

Urban Weatherization Initiative

Board Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Friday, July 27, 2012

Meeting was called to order at 11:00AM by UWI Board Chair, Percy Harris

Attendees: **Voting Board Members:** Deborah Harrington, Percy Harris, Melissa Williams

DCEO Staff: Carmen Colvin, Angela Foster, Sarah Atkins

Guests: Dan Olson Project Manager, Energy Impact Illinois (CMAP); Robert Wordlaw Chicago Jobs Council; Dan Lyonsmith CJC; Angela Bailey CJC; Sean Terry Delta Institute; Robert Abeldano Centers for New Horizons; John Keller DCEO; Carol Bell DCEO; Sandra Jones DCEO; Vanessa Roanhorse Delta Institute; Emily Teleman Chicago Jobs Council; Senator Trotter; Director Vaught.

- I. **Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Harrington inquired about the format of the meeting meetings as to why the minutes were in bullet format. Ms. Colvin responded to the inquiry noting that Ms. Atkins had previously typed the minutes and she has since been informed that the minutes need to be in narrative format. Minutes Approved.

- II. **Marketing:** Ms. Jones reported that the plans for marketing stands the same as presented at the last Board Meeting. Ms. Jones reported that they are ready to move forward on getting the word out to draw in more applicants. Ms. Williams inquired about the vision of marketing from this meeting moving forward into the next month. Ms. Jones reported that press plans remain the same and are working on gathering success stories from the program. Mr. Harris would like for the grantees to submit success stories regarding their trainees in the program. Ms. Harrington stated that we did have individuals from the marketing department at E. St. Louis and presumed that those would have been documented. Ms. Harrington was inspired to hear about how many participants have used UWI to leverage opportunities and how it has been a very transformative experience. Ms. Colvin stated that we will be seeking success stories from grantees. Other issues are that we want to make sure that we get the numbers we are looking to achieve. First year a large learning curve and have addressed issues that have been problematic and we are now beginning to see the numbers that we are looking to produce. From an administrative standpoint, we want to make sure the program is going in the direction we want it to go. In the next phase of the RWP's the Residential Weatherization Program that we continue to

see positive numbers and get people employed and get it out in the community to let more people know what is going on. Ms. Williams asked if it was possible for us to do some ads in community newspapers with a list of the grantees for Weatherization Specialist and Home Energy Auditor and if people are interested in training here is the phone number to call for training. Ms. Colvin wanted to know who would coordinate this. Ms. Williams' concern is that the website is great; however the website itself needs to have a link in which people can click on the grantee listed where contact information can come up for individuals to get in contact with the grantee. Secondly, we live in the digital divide where some of these individuals do not have internet access, so if we put it in community newspapers individuals can be able to contact the grantees that are providing the training. Ms. Harrington commended Ms. Williams for her efforts in trying to contact the community in a way that is not necessarily electronic.

- III. Chicago Jobs Council Presentation:** Mr. Robert Wordlaw thanked the Board for inviting him to come and present information to the Board. Mr. Wordlaw realizes the difficult task regarding the program implementation. Mr. Wordlaw stated that he was here representing four groups that are involved in Energy Efficiency: The Delta Institute, Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, Chicago Jobs Council, and Chicago Metropolitan Alliance. Mr. Wordlaw highlighted some areas that he hoped UWI would be interested in. First, the potential use for UWI funds to fill the gaps in other low income programs—ideas related to stop work scenarios go into homes to do work and see other problems and this weatherization is not going to have an impact and how can we move around and begin to work in a way to consolidate with other programs to make homes energy efficient. Vanessa Roanhorse from Delta Institute provided some examples related to stop work scenarios: implemented a weatherization program for the last four years in the city of Chicago. What we see is most of the homes we go into have moisture damage. The problem is we have already invested time and money into the home, so we either have to stop work on the home and not do any more work which is a waste of time/money. We have a problem of not being able to get the work done because of moisture damage on home. These individuals are low income and do not have the money to spend on fixing it. We want to find a way to use funds to fix problems in home. The second potential use Mr. Wordlaw indicated was to look at ways to use some of the resources to support contractors that will be looking to bid on the work and posed the question of is there any way we would be able to create a long term fund or support that could help these contractors become more competent? The other ideas are this: are there other ways we can look at other kinds of training we can use? We want to sit down and go through these items and see if there are ideas we can come up with to be implemented so that all of these programs that are out there can complement each other and not duplicate what is already in motion. In going back to the original intent of UWI, it had an outreach component, a weatherization component, and a training component. Weatherization was the core of it but other things could benefit from it. Have community

groups doing outreach for enrollment for the program. That was supposed to be the structured part of the program. The training was supposed to be done for unemployed residents of areas that are eligible for the training and develop construction skills that would make these individuals apprentices for other businesses. The flexibility seems to have waned and would like to see the program be more flexible. There could be some way to help home owner not only to weatherize it but make it safe and increase the value of the home. We would like to establish long term relationship with UWI and would be willing to do what we could to achieve the goals of UWI. Ms. Colvin spoke about outreach regarding Mr. Wordlaw's presentation saying that the board has focused on outreach and have collaborations with other organizations, and the goal with marketing that is going out is designed to target the unemployed and underemployed individuals in that community. Secondly, the economic engine that was presented, as we move forward into the awarding of the grants, we have stressed with grantees they are required to hire 50% of successful completers and that gets these individuals employed and gives them work experience. In the process of weatherizing homes the goal is to save the consumer money so the homeowner can now go back and procure items in their community. That way the money is being reinvested right in the neighborhood. We are working towards your goal. In the budgets there is a line item for outreach that is a paid activity where grantees pay for outreach to be done. Mr. Harris stated that on all the RFP's we demanded that all the grantees provide outreach, how they are going to do it and where they are going to get people from. These communities had the highest unemployment. We had to cut budget so there was only a certain amount of money for outreach. When we have more money we can put more towards marketing. We as a program have failed on marketing because not everyone has internet, so how can we get more marketing out there. We have to build up more momentum. We need to find out the pitfalls of other programs because we did not want to fail. My primary goal was to make the Black Caucus look good and admire then for pushing this program. The problem is budget cuts. We can repair many items on a home but can't replace everything with the budget. Sen. Trotter commented that Mr. Wordlaw articulated the presentation to the point with the mind set of getting people here and have basic skills to do the work. Want to empower the communities we represent. There are other programs out there that can fix major problems in the home if/when an auditor recognizes problems that are beyond what he/she can do for the homeowner. We can also be a program that can help to make referrals for the homeowner for these other major problems that may be occurring in the home. These dollars were not for this type of work to do major repairs. As we move forward, we could focus on that as this program gets started. As far as marketing, we need to do more ads to catch peoples eye about the program.

- IV. Grantee Update:** Ms. Foster reviewed the grantee update starting with Home Energy Auditor: Site visits have been concluded for the fourth quarter. Ms. Atkins is the grant

manager for the Home Energy Auditor program. The RFA has been completed and is in review and looking to have it posted by July 31, 2012. There is also an announcement on the web page that indicates that it will be coming soon. Mr. Harris inquired about getting ready to put out another round of grants, but we have not named additional communities yet. Ms. Colvin stated that we are going to address that in this meeting which is why we have not moved forward yet in this process. Ms. Foster stated that, once we have the communities identified, we do have the RFP document ready to go. Ms. Colvin reminded the Board that the current Home Energy Auditor program expires at the end of October and if the RFP goes out this month, the purpose is so that the program doesn't experience any interruption. Mr. Harris would like to have all the time lines printed up and sent to the Board Members. Ms. Foster commented on the certification numbers stating that they have not changed since the last meeting with the exception of Hispanic American Construction Industry Association (HACIA), their certification numbers have jumped from 7 to 12 at this point. Mr. Harris inquired about the total number of trainees certified. Ms. Colvin reported that the total is 121 we are at 64 right now, if I add the additional 6 that HACIA did, we are now at 70. Mr. Harris stated that the reason he asks these questions is that if we hire 50% from this pool, we have to make sure we have enough to pick from. Ms. Colvin stated that it is also why we stated that if you cannot hire, tell us the justification as to why. Ms. Foster referenced the Weatherization Specialist Training program, Ms. Davis who is the grant manager will be out for a short time. All of the site visits for the second quarter for those grants have been scheduled. Ms. Atkins and Ms. Foster will provide the coverage for those grants to ensure they are completed. The RFA schedule has been completed and Ms. Foster is currently working on combining the RFA/RFQ so that we can get that out in August. Ms. Colvin reminded the Board that this grant expires September 31, 2012 and the reason for getting it out is so there is continuity for the program. Ms. Foster reported that the certification numbers are still the same for the Weatherization Specialist program with a total of 52 certified out of 314. Ms. Colvin stated that this grant is still early, and we anticipate in the next quarter reports that these numbers will jump substantially. Mr. Harris inquired about the modifications, and if these modifications will affect the numbers. Ms. Colvin stated that she would like to discuss that during the Executive Session.

- V. Budget:** Ms. Colvin sent out budget, there were some modifications made. In the last budget, there was a substantial number of training programs going through 2016. Ms. Colvin indicated that she has reduced those significantly. In the new budget, I have reduced the number of trainees. As the program grows we will need to have more funding available to do more houses. Ms. Colvin has increased expenditures for Home Energy Auditor and Weatherization Specialist training in that next year hoping to have 25, the year after, 40, the year after that, 50, the year after that, 60. In reference to the Residential Weatherization program, we have received 29 proposals out of that, I am hoping we can award a minimum of 25, next year jumping to 80, the year after that, 140, the year after that, 200. Taking that

into consideration, we are looking at a total expenditure of \$408 Million. In reference to marketing there has been no specific line item for marketing because Ms. Colvin was not sure what kind of budgeting needs to be required for this, but Ms. Colvin will build this in to the budget, so that she can move forward. The board needs to make a decision to cap the amount of training per grantee in order to spend \$6500 to \$7000 for Home Energy Auditor and \$4500 to \$5500 for Weatherization Specialist. When next round of proposals come in they will know up front not to send us grants that are \$9000 per person. A high dollar amount per person, does not necessarily translate into successful trainees in the program. As a part of the next round we are going to incorporate a curriculum for the grantees, so they will have to follow a standardized curriculum that's meeting a minimum criteria. Ms. Colvin would like a clear definition from the Board of the accuracy of the projections and/or what needs to be incorporated into the budget. The CFO has spoken with Ms. Colvin in regards to how we are going to spend this money and what is our plan. Mr. Harris does not have an issue with increasing the number of grantees in training, but likes the idea of increase the homes. Another concern is to have a marketing line so we know what to spend there. We also need to know about travel reimbursements of board members. Ms. Colvin stated that she anticipated that this would come from Administrative costs. Ms. Colvin requested a dollar amount from Mr. Harris regarding travel costs. Sen. Trotter stated that the state has a scheduled cost for travel reimbursements because there is a formula out there for travel. Ms. Harrington inquired about a question related to marketing which goes back to the RFA's language that requires the grantees to do outreach. Wanted to know if there is a way to put that into the RFA. At the end of the grant period we could look back and see what outreach was done. Maybe we can make it part of the site visit. Ms. Foster commented that it is already part of the site visit summary. Ms. Harrington wanted to know the assessment so far as to the grantees outreach efforts. Ms. Foster reported that some are doing better than others and all are doing marketing. Each agency is doing it differently, so it varies, but they are doing marketing. Mr. Harris discussed the UWI logo in that all grantees did not have it at one point and that it needed to be included on the marketing material. Ms. Foster stated that the logo went out to all the grantees. Mr. Harris said part of the problem is that he has not seen any of the flyers that do not have the logo on it. We don't know if they are advertising our program. Ms. Foster indicated that when we sent out the email with the logo, we indicated that all marketing materials need to be approved by the grant manager before it is sent out. This will allow us to make sure we have the logo and know where the marketing is being sent out to from our grantees. Ms. Jones suggested that instead of waiting for grantees to do marketing, we have a template that we could send to the grantees to help them with their marketing/outreach efforts. All they have to do is distribute it instead of creating it. Sen. Trotter suggested changing the name and create a new face for the program that stands out. Mr. Keller suggested creating a cartoon logo that is visual not word based and we can create a whole marketing packet for the grantees. Gather hard data from each grantees marketing efforts (i.e. how many people did you hand flyers to, talk to etc.) that way there is hard data to show the efforts of marketing. Ms. Colvin stated that that may be something we can build into our site visits and in the next

round of RFA's so the grantees are aware of the expectations of marketing. If we let them know we require them to use our documents, at least we know they are getting our name out there. Mr. Harris stated that we can move forward with the budget as well as the per diem for travel. Ms. Colvin stated she would make the adjustments and forward them to the board next week.

VI. Expansion of Target Areas: Mr. Harris stated that he tried to look at high areas of unemployment and looked at percentage of homeowners and percentage of minorities in the community to try and address issue of getting minorities trained and getting their homes done. Highlighted communities that have these issues. Majority of the communities are up north. Ms. Colvin stated that just because they apply, they still have to meet the qualifications no matter what county they are in. Ms. Williams stated that she took each town/city/village, and put them under each county and is looking to see which ones have the highest unemployment rate. Need to group more communities together because some of these towns do not have the population like Chicago. Sen. Trotter suggested using zip codes. Mr. Keller stated that these figures were found using the Census. Ms. Harrington wants this information from Ms. Williams soon to talk about the communities to expand to. Ms. Colvin stated that we can do additional outreach to target the communities. Dir. Vaught inquired about a target number. Ms. Colvin stated that she would like to see a minimum of 20. In Chicago we had about 5 grantees and in other areas we had about 1 or 2 and from the Weatherization Specialist program and we had 6 grantees for the Home Energy Auditor. In the budget proposed for next year, we are trying to reach at least 25 grantees for Home Energy Auditor, Weatherization Specialist, and the Residential Weatherization Training program; this is looking at awards being \$500,000 each. The board will communicate and email Ms. Colvin and move forward with the RFP. In the next round we will specifically identify the communities because we want everyone to be aware of what is out there. We do not want it to be limited to just Chicago and Dolton is not included. Mr. Harris stated that Ms. Williams will email everyone regarding the communities and the Board will have a conference call to vote on the targeted areas.

VII. Intergovernmental Agreements: Ms. Foster stated that we are working on an agreement with the University of Illinois in order to establish a curriculum for both the training programs, Home Energy Auditor and Weatherization Specialist program. In conducting our site visits to date there have been two common variables, one being the T.A.B.E. test and the scoring not being high enough. Grantees accepting applicants with an 8.0 T.A.B.E. but in order to pass the exam, trainees really need a score of at least a 10.0. The second issue that has been discussed is in reference to the curriculum. Everyone is doing things differently based on what they feel is what the participants need. Unfortunately, it has not yielded great success. We have been in communication with U of I who currently works with IWAP

as well as the Department of Energy, so they are aware of any new standards that are out there. U of I tendered a curriculum outline to the Board. There are a few areas for the curriculum; they are willing to work with both programs. The Home Energy Auditor program will contain curriculum for the energy auditor, inspector, crew chief, and final inspector. Both curriculums will be designed for those four job classifications and they will vary between two weeks and four weeks. The Home Energy Auditor training will be for four weeks and the Weatherization Specialist training will be for two weeks. U of I will make sure that all of the expectations of BPI are covered in the curriculum; they will provide handouts for the trainers, power point presentations, provide specifications for all props, and all hands on activities that will apply for BPI certification. The cost that was proposed was \$96,000. The counter offer, we will ask they include modification opportunities at no additional cost and that it be included in the cost of \$96,000. Ms. Colvin stated that in addition to this, we are asking that they provide online tutorial in that the grantees have an opportunity to contact them regarding any questions and assistance. Ms. Foster stated that this was just in reference to the curriculum itself. There are other points that we added in. First, we want them to train the trainers and what the expectations are which will be a four week training in which the trainers will go through the program so they have an understanding of how to train the trainees coming into the program. That is an additional cost of \$20,000. They will also provide us with a technical oversight opportunity, so after the trainers have been trained, now they have to put it to work. Once they are in the field and applying the work, the trainers may have some questions, so the trainers will have an opportunity to discuss with the curriculum with the developers to amend or adjust the curriculum. Ms. Harrington would like some background context regarding the curriculum. Ms. Harrington inquired about how we received this information. Ms. Colvin stated that we contacted the U of I regarding the curriculum. We took a road trip to observe the facility. Ms. Harrington inquired as to how the U of I have performed so far with their curriculum. Ms. Colvin stated that they have performed very well with a pass rate of 92% of individuals that go through the program and those that re-test have a pass rate of about 99%. Ms. Harrington inquired about the money asking whether or not it is in our budget. Ms. Colvin responded by saying that it can be added into our budget if we are going to have this component as part of the program; it is currently not in the budget, but we have \$420 Million available in what was presented today and we are currently spending \$408 Million. To add that to the budget is not going to decrease anything in the budget. As we move forward we want to know what additional costs there would be. We want to own the training material to be able to duplicate it and do what we need to with it as we move forward. Of the \$98,000 that was originally proposed, included props. We are going to require our trainees to get props. There were some costs associated with OSHA training that our grantees can do and they can build that into their budget. Our primary concern as we have gone on site visits has been the standardization of the curriculum and making sure everyone is getting the fundamentals required. Also, in the next round we will be giving more specific instruction on how classes need to be structured. There seems to be a correlation between length of time between classes and testing where there is a drop off

rate for passing the exam. In the next round of RFP's that go out that will be a part of it, so that we can see the success rate that we are targeting. Mr. Harris inquired about if a grantee is using a BPI certified trainer, why would they need to use this curriculum. Ms. Colvin stated that they wouldn't. The only grantee we have using a certified BPI vendor is Albany Park Community Center (APCC) which has the highest pass rate. All grantees need to use a standardized curriculum that has a successful pass rate. Mr. Harris inquired about how long the contract is good for. Ms. Foster stated that we are going to ask they stay with us until the end of the grant period of 2016 and train the trainers for future grants. Mr. Harris wanted to know what the terms are and how contract is going to read. Ms. Foster stated we don't have a contract at this point so we are still in discussion regarding the curriculum. Ms. Harrington stated we need to look at what works and incorporate it into the next grants.

VIII. General Discussion: Ms. Colvin discussed vacancies for applications. One person approved but not signed off on and one was removed. Director Vaught is involved in the process to expedite it. Also, the modification for Local Economic & Employment Development Council (LEED) was tabled at the last Board Meeting; their modification is being addressed today so we can move forward. The budget was sent to everyone. Another issue discussed was local utilities and having energy companies providing the home owners. In city of Chicago we have met with ComEd and can provide access to communities that use the most energy. Ms. Colvin does not have access to reach out to other communities regarding energy companies but wants to reach out to those companies. The language on the website for roof repairs was pulled from the statutes and we have addressed that and understand that we can repair a full roof. Mr. Harris stated if we don't say minor repairs people will think we are going to do the whole roof. The time line for RFP's for Home Energy Auditor July 20th to submit the RFP, July 31 to post after communities have been identified, and due on August 29 to be submitted, submit for review August 31, and scored September 3-17. May be modified based on the number of applications that are submitted.

IX. Next Meeting: August 17, 2012 – Chicago, IL

X. Executive Session

XI. Adjournment