



SCEP
STATE & COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAMS

State Energy Program Bipartisan Infrastructure Law Technical Assistance Workshops

Specialized Tools and Resources

September 21, 2023

Welcome

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt One:** *What topics are you interested in for cohort-based TA (from, or in addition to, our preliminary list)?*
 - **Northeast** (4 SEOs): State Energy Security Plan cohorts*
 - **Mid-Atlantic** (3 SEOs): N/A
 - **Southeast** (4 SEOs): Expanded clarity on the role of State Energy Offices around transmission and distribution planning.
 - **Midwest** (3 SEOs): States need time to review these topics and provide feedback.
 - **Central** (1 SEO): State Energy Security Plans are the top priority right now*
 - **West** (3 SEOs): State Energy Security Plans, specifically equity and financial insecurity for underserved communities*

****SESP TA cohorts led by CESER is already in development. CESER SESP cohorts will cover a range of topics based on state feedback. Cohort participant will not require cohort fees***

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt Two:** *What is the minimum number of participants required to make a TC successful?*
 - **Northeast:** Responses favored a larger number of participants. The more participants, the more successful and useful a TC will be.
 - **Mid-Atlantic:** Responses favored a larger number of participants, with a minimum of 4 participants.
 - **Southeast:** Responses favored a minimum of 5-7 participants.
 - **Midwest:** Responses favored a minimum of 5-7 participants.
 - **Central:** The greater the number, the better (up to 10 participants).
 - **West:** Responses favored a minimum of 2 participants.

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt Three:** *How important is regional grouping vs. regional diversity in a cohort of states?*
 - **Northeast:** Valuable to have both regional grouping and diversity for state energy security planning (***SESP TA cohorts led by CESER is already in development. CESER SESP cohorts will cover a range of topics based on state feedback. Cohort participant will not require cohort fees**).
 - **Mid-Atlantic:** Regional grouping is more valuable for states facing similar issues. Grouping depends on topic area; e.g., federal programs may lend better to wider grouping (regional diversity) to see what's working nationally.
 - **Southeast:** Regional cohorts are good to learn about feasibility of solutions in the area, but diversity is good to learn about original ideas and touch on topics that regional cohorts may not be able to relate to (or help with). Cohorts grouping based on topic.
 - **Midwest:** Regional cohorts are beneficial for regional issues; for topics that are not region-specific, regional diversity is valuable. With regional grouping, programmatic diversity is helpful for seeing different ways of addressing problems with similar demographics and issues.
 - **Central:** Both are important.
 - **West:** Both are helpful, depending on the topic.

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt Four:** *What is the biggest barrier you've experienced, or anticipate experiencing, in your RLF implementation?*
 - **Northeast:** States anticipate that navigating RLF-specific requirements (namely the Energy Audit Tool) and federal requirements will be barriers for RLF implementation.
 - **Mid-Atlantic:** Navigating federal requirements and designing RLF programs. How are we interweaving financing sources? SEOs will also need to increasingly make sure we're not duplicating funds.
 - **Southeast:** The requirements involved in the RLF program led some states to defer funding.
 - **Midwest:** Navigating federal requirements is the biggest barrier addressed, particularly because these are new requirements to navigate. Designing and setting up programs and identifying and working with partners are also barriers.
 - **Central:** The state is more experienced and better equipped to distribute grants; receiving money back has challenges.
 - **West:** Navigating federal requirements, contracts and procurement services, insufficient number of energy auditors in the state.

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt Five:** *What kind of TA would be most valuable for your RLF implementation?*
 - **Northeast:** The most valuable type of TA are tools, research, and analysis to help with Federal requirements, and next is one-on-one direct TA with subject matter experts or topical webinars.
 - **Mid-Atlantic:** Braiding federal programs and avoiding duplicating federal funds.
 - **Southeast:** Case studies, peer exchanges, and tools, research, and analysis to help with Federal requirements are equally valuable. Tools and resources that give guidance on federal requirements are especially helpful. We need access to specialists – 1:1 interactions, even if short, are helpful.
 - **Midwest:** Tools, research, and analysis to help with federal requirements are most valuable; case studies of model programs and topical webinars are also valuable.
 - **Central:** Case studies, real life examples, and peer exchanges.
 - **West:** Peer exchanges and document review.

Synopsis of Workshop 3

- **Prompt Six:** *Is the format of the TA you want different between initiatives (e.g., RLF vs. TCs vs. Broad Scope)?*
 - **Northeast:** TA formats may be different from program to program because different TA must be applied to navigate the unique requirements that must be met under each program (e.g., Energy Audit Tool for RLF program).
 - **Mid-Atlantic:** Broader topics benefit from broader discussions; more specific topics (e.g., RLF) benefit from one-on-one or small group TA. Long applications for technical assistance can be a barrier; states are careful with TA applications submissions and capacity can be a barrier to submit. Easy-to-access TA are most beneficial. Facilitator-led discussions and small group convenings are helpful.
 - **Southeast:** Type of TA will depend on the topic and what is required to understand that topic.
 - **Midwest:** Resources available on-demand are valuable to avoid waiting for a response. It would also be valuable to have a one-stop shop for on-call TA that can point states toward appropriate resources.
 - **Central:** Yes (but still a preference for real life examples).
 - **West:** TA from national labs to assist states in risk assessment and mitigation for SESP updates in the future (***SESP TA cohorts led by CESER is already in development. CESER SESP cohorts will cover a range of topics based on state feedback. Cohort participant will not require cohort fees**)

Feedback

Closing

- The last workshop is on September 28, 2023.
- Your input is invaluable. We've started hosting our weekly office hours on Fridays from 12:00-2:00 PM ET. We strongly encourage attendees to provide written feedback on prompts to your SEP Project Officer, erin.taylor@hq.doe.gov and/or monica.andrews@hq.doe.gov.

Thank You!



SCEP
STATE & COMMUNITY ENERGY PROGRAMS