

Policies, Program Design, and Advocacy to Scale Up Low-Income Energy Efficiency Programs

Jackie Berger, APPRISE

National Energy & Utility Affordability Conference June 26, 2018

APPRISE

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation







LIEE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

LIEE Program Objectives



Energy Savings

- Treat high users
- Install cost-effective major measures
- Ensure high quality work is delivered

Peak Demand

- Contribute to peak demand reduction goals
- Defer new generation or transmission upgrades
- Other programs may be more effective

Cost-Effective Delivery

- Portfolio, sector, program, or measure
- Which test: TRC, UCT, SCT, RIM, PCT
- Discount, avoided costs, baseline, measure life

Households Served

- Total number
- Vulnerable, rural
- Environmental justice, climate change vulnerable

LIEE Program Objectives



Health & Safety	Direct: mold, venting, CO, gas leaksIndirect: temperature, affordability
Energy Affordability	Reduce energy bills for high usageEnergy burden statistics
Environmental Impact	Target dirty fuels, urban areasElectricity usage
Economic Development	Create local jobsIncrease output
Innovative Methods	Test new measures or systemsPilot test, longer term improvements



REGULATORY BACKGROUND AND PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Regulatory Background & Program Structure

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation

Colorado

- LIEE required, EOC administration
- Community Solar Gardens, 5% LI
- Eligibility: 80% AMI
- Projected savings
- TRC, 25% adder for NEBs
- Coordination between utility and WAP

Illinois

- 1/2018: FEJA LIEE Funding utility admin
- Solar for All LI included, job training
- Eligibility: 80% AMI
- Projected savings
- Cost-effectiveness not required for LIEE
- Coordination uncertain

New Jersey

- Utility collaborative
- Eligibility: 225% FPL
- Periodic billing analysis
- Cost-effectiveness not required for LIEE
- Coordination between electric & gas utilities, working to improve WAP coordination

Pennsylvania

- LIURP & Act 129
- Low-income requirements
- Eligibility: 150%/200% FPL
- LIURP: Annual billing analysis
- Act 129: Projected savings
- Cost-effectiveness not required for LIEE
- Little coordination



LOW-INCOME ENERGY BURDEN

Energy Burden



2014 Residential Energy Burden

Main Heat Fuel	All Households		Non-Low- Income		Low-Income		LIHEAP- Recipient	
	Individual	Group	Individual	Group	Individual	Group	Individual	Group
Electric	9.0%	2.6%	3.2%	2.2%	18.4%	8.6%	17.5%	10.2%
Gas	7.5%	2.9%	2.9%	2.3%	17.3%	9.8%	17.7%	12.1%
All Fuels	8.6%	3.0%	3.3%	2.4%	18.4%	10.0%	18.8%	13.1%

Source: LIHEAP Home Energy Notebook, FY 2014.



LIEE FUNDING & OPPORTUNITIES

LIEE Funding Sources



Ratepayer Funding

Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program

• Annual appropriations provided by Congress

LIHEAP

- Up to 15% of block grants can be used to fund WAP
- Up to 25% can be used to fund WAP with a waiver
- 48 states transferred funds to WAP in 2015

LIEE Funding



2015 LIEE Expenditures

State	Electric Utility	Gas Utility	1	Totol		
State			DOE	LIHEAP	Other	Total
СО	\$3,538,787	\$4,380,461	\$4,590,704	\$6,611,666	\$6,500,000	\$25,621,618
IL	\$13,100,000	\$5,200,000	\$3,462,275	\$7,181,815	\$1,008,370	\$29,952,460
NJ	\$11,302,113	\$18,697,887	\$4,308,921	\$12,260,374	\$0	\$46,569,295
PA	\$62,952,299	\$19,652,964	\$12,320,702	\$30,371,473	\$0	\$125,297,438

LIEE Funding



2015 LIEE Expenditures per Household

State	Total	LIHEAP-	Eligible	Under 1	50% FPL	Under 80% SMI	
	Spending	#	\$ Per	#	\$ Per	#	\$ Per
CO	\$25,621,618	377,050	\$68	345,372	\$74	803,528	\$32
IL	\$29,952,460	1,015,201	\$30	964,552	\$31	1,969,925	\$15
NJ	\$46,569,295	761,203	\$61	537,445	\$87	1,398,300	\$33
PA	\$125,297,438	1,050,059	\$119	988,130	\$127	2,097,807	\$60

LIEE Opportunities Assumptions



Potential Savings and Cost-Effective Spending On High-Use Electric Heat Homes

	Value	Notes
Pre-Treatment Usage	20,000; 22,000; 25,000 kWh	30% use this amount or more 2010 WAP: 44% electric heaters >20,000
Avoided cost	\$0.08/kWh	Lazard's Levelized Cost of Energy (12/2016)
Measure Life	15 years; 20 years	Mean life expectancy
Discount Rate	5%	LBNL 2017
Electric Reduction	20%	LIEE evaluation research
NEB Adder	None, 25%	25% NEB adder used in Colorado

LIEE Opportunities Calculation



Potential Savings and Cost-Effective Spending On High-Use Electric Heat Homes

	Scenario								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Assumptions									
Pre-Treat kWh		20,000			22,000			25,000	
Avoided Cost	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
Measure Life	15	20	20	15	20	20	15	20	20
Discount Rate	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%
Savings	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
NEB Adder	0	0	25%	0	0	25%	0	0	25%
Calculations									
kWh Saved/yr	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,400	4,400	4,400	5,000	5,000	5,000
kWh Saved/life	41519	49849	49849	45670	54834	54834	51898	62311	62311
Max spending	\$3,321	\$3,988	\$4,985	\$3,654	\$4,387	\$5,483	\$4,152	\$4,985	\$6,231

LIEE Opportunities Calculation



Annual Number of Electric Heating LIEE Jobs With Average Spending of \$5,000 per Home

State	Total Potential		Budget Needed to Serve 10% Of High-Use Electric Heaters					
	Electric Spending	Jobs with Current Budget	150%]	FPL	80% SMI			
			Budget Needed	% of Current	Budget Needed	% of Current		
CO	\$8,849,498	1,770	\$15,887,850	180%	\$33,622,350	380%		
IL	\$16,595,738	3,319	\$32,410,200	195%	\$59,173,350	357%		
NJ	\$16,272,902	3,255	\$13,975,650	86%	\$31,374,300	193%		
PA	\$75,759,952	15,152	\$39,531,600	52%	\$77,032,800	102%		



LIEE BARRIERS

LIEE Barriers

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation

Economic	Transactions Costs	Social Costs	Health & Safety	Data & Information
Up-front investment	Application	Home tenure	Mold & moisture	Data needed to determine best practices are not
Landlord/ tenant split incentive	Application	Trust	Asbestos	available
Asymmetric cost- effectiveness testing		Language barriers	Knob & tube wiring	Who is served/ not served
Low-income baseline		Literacy	Pests	Services provided
Utility disincentives		Immigration status Neighborhoods	Clutter	
Raided funds	Readying the home	Recruiting/training employees	Structural issues	Savings achieved
				19



LIEE POLICIES AND FINANCING MECHANISMS

Policies & Financing



Offerings/Delivery Models

- Public Utility and Electric Cooperative Programs
 - 25% of U.S. electric consumption, but not regulated
 - Some have implemented EE programs to delay power plant investments
- Heat Island Reduction Programs: community investments in cool roofs and pavements, pervious pavements, tree planting
- Community Solar: multiple subscribers purchase power and receive credit on the bill, lowincome carve-outs
- School-Based Energy Education Programs: broad reach to low-income and disadvantaged

Program Funding

- Ratepayer & WAP
- LIHEAP: crisis replacement of unsafe heating; Assurance 16 education and advocacy; transfer to WAP
- Rate case & merger settlements
- GRID Alternatives Model: no cost solar to low-income through coordination of state funds, other grants, equipment donations, volunteers, and job trainees

Policies & Financing



Financing

- On-Bill Lending
- Pay as You Save: charges remain with the meter
- Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE): assessment on property owner tax bill
- Energy Saving Performance Contracts: ESCO coordinates and is paid from energy savings

Utility Incentives

- Cost recovery: should be equivalent to cost recovery on supply side investments
- Decoupling: removes connection between utility revenue and sales volume
- Energy Efficiency Resource Standards: requires specified consumption reduction
- Energy Efficiency Spending Requirements
- Performance Incentives: financial rewards for measured energy savings

Other Models

• Building Codes: new construction standards

- Green Leases: may help overcome split incentive, include environmental aspects
- Green Banks: finance energy efficiency and other clean energy, work with utility programs



LIEE EVALUATION

LIEE Evaluation Purpose



Measure Program Impacts

- Energy usage
- Energy bill affordability
- Economic impacts
- Environmental impacts
- Health, safety, & comfort
- Cost-benefit analysis

Assess Potential Improvements

- Goal achievement
- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Equity
- Targeting
- Participant Satisfaction

Meet Regulatory Requirements

LIEE Process Evaluation

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation

Evaluation Questions

- How is the program designed?
- How is the program implemented?
- Why is the program achieving or not achieving its goals?
- How can the program be improved?

Evaluation Activities

- Background research: Document review & interviews
- Participant and nonparticipant surveys
- On-site research: observations and inspections

LIEE Impact Evaluation

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation

Evaluation Questions

- How much energy was saved?
- How much energy did individual measures save?
- How do savings vary by pre-treatment usage, housing type, measure package, contractor, home characteristics?

Evaluation Activities

- Program data analysis: Characterize participants, homes, services
- Usage impact analysis: Energy usage billing data
- Payment impact analysis: bills, subsidy, affordability, payment
- Realization rate analysis: comparison of usage estimates to projections
- Cost-effectiveness testing
- Performance measurement



FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings & Recommendations



- Relate to mission
- Concrete & specific
- Outcomes
- Measurement
- Challenging, achievable

Management

- Provide consistent policy
- Coordination: WAP management, electric & gas coordination
- Utility management: customer data
- Agency management: customer acceptance

Measures

- Comprehensiveness
- Based on usage
- Health and safety

Applied Public Policy Research

APPRISE

Institute for Study and Evaluation

Findings & Recommendations



Data

- One database for the program
- Computerized data collection
- Only include fields with an identified purpose

Energy Education

- Partnership model
- Identify opportunities
- Customer follow-up

Quality Control

- Third-party inspector
- Assess missed opportunities and work quality
- Provide additional education

Findings & Recommendations

Applied Public Policy Research APPRISE Institute for Study and Evaluation

Rate Design, Cost Recovery, & Utility Incentives

- Minimize percent of bill that is fixed
- Cost recovery equivalent to supply side
- Decoupling and performance incentives
- Specific LIEE targets and use utility billing analysis to measure savings

Funding & Costs

- LIEE funds may be less likely to be raided if they are not in a separate fund
- Low-income unlikely to participate in cost-sharing
- On-bill repayment may generate participation for moderate-income
- Provide credit enhancements, terms as long as payback, increased incentives, shared risk for energy savings

Evaluation

- Third-party evaluator
- Conducted on regular bases
- Billing analysis and process evaluation
- Performance measurement

Cost-Effectiveness Testing

- Balanced
- Low-income baseline
- Measure prioritization

Further Research



Utility Incentives

- Best strategies
- How do decoupling, EERS, and performance incentives best work together?

Financing

- Will low-to-moderate income take advantage of financing?
- Which methods have greatest potential for low-income?

Raided Funds

• How to provide greatest assurance of continued access to dedicated LIEE funding?

Coordination

• Most successful models for funding coordination?

Health & Safety Investments

- What is the right level of investment?
- How can necessary funding be made available?

Further Research



Non-Energy Impacts

• What level can be expected? What NEB adder is most appropriate?

Innovative Methods

• Which new approaches achieved significant savings and should be replicated?

Environmental Justice

- Are LIEE programs reaching this population?
- If not, how can this be improved?

LIEE Savings

- What level of savings can be achieved through various models?
- More studies comparing billing analysis to random control trials and TRM are needed.

Relative LIEE Savings & Cost-Effectiveness

• Compare LIEE and market-rate energy savings and cost-effectiveness

Contact



Jackie Berger

APPRISE

32 Nassau Street, Suite 200

Princeton, NJ 08540

609-252-8009

jackie-berger@appriseinc.org

www.appriseinc.org