

SESSION 8B

NON-ENERGY BENEFITS: FULLY VALUING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Energy savings isn't the only outcome that can be attributed to successful energy efficiency program implementation efforts. This session considers how to quantify non-energy benefits as well as the significance of those benefits both in terms of value and in decision making by customers, trade allies, and policy makers.

Moderator: Carol White, National Grid USA Service Company, Inc.

PAPERS:

Non-Energy Benefits (NEBs) in Offices and Schools: Do They Influence Building Design and Decision-Making?

Lisa Skumatz, Skumatz Economic Research Associates, Inc.
Ingo Bensch, Energy Center of Wisconsin
Blake Bear, Skumatz Economic Research Associates, Inc.
Stuart Schare, Summit Blue Consulting

Non-Energy Benefits from Commercial and Industrial Energy Efficiency Programs: Energy Efficiency May Not Be the Best Story

Nick Hall, TecMarket Works
Johna Roth, TecMarket Works

An Approach to Quantifying Economic and Environmental Benefits for Wisconsin's Focus On Energy

David Sumi, PA Consulting Group (PA Government Services, Inc.)
Glen Weisbrod, Economic Development Research Group, Inc.
Bryan Ward, PA Consulting Group (PA Government Services, Inc.)
Miriam Goldberg, KEMA-XENERGY

SESSION SUMMARY:

This session provides an overview of efforts taken to quantify and assess the importance of non-energy benefits (NEBs) related to energy efficiency efforts in Wisconsin. The session will consider these benefits from the perspectives of program participants, trade allies, and from a societal perspective. The first paper explores the degree to which NEBs affect decision making in new construction in the non-residential sector. The second paper discusses how survey information was synthesized to identify, quantify, and value NEBs identified by businesses that participated in Wisconsin's Focus On Energy programs. The third paper describes an effort to quantify the economic and environmental effects of energy efficiency program efforts within the state of Wisconsin along with an analysis of how those effects contribute to program cost-effectiveness.

