
US ARRA / DOE WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(JULY 1, 2010-DECEMBER 31, 2011)

Prepared for
Office of Energy Conservation and Weatherization



March 2012



1528 Walnut Street, Suite 1414 / Philadelphia, PA 19102 / 215-545-0054

www.meliorgroup.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Background and Methodology	1
Research Highlights.....	3
Detailed Findings.....	6
Overall Experience	6
Home Energy Review	7
Installations.....	8
Inspection.....	9
Consumer Education.....	10
Significant Change over Time	12
Differences by Demographic Characteristics.....	14
Verbatim Comments.....	17
Demographics of Respondents.....	19
Appendix	
Participating Local Agencies/Cumulative Response Rates	
Survey Instrument	

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

In 2009, Pennsylvania's Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) received a three-year, \$252.8 million stimulus grant from the United States federal government's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for its Weatherization Assistance Program. The program is designed to help low-income households make home improvements in order to decrease energy consumption and cost. DCED contracts this work through 43 local weatherization agencies¹.

Understanding the impact of the program on Pennsylvania households is critical to a successful roll-out of the program. Therefore, in late summer 2010 DCED conducted a pilot household satisfaction survey via mail among Commonwealth residents whose homes were weatherized using funds from the US ARRA Department of Energy program from January 1 to June 30, 2010. The primary purpose of the survey was to measure consumers' overall satisfaction with the quality of the weatherization work and the professionalism of the employees -- and in some cases the contractors -- of the local weatherization agencies.

To continue to monitor household satisfaction with the weatherization process, DCED contracted with The Melior Group to conduct the household satisfaction study through March 2012. Melior used the same methodology (a mail survey) and components of the survey (questionnaire and cover letter) as were used in the pilot study. [An additional question regarding energy conservation behavior was added to the questionnaire beginning with weatherized April 1, 2011. A copy of the most recent survey instrument is included in the Appendix to this report.]

DCED provided Melior with electronic data files containing the names and addresses of a total of 17,988 participants in the ARRA weatherization program who had improvements completed between July 1, 2010 and December 31, 2011. After electronically scanning the lists through mailing software for sufficient mailing information and valid street addresses, a total of 17,131 records were deemed valid for mailing. The Melior Group was responsible for the mailing of the surveys at six intervals: January, 2011; March, 2011; April 2011; August 2011; November 2011; and February 2012.

By March 1, 2012 Melior had received a total of 7,044 usable questionnaires for a response rate of 41%. The margin of error is +/- 0.91% at 95% confidence.

Responses from all returned questionnaires were data entered into software specifically designed for marketing research tabulation and analysis. Each survey response was entered twice by hand and then entries were cross-checked and verified. If any discrepancy occurred, initial entries were deleted and the survey was re-entered and re-verified.

¹ A complete list of participating local agencies is contained in the Appendix.

Cross-tabulations were then developed, using the following analytics: completion date of weatherization, age of head of household, age of home, home type, and agency completing the work (as provided in the DCED HES ARRA database). All responses received for homes weatherized from July 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011 are included in the tabulations.

Data presented in this report is cumulative for the 18-month time period. The data presented is based only to respondents who answered each question. Due to rounding and multiple responses, some columns in tables may not total to 100%.

Reports discussing findings at points in time (from July 1 to December 31, 2010 and from January 1 to June 30, 2011) were provided under separate cover; statistically significant differences from the prior reporting periods are addressed in the section of this report titled "Significant Change Over Time."

RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS

Overall Participant Experience

- **The overall experience of the weatherization program has been a very positive one for program participants.**
- Statewide, participant satisfaction on all aspects of the experience **has remained steady or increased** over time.²
 - Three-quarters of participants or more are pleased with the improvements made to their homes, their contact with the agency, and the speed and quality of work completed.

² Changes in participant satisfaction were tracked at three points during the measurement period (July 1 – December 31, 2010; January 1 - June 30, 2011; and July 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011). See *Significant Change Over Time* on page 12 for more detail.

Performance on Key Metrics

The Melior Group, in conjunction with DCED, identified eight key metrics asked in the survey to capture program participant satisfaction with the entire weatherization experience.

- Participants gave high marks to each metric, but **most especially on metrics pertaining to the local agency’s employees**. The highest satisfaction ratings were given to “Friendly Employees” (89% strongly agree) and the “Installers of the Energy Efficient Products” (81% very satisfied).
- The success of this program is indicated by the high marks given about the overall experience with the program and the respondents’ satisfaction with the changes made to the home. Almost eight in ten (79%) of participants agree that the “entire experience was a good one” and three-quarters (75%) strongly agree that they are “satisfied with the changes made to my home.”

Performance on Key Metrics (%)

Key Metric	Cumulative Statewide Average	Change over Time*
Friendly Employees (Strongly Agree)	89	↔
Installers of the Energy Efficient Products (Very Satisfied)	81	↔
Entire Experience Was a Good One (Agree Strongly)	79	↑
Amount of Time It Took for Installation (Very Satisfied)	79	↔
Excellent Contacts with Agency’s Employees (Agree Strongly)	78	↑
Employees Knew What They Were Doing (Agree Strongly)	78	↑
Work Quality (Agree Strongly)	75	↑
Satisfied with Home Changes (Agree Strongly)	75	↑

*For more information, see “Significant Change Over Time” on page 12.

Research Highlights by Phase

In addition to providing feedback on the overall weatherization process, program participants also responded to a series of questions about each chronological phase of the process.

Home Energy Review:

Program participants were pleased with the energy review that was conducted in their homes. Virtually all believed the local agency's employees or their contractors were friendly. More than three-quarters of participants "agree strongly" that the employees knew what they were doing, could clearly explain to the participants what they were doing throughout the review and why. Importantly, more than nine in ten participants reported that a blower door test³ was performed.

Installations:

Participants were satisfied with the weatherization installation process. More than eight in ten participants were "very satisfied" with the workers who installed the products and their politeness. More than three-quarters of homeowners were "very satisfied" with how well the installers answered questions and communicated with them, the speed of the installation, and the materials and products used.

Inspection:

Over nine in ten participants (92%) indicated that an inspector visited their home to check on the changes that were made. Close to nine in ten (86%) reported that the energy improvements made to their homes passed state inspection standards⁴.

Demographics of Responding Participants:

More than half (54%) of the participants' homes were wood frame, with a full basement and an open joist attic; the majority (59%) resided in homes that were built after 1979. The average participant age was 62 years. Not surprising given the statewide population distribution, Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties were the most represented counties in the respondent pool.

Differences in Demographic Characteristics:

When the data is analyzed by key demographics and home characteristics, the only differences that emerge are those by age of participant. Seniors (65+) were more satisfied with the home energy review, the installation process, and the overall process than were younger respondents. Younger respondents were more likely than seniors to believe they needed more improvements to their home than were recommended.


³ A blower door test is a diagnostic tool to locate points of infiltration in a house and help prioritize air sealing measures. It can help determine levels of air leakage, indoor air quality, and amount of sealing to be performed.

⁴ Based on participants who reported an inspection took place and who signed the results form regarding the inspection (62% of total respondents).

OVERALL EXPERIENCE

THE OVERALL EXPERIENCE WITH THE WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM WAS POSITIVE FOR PARTICIPANTS. HOMEOWNERS FELT THE EMPLOYEES OF THE LOCAL AGENCIES UNDERSTOOD THEIR NEEDS AND THAT THE IMPROVEMENTS MADE WILL ULTIMATELY IMPROVE THE COMFORT AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF THEIR HOMES.


- © **Most program participants felt that the overall experience went well** – more than three-quarters strongly agreed that theirs was a *good experience* (79%), that the *local agency understood their needs* (78%), and that the *contact with the local agency was excellent* (78%). In addition, these participants did see the benefit that the improvements had on their homes. Eight in ten (each) strongly agreed that the improvements will make their *homes more comfortable* (80%) and *more energy efficient* (79%).
- © Of note is that three-quarters of participants (each) strongly agreed that they *felt good about the quality of the work performed* and were *satisfied with the changes made to their homes*.
- © A notably low four in ten program participants strongly agreed (39%) that their homes needed more energy improvements than what was recommended.



HOME ENERGY REVIEW

THE HOME ENERGY REVIEW PROCESS CONDUCTED BY LOCAL AGENCY STAFF WAS A POSITIVE EXPERIENCE FOR THE MAJORITY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.


- © **Clearly, the attitude and knowledge of the local agency staff contributed to the high ratings garnered for elements of the home energy review.**
 - Nine in ten participants felt that the local agency’s employees were *friendly* (89% “strongly agree”).
 - Eight in ten said that the local agency’s employees *helped them understand why the improvements were needed* (81% “strongly agree”) and *provided good explanations about the review process itself* (81% “strongly agree”).
 - More than three-quarters of participants felt the employees were *knowledgeable and clearly explained the home review results* (78% “strongly agree” for each statement).
 - More than nine in ten participants indicated that a *blower door test was performed* (93% agreed “strongly” or “somewhat”).



INSTALLATIONS

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS WERE GENERALLY VERY SATISFIED WITH ALL ASPECTS OF THE WEATHERIZATION INSTALLATION PROCESS.


- © **The attitudes of the employees and the efficiency with which the installations took place are aspects which garnered the highest satisfaction ratings.**
 - Almost nine in ten participants reported that they were “very satisfied” (88%) with the *politeness of the people who did the energy improvements*.
 - About eight in ten participants were “very satisfied” with the *people who installed the energy efficient products* (81%) and the *amount of time it took to install the energy efficient features* (79%).




INSPECTIONS

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO RECALL WHETHER OR NOT AN INSPECTOR VISITED THEIR HOMES, IF THEY WERE ASKED TO SIGN THE REQUIRED FORM FROM THE STATE ABOUT THE RESULTS OF THE INSPECTION AND TO INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT THE WORK PASSED INSPECTION STANDARDS. AS WELL, PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO RECALL THE NUMBER OF VISITS MADE TO THEIR HOMES BY A LOCAL AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE.


- © Over nine in ten program participants (92%) indicated that an inspector visited their homes to check on the changes that were made.



- © Of those whose homes were inspected, 96% noted that they were asked to sign a form required by the state on the results of the inspection.



- © Of the program participants who signed the required form, 86% reported that their home had passed state inspection standards. Just over one in ten (14%) said it needed further services.





- © The average number of visits to a home by a representative of the local agency was 3.4. This includes visits for the energy review, installations and inspection services. Notably, there were some local agencies whose average number of visits exceeded the statewide average – up to an average of 5 visits – potentially indicating less efficiency in their weatherization program practices.

CONSUMER EDUCATION

THE WEATHERIZATION PROCESS HAS HELPED TO CHANGE PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR. MOST PARTICIPANTS REMEMBERED THE CONSUMER EDUCATION EFFORTS AND SAID THEY HAVE MADE CHANGES TO SAVE ENERGY SINCE THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM.


- © For the most part, program participants recalled the consumer education efforts that agency staff had offered them. Nine in ten (90%) indicated that their local agency’s employees gave them information about actions they can take to save energy in the home. Of these, 89% said they received printed material.



Detailed Findings

© **The weatherization process has helped to change participant behavior.** For the most part, almost all program participants (98%) say that they have made changes to save energy since the weatherization improvements were made to their homes.

- The majority (88%) say that they *turn off lights and fans when not in the room*.
- Three-quarters of participants (76%) say they *set the thermostat lower at certain times of the day*.
- Additionally, about six in ten participants say they *do fuller loads of laundry* (59%) and *set heat lower in the winter* (58%).



[Note that this question was included and only asked of participants whose homes were weatherized from April 1 to December 31, 2011.]

SIGNIFICANT CHANGE OVER TIME⁵

OVERALL, IT IS NOTEWORTHY THAT PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION ON ALL METRICS HAS REMAINED STEADY OR INCREASED DURING THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD – NONE HAVE DECREASED.

Overall Experience

- © Participant satisfaction increased significantly over time on aspects regarding the *quality of the work, overall satisfaction with the changes made, overall experience, the local agency’s employees’ understanding of the homeowners’ needs, and belief that the energy improvements will make their homes more comfortable and energy efficient.*
- © Most notable is the percentage of participants who “strongly agreed” that their homes need more energy improvements than were recommended, which decreased 7% percentage points during the measurement period.

Agreement with Statements about the Overall Experience

(% Response, Strongly Agree)

Statements Showing Significant Change Over Time

	2010 Jul-Dec	2011 Jan-Jun	2011 Jul-Dec
I believe the energy improvements will help make my home more comfortable	78%	82%	82%
I believe the energy improvements will make my home more energy efficient	76%	81%	81%
Overall, I’d say my contacts with the local agency’s employees were excellent	77%	77%	81%
The local agency’s employees understood my needs	76%	77%	81%
Overall I feel like the entire experience was a good one	78%	79%	81%
Overall, I am satisfied with the changes to my home	72%	77%	77%
I felt good about the quality of the work	73%	76%	77%
I feel like my home needs more energy improvements than were recommended	43%	35%	36%

⁵ As part of the survey process, changes in participant satisfaction were tracked over time. The results of each survey question were tested for statistically significant differences between three statistically comparable survey periods (July 1 – December 31, 2010, January 1 – June 30, 2011, and July 1 – December 31, 2011). The data presented shows only those questions where significant differences occur.

Detailed Findings

Home Energy Review

- © Participant satisfaction increased significantly on four of the statements regarding the home review. Most notable are the increases in ratings for *employees provided good explanations about what they were going to do during the energy review, employees really knew what they were doing, and results of my home energy review were clearly explained to me* which each increased 5% percentage points during the measurement period.

Agreement with Statements about the Local Agency's Home Review

(% Response, Strongly Agree)
Statements Showing Significant Change Over Time

	2010 Jul-Dec	2011 Jan-Jun	2011 Jul-Dec
Employees provided good explanations about what they were going to do during the energy review	79%	82%	84%
Employees really knew what they were doing	76%	79%	81%
Results of my home energy review were clearly explained to me	75%	78%	80%
Employees seemed very interested in helping me learn how to save money on my energy bills	73%	76%	77%

Installations

- © Participant satisfaction increased significantly during the measurement period for three of the statements regarding the installation process. These are: *how well the installers answered questions and communicated* as well as the *quality of the building materials and products used*, each increasing 4 percentage points.

Satisfaction with Installation Aspects

(% "Very Satisfied" Ratings)
Aspects Showing Significant Change over Time

	2010 Jul-Dec	2011 Jan-Jun	2011 Jul-Dec
How well the people who did your energy improvements answered your questions	77%	80%	81%
Building materials and products used in your home	75%	78%	79%
How well the people who did your energy improvements communicated with you	76%	79%	80%

DIFFERENCES BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

THE ONLY DIFFERENCES BY DEMOGRAPHICS THAT EMERGE ARE THOSE BY AGE OF PARTICIPANT. SENIORS (AGE 65+) WERE MORE SATISFIED WITH THE HOME ENERGY REVIEW, THE INSTALLATION PROCESS, AND THE OVERALL PROCESS THAN WERE YOUNGER RESPONDENTS. YOUNGER RESPONDENTS WERE MORE LIKELY THAN SENIORS TO BELIEVE THEY NEEDED MORE IMPROVEMENTS TO THEIR HOME THAN WERE RECOMMENDED.

Overall Process

- © Seniors (age 65+) were significantly more likely than younger participants to “agree strongly” on all statements about the overall process. And, significantly fewer seniors than younger participants felt that their *homes need more improvements than were recommended*.

Agreement with Statements about the Overall Process

(% Strongly Agree Ratings)

	Statewide Average	Age of Respondent (Years)		
		<50	50-64	65+
The energy improvements will help make my home more comfortable	80	74	79	85
The energy improvements will make my home more energy efficient	79	73	77	83
The entire experience was a good one	79	71	76	85
Contacts with the local agency’s employees were excellent	78	71	77	83
Local agency’s employees understood my needs	78	72	76	83
Felt good about the quality of the work	75	67	72	81
I am satisfied with the changes to my home	75	67	74	81
My home needs more energy improvements than recommended	39	45	42	33

Detailed Findings

Home Energy Review

- © Seniors (age 65+) were significantly more likely than younger participants (<65) to “strongly agree” on almost every aspect of the home review, with the exception of use of a *blower door test*, where there were no real differences by age.

Agreement with Statements about the Home Energy Review

(% Strongly Agree Ratings)

	Statewide Average	Age of Respondent (Years)		
		<50	50-64	65+
Local agency’s employees were friendly	89	83	89	92
Home energy review used a blower door to test how air tight my home was	88	88	87	89
Local agency’s employees helped me understand why my home needed energy improvements	81	78	79	85
Local agency’s employees provided good explanations about what they were going to do during the energy review	81	78	80	85
Local agency’s employees really knew what they were doing	78	71	76	83
Results of my home energy review were clearly explained to me	77	72	75	82
Local agency’s employees seemed very interested in helping me learn how to save money on my energy bills	75	68	73	80
Local agency’s employees explained how I was selected for the review	67	62	65	71
Home energy review was completed soon after I was first contacted by the local agency	66	60	63	71

Inspections

- © There were no significant differences by age of program participant with regard to inspection of weatherization activities completed.

Detailed Findings

Installations

- Seniors (age 65+) were significantly more satisfied with the installation process than were younger participants. Most notable were the higher ratings of satisfaction that seniors gave on *building materials and products used*.

Satisfaction with Elements of the Installation Process

(% Strongly Agree Ratings)

	Statewide Average	Age of Respondent (Years)		
		<50	50-64	65+
Building materials and products used in your home	77	69	76	83
Amount of time it took to install your home's new energy efficient features	79	71	78	84
People who installed your energy efficient products	81	74	79	86
How well the people who did your energy improvements communicated with you	78	71	76	84
How well the people who did your energy improvements answered your questions	79	73	77	84
How polite the people who did your energy improvements were to you	88	81	88	93

Consumer Education

- Seniors (age 65+) were less likely than younger program participants to indicate that local employees gave them printed materials.

Receipt of Information about Energy Saving Actions

(% Response)

	Statewide Average	Age of Respondent (Years)		
		<50	50-64	65+
<i>Local Agency Employees Gave Information about Energy Saving Actions</i>				
Yes	90	90	90	90
No	10	10	10	10
<i>Given Printed Material about Energy Saving Actions</i>				
Yes	89	91	91	87
No	11	9	9	13

VERBATIM COMMENTS

HANDWRITTEN COMMENTS BY THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE PROGRAM WERE NOTED THROUGHOUT THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD. COMMENTS DISPLAYED IN THIS SECTION OFFER A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLING FROM MORE THAN 300 COMMENTS RECEIVED THROUGHOUT THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD. IN GENERAL, PARTICIPANT COMMENTS WERE VERY POSITIVE; HOMEOWNERS ARE APPRECIATIVE OF THE TYPE AND QUALITY OF THE WORK PERFORMED IN THEIR HOMES.

Overall Experience and General Comments

POSITIVE COMMENTS

The two comments below illustrate the types of positive feelings expressed by participants:

"I was very pleased with the work that was done. They also took the time to fix things I did not know about. I couldn't ask for a better group of guys to do the work. They were friendly and very professional. Thank you so much."

"I want to thank you all for everything you done for me. God Bless you all."

Examples of other positive comments include those pertaining to lower energy bills, more comfortable and energy efficient homes, and the quality of the work:

"I would like to thank everyone for all the help they gave me, my bill should be cut in half. Thank you."

"I have indeed realized savings to heat and cool my home."

"Thanks for all the help. My electric bill was lowered 40%."

"My heating bill was way down. This was the best thing to happen to me. Thanks."

"I want to say that since the work was done on my home my gas and electric bills have gone down drastically. Thank you so much!!"

"I have lived in this house 51 years, and this winter has been the most comfortable and I have used less oil than ever. Thank you so very much."

"The energy improvements made a difference in my home and I am very grateful for the service provided."

"Thank you for everything that was done for us. We really see a difference in the running of our AC and our electric bill."

Detailed Findings

"My home is more air tight/not chilly on cold and windy days."

"My home is much more 'tight' now due to weather stripping and caulking."

"House was easier to cool in summer and feels warmer in winter."

"I have more than noticed the difference the energy project has done on my home: it is excellent!! I am so pleased and grateful. This program needs to continue and grow. Thank you!!!"

"We commend all the people that helped us and we thank them from the bottom of our hearts. We are so much warmer this winter. Thanks."

"Inspectors and work crews were very polite. They explained things clearly. It was a pleasure to have workers in my home. They also cleaned up after themselves thoroughly."

The remaining comments pertain to types of specific issues that participants noted.

DISSATISFACTION WITH WORK QUALITY

"Very cold in living room -- door is still letting in very cold air and around windows need more insulation somehow. Floors are cold. Needed water pipes insulated also. Also, the person who worked on my hot water heater broke the latch on the door and I can't open or it will fall apart."

"Initial visit was informative, helpful and professional. Men who did the work had to come back several times, were dirty. Some work started, never finished. No follow up afterwards."

"My back door still has an air problem but I stuffed it with paper towels."

"CO2 detector given to us is faulty even after several battery changes."

"I was happy with everything done to my home. The only thing that I was unhappy with was the mess the workers left behind."

APPLIANCES NOT RECEIVED/IMPROVEMENTS NOT MADE

"I was disappointed. I needed a window and they would not give me one. Other people received a window when needed."


HAVE NOT REALIZED ENERGY SAVINGS

"The new furnace doesn't heat house as well as the old. House seems colder after all insulation done."


DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

This section describes the demographics of the responding program participants and characteristics of their weatherized homes as captured from the DCED HES ARRA database. The data below is based to the total responding sample of 7,044 program participants.

- © **House Type:** More than half (54%) of the homes in the respondent pool are wood frame, with full basement and open joist attic.




- © **Age of Head at Home:** The average age of the responding program participants is 62.0 years. Almost half of the survey respondents (46%) are over age 65, with another 30% age 50-64 and 24% under 50 years.



Detailed Findings

© **Age of Home:** About four in ten (41%) homes were built before 1979.



© **County:** Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties are the most represented counties.

- **11% representation:** Philadelphia County
- **6% representation:** Allegheny County
- **5% representation:** Delaware County
- **3% representation (each):** Berks, Bucks, Erie, Luzerne, Washington, and Westmoreland Counties
- **2% representation (each):** Beaver, Cambria, Clearfield, Dauphin, Lackawanna, Lancaster, Lawrence, Lehigh, Lycoming, Mercer, Monroe, Northampton, Northumberland, Schuylkill, and York Counties
- **1% representation (each):** Adams, Armstrong, Blair, Bradford, Bedford, Butler, Carbon, Centre, Chester, Clarion, Clinton, Columbia, Cumberland, Crawford, Elk, Fayette, Franklin, Huntingdon, Indiana, Jefferson, Lebanon, Mifflin, Montgomery, Perry, Snyder, Somerset, Venango, and Wayne Counties
- **<1% representation (each):** Cameron, Fulton, Greene, Juniata, McKean, Montour, Pike, Potter, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Tioga, Union, Warren, and Wyoming Counties
- **0% representation:** Forest County

**APPENDICES:
Participating Local Agencies
Survey Instrument**

Participating Local Agencies Cumulative Response Rate

Cumulative Response Rate by Agency

Agency Name	Records Provided	Not Mailed⁶	Total Mailed	Number Returned	Response Rate	Percentage of Total
Action Housing, Inc.	1348	78	1270	512	40.3%	7.3%
Armstrong County Community Action Agency	258	21	237	106	44.7%	1.5%
Berks Community Action Program	511	15	496	195	39.3%	2.8%
Blair County Community Action Program	230	0	230	108	47.0%	1.5%
Bucks County Opportunity Council, Inc.	412	14	398	194	48.7%	2.8%
Carbon County Action Committee for Human Services	229	17	212	103	48.6%	1.5%
Center for Community Action	267	5	262	98	37.4%	1.4%
Central Pennsylvania Community Action Program Inc.	433	7	426	202	47.4%	2.9%
Commission on Economic Opportunity of Luzerne County	556	27	529	244	46.1%	3.5%
Community Action Agency of Delaware County	1084	75	1009	346	34.3%	4.9%
Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley, Inc.	675	15	660	261	39.5%	3.7%
Community Action Inc.	203	5	198	95	48.0%	1.3%
Community Action Partnership of Cambria County	188	4	184	61	33.2%	0.9%
Community Action Partnership of Mercer County	291	12	279	123	44.1%	1.7%
Dauphin County Weatherization	381	10	371	151	40.7%	2.1%
Energy Coordinating Agency	835	77	758	291	38.4%	4.1%
Erie County Housing Authority	228	5	223	111	49.8%	1.6%

⁶ Not mailed if record contained an insufficient or incorrect address.

Agency Name	Records Provided	Not Mailed ⁷	Total Mailed	Number Returned	Response Rate	Percentage of Total
Greater Erie Community Action Committee	306	3	303	103	34.0%	1.5%
Housing Authority of the County of Beaver	363	15	348	114	32.8%	1.6%
Housing Authority of the County of Butler	98	0	98	54	55.1%	.8%
Housing Development Corporation of Lancaster County	763	34	729	254	34.8%	3.6%
Indiana County Community Action Program, Inc.	237	25	212	76	35.8%	1.1%
Lawrence County Community Action Partnership	337	26	311	145	46.6%	2.1%
Lycoming/Clinton Counties Commission Community Action, Inc.	379	12	367	152	41.4%	2.2%
Monroe County Weatherization Program	342	27	315	132	41.9%	1.9%
Montgomery County Community Action Development Commission	251	6	245	108	44.1%	1.5%
Northern Tier Community Action Corp.	208	12	196	103	52.6%	1.5%
Northumberland County Weatherization	379	23	356	165	46.3%	2.3%
Northwest Pennsylvania Weatherization, Inc.	257	11	246	105	42.7%	1.5%
Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation	1500	29	1471	454	30.9%	6.4%
Redevelopment Authority of the County of Fayette	368	19	349	109	31.2%	1.5%
Schuylkill Community Action	277	16	261	139	53.3%	2.0%
Scranton/Lackawanna Human Development Agency	370	30	340	163	47.9%	2.3%
SEDA-Council of Governments	594	32	562	260	46.3%	3.7%

⁷ Not mailed if record contained an insufficient or incorrect address.

Agency Name	Records Provided	Not Mailed⁸	Total Mailed	Number Returned	Response Rate	Percentage of Total
South Central Community Action Program Inc.	382	6	376	161	42.8%	2.3%
Steel Valley Opportunities Industrialization Center	398	18	380	143	37.6%	2.0%
Tableland Services Inc.	260	25	235	96	40.9%	1.4%
Tableland Services - C	139	0	139	61	43.9%	.9%
The Trehab Center ⁹	311	32	279	147	52.7%	2.1%
Warren/Forest Economic Opportunity Council	156	13	143	69	48.3%	1.0%
Wayne County Redevelopment Authority	218	19	199	89	44.7%	1.3%
Weatherization, Inc.	210	7	203	101	49.8%	1.4%
Westmoreland Housing Authority	464	25	439	205	46.7%	2.9%
York County Weatherization	292	5	287	134	46.7	1.9%
Statewide Total/Average	17988	857	17131	7043	41.1	100.0%

⁸ Not mailed if record contained an insufficient or incorrect address.

⁹ Trehab Center completed its ARRA-funded work as of June 30, 2011.

Survey Instrument

Home Energy Review Customer Satisfaction Survey

HOME REVIEW: A local agency in your county contacted you about receiving a home energy review to see how much energy your home uses. These first few questions ask about your home energy review.

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The local agency's employees explained how I was selected for the review.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees were friendly.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees helped me understand why my home needed energy improvements.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees provided good explanations about what they were going to do during the energy review.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The home energy review was completed soon after I was first contacted by the local agency.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The home energy review used a blower door to test how air tight my home was.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees really knew what they were doing.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The results of my home energy review were clearly explained to me.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees seemed very interested in helping me learn how to save money on my energy bills.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

INSTALLATIONS: These next questions ask about the energy improvements that were actually made to your home.

How satisfied were you with...?

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Strongly Dissatisfied
The building materials and products used in your home?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The amount of time it took to install your home's new energy efficient features?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The people who installed your energy efficient products?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
How well the people who did your energy improvements communicated with you?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
How well the people who did your energy improvements answered your questions?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
How polite the people who did your energy improvements were to you?	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4



INSPECTION: These final few questions ask you about your experience with the entire energy efficiency project.

1. After your energy improvements were made, did an inspector visit your home to check on the changes that were made?

- Yes → 1a. **IF YES:** Did the inspector ask you to sign a form about the results of the inspection?
- No
 - Yes → 1b. **IF YES:** Did the inspection form say that your home passed
 - No 1b. **IF YES:** or that it needed further services?
 - Passed
 - Needed further services

2. How many times were you visited by a representative of the local agency, including the energy review, energy improvement, and inspection services?

Number of times: _____

3. Did any local agency employees give you information about actions you can take to save energy in your home?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- Definitely no



3a. **IF YES:** Were you given any printed material about how you can save energy in your home?

- Yes
- No

4. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Overall, I'd say my contacts with the local agency's employees were excellent.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
The local agency's employees understood my needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Overall, I felt like the entire experience was a good one.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
I felt good about the quality of the work.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
I believe the energy improvements will help make my home more comfortable.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
I believe the energy improvements will help make my home more energy efficient.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
I feel like my home needs more energy improvements than were recommended.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Overall, I am satisfied with the changes made to my home.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4

5. Since the energy improvements were made to your home, what changes have you made, personally, to save energy in your home? [Check all that apply]

- Set thermostat lower at certain times of the day
- Turn down the hot water temperature
- Do fuller loads of laundry
- Turn off lights and fans when not in room
- Other (please specify) _____
- Unplug electronics not in use
- Set air conditioning higher in the summer
- Set heat lower in the winter
- Haven't done anything

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Please return the survey using the postage paid envelope provided.