

**Green Jobs Green New York (GJGNY)  
Advisory Council Meeting Notes**

September 12, 2013  
1:00pm-4:00pm  
NYSERDA Board Room  
Albany NY

Members of the Green Jobs-Green New York (GJGNY) Advisory Council met via videoconference at NYSEDA's Albany, New York City, and Buffalo offices on 9/12, 2013. Telephone access was made available to members who could not be present at a video conference site. Also attending the meeting were NYSEDA staff members, additional staff members from Advisory Council member organizations, and members of the public. The meeting was videotaped and posted on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSEDA's website](#).

**Attendees—**

**Albany Office:**

Lisa Rosi, NYS Department of Public Service. Members of the public: Keith Cornell, Empire State Development; Kathleen Langton, Affordable Housing Partnership. NYS Energy Research and Development Authority: Frank Murray, Karen Hamilton, Tom Barone, Jeff Pitkin, Susan Moyer, Kevin Carey, Pete Savio, Peggie Neville, Caroline Ruess, Susan Andrews, Carley Murray, Jennifer Meissner, John Ahearn, Linda Miller, additional NYSEDA staff.

**NYC Office:**

Anthony Ng, Center for Working Families; Stephen Edel, Center for Working Families; David Hepinstall, Association for Energy Affordably. Members of the public: Chuck Schwartz, LI Green; Esteban Duran, El Puente; Wamid Muhammad, Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Association; Taleigh Smith, Northwest Bronx Community and Clergy Association; Marriele Robinson; Long Island Progressive Coalition. NYS Energy Research and Development Authority: Michael Colgrove; Sharon Griffith; Paula Rosenberg.

**Buffalo Office:**

Corey Gocker, PUSH Buffalo

**Phone:**

Kate Fish, Adirondack North Country Association; Dick Kornbluth, Building Performance Contractors Association; Jackson Morris, PACE Energy; James Barry, SEIU Local 32BJ; Barbara Guinn, Office of Temporary and Disability Services; Alan Hipps, Housing Assistance Program. NYS Energy Research and Development Authority: Adele Feranti.

The following meeting notes capture discussions, questions, and comments held at the meeting in response to the presentations given by NYSEDA staff. A copy of the presentations and any handouts provided can be found at the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSEDA's website](#).

**I. Welcome and Introductions (Frank Murray)**

After attending 22 of the 23 GJGNY Advisory Council meetings, Frank Murray announced that the September 2013 Advisory Council meeting will be the last meeting he will attend as Chair. Mr.

Murray will be leaving NYSERDA at the end of the month. He thanked all participants in the GJGNY program, including NYSERDA staff and Advisory Council members. He noted that significant progress has been made over the years as can be seen from the program outcomes discussed at the current meeting. He hopes that everyone who has been involved in the program during his tenure will continue with their active engagement. John Rhodes will replace Mr. Murray as Chair of the GJGNY Advisory Council.

It was announced at the last Advisory Council meeting that at two staff involved with GJGNY CBO outreach effort would be stepping down from fulltime employment at NYSERDA: Mark Wyman (NYC) and Sue Andrews (Albany). While NYSERDA is seeking replacements for these those positions, Sue Andrews will be returning on a part time basis. NYSERDA thanks her for staying engaged with GJGNY.

## **II. Financing: Bond Issuance (Jeff Pitkin)**

Frank Murray introduced Jeff Pitkin by noting that the NYSERDA bond issuance is the first time that an environmental agency has linked its objectives specifically to investment in energy efficiency on this scale in the United States. It serves as a national model.

Jeff Pitkin reported that on August 14, 2013, NYSERDA issued \$24.3M in residential energy efficiency financing revenue bonds, which achieved a triple A rating. The bond issue was used to finance residential energy efficiency Tier 1 loans that had been issued through GJGNY.

Bonds were structured with various maturity dates and achieved an overall average interest rate of about 3.2 percent. The bonds issued are fixed-rate taxable bonds that use a portion of the State's qualified energy conservation bond allocation, indicating that the federal government is paying some of the interest on the bonds. Bonds were issued such that principle and interest payments made to bond holders are expected to be matched with money that is coming in from loan borrowers. The bonds are supported by a guarantee from the NYS Environmental Facilities Corporation (EFC) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. The bond documents will require any shortfall in loan collection over the 15 year term would obligate NYSERDA to use monies available in GJGNY revolving loan fund before EFC's guarantee will be called upon. A collateral reserve account has been established coming out of NYSERDA's Better Buildings grant from the U.S. Department of Energy, which allocated and approved approximately \$8.5M for loan loss and debt service reserves. The bond documents will require that over the term of the bonds the amount of loan repayments coming back have a coverage ratio relative to the annual bond principal and interest payments. The Qualified Energy Conservation Bond subsidy that comes back from the federal government reduces the net interest on the bonds to be slightly less than half a percent. The bond issuance allows NYSERDA to recapitalize a substantial portion of the GJGNY Revolving Loan Fund for the residential sector. NYSERDA has created a structure that has the potential for national replicability.

From a financing standpoint, NYSERDA is using an opportunity to take a new sector like clean energy that is trying to access capital markets and leveraging the strength of more mature issuances. Participators investing included not only traditional buyers of bonds but also non-traditional socially motivated investors who want to support sustainable development and green jobs.

*Question:* Will the \$8M still be available as credit enhancement for the next bond issuance?

*NYSERDA response:* That will be a discussion NYSERDA will have with EFC. It could be used to support a second bond issuance. Depending upon the timing, the terms of the agreement state that as the bonds pay down, the \$8.5M gets reduced, but this agreement would need to be resecured at the time of the second bond issuance.

*Comment:* With the budget decreases that constituency-based organizations are facing, we need to be realistic about financing opportunities coordinating with neighborhood sustainability.

*NYSERDA response:* NYSERDA is aware that funding actions and opportunities need to work in concert with community needs.

### **III. Coordination between Assisted Home Performance and EmPower New York (John Ahearn)**

Presentation materials are provided on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSERDA's website](#).

Beginning earlier this year NYSERDA began enhanced coordination between EmPower New York, which serves low-income households with income below 60 percent of state median income, and Assisted Home Performance, which serves households with income between 60 and 80 percent of area median income. NYSERDA's financing contractor, Energy Finance Solutions (EFS), screens consumers for eligibility for the 50 percent incentive through Assisted Home Performance and provides referrals to the EmPower implementation contractor (Honeywell) when the household's income qualifies for EmPower. Referrals used to be made to the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP). This change was initiated due to funding decreases for WAP and increases for EmPower. Referrals currently continue at a steady pace, indicating the referral process is working well.

In addition, previously, work scopes would be developed independently for either program. A project required eligibility for each program in order to participate. NYSERDA will now be working with the contractor and customer on the whole work scope and then determine whether the whole project or portions of the project can be funded by either EmPower or Assisted Home Performance.

Current data shows that, between April 2013 and August 2013, EFS made 445 referrals. Those referrals resulted in 95 approved EmPower work scopes, 33 of which involve coordination with Assisted Home Performance.

*Comment:* Appreciation was expressed for NYSERDA's willingness to address the challenges contractors were facing with EmPower integration. However, improvements are still needed in the processing time and costs.

*NYSERDA response:* For measures that have standardized pricing, such as insulation, NYSERDA has program prices that contractors are required to agree to. Later this month, NYSERDA will be amending the pricing schedule to reflect upstate and downstate pricing disparities. In addition, the Home Performance program has recently launched a program management platform that will assist in communication and in speeding up approvals.

*Question:* In the potential absence of the Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (OTDA) funding the Heating Equipment Repair and Replacement Program this year, is EmPower expected to fill in the gap?

*NYSERDA response:* OTDA has expressed a preference for EmPower to fill in the gap. NYSERDA is meeting internally to assess the possibility and the logistics of doing so, and the potential impact on the program resources. NYSERDA's oil funds are limited, so there are discussions with Housing and Community Renewal (HCR) to assess whether the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) can prioritize oil customers, then NYSERDA can prioritize gas customers. Consultation with the Department of Public Service is also required.

*Question:* Is there any discussion of changing the 60 percent of state median income requirement for EmPower participants, especially for downstate residents?

*NYSERDA Response:* The 60 percent of State Median Income boundary was set to parallel the Weatherization Assistance Program. NYSERDA can consider whether an adjustment can be made to use 60 percent of Area Median Income.

*Question:* The “Enhanced Coordination of EmPower and Assisted Home Performance with Energy Star” presentation slide shows roughly 250 approved and completed projects from 445 referrals. What is the status of the unaccounted for projects?

*NYSERDA Response:* For many of the referrals, customers have been determined as income eligible, but work scopes have not yet been received.

#### **IV. GJGNY 2013 Annual Report (Peggie Neville)**

The 2013 GJGNY Annual Report is due to be filed with the Legislature on October 1, 2013. The 2013 report is reflecting an end date of June 30, which is a difference from the 2012 report, which had a July 31 end date. This aligns with the annual reporting requirement for on-bill financing, and will better facilitate a quarterly reporting schedule moving forward. A draft was sent to the Advisory Council during the final week of August for review and comment. No comments were received. The final 2013 report will include an appendix that is a compilation of marketing materials produced for the GJGNY program. Any comments submitted after the current meeting should be sent to [mf3@nyserdera.ny.gov](mailto:mf3@nyserdera.ny.gov).

#### **V. Evaluation Results and Updates (Jennifer Meissner, Carley Murray)**

Jennifer Meissner began by noting that the evaluation studies discussed are a team effort, and she acknowledged Carley Murray, Michelle Salisbury, Karl Michael, Rohit Vaidya (NMR Group), and Elizabeth Johnston (ICF Consulting) for their contributions.

##### **a. Jobs Impact Assessment**

Presentation materials are provided on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSERDA's website](#).

A subgroup of the GJGNY Advisory Council was consulted for the Jobs Impact Assessment. Results discussed are to be considered preliminary. A finalized version of the evaluation will be distributed.

Study objectives for the Jobs Impact Assessment include estimating the number of direct, indirect, and induced jobs created and retained from GJGNY in addition to examining changes in worker skills and wage level resulting from the GJGNY program.

The study was undertaken with a phased approach. Phase 1 conducted by NMR Group estimates the number of direct job, in full-time equivalents (FTE) attributable to GJGNY-funded program activities. Phase 2 conducted by ICF Consulting utilizes macroeconomic impact analysis to determine indirect and induced job effects in order to understand the total impact on the economy.

The analytic approach of Phase 1 used point-in-time estimates derived from survey responses to determine 2013 and 2015 direct jobs, measured in full-time equivalents (FTE) attributable to GJGNY-funded program activities. Surveys assess up-skilled and up-waged FTEs. Results are parsed out to determine job impacts in disadvantaged communities, which are defined as communities with an unemployment rate greater than the New York State average at the time of the study.

All major programs under the GJGNY umbrella were included in this evaluation. Primary and secondary data sources were consulted. The survey was conducted with more than a dozen respondent groups, who completed more than 200 surveys.

Preliminary results indicate that 906 new or retained FTEs with an average wage of \$20.00 per hour resulted from GJGNY-related work. Sectors supporting the most FTEs from that total include engineering services and residential remodelers. The final report will include a breakdown of new FTEs as compared to retained FTEs.

*Question:* Will the final report include a regional breakdown of job locations?

*NYSERDA response:* Yes. The upcoming slides and the final report will include a regional breakdown.

*Question:* Will the final report include a breakdown of job titles within each sector? Are the wages reported as straight wages?

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* The final report will not include a breakdown of job titles within each sector, though the survey requested listing jobs by position. Variability across sectors does not lend itself to consolidation. Straight wages are reported.

In addition to the 906 new or retained FTEs there were 282 up-skilled and up-waged FTEs reported in 2013. Average wage increase is \$4.24 per hour. Sectors supporting the most up-skilled and up-waged FTEs include engineering services and drywall/insulation contractors.

Finger Lakes and Long Island regions support the highest number of FTEs.

*Question:* Are the regional results due to response rate?

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* The evaluation design focuses attention on representative samples so results should be representative of activity, not response rate.

Of the total direct FTEs created and retained, 17 percent are located in disadvantaged communities.

*Question:* Was the expectation that the number of FTEs in disadvantaged communities would be higher? How does this percentage correspond to the percentage of total disadvantaged workers?

*NYSERDA response:* NYSERDA will work toward characterizing the figures about FTEs in disadvantaged communities more clearly in the final report.

*Question:* When the study references disadvantaged communities does that indicate where the contractors are located or is that where the employees who got hired live?

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* FTEs were tracked according to where the contractors are located.

*Question:* Will the study provide a more nuanced breakdown of each region?

*NYSERDA response:* No breakdown more specific than the regional level will be provided. The data does not lend itself to further disaggregation due to sample size and other reasons.

*Comment:* The statistics provided would be more useful if the figures refer to where the workers are from.

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* This comment points to one of the challenges of a survey-based approach where respondents are Home Performance contractors. The survey inquires about

number of employees retained or hired. To ask the contractors residential demographics of each employee would be cumbersome, less reliable, and might be considered a privacy issue.

*Comment:* NYSERDA should be more proactive in collecting this kind of specific data from contractors as a condition of participation in the program.

*Comment:* It makes sense to ask the contractors about the number of FTEs and not the residential location of employees.

*Comment:* It is difficult to measure success of creating jobs in targeted communities unless we have more specific data.

*NYSERDA response:* The purpose of this study is to provide a high level perspective. There is additional evaluative effort being put toward specific CBO activities, which may provide some of the desired information.

Projected total of FTEs estimated by 2015 is approximately 2,545, with plumbing, heating, and air conditioning contractors as the sector projected to house the largest number of these FTEs. Projections were determined by survey questions provided to the contractor respondents who were asked for their assumptions based on status quo funding.

*Question:* Is it the case that funds for the program are limited according to the current legislation?

*NYSERDA response:* Yes. Funding for GJGNY is limited. Other budgets such as Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) or additional Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) funds may be able to be utilized to continue the GJGNY programs, but NYSERDA has not confirmed future funding.

*NYSERA comment:* Slide 10 shows engineering as the sector currently benefiting from the most FTEs, while slide 14 projects plumbing, heating and air conditioning contracting as potentially benefitting from the most FTEs in 2015. What is a potential reason for this?

*NMR response:* Projections for 2015 had high estimates from a particular respondent associated with a workforce development group focused on training contractors.

*Question:* Since GJGNY funding might account for only a portion of a respondent's incoming funds, how can it be determined what growth is attributed to GJGNY specifically?

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* The study takes attribution into account. The estimates provided are the result of survey questions that asked specifically about activity generated as a result of GJGNY program activity.

*Comment:* In some cases, specifically in the multifamily sector, there is no way for a contractor to know which employee positions are attributable to GJGNY funding as a percentage of total funds.

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* In the case of the Multifamily Performance Program, attribution was allocated based on the percentage of funds that came from GJGNY vs other sources.

*Question:* The assumption is that the numbers provided represent actual jobs and are connected to work in the field. Looking at the projected numbers and extracting out figures for remodelers, insulators, and HVAC, these estimates do not match actual production numbers within GJGNY programs. Was there any kind of analysis conducted to examine whether the study's projections are in equilibrium with the realistic work within and growth of the program?

*NYSERDA and NMR response:* No, the study does not include this type of analysis. Results may be sector specific. While job creation might be attributable to GJGNY funding, the entirety of a 40 hour workday might not be spent on program-related activities.

*Question:* Are their baseline figures that describe the number of FTEs in existence prior to or aside from GJGNY program activity.

*NYSERDA response:* Yes. Regarding the 2013 numbers, approximately 906 FTES attributable to GJGNY represent approximately 60 percent of the reported 1482 FTEs created or retained in total.

*Question:* Was a baseline employment number provided by the respondent?

*NMR response:* No, a baseline employment number was not provided.

*NYSERDA comment:* The 2015 numbers should be considered very speculative. Actual outcomes will depend on what happens with the program. Looking at the 2013 numbers, the types of organizations who participated in the survey classified themselves according to North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes. Some respondents may be doing work across the various sectors. The expectation is that there will be a greater level of detail provided in the final report than is available in today's preliminary results. This kind of study is extremely challenging to undertake. When the final report comes out, NYSERDA looks forward to Advisory Council feedback about methodology and outcomes in addition to input on strategies for moving forward with future evaluations. A subset of Advisory Council members provided input on the plan for this work, which NYSERDA appreciates.

*NYSERDA comment:* In some cases, the desired level of detailed data was difficult to capture due to respondent hesitation to provide information about certain issues such as wages.

Phase 2 of the study provides preliminary results of a macro-level analysis. Direct job information and FTEs were configured within an IMPLAN modeling tool to run modeling scenarios statewide for 2013 and 2015 and to determine indirect and induced economic indicators used to determine overall effects on the economy. Scenarios of analysis include 2013 new jobs, 2013 retained jobs, 2013 up-skilled and up-waged jobs, and 2015 jobs.

Preliminary results through 2013 indicated that the GJGNY program supports approximately 1,590 jobs in New York State and nearly \$125M in gross state product. Every direct job supports 1.6 jobs and every direct dollar of gross state product supports nearly \$2 of total gross state product.

Preliminary projected results through 2015 indicate that GJGNY is expected to support approximately 4,360 jobs in New York State and nearly \$342M in gross state product. Every direct job is projected to support 1.61 jobs and every direct dollar of gross state product is projected to support nearly \$2 in total gross state product.

A graphical depiction of Phase 2 modeling and preliminary results is provided in the PowerPoint presentation slides provided on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSERDA's website](#). Preliminary results show that the most significant impacts are found in number of new jobs. Architecture and engineering, in addition to construction industries, drive job impacts in 2013. The same top two industries dominate the 2015 projections, but with construction overtaking architecture and engineering.

Preliminary results show the average annual wage difference between up-skilled/up-waged workers previous and current wage was \$11,300 per year, which translated to an 18 percent increase.

*Question:* Can some background about the 1.61 multiplier for each direct job be provided?

*NYSERDA and ICF response:* It is based on the number of direct jobs used as input and total effect of jobs as an output for economic modeling. Multipliers are industry specific and tailored to New York State. The aggregate multiplier is the 1.61 multiplier. The details that account for categories of secondary jobs created are provided in presentation slide 22.

*Question:* Is the input for the model total wages expended rather than total program expenditures? If so, what is the reason for the focus on wages rather than program expenses?

*NYSERDA response and ICF response:* Yes, wages rather than program expenditures are the input. This is a challenge of attribution. For example, financing amount can be determined, but if an incentive is involved, especially for an audit, it becomes difficult to distinguish causation. So wage data provided a more reliable input than program expenditure.

*NYSERDA comment:* NYSERDA does this kind of macro-economic analysis on a portfolio level to determine the impact of jobs created across the whole portfolio, which is easier to do than to isolate the impact of jobs within an individual program. It may understate the level of activity that program participants might be seeing, the level of activity program participants are seeing also includes the impact of EEPS and other RGGI programs.

*Question:* Can new FTEs and retained FTEs be included in the final report broken out into a regional analysis?

*NYSERDA response:* Phase 1 provides a regional analysis of direct FTEs. Phase 2 provides a more detailed macro-economic analysis.

*Question:* Is analysis of the aggregation model considered in this study?

*NYSERDA response:* The aggregation model is considered within the constituency-based organization (CBO) study, which is a forthcoming market/process evaluation, and the future Home Performance study. Updates are provided monthly on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSERDA's website](#).

## **b. Market/Process Evaluation–Small Commercial**

Presentation materials are provided on the [GJGNY Advisory Council page of NYSERDA's website](#).

Phase 1 of the Small Commercial market/process evaluation involved in-depth interviews with six financial institutions currently participating in the program in order to gather qualitative information on the small business and not-for-profit (SB/NFP) market served and to gather feedback on how lenders suggest increasing participation in the loan program. This methodology was pursued in order to identify additional marketing strategies and refine the program's market focus in addition to informing future Small Commercial evaluations.

Lenders expressed interest in increasing program participation and are open to becoming more engaged. Lenders reported positive existing relationships with NYSERDA and extensive experience working with the SB/NFP market while noting that SB/NFPs face many barriers in securing financing in general, not specific to energy efficiency financing through NYSERDA's program.

Phase 2 will gather data from non-participating lenders and SB/NFP organizations in order to assess attitudes on loan origination fees, perceived barriers to financing and awareness of programs. In addition, Phase 2 will gather data from non-participating SB/NFPs in order to gauge awareness of the program, interest in energy audits, attitudes about financing of energy efficiency measures, and business characteristics. Data collection is planned for Q4 2013.



### **c. Forthcoming Activities**

The forthcoming CBO market/process evaluation focuses on lessons learned by CBOs, NYSERDA, and the training and implementation services contractor staff. Goals and achievements will be documented while seeking to understand how CBOs are operating in their communities.

In-depth interviews are being conducted with implementation contractors and staff. In addition, 21 in-depth interviews were conducted with 18 CBOs. Results from four CBOs were turned into case studies: Long Island Progressive Coalition, Downtown Manhattan Community Development Center, Rural Ulster Preservation Company, and Public Policy and Education Fund-Southern Tier.

*Question:* Is the Home Performance evaluation mentioned a separate effort?

*NYSERDA response:* Yes. Home Performance contractors and customers are being spoken to as part of a separate evaluation effort.

### **d. Evaluation Advisory Group**

It has been suggested by members of the Advisory Council to create an evaluation sub-group to discuss challenges regarding evaluation methodology and scope. Interest in participating in an evaluation sub-group should be directed to Jennifer Meissner at [jam@nyserda.ny.gov](mailto:jam@nyserda.ny.gov).

*Comment:* NYSERDA should consider adding in-house evaluation peers to this group.

## **VI. Public Input (Karen Hamilton)**

Frank Murray had to leave the meeting due to a prior commitment. Karen Hamilton opened the floor to public comment.

*Comment:* Appreciation was expressed to Frank Murray for his dedicated and direct involvement with the GJGNY program.

*Question:* What is the justification for the elimination of CBO workforce development budgets in the coming years?

*NYSERDA response:* NYSERDA did not eliminate the money for workforce development – but rather the recent CBO solicitation did not provide a separate budget for CBO workforce development outreach. Budgets for participation in energy efficiency outreach and budgets for participation in training outreach were merged. Most CBOs performed both functions, so in the interest of the limited budget, the best approach was to combine the two.

*Question:* The limited budget puts CBOs in the Bronx at a disadvantage. Is this a permanent state for the next two years, or is there room for negotiation?

*NYSERDA response:* To clarify, the solicitation is closed and proposals have been received. The budgets in the solicitation are what NYSERDA and CBOs are working with over the next two years. NYSERDA had to reexamine proposed budgets in light of most of the work happening in one- to four-family homes. The budgets were adjusted based on the potential for work related to the target audience in that sector within each region.

*Comment:* In terms of allocation, it seems that priority should be given to job creation in communities that need it.

*NYSERDA response:* With most of the work through the program being done on one- to four-family homes, that is where the emphasis needs to be. Training does not create jobs. Work creates jobs.

*Comment:* There are many different ways to create jobs. Eliminating a budget seems to be setting up a region dominated with multifamily buildings for failure.

*NYSERDA response:* NYSERDA has not eliminated the budget. In addition, NYSERDA has other programs that support the multifamily sector. Most of the multifamily building work being done in New York City has been initiated by program partners. The CBO effort has not focused on the multifamily sector because that was not in line with the stated need. Suggestions for strategies regarding multifamily work should be directed to Michael Colgrove at [mtc@nyserda.ny.gov](mailto:mtc@nyserda.ny.gov).

*NYSERDA comment:* NYSERDA is still supporting many workforce development initiatives in New York City. Many proposals for new initiatives are being received. NYSERDA will continue having a very robust workforce development initiative throughout the state and in the city.

## **VII. Closing Remarks and Next Steps (Karen Hamilton)**

The next meeting of the GJGNY Advisory Council is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2013. Per the recently established process, NYSERDA will send out a reminder a month prior requesting agenda input from Advisory Council members.