



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

<b>Funding/Award Title:</b>	Program Monitoring and Evaluation for an Energy Efficiency Residential Retrofit and Labeling Project in Four States
<b>Project Title:</b>	BetterBuildings – U.S. State Energy Program: Multi-State Residential Retrofit Project
<b>Submission Due Date:</b>	Friday, July 22, 2011; 5pm EDT
<b>Bidder’s Webinar Date (optional):</b>	Thursday, July 7, 2011; 2:00-3:30pm EDT Contact Mandy Clarke ( <a href="mailto:mclarke@naseo.org">mclarke@naseo.org</a> ) to RSVP.
<b>Expected Period of Performance:</b>	September 1, 2011 – September 30, 2013
<b>Expected Funding Amount:</b>	NASEO anticipates making one award for an amount not to exceed \$505,000.

**Table of Contents**

1. OVERVIEW ..... 4

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND..... 5

    A. Pilot Goals and Objectives..... 5

    B. Pilot Delivery Model..... 6

    C. Project Partners and Stakeholders..... 6

    D. Roles and Responsibilities ..... 9

3. OBJECTIVES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION..... 10

4. SCOPE OF WORK..... 10

5. DELIVERABLES..... 11

6. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS ..... 11

    A. Application Deadlines..... 11

    B. Award Type ..... 12

    C. Amendments to the RFP ..... 12

    D. Communication with NASEO ..... 12

    E. Questions..... 12

    F. Submittal of Proposal..... 12

    G. Proposal Application..... 13

        i. Project Narrative (12 page maximum)..... 13

        ii. Project Cost Proposal (4 page maximum)..... 14

    H. Proposal Format ..... 14

7. PROPOSAL EVALUATION ..... 14

    A. Proposal Evaluation and Selection Process..... 14

    B. Proposal Evaluation Criteria ..... 15

    C. Required Attachments..... 16

9. APPENDICES ..... 16

    Appendix A – Proposal Checklist..... 17

    Appendix B – Evaluation Sample Questions ..... 18

    Appendix C - Existing Evaluation Resources..... 20

    Appendix D – Federal Special Terms and Conditions..... 21

**Request for Proposals (RFP)  
To Conduct  
Residential Energy Efficiency Retrofit Program Monitoring and Evaluation in Four States**

## **1. OVERVIEW**

The National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO) requests proposals from organizations or individuals interested in conducting a process-oriented monitoring and evaluation of the Multi-State Residential Retrofit Project (“Multi-State Project” or “pilot”). The Multi-State Project covered by this RFP was awarded and funded by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) through the U.S. State Energy Program to the state energy offices in the four states of Alabama, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Washington. This collaborative four-state project intends to test the effectiveness of a shared residential retrofit program model, as well as state-specific variations on that model. NASEO is managing the program evaluation on behalf of the four state energy offices. This project is not funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

Ultimately, this project hopes to establish a residential retrofit market that will sustain itself long after the project is completed.

The selected contractor from this RFP process will conduct ongoing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the Multi-State Project to assess how well the programs in each state are achieving the project objectives. The M&E contractor is expected to provide useful feedback to the state energy offices on program implementation that can inform mid-course changes and adjustments.

The expected period of performance is September 1, 2011 – September 30, 2013. NASEO anticipates making one award through a fixed price contract for an amount not to exceed \$505,000.

Proposal Submission: Bidders are strongly encouraged to participate in a bidders’ webinar on July 7, 2011 from 2:00-3:30pm EDT. Please contact Mandy Clarke ([mclarke@naseo.org](mailto:mclarke@naseo.org)) to RSVP for this webinar.

Bidders must submit three (3) hard copies of the proposal proposal to the address below, as well as an electronic proposal submitted via email with a subject line reading “Response to Multi-State Evaluation RFP.” Both electronic and hard copies must be received by the deadline. Hard copies may be mailed or delivered in person during normal business hours from 9AM to 5PM. All proposals must contain a completed and signed Proposal Checklist included as the cover page. Bidders will not be reimbursed by NASEO for any costs associated with preparation of their proposals or oral presentations.

Proposal files must be clearly labeled and submitted to:

Diana Lin  
NASEO  
1414 Prince St.  
Suite 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
[dlin@naseo.org](mailto:dlin@naseo.org)

No phone calls please.

**Proposals must be received by NASEO no later than Friday, July 22, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. eastern time.**

**\*Late proposals and proposals lacking the appropriate completed and signed forms will be returned. Faxed proposals will not be accepted. Proposals will only be accepted at the NASEO mailing address and email address above. If changes are made to this solicitation, notification will be posted on NASEO's web site on the [Multi-State RFP page \(www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states\)](http://www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states).**

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

### **A. Pilot Goals and Objectives**

The goals of the pilot Multi-State Project are to:

1. Motivate homeowners to implement efficiency upgrades;
2. Create and sustain market demand for energy efficiency upgrades to existing homes; and
3. Facilitate increased awareness and valuation of energy efficiency in the marketplace.

The following are objectives common to all four states involved in the Multi-State Project:

1. Increase the number of home energy efficiency upgrades primarily through an increased conversion rate from audits to upgrades;
2. Achieve deeper upgrades to maximize energy-saving opportunities per household;
3. Develop a sustainable market for home energy upgrades, in part by building workforce capacity in both new and existing energy efficiency retrofit markets;
4. Create sustained market demand for energy-efficient homes, in part by integrating awareness and valuation of energy efficiency into the real estate market;
5. Foster the development of community-based public-private partnerships; and
6. Establish a replicable model that can inform other state, regional, and national efforts to increase efficiency upgrades in existing homes.

The states/communities involved in this pilot are:

Alabama – Huntsville and Birmingham

Massachusetts – Springfield and six surrounding communities

Virginia – Charlottesville, Hampton Roads, Richmond and southwest Virginia

Washington – Kitsap County

## **B. Pilot Delivery Model**

“Delivery model” as used in this RFP refers to the combination of strategies, approaches and tools employed to achieve pilot goals. The delivery model in each of the four states includes the following strategies:

- A customized easy-to-use online project management tool to be used by the different stakeholders, including auditors, contractors, and program administrators;
- An Energy Performance Score (EPS), which is a standard metric for home energy performance, issued before and after implementing upgrades. Please [see the Earth Advantage website](#)<sup>1</sup> for an example of the EPS label;
- Direct trainings for contractors, auditors, real estate market professionals (including brokers, appraisers, lenders), and “local champions”;
- Building workforce capacity by employing training techniques and materials that systematically improve energy performance outcomes at the worksite. Visual job aids are integral to these programs. Please see Advanced Energy’s current [Energy Star new construction guidebook](#)<sup>2</sup> as an example of illustrated guidelines;
- Energy efficiency tailored-financing tools; and
- Community-based partnerships and marketing strategies.

In addition to these common strategies, approaches and tools, any state-level variations will be discussed in detail with the selected contractor upon award decision. Detailed implementation plans for each of the four states, including specific goals, objectives, targets, partners, operations, data collection, etc., can be referenced on the Multi-State RFP page under [Additional Information](#) (<http://www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states/index.html#AdditionalInformation>).

## **C. Project Partners and Stakeholders**

The selected contractor will need to coordinate closely with key program partners. Key partners and their roles in the pilot program include:

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.earthadvantage.org/programs/homes/energy-performance-score/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/bldrs\\_lenders\\_raters/downloads/Energy\\_Star\\_v3\\_TEREC\\_Guidebook\\_02.21.11.pdf](http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/bldrs_lenders_raters/downloads/Energy_Star_v3_TEREC_Guidebook_02.21.11.pdf)

<b>Partners (in alphabetical order)</b>	<b>Role</b>
Advanced Energy	Workforce training for regional trainers, Quality Assurance (QA) experts and energy efficiency program managers to use DOE Workforce Guidelines for Home Energy Upgrades in Alabama, Virginia, and Washington. Note: Massachusetts will use its own existing MassGREEN Initiative for this project.
Alabama Department of Economic & Community Affairs (State Energy Office)	Lead for Alabama; Subcontracts to other partners; Reports to DOE
Earth Advantage Institute	Implements Energy Performance Score (EPS) label; Trains auditors and contractors to use EPS label and software; Conducts sustainability training for real estate professionals
Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources	Lead for Massachusetts; Subcontracts to other partners; Coordinates with state utilities and partners; Reports to DOE
National Association of State Energy Officials (NASEO)	Multi-state project coordinator and facilitator; Convenes project steering committee; Manages program evaluation
Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA)	Project coordinator for Alabama and Virginia; Coordinates local partners, financing, workforce training and project implementation
Virginia Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (State Energy Office)	Lead for Virginia; Subcontracts to other partners; Reports to DOE
Washington Department of Commerce (State Energy Office)	Lead for Washington; Subcontracts to other partners; Reports to DOE
Washington State University, Energy Extension Program	Project coordinator for Washington; Coordinates local partners, financing, workforce training and project implementation

These partners are members of the Project Steering Committee, which provides leadership and strategic guidance to ensure successful achievement of objectives and deliverables. The Steering Committee serves as a forum for collaboration among states and partners and is chaired by NASEO.

Additionally, several of the pilot communities comprising this Multi-State Project, operate in areas which overlap or neighbor other similar residential energy efficiency retrofit programs. Specifically, Kitsap County in Washington overlaps with a BetterBuildings EECBG retrofit

project in Bainbridge Island, and overlapping BetterBuildings projects are also operating in Huntsville, Alabama; Charlottesville, Virginia; and Hampton Roads, Virginia. In each of these cases, state energy offices and their project partners have already established working relationships with the other programs and are actively working to coordinate and minimize market confusion. A successful program evaluation for this Multi-State Project should reflect this context.

Lastly, each state is engaging local partners in the pilot communities to assist in conducting marketing and outreach, with the ultimate goal of cultivating a lasting local network to sustain efforts into the future. The selected contractor will be expected to use these local resources and partners in conducting evaluation. It is anticipated that by leveraging local partners, the selected contractor can direct more of their resources to the monitoring and evaluation design and analysis.

## D. Roles and Responsibilities

The following chart describes the roles, responsibilities, and flow of information among the project partners in the program monitoring and evaluation process:



Stakeholders may include: energy utilities, energy efficiency program managers, municipal officials, community groups, “local champions,” energy auditors, home improvement contractors, trade associations, local educational institutions, homeowners, and others.

The Steering Committee membership is discussed previously under Section 2C.

### **3. OBJECTIVES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

The objective of the monitoring and evaluation work is to assist NASEO and the states in identifying effective strategies that help accomplish the goals of the pilot.

To that end, the selected contractor will:

- Provide ongoing feedback on the effectiveness of the overall delivery model in terms of meeting the pilot objectives; and
- Gather and analyze information from stakeholders on the extent to which individual elements are motivating, facilitating, and/or supporting energy efficiency upgrades.

Evaluation example questions can be found in Appendix D. The selected contractor will have access to quantitative information as described in Appendix C. The selected contractor is not expected to gather or analyze quantitative information (such as: utility bill or energy savings analysis). Furthermore, it is not expected that the contractor should assess or evaluate the adequacy of each state's existing evaluation, monitoring, and verification procedures or energy savings analyses.

### **4. SCOPE OF WORK**

#### **Task 1. Develop a Pilot Program Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

The plan will include the following:

- The approach(es), methodology(ies), and specific questions to be used to gather feedback from stakeholders;
- A description of how the selected contractor will monitor pilot progress on an ongoing basis in accordance with Task 2 below;
- A description of how the selected contractor will engage with project partners to accomplish monitoring and evaluation objectives; and
- A schedule of tasks, which may be adjusted as they are implemented.

A preliminary approach should be included in the submitted proposal narrative. A full draft program evaluation plan should be completed within 30 days of award. In consultation with NASEO and the project steering committee, a final program evaluation plan should be completed within 60 days of award. Revisions and adjustments to this program evaluation plan will be made on an as needed basis, as determined by NASEO and the Project Steering Committee.

#### **Task 2. Implement the Pilot Program Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

Using a combination of data gathered in accordance with the approved plan and information from the administrative access to each state's customized on-line project management tool, the selected contractor will monitor and evaluate the pilot programs. The selected contractor will provide feedback to NASEO and any or all of the states as needed, particularly when there is information indicating a barrier to achieving pilot program objectives. This ongoing monitoring will allow states to make any necessary mid-course corrections and adjustments.

#### **Task 3. Provide Monitoring and Evaluation Information on an As-needed Basis**

This includes providing ad hoc reports and updates for presentations or project materials; and participating in meetings or phone calls with NASEO program staff and/or the states as required.

#### **Task 4. Provide Periodic Feedback, Updates and Reports**

The selected contractor will be required to submit the following reporting requirements:

- Quarterly Reporting: Each quarter, provide the following information in electronic format:
  - Progress on tasks specified in the evaluation plan and on deliverables; and
  - Identified areas of potential improvement/ modification to the pilot program
- Final Report: A summary report that synthesizes findings gathered throughout the three-year pilot, including information about the effectiveness of the overall pilot delivery model, and of state-specific strategies.

The selected contractor will be expected to formally report to NASEO. Other communications and monitoring feedback under Tasks 2 and 3 may be provided directly to the state or partner to which it relates, but the selected contractor is also expected to notify NASEO prior to or concurrent to such communications. Additionally, the selected contractor may need to coordinate with possible evaluations of other concurrent and similar residential efficiency upgrade programs in Washington, Alabama and Virginia. The exchanging of evaluation tools and methodologies is strongly encouraged.

## **5. DELIVERABLES**

Deliverables to be submitted by the selected contractor include, but may not be limited to:

1. Draft and final Program Evaluation Plan;
2. Draft and final survey instruments and data collection protocols;
3. Original data files, and final, cleaned evaluation data and analysis files resulting from the evaluation;
4. Draft and final evaluation reports; and
5. Reporting as specified above.

## **6. PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS**

### **A. Application Deadlines**

- The deadline to apply is 5:00pm EDT, Friday, July 22, 2011.
- A bidders' webinar will be held on Thursday, July 7, 2011. It is strongly encouraged for all parties interested in responding to this RFP to attend. Please contact Mandy Clarke ([mclarke@naseo.org](mailto:mclarke@naseo.org)) to RSVP for this webinar.

## **B. Award Type**

NASEO anticipates making one award through a fixed price contract for an amount not to exceed \$505,000.

## **C. Amendments to the RFP**

This RFP may be amended or cancelled at NASEO's sole discretion. Any amendments shall be in writing and made available to all prospective respondents. No oral statement or any persons shall modify or otherwise change or affect the terms, conditions, or project requirements stated in this RFP.

## **D. Communication with NASEO**

NASEO will hold a Q&A session as part of the required bidder's webinar on July 7, 2011; 2:00-3:30pm ET. Additional questions can be submitted to NASEO in writing following the instructions in Section 6E. NASEO will not accept phone calls related to this RFP.

## **E. Questions**

All questions concerning this RFP shall be submitted electronically to: Diana Lin at NASEO [dlin@naseo.org](mailto:dlin@naseo.org) with the subject line "Question on RFP" by Sunday, July 10, 2011.

Responses to the questions will be posted publicly on the [Multi-State RFP Q&A page \(www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states/qa.htm\)](http://www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states/qa.htm). Questions received after Sunday, July 10, 2011 will not receive a response. It is the responsibility of the bidder to visit the website to receive updates and communication about this RFP.

## **F. Submittal of Proposal**

Bidders must submit three (3) hard copies of the proposal proposal to the address below, as well as an electronic proposal submitted via email with a subject line reading "Response to Multi-State Evaluation RFP." Both electronic and hard copies must be received by the deadline. Hard copies may be mailed or delivered in person during normal business hours from 9AM to 5PM. All proposals must contain a completed and signed Proposal Checklist included as the cover page. Bidders will not be reimbursed by NASEO for any costs associated with preparation of their proposals or oral presentations. Proposal files must be clearly labeled and submitted to:

Diana Lin  
NASEO  
1414 Prince St.  
Suite 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
[dlin@naseo.org](mailto:dlin@naseo.org)

Proposals must be received by NASEO no later than Friday, July 22, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. eastern time.

Late proposals and proposals lacking the appropriate completed and signed forms will be returned. Faxed proposals will not be accepted. Proposals will only be accepted at the NASEO mailing address and email address above. If changes are made to this solicitation, notification will be posted on NASEO's web site on the [Multi-State RFP page \(www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states\)](http://www.naseo.org/resources/rfps/4states). No phone calls please.

All proposals shall be firm for a minimum of ninety (90) days after the due date. NASEO will not be liable for any costs incurred by respondents associated with preparing, submitting or presenting proposals under this RFP. Upon submission, all proposals shall become the property of NASEO.

## **G. Proposal Application**

### **i. Project Narrative (12 page maximum)**

The project narrative should include:

(a) ***Introduction*** (executive summary)

This section should provide a clear, concise statement of how the bidder intends to accomplish the tasks in the scope of work. It should also demonstrate the bidder's understanding of the multi-state pilot background and requirements.

(b) ***Statement of Work***

Provide a description of how the bidder will accomplish the project objectives and required tasks outlined under Section 3. Specifically, the bidder should describe their approach and methodology, and define their rationale.

(c) ***Qualifications and Experience***

This section should demonstrate the bidder's capability to provide qualified, efficient and cost-effective services as outlined in this RFP and should:

- Include relevant information about the bidder's organization;
- List the key people (i.e., individuals who will contribute in a substantive way to the execution of the monitoring and evaluation services described in this RFP) who will provide services and an indication of the anticipated number of hours;
- Identify the services to be provided by each key person, and briefly describe each key person's experience and expertise as they relate to the services that that person will provide; and
- Include a brief description of 2 relevant projects that have been completed by the bidder in the last 5 years, including contact information for at least three references.
- Bidders must also provide a resume for each key person as an appendix. Resumes are not included in the page limit.

(d) ***Potential Conflict of Interest***

Identify the nature of any potential conflicts of interest among team members in providing services to NASEO under this RFP. Fully discuss possible conflicts of interest, actual and perceived, which could arise in connection with performance by team members of the proposed contract. Describe how conflicts of interest would be resolved.

**ii. Project Cost Proposal (4 page maximum)**

The cost proposal should include a detailed budget as follows: Provide in an Excel format, the budget breakdown of all direct and indirect project costs, subdivided by major activity costs. Direct costs include: labor, travel, equipment, supplies, meetings, and subcontracts. Provide detail on anticipated hours per month allocated to all key personnel. Provide detail and documentation to support indirect costs and overhead rates. This should describe the basis for the rates proposed (e.g. based on prior period actuals, based on projections, based on independently approved rates) and provide the appropriate documentation. If needed, additional budget narrative may be provided in the form of a Word document.

NASEO reserves the right to audit any indirect rate presented in the proposal and to make adjustments for such differences. Requests for financial statements or other needed financial information may be made if deemed necessary.

**H. Proposal Format**

Proposals should not be submitted in a format that includes expensive binders or graphics. Unnecessary attachments beyond those sufficient to present a complete, comprehensive, and effective response will not influence the evaluation of the proposal. Each page of the proposal should state the name of the bidder, the RFP name, and the page number.

Proposals should use standard 8.5” x 11” white paper, one-inch margins, and a font size not less than 11 point.

**7. PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

**A. Proposal Evaluation and Selection Process**

All proposals received by the due date and meeting the requirements established in this RFP will be reviewed and ranked by a Selection Committee consisting of NASEO staff and other selected representatives from each of the four states and their key partners.

The executed contract (“Contract”), if awarded, will be awarded to the selected respondent(s) proposal(s) that is deemed most advantageous to NASEO. NASEO reserves the right to accept one or more proposals or reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFP, and to waive informalities and irregularities in the proposals that are received. NASEO may award the Contract without discussion with respondents after proposals are received and evaluated.

NASEO may negotiate the terms and conditions with one or more respondents. Respondents may be asked to provide additional detail or make oral presentations of their proposals. The top ranked respondent will be notified in writing as soon as possible after the acceptance of its proposal.

## **B. Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

Final rankings and the contract award will be based on the criteria below.

### **Introduction and Scope of Work (55 out of 100 points)**

<b>Weight</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the bidder demonstrated a clear understanding of the overall pilot goals and objectives?</li> <li>• Has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of the state-level implementation to be evaluated?</li> </ul>
30 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the bidder present a sound approach for accomplishing the objectives listed in Section 3 of this RFP?</li> <li>• Does the narrative clearly address each task in the scope of work?</li> <li>• Is there a sound rationale or justification for the proposed approach(es)?</li> <li>• Is the project organization clear and well defined?</li> </ul>
10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the bidder describe how they will work with other team members and stakeholders consistent with the roles and responsibilities described in Section 2D?</li> </ul>
5 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the bidder appear to have the flexibility to accommodate potentially short notification times and tight deadlines?</li> </ul>

### **Relevant Experience and Qualifications (20 out of 100 points)**

<b>Weight</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
15 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is there evidence that the bidder is experienced in conducting monitoring and evaluation of residential energy efficiency upgrade programs that a) have the components outlined in Section 2B of this RFP, and b) in a manner consistent with the Scope of Work?</li> <li>• To what extent is the bidder experienced in managing programs involving multiple entities and partners? or evaluating effectiveness of technical assistance training, workforce development, capacity building, and financing programs?</li> <li>• Is the staffing plan sufficient to provide timely deliverables?</li> </ul>
5 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are key personnel's education and experience relevant to project needs?</li> </ul>

**Proposed Budget (25 out of 100 points)**

<b>Weight</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
15 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is the budget clear?</li><li>• Are all budget items clearly tied to the proposed activities and the goals and objectives of the project?</li><li>• Is the budget reasonable and realistic?</li><li>• Are hourly rates, overhead rates, and total hours reasonable and appropriate for completing each task?</li></ul>
10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How cost-effective is the proposal?</li><li>• Is the bidder's cost allocation appropriate when compared to the scope of work?</li></ul>

**TOTAL (100 points)**

**C. Required Attachments**

- Signed and completed Appendix A - Proposal Checklist
- Project Narrative
- Contractor Qualifications including current resumes for all key personnel
- Detailed budget
- Budget narrative

\*\*\*\*\*

**9. APPENDICES**

**Appendix A – Proposal Checklist**

**Appendix B – Evaluation Sample Questions**

**Appendix C - Existing Evaluation Resources**

**Appendix D – Federal Special Terms and Conditions**

### Appendix A – Proposal Checklist

On behalf of my organization, \_\_\_\_\_, I certify that this submitted proposal for the Multi-State Project is complete and contains all of the following required elements:

- Project Narrative
- Contractor Qualifications including current resumes for all key personnel
- Detailed budget
- Budget narrative

Further, I certify that all the information below is complete and accurate:

<b>Project Prime</b>	
<b>Project Partners</b>	
<b>Project Budget</b>	
<b>Technical Contact (Name, Title, Email, Phone)</b>	
<b>Financial Contact (Name, Title, Email, Phone)</b>	

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name:

Title:

Organization:

## Appendix B – Evaluation Sample Questions

The following is a list of topics and sample questions that monitoring and evaluation plan might address. Note that these questions are examples and that the list is not exhaustive

1. Program Design and Delivery
  - a. Why are people signing up to participate in the program?
  - b. How and why is the program delivery model affecting transaction costs and process time for participants, auditors, contractors, financing service providers, QA experts, and project coordinators?
  - c. How is each part of the residential service model affecting participation in the program (i.e. audit uptake) and conversion of audits to implemented measures?
  - d. What is the relative usefulness of each program element according to different stakeholders?
  - e. What parts of the delivery system and incentives should be sustained after the grant expires?
2. Perception of Energy Efficiency
  - a. How did/are homeowners learn(ing) about the pilot?
  - b. Have awareness, knowledge, and interest in energy efficiency upgrades increased?
  - c. What do homeowners think about energy efficiency investments in their home?
  - d. Are homeowners thinking differently about whole house retrofits?
  - e. How have the real estate and appraisal community changed their views towards the value of energy efficiency?
  - f. How do local home builders' associations view these programs? In their opinion, what will it take to sustain these programs?
  - g. How do participating installation contractors view the programs? In their opinion, what will it take to sustain these programs?
3. Financing Programs
  - a. Why are homeowners choosing the current amount of financing (rather than more or less)?
  - b. Why are homeowners NOT taking advantage of current financing options?
  - c. What types of financing have been the most appealing to the homeowners?
  - d. What is the loan performance of unsecured energy efficiency loans?
4. Building a lasting capacity and a sustainable market
  - a. What is the effectiveness of training using DOE Workforce Guidelines combined with an implemented QC and QA plan in improving work quality and achieving actual savings?
  - b. What components are important to developing a sustainable workforce and business community? What program elements improved contractors' satisfaction, profitability, competitiveness, and sustainability over time?

- c. To what extent can this activity be sustained with minimal of federal or state public dollars?
- d. Who are the local partners who can help bridge this activity? (Utilities, local energy alliances, etc.)

## **Appendix C - Existing Evaluation Resources**

Existing resources and outreach mechanisms available to the contractor to accomplish the program evaluation objectives include:

- Automated, real-time data through the EPS label web platform in each state. The selected contractor will receive an administrative seat for all the web platforms related to this Multi-State Project. This will provide access to:
  - Asset-based EPS label
  - Home energy audit data (building characteristics, projected energy usage, etc.)
  - Energy efficiency upgrade recommendations
  - Energy savings estimates
  - Qualified contractor profiles
  - Post-retrofit data (implemented measures, energy savings estimates, etc.)
- Required quarterly reporting metrics that state energy offices are providing to DOE. These include:
  - Loan product information
    - Number of loans made
    - Amount of loans made
    - Loan defaults or delinquencies
  - Number of trained individuals
  - Number of certified individuals
  - Number of audits/retrofits completed
- Local energy alliances and other community partners that are already engaged in program marketing and outreach. Working with NASEO, the selected contractor will be expected to coordinate with other key partners in this Multi-State Project as well as make effective use of existing networks of local community-based partners in the pilot communities to accomplish the evaluation.
- National, DOE-sponsored, BetterBuildings evaluation. Currently under development, it is still unclear what the final scope and method of a national evaluation will be. As the national evaluation develops, the selected contractor may be expected to coordinate activities with a national evaluation as appropriate and in consultation with NASEO.
- Additionally, DOE has requested that the states collect utility bill data for all participating homes. However, it is unclear at this point to what extent utilities will be able to provide that information to the program administrators. The selected contractor will not be expected to obtain this information, but may elect to use this data if and when it becomes available.

## **Appendix D – Federal Special Terms and Conditions**

These terms and conditions are included in the cooperative agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), the State Energy Offices in each of the four states of Alabama, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Washington. These terms and conditions are non-negotiable and flow down to all contractors and subcontractors and will be incorporated by reference in the contract with the selected Multi-State Project program evaluation contractor. This project is not funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).

### **SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR USE IN MOST GRANTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS**

#### **RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING CONDITIONS**

Any apparent inconsistency between Federal statutes and regulations and the terms and conditions contained in this award must be referred to the DOE Award Administrator for guidance.

#### **USE OF PROGRAM INCOME - ADDITION**

If you earn program income during the project period as a result of this award, you may add the program income to the funds committed to the award and use it to further eligible project objectives.

#### **STATEMENT OF FEDERAL STEWARDSHIP**

DOE will exercise normal Federal stewardship in overseeing the project activities performed under this award. Stewardship activities include, but are not limited to, conducting site visits; reviewing performance and financial reports; providing technical assistance and/or temporary intervention in unusual circumstances to correct deficiencies which develop during the project; assuring compliance with terms and conditions; and reviewing technical performance after project completion to ensure that the award objectives have been accomplished.

#### **STATEMENT OF SUBSTANTIAL INVOLVEMENT**

- DOE Responsibilities:
  - Co-chairing stakeholder meetings with the State Energy Offices or their representative(s) to provide insight and guidance in developing successful retrofit strategies;
  - Working with the SEOs to facilitate agreements amongst and between states/regions and for-profit and non-profit organizations (in multiple areas such as financing, training,

certification, marketing, and outreach) so that Awardees can take advantage of the national reach of DOE;

- Working collaboratively with Awardees during project implementation to develop and validate methods to determine cost-effectiveness of retrofits and of their overall program approach that are replicable and appropriate to other areas of the country;
- Participating in project management planning activities to ensure DOE's program requirements and/or limitations are considered in performance of the work elements;
- Integrating the work effort to ensure that project results address critical system and programmatic goals established by DOE EERE, in coordination with the State Energy Program. Specific integration includes that required to ensure that stakeholders are being adequately represented and that their needs/expectations are being addressed. Additionally, DOE will coordinate with State Energy Offices to ensure that the plans are represented in their yearly state energy plan submitted to DOE;
- Promoting and facilitating technology transfer activities, including disseminating program results through presentations, publications, and communications with the building community and other energy organizations as well as ENERGY STAR® and Building America personnel; and
- Serving as scientific/technical liaison between awardees, stakeholder groups, and other program staff (e.g., local governments; public utility commissions, Weatherization Assistance Program, ENERGY STAR®, Building America, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability), particularly in the area of matching up the recipient to technical assistance if needed.

- Recipient Responsibilities:

- Performing the project activities supported by the award in accordance with the program/strategic plan, including providing the required personnel, facilities, equipment, supplies and services;
- Managing and controlling project activities in accordance with its own established processes and procedures to ensure tasks and subtasks are completed within schedule and budget constraints defined by the program/strategic plan;
- Notifying DOE point of contact (POC) of all critical decision points and major meetings in sufficient time to allow the POC to participate in person or via phone;

- Co-chairing with DOE, stakeholder meetings to develop successful retrofit strategies;
- Working collaboratively with DOE during project implementation to develop and validate methods to determine cost-effectiveness of retrofits and of their overall program approach that are replicable and appropriate to other areas of the country;
- Implementing an approach to identify, analyze, and respond to project risks that is commensurate with the complexity of the project;
- Defining and revising approaches and plans, submitting the plans to DOE for review, and incorporating DOE comments;
- Coordinating related project activities with team members and external stakeholders to ensure effective integration of all work elements;
- Submitting progress reports and addressing DOE concerns/comments; and
- Participating in technology transfer activities, including disseminating program results through presentations, publications, and communications with the building community and other energy organizations as well as ENERGY STAR® and Building America personnel.

## **SITE VISITS**

DOE/NNSA's authorized representatives have the right to make site visits at reasonable times to review project accomplishments and management control systems and to provide technical assistance, if required. You must provide, and must require your subrecipients to provide, reasonable access to facilities, office space, resources, and assistance for the safety and convenience of the government representatives in the performance of their duties. All site visits and evaluations must be performed in a manner that does not unduly interfere with or delay the work.

## **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

a. Requirements. The reporting requirements for this award are identified on the Federal Assistance Reporting Checklist, DOE F 4600.2, attached to this award. Failure to comply with these reporting requirements is considered a material noncompliance with the terms of the award. Noncompliance may result in withholding of future payments, suspension, or termination of the current award, and withholding of future awards. A willful failure to perform, a history of failure to perform, or unsatisfactory performance of this and/or other financial assistance awards, may also result in a debarment action to preclude future awards by Federal agencies.

b. Dissemination of scientific/technical reports. Scientific/technical reports submitted under this award will be disseminated on the Internet via the DOE Information Bridge ([www.osti.gov/bridge](http://www.osti.gov/bridge)), unless the report contains patentable material, protected data, or SBIR/STTR data. Citations for journal articles produced under the award will appear on the DOE Energy Citations Database ([www.osti.gov/energycitations](http://www.osti.gov/energycitations)).

c. Restrictions. Reports submitted to the DOE Information Bridge must not contain any Protected Personal Identifiable Information (PII), limited rights data (proprietary data), classified information, information subject to export control classification, or other information not subject to release.

**Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 420, DOE reserves the right to amend the reporting requirements to include additional data.**

## **PUBLICATIONS**

a. You are encouraged to publish or otherwise make publicly available the results of the work conducted under the award.

b. An acknowledgment of Federal support and a disclaimer must appear in the publication of any material, whether copyrighted or not, based on or developed under this project, as follows:

Acknowledgment: "This material is based upon work supported by the Department of Energy under Award Number(s) DE-EE0004442."

Disclaimer: "This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof."

## **FEDERAL, STATE, AND MUNICIPAL REQUIREMENTS**

You must obtain any required permits and comply with applicable federal, state, and municipal laws, codes, and regulations for work performed under this award.

## **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS AND CONTACT INFORMATION**

a. The intellectual property provisions applicable to this award are provided as an attachment to this award or are referenced on the Assistance Agreement Face Page. A list of all intellectual property provisions may be found at [http://www.gc.doe.gov/financial\\_assistance\\_awards.htm](http://www.gc.doe.gov/financial_assistance_awards.htm).

b. Questions regarding intellectual property matters should be referred to the DOE Award Administrator and the Patent Counsel designated as the service provider for the DOE office that issued the award. The IP Service Providers List is found at [http://www.gc.doe.gov/documents/Intellectual\\_Property\\_\(IP\)\\_Service\\_Providers\\_for\\_Acquisition.pdf](http://www.gc.doe.gov/documents/Intellectual_Property_(IP)_Service_Providers_for_Acquisition.pdf)

## **LOBBYING RESTRICTIONS**

By accepting funds under this award, you agree that none of the funds obligated on the award shall be expended, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913. This restriction is in addition to those prescribed elsewhere in statute and regulation.

## **NOTICE REGARDING THE PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS -- SENSE OF CONGRESS**

It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available under this award should be American-made.

## **PROPERTY**

Real property, and equipment acquired by the Recipient shall be subject to the rules set forth in 10 CFR 600.130-137, 10 CFR 600.231-233, or 10 CFR 600.320-324 as applicable.

Consistent with the goals and objectives of this project, the Recipient may continue to use Recipient acquired property beyond the Period of Performance, without obligation, during the period of such use, to extinguish DOE's conditional title to such property as described in 10 CFR 600.132-135, 10 CFR 600.231-233, 600.321-324, subject to the following: (a) the Recipient continues to utilize such property for the objectives of the project as set forth in the Statement of

Project Objectives; (b) DOE retains the right to periodically ask for, and the Recipient agrees to provide, reasonable information concerning the use and condition of the property; and (c) the Recipient follows the property disposition rules set forth in the applicable sections of 10 CFR Part 600, if the property is no longer used by the Recipient for the objectives of the project, and the fair market value of property exceeds \$5,000.

Once the per unit fair market value of the property is less than \$5,000, pursuant to the applicable sections of 10 CFR Part 600, DOE's residual interest in the property shall be extinguished and Recipient shall have no further obligation to the DOE with respect to the property.

The regulations as set forth in 10 CFR Part 600 and the requirements of this article shall also apply to property in the possession of any team member, sub-recipient or other entity where such property was acquired in whole in part with funds provided by DOE under this grant or where such property was counted as cost-sharing under the grant.

## **HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

Prior to the expenditure of Federal funds to alter any structure or site, the Recipient is required to comply with the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), consistent with DOE's 2009 letter of delegation of authority regarding the NHPA. Section 106 applies to historic properties that are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. In order to fulfill the requirements of Section 106, the recipient must contact the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and, if applicable, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), to coordinate the Section 106 review outlined in 36 CFR Part 800. SHPO contact information is available at the following link: <http://www.ncshpo.org/find/index.htm>. THPO contact information is available at the following link: <http://www.nathpo.org/map.html>.

Section 110(k) of the NHPA applies to DOE funded activities. Recipients shall avoid taking any action that results in an adverse effect to historic properties pending compliance with Section 106.

Recipients should be aware that the DOE Contracting Officer will consider the recipient in compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA only after the Recipient has submitted adequate background documentation to the SHPO/THPO for its review, and the SHPO/THPO has provided written concurrence to the Recipient that it does not object to its Section 106 finding or determination. Recipient shall provide a copy of this concurrence to the Contracting Officer.