

## **CLEAR-WIN Meeting**

### **April 25<sup>th</sup> 2011**

Participants: Connie Sullinger, Emily Ahonen, Mary Burns, Anita Weinberg, Sal Cali, Dale Clarkson, Sam Churchill, Kert McAfee, William Villanova, Nick Peneff, Stan Bodley, Burton Hughes, ChaNell Marshall, Helen Binns, John Bartlett, Jeff Gordon

- I. Introductions: (see participants)
- II. Grant Agreement Updates
  - a. Grant agreements sent to IDPH management
    - i. Grant agreement applications were sent to the agencies administering CLEAR-Win (Peoria Department of Public Health and Center for Neighborhood Technology), and are back at IDPH. Grant agreement document has been sent up to management now, will then be modified and adjusted, and sent to CNT and Peoria
      - 1. Kert will let the administrative agencies know when to begin reaching out to the communities once he has a better idea of the timeline
  - b. Grant agreements are broad, do not include two pieces from original legislations (taking advantage of weatherization dollars and preference to contractors who hire individuals who live within the communities)
    - i. Hiring from the community and payment discussion
      - 1. Davis Bacon: is CLEAR-WIN required to follow these requirements?
        - a. Not sure
        - b. Stan: contractors should be able to pay on a scale until workers are trained at capacity. They might have received training previously but not specifically to this (or similar) project
        - c. Anita: do you see it as a problem to hire from within the community?
        - d. Stan: not at all, they do it all the time. Individuals feel they should be paid based on training
        - e. Do they come in with knowledge? Most bring skills to the table from previous experience, but most do need to receive specific job skills
      - 2. Illinois Prevailing Wage Act: are they required to follow the IPWA because CLEAR-WIN is receiving State dollars?
        - a. Was amended recently so Burton will send most recent information

3. Sam: Not going to dictate what they have to pay, but make sure they follow whatever is required by State law
- ii. Anita: Where, within the agreements with the administrative agencies, is there the requirement that they are expected to (1) leverage other dollars (e.g. weatherization or additional lead abatement dollars) in order to do more work within the units? and (2) give preference to contractors who hire individuals who live within the communities? How will they be held accountable?
  1. Sam: Yes, it will be written in the narrative
  2. Draft has been sent up to IDPH management, and when it comes back it will be amended to include a narrative (that will include these two points, including saying they are required to follow all State laws, etc.).
- iv. Training: certified renovator (under RRP) is allowed to train on the job, but it must be tracked
  - a. Have to be careful about how much we want to go out there to do that work, if we're hiring individuals as workers under RRP, then the renovator does the training
  - b. Do we want to be providing the resources to become certified firms or abators?
  - c. CDPH: all contractors are renovators and abators (they have both licenses) so they can do mitigation and renovation, and everything covered in RRP
  - d. If folks from within the communities want to become certified firms, we need to decide whether we can provide resources. Currently, we can provide resources for training to become renovators.
  - e. Peoria: they have a pool of contractors all based in Peoria (minus a couple from Chicago), and once they decide on a base that's all the contractors they'll take. They'll look at city wide as "community" to hire from.
    - i. 6 or 7 zip codes in Peoria
    - ii. Some are high risk, others aren't: likely where most of the work will be focused
    - iii. Peoria will look to leveraging some lead abatement dollars to be able to do more work within the units identified.

### III. Window Manufacturer Updates

- a. Have narrowed down to 2 manufacturers
- b. Kert and Sam have discussed additional costs like shipping. They've found out that there is a large discrepancy between shipping costs

between the 2 manufactures. Decided on Armor-clad (Sound Solutions) in Peoria and Serious Materials will be used in the Chicago communities.

- i. Amor-clad ships by load, anywhere to \$75 per truck, to waiving the shipping charge completely based on how many loads going per month versus \$5 per load from Serious
- ii. About the same specs, very high efficiency, heat gain coefficient were pretty similar
- iii. Have Council Members had experience with these companies before?
  1. One experience reported: Amor-Clad required their folks take the measurements and this created problems. Under CLEAR-Win, however, the contractors will do the measurements and orders; therefore should not be a problem with Amor-Clad.
- c. IDPH is not entering into a contract with the window manufacturers; this is a recommendation, based on pricing considerations. If they aren't used, there will need to be a justification; regardless windows used must have been manufactured and assembled in Illinois. IDPH hopes that it can be worked out so that only one invoice per job will be sent to IDPH for windows, including installation and administrative costs. Slightly different process for invoicing if other work besides window replacement will be done.

#### IV. Maintenance Standards

- a. Anita and Kert discussed most recent version
  - i. Kert has a revised copy for discussion
- b. Revision of Standards – points raised:
  - i. “List of best practices” is this something from HUD?
    1. Where will this list come from?
    2. The RRP standard is what's expected.
      - a. Painted surfaces vs. not painted surfaces
      - b. CDPH has a standard form on how to clean
      - c. Legislation implies using RRP for all further maintenance in the unit (cleaning AND repair)
      - d. This is intended to extend to everything (even windows that we might not replace)
      - e. List of best practices need to be described so the owner/occupant know what these are and what they are agreeing to (piece of paper or addendum)
      - f. **ACTION: There will be some kind of attachment describing best practices (city, RRP, etc.)**

- g. EPA has a pre-renovation document with a lot of these standards also (or Peoria has documents as well)
      - i. The Maintenance Standards document should indicate that at time of turnover the unit is cleaned from top to bottom**
    - ii. Spell out what the “granting agencies” are.
      - 1. Public health department or its designee
      - 2. “State or local health department or its designee”
    - iii. #3: take out “In multi-unit buildings”
    - iv. Add a section discussing what will happen in a turnover situation (#5)
    - v. #2: All renovations on property...
    - vi. If the building is sold should be a stipulation that the new owner must rent to low income tenants
    - vii. Property owner’s agreement with administrative agency will include reporting turnover and not increasing the rent for period of 5 years
    - viii. Property owners will need to have an understanding of what RRP is in order to sign this document.
    - ix. ACTION: Kert and Anita will redraft based on this discussion. Same document for the tenant and owner, just be clear who is responsible for what.**
- c. HUD Evaluation:
  - i. HUD evaluation will be doing a pre-sample, clearance and one year post (clearance is done by CLEAR-WIN and HUD grant will look at it)
  - ii. Pre will be done a few weeks prior
  - iii. One year post might be closest HUD researchers can get to check whether the unit is maintained.
  - iv. HUD can’t provide the results of any unit’s one year post to CLEAR-WIN because of IRB restrictions
  - v. There is a stipulation that if HUD researchers get a sample above the threshold, researchers will let residents know that they have a hazard
    - 1. HUD will sample within the rooms where a window is replaced and also at the entry way
    - 2. Per maintenance standard agreement, HUD will let occupants know if they have a problem
    - 3. Does this cause a problem with CLEAR-WIN? If a hazard is identified, it might not come from the windows—but this could be an issue for the contractor
      - a. CLEAR-WIN won’t receive results of the pretest
      - b. Contractors are being evaluated on clearance only

- c. Won't have a difference on the samples outside of the room (whether the sample is high before or not)
  - d. Contractors will stabilize the window after it is replaced
  - e. We don't want to make a bigger hazard than already there. The administrative agencies will have to assess whether the particular units are in reasonable condition to undertake window replacement. *What will be done for clearance?* Dust clearance will be done in whatever room is decided necessary by the administering agency. If it's just specific windows that are being replaced in a room, clearance may only be done in that room. If all units are being done, we would do clearance in common areas.
  - f. The administrative agencies will be responsible for determining what work will be done, and therefore which clearance (abatement vs. RRP) is used.
  - g. Holding owners/occupants to RRP makes the most sense because that's what should be happening
  - h. If a house that has participated in Clear-win becomes vacant, the whole house must be cleaned as determined in RRP before re-rented or sold.
  - i. Contractors are required by whom? to do their regular clearance
- vi. Explaining what researchers from UIC will be working on for the HUD grant in relationship to the Clear-win project:
1. HUD researchers will do pre-window installations samples with assistance of CDPH and PHD, within a few weeks of window installation. In the event that a sample comes back positive, HUD will likely send a letter to the owner and/or to the tenant stating there is a lead hazard, the source is uncertain but if it's near x it could be y, and that any children under six years should be tested if they haven't been already. If you have children you should do a clean up. In addition the window will be installed and the area will be cleaned.
    - a. Window will be installed and clearance will be done. Each specific room where windows were replaced (anywhere) unless other work is done (targeted areas will be in the room where windows are being replaced).

- b. Unit will be approved before they enter into the program, through a visual inspection
  - vii. When CNT and Peoria are doing the assessment the contractor should walk through with them so everyone's on the same page with the scope of work.
    - 1. During assessment, the occupant/owner can be told they should do some work before we come in (such as fixing chipping paint)
  - viii. HUD is only including owner occupied units in their evaluation
    - 1. If there is a 4 unit building that are all in the program, HUD would sample and do common areas
    - 2. If the tenant learns that there is a lead hazard, they can contact the city and report code violations; for this reason the property owner needs to know that this might happen.
    - 3. This might be a reason to stick with only single family owner occupied units. Advisory Council members do not agree with this.
- d. Do occupants have to attend the city's 2 hour training?
  - i. William: Class covers what they can and cannot do mitigation-wise. How to clean up (3 bucket system) after mitigation work, containment, wet scrapping. The purpose of this class is how to do maintenance and mitigation work.
  - ii. Reasons to require attendance:
    - 1. If they are motivated to take this course, that would be a benefit and useful for them, but making it required creates additional complications (time off work, transportation)
    - 2. Reason to is that they are getting windows (and work) for free
  - iii. Reasons not to require attendance:
    - 1. Reason not to is it's another requirement
  - iv. Other points:
    - 1. Standardize maintenance procedures between CNT and Peoria
    - 2. If a tenant or owner is doing their own work, they still need RRP—so just requiring RRP should be sufficient and less confusing

## V. Enrollment Application/Scoring

- a. Scoring sheet for prioritization
  - i. Pros/Cons: Positive points for units where there are children under 5 (+1), 2 + bedroom units (+1), without a mitigation order either currently or in the past, pre-60 housing, pre-40 housing, rental vs. single family, income. With all being equal, date of application is the decision point

1. Should there be somewhere on the application that there are no pending mitigation orders?
  - a. This is a legitimate question for the administrative agency to answer, they have the resources and expertise to find the answer—have to do through CDPH or PPHD to do this
  - b. This is a way to move away from EBLs to prevention because units without mitigation orders are by definition homes where no child EBLs have been identified, but still might contain a hazard. If that hazard is mitigated before an EBL is identified, it is more likely that an EBL will be prevented.
- ii. Negative: code violations
  1. CDPH only worries about lead code violations, no other code violations (except for roof leaking issues)
- iii. Conditions that would screen out units:
  - a. No studios
  - b. Properties with liens against them
- iv. CNT thinks they'll go out twice, first for part of the application process and second for the assessment as part of the scope of work
  1. One application that includes scoring
  2. First visit to identify housing issues, do an assessment and determine scope of work.
  3. Some prescreening should be up to the agency. Further discussion is needed on this point.
- v.
  1. Make sure we require, pre-1978, children, units, etc.
- vi. **Agreement re Points discussion**
  1. **Children: 1 point per unit for children under 5, max of 6**
  2. **1 point for 2 + bedrooms, max of 6**
  3. **2 point for pre-40 housing**
  4. **1 points for 41-60 housing**
  5. **1 point for rental unit, max of 1**
  6. Mitigation orders:
    - a. Suggestion to take 2 points off for any pending mitigation orders
    - b. In Chicago, they only know about the unit where a child had an EBL
    - c. **Conclusion: minus 2 points for mitigation orders on the unit**
  7. Income divisions
    - a. Suggestion to give lower income units an additional point

- b. Suggestion to use rent as income division criteria
  - c. Rent should be no greater than 30% of 80% of the HUD AMI (\$1337 for Peoria, \$1503 for Chicago)
  - d. Conclusion: 1 point per building if the average rent is 30% of 50% of the HUD AMI**
8. Matching decision from last meeting
- a. Those whose rent is more than 60% of HUD AMI, the owner will pay 15% of the cost
  - b. Sam will provide some criteria from CEDA**

VI. Funding considerations

- a. Peoria: combining the efforts of the other programs might mean much more work for the administering agency. However, there might be an administrative burden for tracking the difference in the funding (one program requires a 15% match, CLEAR-WIN might not). Is this what Dale was saying? I thought he thought they could definitely do this.
  - i. If it's possible to do this in Peoria, combining the efforts is fine with IDPH.

VII. Evaluations

- a. Jeff Gordon is going to perform the CLEAR-WIN evaluation for IDPH.
  - i. The agreement for the scope of work that the evaluation will cover can be passed around to the AC members
  - ii. Will be evaluating both sites
  - iii. Not collecting health data from families
  - iv. Working with the data that the program generates
    - 1. Work orders, clearance results, invoices, etc.
  - v. CLEAR-Win works with RRP contractors (not lead abators). Interested in looking at clearance rates and whether there is a difference.  
Will look at: How many people, children served; how many windows replaced; Gage environmental and economic results of that. Also look at energy savings (economic benefit that can be quantified); Job generation: how many man-hours, both manufacturing and installation side, and other work. Will look at time logs
    - 1. Allows Jeff to look at cost of unemployment, etc.
  - vi. Property value
  - vii. Look to calculate economic impact through money spent in communities as well
  - viii. Will try to monetize benefits to children that aren't poisoned by lead—not sure how to do this however
- b. Sam anticipates that we'll see a difference between Chicago and Peoria, and Jeff will be able to present this.



- VIII. Other updates
  - a. Full-time support staff at IDPH will be starting June 1
  - b. Her responsibilities will include working with all the invoices that the administrative agencies send to IDPH
  
- IX. Next Meeting
  - a. Might not need to meet in person, but will need to know if communities have other suggestions around scoring, etc.
  - b. Jen will schedule the next meeting after the first windows are replaced.**