

Urban Weatherization Initiative

Board Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Friday, August 17, 2012

Meeting was called to order at 10:02AM by UWI Board Chair, Percy Harris

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

DCEO Staff: Carmen Colvin; Angela Foster; Sarah Atkins

Guests: John Bey, Alternative Energy Source; Angela Bailey, Chicago Jobs Council; Royce Cunningham, Architectural Services Group

- I. **Approval of Minutes:** Mr. Harris inquired about why the grantees were included in the meeting minutes. Ms. Colvin responded in saying that the Executive Session component of the meeting minutes will not be built into the minutes themselves. Ms. Atkins was doing the meeting minutes and was not informed that the Executive Session should not be included in the meeting minutes. The Executive Session will be deleted from the meeting minutes from the July 27, 2012 Board Meeting and will be resubmitted to Springfield. Minutes Approved.

There was an inquiry as to who called into the meeting besides the members present listed above. There was no response from the individual who called into the meeting. Present members disconnected from the call and re-dialed in. Mr. Harris stated that any recording done by anyone other than the staff is not allowed during the meetings. Only the staff will be recording the minutes to be the official minutes of the meeting. If there is an attempt to record the meeting by another party other than the staff members taking the minutes, the State's Attorney will be contacted. Ms. Harrington wanted the minutes to reflect that prior to the last meeting, this was not an issue and that the current minutes need to reflect that there appears to be a participant on the phone who has not identified themselves. Ms. Colvin will check to see if there is a way to change the passcode to dial into the meeting, as well as have others contact Ms. Colvin or Ms. Foster to indicate their participation in the meeting so that the Board is aware of all who are present on the conference call.

- II. **Budget Discussion:** Ms. Colvin spoke with Diedra Blankenberger who is the Budget Analyst. Ms. Blankenberger has provided a tracking of the bond funds that had been released. Ms. Colvin has been given a bond release tracking form which shows what has been spent to date. Ms. Colvin has been told verbally is that we have up to \$75 Million available. Within 30 days written communication needs to be sent indicating that these funds will be going

out. The budget is based upon projections and estimates. The grantees were awarded at the maximum amount to show the expenditure plan that could occur over a 5 year period. Mr. Harris would like know how much money we have to spend and spend it on what, how much money do we have to spend on the PR program and evaluations. Ms. Colvin will add a line item for this. The grand total of expenditures is \$409 Million. We have \$424 Million with another \$13 Million not being addressed in the budget. There is plenty of funding to do whatever we need and can be added to include items such as a third party evaluation. Ms. Harrington would like clarification under the Administrative costs inquiring is it nearly \$4 Million. Ms. Colvin responded in that under the current budget it is \$525,000 for the life of the budget. This cost can be increased or decreased depending on needs. Ms. Harrington suggested that the Board might need to come up with a reasonable amount and think about the ½ Million and what it could actually pay for. Ms. Harrington's other question surrounding the budget was what is the Board's timeline to finalizing the budget and is there an urgency to finish. Ms. Colvin responded that this is a working document which lets the Budget Department know what the projections are. The Budget may change and be modified, so the urgency is not there like it was 2 months ago. The budget can be amended based on the Board's decisions. Ms. Harrington recommends that the Board Members get together on a conference call regarding the budget.

Ms. Harrington likes the idea of an evaluation and asked if this is embedded into the program now. Ms. Colvin reported that the site visit reports that have occurred and based upon these reports, we have seen certain patterns of successful programs and non-successful program. As we move forward into the next round, we are incorporating recommendations into the document for those patterns. Ms. Harrington would like to know if it is possible to get a summary of recommendations based on the grantees that would talk about challenges, barriers, and lessons learned. Ms. Colvin responded by saying that the Best Practice Discussion yielded similar concerns. Ms. Foster reported that during individual site visit meetings, there are common issues that are being seen. One issue being the participants and their ability for reading and math—scores were low. Both RFA's that are coming out, the implementation of higher levels are written into the language for the next round. Working with the University of Illinois would be a good option. They would be able to go in to look at issues and be able to make recommendations to adjust what is wrong. Ms. Colvin has been contacted by Marlyn McClinton who is the President of Utilivate and has proposed an interest in developing a curriculum for this program. Mr. Harris reminded the members at the meeting that BPI has an outline for who they certify. In the Statutes, it says for the trainees to be either underemployed or unemployed; there are no other qualifications needed.

Ms. Foster discussed Home Energy Auditor RFA regarding the curriculum and BPI website. Ms. Foster stated that there was no curriculum on BPI Website but there are standards. The reason we are not meeting numbers is that there is no standardized curriculum for the grantees. We need a standardized method based on a curriculum or the numbers will

continue to be low. If there is no curriculum it becomes difficult to identify what is not working and we will continue to have issues. Some grantees are working with BPI certified trainers and others working with Community Colleges to train the trainees. Some are successful and others are not. Without a standardized curriculum, we can't guarantee results for the numbers we want to see. Ms. Harrington reported that there are common core curriculums and mentioned Chicago Public Schools (C.P.S.). C.P.S. has standards, but also has a curriculum in place which yields greater consistency. Ms. Colvin reported that the reason we talked with the University of Illinois to begin with because as we began the process and evaluating with site visits and noticed common patterns, there were three major areas. The first being the skill level. The second being the training that was being taught, and the third being the amount of time in between the conclusion of training to the time the test was taken. Based upon a successful program, there needs to be a standardized curriculum. We are seeing the grantees that are following a BPI curriculum are having greater success of getting trainees certified.

Ms. Foster has received a lot of feedback from the grantees in reference to developing a curriculum. The grantees are not comfortable with a standardized curriculum from the University of Illinois for the participants of their community because they feel that the University of Illinois is designing the curriculum from a global perspective and not from an individual community perspective. The curriculum for the Home Energy Auditor program will be four weeks, and the Weatherization Specialist program will be based on a two week curriculum. Mr. Harris suggested that we add standards to the RFP and the grantees would have to meet those standards. Ms. Harrington stated that as a board member, she is here to get results and it is critical to get outcomes. The challenge is standardization and consistency in getting people trained.

- III. Marketing:** Ms. Colvin received a marketing plan from Bob Kettlewell who works for the Governor's office on the communication team and is the individual that compiled this marketing strategy and proposed an outlined approach. The first approach that was proposed is an integrated direct outreach and paid media that targets markets across Illinois based upon the expanded list that was approved. Recommend a phase approach to target areas. Ms. Colvin will be speaking with the Bureau of Regional Economic Development (Team R.E.D.) to discuss marketing strategies for the program. The goal is to increase the eligibility of the program offered through D.C.E.O. to create jobs and job retention. The marketing strategies would be to have printed material of \$20,000, radio ads of \$170,000, and placing ads on public transit for \$60,000 to get the word out about the program. The printed material primarily would be available electronically as well as the development of an interactive website/hotline for interested individuals to contact for more information. All the designs to implement marketing for the program such as strategic planning and implementation, we would be charged a maximum of \$10,000. Ms. Colvin would like the

approval of the board in order to move forward with this marketing strategy and with the approval; this would be an immediate plan of implementation. With the implementation, there would be an evaluation phase to determine what is working and what is not working. Ms. Williams's concern was regarding the Residential Weatherization Program that is coming out and that this is the third or fourth marketing plan that we have talked about and would like to know what has changed from what the Marketing team has told us before. What will marketing be able to do now to let homeowners know about the new program that's out now so people know this program is out there? Ms. Colvin reported that there is going to be a press release and then there was no press release. We would move immediately with print related advertising, radio announcements, and advertisement on public transportation to let residents know about the Residential Weatherization Program. Ms. Harrington would like to see the plan be more specific which includes time lines for this marketing proposal and would like for Bob Kettlewell to be at the next board meeting. Board Chair, Mr. Harris moved for a motion. Motion: tentatively approve \$250,000 budget line item for marketing for U.W.I. contingent upon final approval of a marketing plan that includes a Phase I marketing to the initial five targeted communities and Phase II marketing plan to all the regional expanded communities. Ms. Colvin requested that this be \$260,000 because of the advertising and cost of \$10,000 to implement this marketing strategy. Mr. Harris approved of the cost. Motion approved.

IV. Program Update: Home Energy Auditor RFA is the same as the one sent out last year and there have been no major changes to the document which was approved last year. Mr. Harris stated that everything needed to be tabled until the next meeting. Ms. Foster will forward the Home Energy Auditor document out to the Board. Ms. Colvin reported that this document was approved last year and was unaware that the document needed to be re-approved. Mr. Harris stated that since changes were made, we reserve the right to review the document. Home Energy Auditor and Weatherization Specialist RFA's will be forwarded to the Board Members. Ms. Colvin reminded the board that the Home Energy Auditor grants expire at the end of October and would like to not see an interruption. Mr. Harris made a motion on the Home Energy Auditor in that it will be approved based on modifications that staff made and they can be adjusted and move forward. Motion approved. With that, the rest of the items on the agenda have been tabled until the next Board Meeting.

V. Intergovernmental Agreements: Tabled until next meeting

VI. General Discussion: Tabled until next meeting

VII. Next Meeting: September 21, 2012

VIII. Executive Session: Tabled until next meeting

IX. Adjournment

Submitted by Sarah Atkins