This presentation premiered at WaterSmart Innovations

watersmartinnovations.com



HOW WATERSMART HOME WATER REPORTS EMPOWER CUSTOMERS AND CHANGE PRICE ELASTICITY

Evaluation Results from the EBMUD Pilot Project

Thomas W. Chesnutt, Ph.D., CAP® A & N Technical Services, Inc. <u>http://www.antechserv.com</u> 839 Second Street, Suite 5 Encinitas CA, 92024 760.942.5149 tom@antechserv.com David L. Mitchell M.Cubed 5358 Miles Avenue Oakland CA, 94618 510.547.4369 mitchell@mcubed-econ.com

- Informational Economics and Social Norms Marketing
- Applications to Energy and Water Efficiency
- EBMUD Pilot Design
- Pilot Evaluation
 - Goals & Methods
 - Findings
 - Water Savings
 - Program Channeling Effects
 - Water Use Awareness
 - Cost Effectiveness

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

INFORMATIONAL ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL NORMS MARKETING

Version 1 – Law of Demand, Higher price → less demand (Textbook)

Customer Use = Mean + Elasticity * Price



Elasticity is a scalar and textbook fixed

Water Price can be changed in theory

Version 2 – Information matters, Customer responsiveness can also be changed (Reality Matters)

Customer Use = Mean + Elasticity * Price



Elasticity is informationally malleable Water Price is empirically/politically rigid

INFORMATIONAL ECONOMICS

- Basic Premise: Much of people's behavior is influenced by their perceptions of what is "normal" or "typical"
- Inform them their behavior is outside the norm and they change it to revert to the norm
- Show them their assessment of the norm is inaccurate and they update their assessment and behavior accordingly
- Social norms marketing has been used in a variety of contexts: student drinking/drug use, voting behavior, retirement planning, environmental awareness, charitable giving
- > Opower pioneered its use in Energy Conservation
- WaterSmart now is pioneering its use in Water Conservation

WHAT IS SOCIAL NORMS MARKETING?

Energy Efficiency

- Opower runs programs for more than 90 energy utilities, including 8 of the 10 largest U.S. utilities. Its programs reach more than 22 million homes worldwide
- Water Efficiency
 - WaterSmart runs programs for a growing number of utilities, including EBMUD, City of Sacramento, Irvine Ranch, City of Newport Beach, City of Davis

WHERE IS IT BEING DONE?

Normative Comparisons of Use Against Comparable Customers

- Application of Injunctive Norms
- Targeted Messaging
- > Actionable Information and Enticements
- Impactful Visual Displays of Information

HOW IS SOCIAL NORMS MARKETING IMPLEMENTED?



Impactful Visual Displays of Information

Program	ght			Welcome, Da Settin Househo	
👚 Home	All Track Usage	🕰 Ways To Save	My Actions		
Compare Your Use: July – September			Recommended Water Saving Action	•	
		324 GPD You	Install High-Efficiency Toilets	27 📩 8 43/year	
	191 GPD Average Households		Use a Self-Adjusting Irrigation	17 💩 8 25/year	
	122 GPD Efficient Households		Take A 5 Minute Shower	15 📥 8 37/year	
Compared to homes with <u>similar water needs</u> See more analysis.»			See more actions.»		
t Bay Municipal Util	ity District Programs, Events	and Reminders			
Check for Leak Did you know?	er lawn party - this one gives you s Even a small leak can add up to	a chance to help convert a lawn big water loss. According to the L	into a garden using sheet mulch, all in one	day! We'll	
Meet Your Met Did you know?.	ter A dog might be man's best frien	d, but your water meter is a close	second. A water meter will let you know h	ow much	
	wi FACs	Account Settings	Privace Policy		
Contact Us		Household Profile	le Terms of Use Copyright 2013 All rights reserved		

Comparing Your Use: Last 12 Months



Strong seasonal use and irrigation You use more than double the water in the summer than in the winter, most likely due to irrigation. See <u>outdoor actions</u> you can take to reduce this high summer use.

Breaking Down Your Use: Last 12 Months

Estimated based on your household profile



Watch your irrigation

Your biggest estimated use is irrigation at 40%. The amount of water used by irrigation depends on climate. lot size, landscape, and your watering schedule. Grass requires much more water than shrubs or plants, and a modern irrigation controller can help. See <u>sutdoor actions</u>

Tracking Your Long-Term Use



Not as efficient as last year

You're tracking to use about 56% more than last year.



ISTER CITY

EBMUD PILOT

East Bay Municipal Utility District, California USA



You are here

The drought you can't see

Which is the heaviest

neutrino?

Changing goals of natu

Geophysical methods detect changes in water storage pp. 1543 & 1587

Evaluation conducted by David Mitchell, M.Cubed, and Tom Chesnutt, A&N Technical Services

- Evaluation funded by California Water Foundation and EBMUD
- Research team operated with complete independence of California Water Foundation, EBMUD, and WaterSmart

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF PILOT

Do home water reports...

- 1. Result in measurable reductions in household water use?
- 2. Increase rates of participation in other conservation programs?
- 3. Improve household knowledge and awareness of water use?

THE PRIMARY QUESTIONS

- 1. Are water savings primarily due to changes in outdoor or indoor use, or a combination? Do they vary seasonally?
- 2. Are households above (below) the norm more (less) likely to save water?
- 3. Do paper reports yield more savings than email reports?
- 4. Which other programs get the biggest boost in participation from home water reports? Are households above (below) the norm more (less) likely to participate in other programs?
- 5. Are home water reports cost effective?

THE SECONDARY QUESTIONS

- Treatment Period June 2012 – June 2013
- ► Two Experiments
 - Castro Valley Group Experiment
 - > 24,000 households
 - Random Group Experiment
 - 3,300 randomly selected households throughout EBMUD service area evenly split between control and treatment groups
- Pre and Post Pilot Customer Surveys

	Treatment	Control	Total
Castro Valley Group			
No. Households	10,529	13,765	24,294
No. Meter Reads	362,198	473,204	835,402
Random Group			
No. Households	1,710	1,576	3,286
No. Meter Reads	58,824	54,214	113,038

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

- Castro Valley Group Experiment: Provide insight into effectiveness of home water reports directed at targeted group of homes
- Random Group Experiment: Provide insight into average effectiveness if program expanded to entire service area

WHY TWO EXPERIMENTS?

EVALUATION METHODS

Water Use

- Panel data fixed effects regression models
 - Control for time-variant seasonal and weather effects on consumption
 - Control for time-invariant differences in household characteristics
 - Implement robust regression techniques to control for data anomalies
- Participation in Other EBMUD Programs
 - Logistic dichotomous choice regression models
 - Implement difference-in-differences specification in Puhani (2008)
 - Estimates probability of participation pre and post treatment for treatment and control households

STATISTICAL MODELING

STATISTICAL IMPACT EVALUATION

- ~948,000 meter read consumption values
- 2 Participant Groups (Random and Targeted) matched control groups
- > 2006 to 2013 Data
- > Time Series Cross Section Method
 - Meter-specific Intercept,
 - ► Season, (S),
 - ► Weather (W), and
 - ► Effect of HWR (E)
- Fixed Effects with Variance reflecting clustering
- Estimation Method: Maximum Likelihood

 $Use = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{S}_t, \mathbf{W}_t, E_t) + \varepsilon$ $\ln Use_{i,t} = \mu_i + S_t + W_t + E_{i,t}$ $E_{it} \equiv I_{HWR} \cdot \beta_{HWR}$ $\mathcal{E}_{it} = \mu_i + \xi_{it}$ where $\mu_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$ $\xi_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\xi}^2)$ $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2} = T \cdot \sigma_{\mu}^{2} + \sigma_{\xi}^{2}$



Mean Treatment Effect

- Castro Valley Group Experiment: 6.6% reduction in water use
- Random Group Experiment: 4.6% reduction in water use
- Null hypothesis of No Treatment Effect rejected with better than 99% statistical confidence

WATER USE

- Treatment Effect Scales with Household Use
 - > Top quartile of users saved, on average, 1% more
 - > Bottom quartile of users saved, on average, 3% less
- Also with Water Score (based on Castro experiment)
 - Score = 3 (Take Action!): 7.1%
 - Score = 2 (Doing Okay): 5.2%
 - Score = 1 (Doing Great!): 1.6%

SAVINGS SCALE WITH USAGE

Paper Reports More Effective Than Email

 Households receiving paper reports saved, on average, 1% more than those receiving email reports

PAPER REPORTS MORE EFFECTIVE

- Home Water Reports strongly influenced participation in other programs
 - Households receiving home water reports 2.3 times more likely to participate in an audit or rebate program
 - Biggest impact on audit programs: home water report households were 6.2 times more likely to participate
 - Statistically significant but smaller effect on rebate programs: home water report households were 1.7 times more likely to participate
- Water Score Matters
 - Homes with water score of 3 (Take Action!) significantly more likely to do just that

PROGRAM CHANNELING

Home Water Reports Yielded Cost-Effective Water Savings

- Email Reports: \$250 \$590 per AF; midpoint cost: \$380/AF
- Paper Reports: \$290 \$570 per AF; midpoint cost: \$400/AF

COST EFFECTIVENESS

- Households receiving home water reports continue to underestimate actual water use; no improvement relative to control households
- But, strong evidence households view home water reports as providing useful and actionable information for managing water use:
 - Treatment group 52 to 80% more likely to score EBMUD as "Excellent" in terms of:
 - Showing ways to save money on water bills by conserving water
 - Giving useful tips and tools needed to use water efficiently
 - Offering programs to help household save water

HOUSEHOLD WATER USE KNOWLEDGE

FUTURE RESEARCH

- Is mean treatment effect generalizable to other utilities or parts of the state?
- Savings Persistence: Are savings sustainable or will they fade?
- How important is outdoor water use to overall effectiveness?
- Does report frequency matter? Would providing reports more (less) frequently have much impact on water savings?

STILL TO BE ANSWERED

A & Q