
Subject Focus on Energy Evaluation

Key Findings from In-depth Interviews with Together We Save Program Staff and Database Analysis

To Oscar Bloch,
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
cc Sara Van de Grift,
WECC

From Laura Schauer and Jeremy Kraft,
PA Consulting Group

Date February 26, 2010

The purpose of this memo is to summarize the key findings of the in-depth interviews conducted by PA Consulting Group of program staff and key stakeholders involved with the Together We Save pilot program in Milwaukee. This memo also contains analysis of the program tracking data provided by the Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation (WECC).¹

Program Background

In 2008, the Center on Wisconsin Strategy (COWS) received a Joyce Foundation Grant to promote and improve energy efficiency to residents in the city of Milwaukee. One strategy identified by COWS was to provide residents with loan options to fund energy efficiency projects. This program design evolved into an energy efficiency retrofit program and, between 2008 and 2009, COWS, along with program stakeholders (the City of Milwaukee, We Energies, and the Wisconsin Department of Administration) and through ongoing discussions with WECC, designed a program to offer to Milwaukee residents.

The resulting program is the Together We Save program, a pilot program with the objective of providing deep energy savings to households with moderate to low income. Per the Program Implementation Plan², the objectives of the program are to:

- Utilize the community by forming partnerships with neighborhood leaders, neighborhood groups, and city/utility/government agencies
- Test various outreach, marketing, and ongoing communication techniques to maximize participation and inform homeowners



¹ Two installments of data were provided: January 6, 2010, and February 16, 2010. The participant survey data is based on the tracking data provided January 6.

² The Milwaukee Neighborhood Efficiency Project Program Implementation Plan dated February 2009.

- Deliver optimal building science practices and products based on experience with weatherization and home performance programs to assure energy efficiency standards are met
- Guide and redirect home energy efficiency attitudes and behaviors toward sustainability.

COWS, in consultation with the City of Milwaukee, identified two Milwaukee neighborhoods to participate in the pilot program: a south-side neighborhood and north-side neighborhood.³ COWS selected these neighborhoods as they met criteria of having at least 50 percent home ownership and moderate to low household income.

WECC serves as the program implementation contractor for this pilot program. Their responsibility is oversight of the program and management of staff hired to provide services through the program.

WECC employs five individual community Energy Advocates. These Energy Advocates conduct initial assessments of the participants' homes, act as points of contact, and offer assistance to participants throughout program participation. WECC provided training for these Energy Advocates prior to their working with homeowners through the program. According to the program database, each Energy Advocate worked with an average of 23.6 households, ranging from 18 to 27 households.⁴

The program also employs two consultants that conduct the technical assessments of participants' homes. These consultants make recommendations about which energy efficiency improvements should be made in the home. Homeowners review these recommendations, their costs, and the financial incentives offered through the program (which range from 50 to 100 percent of the total job cost based on income qualifications, discussed further below). Once approved by the homeowners, pre-selected contractors schedule and complete the recommended work. After completion, the consultant returns to the home and reviews whether the equipment was installed correctly.

Last, the program employs a coordinator that reviews the consultants' recommendations before they are sent to the participant. As part of this review, the project coordinator determines whether the recommendations are appropriate for that participant and assigns a pre-defined cost (initially established through the bid process by the contractors) to the various recommended improvements based on submitted costs by the pre-selected contractors.

While WECC is not required to verify energy savings and cost-effectiveness of this program (as it is in a pilot phase), the implementation plan included budgetary, participation, and savings goals. The program had the goal of serving 100 households. The energy savings values per home served was 0.19 kW, 1,192 kWh, 295 therms with a pilot savings goal of 19 kW, 119,200 kWh, and 29,500 therms for all completed homes.

³ South-side: Lincoln Avenue (south) to Pierce St. (north); 43rd and 38th Streets (west to Layton Blvd (east). North-side: Capitol Drive (south) to Villard Ave (north); 84th St. (west) to 60th St. (east).

⁴ The database was missing advocate information for nine households.

The program conducted audits in 137 Milwaukee homes. As of February 2010, 118 remained in the program (19 opted out of the program for various reasons, which will be discussed in the final report with the customer survey results). Due to various constraints discussed within this findings memorandum, not all jobs are completed at the time of this reporting. However, should all 118 homes be completed the program will have surpassed the goal of serving 100 homes.

Program Delivery

The program is designed as a multi-stage offering. Each of these stages are designed to build upon each other with the Energy Advocate as a common thread throughout the majority of stages.

The program is intended to reduce the cost barrier associated with energy efficiency. Prior to implementing the program, WECC worked with the Energy Center of Wisconsin to identify household identified barriers to implementing energy efficiency projects. Households' inability to pay for improvements was identified as the primary barrier. To overcome this financial barrier, the program provides incentives on a sliding scale based on income. Table 1 details the incentive levels.

Table 1. Percent of Project Cost Paid by Income

Income	% of Total Cost Paid by Program
At or below 200% Federal Poverty Level	100% or referred to state Weatherization Assistance Program
201%–250% Federal Poverty Level	90%
251%–300% Federal Poverty Level	75%
Over 300% Federal Poverty Level	50%

The program consists of four main components that are designed to work in concert to achieve long-lasting energy savings in the targeted neighborhoods. These components include community-based Energy Advocates, technical assessments, incentives and payment-plan options for recommended energy efficient equipment, and pre-selected contractors that can perform recommendations turnkey. Each of these components are discussed below.

Application process. The potential participant completes a program application that is submitted to WECC. WECC then verifies the applicant is eligible to participate in the program. The most significant eligibility requirements are that the applicant is within the target neighborhood and is a homeowner.

Walk-through audit. WECC assigns an Energy Advocate to the homeowner once the application is approved and the homeowner is notified that they are eligible to participate. The Energy Advocate sets up an appointment with the homeowner to complete the audit. A review of the documentation shows that, for each home, the Energy Advocate should document prior efficiency improvements made, lighting present in the home at the time of the walk-through audit, and an appliance and electronics inventory. The Energy Advocate may also provide recommendations for energy savings. The Energy Advocate then promotes the next phase of the project and provides as-needed assistance throughout the next steps, including translations services as necessary (Spanish is the most prevalent language other than English).

Pre assessment. A consultant hired through the program next provides a technical walk-through, of the home. Throughout this more in-depth energy assessment, the consultant provides a variety of services including blower door testing, combustion safety testing, and technical analysis of the equipment in the home. The assessment results in written recommendations and estimated costs overall as well as those covered by the pilot program (determined based on income qualifications). The Energy Advocate relays the recommendations to the homeowner.

Participant sign off. After receiving the recommendations and cost information the participant needs to determine whether he or she will proceed with the installation of equipment, which requires a cost commitment. The participant is required to complete all recommended work and use a pre-selected contractor. The participant will also be provided with financing options should they not be able to pay their portion of the co-payment.

Installation of efficiency improvements. Pre-selected contractors next make all the energy efficiency improvements included in the work order. Energy efficiency improvements vary by household, but include attic and wall insulation, air sealing, and equipment such as furnaces, exhaust fans, boilers, water heaters, and central air conditioning systems. Building envelope improvements were the most common recommendations followed by new exhaust fans and replacing hot water heaters. Table 2 details the frequency of each recommendation for households where this information is available in the database. The most prevalent recommendations are shell measures (insulation and air sealing). Equipment recommendations are less frequently cited although furnaces were recommended for about 20 percent of program participants.

Table 2. Equipment Recommended after Technical Assessment (N=99 Households)

Recommended Equipment	Frequency
Central air conditioner	9
Air sealing	69
Boiler	13
Exhaust fan	53
Furnace	20
Hot water heater	34
Insulation (includes attic, sidewall, sillbox, etc.)	76
Pipe wrap	46

Post assessment. Once the work is completed by contractor the Consultant does a final inspection of the home to ensure the recommended improvements were made. This is separate from a quality assurance step, which is completed separate from this process on 5 percent of the homes.

Interview Methodology

PA conducted nine in-depth interviews between December 18, 2009, and January 21, 2010, with staff involved with the program. PA interviewed two WECC staff responsible for overall program management, four Energy Advocates, two technical consultants, and the project coordinator.

Prior to the interviews, PA developed topic guides that were reviewed by both the PSCW and WECC. Topics covered in the interviews included:

- Role in program implementation
- Interaction among program stakeholders
- Customer outreach and interaction
- The walk-through audit
- The technical assessment
- Pre-selected contractors
- Communications with WECC
- Overall program effectiveness.

Due to the limited number of interviews completed and the small number of staff in specific roles, the results presented in this memo will be limited to key finding and next steps. Attributing specific findings to specific roles could potentially breach the confidentiality of these interviews.

Key Findings

Interviewees for the most part believe that the program is working well in that it is convincing customers to go forward with energy efficient changes that they otherwise would not have considered. The interviews also suggest that the program will have a difficult time achieving its goal of 100 completed households by the end of the first quarter of 2010 due to delays in the approval process.

Overall, program staff are satisfied with and excited about the program.

All of the interviews suggest that staff are satisfied with overall program design. Employing locally based Energy Advocates and selecting targeted communities were two program design elements raised by all stakeholders as positive elements of the program. Interviewees also commented that participants involved are receiving needed services that they would otherwise not be able to receive or willing to perform on their own in absence of the program.

Likewise, all interviews noted that WECC staff is responsive to questions and problems and generally very helpful. The interviewees noted only minor logistical problems in regards to communication with WECC and access to the required forms.

Ten percent of participants went through the initial walk-through audit but did not move forward with the program.

The Energy Advocates interviewed believed that a large majority of participants that go through the walk-through audit continue through with the technical assessment. The analysis of the program database supports this assertion, showing that 10 percent (14/137) opted to not continue with the technical assessment after the initial audit with the Energy Advocate. An

additional five customers declined to continue with the program after they received the technical assessment.

According to interviewees, participants that dropped out of the program were interested in measures that were not covered by the program (e.g., windows) or in one case, uncomfortable with the income requirements. According to feedback provided by the Energy Advocates, most of the participants that have received written reports are eager to move forward with the installation of the recommended equipment.

The participant survey will attempt to speak with all customers that applied to participate in the program. These interviews will further explore the reasons why those customers that drop out of the program are not moving forward with program services.

The majority of customers for whom Together We Save captured income information are in the lowest income category and have their projects funded at 100 percent. Although eligible for other low-income programs, they are purposefully included in the Together We Save program.

The program encourages the replacement of lower efficiency equipment or adoption of high efficiency equipment by overcoming the first cost barrier through equipment incentives. The program is designed so that the financial incentive is provided on a sliding scale based on income. Table 3 details the incentive levels by income classification.

The program will pay up to 100 percent of the project costs for households with incomes at or below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level. This income level is also eligible to be served by the state Weatherization Assistance Program. The program was initially designed to direct these low income households to the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) if they were determined to be income eligible. However, WAP has extensive waiting lists which are complicated by their prioritization methods which prioritizes high-energy users in the Milwaukee area. Additionally, the program is experiencing overload due to increased funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Taking these issues into consideration, WECC and WAP staff decided that the Together We Save program should provide services to low-income homes identified by the pilot to ensure they are serviced.

A review of the program database as of January 21, 2009, documents co-payment percentages and values for 51 program participants (39 percent of the participant population). Program staff explained that the remaining participant records are missing information because participants have not filled out the income verification paperwork yet, which is required to establish co-payment levels; have not yet received the technical assessment or resulting report; have not yet decided to continue with the program; or have opted out of the program entirely.

These issues will be further explored in the participant survey. Although interviewees are optimistic that the information will be obtained and projects will move forward for a majority of these participants, the participant survey will explore whether requiring income information is a program barrier. The survey will also verify the program stage of each participant and whether the length of time it is taking to receive the technical assessment or report is an issue for participants and a potential barrier for moving forward with projects.

Table 3 documents the percentage of customers that fit into each income and co-payment category. Of the customers for whom we have income information, nearly half (47 percent) are having their project fully funded and 25 percent are paying 10 percent of the project cost. A quarter of participants are within the highest co-payment classification, contributing 50 percent of the project costs.

Table 3. Percentage of Project Cost Paid by Income Category (N=51 Participants)⁵

Income Level	Percentage of Total Cost Paid by Program	Number of Participating Households	Percentage of Total with Co-payment Data	Average Contribution Amount by the Program	Average Contribution Amount by the Customer
At or below 200% Federal Poverty Level	100%	24	47%	\$8,679	\$0
201% – 250% Federal Poverty Level	90%	13	25%	\$4,721	\$525
251% – 300% Federal Poverty Level	75%	1	2%	\$3,596	\$1,199
Over 300% Federal Poverty Level	50%	13	26%	\$2,310	\$2,310

The database analysis shows that lower income customers' projects are higher in total project cost on average than those in the higher income category. In fact, total project costs households below 200 percent of Federal Poverty Level are nearly double than that for the highest income category (\$8,679 total project value compared with \$4,620, respectively). Prior to the final report, evaluators will rerun this analysis along with measure-specific analysis by income group as the current analysis is only based on the 51 program participants for whom we have co-payment information.

For those participants for whom we have income information, 47 percent are income eligible to participate in the state Weatherization Assistance Program. Interviews assessed whether the Energy Advocates referred customers to this program if income eligible. Energy Advocates said they will at times refer customers to the Weatherization Assistance Program, although based on agreement with Weatherization Assistance Program staff to service these low income households Energy Advocates were not directed to make this referral.

The Together We Save Pilot is unique from other residential Focus on Energy programs with the Energy Advocate and turnkey services providing a differentiating role.

There is question of the differentiation or duplicity of the Together We Save pilot as customers that participate in this program may also be eligible to participate in other Focus on Energy programs, such as the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR program or the lower income

⁵ Costs paid by program data were provided by WECC on January 21, 2010.

Targeted Home Performance with ENERGY STAR program. A review of participant income and demographics along with an understanding of these programs confirms that a significant portion of these customers would likely be eligible to participate in one of these programs.

However, while there is overlap between this program and other residential programs offered in the Milwaukee area, stakeholders wanted to identify the effectiveness of a different service delivery model that intended to provide deeper savings. Discussions with program staff identified distinct differences in program design and service delivery between the Together We Save pilot and other residential programs available in the Milwaukee area. The most notable difference is the role of the Energy Advocate, which is not included within other programs. All parties interviewed unanimously mentioned the Energy Advocate role as not only a key differentiator, but also an important component to this program that they believe enhances its effectiveness. According to program staff, the program design included the Energy Advocate role with the theory that their involvement in the community and their local presence encourages trust and program buy-in by the homeowners. Interviewees believed this is the case, although the customer surveys will confirm this point from the participants' perspective.

In addition to promoting confidence through their local presence, interviews suggest that Energy Advocates add credibility to consultants' recommendations through their observations in the walk-through audit. As part of the initial walk-through audit, the Energy Advocates may point out outdated appliances that the consultant would likely suggest be replaced. According to program staff, these observations would let the participant know what to expect from the technical assessment and give a general picture of where the program might benefit them.

The Energy Advocates often remains engaged at every step of program process, lending support to all parties involved as necessary. They communicate with the consultants and project coordinator and provide those program staff with useful background information regarding the participants prior to and/or throughout the program process. For the program participants, the Energy Advocates are a consistent presence throughout the program process, provide translation services, and facilitate coordination between the homeowners and program staff.

Advocates believe that their role in the program increases the likelihood that participants continue through the various program components by ensuring all the paperwork and requirements are met and maintaining personal connection with participants, especially if projects or work are delayed. For example, Energy Advocates follow up with homeowners to make sure that assessments were scheduled and that income verification forms were turned in to WECC as needed. When work is delayed, the Energy Advocates report that they contact households and ask them to just "hang in there." From their perspective, participants may become quite frustrated with delays in project work but that personal touch keeps them engaged in the program.

Another differentiator in this program is the turnkey approach. The participant does not select the consultant or contractor to perform services; rather, these individuals are pre-selected by a competitive bidding process and assigned to projects through the program. Other community based pilots, such as that offered in Brillion, do not provide this turnkey approach.

Whether these differentiating components improve the effectiveness of this delivery model from the customer's perspective is a researchable issue that will be further explored in the participant survey.

Fewer than half of households that receive audits through the program have CFLs, faucet aerators, or low-flow showerheads directly installed.

In addition to the information provided through the walk-through audit, the Energy Advocates are supposed to provide households with low-cost, energy-saving equipment such as compact fluorescent lamps, faucet aerators, and low-flow showerheads. The household had two options for these pieces of equipment: either they were directly installed by the Energy Advocate or the Energy Advocate left the equipment behind for the customer to self-install.

Table 4 details the number of homes in which measures were directly installed and the average number of units installed per home. Of the 137 households that received a walk-through audit, 59 (43 percent) of households had at least one CFL directly installed, a third of households had a low-flow showerhead directly installed, and a quarter of households had a faucet aerator installed.

Table 4. Audit Measures Provided to Participating Households⁶

Audit Measure	Total Number of Households that Received Measures	Average Number of Measures Installed at Households that Received Measures during the Walk-through Audit	Total Number of Measures Installed
CFL	59	2.83	167
Faucet aerator	38	1.71	38
Showerhead	47	1.21	57

The interviews asked Energy Advocates about these installations and reasons why equipment would not be directly installed. The Energy Advocates provide homeowners with the option of having the equipment installed. The Energy Advocate will leave the equipment with the participant if the homeowner voices preference for the equipment to simply be left behind.

One of the questions raised was whether households installed measures left behind but not directly installed. We will use the participant survey to follow up on this issue and determine what percentage of these measures were installed and whether measures directly installed (and self-installed) are still in place.

Training and education opportunities exist within the program.

Interviews revealed a number of potential training opportunities for Energy Advocates, consultants, and program participants.

Energy Advocates. The Energy Advocates are in a unique position in that they are the first point of contacts for participants. When completing the initial walk-through audit, they have the opportunity to provide energy conservation and efficiency information in a manner that is not as technical as an assessment but can resonate with program participants. Interviews with the Advocates revealed that they are not consistent in the level or type of information they provide

⁶ These numbers were provided by WECC as equipment were not entered into the tracking database if they were only left behind with customers and not directly installed.

to customers. For example, one Energy Advocate may discuss with participants the benefits of reducing their heating temperature in the winter and showing them how to do it, whereas another Advocate may discuss the general benefits of turning down the temperature but is not comfortable with directly changing with the thermostat itself and does not include that physical presentation. Two of four Energy Advocates interviewed reported that while they advise customers about behaviors that they could change in order to save energy, they do not demonstrate those methods during the audit.

Nearly all interviewees mentioned that Energy Advocates are lacking in technical training. This lack of training may limit their ability to address some of the more basic energy efficiency issues when walking through the home. On the other hand, one interviewee stated that Energy Advocates believe they have enough knowledge to discuss issues that are more technical but fear their assessment may be inaccurate or inappropriate. This misdiagnosis can cause them to "stir the pot" in a manner that is counter-productive to the latter recommendations of the consultants in that customers have raised expectations of what the consultants will be able to provide or recommend as part of the technical assessment. Several interviewees said they encouraged Energy Advocates to consult supervisor or program coordinators before attempting to solve or advise on technical problems on their own.

WECC provided a one-day training to Energy Advocates that covered a multitude of issues such as ways to reduce the plug load of computers, televisions, and other home electronics and proper thermostat settings. However, it is our understanding that a more detailed, two-day training has since been developed for Energy Advocates providing services in other communities. It would be worthwhile to have Energy Advocates attend this training to reinforce the message received during the one day training and receive clarity on what should be shared with the homeowner and additional guidance as to what type of information or demonstrations should only be provided through the technical assessment.

Consultants and/or project coordinator. The consultants are the next point of contact for the participant as they go through the technical assessment. When completing the assessment, the consultant may address participant questions if asked, but his primary goal is to conduct the assessment efficiently so that technical recommendations can be made.

This technical report then goes back to the project coordinator, who reviews the specifications of the recommendations before it is distributed to the contractor for installation. Interviews with program staff indicate that this point of the process is a source of project delay, although it is not always clear why that is the case. Program staff discussed that there were a number of times when the project coordinator questioned the report and either sent the consultant back to the home to address questions or visited the home himself to verify or complete the paperwork. This process created significant delay in participants receiving their recommendations and moving forward to the next stage of the program.

It was not possible from interviews to discern whether the issue was mostly a result of the need for more training for the consultants or the level of rigor required of the project coordinator, although both of these issues were clearly identified as impediments in the program. One interviewee addressed this issue head on and said they believed the "training was a little loose with the [project coordinator]" and that requirements were not effectively communicated to the consultants at the onset of the program.

Other interviewees agreed with this perspective which suggests that the initial training of the consultants did not contain enough detail. Even though the consultants were involved in Home Performance assessments before their involvement with the Together We Save pilot, the differences between the reporting requirements of the two programs resulted in delays early on in the program cycle. Often, program staff would require clarification or additional information from the consultants in order to properly price and approve the recommended work.

Regardless of where the lack of communication or training stems from, the technical assessment and reporting process is clearly one element of the program that will need to be addressed should the program continue beyond the first year. The delays reportedly frustrate the participants which may potentially result in their dropping out of the program. Additionally, the need to revisit the home to verify or recollect could potentially impact the program's credibility in the eyes of the participant, particularly if it takes place on top of a significant delay in processing time.

Over time, consultants and program staff both developed improved reporting and as of this memo, program staff believe that the problems have largely been eliminated. If the program were to involve additional consultants as part of the technical assessment process, we would suggest a formalized, program-specific training.

Program participants. The walk-through audit is an opportunity to provide basic energy efficiency and conservation information to program participants and establish a close interfacing relationship with program participants. There are techniques other programs have employed to increase the effectiveness of the walk-through audit, which have been a topic of many studies throughout the years. For example, identifying three energy conservation activities and providing customers an action plan with these activities documented is one such technique.

According to conversations with program managers at WECC, materials were provided to Energy Advocates for distribution after the walk-through audit. They reference the Together We Save Participation Agreement and a Home Performance DVD. Per WECC, these materials were provided to Energy Advocates in a folder to distribute to participants.

However, as discussed above, conversations with all the Energy Advocates revealed that they did not have or distribute all these materials to customers. They recognized that they (the Advocates) received education materials through the program, but did not recall a specific packet of materials for the participants.

Interviewees suggested that it would be useful for WECC to provide some materials with basic energy saving tips that they could leave behind with participants. Going a step further, evaluators believe that providing leave-behind materials that document the specific energy saving recommendations made by the Energy Advocate for that participant would be an even more effective piece given it is customized for the participant and reinforces the information imparted through the audit. Follow-up conversations with WECC staff and the Energy Advocates indicates that some of these materials have been created for other community pilot programs (e.g., Brillion Community Pilot) and could be employed in future pilots.

Including a customized walk-through audit report may also provide another opportunity for the program to follow up with participants and again communicate the message. Participants are touched by the program multiple times through the process, which creates the opportunity for

the program to build repetition of information into the program design. Literature on this topic identify that repetition is a key element to increase the effectiveness of energy education.⁷

For example, Energy Advocates said they oftentimes will continue communication with participants throughout the program process. And the Energy Advocate does receive a copy of the recommendations made at the technical assessment, which the Energy Advocate will communicate to the participant. These points of contact are opportunities for the Advocates to follow up with participants on recommendations made and reinforce the messages relayed through the walk-through audit. However, this process is made difficult if the Advocate does not have per-household documentation of recommendations made.

Recommendations

Based on these early interviews we make the following recommendations for future program efforts.

- If feasible, have the Energy Advocate direct install CFLs and low-flow water devices for all homes they visit to minimize lost opportunities. This practice will ensure some level of education and savings even if the participant chooses to not move forward with additional program services.
- Reintroduce the education materials and folders to the Energy Advocates and reinforce the message that these materials should be distributed to all participants. At minimum, the program should provide Energy Advocates with general materials such as a guide to saving energy, although the program should also consider more customized materials for program participants that include recommendations made through the walk-through audit. Per conversations with WECC, the program is currently considering including a triplex audit form for the Energy Advocate's completion, a copy of which can be left with the program participant after the walk-through audit.
- Continue to provide formal training for the Energy Advocates, consultants, and project coordinator and have all project staff (whether they be new additions to the program or incumbent staff) take the training. One Energy Advocate mentioned that the training developed for the Energy Advocates for Brillion was an improvement over the training provided through the Together We Save program as it built off of the lessons learned from the initial Together We Save training. The training should be completed with the objective of providing customers with consistent services and moving projects through the program more efficiently and effectively.

⁷ PA completed an energy education best practices report as part of the evaluation of the Weatherization Assistance Program evaluation in 2004. This report was based on expert interviews and literature reviews. See Lark Lee, Laura Schauer, and Pamela Rathbun, PA Government Services Inc. *Low-income Public Benefits Evaluation, A Multi-state Study of Low-income Weatherization Programs' Energy Education and Baseload Measures*. February 24, 2004.

Next Steps

We are currently conducting interviews with Together We Save participants to further flesh out many of these process-related issues. Once those interviews are completed, the findings from the in-depth interviews presented in this memorandum and the findings from the participant interviews will be combined and reported. At that point, we will also make additional recommendations for PSCW and program staff consideration.