# SESSION 4A

## PLANNING FOR BETTER PROGRAM RESULTS

*Moderator: Marc Collins, Independent Consultant*

PAPERS:

**Changes in Residential Energy Consumption: Results from the 2009 RECS**
Bill McNary, Energy Information Administration, Washington, DC
**Benchmarking Utility DSM Delivery Performance: Results from a Comparative Review of Efficiency Vermont's 2008 Program Delivery Costs and Energy Savings**
Toben Galvin, Navigant Consulting
Laura Agapay, Navigant Consulting
Randy Gunn, Navigant Consulting
Walter Poor, Vermont Department of Public Service
**Rethinking Multifamily Energy Efficiency Programs and Services: A Program Design Study in Massachusetts**
Rohit Vaidya, NMR Group, Somerville, MA
Tina Haggerty, NSTAR, Westwood, MA
**Are Your Programs Living Up to their Potential?**
Tami Rasmussen, Evergreen Economics, Berkeley, CA
Chris Ann Dickerson, Ph.D, CAD Consulting, Oakland, CA
Wendy Takanishi, Hawaii PUC, Honolulu, HI
Philippus Willems, Ph.D, PWP, North Potomac, MD

SESSION SUMMARY:

This session examines a spectrum of planning issues and approaches with the common theme of improving demand-side management (DSM) program results.

A general assumption is that DSM programs are deployed as a result of needs and potential identified in planning studies. We also like to think that the evaluated results will be seamlessly fed-back into the next cycle of the planning process. These are ideal scenarios that bump-up against the real world of planning versus program implementation timing mismatches, incomplete data, financial and resource limitations and other lack of co-ordination amongst the players, usually from a variety of organizations.

The four papers presented here provide an interesting look at a range of opportunities and attempts to use planning information and processes to generate better program results. In each case, the authors examine the limitations and successes within their scenarios. A more detailed description of each follows.

The starting point for any DSM program should be a thorough understanding of the energy usage patterns of the intended participants in the program. The quadrennial Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) undertaken by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) is one of the most important sources of information for DSM program designers and implementers. McNary's role in the EIA allows him to share with us a preview of the results and trends from the last published data (2005).

McNary will share details regarding the most significant end uses of energy for consumers—space heating, air conditioning, water heating, and, appliances and electronics. Changes to home

electronics usage are hotly anticipated as this is an area of great interest given the increased proliferation and use of these devices.

An often discussed and debated, but rarely quantified, topic in the realm of DSM programming is how much is the right amount? How would a government or efficiency agency know when to ramp-up, or at the other end of the spectrum, stop, DSM programming? Poor, and his co-authors from Navigant Consulting, have attempted to probe this issue by answering a very provocative question about results achieved by Efficiency Vermont. In this case, a benchmarking model was constructed to compare Efficiency Vermont with its peers, since it was already known that a higher percentage of revenue than the norm was dedicated to DSM by the agency. But did it achieve proportionally higher results, too? This question is worth thinking about for all of us involved in DSM because regardless of the level of support and spending, which typically changes over time, any successful attempt to systematically quantify the spending versus results equation aids in adding a rational element to the ongoing debate.

The third perspective presented entails planning inside the context of program delivery. Multifamily energy efficiency programs are notoriously difficult to implement well due to the multiple interests involved. Energy use is split between in-suite and common areas. Tenants and landlords each have "control" over certain aspects of the overall energy consumption, but each can perceive that there is not a direct benefit to efficiency due to obfuscation of the bill savings. Vaidya and his co-author will describe the results of a program planning process undertaken in Massachusetts—where eyes were wide-open about the pitfalls of traditional multifamily programming. By focusing on a participatory program planning exercise before final design and launch, our colleagues in Massachusetts attempted to listen to the needs of all the major "actors" involved and then structure the delivery model accordingly.

Our final paper describes a sophisticated attempt to address the ideal planning-evaluation feedback cycle in the real world. Rasmussen and her co-authors illustrate a radical concept—everyone talking to each other—as implemented in Hawaii. Evaluation results are often completed too late to be optimally included in the planning process. They are often too obscure and regulatory-focused to be best utilized by program implementers. An evaluation process specifically designed to keep program implementers, planners, stakeholders and policymakers in the loop and to ensure that their interests were served is what was attempted in Hawaii. Co-ordinated evaluation processes that are transparent, understood by the broad range of stakeholders and that provide tangible value to all involved not only engender better program results, they demonstrate the value of evaluation itself. …A positive note on which to end our session.