

# Local Government Association

*Market Progress Evaluation Report, No. 4*

*prepared by*

**B&B Resources, Inc.  
Megdal & Associates**

*report #E03-122*

December 30, 2003



**NORTHWEST ENERGY EFFICIENCY ALLIANCE**

[www.nweaalliance.org](http://www.nweaalliance.org)

529 SW Third Avenue, Suite 600  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
telephone: 503.827.8416  
fax: 503.827.8437

# **Local Government Association (LGA) Support Project**

## **Market Progress Evaluation Report #4**

**Conducted for the  
Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance**

**By**

**B&B Resources, Inc.  
Megdal & Associates  
December 2003**



# Table of Contents

|   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Executive Summary .....  | 1  |
|   | Program Description .....  | 1  |
|   | Evaluation Description .....   | 1  |
|   | Key Findings .....   | 1  |
|   | Recommendations .....  | 2  |
| 2 | Introduction.....  | 3  |
| 3 | Background and Previous LGA Support Project Evaluation Findings.....     | 3  |
|   | Background on the LGA Support Project .....                              | 3  |
|   | Previous LGA Support Project Findings and Recommendations .....          | 4  |
| 4 | Evaluation Issues .....  | 6  |
| 5 | LGA Implementer Findings .....   | 6  |
|   | Objectives .....   | 6  |
|   | Montana.....   | 6  |
|   | Oregon.....  | 7  |
|   | Washington.....  | 8  |
|   | Idaho .....  | 9  |
|   | LGA Implementer Interviews – General Observations and Conclusions.....   | 10 |
| 6 | LGA Member Survey Findings.....  | 10 |
|   | General Respondent Information.....                                      | 10 |
|   | Recognition of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance .....            | 12 |
|   | Recognition and Awareness of Alliance Programs and Services .....        | 12 |
|   | Knowledge and Awareness of the LGA .....                                 | 13 |
|   | Summary of Member Survey Findings.....                                   | 14 |
| 7 | Additional Interviews: Findings .....                                    | 15 |
|   | Alliance Project Manager.....  | 15 |
|   | Alliance Contractor – BacGen .....                                       | 15 |
|   | Alliance Contractor - Builder Operation Certification (BOC) .....        | 15 |
| 8 | Follow-up Research and Activities .....                                  | 16 |
|   | Alliance Board Member Interviews .....                                   | 17 |
|   | New Contract Development .....   | 20 |
|   | Draft Statements of Work .....   | 20 |
|   | Board involvement in Statement of Work development.....                  | 21 |
|   | Alliance staff discussions with LGAs .....                               | 21 |
|   | Contract issuance .....  | 21 |
|   | Action plans.....  | 21 |
| 9 | Program Recommendations .....  | 21 |
|   | Continue Introduction of Mutually Beneficial Programs and Services ..... | 21 |
|   | Set Clear Alliance Goals .....   | 22 |
|   | Investigate Discrepancy in Old vs. New Survey Findings.....              | 23 |
|   | Summation.....   | 23 |



## **1 Executive Summary**

### **Program Description**

Each state in the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (Alliance) territory has a Local Government Association (LGA) that provides information and works on issues of interest to its member governments. The LGAs' strong, long-term relationships with their members puts them in a unique position to influence attitudes and actions regarding energy efficiency. In July of 1997, the Alliance approved a program to provide funding to each LGA to promote the Alliance's market transformation efforts among their members. Some of the LGAs also work on energy-related legislative issues and sponsor energy-efficiency activities or events under their Alliance contracts.

### **Evaluation Description**

The goal of this evaluation was to document the achievements and activities of the LGAs. The research conducted took a qualitative rather than quantitative approach, focusing on reviewing previous findings and updating them with new data gathering efforts where appropriate. Interviews were conducted initially with the implementers from each of the four LGAs, 30 members of the LGAs, the Alliance project coordinator, and representatives of the two Alliance projects most relevant to the LGAs, BacGen and Building Operator Certification.

The evaluation effort took a unique twist when, after the preliminary evaluation was presented, the preliminary results were used to improve and enhance the LGA Support project by incorporating these findings into the new contract negotiations. Additionally, interviews were conducted with five Alliance Board members in an attempt to broaden the evaluation perspective. The additional survey results and the impact on the new contracts are included in Section 8 of this report.

### **Key Findings**

An exploratory telephone survey of thirty LGA member governments was conducted to provide information on awareness of the Alliance and its programs, one of the progress indicators contained in the April 2000 Staff Recommendation. Respondents were selected from a group that had responded to an Alliance evaluation mail-out survey in 2000 that asked questions on the same topic, so there was a potential bias toward higher awareness. Care should be taken when interpreting these results.

While the results are only exploratory and not intended for extrapolation to the entire population, some are a cause for discussion at any level. First, several of the people surveyed claimed not to know that their LGA representative was involved with energy efficiency even though they worked with this person on a regular basis. Second, awareness of Alliance programs was quite low. Awareness of the BacGen project actually decreased since the 2000 survey, even though that program has the most direct link to local governments and, as verified by the LGA implementers, has been a major focus of recent LGA efforts.

Interviews with the LGA representatives indicated a high level of confidence that contract obligations were being met and that outreach and information to many member governments was occurring. It was also clear that the Alliance work often overlapped with other LGA work so it was difficult to state categorically how many hours were spent on the Alliance contract.

Another key finding was that the goals and specific desired outcomes of the project are not clearly stated in the contracts or consistently communicated between the Alliance and the LGA contractors. This affected many of the topics discussed in this report.

Finally, it should be noted that the five board members interviewed all indicated that the LGA program was valuable and should be continued.

## Recommendations

- *Continue to Maintain Relationships with the four Local Government Associations (LGA's).* Based on the results of this evaluation effort, it is recommended that the Alliance continue to maintain contracts with the four LGA's. Evaluation results and findings should be used to update the existing contracts in order to create mutually beneficial goals and outcomes for both the Alliance and the contracting LGA's.
- *Investigate Discrepancy in Old vs. New Survey Findings.* Comparing the 2003 to the 2000 survey results shows several peculiarities such as the lowered awareness of BacGen. This could suggest that the past marketing of these programs was more effective than marketing efforts in progress today. Additional research, particularly looking at the situation on a state-by-state basis, may shed light both on this particular topic and more generally on the effectiveness of the LGAs marketing techniques.
- *Set Clear Alliance Goals.* Going forward, the Alliance should develop a clearer understanding of what they want to derive from their relationship with the LGAs. This understanding would include setting short-term objectives (e.g. promote BacGen technology to members) and also long-range goals ( e.g. percent of members aware of Alliance programs).
- *Continue Introduction of Mutually Beneficial Programs and Services.* The Alliance should decide whether cities and towns are a target market for its programs. Given that (a) most of the value provided by the LGAs has been in promoting Alliance programs and (b) Alliance funding for BacGen, the most important program for local governments, is ending soon, it appears that the continuing value of the LGA project to the Alliance is contingent upon the development of future projects relevant to local governments. Discussions with Alliance staff indicate that no major projects of this sort are currently being developed.

## 2 Introduction

In January of 2003, the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (Alliance) contracted with B&B Resources to conduct an evaluation of the Local Government Association (LGA) Support Project. The goal of this evaluation was to document the achievements and activities of the LGAs as they relate to energy efficiency and to provide information to decision-makers to determine if the contract model currently in place is the most appropriate option available to the Alliance.

The research conducted took a qualitative rather than quantitative approach, focusing on reviewing previous findings and updating them with new data where appropriate. Three previous evaluation reports were reviewed during the course of this evaluation<sup>1</sup>:

- *Local Government Cooperative Agreement Special Report – Process Evaluation.* Hagler Bailly Consulting. April 1998. Report E98-005.
- *Market Progress Evaluation Report.* Megdal & Associates, B&B Resources, Inc., Karen Hamilton Consulting. June 1999. E99-029.
- *Market Progress Evaluation Report No. 3.* Megdal & Associates, B&B Resources, Inc. November 2000. E00-066.

The following interviews were conducted to build upon these previous research efforts:

- Implementers for the four state LGAs:
  - ⇒ Idaho Ken Harward, Executive Director; Kate Bell, Associate
  - ⇒ Oregon Andrea Fogue, Senior Staff Associate
  - ⇒ Montana Mike McCourt, Energy Coordinator
  - ⇒ Washington Victoria Lincoln, Energy Project Coordinator; Susan Greenlee, Energy Project Assistant
- BacGen Alliance Project Contractor
- LGA Support Project Coordinator
- Thirty LGA members – Eight interviews were conducted from Idaho, Oregon and Montana and six from Washington.

## 3 Background and Previous LGA Support Project Evaluation Findings

### Background on the LGA Support Project

Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana comprise the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (Alliance) territory. Each state in the territory has a Local Government Association (LGA) that works with their member governments on energy issues. The LGAs' strong, long-term relationships with its members puts them in a unique position to influence attitudes and actions regarding energy efficiency.

---

<sup>1</sup> All reports available at [www.nwalliance.org/resources/evalreports.asp](http://www.nwalliance.org/resources/evalreports.asp).

LGAs were funded through a Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) grant program from the 1980s through 1997. In July of 1997, the Alliance approved a program to continue providing funding to each LGA. For this report, the staff member who receives this funding is called the LGA implementer. The current three-year contract that will expire in June 2003 has a total budget of \$800,800. The funding is equal to approximately half the salary of the LGA implementers, except in Montana where it is equal to approximately three-quarters of the LGA implementer's salary. Expenses related to Alliance activities (travel, promotion, etc.) must also be covered under the funding.

Under the Alliance contract, the LGAs promote the Alliance's market transformation efforts among the hundreds of local jurisdictions in the four-state region. LGA representatives keep their members current on Alliance projects and opportunities of interest to municipal governments. These projects currently include:

- Building Operator Certification
- Commissioning in Public Buildings
- EZSim
- BacGen
- LED Traffic Signals
- BetterBricks
- AM400 (low-cost soil moisture data logger)

### **Previous LGA Support Project Findings and Recommendations**

Over the years, numerous evaluation interviews have taken place with LGA members, LGA staff, board members, Alliance staff and many other involved parties. The findings from these previous efforts are very similar to the findings obtained today. Furthermore, many of the same issues and concerns that surfaced in the older reports remain unresolved today. In particular, Megdal & Associates conducted a mail-out survey of LGA members in their November 2000 Market Progress Evaluation Report. The results showed that LGA members not only had very low awareness of the Alliance, but also of the LGAs' provision of energy efficiency assistance to its members. Specifically:

- One-third of local governments indicated that they were aware of the Alliance and its mission;
- One-third of the local governments knew that the LGA provided energy efficiency assistance;
- 19% of the respondents had seen program materials from the Alliance.

Awareness of some Alliance programs was higher, as shown in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 – Program Awareness in November 2000 Market Progress Evaluation Report**

|  | Awareness |
|--|-----------|
| LightWise (efficient lighting)   | 60%       |
| Resource efficient washing machine (Energy Star/WashWise)                  | 49%       |
| Energy code support  | 45%       |
| Legislative & state regulatory efforts that will support energy efficiency | 43%       |
| Building Operator Certification  | 41%       |
| Energy conference  | 36%       |
| BacGen wastewater treatment process  | 29%       |
| Commissioning Program  | 26%       |
| EZSim  | 11%       |

Though overall awareness was not high, the 2000 report showed that the LGA implementers played an important role in getting the word out about specific Alliance programs. The report stated:

*“Alliance contractors for the BacGen, Building Operator Certification, and EZSim projects were interviewed regarding their relationship to and experiences with the LGA contractors. All of them find the support they receive from the LGA contractors very helpful and useful in reaching local governments. All contractors mentioned the LGA’s ability to get to the “right” person and the trusted relationships they have with the local government decision-makers.”*

It appears that many of the recommendations made in the 2000 report regarding program communications and program marketing have taken place, including:

- Continuing to have joint meetings (i.e., all LGAs meet together) and having Alliance staff visit the LGAs;
- Having the Alliance work with their other project contractors to ensure that they use the LGAs as a “marketing tool” and that joint marketing plans are developed;
- Developing project brochures to target local governments and their particular needs.

One recommendation that does not appear to have been implemented in all states was for LGA implementers to follow-up with member cities that requested more information in the mail-out survey. In Oregon, at least, this was due to a change in personnel where the importance of the follow-up list was not communicated to the new LGA rep.

## **4 Evaluation Issues**

A difficulty in evaluating the LGA Support Project is the lack of a clear connection between the LGA work funded by the Alliance and the ability to identify or attribute outcomes to those activities. In part, this is due to the loose nature of the relationship between the LGAs and their members. This issue was acknowledged during the 2000 contract renewal process when the Board agreed that they were primarily supporting a “partnership relationship” through these contracts rather than expecting specific results. At the same time, and somewhat contradictorily, some Board members desired a higher level of accountability. The contracts that were put in place three years ago attempted to meld these two perspectives. They are quite specific with regard to the types of activities that should be undertaken, however the contracts contain no quantitative progress indicators or required outcomes. Given this situation, it can easily be shown that the LGAs are fulfilling their contractual obligations; on the other hand it is difficult to say whether the value the Alliance is receiving through these contracts is being maximized.

## **5 LGA Implementer Findings**

During March 2003, the implementers from the four state LGAs were interviewed. These discussions focused on the amount of time the LGAs spent on Alliance-related activities. This information was then supplemented with a written list of important activities and accomplishments that was provided by the LGAs and information from the Alliance project manager.

### **Objectives**

The Statement of Work in each of the LGA contracts contains the following three objectives:

- (1) facilitate the marketing of Alliance market transformation projects;
- (2) educate local government elected officials and employees about their energy efficiency options;
- (3) serve as a source of information for the Alliance regarding local government energy issues.

In addition, the League of Oregon Cities contract contains a fourth objective:

- (4) endorse public policy issues in the arena of market transformation consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Regional Review.

### **Montana**

Mike McCourt is the LGA implementer for Montana and forms the part of the LGA known as the Montana Local Government Energy Office (MLGEO). He indicated that on average 90% of his work was focused on promoting Alliance energy projects. This figure is less during the Legislative period which can be very demanding of his time.

Montana is unique from the other LGAs in that its implementer has energy as the number one item on his regular agenda, a result of the Alliance funding almost his entire salary (unlike the other LGA implementers who are funded at 50% or less of their salaries). Another reason for his energy focus is that the Montana LGA is small and Mr. McCourt, who works in Missoula, is geographically separated other Montana LGA staff in Helena. This separation, along with the fact that the LGA is not paying a significant percentage of his salary, appears to result in less LGA-related demands on his time.

Mr. McCourt had this to say regarding the best way to get the word out regarding energy efficiency programs and services:

*“Nothing beats face-to-face in Montana. Our members like to see a face – I try to make presentations on larger projects at least once a year – and then frequently by phone. Basically, I do a loop of travel two or three times a year – pick a route and then spend around a week going out on the road.”*

In 2002, Mr. McCourt made more than twenty site visits to jurisdictions to provide information about Alliance activities and programs. One of Mr. McCourt’s main activities is the promotion of the BacGen project where he continues to play a key role in providing information and educating elected officials and city administrators about the benefits of BacGen. This year, in the Flathead Lake area, BacGen is developing at least five new projects that will go on line this fall. Two years ago the MLGEO was also instrumental in getting the first two BacGen demonstration projects underway in Montana for the cities of Dillon and Roundup. Both of these jurisdictions continue to save at least 50% on electric utility bills each month.

The MLGEO continues to play an important role in the marketing of the Building Operator Certification training in Montana. Since marketing began more than two years ago, more than forty building operators have been through the Level I course and in September, thirteen operators will take the first Level II class series in Bozeman. Mr. McCourt also assists the Northwest Building Operators Association with establishing good working relationships with Montana utilities.

## **Oregon**

The Oregon Implementer, Andrea Fogue, has a much stronger focus on legislative issues than the other implementers. Oregon legislative sessions occur every two years and last for around six months. Unlike the other states, one of the tasks in the Oregon contract specifically requires that the implementer “Stay informed on restructuring/public purposes by attending appropriate meetings.” This was specifically intended to apply to Senate Bill 1149 which addressed electric deregulation in the 1999 legislative session, and developed further in the 2001 session. As part of this task, Ms Fogue continues to serve on the Portfolio Advisory Committee, which outlines options for residential and small customers under Oregon’s electric restructuring plan, including a renewable, time-of-use, and other conservation and efficiency options.

Ms. Fogue travels throughout the state sharing Alliance program information and has visited several BacGen communities. She has also written articles promoting Alliance programs in LocalFocus, the Association's newsletter, and created the "Electric Restructuring and Your City" publication discussing the transition to a restructured utility industry and the critical ties with programs to save energy and cut costs. Ms. Fogue has also worked to promote the LED traffic lights project in Oregon.

Last Spring she held mini energy conferences throughout the state to assist cities with the transition to a restructured electric utility industry, emphasizing the importance of implementing ways to save energy and cut costs. Speakers included the Alliance, Oregon Office of Energy, Energy Trust of Oregon, and utilities. Over sixty cities attended. One meeting was held at the Beaverton Library, which was one of the Alliance's commissioning demonstration projects. The meeting included a tour of the facility to highlight the commissioning features. Ms. Fogue also organized a separate "Energy Tour" of various facilities in the Portland Metro Area to promote energy efficiency, conservation and advanced energy technologies.

## Washington

In Washington, the Association of Washington Cities' LGA splits Alliance project duties between two staff members. Victoria Lincoln has the primary responsibility for working directly with the LGA's members. Susan Greenlee handles research and the quarterly newsletter. Overall, this shared concept seems to work well, in large part due to the time and effort Ms. Lincoln and Ms. Greenlee dedicate toward planning. Ms. Lincoln stated:

*"[(We) set priorities – Susan and I go over what are the[Alliance's] interests and priorities – if the Alliance or Andy contact us regarding a project – for example BacGen – then [we] lay out a game plan – and map out up to six months ahead. This planning includes laying out visits and mailings – come January our emphasis switches to back to the legislative session."*

This planning appears helpful, as the Washington LGA had a better sense than most of the other implementers as to how it spent its time on Alliance projects. The energy-related work of the LGA is known as the Local Government Energy Project (LGEP).

In 2001, the LGEP played a significant role in getting State Building Code Council (SBCC) approval of the first significant code changes since energy codes were originally adopted in the early 1990's. The code amendments went into effect July 1, 2002. LGEP contributed to the success of these code changes by working to get favorable votes from the SBCC members representing cities, counties, and building officials. In addition, they testified in favor of the code changes at the SBCC public hearing, and worked with other organizations to secure support such as the WA Association of Counties, the Governor's policy staff, the state Energy Policy Office and the SBCC public representative.

The LGEP produces “The Operator”, a quarterly newsletter that has been written and distributed to public building operators for the past decade. The newsletter features articles about building efficiency and operations, conservation programs (such as the Alliance, BPA and utilities), training programs, and additional resources such as websites.

The Local Government Energy Project hosted an energy conference in August 2001 that featured Alliance projects such as Energy Star, Energy Ideas Clearinghouse, Building Commissioning, BacGen, LED Project, Lighting Design Lab, and Energy Codes. About 90 participants spent one-and-a-half days attending workshops, listening to guest speakers and visiting displays on a variety of subjects.

The LGEP has worked extensively on the LED traffic lights project, surveying the largest utilities in the state about their LED rebate programs and then marketing them on behalf of the utilities that requested assistance. They featured the LED project in “The Operator” newsletter and held LED workshops at the LGEP energy conference and the AWC Annual Membership Conference in June, 2002. Finally, they worked with the Portland Energy Office outreach program to develop and deliver LED marketing materials.

During the 2001 winter energy crisis, the LGEP acted as the liaison between the state and cities/counties. The LGEP staff forwarded a request from Governor Locke for all government offices to reduce energy usage by at least 10%. LGEP maintained a database of contacts at each city to convey late-breaking information about the crisis and educational materials. Throughout this period of time, cities reported energy use reductions ranging from 5% to as much as 40%.

## **Idaho**

At the end of 2002, the Association of Idaho Cities (AIC) lost their Alliance representative, Debbie Bloom. For this evaluation, the executive director of the Idaho LGA, Ken Harward, and Debbie’s replacement, Kate Bell, were interviewed. As can be expected with this staff turn-over, Kate is still learning her job responsibilities. She indicated that right now she views her largest Alliance-related projects as setting up the energy conference (estimated to be 75% of her time for three months) and building relationships within the LGA member network.

The Alliance project manager and AIC recently took advantage of the new staff being in place to conduct a detailed review of the contract. This was an excellent step that will help ensure that the LGA Implementer understands what the Alliance expects from this project. Due to this staffing change, Idaho LGA activities and accomplishments were not received by the Alliance. However, the AIC has each year produced the Idaho Energy Conference, the largest annual energy conference in the Northwest. Last year almost 300 people attended.

## LGA Implementer Interviews – General Observations and Conclusions

- It is clear that the LGAs feel that they are meeting their contract requirements. However, there appeared to be a disconnect between the level of work the LGA implementers considered necessary to meet their contracts and what the Alliance expected when they began the current contracts. In the future, setting more concrete requirements such as a specific number of monthly contacts with member cities, number of presentations per year, or producing a significant energy event such as the Idaho Energy Conference will help ensure a closer match between LGA accomplishments and Alliance goals. It should be noted, however, that even if such concrete requirements are established it will still not resolve the issue of determining the outcomes or the impacts that result from these contracts.
- All the implementers, with the exception of Mr. McCourt in Montana, had trouble calculating the amount of hours spent on Alliance-related activities. While there is no contractual obligation to track hours or to spend a set number of hours on Alliance-related activities, it struck the evaluator as odd that the implementers do not use some form of tracking given the large amount of funding provided by the Alliance.
- It was difficult for the Idaho and Oregon implementers, and to a lesser extent the Washington implementer, to differentiate the work they did for the Alliance because it was intertwined with their other LGA activities. For example, while their legislative duties were seen as being a number one priority for the LGA, the LGAs, to varying degrees, felt that a percentage of this time should be categorized as Alliance work. **While there is a clear benefit to the Alliance in having access to energy-efficiency-related legislative information, the new contracts should set clear expectations regarding the amount of time the Alliance considers appropriate for this activity and the specific type of information it is interested in.**

Three of the implementers list BacGen as one of the projects where they are dedicating the greatest amounts of their time and energy efficiency efforts<sup>2</sup>. They also feel that this program has the most promise for their members. The implementers all indicated that they would like to see more projects like BacGen (large savings potential, nice fit for smaller cities and towns) brought to them by the Alliance.

## 6 LGA Member Survey Findings

### General Respondent Information

During February 2003, thirty LGA members were contacted with an exploratory survey to determine their awareness of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (Alliance), programs and services sponsored by the Alliance, and energy efficiency services

---

<sup>2</sup> Washington is just beginning to work with the BacGen program, but the LGA implementer sees it as extremely promising.

provided by their Local Government Association. These topics were based on one of the progress indicators from the April 2000 staff recommendation memo, which stated that the LGA's will "...maintain awareness among member communities of the Alliance and its activities as well as services the LGAs can provide." The survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.

Contact names for this research effort were taken from a list of the year 2000 mail-out survey respondents who had provided their names upon returning their survey questionnaire. (Their responses could have remained confidential if desired.) Before the current survey effort was underway, it was felt that this list might be biased towards increased knowledge of the Alliance and energy efficiency efforts since these individuals:

1. Were asked about the Alliance approximately three years ago.
2. Had provided their contact information (and in many cases, requested additional information about the Alliance programs) and these lists had been given to the appropriate LGA as "marketing opportunities."

Survey results did not show this expected higher level of awareness, however. The overall level was low, indicating that three out of the four LGAs likely did not pursue the lists as marketing leads. Neither did the prior surveys seem to increase awareness of the Alliance, as only one person remembered being surveyed on this topic in the past and that person had no additional knowledge of the Alliance or their programs.<sup>3</sup>

The average size of the towns surveyed varied greatly, ranging from less than a thousand to 180,000 residents with a varied range of town sizes surveyed for each state. Table 6.1 provides the sizes of the towns surveyed for each state:

**Table 6.1. Town Sizes of LGA Member Interviewees by State**

|            | Town 1  | Town 2 | Town 3 | Town 4 | Town 5 | Town 6 | Town 7 | Town 8 |
|------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Idaho      | 180,000 | 3,750  | 1,000  | 90,000 | 11,000 | 4,000  | 1,000  | 11,000 |
| Montana    | 2,000   | 15,000 | 3,750  | 60,000 | 3,500  | 1,000  | 3,500  | 25,000 |
| Oregon     | 15,000  | 1,500  | 15,000 | 7,500  | 800    | 1000   | 53,000 | 1,400  |
| Washington | 30,000  | 8,000  | 1,000  | 1,750  | 93,000 | 1,800  | N/A    | N/A    |

Positions and titles of the respondents also varied significantly. Worth noting is that *not a single respondent mentioned that they were not the correct individuals to receive (at least initially) any information related to energy efficiency.* This is an important finding, as it indicates that there is a wide range of positions, from City Clerk to Mayor, that are interested in energy efficiency and, consequently, should be included in any targeted marketing efforts. By state, Table 6.2 shows the titles of the individuals surveyed for this report.

<sup>3</sup> Four of the thirty respondents were new to their position, having taken the place of the previously contacted employee within the past two years.

**Table 6.2. Positions / Titles of LGA Member Interviewees by State**

|            | Town 1             | Town 2             | Town 3                         | Town 4             | Town 5                 | Town 6                   | Town 7               | Town 8              |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Idaho      | Project Manager    | City Clerk         | City Treasurer                 | County Engineer    | Public Works Director  | Building Official        | City Clerk           | Building Official   |
| Montana    | Building Official  | Deputy Asst. Clerk | Community Development Director | City Administrator | Mayor                  | City Clerk               | City Manager         | County commissioner |
| Oregon     | City Administrator | City Manager       | City Administrator             | City Manager       | City Recorder          | City Recorder            | Franchise Specialist | Admin. Assistant    |
| Washington | Facilities Manager | Building Inspector | Public Works Director          | City Administrator | Director of Facilities | Director of Public Works | N/A                  | N/A                 |

The average number of years that the respondent had been at their position also varied greatly, with tenure ranging from less than a year to over thirty years. Overall, the average length of time the respondents had been in their position was approximately ten years. This surprisingly long tenure would be expected to result in higher levels of awareness. However, this supposition did not prove true.

It should be emphasized that because only 30 people were surveyed, results are not statistically significant at a level appropriate for drawing general conclusions. In particular, at an individual state level they should only be used to highlight points of interest. The results are intended as insights into issues of interest to the Alliance.

### **Recognition of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance**

Awareness of the Alliance was low, with only six out of the thirty respondents (20%) indicating that they had at least some knowledge of the Alliance. Three out of these six members were located in Washington. Awareness of the Alliance came through attendance of training sessions sponsored by the Alliance, conference or Energy Fair exposure, participation in a BacGen pilot, and/or the use of the Alliance's Web Site to research energy efficiency.

This level of awareness is lower than that found in the year 2000 mail-out survey, where one-third of respondents indicated that they knew of the Alliance. While there is no contractual requirement that the LGAs promote the Alliance itself, it would seem that recognition should be rising slowly as Alliance projects are promoted over the years, both as the implementers continue to mention the various projects that are funded by the Alliance and because virtually all materials and events associated with the projects have the Alliance name and logo on them.

### **Recognition and Awareness of Alliance Programs and Services**

There was slightly higher awareness of some of the Alliance's programs and services than of the Alliance itself. While respondents may have heard of a particular program, they usually did not know that the program was sponsored by the Alliance. Instead they assumed that it was offered to them by their LGA or local utility. The programs located in the left-hand column of Table 6.3 were read to all respondents.

**Table 6.3 Current Program Awareness Among LGA Members**

| <b>Current Programs</b>                    | <b>2003<br/>Results %<br/>(n=30)</b> | <b>2000<br/>Results %<br/>(n=230)</b> | <b>Difference<br/>Statistically<br/>Significant?</b> |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Building Operator Certification (BOC)      | 37%                                  | 41%                                   | No   |
| BacGen                                     | 13%                                  | 29%                                   | Yes at 90%   |
| LED Traffic Signals                        | 23%                                  | N/A                                   | N/A  |
| EZSim                                      | 3%                                   | 11%                                   | Yes at 80%*  |
| Commissioning Program                      | 17%                                  | 26%                                   | Yes at 80%*  |
| BetterBricks                               | 3%                                   | N/A                                   | N/A  |
| AM400 (low-cost soil moisture data logger) | 0%                                   | N/A                                   | N/A  |

\*The 80% confidence level is usually considered too low to be used for decision-making.

Overall, seventeen of the thirty respondents (57%) indicated that they had heard of at least one of these programs. However, six of these seventeen respondents indicated only a very slight awareness of one program, which they felt was similar to one run by their local utility company or promoted by a state agency. When these six are excluded, it appears that only eleven out of thirty local government respondents surveyed had heard of any of the Alliance's programs or services.

Of the Alliance programs surveyed, only the Building Operator Certification program had over a third of respondents aware of the program, with 11 out of 30 respondents indicating awareness. A disconcerting finding is that the Efficient Building Practices Initiative, which is no longer active and did not exist at the time of the first survey, has an awareness level higher than all but one current program. Though the sample size is too small to draw statistically supportable conclusions, it also seemed odd that awareness of BacGen has decreased even though this program has the most direct link to local governments and has been the focus of a great deal of recent LGA efforts. These results could suggest that the past marketing of these programs was more effective than marketing efforts in progress today.

### **Knowledge and Awareness of the LGA**

While 27 out of 30 respondents had heard of the LGA located in their state, only 13 respondents indicated that they were aware that their LGA had "personnel available to explicitly assist its members with energy efficiency efforts". Of these 13, seven indicated that they were only 'slightly' aware of these services. Consequently, around 20% of respondents (6 out of 30) indicated that they were 'somewhat aware' to 'extremely aware' of these services. The awareness level in the year 2000 mail-out survey was 33%. Respondents who were aware of their state's LGA frequently expressed surprise upon hearing that their LGA was involved in energy efficiency efforts.

*"I have never heard of any of the programs you mentioned. I handle most of the energy efficiency activities for the city. I would be interested in having the Montana representative contact me."*

*“I work frequently with the AWC – but it surprises me to hear that they have activities going on related to energy efficiency. I would have thought that I would have been contacted.”*

A related area for concern is that three respondents indicated that they knew their state’s LGA implementer ‘very well’, but were unaware that this person was involved in ‘any’ type of energy efficiency activities.

*I am very familiar with LOC. I know Andrea Fogue well. I was unaware that they were involved with energy efficiency activities”*

*“Anything that has to do with legislation is brought to us by the Association of Idaho Cities. Nothing has ever been brought to us dealing with energy efficiency. I have had a lot of contact with Debbie Bloom – She has never mentioned energy efficiency programs.”*

Many of the respondents who had heard of their LGAs’ energy efficiency activities expressed interest in acquiring additional information related to these activities.

*“Yes, I knew of these services [from conferences] and I have seen Victoria’s name – but I have never been contacted by her. I would be very interested in hearing more about [energy efficiency] programs and services. It is very hard to sort out all the information out there and determine what might work for us. It would be nice to be able to go to someone for information that is not out there to make a profit.”*

## **Summary of Member Survey Findings**

Results from this small sample of local governments were similar to the results found in the year 2000 mail-out survey. Across the board, the awareness levels showed no improvement. In some cases, the awareness level for programs no longer being operated was higher than programs presently in the field.

Only 20% of respondents indicated that they had anything beyond a slight knowledge of the energy efficiency programs and services offered by their state LGA. While almost all the respondents indicated that they were one of the people who should be getting information regarding energy efficiency for their city, only a few of the respondents had been contacted by their state LGA representative concerning energy efficiency matters.

Overall, it becomes apparent that the LGAs could do a better job of communicating the fact that one of the services that they have available to their members is to provide them with energy efficiency programs and opportunities.

## **7 Additional Interviews: Findings**

### **Alliance Project Manager**

Andy Ekman, the Alliance's coordinator for the LGA Support Project, was interviewed in March 2003. Mr. Ekman praised the LGA implementers, indicating that in his dealings with them the individuals were extremely outgoing and dedicated to their work. The implementers also hold Mr. Ekman in high regard and feel that he is very conscientious and easy to work with. Despite this mutual admiration, there appears to be a gap in understanding each other's roles and responsibilities. While Mr. Ekman feels that the LGAs have in general been very responsive to specific Alliance and Alliance contractor requests, he admits that it is hard to get a good sense of the impacts of the LGAs' efforts and he is forced to rely on reporting from the implementers themselves.

### **Alliance Contractor – BacGen**

BacGen is the Alliance's Wastewater Treatment Program. Among current Alliance projects it has the strongest connection to local governments since almost all municipalities own and operate their own wastewater plants. Martin Shain, BacGen's president, was interviewed to understand the role that the LGAs play in the promotion of this Alliance program. Mr. Shain was extremely complimentary in his appraisal of the LGAs ability to support projects. He stated,

*“After working with the respective local government associations for several years now, I believe BacGen has a unique perspective to offer concerning the value of these organizations to transform projects. From a marketing perspective, and assuming a solid program that these organizations feel they can support, there are few, if any, avenues as potentially powerful as the LGAs. If a tight marketing approach and plan are developed, the LGAs bring not only outstanding knowledge of their market but excellent contacts, referral lists and introductions. Perhaps most important, these referrals come with great credibility, an element that is of extremely high value and nearly impossible to obtain without years of effort. Now that BacGen is fully in the marketing stage of its Alliance-sponsored transformation project, we are, for the first time, fully able to leverage this substantial value and are experiencing the benefits first hand. Further, I would suggest that BacGen would be pressed to meet the aggressive marketing objectives within its Alliance project and business model without the continued support of the LGAs.”*

### **Alliance Contractor - Builder Operation Certification (BOC)**

During the month of June 2003, three individuals associated with the Builder Operation Certification (BOC) program were contacted in order to understand their opinions regarding the BOC program and the importance of the LGAs in the success of the program.

Unlike the BacGen program, which relies heavily on the LGAs to market and promote the service offering, BOC program operators have limited dealings with the LGAs in their state. Marketing of the BOC program by the LGAs appear, in general, to be concentrated in a few limited areas including:

- Publishing BOC articles in their newsletters,
- Identifying recently trained and certified BOC participants in their newsletters,
- Providing booth space to BOC operators at LGA conference events.

One of the individuals interviewed (who was not an BOC program operator, but yet had a great deal of experience with the BOC program) felt that this level of marketing help was sufficient. In fact, he does not see the role of the LGA to be that of promoting the BOC program, especially on an individual basis. Rather, he feels that the main benefit the LGA should provide, is to simply recognize the BOC certification and the benefit of this training in general.

The other two individuals, both BOC program operators, felt that the LGAs could, and should, do more to promote the program. It was felt that this help should include the LGA implementer actively promoting the program, providing program leads and advising their constituents to send people to training.

Consistent with the findings in the rest of the evaluation report, the help offered by the LGAs varied widely from state to state. One state provided absolutely no assistance related to BOC (even though help had been requested by the BOC program implementers); another state used LGA newsletters to promote the program, while a third state actively promoted the program and provided marketing leads to the BOC Operator.

This inconsistency from state to state was perplexing to BOC operators, especially those licensed in more than one state. In fact, it appears that it is unclear to all parties involved (LGAs, BOC operators, Board Members and others) what role the LGAs should play in the promotion of the BOC program. In the new Statements of Work, the LGAs responsibilities related to the BOC program should be more clearly defined. These responsibilities should, at minimum, include scheduled meetings with the BOC operators licensed in their state. As one of the BOC operators noted:

*“The LGAs could be very helpful to us if they were just willing to promote the BOC program a little more—perhaps even to the extent of getting the cities and towns to provide us with lists of building operators—we have struggled to do this on our own.”*

## **8 Follow-up Research and Activities**

A draft version of this report was presented to Alliance Board members in March 2003 at a workshop to discuss renewal funding of the LGA project which would be voted on in April. The draft generated spirited discussion, particularly in regard to the member survey results. It became clear through the discussion that while there was wide support for the

project among Board members, there was also a wide variety of opinions on its value and how it should be structured.

The report stayed in draft form until the April Board meeting where, again after much discussion of the issues brought up in the report, two years of funding for the LGA project was approved through a vote on the following motion:

*Norm Beckert moved to approve funding for the four local government associations for two years, with a total budget of \$523,684 (\$508,684 for project implementation and \$15,000 for evaluation), **subject to the proviso that the issues identified in the evaluation report be addressed and clear expectations for the local government associations be established by July 1.** Ken Keating seconded. Norm added that any conflict of interest issues should also be addressed. (Emphasis added.)*

Given the interplay between the draft report, Board discussions and the renewal vote, it seemed clear that this final report should include documentation of Board members' thoughts and the actions that were taken to comply with Board motion. This section of the report therefore includes interviews conducted with Board members after the April Board meeting and a description of the process through which new statements of work were created.

### **Alliance Board Member Interviews**

During June 2003, five interviews were conducted with Alliance Board Members. The purpose of this research was to:

- Gain a better understanding of Board Members' opinions regarding the role of the LGA support project;
- Document reactions to the LGA Support Project draft evaluation report presented to the Board in late May 2003; and to
- Determine if there are additional activities or projects that are being conducted by the LGA staff (or should be conducted by the LGA staff in the future) that the Board feels should be included in the LGA Support Project's new Statements of Work.

The Board Members interviewed had varying degrees of personal interaction with the LGAs in their states. Interaction with the LGAs ranged from extremely limited to the point where the LGAs played a vital role in the promotion of the Board Members' agendas.

The Board Members all felt that the draft report presented to the Board in May of 2003 was fair and accurately depicted the activities conducted by the LGA's as written into their *present* Statements of Work.

*“The report that was presented to the Board was fine—it accurately presented what was found – [You] shouldn’t make any changes – need to report what was found....”*

One of the suggestions made by the board regarding the draft report was to include more history relating to the LGA Support Project in the report.

*“With the high turnover on the board, it would be useful to fully explain the goals and expectations of the project. Some members may not have understood why the LGAs were an important network for the Alliance.”*

A concern expressed by two Board Members related to the ability of accurately evaluating this project using “quantifiable” objectives. This reflected their belief that major components of the project--such as goodwill and network/relationships--are qualitative in nature and thus cannot be adequately quantified in categories such as dollars spent or dollars saved.

All the Board Members interviewed felt that the LGA support project was valuable and should be maintained by the Alliance. The following comment expresses the general consensus of those interviewed:

*I feel that the LGA Support Project is very worthwhile and that it should be continued on in the future.”*

The reasons offered for the Project’s value, however, varied widely among the Board Members interviewed. Following are some of the rationales provided for program continuation:

- The LGAs are helping to create an energy efficiency infrastructure in their communities.
- Synergy between the Alliance and the LGAs creates numerous opportunities to promote energy efficiency.
- The LGAs are in a unique position to offer the Alliance valuable assistance in critical areas such as code implementation and enforcement.
- The amount of money spent on this project is low compared to the possible rewards.

While in agreement regarding the fact that overall the project presently had value, the Board Members had somewhat differing opinions regarding how the project should be structured, operated and evaluated in the future.

The following activities were specifically mentioned (unsolicited) as being key program components, which should be incorporated into the LGA Statements of Work:<sup>1</sup>

- Availability to respond quickly when needed by the Alliance for special projects or requests (5)
- Energy Code Compliance help through work with local building officials and other parties (4)
- Work to establish political support for energy efficiency from local governments (3)
- Energy Code Development (2)
- Educating (shepherding) local governments on energy efficiency options and strategies (2)
- Energy legislation—tracking and reporting (2)

The one area that appears somewhat controversial is energy legislation. This is due to the fact that the issues presented go well beyond the area of energy efficiency. Consequently, while some members feel that the LGAs should monitor and report on-going energy legislation to the Alliance, others feel uncomfortable with this task being included as part of the LGA Support Project's Statement of Work.

Overall, Board Members felt that the project appeared to be on track for the future. Recent changes made to the way the program is monitored and evaluated were seen as positive. These changes included:

- Increasing the level of contact between the Alliance Board Members and their State's LGA representative.
- Updating the Statements of Work annually to incorporate emerging new priorities such as energy code development and energy legislation monitoring.
- Increasing the "quantifiable" evaluation indicators while also understanding that there is a qualitative aspect to the program that is just as important to understand, but is seen by the Board Members as being extremely difficult to evaluate.

In summary, while some respondents felt that the program could be more successful in getting the word out regarding energy efficiency, and that this program component could be more quantifiably measured by the Alliance, the real value of the program is likely much more qualitative in nature. A large part of the program value is seen in maximizing the unique networking and infrastructure-creating abilities of the LGAs and the ability of the Alliance to call on these capabilities when needed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The number in parenthesis indicates the number of respondents—out of five—who felt that this activity was a key program component.

## New Contract Development

Using recommendations in the draft evaluation report and suggestions that arose from discussion at the April Alliance Board meeting, Alliance staff initiated a process that led to new Statements of Work for the July 2003 - June 2004 period. The key steps of this process include the following.

### Draft Statements of Work

Alliance staff developed a new Statement of Work template that addressed the need for LGAs to better document their efficiency activities and outcomes. The template includes seven tasks:

1. *Program Outreach* lists specific levels of effort for promoting Alliance projects. Included in this task is a survey—to be administered by the LGAs—that will seek to ascertain community knowledge of energy efficiency and current efficiency practices, awareness of local new construction and major renovations, and general interest in energy efficiency.
2. *Conferences and Meetings* addresses the need to present energy efficiency information to communities in group forums. These forums may be annual conferences or a series of community meetings around the state. Electric utilities will be invited to these events.
3. *Document Results of Outreach Activities* requires the LGAs to contact recipients of information and outreach to determine whether they took actions based on the information they received, and how those actions made a difference in their energy consumption.
4. *Conduit for Energy Efficiency Information and Advocacy* is a task that affirms the importance of information flow between the LGAs and the Alliance on issues that may affect energy efficiency in general (e.g., proposed legislation) or Alliance programs in particular. This task also acknowledges that LGAs may take an advocacy role in appropriate forums when such advocacy is not in conflict with the LGAs' policies.
5. *Meet with Alliance Board Members* calls for the LGAs to have at least one meeting per year with Alliance Board members. This task enables Board members to engage in discussions with the LGAs on project results as well as issues and opportunities that may arise in the relationship.
6. *Newsletter Articles and Other Marketing Materials* provides structure for the LGAs to provide electronic and written information to their member communities.
7. *Reporting* covers the method of reporting the LGAs' work. There will be monthly telephone reports and quarterly written reports. Alliance staff will post the written reports on the Intranet website for Board review.

### Board involvement in Statement of Work development

Alliance staff distributed the draft Statement of Work template to Board members for review. Board members involved in Montana and Washington requested a conference call with Alliance staff to discuss the statement of work. In general, Board members felt that the proposed approach reflected the recommendations in the draft evaluation report and concerns they raised at the Board meeting and in other discussions with Alliance staff.

### Alliance staff discussions with LGAs

After providing the statement of work template to Board members, Alliance staff met individually with each LGA representative to walk through the proposed tasks. While these discussions did not result in changes to the tasks, they did lead to fine-tuning within the tasks to best reflect the capabilities of each LGA. For example, the Task 1 outreach activities in Montana could be listed in detail from the outset; in Oregon, however, the LGA will first survey its much larger membership to help prioritize outreach delivery. In all cases, the LGAs were willing to implement the tasks and anticipated a closer working relationship with the Alliance project coordinator.

### Contract issuance

Following the visits to the LGAs, Alliance staff sent the LGAs draft contracts and statements of work based on discussion outcomes. All contracts have now been signed.

### Action plans

Alliance staff again met with each LGA to develop action plans for tasks 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. The action plans are a road map for the next year's work; as such, they go into detail on communities to target, locations of meetings, and timing of all outreach and follow-up contacts. Each LGA now has an action plan for implementing its Statement of Work.

## **9 Program Recommendations**

The following recommendations were included in the draft report originally presented to the Board. As the "New Contract Development" subsection above makes clear many of these recommendations have already been implemented.

### **Continue Introduction of Mutually Beneficial Programs and Services**

The Alliance should decide whether cities and towns are a target market for its programs. Given that (a) most of the value provided by the LGAs has been in promoting Alliance programs and (b) Alliance funding for BacGen, the most important program for local governments, is ending soon, it is clear that the continuing value of the LGA project to the Alliance is contingent upon the development of future projects relevant to local governments. Discussions with Alliance staff indicate that no major projects of this sort are currently being developed.

If the Alliance does decide that cities and towns are a target market, the following steps could be taken to maximize the benefits to the LGAs and the Alliance:

1. Determine the types of programs and services that are good ‘fits’ for the LGAs. These would include programs that offer cities an opportunity to reduce their costs or to lower their energy use. The LGAs appear more eager to promote a program if they feel that they are offering their members a direct benefit. Care should be taken to remember that while the Alliance’s goal is to save energy, the LGAs’ goal is to save their members money and energy. Programs where the LGAs can offer energy savings without large expenditures of cash, time, or effort will result in the best ‘fit’. These programs should also be varied enough to offer benefits to a diverse group of LGA members. This would include programs targeted towards small vs. large cities or rural vs. urban locations.
2. Use the Alliance relationship primarily on those offerings where the LGA is the best method available to ‘get the word out’ to potential program participants.
3. Keep programs coming through the pipeline. If possible, there should be a steady stream of programs and services, all in various stages of development. This would allow an LGA to concentrate on being a demonstration site for one program while also promoting other programs and services to their members.

### **Set Clear Alliance Goals**

Going forward, the Alliance should develop a clearer understanding of what they want to derive from their relationship with the LGAs. This understanding would include setting short-term objectives (e.g. promote BacGen technology to members) and also long-range goals (e.g. percent of members aware of Alliance programs). In particular, the contracts in place with each LGA should be revised. The following examples show how these could be made more concrete:

- Have each LGA conduct an annual survey of their cities and towns to determine the “appropriate person” as the primary contact for energy related issues.
- Each month the LGA implementer will contact twelve city employees or officials from this survey list and introduce the member to the energy efficiency programs and assistance opportunities that are available. These names/titles will be provided to the Alliance as part of the monthly summary report.
- The LGAs should be made aware that future project evaluations conducted by the Alliance might in fact interview these same individuals.

Setting more concrete goals such as the above will ensure that the LGAs are promoting energy efficiency and Alliance programs to a wider range of possible participants. Presently, the LGA Implementers feel that they are reaching the ‘right’ folks when it comes to energy efficiency matters. Our small survey of members indicates that there is a potentially untapped market of members who are also interested in energy efficiency matters.

The Alliance should also determine if one of its LGA goals is to increase public awareness of the Alliance itself or if it is satisfactory that the LGAs promote only the energy efficiency programs delivered by the Alliance. It is unrealistic for the Alliance to expect to see high Alliance-brand awareness if the LGAs are not aware that this is a goal. Ambiguities such as these should be cleared up so that all parties understand what they are expected to accomplish. If the LGAs are expected to promote the Alliance, a brand awareness strategy should be developed that includes a way to measure LGA support program results.

Another area of some confusion is the implementers' legislative duties. In general, the LGA implementers are extremely involved in their states' legislative activities but the individual contracts vary in their mention of this as a task. The question arises as to how much of this work should be considered Alliance-related. There is no common understanding by the LGAs regarding what percent of legislative work could be classified as Alliance-related. Therefore, some LGAs count this work as a small percentage of their Alliance duties, while other LGAs count legislative work as an extremely important task and consequently feel justified in dedicating a large percentage of their Alliance time to this area.

### **Investigate Discrepancy in Old vs. New Survey Findings**

In Section 6 it was noted that among LGA members the Efficient Building Practices Initiative, which is no longer active and did not exist at the time of the first survey, has an awareness level higher than all but one current program. It was also found that awareness of BacGen has decreased even though this program has the most direct link to local governments and has been the focus of a great deal of recent LGA efforts. This could suggest that the past marketing of these programs was more effective than marketing efforts in progress today. It is unclear why this is the case and it seems unlikely that simply increasing the number of respondents in the current survey will significantly change the results. Additional research with a different research approach may shed light both on this particular topic and, more generally, on the effectiveness of the LGAs' marketing techniques.

### **Summation**

As this report shows, numerous changes were made to the LGA Support Project during the period of this program evaluation. Many of these improvements were made in response to the draft evaluation report findings. These recent changes, when combined with the additional recommendations contained in this report, will result in better understanding by all involved parties of the program's objectives. The LGA implementers will be able to set clearer goals that meet the Alliances objectives. The Alliance Board will have a better understanding of not only the program goals, but also how these targets will be evaluated. The Alliance staff will have a better understanding of the myriad of roles played by the LGA's and how these roles complement the Alliance's goals.



# **APPENDIX A**

# Local Government Energy Efficiency Survey 2003 Survey

## RECOGNITION OF THE NORTHWEST ENERGY EFFICIENCY ALLIANCE

Hello, I am calling on behalf of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance to determine if people in local governments are aware of our organization and our work.

- 1 **Have you heard of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance?**  Yes or  No (skip to Q6)
- 2 **How familiar are you with the name and objectives of the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (also referred to as “NEEA” and the “Alliance”)?**
- |                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| ? Extremely familiar | ? Slightly familiar   |
| ? Very familiar      | ? Not at all familiar |
| ? Somewhat familiar  |                       |

If familiar, **can you describe our role?**

---

---

- 3 If familiar – **Can you name some of the projects we fund?** (prompt – to ensure that they have heard of us in a way besides past survey)

---

---

- 4 **How did you hear about these programs?**

---

---

- 5 **Have you ever participated in any of these programs?**

---

---

- 6 Ask All (remove any programs mentioned above): **The following is a list of Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance projects. Can you please tell me which of these projects you have heard of?**

- ⇒ Energy Star/WashWise (Resource efficient washing machine)  Yes  No If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ LightWise (Efficient lighting)  Yes  No If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ Efficient Building Practices Initiative (includes energy code upgrades)  Yes  No If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_?

- ⇒ Builder Operator Certification (BOC)     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ BacGen (New wastewater treatment processing that reduces sewage, energy and is more environmentally friendly)     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ LED Traffic Signals     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ EZSim (Software for building operators to perform simple building commissioning/re-commissioning examination)     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ Commissioning Program (for ensuring new and major renovated buildings are properly commissioned to make at maximum efficiency as a system)     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ BetterBricks     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_
- ⇒ AM400 (low cost data logger)     Yes     No    If yes, Describe \_\_\_\_\_

**7 How did you hear about these programs?**

---



---



---

**8 Have you ever participated in any of these programs?**

---



---

**9 If they have heard of NEEA or any of the programs, When was the last time you heard about the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance or our programs?**

---



---



---

**10 Do you remember how you heard about us (who mentioned)?**

---



---

**11 How do you typically hear about energy efficiency programs and projects (information sources)?**

---



---

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY'S CURRENT STATUS**

**12 In general, what changes have you seen related to the emphasis being placed on energy efficiency? Can you provide some examples of this?**

---



---



---

## AWARENESS AND PARTICIPATION

- 13 The \_\_\_\_ [LGA] has personnel that explicitly assist its members with energy efficiency efforts. How familiar were you with this service provided by \_\_\_\_ [LGA]?
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Extremely familiar | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly familiar                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very familiar      | <input type="checkbox"/> Not at all familiar (skip Q 14)) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat familiar  |   |
- 14 Which of the following statements best describes the extent you have worked with \_\_\_\_ [LGA] on energy efficiency related issues/programs?
- ? Participated in energy efficiency programs, took action, through their help
  - ? Gained information concerning energy efficiency that helped in decision to take action
  - ? Gained information concerning energy efficiency opportunities through them that are still being considered
  - ? Learned about energy efficiency opportunities that were rejected at this time
  - ? Generally learned more about energy efficiency opportunities, but no action considered
  - ? Aware of some of their efforts, but it has had no influence on our actions

## GENERAL INFORMATION

- 15 What is your job title?
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Elected Official of city or town | <input type="checkbox"/> Other city/town staff                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Elected Official           | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff from government other than city or town               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City/Town Manager                | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff from organization representing cities/towns, counties |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public works manager             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other   |
- 16 How long have you held this position?
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> 5-10 years         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years        | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2-5 years        |   |
- 17 Do you work for a city/town and how large is it?
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work for organization other than a city or town | <input type="checkbox"/> Population of 5,000-9,999   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population less than 1,000                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Population of 10,000-19,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population of 1,000-2,499                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Population of 20,000-99,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population of 2,500-4,999                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Population over 100,000     |

***Thank you for your help with this research effort.***

*The Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance is a non-profit group of electric utilities, state governments, public interest groups and industry representatives committed to bringing affordable, energy-efficient products and services to the marketplace in Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington.*