

Seattle City Light

Customer Satisfaction Survey

A Market Research Report

By



February 21, 2007

Contacts

Jean Craciun

President/CEO

CRG Research

Email jcraciun@cgrresearch.com

600 Stewart Street, Suite 1300

Seattle, WA 98101

206.443.8346

Anchorage, AK

Washington, DC

C O N T E N T S

Executive Summary 3

Background & Methodology..... 5

Research Findings 8

 A. Rating of Seattle City Light 8

 B. Experiences During the Windstorm 10

 C. Contacting Seattle City Light..... 14

 D. Attitudes toward Carbon Offsets..... 21

 E. Demographics..... 23

Appendices

A: Survey Instrument 41

B: Additional Tables 47

Copyright © 2007, Craciun Research Group, Inc. All rights reserved.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Jean Craciun, Sociologist/Research Director for CRG Research, was hired as a consultant to assist Seattle City Light (SCL) to conduct a customer satisfaction survey to identify the effects of the recent windstorms on attitudes toward SCL, and to determine opinions about carbon offsets.

The Sample

To meet the first objective, a survey of 400 SCL bill payers was administered using exactly the same methodology and questions as a survey conducted in early December, 2006. The demographics were not identical. However, testing revealed that the results were not affected by the differences. (See “The Sample” in Background and Methods)

Changes Between the First and Second Surveys

Between the first and second surveys, the percentage of respondents who were “very satisfied” with Seattle City Light dropped from 65% to 50%, while the percentage who were “somewhat satisfied” rose a like number from 31% to 44%.

The “very good” rating level for Seattle City Light dropped twenty-six percentage points on the characteristic customers consider most important – *reliable service with few outages*, and it dropped four to ten percentage points on all other features except one. The exception is *online billing that is easy*, which rose eight percentage points. Thirty-two percent (32%) of those surveyed had visited the SCL Website, up from 19% in the last survey.

Experiences During the Windstorm

Two-thirds of the respondents lost power during the recent windstorm, including 27% who lost power for less than twenty-four hours¹. Twenty-two percent (22%) reported that their households were without power for more than two days.

When households lost power during the windstorm, a quarter tried to contact the utility, and of those who did, 44% got through on the first try. In fact, only a few study participants, (44 respondents) actually had some contact with SCL during the windstorm. Of them, 55% rated the service they received average or below.

¹ This figure is higher than the 50% who actually lost power. It is probable that an inadvertent over sampling of those without power occurred by self-selection, with those who had lost power being more willing to be interviewed than those who had not. This guarantees that the survey more than represents the sense of those who lost power. When the survey is weighted so that the ratio of those who lost power to those who didn't is fifty-fifty, the satisfaction level for reliable service actually rises five percentage points.

Sixty percent (60%) of these SCL customers say radio is the best way to keep them informed during a power outage. However, in a later question, three-quarters of the respondents indicated willingness to give SCL their personal phone numbers for use during a power outage.

Attitudes Toward Carbon Offsets

Eighty-two percent (82%) of respondents are at least somewhat concerned about climate change. This is consistent with results found in other Northwest states including a 2006 CRG study of Alaska residents.

Exactly half of the respondents favor, at least somewhat, the purchase of carbon offsets by SCL, and about the same percentage (52%) might be willing to pay ten cents per bill to continue the practice, including 42% who said they would definitely be willing.

B A C K G R O U N D & M E T H O D S

Suzanne Hartman, ABC, APR, Director Communication & Public Affairs Seattle City Light (SCL), hired CRG Research, a Division of Craciun Research Group, Inc. (Consultant), to conduct a customer satisfaction research project. The purpose of the research was to measure consumer awareness, opinions, attitudes, and perceptions regarding SCL. The primary objective for the study was to compare the current state of those factors to a survey conducted in early December 2006, shortly before windstorms caused severe power outages. Additional areas explored in this survey were as follows:

1. The best ways to communicate with customers in general and during an outage.
2. Customers' knowledge of and attitudes toward the company's purchase of carbon offsets.

RESEARCH METHODS

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument was designed in a collaborative process involving Suzanne Hartman of SCL, and Jean Craciun of CRG Research. The interviews were conducted over the period from February 3, 2007 through February 7, 2007.

The survey instrument was carefully designed to obtain thoughtful answers from respondents while avoiding instrument bias. Often, members within a household are subject to varying amounts of bias due to "group think;"² therefore, only one customer per household was interviewed.

THE SAMPLE

CRG Research professional interviewers conducted a survey of four hundred (N=400) randomly selected customers who reside in the SCL jurisdictional boundaries. Survey respondents were screened to ensure that they were the household member who paid the electric bills.

Exactly the same introduction, phone-number list, and selection methods were used in the random sampling for the February survey as were used in the original survey conducted November 30, 2006 through December 3, 2006. According to the laws of chance, the demographics differ; respondents in this sample are somewhat younger, better educated, higher in income, and there are more males than were interviewed in the first survey. To study the differences in answers that this might have caused, the sample was weighted for each variable and the answers to the questions were reprinted. (The tables may be found in Chapter E.3) The maximum deviation from the unweighted results was 2.4 percentage points, well within the margin of error. Most varied by one percentage point or less.

² Subject to strong influence of key member(s), collective group background, or common circumstance.

The sample closely resembles the original in the areas polled, except that the second survey has a few more households from Seattle and a few less from Shoreline.

TABLE A: SCL BOUNDARIES

	First Survey		Second Survey	
City:				
Seattle.....	336	83.6%	345	86.3%
Shoreline.....	35	8.7%	21	5.3%
Burien.....	18	4.5%	18	4.5%
Lake Forest Park.....	8	2.0%	11	2.8%
Tukwila.....	4	1.0%	2	.5%
Normandy Park.....	1	.2%	3	.8%
Total.....	402	100%	400	100%

Differences are not statistically significant

The probability is 19 out of 20, for the overall sample size, that if researchers had sought to interview every SCL customer using the same questionnaire, the findings would differ from these overall survey results by no more than 4.9 percentage points in either direction. Thus, the margin of error is +/- 4.9%. For subgroups, such as those who have visited the SCL website, the margin of error is higher.

The sampling error is not the only way in which survey findings may vary from the findings that would result from talking to every customer in the population studied. Survey research is susceptible to human and mechanical errors such as interviewer recording and data handling errors. However, the standardized procedures used by CRG eliminate such errors associated with paper and pencil methods; thus keeping the human error potential to a minimum.

DATA ANALYSIS & REPORTING

Members of the CRG research team, employing SPSS³, analyzed the sample. The primary procedures reported are frequencies and cross tabulations.

Call summary reports provided by *The Survey System*⁴ allowed supervisors and analysts to monitor the progress of the data collection process. Up to five (5) callback attempts were made to minimize “ready access”⁵ bias and assure the maximum feasible response rate.

³ Trademark registered.

⁴ Trademark registered. Creative Research Systems, Petaluma California

⁵ Potential bias due to interviewing only those usually at home by the phone (e.g. homebound, elders, unemployed, etc.)

Notes to Readers

Included in the presentation of each response is a summary or example of any significant findings, followed by relevant tables. All percentages in the narrative are rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.

Often, a few respondents fail to answer a question. Unless the percentage that failed to answer is significant, these people are not included in the totals upon which the percentages are based. Percentages in the tables occasionally do not add to exactly 100% because of rounding.

Cross tabulations describe data that may be related in some way. In many cross tabulations, categories are combined or omitted because the numbers are too small to be statistically significant. This manipulation may change the totals on which percentages are based, but does not affect the relationships between percentages.

Cross tabulations may be used to indicate differences (or lack of differences) between subgroups of people. When a lack of difference is being shown, a footnote is appended to the table indicating that the differences are not “statistically significant.”⁶

Survey questions are grouped together for reporting purposes when they are related. Also, the order in which the questions are presented in the findings is not the same as in the survey instrument. Refer to the Appendix for the actual question presentation sequence and skip control logic.

⁶ Statistical significance is determined by using a chi-square test with a significance factor of less than .05. The chi square test used by researchers to determine whether a result may be due to random variation is sensitive to sample size, since large random variations may occur in small samples.

R E S E A R C H F I N D I N G S

A. RATING OF SEATTLE CITY LIGHT

Question: Overall, how satisfied are you with Seattle City Light, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied?

Question: How would you rate Seattle City Light on the following – very good, good, average, poor, or very poor? *[List asked at random]*

- On the convenience in contacting them
- On the rates charged
- Reliable service, with few outages
- Using alternative energy sources like wind, solar, or geothermal
- Bills that are easy to read
- Online billing that is easy
- Energy conservation programs
- Help for low-income households

Comparing the first and second surveys conducted, the percentage of respondents who were “very satisfied” with Seattle City Light dropped from 65% to 50%, while the percentage who were “somewhat satisfied” rose a similar percentage from 31% to 44%.

TABLE A1.1: SATISFACTION WITH SCL

	First Survey		Second Survey	
Overall satisfaction:				
Very satisfied.....	256	64.5%	195	49.5%
Somewhat satisfied....	123	31.0%	174	44.2%
Somewhat unsatisfied..	14	3.5%	16	4.1%
Very unsatisfied.....	4	1.0%	9	2.3%
Total.....	397	100%	394	100%

* A few people had no opinion and have been omitted.

The “very good” rating level for Seattle City Light dropped twenty-six percentage points on the characteristic that was previously found to be most important to customers—*reliable service with few outages*, and it dropped four to ten percentage points on all other features except one. The exception is *online billing that is easy*, which rose eight percentage points.

A table which bases percentages on all respondents and includes numbers as well as percentages may be found in the Appendix.

TABLE A1.2: RATINGS OF SEATTLE CITY LIGHT

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Number
Reliable service, with few outages <i>First</i>	61.8%	30.4%	6.1%	1.5%	.3%	395
Reliable service, with few outages <i>Second</i>	36.3%	37.3%	19.9%	4.9%	1.5%	391
Bills that are easy to read <i>First</i>	43.5%	43.0%	12.2%	1.3%		395
Bills that are easy to read <i>Second</i>	34.0%	47.8%	15.6%	1.5%	1.0%	391
Convenience in contacting them <i>First</i>	33.8%	41.8%	20.1%	3.4%	.9%	328
Convenience in contacting them <i>Second</i>	27.5%	42.1%	24.1%	6.0%	.3%	316
Help for low-income households <i>First</i>	26.8%	43.3%	22.9%	4.3%	2.6%	231
Help for low-income households <i>Second</i>	17.6%	46.2%	27.6%	8.0%	.5%	199
Energy conservation programs <i>First</i>	22.3%	47.2%	23.0%	6.6%	1.0%	305
Energy conservation programs <i>Second</i>	18.1%	43.5%	29.3%	7.6%	1.4%	276
Using alternative energy sources <i>First</i>	20.7%	34.7%	26.0%	14.5%	4.1%	242
Using alternative energy sources <i>Second</i>	11.9%	36.2%	25.2%	23.3%	3.3%	210
Online billing that is easy <i>First</i>	18.2%	43.8%	24.8%	6.6%	6.6%	137
Online billing that is easy <i>Second</i>	26.2%	48.5%	20.0%	3.1%	2.3%	130
The rates charged <i>First</i> ..	16.9%	40.3%	30.8%	7.4%	4.6%	367
The rates charged <i>Second</i> ..	11.0%	35.2%	38.2%	11.0%	4.6%	372

Percentages are of each row and based on those with opinions.
Statements have been somewhat abbreviated. See the question on the previous page.

B. EXPERIENCES DURING THE WINDSTORM

Question: During the recent wind storm, did you lose power?

Question: *[Asked if power was lost]* How long was the power off?

Two-thirds of the respondents lost power during the recent windstorm, including 27% who lost power for less than twenty-four hours. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the households were without power for more than two days.

TABLE B1.1: WINDSTORM POWER OUTAGES

Power out for		
Less than 24 hours.....	108	27.0%
24 to 36 hours.....	39	9.8%
36 to 48 hours.....	32	8.0%
More than 48 hours.....	88	22.0%
Did not lose power.....	133	33.3%
Total.....	400	100%

All eighteen of the respondents from Burien and both of the respondents from Tukwila lost power. The numbers from all of the areas except Seattle are too small to accurately measure significance.

TABLE B1.2: WINDSTORM POWER OUTAGES BY AREA

	City:						Total
	Burien	Lake Forest Park	Normandy Park	Seattle	Shore line	Tukwila	
Hours power out:							
None.....		18.2%	33.3%	35.7%	33.3%		33.3%
Under 24.....	27.8%	9.1%		28.7%	9.5%	50.0%	27.0%
24 to 48.....	27.8%	36.4%	33.3%	16.5%	19.0%		17.8%
Over 48.....	44.4%	36.4%	33.3%	19.1%	38.1%	50.0%	22.0%
Number.....	18	11	3	345	21	2	400

Column percentages
 * Difference is not statistically significant

The longer the power was off, the lower the rating of Seattle City Light.

TABLE B1.3: SATISFACTION AND RATING OF POWER OUTAGES

	Hours power out:				Total
	None	Under 24	24 to 48	Over 48	
Overall satisfaction:					
Very satisfied.....	57.6%	52.4%	47.9%	35.2%	49.5%
Somewhat satisfied.....	38.6%	42.7%	42.3%	55.7%	44.2%
Unsatisfied.....	3.8%	4.9%	9.9%	9.1%	6.3%
Number.....	132	103	71	88	394
Reliable service, with few outages					
Very good.....	55.1%	31.8%	29.6%	19.8%	36.3%
Good.....	31.5%	46.7%	32.4%	38.4%	37.3%
Average, poor.....	13.4%	21.5%	38.0%	41.9%	26.3%
Number.....	127	107	71	86	391

Column percentages

The actual number of City Light customer accounts recorded without power was just under fifty percent. It is probable that an inadvertent over sampling of those without power occurred by self-selection, with those who had lost power being more willing to be interviewed than those who had not. This guarantees that the survey more than represents the sense of those who lost power. When the survey is weighted so that the ratio of those who lost power to those who didn't is fifty-fifty, satisfaction levels are slightly higher.⁷

TABLE B1.4: SATISFACTION LEVELS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE WEIGHTED TO ACTUAL POWER-LOSS RATIO

	Weighted	Un-Weighted
Overall satisfaction:		
Very satisfied.....	51.5%	49.5%
Somewhat satisfied....	42.8%	44.2%
Somewhat unsatisfied..	3.8%	4.1%
Very unsatisfied.....	1.9%	2.3%
Total.....	394	394

⁷ “Weighting” is a mathematical procedure which counts each answer as a little more than, a little less than, or equal to its actual value according to a formula. For instance, in this case, the program counts the answer of each person who reported an outage as a little less than one, and each answer from a person who did not lose power as a little more than one.

When the survey is weighted to compensate for the high ratio of those who lost power, the rating for *reliable service* rises five percentage points.

TABLE B1.5: RATINGS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE WEIGHTED TO ACTUAL POWER-LOSS RATIO

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Number
Reliable service, with few outages.....	41.1%	35.9%	17.5%	4.2%	1.2%	389
Reliable service, with few outages, unweighted	36.3%	37.3%	19.9%	4.9%	1.5%	391
Bills that are easy to read.....	36.3%	46.2%	15.2%	1.1%	1.2%	390
Bills that are easy to read, unweighted.....	34.0%	47.8%	15.6%	1.5%	1.0%	391
Convenience in contacting them.....	29.0%	41.1%	24.3%	5.4%	.2%	303
Convenience in contacting them, unweighted.....	27.5%	42.1%	24.1%	6.0%	.3%	316
Help for low-income households.....	17.3%	46.6%	27.1%	8.3%	.8%	200
Help for low-income households, unweighted.	17.6%	46.2%	27.6%	8.0%	.5%	199
Energy conservation programs.....	19.0%	43.2%	29.3%	7.3%	1.1%	277
Energy conservation programs, unweighted...	18.1%	43.5%	29.3%	7.6%	1.4%	276
Using alternative energy sources.....	11.2%	37.0%	26.1%	22.4%	3.3%	207
Using alternative energy sources, unweighted....	11.9%	36.2%	25.2%	23.3%	3.3%	210
Online billing that is easy.....	25.7%	49.1%	19.8%	3.0%	2.4%	125
Online billing that is easy, unweighted.....	26.2%	48.5%	20.0%	3.1%	2.3%	130
The rates charged.....	11.8%	35.4%	37.7%	11.2%	3.9%	369
The rates charged..... unweighted	11.0%	35.2%	38.2%	11.0%	4.6%	372

Percentages are of each row and based on those with opinions.
Statements have been somewhat abbreviated.

C. CONTACTING SEATTLE CITY LIGHT

These questions were asked of those who suffered outages during the windstorm.

Question: *[Asked if power was lost]* Did your household try to contact City Light?

Question: *[Asked if tried to contact SCL]* How did you try?

Question: *[Asked if tried to contact SCL]* How many times did you try to make contact with City Light?

Question: *[Asked if tried to contact SCL]* Were you able to reach them?

Question: *[Asked if reached SCL]* How would you rate the quality and efficiency of the service you received?

Of the households who lost power during the windstorm, a quarter tried to contact the company, and of those who did, 44% got through on the first try. However, a third (33%) was never able to reach the company. Nearly all who tried (96%) used the telephone.

TABLE C1.1: CONTACTS DURING THE OUTAGE

Household:		
Tried to contact SCL.....	66	24.6%
Did not.....	199	74.3%
Not sure.....	3	1.1%
Total.....	268	100%
Tried to contact SCL:		
Once.....	29	43.9%
Two or three times.....	17	25.8%
Four or more.....	20	30.3%
Total.....	66	100%
Household was:		
Able to reach them.....	44	66.7%
Was not.....	20	30.3%
Unsure.....	2	3.0%
Total.....	66	100%
Method of contact:		
Telephone.....	63	95.5%
Email.....	3	4.5%
Website.....	2	3.0%
Service center.....	1	1.5%
911 (live wire down).....	1	1.5%
Total Respondents *.....	66	

* Percentages add to more than 100% because some respondents gave more than one response.

This table is not statistically valid because of the small numbers involved, but is presented for information.

TABLE C1.2 SUCCESS OF OUTAGE CONTACT ATTEMPTS

	Tried to contact SCL:						Total	
	Once		Two or three times		Four or more			
Household was:								
Able to reach them...	21	72.4%	11	64.7%	12	60.0%	44	66.7%
Was not.....	7	24.1%	6	35.3%	7	35.0%	20	30.3%
Unsure.....	1	3.4%			1	5.0%	2	3.0%
Number.....	29	100%	17	100%	20	100%	66	100%

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

The longer the outage, the more attempted calls were made.

TABLE C1.3 NUMBER OF CALLS BY LENGTH OF OUTAGE

	Hours power out:			Total
	Under 24	24 to 48	Over 48	
Tried to contact SCL:				
Once.....	86.7%	50.0%	25.6%	43.9%
Two or three times.....	6.7%	25.0%	33.3%	25.8%
Four or more.....	6.7%	25.0%	41.0%	30.3%
Number.....	15	12	39	66

Column percentages

The majority (55%) of the forty-four respondents who had some contact with SCL during the windstorm rated the service they received good (27%), average (21%), poor (32%), or very poor (2%).

TABLE C1.4: RATING OF CONTACTS

Service was:		
Very good.....	8	18.2%
Good.....	12	27.3%
Average.....	9	20.5%
Poor.....	14	31.8%
Very poor.....	1	2.3%
Total.....	44	100%

Question: Considering the conditions during a storm and the many people with questions, what is the best way for City Light to keep you informed?

Question: Would you consider giving City Light your cell phone or home phone to use to contact you during an outage?

Sixty percent (60%) of these SCL users say radio is the best way to keep them informed during a power outage.

TABLE C2.1 THE BEST WAY TO KEEP PEOPLE INFORMED DURING AN OUTAGE

Best way:		
Radio.....	238	59.5%
Television.....	155	38.8%
Telephone.....	87	21.8%
Door-to-door.....	63	15.8%
email.....	49	12.3%
Website.....	35	8.8%
Cars with loudspeakers.....	32	8.0%
Newspaper.....	14	3.5%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc....	2	.5%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....	1	.3%
Don't know.....	14	3.5%
Total Respondents.....	400	

Percentages add to more than 100% because many respondents gave more than one response.

Forty-one percent (41%) of the respondents are willing to give SCL their cell phone numbers for use during a power outage, and an additional 35% would give the company only their home telephone numbers, which may indicate they do not have a cell phone.

TABLE C2.2 WILLINGNESS TO GIVE TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Respondent would consider		
Yes, cell phone.....	34	8.5%
Yes, both.....	128	32.0%
Yes, home phone.....	139	34.8%
Concerned about security.....	7	1.8%
Unsure.....	9	2.3%
Neither.....	83	20.8%
Total.....	400	100%

The length of the power outage, or even whether or not a respondent experienced an outage, had little to do with whether they were willing to give City Light their telephone numbers for use during an outage.

TABLE C2.3 WILLINGNESS TO GIVE NUMBERS BY LENGTH OF POWER OUTAGE

	Hours power out:				Total
	None	Under 24	24 to 48	Over 48	
Respondent would:					
Supply cell number, or both....	42.1%	37.0%	43.7%	39.8%	40.5%
Supply only home phone number..	38.3%	34.3%	29.6%	34.1%	34.8%
Neither, unsure.....	19.5%	28.7%	26.8%	26.1%	24.8%
Number.....	133	108	71	88	400

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

Question: Do you use the Internet?

Question: [*Asked if uses the Internet*] Is the Internet a good way to get information to you?

Eighteen percent (18%) of those polled do not use the Internet.

Two thirds (65%) of Internet users, and one third (33%) of all customers consider the net a good way to communicate with them.

TABLE C3.1: THE INTERNET AS A WAY TO COMMUNICATE

	Percent of all		Percent of net users	
Respondent:				
Uses the Internet.....	329	82.3%		
Does not.....	71	17.8%		
Total.....	400	100%		
Internet is:				
A good way to get info to customer.....	132	33.0%	132	65.0%
Sometimes good.....	71	17.8%	71	35.0%
Does not use the Internet....	197	49.3%		
Total.....	400	100%	203	100%

Question: [*Asked if uses the Internet*] Have you ever visited the Seattle City Light Website?

Question: [*Asked if the website had been visited*] How would you rate it?

Thirty-two percent (32%) of those surveyed had visited the SCL Website, up from 19% in the last survey.

Fifty-two percent (52%) rated it above average, including 10% who rated it “very good.” These figures have not changed significantly since the last survey (56% above average, with 7% “very good, respectively”)

TABLE C4.1: WEB SITE VISITS AND RATINGS

Respondent has:		
Visited the website.....	126	31.5%
Has not.....	203	50.8%
Doesn't use the Internet.....	71	17.8%
Total.....	400	100%
Website is:		
Very good.....	13	10.3%
Good.....	53	42.1%
Average.....	39	31.0%
Poor.....	4	3.2%
Very poor.....	4	3.2%
Don't recall.....	13	10.3%
Total.....	126	100%

Question: Where do you get most of your information about your electric utility – newspapers, television news, television advertising, radio, mail, the newsletter/ information in your bill, or online from the Internet?

Question: Which of these are better to use if City Light wants to explain new services to you?

There was no significant change between surveys one and two – the SCL newsletter remains at the top of both lists.

Twenty-one percent (21%) of the respondents said they got most of their information about their electric utility from television news and 4% from television ads. As a preferred way to communicate with them, 18% of these customers said news from “television news” and 8% said “television ads.”

TABLE C5.1: SOURCES OF NEWS

	First Survey		Second Survey	
Sources of information:				
Newsletter.....	272	67.7%	256	64.0%
Newspaper.....	151	37.6%	107	26.8%
Mail.....	64	15.9%	48	12.0%
Radio.....	25	6.2%	34	8.5%
Online.....	24	6.0%	32	8.0%
Television news.....			82	20.5%
Television ads.....			17	4.3%
Television	72	17.9%		
Don't get any.....			10	2.5%
No answer.....	12	3.0%	4	1.0%
Total Respondents.....	402		400	
Best way to communicate:				
Newsletter.....	300	74.6%	263	65.8%
Newspaper.....	91	22.6%	59	14.8%
Mail.....	83	20.6%	78	19.5%
Online.....	41	10.2%	55	13.8%
Radio.....	27	6.7%	27	6.8%
Television news.....			70	17.5%
Television ads.....			33	8.3%
Television	67	16.7%		
No answer.....	3	.7%	1	.3%
Total Respondents.....	402		400	

Percentages add to more than 100% because many respondents gave more than one response.

D. ATTITUDES TOWARD CARBON OFFSETS

Question: There has been much talk lately about issues surrounding climate change and the effect of greenhouse gas on the environment. What do you think about it? Are you strongly concerned, somewhat concerned, slightly concerned or not at all concerned?

Question: Seattle City Light was the first electric utility to achieve zero carbon emissions as a result of conservation, renewable power, and purchasing what's called "carbon offsets" from other companies. Did you know that? *[If respondents asked, they were told carbon offset is buying credits for reducing carbon emissions by improving manufacturing or operating methods to reduce greenhouse gases.]*

Sixty percent (60%) of respondents are strongly concerned about climate change and another 22% are somewhat concerned. This is consistent with results found in a National Science Foundation study conducted by CRG on the same topic in August 2006, with Alaskan residents.

TABLE D1.1: CONCERN ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

Respondent is:		
Strongly concerned about climate change.	241	60.3%
Somewhat concerned.....	86	21.5%
Slightly concerned.....	29	7.3%
Not at all concerned.....	35	8.8%
Do not believe in it.....	2	.5%
No answer.....	7	1.8%
Total.....	400	100%

Four in ten (27%) respondents were aware that City Light was the first electric utility to achieve zero carbon emissions.

TABLE D1.2: SCL AS FIRST TO ACHIEVE ZERO EMISSIONS

Respondent:		
Knew that SCL was first.....	108	27.0%
Did not.....	286	71.5%
No answer.....	6	1.5%
Total.....	400	100%

Question: Most of City Light’s net zero carbon emissions comes from conservation and renewable energy. City Light was able to get to zero by buying carbon offsets from other companies. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose City Light buying carbon offsets?

Question: Would you be willing to pay ten cents more on your electric bill to buy carbon offsets?

Exactly half of the respondents favor, at least somewhat, the purchase of carbon offsets, by SCL, and about the same percentage (52%) might be willing to pay ten cents per bill to continue the practice, including 42% who said they would definitely be willing.

TABLE D2.1: CITY LIGHT AND CARBON OFFSETS

+-----+-----+		
+-----+-----+		
Respondent:		
Strongly favors carbon offsets.....	76	19.0%
Somewhat favors.....	124	31.0%
Neutral, unsure.....	53	13.3%
Slightly opposes.....	38	9.5%
Strongly opposes.....	28	7.0%
Not familiar with carbon offsets.....	56	14.0%
No answer.....	25	6.3%
Total.....	400	100%
+-----+-----+		
Respondent would be:		
Willing to pay 10 cents more.....	167	41.8%
Maybe, it depends.....	41	10.3%
Would not.....	123	30.8%
Not familiar with carbon offsets.....	51	12.8%
No answer.....	18	4.5%
Total.....	400	100%
+-----+-----+		

E. DEMOGRAPHICS

Question: Do you own your home or do you rent?

Question: What kind of household do you live in?

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of respondents in the first survey and 84% of those in the second own their homes, and in both surveys, 84% live in single-family homes.⁸

TABLE E1.1: HOUSEHOLD TYPES

	First Survey		Second Survey	
Respondent:				
Own.....	341	86.5%	334	84.3%
Rent.....	53	13.5%	62	15.7%
Total *	394	100%	396	100%
Respondent lives in:				
Single family home.....	328	84.1%	329	83.5%
Duplex.....	6	1.5%	4	1.0%
Four-plex.....	3	.8%	3	.8%
Larger multi-family.....	7	1.8%	6	1.5%
Side-by-side condo/apartment...	24	6.2%	25	6.3%
High-rise condo/apartment.....	20	5.1%	23	5.8%
Townhouse.....	2	.5%	4	1.0%
Total *	390	100%	394	100%

* Some respondents did not answer and have been omitted from the percentage base.

⁸ It is plausible that some people who live in side-by-side condos consider them single-family homes.

Survey respondents were screened to ensure that they were the household member who paid the electric bills. In both surveys, this resulted in a sample that was older and with more women than the general population.

The demographics of the respondents in the two surveys differ somewhat. There were significantly more men in the second survey (47% compared to 37% in the first survey). In addition, those in the second survey were somewhat younger, better educated and had higher household incomes than those in the first, i.e.:

- The median age in the first survey was fifty-eight years, in the second fifty-five.
- Fifty-seven percent of those in the first survey had college degrees, compared to 61% in the second.
- The median household income in the first survey was \$57,786, in the second \$65,236.

To study the differences in ratings that this might have caused, the sample was weighted for each variable and the answers to the questions were reprinted. The maximum deviation from the unweighted results was 2.4 percentage points, well within the margin of error. Most varied by one percentage point or fewer. (Tables E3.1 to E3.3)

Ethnicity was not measured in the first survey. In the second, 86% of the respondents said they were Caucasian.

The table of demographics may be found on the next page.

TABLE E2.1: DEMOGRAPHIC MAKEUP OF THE SAMPLE

	First Survey		Second Survey	
Gender:				
Male.....	149	37.1%	187	46.8%
Female.....	253	62.9%	213	53.3%
Total.....	402	100%	400	100%
Age:				
18 to 29.....	8	2.0%	6	1.5%
30 to 39.....	45	11.5%	50	12.6%
40 to 49.....	61	15.6%	84	21.2%
50 to 59.....	91	23.3%	94	23.7%
60 and up.....	186	47.6%	163	41.1%
Total.....	391	100%	397	100%
Education:				
Less than High School.....	10	2.6%	3	.8%
High School graduate/ GED...	58	14.8%	47	12.0%
Some college or technical...	102	26.1%	102	26.0%
Four-year degree.....	128	32.7%	111	28.2%
Post graduate.....	93	23.8%	130	33.1%
Total.....	391	100%	393	100%
Income:				
Less than \$25,000.....	52	16.2%	39	12.3%
\$25,000 to \$40,000.....	57	17.8%	48	15.1%
\$41,000 to \$55,000.....	43	13.4%	40	12.6%
\$56,000 to \$70,000.....	45	14.0%	47	14.8%
\$71,000 to \$100,000.....	67	20.9%	61	19.2%
Over \$100,000.....	57	17.8%	83	26.1%
Total.....	321	100%	318	100%
Ethnicity:				
Caucasian.....			317	85.9%
African American.....			20	5.4%
American Indian.....			2	.5%
Hispanic.....			8	2.2%
Asian, Pacific Islander.....			19	5.1%
Other, mixed.....			3	.8%
Total.....			369	100%

* Some respondents did not answer and have been omitted from the percentage base.

The following tables show the effects of weighting each demographic variable so that its distribution exactly matches the December, 2006 survey.⁹ Each column indicates the resulting percentages when the survey was weighted for the variable at the top of the column. The maximum deviation from the unweighted results was 2.4 percentage points, well within the margin of error. Most varied by one percentage point or fewer.

TABLE E3.1: SATISFACTION LEVELS WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED

	Weighted by:				Un-weighted
	Gender	Age	Edu-cation	Income	
Overall satisfaction:					
Very satisfied.....	49.8%	51.1%	49.5%	51.9%	49.5%
Somewhat satisfied....	43.8%	42.9%	44.6%	41.7%	44.2%
Somewhat unsatisfied..	4.1%	3.9%	3.5%	4.5%	4.1%
Very unsatisfied.....	2.3%	2.0%	2.3%	1.9%	2.3%
Total.....	393	391	393	312	100%

TABLE E3.2: RATINGS WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED – PART ONE OF THREE

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Number
Reliable service, with few outages, by gender.....	36.7%	36.5%	20.2%	5.0%	1.5%	391
Reliable service, with few outages, by age.....	37.2%	36.9%	19.6%	4.9%	1.4%	387
Reliable service, with few outages, by education..	36.3%	38.4%	19.4%	4.5%	1.4%	385
Reliable service, with few outages, by income.....	36.4%	38.9%	18.2%	4.7%	1.8%	311
*Reliable service, with few outages, unweighted	36.3%	37.3%	19.9%	4.9%	1.5%	391
Bills that are easy to read, by gender.....	34.8%	47.2%	15.3%	1.6%	1.1%	391
Bills that are easy to read, by age.....	34.3%	48.3%	15.0%	1.5%	.9%	388
Bills that are easy to read, by education...	34.3%	48.0%	15.3%	1.5%	.9%	383
Bills that are easy to read, by income.....	35.2%	46.5%	15.8%	1.1%	1.4%	310
*Bills that are easy to read, unweighted.....	34.0%	47.8%	15.6%	1.5%	1.0%	391

⁹ “Weighting” is a mathematical procedure which counts each answer as a little more than, a little less than, or equal to its actual value according to a formula. For instance, in this case there were more men in the second study than the first, so when weighting the second study to match the first, the program counts each male answer as a little less than one, and each female answer as a little more than one.

TABLE E3.2: RATINGS WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED – PART TWO OF THREE

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Number
Convenience in contacting them, <i>by gender</i>	28.2%	41.5%	24.1%	6.0%	.3%	316
Convenience in contacting them, <i>by age</i>	28.4%	41.6%	23.6%	6.2%	.2%	312
Convenience in contacting them, <i>by educa</i>	28.4%	41.9%	23.8%	5.6%	.3%	312
Convenience in contacting them, <i>by income</i>	27.6%	43.1%	23.3%	5.7%	.3%	245
*Convenience in contacting them, <i>unweighted</i>	27.5%	42.1%	24.1%	6.0%	.3%	316
Help for low-income households, <i>by gender</i> ..	17.7%	45.1%	28.5%	8.1%	.6%	200
Help for low-income households, <i>by age</i>	18.4%	45.0%	28.3%	7.9%	.5%	196
Help for low-income households, <i>by educ</i> ..	19.0%	46.1%	26.5%	8.1%	.4%	199
Help for low-income households, <i>by income</i> ..	20.1%	43.8%	26.8%	8.6%	.7%	166
*Help for low-income households, <i>unweighted</i> ..	17.6%	46.2%	27.6%	8.0%	.5%	199
Energy conservation programs, <i>by gender</i>	17.6%	43.5%	29.5%	7.9%	1.6%	276
Energy conservation programs, <i>by age</i>	18.4%	43.6%	29.0%	7.4%	1.6%	274
Energy conservation programs, <i>by educ</i>	19.3%	43.3%	28.5%	7.6%	1.3%	271
Energy conservation programs, <i>by income</i>	18.9%	42.4%	29.9%	7.4%	1.4%	223
*Energy conservation programs, <i>unweighted</i> ...	18.1%	43.5%	29.3%	7.6%	1.4%	276
Using alternative energy sources, <i>by gender</i>	11.6%	36.2%	25.7%	23.2%	3.2%	207
Using alternative energy sources, <i>by age</i>	12.6%	35.0%	26.1%	23.1%	3.2%	206
Using alternative energy sources, <i>by educ</i>	12.9%	36.9%	24.7%	22.3%	3.2%	204
Using alternative energy sources, <i>by income</i>	12.1%	37.2%	24.6%	23.2%	3.0%	177
*Using alternative energy sources, <i>unweighted</i>	11.9%	36.2%	25.2%	23.3%	3.3%	210

TABLE E3.2: RATINGS WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED – PART THREE OF THREE

	Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor	Number
Online billing that is easy, by gender.....	26.1%	48.8%	19.9%	2.8%	2.5%	127
Online billing that is easy, by age.....	27.8%	47.7%	19.8%	2.6%	2.1%	124
Online billing that is easy, by educ.	25.9%	49.6%	18.9%	3.0%	2.6%	130
Online billing that is easy, by income.....	24.0%	50.3%	20.3%	2.8%	2.7%	107
*Online billing that is easy, unweighted.....	26.2%	48.5%	20.0%	3.1%	2.3%	130
The rates charged gender..	10.9%	34.9%	38.3%	11.2%	4.8%	370
The rates charged, by age.	11.1%	35.4%	38.6%	10.5%	4.4%	367
The rates charged educ....	11.1%	35.8%	37.3%	11.1%	4.7%	364
The rates charged income..	13.0%	35.2%	37.1%	9.9%	4.8%	296
*The rates charged..... unweighted	11.0%	35.2%	38.2%	11.0%	4.6%	372

Percentages are of each row and based on those with opinions.
 Statements have been somewhat abbreviated. See question for exact wording.
 q3 to q22 weighted, by gender

TABLE E3.3 RATING THE SCL WEBSITE WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED

	Weighted by:				Un-weighted
	Gender	Age	Edu- cation	Income	
Respondent has:					
Visited the website.	30.1%	29.2%	30.8%	32.0%	31.5%
Has not.....	51.8%	51.7%	49.6%	48.2%	50.8%
Don't use the Web...	18.1%	19.1%	19.6%	19.9%	17.8%
Total.....	400	397	393	318	400
Website is:					
Very good.....	10.5%	10.2%	10.3%	10.8%	10.3%
Good.....	42.6%	43.5%	42.7%	43.8%	42.1%
Average.....	31.1%	29.9%	29.6%	29.8%	31.0%
Poor.....	3.0%	3.3%	3.1%	2.9%	3.2%
Very poor.....	3.0%	3.1%	3.6%	3.6%	3.2%
Never used/Unsure...	9.8%	9.9%	10.7%	9.0%	10.3%
Total.....	120	116	121	102	126

TABLE E3.4 SOURCES OF NEWS WHEN THE FILE IS WEIGHTED

	Weighted by:				Un-weighted
	Gender	Age	Educ.	Income	
Sources of information:					
Newsletter.....	64.0%	64.0%	63.6%	63.8%	64.0%
Newspaper.....	26.8%	27.4%	26.7%	25.4%	26.8%
Television news.....	20.5%	20.9%	21.6%	21.5%	20.5%
Mail.....	12.0%	11.9%	12.0%	11.6%	12.0%
Radio.....	8.5%	8.6%	8.8%	10.0%	8.5%
Online.....	8.0%	7.5%	7.9%	8.2%	8.0%
Television ads.....	4.3%	4.7%	4.9%	4.4%	4.3%
Don't get any.....	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%
No answer.....	1.0%	1.0%	.9%	1.5%	1.0%
Total Respondents.....	400	397	393	318	400
Best way to communicate:					
Newsletter.....	66.4%	65.7%	65.5%	65.5%	65.8%
Mail.....	20.0%	19.0%	18.1%	18.0%	19.5%
Television news.....	17.3%	17.6%	18.5%	18.7%	17.5%
Newspaper.....	15.2%	15.2%	14.6%	15.1%	14.8%
Online.....	13.4%	12.9%	13.2%	14.1%	13.8%
Television ads.....	8.7%	8.4%	8.5%	8.0%	8.3%
Radio.....	6.9%	6.9%	7.2%	6.7%	6.8%
No answer.....	.2%	.3%	.2%	.4%	.3%
Total Respondents.....	400	397	393	318	400

Percentages add to more than 100% because many respondents gave more than one response.

On the following pages the key new questions are cross tabulated by gender, age, education, household income, and ethnicity. Few of the answers differed significantly.¹⁰ Some exceptions are summarized below:

- The greater the education the less likely respondents were to have lost power during the wind storms. This was not true of income, but was true of ethnicity, with Caucasians less likely than others. (Tables E4.3, E4.4 and E4.5)
- Thirty-nine percent (39%) of men and 25% of women have visited the SCL Website, although almost as many women (81%) as men (84%) use the Internet. (Table E4.1).
- Although Internet use declines with age, 69% of those sixty and older are online. [Fourteen percent (14%) of them have visited the SCL Website.] (Tables E4.2)
- Education and income have a strong affect on Internet usage. Only 42% of respondents with no college education are online and only 10% have visited the SCL website. Both Internet usage and website visits rise with income. (Tables E4.3 and E4.4)
- All groups are equally likely to be willing to supply SCL with a phone number in case of outage, but those with higher education are more likely to provide a cell phone number. (Table E4.3)
- By a small margin, women (88%) are more likely than men (79%) to be concerned about climate change. (Table E6.1)
- The higher the education and income, the higher the concern about climate change. (Tables E6.3 and E6.4)
- Men are more likely to oppose the purchase of carbon-offsets and less willing to pay a few cents a month for them. (Table E6.1)
- The differences between Caucasians and the group of all other ethnicities are consistent with the differences shown by education and income.

¹⁰ Using a 95% confidence level for analyses.

TABLE E4.1: POWER OUTAGE AND THE SCL WEBSITE BY GENDER

	Gender:		Total
	Male	Female	
Hours power out: *			
None.....	35.3%	31.5%	33.3%
Under 24.....	24.6%	29.1%	27.0%
24 to 48.....	19.8%	16.0%	17.8%
Over 48.....	20.3%	23.5%	22.0%
Number.....	187	213	400
Respondent would: *			
Supply cell number, or both...	40.1%	40.8%	40.5%
Supply only home phone number.	30.5%	38.5%	34.8%
Neither, unsure.....	29.4%	20.7%	24.8%
Number.....	187	213	400
Respondent has:			
Visited the website.....	39.0%	24.9%	31.5%
Has not.....	44.9%	55.9%	50.8%
Don't use the Internet.....	16.0%	19.2%	17.8%
Number.....	187	213	400

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

TABLE E4.2: POWER OUTAGE AND THE SCL WEBSITE BY AGE

	Age:				Total
	18 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 and up	
Hours power out: *					
None.....	37.5%	38.1%	33.0%	29.4%	33.2%
Under 24.....	19.6%	25.0%	26.6%	31.3%	27.2%
24 to 48.....	17.9%	17.9%	17.0%	17.8%	17.6%
Over 48.....	25.0%	19.0%	23.4%	21.5%	21.9%
Number.....	56	84	94	163	397
Respondent would: *					
Supply cell number, or both...	39.3%	44.0%	46.8%	36.2%	40.8%
Supply only home phone number.	48.2%	31.0%	27.7%	36.8%	35.0%
Neither, unsure.....	12.5%	25.0%	25.5%	27.0%	24.2%
Number.....	56	84	94	163	397
Respondent has:					
Visited the website.....	41.1%	50.0%	39.4%	14.1%	31.5%
Has not.....	57.1%	45.2%	46.8%	54.6%	51.1%
Don't use the Internet.....	1.8%	4.8%	13.8%	31.3%	17.4%
Number.....	56	84	94	163	397

TABLE E4.3: POWER OUTAGE AND THE SCL WEBSITE BY EDUCATION

	Education:				Total
	High School or less	Some college/tech	Four year degree	Post graduate	
Hours power out:					
None.....	18.0%	25.5%	35.1%	43.1%	33.1%
Under 24.....	32.0%	23.5%	37.8%	19.2%	27.2%
24 to 48.....	20.0%	26.5%	13.5%	13.8%	17.8%
Over 48.....	30.0%	24.5%	13.5%	23.8%	21.9%
Number.....	50	102	111	130	393
Respondent would: *					
Supply cell number, or both...	38.0%	37.3%	35.1%	47.7%	40.2%
Supply only home phone number.	34.0%	40.2%	36.9%	30.8%	35.4%
Neither, unsure.....	28.0%	22.5%	27.9%	21.5%	24.4%
Number.....	50	102	111	130	393
Respondent has:					
Visited the website.....	10.0%	34.3%	36.9%	33.8%	31.8%
Has not.....	32.0%	46.1%	55.9%	57.7%	50.9%
Don't use the Internet.....	58.0%	19.6%	7.2%	8.5%	17.3%
Number.....	50	102	111	130	393

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

TABLE E4.4: POWER OUTAGE AND THE SCL WEBSITE BY GENDER INCOME

	Household income:			Total
	Less than \$40,000	\$41,000 to \$70,000	Over \$70,000	
Hours power out: *				
None.....	34.5%	35.6%	33.3%	34.3%
Under 24.....	26.4%	31.0%	27.8%	28.3%
24 to 48.....	14.9%	21.8%	16.7%	17.6%
Over 48.....	24.1%	11.5%	22.2%	19.8%
Number.....	87	87	144	318
Respondent would:				
Supply cell number, or both...	29.9%	43.7%	47.2%	41.5%
Supply only home phone number.	46.0%	34.5%	27.8%	34.6%
Neither, unsure.....	24.1%	21.8%	25.0%	23.9%
Number.....	87	87	144	318
Respondent has:				
Visited the website.....	18.4%	32.2%	43.8%	33.6%
Has not.....	41.4%	54.0%	50.0%	48.7%
Don't use the Internet.....	40.2%	13.8%	6.3%	17.6%
Number.....	87	87	144	318

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

**TABLE E4.5: POWER OUTAGE AND THE SCL WEBSITE
BY ETHNICITY**

	Ethnicity:		Total
	Caucasian	Other	
Hours power out:			
None.....	34.7%	21.2%	32.8%
Under 24.....	26.2%	34.6%	27.4%
24 to 48.....	18.6%	11.5%	17.6%
Over 48.....	20.5%	32.7%	22.2%
Number.....	317	52	369
Respondent would: *			
Supply cell number, or both...	41.3%	34.6%	40.4%
Supply only home phone number.	34.7%	38.5%	35.2%
Neither, unsure.....	24.0%	26.9%	24.4%
Number.....	317	52	369
Respondent has:			
Visited the website.....	32.5%	23.1%	31.2%
Has not.....	52.4%	40.4%	50.7%
Don't use the Internet.....	15.1%	36.5%	18.2%
Number.....	317	52	369

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

**TABLE E5.1: CONTACTING SCL DURING AN
OUTAGE BY GENDER**

	Gender:		Total
	Male	Female	
Best way in an outage:			
Radio.....	65.2%	58.5%	61.7%
Television.....	38.1%	42.0%	40.2%
Telephone.....	16.0%	28.3%	22.5%
Door-to-door.....	12.2%	20.0%	16.3%
email.....	9.9%	15.1%	12.7%
Website.....	9.9%	8.3%	9.1%
Cars with loudspeakers.	3.3%	12.7%	8.3%
Newspaper.....	3.3%	3.9%	3.6%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc.....	.6%	.5%	.5%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....		.5%	.3%
Number.....	181	205	386

Significance cannot be computed for multiple response questions.

TABLE E5.2: CONTACTING SCL DURING AN OUTAGE BY AGE

	Age:				Total
	18 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 and up	
Best way in an outage:					
Radio.....	69.1%	65.1%	59.8%	58.4%	61.7%
Television.....	38.2%	37.3%	35.9%	45.5%	40.4%
Telephone.....	23.6%	22.9%	22.8%	22.1%	22.7%
Door-to-door.....	14.5%	18.1%	21.7%	12.3%	16.1%
email.....	14.5%	16.9%	15.2%	8.4%	12.8%
Website.....	16.4%	10.8%	12.0%	3.9%	9.1%
Cars with loudspeakers.	1.8%	7.2%	6.5%	12.3%	8.3%
Newspaper.....	1.8%	3.6%	3.3%	4.5%	3.6%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc.....				1.3%	.5%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....				.6%	.3%
Number.....	55	83	92	154	384

Significance cannot be computed for multiple response questions.

TABLE E5.3: CONTACTING SCL DURING AN OUTAGE BY EDUCATION

	Education:				Total
	High School or less	Some college/tech	Four year degree	Post graduate	
Best way in an outage:					
Radio.....	68.8%	73.0%	51.4%	58.9%	61.7%
Television.....	52.1%	35.0%	40.4%	40.3%	40.4%
Telephone.....	14.6%	20.0%	22.0%	28.2%	22.6%
Door-to-door.....	10.4%	15.0%	18.3%	17.7%	16.3%
email.....	10.4%	8.0%	16.5%	14.5%	12.9%
Website.....	4.2%	6.0%	10.1%	12.9%	9.2%
Cars with loudspeakers.	6.3%	6.0%	7.3%	12.1%	8.4%
Newspaper.....			7.3%	4.8%	3.7%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc.....			1.8%		.5%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....			.9%		.3%
Number.....	48	100	109	124	381

Significance cannot be computed for multiple response questions.

TABLE E5.4: CONTACTING SCL DURING AN OUTAGE BY INCOME

	Household income:			Total
	Less than \$40,000	\$41,000 to \$70,000	Over \$70,000	
Best way in an outage:				
Radio.....	61.9%	59.8%	61.7%	61.2%
Television.....	48.8%	40.2%	37.6%	41.4%
Telephone.....	15.5%	28.0%	24.1%	22.8%
Door-to-door.....	17.9%	13.4%	17.0%	16.3%
email.....	9.5%	12.2%	15.6%	13.0%
Website.....	7.1%	9.8%	12.8%	10.4%
Cars with loudspeakers.	9.5%	11.0%	7.1%	8.8%
Newspaper.....	2.4%	2.4%	6.4%	4.2%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc.....	1.2%	1.2%		.7%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....	1.2%			.3%
Number.....	84	82	141	307

Significance cannot be computed for multiple response questions.

TABLE E5.5: CONTACTING SCL DURING AN OUTAGE BY ETHNICITY

	Ethnicity:		Total
	Caucasian	Other	
Best way in an outage:			
Radio.....	62.3%	61.2%	62.2%
Television.....	38.0%	53.1%	40.1%
Telephone.....	23.1%	16.3%	22.1%
Door-to-door.....	17.2%	8.2%	16.0%
email.....	13.0%	12.2%	12.9%
Website.....	10.1%	6.1%	9.5%
Cars with loudspeakers.	9.1%	6.1%	8.7%
Newspaper.....	3.6%	6.1%	3.9%
Post note at local coffee shop, etc.....	.6%		.6%
Keep a data base of aged, infirm.....	.3%		.3%
Number.....	308	49	357

Significance cannot be computed for multiple response questions.

TABLE E6.1: CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON OFFSETS BY GENDER

	Gender:		Total
	Male	Female	
Re climate change:			
Strongly concerned.....	58.8%	64.1%	61.6%
Somewhat concerned.....	19.8%	23.9%	22.0%
Not concerned....	21.4%	12.0%	16.4%
Number.....	182	209	391
Respondent: *			
Knew that SCL was first..	31.1%	24.2%	27.4%
Did not.....	68.9%	75.8%	72.6%
Number.....	183	211	394
Re carbon offsets:			
Favors.....	49.2%	50.7%	50.0%
Neutral, unsure.....	28.3%	38.0%	33.5%
Opposes.....	22.5%	11.3%	16.5%
Number.....	187	213	400
Re 10 cents:			
Willing to pay.....	39.6%	43.7%	41.8%
Not willing.....	40.1%	22.5%	30.8%
Maybe, no answer.....	20.3%	33.8%	27.5%
Number.....	187	213	400

Column percentages
 * Difference is not statistically significant

TABLE E6.2: CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON OFFSETS BY AGE

	Age:				Total
	18 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 & up	
Re climate change: *					
Strongly concerned.....	67.9%	58.5%	64.9%	59.0%	61.6%
Somewhat concerned.....	19.6%	22.0%	16.0%	26.9%	22.2%
Not concerned.	12.5%	19.5%	19.1%	14.1%	16.2%
Number.....	56	82	94	156	388
Respondent: *					
Knew that SCL was first..	18.2%	25.0%	30.9%	30.2%	27.6%
Did not.....	81.8%	75.0%	69.1%	69.8%	72.4%
Number.....	55	84	94	159	392
Re carbon offsets:					
Favors.....	60.7%	47.6%	60.6%	42.3%	50.4%
Neutral, unsure.....	30.4%	28.6%	26.6%	39.9%	33.0%
Opposes.....	8.9%	23.8%	12.8%	17.8%	16.6%
Number.....	56	84	94	163	397
Re 10 cents:					
Willing to pay.....	53.6%	36.9%	45.7%	38.7%	42.1%
Not willing.....	21.4%	45.2%	29.8%	27.0%	30.7%
Maybe, no answer.....	25.0%	17.9%	24.5%	34.4%	27.2%
Number.....	56	84	94	163	397

Column percentages. * Difference is not statistically significant

**TABLE E6.3: CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON OFFSETS
BY EDUCATION**

	Education:				Total
	High School or less	Some college/tech	Four year degree	Post graduate	
Re climate change:					
Strongly concerned.....	36.4%	45.5%	66.7%	79.7%	62.0%
Somewhat concerned.....	29.5%	33.7%	19.8%	11.7%	21.9%
Not concerned.....	34.1%	20.8%	13.5%	8.6%	16.1%
Number.....	44	101	111	128	384
Respondent: *					
Knew that SCL was first..	18.4%	25.5%	32.7%	26.9%	27.1%
Did not.....	81.6%	74.5%	67.3%	73.1%	72.9%
Number.....	49	102	107	130	388
Re carbon offsets: *					
Favors.....	42.0%	48.0%	53.2%	51.5%	49.9%
Neutral, unsure.....	38.0%	39.2%	32.4%	27.7%	33.3%
Opposes.....	20.0%	12.7%	14.4%	20.8%	16.8%
Number.....	50	102	111	130	393
Re 10 cents: *					
Willing to pay.....	42.0%	41.2%	42.3%	43.1%	42.2%
Not willing.....	34.0%	27.5%	35.1%	28.5%	30.8%
Maybe, no answer.....	24.0%	31.4%	22.5%	28.5%	27.0%
Number.....	50	102	111	130	393

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

**TABLE E6.4: CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON OFFSETS
BY INCOME**

	Household income:			Total
	Less than \$40,000	\$41,000 to \$70,000	Over \$70,000	
Re climate change:				
Strongly concerned.....	53.0%	65.1%	69.2%	63.8%
Somewhat concerned.....	24.1%	23.3%	16.8%	20.5%
Not concerned.....	22.9%	11.6%	14.0%	15.7%
Number.....	83	86	143	312
Respondent: *				
Knew that SCL was first..	20.9%	31.4%	28.2%	27.1%
Did not.....	79.1%	68.6%	71.8%	72.9%
Number.....	86	86	142	314
Re carbon offsets: *				
Favors.....	52.9%	50.6%	54.9%	53.1%
Neutral, unsure.....	32.2%	32.2%	29.2%	30.8%
Opposes.....	14.9%	17.2%	16.0%	16.0%
Number.....	87	87	144	318
Re 10 cents: *				
Willing to pay.....	43.7%	43.7%	48.6%	45.9%
Not willing.....	27.6%	28.7%	30.6%	29.2%
Maybe, no answer.....	28.7%	27.6%	20.8%	24.8%
Number.....	87	87	144	318

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

TABLE E6.5: CLIMATE CHANGE AND CARBON OFFSETS BY ETHNICITY

	Ethnicity:		Total
	Caucasian	Other	
Re climate change: *			
Strongly concerned.....	62.9%	61.7%	62.8%
Somewhat concerned.....	22.0%	17.0%	21.4%
Not concerned.....	15.0%	21.3%	15.8%
Number.....	313	47	360
Respondent: *			
Knew that SCL was first..	26.8%	20.0%	25.9%
Did not.....	73.2%	80.0%	74.1%
Number.....	313	50	363
Re carbon offsets: *			
Favors.....	52.1%	48.1%	51.5%
Neutral, unsure.....	32.5%	36.5%	33.1%
Opposes.....	15.5%	15.4%	15.4%
Number.....	317	52	369
Re 10 cents:			
Willing to pay.....	44.8%	36.5%	43.6%
Not willing.....	26.5%	44.2%	29.0%
Maybe, no answer.....	28.7%	19.2%	27.4%
Number.....	317	52	369

Column percentages

* Difference is not statistically significant

A P P E N D I C E S

A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Seattle City Light Residential Customer Satisfaction Survey #2

Hello, my name is _____, and I'm with CRG Research, a Seattle company. We are conducting a survey about your public owned electric power utility – Seattle City Light. May I please speak to the person who pays your household Seattle City Light bill? Would that be you? [LOCATE PERSON OR MAKE APPOINTMENT AS NECESSARY] [IF RESPONDENT ASKS - THIS SURVEY SHOULD TAKE APPROXIMATELY 10 MINUTES]

1. [RECORD GENDER]

Male 1
Female 2

2. Overall, how satisfied are you with Seattle City Light, very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat unsatisfied, or very unsatisfied.

Very satisfied 1
Somewhat satisfied 2
Somewhat unssatisfied 3
Very unsatisfied 4
Don't Know/No Answer.. 6

3. How would you rate Seattle City Light on the following – very good, good, average, poor or very poor.
[ROTATE LIST.]

4. On the convenience in contacting them

Very good 1
Good 2
Average 3
Poor 4
Very poor 5
Don't Know/No experience 6

5. On the rates charged

6. Reliable service, with few outages

7. Using alternative energy sources like wind, solar or geothermal

8. Bills that are easy to read

9. Online billing that is easy

- 10. Energy conservation programs
 - 11. Help for low-income households
- [END LIST]

- 12. During the recent windstorm, did you lose power?
1, Yes 2, No

- 13. How long was the power out? [READ LIST]

- 1, Less than 24 hours
- 2, 24 hours to 36 hours
- 3, 36 hours to 48 hours
- 4, More than 48 hours
- 5, Don't know/can't recall

- 14. [IF POWER WAS OUT] Did your household try to contact City Light?

- 1, Yes 2, No 3, Don't know

- 15. [IF TRIED TO CONTACT] How did you try? [READ LIST. ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS]

- 1, Telephone
- 2, Email
- 3, Go to a Service Center
- 4, Other [SPECIFY]
- 5, Don't know

- 16. [IF TRIED] How many times did you try to make contact with City Light?

- 1, Once 2. Two or three times 3. More than four 4, Don't know

- 17. Were you able to reach them?

- 1, Yes 2, No 3, Don't know

- 18. [IF REACHED THEM] How would you rate the quality and efficiency of the service you received?

- Very good 1
- Good 2
- Average 3
- Poor 4
- Very poor 5
- Don't Know/Didn't call 6

19. Considering the conditions during a storm and the many people with questions, what is the best way for City Light to keep you informed? [READ LIST ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS]

- 1, Television
- 2, Radio
- 3, Email
- 4, Website
- 5, Telephone
- 6, cars with loudspeakers
- 7, door-to-door
- 8, Other [SPECIFY]
- 9, No answer

20. Would you consider giving City Light your cell phone or home phone to use to contact you only during an outage?

- 1, Yes, Cell phone
- 2, Yes, Home phone
- 3, Both
- 4, Neither
- 5, Concern regarding security
- 6, No answer

21. Do you use the Internet?

- 1, Yes
- 2, No
- 3, No answer

22. [IF USES INTERNET] Have you ever visited the Seattle City Light Website?

- 1, Yes
- 2, No
- 3, No answer

23. [IF YES] How would you rate it?

- Very good 1
- Good 2
- Average 3
- Poor 4
- Very poor 5
- Don't Know/No experience 6

24. Is the Internet a good way to get information to you?

- 1, Yes
- 2, Sometimes
- 3, No
- 4, No answer

25. Where do you get most of your information about your electric utility? [ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS]

Newspaper	1
Television News	2
Television Advertising	3
Radio	4
Mail	5
Newsletter/Information with your bill	6
Online – the Internet	7
Don't get any information about the utility	8

26. Which of these are better to use if City Light wants to explain new services to you? [ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS]

Newspaper	1
Television News	2
Television Advertising	3
Radio	4
Mail	5
Newsletter with your bill	6
Online – the Internet	7
No answer	8

27. There has been much talk lately about issues surrounding climate change and the effect of greenhouse gas on the environment. What do you think about it? Are you strongly concerned, somewhat concerned, slightly concerned or not at all concerned?

- 1, Strongly concerned
- 2, Somewhat concerned
- 3, Slightly concerned
- 4, Not at all concerned
- 5, Don't believe in climate change
- 6, No answer

28. Seattle City Light was the first electric utility to achieve zero carbon emissions as a result of conservation, buying renewable power and purchasing what's called "carbon offsets" from other companies. Did you know that? [IF THEY ASK WHAT THAT MEANS, IT IS BUYING CREDITS FOR REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS BY IMPROVING MANUFACTURING OR OPERATING METHODS TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GASES].

- 1, Yes
- 2, No
- 3, No answer

29. Most of City Light's net zero carbon emissions comes from conservation and renewable energy. City Light was able to get to zero by buying carbon off-sets from other companies. Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose City Light buying carbon off-sets?

- 1, Strongly favor
- 2, Somewhat favor
- 3, Neutral, Don't know
- 4, Somewhat oppose
- 5, Strongly oppose
- 6, Not familiar with carbon off-sets
- 7, Don't Know/No Answer

30. Would you be willing to pay ten cents more on your electric bill to buy carbon off-sets?

- 1, Yes
- 2, No
- 3, Maybe/it depends
- 4, Not, familiar with carbon off-sets
- 5, Don't know/No answer

31. The following questions will be used for statistical purposes only. First, which of the following age groups do you belong in?

- 1, 18 to 29 years
- 2, 30 to 39
- 3, 40 to 49
- 4, 50 to 59
- 5, 60 and up
- 6, No answer

32. How many years of formal education have you had the opportunity to complete?

- 1, Less than high school or GED
- 2, High School graduate or GED
- 3, Some college or technical school
- 4, Four Year degree
- 5, Post graduate degree
- 6, No answer

33. Which of the following categories describes your annual household income?

- 1, Less than \$25,000
- 2, \$25,001 to \$40,000
- 3, \$41,000 to \$55,000
- 4, \$56,000 to \$70,000

- 5, \$71,000 to \$100,000
- 6, Over \$100,000
- 7, No answer

34. Do you own your home or do you rent?

- 1, Own
- 2, Rent
- 3, Don't know/No answer

35. What kind of household do you live in?

- 1, Single family home
- 2, Duplex
- 3, Four-plex
- 4, Multi-family with 5+ units
- 5, Side-by-side condos or apartments
- 6, High-rise apartments or condos
- 7, Townhouse
- 8, Other [SPECIFY]
- 9, No answer

35. Would you describe yourself as [READ LIST. ACCEPT MULTIPLE ANSWERS]

- 1, Caucasian
- 2, African American
- 3, American Indian
- 4, Hispanic
- 5, Asian, Pacific Islander
- 6, Other, mixed
- 7, No answer

36. Another way that research can be done is through the use of focus groups. Focus groups are small group discussions of 8-10 people talking about a particular topic, many offering cash incentives that vary from group to group. Do you think you would be interested in participating in a focus group on this topic in the future?

- 1 Yes 2 No 3 Don't Know/No Answer

37. [IF YES] Great can I get your name and phone number for a future focus group? (NAME ENTERED AS "JANE DOE")

38. _____
(ENTER PHONE NUMBER AS "(123) 456-7890")

39. That was the last of the questions. Thank you for your time.

B: ADDITIONAL TABLES

**TABLE B1: RATINGS OF SCL – PART ONE
OF TWO**

Reliable service, with few outages		
Very good.....	142	35.5%
Good.....	146	36.5%
Average.....	78	19.5%
Poor.....	19	4.8%
Very poor.....	6	1.5%
Never used/Unsure.....	9	2.3%
Number.....	400	100%
Bills that are easy to read		
Very good.....	133	33.3%
Good.....	187	46.8%
Average.....	61	15.3%
Poor.....	6	1.5%
Very poor.....	4	1.0%
Never used/Unsure.....	9	2.3%
Number.....	400	100%
Convenience in contacting them		
Very good.....	87	21.8%
Good.....	133	33.3%
Average.....	76	19.0%
Poor.....	19	4.8%
Very poor.....	1	.3%
Never used/Unsure.....	84	21.0%
Number.....	400	100%
Help for low-income households		
Very good.....	35	8.8%
Good.....	92	23.0%
Average.....	55	13.8%
Poor.....	16	4.0%
Very poor.....	1	.3%
Never used/Unsure.....	201	50.3%
Number.....	400	100%
Energy conservation programs		
Very good.....	50	12.5%
Good.....	120	30.0%
Average.....	81	20.3%
Poor.....	21	5.3%
Very poor.....	4	1.0%
Never used/Unsure.....	124	31.0%
Number.....	400	100%

Statements have been somewhat abbreviated. See question for exact wording.

(continued)

**TABLE B1: RATINGS OF SCL – PART TWO
OF TWO**

Using alternative energy sources		
Very good.....	25	6.3%
Good.....	76	19.0%
Average.....	53	13.3%
Poor.....	49	12.3%
Very poor.....	7	1.8%
Never used/Unsure.....	190	47.5%
Number.....	400	100%
Online billing that is easy		
Very good.....	34	8.5%
Good.....	63	15.8%
Average.....	26	6.5%
Poor.....	4	1.0%
Very poor.....	3	.8%
Never used/Unsure.....	270	67.5%
Number.....	400	100%
The rates charged		
Very good.....	41	10.3%
Good.....	131	32.8%
Average.....	142	35.5%
Poor.....	41	10.3%
Very poor.....	17	4.3%
Never used/Unsure.....	28	7.0%
Number.....	400	100%

Statements have been somewhat abbreviated. See question for exact wording.