6 5.5%
2	5 2.0%	1 1.1%	3 7.1%C	1 0.9%
1	2 0.8%	- -	- -	2 1.8%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	20 8.2%	5 5.3%	6 14.3%	9 8.3%
Don't Know	12 4.9%	3 3.2%	3 7.1%	6 5.5%
Mean	5.32	5.30	4.95	5.48B
Std. Dev.	1.27	1.07	1.45	1.35

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 63: Q40. The content of the communication you receive from NEEA

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Satisfied [5-7]	178 72.7%	69 73.4%	24 57.1%	85 78.0%B
7	35 14.3%	12 12.8%	5 11.9%	18 16.5%
6	79 32.2%	31 33.0%	13 31.0%	35 32.1%
5	64 26.1%	26 27.7%	6 14.3%	32 29.4%
4 - Neutral	35 14.3%	14 14.9%	10 23.8%C	11 10.1%
3	14 5.7%	6 6.4%	6 14.3%C	2 1.8%
2	5 2.0%	1 1.1%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
1	2 0.8%	- -	- -	2 1.8%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	21 8.6%	7 7.4%	7 16.7%	7 6.4%
Don't Know	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	6 5.5%
Mean	5.27	5.29	4.95	5.38
Std. Dev.	1.26	1.15	1.38	1.29

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

For each type of information that NEEA provides, please indicate how important that information is to you on a one to seven scale, where one means it is not at all important to you and seven means it is extremely important to you.

Table 64: Q41. NEEA business results and outcomes

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Important [5-7]	164 66.9%	70 74.5%B	21 50.0%	73 67.0%
7	47 19.2%	25 26.6%B	3 7.1%	19 17.4%
6	54 22.0%	19 20.2%	8 19.0%	27 24.8%
5	63 25.7%	26 27.7%	10 23.8%	27 24.8%
4 - Neutral	42 17.1%	11 11.7%	10 23.8%	21 19.3%
3	15 6.1%	5 5.3%	6 14.3%C	4 3.7%
2	8 3.3%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
1	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
Total Not Important [1-3]	29 11.8%	11 11.7%	9 21.4%C	9 8.3%
Don't Know	10 4.1%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	6 5.5%
Mean	5.12	5.30B	4.53	5.18B
Std. Dev.	1.47	1.52	1.48	1.38

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 65: Q42. Information about the progress of NEEA initiatives

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Important [5-7]	189	79	25	85
	77.1%	84.0%B	59.5%	78.0%B
7	59	26	4	29
	24.1%	27.7%B	9.5%	26.6%B
6	73	25	10	38
	29.8%	26.6%	23.8%	34.9%
5	57	28	11	18
	23.3%	29.8%C	26.2%	16.5%
4 - Neutral	28	6	7	15
	11.4%	6.4%	16.7%	13.8%
3	12	7	4	1
	4.9%	7.4%C	9.5%C	0.9%
2	3	-	2	1
	1.2%	-	4.8%A	0.9%
1	3	-	1	2
	1.2%	-	2.4%	1.8%
Total Not Important [1-3]	18	7	7	4
	7.3%	7.4%	16.7%C	3.7%
Don't Know	10	2	3	5
	4.1%	2.1%	7.1%	4.6%
Mean	5.50	5.62B	4.82	5.65B
Std. Dev.	1.31	1.18	1.47	1.28

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 66: Q43. Information about emerging technologies

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Total Important [5-7]	187 76.3%	76 80.9%B	25 59.5%	86 78.9%B
7	71 29.0%	28 29.8%	10 23.8%	33 30.3%
6	72 29.4%	28 29.8%	8 19.0%	36 33.0%
5	44 18.0%	20 21.3%	7 16.7%	17 15.6%
4 - Neutral	32 13.1%	11 11.7%	10 23.8%C	11 10.1%
3	10 4.1%	3 3.2%	4 9.5%	3 2.8%
2	3 1.2%	1 1.1%	- -	2 1.8%
1	5 2.0%	1 1.1%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
Total Not Important [1-3]	18 7.3%	5 5.3%	6 14.3%	7 6.4%
Don't Know	8 3.3%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	5 4.6%
Mean	5.56	5.65B	5.05	5.68B
Std. Dev.	1.40	1.28	1.63	1.37

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 67: Q44. What other types of information would you consider extremely important for NEEA to provide to you and your organization?

	Total	Stakeholder Type		
		Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Current projects/status/ impact	25 10.2%	13 13.8%	2 4.8%	10 9.2%
New technologies	21 8.6%	12 12.8% C	5 11.9%	4 3.7%
Planning information/ forecast of long term plans/goals	16 6.5%	8 8.5%	- -	8 7.3%
Collaborative/networking initiatives	16 6.5%	7 7.4%	- -	9 8.3%
Details of savings/cost effectiveness	13 5.3%	5 5.3%	5 11.9% C	3 2.8%
More/better/timely communication of information	13 5.3%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	7 6.4%
Conservation initiatives/ efficiency programs/ issues	13 5.3%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	8 7.3%
Evaluation/analysis results/reports	12 4.9%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	8 7.3%
Research data/market feedback/trends	12 4.9%	4 4.3%	4 9.5%	4 3.7%
Financial/funding information reports	11 4.5%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	7 6.4%
Customized information/ relevant to my business	8 3.3%	3 3.2%	3 7.1%	2 1.8%
Doing a good job of providing information	8 3.3%	4 4.3%	- -	4 3.7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 68: Q44. What other types of information would you consider extremely important for NEEA to provide to you and your organization?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Programs	6 2.4%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
Information on committee/ board discussions/ decisions	5 2.0%	2 2.1%	- -	3 2.8%
Other	25 10.2%	9 9.6%	1 2.4%	15 13.8%B
No/Not any/None/Nothing	29 11.8%	7 7.4%	9 21.4%A	13 11.9%
Don't know	4 1.6%	1 1.1%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
Refused	89 36.3%	36 38.3%	16 38.1%	37 33.9%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 69: Q45. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA newsletter?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	26 10.6%	9 9.6%	3 7.1%	14 12.8%
1	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	- -	4 3.7%
2	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	5 4.6%
3	8 3.3%	6 6.4%	- -	2 1.8%
4	13 5.3%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	6 5.5%
5	3 1.2%	1 1.1%	- -	2 1.8%
6	21 8.6%	8 8.5%	6 14.3%	7 6.4%
7 thru 10	8 3.3%	1 1.1%	1 2.4%	6 5.5%
8 thru 15	43 17.6%	14 14.9%	8 19.0%	21 19.3%
16 thru 20	3 1.2%	1 1.1%	- -	2 1.8%
21+	8 3.3%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
Don't Know	102 41.6%	42 44.7%	19 45.2%	41 37.6%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 70: Q45. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA newsletter?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	26 10.6%	9 9.6%	3 7.1%	14 12.8%
1-5	41 16.7%	18 19.1%	4 9.5%	19 17.4%
6-10	29 11.8%	9 9.6%	7 16.7%	13 11.9%
11+	47 19.2%	16 17.0%	9 21.4%	22 20.2%
Mean	8.18	8.37	9.30	7.66
Std. Dev.	11.58	15.00	10.47	8.75

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 71: Q45A. When you receive a NEEA Newsletter, do you usually read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	117	43*	20**	54*
All of it	7 6.0%	3 7.0%	3 15.0%	1 1.9%
Some of it	56 47.9%	18 41.9%	9 45.0%	29 53.7%
Just glance through it	51 43.6%	21 48.8%	8 40.0%	22 40.7%
Do not read it at all	1 0.9%	-	-	1 1.9%
Don't Know	2 1.7%	1 2.3%	-	1 1.9%
COLLAPSED CODE:				
Read or glance at [1-3]	114 97.4%	42 97.7%	20 100.0%	52 96.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 72: Q45B. Did you find the NEEA Newsletters to be...?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	117	43*	20**	54*
Very useful	15 12.8%	5 11.6%	3 15.0%	7 13.0%
Somewhat useful	87 74.4%	29 67.4%	15 75.0%	43 79.6%
Not very useful	11 9.4%	7 16.3% C	2 10.0%	2 3.7%
Not at all useful	1 0.9%	- -	- -	1 1.9%
Don't Know	3 2.6%	2 4.7%	- -	1 1.9%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	102 87.2%	34 79.1%	18 90.0%	50 92.6%
Not useful	12 10.3%	7 16.3%	2 10.0%	3 5.6%
Mean	3.02	2.95	3.05	3.06
Std. Dev.	0.51	0.55	0.51	0.50

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 73: Q45C. Would you say the frequency of the NEEA Newsletters is...?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	117	43*	20**	54*
About right	93 79.5%	34 79.1%	17 85.0%	42 77.8%
Not frequent enough, or	9 7.7%	1 2.3%	2 10.0%	6 11.1%
Too frequent	6 5.1%	2 4.7%	1 5.0%	3 5.6%
Don't Know	9 7.7%	6 14.0%	- -	3 5.6%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 74: Q46. NEEA Bulletins are subscription or opt-in based, on topics of interest such as job announcements, RFPs, market and evaluation reports, press releases, etc. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA Bulletin?

e

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	46 18.8%	19 20.2%	4 9.5%	23 21.1%
1	1 0.4%	-	-	1 0.9%
2	1 0.4%	1 1.1%	-	-
3	3 1.2%	1 1.1%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
4	4 1.6%	1 1.1%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
5	2 0.8%	-	-	2 1.8%
6	9 3.7%	5 5.3%	2 4.8%	2 1.8%
7 thru 10	5 2.0%	1 1.1%	-	4 3.7%
8 thru 15	31 12.7%	12 12.8%	6 14.3%	13 11.9%
16 thru 20	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	-	4 3.7%
21+	18 7.3%	7 7.4%	-	11 10.1%B
Don't Know	124 50.6%	46 48.9%	28 66.7%C	50 45.9%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 75: Q46. NEEA Bulletins are subscription or opt-in based, on topics of interest such as job announcements RFPs, market and evaluation reports, press releases, etc. In the past 12 months, how many times have you received a NEEA Bulletin?

Base: Total Answering COLLAPSED CODES : II 0 1-5 6-10 11+ Mean Std. Dev.		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
	245	94*	42*	109
	46 18.8%	19 20.2%	4 9.5%	23 21.1%
	11 4.5%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	6 5.5%
	14 5.7%	6 6.4%	2 4.8%	6 5.5%
	50 20.4%	20 21.3%	6 14.3%	24 22.0%
	12.88	14.92	6.71	12.69
	22.17	27.05	5.62	20.11

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 76: Q46A. When you receive a NEEA Bulletin, do you usually read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	75*	29**	10**	36*
All of it	5 6.7%	2 6.9%	1 10.0%	2 5.6%
Some of it	29 38.7%	9 31.0%	3 30.0%	17 47.2%
Just glance through it	39 52.0%	18 62.1%	6 60.0%	15 41.7%
Do not read it at all	1 1.3%	- -	- -	1 2.8%
Don't Know	1 1.3%	- -	- -	1 2.8%
COLLAPSED CODE:				
Read or glance at [1-3]	73 97.3%	29 100.0%	10 100.0%	34 94.4%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 77: Q46B. Did you find the NEEA Bulletins to be...?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	75*	29**	10**	36*
Very useful	12 16.0%	4 13.8%	1 10.0%	7 19.4%
Somewhat useful	51 68.0%	21 72.4%	7 70.0%	23 63.9%
Not very useful	5 6.7%	2 6.9%	2 20.0%	1 2.8%
Not at all useful	6 8.0%	2 6.9%	- -	4 11.1%
Don't Know	1 1.3%	- -	- -	1 2.8%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	63 84.0%	25 86.2%	8 80.0%	30 83.3%
Not useful	11 14.7%	4 13.8%	2 20.0%	5 13.9%
Mean	2.93	2.93	2.90	2.94
Std. Dev.	0.75	0.70	0.57	0.84

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 78: Q46C. Would you say the frequency of the NEEA Bulletins is...?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	75*	29**	10**	36*
About right	61 81.3%	23 79.3%	10 100.0%	28 77.8%
Too frequent	7 9.3%	5 17.2%	- -	2 5.6%
Not frequent enough, or	3 4.0%	1 3.4%	- -	2 5.6%
Don't Know	4 5.3%	- -	- -	4 11.1%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 79: Q47. In the past 12 months, have you received the NEEA Annual Report, or accessed it online at NEEA's web site?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Yes, received	143 58.4%	66 70.2%BC	16 38.1%	61 56.0%
Yes, accessed online	41 16.7%	12 12.8%	9 21.4%	20 18.3%
No, did not receive or access online	44 18.0%	10 10.6%	10 23.8%A	24 22.0%A
Don't Know	17 6.9%	6 6.4%	7 16.7%C	4 3.7%
Total received [1-2]	184 75.1%	78 83.0%B	25 59.5%	81 74.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 80: Q47A. When you received or accessed the Annual Report, did you read all of it, some of it, just glance through it, or not read it at all?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	184	78*	25**	81*
All of it	34 18.5%	15 19.2%	4 16.0%	15 18.5%
Some of it	73 39.7%	32 41.0%	5 20.0%	36 44.4%
Just glance through it	72 39.1%	29 37.2%	13 52.0%	30 37.0%
Do not read it at all	5 2.7%	2 2.6%	3 12.0%	- -
COLLAPSED CODE:				
Read or glance at [1-3]	179 97.3%	76 97.4%	22 88.0%	81 100.0%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 81: Q47B. Did you find the Annual Report to be..

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	184	78*	25**	81*
Very useful	33 17.9%	13 16.7%	1 4.0%	19 23.5%
Somewhat useful	109 59.2%	46 59.0%	14 56.0%	49 60.5%
Not very useful	29 15.8%	12 15.4%	6 24.0%	11 13.6%
Not at all useful	7 3.8%	4 5.1%	2 8.0%	1 1.2%
Don't Know	6 3.3%	3 3.8%	2 8.0%	1 1.2%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	142 77.2%	59 75.6%	15 60.0%	68 84.0%
Not useful	36 19.6%	16 20.5%	8 32.0%	12 14.8%
Mean	2.94	2.91	2.61	3.08
Std. Dev.	0.71	0.74	0.72	0.65

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 82: Q48. Is there anything NEEA could do to improve upon its communications with you and your organization?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Satisfied with the communication	26 10.6%	8 8.5%	4 9.5%	14 12.8%
More frequent communication/current updates	19 7.8%	9 9.6%B	- -	10 9.2%B
More concise/clear/easy to read at a glance	9 3.7%	3 3.2%	- -	6 5.5%
Relevant/specific to needs	9 3.7%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	3 2.8%
Customize to my preferred method of receiving information	8 3.3%	3 3.2%	- -	5 4.6%
Opportunities for networking/interactive communication	8 3.3%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Invite input/interactive/ two way communication	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	- -	4 3.7%
Communications need to demonstrate support/ value available through NEEA	6 2.4%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
More information on technology/strategies/ planning goals	6 2.4%	3 3.2%	- -	3 2.8%
Other	17 6.9%	5 5.3%	7 16.7%AC	5 4.6%
No/Not any/none/Nothing	47 19.2%	16 17.0%	13 31.0%	18 16.5%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 83: Q48. Is there anything NEEA could do to improve upon its communications with you and your organization?

	Stakeholder Type		
Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*
Don't know	3	1	1
	1.2%	1.1%	2.4%
Refused	98	41	14
	40.0%	43.6%	33.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 84: Q49A. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the Residential Advisory Committee?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	142 81.6%	57 76.0%	19 86.4%	66 85.7%
1	10 5.7%	6 8.0%	1 4.5%	3 3.9%
2	3 1.7%	2 2.7%	1 4.5%	- -
3	3 1.7%	3 4.0%	- -	- -
4	3 1.7%	2 2.7%	- -	1 1.3%
Don't Know	13 7.5%	5 6.7%	1 4.5%	7 9.1%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	142 81.6%	57 76.0%	19 86.4%	66 85.7%
1-5	19 10.9%	13 17.3% C	2 9.1%	4 5.2%
Mean	0.23	0.39 C	0.14	0.10
Std. Dev.	0.74	0.95	0.48	0.51

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 85: Q49B. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the Commercial Advisory Committee?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	147 84.5%	61 81.3%	20 90.9%	66 85.7%
1	5 2.9%	1 1.3%	- -	4 5.2%
2	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	- -	- -
3	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	- -	- -
4	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	- -	- -
6	1 0.6%	- -	- -	1 1.3%
Don't Know	15 8.6%	7 9.3%	2 9.1%	6 7.8%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	147 84.5%	61 81.3%	20 90.9%	66 85.7%
1-5	11 6.3%	7 9.3%	- -	4 5.2%
6-10	1 0.6%	- -	- -	1 1.3%
Mean	0.18	0.28	0.00	0.14
Std. Dev.	0.77	0.90	0.00	0.74

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 86: Q49C. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the Industrial Advisory Committee?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	146 83.9%	63 84.0%	21 95.5%	62 80.5%
1	5 2.9%	2 2.7%	-	3 3.9%
2	3 1.7%	1 1.3%	-	2 2.6%
3	3 1.7%	1 1.3%	-	2 2.6%
4	6 3.4%	3 4.0%	-	3 3.9%
6	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	-	-
Don't Know	10 5.7%	4 5.3%	1 4.5%	5 6.5%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	146 83.9%	63 84.0%	21 95.5%	62 80.5%
1-5	17 9.8%	7 9.3%	-	10 13.0%
6-10	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	-	-
Mean	0.30	0.35	0.00	0.35
Std. Dev.	0.99	1.14	0.00	0.98

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 87: Q49D. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	149 85.6%	59 78.7%	20 90.9%	70 90.9%A
1	3 1.7%	3 4.0%	-	-
2	4 2.3%	2 2.7%	-	2 2.6%
3	3 1.7%	3 4.0%	-	-
4	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	-	-
Don't Know	13 7.5%	6 8.0%	2 9.1%	5 6.5%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	149 85.6%	59 78.7%	20 90.9%	70 90.9%A
1-5	12 6.9%	10 13.3%C	-	2 2.6%
Mean	0.17	0.35C	0.00	0.06
Std. Dev.	0.68	0.95	0.00	0.33

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 88: Q49E. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	143 82.2%	55 73.3%	21 95.5%	67 87.0%A
1	8 4.6%	5 6.7%	- -	3 3.9%
2	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	- -	- -
3	5 2.9%	4 5.3%	- -	1 1.3%
4	3 1.7%	3 4.0%	- -	- -
5	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	- -	- -
Don't Know	13 7.5%	6 8.0%	1 4.5%	6 7.8%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	143 82.2%	55 73.3%	21 95.5%	67 87.0%A
1-5	18 10.3%	14 18.7%C	- -	4 5.2%
Mean	0.26	0.52C	0.00	0.08
Std. Dev.	0.86	1.21	0.00	0.41

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 89: Q49F. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the Regional Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC)?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	145 83.3%	60 80.0%	20 90.9%	65 84.4%
1	3 1.7%	2 2.7%	1 4.5%	- -
2	5 2.9%	3 4.0%	- -	2 2.6%
3	1 0.6%	- -	- -	1 1.3%
5	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	- -	- -
6	2 1.1%	1 1.3%	- -	1 1.3%
Don't Know	17 9.8%	8 10.7%	1 4.5%	8 10.4%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	145 83.3%	60 80.0%	20 90.9%	65 84.4%
1-5	10 5.7%	6 8.0%	1 4.5%	3 3.9%
6-10	2 1.1%	1 1.3%	- -	1 1.3%
Mean	0.21	0.28	0.05	0.19
Std. Dev.	0.88	1.03	0.22	0.86

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 90a: Q49G. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the NW Research Group?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	140 80.5%	55 73.3%	20 90.9%	65 84.4%
1	5 2.9%	3 4.0%	-	2 2.6%
2	4 2.3%	-	-	4 5.2%A
3	5 2.9%	5 6.7%C	-	-
4	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	-	-
5	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	-	-
6	1 0.6%	-	-	1 1.3%
7 thru 10	1 0.6%	-	1 4.5%	-
8 thru 15	2 1.1%	1 1.3%	1 4.5%	-
Don't Know	14 8.0%	8 10.7%	1 4.5%	5 6.5%
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	140 80.5%	55 73.3%	20 90.9%	65 84.4%
1-5	17 9.8%	11 14.7%	-	6 7.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 90b: Q49G. In the past year, how many times have you participated in the NW Research Group? (continued)

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	174	75*	22**	77*
6-10	2 1.1%	- -	1 4.5%	1 1.3%
11+	1 0.6%	1 1.3%	- -	- -
Mean	0.44	0.66	0.48	0.22
Std. Dev.	1.55	1.86	2.18	0.84

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 91: Q50. Did you find the (RESTORE SETGRP RESPONSE FOR ALL GROUPS/COMMITTEES) meeting[s] to be:

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
Very useful	31 47.7%	23 57.5%	1 33.3%	7 31.8%
Somewhat useful	29 44.6%	16 40.0%	1 33.3%	12 54.5%
Not very useful	3 4.6%	1 2.5%	- -	2 9.1%
Don't Know	2 3.1%	- -	1 33.3%	1 4.5%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	60 92.3%	39 97.5%	2 66.7%	19 86.4%
Not useful	3 4.6%	1 2.5%	- -	2 9.1%
Mean	3.44	3.55	3.50	3.24
Std. Dev.	0.59	0.55	0.71	0.62

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 92: Q50. Did you find the Residential Advisory Committee meeting[s] to

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	14*	9**	2**	3**
Very useful	4 28.6%	4 44.4%	- -	- -
Somewhat useful	9 64.3%	5 55.6%	1 50.0%	3 100.0%
Don't Know	1 7.1%	- -	1 50.0%	- -
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	13 92.9%	9 100.0%	1 50.0%	3 100.0%
Mean	3.31	3.44	3.00	3.00
Std. Dev.	0.48	0.53	-	0.00

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 93: Q50. Did you find the Commercial Advisory Committee meeting[s] to be:

	Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)
Base: Total Answering	8*	5**	-**
Very useful	2 25.0%	1 20.0%	- 33.3%
Somewhat useful	5 62.5%	4 80.0%	- 33.3%
Don't Know	1 12.5%	- -	1 33.3%
COLLAPSED CODES:			
Useful	7 87.5%	5 100.0%	- 66.7%
Mean	3.29	3.20	3.50
Std. Dev.	0.49	0.45	0.71

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 94: Q50. Did you find the Industrial Advisory Committee meeting[s] to be:

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	12*	5**	_*	7**
Very useful	4 33.3%	2 40.0%	- -	2 28.6%
Somewhat useful	6 50.0%	2 40.0%	- -	4 57.1%
Not very useful, or	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	10 83.3%	4 80.0%	- -	6 85.7%
Not useful	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
Mean	3.17	3.20	-	3.14
Std. Dev.	0.72	0.84	-	0.69

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 95: Q50. Did you find the aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee meeting[s] to be:

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	2*	1**	-**	1**
Very useful	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	- -	- -
Not very useful, or	1 50.0%	- -	- -	1 100.0%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	- -	- -
Not useful	1 50.0%	- -	- -	1 100.0%
Mean	3.00	4.00	-	2.00
Std. Dev.	1.41	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 96: Q50. Did you find the Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee meeting[s] to be:

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	10*	9**	-**	1**
Very useful	10 100.0%	9 100.0%	- -	1 100.0%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	10 100.0%	9 100.0%	- -	1 100.0%
Mean	4.00	4.00	-	4.00
Std. Dev.	0.00	0.00	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 97: Q50. Did you find the Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC) meeting[s] to be:

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	6*	4**	-**	2**
Very useful	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	- -	1 50.0%
Somewhat useful	3 50.0%	2 50.0%	- -	1 50.0%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	6 100.0%	4 100.0%	- -	2 100.0%
Mean	3.50	3.50	-	3.50
Std. Dev.	0.55	0.58	-	0.71

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 98: Q50. Did you find the NW Research Group meeting[s] to be:

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	13*	7**	1**	5**
Very useful	7 53.8%	4 57.1%	1 100.0%	2 40.0%
Somewhat useful	6 46.2%	3 42.9%	- -	3 60.0%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	13 100.0%	7 100.0%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%
Mean	3.54	3.57	4.00	3.40
Std. Dev.	0.52	0.53	-	0.55

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 99: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the (RESTORE SETGRP RESPONSE FOR ALL GROUPS AND COMMITTEES), how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	43 66.2%	27 67.5%	2 66.7%	14 63.6%
7	4 6.2%	3 7.5%	- -	1 4.5%
6	19 29.2%	13 32.5%	1 33.3%	5 22.7%
5	20 30.8%	11 27.5%	1 33.3%	8 36.4%
4 - Neutral	10 15.4%	7 17.5%	- -	3 13.6%
3	7 10.8%	5 12.5%	- -	2 9.1%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	7 10.8%	5 12.5%	- -	2 9.1%
Don't Know	5 7.7%	1 2.5%	1 33.3%	3 13.6%
Mean	5.05	5.05	5.50	5.00
Std. Dev.	1.11	1.17	0.71	1.05

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 100: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the Residential Advisory Committee, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	14*	9**	2**	3**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	8 57.1%	6 66.7%	1 50.0%	1 33.3%
7	1 7.1%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
6	2 14.3%	2 22.2%	- -	- -
5	5 35.7%	3 33.3%	1 50.0%	1 33.3%
4 - Neutral	2 14.3%	1 11.1%	- -	1 33.3%
3	1 7.1%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	1 7.1%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
Don't Know	3 21.4%	1 11.1%	1 50.0%	1 33.3%
Mean	5.00	5.13	5.00	4.50
Std. Dev.	1.10	1.25	-	0.71

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 101: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the Commercial Advisory Committee, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

	Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)
Base: Total Answering	8*	5**	-**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	4 50.0%	3 60.0%	1 33.3%
5	4 50.0%	3 60.0%	1 33.3%
4 - Neutral	3 37.5%	2 40.0%	1 33.3%
Don't Know	1 12.5%	-	1 33.3%
Mean	4.57	4.60	4.50
Std. Dev.	0.53	0.55	0.71

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 102: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the Industrial Advisory Committee, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	12*	5**	-**	7**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	7 58.3%	3 60.0%	- -	4 57.1%
7	1 8.3%	- -	- -	1 14.3%
6	4 33.3%	2 40.0%	- -	2 28.6%
5	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
4 - Neutral	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
3	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	2 16.7%	1 20.0%	- -	1 14.3%
Don't Know	1 8.3%	- -	- -	1 14.3%
Mean	5.00	4.80	-	5.17
Std. Dev.	1.34	1.30	-	1.47

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 103: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the aMW and Cost-Effectiveness Committee, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	2*	1**	-**	1**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	- -	- -
6	1 50.0%	1 100.0%	- -	- -
3	1 50.0%	- -	- -	1 100.0%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	1 50.0%	- -	- -	1 100.0%
Mean	4.50	6.00	-	3.00
Std. Dev.	2.12	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 104: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the Regional Portfolio Advisory Committee, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	10*	9**	-**	1**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	8 80.0%	7 77.8%	- -	1 100.0%
7	1 10.0%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
6	4 40.0%	3 33.3%	- -	1 100.0%
5	3 30.0%	3 33.3%	- -	- -
4 - Neutral	1 10.0%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
3	1 10.0%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	1 10.0%	1 11.1%	- -	- -
Mean	5.30	5.22	-	6.00
Std. Dev.	1.16	1.20	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 105: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the Emerging Technology Advisory Committee (a.k.a. RETAC), how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

	Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)
Base: Total Answering	6*	4**	-**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	5 83.3%	3 75.0%	2 100.0%
6	2 33.3%	2 50.0%	- -
5	3 50.0%	1 25.0%	2 100.0%
3	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	- -
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	1 16.7%	1 25.0%	- -
Mean	5.00	5.00	5.00
Std. Dev.	1.10	1.41	0.00

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 106: Q51. Thinking about your experience with the NW Research Group, how satisfied are you with this process for understanding and influencing NEEA's work? As before, please use a one to seven scale where one means very dissatisfied and seven means very satisfied.

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	13*	7**	1**	5**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	10 76.9%	4 57.1%	1 100.0%	5 100.0%
7	1 7.7%	1 14.3%	- -	- -
6	6 46.2%	3 42.9%	1 100.0%	2 40.0%
5	3 23.1%	- -	- -	3 60.0%
4 - Neutral	2 15.4%	2 28.6%	- -	- -
3	1 7.7%	1 14.3%	- -	- -
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	1 7.7%	1 14.3%	- -	- -
Mean	5.31	5.14	6.00	5.40
Std. Dev.	1.11	1.46	-	0.55

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 107: Q51A. What about your (RESTORE SETGRP RESPONSE FOR ALL GROUPS AND COMMITTEES) experience caused you to rate your satisfaction as a(Q51 RESPONSE)?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	66*	42*	4**	20**
Good collaborative process/support	12 18.2%	8 19.0%	1 25.0%	3 15.0%
Too much focus on NEEA, not enough on committee/members	12 18.2%	9 21.4%	1 25.0%	2 10.0%
Opportunity for networking	10 15.2%	6 14.3%	1 25.0%	3 15.0%
Good information/useful content	7 10.6%	4 9.5%	-	3 15.0%
Little confused/lack focus/detail	7 10.6%	5 11.9%	-	2 10.0%
Applicable/relevant focus	7 10.6%	4 9.5%	-	3 15.0%
Lacking information/purpose	7 10.6%	6 14.3%	-	1 5.0%
Limited experience/attendance	6 9.1%	3 7.1%	2 50.0%	1 5.0%
Other	9 13.6%	6 14.3%	-	3 15.0%
Don't know	2 3.0%	1 2.4%	-	1 5.0%
Refused	11 16.7%	5 11.9%	-	6 30.0%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Using the same one to seven scale, how satisfied are you with...

Table 108: Q52. The format of Advisory Committee meetings

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	37 56.9%	25 62.5%	2 66.7%	10 45.5%
7	4 6.2%	3 7.5%	- -	1 4.5%
6	19 29.2%	13 32.5%	1 33.3%	5 22.7%
5	14 21.5%	9 22.5%	1 33.3%	4 18.2%
4 - Neutral	7 10.8%	3 7.5%	- -	4 18.2%
3	8 12.3%	5 12.5%	- -	3 13.6%
2	2 3.1%	2 5.0%	- -	- -
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	10 15.4%	7 17.5%	- -	3 13.6%
Don't Know	11 16.9%	5 12.5%	1 33.3%	5 22.7%
Mean	4.96	5.00	5.50	4.82
Std. Dev.	1.32	1.39	0.71	1.24

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Using the same one to seven scale, how satisfied are you with...

Table 109: Q53. NEEA's efforts to keep you informed through Advisory Committee meetings

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	43 66.2%	30 75.0%	2 66.7%	11 50.0%
7	5 7.7%	4 10.0%	-	1 4.5%
6	26 40.0%	18 45.0%	2 66.7%	6 27.3%
5	12 18.5%	8 20.0%	-	4 18.2%
4 - Neutral	9 13.8%	5 12.5%	-	4 18.2%
3	5 7.7%	1 2.5%	-	4 18.2%
1	1 1.5%	-	-	1 4.5%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	6 9.2%	1 2.5%	-	5 22.7%
Don't Know	7 10.8%	4 10.0%	1 33.3%	2 9.1%
Mean	5.22	5.53	6.00	4.60
Std. Dev.	1.24	0.97	0.00	1.50

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Using the same one to seven scale, how satisfied are you with...

Table 110: Q54. Your ability to influence NEEA's work through the Advisory Committee process

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
Total Satisfied [5-7]	31 47.7%	23 57.5%	2 66.7%	6 27.3%
7	4 6.2%	2 5.0%	- -	2 9.1%
6	15 23.1%	11 27.5%	- -	4 18.2%
5	12 18.5%	10 25.0%	2 66.7%	- -
4 - Neutral	16 24.6%	10 25.0%	- -	6 27.3%
3	7 10.8%	2 5.0%	- -	5 22.7%
2	2 3.1%	2 5.0%	- -	- -
1	1 1.5%	- -	- -	1 4.5%
Total Dissatisfied [1-3]	10 15.4%	4 10.0%	- -	6 27.3%
Don't Know	8 12.3%	3 7.5%	1 33.3%	4 18.2%
Mean	4.70	4.86	5.00	4.33
Std. Dev.	1.36	1.23	0.00	1.64

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 111: Q55. Would you say the frequency of NEEA Advisory Committee meetings is...

		Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)	
	Base: Total Answering	65*	40*	3**	22**
	About right	39 60.0%	29 72.5%	1 33.3%	9 40.9%
	Not frequent enough, or	3 4.6%	2 5.0%	- -	1 4.5%
	Too frequent	2 3.1%	- -	- -	2 9.1%
Don't Know	21 32.3%	9 22.5%	2 66.7%	10 45.5%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 112: Q57. In the past year, how many times have you participated in other in-person meetings with NEEA staff?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	69 28.2%	26 27.7% C	27 64.3% AC	16 14.7%
1	14 5.7%	4 4.3%	3 7.1%	7 6.4%
2	28 11.4%	13 13.8%	3 7.1%	12 11.0%
3	17 6.9%	9 9.6%	2 4.8%	6 5.5%
4	18 7.3%	6 6.4%	1 2.4%	11 10.1%
5	13 5.3%	3 3.2%	2 4.8%	8 7.3%
6	10 4.1%	5 5.3%	- -	5 4.6%
7 thru 10	16 6.5%	4 4.3%	- -	12 11.0% B
8 thru 15	30 12.2%	8 8.5%	3 7.1%	19 17.4%
16 thru 20	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	- -	7 6.4%
21+	14 5.7%	4 4.3%	- -	10 9.2% B
Don't Know	21 8.6%	12 12.8%	1 2.4%	8 7.3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 113: Q57. In the past year, how many times have you participated in other in-person meetings with NEEA staff?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	69 28.2%	26 27.7%C	27 64.3%AC	16 14.7%
1-5	90 36.7%	35 37.2%	11 26.2%	44 40.4%
6-10	26 10.6%	9 9.6%B	- -	17 15.6%B
11+	39 15.9%	12 12.8%	3 7.1%	24 22.0%B
Mean	7.38	4.82B	1.59	11.80AB
Std. Dev.	15.46	6.76	3.27	21.28

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 114: Q57A. Did you find the other in-person meetings with NEEA staff to be...

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	155	56*	14**	85*
Very useful	99 63.9%	29 51.8%	8 57.1%	62 72.9%A
Somewhat useful	48 31.0%	25 44.6%C	5 35.7%	18 21.2%
Not very useful	4 2.6%	1 1.8%	1 7.1%	2 2.4%
Not at all useful	2 1.3%	- -	- -	2 2.4%
Don't Know	2 1.3%	1 1.8%	- -	1 1.2%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	147 94.8%	54 96.4%	13 92.9%	80 94.1%
Not useful	6 3.9%	1 1.8%	1 7.1%	4 4.7%
Mean	3.59	3.51	3.50	3.67
Std. Dev.	0.61	0.54	0.65	0.65

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 115: Q58. In the past 12 months, approximately how many times have you accessed NEEA's website, NW Alliance.org?

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : I				
0	31 12.7%	8 8.5%	13 31.0% AC	10 9.2%
1	13 5.3%	5 5.3%	3 7.1%	5 4.6%
2	28 11.4%	15 16.0%	3 7.1%	10 9.2%
3	20 8.2%	6 6.4%	4 9.5%	10 9.2%
4	18 7.3%	9 9.6%	1 2.4%	8 7.3%
5	14 5.7%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	9 8.3%
6	25 10.2%	13 13.8% C	6 14.3%	6 5.5%
7 thru 10	13 5.3%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	7 6.4%
8 thru 15	30 12.2%	9 9.6%	5 11.9%	16 14.7%
16 thru 20	12 4.9%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	6 5.5%
21+	25 10.2%	6 6.4%	- -	19 17.4% AB
Don't Know	28 11.4%	13 13.8%	5 11.9%	10 9.2%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 116: Q58. In the past 12 months, approximately how many times have you accessed NEEA's website, NW Alliance.org?

		Stakeholder Type		
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
COLLAPSED CODES : II				
0	31 12.7%	8 8.5%	13 31.0%AC	10 9.2%
1-5	93 38.0%	39 41.5%	12 28.6%	42 38.5%
6-10	38 15.5%	17 18.1%	8 19.0%	13 11.9%
11+	55 22.4%	17 18.1%	4 9.5%	34 31.2%AB
Mean	11.19	8.05	3.92	16.48AB
Std. Dev.	20.60	13.19	4.87	26.99

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base

Table 117: Q58A. Did you find NEEA's website to be...

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	186	73*	24**	89*
Very useful	48 25.8%	15 20.5%	5 20.8%	28 31.5%
Somewhat useful	124 66.7%	49 67.1%	16 66.7%	59 66.3%
Not very useful	11 5.9%	7 9.6%^C	3 12.5%	1 1.1%
Don't Know	3 1.6%	2 2.7%	- -	1 1.1%
COLLAPSED CODES:				
Useful	172 92.5%	64 87.7%	21 87.5%	87 97.8%^A
Not useful	11 5.9%	7 9.6%^C	3 12.5%	1 1.1%
Mean	3.20	3.11	3.08	3.31 ^A
Std. Dev.	0.53	0.55	0.58	0.49

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Table 118: Q59. Finally, please tell me what, if anything, NEEA could do to improve how it interacts with you and your organization

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Satisfied/interaction is good/continue in same direction	35 14.3%	9 9.6%	9 21.4%	17 15.6%
Provide more/better opportunities for interaction/collaboration	26 10.6%	10 10.6%	4 9.5%	12 11.0%
Provide access to information/sharing information/make information easier to obtain	13 5.3%	7 7.4%	3 7.1%	3 2.8%
Reach out more/be more accessible	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	3 7.1%	4 3.7%
Improve communication/clarify initiatives/decisions/program goals	11 4.5%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	5 4.6%
Better coordination/relevance to region/local support	10 4.1%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
Be more knowledgeable of the industry/support utility needs more	8 3.3%	5 5.3%	1 2.4%	2 1.8%
Be more focused on the end user/customer	8 3.3%	2 2.1%	2 4.8%	4 3.7%
Continue to make progress/work on strategic planning/expand initiatives	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	- -	4 3.7%

* small base;

Table 119: Q59. Finally, please tell me what, if anything, NEEA could do to improve how it interacts with you and your organization.

	Stakeholder Type			
	Total	Direct Funder (A)	Other NW Utilities (B)	Non-Utility (C)
Base: Total Answering	245	94*	42*	109
Survey comments	7 2.9%	3 3.2%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Support me in energy saving incentives and cost effectiveness	6 2.4%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
I do not interact with NEEA/not relevant	6 2.4%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	3 2.8%
Provide follow up information/updates on activities	6 2.4%	4 4.3%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Improve evaluation methods/measures/impact	4 1.6%	2 2.1%	1 2.4%	1 0.9%
Opportunities to learn about new technology/plans	4 1.6%	4 4.3% C	- -	- -
Other	17 6.9%	8 8.5%	2 4.8%	7 6.4%
No/Not any/None/Nothing	11 4.5%	4 4.3%	2 4.8%	5 4.6%
Don't know	2 0.8%	2 2.1%	- -	- -
Refused	104 42.4%	38 40.4%	15 35.7%	51 46.8%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/B/C

* small base