Briefing Paper
ACEEE Energy Efficiency Scorecard 2008 and 2009

April 7, 2010

Summary

Each year ACEEE ranks U.S. States' energy efficiency levels with a composite metric they call the Energy Efficiency Scorecard. The Scorecard is made up of various general categories including utility and public benefits, transportation, building energy code, state and government initiatives, and several others. Some of these general categories are further broken into sub-categories, whose combined score influences the general category score.

Oregon has historically placed among the top ten states for energy efficiency on this ranking system; however, we slipped a little last year from second to fourth place. In an effort to examine what caused the decline in rank, Planning removed a sub-category of scoring titled "Targets Energy Efficiency Resource Standards" (EERS) which does not pertain to Energy Trust, and which we received a 0 out of 4 scoring on in both years 2008 and 2009. We noted that several other states that were able to move ahead of us in 2009, they did so through implementation of EERS. To adjust for this factor outside of Energy Trust's control, the analysis below removed this category for both years 2008 and 2009 for participating states' scorecards. We only did this ranking for those states in the top ten.

The original scorecard is based on a score of 50 points possible. After removal of the EERS sub-category from the utility and public benefits category, there is a total of 46 points possible. Our analysis showed that after netting out the EERS sub-category, Oregon maintains its second place score in 2008, and regains this second place score again in 2009. The below tables depict the scorecard before and after adjustment, for year 2008 and 2009.

2008 Original Scores

Rank		Utility and Public Benefits	Transporta-tion	Building Energy Code	CHP	Appliance Standards	State Lead by Example	RD & D	Financial Information and Incentives	Total Score
	Max Points Possible	20	6	8	5	4	2	2	3	50
1	California	14.5	4	8	5	4	2	2	1	40.5
2	Oregon	13.5	3.5	8	5	3	0.5	0.5	3	37
3	Connecticut	15.5	5	4	5	3	2	0.5	1	36
4	Vermont	19	2.5	5	2.5	1	2	0	1	33
5	New York	12.5	4.5	5.5	5	1	1	2	1	32.5
6	Washington	12	4.5	8	4	2	0.5	0	1	32
7	Massachusetts	12.5	3.5	3.5	3	1	1	1	1	26.5
8	Minnesota	13.5	1	5.5	2.5	0	2	0	2	26.5
9	Wisconsin	10	0.5	8	5	0	0.5	2	0	26
10	New Jersey	10	3.5	5	5	1	1	0	0	25.5

2008 After Adjustment

Rank		Utility and Public Benefits	Transporta-tion	Building Energy Code	CHP	Appliance Standards	State Lead by Example	RD &D	Financial Information and Incentives	Total Score
	Max Points Possible	16	6	8	5	4	2	2	3	46
1	California	11.5	4	8	5	4	2	2	1	37.5
2	Oregon	13.5	3.5	8	5	3	0.5	0.5	3	37
3	Connecticut	12.5	5	4	5	3	2	0.5	1	33
4	Washington	11	4.5	8	4	2	0.5	0	1	31
5	New York	9.5	4.5	5.5	5	1	1	2	1	29.5
6	Vermont	15	2.5	5	2.5	1	2	0	1	29
7	Massachusetts	12.5	3.5	3.5	3	1	1	1	1	26.5
8	Wisconsin	10	0.5	8	5	0	0.5	2	0	26
9	New Jersey	8	3.5	5	5	1	1	0	0	23.5
10	Minnesota	9.5	1	5.5	2.5	0	2	0	2	22.5

2009	Original Scores							
		Utility and Public Benefits	Transportation	Building Energy Code	CHP	State Government Initiatives	Appliance Efficiency	Total Score
Rank	Max Points Possible	20	8	7	5	7	3	50
1	California	18.5	6	7	5	5	3	44.5
2	Massachusetts	17	4	7	4	5	2	39
3	Connecticut	17	5	4	5	4.5	2	37.5
4	Oregon	14	5	6	5	4.5	2	36.5
5	New York	14	5	4.5	5	5	1	34.5
6	Vermont	19	4	3.5	2	4	1	33.5
7	Washington	14	6	6	3	2	2	33
8	Minnesota	16.5	2	5	3	4	0	30.5
9	Wisconsin	11	1	4	4	4	0	24
10	New Jersey	9.5	5	3.5	4	1	0	23

2009	After Adjustment							
		Utility and Public Benefits	Transportation	Building Energy Code	CHP	State Government Initiatives	Appliance Efficiency	Total Score
Rank	Max Points Possible	16	8	7	5	7	3	46
1	California	15.5	6	7	5	5	3	41.5
2	Oregon	14	5	6	5	4.5	2	36.5
3	Massachusetts	13	4	7	4	5	2	35
4	Connecticut	14	5	4	5	4.5	2	34.5
5	Washington	12	6	6	3	2	2	31
6	New York	10	5	4.5	5	5	1	30.5
7	Vermont	15	4	3.5	2	4	1	29.5
8	Minnesota	12.5	2	5	3	4	0	26.5
9	Wisconsin	11	1	4	4	4	0	24
10	New Jersey	9.5	5	3.5	4	1	0	23