



# Los Angeles County, California, Summary of Reported Data From July 1, 2010 – September 30, 2013

## Better Buildings Neighborhood Program



Report Produced By:  
U.S. Department of Energy  
June 2014

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This document presents a summary of data reported by an organization awarded federal financial assistance (e.g., grants, cooperative agreements) through the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) Better Buildings Neighborhood Program (BBNP) from July 2010 or September 2010 through September 30, 2013. Although some awards have been extended into 2014, only the data reported through the end of September 2013 are included in this document.

We would like to thank the BBNP recipients who submitted these data, reviewed the information in this document, and provided revisions. We appreciate their perseverance and patience with the reporting process.

We would also like to thank Rebecca Ciraulo and Aayush Daftari at Navigant Consulting and Dave Roberts and Mike Heaney at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) for compiling the quarterly information and the graphs and tables for this report.

Please contact Dale Hoffmeyer at [betterbuildings@ee.doe.gov](mailto:betterbuildings@ee.doe.gov) with any questions about this report.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Los Angeles County, California, Summary of Reported Data ..... 1**
  - 1.1 Introduction ..... 1
  - 1.2 Source of Data ..... 3
  - 1.3 Data Quality ..... 4
  - 1.4 Funding Synopsis ..... 5
  - 1.5 Program Design Synopsis..... 6
  - 1.6 Driving Demand Synopsis ..... 7
  - 1.7 Financing Synopsis..... 9
  - 1.8 Workforce Development Synopsis ..... 11
  - 1.9 Estimated Energy Savings Synopsis ..... 13
    - 1.9.1. Estimated Lifetime Energy Savings per Upgrade Analysis ..... 14
- APPENDIX A: Glossary of Terms ..... 17**
- APPENDIX B: Methodology to Calculate Source Energy Savings..... 22**
- APPENDIX C: Lifetime Energy Savings Calculations ..... 24**

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA



# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

Awardee Number	Recipient Name	State	Total Grant
3562	Los Angeles County	California	\$30,000,000 <sup>1</sup>

## 1.1 Introduction

This document presents a summary of data reported by an organization awarded federal financial assistance (e.g., grants, cooperative agreements) by DOE's BBNP from July 2010 or September 2010 through September 30, 2013. Although some awards were extended into 2014, only the data reported through the end of September 2013 are included in this document.

This document is not an evaluation of the recipient's BBNP program or a final report of the recipient's activities. The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of data reported quarterly by recipients. As the programmatic and building upgrade project data reported quarterly by each recipient is released, it will be available on the BBNP website at <http://energy.gov/eere/better-buildings-neighborhood-program/progress>. This report may be useful to researchers and others who plan to study what recipients reported.

This document, and one like it for each BBNP award recipient, follows a similar structure with graphs and tables. Each document includes the following sections: Funding Synopsis, Program Design Synopsis, Driving Demand Synopsis, Financing Synopsis, Workforce Development Synopsis, and Energy Savings Synopsis. A similar document showing results from all BBNP recipients titled *Better Buildings Neighborhood Program Summary of Reported Data* is also available on the [BBNP website](#).

Two additional sources of information may be useful to researchers interested in the accomplishments of BBNP award recipients. The first is an independent evaluation of BBNP conducted by Research Into Action, NMR Group, Nexant, and Evergreen Economics. A [Preliminary Process and Market Evaluation](#) report was released in December 2012, and a [Preliminary Energy Savings Impact Evaluation](#) report was released in November 2013. Final reports will be released in 2014 and 2015. Second, as the recipient's final technical report is completed, it will be available online on the [BBNP website](#). The final technical report was written by the recipient and contains more detailed information about the recipient's

---

<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Award Summary (2013), Recovery.gov, Accessed June 2014: <http://www.recovery.gov/arra/Transparency/RecoveryData/pages/RecipientProjectSummary508.aspx?AwardIdSu r=102592>.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

accomplishments and lessons learned. Some recipients conducted independent evaluations of their programs, and the final technical report is a source for locating those evaluations.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.2 Source of Data

BBNP included 34 (i.e., 25 Topic 1 and 9 Topic 2) competitively awarded Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA or Recovery Act)-funded [Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grants](#) (EECBGs) and 7 competitively awarded FY10-funded [State Energy Program](#) (SEP) cooperative agreements. Topic 1 EECBGs were awarded at the beginning of June 2010, Topic 2 EECBGs were awarded in August 2010, and SEP agreements were awarded in October 2010. The first Quarterly Program Reports were due from recipients for Q4-2010 (grant start date through December 30, 2010) regardless of when the awards occurred.

All BBNP financial assistance agreements were originally set to expire between May and September 30, 2013. Four EECBGs awards were completed in 2013 (i.e., Toledo, Ohio; Connecticut; Omaha, Nebraska; and University Park, Maryland). The remaining agreements were modified to expire in 2014. For awards with an extended expiration date, the BBNP spending in this report will not equal the total awarded amount.

Organizations that received federal financial assistance under BBNP were required to submit a quarterly Federal Financial Report (SF-425), DOE Progress Report, and a BBNP Program Report. Most of the information in this document is based on recipient's' BBNP Program Report submissions. A copy of the BBNP Program Report (Excel Template) may be obtained by emailing [betterbuildings@ee.doe.gov](mailto:betterbuildings@ee.doe.gov). Recipients were also given the option to submit Program Report information via XML Web service.

EECBG awards were funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA or Recovery Act). All federal recipients of ARRA funds were required to submit quarterly ARRA reports, in addition to agency-specific reports, via the ARRA federal reporting website. Information reported under the authority of ARRA is available on [www.recovery.gov](http://www.recovery.gov). Estimated job creation information in this report was obtained from [www.recovery.gov](http://www.recovery.gov).

EECBG (34) and SEP (7) awards had slightly different mandatory reporting requirements for BBNP Quarterly Program Reports. For example, reporting job hours worked was mandatory for EECBG awards and voluntary for SEP. Reporting workers trained and certified was mandatory for SEP awards and voluntary for EECBG. Reporting the number of active contractors performing building upgrades under the program was mandatory for EECBG awards and voluntary for SEP.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.3 Data Quality

The data summary provided in this document is based on information recipients formally submitted to DOE using the BBNP Quarterly Program Report or ARRA report (EECBG only). Recipients reported quarterly totals for some information like spending, estimated energy savings, assessments completed, and workers trained or certified. Information like invoiced cost and loan amount was reported for each upgrade project. A total invoiced cost or loan amount is obtained from summing all the values reported for each upgrade project record that included this information. Estimated energy savings was reported as a total for the quarter and an estimate was reported for each upgrade project. Where appropriate, the percent or quantity of upgrade projects that had complete information has been indicated. These upgrade project records were used to determine some values in the figures and tables.

The data reported by recipients may include three types of errors: non-response, incorrect response, or processing errors.

**Non-Response:** Although some data in the BBNP Program Report was mandatory and other information was optional, not all recipients consistently reported the mandatory data elements. Missing mandatory data elements can be characterized as not available, not applicable, or not reported.

**Incorrect Response:** Data reported by recipients could be incorrect because the requested information was not understood; there was a lack of attention to detail; or information was misrepresented.

**Processing Errors:** Data reported could also be incorrect because of errors introduced when extracting the data from Program Reports and loading it into a central database. Processing errors can also be introduced when querying the central database to provide summary information.

DOE made several attempts to ask recipients to provide missing information and to verify the information that was reported. For example, recipients were provided a summary of what had been reported and a list of data quality issues following each quarterly reporting period, along with numerous requests to correct errors.




# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.4 Funding Synopsis

Los Angeles County, California, received a \$30,000,000 EECBG. This award included nine sub-grants to other communities including the Association of Bay Area Governments (Oakland), California Center for Sustainable Energy (San Diego), and Sacramento Municipal Utility District. Figure 1 shows total recipient expenditures, other federal expenditures,<sup>2</sup> and non-federal expenditures<sup>3</sup> (e.g., leveraged spending) compared to the total investment in building upgrades (reported as invoiced cost). The total investment in building upgrades exceeded BBNP spending, and only 86% of reported upgrade projects included invoiced cost information.

**Figure 1. Los Angeles County Cumulative Expenditures and Upgrade Invoiced Costs**



The pie chart in Figure 1 shows recipient-reported spending by category. Thirty-seven percent of BBNP spending was for marketing and outreach activities, and 63% for other program expenses.

<sup>2</sup> Other federal expenditures may include additional federal financial assistance award funds or loans from DOE or another federal agency.

<sup>3</sup> Non-federal expenditures may include third-party, in-kind contributions and the portion of the costs of a federally assisted project or program not borne by the federal government. This should include building owner contributions to building upgrade project cost.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.5 Program Design Synopsis

In order to make energy efficiency upgrades as simple and clear as possible for the 10 million people living in Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles County Office of Sustainability made a decision early on to promote a single, regional residential efficiency program. With 78 of the 88 cities in Los Angeles County on board, work proceeded on a unified program name and website. The California Energy Commission took it one step further and made Energy Upgrade California a statewide, whole-house efficiency program, supported by a statewide Web portal, which Los Angeles County agreed to support through grant funding.

Covering 58 counties, Energy Upgrade California combined utility and local government rebates, statewide and local financing options, and training and scholarships for professionals into one easy-to-use, searchable, customizable website. Los Angeles County and its partners throughout the state provided pilot programs tailored to meet the needs of specific communities and neighborhoods while searching for successful, replicable, scalable models to increase the number of upgrades.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.6 Driving Demand Synopsis

Energy Upgrade California BBNP partners promoted energy efficiency upgrades through paid advertising, at community events, and through media relations. An Energy Champion program was devised to promote the program through non-governmental, community-based organizations.

The Los Angeles County program also held a competition for homes to receive upgrades, which drew more than 1,400 applicants and resulted in more than 10,000 website hits. Twenty finalists were selected to receive a free energy assessment. In addition, five homes were selected to receive extensive energy efficiency upgrades, and one winner received a near-net-zero upgrade package. Of the 1,400 applicants, approximately 1,000 indicated that they were willing to be contacted by a participating contractor to discuss energy efficiency upgrades, even if they didn't win. These qualified leads were distributed among the contractors for follow up. In addition, all applicants were sent a coupon redeemable for \$200 on completion of an energy upgrade.

With such a large service area, Energy Upgrade California expected energy experts and other stakeholders, such as local cities and real estate agents, to use their established marketing channels to encourage energy upgrades. With the understanding that contractors often do not have the time or experience to create their own marketing plans or tools, the program developed an online resource center with customizable marketing kits for contractors and other stakeholders. Frequent networking events for participating contractors also provided speakers and training on specific aspects of marketing and program administration.

Energy Upgrade California established an online, print-on-demand center for Energy Upgrade California Participating Contractors to print program marketing materials. Certain materials could be ordered free of charge, while other customized pieces were eligible for co-op matching funds. The marketing pieces raised visibility of home improvement professionals, helped homeowners find qualified contractors, and ensured a consistent message about the program.


Figure 2 shows the cumulative energy assessments and upgrades reported by Los Angeles County from all building sectors through September 30, 2013, and the estimated annual source energy savings<sup>4</sup> (right axis).

---

<sup>4</sup> Source energy, also called primary energy, is the amount of fossil fuels and electricity plus the losses associated with the production of electricity (i.e., losses that occur in the generation, transmission, and distribution). Total estimated source energy savings was calculated by DOE. See Appendix B.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

Figure 2. Los Angeles County Assessments, Upgrades, and Estimated Savings<sup>5</sup>



	Residential Single-Family	Residential Multi-Family Units	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Agricultural Buildings
Assessments	1481	16783	781	0	0
Upgrades	3913	580	273	0	0

<sup>5</sup> The dramatic increase in assessments in 2012 was caused by delays in receiving data from the investor owned utilities.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.7 Financing Synopsis

Table 1 shows the grant funding investments in revolving loan funds (RLFs), loan loss reserves (LLRs), or interest rate buy-down (IRBDs).

**Table 1. Financing Investments and Results (Through September 30, 2013)**

<b>Financing Investments and Results (Through 9/30/13)<sup>6</sup></b>	
RLF (Commercial)	\$0
RLF (Residential)	\$0
Percent of Total Award Invested in RLF	0%
LLR (Multi-Sector)	\$0
LLR (Commercial)	\$0
<b>LLR (Residential)</b>	<b>\$520,000</b>
Percent of Total Award Invested in LLR	2%
Interest Rate Buy-Down	\$0
<b>Total Financing Investment</b>	<b>\$520,000</b>
Percent of Total Award	2%
Total Capital (Private and Other Non-BBNP) Leveraged for Lending	Not Reported
<b>Results<sup>7</sup></b>	
Amount Loaned Out (Residential)	Not Reported
Amount Loaned Out (Commercial)	Not Reported

According to Melinda Barrett, public relations manager for the Los Angeles County Office of Sustainability, California homeowners have traditionally made energy efficiency improvements on an appliance-by-appliance basis. Energy Upgrade California set out to transform the market to value a more holistic, whole-house approach to energy efficiency. Energy Upgrade California originally broke down the upgrade options into a Basic and Advanced package, with the Basic package option including implementation of prescriptive energy efficiency measures. In an effort to increase program participation, the County developed and launched a new, more flexible option called Flex Path, which allowed homeowners to choose from a menu of upgrade

<sup>6</sup> The financing data is for Los Angeles County's newly launched Cool Comfort Financing pilot partially funded by BBNP. Amount loaned, number of loans, and average amount of loan data is not available at the time of this report because the pilot launched in November 2013.

<sup>7</sup> Loan information was not reported and cited as unavailable by the recipient.

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

options with assigned point values and claim a \$1,500 rebate for any combination of two or more measures that totaled 100 points or more.

The Basic Path, which could earn utility rebates of up to \$1,000, included seven required measures—air sealing, attic insulation, duct sealing, hot water pipe insulation, thermostatic shut-off valves, combusting appliance safety testing, and installation of a high-efficiency showerhead. The Advanced Path, which builds on the Basic Path, is a more in-depth, customized approach with rebates totaling from \$1,250 to \$4,000, from the investor-owned utilities. Homeowners were also eligible for the same rebate amounts directly from the Los Angeles County Matching Incentive Program, resulting in a significant increase and a top rebate amount of \$8,000.

For projects exceeding available rebates, Energy Upgrade California launched the Home Energy Loans Program, with loans of up to \$50,000 for eligible homeowners wishing to install insulation, air sealing, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and solar panels as part of their energy upgrade efforts. Los Angeles County partnered with a local financial institution to provide both a loan loss reserve and an interest rate buy-down (not supported with BBNP funds) with the result of being able to offer property owners a 2% interest rate on eligible residential energy efficiency and solar projects. Solar projects must be installed concurrently or after the installation of energy efficiency measures and must be enrolled in the California Solar Initiative (CSI). As of November 30, 2013, Home Energy Loans had funded 310 loans with a total loan value of \$4,750,762.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.8 Workforce Development Synopsis

Table 2 shows the total number of workers trained and certified as reported by recipients. Most recipients reported the number of workers trained and certified each quarter; the table shows the cumulative total through September 30, 2013. The table also shows the number of active participating contractors reported by recipients for one quarter. The number of participating contractors may increase or decrease each quarter. However, it is not summed across quarters because many of the same contractors actively participated during multiple quarters. Therefore, only the number of participating contractors reported in the most recent quarter is provided in the table.

**Table 2. Workforce Development Results (Through 9/30/13)**

<b>Workforce Development Results<sup>8</sup> (Through 9/30/13)</b>	
<b>Number of Trained Workers</b>	187
<b>Number of Certified Workers</b>	103
<b>Active Participating Contractors (Q2-2013)<sup>9</sup></b>	105

Energy Upgrade California in Los Angeles County put a diversity plan in place to attract small, minority-owned energy contracting companies. At the same time, Los Angeles County worked with local community colleges to build a skilled workforce and provide scholarships for Building Performance Institute (BPI) certification. The program also provided tools and training to help participating professionals promote the Energy Upgrade program.

Figure 3 shows jobs created or retained. EECBG recipients were required to report jobs created or retained expressed as “full-time equivalent” (FTE) for Recovery Act reporting, which specified direct jobs created and retained by sub-recipients and vendors. This information is in blue in Figure 3.

EECBG recipients were asked on the BBNP Program Report to report hours worked per quarter directly funded by BBNP funds, as well as hours worked administrating or working on the BBNP program if funded by other federal and leveraged funds (e.g., state and local funds, utilities, financial institutions, private contributions, etc.). This includes but is not limited to administrative staff, consultants, and contractors involved in the management or deployment


<sup>8</sup> Reporting the number of trained and certified workers was mandatory for SEP and voluntary for EECBG. Reporting the number of active contractors was mandatory for EECBG and voluntary for SEP.

<sup>9</sup> Q2-2013 value is reported instead of Q3-2013 because program was coming to a close at the end of Q3 and did not report active contractors.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

of BBNP-related building upgrades and assessment activities. This information is in green in Figure 3 and is estimated based on total hours worked during the quarter reported by the recipient divided by 520 hours per quarter. The BBNP Program Report definition was broader than direct jobs reported for the Recovery Act and is one reason why Recovery Act Reporting and BBNP Reporting in Figure 3 differ.

**Figure 3. Los Angeles County Jobs Created/Retained for the Quarter<sup>10</sup>**



<sup>10</sup> Reporting job hours worked was mandatory for EECBG and voluntary for SEP. ARRA Reporting only includes EECBG data.



# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

## 1.9 Estimated Energy Savings Synopsis

Recipients reported estimated energy savings in two ways. First, recipients were asked to report estimated savings data quarterly: total kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity, therms of natural gas, gallons of fuel oil, and gallons of propane saved, along with dollars in energy costs saved. Table 3 shows the total estimated annual energy savings of the recipient's activities reported through September 30, 2013.

**Table 3. Estimated Annual Energy Savings (Through September 30, 2013), As Reported in Program Summaries**

Estimated Annual Energy Savings (Through 9/30/13)	
kWh Electricity	5,289,897
Therms Natural Gas	1,212,881
Gallons of Oil	0
Gallons of Propane	0
Total Estimated MMBTU Savings (Source Energy) <sup>11</sup>	193,184
Total Estimated Energy Cost Savings	\$645,093 <sup>12</sup>

Secondly, recipients were asked to report estimated savings data quarterly for each upgrade project. Table 4 shows the sum of the estimated energy savings of all building upgrade projects reported by the recipient through September 30, 2013. The second column shows the number of upgrade projects that were summed to estimate the energy savings in the third column.

<sup>11</sup> Total estimated source energy savings is calculated by DOE.

<sup>12</sup> The cost savings underestimates the total because Los Angeles County was not able to obtain the information all of its partners.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

**Table 4. Sum of Estimated Annual Energy Savings (Through September 30, 2013), As Reported for Individual Upgrade Projects**

Sum of Estimated Annual Energy Savings (Through 9/30/13)		
	Number of Projects Summed	Sum of Estimated Savings Reported
kWh Electricity	3,796	11,667,046
Therms Natural Gas	3,711	749,071
Gallons of Oil	0	0
Gallons of Propane	0	0
<b>Sum of Estimated Annual Energy Cost Savings</b>	276	\$462,385 <sup>13</sup>
<b>Method(s) of Savings Prediction</b>	OTHER, DEEMED SAVINGS, ENERGY PRO, ENERGYPRO, PRELIMINARY ENERGY USE ANALYSIS, REM/DESIGN	

The program reported total in Table 3 will not necessarily equal the sum of estimated savings in Table 4. Recipients were originally asked to only report individual building upgrade projects that were estimated to achieve at least a 15% reduction in total building energy use. Recipients were also told to include estimated energy saving from all upgrades in their project summaries, including upgrades that achieved less than a 15% reduction in total building energy use, in their program totals. In 2012, recipients were given the option to continue to report only building upgrade projects that saved 15% or to report all building upgrade projects so long as the total portfolio of projects (by building sector) achieved an average savings of 15%.


### 1.9.1. Estimated Lifetime Energy Savings per Upgrade Analysis

From the beginning of the Better Buildings Neighborhood Program, recipients expressed interest in understanding how their results compared to other recipients. Figure 4 shows an estimated lifetime energy savings per upgrade for the recipient and an average estimated lifetime energy savings per upgrade based on all BBNP-reported projects. This analysis was completed by NREL using recipient-reported project information. The methodology used to complete the analysis is provided in the Appendix C. Eighty-eight percent of the reported BBNP upgrade projects were used in the analysis to calculate the BBNP average because energy savings estimates were missing or incomplete for 12% of reported projects.

<sup>13</sup> The estimated cost savings underestimates the total because Los Angeles County was not able to obtain the information from two of its partners. Only Sacramento Municipal Utility District collected this data, accounting for the total number of projects reflected.

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, SUMMARY OF REPORTED DATA

Figure 4. Estimated Lifetime Energy Savings per Upgrade<sup>14</sup>



There could be several reasons why a recipient's results are higher or lower than the BBNP average. Recipients implemented a variety of program design approaches, including different mixes of energy efficiency measures, and targeted different building types and customer segments. Reviewing the summary report of other recipients may provide insights into program design choices and other factors that could influence results.

In addition to program design decisions, other factors could influence results. For example, programs in more energy-intensive climates may be able to achieve greater savings per upgrade because average energy consumption is higher than the national average. Programs in states with high energy costs may find that customers are more motivated to save more energy than states with low energy costs.

<sup>14</sup> SF is single-family home. CB is commercial building.

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ARR or Recovery Act:	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009
Active Participating Contractors:	Active contractors are qualified (qualified according to the individual recipients' program guidance) contractors who have performed one or more building upgrades in the reporting quarter.
Assessments:	Expert review of building's energy savings opportunities, which typically includes an onsite inspection of the building and its systems and results in recommendations for building energy performance improvements.
BBNP:	Better Buildings Neighborhood Program
BBNP Award Spending:	Total outlay amount for recipients through 9/30/13
Certified Workers:	Number of workers with a nationally-recognized certification. Recipients could choose to adopt an alternative to nationally-recognized certification and provide a justification for the alternative certification chosen.
EECBG:	Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant
IRBD:	(Interest Rate Buy-Down) Program administrators provide lenders or investors with an up-front payment when a financial product is originated to reduce the interest rate a customer pays. The payment is typically the present value of the difference between the interest rate the customer will pay and the "market" interest rate of the financial product over the expected life of the financial product.
Invoiced Upgrade Costs:	Total cost of the building energy efficiency upgrades, as invoiced by the contractor performing the work, which includes the building owner's contribution, and any incentives or grants funded by BBNP funds, other federal funds or non-Federal sources intended to reduce the building owner's cost.

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Jobs Created/Retained:	<p>For the purpose of Recovery Act reporting jobs created and retained was estimated based on the job hours directly funded with BBNP funds during a reporting quarter divided by 520 hours per quarter. EECBG recipients were required to report jobs created or retained expressed as “full-time equivalent” (FTE) for Recovery Act reporting. The Recovery Act reporting specified direct jobs created and retained by sub-recipients and vendors.</p> <p>For the purpose of BBNP Quarterly Program reporting, jobs created and retained was estimated based on the job hours worked directly funded with BBNP funds and job hours worked funded by other federal funds and leveraged funds (i.e. state and local funds, utilities, financial institutions, private contributions, etc.) during reporting quarter divided by 520 hours per quarter. This includes, but is not limited to; administrative staff, consultants, and contractors involved in the management or deployment of assessment and building upgrade activities. The BBNP Program Report definition was broader than direct jobs reported for the Recovery Act</p>
LLR:	<p>(Loan Loss Reserve) A form of credit enhancement through which a program administrator (or other entity) promises to pay lender some portion (less than 100%) of losses the lender endures on financial product or pool of financial products. 5% to 20% LLRs are common.</p>
Labor & Materials:	<p>Recipient outlays of BBNP award funds incurred as part of an assessment or upgrade directly associated with the installation of energy efficient equipment, appliances, or building components (e.g. insulation, windows, etc.). This includes incentives or grants to reduce a building owner’s labor or material costs to complete and energy assessment or upgrade.</p>
Marketing & Outreach:	<p>Recipient outlays of BBNP award funds for communication activities designed to identify, reach and motivate potential customers to participate in a program and learn more (e.g. assessment or other informational activity) about energy efficiency or initiate an energy efficiency upgrade.</p>
MMBtu	<p>One million British thermal units (Btu).</p>
Multi-Family Unit:	<p>unit in a building with multiple housing units--a structure that is divided into living quarters for two or more families or households in which one household lives above or beside another. This category also includes houses originally intended for occupancy by one family (or for some other use) that have since been converted to separate dwellings for two or more families.</p>

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Non-Federal Expenditures:	These may include third-party, in-kind contributions and the portion of the costs of a federally assisted project or program not borne by the Federal Government. This should include building owner contributions to building upgrade project cost.
Other Federal Expenditures:	These may include additional federal financial assistance award funds or loans from the Department of Energy or another federal agency.
Other Program Expenses:	Recipient outlays of BBNP award funds not classified as labor & materials or marketing & outreach. These expenses are often associated with program overhead. Outlays are distinct from DOE's definition of expenditures, which is most relevant with financing programs (i.e., Funds drawn down and provided by the recipient to a third party, to capitalize a loan fund, are considered outlays. Funds drawn down by the recipient to capitalize a loan fund in-house are not considered outlays until the funds are loaned out.).
RLF:	(Revolving Loan Fund) Funds of capital used to provide loans for energy efficiency and renewable energy improvements; loan repayments recapitalize the funding pool to enable additional lending.
SEP:	State Energy Program
Single-Family:	housing unit, detached or attached, that provides living space for one household or family. Attached houses are considered single-family houses as long as they are not divided into more than one housing unit and they have an independent outside entrance. A single-family house is contained within walls extending from the basement (or the ground floor, if there is no basement) to the roof. mobile home with one or more rooms added is classified as single-family home. Townhouses, row-houses, and duplexes are considered single-family attached housing units, as long as there is n household living above another one within the walls extending from the basement to the roof to separate the units.
Source energy:	Also called primary energy, is the amount of fossil fuels and electricity plus the losses associated with the production of electricity (i.e., losses that occur in the generation, transmission, and distribution).
Total Capital (Private and Other non-BBNP) Leveraged for Lending:	Capital committed by one of more third parties for financing energy efficiency building upgrades. This can include federally funded (non-BBNP) revolving loan funds and private capital from credit unions, banks or other financial institutions.
Trained Workers:	Number of workers trained under a nationally-recognized organization or curriculum. Recipients could choose to adopt an alternative to nationally-recognized training and provide a justification for the alternative training chosen.

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Upgrades:

Also called building upgrades or retrofits, an individual or group of measures that a customer undertakes to improve building performance, with benefits including more efficient energy use, improved comfort and indoor air quality, ensured combustion safety, and lower utility bills.



## **APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY TO CALCULATE SOURCE ENERGY SAVINGS**

## APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY TO CALCULATE SOURCE ENERGY SAVINGS

DOE used the following methodology to calculate source energy savings:

$$E_{svgs} = \sum_{i=Energy\ Type} E_{svgs\ source,i}$$

$$E_{svgs\ source,i} = E_{svgs\ site,i} \times CF_{MMBtu,i} \times CF_{Site\ to\ Source,i}$$

where,

$E_{svgs}$  is the total annual energy savings in MMBtu

$E_{svgs\ source,i}$  is the annual source energy savings in MMBtu for each energy type  $i$  as shown in Table B- 1

$E_{svgs\ site,i}$  is the total estimated annual site energy savings for each energy type  $i$  as shown in Table B- 1

$CF_{MMBtu,i}$  is the MMBtu conversion factor for each energy type  $i$  as shown in Table B- 1

$CF_{Site\ to\ Source,i}$  is the site to source conversion factor for each energy type  $i$  as shown in Table B- 1.

**Table B- 1. MMBtu and Site to Source Conversion Factors by Energy Type**

Energy Type	MMBtu Conversion Factor	Site to Source Conversion Factor
Electricity	0.00341214 MMBtu/kWh	3.365
Natural Gas	0.1027 MMBtu/ccf	1.092
Natural Gas	0.1 MMBtu/therm	1.092
Fuel Oil (Type 2)	0.14 MMBtu/gallon	1.158
Propane/LPG	0.09133 MMBtu/gallon	1.151
Kerosene	0.135 MMBtu/gallon	1.205
Wood	20 MMBtu/cord	1

## **APPENDIX C: LIFETIME ENERGY SAVINGS CALCULATIONS**

## APPENDIX C: LIFETIME ENERGY SAVINGS CALCULATIONS

The Lifetime Energy Savings, LES, is the total source energy savings over the expected life of the installed efficiency upgrades, expressed in MMBtu. An LES value is calculated for each grant recipient as follows:

$$LES_r = E_{svgs,r} \times \bar{L}_r$$

where,

$LES_r$  is the Lifetime Energy Savings for grant recipient  $r$

$E_{svgs,r}$  is the total estimated annual energy savings for all projects reported by the recipient (MMBtu/yr)

$\bar{L}_r$  is the project weighted lifetime of the efficiency upgrades reported by a recipient, expressed in years and calculated as follows:

$$\bar{L}_r = \frac{(\bar{L}_{res} \times E_{svgs,res}) + (\bar{L}_{com} \times E_{svgs,com})}{(E_{svgs,res} + E_{svgs,com})}$$

where,

$\bar{L}_{res}$  is the source energy-savings-weighted lifetime of the residential efficiency upgrades installed for a recipient

$E_{svgs,res}$  is the total estimated annual source energy savings in MMBtu for all residential upgrades reported by the grant recipient

$\bar{L}_{com}$  is the project-count-weighted lifetime of the commercial efficiency upgrades installed for a recipient

$E_{svgs,com}$  is the total estimated annual source energy savings in MMBtu for all commercial upgrades reported by the grant recipient

$\bar{L}_{res}$  is calculated as follows:

$$\bar{L}_{res} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^4 (Cnt_i \times E_{svgs,i} \times L_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^4 (Cnt_i \times E_{svgs,i})}$$

where,

$i$  is the type category of efficiency upgrades installed as shown in Table C- 1.

$Cnt_i$  is the number of energy efficiency upgrades of type  $i$  installed by a recipient

$E_{svgs,i}$  is the assumed annual energy savings in MMBtu for each energy efficiency upgrade of type  $i$  as shown in Table C- 1.

## APPENDIX C: LIFETIME ENERGY SAVINGS CALCULATION

$L_i$  is the assumed lifetime in years for energy efficiency upgrades of type  $i$  as shown in Table C- 1.

**Table C- 1. Residential Project Energy Upgrade Categories, Lifetimes and Energy Savings<sup>15</sup>**

Type Category	Description	Assumed Lifetime (Years)	Assumed Source Energy Savings (MMBtu/yr/measure)
R1	Simple direct-install measures including CFL's, low-flow showerheads, water heater blankets, HVAC tune ups and other low cost measures	5	0.5
R2	HVAC replacement, programmable thermostats, refrigerators, dishwashers, hot water heaters and any large appliance	15	7
R3	Duct sealing and duct insulating	15	10
R4	House air sealing, house insulating, window replacement and any other insulating (except duct insulating)	20	20

$\bar{L}_{com}$  is calculated as follows:

$$\bar{L}_{com} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^4 (Cn_j \times L_j)}{\sum_{j=1}^4 (Cn_j)}$$

where,

$j$  is the type category of efficiency upgrades installed as shown in Table C- 2.

$Cn_j$  is the number of energy efficiency upgrades of type  $j$  installed by a recipient

$L_j$  is the assumed lifetime in years for energy efficiency upgrades of type  $j$  as shown in Table C- 2.

<sup>15</sup> Assumed Lifetime for residential measures was estimated by NREL based on a review NAHB Study of Life Expectancy of Home Components, DEER, and consulting with evaluation experts. Assumed Source Energy Savings was estimated/adapted from the Better Building Energy Savings Measure Packages developed by NREL using BEopt. General methodology is documented here: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/50572.pdf>

## APPENDIX C: LIFETIME ENERGY SAVINGS CALCULATION

Table C- 2. Commercial Project Energy Upgrade Categories and Lifetimes<sup>16</sup>

Type Category	Description	Assumed Lifetime (Years)	Assumed Source Energy Savings (MMBtu/yr/measure)
C1	CFLs, faucet aerators and HVAC tune ups	5	100
C2	Commercial kitchen equipment, thermostats	11	6
C3	HVAC (packaged), refrigeration, hot water heaters, LED and linear fluorescent lighting	15	100
C4	Chillers, boilers, PV, solar thermal, insulation, windows	20	100

<sup>16</sup> Assumed Lifetime for commercial measures was estimated by NREL based on a review of DEER and consulting with evaluation experts. Assumed Source Energy Savings was derived using regression analysis of reported commercial projects with energy savings and installed measures. A measure may include several instances of one technology installed in a project.



---

Learn more at: [betterbuildings.energy.gov/neighborhoods](https://betterbuildings.energy.gov/neighborhoods)