

## Questions and Answers on RFP #10-001 for Programs to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions in New Hampshire

RFP Release Date: May 5, 2010  
Proposals Due Date: June 1, 4:30 p.m.

- Q.1 Does Category I include institutions (schools) who have not applied for GHGERF monies but have applied for funds from the local tax payers and OEP [Office of Energy and Planning] monies?
- A.1 *Category I is solely for entities that were awarded grant funds from the GHGERF in 2009. Entities that did not receive a GHGERF award in 2009 are not eligible for this category, even if they applied for or received grant funds from other sources.*
- Q.2 Would a proposal to build a municipal Park and Ride lot in a region that currently lacks one fall within the scope of this RFP?
- A.2 *No. Transportation projects, including a park and ride lot, do not fall within the scope of this RFP because they do not fall within the requirements for Category I, II or III applications.*
- Q.3 Would a college or campus with a broad portfolio of projects be eligible as a "program," even though it might be perceived as a single entity?
- A.3 *No. The RFP is limited to programs that benefit **multiple** entities. An individual college is considered to be a single entity.*
- Q.4 We [2009 GHGERF Grantee] believe we are eligible to submit a proposal in response to RFP GGGERF #10-001 under Category I, and would appreciate confirmation.

Working with local energy committee and municipal stakeholders to understand their energy and carbon footprints, and arrive at and decide on options for audits, and select and act upon projects is more than a 1 year program -- and we acknowledged this in our 2009 proposal to the PUC, i.e.,:

Section 1.10 "A future grant from the PUC would help us perform follow-up inventories in participating towns once their reductions measures are in place."

Section 3 “As the core of the proposed project, we will deliver to 24-48 geographically diverse communities in New Hampshire a series of greenhouse gas emissions inventories, energy audits, follow-up analysis and on-going implementation support, with the ultimate goal of increasing local capacity and demonstrating concrete steps to reduce energy use in underperforming town buildings by 50% within a 60-month time period.”

Page 8 (Step 5) “We anticipate that this work to quantify results will be the focus of a future grant proposal to the RGGI program. “

A.4 *This organization is not eligible to apply for funding under Category 1. The cited references fall short of the requirement in Category 1 that the applicant had provided either a multi-year budget or a multi-year program plan in its 2009 GHGERF proposal. The grantee in this case did not state its proposal was for a multi-year plan, nor did it present a multi-year budget. Rather the grantee indicated an intent to apply for a future grant at some unspecified future time. Similarly, while there was reference to a 60 month timeframe for municipalities to achieve energy reduction projects, there were no specific details on future phases of the program; the scope of work was essentially limited to a one year period. In short, there was an absence of evidence that at the time the proposal was filed, the grantee had specific plans for a second phase of program activity to be funded with GHGERF monies.*

Q.5 The RFP states: The three areas of interest chosen for this solicitation are specific to the development of **programs** as opposed to individual projects.

We are working with a local government entity which has a central campus with multiple buildings that are heated by a central oil fired boiler plant, and we are looking at the possibility of converting the central plant to a wood chip boiler plant. Would the PUC consider this an “individual project” or would it qualify as a “program”.

A.5 *This would be considered an individual project and therefore would not qualify as an eligible program. The RFP states on page 2 that “[p]rograms benefit multiple entities through multiple project sites. Here there is only one entity, a local government entity.*

Q.6 Does a single school district that has a prototype of its proposed energy efficiency program [and] has a demonstrated 90% reduction in building energy usage and that has not previously applied for grants with the PUC qualify for this second RFP or are we excluded? The program is modular, scalable and uses novel approaches with a combination of insulation, energy recovery and energy generation through the use of air source heat pumps. It will be a stretch to use \$1,000,000 as described in Category III.

A.6 *If the proposal will benefit only schools in a single district, it would not qualify as an eligible program; a school district is considered to be a single entity. See Q.5 and A.5 above.*

Q.7 Will there be opportunities in the future for municipalities and small non-profits to receive GHGERF grants for energy efficiency programs or renewable energy installations?

A.7 *There are many categories of eligible programs—as defined the New Hampshire legislature in RSA 125-O:23, II and in PUC Administrative rule 2604.01 -- that the Commission may consider when issuing an RFP. In consultation with the [Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Energy Board](#), the Commission will periodically assess which types of programs will best meet the state's goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Future RFPs may vary in content and focus as a result.*

*Please note that GHGERF monies may only be allocated for energy efficiency, energy conservation and demand response programs. RSA 125-O:23, II. Renewable energy installations are only eligible for funding where it can be shown that such installations will result in an improvement in energy efficiency. For example, in 2009 the GHGERF awarded grant funds for projects in which fossil fuel heating systems were replaced with wood pellet systems that offered significant energy efficiency gains.*

*For information on other possible sources of funding for municipalities and small non-profits, please refer to [Office of Energy and Planning](#) website.*

Q.8 Is a 20 person non-profit residential treatment facility for developmentally disabled individuals considered a low-income housing program which would be eligible for a grant under the low-income housing category for the upcoming GHGERF grants, given that it provides housing for 20 individuals who are not able to live alone and not able to earn enough income to afford to rent or buy their own apartments or homes? Or is their 20 person facility too small for this round of applications?

A.8 *If this proposal would entail a single project at a single facility, it would be ineligible for funding on the grounds that it is not a program that would benefit multiple entities. As described, it appears to be a single project carried out at a single location. In addition, to be eligible for Category III the applicant would have to demonstrate that the residents of the facility “are eligible for federal, state or utility low-income energy assistance, energy efficiency or weatherization programs, or whose income is 60% or less of the state's median household income.” See RFP at p. 12. Finally, in the event the proposal met both of those conditions, the program budget would have to be \$500,000 or higher. The number of residents*

*who would benefit for the project is not necessarily relevant, though in general the Commission is seeking programs that have far-reaching impacts.*

Q.9 The University System of New Hampshire plans on submitting under category II for a program to establish a revolving investment fund for its multiple campuses. A previous Q&A response identifies a college as a single entity, where the University System is addressing 4 main campuses along with various satellite locations that would all qualify for the size limitations under the large energy user definition. Would this program qualify as serving multiple entities?

A.9 *Yes. The colleges within the University System have unique identities and are considered by the Commission to be separate entities. Therefore projects at the various colleges would constitute a program rather than a project.*

Q.10 In Category II, if a program is comprised of 5 or 6 individual projects, do the projects need to be lumped together as one large project, or kept individual, with a sum total of the minimum application amount of \$1,000,000?

A.10 *The **program** budget, comprised of individual projects and other costs such as salary and wages, travel, rent and utilities, etc., must meet the threshold of \$1,000,000. Applicants may describe the individual projects and provide information about the costs and benefits of those projects, including project budgets if so desired.*

Q.11 In Category II, section 5.1 [it] says that applicants must use the Budget Worksheet. Is a worksheet required for each project or for the total program? The worksheet is limited in space, as there are zeros in most of the columns. Are other cost estimate spreadsheets allowed to be used for the cost breakdown?

A.11 *The Budget Worksheet was inadvertently posted as a PDF document, which prevents any entry of data electronically. The document is now re-posted as an Excel spreadsheet to allow for data entry.*

*An applicant's program budget must be entered in the Budget Worksheet. Applicants may also submit budget information regarding projects to be funded through the proposed program. Project budgets may be presented in additional Budget Worksheets or other spreadsheets or formats.*

Q.12 I was confused about the stipulation about having applied for a grant in 2009 – does this specifically mean if we did not apply last year we cannot apply this year?

- A.12 *The requirement in question applies solely to Category 1. Entities that were not awarded GHGERF grant funds in 2009 are not eligible for consideration under that category. However, this requirement does not apply to entities seeking funding under Categories II and III.*
- Q.13 Are your grants awarded specifically to projects in NH because we [entity name deleted] are based in Chicago/California?
- A.13 *Any grants resulting from this RFP will be for programs implemented in New Hampshire only. As stated on p. 2 of the RFP, “[m]onies in this fund must be used to support energy efficiency, conservation and demand response programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions generated within the state.” (emphasis added)*