New Orleans

PERSONNEL BUDGET

Task # and Title	Position Title	Budget Period 1 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 1 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 1 Total Budget Period 1	Budget Period 2 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 2 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 2 Total Budget Period 2	Budget Period 3 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 3 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 3 Total Budget Period 3	Project Total Hours	Project Total Dollars	Rate Basis
Total		-		$ -	-		$ -	-		$ -	0	$ -	

FRINGE BUDGET

Fringe Benefit	Position Title	Budget Period 1 Salary	Budget Period 1 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 1 Total Budget Period 1	Budget Period 2 Salary	Budget Period 2 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 2 Total Budget Period 2	Budget Period 3 Salary	Budget Period 3 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 3 Total Budget Period 3	Project Total Hours	Project Total Dollars	Rate Basis
													Estimated Rate
Total				$ -			$ -			$ -		$ -	

TRAVEL BUDGET

Purpose of Travel	# of Travelers	Depart From	Destination	# of Miles Per Trip	# of Trips	Total Annual Cost	Basis for Estimating Costs
Budget Period 1							
Budget Period 1 Total							
Budget Period 2							
Budget Period 2 Total							
Budget Period 3							
Budget Period 2 Total							
Total						$ -	

EQUIPMENT BUDGET

Equipment Item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
				Budget Period 1	
Budget Period 1 Total					
				Budget Period 2	
Budget Period 2 Total					
				Budget Period 3	
Budget Period 3 Total					
Total					

SUPPLIES BUDGET

General Category of Supplies	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost*	Justification of Need
				Budget Period 1	
Budget Period 1 Total					
Budget Period 2 Total					
Budget Period 3 Total					
Total					

* The City of Decatur has a long history of extensive communication with the community. These estimates are based on the experience of staff with developing and maintaining other programs with similar requirements.

CONTRACTUAL BUDGET

Sub-Recipient Name / Organization	Purpose / Tasks in SOPO	Budget Period 1 Costs	Budget Period 2 Costs	Budget Period 3 Costs	Project Total

					$ -
					$ -
	Sub-Total	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

Vendor Name / Organization	Product or Service, Purpose / Need and Basis of Cost (Provide Additional Support at Bottom of Page as Needed)	Budget Period 1 Costs	Budget Period 2 Costs	Budget Period 3 Costs	Project Total
	Sub-Total				
Total		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Overall Description of Construction Activities:

General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1			
Budget Period 1 Total			
Budget Period 2			
Budget Period 2 Total			
Budget Period 3			
Budget Period 3 Total			
Total			

OTHER DIRECT COSTS

General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1			
Revolving Loan Fund	$ 916,666.67		
ESPC Program	$ 666,666.67		
PACE Program	$ 83,333.33		
Budget Period 1 Total	**$ 1,666,666.67**		
Budget Period 2			
Revolving Loan Fund	$ 916,666.67		
ESPC Program	$ 666,666.67		
PACE Program	$ 83,333.33		
Budget Period 2 Total	**$ 1,666,666.67**		
Revolving Loan Fund	$ 916,666.67		
ESPC Program	$ 666,666.67		
PACE Program	$ 83,333.33		
Budget Period 3 Total	**$ 1,666,666.67**		
Total	$ 5,000,000		

Budget Grand Total $ 5,000,000

Budget Year 1 Total $ 1,666,666.67

USVI

PERSONNEL BUDGET

Task # and Title	Position Title	Budget Period 1 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 1 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 1 Total Budget Period 1	Budget Period 2 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 2 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 2 Total Budget Period 2	Budget Period 3 Time (Hours)	Budget Period 3 Pay Rate ($/Hr)	Budget Period 3 Total Budget Period 3	Project Total Hours	Project Total Dollars	Rate Basis
Task 1 -	\			$ -							-	$ -	Actual Salary
				$ -			$ -					$ -	
				$ -			$ -					$ -	
Total		-		$ -	-		$ -	-		$ -	-	$ -	

FRINGE BUDGET

Fringe Benefit	Position Title	Budget Period 1 Salary	Budget Period 1 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 1 Total Budget Period 1	Budget Period 2 Salary	Budget Period 2 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 2 Total Budget Period 2	Budget Period 3 Salary	Budget Period 3 Fringe Rate (%)	Budget Period 3 Total Budget Period 3	Project Total Hours	Project Total Dollars	Rate Basis
Health, Retirement, Medicare, etc.	\	-	31%	$ -	-	31%	$ -	-	31%	$ -	-	$ -	Estimated Rate
				$ -			$ -			$ -	-	$ -	Estimated Rate
				$ -			$ -			$ -	-	$ -	Estimated Rate
				$ -			$ -			$ -	-	$ -	Estimated Rate
Total				$ -			$ -			$ -		$ -	

TRAVEL BUDGET

Purpose of Travel	# of Travelers	Depart From	Destination	# of Days	Cost per Traveler	Cost per Trip	Basis for Esimating Costs
Budget Period 1							
Domestic Travel							
DC Sustainability Conference							Internet Prices
Domestic Travel Subtotal					$ -	$ -	
International Travel							
International Travel Subtotal							
Budget Period 1 Total						$ -	
Budget Period 2							
Domestic Travel							
						$ -	
Domestic Travel Subtotal							
International Travel							
						$ -	
International Travel Subtotal							
Budget Period 2 Total						$ -	
Budget Period 3							
Domestic Travel							
						$ -	
Domestic Travel Subtotal							
International Travel							
						$ -	
International Travel Subtotal							
Budget Period 3 Total						$ -	
Total						$ -	

EQUIPMENT BUDGET

Equipment item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1					
			$ -		
Budget Period 1 Total			$ -		

Budget Period 2					
			$ -		
Budget Period 2 Total			$ -		
Budget Period 3					
			$ -		
Budget Period 3 Total			$ -		
Total			$ -		

SUPPLIES BUDGET

General Category of Supplies	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1					
Budget Period 1 Total			$ -		
Budget Period 2					
			$ -		
Budget Period 2 Total			$ -		
Budget Period 3					
			$ -		
Budget Period 3 Total			$ -		
Total			$ -		

CONTRACTUAL BUDGET

Sub-Recipient Name / Organization	Purpose / Tasks in SOPO	Budget Period 1 Costs	Budget Period 2 Costs	Budget Period 3 Costs	Project Total
CES, Inc	Assist in program design, strategic energy plan	$ 83,333	$ 83,333	$ 83,333	$ 250,000
Small residential and commercial rebates	Incentivize customers in the short-term to adopt EE/RE measures	$ 302,770	$ 200,000	$ 150,000	$ 652,770
On-bill Financing with WAPA	Upfront funding for on-bill financing program to cover water, electricity	$ 200,000	$ 150,000	$ 100,000	$ 450,000
Neighborhood Canvas Program	Canvas residential areas offering audits and low-cost solutions	$ 125,000	$ 125,000	$ 125,000	$ 375,000
ESCO rate subsidization	Assist in EE, RE upgrades to municipal, residential, and commercial buildings at low, subsidized rates to owners	$ 250,000	$ 150,000	$ 100,000	$ 500,000
					$ -
					$ -
					$ -
	Sub-Total	$ 961,103	$ 708,333	$ 558,333	$ 2,227,770
Total					$ 2,227,770

CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Overall Description of Construction Activities:

General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1			
Budget Period 1 Total	$ -		
Budget Period 2			
Budget Period 2 Total	$ -		
Budget Period 3			

Budget Period 3 Total	$ -		
Total	$ -		

OTHER DIRECT COSTS			
General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period 1			
Budget Period 1 Total	$ -		
Budget Period 2			
Budget Period 2 Total	$ -		
Budget Period 3			
Budget Period 3 Total	$ -		
Total	$ -		

Budget Grand Total $ 2,227,770

SEEA Budget Justification

Personnel

List costs solely for employees of the Applicant. Identify positions to be supported. Key personnel should be identified by title. All other personnel should be identified either by title or a group category. State the amounts of time (e.g., hours or % of time) to be expended, the composite base pay rate, total direct personnel compensation and identify the rate basis (e.g., actual salary, labor distribution report, technical estimate, state civil service rates, etc.). Identify the number of employees (on a Full Time Equivalent) that will be employed in each position or group category. Note the prevailing wage requirements in the ARRA (P.L. 111-5).

Task # and Title	Position Title	Budget Period I			Budget Period II			Budget Period III			Project Total Hours	Project Total Dollars	Rate Basis
		Time (Hours	Pay Rate ($/hr)	Total Budget Period I	Time (Hours	Pay Rate ($/hr)	Total Budget Period II	Time (Hours	Pay Rate ($/hr)	Total Budget Period III			
	Exec. Director	600	56.54	33,924	Exec. Director	600	56.54	Exec. Director	600	56.54	1800	101,772	Actual Salary
	Sr. Prog. Mng	1800	40.38	72,684	Sr. Prog. Mng	1800	40.38	Sr. Prog. Mng	1800	40.38	5400	218,052	Projected Salary
	Deputy Dir.	1000	45.90	45,900	Deputy Dir.	1000	45.90	Deputy Dir.	1000	45.90	3000	137,700	Actual Salary
	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	57,222	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	5400	171,166	Projected Salary
	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	57,222	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	5400	171,166	Projected Salary
	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	57,222	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	Prog. Assoc.	1800	31.79	5400	171,166	Projected Salary
	Sr. Finance	1800	38.50	69,300	Sr. Finance	1800	38.50	Sr. Finance	1800	38.50	5400	207,900	Projected Salary
	Intern	1800	12.00	21,600	Intern	1800	12.00	Intern	1800	12.00	5400	64,800	Actual Salary

Non-Major System Capital Projects Subject to EERE Acquisition Advisory Board Review and/or Approvals Under DOE Order 413												
Project	Project Type	Project Number	Total Project Cost	Costed (As of 5/25/10)	FPD/Certification Level Req'd/FPD Deputy	CD-0 Mission Need	CD-1 Alternatives	CD-2 Baseline	CD-3 Construction Start	CD-4 Commissioning	Original CD Signatories (Pre-March 2010)	Future CD Signatories (March 2010 Forward)
Research Support Facility I	Standard Infrastructure, Less than $100M	06-EE-01	$80,000,000	$64,847,484	Roselle Drahushak-Crow /L2/ Greg Collette	11/19/2004	6/27/2008	12/16/2008	12/16/2008	4th Qtr 10	CD-0: Garman (AE), Sullivan, Moorer, Hoffman, Baldwin, Kersten CD 1-A: Wells (AE), Rodgers, Barton, Meacham, Baldwin, Khan, Phoebe CD 1-B: Wells (AE), Hine	Tier 2 Projects (<$100M) EDFO (AE); DAS BA; DAS TD Eff.; DAS TD Ren.; Dir. FPM; Dir. PBA
Research Support Facility II	Standard Infrastructure, Less than $100M	06-EE-01	$67,660,000	$1,622,891	Roselle Drahushak-Crow /L2/ Greg Collette	11/19/2004	6/27/2008	5/26/2010	5/26/2010	4th Qtr 11	N/A	
Integrated Biorefinery Research Facility I	Program-Specific Science, Less than $100M	07-EE-01	$20,796,000	$17,107,542	Matt Graham /L2/ Greg Collette	11/16/2006	7/18/2008	5/14/2009	5/14/2009	4th Qtr 10	CD-0: Karsner (AE), Wells, Schell, Rodgers, Barton, Meacham, Baldwin, Khan, Phoebe CD 1-A: Wells (AE), Rodgers, Barton, Meacham, Baldwin, Khan, Phoebe CD 1-B: Wells (AE), Chalk, Rodgers, Meacham, Baldwin, Richlen, Hine	
Integrated Biorefinery Research Facility II	Program-Specific Science, Less than $100M	07-EE-01	$13,432,500	$328,472	Matt Graham /L2/ Greg Collette	11/16/2006	7/18/2008	6/18/2010	Jun-10	4th Qtr 11	N/A	
Ingress/Egress and Traffic Capacity Upgrade	Standard Infrastructure, Less than $100M	10-EE-01	$44,000,000	$310,987	Randy Dins /L1/ Greg Collette	4/23/2009	3/30/2010	Sep-10	Sep-10	4th Qtr 11	CD-0: Chalk (AE), Wells, Luschetsky, Beaudry-Losique, Meacham, Phoebe	
Energy Systems Integration Facility	EERE Cross-Cutting Strategic Capability, Greater than $100M	08-EE-01	$135,000,000	$1,723,741	Matt Graham /L3/ Greg Collette	8/9/2007	4/27/2010	Jan-11	Jan-11	2nd Qtr 13	CD-0: Karsner (AE), Wells, Chalk, Schell, Rodgers, Barton, Meacham, Baldwin, Schell, Phoebe	Tier 1 Projects (≥$100M) S-3 (AE); EDFO; PDAS; DAS BA; DAS TD Eff.; DAS TD Ren.; Dir. FPM; Dir. PBA
Regular Appropriations / Recovery Act						Complete	Pending					

Fringe

Sub-recipients may be required to use the same fringe rate as Rebuilding Together, Inc. For now, please leave this section blank.

Task # and Title	Position Title	Budget Period I	Budget Period II	Budget Period III	Total
SEEA Staff	ALL above	172,144.88	172,144.88	172,144.88	516,434.63
SEEA Intern	Above	2,592.00	2,592.00	2,592.00	7,776.00

Travel

Purpose of travel are items such as project management meetings, etc. Identify number of travelers, estimated cost per traveler, and duration of trip. The Basis for Estimating Costs could be items such as past trips, current quotations, Federal Travel Regulations, etc. All listed travel must be necessary for the completion of the program. Do not include any travel associated with training through the National Office—we will incorporate these costs in our travel budget.

Purpose of Travel	No. of Travelers	Depart From	Destination	No. of Days	Cost Per Traveler	Cost Per Tip	Basis for Estimating Costs
Budget Period I							
Prg.Mng	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	12000
Prg. Assoc	3	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	36000
Ex. Dir.	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	3	600	600	2000
Budget Period I Total	**5**			**43**	**1800**	**1800**	**50000**
Budget Period II							
Prg.Mng	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	12000
Prg. Assoc	3	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	36000
Ex. Dir.	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	3	600	600	2000
Budget Period II Total	**5**			**43**	**1800**	**1800**	**50000**
Budget Period III							

Prg.Mng	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	12000
Prg. Assoc	3	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	20	600	600	36000
Ex. Dir.	1	Atlanta	Proposal Cities	3	600	600	2000
Budget Period III Total	**5**			**43**	**1800**	**1800**	**50000**

Equipment

Equipment is generally defined as an item with an acquisition cost greater than $5,000 and a useful life expectancy of more than one year. All proposed equipment should be identified, providing a basis of cost such as vendor quotes, catalog prices, prior invoices, etc., and briefly justifying its need as it applies to the Statement of Project Objectives. If it is existing equipment, and the value of its contribution to the project budget is being shown as cost share, provide logical support for the estimated value shown. If it is new equipment which will retain a useful life upon completion of the project, provide logical support for the estimated value shown. For equipment over $50,000 in price, also include a copy of the associated vendor quote or catalog price list.

Equipment Item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period I					
Budget Period I Total					
Budget Period II					
Budget Period II Total					
Budget Period III					
Budget					

Period III Total					

Supplies

Supplies are generally defined as an item with an acquisition cost of $5,000 or less and a useful life expectancy of less than one year. Supplies are generally consumed during the project performance. Further definitions can be found in 10 CFR 600.

Equipment Item	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period I					
Office Supplies/Phone/Postage/ Printing/Computer/ Printer/Copying/Shipping/ Meetings services			35,000	General operating costs	Costs are for general support of office staff and projects.
Budget Period I Total			**35,000**		
Budget Period II					
Office Supplies/Phone/Postage/ Printing/Computer/ Printer/Copying/Shipping/ Meetings services			35,000	General operating costs	Costs are for general support of office staff and projects.
Budget Period II Total			**35,000**		
Budget Period III					
Office Supplies/Phone/Postage/ Printing/Computer/ Printer/Copying/Shipping/			35,000	General operating costs	Costs are for general support of office staff

Meetings services					and projects.
Budget Period III Total			**35,000**		

Construction

Construction, for the purpose of budgeting, is defined as all types of work done on a particular facility, including erecting, altering, or remodeling. Construction conducted by the award recipient should be justified in this category. Any construction work that is performed by a vendor or sub-recipient to the award recipient should be entered under "Contractual." Identify all proposed construction, providing a basis of cost such as engineering estimates, prior construction, etc., and briefly justify its need as it applies to the Statement of Project Objectives. For major endeavors, a copy of the engineering estimate or quote should also be provided.

Overall description of construction activities:			
General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period I			
Budget Period I Total			
Budget Period II			
Budget Period II Total			
Budget Period III			
Budget Period III Total			

Other Direct Costs

Other direct costs are direct cost items required for the project which do not fit clearly into other categories. Basis of cost are items such as vendor quotes, prior purchases of similar or like items, published price list, etc. Please be very clear when providing a general description and the justification of need for these costs.

General Description	Cost	Basis of Cost	Justification of Need
Budget Period I			
SEEA G&A	206,594.72	G&A on direct costs and subcontracts	Standard G&A costs
Financial/Auditing Services	100,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Program Design Services	106,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Advertising/Communications/Marketing	433,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
EM&V/Utility design	257,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Community Outreach/Conference	83,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Workforce Development	133,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Energy Tracking/Benchmarking	120,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
ESCO City Consultation	66,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Total Budget Period I	1,331,928.03		
Budget Period II			
SEEA G&A	206,594.72	G&A on direct costs and subcontracts	Standard G&A costs
Financial/Auditing Services	100,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Program Design Services	106,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Advertising/Communications/Marketing	433,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
EM&V/Utility design	257,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Community Outreach/Conference	83,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities

Workforce Development	133,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Energy Tracking/Benchmarking	120,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
ESCO City Consultation	66,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Total Budget Period II	1,331,928.03		
Budget Period III			
SEEA G&A	206,594.72	G&A on direct costs and subcontracts	Standard G&A costs
Financial/Auditing Services	100,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Program Design Services	106,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Advertising/Communications/Marketing	433,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
EM&V/Utility design	257,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Community Outreach/Conference	83,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Workforce Development	133,333	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Energy Tracking/Benchmarking	120,000	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
ESCO City Consultation	66,667	Quote from vendors	Service delivery to the communities
Total Budget Period III	1,331,928.03		

Cost Share (i.e. Match)

A detailed presentation of the cash or cash value of all cost share proposed for the project must be provided. Identify the source and amount of each item of cost share proposed by the Applicant and each sub-recipient. Letters of commitment must be submitted for all third party cost share (other than award recipient).

Note that "cost-share" is not limited to cash investment. Other items that may be assigned value in a budget as incurred as part of the project budget and necessary to performance of the project, may be considered as cost share, such as: contribution of services or property; donated, purchased or existing equipment; buildings or land; donated, purchased or existing supplies; and/or unrecovered personnel, fringe benefits and indirect costs, etc. For each cost share contribution identified as other than cash, identify the item and describe how the value of the cost share contribution was calculated.

Funds from other Federal sources MAY NOT be counted as cost share. This prohibition includes FFRDC sub-recipients. Non-Federal sources include private, state or local Government, or any source not originally derived from Federal funds.

Fee or profit will not be paid to the award recipients or sub-recipients of financial assistance awards. Additionally, foregone fee or profit by the applicant shall not be considered cost sharing under any resulting award. Reimbursement of actual costs will only include those costs that are allowable and allocable to the project as determined in accordance with the applicable cost principles prescribed in 10 CFR 600.127, 10 CFR 600.222 or 10 CFR 600.317. Also see 10 CFR 600.318 relative to profit or fee.

Organization/Source	Type (cash, in-kind, etc)	Cost Share Item	Budget Period I Cost Share	Budget Period II Cost Share	Budget Period III Cost Share	Total Project Cost Share
Kresge Foundation	Cash	Fund leverage	200,000	250,000		450,000
Overbrook Foundation	Cash	Fund leverage	50,000			50,000
Kendeda Fund	Cash	Fund leverage	100,000			100,000
		Totals:	350,000	250,000		700,000
Total Project Cost			Cost Share Percent of Award			%1.37

OFFICE OF MAYOR JOHN PEYTON

ST. JAMES BUILDING
117 WEST DUVAL STREET, SUITE 400
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32202

PH: (904) 630-1776
FAX: (904) 630-2391
www.coj.net

January 6, 2010

The Honorable Steven Chu, Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington DC 20585

Dear Secretary Chu:

By this letter, the City of Jacksonville authorizes the Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) to apply for, receive funds, and administer an award on its behalf under the Retrofit Ramp-up Program (U.S. Department of Energy Funding Opportunity Announcement DE-FOA-0000148, Topic 1).

Sincerely,

Mayor John Peyton
City of Jacksonville

City of Charleston
Joseph P. Riley, Jr.
Mayor

January 5, 2010

The Honorable Steven Chu, Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington DC 20585

Dear Secretary Chu:

By this letter, the City of Charleston, SC authorizes the Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) to apply for, receive funds, and administer an award on its behalf under the Retrofit Ramp-up Program (U.S. Department of Energy Funding Opportunity Announcement DE-FOA-0000148, Topic 1).

Most sincerely yours,

Joseph P. Riley, Jr.
Mayor, City of Charleston

JPR,jr/cb

P.O. Box 652, Charleston, South Carolina 29402
843-577-6970 Fax 843-720-3827

Atlanta, GA	Georgia District 5
Carrborro, NC	NC District 4
Chapel Hill, NC	NC District 4
Charleston, SC	SC District 1 and 6
Charlotte, NC	NC District 8 and 9
Charlottesville, VA	Virginia District 5
Decatur, GA	Georgia District 4 and 5
Huntsville, AL	AL District 5
Jacksonville, FL	Florida District 4 and 6
Nashville-Davidson, TN	TN District 5
New Orleans, LA	LA District 2
Celebration Community Development District	FL District 8

seea
SOUTHEAST ENERGY
EFFICIENCY ALLIANCE

1.866.900.SEEA
P.O. Box 13909
Atlanta, GA 30324
www.seea.us
info@seea.us

SEEA Commitment to Davis Bacon:

This is to certify that all laborers and mechanics on projects funded directly or assisted in whole or in part by and through funding appropriated by the ARRA of 2009 will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on projects of a character similar in the locality as determined by subchapter IV of Chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted: Residential	3,185	7,099	10,773	7,380	14,761	22,141
Number of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	598	1,335	2,648	2,164	2,277	2,391
Number of buildings retrofitted: Total	13,944	21,385	31,188	19,314	26,812	34,310
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Residential	10,502,050	22,375,898	36,242,663	30,984,195	45,746,195	60,506,195
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	8,308,522	16,965,624	32,943,563	30,712,623	32,021,039	33,291,397
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Total	39,902,247	66,490,290	106,323,524	81,546,471	98,144,775	114,718,775
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achievedper unit retrofitted	$321	$429	$507	$647	$694	$789
Total Utilities Savings	$5,668,536	$9,663,286	$14,470,204	$8,462,942	$11,870,605	$15,287,933
kWh savings	46,056,856	78,514,198	117,570,409	68,761,405	96,448,669	124,214,455
kBtu (1000 Btu) savings	128,486,817	219,034,480	327,991,294	191,826,688	269,067,055	346,526,481
Jobs created or retained	751	1127	1553	1040	1588	1615
Emissions Reductions (Million MTCDE)	0.026	0.053	0.092	0.072	0.108	0.157
Emissions Reductions (MTCDE)	25,875	53,101	91,605	72,310	107,642	156,641
EECBG Funds Expended: Residential	$891,337	$2,221,419	$3,333,256	$0	$0	$0
EECBG Funds Expended: Commercial	$146,367	$357,692	$553,059	$0	$0	$0
EECBG Funds Expended: Total	$16,397,979	$14,898,792	$18,536,544	$8,108,295	$9,244,782	$9,327,135
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$118,462,008	$55,885,003	$75,964,062	$49,698,735	$49,331,435	$50,041,343
Resources Expended	$134,859,987	$70,783,795	$94,500,606	$57,807,031	$58,576,216	$59,368,478

ASSUMPTIONS

Electricity Reductions	65%	of total savings
Gas Reductions	30%	of total savings
MTCDE per kWh	0.00056	from The Climate Registry General Reporting Protocol, Southeast Average
Cost of Electricity	$0.08	
Cost of Gas per kcf	$13.50	http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/dnav/ng/ng_pri_sum_dcu_SNC_m.htm
MTCDE per kcf	0.055	from The Climate Registry General Reporting Protocol

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

Albemarle/Charlottesville

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted	2175.4	4350.8	8701.6	8701.6	8701.6	8701.6
Total sf of residential buildings retrofitted	4,636,455	9,270,645	16,224,195	16,224,195	16,224,195	16,224,195
Total sf of commercial buildings retrofitted	7,360,566	14,721,132	29,442,265	29,442,265	29,442,265	29,442,265
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	11,997,021	23,991,777	45,666,460	45,666,460	45,666,460	45,666,460
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achieved per unit retrofitted	$511	$511	$511	$511	$511	$511
Average total utility costs saved each year residential	$1,046,017	$2,091,523	$3,660,293	$3,660,293	$3,660,293	$3,660,293
Average total utility costs saved each year commercial						
Average fuel cost savings each year residential	2345862 mmBt	4690578 mmBt	8208798 mmBt	8208798 mmBt	8208798 mmBt	8208798 mmBtu
Average fuel cost savings each year commercial						
Jobs created or retained	97	195	341	341	341	341
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent	0.0588	0.117	0.235	0.235	0.235	0.235
Average emissions reductions per year in metric tons MT	58,785	117,450	234,927	234,927	234,927	234,927
Total reductions in MT for 3 Year performance period	411,162					
EECBG Funds Expended	405,000					
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	82,977,000					
EECBG Funds Expended - **repeat from line above??**						
Resources Expended						
{APPLICANT CAN ADD QUANTITATIVE METRIC}						

Assumptions: The Applicant should list key assumptions made to form the projections listed in this table:

Total Residental Buildings	102,333
Total Commercial Buildings	6437
Total Buildings	**108,770**

Average size of a unit assumed to be the size of an average American home **2,265 ft**

Source: National Association of Homebuilders' "A Century of Progress" report. Link: http://www.nahb.org/fileUpload_details.aspx?contentID=7135

Level of efficiency in each retrofit 30%

Number buildings retrofitted: 2% penetration Year 1; 4% penetration Year 2; 8% penetration thereafter

Jobs: Used Years 1, 2 and 3 totals from "total investments" from Worksheet; Assumed Years 4-6 same as Year 3; Used DOE jobs calculator at: http://www.eecbg.energy.gov/Downloads/EECBG_Estimated_Benefits_Calculator.xls

Average utilities savings: estimated using LEAP calculations; at 30% efficiency, the savings are $511 per year per unit

Average fuel savings and avoided GHG emissions calculated from our baseline reports' commercial and residential values

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

City of Atlanta

Atlanta

	During Project Period			Post Project Period, Years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted	445	955	2,053	2,115	2,178	2,243
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	3914225	8011295	16424849	16917514	17425122	17947876
Average Annual Residential Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted @ 8% Inflation ($)	$ 540.10	$ 583.30	$ 629.97	$ 680.37	$ 734.79	$ 793.58
Average Residential Annual Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted (kWh)	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh
Average Annual Commercial Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted @ 8% Inflation ($)	$ 3,840.00	$ 4,147.20	$ 4,478.98	$ 4,837.29	$ 5,224.28	$ 5,642.22
Average Commercial Annual Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted (kWh)	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh
Jobs Created or Retained	59 FTE Jobs	123 FTE Jobs	258 FTE Jobs	266 FTE Jobs	274 FTE Jobs	282 FTE Jobs
Average lifetime emissions reductions (MMT CO2) per Residential Installation	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2
Average lifetime emissions reductions (MMT CO2) per Commercial Installation (incl'd GEC)	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2
EECBG Funds Expended	$ 4,322,995	$ 2,404,138	$ 4,678,407	$ 7,829,359	$ 8,938,840	$ 9,016,455
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$ 1,067,005	$ 8,895,862	$ 19,065,593	$ 16,626,961	$ 16,251,169	$ 16,929,255
Resources Expended	$ 5,390,000	$ 11,300,000	$ 23,744,000	$ 24,456,320	$ 25,190,010	$ 25,945,710

Assumptions:

1. Buildings retrofitted split between Commercial and Residential
2. Residential square footage retrofitted based on average 2,813 sq. ft. owner occupied single-family detached (EIA Table HC.1.1.2)
3. Commercial square footage retrofitted based on average 25,000 sq. ft.
4. Residential energy savings calculated at an assumed savings rate of 1.92 kWh/sq.ft. x $0.10/kWh x 2,813 sq.ft. with an 8% annual energy inflation rate
5. Commercial energy savings calculated at an assumed savings rate of 1.92 kWh/sq.ft. x $0.08/kWh x 25,000 sq.ft. with an 8% annual energy inflation rate
6. Commercial retrofit projects assumed to be primarily lighting based in order to capitalize on state and other federal incentives
7. Job creation based on 1 FTE per $92,000 expended directly through the program, e.g. retrofit costs and admin. Leverage from other partners omitted.
8. Emissions reduction calculation based on an emissions factor of 0.000699 t CO2/kWh x average 10 year life of residential improvements
9. Emissions reduction calculation based on an emissions factor of 0.000699 t CO2/kWh x average 15 year life of commercial improvements
10. Commercial emissions reduction also includes commitment to Governor's Energy Challenge (GEC) which requires a 15% reduction in energy

consumption
11. Year 1 EECBG Funds Expended includes creation of loan loss reserve that is a recoverable allocation
12. Leveraged funds and in-kind calculations exclude that derived from non-project specific leverage, i.e. municipal retrofits, 3rd party marketing, appliance rebate programs, etc.
13. Resources expended calculations exclude that derived from non-project specific leverage, i.e. municipal retrofits, 3rd party marketing, appliance rebate programs, etc.

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

Carrboro, NC

Town of Carrboro

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted: Residential	80	240	360			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	22	66	99			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Total	102	306	459			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Residential	171,040	513,120	769,680			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	117,700	353,100	529,650			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Total	288,740	866,220	1,299,330			
Average utilities savings: Residential	$50,400	$151,200	$226,800			
Average utilities savings: Commercial	$62,852	$188,555	$282,833			
Average utilities savings: Total, per unit	$1,110	$1,110	$1,110			
Jobs created or retained	6	25	47			
Average emission reductions per unit, residential (million metric tons CO2)	0.00000342	0.00000342	0.00000342			
Average emission reductions per unit, commercial (million metric tons CO2)	0.00000001	0.00000001	0.00000001			
Emissions reductions (million metric tons CO2)	0.00027386	0.00082158	0.00123236			
EECBG Funds Expended: Residential	$36,000	$108,000	$162,000			
EECBG Funds Expended: Commercial	$8,000	$24,000	$36,000			
EECBG Funds Expended: Total	$44,000	$132,000	$198,000			
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$220,000	$660,000	$990,000			
Resources Expended	$264,000	$792,000	$1,188,000			

Assumptions
$3,000 per residential
$6,000 per commercial
90% residential
10% commercial
5 to 1 Leverage

2138	Avg Residentia	From Chapel Hill Fact Book
5350	Avg Commercial Sq Ft	
30%	energy use reduction	
17.4	kWh per squar	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey
0.0332	kcf NG per squ	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey
14721	kWh per house	From 2005 EIA Residential Energy Consumption Survey
57	kcf NG per hou	From 2005 EIA Residential Energy Consumption Survey
$2,100	Avg Utility Bill,	From Chapel Hill Fact Book
$1.78	Avg Utility Bill,	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

Town of Chapel Hill

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted: Residential	180	720	1350			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	20	80	150			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Total	200	800	1500			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Residential	384,840	1,539,360	2,886,300			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	100,000	400,000	750,000			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Total	484,840	1,939,360	3,636,300			
Average utilities savings: Residential	$113,400	$453,600	$850,500			
Average utilities savings: Commercial	$53,400.00	$213,600.00	$400,500.00			
Average utilities savings: Total, per unit	$834.00	$834.00	$834.00			
Jobs created or retained	31	17	17			
Average emission reductions per unit, residential (million metric tons CO2)	0.0000034	0.0000034	0.0000034			
Average emission reductions per unit, commercial (million metric tons CO2)	0.0000580	0.0000580	0.0000580			
Emissions reductions (million metric tons CO2)	0.00178	0.00711	0.01332			
EECBG Funds Expended: Residential	$81,000	$324,000	$607,500			
EECBG Funds Expended: Commercial	$18,000	$72,000	$135,000			
EECBG Funds Expended: Total	$99,000	$396,000	$742,500			
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$495,000	$1,980,000	$3,712,500			
Resources Expended	$594,000	$2,376,000	$4,455,000			

Assumptions

$3,000 investment per residential
$6,000 investment per commercial
90% residential

10%	commercial	
5 to 1	Leverage	
2138	Avg Residential	From Chapel Hill Fact Book
5000	Avg Commercia	From Chapel Hill Fact Book
30%	energy use reduction	
17.4	kWh per squar	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey
0.0332	kcf NG per squ	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey
14721	kWh per house	From 2005 EIA Residential Energy Consumption Survey
57	kcf NG per hou	From 2005 EIA Residential Energy Consumption Survey
$2,100	Avg Utility Bill,	From Chapel Hill Fact Book
$1.78	Avg Utility Bill,	From 2003 EIA Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey

Charleston

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted: Residential	578	1,444	2,022			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	21	52	73			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Total	599	1,497	2,096			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Residential	866,685	2,166,713	3,033,398			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	83,834	209,584	293,418			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Total	950,519	2,376,297	3,326,815			
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achievedper unit retrofitted	$500	$500	$500			
Total Utilities Savings	$299,374	$748,436	$1,047,810			
Jobs created or retained	16	49	82			
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent						
EECBG Funds Expended: Residential	$481,492	$1,203,729	$1,685,221			
EECBG Funds Expended: Commercial	$41,917	$104,792	$146,709			
EECBG Funds Expended: Total	$523,409	$1,308,521	$1,831,930			
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$2,617,043	$6,542,606	$9,159,649			
Resources Expended	$3,140,451	$7,851,128	$10,991,579			

City of Decatur

	During Project Period			Post Project Period, Years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted	55	80	115	118	122	126
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	265,650	424,723	656,300	675,989	696,269	717,157
Average Annual Residential Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted @ 8% Inflation ($)	$ 540.10	$ 583.30	$ 629.97	$ 680.37	$ 734.79	$ 793.58
Average Residential Annual Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted (kWh)	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh	5,401 kWh
Average Annual Commercial Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted @ 8% Inflation ($)	$ 3,840.00	$ 4,147.20	$ 4,478.98	$ 4,837.29	$ 5,224.28	$ 5,642.22
Average Commercial Annual Utilities Savings Achieved per unit Retrofitted (kWh)	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh	48,000 kWh
Jobs Created or Retained	6 FTE Jobs	8 FTE Jobs	12 FTE Jobs	13 FTE Jobs	13 FTE Jobs	14 FTE Jobs
Average lifetime emissions reductions (MMT CO2) per Residential Installation	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2	37.7 t CO2
Average lifetime emissions reductions (MMT CO2) per Commercial Installation (incl'd GEC)	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2	905.1 t CO2
EECBG Funds Expended	$ 177,042	$ 151,504	$ 207,784	$ 278,936	$ 305,942	$ 310,680
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$ 339,208	$ 625,746	$ 940,966	$ 904,277	$ 912,767	$ 944,590
Resources Expended	$ 516,250	$ 777,250	$ 1,148,750	$ 1,183,213	$ 1,218,709	$ 1,255,270

Assumptions:

1. Buildings retrofitted split between Commercial and Residential
2. Residential square footage retrofitted based on average 2,813 sq. ft. owner occupied single-family detached (EIA Table HC.1.1.2)
3. Commercial square footage retrofitted based on average 25,000 sq. ft.
4. Residential energy savings calculated at an assumed savings rate of 1.92 kWh/sq.ft. x $0.10/kWh x 2,813 sq.ft. with an 8% annual energy inflation rate
5. Commercial energy savings calculated at an assumed savings rate of 1.92 kWh/sq.ft. x $0.08/kWh x 25,000 sq.ft. with an 8% annual energy inflation rate
6. Commercial retrofit projects assumed to be primarily lighting based in order to capitalize on state and other federal incentives
7. Job creation based on 1 FTE per $92,000 expended directly through the program, e.g. retrofit costs and admin. Leverage from other partners omitted.
8. Emissions reduction calculation based on an emissions factor of 0.000699 t CO2/kWh x average 10 year life of residential improvements

9. Emissions reduction calculation based on an emissions factor of 0.000699 t CO2/kWh x average 15 year life of commercial improvements
10. Commercial emissions reduction also includes commitment to Governor's Energy Challenge (GEC) which requires a 15% reduction in energy consumption
11. Year 1 EECBG Funds Expended includes creation of loan loss reserve that is a recoverable allocation
12. Years 4-6 are projected cash needs to maintain initial level of capital buy-down support
13. Leveraged funds and in-kind calculations exclude that derived from non-project specific leverage, i.e. municipal retrofits, 3rd party marketing, appliance rebate programs, etc.
14. Resources expended calculations exclude that derived from non-project specific leverage, i.e. municipal retrofits, 3rd party marketing, appliance rebate programs, etc.

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

Hampton Planning District

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted (Residential)	1845	3690	5535	7380	14761	22141
Total buildings Yr 1-6 (Residential)	1845	5535	11070	18450	33211	55352
kWH saved residential	6,642,000	19,926,000	39,852,000			
Number of buildings retrofitted (Commercial)	12	25	37	49	99	148
Cummulative buildings Yr 1-6 (Commercial)	12	37	74	123	222	370
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted (Residential)	3,690,000	7,380,000	11,070,000	14,760,000	29,522,000	44,282,000
Cummulative square footage Yr 1-6 (Residential)	3,690,000	11,070,000	22,140,000	36,900,000	66,422,000	110,704,000
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted (Commercial)	332,622	654,208	986,830	1,270,358	2,578,774	3,849,132
Cummulative square footage Yr 1-6 (Commercial)	332,622	986,830	1,973,660	3,244,018	5,822,792	9,671,924
kWH saved commercial	725,721	2,153,084	4,306,167			
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achieved per unit retrofitted (Residential)	$730,620	$1,461,240	$2,191,860	$2,922,480	$5,845,356	$8,767,836
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achieved per unit retrofitted (Commercial)	$79,829	$157,010	$236,839	$304,886	$618,906	$923,792
Cummulative utilities savings Yr 1-6 (Residential/Commercial)	$810,449	$2,428,699	$4,857,398	$8,084,764	$14,549,026	$24,240,654
Average Utilities Savings, per unit total	$436	$654	$872	$1,088	$979	$1,088
Jobs created or retained	180	180	180	180	720	738
Cummulative Jobs created/retained Yr 1-6	180	360	540	720	1440	2178
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (Residential)	9.72	19.48	29.22	38.97	77.94	116.90
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (Commercial)	1.06	2.09	3.16	4.06	8.25	12.32
Cummulative MMT CO2 reductions Residential/Commercial Yr 1-6	10.78	32.36	64.74	107.77	193.96	323.18
EECBG Funds Expended	$3,365,638	$3,355,638	$3,355,638			
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$20,167,498	$20,167,498	$20,167,498	$20,167,498	$20,167,498	$20,167,498
EECBG Funds Expended						

Resources Expended	$23,533,136	$23,523,136	$23,523,136	$20,167,498	$20,167,498	$20,167,498

Assumptions;
Penetration on Residential Yr 1-3 (1/4, 1/2, 3/4)
Penetration on Commercial Yr 1-3 (1/4, 1/2, 3/4)
Residential Average SF 2,000
Commercial SF Office (11,036) Industrial (38,058)
Penetration on Residential Yr 3-6 (1, 2, 3)
Penetration on Commercial Yr 4-6 (1, 2, 3)
18,000 kWH per year average 20% savings 3,600 kwh
kWH=.11 or $396 per year savings(Residential)
120,000 kWH per year average on 11,000 SF Building
20% Savings per year = 24,000 kWH * kWH=.11 or
$2,640 per year savings (Residential)
Jobs created/retained at 18 per million in sales
CO2 reductions based of 5.28 metric tons per 2000 SF residential
CO2 reductions based of 35.19 metric tons per 11,000 SF Commercial

Project Impact Table For Topic 1

Hunstville

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted	230	470	700			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	1000000	2200000	3200000			
Utilities savings kW	3867600	5988720	7756320			
Savings per Unit	$1,009	$765	$665			
Jobs created or retained	32	32	32			
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent						
EECBG Funds Expended	$1,784,000					
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$25,052	$42,100	$59,848			

Assumptions;

for three years, the following kW has been estimated in Huntsville for the three sectors (residential, commerical/industrial, and municipal

TOTAL RESIDENTIAL kW saved

1,200 homes surveyed (Based on previous pilot program results)

40% implementation rate (Based on previous pilot program results)

12% savings (Estimates based on Energy Star baselines and HERS modeling)

1,200 homes X 40% = **480 homes** X 245.5 kwh monthly savings = **117,840 kwh** X 36 months =

4,242,240 kW

kW/sqft

1.7676

TOTAL COMMERCIAL and INDUSTRIAL kW saved

200 C&I surveyed

50% Implementation apply 1.76 kW/sqft rate of savings (C&I savings couldbe a much higher rate than residential)	**3,535,200**	kW
TOTAL MUNICIPAL kW saved Provided by the City from EECBG application each year estimate (2100000)	**6,467,434**	kW
TOTAL OVERALL	**14,244,874**	

Appendix G - Project Impact Table For JEA/COJ NEFCEA

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6**
Number of buildings retrofitted	400	750	950	950	950	950
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	1,311,800	1,912,750	2,256,150	2,256,150	2,256,150	2,256,150
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings)	42,000	48,000	56,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
Jobs created or retained	257	362	425	240	240	240
Average emissions reductions (MMT CO_2) per unit	26,544	30,336	35,392	35,392	35,392	35,392
EECBG Funds Expended	$ 2,205,600	$ 3,308,400	$ 3,308,400	$ -	$ -	$ -
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind Resources Expended	$ 11,314,770	$ 19,800,848	$ 25,458,233	$ 12,000,000	$ 12,000,000	$ 12,000,000
APPLICANT CAN ADD QUANTITATIVE METRIC						
Resources Expended [Total 6 &7]	**$ 13,520,370**	**$ 23,109,248**	**$ 28,766,633**	**$ 12,000,000**	**$ 12,000,000**	**$ 12,000,000**

The applicant should list key assumptions made to form the projections listed in this table:

		% of housing units or businesses that take advantage of audit or loan subsidies					
•	Background information for building retrofits: Duval county has 394,000 [2000] housing units and 63% [2008] home ownership rate per or US Census or an estimated 248,220 owned residences. Duval county has 56,184 business/ firms per US Census [2002 survey]	0.10%	0.19%	0.24%	0.24%	0.24%	0.24%
•	Supporting information used to calculate square footage of buildings						
	According to the National Association of Home Builders, the average home size in the United States was 2,330 square feet in 2004, up from 1,400 square feet in 1970. The average of the two or 1865 sf. We used Duval County Property Appriaser data for single family occupied housing, that average is 1717 sf	2,252,360,600	3,284,191,750	3,873,809,550	3,873,809,550	3,873,809,550	3,873,809,550
	We used Duval County Property Appriaser data for non-residential that average is approximately 12,500 sf	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000
		2,252,985,600	**3,284,816,750**	**3,874,434,550**	**3,874,434,550**	**3,874,434,550**	**3,874,434,550**

•	MWh savings estimates from JEA DSM program. JEA serves over virtually 100% of Duval County and into 2 surrounding counties	42,000	48,000	56,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
•	Job assumptions [minimum] from DOE RDEE Program Planning Guide						
	Residential [50% of spending] -efficient AC is primary work -11 jobs per $1MM	149	254	316	132	132	132
	Commercial [50% of spending- perscriptive is primary work - 8 jobs per $1MM	108	108	108	108	108	108
	Total Jobs	**257**	**362**	**425**	**240**	**240**	**240**
•	Metric tons of CO_2 reduced taken from EIA [DOE] Voluntary Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Program for Florida	0.632 metric tons of CO_2 per MWh					

New Orleans

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted	7,300	7,300	7,300			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted	14600000	14600000	14600000			
Average utilities savings (e.g.cost and fuel savings) achievedper unit retrofitted	2190000	2190000	2190000			
Jobs created or retained	44	87	87			
Average emissions reductions(MMT CO21) per unit 1 MMT CO2 is million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent						
EECBG Funds Expended						
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$3,100,000	$3,100,000	$3,100,000			
EECBG Funds Expended						
Resources Expended						

US VI

	During Project Period			Post project period, years 4 to 6		
Project Impact Metrics	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
Number of buildings retrofitted: Residential	502	1,004	1,506			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	78	157	235			
Number of buildings retrofitted: Total	580	1,161	1,741			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Residential	753,030	1,506,060	2,259,090			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Commercial	313,800	627,600	941,400			
Total square footage of buildings retrofitted: Total	1,066,830	2,133,660	3,200,490			
Average utilities savings: Residential	$372,298	$744,596	$1,116,894			
Average utilities savings: Commercial	$126,241.74	$252,483.48	$378,725.22			
Average Utilities Savings, Total, per unit	$858.86	$858.86	$858.86			
Jobs created or retained	24	48	73			
Average emission reductions per unit, residential (million metric tons CO2)	0.0000014	0.0000014	0.0000014			
Average emission reductions per unit, commercial (million metric tons CO2)	0.0000035	0.0000035	0.0000035			
Emissions reductions (million metric tons CO2)	0.00100	0.00200	0.00299			
EECBG Funds Expended: Residential	$292,845	$585,690	$878,535			
EECBG Funds Expended: Commercial	$78,450	$156,900	$235,350			
EECBG Funds Expended: Total	$371,295	$742,590	$1,113,885			
Leveraged Funds and In-Kind	$1,856,475	$3,712,950	$5,569,425			
Resources Expended	$2,227,770	$4,455,540	$6,683,310			

Assumptions

50202	total residential cus	2000 census
7845	total commercial cu	2002 economic census, dept of commerce
1.00%	year 1 participation	rate
2.00%	year 2 participation	rate
3.00%	year 3 participation	rate
	investment per	
$3,500	residential	
	investment per	
$6,000	commercial	
85%	residential	
15%	commercial	
5 to 1	Leverage	
	Avg Residential Sq	
1500	Ft	Assumed
	Avg Commercial Sq	
4000	Ft	Assumed
	energy use	
30%	reduction	
	kWh/year	
6000.0	residential	From WAPA Website
410	kBtu propane/year	From DOI Virgin Islands Report, 2006
	kWh/year	
14400	commercial	From WAPA Website
983	kBtu propane/year	From DOI Virgin Islands Report, 2006
	Avg Yearly Utility	
	Bill Inc Water,	
$2,472	Residential	From WAPA Website
	Avg Yearly Utility	
	Bill Inc Water,	
$5,364.00	Commercial	From WAPA Website

January 6, 2010

Secretary Steven Chu
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Chu:

By this letter, The City of Suffolk authorizes the Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) to apply for, receive funds, and administer an award on its behalf under the Retrofit Ramp-up Program (U.S. Department of Energy Funding Opportunity Announcement DE-FOA-0000148, Topic 1).

Sincerely,

Linda T. Johnson

Linda T. Johnson
Mayor

pc: The Honorable Council
Selena Cuffee-Glenn, City Manager
C. Edward Roettger, Jr., City Attorney
Erika S. Dawley, City Clerk
Patrick Roberts, Deputy City Manager
Sherry Hunt, Chief of Staff
Randall A. Gilliland, Chairman of Green Jobs Alliance

Appendix C

NEPA FORM For Completion U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

The Department of Energy (DOE) is required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 as amended (42 U.S.C. 4332(2), 40 CFR parts 1500-1508) and DOE implementing regulations (10 CFR 1021) to consider the environmental effects resulting from federal actions, including providing financial assistance. Please provide the following information to facilitate DOE's environmental review.

PART I: General Information
Title: **Retrofit Ramp-up and General Innovation Fund Programs**
FOA Number: **DE-FOA-0000148**

1. Please describe the intended use of DOE funding in your proposed plan. For example, would the funding be applied to the entire project or only support a phase of the project? Describe the activity as specifically as possible, i.e. planning, feasibility study, design, data analysis, education or outreach activities, construction, capital purchase and/or equipment installation or modification.

The Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA), acting on behalf of 30 cities and towns from Virginia to the Virgin Islands with a population of approximately 5.2 million, seeks to dramatically increase the effectiveness of building retrofits across the region with the significant assistance of $62 Million from the Department of Energy's Retrofit Ramp-Up Solicitation. This proposal intends to transform the Southeast by achieving retrofit results at scale, creating a model for replication across the country. Our city partners have been planning and organizing for this opportunity since February 2009, when SEEA challenged cities to make extraordinary commitments to energy efficiency programming and infrastructure with a $500,000 competitive solicitation and award.[1] Fifteen communities from six states tendered applications, requiring hundreds of hours of work in meetings, planning, research, negotiations with utilities and city councils and partnership-building. The best of those applications are represented by the cities in this proposal, complemented by some communities that have made comparable commitments over the past six months.

Our team of cities for this proposal includes the following:

Atlanta, GA	Decatur, GA
Albemarle County, VA	Hampton Roads Planning District (16 VA municipalities)
Carrboro, NC	Huntsville, AL
Celebration, FL	Jacksonville, FL
Chapel Hill, NC	Nashville, TN
Charleston, NC	New Orleans, LA
Charleston, SC	U.S. Virgin Islands
Charlottesville, VA	Woodbury, TN

2. Does any part of your project require review and/or permitting by any other federal, state, regional, local, environmental, or regulatory agency? **NO**

[1] Information on the competition and City proposals is available at http://www.seealliance.org/programs/cities_proposals.php .

3. Has any review (e.g., NEPA documentation, permits, agency consultations) been completed? **NO**

4. **Provide information about the potential environmental issues, concerns, and impacts associated with your proposal. Please provide as much detail as possible in the following areas: specifics of proposed activities, project locations, size, layout, commitments to waste management and historic preservation. If project specific information is unknown, describe your plan for obtaining this information.** No project specific information is available at this time. Member counties will seek proper approvals for all NEPA requirements. Additionally, we will work with communities to complete appropriate forms (as included below) for categorical exclusion from NEPA review on certain types of projects.

- **SOW FOR [CITY] [COUNTY] OF [_____]**

The [City] [County] of [_____] will only fund projects that fall within the bounded categories in Part I below and, moreover, are consistent with the limitations prescribed therein. This SOW applies to Activity #, ____name of activity____.

Part I – Bounded Categories

1. Conducting residential and commercial building energy audits, which includes hiring technical consultants to conduct such audits.
2. Establishment of financial incentive programs for energy efficiency improvements. (This does not include revolving funds that have not been previously CX'd).
3. Provision of grants to nonprofit organizations and governmental agencies for the purpose of performing energy efficiency retrofits, provided that:
   - Projects Are Limited To: installation of insulation; installation of efficient lighting; heating, venting, and air conditioning (HVAC) and high-efficiency shower/faucet upgrades; weather sealing; the purchase and installation of ENERGY STAR appliances; installation of solar powered appliances with improved efficiency; and replacement of windows and doors.
4. Development and implementation of energy efficiency and conservation programs for buildings and facilities within the jurisdiction of the entity, provided that:
   - Projects Are Limited To: design and operation of the programs; identifying the most effective methods for achieving the maximum participation and efficiency rates; public education, measurement and verification protocols; and identification of energy efficient technologies.
5. Development and implementation of programs to conserve energy used in transportation, provided that:

   - Projects Are Limited To: use of flex time by employers; use of satellite work centers; development and promotion of zoning guidelines or requirements that promote energy efficient development; and synchronization of traffic signals.
6. Development and implementation of building codes and inspection services, and associated training and enforcement of such codes in order to support code compliance and promote building energy efficiency.
7. Projects to increase participation and efficiency rates for material conservation programs.
8. Replacement of traffic signals and street lighting with energy efficient technologies.
9. Development, implementation, and installation on or in any government building of onsite renewable energy technology that generates electricity from renewable resources, provided that:

- Projects Are Limited To:
  - Solar Electricity/Photovoltaic – systems or unit on existing rooftops and parking shade structures must be sized for the load of the particular building it is installed on; or a 60 KW system or smaller unit installed on the ground within the boundaries of an existing facility.
  - Wind Turbine - 20 KW or smaller.
  - Solar Thermal - system must be 20 KW or smaller.
  - Solar Thermal Hot Water - such as appropriately sized for small buildings.
  - Ground Source Heat Pump - 5.5-ton capacity or smaller, horizontal/vertical, ground, closed-loop system.
  - Combined Heat and Power System - boilers sized appropriately for the buildings in which they are located.
  - Biomass Thermal - 3 MMBTUs per hour or smaller system with appropriate Best Available Control Technologies (BACT) installed and operated.

Part II - Integral Element Requirements and Other Conditions

[City] [County] of [_____] will not fund Projects that would:

(1) Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, including requirements of DOE and/or Executive Orders;

(2) Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators);

(3) Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases; or

(4) Adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources. Environmentally sensitive resources include, but are not limited to:

(i) Property (e.g., sites, buildings, structures, objects) of historic, archeological, or architectural significance designated by Federal, state, or local governments or property eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places;

(ii) Federally-listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat (including critical habitat), Federally- proposed or candidate species or their habitat, or state-listed endangered or threatened species or their habitat;

(iii) Wetlands regulated under the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) and floodplains;

(iv) Areas having a special designation such as Federally- and state-designated wilderness areas, national parks, national natural landmarks, wild and scenic rivers, state and Federal wildlife refuges, and marine sanctuaries;

(v) Prime agricultural lands;

(vi) Special sources of water (such as sole-source aquifers, wellhead protection areas, and other water sources that are vital in a region); and

(vii) Tundra, coral reefs, or rain forests.

Waste Stream Conditions

The [City] [County] of [_____] shall obtain a waste management plan addressing waste generated by a proposed Project prior to funding projects or awarding a sub-grant for a Project. This waste management plan will describe the recipient's plan to dispose of any sanitary or hazardous waste (e.g., construction and demolition debris, old light bulbs, lead paint, lead ballasts, piping, roofing material, discarded equipment, debris, and asbestos) generated as a result of the proposed Project. [City] [County] of [_____] shall make the waste management plan and related documentation available to DOE on DOE's request (for example, during a post-award audit). [City] [County] of [_____] shall ensure through specific contract terms that the Sub-recipient complies with all Federal, state and local regulations for waste disposal.

NHPA Conditions

Prior funding projects or awarding a sub-grant for a Project, [City] [County] of [_____] shall comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). If applicable, the Sub-recipient must contact the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO). [City] [County] of [_____] shall retain sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the Sub-recipient has received required approval(s) from the SHPO or THPO for the Project. [City] [County] of [_____] shall deem compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA complete only after it has this documentation. [City] [County] of [_____] shall make this documentation available to DOE on DOE's request (for example, during a post-award audit).

Cumulative Impacts, Connected Actions and Extraordinary Circumstance

DOE's CXs are not absolute. CXs do not apply to Projects that involve "extraordinary circumstances," connected actions, or cumulative impacts that may have significant environmental impacts. *See* 10 C.F.R. § 1021.410(b). If DOE grants a CX based on descriptions in the recipient's RFP for EECBG grants, DOE will base its decision on the lack of such "extraordinary circumstances" and significant impacts. [City] [County] of [_____] shall review section 1021.410 and must immediately contact DOE if it identifies a Project that may involve "extraordinary circumstances," cumulative impacts or connected actions that could have significant environmental impacts. Typically, DOE will either subject the sub-grant for the Project to NEPA review or the [City] [County] of [_____] will elect not to proceed with awarding the sub-grant.

Part III

On the basis of [City] [County] of [_____] assurances in this Project Activity Worksheet, DOE intends to apply one or more CXs to the award for all Projects described in the recipient's RFP. However, because DOE has only recently started employing this approach to categorically excluding sub-grants, there may be unforeseen circumstances that make it inappropriate to apply a CX to a Project(s)

that meets all the Part I and Part II requirements. DOE does not waive its discretion to decline to apply a CX for projects/grants.

By signing below, [City] [County] of [_____] acknowledges the preceding paragraph, agrees to all conditions in Parts I, II and III, and provides its assurance that all statements in the Project Activity Worksheet and attachments are accurate to the best of its knowledge.

_____

Authorized Signatory [City] [County] of [_____]

FOA: DE-FOA-0000148
Project Title: Southeast Community Retrofit Ramp-up Consortium
Applicant & Director: Ben Taube, Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance

PROJECT NARRATIVE FILE

The SEEA Organization

The Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit with the mission of promoting and achieving energy efficiency through networking, program activities, and education. The results of increased energy efficiency will be a cleaner environment, a more prosperous economy, and a higher quality of life in the southeastern United States.

SEEA is based in Atlanta, GA, and is active in the 11-state region of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. SEEA has developed close partnerships with existing energy organizations and businesses in the Southeast, including investor-owned and public utilities , wholesalers, retailers, state governors and energy offices, state public utility commissions, environmental and energy nonprofit organizations, energy service companies, manufacturers, universities, consumer groups, low-income advocates, and residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural consumers.

Key Ingredients of Success

Our proposal and our communities are uniquely qualified due to:

1. The degree of support from governors, state energy offices, utilities, and the private sector;
2. The ability and expertise needed to leverage DOE funds into self-sustaining programs that effect long-term change;
3. Our model work with the city of Charlottesville; and
4. An outstanding team of technical experts who will support partner cities.

SEEA and its delivery team explained within this proposal are well positioned to take advantage of the creation of municipal based energy programs. Through our work over the last year prequalifying cities to ramp up energy programs as well as our model effort in Charlottesville, VA, the SEEA team sees this funding mechanism as our opportunity to move the southeast to an area of the country for model municipal programs. This proposal will document our sustained and continued effort to ensure cities have the resources and deployment venues to ensure that energy efficiency and renewable are embedded with the residential and commercial sectors. This stellar team of NGOs such as the Alliance to Save Energy and the Florida Solar Energy Center as well as resources such as GE to Siemens is fully ready to tackle energy programs across the region.

The Southeast Energy Efficiency Alliance (SEEA), acting on behalf of 30 cities and towns from Virginia to the Virgin Islands with a population of approximately 5.2 million, seeks to dramatically increase the effectiveness of building retrofits across the region with the significant assistance of $62 million from the Department of Energy's Retrofit Ramp-Up Solicitation. This proposal intends to transform the Southeast by achieving retrofit results at scale, creating a model for replication across the country. The population of the Southeast is growing more than twice as fast as the national average, driving a disproportionate growth in the region's demand for energy — upwards of 30% increase in demand over 20 years. Tempering the growth in demand is critically important to the Southeast's economy, environment, and energy security. Yet states and

utilities in this region now spend only one-fifth the national average, per capita, on energy efficiency programs.

Clearly, aggressive action is needed now. Our city partners have been planning and organizing for this opportunity since February 2009, when SEEA challenged cities to make extraordinary commitments to energy efficiency programming and infrastructure with a $500,000 competitive solicitation and award.[1] Fifteen communities from six states tendered applications, based on hundreds of hours of work in meetings, planning, research, and negotiations with utilities and city councils and partnership-building. Charlottesville, Atlanta, Jacksonville, and Charleston are in the process of implementing energy efficiency programs based on the SEEA solicitation and preparation for the bid. The best components of those 15 applications are represented by the cities in this proposal, complemented by some communities that have made comparable commitments over the past six months. In the interim period of award of this proposal by DOE, SEEA will continue its effort working on the implementation of many of these programs with support from foundation dollars. SEEA has already granted Charlottesville, VA $500,000 for project implementation and will support other cities with $450,000 in foundation support for other community work.

Our team for this proposal includes the following:

Atlanta, GA	Decatur, GA
Albemarle County, VA	Hampton Roads Planning District (16 VA municipalities)
Carrboro, NC	Huntsville, AL
Celebration, FL	Jacksonville, FL
Chapel Hill, NC	Nashville, TN
Charlotte, NC	New Orleans, LA
Charleston, SC	U.S. Virgin Islands
Charlottesville, VA	Woodbury, TN

Since last June, we have worked with many of our local government partners which are implementing their proposals, modeled after best practices in Cambridge, MA; Berkeley, CA; Babylon, NY and elsewhere, by utilizing their formulaic EECBG funds to advance their plans. Deploying those funds is a criterion for inclusion among the communities in this proposal. The criteria for award and activities sought in the DOE solicitation are remarkably similar to those in the SEEA February 2009 solicitation, won by Charlottesville/Albemarle County, VA. Indeed, the vastly greater resources promised by the DOE Retrofit Ramp-up Solicitation offer a pathway to accelerate our schedule, build our capabilities, expand our reach, and demonstrate a model for the Southeast and beyond. This proposal will include the programmatic efforts of two classes of communities. For the purpose of the proposal, we have classified communities as Tier I and II. Attributes of each classification are as follows:

Tier I Community: Community that responded to the SEEA RFP in February 2009 and has created a comprehensive approach through a public and private partnership to deploy energy programs on day one of funding. These communities have the strategic plan completed and have leveraged and engaged the utility, financial, political, community, and service sector for comprehensive program offering. These cities include Atlanta, Albemarle County, Charleston,

[1] Information on the competition and the City proposals is available at http://www.seealliance.org/programs/cities_proposals.php .

Charlottesville, Decatur, Hampton Roads District, Huntsville, Jacksonville, New Orleans, Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and the US Virgin Islands.

Tier II Community: Community has committed to the criteria of the SEEA RRP (30-50% market deployment; and 20-40% energy savings per facility within a community) but is in the process of developing the resource and delivery infrastructure. SEEA will work with these communities to leverage experience with other cities such as Charlottesville to move these cities into quick implementation. These cities include Nashville, Woodbury, Charlotte, and Celebration. More detail will follow about both of the Tiers and plan forward.

I. Merit Review Criteria Discussion

The solicitation requires applicants to address separately each of the criteria below in our response:

- Leveraging and Sustainability 25%
- Project Impact 25%
- Project Approach 25%
- Partnership Structure and Capabilities 25%
- Other criteria include Building Code Adoption, ARRA promotion, PACE implementation

Since we believe the key distinguishing characteristics of our region-wide response address two or more of these five criteria simultaneously, we introduce first these outstanding attributes and then provide a tabular display with weightings reflecting how much we believe each attribute contributes to a high score for each criterion.

Leveraging Success Across a Region

1. Goals Statement Embracing the Critical Elements of a Successful Community Energy Program. This statement is in two parts: (1) the major commitments sought in the SEEA February RFP[2] that requires local resources; and (2) a commitment to seek policies and resources from state energy offices and governors.

All of our community partners have completed a planning process and level of commitment, well before the DOE solicitation was released which positions our cities beyond a two-month period since the release of the FOA. We realized the limitations of what a community can do alone and emphasized the importance of gaining committed partners from state energy offices, utilities, and governors. This is particularly important in the Southeast, because our historic utility incentive programs and experience in delivery of energy efficiency programs lag behind much of the rest of the nation. Statewide passage of PACE financing programs, building codes, and benchmarking of public buildings is important. So too is the dramatic expansion of utility incentives, requiring PUC mandates.

2. **Commitment of Local Resources.** We qualified communities to join our proposal only after they agreed to recommit both their resources in their SEEA solicitation last spring, PLUS at least 25% of their formulaic EECBG allocation and could prove that they could meet the 5:1 match requirement. The resources in the original bids are extensive, incorporating specific commitments from city governments, local utilities, universities, school systems, energy services companies, neighborhood groups, and other community organizations.

[2] http://www.seealliance.org/programs/cities.php

3. Threshold Allocation of Resources, then Pay for Performance. SEEA and its team have agreed to an innovative funding allocation formula designed to protect DOE's investment, maximize leverage, incentivize community implementation efforts, and provide an opportunity for new communities to participate a year from now. The funding allocation and initial distribution of DOE funds, if we are successful and if acceptable to DOE, would proceed as follows:

- Participating communities provide three- year estimates of customers served by end use (residential, commercial and industrial, public buildings);
- Communities project average customer investment by end use, and resulting savings;
- Communities divide total investment by 6 to reflect 5:1 leveraging ratio;
- Communities submit metrics to SEEA for review for feasibility of assumptions, given known program design, marketing plan, financing options, etc;
- SEEA provides communities with total adjusted allocation to seek in proposal;
- If award is made, each community is provided one-quarter of allocation, reflecting first-year budget, to cover start-up costs and early participant incentive. Staffing, consultants, marketing plans, collateral materials, establishment of financing programs and customer incentives projected for first year are included;
- An advisory panel, comprised of three SEEA Board members and a DOE representative (to be invited), will assess progress toward milestones for each community, based on clear criteria announced at beginning of grant period;
- Second-year allocations will be made according to progress in meeting first-year milestones; up to $10 million may be reallocated, with DOE permission, following issuance of late fall 2010 solicitation to new cities; and
- Third-year allocations--if acceptable to DOE-- will follow same process, enabling the most successful communities to access budgets larger than original allocation by exceeding their customer participation, investment level, and savings projections.

4. Shared Themes, Resources, and Economies of Scale. SEEA and its strategic team will provide such items as collateral marketing materials, a regional bank selected through a region-wide solicitation, consumer rebates/marketing assistance/service delivery, recognition programs, and tracking of savings protocol common to all cities. SEEA and its team of resources identified in Section V and Appendix F will collaborate to provide the following for all of their cities, when requested:[3]

- A marketing plan second to none in its creativity, breadth, branding, usage of all distribution channels;
- A marketing team for the region procured competitively by SEEA;
- A strong customer recognition program;
- A strong regional or national lending resource to provide financing region-wide, procured competitively (with local option to contract);
- One organization with a focus to coordinate all parties and assure that best practices are communicated to all participants;
- A strong M&V plan to track customer and utility usage pre- and post participation;
- Leverage procurement of EE/RE product suppliers such as GE, Cree, and Honeywell.
- Lobbying, state, local policy support
- Annual Conference of Partnering Cities: SEEA plans to host monthly conference calls with cities, each focused on a common theme or challenge. Secondly, the Cambridge Energy Alliance in collaboration with SEEA and Emerald Cities will be tasked to host an

[3] These are in addition to the customized resources available from SEEA partners, detailed in V. Roles of Participants.

annual conference for all participant cities. This monthly communication and annual conference will improve the pace at which the transmission of best practices proceeds.

5. The Best Resource Team in the Nation. SEEA assembled the best resource team to meet all of DOE's goals — leveraging and sustainability, project impact, project approach, and partnership structure and capabilities. Many of our member communities have also retained local consultants to meet particular needs.[4]

6. The Emphasis on Affordable, Accessible Financing Program Availability. Cities without financing programs which are affordable, accessible and available to all building sectors cannot meet DOE's leveraging goals or impact expectations. In the intermediate term, we believe this requires a combination of widespread energy performance contracting PLUS either on-bill financing or PACE, or both. In the short run, revolving loan funds and third-party financing can bridge the transition. First, we must list the options:

- **PACE financing**: offers long-term financing which can remain within property, enabling longer payback measures, larger project financing for small customers.
- **On-Bill financing**: offered by gas, electric, or water utilities, offers convenient, accessible for shorter term financing of utility fuels; can be expanded to cover non-utility fuels with third-party financing.
- **Third-party financing**: describes wide array of conventional loan programs, including many offered by utilities through supporting lenders.
- **Energy Performance Contracting financing**: often called project finance, is available as tax-exempt municipal lease most common to public and nonprofit institutions; confined to public and institutional buildings by practice, but has potential in large C&I sector.
- **Revolving Loan Funds**: often seeded with public dollars, mixed with third-party financing to offer subsidized interest rates; the bridge to preferable PAC and on-bill programs for most cities.

It is also important to note that new bond offerings can be utilized to fund or underwrite any of these options, with the advantage of lower interest costs: chief among these are bond options created by the federal government, including Qualified Energy Conservation Bonds, Clean Renewable Energy Bonds (CREBs), Qualified School Construction Bonds, and Build America Bonds, which can either be structured as tax exempt bonds or as municipal leases. The Communities will use these resources in addition to those above to financially support the energy programs that are created.

Our communities will administer financing products that are: (1) accessible; (2) affordable; (3) highly availability; (4) flexible; (5) feasible; and (6) accommodate lender concerns.

- **Accessibility** speaks to the convenience or "absence of hassle" associated with customer use of the debt instrument, such as that afforded by loan servicing using an existing billing system.
- **Affordability** addresses primarily the interest rate, with a goal of less than 5-6% per annum, and the term of repayment, since consumers focus on monthly payments, which ideally would be less than projected savings.
- **Maximum availability** means that creditworthiness issues are ameliorated to the extent possible so that widespread participation in a financing program is possible.

[4] We elaborate on the allocation of responsibilities among these region-wide technical partners in V. Roles of Participants.

- **Flexibility** addresses the variability of payment terms in years, up to 15 where possible; it also encompasses issues such as comprehensiveness of measures allowed, prepayment penalties, balloon payments, a range of collateral options, and other factors.
- **Feasibility** addresses the likely political acceptance, regulatory approval, funding availability, and administrative burden associated with features of some one or more of these options.
- **Lender concerns** address the host of issues which bracket a financing entity's willingness to move forward with a new product: collateral, establishing creditworthiness, verification of savings, transaction costs, average loan size and participation rates, recognition, and credit enhancement opportunities are key factors.

We will seek to assure that each of our communities establishes an adequate loss loan reserve to make whichever options are selected accessible, particularly in this period of uncommonly tight credit. It is helpful that DOE has decided that EECBG funds can be utilized for loan loss reserves. Each community will do this carefully and responsibly. There are additional issues on which financing advice to cities is important to introduce:

- **Eligible Customers**: Vulnerable, hard-to-reach customers must have access: affordable housing, nonprofit-owned buildings, small commercial, owner-occupied fit this category.
- **Loan Thresholds and Terms**: Some guidance: 10-12 year term maximum (20 years for renewable, CHP), minimum loan $1/sq ft.; maximum $10/sq ft; interest rate would be zero for buildings below 20,000 sq ft; 2-3% for larger buildings; collateral should be limited to equipment itself for revolving loans where possible.
- **Eligible Measures**: Offer preference to electrically-heated customers. Include measures in gut rehabilitation.
- **Utility Audit Requirement**: A community might offer an incentive for taking the audit by increasing loan amount or decreasing the interest rate by 50 basis points. We might also ask participants to sign utility billing data waivers so the city can track pre and post-consumption. Any customer not achieving a minimum of 10% savings must pay down the loan two years earlier.
- **Marketing the Program:** We will facilitate a joint marketing campaign with the local utility and the city sponsor. It is very difficult to launch any new loan program, and even more difficult to gain participation in today's market. Therefore, marrying this program to an existing utility program or billing system, or an independent NPO agency, is advisable.

The table below represents our attempt to weigh the importance of each of our six distinguishing program attributes against DOE's four criteria. We argue, for example, that our Shared Themes & Resources and Critical Program Elements have a strong bearing on all four of the DOE criteria; Our Pay for Performance incentive strategy affects two of DOE's four critically, as do the others.

ATTRIBUTES and DOE CRITERIA

	Leveraging and Sustainability	Project Impact	Project Approach	Partnership Structure, Capabilities
Critical Program Elements	4	4	3	4
Local Resources Committed	4	4	2	4
Threshold, Pay for Performance	4	4	1	1
Shared Themes, Resources, Economies of Scale	4	4	4	4
Resource Team	3	4	3	3

Financing Accessibility, Affordability	4	4	4	2
Other	Project Milestones, Budget	Project Milestones, Budget	NEPA Compliance	Project Milestones, Budget

Scoring: 1: Not Critical; 2: Some Importance; 3 Important; 4 Very Important

II. Addressing Key Challenges Effectively

We have identified the following five challenges to successfully increasing energy efficiency at the state and local levels:

• Split incentives	• Uncertainty of whom to trust
• Short time horizons	• Complex decision-making structures
• Lack of knowledge	

These challenges are intensified today by both a shortage of capital and owners' disinterest in incurring debt. Furthermore, we do not yet have the utility incentives infrastructure found in the Northeast, Wisconsin, California, or the Northwest. We do have PACE laws in three states—Virginia, North Carolina, and Louisiana — and PACE legislation is pending in several others. To bridge the gap, most of our cities will feature revolving loan funds with healthy loan loss reserves over the next 18 months. While program designs will vary, all our communities have committed to address the following major historical shortcomings in utility and community programs:

Problem	**Response**
1. Recruitment of customers	▪ Local effort/volunteer canvass ▪ Multi-media campaign and branding ▪ Introductions from local organizations
2. Motivating customers to implement	▪ Social: Recognition program, competitions, emotional connection via partners, social marketing methods, small first steps support ▪ Financial: Pay for performance utility pilots
3. Mitigating transaction hurdle (moving beyond audit measures)	▪ Residential, small business advisors ▪ Contractor training for audit ▪ Project management
4. Financing (long-term, creditworthiness, custom to market subsector)	▪ PACE and other on-bill financing ▪ Combined water, electric, gas financing ▪ Revolving loan funds with loan loss reserves and loan guarantees
5. Workforce development (shortages, competency)	▪ Accurate forecasts inform contractor training and certification
6. Lack of coordination for items 1-5 above	▪ Single agency focus: create a nonprofit or quasi-public agency to oversee program activities
7. Eventual program self-reliance	▪ Aggregated demand response payments ▪ Carbon offset monetization ▪ Customer co-pay fees ▪ Utility marketing contracts
8. Special issues (serving nonprofits, public housing, split incentives)	▪ Deeper incentives ▪ Green leases ▪ Mandatory benchmarking ▪ Competitions

III. Project Plan and Timetable

PROGRAM DESIGN

Section V, Roles of Participants, speaks to the kind of program we intend to run in our communities: the mobilization of the nation's experts in targeted areas of program design, community marketing, services delivery, workforce development, and monitoring, verification and evaluation will provide invaluable guidance. The way we have structured the budget allocations on a pay-for-performance basis and our commitment to communicating best practices—embodied in our organizational structure for managing the project—also speaks to our emphasis on solid program design and innovative implementation. Finally, our requirement that communities work closely with their state energy offices, utilities, governor's office, and state legislatures—with our expert assistance—speaks forcefully to our understanding that communities cannot act successfully by themselves.

Geographic and Building Targets: All communities in this application will serve small (1-4 units) and large residential, small (<200kW) and large commercial and, and public buildings.

- **Residential (1-4 units):** Provide one-stop shop services that promote efficiency through large-scale community outreach and social networking, behavior change, technology solutions, and building improvements. The program will be supported by a contractor network and a sustainable financing mechanism as well as leverage Weatherization Assistance Programs (WAP). Resources such as Honeywell, GE, and Siemens have a multitude of experience in the residential efficiency market.

- **Residential Multifamily:** Our cities have a disproportionately large number of multifamily units. Several of our cities will fund multifamily projects in year one. Others will fund multifamily projects until year two due to the split incentive and short time horizon barriers that will delay program start-ups in most communities by one year. We will work closely with our local utilities to create program designs that benefit both tenants and building owners, offering incentives for prescriptive measures and offering grants to low-income tenants. Integration with WAP providers to expand WAP to multifamily buildings is a priority. Performance contracting will be employed for buildings with 50+ units.

- **Nonprofit Program:** Many cities will develop a Non Profit Organizations (NPO) audit, retrofit, and incentive program. The DOE grant will enable us to serve larger nonprofits, such as schools and hospitals, and facilitate Energy Saving Performance Contracts (ESPCs). Two such examples are the Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP) that has been established in Charlottesville, VA (http://leap-va.org/); and the Green Jobs Alliance in Hampton Roads, VA (http://greenjobsalliance.org/).

- **Small commercial:** The same one-stop shop services will also be directed to small commercial customers (less than 200 kW). A similar large-scale community outreach marketing approach will be implemented, focused initially on lighting and behavioral actions. Other major measures, including HVAC, refrigeration, controls, and envelope will be promoted with the support of local utility incentives and contractor networks. Some cities will pay special attention to nonprofit agencies as special focus.

- **Large Commercial/Institutional:** Many of our cities will offer a two-phase approach. The first phase consists of a community mobilization program combined with efforts to

dramatically increase the level of participation in energy efficiency of large commercial and industrial energy consumers by relying on education, training, and low-cost and behavioral measures. The second phase consists of investment-grade audits and major-measure retrofits, including the utilization of energy performance contracting, where appropriate.

- **Public Sector:** The leveraging of existing EECBG funds with energy performance contracting will be the major emphasis. Behavioral and low-cost/no-cost strategies for facility managers and occupants will receive attention as well. Additionally, for the public sector as well as the others, SEEA brings to the cities leverage on bulk procurement of EE/RE technologies.

Community Outreach and Marketing Plan: We are departing from conventional outreach and marketing. Each applicant city has a single organization that is responsible for coordinating all major program elements. . An outreach and marketing strategy will be customized for each community, community organizing principles, and multimedia approaches—including door-to-door canvasses—will be employed in all partner cities. Bill stuffers, billboards, telemarketing, direct mail, and community group approaches, too, will be part of the strategy. Resources such as Cox Communications will provide in kind media services in cities like Atlanta, Decatur, and Hampton Roads, VA as well as others. Each city has a strong partnership with the local utilities and will be collaborating on consistent and joint messaging. An emphasis on cooperating closely with the local utility will be a hallmark of our approach, to ensure that messages are consistent and delivered jointly where possible. In addition to a nationally prominent advertising firm, we intend to utilize Smart Power, OPower, Earth Aid, and the Alliance to Save Energy to craft branding, messaging, and collateral materials with common themes for most of our partner communities, and a strong recognition program will be developed for all classes of participants. Leadership councils by industry segment will be organized for large C&I customers, mostly in the second year of program operation. The value proposition focuses initially on cost reduction, but it also includes keeping up with the neighbors, improving the environment, and being more comfortable. The availability of an accessible, affordable financing program for each market segment makes the value propositions more compelling.

Service Delivery: Each community prescribes its own services delivery system. In the residential sector, a combination of formal audits, expanded weatherization initiatives such as Home Performance with Energy Star, and walk-throughs will be employed. The comprehensive residential programs including those above will be marketed heavily and will include neighborhood canvasses, which will also include solicitations for a formal audit program by each city. In most cities, the local utility is paying for part or all of building visits to small building owners. Where communities have an existing contractor delivery structure associated with the local utility programs, it will be utilized. But we will intervene in most communities with a contractor arranging service, to follow up initial audits and utility-provided contractor visits. In most communities, HVAC and lighting firms serving small firms will be prequalified through a certification or quality control commitment process. The SEEA team will provide to each city an owner's agent as a resource to motivate all public facilities and large institutional buildings to consider energy performance contracting. As part of that service, we would assist the prequalifying of buildings and the managing of a competitive RFP process for selection of ESCOs. In many cases, the owner's agent will also assist in the management of the performance contract itself, from audit to implementation.

Workforce Development: The shortage of a competent, well trained and certified workforce—especially in building auditing, air sealing, HVAC and controls technologies—has hampered

program delivery from California to New England. We will replicate the NYSERDA model of financial support to both trainers and participants in workforce training. We rely heavily on our local community colleges and workforce development agencies to deliver the training. We will initially work with all of our communities to assess accurately the training needs of the contractor community, in part by working directly with local contractor associations. We will also endeavor to forecast accurately labor needs—a shortcoming of many local and regional programs today. Our inclusion of Emerald Cities on our assistance team brings a strong value-added component to the efforts of every community. The participation of the Florida Solar Energy Center (FSEC) in our proposal reflects our commitment to delivering uniform, high quality training across the region. Emerald Cities and FSEC will assess workforce training issues in each of our communities and help local training centers in each to establish quality programs. Charlottesville's initial focus on training quality residential auditors and HVAC contractors through Piedmont Community College is representative of the efforts all communities will undertake. Because the Southeast starts out further behind than most other regions in this area, our offering of resources from the most skilled organizations to all communities will be a major boost to workforce development efforts across the region.

Monitoring, Verification, & Evaluation: SEEA and its cities will meet these requirements by using uniform M&V protocols and a web-based system for collecting and reporting both program activity and customer energy use and savings. We will utilize the same system and methodology for all of our communities. Monitoring and verification will be conducted using rigorous, established protocols such as the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol ("PMPV"). SEEA and its resource team, Peregrine Energy Group, Siemens, Honeywell, Shaw Group, and utilities will establish uniform protocols for the program, and require that each project have an approved M&V plan. This will ensure that savings are measured accurately and consistently by all program participants.

To enable consistent reporting and feedback, SEEA will assure that all of our city partners will incorporate all individual project data into a central database. There, we will calculate total savings, GHG emission reductions, jobs created, and progress compared to goals. This will ensure that those metrics are calculated consistently across all of the individual projects, and will enable us to track and report progress for the program as a whole, and for specific sectors and individual program participants. We will create a secure, user-friendly data entry interface for program members to use to bring data into this central database. This will streamline the data collection process and enable more frequent data updates, and therefore more frequent reporting and feedback. Regular reporting and feedback is essential to enable continuous improvement over the course of the program. SEEA will enforce a requirement that all communities provide detailed progress reports to our team using a secure, web-based reporting tool. This tool will report all program metrics, including energy saved, customers served, dollars invested and leveraged, GHG emissions avoided, and jobs created. This frequent, detailed reporting and feedback will keep all program members focused on the goals and show us what is working well and what isn't, providing just the information that we need to consistently improve the program over time.

SEEA communities will also track energy use and savings by all individual customers participating in the program, and will report that information in aggregate to all stakeholders and on an individual basis to the customers themselves. We will work with every local utility to streamline the data collection process by developing an electronic data transfer protocol that will both address customer privacy issues and allow for the efficient transfer of very large amounts of data. We will report the data using an existing, secure, web-based reporting tool wherever possible.

Financing: The keys to success in our program implementations are the availability of affordable, accessible, market-responsive financing. In the intermediate term, that is either PACE or on-bill financing, or both. The availability of these two forms of financing is key to the eventual financial self-reliance of our programs. Customer co-payments (3-4% transaction fees), demand response payments, utility marketing contracts, and eventual carbon payments are the sources. We will assist each community in crafting a plan that meets the test of financial self-reliance once the grant funding is exhausted. In the short term, both revolving loan funds and conventional financing will be required. For the large MUSH (municipalities, universities, schools, and hospitals) sector, project financing for performance contracts will be required. Our resources such as Wells Fargo, GE, Honeywell, Siemens, EGIA, and others in the local communities have devised innovative methods to overcome most financing barriers to market penetration of EE/RE technology and programs. The availability of Qualified Energy Conservation bonds and other new federal bond offerings will a new mechanism for the cities and lower the interest rates available in our communities. Resources such as HarcourtBrown and Renewable Funding bring the best financing minds in the country to assist our communities. We will put special emphasis on establishing loan loss reserves and other credit enhancements to address the issue of accessibility. Each city implementing a loan program will set aside funds for the loan loss reserve. In addition, Wells Fargo has provided the opportunity to lend up to $750 Million for energy efficiency programs throughout our communities. SEEA and its partner communities will begin to work with Wells Fargo upon program implementation and DOE funding award.

The following are descriptions of the **specific tasks** required to make this network of municipal Energy Alliances work:

TASK 1. Sustainable Design -***Establish, in each SEEA Partner City, the permanent EE/RE organization that will manage the marketing, financing, and contracting innovations required to sustain a commercially self-supporting enterprise.*** The SEEA Team is committed to long-term sustainable jobs and environmental benefits, based on a marketable value proposition and permanent market transformation. This can be achieved only through municipal organizations that combine public sponsorship and governance with private, entrepreneurial management — this could be a new or an existing NPO, a new or existing city agency, or a statutory authority. The criteria for making that decision include management autonomy, access to stakeholders, public recognition/support, management and marketing ability, financing access, technical and contracting sophistication, and others to be developed locally.

Task 1 will being on Day 1 and run the entire 6 years of this plan. It begins by incorporating best practices from the many cities in which the SEEA team has worked, continues by learning from doing in each unique city's structure and dynamic, and concludes with multi-media case studies and new best-practice documentation through electronic and other media outlets.

The financial opportunities of EE/RE vary from city to city, but in every case they will be built on two economic areas:

1. Reducing the waste and delivering the ancillary benefits—at no cost to customers—constitutes the SEEA Value Proposition, which can sustain a long-term enterprise in all the partner cities. Average potential savings around 30% are still available for retrofit capture. Moreover, the ancillary benefits to building owners and managers offer additive values: improved reliability of energy and water systems; increased facility value; greater comfort, security and safety; improved health and productivity; maintenance and replacement savings; and the marketing/PR benefits of "going green."

2. Commoditizing and trading "attributes" generated by our activities:

- Avoidance and/or reduction of penalties for excessive emissions, wastewater, sewage, and other waste streams from industrial and health-care processes;
- Forward electric capacity, reserves, real-time demand response, and other grid-related benefits of improved grid management and load profiles;
- Renewable-energy credits;
- Carbon offsets, voluntary and organized, including local partnerships of emitters with conservers;
- Local electric supply using cogeneration and district energy wherever grid congestion, balancing problems, spinning reserves, or local overloads prevail;
- Performance-based sale of metered demand-side efficiencies where less expensive than utility supplies, undergirded by regulatory "efficiency portfolio standards"; and
- Water supply and conservation, where less expensive than desalination and other treatment options.

TASK 2. Job and Capacity Creation- ***Establish the employment infrastructure to expand local delivery capacity for EE/RE improvements.***

Most job-creation estimates are related to capital investment and range from 10 to 30 new jobs per million dollars of investment. These jobs last only as long as the construction period. In the SEEA Partner Cities, a commitment to recruiting, training, credentialing, placing, and sustaining new and unemployed workers in permanent jobs is based on the permanent need for improved operation and maintenance skills. The best example may be the new profession of "Energy Watchperson," a concept based on the night-watchman job. The Energy Watchperson would pay frequent attention to operational details (settings, valves, filters, occupancy-related controls, leaks, replacements, etc). This role will have a favorable impact on cost and complaints as well as generate a significant demand for labor trained in this skill set.

TASK 3. Coordinated Financing and Marketing Options- ***Make available the most cost-effective financing options, tailored to the needs of each market sector and leveraged with private investment.***

In addition to the array of resources based on ratepayer charges and tax-based funding, larger amounts of private capital can be attracted to this program once the strength of its marketing and sponsorship are shown. This larger resource is based on monetizing savings streams and the selling EE/RE attributes. Recruiting and pre-qualification of ESCOs is one proven method. The program can also aggregate customers and link them directly to financing sources when the diagnostic and savings-guarantee functions of an ESCO are not required.

TASK 4. Allocations to Partner Cities and Agencies- ***Make allocation of EECBG funds to partner cities and agencies initially in accordance with formulas then based on performance.***

The allocation formulas and criteria are described in Section 1 and VII.

TASK 5. Aggressive Marketing- ***Provide marketing collateral materials, training, and direct participation in the innovative marketing program that will drive unprecedented customer participation in all market sectors.***

Direct sales efforts are necessarily local but are given their "punch" by the experienced SEEA marketing team, including:

- *Targeted public education.*
- *Strategies such as Recognition, awards, ratings, peer pressure, guilt.*
- *Performance-based incentives* (either buying reduced consumption from consumers or providing performance-based rebates and subsidies).

- *Displaying real-time cost.* A continuous awareness of the rate and cost of energy/water use is rare among consumers. Effective displays and alarms are now available at modest cost. Their impact on consumption (when coupled with other elements on this list) has been shown to be substantial.
- *Marketing Collaterals and the Value Proposition.*
- *Special-market offers and contracts.*
- *Consistent City Sponsorship.*
- *Consistent, expert, comprehensive, easily-accessed advice.*
- *Utility Collaboration*
- *Enlarged & Staffed Advisory Committees*

TASK 6. Quality Assurance- ***Set up an independent engineer to review designs, commission installations, oversee M&V of savings, and act as ombudsperson.***
On a structured sampling basis, the work of engineers, installers, vendors, and maintenance contractors can be monitored and corrected at an affordable cost. Both a seal of approval and a threat of disapproval can have substantial impact on quality. Quality Control agents can range from home-inspection contractors to large, independent engineering firms.

TASK 7. Contractor Pre-Qualification- ***Pre-qualify ESCOs and other contractors, impose transparent and fair contracts with customers, and require consistent fees.***
In consideration of market development work and city endorsement, contractors can be competitively pre-qualified and required to use transparent, fair, and competitively-priced contracts with customers. Templates of such contracts and RFPs will be available from SEEA.

TASK 8. Code Enforcement and Standards- ***Phase in new codes following a benchmarking program, and enforce both statutory and professional codes and standards.***
Existing codes and those in prospect are growing in consistency, comprehensiveness, and reach; but their enforcement remains in question. The codes carry a number of risks, especially if imposed without careful preparation of the other delivery elements. An orderly phasing in of code changes (including mandatory benchmarking and sub-metering), in concert with key stakeholders and integrated with the other delivery elements, will be required.

TASK 9. Measurement & Verification of Savings, Tracking, and Documentation- ***Set up professional, consistent, nationally-recognized methods of M&V; track progress, document.***
A rigorous, generally-recognized, and consistently-applied protocol of savings measurement and verification, conversion to carbon-footprint reduction, and comparison to established targets will be necessary. It need not be dull: public events, awards, multi-media presentations, and celebrity participation can be the "frosting" on the data "cake." Software and display programs that can handle this process are widely available, some of which the SEEA team has pioneered for municipal EE and RE tracking. Below in Table 1 represents the tasks and work plan for this proposal.