Fast Feedback Results

2011 Final Report

Prepared by
Sarah Castor
April 25, 2012

Executive Summary

Overview of Fast Feedback

Fast Feedback is a short phone survey of a sample of recent program participants to assess satisfaction, understand customer decision making, and gather suggestions for program and process improvements. The survey is generally 10 questions or less, is customized for each program or measure of interest, and is designed to take no more than 5 minutes to complete.

There are quarterly quotas for each program or measure of interest based on the project volume expected in that quarter. We attempt to survey enough participants to achieve 90% confidence and 10% precision each quarter. Calls are made each month to randomly selected participants whose incentive check was processed in the previous month and who have not been surveyed in the previous 12 months. Results are summarized and distributed quarterly to program staff. There is least one opportunity in each survey for the respondent to give feedback that is recorded verbatim on what Energy Trust could do to improve its services or the customer experience, and this feedback is provided with anonymity to program staff on a monthly basis (not included in this report).

A total of 3,439 participants from 2011 were surveyed between February 2011 and February 2012.

History of Fast Feedback

Fast Feedback began as a pilot in mid-2009 for participants in the Existing Buildings and Production Efficiency program.[1] The pilot yielded timely information to programs and participants were appreciative of the opportunity to provide feedback. Based on this success, in the second quarter of 2010 Fast Feedback was extended to most Energy Trust programs. A report on methods and results from Q2 2010 is available on the Energy Trust website; Fast Feedback continues to follow the methods cited in that report.[2]

In Q2 2011, survey calling moved from Energy Trust's general call center to Gilmore Research Group. Survey questions were adjusted to be more consistent across programs and measures, the number of open-ended comments was reduced from two to one (most respondents only provided one comments anyway) and general coding was added to the open comment. Open comments are provided monthly to program staff and are not included in this report.

Summary of results

Satisfaction with overall experience – a rating of 4 or 5 out of 5 – ranged from a high of 100% for Existing Buildings participants from Washington and Residential Solar Water Heating to 83% for New Buildings. Most programs or measures showed 90% or more of participants satisfied.

Free ridership – the portion of participants who would have made energy efficient improvements or upgrades without incentives or information from Energy Trust – was much more variable than satisfaction and ranged from a high of 52% for residential refrigerator participants to a low of 14% for Production Efficiency electric projects. See the appendix for an explanation of free ridership calculations.

[1] http://energytrust.org/library/reports/100310_FastFeedback.pdf
[2] http://energytrust.org/library/reports/101231_Fast_Feedback_Rollout.pdf

Program	Respondents	Percent satisfied*	Free ridership‡	
			Electric	Gas
Commercial Sector				
Existing Buildings – Oregon	199	94%	30%	27%
Existing Buildings – Washington	10	100%	--†	--†
Existing Multifamily	76	87%	27%	48%
New Buildings and Multifamily	71	83%	--†	--†
Industrial Sector				
Production Efficiency	184	91%	14%	20%
Commercial Solar				
Commercial Solar Electric and Water Heating	32	91%	--†	--†
Home Products				
Clothes Washers	261	88%	47%	
Refrigerators	259	90%	52%	
Refrigerator Recycling	262	95%	31%	
Existing Homes				
Air Sealing	138	88%	21%	
Ceiling Insulation	242	92%	28%	
Floor Insulation	231	96%	27%	
Wall Insulation	151	90%	35%	
Duct Insulation	51	88%	31%	
Duct Sealing	158	89%	38%	
Heat Pump	232	88%	42%	
Water Heaters	243	91%	47%	
Windows	128	85%	42%	
Home Performance	109	90%	27%	
Home Energy Review	237	91%	--	
Existing Homes Total – Oregon	1,855	91%	--	
Existing Homes Total – Washington	65**	86%	--†	
Residential Solar				
Residential Solar Electric	140	94%	--†	
Residential Solar Water Heating	20	100%	--†	
Other Renewables				
Small Wind	5	4 of 5	--	

* Percent rating 4 or 5 out of 5 on overall experience; excludes respondent who answered “don’t know”.
** Washington respondents also included in other measure categories above.
† Free ridership is not calculated through Fast Feedback.
‡ Free ridership estimates for residential measures are calculated for Oregon respondents only.

For many programs and measures, the Energy Trust incentive was the most influential of the program aspects in the decision to undertake an energy efficient improvement or upgrade. Other aspects investigated included information provided by Energy Trust, the contractor or design professional, and other features unique to certain programs or measures, such as free pick-up for refrigerator recycling and Solar Energy Reviews for residential solar participants.

Existing homes participants were asked about satisfaction with their trade ally and results were typically in line with results for satisfaction with Energy Trust. They were also asked about whether they considered Energy Trust’s list of approved trade allies when selecting their contractor. Typically, results for this question vary substantially from one quarter to the next, but on average for 2011, they ranged from 20% for windows to 59% for Home Performance.

	Percent satisfied with contractor*	Percent who considered trade ally list
Air Sealing	89%	49%
Ceiling Insulation	87%	27%
Floor Insulation	90%	41%
Wall Insulation	89%	36%
Duct Insulation	94%	51%
Duct Sealing	93%	25%
Heat Pump	93%	22%
Water Heaters	90%	24%
Windows	92%	20%
Home Performance	94%	59%

* Percent rating 4 or 5 out of 5 on overall experience; excludes respondent who answered “don’t know”.