Weatherization Assistance Program: The Federal Perspective
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Funding Outlook

• 2017
  - $223M Formula Distribution
  - $3M HQ T&TA
  - 17% of T&TA to Grantees

• 2018
  - Under CR until March 23
  - Lowest mark received was from the Senate at $215M

• 2019
  - The President’s Budget continues to focus on early stage research & development on energy technologies
A Civics Lesson

• President’s budget submitted to Congress.
• Congress develops and adopts a Budget Resolution which establishes the allocations available to the Appropriations Committees.
• Appropriations subcommittees are given allocation for spending.
• After hearings, the subcommittee moves a bill to the full committee and then to the House/Senate floor.
• A Continuing Resolution or an Omnibus Appropriations Bill is passed in the event appropriation bill(s) do not pass.
Program Year 2018 Planning

• DOE’s goal is to ensure Grantees have sufficient time to prepare PY18 State Plans.
  – Grantees... “shall submit an application... not later than 60 days after the date of notice...” 10 CFR 440.12 (a)

• Determine Grant funding levels when only partial funding is available.
  – Funding is set at FY 2017 levels but, funding is only incrementally available to DOE.

• DOE issued WPN 18-1, ALRD and PY 18 Application Package on December 18, 2017.
Once the FY18 Budget is Approved....

- DOE will issue WPN 18-2, Program Year 2018 Grantee Allocations.

- DOE will adjust Grantee allocations based on the final FY2018 appropriations.

- Grantees will begin their budget modification process.
WAP Leadership

- In the interim, WAP is being managed jointly by Anna Garcia, Jim Carlisle and Erica Burrin

- Plans for FY 18 is to appoint a temporary WAP Manager as budget issues are discussed

- No interruption in receipt of grant funds or WAP management and services
WAP Technical Update
Solution Summit Update

- 4 events: Atlanta, Philadelphia, Phoenix and Biloxi
- Over 60 participants representing a broad spectrum of WAP stakeholders including Grantees, Sub-Grantees, Training Programs, Associations and Federal Staff.
Solution Summits

• Stakeholders were tasked with two objectives
  1. Clarify the key barriers to delivering quality Weatherization programs and services
  2. Brainstorm a list of initiatives and resources that can be utilized to increase the quantity of homes served, without decreasing the quality of the measure installation
# Solution Summit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>BARRIER</th>
<th>TOTAL VOTES</th>
<th>ADDRESSED THROUGH GROUP PROBLEM-SOLVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of funding to hire, pay and retain competent, experienced staff.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many agencies are trying to comply w/ multiple sets of requirements from different funders.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Few weatherization-focused trainings are available in the areas of administration, finance and project management.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Weatherization program rules require extensive experience to implement effectively.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Weatherization technical requirements are often complex and lengthy.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Challenges and process gaps may not be communicated within and across organizations.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is often a lack of accountability at all levels of the network: WAP, grantee, subgrantee, installer and contractor.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Management and administrative staff have limited experience or involvement in quality assurance (QA) policies and procedures.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Documented checkpoints are lacking within and across organizations to confirm that all tasks are completed according to requirements.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of job descriptions and minimum requirements for staff at all levels of the network.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>An innovative, well-thought-out training plan for staff is often missing.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Managers have little to no training on quality management methods and resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution Summit

Participants narrowed the focus of needed improvements to 6 primary themes.

These themes were further refined into specific action steps that could move the program in a positive direction.
Solution Summits

Next Steps:

• Finalize DOE review of the NREL/AE Solution Summit report
• Distribute the report to participants and the wider WAP network along with a DOE response
• Follow up meeting at Energy Out West in Phoenix
Energy Auditor and Quality Control Inspector
Revisions:

• Revisions to the JTAs for EA and QCI have been completed. We are awaiting the final report from the psychometricians and anticipate making that final document available by Summer 2018.

• This revision process is part of the normal maintenance of the JTA per industry standards.

• The "soft skills" have been removed from both JTAs. Those soft skills-related KSAs are now included in a competency model for use by training providers and others.
GHEP Update

The primary outcome

• Recognition that the majority of the technical KSAs in both the EA and the QCI were identical and that the two JTAs could be streamlined into 1 "main" JTA (EA) and one "mini" JTA (QCI) that includes ONLY those items not already covered by the EA JTA.

• The revisions should not have a major impact what a training center is teaching.
  – the relevant technical KSAs are largely the same.
  – Language has been clarified and some redundancies removed, but an auditor or inspector still needs to know how to do the same things as before.
Key Changes for the WAP Network

Training centers

• Ability to streamline training programs to offer a complete EA training and then offer a shorter QCI course that aligns with the updated JTA and covers only those items not already covered in EA.

Individuals

• In order to be a certified QCI, you will need to hold an active EA certification. We are still finalizing details of how that will work for people who are re-certifying (already hold QCI), but do not foresee any major issues. The current plan is that candidates will need to show that they meet the pre-requisites for the EA certification and pass a field exam.
GHEP Update

• There will not be a change to the Quality Work Plan as a result of these revisions.
• The new exam structure is expected to be up and running in mid-2019, but again, given the similarities between the current structure and the new structure, there shouldn’t be any need for major changes to a Grantees training plans or a WTCs curriculum as a result.
• DOE will prepare a recorded presentation to outline and further clarify these changes by April 2018.
Weatherization Assistant – Update

- All audits run as an internet web service on secure servers
- Central data base
- Requires migration of NEAT and MHEA to the web
Integration into the Existing Web Framework

Existing Framework

Web-Based Framework
Advantages of a Web-Based Platform

• **Improved access**
  – Single access point for all four audit tools
  – Data entry from anyplace where there is web access

• **Easier rollout of updates, fuel price indices, etc.**

• **Common database for each agency**
  – Agency auditors and management can access clients, audits, work orders, and libraries created by their fellow auditors
  – Common Setup Library (e.g., costs, settings) used by all auditors

• **State has access to agency databases**
  – Can see audit inputs, costs, recommendations, etc.
  – Improved technical assistance
  – Remote monitoring
  – Data aggregation: measure installation frequencies, average measure costs, types of houses weatherized, etc.

• **DOE has access to state databases**
  – Monitoring
  – Evaluations
Many Elements to Migrate

- **NEAT and MHEA audit software itself**
- **Setup Library**
  - Fuel costs
  - Fuel price indices
  - Measure costs
  - NEAT insulation types
  - User defined measures
- **Client and Agency structure**
- **Work Orders with Supply Library**
- **Reports**
- **Many other optional features**
  - H&S checklist
  - Equipment diagnostics and inputs
  - Key parameters and customizations
Wx Assistant Online Development Timeline

**FY 2018**

- Primary elements of NEAT, MHEA, and Setup Library in their current versions
  - To verify calculations
  - Integrated into the existing web framework of Agency, Account, and Libraries
- Address bugs
- Add ability to export data in HPXML format
  - Home Performance Extensible Markup Language
  - Published by BPI
  - Facilitate communication and exchange of data on residential building and energy performance

**FY 2019**

- Add new features
  - LED lighting
  - ASHRAE 62.2
  - Improved pre and post heating and cooling descriptions
- Other Setup Library elements
- Remaining reports
- Work Orders and Supply Library
- Other optional features
- Then consider migration to an hourly simulation engine
Field Guides – Update Schedule

• Required – Every 3 years
• When is yours due?
  – Grantees received reminder of this from PO’s recently
• How long will it take?
  – Realistic timelines
Field Guide Submittals

- Grantee reviews & revises Field Guide
- Grantee submits guide to Project Officer
- Technical Reviewer compares guide to SWS
Field Guides – SWS and Variance Requests

A conundrum:
• Field guides must align with the SWS (WPN 15-4)
• Sometimes the SWS don’t work for you

The solution:
• Submit a Variance Request
Variance Requests – Tips for Approval

• Get the justification right
• Double check the details
• Be clear and concise
• Be specific

New form available here:
https://goo.gl/forms/GeLNgwYWEgK2aNup2
Field Guides – Where to Learn More

- WPN 15-4, Sections 1 & 2 – Describe SWS alignment and distribution requirements
- State Plan section V.5.1 – Technical Guides and Materials
- EERE site – Training Resources: https://energy.gov/eere/wipo/downloads/training-resources
  - SWS tool navigation training
  - Field Guide and Variance Request Review Process webinars
- New Variance Request form: https://goo.gl/forms/GeLNgwYWEgK2aNup2
Health & Safety – Plan Review

15%
Health & Safety – Plan Review

• Grantee submit H&S Plan if greater than *15% of Program Year Operations budget the PO shall begin additional review process

  • PO first must review, and address initial issues
  • PO contacts Tech Team to request review and submits pertinent supporting materials (e.g., H&S plan, field guide, measure matrix)
  • Tech team has 1 day to determine which 2-3 individuals will review
  • Once review team is decided, Tech Team has 3 days to complete review
  • Once review completed, Tech Team has 3 days to consolidate reviews, and provide dissertation to PO which is then routed back to Grantee

  • *If Grantees plan was previously reviewed and is no more than 3% greater than what was originally approved, new plan does not require a new review
Health & Safety – Plan Review

• What are we looking at?
  • Comparison to historical estimates to actuals
  • Expansion of measures which require additional H&S costs
  • Consistency with other Grantee requests
  • Ability to enforce requested budget limits
  • Language and justifications meet minimum program requirements set forth in program rules and regulations (e.g., WPN 17-7, 10 CFR 440)
What will expedite reviews?

- Use of the optional H&S Template form
- Accurate Measure Matrix
- Clear and Concise

Weatherization Grantee Health and Safety Plan

Optional Template

2.0 — BUDGETING

The H&S Template form is an optional tool to assist with the Plan Review process. The form includes sections for Health and Safety, Program Operations, and Budget. The form is designed to help ensure that all necessary details are included in the Plan Review process.

5.0 — HEALTH AND SAFETY EXPENDITURE LIMITS

The health and safety expenditure limits are set by the government and are used to determine the maximum amount that can be spent on health and safety activities. These limits are important because they help ensure that the funds are used in a way that is consistent with the government's goals.

4.0 — INCIDENTAL REPAIR MEASURES

If necessary, incidental repair measures may be included in the Plan Review process. These measures may be used to address minor issues that arise during the implementation of the project.

5.0 — DEFERRED/REFERRAL POLICY

If a measure is deferred or referred to the referral process, it should be documented in the Plan Review process. This documentation should include the reason for the referral and any additional steps that will be taken to address the issue.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY & RENEWABLE ENERGY

Version 1.0
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</tbody>
</table>
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Corrected Estimating and Production (Annual File) PW/VP Production Schedule:

H&S Budget (Total Average H&S Cost per Unit) (Excluding Program Operations): $0.00

Requested H&S Percentage Per Unit (H&S Budget/Program Operations): $0.00
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Health & Safety – Plan Review

Tech Team H&S Plan Review Team

- Shawn Green, Golden CO, shawn.green@ee.doe.gov
- Jon Muckey, Washington DC, jon.muckey@ee.doe.gov
- Michael Peterson, Golden CO, michael.peterson@ee.doe.gov
- Derek Schroeder, Washington DC, derek.schroeder@ee.doe.gov
- Kelly Cutchin, SMS, kcutchin@sms-results.com
H&S – Where to Learn More

• WPN 17-7, Weatherization Health and Safety Guidance
  – Guidance
  – Table of Issues
  – Attachment A (HVAC)
  – FAQ’s
  – Optional Template
  – Optional Radon Disclosure Form

• 10 CFR 440 (440.1, 440.16, 440.18, 440.21)

• State Plan section V.7 – Health and Safety

• EERE site – Training Resources: https://energy.gov/eere/wipo/downloads/training-resources
  – H&S Plan Optional Template Webinar

• SWS - https://sws.nrel.gov
Desktop Reviews
Desktop Reviews
Desktop Reviews

• What are we looking at?
  – Client files
  – Energy Audits/Priority Lists
  – Work Quality
  – Final Inspection
  – Grantee Monitoring
  – Grantee T&TA
  – Grantee Policies
Desktop Review Team

• Derek Schroeder, Washington DC, derek.schroeder@ee.doe.gov
• Kelly Cutchin, SMS, kcutchin@sms-results.com
• Glen Salas, SMS, gsalas@sms-results.com
• Caleb Simon, SMS, csimon@sms-results.com
Desktop Review – Where to Learn More

- WPN 16-4, Program Monitoring Guidance
- WPN 15-4, Quality Work Plan Requirement
- 10 CFR 440 (440.12, 440.23)
- State Plan section V.8.3 – Monitoring Activities
- EERE site – Training Resources: https://energy.gov/eere/wipo/downloads/training-resources
  - Weatherization Monitoring Training
  - Monitoring Planning & Reporting Template Training
Health & Safety Updates

Radon and ASHRAE
Radon

- National WAP Evaluation Study
  - Conducted ~2010-2011
  - Released 2015
  - Estimated 0.4 pCi/l increase with H&S practices as of 2011

- BARRIER study (HUD-funded)
  - Completed 10/17

- BEX study (DOE- and EPA-funded)
  - Underway
BARRIER study

- Started 2013, ended 2017
- Tested ~100 WAP homes in Illinois and New Hampshire
- Included control homes to make adjustments for weather/radon variability
- Intended to compare “standard” and “enhanced” practices
Major Measures since 2011

- ASHRAE Standard 62.2
  - In all homes

- Well-sealed ground covers
  - Agencies were already doing a good job of sealing ground covers when installed – no real difference between standard and enhanced

- Sealing of sump pumps
  - Only in enhanced homes
Sump pumps

- Only 31 homes had unsealed sump pumps pre-Wx
- Only 16 homes got sealed sump pump covers
- Not enough of a sample to determine the benefits of sealing sump pumps
Outcomes

- No statistically-significant increase in radon on first floors

- Statistically-significant increase in foundations depending on analysis methods
  - Differences or percentage changes in radon
  - Inclusion/exclusion of outliers
BEX Study

- Currently underway, four states:
  - Colorado, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Tennessee
- Final sample expected to be 200 homes
- Had 75 pre-post results as of Dec. 31
- Currently have 140 homes with pre-Wx tests
- Final results expected Dec. 2019
ASHRAE 62.2

- 2019 edition coming out in about 15 months
- DOE **not** requiring updating to 2019
  - Can adopt portions as desired
- Will include changes to multifamily
- Will include several other changes
- Some changes still being considered
Multifamily

- Prescriptive compartmentalization requirement for new construction
- Prescriptive targeted sealing locations for existing units
Other changes

- Expressly permits BPI-1200 combustion safety testing for compliance
- Allows reduction in rate with complex usage of filtration
- Increases required flow rate when unbalanced ventilation is used (exhaust or supply)
- Includes basements in floor area
Other changes

- Allows use of simplified equation to calculate infiltration, same as in SWS
- Expands control options for local exhaust
- Allows non-dedicated circuit breaker as an override for existing homes
Possible changes

- Restrictions on unvented space heaters
- General rewrite/cleanup of main section
- Clarifications for kitchen exhaust
WAP Programmatic Update
WAP Program Year

In PY 2019, October 1\textsuperscript{st} Grantees will need to change their program start date to either:

- April 1\textsuperscript{st}
- July 1\textsuperscript{st}
Grantee Trainings

September 2017: Grantee Planning Calendar

October 2017: Weatherization PAGE Enhancements
Monitoring Planning & Reporting Template
Training & Technical Assistance Planning & Reporting Template

November 2017: New Requirements and Policies for PY18
Weatherization Health & Safety Plan Template

December 2017: SWS Tool
Field Guide & Variance Request Review Process

February 2018: Weatherization Monitoring Training
Grantee Training Webinar Views

- **MONITORING PLANNING & REPORTING TEMPLATE**
  - October 2017: 9
  - November 2017: 14
  - December 2017: 19

- **T&TA PLANNING & REPORTING TEMPLATE**
  - October 2017: 12
  - November 2017: 15
  - December 2017: 17

- **NEW REQUIREMENTS & POLICIES FOR PY18**
  - October 2017: 16
  - November 2017: 19
  - December 2017: 22

- **H&S PLAN TEMPLATE**
  - October 2017: 19
  - November 2017: 19
  - December 2017: 19
# 1. Improve the State Plan submission process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record webinars to outline changes to the annual application package.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold an in-depth training on issues/solutions based on prior year plan submissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarize Grantees with FAO’s role/tools and help build the relationship between Grantees and FAO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a WAP State Plan Development Timeline/Calendar and training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE Improvements and Enhancements (warning screens, rounding issue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE Trainings on WAP Plan Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templates (H&amp;S, Training and Technical Assistance, Monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Oct-Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Improve the timeliness of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinforce with WAP staff and Grantees the 60-day timeline for reviews (so that awards are made on time).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers are conducting WAP state plan pre-reviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct the 1st level WAP review within one week of Plan submission; starting with the budget; using the desk guide; and getting questions and comments back to Grantees quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce a 20-day timeframe for the Grantees to respond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with FAO to assure its response within 30 days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebalance portfolios among staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Improve the clarity and consistency of the feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weatherization Project Officer Desk Guide developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand staff knowledge of content—the fundamentals/440 (regulations) and how to interpret.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create internal guidance on what “DOE can live with but will need to correct” vs. plan rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers will cite the regulation(s) and section(s) of the application instrument in the reviews, as appropriate, to identify specific issues that need to be resolved or expanded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Improve the timeliness of monitoring report feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notify Grantees of the review schedule by the end of January.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule calls (at least 60 days prior to the onsite) with the Grantees who are to be reviewed to discuss deadlines, including when the information requested prior to the onsite visit must be submitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track the receipt of documents from the Grantees internally.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review requested documents prior to the onsite visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize visit notes and complete the checklists by the end of each day while onsite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1. Improve the timeliness of monitoring report feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set clear expectations by informing the Network about how onsite visits are supposed to work, and the process for resolving Grantee issues related to the onsite visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish targets for DOE/WAP regarding the percentage and number of monitoring reports that are issued within 30 days. Begin by determining what the current baseline is for getting reports out within 30 days, and then set a target for improving performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify workarounds and/or tips for using PAGE, in the short term, due to the cumbersome nature of the system. As a longer term solution, consider either fixing it or finding another system.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Improve the clarity and consistency of the monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Under Consideration</th>
<th>In Development</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Date Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review draft report for consistency in timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create pull downs for specific issues and the checklist with common statements and directions to use in the report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Corrective Action Tool (using PAGE to pull findings and corrective actions across Grantees) that catalogues options for corrective actions Grantees might consider (based on actions taken by other Grantees) to resolve similar findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE WAP has shared common monitoring findings/issues at NASCSP meetings and conference calls and will continue to collaborate with NASCSP to inform Grantees about common findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Assessment & Monitoring

• The Department of Energy monitors a percentage of Weatherization Grantees each year.

• The selection of Grantees for onsite monitoring is determined by an annual **Weatherization Risk Assessment**.

• Weatherization’s goal in the annual risk assessment process is to:
  – Remove subjectivity or bias from the analysis.
  – Have questions that are fair, measurable and objective.

**Outcome**: Systematic process to identify the level of risk which determines whether monitoring should be done.
Risk Assessment

Weatherization Project Officers review the following areas for each of their assigned Grantees:

- Carryover Funding
- Grantee Staff Longevity & Experience
- Network Production
- Last Onsite Monitoring Visit from DOE
- Unresolved Monitoring Findings/Concerns
- Reporting History (are QPR, FFR reports submitted on time?)
- A-133 Audit Review
- Management Decision Letters
- Energy Audit Compliance
Monitoring Layers

CONTINUOUS MONITORING (ONSITE AND DESK)

GRANTEE RISK ASSESSMENT

Quarterly Desktop Monitoring

ONSITE MONITORING

Issues Identified (IG report, fraud, waste or abuse, etc.)

AD HOC MONITORING

Quarterly Desktop Monitoring

JANUARY

APRIL

JULY

OCTOBER
Advance Payments
Subgrantee Advances

10 CFR 600.122 (c):
• Whenever possible, advances shall be consolidated to cover anticipated cash needs for all awards made by the DOE to the recipient.

2 CFR 200.305(b)(1):
• The non-Federal entity must be paid in advance, provided it maintains or demonstrates the willingness to maintain both written procedures that minimize the time elapsing between the transfer of funds and disbursement by the non-Federal entity, and financial management systems that meet the standards for fund control and accountability as established in this part.
2 CFR 200.305(b)(1):

- Advance payments to a non-Federal entity must be limited to the minimum amounts needed and be timed to be in accordance with the actual, immediate cash requirements of the non-Federal entity in carrying out the purpose of the approved program or project.

- The timing and amount of advance payments must be as close as is administratively feasible to the actual disbursements by the non-Federal entity for direct program or project costs and the proportionate share of any allowable indirect costs. The non-Federal entity must make timely payment to contractors in accordance with the contract provisions.
Wisconsin Weatherization (WisWAP)

State Fiscal Year 2018 Allocations
$58.5 Million Total

- DOE: 11%
- LIHEAP: 19%
- Public Benefits: 70%

Program Providers
## Contract Timeline (July 1 – June 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Year Contract</th>
<th>Next Year Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Recapture Advances</td>
<td>DOE Plan submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Recapture Advances</td>
<td>Budgets &amp; policy finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Recapture Advances</td>
<td>Contracts signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>July 1 - First Advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>August 1 - Second Advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subgrantee Contract (July 1 – June 30)

• One-twelfth of the grant amount for each of the first two months of this Agreement.

• These funding advances may be reduced at any time during the period of the Agreement if the Grantee or the Division determines that such prepayments are in excess of the Grantee's reported expenses.
5.1 Financial Management

- Advances may only be used for allowable weatherization costs that occur during the grant period.
- Agencies shall maintain unspent advance balances in interest bearing accounts. The accounts shall be liquid and carry no penalty for early withdrawal.
- Interest earned on DOE funds over $500 shall be returned to the State quarterly.
WisWAP Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>PO Line Number</th>
<th>STAR PO Line Number</th>
<th>Vacant Building Fund</th>
<th>Advance Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$200,193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$200,193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$400,386.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract PO Line/ Advance Amounts (Edit)

Contract # 00WX1718.01

- Contract Number: 00WX1718.01
- Grantee: ADVOCAP, Inc.
- Fund: Public Benefits
- PO Line Number: 3
- STAR PO Line Number: 3
- Advance Amount: 200193
- Vacant Building Fund: Yes
Summary

• Advances are necessary to maintain Subgrantee cash flow.
• State fiscal team reallocates and recaptures advances throughout contract term.
• Have a system in place to monitor expenditures and recapture advances.