

**Final Report**  
**Measurement and Evaluation Study**  
**of the 2003 SCG Diverse Market**  
**Outreach Program**

**Prepared for:**



San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
C/O Rob Rubin  
101 Ash Street, NMC16A  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Prepared by:**

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**RLW ANALYTICS**

RLW Analytics, Inc.  
1055 Broadway Suite G  
Sonoma, CA 95476  
707-939-8823



# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Program Overview .....	1
Evaluation Overview .....	1
Major Findings .....	2
Observations and Recommendations .....	3
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Program Overview .....	4
Evaluation Overview .....	5
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Program Summary .....	7
Evaluation of Program Delivery Channels .....	7
<i>Media Support</i> .....	7
<i>Mobile Energy Workshops</i> .....	15
<i>C&amp;I Direct Mail Campaign</i> .....	28
<i>Small Group Presentations</i> .....	32
<i>Energy Efficiency Curriculum and Workshops (sub-contractor USC)</i> .....	32
<i>Booths at Community Events and Grassroots Events</i> .....	33
<i>Readability Test and General Review</i> .....	37
<i>Verification of Brochure Distribution</i> .....	38
<b>Observations and Recommendations</b> .....	<b>40</b>
Media Support .....	40
Mobile Energy Workshops .....	40
C&I Direct Mail Campaign .....	42
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>43</b>
Media Support .....	43
<i>Estimating the Proportion of Spanish-Speaking Households by Zip Code</i> .....	45
<i>Estimating the Proportion of English-Speaking Moderate Income Households by Zip Code</i> .....	45
Mobile Energy Workshops (sub-contractor ADM Associates) .....	49
Business Direct Mail Campaign .....	50
Community Event Sponsorship and Booth Staffing .....	51
Small Group Presentations .....	51
Energy Efficiency Curriculum and Workshops (sub-contractor USC) .....	51

**Appendix.....52**  
Media Support: Residential Awareness Survey Instrument (English)..... 52  
Media Support: Residential Awareness Survey Instrument (Spanish) ..... 56  
Mobile Energy Workshop (MEW) Survey Instrument ..... 60  
C&I Direct Mail Campaign Survey Instrument ..... 68

## Executive Summary

---

This document is the final report for the Measurement and Evaluation Study of the 2003 SCG Local Diverse Market Outreach Program (DMOP). This report contains verification of the number of hard-to-reach customers that have been reached by the program through the program's various delivery channels. Additionally, this report contains measures of program effectiveness resulting from a process evaluation.

### ***Program Overview***

The Diverse Market Outreach Program (DMOP) is an Energy Efficiency Information Program offered in the service territory of the Southern California Gas Company with goals targeting hard-to-reach residential and commercial customers to help them better manage their energy costs. The program provides these customers with useful information on conserving energy, and helps them access other available resources. Furthermore, the program promotes the full range of SoCalGas energy efficiency programs as well as other utility programs, third party energy efficiency programs, and energy efficiency financing and funding resources.

The Diverse Market Outreach Program has two primary delivery channels, which are 1) Mass Market, and 2) Direct Outreach. Each of the two delivery channels has a number of delivery mechanisms to meet program implementation goals. These channels and delivery mechanisms formed the foundation by which RLW conducted this evaluation and verification, and assessed the implementation strategies and materials for this program.

Mass Market efforts consisted primarily of newspaper print advertising in a number of languages; updating of marketing collateral; DMOP brochures inserted into publications; an English-language press release sent out in June and a Spanish-language release sent in July to newspapers in Southern California; bill inserts; and direct mail. In addition, there were several other single-time marketing channels that were used throughout the year.

Direct Outreach tasks consisted of sponsorship and booth staffing at community events; energy efficiency presentations to special interest groups and key community leaders of community-based organizations; Mobile Energy Workshops to small and medium hard-to-reach businesses customers; and public services provided by an Energy Efficiency InfoCenter.

### ***Evaluation Overview***

The primary objective for the program evaluation, measurement and verification was to measure indicators of the program effectiveness through a process evaluation. The process evaluation was designed so that as many of the unique delivery methods as possible could be assessed for effectiveness. All available data were statistically analyzed to measure key indicators of program effectiveness. Areas for program refinement and improvement were also identified.

We addressed the following research questions to assess the program's effectiveness:

- Determining if the program appeared to reach the target market and the intended fraction of the HTR market;
- What were the primary difficulties encountered;
- What were the most effective and most ineffective delivery mechanisms;
- How well was program participation tracking managed;
- How can the delivery mechanisms be improved;
- How effective were the program marketing channels and materials,

- Did the program effectively lead customers to other information and incentive programs, and
- How successful is the program, and what are the identified areas for refinement and improvement.

RLW thoroughly reviewed all program materials made available. After completing the review, the program implementation staff were interviewed. The results of the program implementation staff interviews were used to guide the remainder of the process evaluation.

For the residential component of the program, we conducted an in-language telephone survey in English and Spanish with 302 residential customers to measure general program awareness using targeted random sampling in the HTR neighborhoods. We also summarized attendance and brochure distribution at CBO presentation and booths at community events. For the commercial component of the program, we conducted two telephone surveys. The first was with a random sample of 76 Mobile Energy Workshop participants. The second was a sampling of 100 customers who had received the customized packets of information distributed through the C&I Direct Mail Campaign.

### **Major Findings**

**The DMOP program finished within budget and achieved the targeted outreach goals.** The program costs, as shown in the final budgetary spreadsheet, were \$1,051,973. Additionally, the program appears to have reached over 200,000 hard-to-reach residential customers and over 40,000 hard-to-reach commercial customers.

**Media support targeted to hard-to-reach residential customers appears to be effectively communicating with this customer segment.** Nearly 50% of respondents to the in-language residential awareness surveys state that they do recall reading or hearing about energy saving information provided by SCG. This finding shows that the press releases and ads were successful and cost effective in providing information to the targeted customers. The content of the advertisements and press releases were at an appropriate level for understanding and believability.

**Residential customers who are aware of SCG-provided energy saving information found the information easy to understand and most believe the information.** Over 50% of residential customers who are aware of the SCG-provided information found the information very easy to understand, and over 40% stated they found the information very believable. This suggests that the press releases and ads are delivering energy saving information to the hard-to-reach residential customers it targets.

**Residential customers who are aware of SCG-provided energy saving information were significantly more likely to take at least one energy saving action.** Residential customers who were aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information were significantly more likely to take at least one energy saving action than residential customers who were not aware of the information. This finding reinforces the fact that the media support is effectively communicating with the targeted customers; not only do residential customers recall seeing or hearing the information, but they also are taking energy saving actions as a result.

**Mobile Energy Workshops (“MEWs”) are not making the intended impact on some participants.** In particular, an inordinate number of respondents that we contacted either did not remember participating in the program or claimed no participation in the MEWs. This finding reinforces the idea that workshop representatives should spend more time with each individual business owner to increase the impact of the workshops.

**The Mobile Energy Workshops are inducing participants to make energy efficiency improvements.** Over 40% Mobile Energy Workshop participants recall discussing CFLs during the workshop *and* have already purchased and installed more CFLs as a result. Over 10% of participants recall discussing energy efficient lighting other than CFLs *and* have already purchased and installed such lighting as a result. This finding, combined with the previous finding, further reinforces the fact that not only is the DMOP program effectively delivering energy saving information to these hard-to-reach customers, but the program is also effectively inducing such customers to make energy efficiency improvements.

**Mobile Energy Workshop participants had little prior knowledge or experience with utility sponsored energy efficiency.** Half of Mobile Energy Workshop participants state they had no knowledge of utility sponsored energy efficiency and only 9% of workshop participants report participating in a utility energy efficiency program prior to attending the workshop. This finding validates the fact that the workshops are delivering energy saving information to truly hard-to-reach commercial customers.

**The C&I Direct Mail Campaign is making little impact on a sizable number of recipients.** About 75% of the recipients recall receiving the package but do not recall any details.

### ***Observations and Recommendations***

Several observations were made about the 2003 Diverse Market Outreach Program through the course of conducting this evaluation. Some of these observations have resulted in recommendations for the program. Our major observations are:

1. Overall, the program is effective in both reaching the intended audiences and making a positive impact on energy savings awareness and behavior
2. Program materials were well written, and the content and language was appropriate for the targeted audiences,
3. Media Support is very effective in communicating with residential customers and inducing them to take energy saving actions,
4. Mobile Energy Workshops will be more effective if workshop representatives spend more time with each individual business owner,
5. Mobile Energy Workshops might be even more effective if the same materials were also presented to property owners,
6. A postcard alerting businesses to the upcoming Mobile Energy Workshop would be useful to provide advance notice and interest, and
7. For the C&I Direct Mail Campaign, Customized Energy Efficiency Savings Guides for more business types (minus additional informational guides) could be useful to better instill interest and desired behavior.

## Introduction

---

This is the final report for the Measurement and Evaluation Study of the 2003 SCG Local Diverse Market Outreach Program. In this chapter, we will describe the 2003 program as well as our general evaluation approach.

### ***Program Overview***

The Diverse Market Outreach Program (DMOP) is an Energy Efficiency Information Program offered in the service territory of the Southern California Gas Company targeting hard-to-reach residential and commercial customers to help them better manage their energy costs. It provides these customers with useful information on conserving energy, and helps them access other available resources. The program promotes the full range of SoCalGas energy efficiency programs as well as other utility programs, third party energy efficiency programs, and energy efficiency financing and funding resources. The program also has “hard-to-reach” (HTR) implementation goals. HTR goals are considered to be met if the program reaches 20% of HTR commercial customers, or 40,000 HTR commercial customers, and 10% of HTR residential customers, or 200,000 HTR residential customers.

The Diverse Market Outreach Program has two primary delivery channels by which SCG is coordinating program activities, which are 1) Mass Market, and 2) Direct Outreach. Each of the two delivery channels has a multitude of delivery mechanisms by which the program implementation goals were approached. These channels and delivery mechanisms formed the foundation by which RLW conducted this program EM&V. The implementation strategies RLW assessed for the evaluation are:

- *Community event sponsorship and booth attendance*
- *Small group presentations*
- *Energy Efficiency InfoCenter*
- *Business direct mail campaign*
- *Media relations and press releases*
- *Print advertising*

Program activity was a two-pronged approach of mass market and direct outreach techniques.

Mass Market efforts consisted of:

1. Print advertising created in English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese;
2. Two press releases - an English version sent out in June 2003; and a Spanish language release issued in July 2003 in collaboration with an audio news release;
3. Bill inserts in English and Spanish;
4. Direct mailing – Energy Efficiency InfoCenter postcards were mailed out in September 2003

Direct Outreach tasks were:

1. Updates on several marketing collateral items.
2. Sponsorship and presence of booths at community events staffed by speakers of the appropriate language(s);
3. Bi-lingual energy efficiency presentations to special interest groups and key community leaders delivered in conjunction with SoCalGas’ Public Affairs team;



4. Collaboration with the University of Southern California -Sustainable Cities Program for a specialized presentation on issues and actions for environmental sustainability
5. Mobile Energy Workshops to provide energy efficiency program and resource information to small and medium hard-to-reach businesses customers;
6. Postcard mailings to targeted hard-to-reach businesses;

Fulfillment mailings and support services were also provided for direct customer response to the above. This consisted of a 1-800 number, free on-line audit tool for businesses, and energy efficiency mail-out packages for businesses.

### **Evaluation Overview**

The primary objectives for the program evaluation, measurement, and verification were to measure indicators of the program effectiveness through a process evaluation. The evaluation was designed so that as many of the unique delivery methods as possible could be assessed for effectiveness. Data collection tasks consisted of a program marketing material review, Mobile Energy Workshop participant surveys, residential awareness surveys, survey of recipients of business mail-out packages, and review of program reports.

All quantitative data were statistically analyzed to measure key indicators of program effectiveness. We have also identified areas for program refinement and improvement.

We addressed the following research questions to assess the program's effectiveness:

- Does the program appear to reach the target market,
- Does the program appear to reach the intended fraction of the HTR market,
- What were the primary difficulties encountered that were problematic to program implementation,
- What are the most effective and most ineffective delivery mechanisms,
- How well was program participation information tracked,
- How can the delivery mechanisms be improved,
- What deliver mechanisms should be added for future program implementation,
- How effective were the program marketing channels and materials,
- Did the program effectively lead customers to other information and incentive programs,
- Overall, how successful is the program, and
- Areas for program refinement and improvement.

The process evaluation involved these tasks:

- We conducted a kick off meeting with program implementation staff, followed by several phone calls and e-mails to clarify questions on various elements of the program and program tracking databases.
- RLW began the process evaluation by reviewing the quarterly reports, and the program materials that were new or redesigned from the 2002 program. This review provided RLW with familiarity on the various components of the program.
- For the residential component of the program, we conducted a telephone survey with 300 residential customers measuring general program awareness using targeted random sampling in the HTR neighborhoods where residents are the most likely to have the opportunity to see and read the ads and press releases. We also summarized attendance and brochure distribution at CBO presentation and booths at community events.

- For the commercial component of the program, we conducted two telephone surveys: one with a random sample of 76 Mobile Energy Workshop participants, and the second with a stratified random sample of 100 customers who were listed as being mailed customized business packages on energy efficiency programs, tips, and general recommendations.

## Program Summary

According to the final data provided by SoCalGas, the final budget and served figures were as follows:

	Budgeted/Projected	As Reported in the 4Q Report	As posted in the year-end Budget and Expenditure file
Program Cost	\$1,222,000	\$1,108,600	\$1,051,973
Commercial Customers Served	40,000	53,684	-
Residential Customers Served	200,000	822,028	-

**Table 1: Program Goals – Budgeted and Actual**

## Evaluation of Program Delivery Channels

### Media Support

An important component of the program delivery to hard-to-reach customers was media support and relations. The media generation was primarily through newspaper ads and press releases. The ads and releases were short and focused primarily on attracting attention, communicating a few energy conservation tips, and providing contact sources for more detailed information. Web programming is also included in media support. The program's final budgetary worksheets indicate about \$509,639, or about 40% of the total program budget, was dedicated to media support. The ads and press releases were placed in local Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and Spanish language newspapers, as well as in English in selected HTR target areas<sup>1</sup>. The circulation rates of the newspapers used in this element were considered to be the metric to measure the amount of impact towards the hard-to-reach populations. Staff chose to consider the circulation rates alone, and ignore the incidence rates that the papers may have.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> **Residential Hard-to-Reach:** Those customers who do not have easy access to program information or generally do not participate in energy efficiency programs due to a language, income, housing type, geographic, or home ownership (split incentives) barrier. These barriers are defined as:

- Language – Primary language spoken is other than English, and/or
- Income – Those customers who fall into the moderate income level (income levels less than 400% of federal poverty guidelines), and/or
- Housing Type – Multi-Family and Mobile Home Tenants, and/or
- Geographic – Residents of areas other than the San Francisco Bay Area, San Diego area, Los Angeles Basin or Sacramento, and/or
- Homeownership – Renters

<sup>2</sup> "Incidence rate" refers to the estimated amount of people that will read a newspaper above and including the initial buyer or subscriber. For example, if a newspaper assumes that 2 people on average read each paper and has a circulation rate of 25,000, then its incidence rate is 2\*25,000, or 50,000.

Newspaper advertising and press releases were supplemented by other media:

- Print ads for the Hispanic market on the week of July 14, 2003 were supplemented by one week of ten-second radio traffic report sponsorships
- A Spanish language broadcast e-mail promoting energy efficiency rebates were sent to 117,000 Univision subscribers.
- SCG was able to use an outdoor freeway sign as part of its sponsorship with the Los Angeles County Fair. The rebates-related message was posted between May 2, 2003 and October 24, 2003, and estimated impressions were 2.5 million per week.
- An article about the DMOP was featured in the June 2003 edition of the Gas Company News
- Sponsorship for a series of Spanish-language business seminars provided an opportunity for advertorials to be run during these sessions.

### ***Print Advertising***

Details were not provided on the advertising purchases made. We reviewed copies of the ads themselves, which were clearly professionally designed and appropriate to the targeted audience.

### ***Media Relations***

Two press releases, one in English and one in Spanish, were distributed in Spanish newspapers, as well as in English in selected HTR target areas in Southern California.

For newspapers in languages other than English, the DMOP-provided data included the circulation rates of the papers. The DMOP-provided data did not include any information regarding circulation rates for English papers. We conducted internet research to determine the circulation rates of the English papers to inform our sample allocation strategy.

Table 2 displays the circulation rates of the ads and press releases placed through the 2003 DMOP program by the language of the paper<sup>3</sup>. Overall, the 2003 DMOP ad placements were circulated to approximately 3.5 million newspaper readers. Readers of English papers account for approximately 60% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads, while readers of Spanish papers account for just over 30%. The remaining 10% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads were readers of Asian language papers.

---

<sup>3</sup> The circulation rates listed in Table 2 do not account for repeat ad placements in the same newspaper. We believe it is likely that for a given paper, the readership does not change substantially from one issue of the paper to another. Rather, there is likely substantial overlap between the readerships of a given paper from one issue to another. Therefore, to properly represent the population of individuals exposed to the ads, we have chosen to examine the circulation rates alone.

Language of Paper	Circulation of Ad Placements	% of Total
English	2,105,563	59.2%
Spanish	1,117,850	31.4%
Korean	125,000	3.5%
Chinese	120,000	3.4%
Japanese	45,000	1.3%
Vietnamese	36,000	1.0%
Filipino	5,000	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,554,413</b>	

**Table 2: Circulation of Ad Placements by Language**

To assess the effectiveness of the print ads and press releases, we conducted a telephone survey with a random sample of 302 SCG residential customers (150 Spanish-speakers and 152 English-speakers) targeted by the media campaign to measure media impact and level of program awareness generated by the promotions. The surveys were conducted in the same language types as the newspaper submissions. These results measure general customer awareness of the program.

Because ads placed in Asian-language papers account for just less than 10% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads and the evaluation of the mass media component of the 2002 DMOP program was restricted to individual who could read Korean, Chinese, or Vietnamese, we restricted the 2003 data collection activities to those individuals targeted by the ads in Spanish and English language papers.

### **In-Language Residential Awareness Survey Results**

All survey respondents were asked if they were aware that SCG offers information and programs about reducing energy costs for residential customers. Table 3 summarizes the responses. Over half of respondents are aware that SCG offers such services. English-speaking respondents are significantly more likely to be aware that SCG offers such services (64%) than are Spanish-speaking respondents (48%).

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
Yes	64%	48%	56%
No	36%	52%	44%

**Table 3: Awareness of SCG Offering Energy Saving Information and Programs**

Table 4 presents the incidence of respondents reading or hearing about energy saving information provided by SCG. Overall, nearly half of respondents recall reading or hearing about SCG-provided energy saving information. While the difference between English-speaking respondents and Spanish-speaking respondents is not statistically significant, Spanish-speaking respondents appear to be more likely to recall reading or hearing about SCG-provided energy saving information.

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
Yes	44%	51%	47%
No	56%	49%	53%

**Table 4: Incidence of Reading or Hearing About SCG-Provided Energy Saving Information**

Respondents who recalled reading or hearing about SCG-provided energy saving information were then asked how they learned of the information, and Table 5 displays the results. Overall, approximately 50% saw an insert inside their utility bill, over 10% recall seeing the information on television, over 5% heard the information on the radio, and about 5% either saw an ad in the newspaper or read an article in the newspaper. English-speakers were significantly more likely to either recall seeing the information inside of their utility bill (64%) or not be able to recall the source of the SCG-provided energy saving information (12%) than were Spanish-speakers (42% and 0% respectively). Spanish-speakers were significantly more likely to recall seeing the SCG-provided energy saving information on television (22% versus 1%).

	% of Respondents Aware of SCG Info		
	English	Spanish	Total
Insert Inside Utility Bill	64%	42%	52%
Television	1%	22%	13%
Picked Up / Given Brochure or Info	4%	11%	8%
Heard On the Radio	4%	9%	7%
Mail Other Than Utility Bill	9%	3%	6%
Ad In Newspaper	1%	4%	3%
Friend / Neighbor / Acquaintance	1%	4%	3%
Read Article In Newspaper	1%	3%	2%
Other	1%	3%	2%
Don't Know	12%	-	6%
Refused	-	3%	1%

**Table 5: Source of SCG-Provided Energy Saving Information**

Respondents who were aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information were asked to rate the ease of understanding the information. A scale of 1 to 5 was used, where "1" means "very difficult" and "5" means "very easy". As shown in Table 6, about 50% of respondents found the information very easy to understand, with nearly another 25% stating it was somewhat easy to understand. About 10% of respondents thought the information was either somewhat difficult or very difficult to understand. English-speaking respondents were significantly more likely to perceive the information as easy to understand, as evidenced in the mean ratings.

	% of Respondents Aware of SCG Info		
	English	Spanish	Total
Very Difficult	-	5.3%	2.8%
Somewhat Difficult	4.5%	7.9%	6.3%
Neither Difficult Nor Easy	9.0%	14.5%	11.9%
Somewhat Easy	17.9%	26.3%	22.4%
Very Easy	65.7%	42.1%	53.1%
Don't Know	1.5%	-	0.7%
Refused	1.5%	3.9%	2.8%
Mean Rating	4.49	3.96	4.21

**Table 6: Ease of Understanding SCG-Provided Energy Saving Information**

Next, respondents who were aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information were asked to rate the believability of the information, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very unbelievable and 5 means very believable. Table 7 summarizes the responses. Overall, about 40% of participants found the information very believable, with another 25% stating it was somewhat believable. About 15% of respondents thought the information was either somewhat unbelievable or very unbelievable. Although the difference is not statistically significant, English-speaking respondents appear to be more likely to find the information believable, as evidenced in the mean ratings.

	% of Respondents Aware of SCG Info		
	English	Spanish	Total
Very Unbelievable	7.5%	9.2%	8.4%
Somewhat Unbelievable	3.0%	10.5%	7.0%
Neither Unbelievable Nor Believable	13.4%	5.3%	9.1%
Somewhat Believable	11.9%	34.2%	23.8%
Very Believable	53.7%	34.2%	43.4%
Don't Know	10.4%	2.6%	6.3%
Refused	-	3.9%	2.1%
Mean Rating	4.13	3.79	3.95

**Table 7: Believability of SCG-Provided Energy Saving Information**

Table 8 displays the responses given when interviewees were asked to rate how difficult they believe it is to carry out SCG's energy efficiency recommendations. A scale of 1 to 5 was used, with "1" meaning "very difficult" and "5" meaning "very easy". Approximately 35% of respondents believed it is very easy to carry out SCG's recommendations, with another 30% believing it is somewhat easy. About 15% of respondent believe it is difficult to carry out the recommendations, with 7% stating it is very difficult. Interestingly, Spanish-speaking

respondents appear to be more likely to believe carrying out SCG's recommendations is easy, although the difference is not statistically significant.

	% of Respondents Aware of SCG Info		
	English	Spanish	Total
Very Difficult	4.5%	9.2%	7.0%
Somewhat Difficult	13.4%	3.9%	8.4%
Neither Difficult Nor Easy	17.9%	10.5%	14.0%
Somewhat Easy	31.3%	30.3%	30.8%
Very Easy	28.4%	40.8%	35.0%
Don't Know	4.5%	3.9%	3.5%
Refused	-	1.3%	0.7%
Mean Rating	3.69	3.94	3.82

**Table 8: Ease of Carrying Out SCG's Energy Efficiency Recommendations**

All survey respondents were asked what, if any, energy saving steps they or their family has taken in the past year or two. Table 9 summarizes the responses by respondent language. Nearly 40% of all respondents stated they have taken no energy saving steps. Almost 10% of respondents report they have turned their thermostat heating set-point down, and nearly 10% are not using unnecessary lights and appliances.

Spanish-speaking respondents are significantly less likely to report taking any energy saving actions. English-speaking respondents are significantly more likely to report installing new windows, installing a programmable thermostat, turning the thermostat cooling set point up, or replacing the heating system with a high efficiency unit. Spanish-speaking respondents are significantly more likely to report not using unnecessary lights and appliances or purchasing and installing CFLs.

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
None	26%	47%	36%
Turned Thermostat Heating Set-Point Down	9%	10%	9%
Turn Off / Don't Use Unnecessary Lights / Appliances	5%	11%	8%
Installed New Windows	11%	4%	7%
Bought & Installed CFLs	3%	9%	6%
Installed Programmable Thermostat	10%	-	5%
Installed Weatherstripping Around Windows / Doors	3%	5%	4%
Turned Thermostat Cooling Set-Point Up	6%	1%	4%
Replaced Heating System With High Efficiency Unit	7%	1%	4%
Try To Use Everything Less	2%	5%	3%
Replaced AC With High Efficiency Unit	5%	1%	3%
Installed Attic Insulation	4%	1%	3%
Tuned-Up HVAC System	3%	1%	2%
Bought High Efficiency or Energy Star Appliance	3%	1%	2%
Do Dishes / Laundry in Late Evening / Early Morning	2%	2%	2%
Reduce Hot Water Usage	2%	1%	1%
Close Windows / Doors	1%	1%	1%
Installed Water Heater Blanket	1%	-	1%
Installed Water Efficient Showerhead	1%	-	1%
Other	7%	3%	5%
Don't Know	7%	5%	6%
Refused	1%	1%	1%

**Table 9: Energy Saving Steps Taken In Past Year or Two by Language**



Table 10 presents energy saving steps taken in the past year or two by respondent awareness of SCG-provided energy saving information. While programmable thermostat installation is the only specific energy saving action respondents aware of SCG-provided energy saving information were significantly more likely to report (8% versus 2%), respondents who are aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information are significantly more likely to report taking at least one energy saving action (65% versus 49%)<sup>4</sup>.

These findings suggest that the articles and ads in the in-language newspapers are effectively communicating with customers, as evidenced by the fact that customers who are aware of the information are more likely to have taken at least one energy saving step.

	% of Respondents		
	Aware of SCG Info	Not Aware of SCG Info	Total
None	29%	43%	36%
Turned Thermostat Heating Set-Point Down	12%	7%	9%
Turn Off / Don't Use Unnecessary Lights / Appliances	9%	7%	8%
Installed New Windows	8%	7%	7%
Bought & Installed CFLs	8%	5%	6%
Installed Programmable Thermostat	8%	2%	5%
Installed Weatherstripping Around Windows / Doors	6%	3%	4%
Turned Thermostat Cooling Set-Point Up	2%	5%	4%
Replaced Heating System With High Efficiency Unit	5%	3%	4%
Try To Use Everything Less	3%	3%	3%
Replaced AC With High Efficiency Unit	3%	3%	3%
Installed Attic Insulation	3%	3%	3%
Tuned-Up HVAC System	3%	1%	2%
Bought High Efficiency or Energy Star Appliance	1%	3%	2%
Do Dishes / Laundry in Late Evening / Early Morning	2%	2%	2%
Reduce Hot Water Usage	2%	1%	1%
Close Windows / Doors	1%	1%	1%
Installed Water Heater Blanket	1%	1%	1%
Installed Water Efficient Showerhead	1%	1%	1%
Other	6%	4%	5%
Don't Know	5%	7%	6%
Refused	1%	1%	1%

**Table 10: Energy Saving Steps Taken In Past Year or Two by Awareness of SCG-Provided Energy Saving Information**

<sup>4</sup> The percentage of respondents who report taking at least one energy saving action can be calculated as follows: (% Taking At Least One Step) = 100% - (% Taking No Steps) - (% Don't Know) - (% Refused), or 100% - 36% - 6% - 1% = 57% overall. For those respondents aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information, the calculation is 100% - 29% - 5% - 1% = 65%.

### Demographics

Table 11 displays the home ownership status of respondents by language. Overall, approximately 50% of respondents own their home. English-speaking respondents were significantly more likely to own their home (72%) than were Spanish-speaking respondents (35%).

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
Homeowner	72%	35%	54%
Renter	28%	65%	46%

**Table 11: Home Ownership Status by Language**

All renters were asked if the landlord pays the gas and electric bills. As shown in Table 12, approximately 75% of renters pay their own gas and electric bills. Spanish-speaking renters appear to be more likely to have a landlord that pays these bills, but the difference is not significant.

	% of Renters		
	English	Spanish	Total
Yes	17%	27%	24%
No	81%	71%	74%
Don't Know	2%	1%	1%
Refused	-	1%	1%

**Table 12: Incidence of Landlord Paying Gas & Electric Bills by Language**

Table 13 displays the highest level of education completed by language. Overall, 50% of respondents have completed high school or less, while 18% have completed at least a four-year college degree. Spanish-speakers have completed significantly less education than their English-speaking counterparts.

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
High School Graduate or Less	27%	75%	51%
Some College	39%	13%	26%
4-Year College Degree	17%	5%	11%
Advanced Degree	12%	1%	7%
Don't Know	1%	-	0%
Refused	4%	6%	5%

**Table 13: Level of Education Completed by Language**

Table 14 shows the distribution of 2003 household income by language. Overall, approximately 35% of respondents had a 2003 household income of \$23,000 or less, while 20% had an income of \$43,501 or more. Spanish-speaking respondents were significantly more likely to have an income of \$23,000 or less (47% versus 21%), while English-speaking respondents were significantly less likely to have an income of \$43,501 or more. In general, Spanish-speaking respondents had a 2003 household income significantly less than that of English-respondents.

	% of Respondents		
	English	Spanish	Total
Less Than \$23,000	21%	47%	34%
\$23,001 - \$27,000	7%	14%	11%
\$27,001 - \$32,500	3%	7%	5%
\$32,501 - \$38,000	5%	3%	4%
\$38,001 - \$43,500	7%	3%	5%
\$43,501 or More	36%	5%	20%
Don't Know	7%	9%	8%
Refused	14%	11%	13%

**Table 14: 2003 Household Income by Language**

### Mobile Energy Workshops

According to the program final quarterly report, 167 Mobile Energy Workshops were conducted by Southern California Gas Company's contractor, ADM & Associates, and 2,010 customers participated. According to the program-provided participant lists, a total of 166 Mobile Energy Workshops were conducted, and a total of 1,916 commercial customers participated in the workshops, as shown in Table 15. We assumed one more workshop was performed than recorded, and subsequently reported in the final quarterly report. The program's final budgetary worksheets indicate about \$122,000, or about 10% of the total program budget, was dedicated to Mobile Energy Workshops.

Month	# Workshops	# Attendees
January	9	98
February	20	229
March	21	249
April	22	259
May	21	237
June	20	232
July	20	239
August	19	209
September	14	164
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>1,916</b>

**Table 15: Number of Mobile Energy Workshops and Participants**

### Difficulties Completing Surveys

To assess the effectiveness of the Mobile Energy Workshops, we conducted a telephone survey with 76 participants. Through the course of conducting the 76 surveys, we discovered that the 2003 Mobile Energy Workshops (MEWs) appear to be making little or no impact on many of the respondents we contacted. In particular, an inordinate number of respondents that we contacted either did not remember participating in the program or claimed no participation in the MEWs.

This is shown when comparing the newest results against the 2002 results. In the 2002 evaluation, 20% of the contacts did not remember participating in the program, and less than 1% claimed no participation in the MEW's. In that evaluation, 24% of the participants we contacted were able to complete the survey. In 2003, the number of participants contacted more than doubled, and only 11% did not remember participating in the program. However, 18% claimed no participation in a MEW, and only 9.5% completed the survey.

Table 16 summarizes the survey outcomes for the MEW telephone survey dispositions in 2002 and 2003. Note that in the 2002 evaluation 175 customers were contacted in order to complete the necessary 75 surveys, while in 2003 more than double that amount (369) were needed<sup>5</sup>. Gray rows indicate key findings, and the dark gray rows are at the heart of this section's discussion.

The light gray rows are responses (18 in total) that could have been coded differently. In essence they have been listed by SCG as MEW participants, yet the responses RLW obtained shows that they did not participate (outcome J), or at least leaves some ambiguity regarding their participation in the program (outcome Q). Since only a total of 18 contacts fall into these two categories, we have opted to retain the initial dispositions recorded by the interviewer instead of re-coding these dispositions.

Outcome	Text	# of 2002 Respondents	% of 2002 Respondents	# of 2003 Respondents	% of 2003 Respondents
A	Completed	42	24.00%	35	9.50%
B	Callback	15	8.57%	14	3.80%
C	Left Message	1	0.57%	16	4.30%
D	No Answer	-	0.00%	16	4.30%
E	Refusal	17	9.71%	2	0.50%
F	Termination	-	0.00%	1	0.30%
G	Wrong Number	2	1.14%	19	5.10%
H	Disconnected	2	1.14%	29	7.90%
I	Language Barrier	20	11.43%	55	14.90%
J	Signed Up But Did Not Attend	-	0.00%	5	1.40%
K	No phone number/cannot locate #	9	5.14%	3	0.80%
L	Participant recently passed away.	1	0.57%	-	0.00%
M	Cannot remember program.	35	20.00%	41	11.10%
N	Claims no participation in program.	1	0.57%	67	18.20%
O	Contact no longer w/ Company.	21	12.00%	24	6.50%
P	Company No Longer In Business	9	5.14%	5	1.40%
Q	Incorrect Contact Name Provided	-	0.00%	13	3.50%
R	No Contact Name Provided	-	0.00%	24	6.50%
	<b>Total Calls</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Table 16: 2002 and 2003 Mobile Energy Workshop Outcomes**

The outcome that gained the greatest incremental proportion of participant contacts is "Claims no participation in the program". In 2002 there was only one response that fit that outcome, while in 2003 the evaluation captured 67 of these responses.

<sup>5</sup> Outcome codes A and N are considered completed calls.

### Analysis of Survey Successes

RLW began the analysis by sorting the SCG tracking data by Workshop Date in an attempt to identify any patterns that might help us identify why so many respondents were claiming not to have participated. Unfortunately there were far too many MEW dates in the tracking data, so this exercise did not reveal any meaningful, easy-to-interpret patterns. We next sorted the Mobile Energy Workshop outcome data by month of workshop. "Success Rates" were calculated to yield a percentage that indicates relative success of the Mobile Energy Workshops. All "Success Rates" were calculated by dividing the "Completed" counts by the numbers shown for "Cannot Remember", "Claims No Participation", and combined "Cannot Remember"/"Claims No Participation" counts ( Table 17, below).

Month	Completed	Cannot Remember Program		Claims No Participation		Cannot Remember Program/ Claims No Participation	
	Counts	Counts	Success Rate	Counts	Success Rate	Counts	Success Rate
Jan	0	3	0%	3	0%	6	0%
Feb	3	6	50%	8	38%	14	21%
Mar	4	4	100%	14	29%	18	22%
Apr	1	4	25%	5	20%	9	11%
May	4	5	80%	11	36%	16	25%
Jun	6	2	300%	9	67%	11	55%
Jul	3	7	43%	7	43%	14	21%
Aug	8	5	160%	8	100%	13	62%
Sep	6	5	120%	2	300%	7	86%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>41</b>		<b>67</b>		<b>108</b>	

**Table 17: Relative Success Rate By Workshop Month (2003 Workshops)**

#### "Cannot Remember" Category

A respondent recorded as "Cannot Remember Program" is one whom states that he/she can remember going to the MEW but cannot remember enough to answer the most basic questions about it. Success rates above 100% indicate that more surveys were recorded as "Completed" than "Cannot Remember", whereas success rates below 100% indicate that more individuals could not remember the program than could complete the survey. For five out of the nine months that the MEW's were conducted (specifically January, February, April, May, and July), more individuals listed as participants in those months claimed to not remember the workshop (see shaded areas). The June, August, and September data show that MEW participants listed on those months were able to complete more surveys than people who could not remember the workshops, which is a relative measure of success. June was particularly successful.

#### "Claims No Participation" Category

Respondents who were recorded as "Claims No Participation" stated (sometimes emphatically) that they in no way participated in a MEW described by the RLW telephone surveyor. Success rates above 100% indicate that more surveys were able to be completed; conversely, success rates below 100% indicate that more individuals claimed no participation. For seven out of the nine months that the MEW s were conducted (January through July), more individuals claimed no participation in the workshop than were able to complete a survey (as shown in the shaded areas). Conversely, the September data indicates that the MEWs produced more completed

surveys than people who claimed no participation, a relative measure of success. In this case, September was particularly successful when compared to other months.

### **“Cannot Remember”/“Claims No Participation” - Combined**

Combining the two categories previously discussed yields this combined category. We have combined these two categories because of their similarity. In essence, these are customers that have been deemed participants by SCG (or by SCG's subcontractor ADM), yet they do not recall any aspect of the program. All percentages calculated here are below 100%, indicating that more respondents either could not remember or claimed no participation than were able to complete the survey. Overall, success rates are shown to be poor when the “Cannot Remember” and “Claims No Participation” data are collapsed.

### **Respondent Comments**

Several of the respondents also provided comments that support the quantitative data; selected quotes are shown below:

*“[They] dropped off info and CFL – there was no conversation.”*

*“Walked through, [they] gave [a] light bulb, didn't see any tent. I gave no signature.”*

*“A lady took our business card and said she would be back in two weeks. No one ever came back.”*

*“Neither my wife nor I have any recollection of the program.”*

*“I remember the light bulb, but I didn't sign up for anything or attend a workshop.”*

*“[They] dropped off paperwork and coupons for CFL – that's all I recall.”*

Table 18 summarizes our rate of survey completion for the 2003 MEWs. The rates for “Completion”, “Claims No Participation”, and “Can't Remember” were calculated by dividing the “Completion” counts, “Claims No Participation” counts, and “Can't Remember” counts by the number contacted per month.

In August and September, the percent contacted decreased while the completion rate increased (in comparison with the February and March data where 22% were contacted, but completion rates equaled just 6% and 7%, respectively.) This pattern corroborates what was calculated with the relative success rates in Table 17, where August and September had relative success rates at or above 100%.

Month	Population	# Contacted	% of Pop	Contact Rate	Completion Rate	Claims No Participation Rate	Can't Remember Rate
Jan	98	18	5%	18%	0%	17%	17%
Feb	229	50	12%	22%	6%	16%	12%
Mar	249	54	13%	22%	7%	26%	7%
Apr	259	40	14%	15%	3%	13%	10%
May	237	55	12%	23%	7%	20%	9%
Jun	232	45	12%	19%	13%	20%	4%
Jul	239	46	12%	19%	7%	15%	15%
Aug	209	36	11%	17%	22%	22%	14%
Sep	164	25	9%	15%	24%	8%	20%
Total	1916	369	100	19%	9%	18%	11%

**Table 18: 2003 MEW Data Collection Summary**

### Conclusion

The MEWs initiated more contacts with business owners in 2003 than in 2002. However, fewer respondents were able to actually complete the survey in 2003. Furthermore, it was revealed that respondents frequently did not remember the workshop or claimed no participation. A closer inspection of the 2003 data indicated that increased MEW contacts significantly correlated with more individuals claiming no participation.

In August and September, fewer individuals were contacted by MEW representatives than in previous months. However, the survey completion rate increased sharply ("Claims No Participation" and "Can't Remember" rates stayed high or increased slightly).

The patterns in August and September indicate that less is more – at least as far as the number of participants is concerned. If lower participation rates indicate that workshop representatives are spending more time with each individual business owner, perhaps it is the quality of the interaction that produces higher completion rates. At a minimum, it appears as though the MEW delivery channel of the DMOP has some serious flaws.

The results of the completed surveys are presented in the following section.

### Mobile Energy Workshop Survey Results

Of the 76 participants willing to complete a survey regarding the 2003 Mobile Energy Workshop, 41, or about 54%, state they do not remember the specifics of the workshop well enough to answer the survey questions. These participants state they do recall attending the workshop but they no longer recall any details. The remaining 35 participants were able to successfully complete the survey. The remaining results in this section are based on these 35 participants who could answer the survey questions.

All respondents were asked to rate the level of convenience associated with learning about and attending the Mobile Energy Workshops. A scale of 1 to 5 was used, where "1" means "very inconvenient" and "5" means "very convenient". Table 19 summarizes the responses. Almost half of participants found it very convenient to learn about and attend the workshops. Over 15% of participants state that learning about the workshop was either somewhat or very

inconvenient, suggesting that some workshop participants would prefer to learn about the workshop in advance of the day of the workshop.

	% of Participants	
	Learning About Workshop	Attending Workshop
Very Inconvenient	2.9%	8.6%
Somewhat Inconvenient	14.3%	14.3%
Neither Inconvenient Nor Convenient	11.4%	11.4%
Somewhat Convenient	22.9%	17.1%
Very Convenient	48.6%	45.7%
Don't Know	-	2.9%
<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>4.03</b>	<b>3.79</b>

**Table 19: Level of Convenience Associated with Learning About & Attending Mobile Energy Workshops**

Participants who rated their experience of either learning about or attending the workshop less than “very convenient” were asked for suggestions. Table 20 summarizes the responses. About 18% of these participants would have preferred to make an appointment, and another 18% would have preferred advance notice of the workshop. The remainder had no suggestions or other comments.

	% of Participants
Make An Appointment	18.2%
Provide Advance Notice	18.2%
No Suggestions	54.5%
Other	9.1%

**Table 20: Suggestions to Improve Convenience of Learning About & Attending Workshop**

Next, participants were asked how easy or difficult it was to understand the energy saving information provided by the Mobile Energy Workshop. As shown in Table 21, nearly 35% of participants reported it was very easy to understand, and another 20% found it somewhat easy to understand. Only 3% participants thought it was very difficult to understand the information. This demonstrates that the presentation and materials about energy savings were generally appropriate in their content and language and understood by the type of customers targeted by the program. However, there is an indication that the materials may be a little difficult to understand for a portion of the MEW participants, evidenced by the fact that 31% of participants rated the information less than “somewhat easy”.



	<b>% of Participants</b>
Very Difficult	2.9%
Somewhat Difficult	14.3%
Neither Difficult Nor Easy	17.1%
Somewhat Easy	20.0%
Very Easy	34.3%
Don't Know	11.4%

**Table 21: Ease of Understanding Energy Saving Information**

When asked how much they believe the energy saving information provided by the Mobile Energy Workshop, approximately 25% of participants state they believe all of it, as shown in Table 22. Another 30% of participants believe most of the information. No participants found the information difficult to believe. This is another useful indicator which demonstrates that a potential barrier of believability about energy efficiency does not readily exist with these participants. Both understanding and believability are equally important in moving customers towards the desired actions of energy efficient behavior.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
It Was Difficult to Believe	-
I Believe A Little of It	8.6%
I Believe Some of It	20.0%
I Believe Most of It	31.4%
I Believe All of It	28.6%
Don't Know	11.4%

**Table 22: Believability of Energy Saving Information**

Table 23 summarizes the responses given when participants were asked what they did with the free CFL they received through the program. Nearly 15% of participants do not recall receiving a free CFL. Approximately 60% of participants report they installed the CFL in a fixture in their business, while nearly 10% of participants took the CFL home and used it there. This shows that just over half of the participants (70%) actively used the bulb. Whether or not it was a programmatic intent, it is interesting to see that a significant number of participants took the bulb home to use, which would be an indirect benefit from the program.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Installed In Fixture In Business	62.9%
Don't Recall Receiving One	14.3%
Brought Home & Used It	8.6%
Nothing (stored away, etc.)	2.9%
Don't Know	11.4%

**Table 23: Use of Free CFLs Given to Participants**

Participants were then asked to recall what they discussed during the workshop. Table 24 shows the breakdown of responses recorded. This shows that lighting was obviously the most discussed and remembered item covered in the workshop, as 40% of participants recall discussing compact fluorescent lighting, and nearly 30% recall discussing linear fluorescent lighting. Nearly 20% of participants recall discussing financing for energy efficiency programs. Approximately 25% of participants could not recall the items discussed during the workshop.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Compact Fluorescent Lighting	40.0%
Linear Fluorescent Lighting	28.6%
High Efficiency Equipment	17.1%
Financing for Energy Efficiency Programs	17.1%
Rebate Programs for Residential Use	8.6%
Energy Efficient HVAC	5.7%
Free Light Bulbs	5.7%
Don't Recall	25.7%

**Table 24: Participant Spontaneous Recollection of Items Discussed In The Workshop**

Participants were then read a list of items that may have been presented to them during the workshop, and for each item, asked to indicate if they recalled discussing it during the workshop. For each item they recall discussing, participants were then asked if they have considered or used the item as a result of the discussion. Table 25 and Table 26 display the results. Table 25 displays results for various physical equipment categories, while Table 26 presents results for energy efficiency programs and financing.

Eighty percent of participants recall discussing compact fluorescent bulbs, and 50% recall discussing energy efficient lighting other than CFLs. Forty percent recall discussing energy efficient air conditioning improvements. Nearly 33% of participants recall discussing financing for energy efficient improvements, utility energy efficiency programs, and non-utility energy efficiency programs

Over 40% of participants report they have already purchased and installed more CFLs as a result of the Mobile Energy Workshop. Over 10% of participants have installed energy efficient lighting other than CFLs.

	<b>% of Participants</b>			
	<b>Recall Discussing</b>	<b>Not Considered</b>	<b>Considering</b>	<b>Already Implemented</b>
Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	80.0%	22.9%	14.3%	42.9%
Energy Efficient Lighting Other Than CFLs	51.4%	25.7%	14.3%	11.4%
Energy Efficient AC Improvements	40.0%	22.9%	8.6%	8.6%
High Efficiency Kitchen Equipment	22.9%	14.3%	5.7%	2.9%

**Table 25: Incidence of Discussing & Installing Equipment**

	% of Participants				
	Recall Discussing	Not Considered	Considering	Currently Financing / Participating	Already Financed / Participated
Financing for Energy Efficiency Improvements	31.4%	28.6%	2.9%	-	-
Utility Energy Efficiency Programs	31.4%	22.9%	5.7%	-	2.9%
Non-Utility Energy Efficiency Programs	31.4%	20.0%	11.4%	-	-

**Table 26: Incidence of Discussing & Utilizing Energy Efficiency Programs & Financing**

These same results are then calculated further to derive a conversion factor of those who have or are considering taking action based on what they learned. Table 27 below shows that lighting has the highest conversion rate, with over 50% of respondents who recall learning about lighting actually considering or implementing those measures. The conversion factors drop down further for air conditioning improvements and high efficiency kitchen equipment. This would not seem to not unexpected, because these would be considered more high cost capital improvements that owners either would be reluctant or unable to pursue, or feel they don't need to pursue anyway.

Interestingly, in terms of energy efficiency programs and financing, the proportion of customers not considering is very high. The results show customers are very apprehensive to utilize financing programs for funding energy efficiency improvements, and only about one quarter are considering utility and non-utility rebate/incentive programs.

		"Drop out" factor – NOT CONSIDERING	"Action" factor – CONSIDERING or IMPLEMENTED
<b>Measure</b>	Compact fluorescent bulbs	29%	71%
	Energy efficient lighting	50%	50%
	Energy efficient AC improvements	57%	43%
	High efficiency kitchen equipment	62%	38%
<b>Program</b>	Utility programs	73%	27%
	Non-utility programs	64%	36%
	Financing	91%	9%

**Table 27: Conversion Rates from Receiving to Using Presentation Information**

Participants were asked how much they knew about utility sponsored energy efficiency programs before attending the Mobile Energy Workshop. As shown in Table 28, about 50% of participants knew nothing about utility sponsored energy efficiency programs before attending the Mobile Energy Workshop. Another 15% say they knew only a little. About 10% of participants stated they were familiar with most or all of the programs.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
None	48.6%
Only A Little	14.3%
Knew They Existed, Didn't Know Much About Them	8.6%
Knew They Existed, Familiar With Some of Them	14.3%
Familiar With Most / All of Them	11.4%
Don't Know	2.9%

**Table 28: Knowledge of Utility Sponsored Energy Efficiency Programs Prior to Mobile Energy Workshop**

Table 29 presents the incidence of participating in a utility sponsored energy efficiency program prior to attending the Mobile Energy Workshop. Only 9% of participants report that they have participated in a utility program before the Mobile Energy Workshop.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Yes	8.8%
No	88.2%
Don't Know	2.9%

**Table 29: Incidence of Participating in Utility Sponsored Energy Efficiency Program Prior to Attending Mobile Energy Workshop**

Both of these tables demonstrate positive and clear indications that the targeted goal of conducting outreach to uninformed, hard-to-reach customers was indeed achieved through this program. The results further show that the program is better able to convince HTR customers to take energy efficiency actions, as opposed to energy efficiency actions in conjunction with energy efficiency programs. This would suggest that the customers could use improved information and materials to help them understand the economic benefits of participating in Public Purpose funded energy efficiency programs.

All respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Mobile Energy Workshop's method of presenting information on ways to reduce energy consumption and utility costs, using a scale of "1" to "5", where "1" means "Awful" and "5" means "Great / Very Good". Table 30 summarizes the results. Approximately 25% of participants thought the workshop's method of presenting energy saving information was great or very good, and about another 25% found the method good. About 10% of participants thought the workshop's method of presenting energy saving information was not good. The mean rating among participants who were able to rate their satisfaction is 3.75, or an overall satisfaction level three-quarters of the way between "Okay" and "Good".

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Awful	-
Not Good	11.4%
Okay	25.7%
Good	28.6%
Great / Very Good	25.7%
Not Applicable / Not Presented to Me	-
Don't Know	8.6%
<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>3.75</b>

**Table 30: Satisfaction with Mobile Energy Workshop's Method of Presenting Energy Saving Information**

Next, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with the Mobile Energy Workshop's method of presenting information on energy efficiency programs and financing. As shown in Table 31, nearly 20% of participants thought the workshop's method of presenting information on energy efficiency programs and financing was great or very good. Approximately 25% of participants found the presentation method for information on energy efficiency programs and financing okay or not good. Another 25% of participants state that information on energy efficiency programs and financing was not presented to them. The mean rating among participants who were able to rate their satisfaction is 4.39, or an overall satisfaction level between "Good" and "Great / Very Good".

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Awful	-
Not Good	8.6%
Okay	17.1%
Good	20.0%
Great / Very Good	17.1%
Not Applicable / Not Presented to Me	25.7%
Don't Know	11.4%
<b>Mean Rating</b>	<b>4.39</b>

**Table 31: Satisfaction with Mobile Energy Workshop's Method of Presenting Information on Energy Efficiency Programs & Financing**

The impression made here, then, is that the presentation method or materials of energy efficiency programs and financing was perceived as better than the presentation method or materials on energy saving information. These are interesting findings considering more participants elected to, or are considering, implementing energy saving measures than those that have, or are considering, participation in energy efficiency programs. Moreover, it is also interesting that customers believe the presentation of material on energy efficiency programs was good to very good (4.39), while the great majority have decided not to participate in energy efficiency programs in the future. These findings suggest that there may be other barriers to program participation, other than awareness, that the program needs to consider in order for the MEW program to serve as an effective feeder to incentive-based resource acquisition programs. Some suggestions for improving this component are addressed by the participants in the following discussion.

Finally, respondents were asked for any further comments, compliments, or complaints about the program. Table 32 shows the tabulated results. Over 40% of participants state they have no additional comments or suggestions for the Mobile Energy Workshops. About 10% of participants believe the cost of the recommended equipment is too high, would like to make an appointment prior to the workshop, or would like the rebate information in other languages. Nearly 10% of participants recommend the Mobile Energy Workshops find a method to reach the decision-makers of the property. Others commented on ways provide more information and assistance for participating in energy efficiency programs.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
No Suggestions	45.7%
Equipment Price is Too High	11.4%
Make an Appointment Prior to Visit	8.6%
Find a Method to Reach Decision Makers	8.6%
Provide Rebate Information in Multiple Languages	8.6%
Don't Recall Enough Details to Make Recommendations	5.7%
Provide Additional Information and Forms for Residential Rebate Programs	5.7%
Assist With Paperwork	5.7%
Provide a List of Contractors Familiar With Rebates to Perform the Work	2.9%
Provide Example of Cost and Savings Benefits for Lighting or HVAC Retrofits	2.9%
Language Barriers (Could Not Understand the Presenter)	2.9%
Provide More Information On Rebates	2.9%
Offer More Workshops	2.9%
Other	8.6%

**Table 32: Final Comments Solicited from Participants**

### Demographics

Table 33 presents the participant main line of business. Approximately 25% of participants operate a retail establishment, another 25% of participants operate a restaurant. Approximately 10% of participants operate either a medical office, a beauty salon, or an office. The remaining participants are dry cleaners/laundromats, grocery stores, drug stores, bakeries, and florists.

	% of Participants
Retail	25.7%
Restaurant	22.9%
Medical Office	11.4%
Beauty Salon	8.6%
Office	8.6%
Dry Cleaners / Laundromat	5.7%
Grocery Store	5.7%
Bakery	2.9%
Florist	2.9%
Pharmacy / Drug Store	2.9%
Other	2.9%

**Table 33: Participant's Business Type**

Mobile Energy Workshop participants were asked if they were the owner of the business they represent. As shown in Table 34, about 70% of participants are the owner of the business.

	% of Participants
Yes	71.4%
No	28.6%

**Table 34: Incidence of Business Ownership**

Of those respondents who were not owners, almost all of them identified themselves as a "manager" (6 respondents). Two identified themselves a real estate agent, with one participant stating he/she is a hair stylist.

Table 35 displays the distribution of the number of employees at participant businesses. Over 30% of participants have only one or two employees, nearly 30% of participants have three to five employees. Nearly 10% of participant businesses have eleven or more employees.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
None (Owner Only)	2.9%
One	22.9%
Two	11.4%
Three	8.6%
Four	11.4%
Five	8.6%
Six - Ten	22.9%
Eleven or More	8.7%
Refused	2.9%

**Table 35: Number of Employees**

These demographics show that the workshops clearly reached the intended targeted customers.

### **C&I Direct Mail Campaign**

The outreach effort to hard-to-reach business customers was supported by a direct mail postcard. The postcard design from 2002 was upgraded and printed in the second quarter of 2003, and 40,030 cards were mailed to targeted hard-to-reach customers in September 2003. The postcards included a toll-free number and an e-mail address to contact The Gas Company's Energy Efficiency InfoCenter for more customized advice. Telephone interviews were conducted, following a decision tree to identify the appropriate pieces of energy efficiency information for each respondent. The phone interview results were then used to assemble a customized mail packet of efficiency information.

As shown in Table 36, 6,258 customized efficiency information packets were distributed to commercial customers. About 30% of these packets were distributed to hotels / motels and another 30% were distributed to schools.

	<b># Packets Mailed</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Hotels / Motels	1,716	27%
Office	101	2%
School	1,802	29%
Random	2,639	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,258</b>	

**Table 36: Number of Customized Energy Efficiency Information Packets Distributed**

To assess the effectiveness of the C&I Direct Mail Campaign, we have conducted a telephone survey with 100 recipients of the customized energy efficiency information packets. The results of these surveys are presented in the following section.



### **C&I Direct Mail Campaign Survey Results**

Of the 100 participants willing to complete a survey regarding the 2003 C&I Direct Mail Campaign, 74, or 74%, state they do not remember the specifics of the information packets well enough to answer general survey questions. These participants state they do recall receiving the information packet, but they no longer recall any details. The remaining 26 participants were able to successfully complete the survey. The remaining results in this section are based on these 26 participants who could answer the survey questions.

Table 37 presents the means by which the respondents received the C&I Mailer. About 30% of respondents were contacted by the Infocenter, while about 20% were referred by a utility account representative. Over 40% of participants could not recall how they were contacted.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Contacted by the Infocenter	30.8%
Referred By A Utility Account Representative	19.2%
No - Was Neither Called nor Contacted	7.7%
Don't Know / Cant Recall	42.3%

**Table 37: Means of Receiving Mailer**

Respondents were asked to list any energy efficiency programs in which they recall participating. Not one respondent recalled participating in an energy efficiency program.

Next, for each item comprising the information packet, respondents were asked if they recalled seeing the item, reading the item, and using the information to take at least one action. The responses are summarized in Table 38.

Between 50% - 75% of respondents recall seeing each item comprising the energy efficiency information packet. The item most read by respondents was the Energy Savings Guide for their business type (42% recall reading), and the least read item was the California Energy Efficiency Guide (23% recall reading). The items resulting in at least one action on the part of respondents are the Commercial and Industrial Tip Sheet and the Energy Savings Guide, with 4% and 12% of respondents, respectively, reporting taking at least one action.

Overall, the Energy Savings Guide appears to be the most effective item comprising the packet. Even though only about 55% of respondents recall seeing the Energy Savings Guide, over 40% recall reading it, and over 10% report taking an action based on the information contained in the Energy Savings Guide.

	<b>% of Respondents Who Recall Seeing Item</b>	<b>% of Respondents Who Recall Reading Item</b>	<b>% of Respondents Who Took Action</b>
California Energy Efficiency Guide	65%	23%	-
Commercial and Industrial Tips Sheet	73%	31%	4%
Energy Savings Guide for Business Type	54%	42%	12%
Utility Program Listing Guide	58%	31%	-

**Table 38: Items Respondents Recall Seeing in Mailer**

The remainder of the survey was only administered to respondents who reported using the information contained in at least one of the items comprising the packet. Overall, only five respondents reported using the information contained in at least one of the items comprising the packet. The remaining results will be discussed only in general terms since the small sample size prohibits specifics.

Respondents who reported using the information contained in at least one of the items comprising the packet were asked to rate the usefulness of the item towards giving them information or connecting them to resources to reduce their energy costs, using a scale of 1 to 5 where a 1 means "not at all useful" and a 5 means "very useful". All respondents who were capable on answering the question rated each item as either a 4 or a 5, indicating respondents found each item to be somewhat-to-very useful on average.

Next, respondents were asked if they looked into utility energy efficiency programs based on the information provided in the package. One respondent reported looking further into utility programs after reviewing the information. This respondent stated they looked into and purchased an air-conditioner system through an unspecified program providing HVAC rebates,

Five respondents state that they either have installed or are planning to install energy efficiency upgrades or measures as a result of the information provided in the package. Four of these five respondents state they have already installed at least one energy efficiency upgrade and three of the five have future plans to install a measure.

When asked if they have contacted outside services or support for energy efficiency, two respondents report contacting either a utility, contractor, or engineer to perform an energy audit.

Next, respondents were asked if they told other people about what they learned from the information packet; if so, how many people they told; and if anybody they told about this packet took the action of seeking the same information. Overall, 4 of the 5 respondents stated they did tell others about the information. Three respondents told 1 to 3 other people and one told 4 to 9 other people. Two respondents stated that perhaps 1 to 3 other people sought to receive the same information.

### **Demographics**

Table 39 presents the respondent firm's main line of business. Half of all of the respondents' firms were either a hotel or motel. Schools and offices each represent just over 10% of respondents. Firms comprising the other category were primarily small retail establishments such as a lawn and garden store, a drapery company, a feed shop, etc.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Hotel / Motel	50.0%
Office	11.5%
School	11.5%
Other	26.9%

**Table 39: Firm's Main Line of Business**

Table 40 shows the respondents position with the firm. Nearly 70% of the respondents were owners, while nearly another 20% were managers or property managers. The remaining respondents were bookkeepers, CEOs and directors.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
Owner	69.2%
Manager	11.5%
Property Manager	7.6%
Bookkeeper	3.8%
CEO	3.8%
Director	3.8%

**Table 40: Respondents Position With Firm**

Table 41 shows the how long the respondent has been with their firm. Over 20% of respondents have been with their firm between one and five years, while nearly 40% have been with their firm for six to ten years.

	<b>% of Participants</b>
One - Five	23.0%
Six - Ten	38.4%
Eleven - Fifteen	11.4%
Sixteen - Twenty	15.3%
Twenty-One or More	11.4%

**Table 41: Years at Organization**

### Small Group Presentations

The DMOP program staff developed 30- and 60-minute bilingual presentations and workshops that promoted the concept of energy efficiency and available assistance to residential customers. As shown below, there were two particular homebuyer support groups that were provided with numerous presentations throughout the year.

GROUP/EVENT (N = 58)	Total	Reported in Quarterly Report	DATE (all in 2003)	Location	Attendance
New Economics for Women Homebuyers Seminars	19	ALL	1/25-12/06	Los Angeles	402
LA Neighborhood Housing Services – New Homebuyers Presentations	15	ALL	7/13-12/06	Los Angeles	302
Asian Business Association Mixer	1	(none)	2/19	Downey	100
Presentation to Professional Business Women	1	Q1	2/26	Montebello	10
Kaiser Permanente Social Workers Meeting	1	Q1	3/12	Los Angeles	25
STAT Women's History Month Program	1	Q1	3/29	Howling Monk, IWRD	40
Murrieta Chamber of Commerce	1	Q2	4/14	Murrieta	200
Energy Coalition/6 Cities Energy Project	1	Q2	4/16	CTAC Edison	20
South Bay Energy Rewards meeting – apt. owners	2	Q2	4/18, 4/30	Redondo Beach, Torrance	60
Apartment Owners Association meeting	1	Q3	6/04	Inglewood	35
Help Public Service Foundation	1	Q3	6/05	Compton, Watts, South LA	300
Head Start All-Staff Meeting	1	Q3	6/06	Downey	200
Homeowners Association in Westminster	1	Q3	6/11	Westminster	40
LA County School District, GAIN Pgm	1	Q3	6/17	Downey	18
KCCD Homeownership Fair (3 separate presentations)	3	Q3	6/21	Los Angeles	800 <sup>a</sup>
Montebello Housing New Homebuyers Presentations	3	Q3	6/21, 7/1, 7/19	Montebello	65
Seminar for Non-Profits	1	Q3	9/30	Downey	17
Operation Hope – training session for homebuyer counselors	1	Q4	10/10	Los Angeles	8
Pasadena Chamber of Commerce	1	Q4	11/05	Altadena	59
Burbank Chamber of Commerce	1	Q4	11/13	Burbank	60
Tomorrow's Leaders Train the Trainer presentation	1	Q4	11/14	Los Angeles	63
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>				<b>2,824</b>

<sup>a</sup> Tracking sheet shows 800 attendance; comment box states "1 presentation 500 people (and) 2 presentations with 30 each"

**Table 42: Small Group Presentations**

### Energy Efficiency Curriculum and Workshops (sub-contractor USC)

In conjunction to the CBO presentations, SoCalGas also collaborated with the University of Southern California Sustainable Cities Program to create a presentation called "We're All in This Together: Sustainability Starts at Home". This USC collaborative presentation was presented at 34 of the new homeowner events noted above between July and September.

The presentation itself is a 25-slide PowerPoint show that describes the direct connection between personal energy use and its contributive impacts on energy use, community health,

and quality of the water and air. The general theme of the presentation is on sustainability of resources for cities, and in particular for Los Angeles and Los Angeles County. A hard copy version of the presentation and an initial audience survey was reviewed last year by RLW.

### **Booths at Community Events and Grassroots Events**

SoCalGas sponsored and staffed booths at a variety of community events throughout the year. Bilingual booth staffers distributed in-language and English program materials and answered questions about energy efficiency programs.

Table 43 shows the listing of events, dates, and attendance. The key metric in these events was the count of materials distributed at these events. Attendance at these events were recorded in the tracking database and listed in the quarterly reports. We have noted in the table where differences were found between the attendance counts on the database and from the reports. The subsequent table after that shows events reported in the quarterly reports but not listed on the tracking database.

Group/Event	Location	Date	Attendance reported in tracking database	Attendance in quarterly reports, if different	Researched
Asian American Expo	Fairplex, Pomona	1/25	100,000		
Pan African Film & Arts Festival	Crenshaw Plaza, LA	2/15	50,000		
Quality of Life Expo and LA Marathon	LA Convention Center &	2/27-3/02	23,000		
Carnaval Primavera	Huntington Park, CA	4/04	30,000		
Arroyo Vista Family Health Center	Lincoln Heights, CA	4/11	100		
Arroyo Vista Family Health Center	Hightland Park, CA	4/12	100		
Earth Day at the LA Zoo	Los Angeles, CA	4/26	100,000		
Orange County Korean Festival	Santa Ana, CA	5/02-5/4	40,000		
Maywood Chamber Cinco de Mayo Weekend	Maywood, Ca	5/02-3	4,000		
Asian & Pacific Islander Heritage Council Gala	Santa Ana, CA API community	5/08	200		
Greater E Los Angeles Senior Conference	Los Angeles	5/15	2,000		
Reginald Gentry – Career Day	South Los Angeles	5/16	100		
Women & Business Expo	Ontario Convention Center	5/16	6,000		
Ministry Fair	South Central Los Angeles	5/29	300		
Clergy Appreciation Luncheon	FAME Renaissance West Adams District, LA	6/07	150		
Fiesta Educativa		6/14	200		
KCCD Homeownership Fair	Los Angeles, CA	6/21	800		
Music On Main – Seal Beach	Seal Beach, CA	7/07	(none listed)	2000	
Independent Cities Assn. Conference	Rancho Berardo, CA	7/12	200	2,500	
First Church Of God - Health Fair	Inglewood, CA	7/22	(none listed)	300	
Clinton Elementary School Energy Efficiency	Garden Grove	7/26	60	200	
Black Research & Educational Center Meeting	Los Angeles	8/2	100		
Fiesta Familiar	Santa Ana Zoo	8/2	1,000		
Senior Appreciation Luncheon	Los Angeles, CA	8/15	400		
Southern California Native American Pow Wow	Orange County Fair Grounds	8/23-24	(none listed)	10,000	
African MarketPlace	Downtown LA Sports Area	8/23-31	(none listed)	10,000	
Riverside Expo	(none listed)	9/05	(none listed)		
Black Business Expo	LA Convention Center	9/12-14	(none listed)	7,500	
Moon Festival	Arcadia, CA	9/14	20,000		
LA County Fair		9/12-28	(none listed)		1,200,000
Latino Expo (Sahra Moreno)		9/20	(none listed)		
Corona Business Expo		9/20	(none listed)		
St. Marks Methodist Church		9/20	(none listed)		
South East Job Fair	Los Angeles	9/27	300		
11th Annual Southeast College Conference	SouthGate High School	9/27	(none listed)		
Latino Book & Family Festival	LA Convention Center	9/27-28	(none listed)	10,000	
Taste of Newport	Fashion Island - Newport Beach	9/19	(none listed)		
Greening of LA, Community issues Forum	Los Angeles	10/10	250	100	
Maywood Arts & Crafts Fair	Maywood Community Center	10/18	300	100	
Community Coalition Gala Dinner & Awards	Millennium Biltmore	10/23	300	200	
Black Women's Network Annual Networking Breakfast	Hyatt Regency LA	10/25	600	100	
Los Angeles African American Womens PAC	Lucy Florence Coffee House, LA	10/29	30	50	
Celebrating Our Community	Hawthorne, CA	11/01	500	200	
Brawley's Cattle Call	Brawley, CA	11/02	500		
Los Angeles Neighborhood Housing Services annual luncheon	Los Angeles	11/06	400		
LA City Council Meeting	Watts, CA	11/19	2,000	200	
Latino Book & Family Festival	Ontario	12/06	15,000	1,000	15,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>398,890</b>		

Table 43: Sponsored and Booth Staffed Community Events

<b>Group/Event</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>No. in attendance</b>
Minority Business Owners Association Trade Show	Long Beach	2/27	125
S. CA Plant Engineering and Maintenance Show	Anaheim	3/18-19	160
Access City Hall	LA City Hall	9/18	250
PWS Coin Operated Laundry Show	Commerce	9/20	700
Chinese American Construction Professionals	Alhambra	9/27	3,000
Los Angeles Area Hotel & Lodging Assn. Luncheon	Los Angeles	10/23	15
Asian Pacific Islander Small Business Luncheon	Los Angeles	10/23	250
Asian Pacific Islander Small Business Expo	Los Angeles	10/23	500
Los Angeles Area Hotel & Lodging Assn. Luncheon	Los Angeles	11/13	100
Community Clinic Assn. Of LA County Ambulatory Care Symposium	Los Angeles	11/14	400
Southern CA Visitor Industry Conference	Long Beach	12/03	700
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,200</b>

**Table 44: Quarterly Reports - Community events not listed on database**

### Collateral/Brochure Development and Distribution

RLW reviewed a number of materials in last year's evaluation. The table below describes the materials used in the DMOP program, and which ones are updated or new for 2003 and subsequently reviewed for this report.

Item	Consisting of:	Description	Reviewed 02 Rpt. (X)	(N) New or (U) Updated
Non Residential Energy Efficiency Kits	"Dear Business Customer" cover letter (English)	Two paragraph introductory letter in English, Cantonese, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese that provides contact information and 1-800 numbers	X	
	"Saving Energy and Money – A California Energy Efficiency Guide" (English)	16-page full color booklet with individual sections on reducing energy costs for all types of building systems and equipment	X	
	"Commercial & Industrial Energy-Saving Tips" (English)	One page informational tip sheet on simple energy cost reduction steps	X	
	"Serious savings for business owners" (2002) InfoCenter brochure (2003)	1-page informational sheet (one side English, other side Spanish) on how to use the on-line audit tool	X	U
	"2003 Business Energy Efficiency Programs"	4-page booklet with comprehensive listings on every energy efficiency programs offered by Southern California utilities, municipalities, and statewide (separate program listing guides for LADWP and SCE customers)	X	U
	"The Energy Savings Guide For Hospitals" "... For Schools" "... For Hotels and Motels" "... For Office Buildings"	20-page full color booklet with energy cost reduction steps for each type of building element and systems – each of the four booklets are similar in layout and content, with specialized information specific to the building types as titled	X	
Residential cover letter (all language versions)		One page letter describing the Energy Information Kit enclosed with the letter and contact information	X	
Rebate information sheets		Four page information sheets about rebates – individualized for nine different utilities	X	
Bill insert (March)	1-English version 1-Spanish version	1-page bill inserts on general home energy efficiency tips, rebate availabilities, and contact information for EE programs and information.		N
Bill insert (July)		1/3 page insert summarizing EE offerings on front, language-specific contact numbers on back		N
DMOP brochure	"A Few Pointers..." (English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese)	Brochure providing EE information and general description of programs; 2003 version includes a tear off mailer		U
Info center postcard		Postcard mailed to HTR C&I customers emphasizing the Infocenter and programs		U

**Table 45: Marketing Collateral Reviewed**

Last year RLW reviewed the content of these materials for reasonable applicability, appropriateness, layout, content, and design. Overall, the pieces created for this program were well written, accurate, and professionally designed. All descriptions of energy reduction steps are clearly written and understandable, and none of them appear complex or burdensome in



technical details. The general language, graphics, and overall layouts for all the professionally produced pieces are well done and appropriate for a general audience.

### Readability Test and General Review

As a quantitative test, we performed the Flesch-Kincaid tests for readability and grade level on two of the residential bill inserts, the small business brochure, and the residential brochure.<sup>6</sup> The items we tested scored on the more difficult end of the Flesch Reading Ease scale, and a Flesch-Kincaid Grade level near or at 12.0.<sup>7</sup> As a comparison, we show the test results for another residential HTR piece created last year.

A caveat can be made that this is a test of only a singular paragraph rather than a longer narrative, where the scoring can be more meaningful. With this in mind, the readability and sophistication of the material appear appropriate for general readers, but the scoring we are reporting here suggest that the longer sentence structures and multi-syllable words found within the text might be difficult to readers with literacy levels lower than a 12<sup>th</sup> grade level. It can be reasonably assumed that literacy levels in the hard-to-reach residential target segment, particularly ethnic-speaking customers who use English as a second language, may present more comprehension difficulties than encountered by the wider general population. Given these assumptions, it might be useful to the utility to consider simpler sentence structures and smaller words in the composition of the mass market pieces.

'02 program evaluation	'03 program evaluation	Flesh Reading Ease scale (10 = very difficult, 100 = very easy)	Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level (1 <sup>st</sup> to 12 <sup>th</sup> grade reading level)
Saving Energy and Money booklet		52.6	10.0
	"A Few Pointers" bill insert	16.9	12.0
	"The Energy Efficiency InfoCenter Is Just A Call Away!" bill insert	34.9	12.0
	Small business brochure	30.6	12.0
	Residential brochure	34.7	11.9

**Table 46: Readability Test Results**

RLW reviewed all the content within the Nonresidential Energy Efficiency Information Kits last year. Several updates for minor pieces were made from the previous program year. In particular, the most significant change was for the "2003 Business Energy Efficiency Programs" listings. This handout was revamped and shows a sound improvement on the previous program listing, as shown in this brief comparison from last year's evaluation comments:

<sup>6</sup> These were the best choices because they had complete sentences in a structured format, and were originally composed and released in English.

<sup>7</sup> The *Flesch Reading Ease* computes readability based on the average number of syllables per word and the average number of words per sentence. The higher the score, the greater the number of people who can readily understand the document. Scoring ranges from 0 to 100. Standard writing styles average approximately 60 to 70 points. Complex written material scores at approximately 35 and below.

The *Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level* computes grade-level readability based on the average number of syllables per word and the average number of words per sentence.

<b>Business Energy Efficiency Program listings</b>	
2002 version – evaluation comments	2003 version
On pages 1 – 12, the first column shows a shorthand coding of some sort, and it's not clear what these codes are. It would be useful to either keep and label this column, or, remove it altogether	Eliminated
It's unclear what might be the value to any end use customer to know who the implementer may be for any given program. We would offer that this column could also be eliminated, or, clarified if that would in fact be the entity to contact (in conjunction with the next comment below)	Eliminated
It would obviously be of usefulness to have at least a general contact reference for each program. It would be understood that program staff might not be able to maintain accurate detailed contact information; however, it would seem reasonable to either add a new column (or include in an existing one) for the general website address and main contact number to find out about each program listed.	Inserted – each entry now has a phone number, e-mail, and URL for more information

**Table 47: Non-Residential Program listings – 2002 and 2003 comparisons**

In addition, the layout and narrative for the 2003 listings are clear and well-constructed, which makes it a more useful resource than the one used in 2002.

#### **Verification of Brochure Distribution**

Final reported distribution was as follows (Table 48 below). We note the following for this table:

- The Q1, Q3, and Q4 reports detail that a total of 59,500 updated DMOP brochures and an unspecified amount of other language brochures were printed in 2003. As shown in Table 48, about double of the English version brochures were distributed, which imply that the older versions were distributed in this program year as well.
- The figures shown on the table for residential customer materials are from the tracking database provided to RLW; non-residential totals are from the Q4 report
- Spot checks were made on counts and types of distributed materials reported on the monthly submissions to the PUC on rapid deployment efforts. These counts and types were consistent with the events and amounts shown in the tracking database.

<b>Title</b>	<b>Basic Description</b>	<b>Distributed at/through:</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Languages</b>
<i>Residential Energy Efficiency Kit</i>	Residential Energy Efficiency Resource Guide, List of utility and 3 <sup>rd</sup> party Energy Efficiency Programs, Customer Assistance Brochure, CARE Application	Mailings upon request	5,667 packages mailed 50 distributed at an event	English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese
<i>A Few Pointers on Making Your Home More Energy Efficient</i> (i.e. "the DMOP brochure")	Informational brochure with Home Energy Efficiency Survey info, business reply card, SoCalGas' customer assistance programs	- Events - Presentations - SoCalGas public affairs managers, service calls, and branch payment offices - Inserted into periodicals	103,832 English 76,398 other language	English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese
<i>45 Ways to Save</i>	EE tips for appliances and home energy usage, plus contact information	(same as above)	22,950 English 10,575 Spanish 2,620 Chinese/ Korean	English, Spanish, Chinese, Korean
<i>Customer Assistance Program ("CAP") brochure</i>	Brochure describing the Company's Customer Assistance Program	- Events - Presentations	2,185 English 1,020 Spanish	English, Spanish
<i>Nonresidential Energy Efficiency Information Packet</i>	Nonresidential Energy Efficiency Resource Guide, Energy Savings Guide, List of Local Energy Efficiency Programs, Program applications	Mailings upon request	7,939 (per Q4 report)	English
<i>Small C&amp;I Energy Efficiency InfoCenter postcard</i>	Postcard to promote the Energy Efficiency InfoCenter to small business customers	Direct mail	40,030 (per Q4 report)	English

**Table 48: Distribution of Marketing Collateral**

---

## Observations and Recommendations

---

The overall conclusion our team has made is that this program has performed satisfactorily towards reaching its targeted audience and delivering the program content. As discussed in the first section of this report, the raw quantitative data show that the target number of hard-to-reach customers was reached. As importantly, our empirical analysis showed to what degree the program impacts were made. We have measured the levels of understanding, believability, and motivations to action were impacted by the program, which would give a clear indication of the program effectiveness.

### **Media Support**

The results of the English and Spanish language surveys provided the insight on what and how much impact was made towards hard-to-reach residential customers. Based on the overall results shown in this study, we have made the following observations:

1. In a typical outreach approach in a busy media marketplace like Southern California, it might be reasonable to assume that about 10% to 30% of the targeted market would recall seeing or hearing about it. The fact that nearly half positively recalled SCG information would be a very positive indicator that the media outreach efforts were successful and cost effective.
2. Television was particularly effective in communicating with Spanish-speakers.
3. The content of the advertisements and press releases are shown to be at an appropriate level for understanding and believability. Spanish-speakers found the content to be more difficult to understand and believe than did English-speakers. There was shown to be a bit of drop off in those who believe that the energy savings recommendations could be easily carried out.
4. While installing a programmable thermostat is the only specific energy saving action listed that respondents who are aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information were significantly more likely to report, respondents who are aware of the SCG-provided energy saving information are significantly more likely to report taking at least one energy saving action.

Based on the results, recommendations we would make for the media outreach would be towards further incremental improvements on the past results, which could be:

1. Continue striving towards gaining message exposure, or even better, direct appearances on foreign language TV and radio shows. In particular, it may make further impacts on the use of energy efficiency technologies if a particular appearance, or series of appearances, could focus on a specific element, such as Energy Star appliances, high efficiency residential lighting, or weatherproofing.
2. In the same context, utilize newspaper advertising and press releases to focus on one or two particular elements in depth. This would mean that a series of releases and/or ads would have to be developed and released to create continuity and build upon previous recognition.

### **Mobile Energy Workshops**

The results for the Mobile Energy Workshop survey provided insight on where impacts were made towards small businesses, and how much impact was made. Based on the overall results shown in this study, we have made the following observations:

1. The 2003 Mobile Energy Workshops (MEWs) appear to be making little or no impact on many of the participants. In particular, an inordinate number of survey respondents that we contacted either did not remember participating in the program or claimed no participation in the MEWs.
2. Just over half of the Workshop participants who could recall participating stated they could not recall enough of the Workshop to answer the survey questions. However, a reasonable caveat could be made that if we discount for a) the length of time between attending the workshop and this survey (about 14 to 16 months) and b) an expected level of survey non-cooperation, the level of those who said they couldn't recall anything would be much lower. The amount of detail provided by those who stated that they could recall the workshop would support the contention that they made a positive impact on some participants.
3. Workshop attendees generally were favorable about the method of the program setup and recruitment. There was feedback from some participants that it would have been better to be notified about the upcoming workshop ahead of time, and that property owners should be included on these presentations as well.
4. Participants generally said that the presentations were understandable and believable.
5. The CFL giveaway was generally a useful gesture, and although the intent is for the bulb to be used at the customer's business, it also provided a secondary benefit of potentially introducing an energy efficient product into the recipient's home, as some respondents stated.
6. Information about lighting was the most useful element, judging by the level of recall and actionable steps by participants. Information about efficient air conditioning and kitchen equipment was also recalled to a lesser degree, and some direct implementation also took place.
7. The Workshops proved effective in delivering information to those small business owners that had little or no previous knowledge of or participation in utility programs. However it is not clear that the program design was effective as a feeder to other energy efficiency programs. A longitudinal study with program participants could be conducted to determine the effectiveness of the materials and approach over a longer period of time.

Based on the results, our recommendations for the Workshops are:

1. In order to increase the impact on workshop participants, workshop representatives should spend more time with each individual business owner, even if the total number of workshop participants decreases.
2. It seems that it would be a worthwhile and cost effective gesture to install two interim steps in setting up the workshops. Although not explicitly stated, it seems obvious that the property owner of each strip mall visited were asked for permission to set up the workshop. In that case, it may be beneficial if, during the set up arrangements, the implementation staff could:
  - a. Seek an opportunity to present the same materials to the property owner as well
  - b. Send a postcard to the businesses to notify them of the upcoming event
3. Create a simple follow up mechanism for further inquiries by inquisitive or curious participants. In other words, when an owner expresses a particular interest in an energy efficient measure, the presenter records that query and forwards it to a

program staffer or implementation contractor who can best follow up about that query.

### **C&I Direct Mail Campaign**

The results for the C&I Direct Mail Campaign survey provided insight on where impacts were made towards small businesses, and how much impact was made. Based on the overall results shown in this study, we have made the following observations:

1. The 2003 C&I Direct Mail Campaign appear to be making little or no impact on many of the recipients. In particular, an inordinate number of survey respondents state they do not remember the specifics of the information packets well enough to answer the survey questions. These participants state they do recall receiving the information packet, but they no longer recall any details.
2. Among recipients who can answer the survey questions, most recall seeing each item comprising the package, and about 33% recall reading each item.
3. The Energy Efficiency Savings Guide customized for the specific business types appears to be the most effective item comprising the package, as the greatest percentage of recipients report taking action based on that item.

Based on the results, our recommendations for the C&I Direct Mail Campaign are:

1. Create customized Energy Efficiency Savings Guides for more business types.
2. In reviewing program logic and design for this particular program element, it would seem useful to consider the net impact of measured action against costs to print these materials and perform these mailings. If the program intent is to disseminate energy efficiency information as widely as possible to the target audience, this effort does fit within that effort. Since a significant number of recipients didn't recall the package, we get the impression that they lost interest or shifted attention elsewhere, rather than focus on turning that information into action. Our suggestions for reviewing program logic would be to suggest that "less is more". As identified and recommended above, the customized Guides seem to be retained better than the other materials. It may be, then, that this Guide alone is sufficient to serve the purpose intended by the Program, and any other additional material may make the customer's task of reading and absorbing all this information seem difficult or overwhelming. Common learning theory of the "Rule of Three" reasons that people can best absorb and recall three new things at any given event or situation, but further details can become secondary or forgotten, especially if there is no further reinforcement.

## Methodology

---

RLW began the process evaluation by collecting and reviewing the program materials, and speaking with program implementation staff. We have prioritized the assessment of the delivery channels utilized by the program. Budgetary information and the quarterly reports were also collected and reviewed to determine where program resources were primarily used to finalize the design of the process evaluation.

The process evaluation involved these tasks:

- RLW began the process evaluation by thoroughly reviewing all new or updated program materials.
- After completing our review of program materials, we made several inquiries with program implementation staff. This gave us the opportunity to ascertain or clarify information on the delivery channels used in the program.
- For the residential component of the program, we conducted a telephone survey measuring general program awareness using targeted random sampling in the HTR neighborhoods where residents are the most likely to have the opportunity to see and read the ads and press releases (and in a specific case, hear radio sponsorship announcements). We also summarized attendance and brochure distribution at CBO presentation and booths at community events.
- For the commercial component of the program, we conducted a telephone survey with a random sample of 76 Mobile Energy Workshop participants and a random sample of 100 of those listed as receiving the customized business information packets.

The following paragraphs describe the methods we have used to assess each delivery channel.

### **Media Support**

The ads and press releases were placed in local Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and Spanish newspapers, as well as in English in selected HTR target areas. DMOP program staff provided us a list of newspapers in which the ads were placed which included the name of the paper as well as the dates corresponding to the ad placements. The circulation rates of the newspapers used in this element were considered to be the metric to measure the amount of impact towards the hard-to-reach populations. We have chosen to consider the circulation rates alone, and ignore the incidence rates that the papers may have.<sup>8</sup>

For newspapers in languages other than English, the DMOP-provided data included the circulation rates of the papers. The DMOP-provided data did not include any information regarding circulation rates for English papers. We conducted internet research to determine the circulation rates of the English papers to inform our sample allocation strategy.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Incidence rate* refers to the estimated amount of people that will read a newspaper above and including the initial buyer or subscriber. For example, if a newspaper assumes that 2 people on average read each paper and has a circulation rate of 25,000, then its incidence rate is 2\*25,000, or 50,000.

Table 49 displays the circulation rates of the ads placed through the 2003 DMOP program by the language of the paper<sup>9</sup>. Overall, the 2003 DMOP ad placements were circulated to approximately 3.5 million newspaper readers. Readers of English papers account for approximately 60% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads, while readers of Spanish papers account for just over 30%. The remaining 10% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads were readers of Asian language papers.

Language of Paper	Circulation of Ad Placements	% of Total
English	2,105,563	59.2%
Spanish	1,117,850	31.4%
Korean	125,000	3.5%
Chinese	120,000	3.4%
Japanese	45,000	1.3%
Vietnamese	36,000	1.0%
Filipino	5,000	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,554,413</b>	

**Table 49: Circulation of Ad Placements by Language**

Because ads placed in Asian-language papers account for just less than 10% of individuals potentially exposed to the ads and the evaluation of the mass media component of the 2002 DMOP program was restricted to individual who could read Korean, Chinese, or Vietnamese, we restricted the 2003 data collection activities to those individuals targeted by the ads in Spanish and English papers.

A list of zip codes or cities defining where the newspapers are distributed is not available for this evaluation. The 2000 U.S. Census contains the total number of individuals over the age of 18, the number of individuals over the age of 18 whose primary language is Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Spanish, or English for each zip code in CA. The Census data also contains information on the number of households below various income thresholds, which was invaluable in identifying the zip codes containing English-speaking hard-to-reach customers for the surveys.

For the ads placed in Spanish newspapers, we have used an approach identical to that used in our 2002 evaluation. Specifically, we used the 2000 Census data to identify those zip codes in SCG's service territory with the following attributes: 1) the zip code contains a sizable proportion of all Spanish speakers in SCG's territory and 2) within that zip code, the primary language of a sizable proportion of individuals is Spanish. The zip codes with these 2 attributes will be used as a proxy for the locations where the Spanish papers are distributed within each city.

For the ads placed in English papers, a modified approach was required. For these surveys, we used the 2000 Census data to identify those zip codes in SCG's service territory with the following attributes: 1) the zip code contains a sizable proportion of all English speakers at or below the moderate income level (income levels less than 400% of federal poverty guidelines) in SCG's territory and 2) within that zip code, English speakers at or below the moderate income level comprise a sizable proportion of individuals. The zip codes with these 2 attributes will be

<sup>9</sup> The circulation rates listed in Table 49 do not account for repeat ad placements in the same newspaper. We believe it is likely that for a given paper, the readership does not change substantially from one issue of the paper to another. Rather, there is likely substantial overlap between the readerships of a given paper from one issue to another. Therefore, to properly represent the population of individuals exposed to the ads, we have chosen to examine the circulation rates alone.



used as a proxy for the locations where the English papers are distributed to the hard-to-reach residential population.

Once we identified the zip codes of interest, we purchased a list of a random sample of residents within the identified zip codes who are thought to speak the language of interest. These lists were used as a sampling frame for the telephone survey.

### Estimating the Proportion of Spanish-Speaking Households by Zip Code

For each zip code in SCG's service territory, we determined the total number of individuals age 18 or over as well as the number of individuals over the age of 18 whose primary language is Spanish using the 2000 Census data. These data were combined to determine which zip codes contain a sizable proportion of all Spanish speakers in SCG's territory. These zip codes serve as a proxy for the distribution locations for the newspapers contained ads targeted to Spanish speakers.

Table 50 shows the zip codes we have identified that will be used to generate a sampling frame for the 150 Spanish surveys. According to the 2000 Census data, these zip codes account for approximately 30% of all individuals in SCG's service territory whose primary language is Spanish.

Zip Codes for Spanish Surveys			
90001	90063	91331	92703
90004	90201	91342	92704
90006	90250	91402	92707
90011	90255	91706	93030
90022	90262	91732	93033
90023	90280	91744	
90026	90640	91766	
90033	90650	91911	
90042	90660	92335	
90044	90744	92701	

**Table 50: Zip Code List for Spanish Surveys**

### Estimating the Proportion of English-Speaking Moderate Income Households by Zip Code

The 2000 Census data does not contain data directly relating primary language and income levels. Additionally, the 2000 Census data does not contain data specific to the moderate income levels. Consequently, estimating the proportion of English-speaking households at or below the moderate income level required utilizing several data sources from the Census Bureau.

The following steps describe the procedure to be used to estimate the number of English-speaking households at or below the moderate income level by zip code:

1. Determine the moderate income thresholds by household size,
2. Compute the percentage of households in each income category by zip code,
3. Compute the percentage of households in each household size category by zip code,

4. Compute the percentage of persons whose primary language is English by zip code<sup>10</sup>,
5. Compute the percentage of English-speaking households by zip code,
6. Assuming independence of household income and size, compute the percentage of households in each income and household size category combination by zip code,
7. Since moderate income thresholds are not exactly equal to income category endpoints, assume the percentage of households in each income category is uniformly distributed throughout the interval, and compute the percentage of households below the moderate income threshold by zip code,
8. Assuming independence of household primary language and income, compute the percentage of households in each income and language category combination by zip code, and
9. Multiply the percentage of households thought to be English-speaking and at or below the moderate income level by the total number of households by zip code.

Each of these steps is discussed in greater detail below.

First, we determined the appropriate moderate income thresholds by household size. *Moderate income* is defined to be 400% of the poverty threshold. Poverty thresholds are computed on a national basis and are not adjusted for regional variations and fluctuations. For the purposes of this study, the 2002 poverty thresholds by size of family and number of related children under 18 years were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau website. The source of the 2002 thresholds was the Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement<sup>11</sup>. Since we require only one threshold per household size, the thresholds were averaged by household size. Table 51 presents the poverty and computed moderate income thresholds by household size.

Household Size	2002 Poverty Threshold	Moderate Income Threshold
1	\$ 9,183	\$ 36,732
2	\$ 11,756	\$ 47,024
3	\$ 14,348	\$ 57,392
4	\$ 18,392	\$ 73,568
5	\$ 21,744	\$ 86,976
6	\$ 24,576	\$ 98,304
7	\$ 28,001	\$ 112,004
8	\$ 30,907	\$ 123,628
9+	\$ 37,062	\$ 148,248

**Table 51: Computed Poverty and Moderate Income Thresholds**

<sup>10</sup> All income data from the 2000 Census is reported in units of households, while all data pertaining to the primary language spoken is reported in units of persons. To combine these data, the units in each data file were converted to percentages.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld/thresh02.html>

Since the largest household size included in the census data pertaining to income levels is seven or more persons, it was necessary to combine the thresholds from seven, eight, and nine or more persons in an intelligent manner. Since we believed that households with seven persons were more likely than households with 9+ persons, we computed a weighted average of the thresholds in each category. To accomplish this, it was necessary to determine the number or percentage of households in each household size category. Using the U.S. Census Bureau website, we downloaded the frequency distribution of number of persons per household from the 2001 American Housing Survey (AHS). Similar to the poverty thresholds used in this study, the American Housing Survey data is provided on a national level. Using the AHS data, we computed a weighted average of the moderate income thresholds for households of size seven or greater. Table 52 presents the revised poverty and low income thresholds by household size.

Household Size	2002 Poverty Threshold	Moderate Income Threshold
1	\$ 9,183	\$ 36,732
2	\$ 11,756	\$ 47,024
3	\$ 14,348	\$ 57,392
4	\$ 18,392	\$ 73,568
5	\$ 21,744	\$ 86,976
6	\$ 24,576	\$ 98,304
7+	\$ 30,521	\$ 122,083

**Table 52: Revised Poverty and Low Income Thresholds**

Next, we computed the percentage of households in each income category by zip code. This was calculated as the number of households in each income category in each zip code divided by the total number of households in the zip code. Similarly, we computed the percentage of households in each household size category by zip code. This was calculated as the number of households in each size category in each zip code divided by the total number of households in the zip code.

Next, we needed a method of combining the percentages calculated in steps 2 and 3. The simplest method is to assume that household income is independent of household size and multiply the percentage of households in a particular income category by the percentages of households in the size categories in order to obtain the percentage of households in each income and size category combination. This assumption of independence may not be exactly accurate since one would expect a household with a greater number of occupants to have a higher household income than a household with fewer occupants. However, this assumption most likely does not skew the results by much since the two variables are only weakly correlated to one another. To illustrate the calculation, consider the following simple example; suppose:

- 25% of households have an income less than \$15,000, 50% of households have an income between \$15,000 and \$30,000, and 25% of households have an income greater than \$30,000 and
- 25% of households have 1 person, 50% of households have 2 people, and 25% have 3 or more occupants.

Since we are assuming that household income is independent of household size, the percentage of households of size one with an income less than \$15,000 would be calculated as

25%\*25% = 6.25%. For this example, using this methodology, the joint distribution of household size and income would be computed as shown in Table 53.

	Household Size		
	1	2	3
Less than \$15,000	6.25%	12.50%	6.25%
\$15,000 - \$29,999	12.50%	25.00%	12.50%
\$30,000 or Greater	6.25%	12.50%	6.25%

**Table 53: Example Joint Distribution of Household Size and Income**

Next, we calculated the percentage of households in each zip code whose income is below the moderate income threshold. Since moderate income thresholds are not exactly equal to the income category endpoints provided in the 2000 Census data, it was necessary to devise a procedure of estimating this percentage. To do so, we assumed that the percentage of households in each income category is uniformly distributed throughout the interval and computed the percentage of households below the threshold. For example, suppose that 10% of households in a given zip code have an income less than \$45,000 and two occupants and 10% of households in that zip code have a household income of \$45,001 - \$50,000 and two occupants. As shown in Table 52, the moderate income threshold for a household of two occupants is \$47,024. Then, the percentage of households with two occupants that would be considered moderate income would be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \% \text{ Moderate Income} &= \% \text{ with Income} \leq \$47,024 \\
 &= \% \text{ with Income} \leq \$45,000 + \% \text{ with Income} \in [45,001, 47,024] \\
 &= 10\% + \left[ \int_{45,001}^{47,024} \frac{1}{50,000 - 45,001} dx \right] * (0.1) \\
 &= 10\% + 4\% \\
 &= 14\%.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we needed to combine the income data with the language data. All income data from the 2000 Census is reported in units of households, while all data pertaining to the primary language spoken is reported in units of persons. To combine these data, the units in each data file were converted to percentages.

The simplest method is to assume that household income is independent of language and multiply the percentage of households in a particular income category by the percentages of persons in the language categories in order to estimate the percentage of households in each income and language category combination. This assumption of independence may not be exactly accurate since one would expect an English-speaking household to have a higher household income than a household where the primary language is not English. However, this assumption most likely does not skew the results by much since the two variables are likely only weakly correlated to one another within a given zip code.

Lastly, for each zip code, we multiplied the percentage of households thought to be English-speaking and at or below the moderate income level by the total number of households to estimate the number of English-speaking households at or below the moderate income level for each zip code.

These data were combined to determine which zip codes contain a sizable proportion of all English-speaking households at or below the moderate income level in SCG's territory. These

zip codes will serve as a proxy for the distribution locations for the newspapers contained ads targeted to English speakers.

Table 54 shows the zip codes we have identified that will be used to generate a sampling frame for the 150 English surveys. According to the 2000 Census data, these zip codes account for approximately 20% of all English-speaking households at or below the moderate income level in SCG's service territory.

<b>Zip Codes for English Surveys</b>				
90019	90731	92335	92509	93536
90034	90805	92345	92544	93550
90043	91342	92346	92553	
90044	91351	92376	92627	
90046	91710	92392	92647	
90047	91730	92399	92653	
90250	91786	92404	92683	
90631	91910	92407	93257	
90650	91911	92503	93274	
90706	91941	92504	93535	

**Table 54: Zip Code List for English Surveys**

Once we identified the zip codes of interest, we purchased a list of a random sample of residents within the identified zip codes who are thought to speak the language of interest. These lists were used as a sampling frame for the telephone survey.

Interviewing Service of America<sup>12</sup> (ISA) conducted a total of 302 in-language short telephone surveys (150 Spanish surveys & 152 English surveys) to measure general program awareness. RLW staff designed the telephone survey instrument in English. ISA translated the Spanish survey. They also conducted the in-language surveys and provided the survey data in an English format to RLW for analysis.

The project analyst analyzed the results of the telephone survey. The quantitative process survey analysis was carried out using SPSS, a commonly used statistical software package. RLW calculated frequencies, means, and cross tabulations of data, where appropriate, to provide estimates of population characteristics. All statistical significance tests were conducted at the 90% level of confidence, and statistically significant differences are discussed in the report where appropriate. These tests have been primarily used to make comparisons among the two ethnic groups of interest.

### **Mobile Energy Workshops (sub-contractor ADM Associates)**

Mobile Energy Workshops are designed for hard-to-reach commercial customers to address issues such as how to participate in available energy efficiency programs and how to finance energy efficiency upgrades. Furthermore, the Mobile Energy Workshops follow up with participants of the Mobile Energy Clinic (a third party local program) to help them identify and apply for resources to implement energy efficiency upgrades suggested by the Mobile Energy Clinic. The program's final budgetary worksheets show that approximately 166 Mobile Energy Workshops were conducted.

<sup>12</sup> ISA is a leader in multicultural data collection services, having completed surveys in 65 languages since 1983.

We received comprehensive lists of participants of Mobile Energy Workshops. The lists contain workshop date, business name, contact name, business address, phone number, and fax number. The lists were combined to form a sampling frame for the evaluation.

Using the participant lists, we have verified the number of Mobile Energy Workshops conducted and the number of participants attending those workshops. We used the combined participant list to select a simple random sample of 76 Mobile Energy Workshop participants and conducted a telephone survey to assess the effectiveness of this program delivery mechanism.

The telephone survey explored the success of the workshops in addressing issues such as how much attendees understood about how to participate in available energy efficiency programs and how to finance energy efficiency upgrades. The survey also explored how effective the workshop was in assisting them to identify resources for upgrades suggested by the clinic.

### **Business Direct Mail Campaign**

The outreach effort to hard-to-reach business customers was supported by a direct mail postcard. The postcard design from 2002 was upgraded and printed in the second quarter of 2003, and 40,030 cards were mailed to targeted hard-to-reach customers in September 2003. The postcards included a toll-free number and an e-mail address to contact The Gas Company's Energy Efficiency InfoCenter for more customized advice. Telephone interviews were conducted, following a decision tree to identify the appropriate pieces of energy efficiency information for each respondent. The phone interview results were then used to assemble a customized mail packet of efficiency information.

Using the direct mail recipient lists, we have verified the number of customized energy efficiency packets distributed. As shown in Table 36, 6,258 customized efficiency information packets were distributed to commercial customers. About 30% of these packets were distributed to hotels / motels and another 30% were distributed to schools.

	<b># Packets Mailed</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Hotels / Motels	1,716	27%
Office	101	2%
School	1,802	29%
Random	2,639	42%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,258</b>	

**Table 55: Number of Customized Energy Efficiency Information Packets Distributed**

To assess the effectiveness of the C&I Direct Mail Campaign, we have conducted a telephone survey with 100 recipients of the customized energy efficiency information packets. We stratified the combined recipient list by market segment to select the sample of customers.

The telephone survey explored the following issues with recipients:

- How much were these materials relevant and useful?
- What information did they directly use? What other information and resources did they pursue based on what they received?
- What utility programs did they check into, and ultimately use?
- What energy efficiency measures have they installed based directly on what they had received and/or learned? What measures do they anticipate pursuing in the foreseeable future?

- How much have they verbally shared about what they've learned or done with their peers?

### **Community Event Sponsorship and Booth Staffing**

SCG sponsored and staffed booths at a variety of community events. The bi-lingual booth staffers distributed in-language and English program materials and answered questions about energy efficiency programs.

We have reviewed the total number of booths at community events as well as the number of attendees that were recorded as visiting the event. In particular, the number of attendees at the booths, and the number of brochures distributed through these venues are used to assess if the program met residential HTR goals.

The tracking database listed events that were sponsored and/or attended. For each event, the list shows the name and address of the event, the market segment the presentation served, the number of announced attendees, and the types and number of brochures distributed.

### **Small Group Presentations**

The program collaborates with local community and business groups to host workshops and provide informational presentations. Outreach strategies for each group are unique, reflecting the group's particular needs and resources.

We received a copy of the business customer presentation used as well as a list of organizations where a presentation occurred. For each presentation, the list shows the name and address of the organization, the market segment the presentation served, the number of attendees, and the types and number of brochures distributed.

We have reviewed the content of the presentations. We also summarized the number of presentations and the number of attendees. These data were critical in determining if the program was able to meet HTR goals.

### **Energy Efficiency Curriculum and Workshops (sub-contractor USC)**

The University of Southern California (USC) developed curricula for 30-minute and 60-minute energy efficiency workshops, which were used for presentations in the third quarter of 2003. The curricula was developed last year as a pilot program to answer the question, "Does placing energy conservation in a sustainable/environmental health context increase the percentage of people who access the utility rebate programs, update appliances, and or change their personal energy consumption habits?" The presentation was reviewed last year for content and layout.

### **Media Support: Residential Awareness Survey Instrument (English)**

#### **DMOP Residential Awareness EM&V Survey**

Important issues to remember for this survey:

1. The customer responses are strictly confidential.
2. You will be representing Southern California Gas; professionalism and politeness is as important to us as getting results. If scheduling a call back, be sure to set up a time that is convenient to the customer.
3. All of the questions refer to energy efficiency information promoted by SCG during 2003.

#### **Opening Script**

Hello, this is <<**Interviewer Name**>> calling on behalf of Southern California Gas. During 2003, Southern California Gas created a special program to provide information within your neighborhood about reducing energy costs. The utility is interested in learning how much of this information has reached you.

This is not a sales or telemarketing call – just a short survey of about 5 – 7 minutes. Southern California Gas only wants to learn about what you may recall about the information provided within your neighborhood. These questions are all short answer, and all of your responses are confidential.

First, I'd like to ask you a few background questions about yourself.

#### **SCREEN1\_E: (English Surveys Only)**

Do you read in English?

1.  Yes
2.  No → **Thank and Terminate**

SCREEN3: Are you 18 or older?

1.  Yes
2.  No → **Thank and Terminate**
3.  Refused → **Thank and Terminate**



DEMO1: Are you a homeowner or renter?

- 1.  Homeowner → **Go to Q1**
- 2.  Renter [**ASK DEMO2**]
- 98.  DK → **Find Out Who Would Know. Attempt to Survey that Individual.**
- 99.  Refused → **Go to Q1**

DEMO2 [**IF RENTER**]: Does the landlord pay the electric and gas bills?

- 1.  Yes
- 2.  No
- 98.  DK
- 99.  Refused

**Program Awareness Questions**

- 1. Are you aware that Southern California Gas offers information and programs about reducing energy costs for residential customers like you?
  - 1. Yes
  - 2. No
- 2. In this past summer, do you recall reading or hearing about specific information about energy saving information provided by Southern California Gas?
  - 1. Yes
  - 2. No → **Go to Q7**
- 3. How did you learn about this information? [**MULTIPLE RESPONSES PERMITTED**] [**Do Not Read List**]
  - 1. Insert inside utility bill
  - 2. Picked up/given a brochure or information
  - 3. Read article in newspaper
  - 4. Ad in newspaper
  - 5. Heard about it on the radio
  - 6. Told about it from friend/neighbor/acquaintance
  - 7. Other  
(Specify)\_\_\_\_\_
  - 98. DK
  - 99. Refused

4. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very difficult and 5 means very easy, overall, how *easy* or *difficult* was it for you to *understand* the energy saving information? **[OKAY TO PROMPT]**

**PROMPT]**

1. \_\_\_\_ Very Difficult
  2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Difficult
  3. \_\_\_\_ Neither Difficult Nor Easy
  4. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Easy
  5. \_\_\_\_ Very Easy
  98. \_\_\_\_ DK
  99. \_\_\_\_ Refused
5. Now, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very unbelievable and 5 means very believable, how believable was the energy saving information? **[OKAY TO PROMPT]**
1. \_\_\_\_ Very Unbelievable
  2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Unbelievable
  3. \_\_\_\_ Neither Unbelievable Nor Believable
  4. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Believable
  5. \_\_\_\_ Very Believable
  98. \_\_\_\_ DK
  99. \_\_\_\_ Refused
6. And using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very difficult and 5 means very easy, overall, how easy or difficult do you *believe* it is to carry out SCG's energy efficiency recommendations? **[OKAY TO PROMPT]**
1. \_\_\_\_ Very Difficult to Carry Out
  2. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Difficult to Carry Out
  3. \_\_\_\_ Neither Difficult Nor Easy Carry Out
  4. \_\_\_\_ Somewhat Easy to Carry Out
  5. \_\_\_\_ Very easy to Carry Out
  98. \_\_\_\_ DK
  99. \_\_\_\_ Refused

7. What energy saving steps, if any, have you or your family done in the past year or two? **[DO NOT PROMPT, MULTIPLE RESPONSES PERMITTED]**
1.  None
  2.  Installed programmable thermostat
  3.  Turned thermostat cooling set-point down
  4.  Turned thermostat heating set-point up
  5.  Installed weather-stripping around the doors/windows
  6.  Installed attic insulation
  7.  Installed new windows
  8.  Bought and installed compact fluorescent bulbs
  9.  Tuned up HVAC system
  10.  Bought high efficiency or Energy Star appliance(s)  
**(Specify)** \_\_\_\_\_
  11.  Replaced air conditioner/air conditioning with a high efficiency unit
  12.  Replaced heating system with new high efficiency unit
  13.  Other (Specify  
\_\_\_\_\_
  98.  DK
  99.  Refused
8. What is the highest level of education you have completed? Is it....?
1. High School Graduate or Less
  2. Some College
  3. 4-Year College Degree
  4. Advanced Degree
  98. Don't Know
  99. Refused
9. Lastly, into which of the following categories did your household income fall for 2003?
1. Less Than \$23,000
  2. \$23,001 - \$27,000
  3. \$27,001 - \$32,500
  4. \$32,501 - \$38,000
  5. \$38,001 - \$43,500
  6. \$43,501 or more
  98. Don't Know
  99. Refused

Southern California Gas appreciates your time. Your help will ensure that this program will continue to contribute successfully to supporting residential customers in southern California to reduce energy costs. Thank you very much!

**Media Support: Residential Awareness Survey Instrument (Spanish)**

**Residential Survey – EM&V Survey >>>SPANISH Version<<<**

IMPORTANT ISSUES TO REMEMBER FOR THIS SURVEY:

1. THE CUSTOMER RESPONSES ARE STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.
2. YOU WILL BE REPRESENTING COMPAÑIA DE GAS DEL SUR DE CALIFORNIA; PROFESSIONALISM AND POLITENESS IS AS IMPORTANT TO US AS GETTING RESULTS. IF SCHEDULING A CALL BACK, BE SURE TO SET UP A TIME THAT IS CONVENIENT TO THE CUSTOMER.
3. ALL OF THE QUESTIONS REFER TO ENERGY EFFICIENCY INFORMACION PROMOTED BY SCG DURING 2003.

**OPENING SCRIPT**

Hola, mi nombre es <<**INTERVIEWER NAME**>> y llamo en nombre de la Compañía de Gas del Sur de California. Durante el año 2003, la Compañía de Gas del Sur de California creó un programa especial para proporcionar información en su vecindad/barrio acerca de la reducción del costo de la energía. La compañía está interesada en saber cuánto de esta información llegó a usted.

Esta no es una llamada para ventas o de telemarketing – es solo una breve encuesta de aproximadamente 5 – 7 minutos. La Compañía de Gas del Sur de California solo desea saber lo que usted pueda recordar acerca de la información proporcionada en su barrio. Todas estas preguntas tienen respuestas cortas, y todas sus respuestas son confidenciales.

Primero, quisiera hacerle unas pocas preguntas de fondo acerca de usted.

**SCREEN1\_S: (SPANISH SURVEYS ONLY)**

¿Usted lee español?

1. Si
2. No → **THANK AND TERMINATE**

SCREEN3: ¿Tiene usted al menos 18 años de edad?

1. Si
2. No → **THANK AND TERMINATE**
3. Rehusa → **THANK AND TERMINATE**

DEMO1: ¿Es usted dueño(a) de su residencia, o está alquilando?

1. Dueño(a) → **GO TO Q1**
2. Alquila → **[ASK DEMO2]**
98. DK → **FIND OUT WHO WOULD KNOW. ATTEMPT TO SURVEY THAT INDIVIDUAL.**
99. Rehusa → **GO TO Q1**

DEMO2 **[IF RENTER]:** ¿Está el dueño de la residencia pagando las cuentas de electricidad y de gas?

1. Si
2. No
98. DK
99. Rehusa

### PROGRAM AWARENESS QUESTIONS

1. ¿Sabía usted que la Compañía de Gas del Sur de California ofrece información y programas acerca de la reducción del costo de la energía para clientes residenciales como usted?

1. Si
2. No

2. Durante el último verano, ¿usted recuerda haber oído o leído algo acerca de información específica sobre ahorro de energía proporcionada por la Compañía de Gas del Sur de California?

1. Si
2. No → **GO TO Q7**

3. ¿Cómo se enteró de esta información? **[MULTIPLE RESPONSES PERMITTED] [DO NOT READ LIST]**

1. Panfleto con la cuenta de gas/electricidad
2. Recogió/le dieron un folleto o información
3. Leyó un artículo en un periódico
4. Anuncio en un periódico
5. Lo oyó por radio
6. Se lo dijo un amigo / vecino / conocido
7. Otro (Especifique)\_\_\_\_\_
98. DK
99. Rehusa

4. Usando una escala del 1 al 5, donde 1 significa "muy difícil" y 5 significa "muy fácil," en total, ¿qué tan fácil o difícil fue para usted entender la información sobre ahorro de energía?

**[OKAY TO PROMPT]**

1.  Muy difícil
2.  Algo difícil
3.  Ni difícil ni fácil
4.  Algo fácil
5.  Muy fácil
98.  DK
99.  Rehusa

5. Ahora, usando una escala del 1 al 5, donde 1 significa "muy poco creíble" y 5 significa "muy creíble," ¿qué tan creíble fue la información sobre ahorro de energía? **[OKAY TO PROMPT]**

**PROMPT]**

1.  Muy poco creíble
2.  Poco creíble
3.  Ni increíble ni creíble
4.  Algo creíble
5.  Muy creíble
98.  DK
99.  Rehusa

6. Y usando una escala del 1 al 5, donde 1 significa "muy difícil" y 5 significa "muy fácil," en total, ¿qué tan fácil o difícil usted cree que es llevar a cabo las recomendaciones de la Compañía de Gas en cuanto a uso eficiente de la energía? **[OKAY TO PROMPT]**

1.  Muy difícil de llevar a cabo
2.  Algo difícil de llevar a cabo
3.  Ni difícil ni fácil de llevar a cabo
4.  Algo fácil de llevar a cabo
5.  Muy fácil de llevar a cabo
98.  DK
99.  Rehusa

7. ¿Qué pasos relacionados con ahorro de energía, si alguno, han tomado usted o su familia durante los últimos uno o dos años? **[DO NOT PROMPT, MULTIPLE RESPONSES PERMITTED]**
1.  Ninguno
  2.  Instaló un termostato programable
  3.  Subió el punto de arranque del termostato para enfriamiento
  4.  Bajó el punto de arranque del termostato para calefacción
  5.  Instaló cintas/tiras aislantes alrededor de puertas/ventanas
  6.  Instaló aislación en el entretecho
  7.  Instaló ventanas nuevas
  8.  Compró e instaló bombillas fluorescentes compactas
  9.  Ajustó el sistema de HVAC (aire acondicionado y calefacción)
  10.  Compró electrodoméstico(s) de alta eficiencia o designados Energy Star (SPECIFY)\_\_\_\_\_
  11.  Reemplazó el acondicionador de aire con una unidad de alta eficiencia
  12.  Reemplazó el sistema de calefacción con una unidad de alta eficiencia
  13.  Otro (SPECIFY)  
\_\_\_\_\_
98.  DK
99.  Rehusa
8. ¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que usted completó? Es...?
1. Escuela secundaria o menos
  2. Algo de colegio universitario
  3. Diploma de universidad de 4-años
  4. Diploma avanzado
98.  No sabe
99.  Rehusa
9. Por último, ¿en cuál de las siguientes categorías está el ingreso de su hogar para el año 2003?
1. Menos de \$23,000
  2. \$23,001 - \$27,000
  3. \$27,001 - \$32,500
  4. \$32,501 - \$38,000
  5. \$38,001 - \$43,500
  6. \$43,501 o más
98.  No sabe
99.  Rehusa

La Compañía de Gas del Sur de California le agradece por su tiempo. Su ayuda asegura que este programa continuará contribuyendo exitosamente a que los clientes residenciales del sur de California reduzcan sus costos por energía. Muchas gracias!

### **Mobile Energy Workshop (MEW) Survey Instrument**

#### **Mobile Workshop Participant - M&V Survey Instrument**

1. The customer responses are strictly confidential.
2. You will be representing Southern California Gas (SCG); professionalism and politeness are as important to us as getting results. If scheduling a call back, be sure to set up a time that is convenient to the customer.
3. All of the questions refer to the Mobile Energy Workshops that the respondents attended in summer 2003.
4. Respondents are welcome to contact Rick Anderson at 213-244-3152 for any questions/concerns.

### **Introduction**

Hello, this is <<interviewer>> calling on behalf of Southern California Gas. Can I please speak with «**Contact\_Name**»?

- If contact not available > Schedule call back
- If contact is different than the name provided > Reintroduce yourself, use above
- Refuses to participate > Thank for their time and end call

Your name and phone number were on the list of people who had visited The Gas Company's Mobile Energy Workshop during the summer of 2002. The Gas Company is interested in finding out how much this workshop has helped attendees learn about energy efficiency options for small businesses.

This is not a sales or telemarketing call – just a short follow up survey. The Gas Company only wants to know how effective the workshops were for participants. This is only a short survey of about 5 – 10 minutes. All of the survey responses will be aggregated so that no individual respondent can be identified. May I ask you these questions now?

- IF YES > Continue
- IF NO > Attempt to reschedule

SCREEN 1: First, just to verify – do you recall attending one of The Gas Company's Mobile Energy Workshops? It most likely would have taken place in the parking lot of your strip mall on «**Date\_of\_Workshop**».

- Yes Continue
- Unsure Politely probe if hesitant or unsure
- No Politely thank and terminate; note discrepancy on contact sheet



**[IF UNSURE, USE THESE AS PROMPTS TO VERIFY:** *the contact's name is shown on the registration sheet; it was a one-day outdoor booth set up in the parking lot of their strip mall; the workshop was designed for commercial customers to address issues such as how to participate in available energy efficiency programs and how to finance energy efficiency upgrades. A free CFL was given away for those who visited the Mobil Energy Clinic.*

First, I'd like to ask you some quick background questions about you and your firm or organization?

DEMO1: What type of business do you operate

- (01) Restaurant
- (02) Retail
- (03) Beauty Salon
- (04) Office
- (05) Dry Cleaners
- (06) Medical Office
- (07) Pharmacy/ Drug Store
- (08) Bakery
- (09) Florist
- (10) School
- (11) Other \_\_\_\_\_
- (99) Refused

DEMO2: Are you the owner?

- 1. Yes → **SKIP TO DEMO4**
- 2. No

DEMO3: What is your position (manager, supervisor, etc.)

Position: \_\_\_\_\_ 98.  Refused

DEMO4: How many employees does this business have right now? \_\_\_\_\_

Next, I'd like to ask you about the convenience of learning about and attending the Mobile Energy Workshop.

1. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very inconvenient and a 5 means very convenient, please rate the level of convenience associated with: **(Enter a 98 for Don't Know, 99 for Refused)**

a. Learning About the Workshop\_\_\_\_\_

b. Attending the Workshop\_\_\_\_\_

[Skip Q2 if above responses are both "5"]

2. What suggestions do you have on how it could more convenient for small business customers like you to learn about and attend the Mobile Energy Workshop? **(Record Verbatim Response. Probe for Specifics)**

(01) Make an appointment

(02) Provide advanced notice (mailer or phone call)

(03) Convenient to attend no changes necessary

(04) No Suggestions

(05) Other\_\_\_\_\_

Now, I'd like to ask you about the information you received through the workshop.

3. Overall, how *easy* or *difficult* was it for you to *understand* the energy saving information that was given to you at the Mobile Energy workshop? **[CODE TO FIT – OKAY TO PROMPT]**

ANSWER CHOICE

EXAMPLE RESPONSES

1. \_\_\_ Difficult

(didn't understand at all)

2. \_\_\_ Somewhat difficult

(Understood it all had to do with reducing energy use, didn't quite understand how some of it worked)

3. \_\_\_ Okay

(Understood most of it – no real difficulties)

4. \_\_\_ Easy

(Pretty much understood, no important questions or uncertainty)

5. \_\_\_ Very Easy

(Very understandable the first time I heard/read it)

98. \_\_\_ DK

99. \_\_\_ Refused

4. And overall, how much do you *believe* about the energy saving information that was given to you at the Mobil Energy Workshop, would you say? **[OKAY TO PROMPT - CODE TO FIT]**

ANSWER CHOICEEXAMPLE RESPONSES

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 1. ___ It was difficult to believe | (Hard to believe any of it)                       |
| 2. ___ You Believe a little of it  | (Believe a little, hard to believe most of it)    |
| 3. ___ You Believe some of it      | (some of it I believe/Some I don't believe)       |
| 4. ___ You Believe most of it      | (Believe most/ one or few things hard to believe) |
| 5. ___ Believe all of it           | (Everything was believable)                       |
| 98. ___ DK                         |   |
| 99. ___ Refused                    |   |

**Check Below to Determine if Respondent Received CFL?**

**If Yes, Go to Q5. If No, Go to Q6.**

**Received CFL: «Receive\_CFL»**

5. According to our information, workshop attendees were given a free compact fluorescent light bulb Do you recall receiving the CFL, and if so, what did you do with it? **[CODE TO**

**FIT – PROMPT ONLY IF NECESSARY]**

1. \_\_\_ Don't recall receiving one
2. \_\_\_ Installed it in a fixture in the business
3. \_\_\_ Brought it home and used it
4. \_\_\_ Gave it to somebody else
5. \_\_\_ Nothing [stored away/put away/sitting out]
6. \_\_\_ Threw it out
98. \_\_\_ DK-can't remember
99. \_\_\_ Refused

6. The energy savings information presented through the workshops was customized or tailored-to-fit each individual participant. Please tell me what you recall discussing during the workshop. **(Record in order of response.)**

- (01) Compact Fluorescent lighting
- (02) Linear Fluorescent lighting (lighting other than CFL)
- (03) Energy-efficient Air HVAC
- (04) High efficiency equipment
- (05) Financing for energy-efficiency programs cost & benefits
- (06) Non utility energy efficiency programs
- (07) Rebate programs for residential use
- (08) Free light bulbs
- (09) Can't Recall

7. Now, I am going to read a list of items that *may* have been presented to you during the workshop. For each item, I'd like to ask you a short series of related questions. **(In each column, check the appropriate response)**

Item	Q7A. Do you recall discussing.....during the workshop?	<b>(Only For Items with Yes in Q7A).</b> Q7B. As a result, have you gotten or used, or are you considering getting or using.....?
Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Already bought and put in more
Energy Efficient Lighting Other than CFLs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Already bought and put in more
Energy efficient air conditioning improvements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements already made
High efficiency kitchen equipment	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Already bought and put in more
Financing for Energy Efficiency improvements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Currently Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Currently financing <input type="checkbox"/> Already financed
Utility energy efficiency programs (including municipality programs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Currently Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Currently participating <input type="checkbox"/> Already participated Specify Programs _____
Non utility energy efficiency programs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> DK <input type="checkbox"/> Ref	<input type="checkbox"/> Not considered at all <input type="checkbox"/> Currently Considering <input type="checkbox"/> Currently participating <input type="checkbox"/> Already participated Specify Programs _____

8. Before The Gas Company's Mobile Energy Workshop was set up and presented to you, how much did you already know about utility sponsored energy efficiency? **[CODE TO**

**BEST FIT – OKAY TO PROMPT]**

1. \_\_\_ None **[Skip to Q10]**
2. \_\_\_ Only a little
3. \_\_\_ Knew they existed, didn't know much about them
4. \_\_\_ Knew they existed and familiar with some of them
5. \_\_\_ Familiar with most/all of them
98. \_\_\_ DK
99. \_\_\_ REFUSED

9. Prior to attending the Mobile Energy Workshop, had you ever participated in a utility sponsored energy efficiency program?

1. \_\_\_ Yes
2. \_\_\_ No
98. \_\_\_ DK

10. Overall, how satisfied were you with the workshop's method of presenting information on ways to reduce your businesses energy consumption and utility costs? **[CODE TO FIT –**

**PROMPT ONLY IF NECESSARY]**

1. \_\_\_ Awful [Strong negative perceptions]
2. \_\_\_ Not good [Some definite negative perceptions]
3. \_\_\_ Okay [Generally positive perceptions]
4. \_\_\_ Good [Mostly positive perceptions]
5. \_\_\_ Great/very good [Very positive perceptions]
6. \_\_\_ Not Applicable/was not presented to me
98. \_\_\_ DK
99. \_\_\_ REFUSED

11. Overall, how satisfied were you with the workshop's method of presenting information on energy efficiency programs and energy efficiency financing? **[CODE TO FIT – PROMPT**

**ONLY IF NECESSARY]**

- 1. \_\_\_\_ Awful [Strong negative perceptions]
- 2. \_\_\_\_ Not good [Some definite negative perceptions]
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Okay [Generally positive perceptions]
- 4. \_\_\_\_ Good [Mostly positive perceptions]
- 5. \_\_\_\_ Great/very good [Very positive perceptions]
- 6. \_\_\_\_ Not Applicable/was not presented to me
- 98. \_\_\_\_ DK
- 99. \_\_\_\_ REFUSED

12. Are there any other comments about the Mobile Energy Workshops – either compliments or suggestions for improvement - that you would like to provide

- 1. Make an appointment prior to visit
- 2. Don't recall enough details to make recommendations
- 3. No Suggestions great job presenter/presentation
- 4. Find a method to reach decision makers (landlords/property owners)
- 5. Provide rebate information in multiple languages
- 6. Direct information toward maintenance for lighting or HVAC
- 7. Provide a list of contractors who are familiar with rebate programs & could do the work.
- 8. Provide examples of cost & savings benefits for lighting or HVAC retrofits
- 9. The rebate/incentive form expiration dates were too close; give out rebate forms with longer expiration dates.
- 10. The price is too high/can't afford to buy these measures
- 11. Some language barriers (difficulty understanding presentation)
- 12. Provide additional information and forms for residential rebate programs
- 13. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- 99. REFUSED

Southern California Gas appreciates your time. Your help will ensure that this program will continue to contribute successfully to supporting small businesses in southern California to reduce energy costs. Thank you very much!

**C&I Direct Mail Campaign Survey Instrument****SCG 2003 C&I Direct Mail Campaign Survey Instrument****Introduction**

Hello, this is <<interviewer>> calling on behalf of Southern California Gas regarding their 2003 Non-Residential Energy Efficiency Programs. This is not a sales or telemarketing call. SCG is evaluating how well their business information packages serve their customers, and we're simply contacting those who had received one to ask some follow up questions. May I please speak with «COMPANY»

- 1) If contact not available → **Schedule call back**
- 2) If contact is different than the name provided → **Reintroduce yourself, use above**
- 3) Refuses to participate → **Thank for their time and end call**

Your name was listed in SCG's records as the person that received a customized packet of energy efficiency information. Are you the best person for me to speak with about the energy information packet that was mailed to your business?

- 1) YES → **Continue**
- 2) NO → **Get Contact Name** \_\_\_\_\_

This is only a short survey of about 5 minutes. Could I go over these questions with you now?

- 1) YES → **Continue**
- 2) NO → **Attempt to reschedule**

SCREEN 1: First, just to verify – do you recall receiving a packet of information on energy efficiency from Southern California Gas?

- 1) Yes → **Continue**
- 2) No → **Politely thank and terminate; note error on contact sheet**
- 3) Unsure → **Politely probe if hesitant or unsure and ask if someone else may have received the information packet.**

SCREENER2: Alternate Recipient for mailer contact info

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**IF UNSURE, PROMPT BY REFERRING TO THE DESCRIPTION BELOW. CONTINUE WHEN CONFIRMED – DISCONTINUE IF RESPONDENT IS DOUBTFUL OR DISAGREES THAT HIS/HER FIRM RECEIVED IT**



**DESCRIPTION:** Your business is on a list of customers that were sent a package of information from SCG. This package contained a tips sheet, a utility program listing, and two color information guides to energy savings.

**TO CONTINUE:** These questions are all short answer, and all of your responses are confidential. All of the survey responses will be reported in aggregate so that no individual participant can be identified.

First I would like to ask some quick background questions about you and your firm or organization.

First I would like to ask some quick background questions about you and your firm or organization.

DEMO1: What is your firm/organization's main line of business?

- 1) Hotel/Motel
- 2) Office
- 3) School
- 4) Other \_\_\_\_\_

98) DK (**Confirm if respondent is the correct person to survey**)

99) Refused

DEMO2: Can you please tell me your title and a brief description of your position?

- 1) Title: \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Position: \_\_\_\_\_
3. 98) Refused

DEMO3: How many years have you been at this organization and position?

- 1) Years at organization \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) Years at position: \_\_\_\_\_

1. This package was sent to you as either a response from the utility's Energy Efficiency InfoCenter or a referral from another utility program. Do you recall if you contacted the Infocenter or referred by a utility account representative?

- 1) \_\_\_ contacted the Infocenter > **SKIP TO Q3**
- 2) \_\_\_ referred by a utility account representative > **SKIP TO Q3**
- 3) \_\_\_ NO – was neither referred nor contacted
- 98) \_\_\_ DK/Can't recall
- 99) \_\_\_ Refused

2. Do you recall participating in any Energy Efficiency Programs? **Read list if needed - Record Only One Response.**

- 1) \_\_\_ the Non-Residential Audit Program
- 2) \_\_\_ the Mobile Energy Workshop
- 3) \_\_\_ the Non-Residential Incentive Program
- 4) \_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- 98) \_\_\_ DK/Can't recall
- 99) \_\_\_ Refused

3. Do you recall at least seeing the following items in the package?

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Commercial and Industrial Tips sheet           | Yes | No |
| 2. Utility program listing guide                  | Yes | No |
| 3. California Energy Efficiency Guide             | Yes | No |
| 4. Energy Savings Guide for your type of business | Yes | No |

**If All answers are NO, THANK AND END SURVEY HERE.**

Next, we just want to find out how useful these items were to you.

4. Do you recall at least reading through these items? **Ask for each item listed; circle "N/A" for those that were not recalled in Q3.**

- |   |     |    |     |
|---|-----|----|-----|
| 1. Commercial and Industrial Tips sheet           | Yes | No | n/a |
| 2. Utility program listing guide                  | Yes | No | n/a |
| 3. California Energy Efficiency Guide             | Yes | No | n/a |
| 4. Energy Savings Guide for your type of business | Yes | No | n/a |

**If All remaining answers are NO, THANK AND END SURVEY HERE.**

5. Of those items you recall at least reading through, which ones did you use as information to do at least one action? **Ask for each item listed; circle "N/A" for those that were not recalled in Q4.**

- |   |     |    |     |
|---|-----|----|-----|
| 1. Commercial and Industrial Tips sheet           | Yes | No | n/a |
| 2. Utility program listing guide                  | Yes | No | n/a |
| 3. California Energy Efficiency Guide             | Yes | No | n/a |
| 4. Energy Savings Guide for your type of business | Yes | No | n/a |

**If All remaining answers are NO, THANK AND END SURVEY HERE.**

6. For those items you did use, please rate how useful they were towards giving you information OR connecting you to resources to reduce your energy costs. Use a scale of 1 to 5 where a 1 means "not at all useful" and a 5 means "very useful".

[Circle "98" if DK; circle "N/A" for those indicated as not used at all in Q5]

1. Commercial and Industrial Tips sheet	1	2	3	4	5	98	n/a
2. Utility program listing guide	1	2	3	4	5	98	n/a
3. California Energy Efficiency Guide	1	2	3	4	5	98	n/a
4. Energy Savings Guide	1	2	3	4	5	98	n/a

Next, we're interested in what actions you specifically took based on the information provided in this package.

7. Have you looked further into utility programs?  a. Yes  b. No

**Q7.1 IF YES >** Which ones (list):

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ > **a.1** Did you use it?  a. Y  b. N
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ > **b.1** Did you use it?  a. Y  b. N
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ > **c.1** Did you use it?  a. Y  b. N
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ > **d.1** Did you use it?  a. Y  b. N
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ > **e.1** Did you use it?  a. Y  b. N

8. Have you *installed* OR are you *planning to install* energy efficiency upgrades or measures?

a. Yes  b. No

**Q8.1 IF YES > check all that apply [code "I" for installed – "P" for planning]:**

1.  a. Upgrade/change out lighting
2.  b. Upgrade motors/variable speed drives
3.  c. Weatherproof doors/windows
4.  d. Inspect, tune, or improve building controls
5.  e. Insulate hot water pipes or tanks
6.  f. Check, clean, or fix air handling/ventilation systems
7.  g. Check, clean, or fix air conditioning system(s)
8.  h. Check, clean, or fix heating system(s)
9.  i. Bought/will buy Energy Star office equipment
10.  j. **(FOR RESTAURANTS)** Bought/will buy high efficiency cooking equipment
11.  k. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Have you contacted outside services or support for energy efficiency? \_\_\_ a. Yes \_\_\_ b. No

**Q9.1 IF YES > check all that apply; code to best fit:**

1. \_\_\_ a. Utility, contractor, or engineer to perform energy audit
2. \_\_\_ b. ESCO or contractor about energy performance contracting service
3. \_\_\_ c. HVAC contractor to inspect/assess heating, cooling, or ventilation  
4. systems
5. \_\_\_ d. Electrical or lighting contractor to inspect/assess lighting
6. \_\_\_ e. Engineering firm to analyze/assess specific problem
7. \_\_\_ f. OTHER (list) \_\_\_\_\_

Next, we just want to know how much you might have shared this information with others.

10. Have you told other people about what you learned from the information packet?

- 1) Yes
- 2) No → **Go To Q13**
- 98) DK → **Go To Q13**
- 99) Refused → **Go To Q13**

11. Which statement would best fit how many people you told: **Read 1, 2, and 3 on list**

- 1) I told a few people – perhaps about 1 to 3
- 2) I told some people – perhaps about 4 to 9
- 3) I told a lot of people – perhaps 10 or more
- 98) DK
- 99) Refused

12. As far as you know, has anybody you told about this packet took the action of looking into getting the same information? **Read list:**

- 1) No, nobody
- 2) A few people – perhaps about 1 to 3
- 3) Some people – perhaps about 4 to 9
- 4) A lot of people – perhaps 10 or more
- 98) Don't know
- 99) Refused

And finally, we just want to get any other opinion from you about the package we sent you.

13. Overall, what did you like or dislike about the information packet? **Record Verbatim**

**Response. Probe for specifics as needed.**

---

---

---

14. Is there anything about the packet that the utility should eliminate, adjust, or improve?

**Record Verbatim Response. Probe for specifics as needed.**

---

---

---

**These are all of my questions. Thank you for your time.**