

Assessment of Job Impacts of the Green Jobs - Green New York Program

Final Report

Prepared for:

New York State Energy Research and Development Authority

Albany, NY

Carley Murray
Project Manager

Prepared by:

NMR Group, Inc.

Rohit Vaidya
Vice President

Beth Poulin
Senior Project Manager

November 2013

Notice

This report was prepared by NMR Group, Inc., in the course of performing work contracted for and sponsored by the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (hereafter “NYSERDA”). The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of NYSEDA or the State of New York, and reference to any specific product, service, process, or method does not constitute an implied or expressed recommendation or endorsement of it. Further, NYSEDA, the State of New York, and the contractor make no warranties or representations, expressed or implied, as to the fitness for particular purpose or merchantability of any product, apparatus, or service, or the usefulness, completeness, or accuracy of any processes, methods, or other information contained, described, disclosed, or referred to in this report. NYSEDA, the State of New York, and the contractor make no representation that the use of any product, apparatus, process, method, or other information will not infringe privately owned rights and will assume no liability for any loss, injury, or damage resulting from, or occurring in connection with, the use of information contained, described, disclosed, or referred to in this report.

NYSERDA makes every effort to provide accurate information about copyright owners and related matters in the reports we publish. Contractors are responsible for determining and satisfying copyright or other use restrictions regarding the content of reports that they write, in compliance with NYSEDA’s policies and federal law. If you are the copyright owner and believe a NYSEDA report has not properly attributed your work to you or has used it without permission, please email [print @nyserda.ny.gov](mailto:print@nyserda.ny.gov).

Abstract

This report presents the results of an assessment of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority's (hereafter the "Sponsor" or NYSERDA) Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) Program. GJGNY provides consumers in New York State free or reduced-cost energy audits and low-interest financing, and encourages the installation of energy-efficiency measures using the infrastructure of existing New York programs including: Home Performance with ENERGY STAR[®] Program (HPwES), Multifamily Performance Program (MPP), Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program (SCEE), and the Workforce Development Program (WFD). GJGNY also provides funding for workforce development and job placement and outreach to targeted communities by Constituency-Based Organizations (CBOs).

The GJGNY jobs analysis consisted of two phases and this report is specific to Phase 1. The jobs and wage data from Phase 1 served as inputs to Phase 2, which was an economic impact analysis of the GJGNY Program performed by ICF International, Inc. (ICF).

For the Phase 1 research, NMR Group, Inc. (NMR) conducted research to estimate the number of jobs generated as a result of GJGNY-funded program activities and assessed other job-related impacts such as hourly wage levels and worker skills. In addition, NMR estimated the jobs created in disadvantaged communities in the state.¹

The research conducted by NMR consisted of in-depth interviews and surveys with program partners and trade allies associated with NYSERDA programs that include GJGNY components, as well as analysis of secondary data. Broader questions such as those associated with program delivery and performance are addressed through other process and impact evaluations.

¹ NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Acknowledgements

NMR would like to acknowledge the assistance of Carley Murray at NYSERDA and program staff whom we interviewed. We would also like to acknowledge the cooperation and interest of the implementation contractors and installation contractors. We would like to thank Carla Jackson and staff at Abt/SRBI for data collection. In addition, we wish to thank Jane Peters Ph.D. at Research into Action (RIA), and Glenn Reed for support and review.

Table of Contents

Notice	1
Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Executive Summary	12
Program Description.....	12
Report Objectives and Methodology	12
Key Findings	14
Overall Program Findings.....	14
Program Initiative-Level Findings	17
Key Respondent Group Findings	18
1 Introduction	21
1.1 Background.....	21
1.2 GJGNY Program Integration	22
1.2.1 Existing NYSERDA Programs	22
1.2.2 Other GJGNY Activities	22
2 Objectives and Methodology	24
2.1 Study Objectives.....	24
2.2 Methodology	24
2.3 Primary data	25
2.3.1 ICF Reporting Templates.....	27
2.3.2 2013 New FTEs	28
2.3.3 2013 Retained FTEs.....	28
2.3.4 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs.....	29
2.3.5 2013 Direct FTEs.....	29
2.3.6 2015 Direct FTEs.....	29
2.4 Wage Information	30
2.5 Extrapolation to Population.....	31
2.6 Attribution to GJGNY	33
2.7 Secondary Data	34
3 Program-level FTE and Wage Impacts	36
3.1 Green Jobs – Green New York Program.....	36
3.1.1 Background.....	36
3.1.2 GJGNY Job Creation Activities.....	38

3.1.3	Total FTE Impacts	39
4	Workforce Development and Training.....	48
4.1	Background.....	48
4.2	Key Findings	49
4.2.1	2013 New FTEs	49
4.2.2	2013 Retained FTEs.....	50
4.2.3	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs.....	51
4.2.4	2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities	52
4.2.5	2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities	53
4.3	Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff.....	54
4.3.1	Background.....	54
4.3.2	Key Findings	54
4.4	Workforce Development Trainees	58
4.4.1	Background.....	58
4.4.2	Key Findings	59
5	Outreach and Marketing	62
5.1	Background.....	62
5.2	Key Findings	62
5.2.1	2013 New FTEs	63
5.2.2	2013 Retained FTEs.....	63
5.2.3	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs.....	64
5.2.4	2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities	65
5.2.5	2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities	66
5.3	Constituency-Based Organizations - Staff	67
5.3.1	Background.....	67
5.3.2	Key Findings	68
5.4	Other Job Impacts Resulting from CBO Activities.....	71
5.4.1	Background.....	71
5.4.2	Key Findings	71
5.5	Constituency-Based Organizations - Trainees.....	73
5.5.1	Background.....	73
5.5.2	Key Findings	73
5.6	GJGNY Marketing Contractor.....	76
5.7	CBO Training and Implementation Contractor	77
6	Home Performance with ENERGY STAR	78

6.1	Background.....	78
6.2	Key Findings	78
6.2.1	2013 New FTEs	79
6.2.2	2013 Retained FTEs.....	80
6.2.3	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs	81
6.2.4	2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities	82
6.2.5	2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities	83
6.3	Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors	83
6.3.1	Background.....	83
6.3.2	Key Findings	84
6.4	HPwES Implementers.....	89
6.5	HPwES Financial Service Processors and Providers	89
7	Multifamily Performance Program	90
7.1	Background.....	90
7.2	Key Findings	90
7.2.1	2013 New FTEs	91
7.2.2	2013 Retained FTEs.....	92
7.2.3	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs.....	94
7.2.4	2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities	96
7.2.5	2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities	97
7.3	MPP Performance Partners Staff	97
7.3.1	Background.....	97
7.3.2	Key Findings	98
7.4	MPP Participants	102
7.4.1	Background.....	102
7.4.2	Key Findings	102
7.5	MPP Implementers	107
7.6	MPP Financial Services Processors and Providers	107
8	Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	108
8.1	Background.....	108
8.2	Key Findings	109
8.2.1	2013 New FTEs	109
8.2.2	2013 Retained FTEs.....	109
8.2.3	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs.....	110
8.2.4	2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities	110

8.2.5	2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities	111
8.3	Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors.....	111
8.3.1	Background.....	111
8.3.2	Key Findings	111
8.4	Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program Project Expeditors	114
8.4.1	Background.....	114
8.4.2	Key Findings	114
8.5	SCEE PROGRAM Financial Services Processors and Providers	115
9	Findings and Recommendations	116
9.1	Findings	116
9.2	Recommendations.....	120
	Appendix A Supplementary Findings.....	A-1
A.1	Constituency-Based Organizations.....	A-1
A.1.1	Office Locations.....	A-1
A.1.2	Position Qualifications.....	A-1
A.1.3	Contractor Referral Activity	A-1
A.1.4	CBO Trainee Tracking Systems.....	A-2
A.2	Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors.....	A-3
A.2.1	Perceived Motivation of Customers to Conduct Audit.....	A-4
A.2.2	Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having Audit Completed	A-4
A.2.3	HPwES Audits Performed	A-5
A.2.4	GJGNY Audits for Other NYSERDA Programs	A-7
A.2.5	CBO Referrals to HPwES Contractors.....	A-9
A.2.6	Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Implementing Measures.....	A-9
A.2.7	Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-cost Audit.....	A-10
A.2.8	Measures Installations Due to Audits.....	A-11
A.2.9	GJGNY Low Interest Loans	A-12
A.2.10	Office Locations Conducting GJGNY Activities	A-14
A.3	MPP Participants.....	A-15
A.3.1	Participant Actions if Incentive Not Available.....	A-15
A.3.2	Low Interest Loan.....	A-16
A.4	MPP Performance Partners	A-16
A.4.1	Primary Customer Motivation to Complete Audit	A-16
A.4.2	Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having Audit.....	A-17
A.4.3	Audits Performed by MPP Partners	A-18

A.4.4 CBO Referrals to MPP Partners	A-19
A.4.5 Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Implementing Measures.....	A-19
A.4.6 Impacts of Free/Reduced-cost Audit.....	A-20
A.4.7 Resulting Measures Installations Due to Audits.....	A-21
A.4.8 GJGNY Low-interest Loans	A-21
A.4.9 Office Locations Conducting GJGNY Activities	A-22
Appendix B ICF Reporting Templates	B-1
Appendix C Interview Guides and Survey Instruments	C-1
Workforce Development	C-1
5705a: GJGNY Training Partner Survey – OJT Contractors.....	C-1
5705b: GJGNY Training Partner Survey	C-15
Outreach and Marketing	C-44
GJGNY (Jobs) CBO Training and Implementation Contractor Survey	C-44
GJGNY (Jobs) Marketer Survey	C-58
GJGNY CBO Interview (Jobs Assessment)	C-67
Home Performance with Energy Star	C-92
GJGNY (Jobs) HPwES Contractor Survey.....	C-92
GJGNY (Jobs) HPwES Implementation Contractor Survey	C-121
GJGNY (Jobs) HPwES Financial Services Survey	C-133
Multifamily Performance Program	C-142
GJGNY (Jobs) Performance Partner Survey	C-142
GJGNY (Jobs) MPP Participant Survey	C-170
GJGNY (Jobs) MPP Implementation Contractor Survey.....	C-182
GJGNY (Jobs) MPP Lender Survey	C-192
Small Business/Not-For-Profit (SB/NFP).....	C-203
SBB/NFP Audit Contractor Survey	C-203
GJGNY (Jobs) SB/NFP Lenders Survey	C-216
GJGNY (Jobs) SB/NFP Project Expeditor Survey	C-226

List of Tables

Table ES-1: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total GJGNY	15
Table ES-2: 2013 Total Direct FTEs by Program Initiative	18
Table ES-3: Respondent Groups with Greatest Number of 2013 Direct Jobs	18
Table 4: Primary GJGNY Jobs and Wages Data Sources	26
Table 5: Sample Surveys: Population and Sample Sizes	32
Table 6: GJGNY Attribution Methodology	34

Table 7: 2013 New FTEs - Total GJGNY	40
Table 8: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total GJGNY	42
Table 9: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs and Wages - Total GJGNY.....	44
Table 10: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region - Total GJGNY	46
Table 11: 2013 New FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training.....	50
Table 12: 2013 Retained FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training	51
Table 13: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training ..	52
Table 14: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training	53
Table 15: 2013 New FTEs – Workforce Development and Trainings Partner Staff.....	55
Table 16: 2013 Retained FTEs – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff	56
Table 17: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff	57
Table 18: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff	58
Table 19: 2013 New FTEs – Workforce Development Trainees	59
Table 20: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Workforce Development Trainees.....	60
Table 21: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Workforce Development Trainees	61
Table 22: 2013 New FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing.....	63
Table 23: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing	64
Table 24: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing	65
Table 25: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total Outreach and Marketing .	66
Table 26: 2013 New FTEs – CBO Staff	68
Table 27: 2013 Retained FTEs - CBO Staff	69
Table 28: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – CBO Staff	69
Table 29: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – CBO Staff.....	70
Table 30: 2013 New FTEs - Other CBO Jobs Impacts	72
Table 31: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Other CBO Job Impacts.....	72
Table 32: 2013 New FTEs – CBO Trainees	74
Table 33: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – CBO Trainees.....	75
Table 34: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 FTEs by Region – CBO Trainees.....	76
Table 35: 2013 New FTEs – Total HPwES Program	80
Table 36: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total HPwES Program.....	81
Table 37: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total HPwES Program	82
Table 38: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total HPwES Program.....	83
Table 39: 2013 New FTEs – HPwES Contractors.....	85
Table 40: 2013 Retained FTEs - HPwES Contractors	86
Table 41: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – HPwES Contractors	87
Table 42: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – HPwES Contractors	88
Table 43: 2013 New FTEs – Total MPP Program	92
Table 44: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total MPP Program.....	93
Table 45: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total MPP Program.....	95
Table 46: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total MPP Program	97
Table 47: 2013 New FTEs - MPP Performance Partners Staff.....	98
Table 48: 2013 Retained FTEs - MPP Performance Partners Staff.....	99
Table 49: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – MPP Performance Partners Staff.....	100
Table 50: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – MPP Performance Partners Staff	101

Table 51: 2013 New FTEs – MPP Participants	103
Table 52: 2013 Retained FTEs - MPP Participants.....	104
Table 53: Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – MPP Participants	105
Table 54: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – MPP Participants	106
Table 55: 2013 New FTEs – Total SCEE Program	109
Table 56: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total SCEE Program.....	110
Table 57: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total SCEE Program	111
Table 58: 2013 New FTEs – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors	112
Table 59: 2013 Retained FTEs – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors	112
Table 60: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors	113
Table 61: 2013 Retained FTEs – SCEE Project Expeditors	114
Table 62: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – SCEE Project Expeditors.....	115
Table 63: 2013 New, Retained and Direct FTEs for Top Five NAICS Category.....	117
Table 64: 2013 Direct FTEs by Program Initiative.....	118
Table 65: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Respondent Group	119
Table 66: 2013 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Community Direct FTEs by Region.....	120
Table A - 1: CBO Perceived Impact of Referrals on Contractor Workload	A-2
Table A - 2: Ease of Tracking Trainee Employment Status in SharePoint	A-3
Table A - 3: Primary Motivations for Customers to have Audit Completed through HPwES	A-4
Table A - 4: Primary Barriers for Customers to have Audit Completed through HPwES.....	A-5
Table A - 5: Percentage of HPwES Audits that would have been Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available.....	A-6
Table A - 6: GJGNY Audit-related Activities Performed by HPwES Contractors.....	A-7
Table A - 7: Number of Audits Completed for Other NYSERDA Programs	A-8
Table A - 8: GJGNY Audits Conducted for NYSERDA Programs other than HPwES.....	A-8
Table A - 9: Percentage of Other NYSERDA Program Audits Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available.....	A-9
Table A - 10: GJGNY Audits Conducted through CBO Referrals	A-9
Table A - 11: Primary Barriers for Customers to Install Measures through HPwES	A-10
Table A - 12: Perceptions of Why Free/Reduced-Cost Audit May Not Lead to Energy Efficiency Installations	A-11
Table A - 13: Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-Cost Audits.....	A-11
Table A - 14: Percentage of GJGNY Audits Resulting in Installations of Recommended Energy Efficiency Measures	A-12
Table A - 15: Percentage of GJGNY Audit Customers who took out a GJGNY Loan to Install Measures	A-13
Table A - 16: Percentage of HPwES Installations in the absence of GJGNY Loans	A-14
Table A - 17: HPwES Contractor Total Office Locations.....	A-15
Table A - 18: Participant Actions Taken if Incentives through MPP Program Not Available.....	A-15
Table A - 19: Primary Motivation for Customers to have Audit Completed through MPP.....	A-17
Table A - 20: Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having an Audit	A-18
Table A - 21: Percentage of MPP Audits that would have been Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available.....	A-19
Table A - 22: GJGNY Audits Conducted for NYSERDA Programs other than MPP	A-19
Table A - 23: Primary Barriers for Customers to Install Measures through MPP.....	A-20
Table A - 24: Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-Cost Audits.....	A-21

Table A - 25: Percentage of GJGNY Audits Resulting in Installations of Recommended Energy Efficiency Measures	A-21
Table B- 1: Jobs and Wages – Total GJGNY Program.....	B-2
Table B- 2: 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities – Total GJGNY Program	B-4
Table B- 3: Regions 1 – Total GJGNY Program	B-6
Table B- 4: Regions 2 – Total GJGNY Program	B-8

Executive Summary

Program Description²

The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) provides \$301.6 million of funding from the proceeds of selling CO₂ allowances to help launch a sustainable carbon mitigation plan while meeting the short-term needs of a healthy economy. The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority's (hereafter the "Sponsor" or NYSERDA) Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) Program has been allocated \$112 million of these funds to help create green jobs and stimulate investment in energy-efficiency improvements for residential, multifamily, small business, and not-for-profit buildings. GJGNY also leverages the investments and programs administered by NYSERDA and utilities funded by the System Benefits Charge (SBC), Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS), and Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).

The GJGNY Act of 2009 was signed into law on October 9, 2009³. GJGNY is a statewide program that provides access to energy audits, installation services for eligible energy efficient measures, low-cost financing, and training for various green-collar careers. The GJGNY Program also supports sustainable community development and creates opportunities for green jobs. Designed to leverage existing efforts, the GJGNY Program aligns closely with and is largely delivered through the existing residential, commercial, multifamily, and workforce development program initiatives administered by NYSERDA.

Report Objectives and Methodology

The key focus of this study was to estimate the number of 2013 and 2015 Direct Full-Time Equivalent (FTEs)^{4,5} generated as a result of GJGNY-funded program activities and determine other FTE-related impacts, particularly on hourly wage levels and worker skills. This information served as inputs to an economic impact analysis performed by ICF.

Objectives of the study included:

² NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

³ Green Jobs - Green New York Act of 2009 (A.8901/S.5888 and chapter amendment A.9031/S.6032) Laws of New York, 2009.

⁴ An FTE equals the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. For example, one full time position is equal to one FTE, and one part time position working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time weeks is 0.25 FTEs.

⁵ 2013 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 Direct FTEs plus the respondent's estimate of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015.

- Estimate the number of 2013 New FTEs,⁶ 2013 Retained FTEs,⁷ 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs,⁸ 2013 Direct FTEs⁹ and 2015 Direct FTEs¹⁰ generated as a direct result of GJGNY-funded program activities.
- Determine other FTE-related impacts, particularly on hourly wage levels and worker skills, as well as challenges in recruiting skilled workers.
- Identify the 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs created in disadvantaged communities in the state.¹¹

In order to assess the FTE-related impacts of the GJGNY Program, NMR drew upon both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data collection consisted of in-depth interviews and surveys of several groups associated with GJGNY activities that were likely to have had an impact on the workforce. These included program partners associated with NYSEKDA programs that received GJGNY funding, trade ally groups that provided services for such programs, and firms and organizations involved in the other GJGNY-related activities (e.g., marketing, training, and financing). Secondary data sources included program records provided by NYSEKDA, the New York State Department of Labor (DOL) and Constituency-Based Organizations (CBOs).

Although NMR used state-of-the-art methods to determine program job impacts, it is important to note that this type of analysis has certain challenges and limitations, and key points of context within which to interpret the results.

- Direct jobs (in FTEs) are point-in-time estimates by survey respondents. FTEs reported for 2013 existed in the first quarter of that year and resulted since the inception of the GJGNY program. These 2013 FTEs are assumed to continue to the extent that the GJGNY funding continues. 2015 FTEs were also estimated from the survey and include 2013 FTEs that are assumed to continue through 2015, plus an estimate by survey respondents of the number of additional new FTEs attributable to GJGNY between 2013 and 2015. 2015 job estimates are based on projections that assume GJGNY funding continues through 2015.
- Given the close linkage of GJGNY with ratepayer-funded programs, NMR survey research carefully addressed attribution and worked to isolate the GJGNY impacts.

⁶ 2013 New FTEs are equal to the total number of new full time equivalent positions added because of GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June of 2013.

⁷ 2013 Retained FTEs are equal to the total number of full time equivalent positions retained that would otherwise have been let go, from program inception through May/June 2013.

⁸ 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs are equal to the total number of existing full time equivalent positions that have had an increase in responsibilities and also had an increase in wage level because of the GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June 2013.

⁹ As noted above, 2013 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs.

¹⁰ As noted above, 2015 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 Direct FTEs plus the respondent's estimate of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015.

¹¹ NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

- Due to differences in analytical approaches, results should not be added / compared to results from jobs studies on other NYSERDA programs or portfolios.

Key Findings

This section discusses the key findings of the assessment of the FTE-related impacts report.

The GJGNY Program used a multifaceted approach to stimulate the creation of green jobs. In order to accomplish this, many different entities were involved, such as green job trainers, program implementation contractors, and marketers. Jobs were created, retained, and up-skilled and up-waged for participants who received training, as well as within companies involved with program delivery, recruiting, marketing, and training. GJGNY activities included five primary initiative areas:

- Workforce Development (WFD) and Training Activities
- Outreach and Marketing Activities
- Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) Program
- Multifamily Performance Program (MPP)
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program

The Phase 1 research collected relevant FTE and wage data for respondent groups within each of these initiative areas. Respondent groups varied by program. For example, key respondent groups for Outreach and Marketing activities included the staff at participating CBOs, CBO trainees, and other positions that were created as a result of CBO activities.

The primary types of information reported by all respondents included 2013 New FTEs and associated hourly wage levels, 2013 Retained FTEs and associated hourly wage levels, and 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs and associated hourly wage levels. In addition, the study collected data to estimate 2013 Direct FTEs by region, 2015 Direct FTEs, and total FTEs in disadvantaged communities.

Overall Program Findings

2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities. 2013 Direct FTEs include 2013 New FTEs and 2013 Retained FTEs that experienced hourly wage increases. NMR collected and aggregated 2013 Direct FTEs and related regional data across all reported North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code categories (Table ES-1).¹²

¹² Most survey respondents were given a selection of possible business functions associated with likely NAICS code categories to choose from. If they did not choose a NAICS code category from the selection provided, they were assigned a category based on their description of their primary business function, the description of their

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTEs across the entire GJGNY Program was 905.8 FTEs. The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Finger Lakes with 222.6 FTEs, or 24.6%. Of the total 905.8 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs for the GJGNY Program, 17.2%, or 155.6 FTEs, were in disadvantaged communities. The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Southern Tier with 55.7 FTEs.

Table ES-1: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total GJGNY

Regions	Total Direct FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	905.8	100%	155.6	17.2%
North Country	8.3	0.9%	8.3	0.9%
Bronx	12.6	1.4%	12.6	1.4%
Kings and Richmond	10.3	1.1%	8.3	0.9%
Queens	21.8	2.4%	--	--
Central	73.6	8.1%	13.4	1.5%
New York	71.9	7.9%	--	--
Southern Tier	79.1	8.7%	55.7	6.1%
Western	99.5	11.0%	9.3	1.0%
Finger Lakes	222.6	24.6%	3.0	0.3%
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	104.5	11.5%	39.5	4.4%
Long Island	106.4	11.8%	--	--
Capital	95.2	10.5%	5.5	0.6%
2015 Direct FTEs	2,545.6	NA	498.5	19.6%

2013 New FTEs. NMR collected and aggregated 2013 New FTEs and related hourly wage information across 31 reported NAICS code categories. As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in the addition of 558.8 total new FTEs. Average hourly wage level across all

company business on their website, or a NAICS code category reported by internet sources including manta.com and corpiva.com. For survey non-respondents for which we had a company name, we used the same internet sources to assign NAICS code categories. Consequently, the number of FTEs for specific NAICS categories should be viewed as general estimates that provide an indication of overall magnitudes rather than precise values. For more information, view the NAICS Association website: www.naics.com

NAICS code categories was \$25.23. Engineering Services added the most new FTEs with 151.8 total FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$19.85.¹³

2013 Retained FTEs. NMR collected and aggregated 2013 Retained FTEs and related hourly wage information across 27 reported NAICS code categories. As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in a total of 347.0 retained FTEs. The average hourly wage level across all of these positions was \$28.68. Engineering Services had the largest number of retained FTEs with 173.6 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$24.06.

2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs. NMR collected and aggregated counts of 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs across 26 reported NAICS code categories. As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in a total of 282.2 FTEs of existing staff positions that were up-skilled and received an increase in hourly wages. Prior to their involvement with GJGNY activities, the average hourly wage level for this group was \$22.45. The average hourly wage increase that this group experienced due to the GJGNY Program was \$4.12, which resulted in an average hourly wage level for all of these FTEs combined of \$26.57.

Engineering Services saw the greatest number of 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs with 142.1 total FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$17.26, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$20.85.

GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives also resulted in a total of 258.7 FTEs of existing staff positions that were up-skilled, across NAICS code categories, but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities. 2015 Direct FTEs was calculated for each NAICS code category by combining 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, and a respondent-reported estimate of how many more new FTEs will be added by 2015. NMR collected and aggregated 2015 Direct FTEs across all reported NAICS code categories (Table ES-1). By 2015, the GJGNY Program is projected to have total FTE-related impacts of 2,545.6 FTEs. Of that total, 498.5 FTEs, or 19.6% of 2015 Direct Jobs, are projected to be in disadvantaged communities.

¹³ Note that Engineering Services companies may be wide-ranging, including engineers as well as building auditors. For more information, view the NAICS Association website: www.naics.com

Program Initiative-Level Findings¹⁴

Table ES-2 shows the total 2013 Direct FTE impacts by individual program initiative.

The initiative with the most 2013 Direct FTE impacts was the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program (HPwES) with 495.9 FTEs, or 54.8% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. The HPwES Program includes HPwES contractors as well as the HPwES Program Implementers.

The initiative with the second most 2013 Direct FTEs was the Workforce Development and Training Initiative with 213.6 FTEs, or 23.6% of 2013 Direct FTEs. The Workforce Development and Training Initiative includes Workforce Development Training Partners and Workforce Development Trainees.

The Outreach and Marketing Initiative had a total of 160.6 FTEs, or 17.7% 2013 Direct FTEs. Outreach and Marketing includes staff from several different respondent groups, including Constituency-based Organization (CBO) staff, CBO Trainees, Marketing Contractor, CBO Implementer, and other CBO activities.

The Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) had a total of 28.7 2013 Direct FTEs. The Multifamily Performance Program includes staff from the MPP Partners, MPP Participants, and the MPP Implementers. Finally, the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program had a total of 7.0 2013 Direct FTEs. The SCEE Program includes staff from Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors and SCEE Program Project Expeditors.

¹⁴ While the assignment of FTE impacts to specific program initiative is generally clear-cut, employee and hiring company names for trainees influenced by the CBOs and training partners were not available. Trainee FTEs could not be cross-checked against FTEs reported by HPwES contractors. Since it is possible that there is some overlap in FTEs, the numbers for individual initiatives should be viewed as general estimates that provide an indication of overall magnitudes rather than precise values.

Table ES-2: 2013 Total Direct FTEs by Program Initiative

Program Initiatives	2013 Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total
Workforce Development and Training	213.6	23.6%
Outreach and Marketing	160.6	17.7%
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	495.9	54.8%
Multifamily Performance Program	28.7	3.2%
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	7.0	0.8%
Total Green Jobs – Green New York Program	905.8	100%

Key Respondent Group Findings

Table ES-3 shows the individual respondent groups with the most 2013 Direct FTEs. Home Performance with ENERGY STAR contractors had the most FTEs with 495.5 FTEs, or 54.7% of all 2013 Direct FTEs across the GJGNY Program. Workforce Development Trainees had the second most FTEs with 174.0 FTEs, or 19.2% of all 2013 Direct FTEs across the GJGNY Program. CBO Trainees¹⁵ saw the third most FTEs with 104.4 FTEs, or 11.5% of all 2013 Direct FTEs across the GJGNY Program. Combined, these three groups accounted for a total of 773.9 FTEs, or 85.4% of all 2013 Direct FTEs across the GJGNY Program.

Table ES-3: Respondent Groups with Greatest Number of 2013 Direct Jobs

Respondent Groups	2013 Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors	495.5	54.7%
Workforce Development Trainees	174.0	19.2%
CBO Trainees	104.4	11.5%
Total for Three Largest Respondent Groups	773.9	85.4%
Total Green Jobs – Green New York Program	905.8	100%

¹⁵ CBO trainees are trainees who were recruited by CBO staff to participate in workforce development training. One of the roles of CBOs was to facilitate awareness of workforce training opportunities and to assist with enrollment in those efforts (although not all CBOs did this). During in-depth interviews with the CBOs, NMR asked respondents about the number of trainees who have completed workforce development training because of their recruitment efforts and were subsequently hired into green jobs-related positions.

Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors. As noted above, the HPwES contractors had the most 2013 Direct FTEs relative to the other respondent groups with 495.5 FTEs, or 54.7% of total 2013 Direct FTEs (Table ES-3). Within the HPwES contractor group, Engineering Services had the most 2013 Direct FTEs with 286.7 FTEs. The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Finger Lakes region with 182.5 FTEs. Of the 495.5 total FTEs that represented reported 2013 Direct FTEs from the HPwES contractors, 76.2 FTEs, or 15.4%, were in disadvantaged communities.

2013 New FTEs for HPwES contractors totaled 207.5 FTEs. Engineering Services added the most new FTEs with 116.9 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.75. 2013 Retained FTEs for HPwES contractors totaled 288.1 FTEs. Engineering Services retained the largest number of FTEs with 169.7 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$23.14. 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs for HPwES contractors totaled 240.2 FTEs, with Engineering Services having the greatest number with 140.5 FTEs. By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have a total Direct FTE impact among HPwES contractors of 736.7 FTEs. Of that total, 130.8 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Engineering Services is projected to have the most active FTEs by 2015 with 403.3 FTEs.

Workforce Development Trainees. As noted above, Workforce Development Trainees saw the second most 2013 Direct FTEs relative to the other respondent groups with 174.0 FTEs, or 19.2% (Table ES-3). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was New York with 47.9 FTEs. Of the 174.0 total FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development Trainees, 39.3 FTEs were in disadvantaged communities. The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 10.7 FTEs.

The 2013 New FTE total for Workforce Development Trainees was 174.0 FTEs. Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors added the most new FTEs with 39.2 total FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$15.05. 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs for Workforce Development Trainees totaled 11.7 FTEs, with Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning having the greatest number with 5.7 FTEs. By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have a total Direct FTE impact among Workforce Development Trainees of 1,016.2. Of that total, 163.0 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors are projected to have the most active FTEs by 2015 with 491.9 FTEs.

CBO Trainees. As noted above, CBO Trainees saw the third most 2013 Direct FTEs in comparison to all other respondent groups with 104.4 FTEs, or 11.5% (Table ES-3). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Capital region with 55.9 FTEs. Of the 104.4 total FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the CBO Trainees, 13.0 FTEs were in disadvantaged communities. The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Southern Tier with 12.0 FTEs.

CBO Trainees experienced 104.4 FTEs of 2013 New FTEs. Residential Remodelers added the most new FTEs with 58.3 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$13.86. 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs for CBO Trainees totaled 10.0 FTEs. By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have a total Direct FTE impact among CBO Trainees of 599.6. Of that total, 159.1 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Drywall and Insulation Contractors are projected to have the most active FTEs by 2015 with 286.2 FTEs.

1 Introduction

The primary purpose of the research reported in this document was to support the assessment of economic effects of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority's (hereafter the "Sponsor" or NYSERDA) Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) Program by analyzing its impact on jobs. To this end, NMR Group, Inc. (NMR) conducted research to estimate the number of FTEs generated as a result of GJGNY-funded program activities and assessed other FTE-related impacts such as hourly wage levels and worker skills. In addition, NMR estimated the number of program-related FTEs in disadvantaged communities in the state.¹⁶ This information served as inputs to an economic impact analysis of the GJGNY Program performed by ICF International, Inc. (ICF). The research conducted by NMR consisted of in-depth interviews and surveys with program partners and trade allies associated with NYSERDA programs that include GJGNY components, as well as analysis of secondary data.¹⁷

1.1 Background

On October 9, 2009, the Green Jobs - Green New York Act of 2009 was signed into law. The GJGNY Program ("the Program") supports the goals of this legislation by providing access to no-cost and reduced-cost energy audits, installation services, low-cost innovative financing through revolving load funds, workforce development, and job placement and outreach by constituency-based organizations serving targeted communities.

On August 4, 2011, Governor Andrew Cuomo signed the Power NY Act of 2011, which established an on-bill recovery (OBR) financing mechanism for GJGNY project financing and increased the maximum loan limits for residential and small business/not-for-profit GJGNY loans, subject to certain project payback criteria. While the original legislation called for the OBR Loans to be available by May 2012, NYSERDA was able to implement OBR Loans for residential consumers commencing January 30, 2012. In April 2012, an amendment to the GJGNY law (Public Authorities Law § 1896(5)) made additional changes to improve the OBR financing mechanism.¹⁸

¹⁶ NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

¹⁷ Broader questions such as those associated with program delivery and performance will be addressed through other process and impact evaluations.

¹⁸ New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, "Green Jobs – Green New York Annual Report, Month Ending July 31, 2012," October 2012, <http://www.nysesda.ny.gov/Energy-Efficiency-and-Renewable-Programs/Green-Jobs-Green-New-York.aspx>.

1.2 GJGNY Program Integration

The GJGNY Program seeks to accomplish its goals by integrating with existing NYSERDA programs as well as by providing additional services aimed at increasing energy efficiency in New York, such as creating awareness for programs and offering workforce training.

1.2.1 Existing NYSERDA Programs

GJGNY activities are integrated into the following previously existing NYSERDA programs:

- Home Performance with ENERGY STAR® (HPwES). The New York HPwES Program has been administered by NYSERDA since 2001. The program uses a “whole house” approach to building science by identifying opportunities for greater energy efficiency and installing cost-effective measures in one- to four-family housing. Under GJGNY, households whose income fall below established criteria are eligible for free or reduced-cost audits and GJGNY unsecured loans.
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program. This program, primarily funded¹⁹ by GJGNY, provides assessments and financing for buildings used or occupied by a small business or not-for-profits (NFPs). Customers are free to choose their own contractors to install their projects, while GJGNY funded Project Expeditors provide hands-on assistance to small businesses and NFPs to encourage implementation of energy assessment recommendations.
- Multifamily Performance Program (MPP). MPP is a comprehensive, one-stop program, for all 5+ unit residential buildings. A network of approved energy service contractors (i.e., *MPP Partners*) assist participants with project implementation by completing an initial energy audit and developing an Energy Reduction Plan to reach a source energy use reduction target of 15%. The MPP Partner is also responsible for verifying that the energy-related work scope is installed in compliance with GJGNY requirements. GJGNY offers project financing and partial funding of program incentives for audits and all stages of project development.

1.2.2 Other GJGNY Activities

- CBO Outreach. GJGNY delivers outreach services in targeted communities through a network of Constituency-based Organizations (CBOs). The primary goal of the customer outreach is to increase the number of individuals or businesses making efficiency improvements and to increase enrollment in workforce training programs. The CBOs encourage participation in energy-efficiency programs, facilitate awareness of workforce training opportunities available through GJGNY, and assist with enrollment in those efforts. CBOs deliver outreach, marketing, and education targeted to residents, small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, multifamily building owners, and potential workforce participants.

¹⁹ From time of ARRA award (2009) to 9/30/2013 the Program also had some ARRA funding available to support audits for customers with > 10 employees, less than 100 kW. The impact of this funding on the total number of jobs attributable to GJGNY is not reflected in the assumption of 100% attribution of FTEs to GJGNY for the SCEE program. This assumption does not significantly affect the study results since only 3.8 out of 151.8 total new Engineering Services FTEs, and fewer retained, up-waged or future FTEs are attributed to SCEE program.

- Workforce Development (WFD). The GJGNY WFD activities allow existing NYSERDA contractors²⁰ to expand their capacity to deliver services by providing on-the-job apprenticeship and internship incentives to help defray staffing costs. Initiatives also help build New York State's training infrastructure by working with constituency based training organizations (CBOs) through the expansion of existing training centers, furnishing new training equipment, and expanding field testing and certification examination protocols to help ramp up workforce participation in training and certification. An important component of WFD is to offer career pathways for displaced workers to build skills and re-enter the workforce. Another important component of WFD is to place workers in jobs with NYSERDA contractors, where they can obtain on-the-job training (OJT). The OJT program component is also promoted and facilitated by the New York State Department of Labor.
- Financing. GJGNY financing is available through unsecured reported direct loans financed by the Revolving Loan Fund through two accounts, first the one- to four- family residential buildings and multifamily buildings and a second for buildings occupied by small businesses and NFP organizations. An On-Bill Recovery option became available on January 30, 2012.
- Marketing. GJGNY activities include a statewide marketing effort to promote awareness of the energy audit and loan program and target small businesses, NFPs, residential and multifamily building owners across New York. In addition to building and growing participation in GJGNY, marketing objectives include growing the number of accredited contractors and building the pipeline of New Yorkers participating in GJGNY and energy-efficiency related training.

²⁰ The program is open to any business that has a current partnership agreement or contract agreement in good standing with NYSERDA.

2 Objectives and Methodology

2.1 Study Objectives

The key focus of this study was to estimate the number of 2013 and 2015 Direct Full-Time Equivalent (FTEs)^{21,22} generated as a result of GJGNY-funded program activities and determine other FTE-related impacts, particularly on hourly wage levels and worker skills. This information served as inputs to an economic impact analysis performed by ICF.

Objectives of the study included:

- Estimate the number of 2013 New FTEs,²³ 2013 Retained FTEs,²⁴ 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs,²⁵ 2013 Direct FTEs²⁶ and 2015 Direct FTEs²⁷ generated as a direct result of GJGNY-funded program activities.
- Determine other FTE-related impacts, particularly on hourly wage levels and worker skills, as well as challenges in recruiting skilled workers.
- Identify the 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs created in disadvantaged communities in the state.²⁸

2.2 Methodology

In order to assess the FTE-related impacts of the GJGNY Program, NMR drew upon both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data collection consisted of in-depth interviews and surveys of several groups associated with GJGNY activities that were likely to have had an impact on the workforce. These included program partners associated with NYSERDA programs that received GJGNY funding, trade ally

²¹ An FTE equals the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. For example, one full time position is equal to one FTE, and one part time position working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time weeks is 0.25 FTEs.

²² 2013 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 Direct FTEs plus the respondent's estimate of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015.

²³ 2013 New FTEs are equal to the total number of new full time equivalent positions added because of GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June of 2013.

²⁴ 2013 Retained FTEs are equal to the total number of full time equivalent positions retained that would otherwise have been let go, from program inception through May/June 2013.

²⁵ 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs are equal to the total number of existing full time equivalent positions that have had an increase in responsibilities and also had an increase in wage level because of the GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June 2013.

²⁶ As noted above, 2013 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs.

²⁷ As noted above, 2015 Direct FTEs are equal to 2013 Direct FTEs plus the respondent's estimate of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015.

²⁸ NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

groups that provided services for such programs, and firms and organizations involved in the other GJGNY-related activities (e.g., marketing, training, and financing). Secondary data sources included program records provided by NYSERDA, DOL and CBOs.

2.3 Primary data

NMR drew upon interviews and surveys with a variety of groups associated with GJGNY-funded activities. This effort was based on primary data collection through two parallel paths. NMR leveraged existing data collection efforts by other program evaluations and also independently conducted primary data collection. Listed below are the groups that were interviewed.

- Workforce Development (WFD) and Training Partners
- Workforce Development On-the-Job Training (OJT) Partners
- Constituency-based organizations (CBOs)
- CBO Implementation and Training Contractor
- GJGNY Marketing Contractor
- Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) Contractor
- HPwES Audit/Installation Contractors
- HPwES Program Implementation Contractor
- HPwES Program Quality Assurance Contractor
- HPwES Loan Processors and Providers
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program Assessment Contractors
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program Project Expeditors
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program Lenders
- Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) Partners
- MPP Participants
- MPP Implementation Contractor
- MPP Quality Assurance Contractors

The primary data sources of the GJGNY FTE and wage data are summarized in Table 4. In total, more than 200 different respondents were surveyed.

Table 4: Primary GJGNY Jobs and Wages Data Sources

GJGNY Program/Activity	Respondent Group	Number Surveyed
GJGNY Outreach	CBO Training & Implementation Contractor	1
GJGNY Outreach	GJGNY Marketer	1
GJGNY Outreach	CBOs	18
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Contractors	71
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Loan Processors and Providers	5
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Implementation Contractor	1
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	QA Contractor	1
Multifamily Performance Program	Performance Partners	25
Multifamily Performance Program	Participants	40
Multifamily Performance Program	Implementation Contractor ^a	1
Multifamily Performance Program	QA Contractor*	1
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Assessment Contractors	3
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Project Expeditor	3
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Lenders ^b	4
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners	8
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners/OJT	22
Total		205

^a Interviews conducted by Multifamily Performance Program process evaluation contractor.

^b Interviews conducted by Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program process evaluation contractor.

Except for the largest groups (HPwES contractors, MPP Participants, MPP Performance Partners), NMR attempted to interview all the group members. We conducted surveys of random samples of HPwES contractors, MPP Participants, and MPP Performance Partners. In order to increase the likelihood of interviewing HPwES contractors who had increased their hiring because of GJGNY work, we ranked the HPwES contractor sample by level of activity and sought to survey the more active contractors.

Through these interviews and surveys, we collected the following information from each of the respondents regarding FTE-related impacts within their company from the GJGNY Program:

- Number of 2013 New FTEs and 2013 Retained FTEs by their firm or organization in part-time and full-time positions that could be attributed to the GJGNY Program or GJGNY-supported work
- Number of FTEs that experienced hourly wage increases due to increased responsibility associated with GJGNY training or GJGNY-supported work (i.e., 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs)

- Primary business function, reported in North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code categories²⁹
- Projection of the number of FTEs to be added two years into the future (i.e., 2015 Direct FTEs)
- Hourly wage levels of 2013 New FTEs and 2013 Retained FTEs, as well as hourly wage increases for 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs
- Cities and towns where FTE-related impacts occurred
- Firmographics

As noted above, the primary business function of respondents was categorized by NAICS code categories. Note that the job activities within NAICS code categories may vary across companies and regions.

In addition, we collected the same FTE and hourly wage information from respondents involved with workforce development (i.e., WFD Training Partners and CBOs) about the job placements of their trainees.

2.3.1 ICF Reporting Templates

NMR worked closely with ICF to develop the survey instruments such that the resulting data would best inform ICF's economic impact analysis. The FTE and wage data was organized into two ICF Reporting Templates, titled "Jobs & Wages" and "Regions." These tables were approved by ICF as input to the Phase 2 economic impact analysis. All FTE and wage results were organized by NAICS code category. The ICF Reporting Templates can be viewed in Appendix B. Please note that while the Jobs & Wages table is reproduced in the Appendix in its entirety, the Regions table was reproduced in three separate tables given its width.

In the ICF Reporting Templates we reported the total number of 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, and 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs that were attributable to the GJGNY Program. These FTEs were determined based on interviewee responses and extrapolated to the full population if only a sample from a particular group was surveyed. We also reported the number of 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs in this template. As noted above, 2015 Direct FTEs equals the total of 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs, and 2015 Direct FTEs equals the 2013 Direct FTEs plus the respondents' estimates of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015.

²⁹ Most survey respondents were given a selection of possible business functions associated with likely NAICS code categories to choose from. If they did not choose a NAICS code category from the selection provided, they were assigned a category based on their description of their primary business function, the description of their company business on their website, or a NAICS code category reported by internet sources including manta.com and corpiva.com. For survey non-respondents for which we had a company name, we used the same internet sources to assign NAICS code categories. For more information, view the NAICS Association website: www.naics.com

The GJGNY Jobs Data for ICF Templates shows the total number of 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs for each NAICS code category distributed into the 12 CBO Outreach regions in which the jobs were located. Respondents were asked for the office location of any new FTEs, retained FTEs, or up-skilled and up-waged FTEs that occurred from program inception through May/June of 2013 because of GJGNY Program activity. FTEs were distributed among cities/towns weighted by population if more than one city or town is identified as being the office location of the FTEs. The number of reported 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs in each CBO region located in disadvantaged communities was also reported in the GJGNY Jobs Data for ICF Template.

2.3.2 2013 New FTEs

NMR estimated the number of 2013 New FTEs based on the survey and interview responses. As noted above, 2013 New FTEs equals the total number of new full time equivalent positions added because of GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June of 2013. We asked all survey respondents and interviewees to estimate the total 2013 New FTEs added because of GJGNY-related work. WFD Training Partners and CBOs also provided estimates of the number of previously unemployed trainees who found or were placed in jobs after GJGNY-funded training. These FTE estimates were adjusted by a GJGNY attribution factor and extrapolated to the full population where appropriate. We estimated new FTEs for trainees of Workforce Development On-the-Job Training (OJT) Partners using secondary data provided by NYSERDA.

2.3.3 2013 Retained FTEs

As noted above, 2013 Retained FTEs equals the total number of full time equivalent positions retained that would otherwise have been let go, from program inception through May/June of 2013. The total number of 2013 Retained FTEs was calculated using a parallel method as was used for the 2013 New FTE calculation. Survey respondents and interviewees estimated the total number of FTEs that would have been let go in absence of GJGNY related work, but were retained because of the program. We estimated 2013 Retained FTEs for trainees of WFD OJT Training Partners using secondary data provided by NYSERDA. Since WFD Training Partners (not OJT) and CBOs were not the direct employers of trainees who were already employed while in training, they were not in a position to say if these trainees would have lost their jobs if not for training; therefore 2013 Retained FTEs could not be estimated for CBO and WFD trainees. Similarly, CBO staff were not asked to report on 2013 Retained FTEs at other organizations that they were influential in stimulating jobs because of their GJGNY activities. CBOs were not the direct employers of staff at these other organizations and therefore were not in the position to know whether staff at those organizations were retained because of the program.

2.3.4 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

Survey respondents and interviewees estimated the total number of 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs. As noted above, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs equals the total number of existing full time equivalent positions that have had an increase in responsibilities and also had an increase in wage level because of GJGNY activities, from program inception through May/June of 2013. The increased responsibility could have been due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired. As with 2013 New and Retained FTEs, the numbers of 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs was adjusted by a GJGNY attribution factor and extrapolated to the full population where appropriate. In addition, WFD Training Partners (not OJT) and CBOs estimated the number of trainees who had jobs prior to participating in training who saw an hourly wage increase in their existing jobs or because of GJGNY-funded training. We determined 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs for trainees of WFD OJT Training Partners using secondary data provided by NYSERDA. Note that CBO staff were not asked to report on the existing jobs that were both up-skilled and up-waged at other organizations that they were influential in stimulating jobs with because of their GJGNY activities. CBOs were not the direct employers of staff at these other organizations and therefore were not in the position to know whether existing staff at these other organizations were both up-skilled and up-waged because of the program.

2.3.5 2013 Direct FTEs

The category of jobs referred to as 2013 Direct FTEs reflects the total impact of GJGNY programs on FTEs, from program inception through May/June of 2013. As noted above, it is equal to the sum, across all respondent groups and program initiatives, of 2013 New FTEs and 2013 Retained FTEs that are attributable to the GJGNY Program.

The ICF Reporting Templates shows total 2013 Direct FTEs by NAICS code category and by geographic region in which FTEs were located. The ICF Reporting Templates also show the number of FTEs located in disadvantaged communities. We determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged.³⁰

2.3.6 2015 Direct FTEs

As noted above, 2015 Direct FTEs equals the sum of 2013 Direct FTEs plus respondents' estimates of full time equivalent new positions that will be added because of GJGNY activities by 2015. Respondents were

³⁰ County unemployment levels were selected from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>)

asked how many FTEs they expected to hire in the next two years (by 2015) because of GJGNY activity. Respondents whose companies were under contract for GJGNY-funded work but were uncertain whether their contract with the program would be extended were asked to assume, for the purposes of the question, that it would be extended. Respondents involved with WFD were asked how many trainees they expected would be able to procure jobs in the next two years as a result of the training. Workforce Development On-the-Job Training (OJT) Partners were asked approximately how many more FTE they anticipated adding through NYSERDA's OJT Program over the next 2 years (by 2015).

2.4 Wage Information

NMR collected hourly wage data for 2013 New and Retained FTEs by asking respondents for the typical hourly wage of each position in which FTEs were created or retained. Respondents also reported the previous typical hourly wage of and the increase in hourly wages for 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs. Response choices were hourly wage ranges in increments of \$5, from "Under \$10" to "\$50 or More," while the ranges for hourly wage increases were in increments of \$2, from "Under \$2" to "Over \$10".

The average hourly wage for 2013 New and Retained FTEs reported in the ICF Reporting Templates was calculated by considering the hourly wage for each FTE to be the mid-point of the reported range for the position in which the FTE was newly added or retained. NMR estimated an average hourly wage, weighted by the number of FTEs at that hourly wage for each NAICS code category for which respondents reported hourly wages.³¹ We used a parallel method for calculating the average previous hourly wage and hourly wage increase for 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs. Current hourly wages for 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs were obtained by adding the mid-point of the reported hourly increase to the mid-point of the reported previous hourly wage range. We reported weighted averages for previous hourly wage, hourly wage increase and current hourly wage in the ICF Reporting Templates.

Very few respondents reported hourly wage ranges of "Under \$10" or "\$50 or More" for any of the FTEs reported. In cases where an hourly wage "Under \$10" was reported, NMR conservatively assumed an average hourly wage estimate of \$7.30, the minimum hourly wage as of April 2013 in New York State. If an hourly wage of "\$50 or more" was reported, a conservative hourly wage of \$50 was used for the analysis. In the few cases in which respondents reported an hourly wage increase of "Under \$2" for 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, a conservative increase of \$1 was assumed, and an increase of "\$12 or more" was conservatively considered to be \$12.

³¹ Not all survey respondents provided information on wages.

2.5 Extrapolation to Population

NMR was able to interview or survey all the members of several of the trade allies and partner groups. In these cases, the interviewees represented a census of the group, and the FTE-related impacts determined for these groups were complete. For the groups for which the survey respondents/interviewees represented a sample of the entire population (of Home Performance with ENERGY STAR contractors, for example) in the program, NMR estimated the FTE-related impacts for the non-respondents in the group using simple extrapolation methods. Hourly wages were only reported based on respondent survey estimates and were not extrapolated to group populations in any way. The populations and number of survey completes for the non-census trade allies/partner groups is presented in Table 5.

In most cases, the number of FTEs reported by the surveyed group sample were extrapolated to the population by assigning the simple average number of FTEs per respondent to each non-respondent. The only exception to using the simple average number of jobs per respondent was for the HPwES contractors' job estimates. NMR estimated the number of non-respondent HPwES contractor FTEs by calculating the average survey respondents' FTEs per number of audits plus installed projects. For each non-respondent contractor, NMR then multiplied respondents' average FTEs per number of audits plus installed project to the non-respondent's number of audits plus installed projects to get the non-respondent's FTEs.³²

NMR assigned the FTEs extrapolated as described above to CBO regions and disadvantaged community status in the ICF Reporting Templates using the office location of the non-respondent company.

³² NMR examined the correlation between the number of FTEs versus number of audits and number of projects for HPwES contractors whose workload might be expected to relate to the number of projects and complexity of the work performed. We also looked at the correlation between number of jobs and number of retrofitted units for MPP Participants. However, the correlations were extremely poor and offered no justification for use of a regression equation to determine the number of non-respondent jobs impacts.

Table 5: Sample Surveys: Population and Sample Sizes

Program	Respondent Group	Population	Survey Completes	Extrapolation Method
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Contractors	407	71	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per number of audits plus installations
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Loan Processors and Providers	7	5	Zero FTEs Reported
Multifamily Performance Program	Performance Partners	39 active	25	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per respondent
Multifamily Performance Program	Participants	268	40	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per respondent
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Assessment Contractors	4	3	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per respondent
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Lenders	6	5	Zero FTEs reported
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners	14	8	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per respondent
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners/OJT	36	22	Average FTEs attributed to GJGNY per respondent ³³

³³ New, retained and up-skilled/up-waged were actual FTEs determined from GJGNY Hire Data. Only future jobs were extrapolated based on survey results.

2.6 Attribution to GJGNY

NMR determined attribution for all of the respondent groups within each program. For those program components completely funded by GJGNY, the attribution factor was 100%. These program components included HPwES Loan Processors and Providers, Constituency-based Organizations, GJGNY Marketing, CBO Training and Implementation Contractors, WFD Training Partners, WFD OJT Training Partners, Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors, SCEE Program Project Expeditors, and SCEE Program Lenders.

For other program components, NMR determined and applied GJGNY Program attribution factors to FTE counts based on participant survey questions or information about program and contractor sources of funding as summarized in Table 6.

NMR calculated attribution for HPwES contractors based on their survey responses. We asked contractors responding to the survey to estimate the approximate percentage of audits they would have done had the audits not been available for free or at a reduced cost through GJGNY and the percentage of the installations supported by GJGNY loans they would have done had low-cost GJGNY loans not been available. We determined individual contractor attribution factors by using these responses to adjust the number of audits and installations they had performed since the introduction of GJGNY.

NMR calculated attribution for HPwES Implementation Contractor and the Quality Assurance (QA) Contractor, and Implementation Contractor and the QA Contractor based on the percentage of their program contracts funded by GJGNY since the beginning of the GJGNY Program. According to NYSERDA program staff, GJGNY funding provided approximately 7.5% of all incentives provided for MPP program activities. NMR used this percentage as the attribution factor for MPP Participants and Performance Partners since, by design, the program participants and Performance Partners were not explicitly aware of the role of GJGNY funding on their activities.

Table 6: GJGNY Attribution Methodology

GJGNY Program/Activity	Respondent Group	GJGNY Attribution
GJGNY Outreach	CBO Training & Implementation Contractor	100% GJGNY
GJGNY Outreach	GJGNY Marketer	100% GJGNY
GJGNY Outreach	CBO's	100% GJGNY
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Contractors	Based on Survey Responses
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	Loan Processors and Providers	100% GJGNY
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR	Implementation Contractor	5.3% of contract funded by GJGNY
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR	QA Contractor	7.5% of contract funded by GJGNY*
Multifamily Performance Program	Performance Partners	7.5% of incentives funded by GJGNY
Multifamily Performance Program	Participants	7.5% of incentives funded by GJGNY
Multifamily Performance Program	Implementation Contractor	6.3% of contract funded by GJGNY
Multifamily Performance Program	QA Contractor	9.9% of contract funded by GJGNY
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Assessment Contractors	100% GJGNY
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Project Expeditor	100% GJGNY
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	Lenders	100% GJGNY
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners	100% GJGNY
Workforce Development	WFD Training Partners/OJT	100% GJGNY

* Only 2015 Direct FTEs reported by respondents. NMR used overall MPP GJGNY incentive funding rate for 2015 Direct FTE attribution to GJGNY.

2.7 Secondary Data

NMR reviewed a number of secondary data sources to develop an integrated estimate of FTE-related impacts. These data sources included:

- Program tracking data (e.g., CRIS database, CBO SharePoint site)
- New York State Department of Labor (DOL) jobs for OJT positions
- NYSERDA records for OJT positions
- NYSERDA New Hires list for OJT jobs

- Training partner data
- Pace University study³⁴

Only one CBO respondent provided their own program tracking records. Secondary source data was cross-checked against survey results, and FTE results were adjusted to reflect secondary source findings where appropriate.

³⁴ PACE Energy and Climate Center. 2013. “Making the Right Connections: Ways to Improve Workforce Training to Better Meet Employer Needs in the Green Jobs–Green New York Program.” Prepared for The New York State Energy Research And Development Authority

3 Program-level FTE and Wage Impacts

3.1 Green Jobs - Green New York Program

3.1.1 Background

The Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) Act of 2009 was signed into law on October 9, 2009³⁵ and New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) began operating the GJGNY Program on November 15, 2010. GJGNY is funded by the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) which provides \$301.6 million of funding from the proceeds of selling CO₂ allowances to help launch a sustainable carbon mitigation plan while meeting the short-term needs of a healthy economy. NYSEDA's GJGNY Program has been allocated \$112 million of these funds to help create green jobs and stimulate investment in energy-efficiency improvements for residential, multifamily, small business, and not-for-profit, buildings. GJGNY also leverages the investments and programs administered by NYSEDA and utilities funded by the System Benefits Charge (SBC), Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS), and Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).³⁶

The GJGNY Program includes the following components³⁷:

1. Workforce Development (WFD) – The GJGNY WFD activities engage existing contractors to immediately expand capacity to deliver services and provide direct-entry, on-the-job apprenticeship and internship incentives to help defray staffing costs. Initiatives also help build New York's training infrastructure by working with constituency based training organizations (CBOs), through the expansion of existing training centers, furnishing new training equipment, and expanding field testing and certification examination protocols to help ramp up workforce participation in training and certification. An important component of WFD is to offer career pathways for displaced workers to build skills and re-enter the workforce.³⁸
2. Residential One- to Four-Family Homes – GJGNY financing and free or reduced-cost energy audits for the one-to four-family homes sector are offered through the existing New York Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) Program administered by NYSEDA since 2001. HPwES is a program that uses a “whole house” approach to building science and is used to

³⁵ Green Jobs - Green New York Act of 2009 (A.8901/S.5888 and chapter amendment A.9031/S.6032) Laws of New York, 2009.

³⁶ A US DOE EECBG Better Buildings (Retrofit Rampup) Grant has also provided funding to NYSEDA for a loan loss/debt service reserve. <http://www.ncsl.org/documents/energy/JeffPitkin.pdf>

³⁷ NYSEDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, October 2010.

³⁸ For more details on workforce development see <http://www.nyserda.ny.gov/en/Page-Sections/Green-Jobs-Green-New-York-Planning/~media/Files/EERP/Green%20Jobs%20Green%20New%20York/gjgny-wkforce-dev-op-plan.ashx>.

identify and install cost-effective measures to reduce energy consumption in New York State's one- to four-family housing stock. Under GJGNY, households with incomes below 200% of Area Median Income (AMI) are eligible for free energy audits while those between 200 and 400% of AMI are eligible for reduced-cost energy audits.³⁹

Independent contractors participating in HPwES perform a comprehensive home assessment. This comprehensive review takes into account many aspects of a home including the heating system and hot water heater, windows, doors, weather-stripping and health and safety measures. The contractor also conducts a blower-door test to measure the air that leaks into and out of a home's "envelope." Other health and safety checks include air-quality assessments which test for natural gas leaks or other dangerous situations. These tests are conducted pre- and post-installation of the recommended eligible measures.

In addition to the free or reduced-cost energy audit, under GJGNY, participating homeowners are able to receive the homeowner cash-back incentive or utility rebates and finance the balance (less any NYSERDA HPwES Program incentives or utility rebates) through a GJGNY loan. Income eligible homeowners may participate in the Assisted HPwES Program which provides a larger incentive for the installation of eligible energy efficient measures. Audits and energy services for GJGNY are carried out by HPwES contractors that have a current Contractor Partnership Agreement with NYSERDA.

3. Multifamily – GJGNY financing and co-financing of audits are offered through NYSERDA's existing Multifamily Performance Program (MPP). MPP is a comprehensive, one-stop program, for all 5+ unit residential buildings. The program includes both existing buildings and new construction program paths, that serves market-rate and low-to moderate- income projects using a common application process, and relies on a network of energy service contractors who have demonstrated their ability to provide building performance services to multifamily buildings (MPP Partners). MPP Partners assist participants with project implementation by completing an initial energy audit and developing an Energy Reduction Plan (ERP) - to reach a Source Energy use reduction target of 15%.⁴⁰ The MPP Partner is also responsible for verifying that the energy-related work scope is installed in compliance with GJGNY requirements.

³⁹ See the HPwES application for details on income ranges by county: <http://www.nysesda.ny.gov/Page-Sections/Residential/Programs/Existing-Home-Renovations/~media/Files/EERP/Residential/Programs/Existing%20Home%20Renovations/Energy%20Audits/gjgny-energy-audit-app.ashx>.

⁴⁰ An Energy Reduction Plan (ERP) identifies the set of cost-effective energy-related improvements to be installed, and provides information necessary to guide installation of those measures. The ERP includes a detailed description of the proposed work scope, with the associated costs, projected energy saving, an outline for how costs will be financed, and a proposed schedule for construction.

4. Small Commercial – Energy assessments and GJGNY financing are available for buildings used or occupied by a small business or not-for-profits (NFPs).⁴¹ GJGNY funded Small Commercial Energy Assessments are available to small businesses and NFPs with 10 or fewer employees.⁴² Loans are available to small businesses with up to 100 employees, and to NFPs regardless of the number of employees. The energy assessments are provided through NYSEERDA’s existing network of Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors. Project Expeditors provide hands-on assistance to small business and NFPs to encourage implementation of energy assessment recommendations. GJGNY funds go to expand the service territories beyond the current SBC Program area.
5. Financing – The GJGNY legislation calls for the development of innovative financing mechanisms. GJGNY financing is available through unsecured direct loans financed by the Revolving Loan Fund through two accounts, first the one- to four- family residential buildings and multifamily buildings and a second for buildings occupied by small businesses and NFP organizations. An On-Bill Recovery option became available on January 30, 2012.
6. Marketing – GJGNY plans call for a statewide marketing effort to promote awareness of the energy audit and loan program and target small businesses, NFPs, residential and multifamily building owners across New York. In addition to building and growing participation in GJGNY, marketing objectives include growing the number of accredited contractors and building the pipeline of New Yorkers participating in GJGNY and energy-efficiency related training.
7. Outreach – In addition to statewide marketing, GJGNY is designed to deliver outreach services in targeted communities through a network of constituency-based organizations (CBOs). The primary goal of the customer outreach is to increase the number of individuals or businesses making efficiency improvements and to increase enrollment in workforce training programs. The CBOs encourage participation in energy-efficiency programs, facilitate awareness of workforce training opportunities available through GJGNY, and assist with enrollment in those efforts. CBOs delivering outreach, marketing, and education target residents, small businesses, not-for-profit organization, multifamily building owners, and potential workforce participants.

3.1.2 GJGNY Job Creation Activities

The GJGNY Program used a multifaceted approach to stimulate the creation of green jobs. In order to accomplish this, many different entities were involved, such as green job trainers, implementation contractors for the program, and marketers. Jobs were created, retained, and up-skilled for participants who

⁴¹ The Act defines small business and not-for-profits eligible participants as building owner, lessee, or manager of a structure (not a unit within a structure), and who has the legal authority to contract for the provision of qualified energy-efficiency services.

⁴² ARRA funded Small Commercial Energy Assessments are available to small businesses and NFPs with >10 employees and less than 100 kW.

received training, as well as within companies involved with program delivery, recruiting, marketing, and training. These companies included:

- Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff
- Workforce Development Trainees
- Constituency-Based Organization (CBO) Staff
- CBO Trainees
- Other Job Impacts Created by CBOs
- CBO Training and Implementation Partner
- GJGNY Marketing Contractor
- Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) Implementers
 - HPwES Implementation Contractor
 - HPwES Quality Assurance Contractor
- HPwES Contractors
- HPwES Financial Services Processors and Providers
- Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) Performance Partners
- MPP Participants
- MPP Implementers
 - MPP Implementation Contractor
 - MPP Quality Assurance Contractor
- Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program Project Expeditors
- SCEE Program Financial Services Processors and Providers

3.1.3 Total FTE Impacts

The tables in the sections below show the total FTEs in 2013 for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, and 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs for the entire GJGNY Program. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs.

3.1.3.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in the addition of 558.8 total new FTEs across all 31 reported NAICS code categories (Table 7). The average hourly wage level across all of these positions was \$25.23. Engineering Services added the most with 151.8 new FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$19.85. Residential Remodelers added the second most with 120.8 new FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$13.76. The third most common NAICS code category for new FTEs was Plumbing, Heating, and Air-condition Contractors with a total of 62.6 new FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$15.07.

Table 7: 2013 New FTEs - Total GJGN

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	6.9	\$19.41
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	3.0	\$30.17
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	120.8	\$13.76
237210	Land Subdivision	0.5	--
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	6.0	\$14.28
238210	Electrical Contractor	19.9	\$12.50
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	62.6	\$15.07
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	59.7	\$17.93
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	\$12.00
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.4	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.6	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	3.3	\$24.33
541330	Engineering Services	151.8	\$19.84
541350	Building Inspection Services	59.7	\$18.15
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	6.4	\$49.17
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	4.5	\$35.63
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.5	--
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	2.9	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	1.1	\$50.00
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	6.8	\$22.37
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.6	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.4	\$22.50
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	25.6	\$22.07
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	1.0	\$10.59

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
813910	Business Associations	0.8	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.8	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.8	\$47.50
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	6.7	\$22.50
TOTAL FTEs		558.8	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$25.23

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

3.1.3.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in a total of 347 FTEs that were retained across all 27 reported NAICS code categories (Table 8). The average hourly wage level across all of these positions was \$28.68. Engineering Services retained the largest number of jobs with 173.6 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$24.06. Residential Remodelers retained the second largest number of jobs with 34.6 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.66. The third most common NAICS code category for retained FTEs was Drywall and Insulation Contractors with a total of 30.5 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$17.88.

Table 8: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total GJGNY

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	4.9	--
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	2.3	\$30.00
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	34.6	\$19.66
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$16.07
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	14.7	\$18.75
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	30.5	\$17.88
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.6	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.7	\$24.17
541330	Engineering Services	173.6	\$24.06
541350	Building Inspection Services	23.1	\$22.38
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	7.8	\$42.50
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	0.5	\$50.00
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.4	--
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	6.4	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	1.99	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	9.6	\$23.96
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.9	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	4.9	\$26.88
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	9.1	\$22.58
813910	Business Associations	8.0	\$22.50
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	2.0	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business,	4.3	\$47.50

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
	Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)		
TOTAL FTEs		347.0	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$28.68

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

3.1.3.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives resulted in a total of 282.2 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all 26 reported NAICS code categories (Table 9). Prior to their involvement with GJGNY activities, the average hourly wage level for this group was \$22.45. The average hourly wage increase that these positions experienced due to the GJGNY Program was \$5.12, which resulted in an average hourly wage level for all of these positions combined of \$27.58.⁴³

Engineering Services saw the greatest number of up-skilled and up-waged positions with 142.1 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$17.26, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$20.85.

Drywall and Insulation Contractors had the second greatest number of up-skilled and up-waged positions with 37.9 total FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$17.35, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$22.25.

GJGNY funding for NYSERDA program initiatives also resulted in a total of 258.7 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.⁴⁴

⁴³ Note that the average prior hourly wage, average hourly wage increase, and the total average hourly wage were derived independently and the resulting values for prior hourly wage and average hourly wage increase will not add up to the total hourly average wage.

⁴⁴ Note that attribution and extrapolation were not used to calculate total FTEs of staff with increased responsibilities who did not receive hourly wage increases due to the program.

Table 9: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs and Wages - Total GJGN Y

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	7.1	\$19.19	\$3.24	\$22.43
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	1.6	--	--	--
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.3	--	--	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	32.5	\$16.65	\$6.27	\$22.92
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--	--	--
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	24.2	\$14.69	\$3.96	\$18.65
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	37.9	\$17.35	\$4.89	\$22.25
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.5	--	--	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--	--	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--	--	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.5	--	--	--
541330	Engineering Services	142.1	\$17.26	\$3.59	\$20.85
541350	Building Inspection Services	14.3	\$17.44	\$3.25	\$20.68
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	5.9	--	--	--
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	2.3	\$39.80	\$3.61	\$43.41
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.6	--	--	--
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	1.2	--	--	--
611710	Educational Support Services	0.4	--	--	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.5	--	--	--
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--	--	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.7	--	--	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.6	\$22.22	\$3.25	\$25.47
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	1.7	\$37.50	\$5.00	\$42.49

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
813910	Business Associations	0.4	--	--	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.4	--	--	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.6	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		282.2	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$22.45	\$4.12	\$26.57

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

3.1.3.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts across the entire GJGNY Program was 905.8 FTEs (Table 10).⁴⁵ The regions with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs included the Finger Lakes with 222.6 FTEs, or 24.6% of 2013 Direct FTEs, Long Island with 106.4 FTEs, or 11.8% of 2013 Direct FTEs, and Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 114.5 FTEs, or 11.5% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 905.8 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTE impacts of the GJGNY Program, 155.6 FTEs, or 17.2%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁴⁶ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Southern Tier with 55.7 FTEs, or 6.1% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁴⁵ As noted previously, 2013 Direct FTEs equals the sum of 2013 New FTEs plus 2013 Retained FTEs, from program inception through May/June of 2013.

⁴⁶ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 10: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region - Total GJGN Y

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	905.8	100%	155.6	17.2%
North Country	8.3	0.9%	8.3	0.9%
Bronx	12.6	1.4%	12.6	1.4%
Kings and Richmond	10.3	1.1%	8.3	0.9%
Queens	21.8	2.4%	--	--
Central	73.6	8.1%	13.4	1.5%
New York	71.9	7.9%	--	--
Southern Tier	79.1	8.7%	55.7	6.1%
Western	99.5	11.0%	9.3	1.0%
Finger Lakes	222.6	24.6%	3.0	0.3%
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	104.5	11.5%	39.5	4.4%
Long Island	106.4	11.8%	--	--
Capital	95.2	10.5%	5.5	0.6%
2015 Direct FTEs	2,545.6	NA	498.5	19.6%

3.1.3.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, the GJGN Y Program is projected to have a total FTE impact of 2,545.6 FTEs. Of that total, 498.5 FTEs, or 19.6% or 2015 Direct Jobs, are projected to be in disadvantaged communities (Table 10).⁴⁷

As shown in Table B- 1 in Appendix B, the Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors (NAICS Code 238220) have the highest 2015 direct FTE count (706.0 FTEs) in comparison to all other NAICS Codes despite the fact that 2013 Direct FTE total for this job category were not high in comparison to other job categories (77.3 FTEs). The reason for this high projection for the Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors is that the Workforce Development Partners, who contributed to these projections, had high expectations for 2015 direct FTE growth for this job category.

⁴⁷ As noted above, 2015 Direct FTEs equals 2013 Direct FTEs plus respondents' estimates of full time new equivalent positions that will be added because of GJGN Y activities by 2015.

The following subsections show the total number of FTEs and associated average hourly wage levels by individual program initiative, as well as by key respondent type. Key respondent groups vary by program initiative. For example, key respondent groups for the Outreach and Marketing Activities include the staff at participating Constituency-based Organizations (CBOs), CBO trainees, and other positions that were created as a result of CBO activities. In order to protect the confidentiality of the participating organizations, data for some respondent groups are presented only in aggregate. In these instances, only one or two participating organizations are members of the respondent group. For example, FTEs and hourly wage data for staff working for CBO Implementers or with the GJGNY Marketing Implementation Contractor are only presented in aggregate form in the program-level summary tables, and not provided separately.

4 Workforce Development and Training

4.1 Background⁴⁸

The Workforce Development (WFD) and Training initiative builds on existing NYSERDA, Department of Labor (DOL), and other programs targeted at preparing individuals for clean energy careers in New York State. In particular, workforce development efforts have been expanded to more directly address disadvantaged and emerging workers, pathways-out-of-poverty, and establishing career pathways. In coordination with the DOL, NYSERDA also supports efforts to support business growth, encourage the hiring of new entrants to the workforce, and to advance incumbent workers through on-the-job training and apprenticeship opportunities. Implementation of the approved GJGNY Workforce Development Operating Plan began in mid-2010.

Projects support the training objectives of the Green Jobs - Green New York Act of 2009, including, but not limited to: 1) incremental occupational training to unemployed workers; 2) work readiness and entry-level technical training; 3) apprenticeship and labor-management certification training; 4) skills development for incumbent workers; 5) skills development for new workers to support advancement and improve employee retention; and 6) inventory of curriculum related to the objectives of GJGNY, as well as qualitative research designed to assess skills gaps as identified by employers.

GJGNY workforce development activities are expanding New York State's capacity to deliver training services by working with community-based training organizations and existing training centers, providing much-needed training equipment and tools, and minimizing barriers to delivering field testing and certification exams. The initiative also provides direct-entry, on-the-job, apprenticeship and internship incentives to help defray costs of bringing on new hires.

As a result of the solicitations, 26 contracts have been awarded for infrastructure, curriculum, and certification/accreditation development and technical support, representing \$2.5 million in contract funding. Thirty-two contracts, totaling in excess of \$1.0 million, have been awarded to support apprenticeships and internships. In addition, more than \$77,000 has been provided to individuals and companies to help offset costs of certification, contractor accreditation, and equipment purchases.

Work under this initiative is closely coordinated with the New York State Department of Labor (DOL), New York State Division of Homes and Community Renewal (HCR), New York State Office of

⁴⁸ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

Temporary and Disability Assistance (OTDA) and others, leveraging State, federal and local funds where possible.

4.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs as of the first quarter of 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for all reported Workforce Development and Training activities (including the Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff as well as the Workforce Development Trainees). The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs.

The key groups for which job and wage information were collected are:

- Workforce Development and Training Partners
- Workforce Development Trainees
 - On-the-Job Training (OJT) trainees
 - All other trainees

NMR worked with a survey research firm, Abt SRBI, to interview 22 of 36 OJT Training Partner companies that hired OJT trainees. FTE and wage data collected from OJT WFD Training Partner data was supplemented with additional hire data provided by NYSEDA to derive final FTE count, wage data, and other details for the hired trainees. For the Workforce Development Training Partners not associated with OJT, NMR worked with Abt SRBI to interview eight out of fourteen companies that were contracted through NYSEDA to provide WFD training. These interviews asked about staff and trainees FTEs, wage information, and other details related to office locations and the number of offices conducting GJGNY activities.

The tables presents results by each of the NAICS code categories identified during interviews based on data on both Training Partner Staff and Trainees. Workforce Development Trainees saw more new, retained, and up-skilled and up-waged FTEs overall in comparison to the Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff.

4.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development initiatives resulted in the addition of a total of 185.7 new FTEs across Workforce Development Training Partner Staff and Workforce Development Trainees (Table 11). Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors added the most new FTEs with 39.2 FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$15.05. Residential Remodelers experienced the second largest number of new FTEs with 35.9 FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$12.99.

Table 11: 2013 New FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction (Except For-Sale Builders)	2.0	\$22.00
236118	Residential Remodelers	35.9	\$12.99
238210	Electrical Contractor	19.9	\$12.50
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	39.2	\$15.05
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	18.0	\$17.23
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	\$12.00
541330	Engineering Services	27.0	\$18.19
541350	Building Inspection Services	30.0	\$15.70
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	1.5	\$49.17
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	2.9	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	1.1	\$50.00
624190	Individual and Family Services	4.5	\$24.72
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	1.0	\$10.59
813910	Business Associations	0.8	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.8	--
TOTAL FTEs		185.7	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$15.79

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development initiatives resulted in a total of 27.9 FTEs that were retained across all jobs categories (Table 12). Business Associations retained the largest number of FTEs with 7.99 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.50. Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools retained the second largest number of FTEs with 6.4 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$50.00. The third most common NAICS code category for retained FTEs was Individual and Family Services with a total of 5.0 FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$30.83.

Table 12: 2013 Retained FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	1.0	\$42.50
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	6.4	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	2.0	--
624190	Individual and Family Services	5.0	\$30.83
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.5	\$25.50
813910	Business Associations	8.0	\$22.50
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	2.0	--
TOTAL FTEs		27.9	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$27.50

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development initiatives resulted in a total of 17.4 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all jobs categories (Table 13).

Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 5.7 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$12.50, and following their involvement with GJGNY, the average hourly wage level increased by \$3.00 to an average of \$15.50.

GJGNY funding for Workforce Development initiatives also resulted in a total of 4.3 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

Table 13: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236118	Residential Remodelers	1.0	\$16.47	\$1.50	\$17.97
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	5.7	\$12.50	\$3.00	\$15.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	2.0	\$11.50	\$1.00	\$12.50
541330	Engineering Services	1.0	\$26.50	\$1.00	\$27.50
541350	Building Inspection Services	2.0	\$14.00	\$2.25	\$16.25
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	0.3	--	--	--
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	1.2	--	--	--
611710	Educational Support Services	0.4	--	--	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.0	\$20.83	\$3.00	\$23.82
813910	Business Associations	0.4	--	--	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.4	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		17.4	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$15.40	\$1.96	\$18.92

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from the Workforce Development Program was 213.6 FTEs (Table 14). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was New York with 51.7 FTEs, or 24.2% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 213.6 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development Program, 45.8 FTEs, or 21.5%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁴⁹ The region with the greatest number of 2013

⁴⁹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state

Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 14.4 FTEs, or 6.7% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 14: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs – Total Workforce Development and Training

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	213.6	100%	45.8	21.5%
Bronx	4.0	1.9%	4.0	1.9%
Kings and Richmond	3.0	1.4%	3.0	1.4%
Queens	7.4	3.5%	--	--
Central	20.5	9.6%	9.0	4.2%
New York	51.7	24.2%	--	--
Southern Tier	24.9	11.6%	11.4	5.3%
Western	15.0	7.0%	1.0	0.5%
Finger Lakes	18.4	8.6%	3.0	1.4%
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	32.2	15.1%	14.4	6.7%
Long Island	25.0	11.7%	--	--
Capital	11.5	5.4%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	1,069.0	NA	171.50	16.0%

4.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total job impacts in the Workforce Development Program of 1,069.0 FTEs (Table 14). Of that total, 171.5 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. The majority of these positions (95% of 2015 Direct FTEs) are projected to come from the Workforce Development Trainees. Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors expect to see the most FTEs by 2015, with 491.9 active FTEs.

average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

A brief overview of each of the respondent groups, as well as key findings for those respondent groups, is provided in the following subsections.

4.3 Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff

4.3.1 Background

As noted above, NMR worked with a survey research firm, Abt SRBI, to interview 22 of 36 On-the Job (OJT) Training Partner companies that hired OJT trainees. FTE and wage data collected from OJT Training Partner data was supplemented with additional hire data provided by NYSERDA to derive final FTEs, wage data, and other details for the hired trainees. Note that FTE-related information for the OJT Training Partners is grouped with the OJT WFD Trainees given that these companies conduct the same green job-related work as the trainees themselves.

For the WFD Training Partners not associated with OJT, NMR worked with Abt SRBI to interview eight of fourteen contracted training companies and asked them about job-related information for their own staff (as well as the trainees they worked with). The data provided below focuses on FTE-related information specific to the WFD Training Partner staff that were not associated with OJT.

4.3.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for Workforce Development and Training Partner staff. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the reported NAICS code categories. Note that the data on the Workforce Development and Training Partner staff are included in the overall data for the Workforce Development Initiative reported in Section 4.2.

4.3.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development resulted in the addition of 11.7 new FTEs across all six NAICS code categories among Workforce Development and Training Partner staff (Table 15). Individual and Family Services added the most new FTEs with 4.5 total FTEs followed by Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools with 2.9 new FTEs. The average hourly wage level for staff with Individual and Family Services is \$24.72, and the average hourly wage level for staff with Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools is \$50.00.

Table 15: 2013 New FTEs – Workforce Development and Trainings Partner Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	1.5	\$49.17
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	2.9	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	1.1	\$50.00
624190	Individual and Family Services	4.5	\$24.72
813910	Business Associations	0.8	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.8	--
TOTAL FTEs		11.7	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$32.83

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.3.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development resulted in a total of 27.9 retained FTEs across all NAICS code categories among Workforce Development and Training Partner staff (Table 16). Business Associates retained the largest number of FTEs with 8.0 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.50. Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools retained the second largest number of jobs with 6.4 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$50.00. The third most common NAICS code category for retained FTEs was Individual and Family Services with 5.0 FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$30.83.

Table 16: 2013 Retained FTEs – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	1.0	\$42.50
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	6.4	\$50.00
611710	Educational Support Services	2.0	-
624190	Individual and Family Services	5.0	\$30.83
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.5	\$25.50
813910	Business Associations	8.0	\$22.50
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	2.0	--
TOTAL FTEs		27.9	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$27.50

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.3.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development resulted in a total of 5.7 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs among Workforce Development and Training Partner staff (Table 17).

Environment, Conservation, and Wildlife Organizations saw the second greatest number of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs with 3.0 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$20.83, and following their involvement with GJGNY, the average hourly wage level increased by \$3.00 and to \$23.82.

GJGNY funding for Workforce Development initiatives also resulted in a total of 4.3 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

Table 17: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Service	0.3	--	--	--
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	1.2	--	--	--
611710	Educational Support Services	0.4	--	--	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.0	\$20.83	\$3.00	\$23.82
813910	Business Associations	0.4	--	--	--
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.4	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		5.7	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$20.83	\$3.00	\$23.82

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

4.3.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development and Training Partner staff was 39.6 FTEs (Table 18). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Capital region with 8.5 FTEs, or 21.4% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Mid-Hudson and Westchester experienced the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs with 6.5 FTEs, or 16.4% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the 39.6 total 2013 Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development and Training Partner staff, 6.5 FTEs, or 16.4%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁵⁰ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 3.7 FTEs, or 9.3% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁵⁰ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 18: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Workforce Development and Training Partner Staff

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	39.6	100%	6.5	16.4%
Queens	2.8	7.1%	--	--
Central	6.5	16.4%	--	--
New York	3.8	9.7%	--	--
Southern Tier	5.7	14.3%	2.8	7.1%
Finger Lakes	5.8	14.7%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	6.5	16.4%	3.7	9.3%
Capital	8.5	21.4%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	52.8	NA	8.5	16.1%

4.3.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total FTE impacts for Workforce Development Training Partner staff of 52.8 FTEs (Table 18). Of that total, 8.5 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities.

4.4 Workforce Development Trainees

4.4.1 Background

As noted above, NMR worked with a survey research firm, Abt SRBI, to interview 22 of 36 OJT Training Partner companies that hired OJT trainees. Job and wage data collected from OJT Training Partner data was supplemented with additional hire data provided by NYSERDA to derive final job count, wage data, and other details for the hired trainees. Note that FTE-related information for the OJT Training Partners is grouped with the OJT WFD Trainees given that these companies conduct the same green job-related work as the trainees themselves.

For the WFD Trainees not associated with OJT, NMR worked with Abt SRBI to interview eight of fourteen contracted training companies and asked them about FTE-related information for the trainees they worked with (as well as for their own staff). The data provided below focuses on FTE-related information specific to both the OJT WFD Trainees and all other WFD Trainees not associated with OJT.

4.4.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for Workforce Development Trainees. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. Note that there were no reported retained trainee positions. The tables break out results by each of the reported NAICS code categories. The data on the Workforce Development Trainees are also included in the overall data for the Workforce Development Initiative reported in Section 4.2.

4.4.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development resulted in the addition of 174.0 new FTEs across all nine NAICS code categories among WFD Trainees (Table 19). Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors added the most new FTEs with 39.2 total FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$15.05. Residential Remodelers added the second most new FTEs with 35.9 FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$12.99. Building Inspection Services added the third most new FTEs with 30.0 FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$15.70.

Table 19: 2013 New FTEs – Workforce Development Trainees

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction (Except For-Sale Builders)	2.0	\$22.00
236118	Residential Remodelers	35.9	\$12.99
238210	Electrical Contractor	19.9	\$12.50
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	39.2	\$15.05
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	18.0	\$17.23
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	\$12.00
541330	Engineering Services	27.0	\$18.19
541350	Building Inspection Services	30.0	\$15.70
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	1.0	\$10.59
TOTAL FTEs		174.0	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$14.87

4.4.2.2 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Workforce Development resulted in a total of 12.7 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all NAICS code categories among WFD Trainees (Table 20).

Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning saw the greatest number of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs with 5.7 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$12.50, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$15.50. There were no staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

Table 20: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Workforce Development Trainees

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236118	Residential Remodelers	1.0	\$16.47	\$1.50	\$17.97
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	5.7	\$12.50	\$3.00	\$15.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	2.0	\$11.50	\$1.00	\$12.50
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	\$26.50	\$1.00	\$27.50
541330	Engineering Services	1.0	\$26.50	\$1.00	\$27.50
541350	Building Inspection Services	2.0	\$14.00	\$2.25	\$16.25
TOTAL FTEs		12.7	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$14.55	\$2.03	\$16.58

4.4.2.3 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development Trainees was 174.0 FTEs (Table 21). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was New York with 47.9 FTEs, or 27.5% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Other green jobs in this category were spread across all the remaining CBO regions except for the North Country which did not see any 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the 174.0 total FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the Workforce Development Trainees, 39.3 FTEs, or 22.6%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁵¹ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 10.7 FTEs, or 6.2% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 21: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Workforce Development Trainees

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	174.0	100%	39.3	22.6%
Bronx	4.0	2.3%	4.0	2.3%
Kings and Richmond	3.0	1.7%	3.0	1.7%
Queens	4.6	2.6%	--	--
Central	14.0	8.0%	9.0	5.2%
New York	47.9	27.5%	--	--
Southern Tier	19.2	11.0%	8.6	4.9%
Western	15.0	8.6%	1.0	0.6%
Finger Lakes	12.6	7.2%	3.0	1.7%
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	25.7	14.8%	10.7	6.2%
Long Island	25.0	14.4%	--	--
Capital	3.0	1.7%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	1,016.2	NA	163.0	16.0%

4.4.2.4 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total FTE impacts for Workforce Development Trainees of 1,016.2 FTEs (Table 21). Of that total, 163.0 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors expect to see the most FTEs with 491.9 FTEs estimated by 2015.

⁵¹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

5 Outreach and Marketing

5.1 Background⁵²

GJGNY provides for community-based outreach, enabling one-on-one assistance to home owners, multifamily buildings owners, and small business and not-for-profit owners with the process of participating in GJGNY programs. This, combined with statewide marketing, is intended to increase the reach of the GJGNY, particularly among disadvantaged populations and those not traditionally participating in energy-efficiency programs. Outreach and engagement with these key groups is facilitated through Constituency-based Organizations (CBOs) who reach out to potential program participants. Marketing through the GJGNY Marketing Contractor provides additional outreach and messaging. CBOs are also tasked with engaging potential energy efficiency worker trainees to encourage them to undergo one of the workforce training programs offered by NYSERDA, particularly in disadvantaged communities.

5.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs as of the first quarter of 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for all of the positions involved with Outreach and Marketing activities. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs.

The key groups for which FTE and wage information were collected are:

- Constituency-Based Organization (CBO) Staff
- Other Job Impacts Created by CBOs
- CBO Trainees
- CBO Training and Implementation Partner
- GJGNY Marketing Contractor

The tables below present results by each of the reported NAICS code categories identified during interviews based on data for all groups involved with Outreach and Marketing activities.

The tables do not identify specific groups in order to protect the confidentiality of the two groups that only had one contracting company involved in GJGNY activities. These two groups include the CBO Training and Implementation Contractor, Conservation Services Group (CSG), and the GJGNY Marketing Contractor, Brand|Cool.

⁵² Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

5.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Outreach and Marketing activities resulted in the addition of a total of 147.5 new FTEs across all 11 NAICS code categories. Residential Remodelers added the most new FTEs with 58.3 total new FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$13.86 (Table 22).

Table 22: 2013 New FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236118	Residential Remodelers	58.3	\$13.86
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$12.50
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	12.6	\$16.59
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	23.5	\$17.87
541330	Engineering Services	3.0	\$17.50
541350	Building Inspection Services	7.0	\$17.50
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	4.0	\$36.25
624190	Individual and Family Services	1.5	\$15.83
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	2.9	\$22.50
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	25.0	\$22.07
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	6.7	\$22.50
TOTAL FTEs		147.5	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$17.50

5.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Outreach and Marketing activities resulted in a total of 13.1 FTEs that were retained across all jobs categories (Table 23). Other Social Advocacy Organizations retained the largest number of FTEs with 8.6 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.58.

There were much fewer reported 2013 Retained FTEs in comparison to 2013 New FTEs, in part due to the fact that questions about retained FTEs were not asked for the CBO Trainees or for the other new FTEs created at other companies due to CBO activities.

Table 23: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	0.5	\$50.00
624190	Individual and Family Services	4.0	\$18.75
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	8.6	\$22.58
TOTAL FTEs		13.1	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$22.46

5.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for Outreach and Marketing activities resulted in a total of 13.0 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all NAICS code categories (Table 24).

Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors and Drywall and Insulation Contractors each reported 5.0 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged positions. The average hourly wage level for Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors and Drywall and Insulation Contractors prior to the hourly wage increase was \$12.50, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$17.50.

GJGNY funding for Outreach and Marketing activities also resulted in a total of 116.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

Table 24: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs - Total Outreach and Marketing

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	5.0	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$17.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	5.0	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$17.50
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	2.0	\$50.00	\$5.00	\$55.00
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	1.0	\$37.50	\$5.00	\$42.49
TOTAL FTEs		13.0	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$16.84	\$5.00	\$21.84

5.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from Outreach and Marketing activities was 160.6 FTEs (Table 25). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Capital region with 63.9 FTEs, or 39.8% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 160.6 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from Outreach and Marketing activities, 27.2FTEs, or 17.0%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁵³ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Southern Tier with 12.0 FTEs, or 7.5% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁵³ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 25: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total Outreach and Marketing

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTES	160.6	100%	27.2	17%
Bronx	6.0	3.7%	6.0	3.7%
Kings and Richmond	4.0	2.3%	2.0	1.1%
Queens	3.2	2.0%	--	--
Central	10.0	6.2%	--	--
New York	9.5	5.9%	--	--
Southern Tier	12.0	7.5%	12.0	7.5%
Western	19.0	11.8%	--	--
Finger Lakes	21.0	13.1%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	11.4	7.1%	7.5	4.7%
Long Island	0.9	0.6%	--	--
Capital	63.9	39.8%	--	--
2015 Direct FTES	725.5	NA	200.4	27.6%

5.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTEs associated with Outreach and Marketing activities of 725.5 FTEs (Table 25). Of that total, 200.4 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Drywall and Insulation Contractors expect to see the most FTEs by 2015 with 286.2 FTEs projected, followed by Plumbing, Heating, and Air-Conditioning Contractors with 161.4 FTEs, and Residential Remodelers with 137.3 FTEs.

A brief overview of each of the respondent groups, as well as key findings for those respondent groups, is provided in the following subsections.

5.3 Constituency-Based Organizations - Staff

5.3.1 Background⁵⁴

Constituency-based Organizations (CBOs) work through the GJGNY Program by targeting residents, small businesses, Not-for-Profits (NFP), multifamily building owners, and potential workforce participants in designated communities. CBOs encourage participation in energy-efficiency programs, facilitate awareness of workforce training opportunities, and assist with enrollment in those efforts.

RFP 2038 – Green Jobs - Green New York Outreach Program was released in November 2010 and competitively selected 14 CBOs to support GJGNY OEM. RFP 2327 – Green Jobs - Green New York Outreach Program was released in June 2011 to fill gaps from the previous solicitation; four new contracts and one contract expansion were awarded.

Three CBOs are also under contract to implement aggregation pilots as part of their initiative. Aggregation is the process of identifying a group of homeowners who agree up-front to have the same contractor or contractor team perform their audits and any resulting work. Aggregation is expected to result in more efficient use of contractor resources and reduced need for contractor marketing. Participating contractors agree to provide certain community benefits, which may include living wages and benefits for workers, local hiring, and preferential pricing.

CBOs were also competitively selected to perform outreach to potential energy efficiency worker trainees. The CBOs work with the DOL One-Stop Career Centers and local training organizations to identify appropriate training programs for individuals, particularly from disadvantaged communities. The CBOs also work with the One-Stop Career Centers and local contractors to identify jobs for trained individuals. Two downstate CBOs, Asian Americans for Equality (AAFE) and Downtown Manhattan Community Development Corporation (DMCDC), have translated workforce curriculum into Chinese. Both AAFE and DMCDC have translation activities in their work scopes to introduce new Chinese language materials for both workforce development and customer outreach. To train contractors and workforce recruits in its service territory, DMCDC worked with Taitem Engineering to translate its version of the Materials Procurement Training. Taitem is under contract to NYSERDA to provide partner training for the Multifamily Performance Program.

⁵⁴ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

5.3.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for the 18 participating CBOs. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the two NAICS code categories. Two CBOs were categorized within the Individual and Family Services NAICS code category, and 16 were categorized within the Other Social Advocacy Organizations NAICS code category. Note that the data on the CBO staff are also included in the overall data for the CBO Initiative reported in Section 5.2.

5.3.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs resulted in the addition of 26.5 new FTEs across both NAICS code categories of CBO staff (Table 26). Other Social Advocacy Organizations added 25.0 new FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$22.07, and Individual and Family Services added 1.5 new FTEs and had an average hourly wage level of \$15.83. The fact that Other Social Advocacy Organizations saw more new FTEs than Individual and Family Services is not surprising given that there were only two CBOs that categorized themselves in the Individual and Family Services NAICS code category.

Table 26: 2013 New FTEs – CBO Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
624190	Individual and Family Services	1.5	\$15.83
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	25.0	\$22.07
TOTAL FTEs		26.5	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$21.70

5.3.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs resulted in a total of 12.6 FTEs across all NAICS code categories of CBO staff (Table 27). Other Social Advocacy Organizations retained the largest number of FTEs with 8.6 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.58. Individual and Family Services retained 4.0 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$18.75.

Table 27: 2013 Retained FTEs - CBO Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
624190	Individual and Family Services	4.0	\$18.75
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	8.6	\$22.58
TOTAL FTEs		12.6	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$21.36

5.3.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs resulted in a total of 1.0 FTE of up-skilled and up-waged CBO staff (Table 28). This 1.0 FTE fell within the Other Social Advocacy Organizations NAICS code category. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$37.50, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$42.49.

GJGNY funding for CBOs also resulted in a total 10.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels. Of that total, 1.0 FTE from the Individual and Family Services category received an increase in responsibilities but did not receive an increase in hourly wage level, and 9.0 FTEs in the Other Social Advocacy Organizations category experienced increases in responsibilities but no related hourly wage increases.

Table 28: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – CBO Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	1	\$37.50	\$5.00	\$42.49
TOTAL FTEs		1	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$37.50	\$5.00	\$42.49

5.3.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTEs impacts from the CBO staff was 39.1 FTEs (Table 29). Of that total, Individual and Family Services saw 5.5 FTEs and Other Social Advocacy Organizations saw 33.6 FTEs of Direct FTEs.

In order to protect the confidentiality of the CBO staff, regions where only one CBO was active were combined with other regions. The Western region and Finger Lakes region reported a combined Direct FTE total of 9.0 FTEs, or 23.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Long Island, Mid-Hudson and Westchester, and New York reported a combined Direct FTE total of 7.2 FTEs, or 18.3% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the 39.1 total 2013 Direct FTEs from the CBO staff, 8.5 FTEs, or 21.6%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁵⁵ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Bronx with 5.0 FTEs, or 12.7% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 29: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – CBO Staff

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community	
2013 Direct FTEs	39.1	100%	8.5	21.6%
Bronx	5.0	12.7%	5.0	12.7%
Kings and Richmond	4.0	9.6%	2.0	4.5%
Queens	3.2	8.2%	--	--
Central	6.0	15.4%	--	--
Long Island, Mid-Hudson and Westchester, New York	7.2	18.3%	2.0	4.5%
Finger Lakes and Western	9.0	23%	--	--
Capital	5.0	12.8%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	78.8	NA	17.5	22.1%

⁵⁵ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

5.3.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total FTE impacts for CBO staff of 78.8 FTEs (Table 29). Of that total, 17.5 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Other Social Advocacy Organizations are projected to have 69.3 FTEs by 2015, and Individual and Family Services are projected to have 8.5 FTEs by 2015.

5.4 Other Job Impacts Resulting from CBO Activities

5.4.1 Background

As noted above, during in-depth interviews with the CBOs, NMR asked CBO staff members whether any of the activities they had engaged in for NYSERDA had resulted in the creation of new FTEs in their communities (other than contractor referrals and training). Only one CBO reported new FTEs created at other companies in their communities as a result of their NYSERDA-related activities.

5.4.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs and average hourly wage levels in 2013 for new FTEs created at other organizations as a result CBO activities. The tables also show total 2013 and Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the two NAICS code categories. Note that the data on these other job impacts resulting from CBO activities are also included in the overall data for the CBO Initiative reported in Section 5.2.

5.4.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs resulted in the addition of 9.6 new FTEs across both NAICS code categories for other job impacts resulting from CBO activities (Table 30). Local Government (excluding schools or hospitals) added the most new FTEs with 6.8 total FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.50. Environment, Conservation, and Wildlife Organizations added 2.9 new FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$22.50.

Table 30: 2013 New FTEs - Other CBO Jobs Impacts

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	2.9	\$22.50
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	6.8	\$22.50
TOTAL FTEs		9.6	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$22.50

5.4.2.2 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts at other organizations resulting from CBO activities was 9.6 FTEs (Table 31). All of these positions were created in the Mid-Hudson and Westchester CBO Region with 5.8 FTEs in disadvantaged communities, or 60.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.⁵⁶

Table 31: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Other CBO Job Impacts

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	9.6	100%	5.8	60%
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	9.6	100%	5.8	60%
2015 Direct FTEs	39.6	NA	23.8	60%

5.4.2.3 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total job impacts at other organizations resulting from CBO activities of 39.6 FTEs (Table 31). Of that total, 23.8 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities.

⁵⁶ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

5.5 Constituency-Based Organizations - Trainees

5.5.1 Background

As noted previously, one of the roles of the CBO is to facilitate awareness of workforce training opportunities and to assist with enrollment in those efforts (although not all CBOs did this). During depth interviews with the CBOs, NMR asked respondents about the number of trainees who have completed workforce training because of their recruitment efforts and have subsequently been hired into green jobs-related positions. Where possible, secondary data was used to confirm these estimates and to ensure that all hires fell into green jobs-related company types. When analyzing the survey findings, trainee data was broken out into their own respective NAICS code categories based on the company type that the CBO said the employee found work at.

5.5.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions and up-skilled and up-waged positions for CBO Trainees. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the five NAICS code categories. Note that the data on the CBO Trainees are also included in the overall data for the CBO Initiative reported in Section 5.2.

5.5.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs resulted in the addition of 104.4 new FTEs across all NAICS code categories of CBO Trainees (Table 32). Residential Remodelers added the most new FTEs with 58.3 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$13.86. Drywall and Insulation Contractors added the second most new FTEs with 23.5 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$17.87. The third most common NAICS code category for new FTEs was Plumbing, Heating, and Air-conditioning Contractors with a total of 12.6 FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$16.59.

Table 32: 2013 New FTEs – CBO Trainees

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236118	Residential Remodelers	58.3	\$13.86
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$12.50
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	12.6	\$16.59
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	23.5	\$17.87
541350	Building Inspection Services	7.0	\$17.50
TOTAL FTEs		104.4	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$15.09

5.5.2.2 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

During the in-depth interviews with CBO staff, NMR asked about the number of CBO trainees that were already employed at the time they received GJGNY training, and whether any of those trainees who were already employed got a new job, either in their existing company or at a new company. The interviewers then probed on how many of those trainees who got a new job received an increase in hourly wages that could be attributed to the increased skills they gained from the training.

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for CBOs Trainees resulted in a total of 10.0 FTEs that were up-skilled and up-waged at their new or existing job due to the program (Table 33). The average hourly wage level for both of these NAICS code categories prior to the hourly wage increase was \$12.50, and following their involvement with GJGNY, the average hourly wage level was \$17.50.

GJGNY funding for CBO Trainees who were previously employed prior to training also resulted in a total of 106.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled at their new or existing job but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

Table 33: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – CBO Trainees

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	5.0	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$17.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	5.0	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$17.50
TOTAL FTEs		10.0	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$12.50	\$5.00	\$17.50

5.5.2.3 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from the CBO Trainees was 104.4 FTEs (Table 34). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Capital region with 55.9 FTEs, or 53.5% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the 104.4 total FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the CBO Trainees, 13.0 FTEs, or 12.5%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁵⁷ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Southern Tier with 12.0 FTEs, or 11.5% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁵⁷ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 34: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 FTEs by Region – CBO Trainees

Regions	Total Direct FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	104.4	100%	13.0	12.5%
Bronx	1.0	1.0%	1.0	1.0%
Central	4.0	3.8%	--	--
New York	5.0	4.8%	--	--
Southern Tier	12	11.5%	12.0	11.5%
Western	13.5	12.9%	--	--
Finger Lakes	13	12.5%	--	--
Capital	55.9	53.5%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	599.6	NA	159.1	26.5%

5.5.2.4 2015 Expected FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total FTE impacts for CBO Trainees of 599.6 FTEs (Table 34). Of that total, 159.1 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. The most FTEs are projected by 2015 for Drywall and Insulation Contractors with 286.2 FTEs.

5.6 GJGNY Marketing Contractor

FTE data and wage data as of the first quarter of 2013 is reported for the Marketing Contractor in Table 22, Table 23, Table 24, and Table 25 in aggregate by combining it with findings from all groups in order to protect the confidentiality of the Marketing Contractor and its staff.

NYSERDA competitively procured a marketing contractor, Brand|Cool, to develop and execute a statewide integrated marketing and communication program to support GJGNY. Brand|Cool created new messaging for the various sectors targeted by GJGNY. This messaging was developed through:

- Secondary research completed in the previous reporting period, which compiles findings on consumer attitudes and trends;
- Residential contractor research; and
- Residential and small business on-line focus groups.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

5.7 CBO Training and Implementation Contractor

FTE data and wage data as of the first quarter of 2013 is reported for the CBO Training and Implementation Contractor in Table 22, Table 23, Table 24, and Table 25 in aggregate by combining it with findings from all groups in order to protect the confidentiality of the Training and Implementation Contractor and its staff.

CSG was selected as the GJGNY Training and Implementation Contractor to provide a variety of services including:

- Providing and supporting structured training for the CBOs;
- Providing geographic coordination and support of CBO Outreach programs;
- Enabling effective communication across all regions;
- Tracking CBO goals including recruiting efforts;
- Assessing and fulfilling CBO needs;
- Assisting in planning and coordinating events, if necessary;
- Tracing progress of referrals made to GJGNY;
- Performing data gathering; and
- Providing regular reporting of program activities and results to NYSERDA.

Some of the activities that CSG has conducted included working with NYSERDA staff on the development of the curriculum for a two-day CBO training session for those CBOs selected for outreach activities. Training was held in November (upstate CBOs) and December (downstate CBOs), 2011. CSG has also developed a SharePoint Portal to support CBO outreach efforts.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

6 Home Performance with ENERGY STAR

6.1 Background⁶⁰

Services to the residential sector are delivered through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program (HPwES). HPwES is a “whole house” program that uses building science to identify and install cost-effective measures to reduce energy consumption in New York State’s one-to-four-family residential structures. Contractors perform a comprehensive home energy assessment (audit), including health and safety testing, prior to performing work, and also “test out” of the house after work is complete to ensure a safe and healthy environment after installation of energy-efficiency measures. The program offers low-interest financing and homeowner cash-back incentives to encourage comprehensive work scopes, including a higher incentive level for those households qualifying for the “Assisted” component of the program. Participating households typically reduce their total energy use by 25 to 30% after a participating contractor has completed work on the home. The GJGNY supported free/reduced-cost energy audits and low-interest financing components of HPwES were launched on November 15, 2010. Homeowners seeking services from the program can participate through one of two ways: 1) as individual owners, or 2) as a participant in a CBO-organized aggregation.

Homeowners whose incomes are equal to or less than 80% of the State or area median income (S/AMI), qualifying for Assisted HPwES, may be eligible for a grant of up to 50% of the cost of the eligible work to be performed, up to \$5,000 (or up to \$10,000 for buildings with two to four units), from NYSERDA. These households are a particular target of interest for GJGNY. Communities in areas where energy costs are high in relation to AMI, or those in nonattainment for one or more designated pollutants under the Federal Clean Air Act, are also targeted by the eighteen CBOs conducting outreach.

6.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs as of the first quarter of 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for the HPwES Program. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The four groups for which FTE and wage information were collected are:

- HPwES Contractors
- HPwES Implementers
 - HPwES Implementation Contractor
 - HPwES Quality Assurance Contractor

⁶⁰ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

- HPwES Financial Services Processors and Providers

The tables present results by each of the 10 NAICS code categories identified during interviews based on data on the HPwES Program. As discussed in the methodology section, a variety of methods were used to apply attribution to each of the groups or to extrapolate results to the larger population.

The tables do not identify specific groups in order to protect the confidentiality of the companies that were the sole providers of a particular service to the HPwES Program. These groups include the HPwES Implementation Contractor and the HPwES Quality Assurance Contractor. Note the HPwES Financial Services Processors and Providers reported that they did not have any FTE impacts as a result of the GJGNY Program.

6.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES Program resulted in the addition of 207.8 new FTEs across all NAICS code categories (Table 35). Engineering Services added the most new FTEs with 117.2 total FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.64. Residential Remodelers added the second most new FTEs with 26.4 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$14.67.

Table 35: 2013 New FTEs – Total HPwES Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	4.9	\$17.50
236118	Residential Remodelers	26.4	\$14.67
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$16.07
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	10.7	\$15.23
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	18.3	\$18.35
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.4	--
541330	Engineering Services	117.2	\$19.64
541350	Building Inspection Services	21.5	\$18.67
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	4.9	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.6	--
TOTAL FTEs		207.8	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$17.98

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES Program resulted in the retention of 288.2 FTEs across all NAICS code categories (Table 36). Engineering Services retained the largest number of FTEs with 169.8 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$23.14. Residential Remodelers retained the second most FTEs with 34.5 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.66.

Table 36: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total HPwES Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	4.9	--
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	0.8	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	34.5	\$19.66
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$16.07
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	14.6	\$18.75
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	30.5	\$17.88
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.6	--
541330	Engineering Services	169.8	\$23.14
541350	Building Inspection Services	21.9	\$22.07
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	6.8	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.9	--
TOTAL FTEs		288.2	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$20.26

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-Waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES program resulted in a total of 240.2 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all jobs categories (Table 37).

Engineering Services saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 140.5 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$16.94, and following their involvement with GJGNY, the average hourly wage level was \$22.17.

GJGNY funding for HPwES also resulted in a total of 65.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels. Note that all of these FTEs were associated with the HPwES contractors.

Table 37: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total HPwES Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	6.8	\$19.17	\$3.00	\$22.17
236118	Residential Remodelers	31.2	\$16.67	\$6.67	\$23.33
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air -Conditioning Contractors	13.4	\$22.50	\$2.00	\$24.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	30.9	\$19.31	\$5.11	\$24.42
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.5	--	--	--
541330	Engineering Services	140.5	\$16.94	\$3.69	\$22.17
541350	Building Inspection Services	10.6	\$16.17	\$3.27	\$19.43
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	5.7	--	--	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.7	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		240.2	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$17.93	\$4.44	\$22.37

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from the HPwES Program was 495.9 FTEs (Table 38). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was Finger Lakes with 182.5 FTEs, or 37.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 495.9 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs impacts from the HPwES Program, 76.2 FTEs, or 15.0%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁶¹ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Southern Tier with 32.2 FTEs, or 6.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁶¹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 38: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total HPwES Program

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	495.9	100%	76.2	15.0%
North Country	7.8	2.0%	7.8	2.0%
Kings and Richmond	1.6	0.3%	1.6	--
Queens	9.2	2.0%	--	--
Central	42.4	9.0%	4.1	1.0%
New York	2.0	0.4%	--	--
Southern Tier	40.9	8.0%	32.2	6.0%
Western	60.7	12.0%	7.9	2.0%
Finger Lakes	182.5	37.0%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	51.2	10.0%	17.2	3.0%
Long Island	78.7	16.0%	--	--
Capital	19.1	4.0%	5.4	1.0%
2015 Direct FTEs	737.5	NA	131.2	17.8%

6.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTE impacts in the HPwES Program of 737.5 FTEs (Table 38). Of that total, 131.2 FTES are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. The majority of these positions (99.9% of total 2015 Direct FTEs) are projected to come from the HPwES contractors.

A brief overview of each of the respondent groups, as well as key findings for those respondent groups, are provided in the following subsections.

6.3 Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors

6.3.1 Background⁶²

HPwES contractors engage with the program when an applicant is approved for a free or reduced-cost audit through either the Individual Owner Approach or the Aggregation pilot.

⁶² Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

Under the Individual Owner Approach, the applicant receives a reservation number from the application processing center with the estimated level of audit subsidy that will be paid by NYSERDA to the selected HPwES participating contractor for a completed audit. Once the audit is complete and upgrades are identified, the individual is free to utilize the same contractor if appropriate, or can choose to work with any other HPwES participating contractors that they wish to select.

Under the Aggregation approach, homeowners agree, up-front, to use the same HPwES participating contractor or contractor team to perform audits and retrofit work. Homes that are eligible for the aggregation pilot must be located in areas where the Aggregation pilot has been approved by NYSERDA.

6.3.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for HPwES contractors. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the NAICS code categories. Note that the data on the HPwES contractors is also included in the overall data for the HPwES Program reported in Section 6.2.

6.3.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES Program resulted in the addition of 207.5 new FTEs across all 10 NAICS code categories of HPwES contractors (Table 39). Engineering Services added the most new FTEs with 116.9 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.75. Residential Remodelers added the second most new FTEs with 26.4 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$14.67. The third most common NAICS code category for new FTEs was Building Inspection Services with a total of 21.5 new FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$18.67.

Table 39: 2013 New FTEs – HPwES Contractors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	4.9	\$17.50
236118	Residential Remodelers	26.4	\$14.67
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$16.07
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	10.7	\$15.23
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	18.3	\$18.35
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.4	--
541330	Engineering Services	116.9	\$19.75
541350	Building Inspection Services	21.5	\$18.67
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	4.9	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.6	--
TOTAL FTEs		207.5	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$18.00

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.3.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES Program resulted in the retention of 288.1 FTEs across all 11 NAICS code categories of HPwES contractors (Table 40). Engineering Services retained the largest number of FTEs with 169.7 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$23.14. Residential Remodelers retained the second most FTEs with 34.5 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$19.66. The third most common NAICS code category for retained FTEs was Drywall and Insulation Contractors with a total of 30.5 FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$17.88.

Table 40: 2013 Retained FTEs - HPwES Contractors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	4.9	--
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	0.8	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	34.5	\$19.66
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	3.0	\$16.07
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	14.6	\$18.75
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	30.5	\$17.88
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.6	--
541330	Engineering Services	169.7	\$23.14
541350	Building Inspection Services	21.9	\$22.07
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	6.8	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.9	--
TOTAL FTEs		288.1	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$20.26

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.3.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the HPwES Program resulted in a total of 240.2 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all 9 NAIC code categories (Table 41).

Engineering Services saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 140.5 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$16.94, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$23.33. Residential Remodelers saw the second greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 31.2 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$16.67, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$23.33.

GJGNY funding for HPwES contractors also resulted in a total of 65.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.⁶³

Table 41: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – HPwES Contractors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	6.8	\$19.17	\$3.00	\$22.17
236118	Residential Remodelers	31.2	\$16.67	\$6.67	\$23.33
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	13.4	\$22.50	\$2.00	\$24.50
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	30.9	\$19.31	\$5.11	\$24.42
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.5	--	--	--
541330	Engineering Services	140.5	\$16.94	\$3.69	\$22.17
541350	Building Inspection Services	10.6	\$16.17	\$3.27	\$19.43
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	5.7	--	--	--
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.7	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		240.2	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$17.93	\$4.44	\$22.37

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

6.3.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from HPwES Contractors was 495.5 FTEs (Table 42). Engineering Services (286.7 FTEs), Residential Remodelers (60.9 FTEs), and Drywall and Insulation Contractors (48.7 FTEs) saw the most 2013 Direct FTEs.

The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Finger Lakes region with 182.5 FTEs, or 37.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Long Island experienced the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs with 78.7 FTEs, or 16.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁶³ Note that attribution and extrapolation were not used to calculate total FTEs of staff with increased responsibilities who did not receive wage increases due to the program.

Of the 495.5 total 2013 Direct FTEs from the HPwES Contractors, 76.2 FTEs, or 15.0%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁶⁴ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Southern Tier with 32.2 FTEs, or 6.0% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 42: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – HPwES Contractors

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	495.5	100%	76.2	15.0%
North Country	7.8	2.0%	7.8	2.0%
Kings and Richmond	1.6	0.3%	1.6	0.3%
Queens	9.2	2.0%	--	--
Central	42.4	9.0%	4.1	1.0%
New York	2.0	0.4%	--	--
Southern Tier	40.9	8.0%	32.2	6.0%
Western	60.7	12.0%	7.9	2.0%
Finger Lakes	182.5	37.0%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	51.2	10.0%	17.2	3.0%
Long Island	78.7	16.0%	--	--
Capital	18.7	4.0%	5.4	1.0%
2015 Direct FTEs	736.7	NA	130.8	17.8%

6.3.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTE impacts for HPwES contractors of 736.7 FTEs (Table 42). Of that total, 130.8 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. Engineering Services projects the most FTEs by 2015 with 403.3 FTEs.

⁶⁴ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

6.4 HPwES Implementers

As part of the HPwES Program, NYSERDA entered into contract with an Implementation Contractor, Conservation Services Group, to oversee the Energy Audit implementation component of the HPwES Program. Additionally, NYSERDA entered into contract with a Quality Assurance (QA) Contractor, Honeywell International Inc., to oversee the Quality Assurance component of the HPwES Program.

In order to protect the confidentiality of the staff with the HPwES Implementation Contractor and the HPwES QA Contractor, FTE and wage details are not reported separately but are combined in Table 35, Table 36, Table 37, and Table 38 above together with other respondents by NAICS code category.

6.5 HPwES Financial Service Processors and Providers

As part of the HPwES Program, NYSERDA entered into contract with several financial service processors and providers. These organizations provided a variety of financial services to the program, including loan servicing, title searches, and origination fee processing, and legal financial advisory services.

NMR interviewed five of 16 HPwES Loan Processors and Providers. Three of these respondents were categorized under the Direct Title Insurance NAICS code category, and two were categorized under the Loan Servicing NAICS code category.

The interviews asked the processors and providers to provide the total number their staff positions that were new, retained, and up-skilled and up-waged due to the program. Based on these interviews, there were no relevant new FTEs, retained FTEs, or up-skilled and up-waged FTEs reported for any of the process or providers working with the HPwES Program. This occurred for several reasons: one provider and all of its staff are located outside of the State of New York, one provider was just entering into contract with NYSERDA at the time of the interview, and the three others simply did not experience any new positions, retained positions, or up-skilled and up-waged positions that could be directly attributed to the HPwES Program.

These respondents were also asked whether they anticipated that their companies would add new FTEs over the next two years (by 2015) to support the HPwES loan activities, but there were no relevant positions reported by the processors and providers other than positions located outside of New York State.

7 Multifamily Performance Program

7.1 Background⁶⁵

GJGNY provides financing and co-funding for comprehensive energy audits and the development of an Energy Reduction Plan (ERP)⁶⁶ through NYSERDA's Multifamily Performance Program (MPP). The availability of GJGNY co-funded audits began in September 2010 and GJGNY financing in the multifamily sector was launched in June 2011. MPP is a comprehensive program that serves market-rate and low-to-moderate income projects using a common process, and relies on a network of energy service contractors who have demonstrated their ability to provide building performance services to multifamily buildings. These contractors are identified as MPP Partners, and must be employed by MPP participants to complete specific building performance services.

NYSERDA manages GJGNY-funded services as a seamless part of the MPP process, regardless of whether participants intend to access MPP implementation incentives, utility program rebates, or other financial assistance, or simply intend to fund a portion or all of the energy-related improvements through GJGNY financing.

7.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs as of the first quarter of 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for both the MPP Program. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The groups for which FTE and wage information were collected are:

- MPP Performance Partners
- MPP Participants
- MPP Implementers
 - MPP Implementation Contractor
 - MPP Quality Assurance Contractor

The tables present results by each of the NAICS code categories identified during interviews based on data on all MPP initiatives.

⁶⁵ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

⁶⁶ An Energy Reduction Plan, the ERP, identifies the set of cost-effective energy-related improvements to be installed, and provides information necessary to guide installation of those measures. The ERP includes a detailed description of the proposed work scope, with the associated costs, projected energy saving, an outline for how costs will be financed, and a proposed schedule for construction.

The tables do not identify specific groups in order to protect the confidentiality of the companies that were the sole providers of a particular service to the MPP Program. These groups include the MPP Implementation Contractor and the MPP Quality Assurance (QA) Contractor. Surveys were not conducted with MPP Financial Services Processors and Providers because there were very few loans provided through this program at the time.

7.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP initiatives resulted in the addition of 14.1 new FTEs across all 18 of the NAICS code categories involved with the MPP Program. Residential Property Managers added the most new jobs with 3.3 total FTEs and an average hourly wage level of \$24.33 (Table 43).

Table 43: 2013 New FTEs – Total MPP Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building multifamily residential buildings for others as general contractors)	3.0	\$30.17
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.5	--
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.1	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.6	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	3.3	\$24.33
541330	Engineering Services	0.8	\$29.76
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.2	\$24.67
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	0.5	\$31.02
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.5	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.8	\$17.50
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	0.5	--
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.7	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.8	\$47.50
TOTAL FTEs		14.1	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$29.03

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP initiatives resulted in a total of 14.6 FTEs that were retained across all NAICS code categories (Table 44). Other Similar Organizations (except Business,

Profession, Labor, and Political Organizations)⁶⁷ retained the largest number of FTEs with 4.3 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$47.50.

Table 44: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total MPP Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	1.5	\$30.00
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.1	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.7	\$24.17
541330	Engineering Services	0.6	\$31.30
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.2	\$28.59
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.4	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.6	\$27.50
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	1.4	\$50.00
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.5	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	4.3	\$47.50
TOTAL FTEs		14.6	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$30.73

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

⁶⁷ This industry comprises establishments (except religious organizations, social advocacy organizations, civic and social organizations, business associations, professional organizations, labor unions, and political organizations) primarily engaged in promoting the interests of their members.

7.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP initiatives resulted in a total of 11.6 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all jobs categories (Table 45).

Residential Property Managers saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 2.5 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged positions. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category was not reported by the respondents.

GJGNY funding for MPP initiatives also resulted in a total of 68.4 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Note that attribution and extrapolation were not used to calculate total FTEs of staff with increased responsibilities who did not receive wage increases due to the program.

Table 45: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – Total MPP Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	0.3	\$20.00	\$12.00	\$32.00
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	1.6	--	--	--
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.3	--	--	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--	--	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--	--	--
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.2	--	--	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--	--	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--	--	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.5	--	--	--
541330	Engineering Services	0.6	\$15.69	\$3.48	\$19.17
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.7	\$32.50	\$4.47	\$36.97
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	0.3	\$35.27	\$3.00	\$38.27
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.6	--	--	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.5	--	--	--
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--	--	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	0.6	\$50.00	\$8.33	\$58.33
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.7	--	--	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.6	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		11.6	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$31.32	\$4.71	\$35.98

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of 2013 Direct FTE impacts from the MPP Program was 28.7 FTEs (Table 46). The NAICS code categories with the most 2013 Direct FTEs include Residential Property Managers with 6.0 FTEs and Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations) with 5.1 FTEs.

The regions with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs were New York with 8.7 FTEs, or 30.2% of total 2013 Direct FTEs, and Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 6.3 FTEs, or 21.9% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 28.7 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the MPP Program, 6.3 FTEs, or 21.9%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁶⁹ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Bronx with 2.6 FTEs, or 9.1% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

⁶⁹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 46: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total MPP Program

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	28.7	100%	6.3	21.9%
North Country	0.5	1.7%	0.5	1.7%
Bronx	2.6	9.1%	2.6	9.1%
Kings and Richmond	2.0	6.9%	2.0	6.9%
Queens	2.0	6.9%	--	--
Central	0.9	3.0%	0.3	1.1%
New York	8.7	30.2%	--	--
Southern Tier	0.9	3.0%	0.1	0.2%
Western	3.3	11.5%	0.4	1.2%
Finger Lakes	0.7	2.4%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	6.3	21.9%	0.3	1.2%
Long Island	0.3	1.0%	--	--
Capital	0.7	2.5%	0.1	0.5%
2015 Direct FTEs	49.8	NA	13.7	27.6%

7.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTEs from the MPP Program of 49.8 FTEs (Table 46). Of that total, 13.7 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities.

A brief overview of each of the respondent groups, as well as key findings for those respondent groups, is provided in the following subsections.

7.3 MPP Performance Partners Staff

7.3.1 Background

As noted above, the MPP Program relies on a network of energy service contractors who have demonstrated their ability to provide building performance services to multifamily buildings. These contractors are identified as MPP Performance Partners, and must be employed by MPP participants to complete specific building performance services.

7.3.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for MPP Performance Partners program staff. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the reported NAICS code categories. Note that the data on the MPP Performance Partner staff are also included in the overall data for the MPP Initiative reported in Section 7.2.

Below is a detailed summary of findings of the FTE and hourly wage level impacts associated with the MPP Performance Partners program staff.

7.3.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in the addition of 2.6 new FTEs across all six NAICS code categories of MPP Performance Partners program staff (Table 47). Building Inspection Services added the most new FTEs with 1.2 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$24.67. Engineering Services added the second most new FTEs with 0.7 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$50.00. The third most common NAICS code category for new FTEs was Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services with a total of 0.5 FTEs and no reported average hourly wage level. As noted in prior sections, hourly wage information was missing if a participant did not elect to provide the information during their interview.

Table 47: 2013 New FTEs - MPP Performance Partners Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.1	--
541330	Engineering Services	0.7	\$50.00
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.2	\$24.67
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.5	--
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.1	--
TOTAL FTEs		2.6	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$26.25

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.3.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in the retention of 2.0 FTEs across all NAICS code categories of MPP Performance Partners program staff (Table 48). Building Inspection Services retained the largest number of FTEs with 1.20 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$28.59. Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services retained the second largest number of FTEs with 0.36 FTEs and no reported average hourly wage level.

Table 48: 2013 Retained FTEs - MPP Performance Partners Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.1	--
541330	Engineering Services	0.2	\$22.50
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.2	\$28.59
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.4	--
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.1	--
TOTAL FTEs		2.0	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$28.24

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.3.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in a total of 3.4 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all NAICS code categories (Table 49).

Building Inspection Services saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 1.7 FTEs. The average hourly wage level for this NAICS code category prior to the hourly wage increase was \$32.50, and the average hourly wage level after the hourly wage increase was \$36.97.

GJGNY funding for MPP Performance Partners program staff also resulted in a total of 64.4 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.⁷⁰

Table 49: 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – MPP Performance Partners Staff

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	0.3	\$20.00	\$12.00	\$32.00
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	0.2	--	--	--
541330	Engineering Services	0.5	\$22.50	\$5.00	\$27.50
541350	Building Inspection Services	1.7	\$32.50	\$4.47	\$36.97
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.6	--	--	--
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--	--	--
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.1	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		3.4	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$30.65	\$4.87	\$35.52

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.3.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of 2013 Direct FTEs for the MPP Performance Partners program staff was 4.6 FTEs (Table 50). Building Inspection Services saw the most 2013 Direct FTEs with 2.4 FTEs.

The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was the Western region with 1.8 FTEs, or 40.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. New York experienced the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs with 1.1 FTEs, or 23.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Other CBO regions that saw 2013 Direct FTEs included Mid-Hudson and Westchester, North Country, Queens, Central, Southern Tier, Finger Lakes, Long Island, and the Capital region.

⁷⁰ Note that attribution and extrapolation were not used to calculate total FTEs of staff with increased responsibilities who did not receive wage increases due to the program.

Of the 4.6 total 2013 Direct FTEs from the MPP Performance Partners program staff, 0.6 FTEs, or 10.0%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁷¹ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 0.2 FTEs, or 5.0% of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 50: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – MPP Performance Partners Staff

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	4.6	100%	0.5	10.0%
North Country	0.1	3.0%	0.1	3.0%
Queens	0.1	3.0%	--	--
Central	0.2	5.0%	0.1	2.0%
New York	1.1	23.0%	--	--
Southern Tier	0.1	3.0%	--	--
Western	1.8	40.0%	--	--
Finger Lakes	0.1	3.0%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	0.8	18.0%	0.2	5.0%
Long Island	0.2	3.0%	--	--
Capital	--	--	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	7.5	NA	0.8	10.9%

7.3.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTE impacts for MPP Performance Partners staff of 7.5 FTEs (Table 50). Of that total, 3.4 FTEs are projected to be employed in the Building Inspection Services NAICS code category, 1.6 FTEs will be employed in Engineering Services, and 1.5 FTEs will be employed in Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services.

⁷¹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Of the total projected FTEs by 2015, 0.8 FTEs are expected to be in disadvantaged communities. The region with most projected disadvantaged community FTEs is Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 0.2 FTEs, or 5.0% of 2015 Direct FTEs (Table 50).

7.4 MPP Participants

7.4.1 Background

MPP Participants include owners of multifamily structures with five or more dwelling units, and may include a single multifamily structure or a group of multifamily structures. The MPP Program identifies and targets potential participant who want to make energy-related improvements.⁷²

7.4.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for MPP Participants. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The tables break out results by each of the reported NAICS code categories. Note that the data on the MPP participants are also included in the overall data for the MPP Initiative reported in Section 7.2.

Below is a detailed summary of findings of the FTE and hourly wage level impacts associated with MPP Participants.

7.4.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in the addition of 10.9 new FTEs across all 11 NAICS code categories of MPP Participants (Table 51). Residential Property Managers added the most new FTEs with 3.3 total FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$24.33. New Multifamily Housing Construction added the second most new FTEs with 3.0 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$30.17.

⁷² Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

Table 51: 2013 New FTEs – MPP Participants

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	3.0	\$30.17
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.5	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.6	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	3.3	\$24.33
624190	Community development a non-profit	0.8	\$17.50
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	0.5	--
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.6	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.8	\$47.50
TOTAL FTEs		10.9	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$31.01

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.4.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in the retention of 12.3 FTEs across all NAICS code categories of MPP Participants (Table 52). Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations) retained the largest number of FTEs with 4.3 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$47.50. Residential Property Managers retained the second largest number of FTEs with 2.7 FTEs at an average hourly wage level of \$24.17. The third most common NAICS code category for retained FTEs was New Multifamily Housing Construction with a total of 1.5 FTEs at an hourly wage level of \$30.00.

Table 52: 2013 Retained FTEs - MPP Participants

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	1.5	\$30.00
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.7	\$24.17
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.6	\$27.50
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	1.4	\$50.00
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.5	\$0.00
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	4.3	\$47.50
TOTAL FTEs		12.3	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$33.21

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.4.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for MPP resulted in a total of 7.8 FTEs of up-skilled and up-waged FTEs across all jobs categories (Table 53).

Residential Property Managers saw the greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 2.5 FTEs. New Multifamily Housing Construction saw the second greatest number of FTEs up-skilled and up-waged with 1.6 FTEs. Wage information (including previous hourly wage, average hourly wage, wage increase, and current hourly wage) was not provided by the majority of respondents, and thus could not be included in the analysis.

GJGNY funding for MPP Participants also resulted in a total of 4.0 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.⁷³

Table 53: Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs – MPP Participants

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs			
		Total FTEs	Previous Wage	Average Wage Increase	Average Wage
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction	1.6	--	--	--
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.3	--	--	--
236118	Residential Remodelers	0.2	--	--	--
237210	Land Subdivision	0.4	--	--	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.3	--	--	--
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--	--	--
531311	Residential Property Managers	2.5	--	--	--
624190	Community Development - a Non-Profit	0.5	--	--	--
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	0.6	\$50.00	\$8.33	\$58.33
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.6	--	--	--
813990	Other Similar Organizations (Except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.6	--	--	--
TOTAL FTEs		7.8	NA	NA	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$50.00	\$8.33	\$58.33

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

7.4.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of reported Direct FTE impacts from the MPP Participants was 23.2 FTEs (Table 54). Residential Property Managers saw the most 2013 Direct FTEs with 6.0 FTEs.

⁷³ Note that attribution and extrapolation were not used to calculate total FTEs of staff with increased responsibilities who did not receive wage increases due to the program.

The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was New York with 7.6 FTEs, or 32.6% of 2013 Direct FTEs. Mid-Hudson and Westchester experienced the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs with 5.5 FTEs, or 23.5% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the 23.2 total 2013 Direct FTEs from the MPP Participants, 5.8 FTEs, or 24.9%, were in disadvantaged communities.⁷⁴ The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities was the Bronx with 2.6 FTEs, or 11.3% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 54: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – MPP Participants

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	23.2	100%	5.8	24.9%
North Country	0.4	1.6%	0.4	1.6%
Bronx	2.6	11.3%	2.6	11.3%
Kings and Richmond	2.0	8.6%	2.0	8.6%
Queens	1.9	8%	--	--
Central	0.6	2.5%	0.1	0.6%
New York	7.6	32.6%	--	--
Southern Tier	0.1	0.6%	0.1	0.3%
Western	1.5	6.5%	0.4	1.5%
Finger Lakes	0.6	2.5%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	5.5	23.5%	0.1	0.4%
Long Island	0.1	0.6%	--	--
Capital	0.4	1.7%	0.1	0.6%
2015 Direct FTEs	41.2	NA	12.9	31.3%

⁷⁴ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

7.4.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTEs for MPP Participants of 41.2 FTEs (Table 54). Of that total, 12.9 FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. The NAICS code categories with the most projected employment by 2015 include Residential Property Managers with 11.5 FTEs and the New Multifamily Housing Construction category with 9.2 FTEs.

7.5 MPP Implementers

The MPP Program engaged two implementers: the MPP Implementation Contractor and the MPP QA Contractor. Because there was only two participating companies, specific FTE and wage-related information is only reported for the MPP Implementers in aggregate in Table 43, Table 44, Table 45, and Table 46 to protect their confidentiality. The MPP Implementation Contractor, TRC Engineers Inc. provided program implementation services for the MPP Program, and the MPP QA Contractor, Taitem Engineering, provided quality assurance oversight for the MPP Program.

7.6 MPP Financial Services Processors and Providers

As part of the MPP Program, NYERDA entered into contract with several financial service processors and providers. These organizations provided a variety of financial services to the program, including loan servicing, title searches, and legal financial advisory services. As noted above, surveys were not conducted with MPP Financial Services Processors and Providers. Because there were very few loans provided through this program, there are no jobs impacts projected from these institutions.

8 Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program

8.1 Background⁷⁵

In June 2011, the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program began offering Participation Loans to small businesses with 100 employees or fewer and not-for-profit, with any number of employees, which have Qualified Energy Assessments.⁷⁶ Small businesses and not-for-profits must own, lease or manage the building that their organization uses or occupies and have the authority to contract for the provision of Qualified Energy-Efficiency Services to the building.⁷⁷ If the small business or not-for-profit leases or manages all or part of a building it must obtain permission from the building owner to seek energy-efficiency financing through the program.

NYSERDA offers eligible small business and not-for-profit customers Qualified Energy Assessments from competitively selected Qualified Energy Assessment Contractors. Small business and not-for-profit customers may also obtain Qualified Energy Assessments through utility service providers and other Qualified Energy Consultants NYSERDA enters into agreements with lenders to provide small businesses and not-for-profits with access to low-interest energy-efficiency financing through either the Participation or On-Bill Repayment (OBR) Loan product.

In February 2012, NYSERDA launched a project expeditor pilot to provide assistance to small business and not-for-profit customers to encourage implementation of energy assessment recommendations. The project expeditors follow up with the customers who have received energy assessment through NYSERDA to determine if they are eligible for financial incentives or energy-efficiency financing, help customers apply for available incentives and financing, verify that the technologies and services included in energy project proposals are consistent with technologies recommended in Qualified Energy Assessments, and provide additional technical assistance as necessary. NYSERDA used the expeditor pilot results to inform the development of the competitive solicitation for the next phase of the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program.

⁷⁵ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

⁷⁶ Qualified Energy Assessments must meet NYSERDA's standards and may include either 1) a "Full Walkthrough Commercial Audit," which will provide customers with a thorough examination of energy use, a set of recommendations for Qualified Energy Efficiency Services, installation cost estimates, and associated energy and cost savings; or 2) a "Technology or Equipment Specific Commercial Audit," which will provide basic information on energy use, recommendations on one or more building systems, equipment replacement or upgrade opportunities.

⁷⁷ Qualified Energy Efficiency Services are modifications to non-residential structures based upon recommendations contained in a Qualified Energy Audit performed under a NYSERDA program, by a utility program, or by a Qualified Energy Auditor. Qualified Energy Efficiency Services may include prequalified and custom measures or services including but not limited to: heating, ventilation, air conditioning (HVAC), lighting, controls, building envelope, domestic or service hot water, solar thermal heat or hot water, or business processes (e.g. kitchens, laundries, air compression, etc.)

8.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs as of the first quarter of 2013 for new positions, retained positions, and up-skilled and up-waged positions for the SCEE Program. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. The key groups for which FTE and hourly wage information was collected were:⁷⁸

- Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors
- Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program (SCEE) Project Expeditors

The tables present results by the one NAICS code category identified during interviews that had FTE and wage-related information reported.

8.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for SCEE Program initiatives resulted in the addition of 3.8 new FTEs. All new FTEs were in the Engineering Services NAICS code category and had an average hourly wage level of \$27.50 (Table 55).

Table 55: 2013 New FTEs – Total SCEE Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	3.8	\$27.50
TOTAL FTEs		3.8	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$27.50

8.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for SCEE Program initiatives resulted in a total of 3.2 retained FTEs. All FTEs were retained in the Engineering Services NAICS code category and had an average hourly wage level of \$33.06 (Table 56).

⁷⁸ No jobs or wage impacts of any type were reported for SCEE Program Financial Services Processors.

Table 56: 2013 Retained FTEs - Total SCEE Program

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	3.2	\$33.06
TOTAL FTEs		3.2	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$33.06

8.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, there were no existing positions that were both up-skilled and up-waged. GJGNY funding for the SCEE Program resulted in a total of 5.2 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

8.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of 2013 Direct FTEs from the SCEE Program was 7.0 FTEs, and of those FTEs, all occurred in the Engineering Services NAICS code category (Table 57). The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 3.5 FTEs, or 50.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. The region with the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was Long Island with 1.6 FTEs, or 23.0% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. The Western region also saw of 1.5 FTEs and the Southern Tier saw 0.4 FTEs of 2013 Direct FTEs.

Of the total 7.0 FTEs that represented 2013 Direct FTEs from the SCEE Program, there were no FTEs reported in disadvantaged communities.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ As noted previously, NMR determined disadvantaged community status by comparing the county unemployment rate with the state average. Cities and towns in counties with unemployment rates higher than that of the state average were classified as disadvantaged. County unemployment levels were determined based on data from the New York State Department of Labor (Website: <http://labor.ny.gov/stats/LSLAUS.shtm>).

Table 57: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Total SCEE Program

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	7.0	100%	--	--
Southern Tier	0.4	6%	--	--
Western	1.5	21%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	3.5	50%	--	--
Long Island	1.6	23%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	9.2	NA	--	--

8.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTEs in the SCEE Program of 9.2 FTEs (Table 57). Of that total, no FTEs are projected to be in disadvantaged communities. All of these FTEs are projected to come from Engineering Services

A brief overview of each of the respondent groups, as well as key findings for those respondent groups, is provided in the following subsections.

8.3 Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors

8.3.1 Background⁸⁰

Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors or the Qualified Energy Consultants are individuals who meet program education, experience and other criteria and conduct Commercial Energy Assessments for the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program. Assessment Contractors work with eligible small business and not-for-profit customers to provide assessments through the program.

8.3.2 Key Findings

The tables below show the total FTEs in 2013 for new positions and retained positions for Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors. The tables also show average hourly wage levels for 2013 New FTEs, 2013 Retained FTEs, and total 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs. As of the first quarter of 2013, there were no 2013 up-skilled and up-waged FTEs reported. The tables break out results into the one

⁸⁰ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

NAICS code category, Engineering Services, that had FTE and wage-related information reported. Note that the data on the Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors are also included in the overall data for the SCEE Program reported in Section 8.2. Below is a detailed summary of findings of the FTEs and hourly wage level impacts associated with Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors.

8.3.2.1 2013 New FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the SCEE Program resulted in the addition of 3.8 new FTEs among Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors. All FTEs were in the Engineering Services NAICS code category and had an average hourly wage level of \$27.50 (Table 58).

Table 58: 2013 New FTEs – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs	
		Total New FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	3.8	\$27.50
TOTAL FTEs		3.8	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$27.50

8.3.2.2 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the SCEE Program resulted in the retention of 3.2 FTEs for the Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors. All FTEs were in the Engineering Services NAICS code category and had an average hourly wage level of \$34.50 (Table 59).

Table 59: 2013 Retained FTEs – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	3.2	\$33.06
TOTAL FTEs		3.2	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$34.50

8.3.2.3 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, there were no reported existing positions that were both up-skilled and up-waged as a result of the program. GJGNY funding for the Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors resulted in a total of 1.8 FTEs of existing staff positions that received an increase in responsibilities or were up-skilled but did not receive an increase in hourly wage levels.

8.3.2.4 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

As of the first quarter of 2013, the total number of 2013 Direct FTEs from the Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors was 6.6 FTEs (Table 60). There were no FTEs reported in disadvantaged communities.

The region with the greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs was Mid-Hudson and Westchester with 3.5 FTEs, or 53% of total 2013 Direct FTEs. Long Island experienced the second greatest number of 2013 Direct FTEs with 1.5 FTEs, or 24% of total 2013 Direct FTEs, and the Western region experienced 1.5 FTEs, or 23% of total 2013 Direct FTEs.

Table 60: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	6.6	100%	--	--
Western	1.5	23.0%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	3.5	53.0%	--	--
Long Island	1.6	24.0%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	7.3	NA	--	--

8.3.2.5 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTE impacts for Small Commercial Energy Assessment Contractors of 7.3 FTEs (Table 60). Of that total, there are no FTEs projected to be in disadvantaged communities by 2015.

8.4 Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program Project Expeditors

8.4.1 Background⁸¹

As noted above, in February 2012, NYSERDA launched a project expeditor pilot to provide assistance to small business and not-for-profit customers to encourage implementation of energy assessment recommendations. The project expeditors follow up with the customers who have received energy assessments through NYSERDA to determine if they are eligible for financial incentives or energy-efficiency financing, help customers apply for available incentives and financing, verify that the technologies and services included in energy project proposals are consistent with technologies recommended in Qualified Energy Assessments, and provide additional technical assistance as necessary. NYSERDA plans to use expeditor pilot results to develop future competitive solicitations for the small business and not-for-profit sector.

8.4.2 Key Findings

The tables below show 2013 Retained FTEs, average hourly wage levels for retained FTEs, 2013 Direct FTEs, and 2015 Direct FTEs. Note that as of the first quarter of 2013, there were no reported 2013 New FTEs or 2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs reported. The data on the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program Project Expeditors are also included in the overall data for the SCEE Program reported in Section 8.2.

8.4.2.1 2013 Retained FTEs

As of the first quarter of 2013, GJGNY funding for the SCEE Program resulted in the retention of 0.4 FTEs among SCEE Project Expeditors. These FTEs occurred in the Engineering Services NAICS code category and had an average hourly wage level of \$24.12 (Table 61).

Table 61: 2013 Retained FTEs – SCEE Project Expeditors

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 Retained FTEs	
		Total Retained FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	0.4	\$24.12
TOTAL FTEs		0.4	NA
AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$24.12

⁸¹ Background text from NYSERDA, *GJGNY Annual Report*, July 2012.

8.4.2.2 2013 Direct FTEs, Regional Data, and Disadvantaged Communities

2013 Direct FTEs for the SCEE Project Expeditors equaled the total number of 2013 Retained FTEs (0.4 FTEs) for the Engineering Services NAICS code category because respondents did not report any 2013 New FTEs (Table 62). All of these FTEs occurred in the Southern Tier CBO region. There were no 2013 Direct FTEs reported in disadvantaged communities.

Table 62: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Region – SCEE Project Expeditors

Regions	Total FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Reported Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
2013 Direct FTEs	0.4	100%	--	--
Southern Tier	0.4	100%	--	--
2015 Direct FTEs	1.9	NA	--	--

8.4.2.3 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities

By 2015, GJGNY is projected to have total Direct FTE impacts for SCEE Project Expeditors of 1.9 FTEs (Table 62). Of that total, there are no 2015 Direct Jobs projected to be in disadvantaged communities.

8.5 SCEE PROGRAM Financial Services Processors and Providers

As noted above, NYSERDA enters into agreements with lenders to provide small businesses and not-for-profits with access to low-interest energy-efficiency financing through either the Participation or On-Bill Repayment (OBR) Loan product.

The Small Commercial Energy Efficiency (SCEE) Program Financial Services Processors reported no FTE or wage impacts during in-depth interviews. Out of the six targeted completes, four respondents reported no increase in workload due to GJGNY loan activities, one refused the interview, one interview was not completed in time for analysis. Given the very few loans distributed through the SCEE Program and given the results of the interviews, NMR concludes that there are no FTE impacts to report for any SCEE Financial Services Processors and Providers in 2013.

9 Findings and Recommendations

The focus of this study was to estimate the number of 2013 and 2015 Direct Full-Time Equivalent (FTEs) positions generated as a result of GJGNY-funded program activities and to determine other FTE-related impacts, particularly on hourly wage levels and worker skills. This information served as inputs to an economic impact analysis performed by ICF. In addition, NMR estimated the jobs created in disadvantaged communities in New York State.

The research conducted by NMR consisted of in-depth interviews and surveys with more than 200 program partners, trade allies associated with NYSERDA programs that include GJGNY components, and participants, as well as analysis of secondary data.

The study results should be interpreted within the following key points of context:

- Direct jobs (in FTEs) are point-in-time estimates by survey respondents. FTEs reported for 2013 existed in the first quarter of that year and resulted since the inception of the GJGNY program. These 2013 FTEs are assumed to continue to the extent that the GJGNY funding continues. 2015 FTEs were also estimated from the survey and include 2013 FTEs that are assumed to continue through 2015, plus an estimate by survey respondents of the number of additional new FTEs attributable to GJGNY between 2013 and 2015. 2015 job estimates are based on projections that assume GJGNY funding continues through 2015.
- Given the close linkage of GJGNY with ratepayer-funded programs, NMR survey research carefully addressed attribution and worked to isolate the GJGNY impacts.
- Due to differences in analytical approaches, results should not be added / compared to results from jobs studies on other NYSERDA programs or portfolios.

9.1 Findings

GJGNY-related work via NYSERDA programs resulted in a total of 905.8 Direct FTEs in 2013. Direct FTEs includes new FTEs added because of GJGNY-related work and retained FTEs that would have been let go without GJGNY-related work, but were retained because of that work. Approximately three-fifths (62%) of Direct FTEs were new FTEs and two-fifths (38%) were retained FTEs.

The industry groups with the largest numbers of FTEs added or retained because of GJGNY include Engineering Services⁸² and Residential Remodelers. Table 63 lists FTE and wage data for the ten NAICS industry groups with the highest total Direct FTEs, which accounted for 81% of the total Direct FTEs attributable to GJGNY. The overall weighted average hourly wage of all Direct FTEs with associated wage information was \$20. In general, the average wages within an industry category were higher for retained FTEs than new FTEs. This is reasonable considering that those employees retaining positions would not

⁸² This sector comprises a wide range of companies including engineers and building auditors.

have been entry level employees and are likely to have some experience in their positions, and therefore were of greater value to their employers. Overall wages for retained FTEs were 31% higher than wages for new FTEs.

Table 63: 2013 New, Retained and Direct FTEs for Top Five NAICS Category

NAICS CODE	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs		2013 Retained FTEs		2013 Direct FTEs	
		FTEs	Average Wage	FTEs	Average Wage	FTEs	Average Wage
541330	Engineering Services	151.8	\$19.76	173.6	\$23.99	325.4	\$22.02
236118	Residential Remodelers	120.8	\$13.76	34.6	\$19.66	155.4	\$15.08
238310	Drywall and insulation contractors	59.7	\$17.93	30.5	\$17.88	90.2	\$17.91
541350	Building Inspection Services	59.7	\$18.15	23.1	\$22.38	82.8	\$19.33
238220	Plumbing, heating and air -conditioning contractors	62.6	\$15.07	14.7	\$18.75	77.3	\$15.77
TOP FIVE NAICS CATEGORY FTEs		454.6	NA	276.5	NA	731.1	NA
TOTAL FTEs		558.8	NA	347.0	NA	905.8	NA
TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE HOURLY WAGE		NA	\$18.20	NA	\$23.86	NA	\$20.01

Of the total 905.8 Direct FTEs, 495.9 (54.8%) occurred through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR program (Table 64). Another 374 FTEs (41.3%) were added or retained in various positions by the first quarter of 2013 because of GJGNY-funded activities of the Workforce Development and Training, and Outreach and Marketing initiatives.

Table 64: 2013 Direct FTEs by Program Initiative

Program Initiatives	2013 Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program	495.9	54.8%
Workforce Development and Training	213.6	23.6%
Outreach and Marketing	160.6	17.7%
Multifamily Performance Program	28.7	3.2%
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	7.0	0.8%
Total Green Jobs – Green New York Program	905.8	100%

All of the 2013 Direct FTEs occurring through the HPwES initiative were added or retained by the HPwES contractors, as illustrated in Table 65. Over 400 contractors are active in this program and they report having added or retained almost 500 FTEs from GJGNY program inception through the first quarter of 2013 because of GJGNY related work. Most of the 2013 Direct FTEs that occurred through the Workforce Development and Training, and Outreach and Marketing initiatives were positions obtained or retained by employees who received GJGNY-funded training through OJT, CBO or WFD program partners.

Most of the 2015 Direct FTEs are also projected to occur in the HPwES contractors and OJT, CBO or WFD trainees groups but in different proportions than in 2013. Of particular note, WFD Training Partners projected that by 2015 the number of FTEs added because of job placements of their trainees would increase by a factor of almost 13 when compared to 2013 FTEs. CBOs also projected significant increases in Direct FTEs, by factors of 5.2 and 4.1, respectively, for their trainees and others affected by their GJGNY-funded services. This is in comparison to an overall projected increase in FTEs from 2013 to 2015 by a factor of 2.8.

Table 65: 2013 Direct FTEs and 2015 Direct FTEs by Respondent Group

Respondent Groups	2013 Direct FTEs		2015 Direct FTEs		Ratio of 2015 to 2013 Direct FTEs
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total	
Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors	495.5	54.7%	736.7	28.9%	1.5
OJT Training Partners (re: GJGNY Hires)	114.0	12.6%	246.0	9.7%	2.2
CBOs (re: Trainees)	104.4	11.5%	548.0	21.5%	5.2
WFD Training Partners (re: Trainees)	59.9	6.6%	775.9	30.5%	13.0
Training Partners Staff	39.6	4.4%	52.8	2.1%	1.3
CBO Staff	39.1	4.3%	77.8	3.1%	2.0
MPP Participants	23.2	2.6%	41.2	1.6%	1.8
Miscellaneous Program Contractors	15.9	1.8%	19.2	0.8%	1.2
CBO Other	9.6	1.1%	39.6	1.6%	4.1
MPP Performance Partners	4.6	0.5%	7.5	0.3%	1.6
Total Green Jobs – Green New York Program	905.8	100%	2545.6	100%	2.8

Direct FTEs resulting from GJGNY-related work occurred across twelve NY regions. The regions with largest numbers of new or retained direct FTEs are Finger Lakes with a total of 222.6 FTEs and Long Island with a total of 106.4 FTEs.

Of the total 905.8 GJGNY-related direct FTEs, 155.6 FTEs or 17.2% were located in disadvantaged communities, defined as counties where unemployment rate greater than NY state average. Regions with largest numbers of direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities were Southern Tier with 55.7 total direct FTEs and Mid-Hudson & Westchester with 39.5 total direct FTEs.

Table 66: 2013 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Community Direct FTEs by Region

Regions	Total Direct FTEs		Disadvantaged Community Direct FTEs	
	Number	% Total	Number	% Total
Finger Lakes	222.6	24.6%	3.0	0.3%
Long Island	106.4	11.8%	--	--
Mid-Hudson and Westchester	104.5	11.5%	39.5	4.4%
Western	99.5	11.0%	9.2	1.0%
Capital	95.2	10.5%	5.5	0.6%
Southern Tier	79.0	8.7%	55.7	6.1%
Central	73.8	8.1%	13.4	1.5%
New York	71.8	7.9%	--	--
Queens	21.8	2.4%	--	--
Bronx	12.6	1.4%	12.6	1.4%
Kings and Richmond	10.3	1.1%	8.3	0.9%
North Country	8.3	0.9%	8.3	0.9%
2013 Direct FTEs	905.8	100%	155.6	17.2%

9.2 Recommendations

There may be some overlap in the trainee FTEs reported by CBO or WFD partners and other GJGNY program partners such as HPwES contractors. We recommend tracking CBO and WFD trainee employers before and after training to allow cross checking against program partner companies to reduce the possibility of FTE double counting.

Wage data was difficult to obtain from respondents during interviews and surveys. We recommend improved tracking of pre- and post-training wage data to produce a more reliable analysis of the wage impact of GJGNY training efforts.

A very large number of FTEs among trainees were projected by WFD Training Partners and CBOs for 2015 compared to the reported FTEs for 2013. Since future training efforts are projected to yield much better results than those reported to date, we recommend carefully tracking trainee placements and job retention results for trainees in order to determine whether the large projections were justified.

Appendix A Supplementary Findings

The surveys also collected additional information such as program attribution, information about audits and loans, or the number of office locations conducting GJGNY activities. The Constituency-based Organizations, the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) Contractors, the Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) Participants, and the MPP Partners were all asked additional questions beyond job and wage-related questions. Responses to these questions are discussed in the following subsections.

A.1 Constituency-Based Organizations

NMR Staff conducted in-depth interviews with Constituency-based Organization (CBO) staff. During those interviews, CBOs were asked questions that went beyond job and wage-related information. Responses to those questions are discussed below.

A.1.1 Office Locations

NMR asked CBOs about the number of many New York state office locations in which their organization conducted GJGNY-related activities. Thirteen of the 18 CBOs (72%) reported having a single office location in New York State. Five CBOs (28%) reported conducting GJGNY activities out of more than one office location and, among them, two organizations conducted GJGNY-related activities out of only one of their office locations, two conducted GJGNY activities out of two office locations, and one conducted GJGNY activities out of three office locations. Thus, 15 of 18 CBOs (83%) conducted GJGNY-related activities out of a single office location.

A.1.2 Position Qualifications

CBOs were asked about the position qualifications for added and retained staff, including minimum educational requirements for the positions, and special licenses, certificates, or other training required for the positions. A total of four positions had a minimum educational requirement of a high school diploma or GED, two positions had a minimum educational requirement of a Bachelor's degree, three had a minimum educational requirement of a Graduate degree, and six positions had other requirements. Of the six positions with other qualifications reported, all were required to have experience in their field.

A.1.3 Contractor Referral Activity

CBOs were asked to estimate the impact of the referrals they gave to contractors for audits and measure installation work on the contractors' overall workload. Out of the 18 CBOs interviewed, five reported that

their referrals resulted in a substantial increase in contractor workload, four reported a moderate increase, two reported a minimal increase, and one reported having no impact on contractor’s workload. Five CBOs did not know if their referrals had an impact on their workload, and one said they could not provide an estimate yet because they had only started their contract recently (Table A - 1).

Table A - 1: CBO Perceived Impact of Referrals on Contractor Workload

Perceived Impact	Percentage CBOs (n=18) ⁸³
Substantial	28%
Moderate	22%
Minimal	11%
No Increase	6%
Don't Know	28%
Refused	--
Not Applicable	6%

A.1.4 CBO Trainee Tracking Systems

CBOs were asked how they track the progress and employment status of individuals that they recruit for training. Most respondents (n=10) said they use the SharePoint site in addition to other types of internal contact tracking systems. Common types of internal tracking systems included Excel, Google Documents, and Salesforce. One CBO reported that they are not yet tracking individuals but that they will use Excel as their outreach activities ramp up.

CBOs were also asked about what metrics and information they track in their internal tracking systems. The most common metrics and information tracked included the hire’s name and contact information, and the hire’s employment status. Other metrics that were mentioned with less frequency included the type of work the trainee is interested in, whether they have had any job interviews, certifications, and educational attainment.

Of the ten CBOs who said they use SharePoint to help them keep track of the progress of their trainees, seven said that their SharePoint site is up to date, one said that they wished it was more up to date, and one said it is up to date but does not include information on whether trainees have completed the program yet because they are still in the process of conducting the training.

⁸³ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

CBOs were also asked about how easy or difficult it has been for them to track the progress and employment status of individuals that they have recruited for training. One-half of the CBOs (9) said it was easy or somewhat easy, one CBO said it was very difficult, one said the question was not applicable, and seven said they did not know (Table A - 2).

Table A - 2: Ease of Tracking Trainee Employment Status in SharePoint

Perceived Impact	Percentage CBOs (n=18)
Easy	17%
Somewhat easy	33%
Difficult	--
Very Difficult	6%
Don't know	39%
Refused	--
Not Applicable	6%

One CBO said SharePoint has been easy to use because it is straightforward. Two of the CBOs said it has been easy to keep track of the trainees in SharePoint because they have had so few trainees to date going through the program. One CBO who said it had been somewhat easy to track the employment status of trainees also indicated that the input data is difficult to enter into SharePoint on a weekly basis. Another CBO said the interface is easy, but the user privileges present difficulties because they are not customizable. Another said reporting through SharePoint is somewhat easy, but that it can create double reporting for CBOs that also have to use their own internal tracking systems. The CBO that reported that the process was very difficult said that SharePoint was not intuitive and it takes too many steps to complete, and is not very user friendly.

CBOs were also asked if they had any suggestions for improving the tracking system within SharePoint. One CBO suggested separating the data input and newsletter into categories within the database. Another CBO suggested looking into another software program that could act as a shared portal among contractors, customers, and CBOs. A third CBO suggested switching to Salesforce software. A fourth CBO suggested improving user privileges. A final CBO said they would like to see a system that better consolidates all trainee and homeowner data, such as tracking individual logs and case notes, in order to improve communication between CBOs, contractors, and homeowners.

A.2 Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Contractors

The survey of Home Performance with ENERGY STAR (HPwES) contractors also asked additional questions beyond job and wage-related information. Responses to these questions are discussed below.

A.2.1 Perceived Motivation of Customers to Conduct Audit

HPwES contractors were asked about the one primary motivation for customers to have an audit completed through the HPwES Program. Over one-third of contractors (36%) said they thought the primary motivation was to save on energy costs and bills, about one-fifth (21%) thought the primary motivation was because the audit was provided for free or at a reduced cost, and one-tenth (10%) thought the primary motivation was to get their home evaluated to find out how energy efficient it was (Table A - 3).

Table A - 3: Primary Motivations for Customers to have Audit Completed through HPwES

Primary Motivation	Percentage Contractors (n=71)
Save Energy Costs/Bills	46%
Considering Installing EE Measure Anyway	4%
Get Home Evaluated for EE	10%
Get Expert Advice about EE	3%
Save Energy	1%
Help Environment	--
Replace Broken/Malfunctioning Equipment	--
Because it is Free/Reduced Cost	21%
Qualify for Incentives/Rebates	4%
Increased Comfort of Homes	4%
Other	6%
Don't Know	--
Refused	--

A.2.2 Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having Audit Completed

HPwES contractors were asked to indicate the single most important barrier preventing customers from participating in the free or reduced-cost audits offered by the program. Nearly two-fifths of contractors (37%) indicated that lack of knowledge and awareness was the primary reason that customers did not have an audit completed (Table A - 4).

Table A - 4: Primary Barriers for Customers to have Audit Completed through HPwES

Primary Barrier	Percentage Contractors (n=71) ⁸⁴
Not Enough Money Available/Lack of Budget	7%
Lack of Time	6%
Hassle of Scheduling/Paper/Program Complexity	8%
Waiting for Old Equipment to Break	--
Gathering Energy Use Data	4%
Lack of Knowledge/Awareness	37%
Not Wanting to Feel Obligated to Install Measures	--
Not Expecting to Qualify/Changes in Program Requirements	1%
Skeptical of Free Service	8%
Incomes Questions too Intrusive	1%
Lack of Benefits after Audit	--
None	17%
Other	6%
Don't Know	4%
Refused	--

A.2.3 HPwES Audits Performed

HPwES contractors were asked to estimate the percent of the HPwES Program audits they would have performed had audits not been available for free or at a reduced cost. These contractors estimated that had the audits not been available for free or at a reduced cost, they would have completed an average of 35% of the HPwES audits that they had done. One-fourth of contractors (25%) said that they would have completed 50% of the HPwES Program audits if the audit was not free or offered at reduced-cost, slightly under one-fifth (17%) said they would have completed between 10% of the audits, and slightly over one-tenth (13%) said they would have completed no audits at all (Table A - 5).

⁸⁴ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 5: Percentage of HPwES Audits that would have been Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available

Percentage of Audits	HPwES Contractors (n=71) ⁸⁵
0%	13%
1%	1%
3%	1%
5%	1%
10%	17%
20%	10%
25%	3%
30%	6%
40%	3%
50%	25%
60%	1%
75%	7%
80%	1%
100%	7%
Don't know / Refused	3%
Average percentage audits without GJGNY free or reduced cost audit: 35%	

HPwES contractors were asked about which GJGNY audit-related activities their company has performed (Table A - 6). All of the contractors said that they took an inventory of initial home conditions, including blower-door testing for air-infiltration rates; conducted home health and safety testing, prior to performing work, including diagnostic testing of combustion appliances; developed a work scope for proposed improvement; developed a cost and energy-savings estimate; and performed home health and safety testing, after performing work. The large majority of contractors said they promoted the GJGNY loans (97%) and assisted customers in submitting GJGNY loan applications (94%). Slightly over two-fifths (44%) of contractors said they assisted in the installation of energy-efficiency measures during the audits. Nearly all of the contractors (97%) said they installed energy-efficiency measures as follow-on work after the audits. About one-third of contractors (32%) performed additional audit-related activities, most commonly mentioning infra-red thermal energy scanning.

⁸⁵ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 6: GJGNY Audit-related Activities Performed by HPwES Contractors

(multiple responses)

Activities	HPwES Contractors (n=71)
Inventory of initial home conditions, including blower-door testing for air-infiltration rates	100%
Home health and safety testing prior to performing work, including diagnostic testing of combustion appliances	100%
Work scope for proposed improvement	100%
Cost and energy-savings estimate	100%
Home health and safety testing, after performing work	100%
Promoted GJGNY loans	97%
Installed energy-efficiency measures after the audits	97%
Assisted customers in submitting GJGNY loan applications	94%
Assisted in installation of energy-efficiency measures during audits	44%
Other	32%

A.2.4 GJGNY Audits for Other NYSERDA Programs

HPwES contractors were asked how many GJGNY-funded audits their company had performed for the other NYSERDA programs since mid-November 2010. A total of 11 contractors, or 15% of the sample, said that they had conducted one or more GJGNY-funded audits for NYSERDA programs other than the HPwES Program (Table A - 7).

Table A - 7: Number of Audits Completed for Other NYSERDA Programs

Number of Audits - Other NYSERDA Programs	HPwES Contractors (n=11)
1	1
10	3
19	1
20	1
25	1
60	1
120	1
175	1
700	1
Average number of audits for other NYSERDA programs: 116	

Of the 11 contractors, six contractors reported also having performed GJGNY-funded audits for the EmPower Program, two reported having performed audits for the Deep Energy Retrofit Program, one reported having conducted audits for the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program, one contractor reported having conducted audits for the Multifamily Performance Program, and one reported having conducted audits for the FlexTech Program, (Table A - 8).

Table A - 8: GJGNY Audits Conducted for NYSERDA Programs other than HPwES

NYSERDA Programs	HPwES Contractors (n=11)
EmPower	6
Deep Energy Retrofit	2
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency	1
Multifamily Performance	1
FlexTech Program	1

These contractors were asked to estimate how many of the audits that they had done for other NYSERDA programs would have been performed if they had not been available for free or at a reduced cost. They estimated that they would have completed an average of 16% of the other NYSERDA program audits if they had not been available for free or at a reduced cost. Three-fifths of these contractors (60%) said that they would have completed none of the other NYSERDA program audits (Table A - 9).

Table A - 9: Percentage of Other NYSERDA Program Audits Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available

Percentage of Audits	HPwES Contractors (n=15) ⁸⁶
0%	60%
10%	7%
4%	7%
10%	7%
30%	7%
100%	13%
Average percentage of other program audits without GJGNY free or reduced cost audit: 17%	

A.2.5 CBO Referrals to HPwES Contractors

HPwES contractors were asked if any of the GJGNY audits that their company performed were a result of referrals by CBOs. About three-fifths of the contractors (59%) said that at least some of the audits they performed were a result of referrals by CBOs (Table A - 10).

Table A - 10: GJGNY Audits Conducted through CBO Referrals

Audits Conducted Through CBO Referrals	HPwES Contractors (n=71)
At least some audits conducted because CBO referrals	59%
No audits conducted because CBO referrals	37%
Don't Know	4%

A.2.6 Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Implementing Measures

HPwES contractors were asked the one most important barrier that prevents customers from implementing or installing measures through the HPwES Program after receiving the audit report. Nearly three-fifths of contractors (58%) said that the primary barrier is customers not having enough money to go forward with installing the measures (Table A - 11).

⁸⁶ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 11: Primary Barriers for Customers to Install Measures through HPwES

Primary Barrier	Percentage Contractors (n=71) ⁸⁷
Not Enough Money Available/Lack of Budget	58%
Lack of Time	4%
Hassle of Scheduling/Paper/Program Complexity	3%
Waiting for Old Equipment to Break	--
Gathering Energy Use Data	--
Not Receiving Meaningful Info from Audit	4%
Not Qualifying/Changes in Program Requirements/Savings Investment Ration	18%
Health and Safety Issues to be Fixed First	--
Feel they can do Better on Their Own	1%
Other	7%
None	3%
Don't Know	1%
Refused	--

A.2.7 Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-cost Audit

About four-fifths of contractors (82%) said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audits had led to an increase in their installations of energy efficiency measures through the HPwES Program. Twelve contractors (17%) said they did not believe the free or reduced-cost audits led to an increase in their energy efficiency installations; four thought that the audits did not result in increased installations because the contracting company already offered free audits, and three thought that they did not do so because customers getting the audit did not have the money to pay for the energy efficiency measures (Table A - 12).

⁸⁷ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 12: Perceptions of Why Free/Reduced-Cost Audit May Not Lead to Energy Efficiency Installations

Perceptions of Why Free/Low Cost Audits Have not Increased EE Installations	Percentage Contractors (n=12) ⁸⁸
Company Already Offered Free Audit	33%
Customers Getting Audits Don't have Money to Pay for Installs	25%
Customers Get Audit Because It's Free/Curious	17%
Program Complex	8%
Some Contractors are Not Interested in Doing the Installations	8%
New Customers Coming from Contractors	--
Measures not Cost Effective/Expect Higher Incentives	--
Other	--
Don't Know	8%
Refused	--

Over three-fifths of HPwES contractors (63%) said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audit had led to an increase in the comprehensiveness of their projects through the HPwES Program. Over four-fifths of HPwES contractors (82%) also said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audit has led to an increase in the number of their contracts through the HPwES Program (Table A - 13).

Table A - 13: Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-Cost Audits

Other Audit Impacts	HPwES Contractors (n=71)
Audits led to increase in number of HPwES projects	82%
Audits led to increase in comprehensiveness of HPwES projects	63%

A.2.8 Measures Installations Due to Audits

The HPwES contractors estimated that, on average, about two-fifths of their audits (39%) resulted in the installation of recommended energy efficiency measures. About two-fifths of the contractors (41%) said

⁸⁸ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

that 30% to 50% of their GJGNY audits resulted in their installing recommended energy efficiency measures (Table A - 14).

Table A - 14: Percentage of GJGNY Audits Resulting in Installations of Recommended Energy Efficiency Measures

Percentage of Audits Resulting in Installations	HPwES Contractors (71) ⁸⁹
10% or fewer	14%
15%	4%
20%	7%
25%	8%
30%	14%
35%	1%
40%	13%
50%	13%
55%	1%
60%	3%
75%	6%
80%	1%
90%	1%
95%	3%
100%	3%
Don't know / Refused	7%
Average percentage of audits resulting in installations: 39%	

A.2.9 GJGNY Low Interest Loans

Four out of five HPwES contractors (80%) reported that at least some of their GJGNY audit customers for whom they installed energy efficiency measures took out a GJGNY low-interest loan in order to install the measures. These contractors were asked the percentage of their audit customers that took out a GJGNY loan to install the measures. The contractors reported that an average of nearly two-fifths of their customers (38%) took out a GJGNY loan to install recommended energy efficiency measures. About one-half of the contractors (51%) reported that 25% or fewer customers took out a GJGNY loan to install recommended energy efficiency measures (Table A - 15).

⁸⁹ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 15: Percentage of GJGNY Audit Customers who took out a GJGNY Loan to Install Measures

Percentage of Customers Taking out GJGNY Loans	HPwES Contractors (n=57) ⁹⁰
<10%	18%
10%	11%
15%	11%
20%	2%
25%	9%
30%	7%
40%	7%
50%	7%
60%	11%
70%	5%
75%	4%
80%	5%
85%	7%
89%	2%
90%	2%
Don't know / Refused	4%
Average percentage of customers taking out GJGNY loans: 38%	

HPwES contractors who reported at least some customers who took out a GJGNY low-interest loan to install energy efficiency measures were asked the percentage of the installations supported by GJGNY loans that they would have done had the low cost GJGNY loans not been available. On average, these contractors reported that, in the absence of the GJGNY loan, they would have done only about one-fourth (25%) of the installations. About one-fifth of contractors (21%) reported that they would not have done any installations. Slightly over one-third of contractors (36%) reported that they would have done between 1% and 20% of the installations in the absence of the GJGNY loans (Table A - 16).

⁹⁰ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 16: Percentage of HPwES Installations in the absence of GJGNY Loans

Percentage of Installations without GJGNY Loans	HPwES Contractors (n=57) ⁹¹
0%	21%
1-10%	16%
15%	6%
20%	14%
25%	5%
30%	5%
50%	13%
70%	2%
75%	2%
80%	2%
95%	4%
100%	4%
Don't know / Refused	7%
Average percentage of installations without GJGNY loan: 25%	

A.2.10 Office Locations Conducting GJGNY Activities

HPwES contractors were asked about the number of office locations their company had in New York State, and of those office locations, the number that were involved with performing GJGNY audits, installations, or loan services since 2010. The large majority of contractors (90%) reported only one office location out of which they performed GJGNY-related work (Table A - 17).

⁹¹ Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table A - 17: HPwES Contractor Total Office Locations

Office Locations	HPwES Contractors (n=71)
One	90%
Two	7%
Four	3%

A.3 MPP Participants

The survey of Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) participants asked additional questions beyond job and wage-related information. Responses to these questions are discussed below.

A.3.1 Participant Actions if Incentive Not Available

MPP participants were asked to think about what actions they would have taken if incentives for developing an Energy Reduction Plan (ERP) and installing recommended efficiency measures had not been available through the MPP Program. About one-half of the respondents (54%) said they would not have paid for the development of the measures and installations recommended in the ERP, 10% said they would have paid for the development of the ERP but postponed the installation of the measures, and another 10% said they would have installed the recommended measures around the same time and would have paid full price for the installation (Table A - 18).

Table A - 18: Participant Actions Taken if Incentives through MPP Program Not Available

Actions Taken if Program Not Available	MPP Participants (n=39)
Not Paid for Development of ERP	54%
Paid for Development of ERP but Not Installed Any Measures	8%
Paid for the Development of the ERP but postponed Installation of Measures	3%
Paid for the Development of ERP but Installed Fewer Measures	10%
Paid for the Development of ERP and Installed Recommended Measures Around Same Time and Paid Full Price	10%
Done Something Else (Other)	--
Don't know	15%
Refused	--

A.3.2 Low Interest Loan

Four MPP participants said that they took advantage of the low-interest rate financing available through the program. Of those four, three participants said they would have sought low interest rate financing elsewhere if it had not been available through the program, and one participant said they would not have sought financing elsewhere. One participant would have sought financing from the same lending institution, one participant would have sought financing from a different lending institution, and one participant would have sought financing from both. One participant said that if they had not obtained low interest-rate financing through the MPP, they would have installed the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan anyway.

A.4 MPP Performance Partners

The survey of Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) Partners also asked additional questions beyond job and wage-related information. Responses to these questions are discussed below.

A.4.1 Primary Customer Motivation to Complete Audit

The survey of MPP Partners asked respondents what they thought was the one primary motivation was for customers to have an audit completed through MPP. Five out of the ten respondents said that the primary customer motivation was to save on energy costs and bills. Two MPP Partners said the primary motivation for customers was that the audit was provided for free or at a reduced-cost audit, two partners said the primary customer motivation was to qualify for incentives, and another partner thought the primary customer motivation was to get their property evaluated for energy efficiency (Table A - 19).

Table A - 19: Primary Motivation for Customers to have Audit Completed through MPP

Primary Motivations	MPP Partners (n=10)
Save Energy Costs/Bills	50%
Considering Installing EE Measure Anyway	--
Get Home Evaluated for EE	10%
Get Expert Advice about EE	--
Save Energy	--
Help Environment	--
Replace Broken/Malfunctioning Equipment	--
Because it is Free/Reduced Cost	20%
Qualify for Incentives/Rebates	20%
Increased Comfort of Homes	--
Don't Know	--
Refused	--

A.4.2 Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having Audit

The survey asked MPP Partners what they thought was the one most important barrier preventing customers from participating in the free or reduced-cost audits offered by the program. Of the 10 total respondents, four partners thought that not having enough money was the primary reason that customers did not have an audit completed (Table A - 20).

Table A - 20: Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Having an Audit

Primary Barriers	MPP Performance Partners (n=10)
Not Enough Money Available/Lack of Budget	40%
Lack of Time	20%
Hassle of Scheduling/Paper/Program Complexity	10%
Waiting for Old Equipment to Break	--
Gathering Energy Use Data	--
Lack of Knowledge/Awareness	10%
Not Wanting to Feel Obligated to Install Measures	--
Not Expecting to Qualify/Changes in Program Requirements	--
Skeptical of Free Service	--
Incomes Questions too Intrusive	--
Lack of Benefits after Audit	--
None	--
Other	--
Don't Know	20%
Refused	--

A.4.3 Audits Performed by MPP Partners

The survey asked MPP Performance Partners to estimate the percent of MPP audits they would have performed had they not been available for free or at a reduced cost. Of the total 10 respondents, three said they would have conducted zero to five percent of the audits, and three said that they would have completed 80% to 100% of the audits (Table A - 21).

Table A - 21: Percentage of MPP Audits that would have been Completed if the GJGNY Free or Reduced-Cost Audit had not been Available

Percentage of Audits	MPP Performance Partners (n=10)
0%	1
5%	2
40%	1
50%	1
80%	1
100%	2
Don't know	2

The survey asked MPP Performance Partners if they had conducted GJGNY-funded audits for any other NYSERDA programs. Five of the ten respondents reported having done so. Two partners said they had conducted audits for the HPwES Program and one said they had conducted audits for the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program (Table A - 22).⁹² These respondents reported that they had conducted an average of 192 audits for these other NYSERDA programs and they would of conducted 25% of those audits had they not been available for free or at a reduced cost.

Table A - 22: GJGNY Audits Conducted for NYSERDA Programs other than MPP

Percentage of Audits	MPP Performance Partners (n=3)
HPwES	2
Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program	1

A.4.4 CBO Referrals to MPP Partners

Seven of the ten MPP Partners who responded to the survey said that they had performed an average of 26 GJGNY-funded audits as a result of referrals by CBOs.

A.4.5 Primary Barriers Preventing Customers from Implementing Measures

The survey asked MPP Performance Partners what they thought was the one most important barrier that prevents customers from implementing or installing measures through the MPP Program after they receive

⁹² Please note that one respondent reported conducting audits for the FlexTech program, and one reported conducting audits for the EmPower program. These responses were excluded from the analysis because they were not GJGNY-funded programs.

their audit report. Six of the ten MPP Partners said that the primary barrier is that customers did not have enough money to go forward with installing the measures (Table A - 23).

Table A - 23: Primary Barriers for Customers to Install Measures through MPP

Primary Barrier	MPP Performance Partners (n=10)
Not Enough Money Available/Lack of Budget	60%
Lack of Time	10%
Hassle of Scheduling/Paper/Program Complexity	10%
Waiting for Old Equipment to Break	--
Gathering Energy Use Data	--
Not Receiving Meaningful Info from Audit	--
Not Qualifying/Changes in Program Requirements/Savings Investment Ratio	10%
Health and Safety Issues to be Fixed First	--
Feel they can do Better on Their Own	--
Other	--
None	10%
Don't Know	--
Refused	--

A.4.6 Impacts of Free/Reduced-cost Audit

Seven MPP Partners said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audits had led to an increase in their numbers of installations of energy efficiency measures through MPP, one MPP Partner did not think the free or reduced-cost audits had led to an increase in their energy efficiency installations, and two did not know. The MPP Partner who did not believe the audits led to an increase in energy efficiency installations said they did not think the audits are attracting new customers because the contracting companies are already doing the marketing.

Six of the MPP Partners said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audit had led to an increase in the number of their contracts through MPP. Eight MPP Partners said that they thought the availability of the free or reduced-cost audit had led to an increase in the comprehensiveness of their projects through MPP (Table A - 24).

Table A - 24: Other Impacts of Free/Reduced-Cost Audits

Other Audit Impacts	MPP Performance Partners (n=10)
Audits led to increase in number of MPP installations	7
Audits led to increase in number of MPP contracts	6
Audits led to increase in comprehensiveness of MPP projects	8

A.4.7 Resulting Measures Installations Due to Audits

Four of the ten MPP Partners said that 100% of their GJGNY audits resulted in their installing recommended energy efficiency measures for customers, and seven of the ten MPP Partners said that at least one-half of their audits resulted in their installing recommended energy efficiency measures for customers (Table A - 25).

Table A - 25: Percentage of GJGNY Audits Resulting in Installations of Recommended Energy Efficiency Measures

Percentage of Audits Resulting in Installations	MPP Performance Partners (n=10)
15%	1
20%	1
30%	1
50%	1
60%	1
80%	1
100%	4

A.4.8 GJGNY Low-interest Loans

Of the ten respondents, six MPP Partners said that at least some of their GJGNY audit customers for whom they installed energy efficiency measures took out a GJGNY low-interest loan in order to install the measures. Three MPP Partners said that none of their GJGNY audit customers for whom they installed energy efficiency measures took out GJGNY low-interest loans, and one did not know.

Of the MPP Partners that said at least some of their customer took out a GJGNY loan, one said that 100 of their customers for whom they installed measures took out a GJGNY loan, one said that 10 customers took out a GJGNY loan, one said that three customers took out a GJGNY loan, and one said that one customer took out a GJGNY loan, and two did not know.

MPP Partners were asked what percentage of the installations supported by GJGNY loans that they would have done had the low cost GJGNY loans not been available. Of the four respondents who knew how many of their customers had taken out GJGNY loans to finance their installations, one said that 100% of the installations would have gone forward if the GJGNY loans had not been available, one said that 50% of the installations would have gone forward if the GJGNY loans had not been available, one said that 10% of the installations gone forward if the GJGNY loans had not been available, and a the fourth MPP Partner did not know what would have happened.

A.4.9 Office Locations Conducting GJGNY Activities

MPP Partners were asked about the number of office locations their company had in New York State, and of those office locations, the number that have performed work related to MPP since September 2010. Five of the ten MPP Partners reported working out of only one office location for all of their activities, including those related to the MPP Program. Two reported working out of two office locations for all of their activities, including those related to the MPP Program. Two reported working out of two office locations but only conducting work for the MPP Program out of one of those office locations. One reported working out of both of their office locations for all their activities, including for the MPP Program, and one MPP Partner reported having three office locations but only performing MPP Program-related activities out of two of those office locations.

Appendix B ICF Reporting Templates

NMR worked closely with ICF to develop the survey instruments such that the resulting data would best inform ICF's economic impact analysis. FTE and wage data was organized into the two ICF Reporting Templates below. These tables were approved by ICF as input to the Phase 2 economic impact analysis. All FTE and wage results were organized by NAICS code category. Please note that while the Jobs & Wages table is reproduced in the Appendix in its entirety, the Regions table was reproduced in three separate tables given its width. Table B- 1 below presents job (in FTEs) and wage data by NAICS code category for the entire GJGNY program.

Table B- 1: Jobs and Wages – Total GJGNY Program

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs		2013 Retained FTEs		2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs				2015 Direct FTEs
		FTE	Current Wage	FTE	Current Wage	FTE	Previous Wage	Ave Wage Increase	Current Wage	Total
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	6.9	\$19.41	4.9	--	7.1	\$19.19	\$3.24	\$22.43	17.8
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building Multifamily Residential Buildings for Others as General Contractors)	3.0	\$30.17	2.3	\$30.00	1.5	--	--	--	10.0
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.4	--	0.4	--	0.3	--	--	--	1.5
236118	Residential Remodelers	120.8	\$13.76	34.6	\$19.66	32.5	\$16.65	\$6.27	\$22.92	528.7
237210	Land Subdivision	0.5	--	0.4	--	0.4	--	--	--	1.4
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	6.0	\$14.28	3.0	\$16.07	--	--	--	--	11.5
238210	Electrical Contractor	19.9	\$12.50	--	--	--	--	--	--	19.9
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	62.6	\$15.07	14.7	\$18.75	24.2	\$14.69	\$3.96	\$18.65	706.0
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	59.7	\$17.93	30.5	\$17.88	37.9	\$17.35	\$4.89	\$22.25	418.5
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	\$12.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.0
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	0.4	--	0.6	--	0.5	--	--	--	2.5
522390	Loan Servicing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
524127	Direct Title Insurance Carriers	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.6	--	0.3	--	0.3	--	--	--	1.5
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.2	--	0.2	--	0.2	--	--	--	0.7
531311	Residential property managers	3.3	\$24.33	2.7	\$24.17	2.5	--	--	--	11.5
541330	Engineering Services	151.8	\$19.76	173.6	\$23.99	142.1	\$17.26	\$3.59	\$20.85	478.4
541350	Building Inspection Services	59.7	\$18.15	23.1	\$22.38	14.3	\$17.44	\$3.25	\$20.68	121.7
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	6.4	\$49.17	7.8	\$42.50	5.9	--	--	--	15.7
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	4.5	\$35.63	0.5	\$50.00	2.3	\$39.80	\$3.61	\$43.41	5.1
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.5	--	0.4	--	0.6	--	--	--	1.5

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	2013 New FTEs		2013 Retained FTEs		2013 Up-skilled and Up-waged FTEs				2015 Direct FTEs
		FTE	Current Wage	FTE	Current Wage	FTE	Previous Wage	Ave Wage Increase	Current Wage	Total
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	2.9	\$50.00	6.4	\$50.00	1.2	--	--	--	12.2
611710	Educational Support Services	1.1	\$50.00	2.0	--	0.4	--	--	--	4.1
624190	Individual and Family Services	6.8	\$22.37	9.6	\$23.96	0.5	--	--	--	28.7
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	--	0.1	--	0.1	--	--	--	0.2
813311	Human Rights Organizations	0.6	--	0.9	--	0.7	--	--	--	3.0
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	3.3	\$22.50	4.9	\$26.88	3.6	\$22.22	\$3.25	\$25.47	18.4
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	25.6	\$22.07	9.1	\$22.58	1.7	\$37.50	\$5.00	\$42.49	71.7
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	1.0	\$10.59	--	--	--	--	--	--	4.0
813910	Business Associations	0.8	--	8.0	\$22.50	0.4	--	--	--	9.8
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	0.8	--	2.0	--	0.4	--	--	--	3.8
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	0.8	\$47.50	4.3	\$47.50	0.6	--	--	--	6.3
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	6.7	\$22.50	--	--	--	--	--	--	27.7
TOTAL JOBS		558.8	NA	347.0	NA	282.2	NA	NA	NA	2,545.6
SIMPLE AVERAGE WAGE		NA	\$25.22	NA	\$28.68	NA	\$22.45	\$4.12	\$26.57	NA
WEIGHTED AVERAGE WAGE		NA	\$18.20	NA	\$23.86	NA	\$17.42	\$4.12	\$21.53	NA

-- Not all respondents answered the survey wage questions.

Table B- 2 presents total 2013 Direct FTEs and total 2015 Direct FTEs by NAICS Code. It also presents the number of 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs in disadvantaged communities.

Table B- 2: 2013 and 2015 Direct FTEs and Disadvantaged Communities – Total GJGNY Program

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	2013 Direct FTEs		2015 Direct FTEs	
		Direct FTEs	Disadvantaged FTEs	Direct FTEs	Disadvantaged FTEs
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	11.8	2.0	17.8	5.5
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building Multifamily Residential Buildings for Others as General Contractors)	5.3	1.1	10.0	3.5
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	0.8	0.4	1.4	0.5
236118	Residential Remodelers	155.4	16.5	528.7	35.9
237210	Land Subdivision	0.8	0.3	1.4	0.5
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	8.9	6.0	11.5	8.5
238210	Electrical Contractor	19.9	1.8	19.9	1.8
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	77.3	17.1	706.0	95.4
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	90.2	41.5	418.5	216.1
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	1.0	2.0	2.0
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	1.0	-	2.4	-
522390	Loan Servicing	-	-	-	-
524127	Direct Title Insurance Carriers	-	-	-	-
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	0.9	0.3	1.5	0.5
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	0.4	0.1	0.7	0.1
531311	Residential property managers	6.0	2.2	11.5	4.2
541330	Engineering Services	325.4	39.0	478.4	64.4
541350	Building Inspection Services	82.8	3.1	121.7	5.2
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	14.2	-	15.7	-
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	5.0	-	5.1	-
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.8	-	1.5	-

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	2013 Direct FTEs		2015 Direct FTEs	
		Direct FTEs	Disadvantaged FTEs	Direct FTEs	Disadvantaged FTEs
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	9.3	3.7	12.2	4.8
611710	Educational Support Services	3.1	2.8	4.1	3.7
624190	Individual and Family Services	16.4	0.6	28.7	1.7
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	0.1	-	0.2	-
813311	Human Rights Organizations	1.5	-	2.9	-
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	8.3	1.9	18.4	7.5
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	34.7	9.0	71.7	18.8
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	1.0	1.0	4.0	1.0
813910	Business Associations	8.8	-	9.8	-
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations	2.8	-	3.8	-
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	5.1	0.2	6.3	0.3
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	6.7	4.0	27.7	16.6
TOTAL JOBS		905.8	155.5	2,545.6	498.5

Table B- 3 presents total 2013 Direct FTE data and 2013 Direct FTEs for disadvantaged communities (titled as “D.C.” in the table below) for six of the twelve CBO regions.

Table B- 3: Regions 1 – Total GJGNY Program

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	North Country		Bronx		Kings and Richmond		Queens		Central		New York	
		Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	-	-	-	-	2.0	2.0	-	-	8.4	-	-	-
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building Multifamily Residential Buildings for Others as General Contractors)	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.7	-	0.1	0.1	2.8	-
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	-	-	-	0.3	-
236118	Residential Remodelers	5.8	5.8	0.1	0.1	-	-	1.4	-	25.0	1.7	15.5	-
237210	Land Subdivision	-	-	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	0.3	-
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
238210	Electrical Contractor	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	15.3	-
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	-	-	0.8	-	2.8	1.0	20.2	-
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	-	-	-	-	1.0	1.0	-	-	16.0	6.8	-	-
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
522390	Loan Servicing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
524127	Direct Title Insurance Carriers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	0.4	-
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-
531311	Residential property managers	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.4	-	0.3	0.1	2.0	-
541330	Engineering Services	0.6	0.6	4.0	4.0	1.6	1.6	8.6	-	8.5	3.7	3.7	-
541350	Building Inspection Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	0.5	-

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	North Country		Bronx		Kings and Richmond		Queens		Central		New York	
		Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools							2.8					
611710	Educational Support Services												
624190	Individual and Family Services	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	-	-	-	0.3	-
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
813311	Human Rights Organizations	-	-			-	-	-		-	-	-	
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	-	2.3	-
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	-	-	5.3	5.3	3.8	1.8	3.2	-	6.1	-	4.8	-
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
813910	Business Associations									6.0			
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations											2.8	
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	-	-	-	0.3	-
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL JOBS		8.3	8.3	12.6	12.6	10.3	8.3	21.8	-	73.8	13.4	71.9	-

Table B- 4 presents total 2013 Direct FTE data and 2013 Direct FTEs for disadvantaged communities (titled as “D.C.” in the table below) for the six CBO regions not listed in Table B-3 above.

Table B- 4: Regions 2 – Total GJGNY Program

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	Southern Tier		Wester		Finger Lakes		Mid Hudson & Westchester		Long Island		Capital	
		Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE
236115	New Single-Family Housing Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-
236116	New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building Multifamily Residential Buildings for Others as General Contractors)	-	-	0.3	0.1	0.1	-	0.3	0.1	-	-	0.2	0.1
236117	New Housing Operative Builders	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
236118	Residential Remodelers	3.4	2.5	13.9	1.0	13.9	-	17.1	5.5	9.1	-	50.3	-
237210	Land Subdivision	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
238150	Glass and Glazing Contractors, Windows	6.0	6.0	-	-	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
238210	Electrical Contractor	1.8	0.9	-	-	0.9	-	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	-
238220	Plumbing, Heating and Air-Conditioning Contractors	9.3	5.5	3.1	-	17.2	2.0	10.5	5.6	-	-	11.0	0.4
238310	Drywall and Insulation Contractors	31.8	31.8	18.8	-	8.4	1.0	7.2	1.0	4.0	-	3.1	-
423610	Electrical Apparatus and Equipment, Wiring Supplies, and Related Equipment Merchant Wholesalers	1.0	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
444190	Other Building Material Dealers	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
522390	Loan Servicing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
524127	Direct Title Insurance Carriers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
531110	Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
531210	Offices of Real Estate Agents and Brokers	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	0.0	-
531311	Residential property managers	0.1	-	0.8	0.3	0.2	-	0.2	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.1
541330	Engineering Services	18.3	5.2	53.5	7.9	140.2	-	30.9	11.1	40.2	-	15.2	4.9
541350	Building Inspection Services	-	-	3.2	-	23.6	-	13.4	3.0	40.4	-	-	-
541611	Administrative Management and General Management Consulting Services	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.7	-	2.0	-
541618	Other Management Consulting Services	0.2	-	-	-	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-
541690	Other Scientific and Technical Consulting Services	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
611310	Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools	2.8	2.8			2.8		0.9	0.9				

NAICS Code	NAICS Description	Southern Tier		Wester		Finger Lakes		Mid Hudson & Westchester		Long Island		Capital	
		Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE	Direct FTE	D.C. FTE
611710	Educational Support Services							3.1	2.8				
624190	Individual and Family Services	-	-	-	-	6.6	-	0.1	-	-	-	8.5	-
811412	Appliance Repair and Maintenance	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
813311	Human Rights Organizations	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
813312	Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	5.4	1.7	0.1	-	0.0	-
813319	Other Social Advocacy Organizations	0.1	0.1	5.5	-	-	-	2.1	1.9	0.9	-	3.0	-
813410	Civic and Social Organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	1.0	-	-	-	-
813910	Business Associations	2.8											
813930	Labor Unions and Other Similar Labor Organizations												
813990	Other Similar Organizations (except Business, Professional, Labor, and Political Organizations)	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-
999300	Local Government Excluding Schools or Hospitals	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.7	4.0	-	-	-	-
TOTAL JOBS		79.0	55.7	99.5	9.2	222.6	3.0	104.5	39.5	106.4	-	95.2	5.5

Appendix C Interview Guides and Survey Instruments

Below are the interview guides and survey instruments used to conduct the in-depth interviews and CATI surveys for the GJGNY Program initiatives.

Workforce Development

5705a: GJGNY Training Partner Survey – OJT Contractors

TRAINING PARTNER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from SRBI. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation as an on-the-job Training Partner in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program. We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your organization from this participation and as a result of your activities associated with hiring and on-the-job training. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

QI1a. May I please speak with *[READ-IN CONTACT NAME]*?

1. SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT *[GO TO QII]*

2. LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE [*SCHEDULE CALLBACK*]

3. LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY [*GO TO Q12*]

9. REFUSED [*GO TO Q12*]

QI1. First, my records indicate that [*WFD TRAINING PARTNER NAME*] is currently a participating contractor for on-the-job training in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program. Is this correct?

1 YES [*GO TO Q13*]

2 NO [*THANK AND TERMINATE*]

8 Don't know [*GO TO Q12*]

9 Refused [*GO TO Q12*]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in on-the-job training in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [*THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.*]

2 NO [*THANK AND TERMINATE*]

9 REFUSED [*THANK AND TERMINATE*]

QI3. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with on-the-job training in the Workforce Development Program?

1 YES

2 NO [READ: We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with on-the-job training in the Workforce Development Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number of this person?] [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] *[THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]*

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI4. What is your company's primary business function?

01 Building inspection services 541350

02 Engineering Services (engineering consulting, design, and/or services) 541330

03 Plumbing, heating and air -conditioning contractors 238220

04 Drywall and insulation contractors 238310

05 Glass and glazing contractors, windows 238150

06 New Single-Family Housing Construction (except For-Sale Builders) 236115

07 New Multifamily Housing Construction (except For-Sale Builders) 236116

08 New Housing For-Sale Builders 236117

09 Residential Remodelers 236118

10 Merchant wholesalers of durable goods [e.g. Insulation materials, Warm-air heating and A/C equipment, plumbing and hydroponic heating equipment, Windows] [SPECIFY GOODS_____]

11 Other [Specify_____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

98. Don't know

99. Refused

LOCATIONS

QL1. How many office locations does your company have in New York state? [MIN=1, MAX = 5000,

where 5000=5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998. Don't know

9999. Refused

QL2. **[IF QL1 = 2 to 5000]**: Thinking of all the work that your company has performed related to NYSERDA PON 2033 B for implementing On-the-Job Training, (OJT) out of how many of your New York state office locations was this work performed? [RANGE 0 TO 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998. Don't know

9999. Refused

STAFF ADDITIONS/TRAINING

Display: Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full

time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

QJA5. How many employees has your organization hired and/or trained through NYSERDA's On-the-Job Training Program? [MIN=0, MAX =30, where 30=30 or more]

[INTERVIEWER: If Resp. says "Don't Know," probe: "This information is important to the accuracy of our evaluation. Is it possible to find out this information?"]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998. Don't know

9999. Refused

[IF QJA5=0 OR DK OR REF, THANK AND TERMINATE. ELSE CONTINUE.]

QJA6. Can you please tell me the job title for **each employee** that you hired or trained through NYSERDA's On-the-Job Training Program? [If multiple employees hired for same position, record each separately.]

(Programmer: LOOP THROUGH QJA6 BASED ON RESPONSE AT QJA5.)

(Programmer: See list of response codes at the end of the document.)

	Job Title of Employee
A. Employee 1	
B. Employee 2	

X. Employee X	

(Programmer: Create the following sub-list based upon responses to QJA6 series:

Sub-List: This will be a list of only the unique occurrences of the responses given at QJA6. So,

if “Crew Lead” is given 3 times at QJA6, this list will only contain 1 occurrence of

“Crew Lead.”

QJA7. You mentioned several employees in your company that you hired and/or trained through NYSERDA’s On-the-Job Training Program.

[ASK a. THROUGH h. FOR EACH EMPLOYEE LISTED IN QJA6]

Display: Thinking about the (*1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc...*) position that you mentioned, which was a **(POSITION**

FROM QJA6)...

(Add the following note above the question text at each item “a” through “h”...

[INTERVIEWER: If needed, say: “As a reminder, we are talking about the (*1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, etc...*) position that you mentioned.”)

a. In what city or town in New York State was [**POSITION from QJA6**] hired and/or trained?

[multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

b. Was the [**POSITION FROM QJA6**] position a full-time or part-time position?

1 = Full Time

2=Part Time

8 = Don't Know

9=Refused

c. *[IF "b" NOT A FULL-TIME POSITION:] How many Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) did the [POSITION*

FROM QJA6] position represent? [MIN=0, MAX=30]

_____ (Numeric response)

98. Don't know

99. Refused

d. Is the *[POSITION FROM QJA6]* position a permanent or temporary position?

1 = Permanent

2 = Temporary

8 = Don't Know

9 = Refused

e. Was the *[POSITION FROM QJA6]* position a new hire or an existing employee who was provided additional training?

1 = New Hire

2 = Existing Employee given additional training

8 = Don't Know

9=Refused

f. For (**POSITION FROM QJA6**), what is the 2013 typical hourly wage range? Just stop me when I get

to the right category 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QJA7f]	Hourly Wage Range										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00	Position is commission- based

g. [IF "e"=EXISTING EMPLOYEE] Did the [POSITION FROM QJA6] position see an increase

in their wage level as a result of the On-the-Job Training Program?

1 Yes

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QJA6]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QJA6]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QJA6]

h. [IF "g"= YES]: What was the average hourly wage increase for [POSITION FROM QJA6] positions

that saw a wage increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

	Hourly wage increase							
Position [LIST POSITION FROM QJA6 IF QJA7e = EXISTING EMPLOYEE]	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00	Position is commission based

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40-hours full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.

Position [LIST QJA6]	a. City or town in New York State where employee was hired and/or trained	b. Full-time or Part-time	c. IF PART-TIME: # of FTEs	d. Permanent or Temporary	e. New Hire or Existing Employee

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ2. You mentioned that your company has hired or trained a total of *[QJA5]* employees to date through NYSERDA’s On-the-Job Training Program.

[Programmer: Loop through “a” and “b” for each unique position from QJA6 (i.e. – use sub-list from QJA6 series)

a. Approximately how many more *[UNIQUE POSITION FROM QJA6]* Full Time Equivalent (FTE) employees do you anticipate your company will add through NYSERDA’s On-the-Job Training Program over the next 2 years (by 2015)? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

b. *[IF QPJ2a>0]* How many of the jobs that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[INSERT LIST OF <u>UNIQUE</u> POSITIONS FROM QJA6]	a. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of WFD activity over next 2 years (by 2015)	b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
A. Position 1		
B. Position 2		
X. Position X		

Finally, please note that over the next few months, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program. That evaluation will have a different focus from the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success. We would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

ANSWER CODE LIST FOR QUESTION QJA6:

- 1 Apprentice Energy Auditor
- 2 BPI Tech Trainee
- 3 Construction Manager
- 4 Construction Laborer

5	Construction Supervisor
6	Crew Auditor
7	Crew Lead
8	Crew Member
9	Crew Weatherization Leader
10	Energy Auditor
11	Energy Auditor/Field Inspector - Entry
12	Energy Auditor/Field Inspector Level 1
13	Energy Auditor/Sales
14	Energy Efficiency Installer
15	Energy Installer 1
16	Energy Services Technical Adviser
17	Field Energy Auditor
18	Green Energy Crew Worker
19	Green Energy Foreman
20	Home Performance Adviser
21	Home Performance Crew Member
22	Home Performance Technician

23	HVAC & Installation Tech
24	HVAC Laborer
25	HVAC service installer/auditor
26	Installer
27	Installer/Foreman
28	Insulation Supervisor
29	Insulation Worker
30	Laborer
31	Lighting Specialist
32	Mechanical Crew Member
33	Operations Manager
34	Project & Application Designer
35	Project Manager
36	Residential Program Manager
37	Retrofit Crew Leader
38	Retrofit/Foam Foreman
39	Sales Tech
40	Sales/Auditor

- 41 Senior Energy Auditor/HERS Rater
- 42 Solar Hot Water Installer
- 43 Solar Thermal Specialist
- 44 Solar Thermal Specialist-Hydronic
- 45 Spray Foam Asst.
- 46 Supervisor
- 47 Supervisory Crew Lead
- 48 Technician
- 49 Weatherization Installer
- 50 Weatherization Technician
- 90 Other (Specify):
- 98 Don't Know
- 99 Refused

5705b: GJGN Y Training Partner Survey

TRAINING PARTNER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from SRBI. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation as a Training Partner in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program (WFD). We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your organization from this participation and as a result of your activities in putting people through training. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

QI1a. May I please speak with [READ-IN CONTACT NAME]?

1 SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT *[GO TO Q11]*

2 LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE *[SCHEDULE CALLBACK]*

3 LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY *[GO TO Q12]*

4 REFUSED *[GO TO Q12]*

QI1. First, my records indicate that [WFD TRAINING PARTNER NAME] is currently a participating contractor in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program. Is this correct?

1 YES [GO TO QI3]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't know [GO TO QI2]

9 Refused [GO TO QI2]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI3. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the Workforce Development Program?

1 YES

2 NO [READ: We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with the Workforce Development Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number of this person?] [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI5. Which of the following NYSERDA Workforce Development Program Opportunity Notices (PONs) have you been contracted to provide services for?

- a. PON 2011 for Solar Thermal Training
- b. PON 2032 for Technical Training
- c. PON 2033 Category A for modifying existing curriculum and training
- d. PON 2034 for Curriculum Inventory and Needs Assessment

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

[Programmer: If NOT Yes to ALL of QI5 series, THANK AND TERMINATE.]

DISPLAY: In providing your responses to the following questions, please keep in mind any work your organization has done for these NYSERDA PONs...***[INSERT PON#s].***

[PROGRAMMER NOTE: IN THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, WHEREVER “[INSERT PON #s]” IS NOTED, ADD IN THE PON #s FOR EACH “YES” FROM QI5 series (E.G., NYSERDA PON 1816).]

LOCATIONS

QL1. How many office locations does your organization have in New York state? [MIN= 1, MAX = 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QL2. [IF QL1 = 2 to 5000]: Thinking of all the work that your organization performed related to NYSERDA [INSERT PON#s], out of how many of your New York state office locations was this work performed? [RANGE 0 TO 50, where 50= 50 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

POSITIONS

[READ] The following series of questions pertains to the STAFF who participates in all of the activities that your organization has performed related to the NYSERDA [INSERT PON#s]. We will ask you the positions or job titles held, followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

1 = CONTINUE

Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE

is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.

1 = CONTINUE

QP1a. What are the types or titles of staff positions that have been involved in conducting these activities?
 [RECORD NAME OF EACH INDIVIDUAL POSITION TYPE]

	Types of positions involved in conducting activities for NYSERDA PONs
A. Position 1	
B. Position 2	
X. Position X	

STAFF ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. Did your organization need to hire additional staff for any positions to handle the work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]?*

1 Yes

2 No -----> **SKIP TO QJA3**

8 Don't know -----> **SKIP TO QJA3**

9 Refused -----> **SKIP TO QJA3**

QJA2. *[IF QJAI=YES]* You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in the work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*.

[ASK a. THROUGH f. FOR EACH POSITION LISTED IN QP1a]

a. Were jobs added at the *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* position because of work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*?

1 Yes **[ASK b. through f.]**

2 No **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

8 Don't know **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

9 Refused **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were *[POSITION from QP1a]* jobs added because of the work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many full time *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

d. How many part time *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

e. What is the total number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) that were added as *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* ? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

f. [IF QJA2e>0 and <98] How many of the (*insert from “e”*) FTEs that you added were permanent positions? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

[Programmer: “f” cannot exceed “e”. ELSE REPEAT series with next position from QP1a.

[Definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40-hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of WFD-related work	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was added	c. Number of Full Time Jobs Added	d. Number of Part Time Jobs Added	e. Total FTEs added because of WFD-related work	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

QJA3. Thinking of the work that you have performed to date for NYSERDA [*INSERT PON#s*], as a result of this work, has your organization been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA4. *[IF QJA3=YES]* You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*.

[ASK a. through e. for each position listed in QP1a]

a. Were jobs retained at the *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* position because of work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*?

1 Yes **[ASK b. through e.]**

2 No **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

8 Don't know **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

9 Refused **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were *[POSITION from QP1a]* retained because of work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

c. How many full time *[POSITION from QP1a]* were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

d. How many part time *[POSITION from QP1a]* were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

e. What is the total number of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) that were retained as *[POSITION from QP1a]* because of the work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

[Definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a full-time week of 40 hours is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained because of WFD	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of Full Time Jobs retained	d. Number of Part Time Jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained because of WFD

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

[IF QJA1 OR QJA3 = YES, FOR EACH OF THE POSITIONS MENTIONED IN QJA2a OR QJA4a, ASK] REPEAT FOR EACH POSITION MENTIONED, Up to 10. For each position, ask a first followed immediately by b.

QPQ1. Thinking about the position of (*READ IN EACH POSITION FROM QJA2a OR QJA4a*) that you have identified as having been added or retained because of work for NYSERDA [*INSERT PON#s*]:

- a. What are the minimum educational requirements for this position? (SEE below)

- b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training required for this position? [RECORD]

Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]	a. Minimum educational requirements for this position 1 = No requirement 2 = HS diploma / GED 3 = Some college, no degree 4 = Associate or Vocational degree 5 = Bachelor's degree 6 = Graduate degree 7 = Other (please specify) 8 = Don't Know 9 = Refused	b. Special licenses, certificates, or other training required for this position

c. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for each of the following positions which were added or retained to conduct work for NYSERDA [INSERT PON#s] ? For (POSITION), what is the typical hourly wage range? Just stop me when I get to the right category 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position Added <i>[LIST QJA2a]</i>	2013 typical hourly wage range										11 Position is commission-based
	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	
Position Retained <i>[LIST QJA4a]</i>	2013 typical hourly wage range										11 Position is commission-based
	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	

d. (ASK FOR EACH POSITION AFTER ALL a, b, AND c ARE ASKED) If your company needs to recruit qualified workers for *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Did you need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to conduct the work related to NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No -----> *SKIP TO NEXT SECTION QPJ2*

8 Don't know -----> *SKIP TO NEXT SECTION QPJ2*

9 Refused -----> *SKIP TO NEXT SECTION QPJ2*

[ASK for each position listed in QP1a]

QEP2. *[IF QEP1=YES]* You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*.

a. Did any employees in existing *[POSITION FROM QP1a]* positions see an increase in responsibilities?

1 Yes

2 No **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

8 Don't know **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

9 Refused **[REPEAT a. with next position from QP1a]**

b. *[If QEP2a = YES]* How many FTEs in this position experienced an increase in responsibilities?

[MIN=0.25, MAX=50]

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

c. *[If QEP2a = YES]* How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? [Min=0, Max = 50, where 50 = 50 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

[Programmer: QEP2c can NOT exceed QEP2b]

c1. *[IF QEP2C>0<98]* In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in	c. Number of FTEs in the position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and	c1. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase
---	---	---	---

	responsibilities	saw an increase in their wage level.	in wage level

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

d. What was the average hourly wage range for *[POSITION FROM QEP2c]* positions that saw a wage increase prior to the increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase										11 Position is commission- based
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00	

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

e. What was the average hourly wage increase for *[POSITION FROM QEP2c]* position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	Hourly wage increase							8 Position is commission based
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00	

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ2. You have estimated that your organization has added or retained a total of *[sum of QJA2e + sum of QJA4e]* FTE positions to date because of work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*.

a. Approximately how many more FTE positions do you anticipate your organization will add because of work for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]* over the next 2 years (by 2015)? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

b. *[IF QPJ2a>0 and <998]* How many of the jobs that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[Programmer: QPJ2b can NOT exceed QPJ2a.]

<i>[INSERT LIST OF POSITIONS FROM QJA2a AND QJA4a]</i>	a. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of WFD activity over next 2 years (by 2015)	b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
A. Position 1		
B. Position 2		
X. Position X		

TRAINING ACTIVITY

QT1. How do you track the progress and employment status of individuals that your organization recruits for training? (DO NOT READ; MULTIPLE RECORD)

- 1 Internal Tracking System (Specify)
- 2 Software Program (Specify)
- 7 All Other Mentions (Specify)
- 8 Don't Know
- 9 Refused

QT2. *[IF RESPONDENT MENTIONS INTERNAL TRACKING SYSTEM IN QT1]:* What metrics and information do you track on your internal tracking system? Does it track...?

- a. the number of trained recruits?
- b. the type of training each recruit goes through?
- c. the employment status of each recruit?
- d. job placements?
- e. full-time or part-time status of each recruit?
- f. temporary or permanent status of each recruit?
- g. seasonal or year-round status of each recruit?
- h. position and wage level if currently employed recruits?

i. position and wage level in new jobs?

j. anything else? (Specify)

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

(Programmer: ASK QT3 for EACH PON# MENTIONED AT Q15.)

QT3. Since 2010, for NYSERDA *[INSERT PON#s]*, approximately how many:

a. individuals have completed training as a result of your efforts? [MIN=0, MAX=1000, 9998=Don't Know, 9999=Refused]

b. individuals are currently being trained? [MIN=0, MAX=1000, 9998=Don't Know, 9999=Refused]]

(Programmer: IF DK/REF TO ALL OF QT3a series OR SUM OF QT3a=0, SKIP TO QT13.)

QT4. Since 2010, approximately how many trainees have been placed in or found jobs? [MIN=0, MAX=1000, 998=Don't Know, 999=Refused]]

QT4a. In general, in which cities or towns in New York State did the trainees get jobs? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF CITIES / TOWNS]

[Mention #(insert #)] (Programmer: Set Max # in loop at 15.)

1 Gave Response

2 No Further Mentions [DO NOT SHOW AT 1st MENTION]

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

(Programmer: ASK QT4b FOR EACH MENTION IN QT4a. IF DK/REF TO ALL MENTIONS, SKIP TO QT5.)

QT4b. For each city or town, can you please tell me approximately what percentage of the trainees got jobs there? [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

City or Town	Percentage of Jobs in each Location

TOTAL	100%
-------	------

(Programmer: Total of mentions from QT4b series must sum to 100.)

QT5. In general, what are the types of companies that these trainees have been placed in or found jobs?
(DO NOT READ; MULTIPLE RECORD)

01 Building inspection services

02 Engineering Services (engineering consulting, design, and/or services)

03 Plumbing, heating and air -conditioning contractors

04 Drywall and insulation contractors

05 Glass and glazing contractors, windows

06 New Single-Family Housing Construction (except For-Sale Builders)

07 New Multifamily Housing Construction (except For-Sale Builders)

08 New Housing For-Sale Builders

09 Residential Remodelers

10 Merchant wholesalers of durable goods [eg. Insulation materials, Warm-air heating and A/C equipment, plumbing and hydroponic heating equipment, Windows] [SPECIFY GOODS_____]

11 Other [Specify_____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

QT6. For each company type, can you please tell me:

(ASK “a,” “b” and “c” for EACH response given at QT5. ASK “a” for each response at QT5 first, then ask “b” for each, then ask “c” for each.)

a. Approximately how many of the [QT4] trainees that were placed or found jobs because of your efforts got jobs with a [QT5] company. [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref **(Programmer: Total of mentions from QT6a series must sum to QT4.)**

b. What percentage of those jobs at the [QT5] company were full-time jobs. [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

c. What percentage of those jobs at the [QT5] company were part-time jobs. [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[Programmer: Sum of QT6b+QT6c should equal 100% for EACH item from QT6a.]

Company Type	a. Number of Jobs in each Company Type	b. Percentage Full Time Jobs	c. Percentage Part Time Jobs
TOTAL	{Sum = QT4}	100%	100%

QT7. In general, what are the types of positions that these trainees have been placed in or found jobs?

[INTERVIEWER: Probe for “Any Others?” until no further mentions.]

[Mention #(insert #)] (Programmer: Set Max # in loop at 15.)

1 Gave Response

2 No Further Mentions

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

QT8.

(ASK “a” and “b” for EACH response given at QT7. ASK “a” for each response at QT7 first, then ask

“b” for each)

a. Of the trainees that have been placed in or found jobs, approximately what percentage of them got jobs as *[insert from QT7]*. [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

(Programmer: Total of mentions from QT8a series must sum to 100.)

b. For (*insert from QT7*)... what is the average wage range for that position.

(1=Under \$10.00, 2=\$10.00-\$14.99, 3=\$15.00-\$19.99, 4=\$20.00-\$24.99, 5=\$25.00-\$29.99, 6=\$30.00-\$34.99, 7=\$35.00-\$39.99, 8=\$40.00-\$44.99, 9=\$45.00-\$49.99, 10=Over \$50.00, 98=Don't Know, 99=Refused)

QT5. Position Type	QT6a. Percentage of Jobs in each Position Type	QT6b. Average Wage Range
TOTAL	100%	

QT9. Thinking of the *[TOTAL SUM FROM QT3A series]* trainees who have completed training as a result of your activities, at the time they started the training...?

a. Approximately what percentage of them were previously UNemployed?

_____ % [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

b. Approximately what percentage of them were previously Employed:

_____ % [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[Programmer: Sum of QT9a+QT9b must equal 100%]

(Programmer: IF QT9b=0, SKIP TO Q13.)

QT10. Thinking of the trainees who were already employed at the time they started that training, approximately what percentage got a new job, either in their existing company or in another company? [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

(Programmer: IF QT10=0, SKIP TO Q13.)

QT11. Thinking of these already employed trainees who got a new job in their existing company or in another company, approximately what percentage got an increase in wages that could be attributed to the increased skills they gained from the training? [MIN= 0, MAX = 100] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

(Programmer: IF QT11=0, SKIP TO Q13.)

QT12. Thinking now of just those already employed trainees who got a new job with higher wages...

a. What was their average hourly wage range in their prior position?

(1=Under \$10.00, 2=\$10.00-\$14.99, 3=\$15.00-\$19.99, 4=\$20.00-\$24.99, 5= \$25.00-\$29.99, 6=\$30.00-\$34.99, 7= \$35.00-\$39.99, 8=\$40.00-\$44.99, 9=\$45.00-\$49.99, 10=Over \$50.00, 98=Don't Know, 99=Refused)

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for those who got a new job with higher wages?

(1=Under \$2.00, 2= \$2.00-\$3.99, 3= \$4.00-\$5.99, 4=\$6.00-\$7.99, 5=\$8.00-\$9.99, 6=\$10.00-\$11.99, 7=Over \$12.00, 8=Don't Know, 9=Refused)

QT13. Looking ahead to the next two years, approximately how many trainees do you anticipate will be placed in or find jobs as a result of training activities facilitated by your organization? [MIN=0, MAX=500, where 500=500 or more, 998=Don't Know, 999=Refused]

QT14a. How easy or difficult has it been for you to track the progress and employment status of trainees?

1 Very easy

2 Somewhat easy

3 Somewhat difficult

4 Very difficult

8 Don't know

9 Refused

b. *[IF QT14a = 3 OR 4]* Why do you say that?

1 Gave Response

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

c. *[IF QT14a = 3 OR 4]* Do you have any suggestions for improving the tracking system?

1 Gave Response

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

QT15: *[IF QT1 ≠ 8 OR 9 (DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED)]*: You mentioned earlier that you have a system to track the progress and employment status of trainees. To be able quantify how successful NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program has been, we need to obtain good information on job placements of trainees. We would really appreciate it if you could share with us the job placement information from your tracking system. Is that possible? This information will be used only in aggregate and is very important for the purpose of regulatory reporting requirements.

1 Yes ---> **GO TO Q15a**

2 No

3 Maybe – need to discuss with others in organization

8 Don't know

9 Refused

Q15a. Thank you for your willingness to share this information. Someone from NMR will be contacting you separately within the next few days to obtain this information.

1 CONTINUE

QT16: *[IF QT15=No]*: As I mentioned, this information will be really important for helping us establish the value of the program and is vital to its future success. Any reporting of this information will only be in aggregate and will not identify specific individuals. Is there any way that you could share it with us?

1 Yes ---> **GO TO Q16a**

2 No

3 Maybe – need to discuss with others in organization

8 Don't know

9 Refused

Q16a. Thank you for your willingness to share this information. Someone from NMR will be contacting you separately within the next few days to obtain this information.

1 CONTINUE

Finally, please note that over the next few months, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's Workforce Development Program. That evaluation will have a different focus from the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success. We would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

Outreach and Marketing

GJGNY (Jobs) CBO Training and Implementation Contractor Survey

CBO TRAINING AND IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTOR NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

INTRO. Hello, my name is ___ calling from NMR . We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's role as Training and Implementation Contractor for the Constituency-based Outreach Program. We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company of this program. All your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. May I please speak with [RESPONDENT NAME]?

- 1 YES--Speaking with listed respondent
- 2 NO--Listed respondent not available (arrange callback)
- 3 Listed respondent no longer with company
- 9 REFUSED--Thank and terminate

Q11. [ASK IF INTRO=3,9] Is there someone else who would know about your company's role as Training and Implementation Contractor for NYSERDA's CBO Program?

1 Yes [ASK FOR NAME AND PHONE #. THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW

WITH BEST CONTACT]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your company's role as Training and Implementation Contractor for NYSERDA's CBO Program?

1 Yes

2 No [READ: "We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about

your company's experience with NYSERDA's CBO Program. Could you give me the name

and telephone number of this person?" THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW

WITH BEST CONTACT]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QN1. What is your company's primary business function?

1 Engineering Services 541330

2 Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3 Architectural Services 541310

4 Building Inspection Services 541350

5 Other [Specify] [RECORD VERBATIM] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

8 Don't know

9 Refused

POSITIONS

QP1. The following series of questions pertains to the STAFF who participates in all of the activities that your company has performed related to implementing the CBO Program and training the CBOs. We will ask you the positions or job titles held, followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

What are the types or titles of staff positions that have been involved in conducting these activities?
[RECORD NAME OF EACH INDIVIDUAL POSITION TYPE]

STAFF ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. Some of the following questions in this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 20 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.5 FTEs.

Has your company needed to hire additional staff for any positions because of implementation and training activities for the CBOs?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA2. You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in CBO training and implementation work.

[ASK a. through g. for each position listed in QP1]

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. Fill in matrix just for any positions for which jobs were added (leave other rows blank).]

a. Were jobs added at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of CBO work since the introduction of GJGNY loans? [IF YES, ASK B THROUGH G. IF NO, dk or refused, GO TO NEXT POSITION.]

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE ADDED:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] jobs added because of implementation and training activities for the CBOs? [multiple cities/towns possible for response]
[RECORD VERBATIM]

c. How many full-time jobs were added?

d. How many part-time jobs were added?

e. What was the total number of FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) added at that position because of CBO work?

f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[If RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. "Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions.

That being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have added would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended."]

a. Jobs added for position? (Y/N)	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Number of FULL TIME jobs added	d. Number of PART TIME jobs added	e. Total FTEs added	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?	
					If contract is extended	If contract is not extended

QJA3. Has your company been able to retain staff because of implementation and training activities for the CBO Program that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA4. You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to implementing the CBO Program and training the CBOs.

[ASK a. through e. for each position listed in QP1]

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. After filling in 'yes' or 'no' for 'jobs retained?' for each position, fill in matrix just for any positions for which jobs were retained (leave other rows blank).]

a. Were jobs retained at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of CBO work?

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE RETAINED:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were these [POSITION from QP1] retained [multiple cities/towns possible for response]

c. How many full-time jobs were retained?

d. How many part-time jobs were retained?

e. What was the total number of FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) retained at that position?

[If RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. "Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions. That being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have retained would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended."]

a. Jobs retained for position? (Y/N)	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of FULL TIME jobs retained	d. Number of PART TIME jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained	f. How many of the retained FTEs were permanent positions?	
					If contract is extended	If contract is not extended

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

QPQ1. Thinking about the positions that you have identified as having been added or retained because of implementation and training activities for the CBOs:

[IDENTIFY POSITIONS ADDED OR RETAINED, FROM QJA2 AND QJA4, OUT OF ALL POSITIONS LISTED BELOW. ASK A and B FOR EACH POSITION ADDED OR RETAINED.]

a. What are the minimum educational requirements for hiring the positions?

b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training required for the positions? [OPEN ENDED]

c. If your company needs to recruit qualified workers for [POSITION FROM QP1] in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]	a. Minimum educational requirements for this position A = No requirement B = HS diploma / GED C = Some college, no degree D = Associate or Vocational degree E = Bachelor's degree F = Graduate degree G = Other (please specify)	b. Special licenses, certificates, or other training required for this position	c. Do you anticipate difficulty recruiting future qualified workers for this position? Y/N/DK

QPQ2. Again, thinking about the positions that you have identified as having been added or retained because of CBO related activities for NYSERDA:

[IDENTIFY POSITIONS ADDED OR RETAINED, FROM QJA2 AND QJA4, OUT OF ALL POSITIONS LISTED BELOW. ASK A-C FOR EACH POSITION ADDED OR RETAINED. LEAVE OTHER ROWS BLANK.]

c. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for these positions conducting CBO-related activities?

Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]	2013 typical hourly wage range											
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00	Position is commission- based	Yearly salary

EXISTING POSTION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Since becoming implementation and training contractor for the NYSERDA CBO Program, did your company need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to conduct the work related to the program? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

10 NA

QEP2. You have reported that the following positions in your organization were involved in work related to implementing the CBO Program and training the CBOs.

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. Fill in b. and c. in matrix just for any positions in which staff had an increase in responsibilities.]

a. Did any existing employees in the [POSITION FROM QP1] position see an increase in responsibilities because of CBO work?

b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

d. [FOR POSITIONS IN WHICH ANY STAFF SAW INCREASED WAGES] In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located?

[MULTIPLE CITIES/TOWNS POSSIBLE FOR RESPONSE]

a. Increase in responsibilities?	b. FTEs that experienced increase in responsibilities	c. Out of staff with increased responsibilities, FTEs that experienced an increase in wage level	d. Cities/towns in which staff who experienced increase in wage level were located

QEP3. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage for each position prior to the increase?

Position	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	\$50.00 or more

QEP4. a. For each position with a wage increase, what was the average increase in hourly wages?

[FILL OUT A ROW FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WHOSE WAGE RATE INCREASED.]

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	\$12.00 or more

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of CBO activities for NYSERDA over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

[IF CONTRACT EXTENSION CAME UP PREVIOUSLY, PREFACE WITH: "If your contract were to be extended,"]

1 Yes

2 No-----> SKIP TO END

8 Don't know-----> SKIP TO END

9 Refused-----> SKIP TO END

QPJ2. [ASK IF QPJ1=1]

a. At which positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of CBO Program activities?

b. For each position in which jobs are added, approximately how many more FTEs do you anticipate your organization will add because of the CBO Program work over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

c. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015)	Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of CBO-related activity over next 2 years (by 2015)	How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

QW1. That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that over the next few weeks, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your role in NYSERDA's CBO Program. That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success.

NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

GJGNY (Jobs) Marketer Survey

MARKETER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

SCREENING

QS1. Thinking of all of the activities you and others in your firm have performed as the Marketer for the Green Jobs – Green NY Program (GJGNY) since September 2010, has your firm experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload as a result of those activities?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES] As a result of that increase in workload, has your firm: [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. hired additional staff?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

QN1. [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES] What is your company's primary business function?

1. Engineering Services 541330

2. Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3. Architectural Services 541310

4. Building Inspection Services 541350

5. Other [Specify _____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company primary business function.]

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

a. Which positions in your company were added because of GJGNY marketing activities?

b. At which locations in New York State were jobs added?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions were added?

d. How many of these FTEs were permanent positions?

a. Position that was added because of MPP implementer activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of GJGNY marketing activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

a. In which positions in your company were jobs retained because of GJGNY marketing activities?

b. At which locations in New York state were jobs retained in each position?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at each position?

a. Position that was retained because of MPP implementer activities	b. City or town in New York State where position was retained	c. Total FTEs retained

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of MPP marketing activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. [IF QS2c = YES]

a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of GJGNY marketing activities?

b. How many FTEs in each of those positions experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in each of those position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

e. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in each position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response]

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of MPP implementer	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
---	---	--	---

activities		wage level	

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for each position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00
Group Account Director										
Brand Strategist										

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for each position that saw a wage increase?

Not directly applicable, increases were a combination of salary increase and bonuses.

Position [LIST QEP1a IF	Hourly wage increase

QEP1c = YES]	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF Qs2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “You have estimated that your firm added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA3c] FTE positions because of MPP marketing activities.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate your company will add staff because of GJGNY marketing activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] What positions do you anticipate adding over the next two years?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next two years because of MPP marketing activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next two years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of MPP implementer activities	c. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of MPP implementer activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs

GJGN Y CBO Interview (Jobs Assessment)

CBO NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

A. RECORD CBO ACTIVITY TYPE FROM SAMPLE DATA:

1. AGGREGATION PILOT

[People United for Sustainable Housing (PUSH), Public Policy and Education Fund of New York (Central New York) (PPEF Central), Long Island Progressive Coalition (LIPC)]

2. Workforce outreach to bring participants into NYSERDA training programs

3. Energy efficiency outreach to bring participants into NYSERDA programs

INTRODUCTION

We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation in the Green Jobs - Green New York Outreach Program as a Constituency-Based Organization (CBO). We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your organization from this participation and as a result of your activities in putting people through training. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. This survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Is now a good time for us to speak?

1. YES – AVAILABLE NOW

2. NO – NOT AVAILABLE [ARRANGE CALLBACK]

9. REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI1. What activities did you engage in as a CBO for NYSERDA? [DO NOT READ. CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

1. Workforce outreach to bring participants into NYSERDA training programs
2. Energy efficiency outreach to bring participants into NYSERDA programs
3. Aggregation pilot
4. Pre-screening participants for financing
5. Developed new training curriculum
6. Translations of training materials
7. Other (specify): _____

98. Don't know

99. Refused

In providing your responses to the following questions, please keep in mind any work your CBO has done for the NYSERDA Program.

LOCATIONS

QL1A. How many office locations does your organization have in New York state? In giving your response, please include any offices that your parent organization may have. [MAX = 5000]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998. Don't know

9999. Refused

QL1B. [IF QL1A>1]: Thinking of all the work that your CBO performed related to the NYSERDA Outreach Program, out of how many of your New York state office locations was this work performed? [MAX = 5000]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998. Don't know

9999. Refused

POSITIONS

QP1. Thinking of all of the activities that your CBO has performed related to the NYSERDA Outreach Program, what are the types or titles of positions in your CBO that have been involved in conducting these activities? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF POSITIONS / TITLES]

	Types/titles of positions involved in conducting CBO-related activities for NYSERDA
A. Position 1	
B. Position 2	

X. Position X	
---------------	--

STAFF ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. Did your organization need to hire additional staff for any positions to handle the CBO-related work for the NYSERDA Outreach Program?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No -----> SKIP TO QJA3
- 8. Don't know -----> SKIP TO QJA3
- 9. Refused -----> SKIP TO QJA3

QJA2. [IF QJA1=YES] You have reported that the following positions in your organization were involved in CBO-related work for the NYSERDA Outreach Program.

[LIST POSITIONS ENTERED IN QP1]

- a. For which positions and
- b. at which location(s) were jobs added in New York State because of the CBO-related work for the NYSERDA Outreach Program?
- c. How many full time positions were added?
- d. How many part time positions were added?
- e. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were added at that position and location because of the CBO-related work for NYSERDA?
- f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT BRING UP THE CONTRACT EXTENSION ISSUE, RECORD INFORMATION IN CONTRACT EXTENDED COLUMN.

IF RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions. That

being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have added would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended.

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added	b. City or town in New York State where position was added	c. Number of Full Time Jobs Added	d. Number of Part Time Jobs Added	e. Total FTEs added because of CBO-related work	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?	
					If Contract Extended	If Contract is Not Extended

QJA3. Thinking of the CBO-related work for the NYSERDA Outreach Program that your organization has performed to-date, as a result of this work, has your organization been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1. Yes

2. No -----> SKIP TO QJA5

8. Don't know -----> SKIP TO QJA5

9. Refused -----> SKIP TO QJA5

QJA4. [IF QJA3=YES] You have reported that the following positions in your organization were involved in CBO-related work for the NYSERDA Outreach Program.

[LIST POSITIONS ENTERED IN QP1]

- a. For which positions and
- b. at which location(s) in New York State have you been able to retain jobs because of the CBO-related activity?
- c. How many full time positions were retained?
- d. How many part time positions were retained?
- e. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at that position and location because of the CBO-related activity?

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained	b. City or town in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of Full Time Jobs retained	d. Number of Part Time Jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained because of CBO-related activity

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

[FOR EACH OF THE POSITIONS MENTIONED IN QJA2a OR QJA4a, ASK]:

QPQ1. Thinking about the positions that you have identified as having been added or retained because of CBO-related activities for the NYSERDA Outreach Program:

- a. What are the minimum educational requirements for the positions?
- b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training required for the positions? [OPEN ENDED]

c. If you need to recruit qualified workers for these positions in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

d. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions conducting CBO-related activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA2a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00
Position Retained [LIST QJA4a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Did you need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to handle CBO-related work for NYSERDA? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1. Yes

2. No -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QPQ1

8. Don't know -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QPQ1

9. Refused -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QPQ1

QEP2. [IF QEP1=YES] You have reported that the following positions in your organization were involved in CBO-related work for NYSERDA.

[LIST POSITIONS ENTERED IN QP1]

- a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities?
- b. How many staff members in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?
- c. How many of the staff members in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.
- d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities	b. Number that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. How many of the staff members in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level?	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level

--	--	--	--

QEP3. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for this position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for this position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF QJA1 OR QJA3= YES: READ “You have estimated that you have added or retained a total of [sum of QJA2e + sum of QJA4e] FTE positions because of CBO-related work for NYSERDA so far. “]

[IF CONTRACT EXTENSION CAME UP PREVIOUSLY, PREFACE EACH OF a. and b. BELOW WITH: “If your contract were to be extended,”]

- a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Approximately how many more FTE positions do you anticipate your organization will add because of CBO-related work activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)?
- b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

[INSERT LIST OF POSITIONS FROM QJA2a AND QJA4a]	a. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of CBO-related activity over next 2 years (by 2015)	b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
---	--	---

A. Position 1		
B. Position 2		
X. Position X		

CONTRACTOR REFERRAL ACTIVITY

ASK THIS SECTION ONLY FOR CBOs WHO PARTICIPATED IN ENERGY EFFICIENCY
OUTREACH OR AGGREGATION PILOT OR REFERRALS TO OTHER NYSERDA PROGRAMS
(FROM Q11)

QCR1. Among the contractors to whom you have referred audit and measure installation work, to the best of your knowledge, what has been impact of your referrals on their overall workload ? Would you say it has resulted in:

- 1. Substantial,
- 2. Moderate,
- 3. Minimal, or
- 4. No increase in contractor workload?
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Refused

QCR2. To the best of your knowledge, have these contractors needed to add staff to handle the increased workload from your referrals?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 8. Don't know
- 9. Refused

QCR3. [IF QCR2 = Yes] In total, approximately how many contractors have needed to add staff to handle the increased workload from your audit and retrofit referrals?

QCR4. [IF QCR2 = Yes] In total, approximately how many FTEs do you estimate these contractors have needed to add to handle the increased workload from your audit and retrofit referrals? [IF MORE THAN ONE CONTRACTOR, RECORD TOTAL FTEs ADDED FOR ALL OF THE CONTRACTORS COMBINED]

TRAINING ACTIVITY

ASK THIS SECTION ONLY FOR CBOs WHO PARTICIPATED IN WORKFORCE OUTREACH (FROM Q11)

QT1. How do you track the progress and employment status of individuals that your CBO recruits for training?

QT2. [IF RESPONDENT MENTIONS INTERNAL TRACKING SYSTEM IN QT1]: What metrics and information do you track on your internal tracking system? [PROBE FOR number trained, type of training, employment status, job placements, full-time or part-time, temporary or permanent, seasonal or year-round, position and wage level if currently employed, position and wage level in new jobs]

QT3. [IF NOT MENTIONED IN QT1]: The NYSERDA CBO Program has established a SharePoint website to help you keep track of the progress of trainees. Are you using this website for this purpose?

1. Yes

2. No

8. Don't know

9. Refused

QT4. Since the start of your training recruitment activities for the NYSERDA CBO Program, approximately how many:

a. individuals have completed training as a result of your efforts?

b. individuals are currently being trained?

a. Number of Individuals Completed Training:

b. Number of Individuals Currently in Training:

QT5 . How is your organization tracking and verifying:

a. Number of Individuals Completed Training:

b. Number of Individuals Currently in Training:

QT6. Since the start of your recruiting activities for NYSERDA training, approximately how many trainees have been placed in or found jobs?

QT6a. In general, in which cities or towns in New York State were these new jobs created? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF CITIES / TOWNS]

QT6b. For each city or town, can you please tell me approximately what was the percentage of jobs that were created? (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)

City or Town	Percentage of Jobs in each Location
TOTAL	100%

QT7. In general, what are the types of companies that these trainees have been placed in or found jobs? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF COMPANY TYPES]

QT8. For each company type, can you please tell me:

a. Approximately what percentage of trainees got jobs. (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)

b. The percentage that were full-time jobs.

c. The percentage that were part-time jobs.

Company Type	a. Percentage of Jobs in each Company Type	b. Percentage Full Time Jobs	c. Percentage Part Time Jobs
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

QT9. In general, what are the types of positions that these trainees have been placed in or found jobs? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF POSITIONS / TITLES]

QT10. For each position type, please tell me:

a. Approximately what percentage of your trainees got jobs. (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)

b. The average wage range for that position.

(Under \$10.00, \$10.00-\$14.99, \$15.00-\$19.99, \$20.00-\$24.99, \$25.00-\$29.99, \$30.00-\$34.99, \$35.00-\$39.99, \$40.00-\$44.99, \$45.00-\$49.99, Over \$50.00)

QT9. Position Type	QT10a. Percentage of Jobs in each Position Type	QT10b. Average Wage Range
TOTAL	100%	100%

QT11. Thinking of the [NUMBER FROM QT4A] trainees who have completed training as a result of your activities, at the time they started the training, approximately what percentage of them were unemployed and what percentage were employed?

Previously Unemployed: _____%

Previously Employed: _____%

QT12. Thinking of the trainees who were already employed at the time they started that training, approximately what percentage got a new job, either in their existing company or in another company?

QT13. Thinking of these already employed trainees who got a new job in their existing company or in another company, approximately what percentage got an increase in wages that could be attributed to the increased skills they gained from the training?

QT14. Thinking now of just those already employed trainees who got a new job with higher wages, what was

- a. their average wage range in their prior position; and
- b. what was their average wage range in their new position?

a. Average wage range in prior position.

(Under \$10.00, \$10.00-\$14.99, \$15.00-\$19.99, \$20.00-\$24.99, \$25.00-\$29.99, \$30.00-\$34.99, \$35.00-\$39.99, \$40.00-\$44.99, \$45.00-\$49.99, Over \$50.00)

b. Average wage range in new position.

(Under \$10.00, \$10.00-\$14.99, \$15.00-\$19.99, \$20.00-\$24.99, \$25.00-\$29.99, \$30.00-\$34.99, \$35.00-\$39.99, \$40.00-\$44.99, \$45.00-\$49.99, Over \$50.00)

QT15. Looking ahead to the next two years, approximately how many trainees do you anticipate will be placed in or find jobs as a result of training activities facilitated by your CBO?

QT16 [IF QT3=YES]: You mentioned earlier that you use the NYSERDA SharePoint website to help you keep track of the progress of trainees. How up-to-date and complete is your CBO's information on this website?

QTR17. How easy or difficult has it been for you to track the progress and employment status of individuals that your CBO has recruited for training? Why do you say that? Do you have any suggestions for improving the tracking system?

QT18: [IF QT3=No OR QT16=Not up-to-date AND RESPONDENT CITED INTERNAL SOFTWARE PROGRAM OR SYSTEM TO TRACK TRAINEE PROGRESS AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN QT1]: You mentioned earlier that you have your own system to track the progress and employment status of trainees. To be able quantify how successful the NYSERDA CBO Program has been, we need to obtain good information on job placements of trainees. We would really appreciate it if you could share with us the job placement information from your tracking system. Is that possible? This information will be used only in aggregate and is very important for the purpose of regulatory reporting requirements.

1. Yes ---> ARRANGE TO OBTAIN THE JOB PLACEMENT INFORMATION

2. No

3. Maybe – need to discuss with others in organization

8. Don't know

9. Refused

QT19: [IF QT18=No]: As I mentioned, this information will be really important for helping us establish the value of the program and is vital to its future success. Is there any way that you could share it with us?
[OFFER OPTIONS FOR MASKING NAMES AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF TRAINEES OR OBTAINING THE INFORMATION IN AGGREGATE BY COMPANY TYPE].

OTHER CBO ACTIVITIES

QOA1. Thinking of any activities that your CBO has engaged in for NYSERDA, other than contractor referrals and training which we have already discussed, have any of these other activities resulted in the creation of new jobs in your community?

1. Yes

2. No -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QW1

8. Don't know -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QW1

9. Refused -----> SKIP TO NEXT SECTION, QW1

QOA2. What are the other activities that your CBO has engaged in that have resulted in the creation of new jobs in your community?

QOA3. Since your CBO started engaging in these other activities, approximately how many jobs have been created in New York State?

QOA4. In general, in which cities or towns in New York State were these new jobs created? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF CITIES / TOWNS]

QOA5. For each city or town, can you please tell me approximately what was the percentage of jobs that were created. (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)

City or Town	Percentage of Jobs in each Location

TOTAL	100%

QOA6. What are the types of companies where these new jobs have been created? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF COMPANY TYPES]

QOA7. For each company type, can you please tell me:

- a. Approximately what was the percentage of jobs that were created. (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)
- b. The percentage that were full-time jobs.
- c. The percentage that were part-time jobs.

Company Type	a. Percentage of Jobs in each Company Type	b. Percentage Full Time Jobs	c. Percentage Part Time Jobs
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

QOA8. In general, what are the types of positions or titles of these jobs? [GET SPECIFIC AND DETAILED LIST OF POSITIONS / TITLES]

QOA7. For each position type, please tell me:

a. The approximate percentage of jobs in each position. (TOTAL SHOULD ADD TO 100%)

b. The average wage range for that position.

(Under \$10.00, \$10.00-\$14.99, \$15.00-\$19.99, \$20.00-\$24.99, \$25.00-\$29.99, \$30.00-\$34.99, \$35.00-\$39.99, \$40.00-\$44.99, \$45.00-\$49.99, Over \$50.00)

QOA6. Position Type	QOA7a. Percentage of Jobs in each Position Type	QOA7b. Average Wage Range
TOTAL	100%	100%

QOA8. Looking ahead to the next two years, approximately how many jobs do you anticipate will be created as a result of these other activities performed by your CBO?

NAICS CODE

S1. QN1. What is your organization's primary business function? [READ DESCRIPTIONS AND EXAMPLES IF NECESSARY]

1. Individual and Family Services (except specifically directed at child & youth or elderly or persons with disabilities - examples: community action services agencies, multipurpose social services centers, family social services centers.) 624190

2. Social Advocacy Organizations (except human rights and environmental protection, conservation, and wildlife preservation - examples , community action advocacy organizations, antipoverty advocacy organizations, neighborhood development advocacy organizations, social change advocacy organizations, social service advocacy organizations, tenants' advocacy associations) 813319

3. Human Rights Organizations (establishments primarily engaged in promoting causes associated with human rights either for a broad or specific constituency) 813311

4. Environment, Conservation and Wildlife Organizations (establishments primarily engaged in promoting the preservation and protection of the environment and wildlife) 813312

5. Civic and Social Organizations (establishments primarily engaged in promoting the civic and social interests of their members. – examples: fraternal lodges, ethnic associations, social clubs.) 813410

6. Business Associations (establishments primarily engaged in promoting the business interests of their members - examples: Chambers of commerce, trade associations.) 813910

7. Other [Specify_____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

WRAP UP

That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that over the next few weeks, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's CBO Program. That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success. NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

Home Performance with Energy Star GJGNY (Jobs) HPwES Contractor Survey

HPwES CONTRACTOR NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

TOTAL NUMBER OF GJGNY AUDITS COMPLETED for HPwES:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from SRBI. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation in performing Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) free/reduced-cost energy audits and installing energy efficiency measures through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program (HPwES). We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company of GJGNY-funded audits and GJGNY loans for measure installations. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

NOTE: ASK QI1a first, THEN QI2, THEN QI1

QI1a. May I please speak with [READ-IN CONTACT NAME]?

1 SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT [GO TO QI1]

2 LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE [SCHEDULE CALLBACK]

3 LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY [GO TO QI2]

9 REFUSED [GO TO QI2]

QI1. First, my records indicate that [HPwES CONTRACTOR NAME] is currently a participating contractor in NYSERDA's Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program. Is this correct?

1 YES [GO TO QI3]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't know [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 Refused [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI3. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 YES

2 NO [READ: We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with the Home Performance Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number of

this person?] [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI4. What is your company's primary business function?

01 Building inspection services

02 Engineering Services (engineering consulting, design, and/or services)

03 Plumbing, heating and air -conditioning contractors

04 Drywall and insulation contractors

05 Glass and glazing contractors, windows

06 New single-family housing construction

07 New multifamily housing construction

08 New housing for-sale builders

09 Residential remodelers

10 Merchant wholesalers of durable goods [eg. Insulation materials, Warm-air heating and A/C equipment, plumbing and hydroponic heating equipment, Windows] [SPECIFY GOODS_____]

11 Other [Specify_____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

98 Don't know

99 Refused

ACTIVITY REVIEW

QA1. According to program records, since the introduction of the GJGNY free or reduced cost audits in mid-November 2010, your company has completed [NUMBER FROM SAMPLE] audits through the HPwES Program. Is this correct?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA1a. [IF QA1 = 2] How many GJGNY free or reduced cost audits has your company completed through the HPwES Program since mid-November 2010. [MIN=0 MAX = 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA2. Based on your experience, what do you think is the **ONE** primary motivation for customers to have an **audit** completed through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program? [**DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE**]

01 TO SAVE ON ENERGY COSTS/BILLS

02 THEY WERE CONSIDERING INSTALLING ENERGY EFFICIENT MEASURES

ANYWAY

03 TO FIND OUT HOW ENERGY EFFICIENT THEIR HOME IS/TO GET THEIR

HOME EVALUATED

04 TO GET AN EXPERT'S ADVICE ABOUT WHAT ENERGY EFFICIENCY

MEASURES TO INSTALL/HOW TO MAKE THEIR HOME MORE ENERGY

EFFICIENT

05 TO SAVE ENERGY—NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED WHETHER FOR COST,

ENVIRONMENT

06 TO HELP THE ENVIRONMENT

07 TO REPLACE BROKEN OR MALFUNCTIONING EQUIPMENT

08 BECAUSE IT IS FREE/REDUCED COST

09 QUALIFY FOR INCENTIVES / REBATES

10 INCREASED COMFORT OF HOME

11 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ **[RECORD VERBATIM]**

98 DON'T KNOW

99 REFUSED

QA3. In your opinion, what is the **ONE** most important barrier that prevents customers from participating in the free or reduced-cost audits offered by the program? **[DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]**

01 NOT ENOUGH MONEY AVAILABLE/LACK OF BUDGET

- 02 LACK OF TIME
- 03 THE HASSLE OF SCHEDULING, PAPERWORK, PROGRAM COMPLEXITY, ETC.
- 04 WAITING FOR OLD EQUIPMENT TO BREAK/WEAR OUT
- 05 GATHERING ENERGY USE DATA
- 06 LACK OF KNOWLEDGE/AWARENESS
- 07 NOT WANTING TO FEEL OBLIGATED TO INSTALL MEASURES
- 08 NOT EXPECTING TO QUALIFY/CHANGES IN PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
- 09 SKEPTICAL OF FREE SERVICE
- 10 INCOME QUESTIONS ARE TOO INTRUSIVE
- 11 LACK OF BENEFITS AFTER THE AUDIT
- 12 NONE
- 13 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ [RECORD VERBATIM]
- 98 DON'T KNOW
- 99 REFUSED

QA4. Approximately what percentage of these audits do you think your company would have done had they not been available for free or at a reduced cost? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA5. Which of the following GJGNY audit related activities has your company performed?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know 9 Ref

- a. Inventory of initial home conditions, including blower-door testing for air-infiltration rates?
- b. Home health and safety testing, prior to performing work, including diagnostic testing of combustion appliances?
- c. Develop a work scope for proposed improvement?
- d. Develop a cost and energy-savings estimate?
- f. Promote GJGNY loans?
- g. Assist in submitting GJGNY loans?
- h. Installation of energy-efficiency measures during the audits?
- i. Home health and safety testing, after performing work?
- j. Installation of energy-efficiency measures as follow-on work after the audits?
- k. Any other audit related activities not mentioned?[SPECIFY]

QA6. Has your company conducted GJGNY-funded audits for any NYSERDA programs, OTHER than HPwES?

1 Yes

2 No [SKIP TO QA10]

8 Don't know [SKIP TO QA10]

9 Refused [SKIP TO QA10]

QA7. [IF QA6 = YES] For which programs? [Multiple Record]

1 Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program

2 Multifamily Performance Program

3 Other [SPECIFY]

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA8. [IF QA6 = YES] Approximately how many GJGNY-funded audits has your company performed for these other NYSERDA programs since mid-November 2010? [MIN=0 MAX = 2000, where 2000 = 2000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA9. [IF QA6 = YES] Approximately what percentage of these audits for other NYSERDA programs do you think your company would have done had they not been available for free or at a reduced cost?

[MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA10. Were any of the GJGNY audits that your company performed a result of referrals by Constituency-Based Organizations (CBOs)?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

[IF ASKED: A Constituency-Based Organization is an organization that provides services to economically or socially disadvantaged persons within a specified community, and which is supported by members of the community in which it operates. CBOs work in NYSERDA's Outreach Program to encourage residents, small businesses, not-for-profit organizations (NFP), and multifamily building owners to participate in energy-efficiency programs, by referring them to NYSERDA programs or energy efficiency contractors ."]

QA11. [IF QA10 = YES] Approximately how many? [MIN=0 MAX =2000 , where 2000 = 2000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA12. After customers receive their audit reports, what is the **ONE** most important **barrier** that prevents customers from implementing or installing measures through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program? **[DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]**

01 NOT ENOUGH MONEY AVAILABLE/LACK OF BUDGET

02 LACK OF TIME

03 THE HASSLE OF SCHEDULING, ETC.

04 WAITING FOR OLD EQUIPMENT TO BREAK/WEAR OUT

05 GATHERING ENERGY USE DATA

06 NOT RECEIVING MEANINGFUL INFORMATION FROM AUDIT/NOT

UNDERSTANDING AUDIT REPORT

07 NOT QUALIFYING/CHANGES IN PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS/SAVINGS TO

INVESTMENT RATIO

08 HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES HAS TO BE FIXED BEFORE IMPLEMENTING

MEASURES.

09 THEY FEEL THEY CAN DO BETTER GOING ON THEIR OWN AND SHOPPING

FOR INDIVIDUAL SAVINGS.

10 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ **[RECORD VERBATIM]**

11 NONE

98 Don't know

99 Refused

QA13. Do you think the availability of **free or reduced-cost audits** has led to an increase in your **installations of energy efficiency measures** through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA14. [IF QA13 = NO] Why not?

01 COMPANY ALREADY OFFERED FREE AUDITS

02 CUSTOMERS GETTING AUDITS DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR
INSTALLATIONS/ECONOMIC CONDITION

03 CUSTOMERS GET AUDIT JUST BECAUSE IT IS FREE OR OUT OF CURIOSITY
BUT AREN'T INTERESTED IN INSTALLING MEASURES

04 PROGRAM IS COMPLICATED/REQUIREMENTS ARE TOO BURDENSOME

05 THERE ARE TOO MANY CONTRACTORS OUT THERE SIMPLY JUST TO DO
THE FREE AUDITS AND GET THE INCENTIVE AND ARE NOT INTERESTED IN DOING
THE OTHER MEASURES.

06 DON'T THINK IT'S ATTRACTING NEW CUSTOMERS. NEW

CUSTOMERS ARE COMING FROM CONTRACTORS, BECAUSE THEY'RE

ALREADY DOING THE MARKETING.

07 MEASURES NOT COST EFFECTIVE / PEOPLE EXPECT HIGHER INCENTIVES

08 Other (specify) _____

98 Don't know

99 Refused

QA15. Do you think the availability of **free or reduced-cost audits** has led to an increase in the **comprehensiveness of your projects** through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA16. Do you think the availability of **free or reduced-cost audits** has led to an increase in the **number of your contracts** through the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA17. Approximately what percentage of all of your company's GJGNY audits resulted in your company installing recommended energy efficient measures for the customer? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA18. [IF QA17>0% AND < 101%] Did any of the GJGNY audit customers for whom your company installed energy efficient measures take out a GJGNY loan in order to install the measures?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA19. [IF QA18 =Yes] Approximately what percentage? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA20. [IF QA18=Yes AND QA19 >= 0% AND < 101%] Approximately what percentage of the installations supported by GJGNY loans do you think your company would have done had low cost GJGNY loans not been available? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

LOCATIONS

QL1. How many office locations does your company have in New York State?[MIN= 1, MAX = 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QL2. [IF QL1 = 2 to 5000]: Thinking of all the work that your company has performed related to GJGNY audits/installations/loans since November 2010, out of how many of your New York State office locations was this work performed? {RANGE 0 TO 50, where 50 = 50 or more}

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

POSITIONS

QP1. The following series pertains to the STAFF who participates in all of the activities that your company has performed related to GJGNY audits, installations, and loans. We will ask you the positions or job titles held, followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

a. what are the types or titles of staff positions that have been involved in conducting these activities?[RECORD NAME OF EACH INDIVIDUAL POSITION TYPE]and

b. For the [READ EACH POSITION FROM QP1a]position, on average, approximately how many hours were spent per project ?Again, if a single person performs multiple functions, please add the total hours worked by that single individual across all job functions.[RECORD HOURS SEPARATELY FOR EACH POSITION] Range = 1 to 2000, where 2000 = 2000 or more 9998=Don't know 9999=Refused

	a. Types/titles of staff positions involved in GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity (Examples: Project Manager, Auditor, Analyst, Office Support, Installer, etc.)	b. Average number of hours <u>per project</u> involved in GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity
A. Position 1		
B. Position 2		
X. Position 10		

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. Since the introduction of the GJGNY-funded energy audits and GJGNY loans in November 2010 has your company needed to hire additional staff for any positions because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA2. [IF QJA1=YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to GJGNY audits/installations/loans.

[ASK a. through g. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Were jobs added at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity?

1 Yes [ASK b. through g.]

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] jobs added because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many full time [POSITION FROM QP1] were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

d. How many part time [POSITION FROM QP1] were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

e. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were added as [POSITION FROM QP1] ? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

f. [IFQAJ2e >0] How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

g. [IFQAJ2e >0] How many FTEs would have been added at this position if there had been no GJGNY-funded audits or GJGNY loans? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

[Definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was added	c. Number of Full Time Jobs Added	d. Number of Part Time Jobs Added	e. Total FTEs added	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?	g. Total FTEs that would have been added if there had been no GJGNY-funded audits or GJGNY loans
<i>Example: Analyst</i>	<i>Albany</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>0</i>

QJA3. Since the introduction of the GJGNY-funded energy audits and GJGNY loans in November 2010, has your company been able to retain staff because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA4. [IF QJA3=YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to GJGNY audits/installations/loans.

[ASK a. through f. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Were jobs retained at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity?

1 Yes [ASK b. through g.]

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] retained because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

c. How many full time [POSITION from QP1] were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

d. How many part time [POSITION from QP1] were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

e. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were retained as [POSITION from QP1] ? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

f. [IF QJA4e>0]How many FTEs would have been retained at this position if there had been no GJGNY-funded audits or GJGNY loans? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of Full Time Jobs retained	d. Number of Part Time Jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained	f. Total FTEs that would have been retained if there had been no GJGNY-funded audits or GJGNY loans
<i>Example: Auditor</i>	<i>Albany</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>0</i>

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

[IF QJA1 OR QJA3 = YES, FOR EACH OF THE POSITIONS MENTIONED IN QJA2a OR QJA4a, ASK] REPEAT FOR EACH POSITION MENTIONED, Up to 10. For each position, ask a first followed immediately by b.

QPQ1. Thinking about the position of (READ IN EACH POSITION FROM QJA2a OR QJA4a) that you have identified as having been added or retained because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity:

- a. What are the minimum educational requirements for this position? (SEE below)
- b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training are required for this position? [RECORD]

<p>Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]</p>	<p>a. Minimum educational requirements for this position 1 = No requirement</p> <p>2 = HS diploma / GED</p> <p>3 = Some college, no degree</p> <p>4 = Associate or Vocational degree</p> <p>5 = Bachelor's degree</p> <p>6 = Graduate degree</p> <p>7 = Other (please specify)</p> <p>8 Don't know</p> <p>9 Refused</p>	<p>b. Special licenses, certificates, or other training required for this position</p>	
---	---	---	--

c. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the each of the following positions which were added or retained because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity? For (POSITION), what is the typical hourly wage range? Just stop me when I get to the right category 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position Added	2013 typical hourly wage range										
[LIST QJA2a]	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	11 Position is commission-based
Position Retained	2013 typical hourly wage range										
[LIST QJA4a]	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	11 Position is commission-based

d. (ASK FOR EACH POSITION AFTER ALL a, b, AND c ARE ASKED) If your company needs to recruit qualified workers for [POSITION FROM QP1] in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Did your company need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to conduct the work related to GJGNY audits and resulting installations and GJGNY loans? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QEP2. [IF QEP1 =YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to GJGNY audits/installations/loans.

[ASK for each position listed in QP1]

a. Did any employees in existing [POSITION FROM QP1] positions see an increase in responsibilities?

1 Yes

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. [If QEP2a = YES] How many FTEs in this position experienced an increase in responsibilities? [MIN=0, MAX=50]

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

c. [If QEP2a = YES] How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? [Min 0 , Max = 50, where 50 = 50 or more, 98 = DK 99 = REF

_____Number

C1. [If QEP2a = YES] In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in the position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level.	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
<i>Example: Project Manager</i>	2	2	

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

d. What was the average hourly wage range for [POSITION FROM QEP2c] positions that saw a wage increase prior to the increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase										
	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	11 Position is commission -based

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

e. What was the average hourly wage increase for [POSITION FROM QEP2c]positions that saw a wage increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	hourly wage increase							
	1 Under \$2.00	2 \$2.00- \$3.99	3 \$4.00- \$5.99	4 \$6.00- \$7.99	5 \$8.00- \$9.99	6 \$10.00- \$11.99	7 Over \$12.00	8 Position is commission based

OTHER JOB IMPACTS

QOJ1. Some employment is subject to seasonal variations. Employment seasonality could take two forms, one is **layoffs** and the other is **reductions in work hours** for several weeks or months of the year. Have any of your company's employees avoided seasonal layoffs or reduced-hour work weeks because of GJGNY-SPECIFIC audit/installation/loan activities?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QOJ2. [IF QOJ1 = YES] The following questions seek to understand the impact of GJGNY activities on **both** forms of seasonal impacts: layoffs and reduced-hour work weeks.

You have reported that several positions in your company were involved in work related to GJGNY audits/installations/loans.

[ASK a. through e. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Does the [POSITION FROM QP1] position in your company normally experience a seasonal employment impact related to audit/installation/loan activities?

1 Yes

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION if QOJ2a = YES] How many employees in this position **avoided layoffs** or had **shorter seasonal layoffs** because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activities? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50]
98 = Dk 99 = Ref

c. [IFQOJ2b >0] For these employees, what was the average number of unemployed work weeks **avoided**? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

d. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION if QOJ2a = YES] How many employees in this position **avoided reduced-hours work weeks** or had **fewer reduced-hour work weeks** because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activities? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

e. [IFQOJ2d >0] For these employees, on average, how many reduced-hour work weeks were **avoided** per employee? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

a. Position that normally experiences a seasonal employment impact related to audit/installation/loan activities	b. Number of employees that avoided or had shorter seasonal layoffs	c. Average number of unemployed work weeks avoided per employee	d. Number of employees that avoided or had fewer reduced-hours work weeks	e. Average number of reduced-hours work weeks avoided per employee
<i>Example: Installer</i>	2	8	1	10

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. According to program records, your company has performed approximately [if QA6 = YES, READ “more than”] [IF QA1a= 1 to 5000 :QA1a, otherwise NUMBER FROM SAMPLE] GJGNY free/reduced-cost audits since November 2010. Approximately how many more such audits do you expect to perform over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

_____ (Numeric response) [MIN= 0, MAX = 5000]

9998 Don’t know

9999 Refused

QPJ2. You have estimated that your company has added or retained a total of [sum of QJA2e + sum of QJA4e] FTE positions to date because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity.

a. Approximately how many more FTE positions do you anticipate your company will add because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

b. [IF QPJ2a>0] How many of the jobs that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[INSERT LIST OF POSITIONS FROM QP1a]	a. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)	b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
--------------------------------------	--	---

That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that over the next few months, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your company’s participation in NYSERDA’s Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program). That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts we covered in today’s questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the

value of the program and will be important to the program's future success. NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that survey as well.

Thank you again for your time!

GJGNY (Jobs) HPwES Implementation Contractor Survey

HPwES IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTOR/QA CONTRACTOR COMPANY NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

INTRO. Hello, my name is ___ calling from NMR . We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's role as [Implementation Contractor/Quality Assurance Contractor for the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program (HPwES)]. We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company of being Audit Contractor of this program. All your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. May I please speak with [RESPONDENT NAME]?

- 1 YES--Speaking with listed respondent
- 2 NO--Listed respondent not available (arrange callback)
- 3 Listed respondent no longer with company
- 9 REFUSED--Thank and terminate

Q11. [ASK IF INTRO=3,9] Is there someone else who would know about your company's role as Implementer/Quality Assurance Contractor for NYSERDA's Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 Yes [ASK FOR NAME AND PHONE #. THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW

WITH BEST CONTACT]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your company's role as Implementer/Quality Assurance Contractor for the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program?

1 Yes

2 No [READ: "We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about

your company's experience with the Home Performance Program. Could you give

me the name and telephone number of this person?" THANK AND TERMINATE.

SCHED INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QN1. What is your company's primary business function?

1 Engineering Services 541330

2 Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3 Architectural Services 541310

4 Building Inspection Services 541350

5 Other [Specify] [RECORD VERBATIM] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

8 Don't know

9 Refused

POSITIONS

QP1. The following series of questions pertains to the STAFF who participates in all of the activities that your company has performed related to your implementation of/quality assurances activities related to the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program. We will ask you the positions or job titles held, followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

What are the types or titles of staff positions that have been involved in conducting these HPwES implementation/quality assurance activities? [RECORD NAME OF EACH INDIVIDUAL POSITION TYPE]

STAFF ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. Some of the following questions in this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 20 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.5 FTEs.

Has your company needed to hire additional staff for any positions because of implementation/QA activity for HPwES?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA2. You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to the implementation/quality assurance of HPwES.

[ASK a. through g. for each position listed in QP1]

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. Fill in matrix just for any positions for which jobs were added (leave other rows blank).]

a. Were jobs added at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of implementation/quality assurance activity for HPwES since the introduction of GJGNY? [IF YES, ASK B THROUGH G. IF NO, dk or refused, GO TO NEXT POSITION.]

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE ADDED:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] jobs added because of implementation/quality assurance activity for HPwES? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many full-time jobs were added?

d. How many part-time jobs were added?

e. What was the total number of FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) added at that position because of HPwES work?

f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[If RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. "Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions. That being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have added would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended."]

a. Jobs added for position? (Y/N)	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Number of FULL TIME jobs added	d. Number of PART TIME jobs added	e. Total FTEs added	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?	
					If contract is extended	If contract is not extended

QJA3. Since the introduction of the GJGNY-funded energy audits and GJGNY loans / in November 2010, has your company been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA4. You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to implementation/quality assurance activity for HPwES.

[ASK a. through e. for each position listed in QP1]

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. After filling in 'yes' or 'no' for 'jobs retained?' for each position, fill in matrix just for any positions for which jobs were retained (leave other rows blank).]

a. Were jobs retained at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of implementation/quality assurance activity for HPwES?

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE RETAINED:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were these [POSITION from QP1] retained [multiple cities/towns possible for response]

c. How many full-time jobs were retained?

d. How many part-time jobs were retained?

e. What was the total number of FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) retained at that position?

[If RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. "Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions. That being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have retained would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended."]

a. Jobs retained for position? (Y/N)	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of FULL TIME jobs retained	d. Number of PART TIME jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained	f. How many of the retained FTEs were permanent positions?	
					If contract is extended	If contract is not extended

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

QPQ1. Thinking about the positions that you have identified as having been added or retained because of implementation/quality assurance activities for HPwES:

[IDENTIFY POSITIONS ADDED OR RETAINED, FROM QJA2 AND QJA4, OUT OF ALL POSITIONS LISTED BELOW. ASK A and B FOR EACH POSITION ADDED OR RETAINED.]

- a. What are the minimum educational requirements for the positions?
- b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training required for the positions? [OPEN ENDED]
- c. If your company needs to recruit qualified workers for [POSITION FROM QP1] in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]	a. Minimum educational requirements for this position A = No requirement B = HS diploma / GED C = Some college, no degree D = Associate or Vocational degree E = Bachelor's degree F = Graduate degree G = Other (please specify)	b. Special licenses, certificates, or other training required for this position	c. Do you anticipate difficulty recruiting future qualified workers for this position? Y/N/DK

QPQ2. Again, thinking about the positions that you have identified as having been added or retained because of Implementation/quality assurance activities for NYSERDA:

[IDENTIFY POSITIONS ADDED OR RETAINED, FROM QJA2 AND QJA4, OUT OF ALL POSITIONS LISTED BELOW. ASK A-C FOR EACH POSITION ADDED OR RETAINED. LEAVE OTHER ROWS BLANK.]

c. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for these positions conducting HPwES-related activities?

Position added or retained	2013 typical hourly wage range
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------

[LIST QJA2a AND QJA4a]	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00	Position is commission- based

EXISTING POSTION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Since the introduction of GJGNY audits and loans in 2010, did your company need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to conduct the work related to implementing/providing quality assurance for the HPwES Program? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

10 NA

QEP2. You have reported that the following positions in your organization were involved in work related to implementing/providing quality assurance for HPwES.

[POSITIONS FROM QP1 will be listed. Fill in b. and c. in matrix just for any positions in which staff had an increase in responsibilities.]

a. Did any existing employees in the [POSITION FROM QP1] position see an increase in responsibilities because of HPwES work?

b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

d. [FOR POSITIONS IN WHICH ANY STAFF SAW INCREASED WAGES] In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [MULTIPLE CITIES/TOWNS POSSIBLE FOR RESPONSE]

a. Increase in responsibilities?	b. FTEs that experienced increase in responsibilities	c. Out of staff with increased responsibilities, FTEs that experienced an increase in wage level	d. Cities/towns in which staff who experienced increase in wage level were located

QEP3. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage for each position prior to the increase?

Position	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	\$50.00 or more

QEP4. a. For each position with a wage increase, what was the average increase in hourly wages?

[FILL OUT A ROW FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WHOSE WAGE RATE INCREASED.]

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	\$12.00 or more

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of CBO activities for NYSERDA over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

[IF CONTRACT EXTENSION CAME UP PREVIOUSLY, PREFACE WITH: "If your contract were to be extended,"]

1 Yes

2 No-----> SKIP TO END

8 Don't know-----> SKIP TO END

9 Refused-----> SKIP TO END

QPJ2. [ASK IF QPJ1=1]

a. At which positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of HPwES implementation/quality assurance activities?

b. For each position in which jobs are added, approximately how many more FTEs do you anticipate your organization will add because of HPwES implementation/quality assurance activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015)	Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of CBO-related activity over next 2 years (by 2015)	How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

QW1. That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that over the next few weeks, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's HPwES Program. That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success.

NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

GJGNV (Jobs) HPwES Financial Services Survey

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMPANY NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

INTRO. Hello, my name is ___ calling from NMR . We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's providing financial services for the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program (HPwES). We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company of providing financial services for this program. All your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

May I please speak with [RESPONDENT NAME]?

- 1 YES--Speaking with listed respondent
- 2 NO--Listed respondent not available (arrange callback)
- 3 Listed respondent no longer with company
- R REFUSED--Thank and terminate

QI1. Is there someone else who would know about your company's role in NYSERDA's HPwES Program?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No [THANK AND TERMINATE]
- R Refused [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the HPwES Program?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No [READ: "We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with the HPwES Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number of this person?" THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT]
- R Refused [THANK AND TERMINATE]

Q21. What is your company's primary business function?

- 1 Commercial Banking 522110
- 2 Savings Institutions 522120
- 3 Architectural Services 541310
- 4 Credit Unions 522130
- 5 Other [Specify] [RECORD VERBATIM] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]
- D Don't know
- R Refused

SCREENING

QS1. As a result of your firm's anticipated participation in offering services in support of the Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program loans, have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No -----> SKIP TO END
- D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END
- R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES]

[READ IF LENDER IS JUST NOW ENTERING INTO CONTRACT WITH THE PROGRAM]

Considering all of the activities that you and others in your organization anticipate performing related to HPwES, has your company:

[READ IF LENDER HAS PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM] Thinking of all of the activities that you and others in your organization have performed to date providing financial services for the HPwES Program, has your company:

[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. needed to hire additional staff for any position because of HPwES loan activities?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know

R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff because of HPwES loan activities? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the following questions in this survey will ask about hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

JOB ADDITIONS

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

- a. For which positions in your company were jobs added because of anticipated HPwES loan activities?
- b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs added because of anticipated HPwES loan activities?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were added at that position?
- d. How many of the added FTEs are expected to be permanent positions?

a. Position that was added because of HPwES loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
<i>Example: Loan Officer</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of HPwES loan activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

JOB RETENTIONS

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained because of anticipated HPwES loan activities?

b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs retained because of anticipated HPwES loan activities?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at that position?

a. Position that was retained because of HPwES loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	e. Total FTEs retained
<i>Example: Data Processor</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of anticipated HPwES loan activities?

Position Retained	2013 typical hourly wage range									
[LIST QJA3a]	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

a. [ONLY RESPONDENTS WHO CONTINUE TO HAVE A CONTRACT WITH NYSERDA] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of HPwES loan activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No -----> SKIP TO END
- D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END
- R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] At what positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of HPwESloan activities?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ "more"] FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next 2 years because of HPwES loan activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of HPwESloan activities	c. Estimate of how many <u>more</u> FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of HPwES loan activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	2	1

QW1. [ALL RESPONDENTS] That's all our questions for now. Please note that over the next few weeks, you will probably receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's HPwES Program. That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It also will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success.

NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

Multifamily Performance Program

GJGNY (Jobs) Performance Partner Survey

CATI Note: Set up from the program for 5704, Home Performance with ENERGY STAR. All changes are tracked in this document and these changes are largely wording modifications.

MPP PERFORMANCE PARTNER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

TOTAL NUMBER OF GJGNY AUDITS COMPLETED for HPwES:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from SRBI. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation in the Multifamily Performance Program. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

NOTE: ASK QI1a first, THEN QI2, THEN QI1

QI1a. May I please speak with [READ-IN CONTACT NAME]?

1 SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT [GO TO QI1]

2 LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE [SCHEDULE CALLBACK]

3 LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY [GO TO QI2]

9 REFUSED [GO TO QI2]

QI1. First, my records indicate that [MPP Performance Partner NAME] is currently a Performance Partner in NYSERDA's Multifamily Performance Program. Is this correct?

1 YES [GO TO QI3]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't know [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 Refused [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Multifamily Performance Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI3. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the Multifamily Performance Program?

1 YES

2 NO [READ: We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with the Multifamily Performance Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number

of this person?] [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI4. What is your company's primary business function?

01 Building inspection services (541350)

02 Engineering Services (541330)

03 Architectural Services (541310)

04 DO NOT DISPLAY Drywall and insulation contractors

05 DO NOT DISPLAY Glass and glazing contractors, windows

06 DO NOT DISPLAY New single-family housing construction

07 DO NOT DISPLAY New multifamily housing construction

08 DO NOT DISPLAY New housing for-sale builders

09 Residential remodeling (236118)

10 DO NOT DISPLAY Merchant wholesalers of durable goods [e.g. Insulation materials, Warm-air heating and A/C equipment, plumbing and hydroponic heating equipment, Windows] [SPECIFY GOODS_____]

11 Other [Specify_____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

98 Don't know

99 Refused

ACTIVITY REVIEW

QA1. In September 2010, the Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) began receiving Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) co-funding for audits and, in June 2011, MPP began offering GJGNY-funded low-cost financing. In June of 2012, GJGNY began co-funding MPP installations as well. We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company after the introduction GJGNY funding to these MPP Program components. As a result of your firm's role as a Performance Partner for MPP, have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company since Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) funding was introduced into MPP in September 2010?

1 Yes

2 No [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't know [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 Refused {THANK AND TERMINATE]

QA1a. [IF QA1 = 1] How many audits has your company completed through MPP since September 2010. [MIN=0 MAX = 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA2. Based on your experience, what do you think is the ONE primary motivation for customers to have an audit completed through the Multifamily Performance Program? [DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]

01 TO SAVE ON ENERGY COSTS/BILLS

02 THEY WERE CONSIDERING INSTALLING ENERGY EFFICIENT MEASURES

ANYWAY

03 TO FIND OUT HOW ENERGY EFFICIENT THEIR HOME IS/TO GET THEIR

HOME EVALUATED

04 TO GET AN EXPERT'S ADVICE ABOUT WHAT ENERGY EFFICIENCY

MEASURES TO INSTALL/HOW TO MAKE THEIR HOME MORE ENERGY

EFFICIENT

05 TO SAVE ENERGY—NOT FURTHER SPECIFIED WHETHER FOR COST,

ENVIRONMENT

06 TO HELP THE ENVIRONMENT

07 TO REPLACE BROKEN OR MALFUNCTIONING EQUIPMENT

08 BECAUSE IT IS FREE/REDUCED COST

09 QUALIFY FOR INCENTIVES / REBATES

10 INCREASED COMFORT OF HOME

11 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ [RECORD VERBATIM]

98 DON'T KNOW

99 REFUSED

QA3. In your opinion, what is the ONE most important barrier that prevents customers from participating in the GJGNY-subsidized audits offered by the program? [DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]

01 NOT ENOUGH MONEY AVAILABLE/LACK OF BUDGET

02 LACK OF TIME

03 THE HASSLE OF SCHEDULING, PAPERWORK, PROGRAM COMPLEXITY, ETC.

04 WAITING FOR OLD EQUIPMENT TO BREAK/WEAR OUT

05 GATHERING ENERGY USE DATA

06 LACK OF KNOWLEDGE/AWARENESS

07 NOT WANTING TO FEEL OBLIGATED TO INSTALL MEASURES

08 NOT EXPECTING TO QUALIFY/CHANGES IN PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

09 SKEPTICAL OF FREE SERVICE

10 INCOME QUESTIONS ARE TOO INTRUSIVE

11 LACK OF BENEFITS AFTER THE AUDIT

12 NONE

13 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ [RECORD VERBATIM]

98 DON'T KNOW

99 REFUSED

QA4. Approximately what percentage of these audits do you think your company would have done had they not been subsidized by GJGNY funds? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA5. Which of the following GJGNY audit related activities has your company performed?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know 9 Ref

- a. Inventory of initial home conditions, including blower-door testing for air-infiltration rates?
- b. Home health and safety testing, prior to performing work, including diagnostic testing of combustion appliances?
- c. Develop a work scope for proposed improvement?
- d. Develop a cost and energy-savings estimate?
- f. Promote GJGNY loans?
- g. Assist in submitting GJGNY loans?
- h. Installation of energy-efficiency measures during the audits?
- i. Home health and safety testing, after performing work?
- j. Installation of energy-efficiency measures as follow-on work after the audits?
- k. Any other audit related activities not mentioned?[SPECIFY]

QA6. Has your company conducted GJGNY-funded audits for any NYSERDA programs, OTHER than MPP?

1 Yes

2 No [SKIP TO QA10]

8 Don't know [SKIP TO QA10]

9 Refused [SKIP TO QA10]

QA7. [IF QA6 = YES] For which programs? [Multiple Record]

1 Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program

2 DO NOT DISPLAY

3 Other [SPECIFY]

4 Home Performance with ENERGY STAR

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA8. [IF QA6 = YES] Approximately how many GJGNY-funded audits has your company performed for these other NYSERDA programs since September 2010? [MIN=0 MAX = 2000, where 2000 = 2000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA9. [IF QA6 = YES] Approximately what percentage of these audits for other NYSERDA programs do you think your company would have done had they not been available for free or at a reduced cost?
[MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA10. Were any of the GJGNY-subsidized audits that your company performed a result of referrals by Constituency-Based Organizations (CBOs)?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

[IF ASKED : A Constituency-Based Organization is an organization that provides services to economically or socially disadvantaged persons within a specified community, and which is supported by members of the community in which it operates. CBOs work in NYSERDA's Outreach Program to encourage residents, small businesses, not-for-profit organizations (NFP), and multifamily building owners to participate in energy-efficiency programs, by referring them to NYSERDA programs or energy efficiency contractors.”]

QA11. [IF QA10 = YES] Approximately how many? [MIN=0 MAX =2000 , where 2000 = 2000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QA12. After customers receive their Energy Reduction Plan (ERP), what is the ONE most important barrier that prevents customers from implementing or installing measures through the Multifamily Performance Program? [DO NOT READ, ACCEPT ONE RESPONSE]

01 NOT ENOUGH MONEY AVAILABLE/LACK OF BUDGET

02 LACK OF TIME

03 THE HASSLE OF SCHEDULING, ETC.

04 WAITING FOR OLD EQUIPMENT TO BREAK/WEAR OUT

05 GATHERING ENERGY USE DATA

06 NOT RECEIVING MEANINGFUL INFORMATION FROM AUDIT/NOT

UNDERSTANDING AUDIT REPORT

07 NOT QUALIFYING/CHANGES IN PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS/SAVINGS TO

INVESTMENT RATIO

08 HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES HAS TO BE FIXED BEFORE IMPLEMENTING

MEASURES.

09 THEY FEEL THEY CAN DO BETTER GOING ON THEIR OWN AND SHOPPING

FOR INDIVIDUAL SAVINGS.

10 OTHER (SPECIFY): _____ [RECORD VERBATIM]

11 NONE

98 Don't know

99 Refused

QA13. Do you think the availability of subsidized audits has led to an increase in your implementation of energy efficiency measures through the Multifamily Performance Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA14. [IF QA13 = NO] Why not?

01 COMPANY ALREADY OFFERED Reduced cost AUDITS

02 CUSTOMERS GETTING AUDITS DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH MONEY TO PAY FOR

INSTALLATIONS/ECONOMIC CONDITION

03 CUSTOMERS GET AUDIT JUST BECAUSE IT IS Subsidized OR OUT OF CURIOSITY

BUT AREN'T INTERESTED IN INSTALLING MEASURES

04 PROGRAM IS COMPLICATED/REQUIREMENTS ARE TOO BURDENSOME

05 THERE ARE TOO MANY Companies OUT THERE SIMPLY JUST TO DO

THE subsidized AUDITS AND GET THE INCENTIVE AND ARE NOT INTERESTED IN
DOING THE OTHER MEASURES.

06 DON'T THINK IT'S ATTRACTING NEW CUSTOMERS. NEW

CUSTOMERS ARE COMING FROM companies, BECAUSE THEY'RE ALREADY DOING
THE MARKETING.

07 MEASURES NOT COST EFFECTIVE / PEOPLE EXPECT HIGHER INCENTIVES

08 Other (specify) _____

98 Don't know

99 Refused

QA15. Do you think the availability of GJGNY-subsidized audits has led to an increase in the
comprehensiveness of your projects through the Multifamily Performance Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA16. Do you think the availability of GJGNY-subsidized audits has led to an increase in the number of
your contracts through the Multifamily Performance Program?

1 YES

2 NO

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA17. Approximately what percentage of all of your company's GJGNY audits resulted in your company implementing recommended energy efficient measures for the customer? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA18. Since the introduction to MPP of GJGNY-funded low-cost financing in June 2011, did any of the MPP customers for whom your company provided energy efficiency services or improvements take out a GJGNY-funded loan in order to finance these services or improvements?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QA19. [IF QA18 =Yes] Approximately how many? [RANGE = 0 TO 997]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

QA20. [IF QA18=Yes AND QA19 >= 0 AND < 998] Approximately what percentage of the services or improvements supported by GJGNY financing do you think your company would have done had low cost GJGNY financing not been available? [MIN=0%, MAX=100%]

_____ (Numeric response)

998 Don't know

999 Refused

LOCATIONS

QL1. How many office locations does your company have in New York State?[MIN= 1, MAX = 5000, where 5000 = 5000 or more]

_____ (Numeric response)

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QL2. [IF QL1 = 2 to 5000]: Thinking of all the work that your company has performed related to MPP since September 2010, out of how many of your New York State office locations was this work performed? {RANGE 0 TO 50, where 50 = 50 or more}

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

POSITIONS

QP1. The following series pertains to the STAFF who participates in providing MPP-related services. We will ask you the positions or job titles held, followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

a. what are the types or titles of staff positions that have been involved in conducting these MPP-related services?[RECORD NAME OF EACH INDIVIDUAL POSITION TYPE]and

b. For the [READ EACH POSITION FROM QP1a] position, on average, approximately how many hours were spent per MPP project ?Again, if a single person performs multiple functions, please add the total hours worked by that single individual across all job functions.[RECORD HOURS SEPARATELY FOR EACH POSITION] Range = 1 to 2000, where 2000 = 2000 or more 9998=Don't know 9999=Refused

	a. Types/titles of staff positions involved in MPP – related services (Examples: Project Manager, Auditor, Analyst, Office Support, Installer, etc.)	b. Average number of hours <u>per project</u> involved in MPP-related services
A. Position 1		
B. Position 2		

X. Position 10		

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. After GJGNY-funds were introduced to the Multifamily Performance Program in September 2010 has your company needed to hire additional staff for any positions because of an increase in workload from MPP-related activity?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA2. [IF QJA1=YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to MPP.

[ASK a. through g. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Were jobs added at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of MPP-related activity?

1 Yes [ASK b. through g.]

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] jobs added because of MPP-related activity? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many full time [POSITION FROM QP1] were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

d. How many part time [POSITION FROM QP1] were added? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

e. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were added as [POSITION FROM QP1] ? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

f. [IFQAJ2e >0]How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

g. [IFQAJ2e >0]How many FTEs would have been added at this position if there had been no MPP activity? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = Dk, 99 = Ref

[Definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of MPP-related activity	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was added	c. Number of Full Time Jobs Added	d. Number of Part Time Jobs Added	e. Total FTEs added	f. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?	g. Total FTEs that would have been added if there had been no MPP-related activity
<i>Example: Analyst</i>	<i>Albany</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>	<i>0</i>

QJA3. Since the introduction of the GJGNY-funding in September 2010, has your company been able to retain staff because of an increase in workload from MPP-related activity who would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QJA4. [IF QJA3=YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to MPP.

[ASK a. through f. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Were jobs retained at the [POSITION FROM QP1] position because of MPP-related activity?

1 Yes [ASK b. through g.]

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION from QP1] retained because of MPP-related activity? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

c. How many full time [POSITION from QP1] were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

d. How many part time [POSITION from QP1] were retained? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

e. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were retained as [POSITION from QP1] ? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

f. [IF QJA4e>0]How many FTEs would have been retained at this position if there had been no increase in MPP workload after the introduction of GJGNY funds in September 2010? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50, 50 = 50 or more] 98 = DK 99 = Ref

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained because of MPP-related activity	b. Cities or towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Number of Full Time Jobs retained	d. Number of Part Time Jobs retained	e. Total FTEs retained	f. Total FTEs that would have been retained if there had been no increased MPP workload
<i>Example: Auditor</i>	<i>Albany</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>0</i>

POSITION QUALIFICATIONS & WAGE LEVELS

[IF QJA1 OR QJA3 = YES, FOR EACH OF THE POSITIONS MENTIONED IN QJA2a OR QJA4a, ASK] REPEAT FOR EACH POSITION MENTIONED, Up to 10. For each position, ask a first followed immediately by b.

QPQ1. Thinking about the position of (READ IN EACH POSITION FROM QJA2a OR QJA4a) that you have identified as having been added or retained because of MPP-related activity:

- a. What are the minimum educational requirements for this position? (SEE below)
- b. What special licenses, certificates, or other training are required for this position? [RECORD]

<i>Position added or retained [LIST QJA2a AND</i>	<i>a. Minimum educational requirements for this position 1</i>	<i>b. Special licenses, certificates, or other training</i>	
---	--	---	--

<i>QJA4a]</i>	<i>= No requirement</i> <i>2 = HS diploma / GED</i> <i>3 = Some college, no degree</i> <i>4 = Associate or Vocational degree</i> <i>5 = Bachelor's degree</i> <i>6 = Graduate degree</i> <i>7 = Other (please specify)</i> <i>8 Don't know</i> <i>9 Refused</i>	<i>required for this position</i>	
---------------	---	-----------------------------------	--

c. What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the each of the following positions which were added or retained because of MPP-related activity? For (POSITION), what is the typical hourly wage range? Just stop me when I get to the right category 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position Added [LIST QJA2a]	2013 typical hourly wage range										11 Position is commission-based
	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00-\$14.99	3 \$15.00-\$19.99	4 \$20.00-\$24.99	5 \$25.00-\$29.99	6 \$30.00-\$34.99	7 \$35.00-\$39.99	8 \$40.00-\$44.99	9 \$45.00-\$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	

Position Retained [LIST QJA4a]	2013 typical hourly wage range										
	1 Under \$10.0 0	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	11 Position is commission -based

d. (ASK FOR EACH POSITION AFTER ALL a, b, AND c ARE ASKED) If your company needs to recruit qualified workers for [POSITION FROM QP1]in the future, do you anticipate difficulties doing so?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. Did your company need to increase the responsibilities of existing staff to conduct the MPP-related work after the introduction of GJGNY funding in September 2010? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

9 Refused

QEP2. [IF QEP1 =YES] You mentioned that several positions in your company were involved in work related to MPP.

[ASK for each position listed in QP1]

a. Did any employees in existing [POSITION FROM QP1] positions see an increase in responsibilities?

1 Yes

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. [If QEP2a = YES] How many staff members in this position experienced an increase in responsibilities?
[MIN=0, MAX=50]

_____ (Numeric response)

98 Don't know

99 Refused

c. [If QEP2a = YES] How many of the staff members in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? [Min 0 , Max = 50, where 50 = 50 or more, 98 = DK
99 = REF

_____Number

C1. [If QEP2c >0<98] In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities	b. Number that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of staff members in the position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level.	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
<i>Example: Project Manager</i>	2	2	<i>Albany, White Plains</i>

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

d. What was the average hourly wage range for [POSITION FROM QEP2c] positions that saw a wage increase prior to the increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase										11 Position is commissi on-based
	1 Under \$10.00	2 \$10.00- \$14.99	3 \$15.00- \$19.99	4 \$20.00- \$24.99	5 \$25.00- \$29.99	6 \$30.00- \$34.99	7 \$35.00- \$39.99	8 \$40.00- \$44.99	9 \$45.00- \$49.99	10 Over \$50.00	

[FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP2c, ASK]

e. What was the average hourly wage increase for [POSITION FROM QEP2c]positions that saw a wage increase? 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

Position [LIST QEP2a IF QEP2c = YES]	hourly wage increase							
	1 Under \$2.00	2 \$2.00- \$3.99	3 \$4.00- \$5.99	4 \$6.00- \$7.99	5 \$8.00- \$9.99	6 \$10.00- \$11.99	7. Over \$12.00	8 Position is commission based

OTHER JOB IMPACTS

QOJ1. Some employment is subject to seasonal variations. Employment seasonality could take two forms, one is layoffs and the other is reductions in work hours for several weeks or months of the year. After the introduction of GJGNY funding in September 2011, have MPP-related activities impacted the seasonality or continuity of employment for any of your company’s employees?

1 Yes

2 No [GO TO QJP1]

8 Don’t know [GO TO QJP1]

9 Refused [GO TO QJP1]

QOJ2. [IF QOJ1 = YES] The following questions seek to understand the impact, since the introduction of GJGNY funding in September 2010, of MPP-related activities on both forms of seasonal impacts: layoffs and reduced-hour work weeks.

You have reported that several positions in your company were involved in work related to MPP.

[ASK a. through e. for each position listed in QP1]

a. Does the [POSITION FROM QP1] position in your company normally experience a seasonal employment impact related to audit/installation/loan activities?

1 Yes

2 No [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

8 Don't know [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

9 Refused [REPEAT a. with next position from QP1]

b. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION if QOJ2a = YES] Since the introduction of GJGNY funding in September 2010, how many employees in this position avoided layoffs or had shorter seasonal layoffs because of MPP activities? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

c. [IFQOJ2b >0] For these employees, what was the average number of unemployed work weeks avoided? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

d. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION if QOJ2a = YES] How many employees in this position avoided reduced-hours work weeks or had fewer reduced-hour work weeks because of MPP-related activities? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

e. [IFQOJ2d >0] For these employees, on average, how many reduced-hour work weeks were avoided per employee? [MIN= 0, MAX = 50] 98 = Dk 99 = Ref

a. Position that normally experiences a seasonal employment impact related to MPP	b. Number of employees that avoided or had shorter seasonal layoffs	c. Average number of unemployed work weeks avoided per employee	d. Number of employees that avoided or had fewer reduced-hours work weeks	e. Average number of reduced-hours work weeks avoided per employee
---	---	---	---	--

activities				
<i>Example: Installer</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>10</i>

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. You indicated earlier that your company has performed [NUMBER FROM QA1] audits since September 2010. Approximately how many more such audits do you expect to perform over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

_____ (Numeric response) [MIN= 0, MAX = 5000]

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QPJ1a. You indicated earlier that, since June 2011, [Number from QA4] of your MPP customers took out a GJGNY-funded load to finance energy-efficiency services or improvements. Approximately how many more customers do you expect will take out such GJGNY-funded loans over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

_____ (Numeric response) [MIN= 0, MAX = 5000]

9998 Don't know

9999 Refused

QPJ2. You have estimated that your company has added or retained a total of [sum of QJA2e + sum of QJA4e] FTE positions to date because of MPP-related activity.

a. Approximately how many more FTE positions do you anticipate your company will add because of MPP-related activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

b. [IF QPJ2a>0] How many of the jobs that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs? [MIN= 0, MAX = 500] 998 = Dk 999 = Ref

[INSERT LIST OF POSITIONS FROM QP1a]	a. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added because of GJGNY audit/installation/loan activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)	b. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
--------------------------------------	---	--

That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that in about a month, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Multifamily Performance Program). That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts we covered in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be important to the program's future success. NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that survey as well.

Thank you again for your time!

GJGN Y (Jobs) MPP Participant Survey

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from SRBI. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's participation in the Multifamily Performance Program. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

QI1a. May I please speak with [READ-IN CONTACT NAME]?

1 SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT [GO TO QS1]

2 LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE [SCHEDULE CALLBACK]

3 LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY [GO TO QI2]

9 REFUSED [GO TO QI2]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in NYSERDA's MPP Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QS0. Since September 2010, how many projects have you completed through MPP?

OF PROJECTS: _____ (RANGE: 0 – 997; DK: 998, REF: 999)

QS1. As a result of your firm's participation in MPP since September 2010, have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company?

1 Yes [ASK QS2]

2 No [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't Know [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 Refused [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QS2. Considering all MPP projects that your company has participated in since September 2010, have you:
[ASK ALL]

QS2a. Needed to hire property and/or management staff to support these MPP projects?

1 Yes [ASK QS2b]

2 No [ASK QS2b]

8 Don't Know [ASK QS2b]

9 Refused [ASK QS2b]

QS2b. Been able to retain property and/or management staff in your or your organization's employ who otherwise would have been let go?

1 Yes [ASK QS2c]

2 No [ASK QS2c]

8 Don't Know [ASK QS2c]

9 Refused [ASK QS2c]

QS2c. Increased the responsibilities of existing staff to support MPP projects? [This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.]

1 Yes [ASK QN1]

2 No [ASK QN1]

8 Don't Know [ASK QN1]

9 Refused [ASK QN1]

QN1. [IF QS2a =1 OR QS2b = 1 OR QS2c = 1] What is your company's primary business function?

1. Lessors of Residential Buildings and Dwellings (Constructing and leasing residential buildings on their own account, including owner-lessors and building renters who sub-let to others - may manage the property themselves or have others manage it for them.) 531110

2. Residential property managers (Establishments primarily engaged in managing residential real estate for others) 531311

3. Property owners' associations (Condominium and homeowners' associations, tenant associations except advocacy, cooperative owners' associations) 813990

4. Residential Remodelers (Remodeling or repairing existing houses and other residential buildings, either for others or on own account for sale) 236118

5. New Housing For-Sale Builders (Building multifamily buildings on their own account for sale as speculative builders or merchant builders) 236117

6. New Multifamily Housing Construction (Building multifamily residential buildings for others as general contractors) 236116

7. Other [RECORD VERBATIM] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

8. Don't Know [Continue]

9. Refused [Continue]

Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

- a. For which positions in your company were jobs added to support MPP projects?
- b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs added to support MPP projects?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were added at that position and location?
- d. How many of these FTEs were permanent jobs?

[Definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of MPP projects	b. Cities/towns in NY State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	<i>Albany, Troy</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added to support MPP projects?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range											
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00	Commission-based	Gave response in annual salary

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained to support MPP projects?

b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs retained to support MPP projects?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at that position and location?

a. Position that was retained because of MPP projects	b. Cities/towns in NY State where position was retained	c. Total FTEs retained
<i>Example: Data Processor</i>	<i>Buffalo, White Plains</i>	<i>1.6</i>

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained to support MPP projects?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range											
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00	Commission-based	Gave response in annual salary

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. [IF QS2c = YES]

- a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities?
- b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?
- c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.
- d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
<i>Example: Clerk</i>	2	2	<i>Buffalo, Troy</i>

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

What was the average hourly wage range for this position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c =	Hourly wage range prior to increase											
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00	Commis- sion-	Gave response in

YES]												based	annual salary

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for this position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly Wage Increase								
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00	Commi ssion- based	Gave response in annual salary

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF QS2a OR QS2b = YES, READ “You have estimated that you have added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA2c] FTE positions to date to support MPP projects.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Approximately how many [IF QS2a OR QS2b = YES, READ “more”] FTE positions do you anticipate your company will add because of MPP projects over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

b. At what positions will each of these FTEs be added?

c. How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

a. Estimate of how many <u>more</u> FTEs will be added because of MPP projects over next 2 years (by 2015)	b. Position of FTEs added over next 2 years.	c. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	2	1

QR1. [ALL RESPONDENTS] If incentives for developing an Energy Reduction Plan and installing recommended efficiency measures had not been available through the MPP, which of the following actions do you think you would have taken? Would you have:

- 1 Not paid for the development of an ERP

- 2 Paid for the development of the ERP but not installed any measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan

- 3 Paid for the development of the ERP but postponed installation of the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan by more than one year

- 4 Paid for the development of the ERP but installed fewer measures than recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan

- 5 Paid for the development of the ERP and installed the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan s around the same time and paid the full price for the installation

- 6 Done something else (SPECIFY _____)

8 Don't Know

9 Refused

QAL0. Did you take advantage of the low-interest rate financing available through the MPP?

1 Yes [CONTINUE]

2 No [End]

8 Don't Know [End]

9 Refused [End]

QAL1. If low-interest rate financing had not been available through the MPP, would you have sought financing from another source?

Yes [ASK QAL2]

No [QAL3]

Don't Know [End]

Refused [End]

QAL2. (IF QAL1=1) From whom would you have sought financing?

1 Same lending institution [End]

2 A different lending institution [End]

3 Other (RECORD VERBATIM) [End]

8 Don't Know [End]

9 Refused [End]

QAL3. (IF QAL1=2) If you had not obtained low-interest rate financing through the MPP, which of the following actions do you think you would have taken? Would you have:

1 Not installed the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan

2 Installed fewer measures than recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan

3 Installed the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan s around the same time

4 Postponed installation of the measures recommended in the Energy Reduction Plan by more than one year

5 Done something else (SPECIFY)

8 Don't know

9 Refused

[END OF SURVEY] This concludes our survey. On behalf of NYSERDA, thank you very much for your time today.

GJGN Y (Jobs) MPP Implementation Contractor Survey

MPP IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTOR/ QUALITY ASSURANCE CONTRACTOR NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

SCREENING

QS1. Thinking of all of the activities you and others in your firm have performed as the Implementation/Quality Assurance Contractor for the Multifamily Performance Program (MPP) since September 2010, has your firm experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload as a result of those activities?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES] As a result of that increase in workload, has your firm: [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. hired additional staff?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

QN1. [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES] What is your company's primary business function?

1 Engineering Services 541330

2 Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3 Architectural Services 541310

4 Building Inspection Services 541350

5 Other [Specify _____] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company primary business function.]

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

- a. Which positions in your company were added because of MPP implementation/quality assurance activities?
- b. At which locations in New York state were jobs added?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions were added?
- d. How many of these FTEs were permanent positions?

a. Position that was added because of MPP implementer/QA activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
Example: Office Staff	Albany, Troy	1.4	1.0

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of MPP implementation activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

a. In which positions in your company were jobs retained because of MPP implementation activities?

b. At which locations in New York State were jobs retained in each position?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at each position?

a. Position that was retained because of MPP implementer/QA activities	b. City or town in New York State where position was retained	c. Total FTEs retained
Example: Data Processor	Buffalo, White Plains	1.6

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of MPP implementation/QA activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. [IF QS2c = YES]

a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of MPP implementation/QA activities?

b. How many FTEs in each of those positions experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in each of those position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

e. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in each position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response]

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of MPP implementer/QA activities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for each position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for each position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF Qs2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “You have estimated that your firm added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA3c] FTE positions because of MPP implementation/QA activities.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate your company will add staff because of MPP implementation/QA activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] What positions do you anticipate adding over the next two years?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next two years because of MPP implementation/QA activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next two years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of MPP implementer/QA activities	c. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of MPP implementer/QA activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs

GJGNY (Jobs) MPP Lender Survey

MPP LENDER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

SCREENING

QS1. As a result of your firm’s participation in offering Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) financing for the Multifamily Performance Program (MPP), have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company since the loans were first offered in June 2011?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES] Considering all of the activities that you and others in your organization have performed to date related to GJGNY loans for the MPP, has your company: [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. needed to hire additional staff for any position because of MPP loan activities?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff because of MPP loan activities? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

QN1. [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES] What is your company's primary business function?

1. Commercial Banking 522110

2. Savings Institutions 522120

3. Credit Unions 522130

4. Other [Specify _____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company primary business function.]

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the following questions in this survey will ask about hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs added because of MPP loan activities?

b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs added because of MPP loan activities?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were added at that position?

d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[Pull down definition for FTE : An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of MPP loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
<i>Example: Loan Officer</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of MPP loan activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

- a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained because of MPP loan activities?
- b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs retained because of MPP loan activities?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalentents (FTEs) were retained at that position?

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained because of MPP loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	e. Total FTEs retained
<i>Example: Data Processor</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of MPP loan activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1 [IF QS2c = YES]

- a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of MPP loan activities?
- b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in?
- c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.
- d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of MPP loan activities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
<i>Example: Clerk</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for this position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for this position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF Qs2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “You have estimated that you have added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA3c] FTE positions to date because of MPP loan activities.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of MPP loan activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] At what positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of MPP loan activities?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “more”] FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next 2 years because of MPP loan activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of MPP loan activities	c. Estimate of how many <u>more</u> FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of MPP loan activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	2	1

Small Business/Not-For-Profit (SB/NFP)⁹³

SBB/NFP Audit Contractor Survey

SB/NFP AUDIT CONTRACTOR NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

INTRO. Hello, my name is ___ calling from NMR . We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's role as Audit Contractor for the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program. We would like to learn about the jobs impacts on your company of being Audit Contractor of this program. All your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. May I please speak with [RESPONDENT NAME]?

- 1 YES--Speaking with listed respondent
- 2 NO--Listed respondent not available (arrange callback)
- 3 Listed respondent no longer with company
- 9 REFUSED--Thank and terminate

⁹³ The Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program is now referred to as the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency Program (SCEE), and audits are referred to as assessments in this program, SCEE and small commercial assessments are used in the body of this report.

QI1. [ASK IF INTRO=3,9] Is there someone else who would know about your company's role in NYSERDA's Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program?

1 Yes [ASK FOR NAME AND PHONE #. THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW

WITH BEST CONTACT]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI2. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program?

1 Yes

2 No [READ: "We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about

your company's experience with the SB/NFP Program. Could you give me the name

and telephone number of this person?" THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHED INTERVIEW

WITH BEST CONTACT]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QN1. What is your company's primary business function?

1 Engineering Services 541330

2 Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3 Architectural Services 541310

4 Building Inspection Services 541350

5 Other [Specify] [RECORD VERBATIM] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company activities.]

8 Don't know

9 Refused

SCREENING

QS1. As a result of your company's role as the Audit Contractor for the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program (SB/NFP), have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

QS2a. [ASK IF QS1=1] Thinking of all of the activities that you and others in your organization have performed to date as the Audit Contractor for the SB/NFP Program, has your company needed to hire additional staff for any position because of SB/NFP auditing activities?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

QS2b. [ASK IF QS1=1] Because of your role as the Audit Contractor for the SB/NFP Program, has your company been able to retain any staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

QS2c. [ASK IF QS1=1] Has your company increased the responsibilities of existing staff because of SB/NFP audit activities? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

8 Don't know

JOBS ADDED

QJA1. [ASK IF QS2a=1] The following series of questions pertains to the STAFF who participates in all of the activities that your company has performed related to your role as audit contractor for the SB/NFP Program. We will ask you the positions or job titles held by staff who were added or retained, or who saw an increase in responsibility. This will be followed by a series of questions about EACH of the positions mentioned. We realize that in some organizations a single individual can have multiple job titles or functions. When that is the case, please consider the primary job title that person uses.

Also, some of these questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 20 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.5 FTEs.

a. For which positions in your company were jobs added because of SB/NFP auditing activities?

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE ADDED:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION] jobs added because of auditing activity for SB/NFP? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many total FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) were added at that position?

d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[If RESPONDENT BRINGS UP ISSUE OF CONTRACT EXTENSION, USE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE TO REQUEST SEPARATE ESTIMATES IF CONTRACT IS EXTENDED AND IF IT IS NOT. " Please keep in mind that, as evaluators, we have no involvement in program contract decisions. That being said, could you please estimate how many of the FTEs that you have added would continue as permanent positions if your contract is extended, and how many would continue as permanent positions if your contract is not extended."]

a. Position that was added because of SB/NFP auditing activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

QJA2. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION REPORTED IN QJA1] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for each of the positions added because of Small Business Program auditing activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

JOBS RETAINED

QJA3. [ASK IF QS2b=1]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained because of SB/NFP auditing activities?

[FOR EACH POSITION AT WHICH JOBS WERE retained:]

b. In what cities or towns in New York State were [POSITION] jobs retained because of auditing activity auditingy for SB/NFP? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

c. How many total FTE's (full-time equivalent employees) were retained at that position?

a. Position that was retained because of SB/NFP auditing activities	b. City or town in New York State where position was retained	c. Total FTEs retained

QJA4. [ASK IF QJA3a IS NOT BLANK FOR EACH POSITION REPORTED] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for each of the positions retained because of Small Business Program auditing activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSTION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1. [ASK IF QS2c=1] Earlier you said that some of your existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of SB/NFP auditing activity.

a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of SB/NFP auditing activities?

[FOR EACH POSITION NAMED:]

b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of SB/NFP auditing activities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level

QEP2. [ASK FOR EACH POSITION REPORTED IN QEP1]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for these positions prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

QEP4. a. For each position with a wage increase, what was the average increase in hourly wages?

[FILL OUT A ROW FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WHOSE WAGE RATE INCREASED.]

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED STAFF ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of SB/NFP auditing activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

[IF CONTRACT EXTENSION CAME UP PREVIOUSLY, PREFACE WITH: "If your contract were to be extended,"]

1 Yes

2 No-----> SKIP TO END

8 Don't know-----> SKIP TO END

9 Refused-----> SKIP TO END

QPJ2. [ASK IF QPJ1=1]

- a. At which positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of SB/NFP auditing activity?

- b. For each position in which jobs are added, approximately how many more FTEs do you anticipate your organization will add because of SB/NFP auditing activity over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

- c. How many of the FTEs to be added over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of SB/NFP auditing activity	c. Estimate of how many more FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of MPP implementer activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs

QW1. That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that over the next few weeks, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your participation in NYSERDA's SB/NFP Program. That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts focus that we had in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be vital to the program's future success.

NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that interview as well.

Thank you again for your time!

GJGNY (Jobs) SB/NFP Lenders Survey

SB/NFP LENDER NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

SCREENING

QS1. As a result of your firm's participation in offering Green Jobs - Green New York (GJGNY) financing for the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program (SB/NFP), have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company since the loans were first offered in June 2011?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES] Considering all of the activities that you and others in your organization have performed to date related to GJGNY loans for the SB/NFP, has your company: [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. needed to hire additional staff for any position because of SB/NFP loan activities?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff because of SB/NFP loan activities? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

QN1. [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES] What is your company's primary business function?

1. Commercial Banking 522110

2. Savings Institutions 522120

3. Credit Unions 522130

4. Other [Specify _____][VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company primary business function.]

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the following questions in this survey will ask about hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

QJA1. [IF QS2a = YES]

- a. For which positions in your company were jobs added because of SB/NFP loan activities?
- b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs added because of SB/NFP loan activities?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalentents (FTEs) were added at that position?
- d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?

[Pull down definition for FTE An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of SB/NFP loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
<i>Example: Loan Officer</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of SB/NFP loan activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

QJA3. [IF QS2b = YES]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained because of SB/NFP loan activities?

b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs retained because of SB/NFP loan activities?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at that position?

[Pull down definition for FTE in e.: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was retained because of SB/NFP loan activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	e. Total FTEs retained
<i>Example: Data Processor</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>	<i>1.4</i>

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of SB/NFP loan activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00-\$14.99	\$15.00-\$19.99	\$20.00-\$24.99	\$25.00-\$29.99	\$30.00-\$34.99	\$35.00-\$39.99	\$40.00-\$44.99	\$45.00-\$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1 [IF QS2c = YES]

- a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of SB/NFP loan activities?
- b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in?
- c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.
- d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of SB/NFP loan activities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. Number FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
--	---	--	---

<i>Example: Clerk</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>Albany, Buffalo</i>

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for this position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00 - \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00 - \$49.99	Over \$50.00

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for this position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF Qs2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “You have estimated that you have added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA3c] FTE positions to date because of SB/NFP loan activities.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of SB/NFP loan activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] At what positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of SB/NFP loan activities?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “more”] FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next 2 years because of SB/NFP loan activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of SB/NFP loan activities	c. Estimate of how many <u>more</u> FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of SB/NFP loan activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	2	1

GJGNY (Jobs) SB/NFP Project Expeditor Survey

SB/NFP PROJECT EXPEDITOR NAME:

CONTACT NAME:

PHONE:

EMAIL:

INTERVIEW DATE:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is ___ calling from NMR. We are conducting a survey on behalf of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, NYSERDA, regarding your firm's role as a Project Expeditor in the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program. All of your responses will be combined with answers from other respondents and all of your information will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

NOTE: ASK QI1a first, THEN QI2, THEN QI1

QI1a. May I please speak with [READ-IN CONTACT NAME]?

1. SPEAKING WITH LISTED RESPONDENT [GO TO QI1]
2. LISTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE [SCHEDULE CALLBACK]
3. LISTED RESPONDENT NO LONGER WITH COMPANY [GO TO QI2]
9. REFUSED [GO TO QI2]

QI1. First, my records indicate that [SB/NFP PROJECT EXPEDITOR NAME] is currently working as a project expeditor in NYSERDA's Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program. Is this correct?

1 YES [GO TO QI3]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

8 Don't know [GO TO QI2]

9 Refused [GO TO QI2]

QI2. Is there someone else who would know about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program?

1 YES [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

2 NO [THANK AND TERMINATE]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

QI3. Just to confirm, are you the person at your company who is most knowledgeable about your experience with the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program?

1 YES

2 NO [READ: We would like to talk to the person who is the most knowledgeable about your company's experience with the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program. Could you give me the name and telephone number of this person?] [ASK FOR NAME: _____ AND TELEPHONE #: _____] [THANK AND TERMINATE. SCHEDULE INTERVIEW WITH BEST CONTACT.]

9 REFUSED [THANK AND TERMINATE]

SCREENING

QS1. As a result of your company's role as a Project Expeditor for the Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program (SB/NFP), have you experienced either a permanent or temporary increase in workload for your company since you first took on this role in February 2012?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No -----> THANK AND TERMINATE
- D Don't know -----> THANK AND TERMINATE
- R Refused -----> THANK AND TERMINATE

QS2 [IF QS1 = YES] Considering all of the activities that you and others in your organization have performed to date related to your role as Project Expeditor for SB/NFP, has your company: [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

a. needed to hire additional staff for any position because of Project Expeditor related activities?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know
- R Refused

b. been able to retain staff that would otherwise have been let go?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

c. increased the responsibilities of existing staff because of Project Expeditor related activities? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

1 Yes

2 No

D Don't know

R Refused

QI4. [IF QS2a =YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES] What is your company's primary business function?

1. Engineering Services 541330

2. Other Management Consulting Services (management consulting services except administrative and general management consulting; human resources consulting; marketing consulting; or process, physical distribution, and logistics consulting) 541618

3. Architectural Services 541310

4. Building Inspection Services 541350

5. Other [Specify_____] [VERY IMPORTANT: Record specific details of company primary business function.]

JOB ADDITIONS/RETENTIONS

[IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES OR QS2c = YES, READ] Some of the questions in the remainder of this survey will ask about changes in hiring, retention, or promotions in your company. These questions will ask for information in terms of number of jobs and also in terms of number of FTEs. In answering the questions in terms of FTEs, please keep in mind that an FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule. So one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40 hours full-time week of is 0.25 FTEs.

QJA1. [IF QS2a= YES]

- a. For which positions in your company were jobs added because of Project Expeditor related activities?
- b. At which location(s) in New York State were jobs added because of Project Expeditor related activities?
- c. How many total Full Time Equivalentents (FTEs) were added at that position?
- d. How many of these FTEs were permanent positions?

[Definition for FTE: An FTE is the total hours worked in a job divided by the number of hours in a full-time schedule, so one full time job is equal to 1 FTE, and one part time job working 10 hours of a 40-hour full-time week is 0.25 FTEs.]

a. Position that was added because of Project Expeditor related activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was added	c. Total FTEs added	d. How many of the added FTEs were permanent positions?
<i>Example: Office Staff</i>	<i>Albany, White Plains</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.0</i>

QJA2. [IF QS2a = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions added because of Project Expedito related activities?

Position Added [LIST QJA1a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

QJA3. [IF QJA3=YES]

a. For which positions in your company were jobs retained because of Project Expedito related activities?

b. At which location(s) in New York State have you been able to retain jobs because of Project Expedito related activities?

c. How many total Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were retained at that position?

a. Position that was retained because of Project Expedito related activities	b. Cities/towns in New York State where position was retained	c. Total FTEs retained
<i>Example: Data Processor</i>	<i>Buffalo, White Plains</i>	<i>1.6</i>

QJA4. [IF QS2b = YES] What is the 2013 typical hourly wage range for the positions retained because of Project Expeditor related activities?

Position Retained [LIST QJA3a]	2013 typical hourly wage range									
	Under \$10.00	\$10.00- \$14.99	\$15.00- \$19.99	\$20.00- \$24.99	\$25.00- \$29.99	\$30.00- \$34.99	\$35.00- \$39.99	\$40.00- \$44.99	\$45.00- \$49.99	Over \$50.00

EXISTING POSITION WAGE LEVEL CHANGES

QEP1 [IF QS2c=YES]

a. Which positions of existing staff saw an increase in responsibilities because of Project Expeditor related activities?

b. How many FTEs in that position experienced an increase in responsibilities?

c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities saw an increase in their wage level? This could be due to a promotion or specialized training or knowledge acquired.

d. In what cities or towns in New York State were the staff members who saw an increase in wage level in that position located? [multiple cities/towns possible for response] RECORD VERBATIM.

a. Position that saw an increase in responsibilities because of Project Expeditor related activities	b. Number of FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities	c. How many of the FTEs in that position that experienced an increase in responsibilities and saw an increase in their wage level?	d. Cities or towns in New York State where position saw an increase in wage level
<i>Example: Clerk</i>	<i>2.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>Buffalo, White Plains</i>

QEP2. [FOR EACH STAFF MEMBER WITH INCREASED WAGES MENTIONED IN QEP1c, ASK]

a. What was the average hourly wage range for this position prior to the wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF	Hourly wage range prior to increase									
	Under	\$10.00-	\$15.00-	\$20.00-	\$25.00-	\$30.00-	\$35.00-	\$40.00-	\$45.00-	Over

QEP1c = YES]	\$10.00	\$14.99	\$19.99	\$24.99	\$29.99	\$34.99	\$39.99	\$44.99	\$49.99	\$50.00

b. What was the average hourly wage increase for this position that saw a wage increase?

Position [LIST QEP1a IF QEP1c = YES]	Hourly wage increase						
	Under \$2.00	\$2.00- \$3.99	\$4.00- \$5.99	\$6.00- \$7.99	\$8.00- \$9.99	\$10.00- \$11.99	Over \$12.00

PROJECTED JOB ADDITIONS

QPJ1. [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES: READ “You have estimated that you have added or retained a total of [sum of QJA1c + sum of QJA3c] FTEs to date because of Project Expeditor related activities.”]

a. [ALL RESPONDENTS] Do you anticipate that your company will add staff because of Project Expeditor related activities over the next 2 years (by 2015)?

1 Yes

2 No -----> SKIP TO END

D Don't know -----> SKIP TO END

R Refused -----> SKIP TO END

b. [IF QPJ1a = YES] At what positions do you anticipate adding staff over the next 2 years because of Project Expeditor related activities?

c. [IF QPJ1a = YES] Approximately how many [IF QS2a = YES OR QS2b = YES, READ “more”] FTEs do you anticipate adding at each position over the next 2 years because of Project Expeditor related activities?

d. [IF QPJ1a = YES] How many of the FTEs at each position that you anticipate adding over the next 2 years are likely to be permanent jobs?

b. Positions with added staff over next 2 years (by 2015) because of Project Expeditor related activities	c. Estimate of how many <u>more</u> FTEs will be added over next 2 years because of Project Expeditor related activities	d. Estimate of number FTEs to be added over the next 2 years that are likely to be permanent jobs
<i>Example: Clerk</i>	2	1

That is the end of our questions for now. Please note that in about a month, you will likely receive a call from another evaluation contractor to answer a few questions about your company's participation in NYSERDA's Small Business/Not-for-Profit Program). That evaluation will have a different focus than the job impacts we covered in today's questions. It too will be critical to helping establish the value of the program and will be important to the program's future success. NYSERDA would genuinely appreciate your cooperation with that survey as well.

Thank you again for your time!