

# **Do Energy Efficiency Investments Deliver?**

**Short Course: Physics of Sustainable Energy** 

#### **Michael Greenstone**

Milton Friedman Professor in Economics and the College University of Chicago

**Director** Energy Policy Institute at the University of Chicago

# Understanding the Energy Efficiency Gap



# **Energy Efficiency is Part of Every GHG Mitigation**

#### **Plan** GHG Mitigation Scenario



CO <sub>2</sub> abatement	2020	2035
Energy service demand	16%	9%
End-use efficiency	42%	42%
Supply efficiency	8%	7%
Fuel and technology switching in end-uses	6%	6%
Renewables	21%	25%
Biofuels	3%	3%
Nuclear	3%	5%
CCS	1%	2%
Total (Gt CO <sub>2</sub> )	1.5	5.9



## Politicians agree on energy efficiency



Discrete Following

FACT: 78% of Americans agree with increasing energy efficiency standards for new appliances and buildings (via @NRDC). #ActOnClimate



We must move aggressively toward energy efficiency and the development of sustainable energy sources.





## Politicians agree on energy efficiency





FACT: 78% of Americans agree with increasing energy efficiency standards for new appliances and buildings (via @NRDC). #ActOnClimate



We must move aggressively toward energy efficiency and the development of sustainable energy sources.







The Energy Efficiency Improvement Act was passed today. I'm proud of our bipartisan effort to improve the economy & protect the environment



🥆 🔣 📢 🖬 🗾 🦉 🔜 🧐 関

6:27 PM - 21 Apr 2015

13



Sen. McConnell Press 🧇 @McConnellPress

Ŭ. 👤 Follow

McConnell blames Dems for stalled energy efficiency bill | TheHill thehill.com/policy/energy- ... via @TheHill

🚺 🔛 🍖 🧐 🥘



RETWEETS

4

McConnell blames Dems for stalled energy bill McConnell assailed Democrats for blocking amendments to the energy bill thehill.com

2 10:09 AM - 8 May 2014



## Utility programs promote energy efficiency





## What drives this support for energy efficiency?

#### McKinsey Global GHG Abatement Cost Curve



# **Key Characteristics of Energy Efficiency**

# (1) Economically and Environmentally Attractive (Especially Relative to Alternative Options)

» Classic win-win: (a) it's an investment consumers should want to make;
(b) provides GHG and pollution benefits

» There should be a clear private sector motivation, so very low cost approach to GHG mitigation

#### (2) Technologically Feasible and Available

» While many of the most significant opportunities for GHG reduction still require technological innovation and cost reduction (CCS, biofuels, etc.), energy efficiency measures are available and market-ready today.



# **Key Characteristics of Energy Efficiency**

#### And yet...

#### (3) There is an Energy Efficiency Gap

- » Energy efficiency measures are not as widely adopted in the marketplace as expected
- » Public policy in the United States and globally is required to drive efficiency improvements



## How can this be?

- (1) Numerous market failures and/or behavioral biases could explain why negative-cost investments are not being made
  - » Lack of information
  - » Principal-agent problems (owner-renter, manager owner)
  - » Behavioral biases: Inattention, myopia, loss aversion, etc.

(2) Another possibility: consumers absorb the efficiency gains through higher levels of consumption given reduced costs (the rebound effect).



## How can this be?

(3) It's also possible that costs have been understated and gains have been overstated in some instances



## **Energy efficiency measurement gap?**



# "Do Energy Investments Deliver? Evidence from the Weatherization Assistance Program" (2015)

Fowlie, Greenstone and Wolfram

# **Experiment Overview and Design**



## **Research Questions**

- 1. What increases household participation in the Weatherization Assistance Program?
- 2. What is the average effect of weatherization assistance on household energy consumption?
- 3. How do experimental estimates of real-world efficiency impacts compare to ex ante engineering estimates?
- 4. Is there evidence of a rebound effect?
- 5. What is the rate of return to residential energy efficiency investments, privately and socially?



## **Our Research Objectives**

- 1. Conduct a large-scale field experiment designed to measure the real-world returns on investments in residential energy efficiency improvements
- 2. Construct valuation measures that account not only for energy savings, but also consumers' valuation of warmer indoor temperatures
- **3.** Assess the rate of return on investments in energy efficiency from both a private and social perspective

## **The Federal Weatherization Assistance Program**

#### (1) The United States' largest residential energy efficiency program

- » Since its inception in 1976, more than 7 million low-income households have received weatherization assistance through the program.
- » Weatherization retrofits (including insulation, furnace replacement, infiltration reduction) are provided for free to eligible households.
- » Multiple purposes, including to reduce the energy burden of lowincome Americans by installing energy efficiency upgrades in their homes.

#### (2) Experienced a significant increase in funding and activity

» American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 significantly increased WAP spending from roughly \$450 million in 2009 to nearly \$5 billion for the 2011-2012 program years.



## **Engineering Analysis is an Integral Part of WAP**



- Before implementing a WAP efficiency retrofit, program engineers conduct a detailed household energy audit
- The National Energy Audit Tool (NEAT) is used to estimate potential savings and identify energy efficiency measures deemed to be cost effective.
- In order for a measure to be implemented, the cumulative savings to investment ratio must be equal to or greater than 1



## **Study Location: South Central Michigan**

- Michigan's cold winters and large low-income population put it atop the list of "most deserving" recipients of WAP funding.
- Michigan received over \$200M in ARRA funding to support the weatherization of over 35,000 homes between April 2009 – March 2012.
- Maximum expenditure raised to \$6,500 per home under ARRA





## **Visual Overview of Our Experiment**

Start with a sample of **34,161** presumptively eligible households



## **Visual Overview of Our Experiment**





## We Worked Hard to Encourage Participation

<b>Encouragement Effort</b>
-----------------------------

Encouraged group (households)	8,648
House visits/canvassing	6,694
Number of robo-calls 2	23,500
Number of personal calls	9,171
Follow up in-person appointments	2,720
Average cost/hh	\$55.10

- We made contact with roughly two-thirds of the households in the treatment group.
- We worked with Fieldworks, LLC, a nationally recognized firm specializing in grass roots outreach
- Michigan-based Fieldworks staff helped us develop a persuasive recruit-and-assist strategy, cut turf, hire local people from the community, support staff on the ground, and manage field operations.



## **Our Outreach Efforts had an Impact...**

#### **Program Response Rate**



Control group



## ...Increasing Weatherization Uptake by 5 Percentage Points





## However, 6 Percent Participation is Low

# We can rule out some of the standard explanations for the energy efficiency gap:

- 1) Capital Constraints
- 2) Information Costs/Lack of Information
- 3) Split Incentive Problems

#### **Bottom lines:**

- It costs about \$1,000 per additional weatherized household in encouragement costs
- Results suggest that the hard-to-measure "process" costs of pursuing residential energy efficiency improvements are substantial



## **Data Collected**

#### For all households that applied for weatherization between February 2011 and May 2012, we collected:

- 1) Raw household energy consumption data
  - » Monthly energy consumption (natural gas and electricity) data from partner utility: 2008-2014.
- 2) Application and efficiency audit data obtained from implementing agencies
  - » Engineering estimates of baseline energy use, installation costs, and energy savings
  - » Which measures passed the cost-benefit analysis
- 3) Implementation data, including the cost of the specific measures implemented
  - » Work order and job report data



## **Pre-Experiment Energy Consumption**

	Experimental Encouraged	Experimental Controls
Winter gas (MMBtu)	10.40	10.38
	(5.36)	(5.23)
Summer gas (MMBtu)	2.84	2.79
	(3.87)	(1.93)
Winter elec (MMBtu)	2.12	2.10
	(1.17)	(1.20)
Summer elec (MMBtu)	2.17	2.17
	(1.30)	(1.28)
Total Households	7,549	21,339

Notes: Columns report average consumption, standard deviations are in parentheses.



## **Excerpt from a Detailed WAP Audit Report**

## Annual Energy and Cost Savings

Index	Recommended	Components	Heat	ing	Cooli	ng	BaseL	oad	Total
	Measure		(MMBtu)	(\$)	(kWh)	(\$)	(kWh)	(\$)	(MMBtu)
1	Infiltration Redctn		7.6	87	0	0	0	0	7.6
2	High Eff Furnace	H1	28.5	327	0	0	0	0	28.5
3	Kneewall Insulation	A4,A5	15.5	177	0	0	0	0	15.5
4	Lighting Retrofits	LT1,LT2,LT3,LT4,LT5	0.0	0	0	0	755	83	2.6
5	Sillbox Ins.	F1	0.8	10	0	0	0	0	0.8
6	Attic Ins. R-38	A1,A2	9.8	112	0	0	0	0	9.8
7	Wall Insulation	WL1,WL2,WL3,WL4, WL5,WL6	10.2	117	0	0	0	0	10.2

\*\*Audit-based modeling predicts this household will reduce annual heating costs by \$913.

# Impact of Weatherization on Household Energy Consumption and Cost-Benefit Analysis



## Weatherization Reduced Energy Consumption...





### ...But not as much as the Engineering Models Predicted





## No Evidence of a Rebound Effect

#### Average Indoor Temperature (°F)



- We independently verified thermostat settings and indoor temperature through follow-up visits.
- For both thermometer and thermostat readings, there was less than a 1 percent difference in temperature between weatherized and unweatherized households.



#### **Present Value of Discounted Savings**

	D	iscount Rate	
Time Horizon	3 Percent	6 Percent	10 Percent
10 Years	\$2,003	\$1,728	\$1,443
16 Years	\$2,949	\$2,373	\$1,837
20 Years	\$3,493	\$2,693	\$1,999
**Average Investm	ent in Efficiency M	easures: \$4 580	

» Savings-weighted average of engineers' estimates of measure lifespan: 16 years.

- » Table uses average retail energy prices in 2013 (in \$2013) to value energy savings.
- » No consideration of price volatility.



#### **Private Internal Rates of Return**

Time Horizon	NEAT Projection	Experimental Estimates	
10 Years	7.0%	-10.5%	
16 Years	11.8%	-2.2%	
20 Years	12.8%	0.3%	

» Column (1) uses NEAT projected energy savings

» Column (2) uses estimated energy savings + the upper bound of monetized benefits from increased warmth

» All calculations use 2013 prices; realized costs associated with efficiency measures only



#### **Social Internal Rates of Return**

Time Horizon	NEAT Projection	Experimental Estimates		
10 Years	-1.0%	-20.0%		
16 Years	5.4%	-9.5%		
20 Years	7.0%	-6.1%		

» Column (1) uses NEAT projected savings and emissions reductions (CO $_{\rm 2}$  at \$38/tonne)

» Column (2) uses estimated savings ad emissions reductions



#### **Cost per Ton of Avoided CO2**

	3%	5 Discount Rate	7% Discount Rate			
Time Horizon	NEAT Projection	Experimental Estimates	NEAT Projection	Experimental Estimates		
10 Years	\$29	\$552	\$61	\$701		
16 Years	-\$19	\$329	\$14	\$484		
20 Years	-\$35	\$255	<b>\$</b> 0	417		

» Column (1) uses NEAT projected energy savings

» Column (2) uses estimated energy savings + the upper bound of monetized benefits from increased warmth

» All calculations use 2013 prices; realized costs associated with efficiency measures only









## Conclusions

#### (1) Evaluate and Work to Improve the Engineering Models

» It appears that the engineering models systematically overstate potential benefits

# (2) Work to ensure that energy efficiency investments deliver as promised

» Conduct ex-post performance evaluations using state-of-the-art methods

(3) Rely on the most efficient approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions

(4) Further research is needed!

# **Bonus Findings:**

# "Measuring the Welfare Effects of Energy Efficiency Programs" (2016)

**Allcott and Greenstone** 



## **Overview of Field Experiment**

- Field experiment targets single-family homes in Madison and Milwaukee eligible for the Green Madison and Me2 energy efficiency programs.
- Experimental population of 102,000 households randomly divided into treated and control groups. 80,000 households are mailed two identical marketing letters. Letter variations include informational/behavioral treatments and audit subsidies.
- We track natural gas and electricity usage for almost all households in the experimental sample that receive an audit.





79,994 households randomly assigned to treatment



## **Over Half of Recommended Investments had Negative NPV**





### Large Empirical Shortfall in Post-Audit Energy Savings





### Simulated vs. Empirical Estimates of Post-Audit Savings



# **Future Research**



#### **The E2e Project**





Michael Greenstone University of Chicago



Chris Knittel



Catherine Wolfram UC Berkeley

#### 18 affiliated professors from top universities



John Deutch George P. Shultz Cass Sunstein

Susan F. Tierney Daniel Yates



### **Current E2e Project Work**

- (1) RCT of data analytic product for large-scale industrial customers (LightApp, CEC)
- (2) Big data study of EE investments in school (CA)
- (3) Information provision for automobile choice (Ford)

(4) Information provision among commercial firms (EnerNOC and Eversource)

(5) Many others...