



Evaluation of reEnergize Lincoln Program – Study 2

November 19, 2013

With Contributions from

Ryan Anderson
Lisa M. PytlikZillig
Alan J. Tomkins

The Public Policy Center
University of Nebraska
215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 401
Lincoln, NE 68588 – 0228
Phone: 402 – 472 – 5678
FAX: 402 – 472 – 5679
Email: ppc@nebraska.edu

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

The University of Nebraska Public Policy Center provides assistance to policymakers in all three branches of government and researchers on a wide range of public policy issues. The mission of the PPC is to actively inform public policy by facilitating, developing, and making available objective research and analyses of issues for elected and appointed officials; state and local agency staff; the public at large; and others who represent policy interests.

215 Centennial Mall South, Suite 401, Lincoln, NE 68588-0228

Ph: 402-472-5678 | Fax: 402-472-5679

www.ppc.nebraska.edu



The University of Nebraska does not discriminate based on gender, age, disability, race, color, religion, marital status, veteran's status, national or ethnic origin, or sexual orientation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 3

Evaluation Questions and Methods 4

Quantitative Results 5

Overview of Open-Ended Comments 16

Discussion 18

Attachment A: Survey 19

Attachment B: Open-Ended Comments 30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lincoln's reEnergize program was intended to allow property owners and renters to make energy efficiency upgrades to single and multifamily homes and commercial buildings. In the assessment reported here, community members were surveyed about their opinions of the program. A total of 302 Lincoln residents responded to the reEnergize Study 2 survey. Of these, 72% of the respondents said they had not participated in the program, 23% said they had, and the remainder were unsure. ReEnergize participants were compared to nonparticipants on their responses to local energy policy, personal conservation activities, and the energy characteristics of their residences.

Home Energy Efficiency

- ReEnergize participants were more likely than nonparticipants to report already having the following energy efficiency improvements: insulation in walls/ceilings/attics, an energy-efficient furnace, and geothermal systems for home heating and cooling. Additionally, reEnergize participants reported, on average, less need for additional improvements in insulation or home heating.
- ReEnergize participants were more knowledgeable than nonparticipants about the current energy efficiency of their residences, as they were less likely to respond that they "did not know" whether their homes featured improvements such as insulation and an energy-efficient furnace.
- The only energy-related home feature that reEnergize participants were less likely to have than nonparticipants was the use of electricity for home heating and cooking.

Conservation and Policy Views

- ReEnergize program participants appeared to be more environmentally conscious on average than nonparticipants. A greater proportion of reEnergize participants reported making personal efforts to recycle, compost, and reduce household waste as compared to nonparticipants.
- Survey respondents as a whole showed strong support for Lincoln's existing policy goals for its energy efficiency programs. ReEnergize participants expressed more support on average than nonparticipants for stronger energy efficiency policies at the local level.
- On average, reEnergize participants placed higher importance than nonparticipants on policy goals related to environmental protection, conserving energy, reducing dependence on foreign oil, and helping low-income families.

Future Strategies

- Both reEnergize participants and nonparticipants favored cross-promotion with Lincoln Electric System and Black Hills Energy and working with neighborhood associations and home improvement stores as methods of promoting programs like reEnergize.
- Both reEnergize participants and nonparticipants also believed that providing a free energy evaluation would be the most effective way of increasing participation in a program like reEnergize.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND METHODS

The reEnergize program, which ran from approximately January 2011 through May 2013, was designed to reduce energy use throughout the community by providing incentives to property owners and renters to make energy efficiency upgrades to single and multifamily homes and commercial buildings. The reEnergize evaluation included two parts: Study 1 addressed questions related to participation in the program, and Study 2 addressed questions pertaining to perceptions of Lincoln community members as a whole. This report presents the results of Study 2.

The evaluation questions for Study 2 included:

1. How do reEnergize program participants compare to other groups of energy-conscious Lincoln residents?
2. Which strategies do Lincoln residents think would be most effective for increasing participation in programs like reEnergize?

The Public Policy Center used an online survey to obtain information to answer these questions. To recruit participants, the survey was presented as an optional addition to the annual Taking Charge online survey.¹ The energy survey was also e-mailed to a list of energy-conscious residents that included residents who had participated in past energy efforts (e.g., the Lincoln Energy Challenge, the reEnergize program, and other similar programs). Survey questions were adapted from or inspired by similar questions included on the reEnergize Study 1 survey, the Residential Energy Consumption Survey conducted by the Energy Information Administration, and the Lincoln Community Energy Survey conducted by the Public Policy Center in 2012 (the full survey used for this evaluation can be found in Attachment A). The survey was then administered online using Qualtrics – a secure online survey service. Participant responses were imported to SPSS for analysis. Where tests of statistical significance were conducted, Pearson’s chi-square tests or within or between t-tests of differences of means were used, as appropriate for the data.

¹ The Taking Charge survey concerns the Lincoln city budget and is typically taken by 1,000-2,000 persons each year.

RESULTS

SAMPLE & DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 302 participants responded to the reEnergize Study 2 survey. Of these, 217 completed the questions as an optional addendum to the 2013 Taking Charge survey and 85 completed the survey in response to the request e-mailed to Lincoln residents who had previously expressed an interest in energy conservation or policies. Of the survey participants, 216 (72%) said they had not participated in reEnergize Lincoln, 69 (23%) said they had participated, and 17 (6%) said they were not sure.

Demographic information was obtained for the 217 respondents who participated in the Taking Charge survey (see Table 1). Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using independent groups t-tests and revealed that, in the Taking Charge survey sample, reEnergize participants were significantly more liberal than nonparticipants on economic issues. ReEnergize participants are also (with marginal significance, $p < .10$) more highly educated than nonparticipants. Overall, among those survey respondents who completed at least part of the reEnergize survey, 94.8% identified as white.²

Table 1: Demographics of Survey Participants From Taking Charge

Demographic Information	reEnergize Participant Mean (SD)	NON-Participant Mean (SD)	Overall Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
Average age	45.97 (14.79)	48.44 (15.01)	47.31 (14.99)	$t(20.33)=-.67$, $p=.514$
% Male	61%	53%	60%	$t(18.75)=-.60$, $p=.555$
Overall Ideology ¹	3.66 (1.85)	2.92 (1.89)	3.73 (1.91)	$t(13.88)=1.36$, $p=.197$
*Ideology: Economic issues ¹	4.01 (1.84)	3.13 (1.46)	4.00 (1.85)	$t(19.54)=2.27$, $p=.035$
Ideology: Social issues ¹	3.17 (1.97)	2.75 (1.65)	3.26 (2.00)	$t(18.91)=-.955$, $p=.352$
Education ²	6.09 (1.55)	6.78 (1.48)	6.11 (1.57)	$t(20.78)=-1.87$, $p=.075$

*Significant difference between groups ($p < .05$), p -values are not corrected for multiple comparisons.

¹ Range: 1 = Strongly Liberal, 2 = Moderately Liberal, 3 = Weakly Liberal, 4 = Centrist/Middle of the Road, 5 = Weakly Conservative, 6 = Moderately Conservative, 7 = Strongly Conservative.

² Range: 1 = Less than high school, 2 = Some high school, 3 = High school diploma, 4 = Some college, 5 = Two year college or technical degree, 6 = Four year college degree, 7 = Some graduate school, 8 = Advanced degree.

² Not all of those who started the energy survey completed all of the questions. All of the survey respondents who completed the question identifying themselves as either reEnergize participants or nonparticipants also categorized themselves as White.

APPROVAL OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY GOALS

Respondents were asked to evaluate two broad goals designed to guide Lincoln’s current and future energy priorities. For each goal, respondents were asked first whether they approved of the goal in general; and second whether the difficulty of that goal was set either too high or too low. Participants indicated their answers by placing a pointer at some place along a continuous “slider” ranging from -100 (indicating maximum disapproval or a maximum recommended decrease in goal difficulty) to +100 (indicating maximum approval or maximum recommended increase in goal difficulty). Overall, survey participants expressed strong positive approval of both goals and also believed that the City’s targets should be increased for both (see Table 2). Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using independent groups t-tests and revealed that, compared to nonparticipants, reEnergize participants expressed higher approval on average for both goals and suggested that the target for each should be increased to a greater degree.

Table 2: Approval of Energy Efficient Goals

Slider Exercise: To what extent do you approve of this goal?	reEnergize NON- Participant Mean (SD)	reEnergize Participant Mean (SD)	Overall Mean (SD)	Significance-Test Results
*Approve of Goal 1: Meet Lincoln’s increasing energy demands using sustainable energy sources and increasing efficiency through at least 2016 ¹	+57.00% (50.10)	+79.42% (37.97)	+61.22% (48.07)	$t(279)=-3.41,$ $p=.001$
• * For Goal 1, do you feel that this goal is currently set at the right level of difficulty, or that the difficult show be raised or lowered? ²	+21.10% (40.52)	+38.28% (39.43)	+23.95% (41.08)	$t(98.8)=-2.95,$ $p=.004$
*Approve of Goal 2: Improve the energy efficient of Lincoln’s municipal buildings and infrastructure by at least 20% by 2020, using 2012 baseline ¹	+49.87% (46.40)	+73.00% (36.18)	+54.22% (45.28)	$t(278)=-3.74,$ $p<.001$
• * For Goal 2, do you feel that this goal is currently set at the right level of difficulty, or that the difficult show be raised or lowered? ²	+18.30% (37.13)	+36.63% (39.921)	+21.70% (37.52)	$t(85.7)=-3.10,$ $p=.003$

*Significant difference between groups ($p < .05$), p -values are not corrected for multiple comparisons.

¹ Range: -100 = strongly disapprove, 0 = Neutral, +100 = Strongly approve.

² Range: -100 = lower a great deal, 0 = maintain current target, +100 = raise a great deal.

IMPORTANCE OF POLICY GOALS

Participants were next asked to evaluate the importance of various policy priorities associated with energy efficiency programs. Overall, participants rated the goals of “helping to conserve energy,” “reducing government waste” and “helping the environment” as especially important, and rated the goals of “keeping cost to business low” and “improving local property values” as relatively less important (see Table 3). Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using independent groups t-tests and revealed that reEnergize participants rated five of the seven goals significantly higher than nonparticipants: “helping to conserve energy,” “reducing government waste,” “helping the environment,” “reducing our dependence on foreign oil,” and “improving local property values.”

Table 3: Importance of Policy Goals

Policy Goal: How important are each of these issues? ¹	reEnergize NON-Participant Mean (SD)	reEnergize Participant Mean (SD)	Overall Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
*Helping to conserve energy	4.25 (1.01)	4.68 (.56)	4.33 (.93)	t(281)= -3.41, p=.001
*Reducing government waste	4.04 (1.08)	4.35 (.91)	4.12 (1.03)	t(134.9)= -2.37, p=.019
*Helping the environment	4.00 (1.19)	4.58 (.74)	4.11 (1.13)	t(283)= -3.81, p<.001
*Reducing dependence on foreign oil	3.88 (1.18)	4.24 (.98)	3.98 (1.13)	t(133.7)= -2.45, p=.016
Saving taxpayer money	3.79 (1.10)	3.97 (1.06)	3.85 (1.08)	t(118.3)= -1.25, p=.215
*Helping low-income families	3.56 (1.14)	4.24 (.98)	3.68 (1.12)	t(128.8)= -3.35, p=.001
Keeping cost to business low	3.33 (1.13)	3.59 (1.12)	3.41 (1.11)	t(116.2)= -1.69, p=.095
*Improving local property values	3.29 (1.09)	3.65 (1.14)	3.36 (1.11)	t(108.3)= -2.25, p=.026

*Significant difference between groups ($p < .05$), p -values are not corrected for multiple comparisons.

¹ Range: 1 = not important at all, 2 = a little important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = quite important, 5 = very important.

RECENT PROGRAMS & ACTIVITIES

Participants were also asked to rate their familiarity with and participation in a selection of local energy-efficiency programs (see Table 4 for overall descriptive information). ReEnergize nonparticipants were examined separately from participants, and paired samples t-tests were used to determine whether nonparticipants were significantly more or less aware of other programs on average than they were of reEnergize. The results (see Table 5) indicated that reEnergize nonparticipants were significantly *less aware* of reEnergize Lincoln than the Sustainable Energy Program, the Low-Income Weatherization Program, and the Lincoln Energy Challenge. However, reEnergize non-users were significantly *more aware* of reEnergize than they were of the Dollar and Energy Saving Loans program.

Table 4: Familiarity With Local Programs, All Survey Respondents

Program	Frequencies (Percent)					Mean (SD)
	Haven't heard of it (1)	Haven't used it (2)	Not sure if I've used it (3)	Used it >1 year ago (4)	Used it in past year (5)	
reEnergize Lincoln	77 (25.5%)	139 (46.0%)	17 (5.6%)	10 (3.3%)	59 (19.5%)	2.45 (1.42)
Sustainable Energy Program	71 (23.5%)	156 (51.7%)	34 (11.3%)	20 (6.6%)	21 (7%)	2.22 (1.09)
Lincoln Energy Challenge	139 (46.5%)	85 (28.4%)	31 (10.4%)	30 (10%)	14 (4.7%)	1.98 (1.18)
Low-Income Weatherization Assistant Program	78 (25.8%)	200 (66.2%)	13 (4.3%)	6 (2%)	5 (1.7%)	1.87 (.72)
Kilowattchers	156 (51.7%)	96 (31.8%)	27 (8.9%)	16 (5.3%)	7 (2.3%)	1.75 (.98)
Dollar and Energy Saving Loans	152 (50.5%)	126 (41.9%)	16 (5.3%)	4 (1.3%)	3 (1%)	1.6 (.74)

Table 5: Familiarity With Local Programs, reEnergize Nonparticipants Only

Program	Frequencies (Percent)					Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
	Haven't heard of it (1)	Haven't used it (2)	Not sure if I've used it (3)	Used it >1 year ago (4)	Used it in past year (5)		
*Sustainable Energy Program	55 (23.7%)	135 (58.2%)	24 (10.3%)	14 (6%)	4 (1.7%)	2.04 (.86)	t(231)=-5.27, p<.001
*Lincoln Energy Challenge	108 (47.0%)	68 (29.6%)	26 (11.3%)	19 (8.3%)	9 (3.9%)	1.93 (1.13)	t(229)=-2.73, p=.007
*Low-Income Weatherization Assistant Program	58 (25.0%)	158 (68.1%)	9 (3.9%)	5 (2.2%)	2 (.9%)	1.86 (.66)	t(231)=-2.36, p=.019
reEnergize Lincoln	77 (33.0%)	139 (59.7%)	17 (7.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.74 (.58)	(comparison program)
Kilowattchers	122 (52.8%)	73 (31.6%)	20 (8.7%)	12 (5.2%)	4 (1.7%)	1.71 (.95)	t(230)=-.47, p=.636
*Dollar and Energy Saving Loans	115 (49.8%)	99 (42.9%)	14 (6.1%)	3 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	1.59 (.67)	t(230)=3.43, p=.001

*Significant difference (p<.05) between reEnergize non-participant awareness of this program and their awareness of reEnergize.

Finally, an analysis was conducted only among those who *had not heard* of reEnergize prior to taking the survey (see Table 6). Although these respondents were more familiar on average with each of the other remaining local energy programs, very few reported actually participating in any of the programs.

Table 6: Familiarity With Local Programs, Hadn't Heard of reEnergize ONLY

Program	Frequencies (Percent)					Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
	Haven't heard of it (1)	Haven't used it (2)	Not sure if I've used it (3)	Used it >1 year ago (4)	Used it in past year (5)		
*Sustainable Energy Program	37 (48.7%)	32 (42.1%)	6 (7.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1.63 (.75)	$t(75) = -4.07, p < .001$
*Lincoln Energy Challenge	61 (80.3%)	8 (10.5%)	6 (7.9%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	1.30 (.67)	$t(76) = -7.90, p < .001$
*Low-Income Weatherization Assistant Program	34 (44.2%)	39 (50.6%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	1.65 (.72)	$t(75) = 7.39, p < .001$
*Kilowattchers	59 (77.9%)	10 (13.2%)	4 (5.3%)	3 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	1.36 (.76)	$t(75) = -3.66, p < .001$
*Dollar and Energy Saving Loans	63 (81.8%)	12 (15.6%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	1.22 (.53)	$t(75) = -3.92, p < .001$
reEnergize Lincoln	77 (100.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0)	N/A

*Significant difference ($p < .05$) among those who had not heard of reEnergize regarding their awareness of this program compared to their awareness of reEnergize.

PROMOTION STRATEGIES

Participants were next presented with a brief description of the reEnergize program and asked to rank a series of eight possible strategies for promoting a program like reEnergize to new users. Among the strategies listed (see Table 7), the most popular promotion strategy by far was “cross-promotion with LES and Black Hills Energy.” The least popular promotion strategies involved niche targeting of underserved populations, including “working with senior citizen groups” and “non-English language promotion.” Independent groups t-tests revealed no significant differences in the rankings of various promotion strategies between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants.

Table 7: Ranking Promotion Strategies

Promotion Strategy	Ranking by Effectiveness, Frequency (Percent)								Avg. Inverse Rank ¹ (SD)
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Cross-promotion with LES and Black Hills Energy	89 (45.2%)	51 (25.9%)	28 (14.2%)	11 (5.6%)	12 (6.1%)	1 (.5%)	2 (1%)	3 (1.5%)	6.16 (2.50)
Neighborhood associations	25 (14.3%)	37 (21.1%)	48 (27.4%)	22 (12.6%)	20 (11.4%)	14 (8%)	7 (4%)	2 (1.1%)	4.54 (2.74)
Home improvement stores	18 (10.1%)	33 (18.5%)	41 (23%)	36 (20.2%)	22 (12.4%)	15 (8.4%)	11 (6.2%)	2 (1.1%)	4.37 (2.61)
Social media	44 (28.9%)	24 (15.8%)	14 (9.2%)	26 (17.1%)	14 (9.2%)	13 (8.6%)	6 (3.9%)	11 (7.2%)	3.89 (3.17)
Yard signs	23 (14.8%)	28 (18.1%)	28 (18.1%)	15 (9.7%)	17 (11%)	21 (13.5%)	11 (7.1%)	12 (7.7%)	3.60 (2.95)
Online reviews	13 (9.1%)	21 (14.7%)	13 (9.1%)	18 (12.6%)	25 (17.5%)	24 (16.8%)	13 (9.1%)	16 (11.2%)	2.89 (2.73)
Senior citizen groups	5 (3.5%)	16 (11.1%)	14 (9.7%)	21 (14.6%)	20 (13.9%)	23 (16%)	21 (14.6%)	24 (16.7%)	2.54 (2.49)
Non-English language promotion	2 (1.5%)	4 (3.1%)	12 (9.2%)	24 (18.3%)	21 (16%)	15 (11.5%)	28 (21.4%)	25 (19.1%)	2.04 (2.20)

¹ Inverse ranking is organized as following: For each ranking of #1 (most important), a strategy received an inverse ranking of 8; for each ranking of #2 (second most important), a strategy received an inverse ranking of 7, etc. Strategies received an inverse ranking of 0 whenever a participant chose not to rank a particular strategy (indicating that they did not believe the strategy to be worth pursuing).

POLICY CHANGES

Participants were next asked to rank a series of proposed policy changes that might enable programs like reEnergize to reach a broader audience of potential users. The rankings (see Table 8) revealed a clear preference for “providing a free home energy evaluation,” with “provide more information about the environmental impacts of saving energy” ranked as the potential policy change least likely to be effective. Independent group t-tests revealed no significant differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants on the rankings given as part of this exercise.

Table 8: Ranking Potential Policy Changes

Policy Change	Ranking by Effectiveness, Frequency (Percent)				Avg. Inverse Rank ¹ (SD)
	1	2	3	4	
Provide a free energy evaluation	130 (64.0%)	50 (24.6%)	18 (8.9%)	5 (2.5%)	3.15 (1.28)
Provide more information about the financial benefits of energy upgrades	50 (26%)	68 (35.4%)	63 (32.8%)	11 (5.7%)	2.39 (1.30)
Cover more financial costs of upgrades	40 (22.5%)	63 (35.4%)	44 (24.7%)	31 (17.4%)	2.07 (1.41)
Provide more information about the environmental impacts of saving energy	6 (3.6%)	21 (12.7%)	40 (24.2%)	98 (59.4%)	1.17 (1.02)

¹Inverse ranking is organized as following: For each ranking of #1 (most important), a strategy received an inverse ranking of 4; for each ranking of #2 (second most important), a strategy received an inverse ranking of 3, etc. Strategies received an inverse ranking of 0 whenever a participant chose not to rank a particular strategy (indicating that they did not believe the strategy to be worth pursuing).

YOUR HOUSE: PROPERTY CHARACTERISTICS

The remaining questions asked participants about various aspects of the energy-efficiency of their own residences. Participants were asked to describe some basic characteristics of their primary residence, including whether they are a renter or an owner-occupier, the year their residence was built, the year they first moved in, and how often they found their home to be too drafty during the most recent winter. On the question about home draftiness, participants were asked to respond on a four point scale ranging from “never” to “all of the time.” Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using independent group t-tests and revealed that a significantly higher percentage of reEnergize participants were owner-occupiers than nonparticipants (see Table 9). This suggests that more work may be needed to reach the rental community. There was also a marginally significant ($p < .10$) difference between the two groups in terms of property age, with reEnergize participants generally occupying older properties than nonparticipants. This trend is consistent with the reEnergize goal of reaching home owners with an above-average need for energy improvements, as older homes tend to be less energy efficient. There were no reported differences between groups in draftiness of one’s home or in the year of taking up residence in that home.

Table 9: Between Groups Property Characteristics

Property Characteristics (Group Comparisons)	reEnergize NON- Participant Mean (SD)	reEnergize Participant Mean (SD)	Overall Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
*Owner-Occupied	76% (42.83)	94% (24.04)	81% (39.32)	$t(268)=-3.24,$ $p=.001$
Year Built	1954 (32.62)	1940 (25.65)	1948 (29.86)	$t(44.23)=1.93,$ $p=.06$
Year Current Resident Moved In	2001 (11.2)	2000 (13.17)	2000 (12.12)	$t(61.54)=.13,$ $p=.897$
How Drafty?¹	1.83 (.88)	2.0 (.80)	1.85 (.85)	$t(269)=-1.42,$ $p=.158$

**Significant difference between groups ($p < .05$), p -values are not corrected for multiple comparisons.*

¹ Question: “How often have you or other members of your household found your home too drafty last winter?”

Range: 1 = never, 2 = some of the time, 3 = most of the time, 4 = all of the time.

YOUR HOUSE: NEED FOR IMPROVEMENTS

Participants were next asked about their desire for a series of energy improvements. Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using independent group t-tests and revealed that reEnergize participants reported significantly less need for insulation upgrades and upgraded heating systems. This suggests the reEnergize program may have succeeded in assisting participants in making these upgrades. There were no differences, however, relating to efficient windows, doors, appliances, and cooling systems, suggesting that reEnergize had less effect on these improvements.

Table 10: Need for Energy Improvements

Improvement	Overall Frequencies (Percent)			Mean (SD)
	No need for improvement (1)	Could be improved somewhat (2)	Greatly needs improving (3)	
More energy efficient windows	92 (32.3%)	105 (36.8%)	88 (30.9%)	1.99 (.8)
More energy efficient doors	80 (28.1%)	149 (52.3%)	56 (19.6%)	1.92 (.69)
More energy efficient appliances	92 (32.2%)	142 (49.7%)	52 (18.2%)	1.86 (.7)
Upgraded/more efficient cooling	130 (45.6%)	84 (29.5%)	71 (24.9%)	1.79 (.82)
Insulation upgrades	120 (42.3%)	115 (40.5%)	49 (17.3%)	1.75 (.73)
Upgraded/more efficient heating	140 (49.1%)	99 (34.7%)	46 (16.1%)	1.67 (.74)

Table 11: Between Groups Need for Energy Improvements

Improvement ¹ (Group Comparisons)	reEnergize NON-Participant Mean (SD)	reEnergize Participant Mean (SD)	Overall Mean (SD)	Significance Test Results
More energy efficient windows	1.99 (.82)	2.06 (.73)	1.99 (.8)	$t(264)=-.67$, $p=.503$
More energy efficient doors	1.91 (.72)	1.98 (.6)	1.92 (.69)	$t(264)=-.81$, $p=.417$
More energy efficient appliances	1.85 (.71)	1.94 (.71)	1.86 (.7)	$t(111.7)=-.89$, $p=.374$
Upgraded/more efficient cooling	1.84 (.8)	1.73 (.85)	1.79 (.82)	$t(105.3)=.95$, $p=.113$
*Insulation upgrades	1.83 (.74)	1.51 (.66)	1.75 (.73)	$t(120.4)=3.30$, $p=.001$
*Upgraded/more efficient heating	1.74 (.74)	1.49 (.71)	1.67 (.74)	$t(112)=2.44$, $p=.016$

*Significant difference between groups ($p<.05$), p -values are not corrected for multiple comparisons.

¹ Range: 1 = no need for improvement, 2 = could be improved somewhat, 3 =greatly needs improving.

YOUR HOUSE: IMPROVEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE

Participants were asked whether various energy-saving improvements had already been implemented in their household (see Table 12). Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants (see Table 13) were examined using Pearson’s chi-square tests and revealed two primary results. First, reEnergize participants were significantly *more* likely to say that their households featured insulation, an energy-efficient furnace, and a geothermal system for heating and cooling, suggesting that the reEnergize program succeeded in encouraging investment in these energy-saving technologies. Second, reEnergize participants were significantly *less* likely to respond that they “don’t know” whether their household features improved insulation and an energy efficient furnace. This suggests that the reEnergize program succeeded in educating users about the energy-efficiency status of their properties.

Table 12: Presence of Energy Improvements

Improvement	Overall Frequencies (Percent)		
	Yes	No	Don’t Know
Insulation in walls, ceiling, attic, etc.	216 (74.5%)	38 (13.1%)	36 (12.4%)
Use natural gas for heating/cooking	182 (62.8%)	94 (32.4%)	14 (4.8%)
Use electricity for heating/cooking	178 (61.6%)	101 (34.9%)	10 (3.5%)
Energy-efficient furnace	156 (54.2%)	87 (30.2%)	45 (15.6%)
Energy-efficient cooling system	140 (48.3%)	101 (34.8%)	49 (16.9%)
Energy-efficient windows	121 (41.6%)	139 (47.8%)	31 (10.7%)
Energy-efficient doors	95 (33.1%)	158 (55.1%)	34 (11.8%)
Geothermal heating/cooling system	8 (2.8%)	259 (89.3%)	23 (7.9%)

Table 13: Between Groups Presence of Energy Improvements

Improvement (Group Comparisons)	reEnergize NON-Participant Mean -(SD)			reEnergize Participant Mean -(SD)			Significance Test Results
	Yes	No	Don’t Know	Yes	No	Don’t Know	
*Insulation in walls, ceiling, attic, etc.	140 [^] (68.3%)	32 (15.6%)	33 [^] (16.1%)	59 [^] (89.4%)	6 (9.1%)	1 [^] (1.5%)	$\chi^2(4) = 17.21,$ $p = .002$
Use natural gas for heating/cooking	124 (60.5%)	69 (33.7%)	12 (5.9%)	47 (71.2%)	18 (27.3%)	1 (1.5%)	$\chi^2(4) = 3.61,$ $p = .461$
*Use electricity for heating/cooking	134 [^] (65.7%)	60 [^] (29.4%)	10 (4.9%)	32 [^] (48.5%)	34 [^] (51.5%)	0 (0%)	$\chi^2(4) = 13.86,$ $p = .008$
*Energy-efficient furnace	101 [^] (49.3%)	67 (32.7%)	37 [^] (18%)	45 [^] (70.3%)	14 (21.9%)	5 [^] (7.8%)	$\chi^2(4) = 9.18,$ $p = .057$
Energy-efficient cooling system	95 (46.3%)	72 (35.1%)	38 (18.5%)	35 (53.0%)	24 (36.4%)	7 (10.6%)	$\chi^2(4) = 3.42,$ $p = .491$
Energy-efficient windows	86 (41.7%)	95 (46.1%)	25 (12.1%)	25 (37.9%)	38 (56.6%)	3 (4.5%)	$\chi^2(4) = 6.89,$ $p = .142$
Energy-efficient doors	70 (34.7%)	109 (54.0%)	23 (11.4%)	18 (27.3%)	41 (62.1%)	7 (10.6%)	$\chi^2(4) = 4.15,$ $p = .386$
*Geothermal heating/ cooling system	2 [^] (1.0%)	187 (91.2%)	16 (7.8%)	4 [^] (6.1%)	59 (89.4%)	3 (4.5%)	$\chi^2(4) = 13.71,$ $p = .008$

*Significant difference between groups ($p < .05$). [^]Pairwise difference ($p < .05$, uncorrected).

YOUR CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

Finally, participants were asked whether they personally engaged in activities to conserve energy and waste in their own households. Differences between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants were examined using Pearson’s chi-square tests and revealed that reEnergize participants were significantly more likely to recycle, reduce household waste and compost.

Table 14: Personal Conservation Activities

Activity	reEnergize NON-Participant Frequencies - (Percent)		reEnergize Participant Frequencies -(Percent)		Overall Frequencies (Percent)		Significance Test Results
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
*Recycle	165 (80.1%)	41 (19.9%)	60 (90.9%)	6 (9.1%)	243 (83.5%)	48 (16.5%)	$\chi^2(1)=4.09$, $p=.043$
*Reduce household waste	150 (73.2%)	55 (26.8%)	58 (87.9%)	8 (12.1%)	225 (77.6%)	65 (22.4%)	$\chi^2(1)=5.92$, $p=.015$
*Compost	89 (43.4%)	116 (56.6%)	40 (60.6%)	26 (39.4%)	136 (47.1%)	153 (52.9%)	$\chi^2(1)=6.05$, $p=.014$

**Significant difference between groups ($p<.05$), p -values are exact, and not corrected for multiple comparisons.*

OVERVIEW OF OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

Throughout the survey, participants were given numerous opportunities to offer open-ended comments regarding survey topics. These comments are presented unedited and in their entirety in Attachment B. Although these comments reflected a broad range of views on issues related to energy efficiency, a few common themes were apparent. These can be divided into several categories.

With regard to **City's energy goals**, common themes included:

- Strong support for improving the energy efficiency of municipal buildings. This was often touted as a way to both protect the environment and save taxpayer money, as illustrated by the comment:
"Although the initial cost is greater, for the length of time the buildings will be used, it will more than pay itself back to the residents and taxpayers of Lincoln."
- An emphasis on long-term thinking as opposed to short-term decision making. Many participants believe that while improvements in energy efficiency may be expensive to install, the cumulative savings generated over each technology's lifetime would more than pay for the initial cost:
"Invest now, reap benefits for generations. Infrastructure investment with a medium to long term payback is one of the absolute best functions of government."
- Support for stronger building codes. Many participants favor a stronger building code to enforce energy efficiency standards on new construction:
"Look to eventually have mandatory high efficiency appliances in all new construction."
- Strong support among many participants for increasing renewable energy as a share of the local energy generation portfolio. Numerous comments, such as the following, stressed the importance of renewable energy:
"We need to move on clean renewable, energy solutions. If anyone is concerned with image and making Lincoln an attractive place to live, here is the best way to do so, make it a sensible and sustainable place to live. MORE CLEAN ENERGY, NO MORE COAL."

However, some participants also expressed concern about the cost of current renewable energy options and advised caution before implementing relatively new technologies:

"Don't be wasting money on unproven technology to save energy. Reality is the technology isn't ready and we can't afford more mistakes on buying systems that don't work. LES's windmills are a good example of this. They keep the tree huggers happy but they don't really contribute enough energy to amount to squat."

Related to **local energy-efficiency programs** in general, common themes included:

- Many participants expressed a desire for additional information on these programs:
"I would definitely like information regarding programs mentioned above."
- While some participants expressed gratitude for the existing portfolio of local energy programs, others felt these programs represented wasteful government spending:
"Stop spending money that could be used to lower my utility bills."
- Some concern about the lack of programs to cover people in all circumstances, in particular those living in rental properties:
"How do any of these programs help apartment dwellers?... Apartment rates keep going up, but no newer energy efficient appliances are provided."

Pertaining to **reEnergize Lincoln** specifically, common themes included:

- Concern over the high cost of an energy evaluation. Some participants said this initial cost discouraged them from looking into the program any further:
“My hesitancy in using it is paying for the evaluation, because I don't know if just having the evaluation itself is worth what I would have to pay for it. If it were free, I'd have it in a heartbeat, and would likely implement some of the changes as I was about to afford them.”
- Some concerns were also expressed over specific services not covered by the program – for instance, no reimbursement for installation of wall insulation unless a wall was completely uninsulated to begin with:
“Have a criticism with the program that will help with wall insulation only if No insulation at all in walls. This excludes most of those homes that have nearly none and could benefit those customers as well as your program. It took two contractors on two occasions to actually determine I had a minimal amount, thus was ineligible [for the program].”

DISCUSSION

This study extends the findings from the earlier survey of reEnergize program users by seeking the views of nonparticipants, and allowing a direct comparison between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants. Because this survey represented a self-selected sample of Lincoln residents who expressed interest in a survey on energy policy, there is good reason to believe that it represents a pool of potential participants in future energy-efficiency programs. By drawing comparisons between the views of reEnergize participants and nonparticipants, we can suggest more effective strategies for reaching potential recruits in future energy conservation efforts.

This study suggests that reEnergize served as an effective educational tool, as reEnergize participants were significantly more likely than nonparticipants to know whether or not their property had already acquired important energy-saving technologies. The present results also further support Study 1 findings that reEnergize succeeded in encouraging participants to invest in some energy-saving technologies. ReEnergize participants were significantly more likely than nonparticipants to have already invested in improved insulation and efficient heating systems and significantly less desire for these improvements on average. However, when it came to efficiency of windows, doors, appliances and cooling systems, reEnergize participants and nonparticipants looked the same in terms of their desires for improvements. This could indicate that reEnergize had less effect on these improvements.

This study also indicates the potential for significant growth in reEnergize and similar programs. ReEnergize participants appear to be more environmentally conscious as a whole than nonparticipants, even within this self-selected sample. This suggests a continued need to reach out to Lincoln residents who care about environmental policy (at the very least, care enough about it to respond to an online survey) but aren't highly motivated to seek out energy conservation programs on their own. In addition, reEnergize nonparticipants were significantly more aware of, and may have even participated in, a number of other local energy-efficiency programs. Increased coordination between these local organizations may improve overall participation by allowing interested residents to find the program which is the best fit for their needs.

No significant differences are apparent between reEnergize participants and nonparticipants in responses to explicit questions concerning promotional strategies for programs like reEnergize. In the current study as well as Study 1, respondents overwhelmingly favored cross-promotional efforts with LES and Black Hills Energy, and expressed little enthusiasm for more targeted strategies (e.g., involving senior citizen groups and non-English language promotion). In addition, both reEnergize participants and nonparticipants recommended offering a free energy evaluation as the policy change which would most effectively increase enrollment in a program like reEnergize.

Overall, these results support reEnergize success within the population it managed to reach. The work which remains, primarily, is to engage the larger population of environmentally conscious Lincoln residents who did not participate in the program the first time around.

ATTACHMENT A: ONLINE SURVEY

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The City of Lincoln has been working to increase its energy efficiency and is interested in residents' views on the goals it should be setting related to energy and sustainability.

At the local level, energy conservation saves money and energy, benefiting homeowners, businesses, and others in the community. Energy efficiency is the fastest, cheapest, and largest untapped solution for saving energy and money, and preventing greenhouse gas emissions. The costs to implement energy efficiency programs are typically only one-third the cost of building new energy generation resources, such as new power plants. Below are two goals related to sustainable energy use. Use the response scales below each goal to indicate your feelings about these goals.

Goal 1: At least through 2016, meet Lincoln's increasing energy demands using sustainable energy sources and by increasing energy efficiency.

As Lincoln grows, the new businesses and residences require more energy. Eventually, increased energy needs require adding infrastructure for creating energy (e.g., power plants). The City's locally-owned utility, Lincoln Electric System (LES), has set a goal to meet the community's increasing energy needs through 2016 using sustainable and renewable energy sources (e.g., wind-generated energy) and reducing demand through improving energy efficiency of new and old structures. By doing this, customers save money, reduce the system wide need for energy during more expensive peak periods of the year, delay the necessity to build additional, high-cost power plants, and increase the diversity of energy in use in Lincoln. Taking advantage of energy efficiencies also helps to keep rates for electricity in Lincoln among the lowest in the country. Projects funded in the first three years of the LES Sustainable Energy Program resulted in about \$2 million in annual customer savings. By using methane gas from the City landfill to generate electricity starting in 2013, LES will be reducing greenhouse gas emissions equal to 185 railcars' worth of coal every year.

- To what extent do you approve of this goal? (Range: -100 = strongly disapprove, 0 = Neutral, +100 = Strongly approve)

For Goal 1, do you feel that this goal is currently set at the right level of difficulty, or that the difficulty of the goal should be raised or lowered?

For example, a more difficult goal would be to try to meet Lincoln's increases in energy needs through sustainable energy sources, even past 2016, perhaps until 2017 or even 2020. A less difficult goal would be to try to meet Lincoln's increases in energy needs through sustainable sources through a date prior to 2016, such as 2015.

- Should Goal 1 be raised or lowered? (Range: -100 = lowered a great deal, 0 = maintain current target, +100 = raised a great deal)

Goal 2: Improve City of Lincoln energy efficiency within its municipal buildings and infrastructure by at least 20% by 2020, with 2012 as baseline.

The City of Lincoln signed up to be a U.S. Department of Energy “Better Buildings Challenge Partner,” and publicly pledged to improve the energy intensity of its own citywide building portfolio including libraries, community centers, police and fire stations, etc. by at least 20% by the year 2020. This goal will save hundreds of thousands of dollars for taxpayers annually, but will require significant upfront investment and planning in the next few years.

- To what extent do you approve of this goal? (Range: -100 = strongly disapprove, 0 = Neutral, +100 = Strongly approve)

For Goal 2, do you feel that this goal is currently set at the right level of difficulty, or that the goal should be raised or lowered?

For example, a more difficult goal would involve improving efficiency more than 20% by 2020, and a less difficult goal would involve improving efficiency less than 20% by 2020.

- Should Goal 1 be raised or lowered?

If you have any comments or questions about the preceding exercises, please use the text box below.

[See “Open-ended comments about Goals” in Attachment B.1]

POLICY PRIORITIES

On the prior page, you indicated your level of approval or support (or disapproval or lack of support) for energy efficiency goals. There are many reasons why residents may or may not support energy efficiency programs in Lincoln. Below is a list of commonly cited issues that people think of when thinking about sustainable energy programs. When it comes to sustainable energy programs, how important are each of these issues?

	Not important at all	A little important	Somewhat important	Quite important	Very important
Saving taxpayer money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helping the environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reducing government waste	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reducing our dependence on foreign oil	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helping low-income families	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping cost to business low	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improving local property values	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helping to conserve energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other? (Please specify.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you have any comments, questions, or suggestions about this exercise, please use the text box below.

[See “Open-ended Comments about Policies” in Attachment B.2]

RECENT PROGRAMS & ACTIVITIES

Below are some of the main energy programs in Lincoln, along with links to more information. Additional information on energy efficiency programs is available in the Integrated Resource Plan developed by Lincoln Electric System (LES). Please indicate the level of your involvement or familiarity with each program prior to taking this survey.

Dollar and Energy Saving Loans: This program, which is administered by the Nebraska Energy Office, offers low-interest loans for the purchase of new energy improvements.

This program offers loans at subsidized interest rates of 2.5%, 3.5%, and 5% for projects such as replacing appliances, installing new heating and cooling units, upgrading light fixtures, and installing wind or solar cells for the production of renewable energy. You can read more about Dollar and Energy Saving Loans at neo.ne.gov

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

Kilowattchers: This effort, which is also administered by Lincoln Electric System (LES), offers an online experience for area residents to learn how to save money and energy and reduce their impact on the environment. S

The Kilowattchers website includes information on implementing energy-efficiency measures in all cost ranges, from replacing standard light bulbs with compact fluorescent bulbs (CFLs) to installing insulation. Visitors to the website are encouraged to accept energy-efficiency challenges and then learn about that challenge's impact on energy usage, bills and the environment. You can read more about this program at Kilowattchers.com

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

Lincoln Energy Challenge: This program focused on encouraging private businesses and residents to use less energy.

Nearly 2,000 residents participated in the 2011 Lincoln Energy Challenge, pledging actions that would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by over 500,000 lbs a year. You can read more about the Lincoln Energy Challenge at communityactionatwork.org

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program: This program, which is currently overseen by the Nebraska Energy Office, offers financial support to low-income families looking to improve the energy efficiency of their homes.

Since 2010, this program has helped weatherize more than 4,243 homes statewide, including 351 in Lancaster and Saunders counties. Homes at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level qualify for the assistance in this program, which helps decrease the family's monthly energy budget while reducing demand on existing power plants. Federal funding for this program is set to expire in 2013. You can read more about the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program at neo.ne.gov

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

reEnergize Lincoln: This program offers financial assistance for energy evaluations and upgrades for Lincoln residents.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided a one-time federal grant to establish the reEnergize Program, a collaborative effort between Omaha and Lincoln that helped pay for professional energy evaluations and upgrades to more than 500 households and 60 commercial/non-profit properties in Lincoln by September 2013. You can read more about reEnergize Lincoln at reenergizeprogram.org

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

Sustainable Energy Program: This program, which is administered by Lincoln Electric System (LES), offers financial assistance to purchase energy upgrades for residents and businesses.

In 2012, LES spent a total of \$3 million helping customers to purchase high-efficiency heat pumps and air conditioners, improve home insulation, and retrofit commercial and industrial lighting fixtures. You can read more about the Sustainable Energy Program at les.com

- Have not heard of this program (before now)
- Have heard about this program, but definitely have not used it
- Have heard of this program, not sure if I've used it
- Last made use of this program more than 12 months ago
- Have used this program in the last 12 months

Lincoln Community Energy Conversation: Cleaner Greener Lincoln held a public engagement event concerning energy efficiency programs on Saturday August 18, 2012 at City Hall.

In conjunction with the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, Cleaner Greener Lincoln brought local administrators, energy experts and Lincoln residents together to discuss ongoing efforts to improve energy efficiency in both the public and private sectors. You can read more about the Community Energy Conversation at ppc.unl.edu.

Did you participate in last year's Community Energy Conversation?

- No, but I had heard about it
- Not sure if I heard about it or participated
- Yes, I participated
- No, and I had not heard about it (before now)

If you have any comments, questions or suggestions about this exercise, please use the text box below.

[See "Open-ended Comments about Programs" in Attachment B.3"]

reENERGIZE LINCOLN: PROMOTION

Now we'd like you to consider one local energy program in particular: reEnergize Lincoln. This program offers financial assistance for energy evaluations and upgrades for Lincoln residents. There are two different pathways that participants may qualify for, based on household income:

Low/Moderate Income Path: To take part in this path, the resident must provide proof of income to the evaluator (rental properties also qualify for this path as long as the tenants meet the income requirements). Those who qualify will only need to pay \$100 for an initial energy evaluation (a service which typically costs about \$400). The energy evaluator will then create a recommended package of energy improvements designed to produce the best return on investment, and reEnergize will cover the entire cost of installing these upgrades (up to \$3,000).

Market Rate Path: This option is for households that do not meet the requirements for the Low/Moderate Income Path. With this path, reEnergize will pay \$100 towards the cost of your initial energy evaluation (a service which typically costs about \$400). If you then decide to go forward with a selection of the upgrades recommended by your energy evaluator, and if those upgrades save an estimated 15% off your energy bill or more, reEnergize will reimburse you for up to half of the total project cost. Finally, reEnergize pays the entire cost of a final checkout evaluation, a \$150 value that helps to ensure that the newly installed upgrades are working properly. You can read more about reEnergize Lincoln at reenergizeprogram.org

Now that you know more about the reEnergize program, what do you think would be the most effective strategy to promote a similar program in the future? For each of the promotion strategies that you believe are worth pursuing, please drag them into the box on the right and rank them in their order of probable success. Rank the MOST important/effective strategy FIRST, and the LEAST important/effective strategy LAST.

Best Promotion Strategies	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Use of social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Posting online reviews from previous program users
<input type="checkbox"/>	Posting yard signs in front of participating homes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cross-promotion through LES and Black Hills Energy
<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-English language promotion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with home improvement stores
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with neighborhood associations
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with senior citizen groups

If you have any questions about the reEnergize program, additional suggestions, or would like to explain your responses to the previous questions, you may use the text box below.

[See "Open-Ended Comments about ReEnergize Promotion" in Attachment B.4]

REENERGIZE LINCOLN: PROGRAM CHANGES

Now that you know more about the reEnergize program, what would be the most effective change to encourage people to use a similar program in the future? For each of the program changes that you believe are worth pursuing, please drag them into the box on the right and rank them in their order of probable success.

Best Program Changes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide a free energy efficiency evaluation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cover more financial costs of upgrades
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide more information about the financial benefits of energy upgrades
<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide more information about the environmental impacts of saving energy

If you have any questions about the reEnergize program, additional suggestions, or would like to explain your responses to the previous questions, you may use the text box below. We are especially interested in your ideas about reducing energy consumption in Lincoln, and about programs like reEnergize, which encourage energy efficiency.

[See “Open-Ended Comments about ReEnergize Program” in Attachment B.5]

YOUR HOUSE

Because energy efficiency programs affect different types of residences differently, these questions will help us know if we are getting feedback from people in a variety of different housing situations.

Which of the following best describes you? (Please check all that apply)

- I own the house I live in
- I own the duplex/townhouse I live in
- I own the apartment I live in
- I own the mobile home I live in
- I rent the house I live in
- I rent the duplex/townhouse I live in
- I rent the apartment I live in
- I rent the mobile home I live in
- I rent out a house (or houses) I own
- I rent out one or more duplexes/townhouses I own
- I rent out an apartment (or apartments) I own
- I rent out a mobile home (or homes) I own

In what year was your primary residence built? Your best estimate is fine.

In what year did you first move in to your primary residence?

How often have you or other members of your household found your home too drafty last winter? Would you say it was:

- All of the time
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Never

Please also give us an idea of your energy efficiency needs. To what extent do you feel your primary home or residence needs the following:

	No need for improvement or upgrading	Could be improved somewhat	Greatly needs improvement or upgrading
More energy efficient windows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More energy efficient doors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insulation upgrades	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More energy efficient appliances	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upgraded and more efficient heating system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upgraded and more efficient cooling system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate whether or not your home has the following energy related features.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Energy-efficient windows	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy-efficient doors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy-efficient furnace	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy-efficient cooling system	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A geothermal system for heating and cooling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Insulation in your walls, ceiling, attic, and crawl spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of natural gas as an energy source for heating and cooking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Use of electricity as an energy source for heating and cooking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please indicate whether or not your household has been involved in a continuing effort to do each of the following in the past year.

	Yes	No
Recycle	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compost	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reduce household waste	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

ATTACHMENT B: OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

The following are the full set of comments submitted by Lincoln residents, unedited and in the formats received from the online survey. These are organized by topic area as defined by the text box into which they were entered. For example, after the Lincoln's energy goals activity, participants were given the opportunity to explain or comment. Comments typed in response to that prompted opportunity are listed in that category, even if they pertained to other areas. No edits were made for grammar, spelling, and so on. Line breaks are indicated by “/”.

B.1 COMMENTS ON LINCOLN'S ENERGY GOALS

- We were unable to do our plan, reapplied but have been refused participation so we can't say we have had good results from trying. Very discouraged. Thanks.
- =the goal for the buildings and infrastructure should be set higher. I used the ReEnergize program for my home and found my consumption is down by 35% minimum. There are programs like this from the Federal Governemnt to help with city structures.
- cost is always a consideration but i don't have a problem with spending more now for future savings.
- For Goal #1 - what are the demands we are trying to meet?
- I am not sure I know enough about the city of Lincoln municipal buildings to make a good assessment
- I am supporting the 20% because it is the minimum. I assume if we can do better, we wil..
- I strongly believe that City & County properties should be more energy efficient, with an emphasis placed on "green" energy when/if possible. Although the initial cost is greater, for the length of time the buildings will be used, it will more than pay itself back to the residents and taxpayers of Lincoln. / I also think that more of an emphasis should be made to include business owners in the energy efficiency push. I am thankful for ReEnergize Lincoln's efforts as a homeowner, but as a patron to businesses I see a lot of energy waste, and even in situations like the 2012 water restrictions many businesses overwatered to the point of (in my opinion) negligence to the water levels.
- I'm finding your questions very confusing--I can't answer them as written.
- Invest now, reap benefits for generations. / Infrastructure investment with a medium to long term payback is one of the absolute best functions of government. The private homeowner won't install a super high efficiency residential hot water heater in a residence because the payback period is longer than the anticipated period of ownership. The public infrastructure period of ownership is decades, making long-term investments with long payback periods not only feasible, but prudent.
- Look to eventually have mandatory high efficiency appliances in all new construction; incentives for those who do it voluntarily.
- The city should be leading the way in energy efficiency. They should be shooting for more than 20% efficient.
- Will/have you published the types of energy savings measures you have taken and possible additional measures that could be taken. If not, I think that could be good info.
 - 1. Lessen light pollution. / 2. Wind energy/solar energy for the homeowner. / 3. Continue homeowner information for insulating, etc.
 - Add wind turbines north of town instaed of importing energy from out of state
 - Confusing questions.

- Create incentives for citizens to install solar panels on their houses. I would do it myself but the financial gains do not exist.
- Don't be wasting money on unproven technology to save energy. Reality is the technology isn't ready and we can't afford more mistakes on buying systems that don't work. LES's wind mills are a good example of this. They keep the tree huggers happy but they don't really contribute enough energy to amount to squat.
- Energy conservation is crucial b/c that means that we reduce the need for buying more expensive sources of electricity.
- Energy efficiency is the fastest, cheapest, easiest and least controversial "source" of energy. It should be pursued as strongly as possible.
- Goal 1 is worded unfairly. I think Lincoln should attempt to meet energy demands by encouraging energy efficiency. However, if people want sustainable energy, good for them, I just don't think Lincoln should force it on them.
- Goal 1: Regarding the timeline (second question): this goal should be ongoing, but major steps should start now. Goal 2: Regarding the timeline (fourth question): this goal should be sought more aggressively. Improve Lincoln's municipal building energy efficiency by more than 20% during a shorter timeline!
- Goal 2: Lead by example.
- Government needs to encourage sustainable energy policy and force by code. Codes increase the cost of rehabbing existing assets and new construction which decreases jobs. However if savings were rewarded with incentives the economic playing field remains balanced
- Grant programs for increasing energy efficiency for homeowners based on income and age of home would be awesome.
- How about a few new water wells? Lincoln should not have to contend with water rationing every year. We need to bring all of LES and the Water System up to date. Water and electric usage is increasing in Lincoln because it is growing but our services aren't growing to meet the demands of their customers. We don't need any more high paid CEO's but we do need services. /
- I believe energy efficiency will help guarantee Lincoln's future growth and development.
- I see climate change and negative effects on our community and state. Saving energy and using alternative energy sources are critically important and needed.
- I understand that with new federal regulations it gets harder and harder to meet energy needs in a cost effective way with traditional energy sources. However, many new renewable energy sources are not nearly as efficient or cost effective. In some cases the technology may need further development or the renewable energy source would not be viable without government subsidy. LES should look to adopting the best practices without charging headlong into new energy fads.
- I would like to see Lincoln become a leader in the nation for sustainable energy.
- If solar power was subsidized for the consumer, similar to the soon-to-be ending Germany plan, I think that Lincoln could easily meet the goals of sustainable energy resources. We should try to decentralize the power-grid more to show the nation that it can be done. / As for the municipal buildings, improving efficiency should also be coupled with additions of geothermal, regardless of retrofit cost.
- Increasing energy efficiency saves taxpayer resources and, thus, should be a high priority.
- Infrastructure is not easily seen so it's easy to spend the money elsewhere and it's appreciated more but infrastructure is the highest priority we need a reliable energy grid, road & sewer network and we need to get all cables buried. The payback is long term.
- Just as the newspaper voiced recently, I think we need more emphasis on recycling. We need ways that will motivate people to do this. How about recycling for plastic and metal

downtown? I see this in other towns. We aren't setting the example there.

- LES is one of the MOST EXPENSIVE ele company there is in the state of Nebr. They charge way more than most others & are always going to the council for more. When prices go up to pay for something it NEVER comes back down so what are they doing with it?? LES should be sold as they do not have a clue as how to run a business. I ask family & friends in Nebr what they are paying. LES is way over what they are paying. Some are over doubled. WHY?? I have caught there trucks sitting in alleys all day. They only got out to stretch their legs & then got back in the truck. They were being paid a very good wage to do nothing & it has happened more than once a year & in more than 4 year That I watched. Oh & let's not forget how every year they do not buy enough ele so that also up's our rates. I have NEVER lived in a place that is so incopident as they are. There are more raised rates here in 1 year as in 10 years where I moved from. I paid the more here for a 1 br apt med sized apartment as I did where I came from. That was in a 2 br, plus office, HUGE kitchen & dining room house. Why?? Some body is getting very rich off of ripping off the people of Lincoln
- LES needs to build more windmills. Pure and simple. Two is not enough. We have a heck of a lot of wind around here and aren't taking advantage of it. I support energy efficiency in all of its forms, and would gladly pay more (at least slightly more, anyhow) on my electric bill to see it open. Coal is awful stuff. Nuclear is OK, but scary. Natural gas and WIND. Why do we only have two windmills? Build a windfarm!!
- Lincoln is doing pretty good in being a green city but there are still options out there. What about building the state's first solar power plant? Additional wind turbines in the portfolio? Converting more of Lincoln's street lights in LEDs to help with the sustainable energy goal?
- Most of these programs the costs outweigh the benefits unless the market for energy changes a great deal in the future. The religious belief that somehow mankind is responsible for global warming is one the city should not try and force on the rest of the citizens of Lincoln who don't believe in that belief.
- One must also consider the costs of reaching the goal. The payback period must be reasonable.
- Our street lights need revised to reduce waste and emissions from commuters. Van Dorn between 9th and 10th, South between Normal and 40th, the Warlick/Old Cheney disaster area are examples. There are also too many lights and intersections along major routes like Hwy 2, O Street, 84th, 70th and Old Cheney to accommodate businesses. With better design, traffic could be routed within the strip mall to other arterial roads and have less intersections and lights.
- People should be doing the responsible thing and conserve our resources. Why are we paying people to put in "high efficiency" equipment? Individuals and Businesses should want to do the right thing - morally and ethically
- Sometimes facts are skewed to make things look better or more efficient. Even with recycling. It reduces the need for raw material but still takes energy and transportation costs and facilities to make it work. Some older appliances may take more energy to run but last longer than modern ones so you have to factor the cost of more maintenance, more parts, more money.
- The City fails in so many areas to improve energy efficiency in their buildings. Step out of the box. As a trial project, utilize UNL engineering students on a trial basis to design an energy efficiency buildings (see Professor Tim Wentz). Quit using just the low bid for direct replacements of equipment or lighting. Study energy efficiency in all City buildings and then improve it. / / Increase the L.E.S. Sustainable Energy Program. Even consider utilizing that on City projects and then publicizing it. Think about that concept.
- There are too many other facets to properly address the "energy efficiency" questions as posted above. For example, (and this is only ONE example) of course there is a need to

energy efficient, however, the cost of "getting there" is of equal or greater importance. (ie- the use of LED lighting is right for SOME applications however, the cost and the APPROPRIATE use of LED's is a balance that must be properly implemented. We cannot blindly "carte blanche" apply the use of LED's to ALL of the lighting applications. / / While this example is oriented to LED's, the same principle applies to being energy EFFICIENT.

- There is hardly any investment that is more important than energy efficiency.
- This sounds admirable, but I'm not sure about the level of public awareness regarding these issues. Lowering the environmental impact of the city is well & good, but local citizenry need to be involved. People need to be aware of how much electricity & water they use relative to their neighbors, for example. When the drought hit, people were resentful of the water caps. It's one thing to sacrifice your lawn; another to sacrifice a garden that feeds you or a neighborhood area. In Lincoln & in the rest of the country there needs to be greater local awareness of resource usage. Awareness & competition between neighbors/communities will further drive energy use down.
- to me, this is a no-brainer. We as tax payers are footing the bill for all the energy-wasting buildings. Therefore, we need to do all within our power to either move into buildings that already are very energy-efficient, or replace buildings. Also, start buying & using vehicles that burn natural gas. Replace all old style lighting in all buildings, etc., with new energy-efficient lighting.
- We need to drastically reduce how much energy we're using.
- We need to move on clean renewable, energy solutions. If anyone is concerned with image and making Lincoln an attractive place to live, here is the best way to do so, make it a sensible and sustainable place to live. MORE CLEAN ENERGY, NO MORE COAL.
- We, as a planet, are using up the finite resources available at a rate that is increasing exponentially which is not sustainable! Considering the time it will take to bring renewable energy up to the point where it can supply all of our needs, which is growing daily, we need to begin the massive effort, which we can do with on the shelf technology, NOW!!! If we don't, we'll start paying the price in only a few short decades! We can't live without power anymore! Our society will crumble into something nobody with any common sense wants to even consider! This isn't taking into account what's already happening to our planet! Debate the cause all you will but you can't debate the facts of what's going on! The time to fix this problem, which we can do, has actually passed so we need to get to it because we're behind already! We're going to need a few decades and that's about all the time we have left! Reality may suck but we have to live here! (Where else are we going to go?) Let's quit being stupid and get to it already!
- When dealing with old buildings sometimes 20% efficiency is the best you can do.

B.2 COMMENTS ON GENERAL ENERGY POLICY GOALS

- I have a problem with "low-income families" definition here. Way too vague a statement./category. I work for a housing related non-profit and I see so many try to take advantage of the system. Mostly imigrants from Arab countries. It's unbelievable how many of these people come here and within weeks are deemed disabled so they don't have to work. I suggest a qualifying process for the so called "low income families" served here.
- I have been disappointed by the reEnergize program. I desperately need a new air conditioner. I was hopeful there would be assistance to get it. I was told that I would have to pay \$300- \$400 for an energy evaluation which would surmise what I needed to have a more energy efficient home. Based on the proposal, a certain amount would be put towards it and I would be able to finance the rest. There were two meetings I could attend to learn more about the program. Due to

prior obligations I couldn't attend either meeting. As of today, I do not have the money for the air conditioner. Thankfully we are almost into the fall so I will probably be able now to wait till next year. Hoping to save at least 1/2 of what I need by then. / / I looked at the list of contractors and Absolute Comfort is not listed. They check my furnace and air conditioner every year. 2 years ago I bought a furnace from them. I trust them and was sorry to see that if I did work with the reEnergize program, I would be unable to use them / / My name is Robbi Masloskie Phone: 402-890-5448 /

- I think the city should work on using its waste stream for energy, and it should require recycling.
- / Can't understand how sustainable energy programs affect property values without energy costs going up?
- Again, this question is not worded fairly. Sustainable energy and energy efficiency are two different concepts. Taking steps to improve energy efficiency might help make our current energy use sustainable, but they are not one in the same.
- As I said in my previous comment, we need to motivate by education and other ways for all of us to recycle more and be more conscience of what we are doing the environment.
- By Reducing our dependence on foreign oil I hope you mean producing more oil in US.
- City-wide, curbside recycling. Raise questions about why trash (dumping in the landfill) is almost twice the cost of sorting and recycling is
- Cutting waste is always a good idea but frequently what is cut isn't what needs to be cut. Helping the environment and changing to alternative energy sources is good political sense given climate change. Citizens love our parks and our libraries, for example, cuts in library hours, too many cuts in park maintenance, etc. negatively affect our view of the city.
- Energy efficiency is an investment that already makes great sense, and as energy prices rise and pollution restrictions become more stringent, efficiency investments will be even greater investments. They moderate, or soften the blow, of future price spikes, easing the burden on individuals, businesses and the city.
- Everyone should want to conserve energy. We went through an energy crisis in the 70's and 80's. This is nothing new!
- For Lincoln to be a vibrant city that's alive, a city where people and businesses want to be, we have to make it that way! If we don't invest to make it that way, it won't become that way! Invest now while rates are low, the technology and man power is affordable! Pay a little now or a lot later! The choice is ours! Let's quit being stupid and make the right one!
- Get rid of the newly created position that the old police chief was given and let the heads of those departments run their own areas. We don't need to be paying a figure head. Put that money back into the police force. / / Stop wasting money on new facilities when the old fire houses are just fine.
- Green is the future!
- I don't really see the connection with some of these to sustainable energy. How would it reduce government waste? I don't think it's ever going to REDUCE costs to businesses, individuals, the poor, or taxpayers - at least not until the technology has a chance to cheapen and improve. None of that matters if the planet is destroyed. Nearly everyone (rich and poor) could pay a little more. I'd be happy to pay double my current electric bill if I knew it was being used to shut down coal plants and build windmills.
- I think Lincoln is a great city and I like what they are trying to achieve but I see politics getting in the way. The city council should not be voting according to party beliefs or against the mayor because of his party affiliation. The mayors office and council should be operating together to conduct city business such as a corporation would be to make their company profitable.
- I think sometimes we just have to bite the bullet and do the RIGHT thing, even if it's expensive.

- It is not the city issue for dependence on foreign oil. Don't mandate programs and force policy such as recycling. Give citizens the information and let them decide. Government shouldn't drive the market for energy efficient products by mandating in codes or requirements. Let the market drive not government
- It's a good exercise to help gain consensus on energy improvement. We have so many reasons to be more responsible, but every day we fail to do just that we lose that day forever.
- many children continue their education until 28 and cannot afford healthcare coverage and school costs and rent but are trying to be independent and productive members of our community
- My only comment would be on the city buses. I believe Lincoln could use a much smaller style of bus. I don't believe I've ever seen more than a half dozen people on one bus at any time. The smaller van style bus I think would be better and more efficient, not to mention the larger buses don't fit in most turn lanes Lincoln has.
- Same comments as posted on the previous page. Too many facets to give a blanket answer to limited proposed questions.
- The property taxes are being wasted on things such as the Arena for the University. The University will eventually inherit the arena just as they did the Bob Devaney Center. / It should not be the responsibility of the citizens of Lincoln to provide for the University. The University is a state institution and should receive everything from the state. The downtown area needs to be left alone for awhile and the residential neighborhoods need to be catered to for awhile.
- We're all dead if we don't find new ways of living on this planet. At the most basic level, we all need to use energy, and if the way we use energy continues as it is now, we're doomed. Not trying to be melodramatic, I really wish it were that simple or lighthearted. We don't do something different, we all die.
- When everyone had to cut back did LES? No they just kept upping the rates. Did this help people who lost their jobs? No. Did they do ANYTHING at all to lower the cost of ele?? NO Did they try & work with people for long term? NO. / I would like to know one thing cost wise that LES has done to help the people of Lincoln. / When I move here they had a heater in the front that said how cheap it was to run in Lincoln. I called & asked if they knew they could be sued for faluse advertising. Then It went to This is how much you would pay in De Moines Iowa(Sorry about the spelling) but who care's? I live here. They could not find ANYWHERE in Nebr that would have worked for their sign. How sick is that? Being ripped off on EVERY ele bill by the city you live in.
- Whether you accept climate change or not, we have to look at changes in how we produce and use resources, seeking to follow a more sustainable approach to living.

B.3 COMMENTS ON RECENT LINCOLN ENERGY PROGRAMS

- Have a criticism with the program that will help with wall insulation only if No insulation at all in walls. This excludes most of those homes that have nearly none and could benefit those customers as well as your program. It took two contractors on two occasions to actually determine I had a minimal amount, thus was ineligible. Not clear to those outside which programs are which and communication among them could be improved.
- I attempted to use reEnergize but was prevented from doing so by my evaluator who said that he could not test my home due to attic vermiculite, and had no guidance as to any alternatives. He referred me to the director in Omaha, who never returned my calls.
- I emailed to try and participate in the ReEnergize program but did not get a call or email returned.

- I haven't really been involved in this because I don't meet the income limits and my house has upgrades like insulation, energy efficient windows and appliances.
- In Omaha, a program offered a device to use in the home to track electric use for a period of time; I think it would be educational to try out different practices to see their effects on usage.
- Our family is blessed with an income where we do not have to use financial programs. Every year or so, I read up on current ideas for energy conservation. I have done this all my life. Which makes me think that back in the 70's schools were very into involving teachers in energy conservation at schools. I don't remember any such efforts in the 80's , 90's or 20's.
- We called about the programs above (the ones I cited) but either did not qualify or the offers did not work for us in our older home...so we did not actually "use" the program.
- Did not attend the Cleaner Greener Lincoln event due to disagreements with several of the speakers. Line up of presentations was not balanced in offering several view points of approaches towards energy conservation.
- Good to know there are services and programs built to support these ventures!! We do not qualify for the reEnergize program but looked in to the possibility. Completed the Energy Challenge in 2012.
- Government does not have to be involved in everything. Stay out of it.
- How about solar panels on public buildings?
- How do any of these programs help apartment dwellers? / / Electric range from 1976--NOT energy efficient / Refrigerator from 1992--NOT energy efficient / / Apartment rates keep going up, but no newer energy efficient appliances are provided. How about programs for apt owners to purchase energy efficient appliances for their tenants???
- How in the hell is LES going to show people how to save when they can't do it themselves?? What would help people even more would be to lower the cost of ele to around what others pay with their ele companys. That would cut most peoples bills in half. Do you think that would work?? Make ele affordable? That should be the first & main thing that is done with LES or as I said before sell it.
- I am encouraged that Lincoln has so many programs and wishes to continue to fund them. They do help the people who need them!
- I didn't particpate in Lincoln's Community Energy Conversation due to a major scheduling conflict, not because I wasn't interested.
- I have a general comment, which is to say that the "Walt" branch of the LIncoln library burns its lights "full up" all night long. This is a wanton waste of energy, and taxpayer \$\$\$. At one point, after complaning about this, I was told this was necessary for security reasons. That can't be true, since banks (which have a much higher stake than libraries to protect their holdings) are not lit up like Christmas trees all night long. There has to be a more efficient way to provide security for the library than burning the lights all night long. PLEASE let's get this fixed.
- I would definitely like information regarding programs mentioned above.
- LES makes program participation difficult for small businesses and owners of commercial properties. While LES focuses on large results, due to the efficiency of same, most program's are not understood or available to small property owners
- NEED INFORMATION REGARDING THESE PROGRAMS
- Obviously, programs need more publicity. i read teh J-S every day. I don't see these programs in the news.
- Renters should be allowed these incentives!
- See previous comments. Stop spending money that could be used to lower my utility bills.
- The five "pigeon" holes provided for answers are tooooooo limited. Perhaps another pigeon hole saying Have heard about it and think it is a waste???

- The L.E.S. Sustainable Energy Program has been a huge success. It saves all of their energy consumers costs. The program ran out of funds this month because of higher than expected lighting projects. More funds need to be allowed for this program. I suggest increasing it on a projected basis as necessary. / / The City needs to utilize this program for their own use. All taxpayers would benefit from that.
- There are programs that I am not aware of, so feel that others aren't aware of these either.
- These are all useless programs and activities. Please stop using taxpayer money these. The city government should not be concerning itself with these items.
- This is like an old record. "We" should want to do the right thing for the earth and conserve our natural resources! When equipment wears out replace it with energy efficient equipment. You would have to live under a rock not to know about all the things our tax payer dollars are paying for: Lincoln Energy Challenge, Sustainable Energy Program, reEnergize Lincoln (poorly run), Dollar and Energy Saving Loans (I actually attempted to use this, but gave up in frustration because of all the red tape and rules), Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program, Kilowattchrs, and Lincoln Community Energy Conversation; this is not "free" money if comes from us the taxpayers!!!!
- We need to develop more use of wind energy
- When the citizens decrease their energy use, we still get punished because our rates increase. All building owners need to be forced to bring thier buildings, commercial or residential, up to specs for energy savings before they could sell them and then only one time should a person have to do that. EX: my house is energy effecient, so If I see it the next one needs to be alread so I don't have to pay again. The programs offered were not offered when we spent the \$\$\$\$ to make ours effecient

B.4 COMMENTS ON reENERGIZE PROMOTIONAL STRATEGIES

- Acquire funding for program after study of needs. Promote the program strongly. Work with groups in the city. Remember home owners are probably use the most energy and are the ones where are large return on savings could be accomplished. Just my thoughts or opinion.
- BILLBOARDS...they work
- I heard about the program when I called into LES to inquire about energy saving tips, programs or advice.
- I think the city has the resources to explore the utility of each program they desire to advance with the information in its property and tax rolls. A door to door campaign, or a phone campaign, would be a proper accompaniment to any program that is truly desired to succeed.
- I was very disappointed in this program.
- I wish the program had not discontinued the part of the program to replace inefficient lights. I can understand that perhaps the program needed to be better controlled, but to cancel it seems extreme. In my house, new lights were suggested as the change that would yield the most savings.
- Use the non-English language promotion in utility bills / / Work with home improvement stores and grocery stores
- A new program similar to reEnergize needs to be more clearly thought out and managed, not by engineers focused on and experienced in large commercial clients/projects, but by individuals and/or groups with a wider "real world" experience with a range of situations and people.
- Again the choices available do not fully offer an opinion other than agreeance with this program. I would suggest that the City of Lincoln pay attention to effective and cost efficient

governing.....get out of the "subsidy" business.....let people make their own choices. At the above mentioned 15% (or greater) savings would result in a payback of less than 7 years (5 years @ 20%, etc). If the property owner cannot understand energy efficiencies, then they will pay the increased cost rather than laying that cost off to the taxpayers of Lincoln.

- Don't make the program more confusing than what it needs to be. Don't work with sustainability coordinator in Omaha any further.
- Don't waste a lot of money on advertizing. A note in the utility bill is enough.
- Facebook and Twitter are practically free, minus the labor to post things. It would be the most cost effective marketing to get awareness, involvement and opinions about this program.
- For some low income households, not everyone has access to the internet to find out about these programs. In addition, I'm not all that bad off and before a year ago, I hadn't heard of some of these programs. More advertisement of these programs would hopefully then help them spread by mouth to those who needs them.
- Have realtors provide information at closing
- I actually participated in the reEnergize program and had some concerns about how it was done. There was some good to it but caulking my storm windows was completely ignored and that is where the greatest loss of energy happens. Instead they insisted that the money first of all go to new light bulbs. I am perfectly capable of purchasing those even if slowly, but I am not capable of second story work on caulking windows. Also, some of the workers/evaluators were not respectful so I was left with a bad taste overall. On the one hand it was left to me to make sure the workers did all they were supposed to do, but they split up and worked on the attic and the basement at the same time and hated it when I, a woman, questioned if something was complete. They made me look like "one of those" people who is "never satisfied", but the evaluator insisted that I was the one who needed to insure that all was complete instead of supervising it himself. Some of the work was badly done so I am left with an attic fan closure that won't close completely and will have to find someone to fix that problem.
- I don't believe that rental properties should be eligible to be upgraded free of charge to the owner while they are taxpayers also, they are receieving a financial gain paid for by others.
- I don't think anything should be done to promote this. The funds that are being wasted on this program should be used on other things like **FIXING THE ROADS!**
- I have a general comment, which is to say that the "Walt" branch of the LIncoln library burns its lights "full up" all night long. This is a wanton waste of energy, and taxpayer \$\$\$. At one point, after complaning about this, I was told this was necessary for security reasons. That can't be true, since banks (which have a much higher stake than libraries to protect their holdings) are not lit up like Christmas trees all night long. There has to be a more efficient way to provide security for the library than burning the lights all night long. **PLEASE** let's get this fixed.
- I never click or acknowledge online adds.
- I still do not see how this program affects apartment dwellers. We cannot make changes in the apartments--that is up to the owner. / / And the owner does not make improvements which result in saving energy, such as newer appliances.
- I think you are doing all of these
- I would suggest that the City also work with locally owned home improvement businesses so that they can advise their customers of the program.
- Include television with social media. Newspaper.
- I've heard a lot about this program, but didn't understand it. Neighborhood associations should promote it more, and having an online presence through social media and a dedicated website would be great.
- Radio inverviews explaining and promoting would be a good idea. Promotion in the

newspaper and the online newspaper.

- Sadly, money is usually the main way to incentivize these things, so that can be the hook to make people take notice. Focusing on the savings and economic freedoms may be the most effective strategy to promote these ventures.
- The City should not invest much taxpayer money in this program. Get out of competition with the private sector.
- The reenergize program appeared to have been run inefficiently!!! The red tape and unorganized program was a poor use of taxpayer dollars!
- There are a lot of people out there that do not have \$100.00 to throw away, let alone the cost of what needs to be done. Senior citizens are mostly on a set budget. That 100 could mean they skip their med's or food. It's another way to suck money out of people. I could go in their house for FREE & give the 10 good & cheap to no cost ways to lower their ele bill. / Do you have a clue how many people in Lincoln do not turn on lights to read because it costs too much? How about watching TV? How many watch only the news so they can save ele. How about cooling. Any clue to the ones who will not turn on the a/c no matter how hot it is or the ones who set it on 80 or above?? How cool do you set yours?? Why don't you come to some of these areas & see how LES is hurting the people of Lincoln. Or are you afraid to see how many??
- Use the newspaper!

B.5 COMMENTS ON REENERGIZE POLICY CHANGES

- can't get the program to work 1. free energy evaluation 2. cover more financial costs proportional to household income
- Determine AND publicize availability to MULTI family dwelling (apartments etc)....
- I am concerned about increasing the amount of reimbursement...it has to be paid for by 'someone', and we all may incur higher costs if more is paid so the upgrades are made. I think a personal investment is always much more likely to promote learning and use of an idea. For instance, dental patients often complain that their insurance covers 100% of the cost of preventive care, but only 50% of major dentistry. That is because the ins. co. wants them to take responsibility. If the person has more of an investment in energy resources this way, they may be more likely to choose and use wisely, knowing that to not do so may create even bigger costs to them. (That seems a bit convoluted in the way I wrote it, but I think you can get the picture.)
- I think "encouraging" energy efficiency is insufficient. Set each household with a goal, and give them a budget and a deadline, with an additional tax benefit once the goal has been achieved.
- I think a device to measure electric usage real-time would help to encourage people to make changes. I think the incentives to replace inefficient lights was very good, especially if you offer to recycle the old lights. / / Overall, I was very satisfied with the reEnergize program--from the staff in the reEnergize office, to my evaluator (David Holtzclaw), to my contractor (Mike Ballard). They were all very helpful, professional, knowledgeable, and efficient.
- I think that energy savings and assistance with upgrades are probably the strongest incentives for a successful program.
- My son participated in the ReEnergize program and he also received a low interest loan to fund the upgrades. It was great. However, he had to be persistent in pushing through to get the ball rolling after the first energy assessment. I don't know if the program was too new when he signed up, but the audit was done in May and it was the end of September before the work was done. It would have not been done at that time if we hadn't had a contractor that we had worked with in the past on an LES project who helped him get it moving. The program was great, but

very frustrating!

- This program was not promoted enough. In addition to the suggestions on the prior pages, all mainstream media should be asked to provide PSAs, as well as news coverage
- Although the environmental costs/benefits should be front and center in the reasons for doing such programs, people are very heavily propagandized about the environment. As much as it pains me to say, less focus on the environment may help reach more people at first. It should never be said that the environment is not a reason to pursue energy efficiency and cleanliness, but as a strategy for encouraging change it may be detrimental in this place at this time.
- Am personally hoping the cost of solar panels will decrease. Perhaps this could be a part of reenergize.
- As a renter in Lincoln, it's not up to me to retrofit the house I live in to be more energy efficient. My landlord (and I suspect the majority of Lincoln landlords) are very financially conscious. However, rented properties are often in more dire need for energy retrofits, as many of them are run-down. Making the reEnergize program more financially attractive and accessible to landlords would make a huge impact in making Lincoln more energy efficient!
- As an employee with the reEnergize Program, my response is biased. The best way to get more people involved and make the program work better is more streamlined administration and concrete expectations for participants.
- Despite all of the information out there about ways to be more energy efficient, there are still a lot of people and businesses who just don't get it and/or don't care, and there is still a lot of low-hanging fruit out there to harvest. But these people are a little harder to reach and need more/better messaging and more incentives. It can certainly be done, but it needs to be done better...clearer and focused message, easier involvement, more realistic timeline.
- Don't invest taxpayer money in these programs. Let the private sector handle it. The City needs to get out of social programs like this and concentrate on street improvements.
- Have apartment owners replace appliances when over 20 years old in order to save energy. Give the owners some incentive to save energy/money for apartment tenant.
- I got my friend to do it and then she got our coworker to do it. I wish that I also could have done it but I rent my house, I do not own. I wish that there was an easier way to connect landlords and willing tenants. I would have paid for it myself, too! :)
- I have a general comment, which is to say that the "Walt" branch of the Lincoln library burns its lights "full up" all night long. This is a wanton waste of energy, and taxpayer \$\$\$. At one point, after complaining about this, I was told this was necessary for security reasons. That can't be true, since banks (which have a much higher stake than libraries to protect their holdings) are not lit up like Christmas trees all night long. There has to be a more efficient way to provide security for the library than burning the lights all night long. PLEASE let's get this fixed.
- I was told that the reEnergize program gave the homeowners more choice as to what seemed the best use of the funding. That would be better for Lincolniters as well.
- I would suggest not funding re-Energize in the future. From what I could tell, it was not set up and used efficiently. Kind of like keeping the door open when the air conditioner is on and it is 100 degrees outside.
- I would suggest that the City establish a program like the German Feed-In Fee program.
- I would suggest that the city government become proactive to encourage reduction of spending of taxpayer monies rather than crying about not being able to balance the budget or even considering raising the sales tax rate again. City government was elected to govern the day to day operations of Lincoln not create/sustain social programs that benefit a minority of the taxpayers.
- I'd like to see a solar or wind buy in for whole blocks/neighborhoods

- If you want people to save energy you need to show them they will save money.
- I'm a renter so I don't have a need for these programs but it would be a good idea if landlords could benefit from it.
- Information on energy upgrades make no difference to a lot of the poor people. As I said before. Do it to your rich people the poor do not need it here that as they already have to do without for many things or they can not pay the bill. A lot of people are too proud to ask for help. They just go with out. / Nice way to treat the elderly who have already gave their all. / Some Golden Years.
- Looks towards more green ways to help reduce energy consumption, both in the private and public sector. Wind turbines on homes would help out, too, but not too clear about the requirements Lincoln has - perhaps publicize these more to encourage it. The way I currently understand it, private wind turbines have to be affixed to people's houses. I could be wrong about this requirement, but not all houses can support a wind turbine. Be nice if we could put them on a pole in our backyards.
- Nothing, this is a bad program and a waste of taxpayer funds.
- Recycle, recycle, recycle.
- See previous comment
- The federal government gave back a certain percent of the cost for items like insulation, new doors and new windows on federal taxes a few years ago. Could Nebraska do that? Or the city of Lincoln through it's property taxes?
- These Answers should reflect a pragmatic assesment of what I perceive to be more effective, not necessarily what might appeal to me...
- These seem pretty obvious. I would say the BEST way to encourage people to use it would be to make the evaluation completely free, for everyone. Then, offer assistance with the remaining pool of money. My hesitancy in using it is paying for the evaluation, because I don't know if just having the evaluation itself is worth what I would have to pay for it. If it were free, I'd have it in a heartbeat, and would likely implement some of the changes as I was about to afford them.
- This program seems aimed at people uneducated, ignorant, or uninterested in what makes a home more efficient. I'm not particularly interested because I feel I already know how I could make my house more energy efficient, and what bang for my buck I could get for things like caulking windows, weatherstripping, attic insulation, a newer fridge. The cheap easy things I've already done, caulking and weatherstripping, etc. The pricier things like a new furnace I can't afford, and some things I won't do because it destroys the historic or aesthetic character of the house in my opinion. Such as installing a false ceiling at eight foot instead of the current ten foot ceilings, or replacing the fancy but un-insulated front door.