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Executive Summary

This report is prepared in response to the decision made at the October 23, 2015 Green Jobs – Green New York (GJGNY) Advisory Council Meeting to establish a Community Outreach Discussion Working Group to determine how best to leverage valuable resources toward achieving the best outcome for low- to moderate-income households. The Working Group addressed the following items to inform a future Community-Based Engagement Initiative:

- Identify the activities that future locally-based engagement organizations will perform to increase LMI participation in clean energy activities.
- Review current LMI outreach efforts by constituency-based organizations (CBOs) to determine what has been successful and what has not been successful to inform future program design.
- Identify metrics for each proposed activity future locally-based engagement organizations in order to properly measure success of these efforts.
- Identify the characteristics of organizations and personnel that would best support the locally-based engagement effort.

The Community Outreach Discussion Working Group consists of 14 members who represent CBOs, low-to moderate-income consumer advocates, and stakeholders (including contractors) of the home energy services industries. The group is chaired by Kelly Tyler, the director of Communities and Local Government at NYSERDA. It met 10 times to discuss barriers, review current outreach program efforts, and develop the recommendations in this report. Except where noted, the recommendations in this report reflect the consensus of all members of the Working Group. Where complete agreement could not be reached, multiple views are provided.

NYSERDA thanks the members of the Working Group for their time and effort in providing valuable feedback on the program, along with creative solutions to the challenges and barriers identified.

NYSERDA looks forward to continuing the discussion on the recommendations that require further research or development, along with other program and market-related topics.
1 Introduction

1.1 Establishment of the GJGNY Program

On October 9, 2009, the Green Jobs - Green New York Act of 2009 (the Act), was signed into New York State law. The purpose of the GJGNY program is to:

- Promote energy efficiency, energy conservation, and the installation of clean energy technologies.
- Reduce energy consumption and energy costs.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Support sustainable community development.
- Create green job opportunities, including opportunities for new entrants into the State’s workforce, the long-term unemployed and displaced workers.
- Use innovative financing mechanisms to finance energy efficiency improvements through energy cost savings.

Among other initiatives, this Act directed NYSERDA to issue one or more competitive opportunities to solicit applications from partnerships or consortia composed of CBOs that can connect community members to GJGNY. In awarding contracts to CBOs, NYSERDA was directed to:

- Target communities in areas where energy costs are particularly high in relation to a measure of median household income, as determined by NYSERDA, or that have been designated as a nonattainment area for one or more pollutants pursuant to Section 107 of the federal Clean Air Act, while also reflecting geographic diversity of the State.
- Give preference in awards to applicants that include significant participation by minority-and women-owned business enterprises (MWBEs).
- Give preference to applications to serve economically distressed communities.

Since 2009, NYSERDA has issued several competitive opportunities to establish a network of CBOs that can conduct outreach and support the GJGNY program. There are currently 11 CBOs under contract to NYSERDA implementing outreach efforts and a statewide implementation contractor providing training, support, and reporting to the CBOs and NYSERDA.

The GJGNY program provides outreach services in targeted communities through CBOs, which locate residents, businesses, not-for-profits, multifamily building owners, and potential workforce participants. CBOs encourage participation in energy efficiency programs, facilitate awareness of workforce training
opportunities available through the GJGNY program, and assist with enrollment in those efforts. CBOs also help identify additional funding sources to cover the cost of necessary non-energy improvements, or the cost-share needed for energy improvements.

CBO activities are just one component of the GJGNY program; however, they touch upon all of the other components (Workforce Development, energy audits and the revolving loan fund). Some CBOs also conduct aggregation pilots to encourage Home Performance with ENERGY STAR® (HPwES) retrofits by grouping retrofit projects into clusters using the same contractor to reduce costs, streamline program processes, and provide community benefits. While the scopes of work that guide each CBO are different, as a group the CBOs work to connect community members to GJGNY program services.

1.2 Program Evolution

Outreach to LMI communities and households has been managed in accordance with the GJGNY Act since its inception. The Act required that all of the contracts awarded for outreach for the GJGNY Program be to CBOs or partnerships or consortia including CBOs. The Act defined a CBO as “an organization incorporated for the purpose of providing services or other assistance to economically or socially disadvantaged persons within a specified community, and which is supported by, or whose actions are directed by, members of the community in which it operates.”1

However, as the GJGNY program funding is almost fully expended, a Community-Based Engagement Initiative will now be included within the Communities Chapter of the Clean Energy Fund Investment Plan. The flexibility of this new funding source will enable evolution of the Community-Based Engagement Initiative, learning from lessons of the past, enabling an expansion of the definition of “CBO” to include other types of locally-based organizations that could also effectively accomplish the mission and meet the needs and goals of the future. Locally-based organizations that have strong ties to their community and an established group of local partners are well-positioned to best support the new effort to engage and stimulate the regional market to influence and drive clean energy actions of homeowners, renters, and community stakeholders.

1 Public Authorities Law Section 1891(3).
1.3 Community Outreach Discussion Working Group

This report is submitted to summarize the results of the Community Outreach Discussion Working Group established at the October 23, 2015, Green Jobs – Green New York (GJGNY) Advisory Council Meeting. The Working Group consists of 14 members who represent CBOs, LMI consumer advocates, advocates on utility and housing issues, Spanish speaking communities, stakeholders (including contractors) of the home energy services industries, and women, children, and members of the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) community. Members of the Community Outreach Discussion Working Group are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Community Outreach Discussion Working Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Tyler</td>
<td>NYSERDA (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Carrick</td>
<td>Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Edel</td>
<td>Center for Working Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Gocker</td>
<td>PUSH Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Kempe</td>
<td>RUPCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Kuflik</td>
<td>Green Street Solar Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Kulaszewski</td>
<td>PUSH Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Langton</td>
<td>AHP Homeownership Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Metcalfe</td>
<td>Building Performance Contractors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Rooney</td>
<td>Oil Heat Institute of Long Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Schweiger</td>
<td>Efficiency First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Smith</td>
<td>Home Energy Performance by Halco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Tyson</td>
<td>Long Island Progressive Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Waldorf</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Outreach Discussion Working group met in 2016 on January 5, February 2, February 11, February 25, March 10, March 17, March 24, March 31, and April 7. Meeting notes are provided in Appendix B. Two additional meetings were held on July 19 and August 11 to review the draft report and comments have been incorporated. Except where noted, the recommendations in this report reflect the consensus of all members of the Working Group.
2 Background

To put forth recommendations, the Community Outreach Discussion Working Group first outlined the goals of a future Community-Based Engagement Initiative and hypotheses that were used to inform the discussion on activities that future locally-based engagement organizations will implement.

2.1 Current CBO Outreach Efforts

GJGNY provides for community-based outreach, enabling one-to-one assistance with the process of participating in NYSERDA programs. This community-based approach, combined with statewide marketing, facilitates reaching disadvantaged populations and those not traditionally participating in energy-efficiency programs. CBOs’ primary activity is conducting outreach to encourage residential retrofits eligible for NYSERDA’s HPwES program. CBOs execute several additional secondary activities that may include additional follow up, assisting customers with paperwork and access to a variety of incentive and loan programs, finding a contractor, reviewing work scopes, etc. in order to successfully assist a customer in completing retrofit projects. This customer follow-up ensures that customers take advantage of all of the opportunities available to them.

Many CBOs are able to help their clients access other financial resources in addition to NYSERDA’s energy efficiency programs in order to implement clean energy projects. In areas where CBOs do not currently exist, some contractors are able to leverage other funding and resources. However, a lot of the smaller contractors do not have the capacity to do this, which is where CBOs have the greatest impact.

Strategies that provide one-on-one follow-up appear to be key to generating retrofits. Establishing good relationships with retrofit contractors and helping participants access funding to complete needed health and safety upgrades prior to the energy efficiency upgrades also emerged as elements of successful strategies. Although one-to-one assistance can be a more expensive form of outreach, it facilitates reaching households with limited incomes who otherwise might not participate and enabling them to permanently reduce their energy bills, as well as improve health effects, comfort and home safety, providing personal, societal, and environmental benefits.
2.2 Goals of Community-Based Engagement Initiative

During its meetings, the Working Group identified a need to clearly outline the goals for the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative. Addressing the energy affordability needs of the LMI households and communities will be the primary goal of the new initiative. The Working Group outlined the following additional goals:

- Promote energy efficiency and the installation of clean energy technologies to reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Provide information on programs and resources including information to achieve greater energy literacy through education.
- Act as a market-enabler, stimulator, and aggregator of clean energy demand, both in promising areas that need public investment as a bridge to market readiness or among otherwise underserved populations, such as rural, LMI, and environmental justice communities as well as in market-ready sectors.
- Support sustainable community development and create opportunities for green jobs.
- Enhance access to and uptake of energy efficiency and renewable energy programs and solutions for LMI households and communities.
- Facilitate awareness of clean energy workforce training opportunities available locally and assist with regional enrollment in those efforts.
- Increase access to financing for LMI communities and households.

2.3 Key Hypotheses for Community-Based Engagement Initiative

The future Community-Based Engagement Initiative will build on the efforts of the previous GJGNY CBO efforts, while also removing previously ineffective strategies and restructuring the approach to increase the success of engagement efforts. The Community Outreach Discussion Working Group identified the following hypotheses that were used to inform the discussion on activities that future locally-based engagement organizations will implement:

- If we enhancing access to and uptake of energy efficiency and renewable solutions for LMI households and communities, then we will help New York State meet its ambitious clean energy, environmental, and affordability goals.
- If locally based organizations that have knowledge and expertise to make programs more accessible, and to identify available resources that can be successfully leveraged to deploy energy efficiency improvements to the residents of their community, then their engagement with customers should result in an increase in successfully completed projects.
- If aggregation is a model that can create great relationships with contractors, then it should lead to very successful outcomes, but it may not work in every area of the State. Successful outcomes from an aggregation project may include:
- Benefits to the homeowner such as lower costs through standardized or otherwise discounted bulk pricing and a simplified participation process.
- Benefits to the targeted community by creating jobs that may comply with certain standards and may be filled by residents of the community.
- Results that complement ongoing market transformation efforts by expanding awareness, increasing education, and reaching populations not currently responding to programs.

- If counties are economically diverse, then a one size fits all approach may not work with community engagement efforts.
- If locally-based organizations are there to support home owners, tenants, and landlords through the entire process of making improvements to the home and in ways that they may not otherwise be assisted by contractors (completing applications, working with lenders, applying for financing, attending assessments, project oversight, following up with consumers, addressing issues with workmanship, etc.), then their engagement with customers should result in an increase in customers that previously did not participate in clean energy programs and in the number of completed projects.
3 Barriers to Participation in Clean Energy Programs for CBOs and LMI Households

The Working Group identified numerous barriers faced by existing CBOs as well as by LMI households and communities to participating in clean energy programs, as described in this section. The Working Group addressed these barriers by identifying future activities locally-based engagement organizations could implement as outlined in Section 4.

3.1 Challenges and Barriers for Existing CBOs

The organizations conducting residential outreach have encountered several notable challenges. At a high level, these challenges and barriers can be broken into the following categories: education, marketing, metrics tracking, relationship with contractors, and resources. Encouraging participants to complete assessments and retrofits, ensuring participants secure project funding, and overcoming other barriers for participants to complete retrofits, have all been more challenging than expected. Finding and establishing relationships with reliable and responsive contractors and helping participants navigate the HPwES program have also challenged CBOs. CBOs have adapted their strategies to overcome these challenges throughout the contract period. The following paragraphs outline the different challenges identified by the Working Group and how CBOs have worked to overcome those challenges. Additional barriers that still need to be addressed in the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative are also outlined.

In the current GJGNY outreach program, there is an inconsistent level of education across all of the CBOs in energy efficiency and renewable energy. To address this concern, several CBOs have provided their staff with courses and trainings such as Building Performance Institute (BPI) certifications and BPI Building Science Principles certificate. Some CBOs lack of awareness of new participating contractors and an understanding of the service territory of contractors in their region, which leads to confusion for CBOs and customers.

In regards to marketing, there is a lack of updated marketing tools to reflect current understanding of market status and challenges. Additionally, lack of a good, central database for information sharing between CBOs and contractors is a barrier to metrics tracking for the GJGNY program. This lack of a good, central database makes it difficult to track projects and customer interactions. Currently, each CBO has their own, separate tracking system and there are several databases at NYSERDA used to track information for the various activities conducted by CBOs.
Inconsistent relationships between CBOs and contractors creates challenges with implementing projects. The majority of CBOs have been able to forge successful relationships with contractors which has resulted in the ability to increase the number of projects that are completed after the home energy assessment phase. However, a few of the CBOs from the Working Group noted challenges in their region with contractors and subcontractors including unwillingness by the contractor to use on-bill recovery financing, not understanding the “house as a system” (whole building) approach, lack of communication with the CBO, and in some cases trying to oversell to the homeowner.

CBOs cover large territories which are difficult to provide services to consistently. Additionally, there are large gaps that exist in areas served by CBOs across New York State.

There is a lack of definitions for terms commonly used in the CBO efforts to keep everyone on the same page. This lack of common terminology leads to confusion between CBOs and contractors on what different activities CBOs are performing involve.

### 3.2 Barriers to LMI Households and Communities

Cost is a barrier that keeps projects from moving beyond the home energy assessment phase. There is a lack of available capital for both homeowners (who have difficulty paying utility bills) and building owners (who are hesitant to take on additional debt). Additionally, LMI consumers have difficulty accessing financing for clean energy projects.

Lack of awareness or education about energy efficiency is a barrier to participation in clean energy programs for LMI communities and households. There is a lack of awareness and/or skepticism about the ability to deliver on performance among residents and building owners. Additionally, end users do not know how to operate and maintain equipment, such as high efficiency boilers or furnaces, once it is in place. More education is needed on how to operate and maintain equipment post-installation.

Many homeowners are still unaware of the NYSERDA programs available to them for energy efficiency. It is very difficult to promote programs that many people are still unaware of and competitive advertising regarding solar energy has created an obstacle to educating homeowners on the value of energy efficiency.
Outreach support to LMI communities and households is not currently being provided consistently throughout the state and there are gaps in different regions. As required in the GJGNY Act, each CBO currently focuses on particular communities within their region, generally in the area that the CBO is physically located.

Homeowners who qualify for the Assisted Home Performance with ENERGY STAR incentive often do not qualify for a loan, and typically do not have the savings to invest in the project. While CBO’S serve many low to moderate income customers, CBO’s are left in a position of focusing more on market rate customers to meet deliverables for numbers of retrofits, which is the current main metric for success for CBOs.

Lack of coordination across State-sponsored LMI focused initiatives, community organizations, and financial institutions can be a barrier to finding effective solutions. Coordination among these parties would allow for better packaging of resources for LMI consumers and increase participation in clean energy programs.

Low energy prices are becoming an obstacle to motivating homeowners to take action. This obstacle is also making the Savings to Investment Ratio (SIR) harder to show on some projects, which affects the availability of NYSERDA financing.

LMI consumers sometimes receive inconsistent direction from locally-based engagement organizations and contractors. For example, even though On-Bill Recovery (OBR) Financing is an option that homeowners want to use and CBOs promote the benefits of OBR, contractors may not offer the option because, in many cases, they know the project will not pass the strict cost-effectiveness criteria for OBR. More coordination is needed between the locally-based engagement organizations and contractors so they provide clear and consistent direction to end users.

An additional barrier to both LMI consumers and CBOs involves the complexity of the different clean energy programs and resources that are available to customers. Current NYSERDA programs are complex and time consuming compared to most home retrofit projects. The NYSERDA process has many decision points, each of which adds time to the project and adds additional opportunities for a customer to say no or drop the project after losing interest. The complexity of the process is difficult to communicate concisely and can be discouraging to customers.
Some contractors do not provide multiple proposals that prioritize recommended measures by cost effectiveness. Recommended measures are often combined together in one or two scenarios and customers cannot compare the relative savings of each recommended measure. LMI customers may feel they need to install a project that is too expensive for them or not at all. CBO’s reach many LMI customers to help them create a more reasonable work scope, but many opt out of the program or may not be a priority for the contractor if they are not able to complete a large work scope.
4 Recommendations

This section provides the Working Group recommendations for future activities for the next round of locally-based engagement organizations.

4.1 Key Considerations for Future Community-Based Engagement Initiative

The Community Outreach Discussion Working Group identified several elements that should be included in the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative to address some of the barriers identified in Section 3. These elements introduce what a future Community-Based Engagement Initiative should address. Specific activities are identified in Section 4.2.

The future Community-Based Engagement Initiative should focus on clear and measurable outcomes so success is easy to define and measure. While the current CBO contracts have consistent overarching goals, the task(s), retrofit goals, and targets, varied from region to region which, at times, made it difficult to quantify results and measure success as a whole for the program. Additionally, a chief emphasis of success for CBOs was the number of retrofits generated for the HPwES Program. Limiting the focus of success to this single measurement down-scored the value of the CBO efforts, and it is recommended NYSERDA consider additional metrics. Locally-based engagement organizations need to facilitate relationships between local economic development agencies, local community-based organizations, contractors, and other agencies and organizations to maximize the potential impact of engagement efforts to the LMI households and communities. This will enable locally-based engagement organizations to work with other locally-based organizations to form partnerships and extend the engagement to a broader audience.

The future Community-Based Engagement Initiative should include quarterly plans to set flexible goals throughout the program. This practice will also allow locally-based engagement organizations to adjust strategies as the program is being implemented and as opportunities for LMI consumers and households evolve. Currently, NYSERDA energy efficiency programs require customers select and work with a participating contractor. The Working Group suggested that upon a customer completing an application for NYSERDA programs they receive contact information for their regional locally-based engagement organization to ensure customers are provided with this resource and increase the likelihood of
successfully completed projects. A list of common definitions (Appendix A) should be incorporated into the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative. During the current CBO effort, there has been different interpretations of what certain elements of the program are meant to address. For example, several CBOs have different interpretations of how NYSERDA defines aggregation and how it should be implemented. A list of common definitions should help to address this confusion.

The next Community-Based Engagement Initiative should target regional coverage based on the 10 Economic Development Regions as defined by Empire State Development. The regions are North Country, Capital District, Mid-Hudson, Long Island, New York City, Mohawk Valley, Southern Tier, Central New York, Finger Lakes, and Western New York. This geographic alignment with other State efforts would allow for full Statewide coverage with locally-based engagement organizations that can provide services throughout each region. Additionally, although efforts will primarily target LMI communities and households, locally-based engagement organizations will also assist market-rate customers.

Locally-based engagement organizations should have an awareness and alignment with Regional Economic Development Councils (REDCs) and what they are doing in their region. REDCs tend to focus on individual communities that are in need. Locally-based engagement organizations need to be aware of those communities along with the additional resources that will be brought to that community. Homes and Community Renewal (HCR) is one of the groups that participates in the REDCs; locally-based engagement organizations that have relationships with HCR can be kept aware of opportunities through HCR. Although the Neighborhood Preservation Coalitions and Rural Preservation Coalitions (NPCs and RPCs) administered by HCR are not included in the Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) process administered by REDCs, the CFA does include some funding opportunities from HCR, such as the NY Main Street (NYMS) and Urban Initiatives (UI) programs, that locally-based engagement organizations can concurrently leverage to provide opportunities for residential and commercial energy efficiency.

The Working Group identified a need to have a better system to associate and attribute leads back to locally-based engagement organizations. The issue was traced back to language on the application. Specifically, the terminology used in the question on the application needs to be simplified or the question needs to be asked differently. For example, most consumers do not know what the acronym “CBO”
means, and may not know the full term without explanation. Members of the Working Group suggested the application be changed so that the lead is directly attributed to the locally-based engagement organizations through automated hyperlinks or some other mechanism so that the consumer does not have to remember to select the organization on the application.

The future initiative should take into account that many organizations are generally not allowed to become certified MWBEs. NYSERDA should reconsider the language included in the GJGNY law and included in past solicitations for locally-based engagement to give preference in awards to applicants that include significant participation by minority-and women-owned business enterprises (MWBEs) and add to this language, partnerships with MWBEs or organizations that consistently employ women and/or minorities.

The future Community-Based Engagement Initiative should ensure educational barriers by the local engagement contractors are addressed by including requirements for technical expertise in the selection process and throughout the program. A routine conference call or meeting is suggested however, it is recognized, that alone may not achieve the requisite level of expertise necessary for locally-based engagement organizations to efficiently provide reliable, authoritative, professional services to customers, and that additional educational opportunities may be necessary.

The local engagement organization should provide and continue to build strategic business relationships with local partners with the intention of extending NYSERDA’s outreach to residential, LMI customers. This network of local partnerships (e.g., block clubs, Building Performance Contractors Association and Efficiency First) will act as channels for marketing, referrals, financing, resource identification, and project implementers. The Working Group recommends the future engagement organizations facilitate routine conference calls and/or webinars with partners that result in information exchanges and mutually beneficial strategies focused on LMI engagement that results in clean energy projects.

To address marketing related challenges, NYSERDA should work on an ongoing basis with locally-based engagement organizations to ensure marketing tools are up-to-date and reflect current market conditions. NYSERDA should also work with the future engagement organizations to ensure quality marketing tools are developed and maintained. To address the lack of awareness barrier for LMI communities and households’ barrier outlined above, Working Group members suggest that NYSERDA increase its own marketing efforts or allow locally-based engagement organizations to publish their own advertising.
To address the database barrier described above, NYSERDA should work with the existing CBOs and future engagement organizations to define the data needs, identify the data sharing requirements related to different parties, establish appropriate centralized databases, and simplify data collection processes.

Building relationships with contractors was identified as a key task for the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative by the Working Group. NYSERDA should direct current CBOs to continue to develop strong relationships with contractors and identify any challenges or issues to NYSERDA for resolution. NYSERDA should also develop a training component for contractors so they understand what locally-based engagement organizations offer as a resource.

NYSERDA is actively working to address the complexity of clean energy programs by removing the silos that have existed between programs in the past and working to streamline programs. This work will lead to locally-based engagement organizations and contractors being able to more easily navigate NYSERDA program resources and reduce response time to customers on what resources are the best fit for their projects. One example of this work to remove silos between existing programs involves the integration of EmPower and HPwES. This integration will resolve current contractor issues with confusion between programs and provide greater continuity for the customer. Members of the Working Group noted that the separation of the audit from the implementing contractor could serve a critical role in building trust and creating a more competitive environment for contractors. Having contractors bid on jobs that have been audited would also solve the issue of customers getting more than one option for implementation. Other members of the Working Group noted, however, that doing this would also make the process even more complex and could lead to delays with project implementation.

4.2 Essential Engagement Activities for LMI Households and Communities

In identifying future engagement activities, the Working Group wanted to ensure that each activity was SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound) to make it easy to associate clear outcomes with each activity. The Working Group proposed to include a set of base activities that every locally-based engagement organization would have to implement as well as a separate pot of funds for regional-specific focused activities. Organizations would submit proposals to do “pilot projects” focused on a specific effort in a defined region with a set timeframe, specific activities, and measurable outcomes. Examples could include aggregation projects, workforce development initiatives, and energy challenge
campaigns (similar to Solarize campaigns). As the initiative is implemented and NYSERDA incorporates lessons learned, changes may be made to the activities of the locally-based engagement organizations. Additionally, the quarterly plan process outlined in Section 4.1 will allow future engagement organizations to incorporate regional differences in setting goals and outlining activities as well as being able to shift the scope of activities to incorporate changes that reflect current market needs.

The remainder of Section 4 outlines the base activities recommended by the Working Group.

4.2.1 Connecting Consumers to External Programs and Resources

Locally-based engagement organizations would assist customers with completing applications for projects and help customers find the financial resources to complete projects based on the home energy assessment conducted by a contractor. Locally-based engagement organizations would assist consumers with accessing NYSERDA, other State, federal, and local resources to complete clean energy projects and to help reduce their energy burden including payment assistance. These organizations would be expected to have knowledge of all of these available resources. Additionally, in the future, locally-based engagement organizations could play a value added role to ensure quality assurance of programs for NYSERDA.

Some members of the Working Group noted that locally-based engagement organizations do not necessarily possess the skills needed to leverage other sources of funding and/or financing for customers and that these skills are more akin to larger organizations, not necessarily the smaller, locally-based organizations. However, the ability to leverage other sources of funding and financing for projects will be essential to assist customers with securing funding for completing projects.

4.2.2 Contractor Engagement

Under this activity, locally-based engagement organizations would work with the Home Performance Program contractors and other NYSERDA contractors to clarify work scopes and enable projects to move forward. Additionally, locally-based engagement organizations could create templates and tools to help make work scopes more understandable to customers. However, some members of the Working Group felt that these templates and tools should be created by a central program and implementation contractor.
for the Community-Based Engagement Initiative or by the contractors. NYSERDA could require contractors to provide templates and tools that are more understandable through contractor education and training. Locally-based engagement organizations would hold routine meetings with contractors to coordinate efforts on an ongoing basis and avoid duplication of efforts.

Locally-based engagement organizations need to create unique ways to engage contractors with a shared goal of serving more LMI customers. They could partner for tabling at events and other forms of combined marketing and engagement. Contractors often engage in events on a routine basis and should invite locally-based engagement organizations to participate with them. In addition, locally-based engagement organizations should work with contractors in order to assist them in learning how to access and leverage other sources of funding for clean energy projects so that they are better positioned to offer this support to future projects.

NYSERDA should also encourage contractors to reach out to locally-based engagement organizations and form strong partnerships. The Working Group noted that there is an opportunity to continue to improve the relationship between contractors and locally-based engagement organizations. One option identified by the Working Group was incentivizing the contractors to work more closely with the locally-based engagement organizations. This could also expand the breadth of our efforts into communities that current clean energy programs do not already reach.

Locally-based engagement organizations can play a critical role at reducing the level of overhead involved for contractors to participate in NYSERDA or other incentive and financing programs. Additionally, community-based organizations can assist in reducing the costs of customer acquisition through providing qualified leads to contractors and through the community events and education programs they execute. The Working Group identified prequalification as a huge benefit to the contractor. This involves the locally-based engagement organization providing a qualified lead (meaning the engagement organization has assessed the likelihood to acquire financing and the willingness of the homeowner to move forward) to the contractor. Working Group members noted that it is important that engagement by contractors with the locally-based engagement organizations does not increase their overhead, but instead decreases is through all of the ways cited throughout this report.
4.2.3 Partner Development and Engagement

Locally-based engagement organizations should work with other locally-based organizations to form partnerships to extend the education and outreach to a broader audience. Effective partnerships established by locally-based engagement organizations will result in increased market penetration and additional customer project activity. The locally-based engagement organizations will need to demonstrate that they have a really strong partner network and have the ability to form new partnerships. It is important to find organizations that are doing work similar to the locally-based engagement organizations so that they can share information where both parties benefit from the relationship. The Working Group agreed that partnerships should be ongoing relationships with exchanges of leads and referrals between the two entities, not just one-time occurrences.

4.2.4 Consumer Education and Marketing

This activity would entail tabling at events, community presentations, and one-on-one engagement to community leaders and elected officials. It would include speaking at rotary clubs, chambers of commerce, community groups, church groups, employee benefit fairs, lunch and learns, etc. and responding to inquiries from customers that actively seek information and assistance. Additionally, locally-based engagement organizations should target more events aimed at LMI customers as opposed to attending a lot of events where mainly higher-income level homeowners attend.

The Working Group also suggested that locally-based engagement organizations should look for unique strategies such as engaging consumers on clean energy at events that are not related to clean energy. Another strategy would be to invite participants to walk with contractors as they conduct a home energy assessment. NYSERDA could encourage locally-based engagement organizations to coordinate with the New York State Department of Education to teach energy workshops for school districts so that students, parents, teachers, renters, landlords and homeowners will be more consistently encouraged to participate in clean energy programs.

Locally-based engagement organizations could be asked to develop case studies to bring in more referrals, be engaged in social media, create and maintain websites, develop brochures, and develop flyers. Some elements that are currently missing from marketing materials are a focus on health and safety, quality assurance, and language diversity. Engagement organizations should work with
NYSERDA to customize marketing materials to fit the needs of the community or group to which they are conducting the engagement. Additionally, engagement organizations will work with NYSERDA to increase media involvement and engagement at events to get the word out to a broader audience.

Locally-based engagement organizations should also assist customers with language barriers, such as Spanish-speaking customers, by referring them to resources that can assist them and track the number of these types of customers where this assistance was provided.

### 4.2.5 Facilitating Finance Applications

Under this activity, locally-based engagement organizations would assist customers with applications, loan qualification, and understanding the process. While loan applications can be completed privately by applicants and submitted on-line, often times, customers who need assistance filling out an application do not feel comfortable providing personal financial information to contractors so locally-based engagement organizations may fill a critical role in making loan applications successful.

### 4.2.6 Regional-Specific Activities

As noted earlier, the Working Group proposed that NYSERDA have a separate fund to which engagement organizations can propose for regional-specific activities. Locally-based engagement organizations could submit proposals on a quarterly basis to NYSERDA for review and approval of these regionally specific activities. Proposals would be competitively selected from the pool of proposals received based on specific criteria. The Working Group identified two main regional-specific activities, which include aggregation and workforce development as examples of regional-specific activities.

Several members of the Working Group felt that aggregation is not the answer to scalability. Other members of the Working Group felt aggregation was a successful strategy to accelerate clean energy deployment. Several existing CBOs have chosen not to do aggregation because of the perceived obstacles and instead focused on marketing efforts that were already working in their regions. Thus, the Working Group decided to move aggregation to a region-specific activity instead of a base activity for all.

However, other members of the Working Group noted that aggregation could be a successful strategy that works in every part of the State. In some areas where aggregation did not work, existing CBOs were unprepared to sell energy efficiency, did not fully understand the home performance marketplace, and/or
were unable to garner support among contractors to get the work done. The CBOs that completed successful aggregation pilots were able to overcome these challenges. Should aggregation become part of the new Community-Based Engagement Initiative, the engagement organizations should receive extensive training on how to run a successful aggregation program, including mentoring from successful aggregators that have real experience.

Members of the Working Group identified the need to expand the concept of aggregation to different scenarios that may require coordination with other programs such as low-rise residential new construction for deep energy retrofits, multifamily performance, NY-Sun, etc. so that participating Home Performance contractors can be part of potentially bigger projects. In aggregation, there is not much of an opportunity for locally-based, untrained and disadvantaged workers to be involved. As is current practice, the Working Group suggested that community benefit agreements be used with participating contractors, who would agree to hire from the community to create some workforce development related benefits for the aggregation project.

Considering the points above, the Working Group recommends that, as in the past, aggregation be a region-specific activity instead of a base activity for all.

With regard to workforce development, different efforts undertaken by CBOs have resulted in various degrees of success. As an example of a successful effort, locally-based engagement organizations have provided university students with internships at the locally-based engagement organization and those students were then later employed in the clean energy industry.

Locally-based engagement organizations could facilitate and connect contractors (not just limited to Home Performance Program contractors) with resources in the community that they may not be aware of, such as courses and training programs at the local community colleges to assist contractors with acquiring new or advanced job positions in the clean energy industry. Additionally, locally-based engagement organizations could form partnerships with employers for either internships or job placement. This could help bridge the gap between community members and employers seeking to hire.

NYSERDA’s Workforce Development Team would be part of the training of the engagement organizations up front. Despite several strategies being identified, the Working Group still believed that this activity would be better suited as a region-specific activity rather than a base activity.
5 Expected Outcomes and Metrics

This section provides the Community Outreach Discussion Working Group recommendations for expected outcomes and metrics associated with the activities outlined in Section 4. Table 2 outlines the expected outcomes and metrics by activity. Metrics will be better understood over time and may be adjusted as the initiative is implemented. Some of the metrics described below may need to be reported by parties other than the engagement organizations.

Table 2. Expected Outcomes and Metrics by Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Connecting Consumers to External Programs and Resources | • Number applications/leads for projects that apply to NYSERDA and other programs  
• Reduction of energy burden  
• Number of projects that could not have gone forward without the additional resources provided through the engagement organization  
• Amount of additional funds leveraged (Housing and Community Renewal (HCR) funding, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding through municipalities, etc.)  
• Resulting energy savings and greenhouse gas emissions  
• Conversion rate from audit to completed retrofit  
• Conversion rate from lead to completed audit |
| Contractor Engagement                              | • Number of working relationships that exist with contractors  
• Savings from the resulting projects  
• The recruitment of new contractors and minority and women-owned business enterprise (MWBE) into the program  
• Job creation (for examples, contractors are able to hire new employees as a result of the relationship developed with the locally-based engagement organizations) |
| Partner Development and Engagement                 | • Number of new partnerships that are formed that result in an increase in project activity  
• Case studies describing successful types of partnerships, roles for partners and impacts of the partnership  
• Number of resulting projects that come out of that partnership and the resulting energy/greenhouse gas savings |
| Consumer Education and Marketing                   | • Number of attendees at events who had direct interaction with engagement organization  
• Number of events completed  
• Outcomes of the event including number of leads generated for specific programs  
• Resulting energy savings from projects |
| Facilitating Finance Applications                  | • Number of applicants assisted with loan applications (free home energy assessments, subsidy application, credit application, external grant application)  
• Completed loans  
• Anticipated energy savings  
• Number of customers making payments on loans/ Number of customers not making payments on loans |
NYSERDA is trying to focus financial resources where dollars invested can make the most impact on energy savings/greenhouse gas emission savings. Members of the Working Group identified a concern on whether or not savings should be tied to leads generated for programs because locally-based engagement organizations do not have any control over completion of projects and resulting energy savings.

Engagement organizations generate a lot of leads that may not come to fruition if the customer opts not to go forward with the retrofit project. Members of the Working Group were not convinced that savings should be a measure of success of locally-based engagement organizations’ engagement efforts. Although locally-based engagement organizations are involved with projects through completion, they do not have a direct impact on the measures that are installed for a project because they do not control the actual work scopes once the contractor gets involved.

Several suggestions were made on how to resolve this concern including having the contractor include projected energy savings in the work scope so that locally-based engagement organizations can access that information. Locally-based engagement organizations may be able to access utility information through working with the weatherization program and/or directly with the utilities. However, past CBOs have not been able to obtain data from utilities due to privacy issues. NYSERDA has agreements in place to obtain energy consumption data from utilities, and is currently developing plans for a secure data transmission and repository. Another suggestion was made that rather than having locally-based engagement organizations spend their budget on tracking down energy savings, NYSERDA can tie energy savings back to leads generated by these organizations using NYSERDA’s databases. NYSERDA will work with the future engagement organizations to develop a simple process to connect energy savings to leads for performance tracking.
6 Characteristics of Successful Locally-Based Engagement Organizations

The Working Group provided recommendations on what characteristics future locally-based engagement organizations should possess in order to ensure a successful Community-Based Engagement Initiative. Specifically, these organizations should have technical expertise, basic financial knowledge, and strong relationships in the community.

One of the key characteristics identified for NYSERDA’s next initiative is minimum standards for technical expertise. There were different views expressed by members of the Working Group on the appropriate level of technical expertise that should be required for future locally-based engagement organizations. Some members of the Working Group felt that not every individual needs to have the Building Performance Institute (BPI)-Building Analyst certification but contractors should have to demonstrate technical qualifications such as trainings completed (BPI Building Science Principles certificate). Other members of the Working Group felt that at a minimum, there should be at least one individual who completes the BPI Building Science Principals Certificate Course and possible the BPI Building Analyst and Envelope Professional certifications. NYSERDA could require different options for locally-based engagement organizations to demonstrate technical expertise to allow for flexibility in this requirement. Only staff members with demonstrated technical expertise (such as the BPI Building Analyst certification) can address issues of workmanship done by the contractors and provide quality assurance for the customer and program(s) providing financial assistance to the project.

The Working Group suggested that NYSERDA set aside funding in the future Community-Based Engagement Initiative for professional development for locally-based engagement organizations to increase knowledge in energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors. NYSERDA could also include training as part of webinars that are held on a routine basis with locally-based engagement organizations. NYSERDA’s Workforce Development Team may be able to provide access for contractors to the BPI Building Science Principles certificate course at a reduced rate. Some members of the Working Group also noted that NYSERDA should ensure CBOs have the knowledge and understanding of the energy modeling predominantly utilized by contractors in their region. That way, they can properly assist customers with questions regarding the audit performed by the contractor.
Another key characteristic identified was that locally-based engagement organizations should possess a basic financial knowledge because they will be involved in facilitating finance applications. The Working Group identified language skills as something future organizations will need to possess since they have to be able to speak the languages to the communities’ that they serve. Locally-based engagement organizations should also have to demonstrate strong sales experience as that is one of the key skills organizations will need to possess in order to be successful. NYSERDA can also provide sales training through the planned routine webinars described above.

Locally-based engagement organizations need to demonstrate good working relationships with contractors. In order to demonstrate this, future locally-based engagement organizations should be required to provide letters of recommendation and support from contractors within the region(s) they are proposing to serve. Additionally, locally-based engagement organizations should provide letters of recommendation and support from local organizations such as churches, rotary clubs, etc. to demonstrate strong ties to the communities in their region(s).

Lastly, locally-based engagement organizations should demonstrate the ability to form and maintain strong relationships with the municipalities and communities they will be working in.

These organizations should also demonstrate the ability to access and leverage additional grant (local, State, and federal) funding and be able to package these resources for projects. Locally-based engagement organizations should demonstrate the ability to reduce the energy burden for end users, such as familiarity with utility bill payment assistance programs.
NYSERDA Response to Recommendations

NYSERDA endorses the recognition throughout this report that many households and communities are not aware of the clean energy opportunities that are available to them or are unable to access them due to financial barriers to project implementation. In particular, low- to moderate-income (LMI) consumers pay a disproportionate share of their income toward the cost of energy. These consumers also are less likely to be reached in the near term by clean energy market actors and project developers because of perceived credit risks. Enhancing access to and uptake of renewable and energy efficiency solutions for LMI households and communities will enable New York State to meet its ambitious clean energy, environmental, and affordability goals.

As mentioned earlier in this report, addressing the energy affordability needs of the LMI households and communities will be the primary goal of the new Community-Based Engagement Initiative and it is essential to focus on this goal when reviewing past outreach efforts and making recommendations for this new initiative. With this primary goal in mind, NYSERDA has reviewed the recommendations included within this report and outlined responses to those recommendations below.

NYSERDA agrees with the recommendations of the Working Group that there is value in having a set of base activities being undertaken by locally based engagement organizations, while also enabling regional-specific activities. Given the anticipated changes to NYSERDA programs over the next few years, leveraging other sources of funding and financing in order to assist LMI households with completing clean energy projects will become a primary activity. Although this is something current CBOs actively do in order to assist LMI households, the primary focus of the current CBO program is enrolling customers in NYSERDA GJGNY funded programs. It is important to highlight this significant change and note that these skills will be an essential component of the new Community-Based Engagement Initiative.

Regarding the metrics included in Section 5, NYSERDA agrees with the scope covered by these metrics, but recognizes that some deserve more weight than others when measuring performance and impact in the new initiative. NYSERDA will focus more on metrics with clearly defined outcomes and measurements of success that demonstrate direct benefits to LMI households and communities. Primary metrics for the

---

new initiative will focus on the impact the new initiative has had on addressing the energy affordability needs of LMI households and communities. For example, energy bill savings and additional funds leveraged that enable projects to move forward will be weighted more heavily than number of attendees at an event or number of events completed.

Throughout the report, there are several references regarding locally-based engagement organizations playing a value-added role in quality assurance for NYSERDA programs. NYSERDA currently addresses quality assurance for its programs by inspecting a sample of contractors’ projects and reviewing work in response to consumer concerns. Quality assurance inspections are accomplished by an independent third party whose technicians are trained in building science and energy efficiency project techniques. In order to avoid duplication of services between its contractors, NYSERDA will not include this role in the new initiative. However, NYSERDA will continue a dialog with CBOs to better understand their views regarding the quality assurance of LMI households and will focus on the continuous monitoring and improvement of existing quality assurance services. In addition, NYSERDA encourages CBOs and the future local engagement organizations to refer customer concerns to NYSERDA.

NYSERDA agrees with the recommendations of the Working Group in clearly outlining skills and qualifications in the new Community-Based Engagement Initiative so that we ensure we receive proposals from organizations that are best suited to perform the work. Key skills that we will look for include the ability to access and leverage funding from other State, federal, and not-for-profit entities; the ability to form strong partnerships with contractors and other locally-based engagement organizations to extend the outreach to a broader audience; the ability to conduct effective outreach activities, and technical expertise, meaning basic building science knowledge. Although NYSERDA plans to hold routine webinars for training (e.g., NYSERDA programs and initiatives; marketing and communication protocols; free online technical training opportunities; etc.) and information sharing between locally-based engagement organizations in the new initiative, the solicitation will include requirements for technical expertise to ensure organizations are selected that possess the necessary skills to be successful in addressing the needs of LMI households and communities in the new initiative. NYSERDA will require different options for locally-based engagement organizations to demonstrate community engagement experience and technical expertise to allow for flexibility in this requirement.
Several concerns were raised throughout the report regarding access to data for reporting and lack of a good, central database. NYSERDA will work with the existing CBOs and future locally-based engagement organizations define the data needs, identify the data sharing requirements related to different parties, establish appropriate centralized databases, and simplify data collection processes.

Members of the Working Group expressed concern regarding the new initiative no longer requiring organizations to meet the definition of a CBOs per the GJGNY legislation and as required in the current GJGNY outreach program. NYSERDA is expanding the definition so that it does not exclude other types of locally-based organizations that can effectively accomplish the goals of the new initiative. NYSERDA will focus more on the qualities and skills of organizations as opposed to structural and administrative characteristics, all with the objective of best serving LMI households.

In summary, NYSERDA again thanks the members of the Working Group for their time and effort in providing valuable feedback and recommendations for the Community-Based Engagement initiative. NYSERDA looks forward to launching this new initiative and working collaboratively with stakeholders in the LMI market to ensure its success at reducing the energy burden for LMI households and communities. NYSERDA will continue to explore the other recommendations in the report that are not mentioned above, discuss them with CBOs, home performance contractors and other stakeholders to better understand the impact of the recommendation on the ability to best serve LMI households, and report back to the GJGNY Advisory Council at a later date regarding their status.
Appendix A: List of Common Definitions

**Aggregation**: A collection of eligible homes, businesses and/or not-for-profits in the same neighborhood, brought to the program by an organization under contract (or subcontract) to NYSERDA for engagement services, and who have all agreed up-front to use the same contractor or contractor team to perform assessments and the ensuing retrofit work. This practice includes a community benefits agreement that comes with discount for people getting the retrofit as well as benefits that create pathways for people to attain jobs (wage and hiring standards). Additionally, multiple contractors should be included in an aggregation effort.

**Environmental-Justice**: Environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.³

**Environmental Justice Communities**: Environmental justice communities are commonly identified as those where residents are predominantly minorities or low-income; where residents have been excluded from the environmental policy setting or decision-making process; where they are subject to a disproportionate impact from one or more environmental hazards; and where residents experience disparate implementation of environmental regulations, requirements, practices and activities in their communities.⁴ As established in DEC Commissioner Policy 29 on Environmental Justice and Permitting (CP-29)⁵, Potential EJ Areas are 2000 U.S. Census block groups of 250 to 500 households each that, in the 2000 Census, had populations that met or exceeded at least one of the following statistical thresholds:

- At least 51.1 percent of the population in an urban area reported themselves to be members of minority groups; or
- At least 33.8 percent of the population in a rural area reported themselves to be members of minority groups; or

---

³ [https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice](https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice)
• At least 23.59 percent of the population in an urban or rural area had household incomes below the federal poverty level.

**Local Partners:** Groups, organizations, and/or individuals representing constituency groups that may include, but are not limited to: economic development agencies, business associations, community action agencies, chambers of commerce, municipal governments, business leaders, incubators, nonprofits, civic groups, utilities, other NYSERDA contractors, and others.

**Low- to Moderate-Income:** Less than or equal to 60 percent of the area (county) median income (AMI) for low income and above 60 up to 80 percent of the AMI for moderate income.

**Packaging of Resources:** Engagement organizations would be responsible for creating packages of services for consumers and connecting them to the appropriate programs and/or assisting with the prequalification or application process.

**Partnerships:** Strategic business relationships created with Local Partners by the engagement organization with the intention of extending NYSERDA’s engagement to residential, small business, and multifamily customers.

**Pilot Project:** A project implemented by the engagement organization that involves the initial small-scale implementation of an activity or set of activities to test the viability of the initial pilot project and inform development of a long-term strategy.

**Priority Projects:** Projects defined by the Regional Economic Development Councils as meeting their regional goals for economic development and recommended to the Governor for funding.

**Regional Economic Development Councils (REDCs):** Appointed by the Governor and oversee the regional growth and development strategies they have defined to meet the goals and objectives for regional growth. (See http://nyworks.ny.gov).

**Regional Strategic Plan:** The summary plan that each region submitted to the State of New York as part of the Governor’s New York Open for Business Regional Economic Development Councils competition in 2011. The Plan describes the characteristics, demographics, geographic and economic data, challenges and opportunities unique to a region. It also provides an outline to grow the regional economy by focusing on Priority Projects which stimulate investment and growth in the region.
**Underserved Populations**: Historically unserved and underserved communities are those groups that either have documented low levels of access and/or use of clean energy services and programs, face educational or language barriers to participation in clean energy programs and/or the policy making process for clean energy, may have low incomes and therefore carry a high energy cost relative to household income, and/or have been identified as priorities for clean energy services or program.
Appendix B: Green Jobs-Green New York
Community Outreach Discussion Working Group
Meeting Notes
Participants met via phone call, in person, and videoconference at NYSERDA’s Albany and Buffalo offices on January 5, 2016. Telephone access was made available to members who could not be present at a video conference site.

The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
NYSERDA Director of Communities and Local Government and working group facilitator, Kelly Tyler, introduced herself and had Jessica Waldorf perform a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly suggested and the Working Group agreed that the high level goal of the Working Group will be to provide NYSERDA with a recommendation to the Green Jobs Green New York (GJGNY) Advisory Council for future outreach efforts that will increase low-to-moderate (LMI) income participation in clean energy activities. In particular, recommendations shall include the identification of tasks and associated metrics that a support contractor (i.e. CBO) shall perform to support NYSERDA’s LMI efforts under the Clean Energy Fund. Recommendations may also include the characteristics of organizations and personnel that would best support the effort. She then invited comment from those present on all topics, beginning with thoughts/ideas for tasks for future contractors.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)
What are the needed tasks that will encourage clean energy activities by the LMI sector?
Comments/Discussion included:
• Continue to building relationships and help people through the process to ensure that projects move forward. Work with other organizations (throughout Western NY) to reach broader audience (City Neighborhood Housing Services). Customers need some hand holding.

• Counties are very economically diverse; consequently, there isn’t a one size fits all approach that works. As an example, through current efforts, aggregation hasn’t worked in rural areas.

• Constituency Based Organizations (CBOs) can leverage external funding to help support projects and bring resources, technical expertise, assist in accessing local banks for Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) funding, work with housing programs, etc.

• CBOs have expertise to know how to make programs accessible and expertise in knowing the resources that are out there.

• Couple outreach with the EmPower Program - CBOs spent a lot of time with LMI consumers but can’t get them access to financing.

• It’s critical that we find ways for homeowners to reduce energy demand through residential programs.

• If focus is to expand community outreach, need to work backwards and see what the impediments are that we have faced.

• Expand the breadth of area the local contractor is to cover. LMI residents live/work next to market-rate customers. You can’t implement community outreach and get results without addressing opportunities for both audiences.

• Impediments preventing success include LMI consumers unable to get access to financing.

• Continue to expand criteria to allow for broader eligibility. CBOs can work with philanthropic organizations where loans are forgiven at some point.

• Discussed Neighborworks Loan Program which is able to consolidate lending and provide financing to others that wouldn’t quality for NYSERDA financing.

• Would be helpful if outreach contractor/NYSERDA put together regional matrix of all available funding. This might be easier to do based on region rather than across all of New York State.

• Need to have CBOs that can find and leverage external resources.

• Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are available in local communities that CBOs can help access.

• One of tasks for outreach contractors should be to put together a menu of available programs and resources, many of which are specific to the region. CBOs research/secure/leverage other funding (grants) to get resources to fill in the gaps.

• The need exceeds the supply of funds. RUPCO has long list of homeowners in need of funds still waiting for next round of funding. GJGNY funding took a long time for work scopes to get approved.

• CBOs are constantly facing hang ups in the process (e.g., EFS).

• Need regional support coverage throughout the state is not consistent. (Current CBO network does not cover entire state leaving regional gaps of service.)

• Capacity of CBOs varies region-to-region. Regions have unique needs. Discuss the need to target and the best way to do that.

• Proposers could suggest different targets and strategies

• Consumer education is a big component of what we should be doing and should broaden metrics of success to include number of presentations/educational seminars related to consumer education, as one example.
• People don’t know how to use new equipment once it is in place. More education needed to end users on how to operate and maintain equipment once it is in place.
• One CBO mentioned they positioned their team to serve as a bridge between the customer and Home Performance (HP) contractor in order to protect customer interest by value propositioning. Having someone that isn’t profit motivated is important.
• What type of education is most effective?
• One on one education with a customer is the best
• Discussed the CNY Energy Challenge Program performed by the Central New York Regional Development and Planning Board, which organized homeowners into small groups and conducted and implemented behavioral strategies that resulted in a with the goal to reduce residential energy use and get them into the HP Program.
• Discussed tailored education programs such as providing curriculum/education to middle school students. Students, in turn, bring home information to homeowners.
• Discussed the importance of a health and safety educational component and a home energy score that has real meaning and means something to the consumer that selling or buying their home.
• Need to make sure that CBO staff is well educated so they know what they are talking about when in the field.
• CBO staff education is definitely an area we are concerned about.
• Have CBOs been engaged with the Regional Economic Development Councils (REDCs)? REDCs are very informative and update their work every year in the form of Regional Strategic Plans, all of which have targeted focuses to spur activity/progress in low income communities. They also have REDC working groups in specific areas and it could be beneficial to have CBOs engaged in the REDCs and some associated working groups.
• Align LMI outreach efforts with the REDC Regional Sustainability Plans
• One CBO mentioned they submitted a CFA to the REDC for funding for state programs and participated in the Phase I regional plans.
• Discussed the workforce coordination role for CBOs: CBOs assisted in programs that created good paying local jobs, which helps to build relationships with homeowners. Assisting job seekers with finding Clean Energy jobs by using lead generation capacity with contractors to have them work with RUPCO to connect job seekers, help job seekers get access to training, matchmaking, mentoring, soft support, and transportation (hard) support.
• Aggregation can be a great model and creates great relationships with contractors.
• Aggregation doesn’t work in every area and good relationships can be achieved without aggregation. We should incentivize contractors to work well with CBOs.
• It is great to foster good relationships between CBOs and contractors.
• CBOs should have more involvement with municipalities and local land banks.
• Discussed the relationship CBOs could have with the land bank and municipalities to get resolutions passed by municipalities to have individuals designated to assist with GJGNY effort.

In summary of the discussion, potential roles for future outreach efforts may include:
  o Relationship building;
  o Aggregation;
  o Connecting consumers to external programs and resources; Packaging of resources
o Contractor and community resource; Assist contractors in finding other community resources if issues in home prevent other EE work to go forward
o Workforce development;
o Regional Economic Development Council engagement;
o Partner development;
o Consumer education -- Drive education and awareness of the low cost steps and behaviors LMI residents and building owners can take to save on utility bills;
o Facilitating finance applications;
o Outreach (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers);
o Contractor engagement and education (applications, find other resources, lead generation, contracts for aggregation); and
o Regionally specific focused tasks

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)
Meeting minutes and a Doodle Poll to set up weekly meetings will be forthcoming. The agenda for the next meeting will include a discussion of how we want to measure success and (if time allows,) the identification of characteristics for the types of organizations that can conduct these tasks. Additionally, we may choose to discuss (define) the value to contractor for CBO engagement.
I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and had Jessica Waldorf perform a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly noted we are planning to extend the current CBO contracts through December 31, 2016, and clarified the discussion that this working group should focus on is for the future contractors, not the existing pool of CBOs. We would like to get a better sense of what is working now, what isn’t working now, and what we should focus on under the next round of outreach in the future, likely starting January 1st, 2017, when the CBO contracts expire.

Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. No changes were suggested.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)

- Kelly reviewed the summary of potential roles for future outreach efforts identified from the previous meeting to see if anyone had changes or additional comments. Those roles include the following:
  - Relationship building;
  - Aggregation;
  - Connecting consumers to external programs and resources; Packaging of resources
- Contractor and community resource; Assist contractors in finding other community resources if issues in home prevent other EE work to go forward
- Workforce development;
- Regional Economic Development Council engagement;
- Partner development;
- Consumer education -- Drive education and awareness of the low cost steps and behaviors LMI residents and building owners can take to save on utility bills;
- Facilitating finance applications;
- Outreach (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers);
- Contractor engagement and education (applications, find other resources, lead generation, contracts for aggregation); and
- Regionally specific focused tasks

- What would be some of those regionally specific focused tasks? For example, someone noted in the last meeting that aggregation doesn’t work in every region and could be a regionally-focused task. A couple of entities responded that aggregation was a good example. One person suggested that we drill down to a more local level for specific tasks such as a neighborhood or census block. Other than aggregation, no other region or local specific tasks were identified.
- Aggregation has been something that has worked really well for PUSH Buffalo. When we (Jason) are reaching out to end users, the message isn’t the same for everyone so it makes sense to have more specific outreach. For example, the outreach and messaging differs between rural vs. urban areas.
- Kelly asked – What type of outreach are you referring to?
- Working with elected officials but also doing canvassing in the neighborhood through local events. The elected officials really need that education too.
- One member suggested that NYSERDA comb through reports of successful CBOs to see what activities are working and include those as part of the future outreach contract.
- Direct leads and referrals from NYSERDA to the CBOs have been working very well and should continue in the future.
- A suggestion was made to see what the numbers look like in areas where we don’t have CBOs vs. the areas we do and what the differences are. When the Round 1 contracts started, zip codes were identified where the CBOs served. All of the jobs we received credit for would be identified on a zip code basis. Possibly use GIS to see what parts of the state CBOs are effective vs. what parts they are not.
- One CBO mentioned that one activity they have been doing is working with churches directly. We have 25 churches to reach a broader audience and getting about 40 retrofits. One of the things about that is that the churches have very different income levels. How will this work if we focus on low to moderate income in a very diverse audience? Don’t think that it is region-specific, but we should be looking at how we get to a larger audience.
- Is partner development something that is working? What are we referring to when we talk about partner development?
  - The group seemed to agree, yes, partner development is an essential task for outreach.
  - An example provided was work with Presbyterian churches where she formed a very good partnership with them that resulted in a lot of projects being generated.
• The marketing to the market rate customers is the same for low-to-moderate customers (e.g. discussing the benefits of air-sealing), but the lower income community may just require a lot of additional handholding.
• In WNY, PUSH has been able to leverage the benefit of funding through the CBA (Community Benefits Agreement) and that has been a very effective pitch to customers.
• The CBA has been very effective in other regions as well and has helped to reduce the financial burden to the customer, especially in cases where we are doing aggregated projects.
• A member asked -- Are aggregation projects run similar to a solar aggregation campaign? Do they have a certain region, certain price guarantees, etc.?
  o Work with a group of contractors to sign agreements to offer discounted pricing to homeowners working with us in bundles. Based on volume of work, the Contractors are also agreeing to give us first-source hiring agreements so that the contractors come to us for individuals when they are looking to hire additional staff.
• Is the work that is performed a specific set of things or is it just anything that is needed?
  o It is all based on the audit that is done for the building. Anything found as part of the audit is available as part of the aggregation project.
• The churches also want solar to be included as part of the project, but we always try to encourage them to do efficiency first. Solar contractors are always coming to us for projects, but we can’t give them to specific contractors. We would like to have solar included as part of the future roles for contractors.
• A few members of the working group mentioned they would also like the health and safety piece to be part of the work we do with customers. Unfortunately, we have to say now that if these are what they want addressed, we have to channel them to a different source.
• Are the current CBOs the types of organizations that can seek out external funding?
  o There are other groups that would provide the actual funding.
• Each CBO has their own different capacity. It is often a lot of work and takes time to track down these funding resources. A local resource guide of funding opportunities may be helpful to channel customers to the appropriate source.
  o NYSERDA could certainly help put this together, but we would look to the local organizations to help us identify those opportunities.
  o Some of this funding comes through CDBG grants that are given to local organizations like not-for-profit organizations. Part of the role could be to partner with municipalities to figure out what other funding opportunities there are. We should also be looking to health and safety projects and trying to push efficiency and other opportunities with those customers.
• **CBO and Contractor Engagement**
  o In reviewing the notes that we took at our last meeting, there weren’t a lot of specific details on what types of activities CBOs could be doing with contractors. Can we take some time to talk about what current activities are, what is working, and what could be expanded upon?
  o One CBO suggested contractors should refer all customers to CBOs to handle the paperwork and work with Customers to help make projects work. Currently, we work with the contractor to complete financing paperwork and other paperwork from the contractor to help make projects work and accessing all external financing opportunities.
There should be some sort of formal relationship defined between the contractor and the CBO.

CBOs are reducing 10% of the cost for a project by completing the paperwork for the project. In exchange, they give the customer a reduction in the cost for a project and pay their employees working on the project a living wage.

This could be defined as aggregation.

Some contractors partner with church groups and do different types of shows and take care of the process to walk customers through the process if they don’t have a CBO serving the area.

One contractor mentioned they tried working with CBOs, but it doesn’t always work. Getting the customer is the hardest part and once you have them, you have to work with them as part of the sales process and to build the relationship, not give the lead away to a third party. If that process goes awry, then there is an opportunity for CBOs to step in and assist with the project and trying to get it to move forward.

Contractors might not want to hand off projects to a CBO if it means losing 10% of the cost of a project. They might not be willing to work with a CBO unless there was some other reason.

I think what we are talking about is working together on making a sale to a customer as opposed to handing them off once a customer is on board to complete a project. In some regions we work together to sell programs to customers so that it is not seen as a competitive environment and instead as a collaboration.

A good contractor can do all of the sales themselves. It is less risky for a contractor’s sales person to work with a customer then to hand it off to a CBO. This could differ if the CBO has an existing relationship with a contractor.

CBOs are giving contractors leads and then work as a team together to get the homeowner to go through the program.

Even if we aren’t providing leads to one specific contractor, when we are out doing events, we are promoting local contractors as an objective. That is something that should be kept in mind.

There is a difference between a lead and qualified lead where you take on the paperwork. A qualified lead when you have done the work to calculate the financing and potential for a project to move forward, that is a huge benefit to the Contractor (pre-qualification).

Would love to have an outside entity that provided qualified leads since as a contractor without a CBO in the region, we do a lot of that work ourselves.

Contractor mistrust is something that has come up but as a contractor we do not have that experience and have very successful relationships with our customers. Most contractors are capable of doing that side of the business on our own.

A bridge between the customer and contractor is not necessary. Contractors need and should form good relationships with customers on their own. We would, however, like it if there were someone else to do the paperwork.

Summary of Some Additional Roles/Activities for CBOs

- Combined market rate and LMI outreach
- Follow-up on direct leads/referrals from NYSERDA
- Elected/Municipal staff engagement
• Leveraging of external funds for outreach/education

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)
NYSERDA will send out a Doodle poll to get a reoccurring meeting scheduled. Agenda items for the next meeting may include a break-down of activities for each role identified.
Participants met via conference call on February 11, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and had Jessica Waldorf perform a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. No changes were suggested. She reviewed the end goal of the working group, which is a final report to GJGNY Advisory Council and noted that this input will be considered in development of the next solicitation.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)

1. Question posed to group: What are the barriers that CBOs are trying to address in the market?
   a. The financing process is difficult to get through, especially for the LMI communities. CBOs are addressing this barrier by assisting customers with getting through the financing process.
b. There is a lack of awareness in the market and customers do not understand the need for energy efficiency. Customer education from CBOs can help address this barrier. Tools to help residents reduce energy use on their own would be extremely helpful. Discussed the ability to share tools and best practices of the CBOs through SharePoint or through meetings of the CBOs, such as the downstate convening that happens on a routine basis.

c. Cost is a barrier that keeps projects from moving beyond the audit phase.

d. Even though On Bill Recovery (OBR) is an option that home owners want to use, contractors dislike (or refuse to use) the option. This is frustrating because CBOs promote the benefits of OBR, but home owners get a different message from contractors that don’t like the loan product.

e. Low energy prices are becoming an obstacle to motivating homeowners to take action. This also making the Savings to Investment Ratio (SIR) harder to show on some projects, which affects the availability of the NYSERDA financing.

2. Question posed to group: What is the value proposition that CBOs bring to the table as opposed to the next available alternative, which would be to not have any NYSERDA outreach intervention?
   a. Customers might not be able to make it through the program process on their own.
   b. Serve as trusted advisor and are able to convince customers to move forward on projects.
   c. Can assist with difficulty of finding financial resources to implement projects.
   d. Are able to assist LMI communities in areas where they wouldn’t otherwise be assisted by contractors. Other contractors do not provide information for assistance programs available to LMI households, or have limited to no experience using them. CBOs are knowledgeable about these programs and proactively promote them to the LMI communities.
   e. CBOs are not profit motivated and are instead there to advocate for home owners through the entire process of making improvements to the home (completing applications, working with Energy Finance Solutions (EFS), applying for financing, attending assessments, project oversight, following up with folks, addressing issues with workmanship, etc.).
   f. Consumer protection: CBOs are not contractors, but have the same certification that NYSERDA requires the contractors to have (e.g. Building Performance Institute Certified Building Professionals) so we can let home owners know what measures make the most sense (versus what a contractor may want to sell), and ensure that a comprehensive assessment is being completed at the home. Note that this does not apply to all CBOs.
   g. CBOs help homeowners understand all of the various program options that are available (EmPower, Assisted Home Performance, etc.) We can also help guide people out of the program if they have pre-existing conditions that may prohibit a contractor from being able to make improvements, and guide them to resources to address those issues first.
3. **Question posed to group:** What are some of the barriers to success of CBOs and how can we help overcome them?
   a. Lack of marketing tools to help customers understand value of program participation.
   b. Lack of good, central database for information sharing between CBOs and contractors. This also makes it difficult to track quality assurance for projects and customer interactions. Currently, each CBO has their own, separate tracking system.
   c. Question was posed on what the real focus of our efforts should be on. Should we focus on outreach (getting an energy audit) or more on getting customers to proceed with the actual retrofit? Answer was that we should focus on the entire process from the point at which the customer becomes aware of the program through the actual retrofit. Discussed the need to have a list of common definitions so that everyone is on the same page on what we mean when we refer to outreach and other common terms used for the CBO efforts.
   d. Large territories can be difficult to cover.
   e. Metrics for EmPower Program referrals aren’t counted towards current CBO metrics.
   f. Some CBOs face issues with contractors such as:
      i. Lack of respect for home owners (stereotyping)
      ii. Unwillingness to utilize On Bill Recovery (OBR)
      iii. Trying to oversell to the home owner, which leads to a lack of confidence in the contractor
      iv. Subcontractors and installation crews not understanding the “house as a system” (whole building) approach
      v. Lack of communication between contractor and CBO (at times)

4. **Review of each of the proposed task and discuss each in detail:**
   a. Regionally specific focused tasks
      i. Discussed having this as a separate pot of funds for CBOs to conduct pilot projects.
      ii. Aggregation might not be a good fit under this and a better fit for a common task. Discussed the need for a conversation reviewing this topic so that everyone has the same understanding of what we mean by aggregation.
      iii. Ability to partner with schools and students for pilot projects is a good example.
      iv. Community meetings similar to solarize that focused on energy efficiency.
   b. Aggregation
      i. This approach allows the home owners to work with a trusted organization that is looking out for the best interest of the home owner. This also allows more completed projects to happen because of discounts associated with aggregation, and better follow up than what a contractor would provide. Customers often perceive contractor follow up as pressure to sell something.
   c. Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources)
      i. CBOs that can do this help alleviate contractors from getting “bad leads”
if there are programs that need to happen before any energy efficiency work can happen. Braided funding sources can also help address the whole house to make larger improvements while making the house more energy efficient, especially for folks in the lower income range.

d. Contractor engagement and education

e. Workforce development
   i. When working with contractors in aggregation, there is no accountability (or support from NYSERDA) to enforce collective bargaining agreements to hire even though we are increasing the amount of work that contractors are getting and growing their business.

f. Regional Economic Development Council engagement

g. Partner development
   i. Discussed using community groups, such as Rotary Club or church groups, that can help push out the message. Music festivals, bridal shows, and other events should be tried to be used for greater outreach and to attain greater impact. Person-to-person outreach is effective and radio ads have shown to be not an effective form of outreach.

h. Consumer engagement and education
   i. Working with local organizations to attend events not necessarily related to energy and being able to make contacts with customers that way.
   ii. Build trust with home owners going through the process. Home owners have a hard time trusting contractors to do right by them rather than upsell to make additional profits.
   iii. This is a value added by CBO’s during the relationship building process, and initial one on one interactions. Contractors care less about education, and more about being able to do work.

i. Facilitating finance applications

j. Outreach and marketing (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers)
   i. By CBOs taking on this role more projects get completed, and the contractors can save on their overhead for these types of activities. This really helps smaller contractors to grow their business because they can spend less (or no) time doing outreach, and focusing on the work of installing equipment.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)

1. Develop common definition list for different activities CBOs will complete.
2. NYSERDA staff will review current marketing tools developed by NYSERDA and CBOs.
3. Continue discussion on individual tasks and then discuss what the outcomes will be of those tasks (metrics and measurements of success)
4. We will reconvene in two weeks.
5. We want to set up a final meeting in March with all of the working group members to review progress to date and pull together a final report for the GJGNY Advisory Council.
Green Jobs Green New York (GJGNY)
Community Outreach Working Group
Meeting Four

Meeting Agenda
February 25, 2016
3:00 pm - 4:00 pm

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Response and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Tyson</td>
<td>Long Island Progressive Coalition</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Langton</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Partnership Home Ownership Center</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Metcalfe</td>
<td>Building Performance Contractors Association</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Kulaszewski</td>
<td>PUSH Buffalo</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Carrick</td>
<td>Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Smith</td>
<td>Home Energy Performance by Halco</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Griffith</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Tyler</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Waldorf</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Khachadourian</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Hughes</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Clark</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>Attending via conference call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants met via conference call on February 25, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and had Jessica Waldorf perform a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. One change was suggested, which was to add in a comment to the meeting notes to clarify that not all CBOs have BPI certification.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)

5. Reminded the group that one of the goals of this working group is to outline clear traits that future LMI outreach contractors should possess and discussed some of those traits.
   a. BPI certifications should not be required, but the outreach contractor should understand the general concepts to be able to respond to questions and provide general guidance to customers. There is a benefit to having the certification or at least taking the courses related to BPI certification.
   b. It might make sense to have a requirement for outreach contractors to provide documentation of relevant courses completed to demonstrate basic energy efficiency/renewable energy knowledge, such as BPI Building Analyst course.
c. Outreach contractors should demonstrate a basic financial knowledge since this is an area that CBOs are heavily involved in. There was a financial literacy training that Cornell Cooperative Extension conducted through EmPower when that program first started. This course could be an opportunity to meet this need.

d. Not every outreach contractor should have to demonstrate specific knowledge in the financial area since this isn’t something that every CBO does.

6. Reviewed list of common definitions that will be used for the purposes of the working group as well as in the future LMI outreach solicitation.

a. **Aggregation**: A collection of eligible homes, businesses and/or not-for-profits in the same neighborhood, brought to the program by an organization under contract (or subcontract) to NYSERDA for outreach services, and who have all agreed up-front to use the same contractor or contractor team to perform audits and the ensuing retrofit work.
   
   i. Definition is missing community benefits agreement that comes with discount for people getting the retrofit as well as benefits that create pathways for people to attain jobs (wage and hiring standards).
   
   ii. Also missing that this should include multiple contractors as part of the aggregation effort.

b. **Low-to-Moderate Income**: Less than or equal to 80 percent of the area (county) median income (AMI) for low income and 120 percent of the AMI for moderate income.

c. **Packaging of Resources**: Outreach organizations would be responsible for creating packages of services for consumers and connecting them to the appropriate programs and/or assisting with the pre-qualification or application process.

d. **Local Partners**: Groups, organizations, and/or individuals representing constituency groups that may include, but are not limited to: economic development agencies, business associations, community action agencies, chambers of commerce, municipal governments, business leaders, incubators, non-profits, civic groups, utilities, other NYSERDA contractors, and others.

e. **Partnerships**: Strategic business relationships created with Local Partners by the outreach organization with the intention of extending NYSERDA’s outreach to residential, commercial, institutional, and municipal customers.

f. **Regional Economic Development Councils (REDCs)**: Are appointed by the Governor and oversee the regional growth and development strategies they have defined to meet the goals and objectives for regional growth. (See http://nyworks.ny.gov).

g. **Regional Strategic Plan**: The summary plan that each region submitted to the State of New York as part of the Governor’s New York Open for Business Regional Economic Development Councils competition in 2011. The Plan describes the characteristics, demographics, geographic and economic data, challenges and opportunities unique to a region. It also provides an outline to grow the regional economy by focusing on Priority Projects which stimulate investment and growth in the region.
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h. **Priority Projects:** Projects defined by the Regional Economic Development Councils as meeting their regional goals for economic development and recommended to the Governor for funding.

i. **Pilot Project:** A project implemented by the outreach organization that involves the initial small-scale implementation of an activity or set of activities to test the viability of the initial pilot project and inform development of a long-term strategy.

7. **Continued review of each of the proposed task and discussed each in detail.**
   a. Regionally specific focused tasks
      i. Reviewed discussion from last meeting on funding for pilot projects.
   b. Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources)
      i. Would like to have relationship with contractors to complete paperwork for projects and helping customers find the financial resources to complete projects from the energy audit conducted by the contractor.
      ii. Chris Carrick reviewed work done on solarize campaigns his organization has assisted with implementing per the request of the working group. Solarize campaigns involve a group of community organizers, municipalities, or not-profit organizations that form a campaign to do a large outreach effort to educate homeowners about solar energy in general as well as the specific benefits of the solarize campaign. These benefits can include a discount from the participating contractors that is secured through a competitive bidding process. Through this effort, the lead contractor typically educates consumers about other resources available to them including energy efficiency (Home Performance, EmPower, etc.). The purpose is to make it easier and more affordable to implement solar projects. The organization assists the customers through the process of getting the audit, then implementing the measures. The organization does a lot of work with customers to sign them up for the campaign all the way through the completion of the solar panel installation. This is a good example of an aggregation project and what is meant by aggregation for the purposes of this working group and future LMI outreach solicitation. It is a focused marketing effort that results in a discounted rate for multiple energy efficiency or renewable energy projects.
      iii. If you are asking a contractor to give a discount, then we should include the requirement that it is in a neighborhood and not a large geographic area.
      iv. Shouldn’t only be limited to neighborhood since this doesn’t apply in every area. This can create an unnecessary weight to create that bundle of projects.
      v. It is hard to implement the neighborhood component, but this allows us to reduce costs and increase the chances of local hiring for the project.
   c. Contractor engagement and education
   d. Workforce development
i. If a workforce component is included, partnerships could be formed with employers for either internships or job placement. This could help bridge the gap between community members and employers seeking to hire. NYSERDA’s Workforce Development Team would be part of the training of the outreach contractors up front. This would not just be limited to the Home Performance Program.

e. Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) engagement

f. Partner development and engagement
   i. Discussed the example brought up in past meetings about working with churches.
   ii. What do we mean by partner engagement?
      1. We don’t have enough funds to gain access to every potential customer that could participate in our programs. Thus, we look to our outreach contractors to work with other organizations to form partnerships to extend the outreach to a broader audience. Effective partnerships would result increased market penetration and additional end-user project activity. We are looking to the outreach contractors to have a really strong partner network that they can either bring to the initial contract or have the ability to form new partnerships.
      2. One organization mentioned that they included a strong focus on this in the first round, but removed it in the second round as it wasn’t found to be successful. The main reason is that the organization was locked into the requirements and couldn’t make changes throughout the contract term.
      3. Discussed the options of having quarterly plans to set flexible goals throughout the contract period. General consensus was that this would be a good addition to the solicitation and resulting contracts.

g. Consumer engagement and education

h. Facilitating finance applications
   i. Outreach and marketing (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers)

j. Aggregation
   i. When aggregation didn’t work, what were the obstacles?
      1. CBOs have chosen not to do it because of the perceived obstacles and instead focused on already existing working efforts.
      2. Access to financing and whether or not people can afford to do the work.
   ii. Aggregation is not the answer to scalability, we need to solve other issues including expanding the definition for LMI to 120% AMI, affordability of projects, access to financing, etc.
   iii. If you aren’t doing aggregation, then you can’t recommend specific contractors to customers. This prevents success of projects. Some CBOs give limited lists of contractors, but this is not something all current CBOs
thought was allowable. Need to determine if this is something that will continue in the future.

iv. If giving a narrowed-down list isn’t allowable, would it be possible to have CBOs give the name of the potential customer to a list of contractors and whomever contacts them first gets the project?

v. In past solarize campaigns, we have encouraged them to stick with one to three contractors and it has been a successful approach. Is it possible to step back from the whole-house approach and just stick with a few measures so that the contractor can get economies of scale with visibility, project implementation, etc.? This is a lesson learned from solarize campaigns. When people in the neighborhood see solar panels on their neighbor’s houses, then it is something that others in the community want to proceed with.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)

1. Will reconvene in two weeks and continue the discussion on remaining tasks including workforce development, contractor engagement and education, REDC engagement, outreach and marketing, consumer engagement and education, and facilitating finance applications.

2. Will also discuss metrics we can associate with each defined task at the next meeting and confirm a schedule for remaining meetings of the working group and final report to the GJGNY Advisory Council.
Participants met via conference call and webinar on March 10, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and had Jessica Waldorf perform a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. One change was suggested, which was to add Hal Smith as attendee. NYSERDA revised the notes from the last meeting to include this change.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)
8. Reviewed list of common definitions
   a. No changes were suggested.
9. Continue review of each of the proposed task and discuss each in detail.
   a. Regionally specific focused tasks – Covered during previous calls
      i. Contractor recruitment (e.g. NYC, Capital District, North Country, etc.)
   b. Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources) – Covered during previous calls
   c. Contractor engagement and education
      i. Referring to Home Performance and other NYSERDA program contractors here.
ii. Outreach Contractors are good at handling the application processes for end-users and working with the Contractors on clarification on work scopes and bringing additional funding to the project to make it work.

iii. When new contractors under next LMI Outreach Solicitation are in place, we should send out an introduction letter to local contractors so they know who the new contractors are and what they will be doing in each region.

iv. Suggest having more routine meetings between contractors and Outreach Contractors to coordinate efforts on an ongoing basis.

v. Outreach Contractors handle relationships with contractors differently, but the idea would be to have meetings with contractors to find out the work the Outreach Contractors do and improve the communications between the two entities.

vi. In most parts of the state, BPCA has monthly/bi-monthly meetings to coordinate with contractors in each region and Outreach Contractors have not attended these meetings in the past. Highly encourage Outreach Contractors to attend these in the future. BPCA has four groups around the state that meet regularly (either monthly or bi-monthly depending on the region).

vii. Could measure success here based on the number of working relationships that exist with contractors and the resulting projects. Another goal is recruitment of new contractors into the program.

viii. Working with contractor associations has been a very successful way to engage with contractors.

ix. Would like Outreach Contractors to focus more on bringing in more projects to existing contractors and completion of projects.

x. Bringing in more MWBEs into the program through contractors.

xi. Mentoring program to engage entry level contractor staff into the program and educate them on comprehensive home energy audits.

d. Partner development and engagement – Covered during previous calls

e. Aggregation – Covered during previous calls

f. Workforce development

i. In the past, there wasn’t enough workload to keep newly trained workers from low income communities on staff. We didn’t get enough work to keep these employees hired and there was also a ton of individuals that were trained but didn’t receive employment.

ii. Past training programs with BOCES were not successful.

iii. Need to be able to keep track of individuals that went through past trainings as there may be future opportunities. NYSERDA does have a database of past trainees.

iv. This could be something that we do on a regional basis.

v. On-the-job training program has been very successful and has assisted with job retention.
vi. Outreach Contractors have worked with a lot of university students to have internships at the Outreach Contractor that have then went on to retain employment in the clean energy industry.

vii. Outreach Contractors could connect contractors with resources in the community that they may not be aware of, such as courses and training programs at the local community colleges. Outreach Contractors could play a facilitation and connection role for contractors.

g. Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) engagement
   
i. REDCs are a governor’s effort that were established in 2011 to have ten REDCs across the State made up of volunteer community and business leaders.

   ii. Every year, the REDCs develop Regional Strategic Plans that include goals and priority projects that will be the focus for the region in terms of economic development.

   iii. Past discussions for Outreach Contractor roles include engagement with the REDC by attending meetings, becoming members of working groups, and identifying projects that Outreach Contractors could assist with and develop as part of this engagement.

   iv. Have Outreach Contractors and/or contractors engaged with the REDCs in the past? PUSH Buffalo is an example of one that is actively engaged in the REDC. However, there are several Outreach Contractors that are not actively engaged.

   v. REDCs have energy related working groups that would probably make sense for Outreach Contractors to be engaged with.

   vi. NYSERDA also funded the development of Regional Sustainability Plans that are available on the REDC website as well as on the NYSERDA website.

   vii. REDC central website: www.regionalcouncils.ny.gov

   viii. A lot of the projects that the REDCs focus on would be on a much larger scale in terms of dollar amount and focused more on commercial/industrial projects.

   ix. There needs to be more engagement between agencies at a higher level. There is a state agency resource team so representatives of different agencies attend these meetings. A lot of great ideas happen at a local level, but then do not move forward once brought back to the councils.

   x. This is a valuable activity for Outreach Contractors to be engaged in since the REDCs are setting priorities for the future of the region. This way, Outreach Contractors can be aware of upcoming programs and develop potential focus areas for outreach and lead generation.

h. Consumer engagement and education - Will discuss during next call

i. Facilitating finance applications - Will discuss during next call

j. Outreach and marketing (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers) - Will discuss during next call

10. Program Deliverables & Metrics
a. Will discuss during next call

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)

1. Timeframe:
   a. Goal is to have last working group meeting March 24\textsuperscript{th}
   b. Provide report for review the following week with a review of the draft report the week of April 7\textsuperscript{th}.
   c. Shortly after this, we would look to finalize the report for submission to the GJGNY Advisory Council mid-late April.

2. Will discuss remaining tasks as outlined above during the next meeting as well as program deliverables and metrics.
Participants met via conference call and webinar on March 17, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Jessica Waldorf introduced herself and performed a Roll Call for attendees. Jessica asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. No changes were requested.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)
11. **Continue review of each of the proposed task and discuss each in detail.** Jessica sent out a document in advance of the meeting that summarized the working group’s progress to date including our discussion of future tasks for outreach organizations to perform. Jessica reviewed the document and then start
   a. Regionally specific focused tasks
   b. Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources)
   c. Contractor engagement and education
      i. Create unique ways to engage contractors
   d. Partner development and engagement
   e. Aggregation
   f. Workforce development
   g. Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) engagement
h. Consumer engagement and education
   i. Tabling at events – would count the number of events completed, what was the outcome of those events, what leads were generated, etc. Looking at these would allow LMI Outreach Organizations to target events that have proven to be the most successful.
   ii. Community presentations
   iii. One on one outreach to community leaders and elected officials
   iv. Social media and other forms of outreach
   v. Speaking at rotary clubs, chambers of commerce, community groups, church groups, etc.
   vi. Pair up with a contractor after events or presentations are set up to leverage the interaction with contractors.
   vii. Look for unique strategies such as events that do not tie back to clean energy, but use them as an opportunity to engage consumers on clean energy. Examples include Tupperware parties, music festivals, Home Depot, etc. Another example would be an active energy audit where contractors would invite end users to a live energy audit so they can walk through it with the contractor.
   viii. Some items are challenging depending on where they are coming from. Many times events you are doing are one-off events that limit the ability to include every contractor. Often, it works better when contractors have events where they can invite the LMI Outreach Organization to.
   ix. Contractors often engage in events on a routine basis. Try to engage in events where other contractors would not be (bridal shows, etc.).
   x. Other measures of success could include the amount of individuals who attended an event in addition to just those that turn into leads for specific programs.
   xi. Need to have a better system to associate and attribute leads back to LMI Outreach Organizations. The terminology needs to be simplified or the question on the application needs to be asked differently. A lot of consumers don’t know what “CBO” means.
   xii. Could have automated hyperlinks so that the applicant goes through the LMI Outreach Organization’s website and the lead is directly attributed to them.
   xiii. The window that existing LMI Outreach Contractors are targeting are 60-80% AMI and this is a very small window. Maybe this should be expanded above the 80% level to reach a broader audience. The next solicitation will focus on LMI, but LMI Outreach Organizations would get credit for market-rate leads. Assisted Home Performance money should be spread beyond the 80% range. This could be done at a sliding scale where the incentive differs depending on the income (AMI) range. EmPower and Assisted Home Performance are going to be combined into one program.

i. Facilitating finance applications
i. Past discussions on consolidating applications have not been successful. This refers to consolidating incentive program applications with GJGNY loan applications.

ii. CBOs have been prevented with discussing applications with EFS and it would be very helpful for applications to include a disclosure that allows CBOs to interact with EFS.

iii. Assist people with paperwork, loan qualification, and understanding the process. Customers do not feel comfortable providing income tax information to contractors (not necessarily Home Performance Contractors, but other general contractors) so LMI Outreach Organizations fill a critical role in making loan applications successful.

iv. NYSERDA should do a better job of separating out the different types of contractors, specifically separate out Home Performance Contractors, from plumbing, etc.

v. Measurements of success could include number of applicants assisted with loan applications, successful applications, and completed loans.

j. Outreach and marketing (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers)
   i. Development of case studies to get more referrals in.
   ii. Websites, brochures, flyers, etc.
   iii. Changing materials to fit the needs of the community or group that you are conducting the outreach to.
   iv. Past NYSERDA driven marketing materials have not included LMI Outreach Organization contact information. Including this would help keep the relationship of the LMI Outreach Organization with the end-user.
   v. Something that is currently lacking is a focus on health and safety as well as quality assurance in case studies and other marketing materials.

12. Program Deliverables & Metrics
   a. Will discuss during next call

13. Characteristics of Successful LMI Outreach Organizations
   a. Next solicitation should include minimum standards for technical expertise. Not everyone needs to be Building Performance Institute (BPI) certified but proposers should have to demonstrate technical qualifications, trainings completed, etc.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)
   3. Will discuss program deliverables and metrics and review the document outlining key elements for the next LMI Outreach Initiative.
Participants met via conference call and webinar on March 24, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Jessica Waldorf introduced herself and performed a Roll Call for attendees. Jessica asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. No changes were requested.

II. Discussion (All Attendees)
1. **Program Deliverables & Metrics:** Jessica sent out a document in advance of the meeting that summarized the working group’s progress to date including our discussion of future tasks for outreach organizations to perform. Jessica reviewed the document and then started discussion on remaining activities and associated metrics.
   a. **Regionally specific focused tasks (Aggregation and Workforce Development) – not discussed**
   b. **Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources)**
      i. **Outcomes and metrics could include:** # projects generated for NYSERDA programs; amount of additional grant funds leveraged (HCR funding, HUD funding through municipalities, etc.); resulting energy savings and greenhouse gas emissions;
         1. Existing contractors do not have comprehensive lists of other external funding sources.
2. Suggest work scope that contractor develops include projected energy savings so that Outreach Organizations can access that information.

3. Future Outreach Organizations could reach out to homeowners to get before and after energy use information to get actual savings that result from projects. This could be an additional activity that future organizations do. However, Outreach Organizations do not want their performance to be measured based on resulting project energy savings, which they do not have any control over.

4. The weatherization program uses a fuel release form so that homeowners agree to allow access to utility information in the future. There have been problems working with the utility to access that information in the past but may not be an issue in the future.

5. Question: Can we clarify what the purpose of this activity is to identify tasks and resulting metrics? Will future organizations be asked to set these as performance targets? The purpose of this activity is to link applicants with all of the available funding possible to complete projects. Metrics may not be performance targets, but will have to be identified by the LMI Outreach Organization as a measure of success for each project worked on under this activity.

c. Contractor engagement and education
   i. Outcomes and metrics could include: the number of working relationships that exist with contractors, savings from the resulting projects, the recruitment of new contractors and MWBEs into the program, and job creation (are contractors able to hire new employees as a result of the relationship developed with the LMI Outreach Organization).
      1. Not every partnership results in contractors hiring new employees, but we should be able to count the ones that do as a measure of success.

d. Partner development and engagement
   i. Examples of this include block clubs, rotary clubs, etc.
   ii. Important to find organizations that are doing similar work and where you can share information where both parties benefit from the relationship.
   iii. Outcomes and metrics could include: The number of new partnerships that are formed, the number of resulting projects that come out of that partnership, and the resulting energy/greenhouse gas savings.
      1. Sometimes there is a costs to developing these partnerships. When you ask not-profit organizations, for example, they may want a reimbursement for referral to a program.
      2. We have been able to see success through other efforts with outreach organizations establishing relationships with organizations where there is an even exchange between the two entities of leads for different programs/activities.
3. We do not want to have one-off partners, but ones where ongoing relationships are established and there is an exchange of leads and referrals between the two entities.

**e. Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) engagement**
   i. This activity should be an optional activity.
   ii. HCR is one of the groups that participates in the REDCs so LMI Outreach Organizations can be kept aware of opportunities through the relationship they have with HCR.
   iii. Would like LMI Outreach Organizations to have an awareness and alignment with the REDCs and what they are doing.
   iv. REDCs tend to focus on individual communities that are in need and it would be good for the LMI Outreach Organizations to be aware of what those are so they are aware of the additional resources that will be brought to that community.
   v. REDCs are at a very high level and there isn’t a lot of communication down to the community level and to community based organizations. If there was a better communication flow, it would be a lot easier for community based organizations to focus efforts based on REDC priorities.
   vi. **Outcomes and metrics could include:** projects that come out as a result of REDC involvement/awareness; outreach that is focused based on REDC engagement; etc.

**f. Consumer engagement and education**
   i. **Outcomes and metrics:** Number of attendees at events; number of leads generated for specific programs; resulting energy savings; case studies/white papers for different campaigns to show success; etc.

**g. Facilitating finance applications**
   i. **Outcomes and metrics:** Measurements of success could include number of applicants assisted with loan applications, successful applications (free audits, subsidy application, credit application, grant application), completed loans, possibly energy savings, completed loans, number of people paying on loans, etc.

**h. Outreach and marketing (lead generation, tabling, events, referrals, public presentations, assisting contractors with troublesome customers)**
   i. Past NYSERDA driven marketing materials have not included LMI Outreach Organization contact information. Including this as well as a logo would help keep the relationship of the LMI Outreach Organization with the end-user.
   ii. More language diversity for program applications and marketing materials. There is not enough of this currently and current CBOs have had to create a lot of this on their own.
   iii. Materials should be simple and attractive so that the information is not overwhelming, but also interesting to the end-user.
   iv. There should be more media involvement and engagement at events to get the word out more to a broader audience.
v. It would be good to get clean energy out as a public service announcement and have a higher level of importance focused on this activity. This is another role that utilities could play because they have routine marketing efforts that we could add information to.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)
   1. For the next call, we will review progress to date and give people a chance to review the summary document in advance of our next meeting to provide comments on for discussion.
Participants met via conference call and webinar on March 31, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and performed a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. The following changes were requested and made to the meeting notes:

1. Change item 1b under the “Discussion” section to insert the word “grant” in front of “funds leveraged.” We should be clear here that we are referring to grant funding specifically.
2. Add to item 1b-3 under “Discussion” that “However, Outreach Organizations do not want their performance to be measured based on resulting project energy savings, which they do not have any control over.”

II. Discussion (All Attendees)

14. Review of “GJGNY Community Outreach Initiative Elements v4.0” document Jessica sent out prior to the meeting that summarizes progress made to date. Jessica sent out an updated version of this document in advance of the meeting, which summarizes the working group’s progress to date including our discussion of future activities for outreach organizations to perform. Jessica reviewed the document and then started discussion each section of the document.

   a. Goals
Another measurement would be majority/minority census track, which enabled you to help both higher income households and lower income neighborhoods as a way to focus efforts. There are LMI communities/census tracks, LMI households, and majority/minority census tracks (more than 50% of that area consists of minority households) that may not be LMI.

Increase access to financing for LMI communities and households.

**Barriers to Success of Existing CBOs**

- Lack of good marketing tools to help customers understand value of program participation.
- Lack of quality education across all CBOs in energy efficiency and renewable energy.
- Lack of awareness of new contractors as they come on board and lack of relationships with existing contractors.
- Unclear service territory of contractors leads to confusion by CBOs and by customers of what contractors are available in each service territory.
  1. NYSERDA can look into improving the website selections by territory to make sure the correct contractors are showing based on customer information entry.
  2. Would ranking and rating of contractors based on quality of work be helpful?
    a. CBOs find it hard to select contractors in the current web-based selection system on NYSERDA’s website. CBOs have skepticism on whether or not the rating would be effective and useful. However, some sort of system and more detailed information that is also user-friendly to get a sense of quality of contractors would be very useful.
    b. From a sales perspective, contractors want to be able to provide a simple list of options. For the CBOs, if you provide too many options, it can be overwhelming to the end-user who is trying to select a contractor. The CBO can put a customer out to a group of contractors and whoever contacts the customer first would be a good solution to simplifying the process for the customer and improving the relationship between the CBOs and the contractors.

**Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources)**

- Concern was brought up on whether or not savings should be tied to leads generated for programs since Outreach Organizations do not have any control over completion of projects and resulting energy savings.
- NYSERDA is trying to focus financial resources where we can get the most value for dollars invested so we want to be able to show energy savings/greenhouse gas emission savings as a result of this outreach effort. We have discussed showing dollars leveraged as a metric under this activity in past discussions, but we would also like to associate that with savings/greenhouse gas emission savings.
iii. There are obstacles that prevent Outreach Organizations from getting projects completed.

iv. Suggested that we show an average savings per project so that detailed savings for each individual project is not something that has to be tracked and so that savings are normalized among all of the Outreach Organizations.

v. Contractors are forced to show every bit of outreach performed to be able to tie it to direct energy savings.

vi. Outreach Organizations, on the other hand, generate a lot of project leads that may not come to fruition if the contractors do not follow up with customers for project completion.

vii. Existing CBOs are not convinced that savings should be a measure of success of their outreach efforts.

d. Characteristics of Successful LMI Outreach Organizations

i. Next initiative should include minimum standards for technical expertise. Not everyone needs to be Building Performance Institute (BPI) certified but proposers should have to demonstrate technical qualifications, trainings completed, etc. (BPI Building Science Principles certificate, etc.).

   1. Suggested that NYSERDA set aside funding in future LMI Outreach Initiative for professional development for LMI Outreach Organizations to increase knowledge in energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors.

   2. Alternatively, NYSERDA could include this as part of webinars that are held on a routine basis with LMI Outreach Organizations.

   3. NYSERDA may be able to provide access to the BPI Building Science Principles certificate course at a reduced rate through its Workforce Development Team.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)

2. For the next call, we will continue review of the “GJGNY Community Outreach Initiative Elements v4.0” document.

3. The draft report will be sent out next week for review and final discussion at the April 14th meeting.
Participants met via conference call and webinar on April 7, 2016. The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting.

I. Welcome and Introductions (Kelly Tyler)
Kelly Tyler introduced herself and performed a Roll Call for attendees. Kelly asked if everyone had a chance to review the meeting notes and if everyone had any changes. The following changes were requested and made to the meeting notes:

3. Change item 1a under the “Discussion” section to revise language to state “There are LMI communities/census tracks, LMI households, and majority/minority census tracks (more than 50% of that area consists of minority households) that may not be LMI.”

II. Discussion (All Attendees)
15. Review of “GJGNY Community Outreach Initiative Elements v5.0” document Jessica sent out prior to the meeting that summarizes progress made to date. Jessica sent out an updated version of this document in advance of the meeting, which summarizes the working group’s progress to date including our discussion of future activities for outreach organizations to perform. Jessica reviewed the document and then started discussion on remaining sections of the document.

a. Assumptions/Hypotheses
   i. Deleted “great” in the following sentence: “Aggregation is a model that can create great relationships with contractors and lead to very successful outcomes, but it does not work in every area of the State.

b. Barriers to LMI Consumer
   i. Changed “residents” to “homeowners” in the following sentence: “Lack of available capital for homeowners who are having difficulty paying utility bills and are hesitant to take on additional debt. Cost is a barrier that keeps projects from moving beyond the audit phase.”
ii. Revised language in following sentence: “Lack of coordination across state-sponsored LMI focused initiatives and community organizations and financial institutions.

c. **Key Considerations for a LMI Outreach Initiative (Revised language in following bullets)**
   
i. Facilitate relationships between LMI Outreach Organizations, local economic development agencies, local community-based organizations, contractors, and other agencies and organizations to maximize the potential impact of outreach efforts to the LMI households and communities.
   
ii. Include quarterly plans to set flexible goals throughout the contract period. This will also allow LMI Outreach Organizations to adjust strategies as the program is being implemented.
   
iii. Next LMI outreach initiative should target regional coverage based on the ten (10) Economic Development Regions as defined by Empire State Development. Regions include: North Country, Capital District, Mid-Hudson, Long Island, New York City, Mohawk Valley, Southern Tier, Central New York, Finger Lakes and Western New York. This would help to align with other State efforts and allow for full Statewide coverage with LMI Outreach Organizations that can provide services throughout each region.


d. **What types of outreach activities are essential to increase participation in LMI clean energy projects?** Added to this section “SMART goals and objectives (Specific Measurable Achievable Relevant and Time-bound)”

e. **Connecting consumers to external programs and resources (packaging of resources):**
   
i. Suggest including projected energy savings in the work scope developed by the contractor so that Outreach Organizations can access that information. Alternatively, Future Outreach Organizations could reach out to homeowners to get before and after energy use information to get actual savings that result from projects. LMI Outreach organizations may be able to access utility information through working with the weatherization program and/or directly with the utilities. However, past CBOs have had problems working with utilities. Added “NYSERDA has current effort to work with utilities to gather local energy savings data by community that could address this effort.” This was added based on the discussion that LMI Outreach Organizations should not have to spend time tracking down data when they could be making better use of their time working with customers.
   
ii. Continued discussion here on whether or not LMI Outreach Organizations should be measured based on energy savings.
iii. Existing CBOs are not convinced that savings should be a measure of success of their outreach efforts. Added: “LMI Outreach Organizations do not have a direct impact on the completion of a project since they are not responsible for modeling the projects or for the eligibility of homeowners and tenants for incentives and financing to complete recommend home energy improvements.”

f. Characteristics of Successful LMI Outreach Organizations
   i. Ability to access and leverage additional grant (local, state, and federal) funding for projects.

III. Next Steps and Adjourn (Kelly Tyler)
   4. This was the last regularly scheduled call. NYSERDA will send out a draft of the report to the working group for review the week of April 18th. We will cancel weekly meetings and reconvene on April 28th to review comments and finish the final report.
NYSERDA, a public benefit corporation, offers objective information and analysis, innovative programs, technical expertise, and support to help New Yorkers increase energy efficiency, save money, use renewable energy, and reduce reliance on fossil fuels. NYSERDA professionals work to protect the environment and create clean-energy jobs. NYSERDA has been developing partnerships to advance innovative energy solutions in New York State since 1975.

To learn more about NYSERDA's programs and funding opportunities, visit nyserda.ny.gov or follow us on Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, or Instagram.