# METHODS, EVIDENCE, AND POLICY SUPPORT – MULTIPLE BENEFITS/ NEIs

PRODUCTIVIT

*IEA Multiple Benefits Meetings Paris, 3/6/18* 

Lisa A. Skumatz, Ph.D. Skumatz Economic Research Associates, Inc. 762 Eldorado Drive, Superior, CO 80027 303/494-1178 email: <u>skumatz@serainc.com</u> © 2018 SERA

# STATUS / QUESTIONS

- 1. Methods / BMPs?
- 2. Evidence? Gaps? Priorities?
- 3. Transferability / Consistency?
- 4. Policy Progress, Adoption, Barriers
- 5. Next Steps

# 1. ARE THERE BMPS / MEASUREMENT METHODS?

### MB/NEI PERSPECTIVES AND MEASUREMENT BMPs

#### **Program Attribution - Net Three:**

- Net Positive <u>& NEGATIVE</u>
- Net beyond standard efficiency
- Net to gross applies

Non-Overlapping
 Consistent Units
 Discount rates

	Utility	Society	Participant	(Res&ICI
				)
	<ul> <li>Carrying cost on arrearages</li> <li>Bad debt written off</li> <li>Shutoffs / Reconnects</li> <li>Notices; calls, collection costs</li> <li>Emergency gas service calls (for gas flex connector and other programs)</li> <li>Insurance savings</li> <li>Transmission and distribution savings (usually distribution)</li> <li>Fewer substations, etc.</li> <li>Power quality / reliability</li> <li>Reduced subsidy payments (low</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Economic development benefits – direct and indirect multipliers</li> <li>Tax effects</li> <li>Emissions / environmental (trading values and/ or health / hazard benefits)</li> <li>Health and safety equipment</li> <li>Water and waste water treatment or supply plants</li> <li>Fish / wildlife mitigation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Water / wastewater bill savings</li> <li>Operating costs (non-energy)</li> <li>Equipment maintenance</li> <li>Equipment performance (push air better, etc.)</li> <li>Equipment lifetime</li> <li>Shutoffs / Reconnects</li> <li>Property value benefits / selling</li> <li>(Bill-related) calls to utility</li> <li>Comfort</li> <li>Aesthetics / appearance</li> <li>Fires / insurance damage (gas)</li> <li>Lighting / guality of light</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Control over bill</li> <li>Understanding / knowledge</li> <li>"Care" or "hardship" (low income)</li> <li>Indoor air quality</li> <li>Health / lost days at work or school</li> <li>Fewer moves</li> <li>Doing good for environment</li> <li>Savings in other fuels or services (as relevant)</li> <li>CUC and</li> </ul>
So	income) urceth@Skumatz/SERA,1996 on)	<ul><li>National security</li><li>Health care</li></ul>	• Noise • Safety	• On O and environmental effects • Negatives

## NEGATIVES / PERCEIVED COST OF PROGRAM BARRIERS



Source: Skumatz Economic Research Associates research

### MB/NEI MEASUREMENT – 4 MAIN MEASUREMENT APPROACHES

		Direct	Corp. Records, Utility data	
	EIS	Secondary	Change x value Financial, health	→Monetized
Z	Z	Model	Third party; jobs Emissions; health	MB/NEIs
		LSurvey	Specialized, academic, Best for some NEBs	Story of a ferry then it is academic

Established methods, but continual exploration

#### □ Tradeoffs

- Multiple methods / triangulation commonly used
- Surveys most appropriate for some
- Balancing precision, practical avoid bias / stats / large "N"
- Accuracy level needed... 80/20 for some applications

Source: Skumatz / SERA research

6



HTM=Hard to measure; HTA=Hard to answer

**SERA** 

Source: SERA Research

### PARTICIPANT MEASUREMENT METHODS COMPARISON



# **PROS AND CONS OF MB/NEIS MEASUREMENT METHODS**

Used for	Major Advantages	Major Disadvantages					
Direct measurement	Direct measurement (specific studies of changes on-site)						
Com'l labor,	Direct, precise, attributable	Small estimation sample sizes; specialized					
productivity, etc.		cases, poor transferability; expensive					
Secondary measurer	ment (attributable change in incidence times marginal val	uation from secondary literature)					
Insurance, water,	Long history; easy secondary sources	Not available for all NEBs					
health, others Credible to reviewers; vetted inputs							
Models (third party, ve	etted models of attributable impacts based on local / prog	ram inputs on base & test case)					
Emissions,	Third party, peer-vetted models available for	Not available for all NEBs					
economics	economics / jobs and emissions						
Surveys (multiple aca	demic-based approaches for surveys of participant effect	s, valued appropriately)					
Wide variety of	Large sample sizes & statistical properties	Concerns about surveys as a source of					
Participant NEBs	Affordable	quantitative values & reliability					
	Multiple estimates leading to similar ranges	Recall from survey respondents					
	Direct method of measuring some key NEBs	Proper attribution to programs, measures					

### HOW THE MB/NEIS ARE MONETIZED (NEED MONETIZED IN B/C & ROI CALCULATION)



10

# 2. EVIDENCE FOR VALUES? GAPS? PRIORITIES?

### EMISSIONS (SOCIETAL NEBS)

- □ Simple to complex models (slippery slope)
- Baseload vs. peak
- Some elements well / already accepted
- Incorporation as adder



Subtotals by major categories	Dollar NEB Values	Typical	Percentage NEB Values	Typical	Consis-	Varies with Pgm
Weatherization Programs	Range Low-High	Value	Range Low-High	Value	tency	Target Audience, et
UTILITY PERSPECTIVE				-		
Payment-related	\$2.55 - \$14.50	\$6.40	1% - 14.5%	4.7%	*	Pgm
Added if Low Income subsidies avoided	\$3.00 - \$25.00	\$13.00	4% - 29.0%	16.4%	*	Pgm & target
Service Related	\$0.10 - \$8.50	\$3.25	0.1% - 2.7%	0.8%	*	Pgm
Other Primary Utility	\$0.13 - \$2.60	\$1.40	2.1% - 3.3%	2.4%		
TOTAL UTILITY NEBs	\$5.78 - \$50.60	\$24.05	7.4% - 49.5%	24.4%		
UTILITY NEBs MULTIPLIER	3% - 25%	12%				
SOCIETAL PERSPECTIVE						
Economic	\$8.00 - \$340.00	\$115.00	3.0% - 237.6%	31.1%	*	Pgm
Environmental / Emissions	\$3.00 - \$180.00	\$60.00	0.7% - 57.9%	7.1%	**	Ltd variation
H&S equipment / fires	\$0.00 - \$0.30	\$0.00	0.3% - 0.3%	0.0%		Pgm
Health Care	\$0.00 - \$0.00	\$0.00	0.0% - 0.0%	0.0%		Pgm
Water / Wastewater infrastructure	\$1.00 - \$28.00	\$15.00	0.9% - 33.1%	17.0%		Pgm
TOTAL SOCIETAL NEBs	\$12.00 - \$548.30	\$190.00	5.0% - 329.0%	55.3%		
SOCIETAL NEBs MULTIPLIER	6% - 274%	95%				
PARTICIPANT PERSPECTIVE						
Water and Other bills	\$2.85 - \$54.00	\$15.00	4.5% - 63.4%	20.0%	*	Pgm
Financial / customer service	\$0.27 - \$36.70	\$3.60	8.7% - 16.4%	3.4%	*	Pgm & target
Economic Dev'p / Hardship	\$0.00 - \$115.00	\$75.00	26.3% - 55.3%	8.0%		Pgm & target
Equipment Operations	\$26.00 - \$127.00	\$82.00	17.1% - 42.7%	28.4%		Pgm
Comfort, Noise, Related	\$26.00 - \$105.00	\$69.00	12.2% - 51.3%	26.6%	*	Pgm
Health / Safety	\$3.02 - \$100.50	\$16.50	1.5% - 59.5%	12.8%	*	Pgm
Control / Education and Contributions	\$26.25 - \$177.00	\$89.75	19.8% - 72.0%	26.2%	*	Pgm
Home Improvements	\$10.50 - \$77.00	\$36.00	8.3% - 38.4%	18.8%	~	Pgm
Special / reliability / other	\$0.00 - \$4.05	\$0.00	0.0% - 4.8%	0.0%		Ltd, target
TOTAL PARTICIPANT NEBs	\$94.89 - \$796.25	\$386.85	98.5% - 403.8%	144.1%		
PARTICIPANT NEBs MULTIPLIER	47% - 398%	193%				
All NEBS Multipliers: Polotivo to Bill Sovinge						
	3% - 25%	12%	7% - 49%	24%		
Societal	6% - 274%	95%	5% - 329%	55%		
Participant	47% - 398%	193%	99% - 404%	144%		
ALL Multiplers - relative to bill savings	56% - 698%	300%	111% - 782%	224%		
		00070	111.0 /02/0	22.770		

NOTE: Ltd variation for emissions are for peak / off-peak focused programs.

### VALUE RANGES

Normalizing issues

Commercial

	RES	RES	RES	RES	RES
		Range	Quality		Range
	Avg \$	(times)	(*=low)	Other	(mult)
UTILITY					
Payment Related	6.4	**+	****		
If Low Income	13	**	****		
Service Related	3.25	**+	**		
Other primary Util	1.4	**	*		
Total					
SOCIETAL					
			***	Mult: 1.057,	
Economic	115	***	improvi	.5286, 1.64	**+
Emissions	60	***	****		
H&S Eqpt/Fires	0	**	*		
Health Care			*		
Water/WW Infra	15	**	***		
PARTICIPANT					
				1.7-1.8, 8,	
Water/other bills	15	***	***	10, 5, 17, 18	**
Financial/Pymt/CS	F 3.6	*****	**		
Hardship	75	**	*		
				35, 49, 54,	
Eqpt Operations	82	*+	**	124, 28, 151	*+
Comfort, Noise, et	69	*+	***	31, 41	*
H&S	16.5	****	*	2-8, 1-6, 6-8	****
Control / Educ	90	**	*		
Home Improvem't	36	**	***	60, 133	**
	1				
		·	•	SER	

# **C&I PROGRAMS "NEBBED"**

- New construction
- Lighting
- Motors
- Audit
- Eqpt. rebate
- Commissioning
- Technical assistance
- Training / outreach
- D PV
- Retail renewable
- □ SPC

- DG / CHP
- □ HVAC
- Equipment rebate
- Other
- Building codes, incentives by cities
- Thousands of surveys, results
  - By measures
  - By program types
  - By many sectors
  - By stakeholders
  - By geography
- Variety of end uses

### **EXPRESSING NEBS VALUE-CX**

Yellow is highest per category	NEB Value per \$1 of gross C× cost	NEB Value per \$1 C× rebate provided	Benefit per "net" C× cost (\$1)	Benefit per building square foot	Imptc of C× compared to construct & O&M cost (0-100)
Overall	\$1.00	\$2.30	\$3.10	\$0.50	70.5
Respondent Role					
Facility Mgrs	\$1.20	\$2.80	\$4.30	\$0.70	79.1
Construction related	\$0.90	\$1.20	\$2.00	\$0.40	68.8
A&E	\$0.60	\$2.90	\$0.80	\$0.80	62.5
Facil / maint	\$0.50	\$1.20	\$1.10	\$0.20	46.7
Building Type					
Office	\$2.00	\$4.90	\$3.40	\$1.00	91.3
University	\$0.90	\$2.00	\$4.90	\$0.60	70.5
Prison (small sample)	-\$0.40	-\$0.80	-\$0.60	10 A	50.0
Other	\$0.90	\$2.00	\$1.70	\$0.50	58.0
Business Type					
Gov't / University	\$1.10/\$0.80	\$2.60/\$1.80	\$3.90/\$1.70	\$0.60/\$0.40	67.5 / <mark>75.0</mark>
Systems Commissioned	Ľ				
HVAC only / More	\$1.40/\$0.90	\$3.00/\$2.20	\$10.50/\$1.80	\$1.20 / \$0.40	79.0 / 67.7
Type of Commissioning					
New / Retrofit	\$0.70/\$1.90	\$1.60 / \$4.70	\$2.90 <mark>/\$3.70</mark>	\$0.50/\$0.70	62.1/ 90.0

#### Strong value from RetroCx

# PROGRESS / GAPS

#### Measure-based NEBs

- Some measure-based estimates
- For multi-measure programs need to sample for measures; until then:
  - □ Across the board
  - Savings share
  - □ Regression

#### Commercial gaps in multiple measures

Strong on lighting; some motors; weak cooking, process

### JOBS / ECONOMICS -PROGRAM VARIATIONS



**SERA** 

# PROGRESS / GAPS

#### □ Gas vs. Electric

- Some research-commonly program-wide, not disaggregated
- Limited research finds participant NEBs may have similar order of magnitude multipliers
- Not much research on fuel patterns a gap / thin

#### D MF

- Less-commonly-studied; complicated by poor response and complexity of sector (decision-maker; some measures in home / some central); separate from low income not common
- Study provides some indicative results on occupants vs. owners (112% vs 71%); some comparisons to SF; Gap.

#### Evidence on Values

- Health, emissions, jobs / econ, productivity, property values
- …on Applied Measurement methods
  - Measurability issues, overviews, health, GHG modeling progress
- …on Applications, Uses, and Users
  - National health care policy, Firms, planners & outreach, B/C, National economic development...
- ... on Transferability
  - Patterns in values; transferability between countries
- □ ... and Assessment of Research Gaps
  - Values, Measurement methods, Applications / uses, Transferability, Underpinnings

# 3. TRANSFERABILITY / CONSISTENCY?

# CONSISTENCY & TRANSFERABILITY OF MB/NEIs

22

□ US policymakers of two minds:

- Transferability to save costs, reduce risk; but
- Relevant to "our" program?

Variability	Relevant NEB Categories
Program / measure invariant (suitable for "adder")	<ul> <li>Environmental / emissions – links to energy savings (varies with generation mix, and local air conditions, and time of day, but not primarily with measures / program)</li> </ul>
Program / measure dependent	<ul> <li>Economic – societal (depends on measures and local manufacture / installation)</li> <li>Health and safety, health care, illnesses – societal and participant (measure)</li> <li>Water / wastewater infrastructure and water bill savings – societal and participant</li> <li>Participant benefits including: equipment operations, lifetime, O&amp;M, comfort, noise, control / education, home-improvements. Note: if measure bundles are "similar" participant NEB multipliers are similar in different areas of country.</li> </ul>
Climate dependent	<ul> <li>Participant benefits including comfort, but when expressed as percent of energy savings, this variability may be mitigated. Note: if measure bundles are "similar" participant NEB multipliers are similar in different areas of country.</li> </ul>
Residential Target dependent (low income or MF vs. SF) Biz sector	<ul> <li>Payment related – utility (arrearages, etc. stronger for low income targets)</li> <li>Health and safety, health care, illnesses – societal and participant (higher with chronically ill, vulnerable populations)</li> <li>Participant benefits related to hardship and payments</li> <li>Initial information indicates non-low-income NEBs for occupant MEs are similar to SE</li> </ul>
Source: Skumatz / SE	RA research

### TRANSFERABILITY – VARIATIONS INTERNATIONALLY?

- Variations in priority topics (e.g. mold)
- Values (major variations in costs like health...)
- Many studies lack clear information on program design features / assumptions for transferability
  - And some studies exclude some MB/NEIs, affecting comparisons
- Not extensively researched (yet);
  - IEA evidence subcommittee

### 4. USE IN POLICY – US ADOPTION & BARRIERS

# US POLICY FRAMEWORK IS MOSTLY STATE B/C TESTS

# NOT All MB/NEIs should be included Since 2002, check marks for which NEBs for each test TRC, SCT, etc.

Test	Benefits	Costs	States Using Traditionally	Improved treat- ment with NEBs
Utility Cost (or Program Administrator Test) (UCT or PAC)	<ul> <li>Avoided supply costs for transmission, distribution, and generation (TD&amp;G)</li> <li>Avoided gas and water supply costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Program administration</li> <li>Participant incentives</li> <li>Increased supply cost</li> </ul>	CA, CT, HI, IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, MO, NY, OR, RI, TX, VA, WA, BPA	Use cost only paid by the utility
Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) (or No Loser's Test, or non- participants test)	<ul><li>Same as above plus</li><li>increased revenue</li></ul>	<ul><li>Same as above plus</li><li>Decreased revenue</li></ul>	AR, CO, FL, GA, HI, IA, IN, MI, MN, NC, ND, NV, SC, VA, WI	
Participant cost	<ul> <li>Utility bill reductions</li> <li>Participant incentives</li> </ul>	Participant direct     costs	AR, CA, FL, HI, IA, IN, MI, MN, NY, VA	Participant NEBs

*Source:* ©*Skumatz Economic Research Associates (SERA); Rights reserved; may be used with permission of author* 

SERA

### 4 MAIN METHODS FOR INCLUDING MB/NEIs IN REGULATORY TESTS

	Maxin DSM oppor & feed Accura tailori	nize tunities lback; acy / ng	Minimize Regulatory & Implementer Risk	Minimize & Evaluation r Cost	
Adder					
Readily					
Measurable					
Hybrid					
All NEBs					

### STATES WITH MB/NEIS IN C/E TESTS



NEB options to date:

- Adders
- "Readily Measured"
- Hybrid
- "All-In"

States with NEBs in C/E tests for At least one type of program

Various stages of deliberations, working groups, TRM work, etc. in states in Midwest, mid-Atlantic and elsewhere.

### **STATE TREATMENT OF NEIS**

	-	
Regulatory /		
Screening		
Application	Utilities / regions	
Program		
Marketing	Fairly widespread use in utilities / states across the country	
ADDER	IA (10% elec, 7.5% gas, 1999); CO (10% adder, 25% Low Inc, 2008); OR (Carbon	
ADDER	\$15/ton; 10% adder, 2008); WA (10% adder, 2008); VT (15%+15% LI); DC (10%);	
Test / Pgm	NY(\$15 adder for carbon); NW (15%); for low income (LI) or <1 (CA*, ID, OR, WA*,	
Screen - adder	UT, WY, NH, NY, CT)	$\leq$
EASILY	MA (NEBs must be "reliable & with real economic value"; utility, prop, H&S,	Q
MEASURED	comfort; LI; eqpt, util, all costs of complying with foreseeable environmental	Ē
TIENSONED	regulations); CA (low income); VT (maint, eqpt replacement, LI, comfort, H&S,	AG
	prop, util, societal); CO (measureable with current mkt values); NH (as adder; LI);	GR
	BCHydro (maint, GHG, lifetime, product loss, productivity, floorspace); DC (eqpt,	(ES
Test / Pgm	comfort, H&S, prop, societal); OR (esp. C&I carbon value on societal test, PV	NS.
Screen - readily	deferred plant extension, water / sewer savings, laundry soap); CT (LI); RI (LI;	
measured	quantify util, societal; H&S, eqpt, prop, comfort); NY (LI, eqpt)	
HYBRID		Ŷ
ΠΟΛΙΟ	CO (measureable with current mkt values); OR (esp. C&I carbon value on societal	
	test, PV deferred plant extension, water / sewer savings, laundry soap); DC, VT.	
ALL-IN /	With quantification: MA, RI. MA order / decision - becoming broader - count in	
$RD \cap A \cap$	res & ICI / demonstratable including survey-based (not yet econ); Broad-based	
DRUAD	inclusions of all NEBs as an official screen: not yet found.	

*Source:* ©*Skumatz Economic Research Associates (SERA);* may be used with permission of author

# **SELECTED STATE PROGRESS**

#### □ CA

- 2001 LIPPT, model\*
- NY
  - Mid-2000s measurement & scenarios, not included\*
- 🗆 CO
  - Adders (10% electric, 25% LI, 5% gas)\*
- D VT
  - 15% adder; helped by previous research\*
- DC
  - 10% NEB adder, 10% risk, 10% enviro + NEBs in goals & measured benchmarks

# **SELECTED STATE PROGRESS**

#### Dominos / ongoing:

- Midwest Some NEBs in tests, intervenor raised, TRM process, discussions stalled
- Mid-Atlantic Considered as part of broader regulatory change; "informational proceedings", B/C expected in next stage
- Midwest Regulatory commission decided to conduct revisions of B/C rules; considered NEB process; reversed that section of rules; pick up again next year
- □ State adoption
  - Numbers, precedent (name an issue)
    - Intervenors / legislation / collaboratives

# B/C EQUATION – POLICY FRAMEWORK <u>RISK</u> SOURCES



Measuring savings with a micrometer – cutting with a chainsaw

SERA

- NEIs as accurate as many inputs relative risk
- Source: 31 Skumatz / SERA Independent research

Telling a story

### FORMAT FOR STATE-LEVEL MB/NEI RECOMMENDATIONS

	Utility	Soc	Part	Conserv. Rec'm	Rationale
Base Percent	X%	X%		X%	Program- invariant (kWh)
Low Income	X%	X%	X%	X%	Policy rationale; mult sources
Weatherization		X%	X%	X%	Substantial Participant & Soc impacts
Measure / Program-specific			X%		Varies by measure, sector
Other Recom's					Local Research

#### Developing values for multiple states & utilities

Source: Skumatz / SERA

# 5. NEXT STEPS / CONCLUSIONS

Members from US, EU (Germany, France, Netherlands, UK, Sweden) and Australia; academics, consulting, industry, government

#### Focus of the Subcommittee

- Consider measurement of <u>all NEBs</u>, not just current ones, and multiple (and improved) <u>measurement</u> <u>methods (primary, secondary, and survey-based)</u>
- Short term priorities include those relevant for <u>cost-</u> <u>effectiveness & political / program</u> attention (health)
- Advance research to get MBs well & consistently measured / <u>accepted</u> / well-known AND integrated into program & <u>policy analysis as a matter of routine</u>.
- Defensible, well-<u>estimated NEB values</u>
  - Documentation and continued progress; library.

#### □ Key early activities:

- Assemble / review / assess existing literature and assemble case studies
- Matrix of values for sectors, mapping for measures & programs
- ID where normalized NEBs are transferable (international)
- Vet new estimation methods
- Evidence on policy applications / opportunities
- ID / fill research gaps
- IEPPEC Paper (2016) published reviewing 30 papers, 6 topics (health, emissions, jobs / econ, productivity, property values)

- On-going monitoring of international research, metrics, case studies, best practices; stakeholder engagement
- Next Steps in each area
  - Values ID gaps / "bound" values; political traction, high value; library / resource
  - Measurement methods next generation methods
  - Applications / uses inventories underway
  - Transferability consistency of values; national policy approaches
- □ Conclusion
  - First literature review by committee; continuing to work toward goals

# TAKEAWAYS ON MBs / NEIs



- 1. Defensible methods
- 2. Available estimates
  - Valuable many exceed savings
    - Gaps
- 3. Transferable (depends)
- 4. Uncertainties acceptable?
  - Relative risk; Benefit-cost
- 5. Policy progress / State dominos
  - US framework mostly state level; different internationally
- 6. Next Steps continued research internationally on topics

# **Questions?**

Lisa A. Skumatz is Principal of the research and consulting firm Skumatz Economic Research Associates (SERA) and President of the non-profit Econservation Institute. An economist and econometrician, Dr. Skumatz has been evaluating energy programs for utilities, regulators, and interveners for 35 years. She began work in nonenergy benefits (NEBs) in 1994, developing measurement methods and incorporating NEBs in costeffectiveness tests, policy, planning, marketing, and other applications. Dr. Skumatz currently serves as the statewide evaluation oversight contractor for Connecticut's Eneroy

ELECTR 6211 1-14

#### Efficiency Programs' Non-Energy Benefits: How States are Finally Making Progress in Reducing Bias in Cost-Effectiveness Tests

Utilities implement residential, commercial, and other energy efficiency programs with the goal of reducing energy use. However, they have long ignored the array of indirect, or non-energy, impacts deriving from these programs. These benefits accrue to three classes of beneficiaries: participants, the utility, and society as a whole. Though non-energy benefits have been a topic of conversation for 20 years, they are only now being incorporated into benefit–cost tests.

#### Lisa A. Skumatz, Ph.D.

Skumatz Economic Research Associates (SERA),

Phone: 303/494-1178

skumatz@serainc.com

We're developing products and services that enhance customers' productivity and positively impact their energy efficiency

### **APPEALING BEYOND EE**

### HunterDouglas 🛟



### BEYOND EE-"SELLABLE" TO SEGMENTS



### **BEYOND EE - "SELLABLE" TO SEGMENTS**

just clothes.

clean more than

Some washers

Water mentioned first

ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup> labeled clothes washers use about 50 percent less water and energy than conventional washers. And less energy means burning less fossil fuels that contribute to smog, acid rain, and global climate change. Finally there's a washer that does more than clean clothes — it helps protect the environment. Look for the ENERGY STAR label.



-

#### DUCTLESS HEATING AND COOLING SYSTEMS are the ideal

solution for your electrically heated home, especially if you use baseboard, wall, or forced-air furnace heating. When you have a ductless system's efficient, quiet and even air distribution, you have:

- TOTAL COMFORT no matter the weather, no matter the season
- 25-60% SAVINGS on electric heating costs
- SUPER-EFFICIENT TECHNOLOGY to cut energy wistle

You may be eligible for HUNDREDS IN UPPRONT SAVINGS with utility incentives.

01 The OUTDOOR UNIT sits outside of your home at ground level.

02 The INDOOR UNIT is connected to the outdoor unit by a few small cables, including a refrigerant line.

03 A handy REMOTE CONTROL gives you constant temperature control.

#### GREAT WITH DUCTLESS TECHNOLOGY.

Visit goingductless.com to find an installer like me and learn more.

### COMFORT

LIVE *E* DUCTLESS LIFE More comfort. More savings.

# **KEY APPLICATIONS OF NEBS**

#### MARKETING & ROI -

Sell what's valuable to customers; link to peers

#### **B/C TESTS** –

Refined C/E for program & portfolio; reduce bias in investment

#### PROGRAM REFINEMENT –

Positive & Negative NEBs for measures, barriers, incentives, and targeting

#### **POLICY / GOALS**

Quantifies Non-energy goals (e.g. Low income, jobs, etc).

#### **TRAIN THE CHAIN** –

Align / Educate Actors on NEB priorities