


ornl

**OAK RIDGE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY**

LOCKHEED MARTIN



FILED

OCT 24 2003

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Progress Report of the National Weatherization Assistance Program

Linda G. Berry
Marilyn A. Brown
Laurence F. Kinney



MANAGED AND OPERATED BY
LOCKHEED MARTIN ENERGY RESEARCH CORPORATION
FOR THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Exhibit B

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831; prices available from (423) 576-8401, FTS 626-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions or authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

*Progress Report of the
National Weatherization
Assistance Program*

Linda G. Berry
Marilyn A. Brown
Laurence F. Kinney*

*Synertech Systems Corporation

September 1997

Prepared for the
Office of State and Community Programs
Office of Building Technology, State and Community Programs
U. S. Department of Energy
Under the Direction and Supervision of
Jeanne Van Vlandren
Director, Office of State and Community Programs

Prepared by the
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831
Managed by
Lockheed Martin Energy Research Corp.
for the
U. S. Department of Energy
Under Contract DE-AC05-960R22464

INCREASES IN PROGRAM ENERGY SAVINGS AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (1989-1996) AT A GLANCE

ENERGY SAVINGS IN GAS-HEATED HOMES

<u>First-year savings</u>	<u>Savings per dwelling</u>	<u>Percent of total gas consumption</u>	<u>Percent of gas space heat consumption</u>
1989 (PRISM analysis of billing data for homes in the representative national sample that heat with gas)	17.3 Mbtu	13.0%	18.3%
1996 (national estimate derived from Metaevaluation of 17 state-level evaluations of savings in gas-heated homes)	31.2 Mbtu	23.4%	33.5%

VALUE OF GAS ENERGY SAVINGS (in 1996 dollars)

	<u>First year</u>	<u>20 years</u>
1989	\$107/dwelling	\$1,707/dwelling
1996	\$193/dwelling	\$3,047/dwelling

COST EFFECTIVENESS

	1989	1996
Program Benefit/Cost Ratio ^a	1.06	1.79
Installation Benefit/Cost Ratio ^b	1.58	2.39
Societal Benefit/Cost Ratio ^c	1.61	2.40

^a The program benefit/cost ratio compares the discounted value of the energy savings to total program costs with an assumed lifetime of 20 years and a discount rate of 4.7%.

^b The installation benefit/cost ratio compares the discounted value of energy savings to installation (labor and materials) costs with an assumed lifetime of 20 years and a discount rate of 4.7%.

^c The societal benefit/cost ratio compares the discounted value of both energy and nonenergy benefits (such as employment and environmental impacts) to total program costs with an assumed lifetime of 20 years and a discount rate of 4.7%.

CONTENTS

The National Weatherization Evaluation of the 1989 Program Year and the Metaevaluation of 1996 are described in two ways in this summary document. The text on the right-hand (odd) pages summarizes the results of the two evaluations conducted by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The photographs and explanations on the left-hand (even) pages illustrate weatherization operations and tactics.

Even Pages

At A Glance Summary	ii
Remarks by President Clinton and Secretary Peña	iv
1996 Increases in Program Performance	2
Single-Family Detached Homes	4
Advanced Air Sealing	6
Mobile Homes	8
Row Houses	10
Large Multifamily Buildings	12
Doors and Windows	14
Sources of Weatherization Funding	16
Geography of Utility Programs	18
Profiles of Six Coordinated Programs	20
1996 Metaevaluation	22
1996 Metaevaluation Findings	24
1996 Performance Improvements/Nonenergy Benefits	26
Summary of 1994 Regulatory Changes	28
Air Infiltration/Exfiltration	30
Housing Rehabilitation	32
Dense-Pack Cellulose	34
Energy Savings in 1989 and 1996	36
Nonenergy Impacts	38
Health and Safety	40
Single-Family Detached Homes	42
Distribution Systems	44
Domestic Hot Water	46
Mobile Home Measures	48
Heating Systems	50
Large Multifamily Measures	52
Targeting Savings Potential	54
Advanced Energy Audits	56
Blower Doors	58
Attics	60
Relationship of Costs to Savings	62
Targeting Needy Households	64
High Savings from Attic Insulation	66
Basements	68
Keys to Success	70
Putting It All Together	72
References	74
Acknowledgments	76

Odd Pages

I. Overview	1
II. Program History	5
III. The Scope of Weatherization	7
A. Types of Measures Used	7
Measures for Mobile Homes	9
Measures for Row Houses	11
Measures for Large Buildings	11
B. Sources of Funds	15
C. Uses of Funds: DOE Sets the Pace	19
D. Utility Partnerships	19
IV. Metaevaluation Methods and Results for 1996	23
A. Three Methods Show Trend Toward Higher Savings	23
B. Reasons for Increases in Program Savings	27
C. Nonenergy Benefits of Weatherization	27
D. Cost-Effectiveness Results	29
E. Conclusions from the 1996 Metaevaluation	31
V. National Evaluation Methods and Results for 1989	33
A. National Evaluation Process and Publications	33
B. Diversity of Dwellings and Agencies	35
C. Program Benefits	37
National Energy Savings in 1989	37
Nonenergy Benefits	39
D. Cost Effectiveness	43
Program Costs	43
National Cost Effectiveness	45
E. Performance by Climate Region in 1989	47
The Cold Climate Region	49
The Moderate Climate Region	51
The Warm Climate Region	53
VI. Response to Evaluation Findings	55
A. Savings Associated With Specific Program Practices	55
B. Promising Management Practices	59
C. The Warm Climate Weatherization Initiative	61
VII. Remaining Opportunities	63
A. Additional Investments per Home	63
B. Targeting the Neediest Households	65
VIII. The Future of Weatherization: The Next Steps	67
A. Service Delivery Procedures	67
B. Weatherization Measures	69
IX. Conclusions	71
Significant Findings	73

"I have seen first hand how many jobs weatherization programs create and also how much good they can do . . . A lot of this weatherization work for poor people, especially for a lot of elderly people who are stuck in these old houses that have holes in the walls . . . or in the floor, not only makes them warmer in the winter and cooler in the summer, they also save money on their utility bills. [Weatherization] conserves energy and puts more money in the pockets of people who have just barely enough to get by. So I strongly support [weatherization programs] . . . It's a kind of hard sell in the Congress now because the price of oil is so low and energy is so cheap--it's much cheaper in America than it is in any other major country. But if you just have enough to get by on, [if] you're living on a Social Security check or you're living on a minimum wage, [utility bills] are still very, very expensive and a big part of your budget."

President Clinton's remarks concerning the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program at the Summer of Service Forum held at the University of Maryland, August 31, 1993.

"By implementing energy-saving measures in low-income homes, the Weatherization Program works to correct the disproportionate energy burden faced by low-income Americans who often face the difficult choice between buying food or fuel. Consequently, weatherization helps low-income residents gain financial independence, thus offering a hand-up not a hand-out."

Excerpt from Secretary Peña's testimony before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, May 13, 1997.

Progress Report of the National Weatherization Assistance Program

I. OVERVIEW

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Weatherization Assistance Program (the Program) has long served as the nation's core program for delivering energy conservation services to low-income Americans. The Program reduces the heating and cooling costs for low-income families -- particularly the elderly, persons with disabilities, and children -- by improving the energy efficiency of their homes and ensuring their health and safety. In combination with closely related programs sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and supplemental funding from other sources, the DOE Weatherization network is operated by state entities in all 50 states and is managed by the DOE Office of State and Community Programs (OSCP). This network has weatherized more than *four and one-half million* households since its inception in 1976.

In 1990, DOE sponsored a comprehensive evaluation and assessment (the National Evaluation) of the Weatherization Program under the supervision of Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL). The National Evaluation concluded that the Program meets the objectives of its enabling legislation and fulfills its mission statement. Specifically, it







- saves energy,
- lowers fuel bills, and
- improves the health and safety of dwellings occupied by low-income people.

In addition the National Evaluation concluded that, based on 1989 data, the Program has been achieving its mission in a cost-effective manner, with benefits exceeding costs according to all three standards employed by the evaluators. Annual savings for households heated with natural gas, the predominant home heating fuel, were estimated to average 17.3 Mbtu per weatherized dwelling. This constituted a reduction of 18.3 percent in natural gas consumption for space heating, or a 13.0 percent reduction in natural gas consumption for all end uses. The National Evaluation also pointed to several promising approaches and practices that could further improve the overall performance of the Program in future years.

A 1996 Metaevaluation of 17 state-level evaluations (the Metaevaluation) suggested that improved practices have indeed produced 80 percent higher average energy savings per dwelling today as compared to the measured savings in 1989. The Metaevaluation, which developed a regression-based national estimate of savings, indicated that average savings in homes using natural gas as the primary heating fuel were 31.2 Mbtu, which was 33.5 percent of natural gas space heating consumption. The savings constituted a reduction of 23.4 percent in consumption of natural gas for all end uses.

1996 INCREASES IN PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

The Metaevaluation in 1996 showed an 80% increase in energy savings, greater reductions in CO₂ emissions, and increased cost effectiveness since 1989




Cost-Effectiveness Results for Gas-Heated Homes: Benefit/Cost Ratios* from Three Perspectives in 1989 and 1996

	Program	Installation	Societal
National Evaluation 1989	1.06	1.58	1.61
Metaevaluation Results 1996	1.79	2.39	2.40



*See page 29 for an explanation of the calculation procedures and a definition of the three perspectives.

With the increased energy savings, the value of annual avoided energy costs per gas-heated household also increased from an average of \$107 to \$193, and the benefit/cost ratio for the Program rose from 1.61 to 2.40.




Although the Weatherization Program has successfully accomplished a significant portion of its mission, additional activities need to be undertaken to meet the ongoing need for low-income weatherization. The Department of Health and Human Services has reported that, based on Energy Information Administration data, there were 29.1 million households with incomes near or below the federal poverty guidelines for Weatherization eligibility in 1994. These households were spending an average of 14.9 percent of income for residential energy. This compares to an average expenditure of 3.6 percent of income for residential energy by non-low-income households. The most recent Residential Energy Consumption Survey indicates that 1.5 million households experienced heating interruptions because of their financial situations during one year.

From Program Year (PY) 1985 through PY 1995, the Program's network of 1,100 local agencies weatherized an average of 200,000 dwellings per year. Substantial budget reductions for Weatherization Assistance in PY 1996 and PY 1997 have forced a reduction in the number of agencies performing weatherization and have cut the number of dwellings weatherized to approximately 70,000 annually. This downsizing is the most recent challenge to carrying out the Program's mission in an efficient and effective manner.




SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOMES

This series of photographs illustrates the age and diversity of single-family homes weatherized by the Program.




The weatherization job on this house will include foundation wall repair.




This roofline suggests complex paths for air leakage.



Patterns of snow and ice indicate a leaky, poorly insulated attic.





A good candidate for wall insulation.



This concrete block house is typical of homes that are weatherized in rural Georgia.

II. PROGRAM HISTORY

Most Americans were dramatically affected by the 1973 oil crisis. Huge home heating bills were a heavy burden on some household budgets, sinking many families into debt. Low-income families in cold climate states, who received high heating bills, suffered the most severe consequences. In Maine, where nine out of ten homes are heated with oil, state officials and community action agencies worked with homeowners and renters to seal house leaks (where costly heated air poured out and cold air entered). Retrofitting cut bills and saved oil. Out of this effort, the Nation's first weatherization program was born. Congress created the DOE's Weatherization Assistance Program in 1976 under Title IV of the Energy Conservation and Production Act.



The Program initially emphasized emergency and temporary measures, including caulking and weatherstripping of windows and doors, and low-cost measures such as covering windows with plastic sheets. By the early 1980's, the emphasis had turned to more permanent and more cost-effective measures, such as installing storm windows and doors and insulating attics. In 1984, regulations were passed to allow Weatherization Assistance funds to be spent on space and water heating system efficiency changes. In 1985, spending for the replacement of defective furnaces and boilers was approved.

In the 1990's, the trend toward emphasizing more cost-effective measures continued with the development and widespread adoption of advanced audits. Advanced audits are now used in 37 states. By 1996, the Program's performance had improved significantly because of the implementation of many of the recommendations of the National Evaluation and of other DOE-sponsored research. In spite of funding reductions, technical advances produced 80 percent higher energy savings per dwelling. Increases in energy savings were achieved through better training, audit tools, and management practices with little increase in cost.


Among the new DOE regulations implemented in 1994 were changes that promote the use of advanced audits, and that permit the use of cooling efficiency measures such as air conditioner replacements, ventilation equipment, and screening and shading devices. In warm climates, where cooling costs may be higher than heating costs, cooling measures can now be installed when appropriate. Barriers to performing work on heating systems and mechanical equipment have also been removed. The requirement that 40 percent of Program funds be spent on materials is waived in states that adopt approved advanced audits, thus ensuring audit-driven cost-effectiveness tests of investments. With increased flexibility, better measure selection procedures, and more advanced diagnostics (such as blower-door directed air sealing), the Program now installs more cost-effective combinations of measures tailored to the needs of particular dwellings and climates.

ADVANCED AIR SEALING

In the last several years, it has been shown that some previously ignored areas of dwellings can be potent sources of convective losses. If such losses are found and treated, they offer high potential for savings. As illustrated in the figures, these include interstices between floors, spaces between the conditioned envelope and such buffer zones as porches and garages, and areas between old and new portions of dwellings. The blower door, in conjunction with a gauge that measures differences in pressure, is a valuable tool in identifying leakage to or from these areas, helping both in identifying the magnitude of the leakage and in verifying when such measures as the blowing of high-density cellulose or other air-sealing measures will solve the problem. Weatherization agencies that integrate these tests and tactics into routine operations achieve excellent savings.




As revealed by a blower door and a pressure gauge in a test that takes only several minutes, the area under this porch is directly connected to the envelope through floor joists between the first and second floor. High-density insulation is being used to air seal this largest hole in the dwelling.



Note the infiltration area under the bathroom sink, which connects to the attic via a stud cavity in an interior wall.



Air sealing a plumbing chase on the first floor that corresponds with both attic and basement. Sealing holes in inconspicuous and hard-to-get-to places are frequently those which result in good, cost-effective weatherization jobs.




III. THE SCOPE OF WEATHERIZATION

A. Types of Measures Used

A variety of weatherization measures are used by DOE's Weatherization Program to improve the energy efficiency of dwellings occupied by low-income people. Although audit methods to optimize the type and amount of weatherization measures have improved, the set of measures that is typically considered has remained relatively constant between 1989 and 1996. Detailed results from the National Evaluation indicated that the following measures were those most commonly used in 1989:

Air leakage control was the most common type of weatherization measure installed in single-family and small multifamily dwellings. General caulking and weatherstripping around windows and doors were by far the most common of these measures at the time of the National Evaluation. Today, blower-door directed air sealing and air leakage control measures for distribution systems are used frequently. These techniques reduce air leakage much more effectively.

Advanced Audits Select More Insulations, Fewer Storm Windows



Insulation was the next most common type of energy conservation measure installed. Attic insulation was either used for the first time or added to existing insulation in the majority of homes receiving insulation. Wall insulation was installed in less than 20 percent of homes. Today, with the use of advanced audits, attic and, especially, wall insulation are installed much more frequently.

Energy-efficiency improvements to water heater systems were made in 56 percent of the weatherized homes in 1989. Most of these retrofits involved tank or pipe insulation. Today an even larger majority of homes receive water heater measures. In addition, water temperatures are reduced and low-flow showerheads are added in a higher percentage of homes.

Energy-efficiency improvements to windows and doors occurred in 42 percent of homes weatherized at the time of the National Evaluation. Additional window and door work was conducted primarily for repair purposes. By far, the majority of these improvements involved the addition of storm windows (36 percent) or the replacement of entire windows (37 percent). Advanced audits are unlikely to recommend storm windows or window or door replacements in most homes. Therefore, these measures are installed less frequently today.

Nearly one-third (30 percent) of the homes weatherized had energy-efficiency improvements made to their space heating systems. Most of these improvements involved tune-ups, during which heating systems were cleaned, controls adjusted, and filters replaced. Increased attention to space heating measures probably characterizes the Program

MOBILE HOMES


Due to the economic realities of affordable housing, many low-income families live in mobile homes.



Evaporative chillers (swamp coolers) often mean large leaks.



This home used over \$1,000 of fuel oil per heating season before weatherization tightened it up and installed a more efficient oil burner.



New doors and windows sometimes save energy, but air sealing ducts in mobile homes are usually a more cost-effective retrofit.



Mobile homes with poor foundations often develop major structural problems.



Very poor insulation causes major problems with mobile homes built before HUD's energy standards were adopted in 1976.




Skirting under a mobile home is not as important for the heating bill as belly board insulation, which can be blown in by weatherization crews.

today because barriers to performing work on heating systems and mechanical equipment have been removed. Distribution systems also now receive increased attention for both heating and cooling applications. In addition, new regulations implemented in 1994 allow for the use of **cooling efficiency measures** including air conditioner replacement, ventilation equipment, and screening and shading devices. These measures enable the Program to more effectively address the energy efficiency needs of homes in warm climates.

The requirement that 40 percent of Program funds be spent on materials is waived in the 37 states that have adopted approved audits, thus ensuring that the most cost-effective package of investments will be selected. These and other Program updates allow increased flexibility to select the most appropriate measures for specific dwellings in particular regions.

Measures for Mobile Homes

There are seven million "manufactured homes" in the United States and the number is growing. Well over half were constructed before 1976, when HUD initiated its mandatory national standards on manufactured home construction. These older units, which tend to be occupied by lower-income people, suffer from a variety of ills. Energy problems stem from shoddy construction, improper site set ups, and poor maintenance. As a result, many are leaky, uncomfortable, and have high energy bills.



**Mobile Home Heating System
Distribution System**

The profile of weatherization measures installed in mobile homes differed from that of other housing types. In 1989, mobile homes were much less likely to receive any type of insulation than the average home (20% vs. 62%), and nearly all mobile home insulation consisted of floor insulation. Blowing the space between

the belly board and the floor of older mobile homes with insulation, in combination with attention to air sealing and duct leakage, solves many conductive and convective problems so that less heat is wasted.

Blower-door-assisted air sealing is becoming a more prominent part of mobile home weatherization. Quite frequently, major leaks are found in unobvious places, such as main electrical boxes, plumbing chases, and ducts. The combination of leaks in mobile home ducts and belly boards results not only in low heating and cooling efficiency, but also in uncontrolled air leakage. This wastes energy and can affect indoor air quality, raise moisture levels, and cause structural deterioration.

In 1989, water heating measures were installed less frequently (48% vs. 56%) in mobile homes than in other types of structures, while window and door measures (50% vs. 42%) were installed more frequently. Installation of inside storm windows covering leaky jalousie-type win-

Although most dwellings weatherized are single-family detached structures, other dwelling types are also common.

ROW HOUSES (SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED DWELLINGS)

Row houses, which predominate in many older American cities in the Northeast, can be extremely wasteful of energy. Leaky flat roofs cause falling ceilings and massive air leakage.




The space under these bay windows may cause more energy waste than the windows themselves.



The space above porch ceilings is often connected to the inside of the front wall.




A solid exterior may conceal inner decay.



Leaky roofs pose big problems.





The consequences of unrepaired roof leaks.



Newly missing next-door neighbor causes major air infiltration.

Weatherized Row Houses and Mobile Homes Are Concentrated in the Moderate Climate Region

dows was especially common in mobile homes. Most mobile homes received one or more measures that were especially suitable for this type of dwelling, including underpinning, skirting, cool seals on the roof, and belly board insulation.



An audit designed specifically for mobile homes is being developed for the Program's use. This advanced audit will improve the auditor's ability to select the most cost-effective packages of measures for mobile homes.

Measures for Row Houses

Row houses tend to be among the most wasteful and leaky housing stock in the country. Accordingly, extensive air sealing measures were undertaken on virtually all weatherization jobs performed in 1989. The work is complicated in that some air leakage may be conditioned air from an adjoining house, a fact that affects both energy use and indoor air quality. In addition, part of the inherent architectural charm of row houses, including such details as porches and bay windows, can mask subtle convective and conductive problems. Thus, air sealing these homes requires special care and sealing techniques.


In 1989, "first time" attic insulation was installed at higher rates in row houses than in any other type of housing, pointing out their poor thermal condition. In addition, roof repairs were used more frequently for row houses than for other housing types. A major source of energy waste in older row houses occurs when their flat roofs leak water, ultimately causing ceilings to fall. This allows stack-effect infiltration to have devastating effects on the fuel bill. As explained on page 30, stack-effect infiltration results from the rising of warm air in the interior, pulling in air at the bottom of the conditioned

envelope and exhausting warm air at the top. Pressure differences at the top and bottom are at their maximum, which makes holes in these areas critical to repair.


Measures for Large Buildings

The weatherization of large multifamily buildings, those with five or more units, presents local agencies with challenges different from those presented by smaller dwellings. Most of the work is accomplished in distressed urban areas where both buildings and much of the surrounding communities suffer from maintenance problems and even abandonment. Consequently, facade facelifts in the form of window repair and replace-


LARGE MULTIFAMILY BUILDINGS



This large building in the Bronx was almost ready for abandonment when weatherization played a key role in its restoration.



This is a large multifamily dwelling in Holyoke, Massachusetts, which was weatherized by HAP Inc., from Springfield, Massachusetts.




This is the back of a four-story building in Brooklyn. After air sealing, boiler, and window replacements, the energy expenditures for this building are approximately 40 percent less than the previous year's fuel expenditures.

ment has been the focal point of most large multifamily operations, accounting for 80 percent of material expenditures in Program Year 1989 in which 20,000 units in multifamily buildings were weatherized (MacDonald, 1993). In rental units, which dominate in multifamily buildings, local agencies have special safeguards in place to ensure that energy saving benefits are passed along to the tenant. In addition, a significant landlord financial contribution to the project is often required.

The diversity of housing stock and approaches to weatherization found in single-family housing also holds true in the multifamily sector, where the unique features of the urban environment require especially creative responses. This diversity is illustrated by findings from three case studies summarized below (Kinney et al., 1994).

50 Percent of Multifamily Weatherizations Take Place in New York and the Rest in Other Large Cities



Multifamily Weatherization Takes Place in Large Cities

The New York City weatherization operation, with its 22 local agencies, accomplishes over half of the multifamily weatherization work done nationally by the Weatherization Program. The need for such services is apparent. New York City has 126,000 multifamily buildings with more than 1.9 million apartments. An average apartment uses over 865 gallons of fuel oil (or its equivalent) annually for heat and domestic warm water, a startlingly large number for the climate and average apartment size. This inefficiency makes multifamily buildings very good targets for cost-effective conservation retrofits.

The trend in current multifamily weatherization operations in New York City is to concentrate on the heart of the building, the boiler room, and on its arteries, the distribution system. Poorly designed, controlled, and maintained heating systems are a major culprit in causing some buildings to consume five to six times as much energy as their neighbors. In response, professional energy auditors using state-of-the-art testing equipment and EA-QUIP analytical software undertake building audits that result in detailed work orders. These include computations of costs and benefits of all retrofit measures anticipated and specifications of each element of the proposed work. These work orders, most of which are accomplished by the staff of the New York City Weatherization Coalition, are instrumental both in ensuring that resulting weatherization work meets rigorous standards and in leveraging funding from building owners.


In Chicago, the City government administers the Weatherization Program, serving single-family, smaller, privately owned multifamily buildings (typically three and four story walk-ups), and larger public housing projects managed by the Chicago Housing Authority. Because of the Program's excellent reputation for quality performance, a waiting list of over one year for weatherization services has resulted. Buildings on the waiting list are served on a first-come, first-served basis.

Past weatherization measures were concentrated at the apartment level with strong emphasis on storm and replacement windows.


DOORS AND WINDOWS

Although most dwellings require air sealing, insulation, furnace retrofits, and at least minor repair work, exactly which tactics to employ is a decision that depends on the circumstances of the dwelling, the funding of the agency, and the **know-how of the auditor and crews**. The National Evaluation, plus testimony from experienced practitioners in the field, has shown that cookbook procedures employed in the early days of the Program—weatherstripping, caulking, and storm windows—were only marginally effective. Audits using advanced diagnostics direct crews to the real problems in a dwelling and usually result in more cost-effective work.

Window and door repair is a necessary part of most weatherization operations, but many agencies have abandoned the practice of routinely installing storm windows and exterior doors because they have found these measures do not save as much as many other less costly conservation measures.



A new lock set is only marginally cost effective as a weatherization measure (it can aid in air sealing), but since it supplies a measure of security, this repair can be the most important one for a client. Sometimes a new door performs a similar security function.




When doors and frames are in this condition, weatherization jobs include replacement of both.

Although this storm window is still functional, missing window trim and a rotten sill plate have done substantial damage. The sash weight is visible from the outside of this dwelling.



Glass replacement is inevitably time consuming but necessary. Most agencies rebuild the sash to ensure good air sealing.

When window frames are out of square in an older home—usually due to foundation problems—some agencies try to repair the primary window and install new storm windows.



This basement window will be replaced by fixed-board insulation sealed in place by foam.

The new policy in Chicago is to weatherize whole buildings, which allows for working on heating systems before treating thermal losses in apartments. Frequently, the new policy results in the replacement of large, inefficient boilers and the integration of modern electronic controls. In all cases, whenever major measures such as boiler replacements or large-scale window replacements are undertaken, building owners are required to bear 50 percent of the costs. In smaller buildings where tenants can control their own heat, digital thermostats are frequently installed.


Weatherization agencies in Minnesota weatherize about 1,000 large multifamily units each year, most of which are in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. These units range from row houses to 20-story high-rise buildings, but the most common are two- and three-story frame walk-ups with brick facades. Larger building work concentrates on boiler repair, controls, and distribution systems, with little emphasis on window repair work or even air sealing. Smaller buildings are air sealed (with emphasis on attic bypasses) and insulated like single-family dwellings. Multifamily work is guided by information from fuel bills and instrumented audits.

Weatherization of large buildings in our nation's largest cities is a complex process. There is a growing cadre of technically competent engineers and contractors that is involved in the Weatherization Program's large multifamily retrofits. These individuals practice such important crafts as making single-pipe steam systems work efficiently. When their practical wisdom is communicated clearly to building supervisors, systems tend to be maintained much better, with the consequence that savings endure. These long-term energy savings can play a key role in the revitalization of distressed neighborhoods in our nation's larger cities.

B. Sources of Funds


To implement the Weatherization Program, DOE provides money to State Weatherization Agencies, more than 80 percent of which are located within executive departments responsible for human services, community development, or economic development. In turn, these agencies allocate funds to local agencies, of which 81 percent are private, nonprofit Community Action Agencies. Most of the remaining entities are local or county governmental agencies and Native American tribes. The weatherization work is done by employees of these local agencies or by contractors.

Although other organizations fund and implement low-income weatherization programs, DOE has been the dominant source of funding for low-income weatherization. Between 1978 and 1996, DOE provided 45 percent of total funding. More investment was made in low-income weatherization in the late 1980's than in earlier years, and considerably less in the 1990's than in the 1980's. More homes have been weatherized in cold states than in warm states, which partly reflects the formula used to allocate DOE's funds in the 1980's. That formula



Three Major Sources of DOE Weatherization Program Funds, 1978 to 1992

SOURCES OF WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM FUNDS PY 1978-1989



Definitions of Program Types:

DOE/WAP = funds spent under DOE Weatherization Program rules and regulations.




HHS/WX = funds spent under HHS LIHEAP guidelines and not DOE's rules and regulations.

Utility = funds spent in utility programs independent of DOE's rules and regulations.

Other = funds spent in state weatherization programs or other independent programs.

Major Funding Sources for the DOE Weatherization Program Decreased Sharply in 1996

weighted heating degree days much more heavily than cooling degree days. In 1995, the funding formula was changed to increase the proportion of funding going to warm climate states. The intent of the changes was to provide warm climate states with a greater share of the funding while protecting the Program capacity of the states with cooler climates. The revised formula emphasizes all residential energy expenditures (including heating and cooling costs). It provides states with a fixed base amount derived from the FY 1993 allocation. Funds in excess of those needed to meet the base amounts are allocated according to the revised formula. On a national level, DOE funding for its 1996 program totaled \$111.5 million, which compares to DOE funds of \$214.8 million in 1995. This nearly 50% reduction in funding in one year's time was the result of budget cuts passed by the 104th Congress.




In the 1980s a major source of weatherization resources was the **Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)**, administered by HHS. Since 1982, states have had the flexibility to allocate up to 15 percent of LIHEAP funds (now 25 percent after receiving a waiver) to energy conservation measures. Total LIHEAP funding peaked in 1987 and has since declined. In 1996, LIHEAP funds were about 72% of what they were in 1989. In spite of the reduction in total LIHEAP funding, however, the amount of LIHEAP funding spent on weatherization has actually increased. In 1989, \$106.1 million in LIHEAP funds were spent on weatherization. In 1996, \$134.0 million in LIHEAP funds were used for weatherization. This increase in LIHEAP contributions to weatherization, during a time when its overall budget declined, suggests that weatherization is seen as an especially effective way of producing a long-term reduction in the energy burdens of low-income households.


A third major source of weatherization money in the 1980s was the **Petroleum Violation Escrow (PVE) Fund**. These funds came from legal penalties assessed against oil companies convicted of violating price controls. The exhaustion of PVE funds devoted to low-income weatherization on a one-time basis was the most dramatic cause of the decline in total weatherization funding from 1987 to 1992. State program managers indicated that total funding for low-income weatherization dipped 30 to 40 percent between 1990 and 1994, primarily because of the exhaustion of PVE funds.

Utilities provided 9.6 percent of funding available for low-income weatherization between 1978 and 1989. Utility programs and funding were responsible for 22 percent of all units weatherized during that 12-year period. Among the 49 utilities that spent \$418 million on energy measures between 1978 and 1989 the average investment per unit was only about one-third as much as in the DOE Weatherization Program. A small amount of funding for low-income weatherization came

THE GEOGRAPHY OF UTILITY PROGRAMS



Geographic Distribution of Utility Expenditures on Low-Income DSM Programs in 1992



Geographic Distribution of Utility Expenditures per Low-Income Household in 1992

from miscellaneous other sources, including owners of rental housing weatherized under the Program and state weatherization programs, which in some cases emphasized comprehensive home repair or heating system retrofits.

The impending restructuring of the electric utility industry poses uncertain prospects for continued utility funding of low-income programs. Past programs to assist low-income households with energy efficiency have been funded through regulated utility rates, but obtaining low-income funding may become more difficult in a more competitive and less regulated industry structure. The Weatherization network has been actively presenting low-income interests and concerns to policymakers in state regulatory commissions and legislatures. As a result of these efforts, restructuring programs in states such as California and Massachusetts, which have been the first to initiate restructuring, have continued funding for low-income energy efficiency. The Weatherization network also continues to be successful in securing funding from utilities in other states where the pace of change is slower and traditional regulation remains firmly in place.

C. Uses of Funds: DOE Sets the Pace

Regardless of its source, most funding for low-income weatherization has been spent according to DOE's Weatherization Assistance Program rules. By law, all funds appropriated to the Program by DOE are governed by DOE rules and regulations. In contrast, funds appropriated by LIHEAP can be spent by that program's much broader guidelines, which have allowed, for example, greater expenditures on furnace and boiler retrofits and replacements. Similarly, utility low-income DSM programs and


state funding for weatherization can be spent as the funding agency deems appropriate.

In practice, 76 percent of all low-income weatherization money spent in the 12-year period between 1978 and 1989 was guided by DOE rules and procedures. Before 1989, about 12 percent was spent in programs under LIHEAP regulations. Today the percentage of funds spent under LIHEAP regulations has risen to 35 percent. DOE's central role in directing weatherization activities nationwide is underscored by the fact that the vast majority of non-DOE funds have been channeled through the Program. This distribution process also indicates the importance of the new Program rules in guiding future weatherization activities.


D. Utility Partnerships

Utility programs made significant contributions to the effort to weatherize low-income dwellings. According to Power et al. (1992), 102 utility low-income energy-efficiency programs operated in 1989, with investments totaling \$97 million (or \$109 million, expressed in 1992 dollars). By 1992, these numbers had increased to 132 programs with an annual expenditure of \$141 million (Brown et al., 1994).


**FULL SCALE WEATHERIZATION
BY PROGRAM PY1978-PY1989**



PROFILES OF SIX COORDINATED PROGRAMS



First-Year Energy Savings of Six Coordinated Programs



Costs of Six Coordinated Programs by Source of Funding

Utility programs tend to be concentrated in a few states where weatherization services for low-income customers have been mandated by regulatory bodies. On average, utility-sponsored low-income programs invest about one-third as much per dwelling as the DOE Program. Unlike the DOE Weatherization Program, many of the electric utility programs for low-income customers focus primarily on lighting and appliance measures. Water-heating measures (particularly low-flow showerheads) are common to both gas and electric utility low-income programs. "Major" measures such as attic, wall, and floor insulation and storm windows are less common in these utility programs than in DOE's Weatherization Program.

By pooling utility and government resources in "coordinated" programs, utilities are able to offer more comprehensive weatherization to their low-income customers. Three types of utility low-income partnerships exist, which involve varying degrees of coordination between government and utility cosponsors (Brown and Hill, 1994).

•**Parallel Programs.** In these cases, the local weatherization agency operates two parallel programs--one funded by government grants and the other funded by utility contracts. The utility simply employs the agency as a subcontractor to deliver energy-efficiency services to low-income households. The utility-funded program is coordinated in the sense that some of the same staff and equipment are used by both programs.

•**Supplemental Programs.** These programs use utility funds to supplement the agency's government-funded weatherization program, with no changes to the operation of that program. The result is more weatherized homes, more comprehensive weatherization, or both.


•**Coupled Programs.** These programs employ a combination of utility and government funds to deliver weatherization services as part of an integrated program that is distinct from the agency's preexisting government-funded program. This type of program has the potential to outperform parallel and supplemental programs by taking advantage of the unique capabilities of each cosponsor.

Each of these types of coordinated programs provides utilities with access to trained weatherization professionals and associated equipment, which is often quite sophisticated and conducive to high-quality weatherization. In many regions of the country, there is a scarcity of such capability. In addition, community action agencies are often uniquely qualified to tackle the problems associated with substandard shelter.

Brown and Hill (1994) conducted case studies of six coordinated low-income weatherization programs. All six programs achieved impressive levels of energy savings. For the three coordinated gas programs, annual savings ranged from 409 to 635 ccf (hundred cubic feet) per dwelling, and for the three electric utility programs, annual savings ranged from 2,282 to 3,323 kWh (kilowatt-hours) per dwelling. Costs for the six coordinated programs ranged widely from \$1,539 to \$4,950 per dwelling. This range of costs is high relative to the amount typically spent in the DOE Weatherization Program, which averaged \$1,550 per dwelling in 1989. In

1996 META-EVALUATION

Thirteen States Provided Results for the 1996 Metaevaluation



Estimated National Program Energy Savings in 1989 and 1996 in Homes that Heat Primarily with Natural Gas

	Mbtu of Natural Gas Saved per Dwelling	Percentage Reduction in Natural Gas Consumption for Space Heating	Percentage Reduction in Natural Gas Consumption for All End- Uses
National Evaluation Results for 1989	17.3	18.3%	13.0%
Metaevaluation Results for 1996 Based on Regression Model	31.2	33.5%	23.4%

addition, it is much higher than the typical investment levels of stand-alone utility-operated low-income weatherization programs.

Need to Update National Estimate of Savings

- National Evaluation estimated savings for homes weatherized in 1989.
- Program performance has improved during the last seven years.

Objectives of Metaevaluation

- Locate state-level evaluations
- Review evaluations
- Organize findings
- Develop method of applying state-level findings to nation
- Estimate regression models
- Apply model results to national inputs to develop national estimate

Ten States With One Evaluation

- Colorado (1993-1995)
- Indiana (1991-1992)
- Kansas (1992)
- Nebraska (1994)
- New York (1990)
- North Carolina (1990)
- North Dakota (1990-1992)
- Texas (1991-1992)
- Wisconsin (1992)
- Wyoming (1996)

Three States With More Than One Evaluation

- Iowa (1992-93) and (1995)
- Ohio (1990-91), (1993-94), and (1994-95)
- Vermont (1992-93) and (1993-94)

The utilities and community action agencies managing each of the six coordinated programs indicated that the benefits of coordination far outweighed the costs.

IV. META-EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS FOR 1996

A number of state Program offices conduct periodic evaluations of the energy savings produced by their efforts. With the help of these offices, a metaevaluation of 17 state-level evaluations conducted since 1990 was recently completed for DOE by Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The state-level evaluation results were used to produce the estimate of national savings for 1996 discussed below (Section A). This estimate was developed by summarizing and integrating the findings of the state-level evaluations (Berry, 1997). The results are only for homes heating with natural gas, the only fuel for which all of the state-level evaluations provided results. Three of the thirteen states with evaluations conducted since 1990 had evaluated their Program more than once in the last seven years.


The approach chosen to estimate the 1996 national savings was to use regression modeling to develop the best linear equation for predicting savings. The data from the 17 recent state-level evaluations (1990-1995) were used to develop this predictive tool. Then the parameters of the best predictive model were applied to the appropriate average national input values for each predictor in the equation. For example, the average heating degree days for the available evaluations was 5,942. Nationally, the population weighted 30-year average of heating degree days is 4,499. Therefore, the national average of 4,499 heating degree days was used as the input to the regression model used to predict national savings. For the most part, national input values were taken from the National Evaluation, which was based upon a representative national sample. Details of model development and of the rationale for selecting specific national input values are given in Berry (1997).

A. Three Methods Show Trend Toward Higher Savings

Regression Analysis. The key finding of the Metaevaluation's regression analysis is that, in the last seven years, improved practices have produced 80% higher average energy savings per dwelling. The most recent comprehensive evaluation of the Program was based on an analysis of changes in pre- and post-weatherization energy consumption for a representative national sample of homes weatherized in 1989. This National Evaluation found that dwellings that heated primarily with natural gas, which made up over 50% of the national sample, had average savings of 17.3 Mbtu per dwelling, which was 18.3% of space heating consumption, or 13.0% of the total consumption of natural gas for all end

1996 META-EVALUATION FINDINGS

**Predictive Value of Fit for the Three-Variable
(Pre-Weatherization Consumption, Year, Audit Type)
Regression Model**



**Literature Review Findings on Central Tendencies
Characterizing the Percentage of Energy Savings in 1981-1989
and in 1990-1996**

	n	Median	Mean	Interquartile Range	Range
1980-89	25	12%	13%	12-16%	6-23%
1990-96	17	20%	22%	18-24%	13-34%

Upward Trends in Energy Savings in Ohio, Vermont, and Iowa

Ohio			Vermont			Iowa		
Year	Mbth	Percent	Year	Mbth	Percent	Year	Mbth	Percent
1990-91	20.5	12.6%	1992-93	18	17.8%	1992-93	25.2	18.6%
1993-94	29.3	20.4%	1993-94	24.5	20.1%	1993-94	n/a	n/a
1994-95	31.0	22.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	1995	27.3	21.7%


uses (Brown, Berry, Balzer, and Faby, 1993). The Metaevaluation of state-level evaluations of the Program, which developed a regression-based national estimate of savings, indicated that savings in 1996, in homes using natural gas as the primary heating fuel, were 31.2 Mbtu, which was 33.5% of natural gas space heating consumption, or 23.4% of the total consumption of natural gas for all end uses (Berry, 1997).

Literature Review Findings. In addition to the regression modeling results summarized above, two additional types of evidence (from a literature review and from comparisons within the same state over time) demonstrate the trend toward increased Program energy savings.

Six years before conducting the 1996 Metaevaluation, ORNL completed a similar task in preparation for the National Evaluation. That task was a literature review (which was completed in 1990) and is presented in Section 1.4 of Brown et al. (1993). Comparisons of findings from the 1990 and 1996 literature reviews show a trend toward increased savings. The 1990 literature review concluded that the state-level evaluations available at that time (covering the years of 1981-1989) showed typical energy savings (expressed as the percentage reduction in the total consumption of the primary heating fuel) of between 12% and 16%, with a range of 6% to 23% savings in various locations. The 1990 literature review also concluded that a number of demonstration projects indicated that the Program could potentially achieve much greater savings (25% to 40%). The similarity in findings from that literature

review (i.e., expected average savings of 12% to 16%) and the results of the National Evaluation (13.0% of the total consumption of natural gas for all end uses or 18.3% as a percentage of consumption for space heating) created confidence that a review of the state-level evaluations conducted since 1990 would also yield a reasonably accurate current estimate of national savings. The 1996 review of state-level evaluations covering weatherizations performed in 1990 through 1996 showed typical savings of 18% to 24% (expressed as the percentage reduction in the total consumption of the primary heating fuel), with a range of savings from 13% to 34%.

At Same Levels of Pre-Weatherization Consumption, Most Evaluations Completed Since 1990 Show Higher Savings Than in 1989



1996 PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS/NONENERGY BENEFITS

Some Reasons for Improved Program Performance in 1996

Shift From Priority Lists to Advanced Audits

- No advanced audits in 1980's
- 37 States used advanced audits in 1996

More Use of Blower-Door Directed Air Sealing

Increased Targeting of Dwellings With High Potential for Savings

Revised DOE Regulations That Promote More Cost-Effective Tailoring of Measures to the Specific Needs of Individual Dwellings and Regions

- Removed barriers to heating system efficiency measures
- Allowed cooling measures
- Promoted use of advanced audits

Nonenergy Benefits are Numerous and Important

Affordable Housing

- maintain or enhance residential property values
- extend the lifetime of low-income housing
- decrease homelessness and mobility

Improving Comfort, Health, and Safety

- improve livability and thermal comfort of homes
- prevent fires
- reduce CO hazards from defective and unvented heating systems

Impacts on Household Budgets

- increase resources for nonenergy expenditures

Utility Benefits

- reduce utility arrearages
- reduce utility terminations and reconnections

Employment and Economic Benefits

- increase economic output
- increase employment
- generate tax revenues


Environmental Benefits

- reduce emissions of combustion by products

Trends within States. Three states for which savings could be compared over time -- Iowa, Ohio, and Vermont -- all showed significant increases in savings. The trend toward increased savings over time in these states is unmistakable.

B. Reasons for Increases in Program Savings

Several reasons exist for the trend toward higher savings. Three important technical improvements are discussed below.



Advanced audits had not yet been introduced in 1989. Today 37 states use them. Two demonstration studies, one in New York and one in North Carolina, have shown the superior energy savings achieved with the use of advanced audit procedures (New York State Energy Research and Development Authority and New York State Department of State, 1993; Sharp, 1994). In North Carolina the introduction of an advanced audit increased heating energy savings from 23% to 33%. In New York, savings increased from 25% to 34%.

Blower-door directed air sealing is another important technology that has contributed to the trend toward increased savings. In 1989 only a few states used this technology; now most do. With the use of blower doors to guide air sealing, investments in air infiltration reduction will produce higher savings.

Targeting high-energy consumers is a Program management technique that produces higher savings. More agencies use this practice today. Many studies have shown that high pre-weatherization consumption is the best predictor of high energy savings (Brown et al., 1993; Columbia Gas of Ohio, 1995; Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, 1994, Berry, 1997).

Additional reasons to expect a trend toward higher energy savings relate to the implementation of Program regulations designed to capture opportunities for improvement. Among the **revised DOE regulations** issued in 1994 were changes that promote the use of advanced audits and permit the use of **cooling efficiency measures** such as air conditioner replacements, ventilation equipment, and screening and shading devices.

C. Nonenergy Benefits of Weatherization

Most of the state-level evaluations did not address the issue of the nonenergy benefits of weatherization at all. Only one, the Iowa evaluation, gives much attention to nonenergy benefits. The Iowa evaluation notes that the potential benefits of weatherization include:

- improved client safety and health;
- reduced utility collection costs and write-offs;
- improved property value, longevity, and maintenance of affordable housing;

SUMMARY OF 1994 REGULATORY CHANGES

Summary of 1994 Regulatory Changes Governing DOE's Weatherization Program

	OLDRULES	NEWRULES ^a
Weatherization materials and measures	Services provided include: -air sealing -caulking and weather stripping -furnace and boiler tune-up, repair, and replacement -cooling system tune-up and repair -replacing windows and doors and adding storm windows and doors -insulating attics, walls, and foundations -client education	Added the following: -replacement air conditioners -ceiling, attic, and whole-house fans -evaporative coolers -screening -window films
Materials requirement	40% of funds must be spent on materials	Waiver of 40% requirement may be granted if an advanced audit procedure is used
Rental unit requirements and protections	Owner permission 66% of eligibility required for large multifamily units and 50% eligibility required for duplexes and four-unit buildings Weatherization benefits to accrue primarily to low-income tenants	Expanded renters protection -benefits and no rent increase even for renters paying for energy through rent -States may require financial participation from landlords
Eligibility and targeting	Up to 125% of poverty, or the state may elect to use LIHEAP eligibility criteria Special consideration given to the elderly and persons with disabilities	Special consideration also given to families with young children
Reweathering	Allowed reweatherization of unit partially weatherized from September 30, 1975 to September 30, 1979	Cut-off date for reweatherization extended to September 30, 1985

^aThe final version of the new DOE rulemaking was published in the Federal Register of March 4, 1993.

- reduced environmental impacts from energy production and transport; and
- additional economic activity and jobs for Iowa.

Only the economic activity and job creation benefits were quantified in the Iowa study. Using an input-output analysis, the study concluded that each million dollars of Program spending produces about \$240,000 worth of additional economic activity. This additional economic activity supports 5.6 additional jobs (The Statewide Low-Income Collaborative Evaluation (SLICE) of Iowa, 1994). The Iowa study did not assign a specific dollar value to any additional nonenergy benefits. However, it concluded that even conservative estimates of these nonenergy benefits would significantly increase the cost effectiveness of the Program.

In the National Evaluation, an effort was made to quantify the dollar value of some nonenergy benefits. The highest dollar values were assigned to employment and environmental benefits (Brown, Berry, Blazer, and Faby, 1993). The methods used to estimate the dollar value of the range of nonenergy benefits varied. These methods are explained in Chapter 6 of Brown et al. (1993). The final estimate of the net present value of all of nonenergy benefits that were monetized was set at \$976 per dwelling in 1989 dollars. This is the estimate that is used in the next section to estimate Program cost effectiveness from the societal perspective, which is the only perspective that includes nonenergy benefits.


D. Cost-Effectiveness Results

Because of the higher average national savings estimated for the Program in 1996, cost-effectiveness estimates also increased. The National Evaluation used three perspectives¹ for estimating cost effectiveness:

- the program perspective, which compares energy benefits to total costs;
- the installation perspective, which compares energy benefits to installation costs; and
- the societal perspective, which compares energy and nonenergy benefits to total costs.

¹ In the National Evaluation, three perspectives were used to develop benefit/cost ratios: the program perspective, the installation perspective, and the societal perspective. The program perspective compares the discounted value of energy savings to total program costs (including labor, materials, overhead, administrative, and all other categories of both fixed and variable costs). The installation perspective compares the discounted value of energy savings to installation-related program costs (i.e., installation labor and materials costs). The societal perspective compares the discounted value of both energy and nonenergy benefits (such as employment and environmental benefits) to total program costs (including labor, materials, overhead, administrative, and all other categories of both fixed and variable costs). All three perspectives used an assumed measure lifetime of 20 years and a discount rate of 4.7%. To make the 1996 benefit/cost ratios comparable to the National Evaluation ratios the same definitions and assumptions were used.

AIR INFILTRATION/EXFILTRATION



Very leaky houses are uncomfortable and have high energy bills, so finding and curing infiltration problems is a high priority for weatherization operations. The rate of air infiltration in a home depends on many factors, the most important being the size and location of holes in the thermal envelope and the difference in temperature between inside and outside. Warm air inside a dwelling gives rise to "stack effect" infiltration as it tries to escape from the top of the envelope, sucking in cold air at the bottom. Wind and leaks in duct systems can also have a major effect on infiltration, but these effects are not usually as constant over the heating season as is stack-effect infiltration, which is at its worst on coldest days.

Note that in the middle of the heated envelope there is a neutral pressure zone where neither infiltration nor exfiltration occurs due to stack effect. This explains why caulking and weatherstripping in mid-envelope tends to save less energy than careful attention to the bottom and top of the envelope, where these natural driving forces are greater.

**Benefit/Cost Ratio for Gas-Heated
Dwellings in 1989 and 1996**

PERSPECTIVE	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
PROGRAM	Energy Savings Only	All Costs
	1989 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.06 1996 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.79	
	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
INSTALLATION	Energy Savings Only	On-Site Installation Costs
	1989 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.58 1996 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 2.39	
	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
SOCIETAL	Both Energy and Nonenergy Benefits	All Costs
	1989 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.61 1996 Benefit/Cost Ratio = 2.40	
	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED


E. Conclusions from the 1996 Metaevaluation

All aspects of the Metaevaluation point to improved performance during the past seven years. In spite of funding reductions, technical advances have produced 80% higher energy savings on a per dwelling basis. Increases in energy savings were achieved through better training, audit tools, and management practices with little increase in costs. The trend toward increased savings was demonstrated in three ways:


- *regression modeling results obtained from a metaevaluation of 17 state-level evaluations;
- *comparisons of a 1990 and a 1996 literature review of state-level evaluations; and
- *comparisons of within state savings over time.

Each of these approaches pointed to significant increases in Program energy savings. As a result, Program benefit/cost ratios are even higher today than they were in 1989, with a 1996 societal benefit/cost ratio of 2.40.

The DOE will continue to monitor on-going state-level evaluation efforts and will conduct several cooperative state-level evaluations in the next few years. Results of additional state-level evaluations will be incorporated into the metaevaluation framework as they become available. Periodically updated metaevaluation results will be used to track Program performance.




Housing Rehabilitation



This rehabilitated home had new windows installed with HUD funds, and insulation installed with DOE funds.



Before Weatherization



After Weatherization

This dilapidated home which received an impressive retrofit is one example of the substandard housing local agencies often serve. Holes in roofs, walls, and ceilings, and broken windows are common problems. Leveraged funds from non-DOE sources are often used to meet housing rehabilitation needs.


V. NATIONAL EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS FOR 1989

A. National Evaluation Process and Publications

The National Weatherization Evaluation was a comprehensive evaluation of the Weatherization Assistance Program, which was designed to accomplish the following goals:

- estimate energy savings and cost effectiveness;
- assess nonenergy impacts;
- describe the weatherization network;
- characterize the eligible population and resources; and
- identify factors influencing outcomes and opportunities for the future.

The National Weatherization Evaluation's
Three Climate Region



Working groups with more than 30 nationally known evaluation specialists and conservation program professionals were formed to help define these goals. They gave guidance to the ORNL evaluation team in planning five major studies and in reviewing draft reports. The five studies were as follows:

Single-Family Study--this study estimated the national savings and cost effectiveness of weatherizing single-family and small multifamily dwellings that use natural gas or electricity for space heating.

Fuel-Oil Study--this study estimated the savings and cost effectiveness of weatherizing single-family homes in nine northeastern states that use fuel oil for space heating.


Multifamily Study--this study described the measures used, resources employed, and challenges faced in weatherizing large multifamily buildings.

Network Study--this study characterized the weatherization network's leveraging, capabilities, procedures, staff, technologies, and innovations.

Resources and Population Study--this study profiled low-income weatherization resources, the weatherized population, and the population remaining to be served.

DENSE-PACK CELLULOSE

Powerful blowing machines make the job of installing cellulose insulation more efficient.




Installing cellulose at high density has been found to be a powerful technique for installing insulation and achieving air sealing at the same time. Many crews find that the infiltration rates of some houses can be cut in half without using a tube of caulk. The secret is careful installation of high-density cellulose in wall cavities (and other places where it really counts) with a tube inserted directly where the insulation needs to go--and using power blowing machines to pack it in tightly.

Installing insulation as the snow flies.



The small tube at the top is snaked into wall cavities, then slowly withdrawn as insulation fills them up. The result is a very tight fill.



Preparation, insulation, and cleanup keeps two weatherization team members working for most of a day.



Wall preparation. Shingles are positioned for fast reattachment after insulation blowing.

The findings from each of these studies were documented in a series of eleven reports published between 1990 and 1994. References to these reports are at the end of this document.

B. Diversity of Dwellings and Agencies

Perhaps the most striking finding of the comprehensive National Evaluation was the diversity among local weatherization agencies across the country. Some agencies weatherized 15 homes in a year; others weatherized thousands. Some agencies achieved savings of 30 to 40 percent of pre-weatherization consumption. Others produced no measurable savings. Some agencies employed state-of-the-art procedures, used a variety of funding and technical resources, and performed sophisticated self-evaluations. Others followed the same procedures year after year, did not evaluate their impacts, and relied entirely on DOE for funding. With the downsizing of the Program in the last few years, many areas previously served by the smaller agencies have been incorporated into larger agency service areas.


The housing stock addressed by the Program also is diverse. Most low-income people live in homes built when energy was not an expensive commodity. Poor insulation and leaky construction have wasted energy from the start, and, inevitably, aging makes structures more energy inefficient, more expensive to heat, and often cold, unsafe, and unhealthy. Among the dwellings weatherized in 1989, 39 percent were more than 50 years old. On the other hand, only 12 percent were less than 10 years old.

Dwellings can be classified into five types. Each type has unique weatherization needs.


Single-family detached homes were the dominant type of structure weatherized by the Program in 1989 (representing 58 percent of the total). Half of these single-family detached units heated primarily with natural gas, and only 10 percent heated with electricity. Elderly occupants resided in 40 percent of these houses, a higher concentration than for any other dwelling type. The vast majority of these houses (73 percent) were owner-occupied.

Single-family attached dwellings (often called row houses) comprised the smallest housing-type category (3 percent of the weatherized population). Almost all were centrally heated (93 percent). As a class, these were the oldest buildings, with a mean age of 56 years. They also tended to have higher-income occupants and were located almost entirely in the moderate region.

Mobile homes comprised 18 percent of the weatherized population. They were by far the "newest" units, with an average age of only 17 years. These homes were more likely than any other housing to be heated with a nonmetered fuel (mainly propane) and were 78 percent owner-occupied. Mobile homes were occupied by individuals with the lowest incomes.



Year of Construction of Dwellings Weatherized in 1989



Types of Dwellings Weatherized in 1989


ENERGY SAVINGS IN 1989 AND 1996

Net average annual energy savings (by fuel type) per dwelling for dwellings weatherized in 1989 (based on a billing analysis of a representative national sample of homes)

Estimated average annual savings per dwelling heated with natural gas in 1996 (based on a regression model developed from 17 state-level evaluations of natural gas savings conducted between 1990 and 1995)

Primary heating fuel	Percent of space heating consumption	Percent of total fuel consumption	Net savings (Mbtu/year)
Natural gas 1989 National Evaluation	18.3%	13.0%	17.3 Mbtu/year
<i>1996 Metaevaluation (estimated from regression model)</i>	33.5%	23.4% ✓	31.2 Mbtu/year
Electricity	35.9%	12.2% ✓	18.9 Mbtu/year
Fuel Oil (Northeast)	17.7%	17.7%	22.4 Mbtu/year
All fuels*	18.2%	13.5% ✓	17.6 Mbtu/year

*includes estimates for propane, wood, kerosene, and other fuels



Small multifamily dwellings (those located in buildings with 2 to 4 units) comprised 12 percent of the weatherized population. They were heated primarily with natural gas (73 percent) and were typically renter-occupied (82 percent). Compared to single-family detached homes, they were only half as likely to have an elderly or handicapped occupant.

Large multifamily dwellings comprised 9 percent of the weatherized population and represented a distinct building type. They were located almost entirely in the moderate and cold regions (approximately half are located in New York City), and they tended to be older than the single-family dwellings weatherized by the Program (52 percent vs. 38 percent were built before 1940). This type of dwelling is, for the most part, centrally heated by gas, electricity, or fuel oil.

C. Program Benefits

National Energy Savings in 1989

During Program Year (PY) 1989, the Program weatherized 198,000 single-family or small multifamily homes, resulting in net energy savings during the following year equivalent to 601,000 barrels of oil, or almost 1,650 barrels of oil per day.² Over the estimated 20-year lifetime of the weatherization measures, net savings from Program expenditures in 1989 are projected to be **69.7 trillion Btus, the energy equivalent of 12 million barrels of oil**. These estimates are based on measured reductions in the use of primary heating fuels after weatherization. Savings of supplemental heating fuels were not measured.

Gas-heated dwellings accounted for 50 percent of the dwellings weatherized by the Program in 1989. It is estimated that the Program, which addresses only space heating and sometimes water heating energy efficiency, saved 18.3 percent of the gas used for space heating. This represented 13.0 percent of total gas use, including water heating, cooking, and other gas-appliance uses. Variations in savings by dwelling type were significant. For example, single-family detached dwellings (the dominant dwelling type served by the Program) saved over 50 percent more natural gas per dwelling than did mobile homes.

Electrically heated homes represented only 10 percent of the dwellings weatherized under the Program during 1989. Weatherization of these dwellings saved 35.9 percent of the electricity used for space heating. This represented 12.2 percent of total electricity use. As with gas-heated homes, both single-family detached and small multifamily dwellings saved more electricity than did mobile homes.


Equivalent 1989 Savings in Barrels of Oil

per day	1,650
per year	601,000
20-year lifetime	12 million

²A barrel of oil is equal to 42 U.S. gallons and represented approximately two weeks of petroleum consumption per American in 1990. The equivalent number of barrel(s) of oil is, of course, a concrete way of expressing the 3,370 billion British thermal units (Btus) saved during 1990 due to weatherization work on single-family dwellings during Program Year 1989. In reality, of course, the savings occurred not only in gallons of oil, but also in hundreds of cubic feet (ccf) of natural gas, kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity, and other units of fuel. Where electricity is concerned, savings reported include the energy required to generate electricity at its source.

NONENERGY IMPACTS

Type of nonenergy impact	Value of the impact per dwelling
Increased property value	\$126
Reduced incidence of fire	\$3
Reduced arrearages	\$32
Federal taxes generated from direct employment	\$55
Income generated from indirect employment	\$506
Avoided costs of unemployment benefits	\$82
Environmental externalities	\$172
Total	\$976



Occupant Perceptions of Nonenergy Benefits of Weatherization in Weatherized and Control Dwellings

The Fuel-Oil Study showed that an average single-family dwelling located in the Northeast and heated primarily by fuel oil saved 160 gallons of fuel oil in the first year following weatherization. This is equivalent to 22.4 million Btus, or 17.7 percent of total fuel-oil use. (Fuel oil is generally used only for space heating.)

Measured savings for gas, electricity, and fuel oil were combined with estimates of energy savings for dwellings that heated primarily with other fuels such as propane, wood, kerosene, and coal. The average savings for all single-family and small multifamily dwellings weatherized in 1989 was estimated to be 17.6 million Btus per year, 18.2 percent of the energy used for space heating and 13.5 percent of total energy use.


Nonenergy Benefits

The Program's weatherization activities have numerous benefits beyond reductions in energy consumption. Improvements to dwellings often raise the health, safety and comfort levels of occupants as well as increase the value of their homes. Reducing energy demand decreases the environmental impacts of energy production. In addition, lowering energy consumption produces a variety of economic benefits such as reduced energy burdens, more funds for other expenditures, and increased employment. In this section, information on selected nonenergy benefits is discussed.

Occupants' perceptions of the health, safety and comfort of their homes were much improved after weatherization. Occupants of weatherized and control homes were asked to rate the comfort, draftiness, safety, and heating expenses for their homes. They also were asked to rate their own health (in terms of the incidence of illnesses, such as colds, flu, allergies, headaches, nausea, arthritis, which may be affected by the temperature, CO levels, or draftiness of the dwelling).

On every rating scale the weatherized group reported a highly significant and positive change after weatherization was completed. The control group, on the other hand, reported no change in any of the ratings. Thus, the weatherization clients experienced improvements in the comfort and safety of their homes, while the control group did not. The weatherized group also believed their homes became less drafty and their heating bills more affordable after weatherization. The control reported no changes. Finally, the weatherized group believed that there had been an improvement in their own health, while the control group did not. Although it is difficult to place a monetary value on these health, safety, and comfort benefits, occupants of weatherized dwellings recognize and appreciate them.

Environmental benefits from weatherization include the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The principal gases of concern from the perspective of global warming are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O). The following calculations are based on dwellings weatherized in 1989 that heated primarily with electricity, natural gas, fuel oil, LPG, or kerosene.




Rate change equivalent emission reductions of Program, by type of greenhouse gas.


HEALTH AND SAFETY




Testing for carbon monoxide ensures both furnace efficiency and safety.



Some weatherization crews install security measures on first-story windows.



Smoke alarm installations improve safety.



Higher-level windows receive grates to promote child safety.

Weatherizing a dwelling that heats primarily with natural gas reduces **carbon** emissions by 0.2489 metric tons per year. Weatherizing a dwelling heating with electricity reduces carbon emissions by 0.475 metric tons per year, assuming that emissions from electricity generation are equivalent to those from bituminous coal combustion. The carbon emission reductions per dwelling unit for fuel oil, LPG, and kerosene are 0.445, 0.263, and 0.306 metric tons of carbon, respectively. These estimates translate into CO₂ emissions 3.67 times higher because of the additional weight of the two oxygen atoms.

Methane has 35 times the warming potential of CO₂. If the entire cycle of production, transmission, distribution, and household end-use is included, a typical weatherized dwelling heated primarily with natural gas will reduce methane emissions (in CO₂ equivalents) by 0.090 metric tons per year. The emission reductions from the other types of heating fuels are much smaller.

Electricity generation is the only source of **nitrous oxide** emissions that is relevant to home heating. Weatherization yields an annual reduction in N₂O emissions of 0.173 metric tons per electrically heated dwelling, in CO₂ equivalents.




Figure 1: CO₂-equivalent emission reductions of all houses weatherized by the program in 1989 over the 20-year lifetime of the measures, by type of heating fuel

The 1989 Program as a whole reduced the equivalent of more than 4 million metric tons of CO₂ over the 20 year lifetime of the measures in the 198,000 weatherized homes. The amount of CO₂-equivalent emission reductions due to various types of heating fuels and greenhouse gases are shown in the figure on this page. Since most of the dwellings weatherized by the 1989 Program were heated primarily with natural gas, these dwellings are responsible for the biggest share of the CO₂-equivalent reductions. They are also the only dwellings with a measurable methane impact. Carbon reductions account for the vast majority of the Weatherization Program's reductions of CO₂-equivalent greenhouse gas emissions. The next largest greenhouse gas impacted by the Program is methane.

The value of nonenergy benefits is often difficult to quantify. For the purposes of the evaluation, selected nonenergy benefits were assigned a dollar value, but the methods used to estimate their value varied.

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOMES ARE FIFTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF TOTAL DWELLINGS WEATHERIZED




This farmhouse saved over 50 percent by air sealing, wall insulation, and furnace replacement.



An uninsulated attic and air leakage between the porch and main structure are the main energy problems with this dwelling.



Joining the new to the old often causes trouble.



Movement of deteriorated foundation walls has opened large paths for air leakage.




Retrofit siding hides major holes that cause air leakage.



Built in sections over many years, this dwelling has major leaks between the main house and newer additions.

Estimates of environmental benefits relied on a literature review and on information about the proportions of weatherized dwellings using various fuel types and the average savings of different fuels. Estimates of employment benefits combined a literature review with data on Program employment, the skill levels of workers, and managers' judgments concerning the job market for weatherization workers. Data on Program expenditures for home repair were used to quantify the benefits associated with maintaining or enhancing property values and extending the lifetimes of dwellings. The monetary benefits of reducing the incidence of fires were quantified using insurance industry data. Estimates of reductions in arrearages were based on a literature review and data on payment histories collected on the dwellings included in the National Evaluation. For each benefit included in the estimate, we developed an average value per weatherized dwelling.



Installation Costs for Single-Family and Small Multifamily Dwellings Weatherized in 1989

Ultimately, the dollar value of nonenergy benefits resulting from the weatherization of single-family and small multifamily dwellings was estimated to be \$976 per dwelling. The table on page 38 provides a summary of these nonenergy benefit estimates.

D. Cost Effectiveness

Cost effectiveness is a measure of how well a program works. To assess the cost effectiveness of the Weatherization Assistance Program, the market value of energy savings (and in some cases other benefits) was compared to the cost of installing the measures that produced them. Benefits and costs were discounted over

the estimated life of the measures. Cost effectiveness was assessed only for single-family and small multifamily dwellings because estimates of program impacts were not available for large multifamily buildings, which comprised only 9 percent of the dwellings weatherized in 1989.

Program Costs

DOE regulations in 1989 required (subject to certain exceptions) that the average of all costs not exceed \$1,600 per house. When the weatherization work is supplemented by non-DOE funds, average costs may exceed \$1,600.

To provide a picture of costs that is reasonably consistent regardless of the sources of funds used, costs were grouped under two broad categories: (1) installation costs (i.e., labor and materials assignable to particular houses) and (2) overhead and management costs. Overhead and management costs include costs directly related to installation but not readily assignable to particular houses (e.g., vehicles, travel time, and field supervision), and program management (e.g., intake, inspections, training and general administration).


DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS



The blower door and pressure-measuring gauges are useful both in quantifying duct leakage associated with duct work and in revealing the locus of significant leaks. Protocols for using both blower doors and the distribution system's own fan to quantify leaks are currently being developed, and several companies have recently developed small calibrated blowers useful in leak detection and quality control in duct sealing.

Recent research has revealed that the distribution systems associated with central heating and air conditioning units are themselves frequently leaky. The combination of loose houses and large holes in return air systems results in inefficiency, uncomfortable drafts, and high energy bills. The combination of tight houses and large holes in return air systems can cause backdrafting of the products of combustion from furnaces and hot water heaters, can dramatically increase the rate at which radon enters the dwelling--and can propel of these undesirable gases through the furnace's heat exchanger directly into the main part of the dwelling.

Duct problems can also negate the benefits of other weatherization work. On the other hand, sealing and balancing duct systems can raise furnace system efficiency, lower overall air infiltration, solve moisture problems, enhance indoor air quality--and save energy.




Permanent air sealing of the return air system is accomplished with a fiberglass mesh and special mastic.



A wooden return system on a gravity furnace is not only leaky but also immediately adjacent to sundry volatile organic compounds. When the furnace is fired, fumes from these compounds can be whisked from the basement into the living area.

This return air duct is the only one in the dwelling for a 100,000 Btu/hour furnace in a Philadelphia row house. Undersized by a factor of 20 when initially installed, it is now full of dirt. A \$50 retrofit would save well over \$100 each heating season.



Holes like these in supply ducts can be quite wasteful--yet they can be repaired quickly and cost effectively.

Installation costs for single-family and small multifamily dwellings weatherized in 1989 averaged \$1,050. For not quite half (45 percent) of the dwellings, these costs fell within the \$600 to \$1,200 range. The chart on page 43 shows the range of costs.

Because of variations in record keeping, it proved difficult to specify overhead and management costs with the same degree of precision as installation costs. After approaching the problem from several perspectives, the evaluators settled on an average cost of \$500 per single-family and small multifamily dwelling nationwide.

The evaluation examined cost effectiveness in detail from three perspectives:

- The **program perspective**: the only benefit valued was net energy savings, and costs included installation, management, and overhead costs.

- The **installation perspective**: the only benefit valued was net energy savings and the only costs included were installation expenditures; and

- The **societal perspective**: benefits included both net energy and nonenergy benefits, and costs included installation, management and overhead.

National Cost Effectiveness

The results of each of the three perspectives used to measure cost effectiveness are described below.

The **program perspective** is the most conservative analysis because it includes all classes of costs (i.e., both installation costs and program overhead and management) but only the value of energy savings as a benefit. From this perspective, the national program is still cost effective. For gas-heated homes, the benefit/cost ratio is 1.06. For electrically heated homes, the ratio is 1.13, and for dwellings located in the Northeast heated primarily with fuel oil, the benefit/cost ratio is 1.48.


For the Program as a whole, including all fuel types, the program benefit/cost ratio is 1.09.

The **installation perspective** is the traditional approach used to evaluate weatherization programs. Nationally, for gas-heated dwellings, weatherization costs averaged \$1,015 in 1989 dollars. Average energy

PERSPECTIVE	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
PROGRAM	Energy Savings Only	All Costs
	Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.09	
INSTALLATION	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
	Energy Savings Only	On-Site Installation Costs
	Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.61	
SOCIAL	BENEFITS INCLUDED	COSTS INCLUDED
	Both Energy and Nonenergy Benefits	All Costs
	Benefit/Cost Ratio = 1.72	


National Benefit/Cost Ratios for Fuel Types for the 1989 Program

DOMESTIC HOT WATER



Well-insulated water heaters use less fuel.

Conserving energy used to heat water is usually a cost-effective undertaking. Stopping leaks with minor plumbing repairs can result in substantial savings, as can installing low-flow devices like shower heads and faucet aerators. Most weatherization agencies report that the best results come from combining client education with good-quality shower heads. Similarly, the installation of tank insulation by weatherization agencies is frequently accompanied by turning down the thermostat on the water heater, an action that is often taken in conjunction with client education to promote sustained energy savings. Many agencies also install pipe insulation a few feet on the cold water inlet side (to prevent thermosiphoning during the standby cycle) and 10 feet or more on the hot water side.



A flue damper installed on this domestic hot water heater limits heat loss to the chimney during the off cycle.



The weatherization crew that insulated the tank and pipes entering and exiting from this hot water heater did an excellent job.

savings benefits were calculated to be worth \$1,605. The resulting benefit/cost ratio, therefore, is 1.58. For electrically heated dwellings, average expenditures of \$1,025 yield energy savings benefits of \$1,728, producing a benefit/cost ratio of 1.69. For dwellings located in the Northeast heated primarily with fuel oil, average installation costs of \$1,192 yielded energy saving benefits of \$2,694, producing a benefit/cost ratio of 2.26.

**Benefit/Cost Ratios
for Gas-Heated Homes**

Perspective	1989	1996
Program	1.06	1.79
Installation	1.58	2.39
Societal	1.61	2.40

For the 1989 Program as a whole, including all fuel types, the installation benefit/cost ratio is 1.61.

The **societal perspective** produces the highest benefit/cost ratios because it includes an estimated value of the nonenergy benefits of weatherization (\$976), which exceeds the overhead and management costs of weatherization (\$500). For gas-heated dwellings, the benefit/cost ratio is 1.61. For electrically heated dwellings, the benefit/cost ratio is 2.33. For fuel-oil-heated dwellings located in the Northeast, the benefit/cost ratio is 2.01.

For the Program as a whole, including all fuel types, the societal benefit/cost ratio is 1.72.

The bottom line is that the Program is a cost-effective government investment. Total costs (including materials, labor, overhead, and management) for all fuel types averaged \$1,550 per single-family and small multifamily dwelling weatherized in Program Year 1989. The net current value of the energy saved per dwelling is \$1,690 (in 1989 dollars). This results in a benefit/cost ratio of 1.09. When conservative values are included for some of the Program's various nonenergy benefits, the benefit/cost ratio increases to 1.72.

Because of the higher average national savings estimated for the Program in the 1996 Metaevaluation, cost-effectiveness estimates also increased. In 1989, the National Evaluation estimated the Program benefit/cost ratio for gas-heated homes from the program perspective as 1.06. Applying the same procedures and assumptions used in the National Evaluation to the 1996 savings estimate yields a benefit/cost ratio of 1.79. With the installation perspective, the 1989 result is 1.58, and for 1996 is 2.39. Societal ratios, which include the value of nonenergy benefits, were 1.61 in 1989, and 2.40 in 1996.


E. Performance by Climate Region in 1989

Performance indicators for the national Program mask a great deal of diversity. This diversity springs from regional differences and associated housing types and needs and from varying practices of weatherization agencies. The following sections discuss differences by region. Characteristics of the housing stock and local agencies account for much of the regional variation in weatherization practices and measures installed. These, in turn, provide important background for understanding regional variations in weatherization costs, energy savings, and cost effectiveness.


As a whole, the 1989 Program was most cost effective in the cold and moderate climate regions of the country, where program activity was

MOBILE HOME MEASURES


Many mobile homes have inconspicuous air leakage paths that can be clearly identified with blower doors. Successful weatherization work focuses on closing leaks at the bottom of the conditioned envelope, especially around the duct system. A recent Indiana study showed that 32 percent savings in mobile homes resulted from blower-door guided infiltration reduction and from blowing cellulose insulation in the belly board. A recent evaluation of the Vermont Weatherization Assistance Program provided evidence of substantial electricity savings from air sealing the water heater compartment of mobile homes, even when the electric water heater had already been jacketed.



The interface between the riser in a supply duct and the floor of a mobile home is frequently found to be a source of air leaks, both when the furnace fan is on and when it is not. Here a technician in Indiana uses a technique his agency developed to achieve a tight, lifelong seal.



Sealing the opening to the evaporative cooler during winter months is routinely accomplished by weatherization technicians in Arizona, who find this a very cost-effective weatherization tactic with both mobile homes and site-built structures. Solar screens also result in significant savings in this semidesert climate.



A 30-foot-long plastic pipe is used to blow insulation between the belly board and the floor of a mobile home.

concentrated. In the warm climate region, where agencies were smallest and the low-income housing was most dilapidated, the Program saved less energy per dollar expended.

The Cold Climate Region


The cold climate region contains 11 states with an average of 7,444 heating degree days. In 1989, approximately 150 local agencies in this region weatherized more than 40,000 dwellings (18 percent of the total weatherized population).

Benefit/cost ratios were greater in this region than in any other region, ranging from 1.3 to 2.9 depending upon the perspective. This region also achieved the highest savings of any region, based on the Single-Family Study. For natural gas consumption, the first-year net savings of 235 ccf represented a 25 percent reduction in the gas used for space heating and an 18 percent reduction in total gas usage. Net electricity savings totaled 2,686 kWh for the first year, which was a 42 percent reduction in electricity use for heating and a 14 percent reduction in total electricity usage. Total costs averaged \$1,576 per household, higher than the national average.


The majority of weatherized homes in the cold region are single-family detached (63 percent). Findings from the Single-Family Study show that this region has the oldest housing stock (averaging 45 years) and weatherizes dwellings that are on average larger than the other two regions (1,181 square feet). The primary heating fuel, as with all regions, is natural gas. This region, however, has a significantly higher portion of the population using fuel oil. A central heating system was found in 83 percent of the dwellings, the largest proportion of any region, and supplemental heating fuels were less common (24 percent of the weatherized single-family population). Two-thirds of these dwellings were owner-occupied, and they had the largest average number of occupants of any region.

The cold region used the most rigorous methods for both client and weatherization measures selection. Integrated audits for measure selection were used over three times more frequently than the national average. The use of advanced diagnostic techniques was higher than in any other region. The Single-Family Study showed that blower door tests were performed almost twice as frequently as the national average. The cold climate zone had high installation rates for insulation, water heating, and space heating measures. In contrast, the cold region had relatively low installation rates for structural measures and windows and doors.

Types of Dwellings Weatherized in 1989 in the Cold Region



Types of Heating Fuels in Single Family and Small Multifamily Dwellings Weatherized in 1989 in the Cold Region



HEATING SYSTEMS


From left to right: A boiler technician, a local weatherization official, and an owner celebrate the recent installation of an energy-efficient boiler in a large multifamily building in Brooklyn. Owners in New York and some other states provide 25 percent or more of the cost of the work, thus leveraging scarce weatherization funds.




Modern multi-setback thermostats are cost-effective measures in many weatherization jobs.




Kerosene heaters, like this one stored in the basement, contribute to poor indoor air quality. Education work with weatherization clients includes stern warnings about the hazards of these heaters--and the importance of getting rid of them entirely.



Furnace testing for safety and efficiency has recently become a routine part of many weatherization operations, yet there are still states which pay little attention to heating system work. Others do major work--when needed--ranging from switching to efficient oil burners to boiler replacement.



Many weatherization agencies use furnace testing equipment to measure the efficiency and safety of heating equipment.



An old boiler in a single-family dwelling in Philadelphia has plenty of life left in it, but its burner was inefficient and unsafe. This new burner assembly will save about 14 percent of the annual fuel oil bill.



Filthy return air filters, found frequently in the weatherization program, are both unhealthful and inefficient. Cleaning and tuning of furnaces, setting controls for efficiency, replacing filters--and empowering clients to do the job in the future--are routinely accomplished in most weatherization operations.

• **Installing attic insulation.** The 1989 evaluation clearly showed that the installation of insulation in attics never before insulated is particularly cost effective. Today advanced audits consistently recommend more attic insulation than was recommended by the priority list selection procedures used by most agencies in 1989.

• **Installing wall insulation.** During the time of the 1989 evaluation, only a few agencies had begun using the high-density installation technique (which accomplishes air sealing and insulation with a single operation). However, weatherization jobs that included high-density wall insulation showed even greater savings than those that used the older technique. More agencies are using high-density wall insulation techniques today.

• **Blower-door-assisted air sealing.** The payoff expected from blower-door-assisted air sealing was not discernible in the Single-Family Study in 1989. Because the effectiveness of blower-door-assisted air sealing has been demonstrated in small scale studies, this unexpected finding was attributed to the fact that blower doors were just being introduced into local agency procedures in 1989, when only 18 percent of completed dwellings received blower-door-assisted sealing. Today, many agencies offer training in blower door use, and many homes receive blower-door-assisted sealing. In fact, low-income weatherization agencies have become leaders in the application of blower doors and are generally convinced they save energy.

Recommended Practices

- Client education
- Resource leveraging
- Utility partnerships
- Housing rehabilitation funds

B. Promising Management Practices

A handful of other practices employed by many weatherization agencies clearly make sense, but their impact could not be quantified in the 1989 evaluation. These include client education and resource leveraging. Some agencies are very active in providing client education and report good success in forming partnerships in which recipients of weatherization services participate in a number of concrete conservation activities in their homes.

Leveraging from utilities to accomplish the ends of demand-side management on the one hand and cost-saving conservation services for low-income families on the other has been an important opportunity for enhancing weatherization. Some agencies, for instance, provide electricity conservation services in conjunction with weatherization. These routinely involve removing inefficient incandescent lighting fixtures and replacing them with compact fluorescent lighting, and sometimes replacing inefficient refrigerators with efficient ones. Other utility partnerships have enabled capital-intensive investments such as energy-efficient replacement furnaces that otherwise might not be possible.

Still problematic for many local agencies is the extremely poor condition of many dwellings. The Program will be stronger when


ATTICS



This is a 12-inch fiberglass batt that has been on top of a small crack in the ceiling below for only one winter. The dirt is from the passing of massive amounts of air driven by stack-effect exfiltration.



Single-component foams in conjunction with rigid board stock cut to fit attic openings achieve tight, long-lasting attic sealing.



This space between the chimney interior framing is completely open to the attic. Sealing this at the level of the attic insulation is likely to save more energy than replacing every window in the dwelling. An experienced weatherization crew technician can thoroughly (and safely) seal this opening in 15 minutes with a material cost of \$4.



Interior walls open to attics are commonplace—and must be sealed to prevent thermal siphoning. If this hole is not sealed during weatherization, the interior wall below is likely to be much colder in the winter than exterior insulated walls.


adequate housing rehabilitation funding allows local agencies to provide needed repairs and to devote a larger share of their DOE funds to energy-efficiency improvements.

C. The Warm Climate Weatherization Initiative


The lower-than-average savings in the warm climate region suggested the need for efforts designed to identify and implement ways of increasing energy savings from weatherization in warm climates. In addition, studies had decisively shown that improved procedures in warm climates could produce dramatic improvements in savings. The results of a 1993 ORNL study, for example, showed that the use of an advanced audit procedure more than doubled the amount of energy savings in North Carolina homes. A similar study in Virginia found that savings more than doubled with the implementation of improved procedures.

Although some improvements were already being adopted, DOE believed that it was important to accelerate the pace of change. Therefore, DOE decided to sponsor the Warm Climate Weatherization Initiative. This Initiative was designed to identify, develop, test, and transfer into widespread use a set of technological and programmatic approaches that can further increase the energy saved by weatherizing low-income homes in warm climates.


Overview of the Warm Climate Weatherization Initiative



RELATIONSHIP OF COSTS TO SAVINGS



Relationship of Amount Invested in Weatherization Measures to Energy Savings



Average Material Costs (in 1989 dollars): All Weatherized Dwellings vs. High- and Low-Saving Dwellings

The Warm Climate Initiative began with a Situation Analysis, in 1994, and a Planning Workshop, in 1995. The Situation Analysis, which was distributed prior to the Workshop, described current weatherization practices, housing conditions, energy end-use profiles, warm climate issues, and promising new technologies. The Workshop (which brought together Program representatives from all of the warm climate states, several local agencies, and DOE Headquarters, along with technical experts, and utility representatives) was asked to review the background information, identify the most important issues, and set an agenda for future research and improvements. Many of the Workshop recommendations have now been implemented. An ORNL report assessing cooling measures was completed in 1996, and research on the conditions that determine the effectiveness of storm windows produced preliminary results in the same year. Modifications to the National Energy Audit (NEAT) designed to improve its usefulness in warm climates are currently nearing completion. Furthermore, cooperative state-level evaluations in three warm climate states began in 1997.

VII. REMAINING OPPORTUNITIES

A. Additional Investments per Home

In general, the amount invested in weatherizing a home is directly related to the magnitude of energy savings. A regression analysis of over 1,800 gas-heated homes showed that gas energy savings increased by 15 ccf/year with each additional \$100 invested in labor and materials. The average rate of increase in energy savings did not diminish as investments increased from \$1,000 to \$3,000. In PY 1989, the average investment per house was about \$1,000 for labor and materials. Houses that received larger investments, however, clearly saved more energy. For example, high-saving dwellings benefited from total expenditures for labor and materials of \$1,192, which was 14% more than the national average of \$1,050. Low-saving dwellings, however, received an investment of only \$714 (or 68%) of the average national investment. Similarly, higher-saving agencies were more likely to obtain funds from non-DOE sources so that a higher average investment per dwelling was possible. These results suggest that there is a cost-effective potential for substantially increasing energy savings by increasing the average investment per dwelling.


The proportion of the funds invested in various types of weatherization measures also is an important determinant of energy savings. In high-saving dwellings, 38% of the total spent on materials was invested in insulation and 16% in heating systems. In low-saving dwellings, in contrast, 27% of the total spent on materials was invested in insulation and 3% in heating systems. In low-saving dwellings far larger proportions were spent on structural repairs (25% versus 7%) than in high-saving dwellings, and more was invested in windows and doors (15% versus 4%). Similarly, higher-saving agencies invested more in insulation and heating systems and less in windows and doors.

Many Opportunities for Additional Cost-Effective Investments

- Further reduce air leakage
- Increase levels of insulation
- Give more attention to heating systems and ducts
- Use more leveraged funds for housing rehabilitation

TARGETING NEEDY HOUSEHOLDS

LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS AND SUBPOPULATIONS IN 1990



*averaging \$1,233 in annual energy expenditures

**averaging 30.1% of their income

Targeting high-burden and high-expenditure households offers the opportunity to reduce utility bills of the neediest households and achieve sizable energy savings. The above diagram identifies 2.1 million program-eligible households that have both high energy expenditures (averaging \$1,339 per year) and high energy burdens (averaging 30.4 percent of their income).

Many measures installed by the Program show significant opportunities for additional energy-efficiency improvements. Although the weatherized homes were clearly tighter than the control homes, approximately 80% of them still had air leakage rates that exceeded 1,500 cfm₅₀ (a threshold above which more air-infiltration reduction is generally recommended). The R-values in weatherized homes were significantly higher than those in control homes. However, the R-values of the attic insulation in weatherized homes were still often below DOE-recommended levels. For example, about 26% of weatherized homes had attic R-values of less than R-19 and 63% had R-values of less than R-30. R-19 or less is below recommended levels in all climate regions in the U.S. and R-30 is below the recommended level for all except the hottest regions. The need for more frequent installations of attic and wall insulation was especially important in the warm climate region. The poor condition of heating systems and ducts in many homes also pointed to opportunities for additional savings (Berry and Brown, 1994).

Although many important and cost-effective energy-efficiency improvements are being implemented by the Program, more funding would make it possible to do much more. Because of the overhead costs involved in setting up work in each home, it would be most cost efficient to capture as many opportunities as possible during the DOE-sponsored installation. In addition, because a home will rarely be revisited at a later date, cost-effective measures that are not installed are likely to be long-term "lost opportunities." Leveraged funds from utilities and other sources are an important vehicle for providing more complete and comprehensive weatherization and for minimizing lost opportunities.

Many low-income homes need extensive structural repairs, which must be paid for with leveraged funds. For these homes, leveraging of housing rehabilitation funds to supplement DOE funds is an essential step in achieving structural integrity and energy efficiency.


B. Targeting the Neediest Households

The Department of Health and Human Services has reported that, based on Energy Information Administration data, there were 29.1 million households with incomes near or below the federal poverty guidelines for weatherization eligibility in 1994. Given the large population remaining to be served by the Weatherization Program, it is critical for local agencies to focus resources on households with the greatest need for weatherization and with the largest potential for benefits.

One strategy for targeting weatherization assistance funds is to identify households with both high energy expenditures and high energy burdens. High-expenditure households are good targets because high expenditures are correlated with high energy savings potential. High-burden households are good targets because they can least afford the costs of the energy they consume and they are the least likely to be able to make energy-saving investments in their homes.

The 1990 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) was used to estimate statistically the size and characteristics of the target groups



HIGH SAVINGS FROM ATTIC INSULATION



The core of this wood-framed home was built around 1955; since then, two small additions have been constructed, resulting in 1,277 square feet of living space and in a complicated roof-line prone to water and air leakage. Prior to weatherization, the home had no insulation in its attic, walls, or foundation, and its 14 wooden window frames and two wooden doors were rotten and leaky. The home was heated by two gas space heaters—one in the living room and the other in one of the four bedrooms. The 30-gallon water heater and the stove also used natural gas.

The weatherization agency spent \$900 in materials and \$400 in labor to weatherize this house. A state-wide priority list of measures was used to select the weatherization measures. The job involved blowing approximately 3" of loose-fill fiberglass insulation across the attic floor, adding two gravity vents for each of the bathrooms, repairing and replacing several windows, replacing one of the doors, and generally caulking and weatherstripping.

During the year after weatherization, the client used 1,002 ccf of natural gas, representing a decrease of 141 ccf (12.3%). The occupants judged their home to be noticeably less drafty after weatherization and much less expensive to heat.



that appear to have the greatest potential to benefit from weatherization assistance. The evaluation defined the groups as follows:

- **High-Expenditure Households**--those with the highest space heating costs per heating degree day and square foot relative to others in their climate zone and region. This group included 5.0 million low-income households which had average energy expenditures of \$1,233 and an average energy burden of 19.2% of income.

- **High-Burden Households**--those with the highest energy burden (expenditures in proportion to income) relative to others in their climate zone and region. This group included 7.2 million low-income households which had average energy expenditures of \$1,175 and an average energy burden of 30.1% of income.

- **High-Burden/High-Expenditure Households**--those that qualified in both categories above. This group included the 2.1 million households which had average energy expenditures of \$1,339 and an average energy burden of 30.4% of income.

Several key characteristics help to define the High-Burden/High-Expenditure households. These households have very low incomes--they have an average income of \$6,114 compared to \$10,048 for all low-income households. A substantial share of these households represent vulnerable population groups--about 40% are elderly households and another 24% are single-parent households. In other ways, however, they are much like other low-income households--they occupy the same types of dwellings and they use the same types of fuels. Thus, in order to target these households, local agencies need to be particularly attuned to their client's expenditure and burden levels.

VIII. THE FUTURE OF WEATHERIZATION: THE NEXT STEPS

The various reports produced by the National Weatherization Evaluation presented a comprehensive profile of the weatherization procedures and measures that characterized high-performing agencies and high-saving dwellings. The following recommendations, which resulted from these findings, describe a series of next steps to enhance the Weatherization Program beyond its already strong foundation.

The Metaevaluation results, which showed an 80% increase in energy savings during the past seven years, suggest that substantial progress has already been made in implementing many of the National Evaluation's recommendations.

A. Service Delivery Procedures

- **Enhance the existing high quality of the weatherization work force through increased training and professional development.** High-performing agencies were characterized by experienced and well-trained employees. Improving the ability of the weatherization work force to employ diagnostic reasoning and principles from building science will result in even more cost-effective weatherization.


BASEMENTS

These photos illustrate a weatherization tactic used to block massive infiltration at the bottom of the heated envelope. Sometimes doors or even insulating walls have to be constructed to form an effective air barrier. Skilled weatherization crews can accomplish this job in two hours or less at a materials cost of only \$60 or so.

A new bulkhead door and insulated sheathing isolate the area under a porch, thus solving a major infiltration problem.



Sealing a new basement partition wall.



Outside view, bulkhead doors open.



Inside view, new partition wall with weatherstripped access door.



Air sealing at sill plate with foam. This infiltration-stopping measure is necessary with most weatherization jobs.

• **Encourage agencies to direct their resources towards clients that have higher-than-average levels of energy burden.** This can be done either through the selection of clients that have a higher-than-average energy burden or the determination of investment levels based on the pre-weatherization energy burden. Both the Single-Family and the Fuel-Oil Studies found that energy savings are greatest in dwellings that consume large amounts of energy prior to weatherization. These same households also tend to spend a high proportion of their income on energy. By matching levels of investment with potential for savings, overall program cost effectiveness will improve.

Technology Transfer Efforts in the 1990's

- Development and promotion of advanced audits
- Warm Climate Initiative
- Development of mobile home audit
- Refined assessment methods for storm windows

• **Encourage the efforts of states to mobilize other resources to address the rehabilitation needs of low-income housing.** This will enable DOE resources to be focused more on energy-efficiency improvements. Most high-performing agencies have access to non-DOE funds to help pay for housing repairs. The Program will be stronger as more local agencies have access to non-DOE funds for housing rehabilitation while using DOE funds to improve energy efficiency.

• **Establish technology transfer mechanisms to promote replication of the success of high-performing agencies.** One striking finding of the Single-Family Study is the tremendous diversity among local agencies. A challenge to DOE's Weatherization Program is to help bring the less innovative and less advanced agencies up to the level of the high-performing agencies in their region. The promotion of advanced audits and the Warm Climate Initiative are two examples of successful recent technology transfer efforts. Additional research efforts that are nearing completion include the development of an audit designed specifically for mobile homes and the development of refined assessment methods for decisions about the installation of storm windows. When these improved tools are adopted by the Weatherization network, additional improvements in performance will result.


B. Weatherization Measures

• **Continue the Program's strong emphasis on attic, wall, and floor insulation.** High savings in both the Single-Family and Fuel-Oil Studies are associated with greater-than-average levels of investment in insulation. High-density wall insulation techniques that can achieve air sealing and insulation in the same operation appear to be especially effective. Advanced audits tend to increase the level of investment in both wall and attic insulation.

• **Further analyze the role of replacement windows and storm windows.** The Single-Family and Fuel-Oil Studies showed that large investments in windows are especially characteristic of dwellings and agencies that achieve lower-than-average energy savings. Yet at least one high-performing agency specialized in storm windows. Further, owner investments in the weatherization of large multifamily buildings tend to target storm windows. Preliminary research, conducted in 1996, has refined assessment methods for determining the conditions under which storm and replacement windows are a cost-effective Program expenditure. The findings from this research will be incorporated into future versions of the National Energy Audit.

KEYS TO SUCCESS

Case studies of ten high-performing local agencies demonstrate that there are many different formulas for the successful operation of a weatherization program. Each of the ten agencies employs a unique combination of useful and innovative approaches. At the same time, common features do exist. The following table summarizes the most notable characteristics that distinguish the ten high-performing agencies from other agencies. These noteworthy features range from agency and staff characteristics to client recruitment and selection practices; weatherization measures; resource leveraging; and cost controls.



Category	Characteristics of a Majority of the High Performers
Agency Characteristics	Large, multi-program community action agencies
Characteristics of Weatherized Housing	High levels of pre-weatherization energy use; older dwellings; more elderly occupants; fewer mobile homes; more central heating; fewer supplemental heating fuels
Weatherization Staff	Limited turnover and substantial weatherization experience
Delivery System	In-house crews supplemented by contractors for furnace work
Client Recruitment	Reliance on LIHEAP rosters for recruiting applicants
Selection of Clients and Investment Levels	Strong and increasing focus on high energy users
Blower Door Use	Limited use in 1989, extensive use in 1996, during the audit, while air sealing, and as part of the final inspection
Weatherization Measures	More first-time attic insulation and wall insulation; furnace retrofits and replacements; and water-heater measures
Leveraging Home Repairs	Access to housing rehabilitation funds from non-DOE sources
Cost Controls	Effective cost controls such as bulk purchasing & in-house fabrication of measures

• **Increase the emphasis on replacing inefficient space-heating systems.** High-performing agencies identified in the Single-Family Study replaced more space-heating systems than other agencies. In addition, they made greater use of instrumented analyses of furnaces and boilers to select measures that promote health, safety, and energy efficiency. System replacements and instrumented analyses were characteristic of high-saving homes in both the Single-Family and Fuel-Oil Studies.

• **Increase attention to heating system distribution systems.** Dwellings that received duct leakage control measures and distribution system diagnostics achieved above-average savings in the Single-Family Study.

• **Increase attention to water-heating measures.** Water-heating conservation measures are characteristic of high-saving homes in the Single-Family and Fuel-Oil Studies. Measures to consider should include domestic warm water tank and pipe insulation, water temperature reduction, low-flow showerheads, and aerators.

• **Select measures based on savings-to-investment ratios produced by audits.** The Program has successfully moved away from the use of prescriptive methods such as statewide priority lists for the selection of measures. Advanced audits that rank measures by savings-to-investment ratios, calculated for each individual house, were used in 37 states in 1996.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Weatherization is a sound public program that has advanced technically during the past seven years. In spite of some impediments, such as reduced funding, **the Program is saving 80% more energy per dwelling and is more cost effective than in 1989.** Procedures and measures associated with higher energy savings and new technologies are the major sources of this progress.

Societal benefits resulting from the Program include:

- the creation of about 8,000 jobs (in 1996);
- cleaner air through reduced CO₂ and power plant emissions;
- reduced consumption of imported fuels through reduced residential consumption; and
- reduced demand on other social programs such as fuel assistance, housing and health care.

Other benefits include improvement of neighborhood housing conditions, and promoting the use of newly developed conservation tools, materials and techniques. Most importantly, alleviation of the high energy burden faced by low-income Americans enables them to gain increased financial independence and greater flexibility in spending for other essential items.


The table on page 73 compares the findings of the National Evaluation of the Weatherization Assistance Program, based on 1989 data, to the Metaevaluation of 17 state-level evaluations completed in 1996.

To sum up, the Weatherization Assistance Program Works!

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER



This home in rural New England had a weatherization job that reduced energy costs by more than 50 percent. After the knee wall on the second floor was accessed with a saw from the outside, extensive air sealing and insulation work were performed. (The access hole is now covered with a rectangular vent.) This weatherization job also included extensive repair of a leaky distribution system and other infiltration-stopping measures, including a new basement door. Although exterior aesthetics were not altered, the clients were overjoyed with a much more comfortable house--and a \$600 per year saving on their oil bill.



Significant Findings of the 1989 National Weatherization Evaluation and the 1996 Metaevaluation for Gas-Heated Dwellings

Finding	1989 Value for Gas-Heated homes	1996 Value for Gas-Heated homes
Annual energy savings per dwelling (in Mbtus)	17.3	31.2
Energy savings as a percentage of energy used for space heating	18.3%	33.5%
Energy savings as a percentage of total gas consumption	13.0%	23.4%
Value of annual energy savings per dwelling in 1996 dollars	\$107	\$193
"Program" benefit/cost ratio*	1.06	1.79
"Installation" benefit/cost ratio**	1.58	2.39
"Societal" benefit/cost ratio***	1.61	2.40

*Based on energy-savings benefits and total weatherization costs.

**Based on energy-savings benefits and labor and materials costs.

***Based on energy-savings, employment, and other non-energy benefits and total weatherization costs.

REFERENCES

This summary is substantially based on the following documents:

- Berry, Linda G. 1997. *State-Level Evaluation of the Weatherization Assistance Program in 1990-1996: A Metaevaluation That Estimates National Savings*, ORNL/CON-435, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Berry, Linda G., and Marilyn A. Brown. 1994. *Patterns of Impact in the Weatherization Assistance Program: A Closer Look*, ORNL/CON-331, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Brown, Marilyn A., Linda G. Berry, Richard A. Balzer, and Ellen Faby. 1993. *National Impacts of the Weatherization Assistance Program in Single-Family and Small Multifamily Dwellings*, ORNL/CON-326, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Brown, Marilyn A., Linda G. Berry, Laurence F. Kinney. 1994. *Weatherization Works: Final Report of the National Weatherization Evaluation*, ORNL/CON-395, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Brown, Marilyn A., Linda G. Berry, Laurence F. Kinney, James O. Kolb, Thomas C. Wilson, and Dennis L. White. 1993. *Keys To Success: Ten Case Studies of Effective Weatherization Programs*, ORNL/CON-328, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Brown, Marilyn A., Mark A. Beyer, Joel Eisenberg, Edward J. Lapsa, and Meg Power. 1994. *Utility Investments in Low-Income Energy-Efficiency Programs*, ORNL/CON-379, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Brown, Marilyn A., and Lawrence J. Hill. 1994. *Low-Income DSM Programs: Methodological Approach to Determining the Cost-Effectiveness of Coordinated Partnerships*, ORNL/CON-375, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Columbia Gas of Ohio. 1995. *An Administrative Report on the Columbia Gas 1993-1994 Warm Choice Program*, prepared by A&C Enercom, Inc., for Columbia Gas of Ohio.
- Eisenberg, Joel F., Eugene Michels, David Carroll, and Nancy Berdux. 1994. *The Scope of the Weatherization Assistance Program: Profile of the Population in Need*, ORNL/SUB/92-SK904/V2, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Kinney, Laurence F., Thomas C. Wilson, Glenn Lewis, Marilyn A. Brown, and J. Michael MacDonald. 1994. *Case Studies of Weatherization in Large Multifamily Buildings*, ORNL/CON-396, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn., Draft.

REFERENCES (Continued)

This summary is substantially based on the following documents:

- MacDonald, J. Michael. 1993. *Description of the Weatherization Assistance Program in Larger Multifamily Buildings for Program Year 1989*, ORNL/CON-329, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Mihlmester, Phillip E., Wallace C. Koehler, Jr., Mark A. Beyer, Marilyn A. Brown, and Darrell A. Beschen, Jr. 1992. *Characterization of the Weatherization Assistance Program Network*, ORNL/CON-324, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- New York State Energy Research and Development Authority and New York Department of State. 1993. *Instrumented Audits Technology Transfer Project*, prepared by Synertech Systems Corporation. Energy Authority Report 94-6.
- Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Bureau of Consumer Services. 1994. *LIURP Low Income Usage Reduction Program: Historical Report and Program Analysis*, in collaboration with Pennsylvania State University Consumer Services Information System Project.
- Power, Meg, Joel F. Eisenberg, Eugene Michels, Marjorie J. Witherspoon, and Marilyn A. Brown. 1993. *Scope of the Weatherization Assistance Program: The Weatherized Population and the Resource Base*, ORNL/CON-325, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Sharp, Terry. 1994. *The North Carolina Field Test: Performance of the Preliminary Version of an Advanced Weatherization Audit for the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program*. ORNL/CON-362, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.
- Ternes, Mark P., and William P. Levins. 1993. *Impacts of the Weatherization Assistance Program in Fuel-Oil Heated Houses*, ORNL/CON-327, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For additional help in preparing this report, special thanks to Terry Baxter, Mike Bonn, Connie Cudd, Joel Eisenberg, Philip Hayes, Jeanne Van Vlandren, and Heather Walden. Members of the National Weatherization Evaluation's working groups helped design the National Evaluation, guide its implementation, and interpret its findings. The authors are grateful for their contributions and would like to acknowledge them individually:

Jeff Ackermann
Colorado Department of
Local Affairs

Don Barnett
Missouri Department of
Natural Resources

Mary Ann Bernald
Edison Electric Institute

Jeff Brown
Energy Division,
North Carolina Department of
Commerce

Dale Canning
Salt Lake Community Action
Agency

David Carroll
Response Analysis
Corporation

Mert Dahn
State of Arizona
Department of Commerce
Energy Office

Margaret Eels
Princeton University Center
for Energy and
Environmental Studies

Michael Foley
National Association of
Regulatory Utility
Commissioners

Michael Ganley
National Rural Electric
Cooperative Association

Richard Gerardi
New York State Dept. of State
Division of Economic
Opportunity

Sharon Gill
U.S. Department of Energy,
Chicago Support Office

Larry Goldberg
Sequoia Technical Services

Minam Goldberg
U.S. Department of Energy,
Energy Information
Administration

Judy Gregory
Center for Neighborhood
Development

Al Guyant
Public Services Commission
of Wisconsin

Martha Hewitt
Center for Energy and the
Urban Environment

Bion Howard
Alliance to Save Energy

Larry Kinney
Synetech Systems
Corporation

Judith Lankall
Orange and Rockland
Utilities

Leon Litov
U.S. Department of Health
and Human Services

Ron Marabito
Michigan Department of
Labor
Bureau of Community
Services

Jane Marden
American Gas Association

Phil Mihlmester
Aspen Systems Corporation

John Mitchell
Consolidated Edison
Company, Inc.

Barry Moline
American Public Power
Association

John Nelson
Wisconsin Gas Company

Karl Pnasek
Director, Community Action
Program Services

Meg Power
National Community Action
Foundation

Bill Prindle
Alliance to Save Energy

Ken Rauson
The Commonwealth of
Massachusetts

Jeffrey Schlegel
Wisconsin Energy
Conservation Corporation

Ken Tominak
Vermont Energy Investment
Corp.

Wendell Thompson
U.S. Department of Energy

Marjorie T. Waterspoon
National Association of State
Community Services
Programs