

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

I. Introduction

- Illinois Department of Public Health – yellow card
 - IDPH employees filed out Automobile Liability Coverage form
- Other
 - Kert will be the co-chair of the council, along with Anita
 - Sam will be taking a step back, but still available.

II. Window Manufacturer's update

- One of the manufacturers came up with some prices
- Between Serious and another group called Armaclad Sound Solutions, which is also out of Chicago, there is some fairly competitive pricing.
 - We are going to leave it up to the group to figure out which company to use – whether we want to use one or both of the sources.
 - Kert did a cost comparison between the two and what they can provide for us depending on the type and size of the window
 - Serious has lower cost on doublehangs – up to 80 united inches (united inches = length of the window plus the width.) Their prices were better than Armaclad, but once you got above that, Armaclad was more competitive. But, Kert is unsure whether we will see windows bigger than 80 united inches. For “slider” windows, Armaclad had all better prices.
 - We could leave it up to Peoria to see which is better. Peoria has to deal with delivery costs as well. (Kert didn't get delivery pricing.)
- Feedback/Comments:
 - Other key things go in besides price – how have they worked with other contractors, what is their time line, etc. Peoria and CEDA need to call people who have worked with those people and figure this out. Is there an advantage to going with a single rather than multiple contractors?
 - Armaclad was one of the first to respond. They told Jeff that they wouldn't be able to meet all of the specs. But Armaclad did send a spec list for all of their doublehangs. They look competitive from what Kert can tell.
 - Helen: Contact CEDA to figure out their relationship with the company, what their specifications are.
 - Sam: One of our driving factors also is the possibility of a training program. Neither one of them put forth a training program. One said no, the other said, “they would look into it.” Armaclad said that they couldn't.
 - Anita: Are these the same rates that they would give us if they had a big job?
 - Kert: We can't specify the number of windows, because we don't have the number of houses, so it is just a “large” job.
 - Sam: The good news is we've got two manufacturers that get along. They do not do installations. The other issues that we have are not the windows, but

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

the methodology that we are going to employ for the payment of the windows. One of the items that we looked at would be that the companies would invoice us for the total cost: windows, installations, etc. per dwelling, and what other minor issues and their costs, and their administrative fees. That would make it simpler. The possibility of IDPH not entering into a contract with a manufacturing company may be extremely difficult. But if there can be a guarantee, per window, and a cost associated with it, that would be better. To try to get a contract through would be extremely difficult. There could also be a grant agreement.

- Question: If we had ten times as much money, would the program still go with a single window manufacturer?
 - Sam: Yes.
 - Comment: Any time you are stuck on one supplier, there is potential trouble. If you don't have an alternative supplier, that is not always a wise option.
 - Nick: Nick experienced a problem when he worked with only 1 contractor, and they had to stop working for 6 or 7 weeks due to a labor dispute.
 - Helen: Let each group negotiate the window specs, but it should be at the local level.
 - Nick: I think we should put the question to our evaluators if the variables are important enough to change our evaluation.
- Kert: Warranties were mentioned. Each company offered at least 20 [years].
- Comment (Anita) – Perhaps we should all sit down with Dale.
 - Helen: We should also sit down with the CEDA person.
 - Anita: Anne may know the people in Sound Solutions.
 - Helen: We need to keep an option open and a competitive edge going.
 - Anita: ChaNell and Dale should sit down to figure out the next steps.
 - Helen: I'm not sure we had every potential manufacturer identified. Dale has worked with a bunch of companies and maybe you want to pull this in and put this in front of them.
 - We all have limited expertise on this issue, and we should meet with those people that have more knowledge and then recollect at the advisory council meeting.
- Sam: A lot with the pricing in the industry is the double windows. If we are looking at \$320/installation, for 20 windows, that comes to \$6400. Earlier, we were looking at \$10,000 to 11,000 per dwelling. Maybe it will be less than what we anticipated, so maybe we will be able to do more within the dwelling, or do more dwellings.
- **Conclusion:**
 - Anita: We all have limited expertise on this issue, and we should meet with those people that have more knowledge and then recollect at the advisory council meeting.

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

III. CLEAR Win application criteria

- Minutes were passed out.
- Anita: The application criteria group met last week. ChaNell, John, Cort, Mike Scoby, Willy Villaloma were present.
- The group reviewed the city's application form for its lead program, reviewed the CEDA application for the home energy assistance's program, and CNT's application form. They also reviewed the legislation.
- As for as the legislation is concerned, the necessary criteria is spelled out.
- There are two applications: 1) the initial screening, and 2) a more detailed application.
- Goal: Seeking to have window replacement where low-income families reside. (See handout)
 - The group borrowed ideas from CNT –they looked at the rent of the unit rather than the income of the renter. This avoids the issue of renters who do not want to share their income, and whether what they say is honest.
 - Minimum criteria for rentals:
 - Look to rent by unit.
 - Rent should be no greater than 30% of 80% of the HUD area median income (AMI)
 - The AMI for Chicago is \$75,100. The maximum income for a family of 4 would be \$1503.
 - For Peoria, the maximum rental income for a family of 4 would be \$1334.
 - ChaNell: The committee could decide to change this to a lower threshold.
 - Helen: You might want to prioritize your participants.
 - Owner occupied unit – looking at HUD AMI, if it is over 60% of the HUD AMI, the owner is expected to share the cost.
 - Scoring process
 - You earn positive points if:
 - It is a rental unit
 - There are children five years old or younger residing in the unit
 - If the unit has 2 or more bedrooms, or
 - If the unit has one bedroom.
 - Comment:
 - Decided not to include a question about pregnant women, as it would be a dangerous road to travel.
 - Also removed “owner occupied” language
 - Other considerations:
 - The number of windows in the unit/building
 - No studios
 - No fixed picture windows
 - No properties with liens

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

- Property owner must agree to attend Healthy Homes/LSWP training offered by City
- Scoring and criteria discussion:
 - Helen: Maybe you want to arrange it so if there are 4 units, and only 3 of the units have children residing there. So if 3 of the units have children, they get 3 more points.
 - Anita: We are looking at the housing stock in Peoria and Englewood to determine how many units are in the buildings.
 - Anita: We can change the one bedroom to be neutral (as there are no studios.)
 - Dale: Why are you eliminating owner occupied for additional points?
 - Anita: Our priority is the rental units. It is also in the legislation, which only refers to rentals. But the owners can still be in the pipeline.
 - Chicago is about 50/50 for renters to owners.
 - Anita: Now that the 2010 census is out, we could look at that to get more information.
 - Dale: “Owner occupied,” meaning, the person owns the building and is living there, is what he considers an “owner.” A landlord is one who owns the building and is renting it out for business purposes. So if you have 4 unit building, and the owner lives in one unit, the landlord can also apply. We haven’t run into that.
 - Sam: It may be difficult for the administrative agencies to track that.
 - Dale: It hasn’t been a problem so far. Right now, ours is 50/50 and some homes include pregnant women, or homes with children with EBLLs.
 - Sam: I hope we can make this a grant program.
 - ChaNell: This may be something we could do, with the cost sharing. We currently go through CIC (Community Investment Corporation) and they give landlords low interest loans for the additional work they do for energy efficiency stuff. Perhaps we could do that here.
 - Helen: That seems like a nice thing we could do to attract more people.
- Class requirement/training discussion:
 - Helen: Perhaps the language should be changed so it says that owners have to “attend” rather than “agree” to attend the training.
 - Anita: Should phrase it so they have the training prior to the work being done.
 - Sam: The City of Chicago has a 2.5 hour training. If we were to pay a trainer, if we could enter into an agreement, if they could attend this 2 hour lead training session, then we know and Dale knows that they’ve been through that.

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

- This class is informational, but it does allow the property owner to do the work on their own property. As property owners are identified, they will be able to attend. If we contract in Peoria, maybe we could talk to the city, even if we could contract with them, so maybe their training could not be solely focused on Chicago. We could tape it, and put it online. We could do a webinar. It could be in English and Spanish.
 - Comment: The owners may not have access to the internet. However, they could go to the library.
 - We would have to look at this training to see if it would be able to help the owners maintain the property. We will have to teach towards the standards. If the training doesn't do that currently, we're going to have to make sure that it does do that. The act requires the standards to be adhered to.
 - Comment: The training is more lead safe work practices, more so than lead abatement. It's more on proper cleaning. We're going to have to look at it. Maybe we don't want them to go through a standardized training. It should be more informal. The certificate is only used to show that they went through the training. Perhaps we should use a different term for certificate. A notice of education.
 - Even if we bring in someone else, we need to make sure that we must recognize that we are bringing in the cost.
 - Comment: We could also make copies of DVDs. Some are in Spanish. It seemed like they were distributing the DVDs in English and Spanish at the CDC training 2 years ago.
 - Sam: We aren't providing a general training, it is just a training for the requirements for maintenance.
 - Nick: It would have to be less than 6 feet, and also window replacement could not count as maintenance.
 - Sam: This is a good foundation for an evaluation.
- **Conclusion on class requirement/training:**
 - Loyola will get more details on the specifics of the training that the City does before the next meeting.
- Cost requirement discussion:
 - For a property owner to have to pay, it would have to be 60% of the HUD AMI. There is a chart to tell us that. How are we going to decide on the cost sharing? Is there going to be a consistent standard?
 - Response: There should be a consistent standard. Those individuals will have to pay 15% of the total cost.
 - Dale: We are just taking the total cost of the project, and charging landlords 15% of that. Landlords are technically a business. We don't care what the landlord's income is. If the landlord doesn't have the money, and can prove it with taxes, we will waive that fee.

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

- Comment: Maybe we should give them a point if they can pay a portion. This may push this into the homeowners. Perhaps rental property owners may see that as an investment.
 - Feedback: 15% is a small amount. (Group disagrees.)
- **Conclusion on cost requirement:** For those whose rent is more than the 60% of the HUD AMI, they will pay 15% of the total cost of the project.
- Point system conversation:
 - 2 bedrooms and more, let's just give them 1 bonus point. (Not 1 point per room.)
 - Others disagree. There was no resolution on this issue.
- Application discussion
 - We should look to the CNT application. It was well laid out.
 - The scoring criteria is the later application. The scoring is how we select the specific ones. The minimum criteria, (A and C on the handout) and then we will go on to score them if they meet those criteria.
 - Screening v. Scoring:
 - Screening is the process of determining whether or not individuals are eligible. Scoring gets confusing. There must be a benchmark, otherwise, when people come in, the spectrum of scoring will change along the way.
 - Comment: People may be able to jump up, maybe it sets a priority that we want to use.
 - It makes sense when you have a big pool, but then they will move up. If someone comes in, then you will bump them up.
 - Kert: Maybe we do 10, and then someone comes in, (and there is a lag) then they go to the top.
 - Comment: Then it becomes first come first serve.
 - Helen: The benchmark comes in with the minimum requirements. If they meet the minimum requirements, that is the benchmark.
 - Dale: We use a first come, first serve system
 - Anita: We could establish the deadline and then have rounds. If within that pool, if some of the scores are too low.
 - ChaNell: It might work better to have both things going on, so that you have a pool and a minimum score. You don't want to have a minimum score to just carry over to the next pool.
 - Comment: Maybe keep letting people apply and keep rating them according to the rating system. If you apply earlier, you have a better chance of getting the service, and you have kids in there and you have an older unit. Maybe it is okay. If this is a pilot, we can say, look at the great need that we have to expand. Maybe it is good to just let people apply.
 - Comment: Can you still show the need with deadlines also?

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

- Comment: If we have a deadline, we could also have a waiting list. Then we can show the need of the program
 - Helen: You could do this is a way so that there isn't necessarily a waiting list.
 - Anita: I think we should do this with a deadline because we may get more applications if people feel there is a time limit, it will get them to act sooner.
 - Comment: We are going to run out of money sooner r later. Maybe we need to say that we only have enough funding for so many homes.
- **Conclusion:**
- We would like to see a 15% share of landlords that exceed the 60% of HUD AMI. These are people not living in the building.
 - We would like to see a cost share, and we may need to sit down, and talk that through and report back the council later.
 - CNT and Peoria and IDPH will think through the scoring criteria. This will be partly based on the data we get from the census.
 - Maybe we should talk to Dan Calamari about timelines, and the processes used for the application process.

IV. HUD award to UIC for evaluation

- Sal, and Emily Honen
- They received the grant.
 - It is enough money to do the project but it assumes that they are getting some help from the other departments. The evaluation consists of taking wipe samples up to a week before the window replacement takes place. It calls for 10 wipe samples per house. It is before the project and then another one a year later. The goal is 40 houses and 10 will drop out. They want to have at least 80 houses before and after. It will be comparing the dust results. It will be comparing 50 in each, in Peoria and Chicago.
 - There will also be other comparisons. There will be a health survey. It will be compared to another program in the state. The part managed at UIC will be the health survey and the environmental sampling. The recruitment will come from the larger list that you will get. They will work from the CNT window replacement group.
 - Can send the abstract (perhaps electronically.)
 - The HUD funded it fully. They are not sure of the start date. There will be human subjects and consent forms will need to be filled out.
 - The selection order – sometimes when you are trying to get people to sign up for a program, you never know how it is going to come off. Sometimes you have to leave it open to the people that can sign up.
 - Comments:

CLEAR-Win Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

- Sal has an outline of sampling survey? Sal can give that out. It is public domain because it was submitted to HUD. He will make sure that that is available for Kert as that is developing.
 - Make sure that the study participants will sign to hand over the data they give to UIC, so it can be shared with the other study.
 - The program isn't collecting any health information.
 - CDPH and Peoria Health Departments – the actually sampling will have to be done by someone who is an inspector/risk assessor.
 - The study will look at dust, and other health issues. There will not be any monitoring of blood. The other piece that this group needs to look at is the criteria that are identified so we can have a great piece of material that will go back to the legislature.
- Emily has worked with one of the projects.

V. Update on Jeff Gordon evaluation

- Jeff is with the University of Illinois architectural program
- A grant application needs to be sent to him.
- Besides building upon what Jeff did for the Get the Lead Out! program, all of that will be carried over for the evaluation of this program. Jeff is currently working with 2 economic professors – they are looking at the economics that are involved in this program – including energy savings and how to set that up.
 - Economics isn't Jeff's strong point. They are working together to develop a structure to use in the evaluative process.
 - CNT has a structure to evaluate energy cost savings, but not to the other specifics.
- Sal's project is totally separate from CLEAR-Win. It is separate. The department will tailor the Clear-Win project the best they can.
 - Helen: Just would like to see the plan for the evaluation.
 - Nick: Does it make sense to use the EPA model that they used?
 - Anita: So, before something is finalized with Jeff, the advisory council wants an opportunity to know certain things in the evaluation. This will be easier to do once we see what is being proposed. The concern is, we don't want to sign off on something that we didn't necessarily agree to.
 - Sam: This is the purpose of the advisory council, to make recommendations on what they want to see on the CLEAR-Win public act. Sam emphasized that when folks saw CLEAR-Win in HUD's evaluation, he was advised to tell the council that it was an "advisory council" – it makes recommendations to the department. The folks that sit higher up than Sam make the final decisions, and if they say something different than the council, Sam will go with that.
 - Anita: But we still want to be able to advise before things are finalized.
 - Helen: It may be good for Jeff to connect with CNT and their evaluation, if he isn't familiar with it.
- **Conclusion**

- Sam will send Jeff's draft to the council once he gets further down the grant application process.

VI. Grant application status for CNT and Peoria

- Sam shared the process of grant applications with IDPH:
 - First, an agency or organization must complete an application for the grant and send it back in to IDPH before the grant form process can start.
 - This process is new. It amounts to the agency that is seeking the grant completes the form, and identifies what it is doing for this grant. IDPH asks what other grants they have received – there are a lot of hoops to jump through.
 - Once the application has been sent to CNT and the other has been sent to Peoria, they will complete the rest of the application and send it back into us. From that point, IDPH will take that, and then a grant application review committee will meet. The grant application review committee consists of several individuals, and they will meet with them and explain the application and the process. The committee will make a recommendation to the administration of IDPH: go with what they have presently, reduce the funding, deny the application, or redo the application.
 - Sam's expectation is that they will approve this application as is, especially as it is a pilot project. Once it is approved by the grant committee, the director of health approves it, and then it comes back to "us", and we can develop the actual grant. It contains the same language in the grant application. After the application is sent in, it will come back to us, and then the council will sign it, and it can be acted upon.
 - Sam hopes that this will have a quick turnaround - before the end of March.
- Sam wants it all executed before the end of April. This is a bit of a crunch.
- **Action steps / Conclusion**
 - Sam will set up a time early next week for a conference call to discuss the window piece. Sam will use his conference line.
 - Sam expects to meet again in March again. Through our phone discussions, we can make revisions be able to meet again.
 - Perhaps Jen will be able to get us a couple of meeting dates.