

Participant Survey: March 22, 2012 DEDI Collaborative Stakeholder Meeting

Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey on the content and layout of the second meeting held in DEDI's collaborative stakeholder series, convened on March 22, 2012. Your feedback is essential to ensure this process is productive and meets the needs of participants. The information you provide on this form will be kept confidential. Thank you for your participation!

1. Which of the following best represents your company or organization?

- Academic/Research Institution
- Membership organization
- Manufacturer/Retailer
- Non-profit
- State or Local Government
- Utility
- Energy Service Company/Contractor/Consultant
- Business Chamber
- Other

Other (please specify)

Participant Evaluation, March 22, 2012 DEDI Collaborative Meeting

2. What were your primary reasons for attending the March 22, 2012 collaborative meeting? Please check all that apply.

- Interest in subject matter
- Designing or coordinating new programs and/or policies related to energy efficiency
- Improving existing programs and/or policies related to energy efficiency
- Learning about model programs and/or policies for energy efficiency in other States
- Promoting Policy and Program Best Practices in Kentucky as they relate to energy efficiency
- General support of energy efficiency in Kentucky
- Access to network of information and contacts
- Access to forum for informal discussion amongst diverse participants
- Other (please specify)

3. Which of the following objectives were met during the course of the meeting? Please check all that apply.

- Revisited opportunities and barriers to efficiency across Kentucky's energy sectors (identified during individual stakeholder meetings), and identified new opportunities that have arisen.
- Discussed how other states are addressing similar opportunities and barriers to efficiency, and whether elements of their strategies are appropriate for Kentucky.
- Held group discussions and breakout sessions to identify opportunities for responsible expansion of energy efficiency efforts across all sectors.
- Generated a list of realistic proposed actions on issues addressed, for incorporation into the resulting Action Plan.
- Generated a list of questions that require additional inquiry before further discussion in Meeting 3.
- Other (please specify)

4. How organized was the meeting?

- Extremely organized
- Organized
- Not organized
- Other (please specify)

5. Please rate the meeting's diversity of attendees.

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Other (please specify)

6. What additional stakeholders do you believe should be invited to the next meeting, if any?

7. How much has your understanding of the opportunities and barriers to energy efficiency in Kentucky improved as a result of attending the meeting?

- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all
- Other (please specify)

8. How much has your understanding of the ultimate Action Plan proposed for this collaborative process improved as a result of the meeting?

- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all
- Other (please specify)

9. Did the meeting facilitators allow enough time for breaks in between sessions?

- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify)

Participant Evaluation, March 22, 2012 DEDI Collaborative Meeting

10. What topics would you like to see covered during Meeting 3 and/or in Interim Work Group teleconferences?

11. Please list below what you think worked particularly well during the meeting, and what did not work as well, if anything?

12. Overall, were you satisfied with the meeting?

- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify)

13. Overall, was the meeting worth your time?

- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify)

Morning General Session

14. How useful to your organization were the summaries of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy's technical analyses?

If you have comments for how to improve this session, or questions on the content, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

15. How useful to your organization were the morning reports from each Interim Work Group on discussions had between Meetings 1 and 2 (i.e. Residential, Industrial, Commercial, and DSM Statute issues)?

If you have comments for how to improve these kinds of reports, or questions on the content, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

16. What topics or issues would you like to see addressed in breakout sessions for Meeting 3?

Breakout Sessions, Block A (Morning)

17. Which breakout session did you attend in the morning block?

- Breakout Session #1, Yellow - Residential Efficiency Programs
- Breakout Session #2, Red - Transparency/Process Improvement
- Breakout Session #3, Blue - Industrial Efficiency
- Did not attend

18. How useful to your organization was this breakout session?

If you have comments for how to improve the breakout sessions, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

19. Did the facilitator(s) provide you with enough opportunities to provide comments on the issues discussed during the breakout session you attended?

If you answer "No", please provide comments in the "Other" box for how we could accommodate more discussion in future meetings.

- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify)

20. How useful to your organization were the summary reports provided after Breakout Sessions, Block A?

If you have comments for how to improve these kinds of reports, or questions on the content, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

Guest Speakers: Perspectives on Kentucky's Energy Efficiency Opportunities

21. How useful to the discussion were the remarks from the Kentucky Public Service Commission?

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Did not attend

22. How useful to the discussion were the remarks from the Office of the Attorney General?

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Did not attend

23. How useful to the discussion were the remarks from the Kentucky Association of Manufacturers?

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Did not attend

24. Did the meeting facilitators allow adequate time for discussion following the speakers' remarks?

- Too much time
- The right amount
- Too little
- Other (please specify)

25. What topics would you like guest speakers to cover during Meeting 3, if any?

If you have specific suggestions for guest speakers, please provide that below.

Breakout Sessions, Block B (Afternoon)

26. Which breakout session did you attend in the afternoon block?

- Breakout Session #4, Yellow – Improving Kentucky’s Housing Stock
- Breakout Session #5, Red - Transparency/Process Improvement
- Breakout Session #6, Green - Commercial Efficiency
- Did not attend

27. How useful to your organization was this breakout session?

If you have comments for how to improve the breakout sessions, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

28. Did the facilitator(s) provide you with enough opportunities to provide comments on the issues discussed during the breakout session you attended?

If you answer "No", please provide comments in the "Other" box for how we could accommodate more discussion in future meetings.

- Yes
- No
- Other (please specify)

29. How useful to your organization were the summary reports provided after Breakout Sessions, Block B?

If you have comments for how to improve these kinds of reports, or questions on the content, please provide in the "Other" box below.

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Other (please specify)

30. If you attended Breakout Session #5, Red - Transparency/Process Improvement, how useful to the discussion were the remarks from David Baker of the Illinois Energy Office, Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity?

- Extremely useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Did not attend