



July 16, 2010

Mr. Paul Johnson
Executive Director
Office of Energy Conservation and Weatherization
Anystate Department of Community and Economic Development
500 Main Street, 2nd Floor
Anytown, AS 17620-0144

Subject: Monitoring Report
Grant: 000000000

Dear Mr. Johnson

On May 24-27, 2010, Judith Daily, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) Project Officer, conducted a quality assurance on-site monitoring assessment of the Anystate Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP).

The monitoring assessment included a review of administrative, financial, and programmatic aspects of the Anystate WAP. Please find enclosed the DOE Monitoring Report, which summarizes observations and recommendations made during the monitoring visit. Please submit a response within the next 15 days indicating what follow-up actions will be taken on the corrective actions, observations, and recommendations contained in the report.

Please contact Ms. Daily or me if you have any questions or concerns about this report. We may be reached at judith.daily@netl.doe.gov, (123) 456-7890 and florence.helm@netl.doe.gov, (123) 456-7891.

We look forward to continued interaction with you and your staff in the effective implementation and operation of the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Sincerely,

Florence Helm

Florence Helm
Division Director
Intergovernmental Projects and Outreach Division

Enclosure

cc:



QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) MONITORING REPORT
ANYSTATE, USA

Grantee: Anystate Department of Community and Economic Development
500 Main Street, 2nd Floor
Anytown, AS17620-0144

Date of Visit: May 24-27, 2010

Grant: 000000000

I. SUMMARY

On May 24-27, 2010, Judith Daily, National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) Project Officer, and DOE contractors conducted Quality Assurance assessments in the Urbana region of the Anystate, USA Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP). The assessment included site visits to client homes under the WAP as implemented in Anystate.

Concerns and action items have been identified and included in this report. The Grantee will be required to provide their response within the time frame specified.

As part of the oversight responsibilities under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), the Department of Energy (DOE) will conduct more frequent monitoring visits of the Anystate WAP. DOE has worked with the Grantee to arrange visits to the subgrantees and additional client homes.

A. Purpose of Review

The QA assessment was conducted to determine the Grantee's adherence to the DOE approved Priority List, State Plan, and State Field Guide or technical standards. QA visits are also intended to identify program strengths and areas for improvement, to identify accomplishments and success stories, to evaluate the Grantee's monitoring and oversight of subgrantees, to assess compliance with federal and state regulations, policies and procedures, and to determine what DOE can do to assist the Grantee in implementation of the program.

The primary outcome of the WAP is the installation of high quality, energy efficiency services in the homes of low-income families. The quality of the work performed by subgrantee crews and contractors determines whether the predicted results of energy savings will accrue to the clients.

B. Process

The QA visit identified seventy homes in six subgrantee service areas to receive assessments. Due to scheduling conflicts, approximately 62 homes actually received reviews.

In the following sections of this report, observations, concerns, and recommendations are cited based upon the QA assessments. This information should be reviewed and acted upon where necessary in order to ensure that the Anystate WAP is delivering effective and efficient weatherization services to low-income clients in Anystate.

C. Summary of QA Visits listed by Subgrantee

Any County Opportunity Council: Subgrantee appears to follow the Priority List for measures installed. Work appears to meet program standards and reflects good workmanship.

Community Action Agency of This County: Lack of awareness or moisture issues were in two of the homes receiving QA visits, lack of coordination of agency with PECO program, CO testing not routinely completed on gas cook stoves, outside venting of clothes dryer is an issue, files numbers for blower door readings and heated space calculations are questioned, LSW are not in evidence, adherence to the Priority List is haphazard, missing by-passes and opportunities for air sealing. Window replacements were not justified in the client file and replacement windows installed are not Energy Star labeled. It is noted that the windows installed did not have proper justification to be charged to WAP. Charges for windows at the homes receiving QA visits are questioned. AS must provide justification for the window replacements using the NEAT Audit or other justification as outlined in the 2008 Weatherization Standards and Field Guide for Anystate. Subgrantee staff seems receptive to additional training and a willingness to make corrections was evident at the QA visit.

Energy Comforting Agency (ECA): Blower Door numbers appear inaccurate. Routinely saw homes of 1200 square feet with initial BD numbers of around 6000 with post numbers of 5000. If these numbers are accurate, severe air leakage is still occurring in the homes and major by-passes are going undetected. Subgrantee primarily works in row houses and has a tendency to do prescriptive air sealing without completing a site-specific assessment. Subgrantee, based on measures observed, does not appear to understand the “house as a system” approach and does not use the blower door to guide air sealing in homes. Failure to follow the Priority List or justification for skipped measures is not evident in the client files or at the home. It is noted that the windows installed did not have proper justification to be charged to WAP. Charges for windows at the homes receiving QA visits are questioned. AS must provide justification for the window replacements using the NEAT Audit or other justification as outlined in the 2008 Weatherization Standards and Field Guide for Anystate. No evidence of LSW despite measures that would trigger LSW. QA visits included previously weatherized homes, but it was unclear that effective coordination with the other subgrantee serving Urbana was occurring to ensure programmatic compliance for reweatherized homes. Two of the homes receiving QA visits did not have the dryer vented to the outside. Band joist air sealing and insulating was routinely called for and installed, however, the installation was incomplete, which greatly decreased the measure’s effectiveness.

Housing Development Corporation for These, That, Those and T'other Counties: Failure to follow the Priority List or justification for skipped measures is not evident in the client files or at the home. It is noted that the windows installed did not have proper justification to be charged to WAP. Charges for windows at the homes receiving QA visits are questioned. AS must provide justification for the window replacements using the NEAT Audit or other justification as outlined in the 2008 Weatherization Standards and Field Guide for Anystate. No evidence of LSW despite measures that would trigger LSW. Subgrantee appears to need additional training and technical assistance in building science concepts in order to understand the importance of aligning the thermal and pressure boundaries in a home. Subgrantee does not use the Blower Door as a diagnostic tool to guide air sealing measures in a dwelling. Subgrantee follows prescriptive air sealing in all homes receiving QA visits without completing a site-specific assessment. Files appear organized and complete.

Mainely County Community Action Development Commission: Subgrantee appears to follow the Priority List for measures installed. Work appears to meet program standards and reflects good workmanship.

Urbana Housing Development Corporation (UHDC): Failure to follow the Priority List or justification for skipped measures is not evident in the client files or at the home. It is noted that the windows installed did not have proper justification to be charged to WAP. Charges for windows at the homes receiving QA visits are questioned. AS must provide justification for the window replacements using the NEAT Audit or other justification as outlined in the 2008 Weatherization Standards and Field Guide for Anystate. While visiting "In-Progress Units" window replacements that were not justified in the client file and replacement windows installed are not Energy Star labeled. No evidence of LSW despite measures that would trigger LSW. Multiple homes did not have the second floor dropped ceiling air sealing completed in advance of insulation, which drastically reduces the effectiveness of the insulation. Additional education on air sealing before insulation should be provided as training and technical assistance. QA visits included previously weatherized homes, but it was unclear that effective coordination with the other subgrantee serving the Urbana area was occurring to ensure programmatic compliance for reweatherized homes. Accuracy of Blower Door numbers is questioned. For example: QA consultants requested demonstration of a blower door test to be performed at a home, however, despite two subgrantee crews working in the area, a complete blower door set up could not be assembled for a test demonstration.

D. Concerns and Action Items

The following are concerns and action items as identified during the QA visit:

- **Concern:** Subgrantees receiving QA visits do not appear to complete moisture assessments as part of the initial audit. A moisture assessment and protocol is required and can be referenced in Weatherization Program Notice 05-1, Section 5.14. WPN 05-1 also requires a training protocol for the Grantee to provide to subgrantees. **Action Item:** PO requests that amendments to EE0000135 and EE0000290 be submitted to incorporate a moisture protocol as required by Program Guidance by August 20, 2010.

- **Concern:** Subgrantees receiving QA visits do not appear to follow the DOE approved Priority List of measures. Multiple subgrantees did not provide justification for skipping measures on the Priority List. It is noted that skipping measures without justification could result in disallowed costs. **Action Item:** PO requests that a corrective action plan be implemented to ensure the approved Priority List is implemented consistently on a state-wide basis by August 20, 2010.
- **Concern:** Subgrantees receiving QA visits do not appear to practice Lead-Safe Weatherization (LSW) as required by WPN 08-6 and 09-6. Multiple subgrantee files did not substantiate that LSW was followed in instances where de minimus levels or measures would trigger the LSW requirement. **Action Item:** PO requests that a corrective action plan be implemented to ensure the approved LSW is implemented consistently on a state-wide basis by August 20, 2010.
- **Concern:** Subgrantees receiving QA visits do not appear to practice blower door directed air sealing as required by the Anystate Weatherization Standards and Field Guide, dated September 2008. **Action Item:** PO requests a training plan be developed to provide additional training and technical assistance to the subgrantee network to ensure that the Anystate technical standard is implemented consistently on a state-wide basis by August 20, 2010.
- **Concern:** Subgrantees receiving QA visits had a number of windows installed and did not have proper justification to be charged to WAP based on AS's January 15, 2010 approved Priority List. Charges for windows at the homes receiving QA visits are questioned. **Action Item:** AS must implement monitoring procedures to ensure adherence to the DOE approved Priority List of Measures and to ensure that windows installed are Energy Star labeled. Without proper justification, these questioned costs may become disallowed costs. PO requests a corrective action be implemented to ensure that the approved Priority List of Measures is monitored and implemented consistently on a state-wide basis by August 20, 2010.
- **Concern:** Both ECA and UHDC serve the same geographic area and there appears to be little coordination in service delivery or to ensure compliance with 42 U.S.C. 6865(c)(2) with regards to the reweatherization of dwellings. **Action Item:** PO requests a corrective action be implemented to ensure that dwellings will be reweatherized in accordance with 42 U.S.C. 6865(c)(2) by August 20, 2010.

II. PROMISING PRACTICES

The Grantee's reorganization has created a number of additional Field Monitors positions that will assist the Grantee in its oversight responsibilities and allow for targeted technical assistance at the subgrantee level. Grantee is also focusing on the quality of production under ARRA and meeting with the subgrantees to ensure this message is communicated clearly.

III. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

There are number of corrective actions required. The Grantee should address these items by the date indicated and notify the DOE when completed.

Technical assistance is available to the Grantee as requested to ensure consistent and effective implementation of the WAP.

IV. IN CLOSING

The purpose of the on-site monitoring assessment was to review and evaluate the condition of the Anystate WAP as well as provide technical assistance. All comments and recommendations are intended to assist the Weatherization staff in the continual improvement of the quality of work performed by the Anystate WAP.

V. CERTIFICATION

I have conducted this monitoring visit in accordance with DOE standard procedures using the appropriate monitoring checklists for the purpose of forming an opinion on the general administration of the grant.

This was not an audit, and therefore all areas examined were only examined for purposes of obtaining an assessment of compliance with program requirements.

Judith Daily

Judith Daily
Project Officer

7/16/10

Date