

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

October 13, 2010

Ms. Karen Swenson
Executive Director
Greater East Texas Community Action Program
P.O. Box 631938
Nacogdoches, Texas 75963

Re:

LIHEAP Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #81100000496 DOE/ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #16090000768 DOE Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #56090000463

Dear Ms. Swenson:

Enclosed is a report that details the monitoring review of Greater East Texas Community Action Program's (GETCAP) Weatherization Assistance Program contracts with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the Department). This information is provided to ensure that compliance with the contracts is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The monitoring report includes four (4) findings and two (2) recommended improvements. Please submit a response to this office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter.

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact Giovani "Gio" Giunca, Program Officer, at (512) 475-3861. The assistance provided to the Program Officer by the agency is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sharon Gamble

Manager

Energy Assistance Section

Cc: Robert Crow, Board Chair

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (WAP) CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Dates of Review:

July 19-22, 2010

FOCUS OF REVIEW

CONTRACT NAME	CONTRACT NUMBER	CONTRACT AMOUNT	CONTRACT DATES
LIHEAP	81100000496	\$761,330	4/1/2009 to 3/31/2010
DOE/ARRA	16090000768	\$2,924,302°	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE	56090000463	\$608,583	4/1/2009 to 3/31/2010

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The evaluation of the Greater East Texas Community Action Program (GETCAP) program consisted of client file reviews, on-site inspections, interviews with clients, and analysis of both quality of subcontractor workmanship and final inspection techniques.

The following was noted during the review:

- Subcontractor workmanship deficiencies on seventeen (17) client units inspected.
- Questioned costs for weatherized units containing unvented gas space heaters with no oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present.
- Disallowed costs for installed weatherization measures not following audit guidelines, not included in the audit and/or weatherization measures implemented as remodel type work and not a weatherization measure.

Client File Review

Recommended Improvement #1: A review of GETCAP client files revealed lack of income documentation for household members over the age of eighteen (18) in two (2) of the twenty-eight (28) files reviewed. GETCAP is reminded that income for all household members over the age of eighteen (18) must be calculated in the total household income, and supporting documentation of the income for all applicable household members must be kept in the client file. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.507 (d)

Recommended Improvement #2: A review of GETCAP client files revealed that four (4) of the twenty-eight (28) files had energy audits that were conducted after weatherization work had finished on the homes. GETCAP is reminded that the initial energy audit, from which the initial work order is generated, should be kept in the client file. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.526

Finding #1:

Incomplete Documentation:

- A) Client files N155-09, A451-05, N213-10, A109-09, A116-10, A112-10, A113-10, AMH17-10, AMH16-10, C102-10, N199-10, N154-09, N190-10, N167-09, N125-10, AND N117-09: BWR incomplete; missing information such as final blower door reading and dollar amounts; no work start date; no work end date, etc. Multiple weatherization measures grouped together under one line item.
- B) Attic and wall inspection forms incomplete.

Action Required:

- A) GETCAP must provide completed BWR forms to the Department with the response. The Department requires that GETCAP implement in their Standard Operating Procedures that it is mandatory to provide properly filled out BWR forms. Reference: Contract Section 13. A, 13. B (4)
- B) GETCAP must provide completed attic and wall inspection forms to the Department with the response. The Department requires that GETCAP implement in their Standard Operating Procedures that it is mandatory to provide properly filled out wall and attic forms. Reference: Contract Section 13. A, 11, 12

Performance Review

Finding #2:

Inadequate Final Inspection Techniques: Onsite home inspection of weatherized units revealed that seventeen (17) of the twenty-four (24) units inspected would require a return to address deficiencies in subcontractor workmanship. Deficiencies included: lack of attic insulation certificates, tags or rulers, flex gas line through the HVAC appliance housing, missing mastic at HVAC units and plenum, doors not closing as intended. Please refer to Attachment A, in this report to list the deficiencies of each seventeen (17) units inspected that require attention. Throughout the onsite inspection the Department observed an aggregate of disallowed costs to be \$62,308.38

Action Required:

GETCAP must return to the client units listed in Attachment A, and address the deficiencies noted on each unit. GETCAP must also assure the Department in its response to this report that proactive measures will be taken to prevent future instances of poor workmanship from its subcontractors. Those measures at a minimum should include periodic visits to client units while work is in progress, to insure that the quality of work that is being performed meets GETCAP's requirements, and the Department's expectations. Reference: 10 CFR Part 440; §440.16 (g)

The Department requires GETCAP to reimburse the ARRA contract the amount of \$62,308.38 from unrestricted funds for all disallowed costs associated with Finding #2. Please submit documentation of this financial transaction as part of the response to this report.

Finding #3:

Inadequate Energy Audit Procedures: \$47,980.00 Questioned Costs on energy audits reviewed during monitoring visit. Review of NEAT audits in twenty-eight (28) client files revealed that weatherization measures were being installed without ranking on the energy audit with a savings-to-investment ratio (SIR) of 1.0 or greater; additional 'incidental repair' measures were being installed despite the lack of proper justification support from the energy audit.

Action Required:

GETCAP must return to the energy audits for the files reviewed, and revise the audits with all the measures listed. As part of the response to this report, copies of the revised audits must be provided to the Department. Any measures that do not rank on the submitted audits, or are not paid for with the local funds that were leveraged on these homes, are subject to disallowed costs. GETCAP must also assure the Department that proper procedures are followed to ensure the proper inputting of information into the energy audits. The Department does appreciate GETCAP's effort in implementing the NEAT audit. Reference: ARRA Contract Section 11 (B); DOE and LIHEAP Contracts Section 9 (B); 10 CFR Part 440; §440.21 (d)

Finding #4:

Health and Safety Issue

Onsite inspection revealed two (2) health and safety issues requiring attention.

- A) Client file # N234-10 indicated the unit was below the calculated Building Tightness Limit (BTL) at time of inspection.
- B) Client file # N173-09 unvented gas space heater CO reading 37 ppm.

Action Required:

- A) GETCAP must return to the above units and install mechanical ventilation and/or ensure that existing mechanical ventilation is venting to the exterior and in good working condition according to the manufacturers specification. GETCAP must implement a department policy that clearly states processes and procedures for the final inspector/assessor to address Building Tightness Limit levels. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.528 (b)
- B) GETCAP must return to the above unit and address the health and safety issue. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.528

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs representative, Giovani "Gio" Giunca and Michael Podoloff participated in an exit conference with GETCAP representatives: Karen Swenson and Carl Singleton

Signature:	for ell	10-13-10
	Giovani "Gio" Giunca, Program Officer	Date
Signature:	who told the	10-13-10
	Michael Podoloff, Program Officer	Date

ATTACHMENT A

DOE/AR	VAP Units Inspected RA Units Inspected IEAP Units Inspect	- 14	DOE/WAP Unit Returns – DOE/ARRA Unit Returns – 10 ARRA/LIHEAP Unit Returns – 7
Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
N117-09	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Multiple unvented gas space heaters with no oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present. 2. Attic, no insulation shield at vents. 3. Attic no insulation certificate.
			Questioned Cost: 1. According to Department Of Energy "Weatherization Program Notice 08-4" related to space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on subject residence.
			Questioned Cost \$7,999.39
			*Disallowed Costs: 1. Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: tub surround, \$200.00, Screen door latch, \$9.00, ¾" CD plywood over lay \$195.00, shower faucet \$160.00, misc. labor charge \$400.00, misc. labor charge \$50.00, melamine replacement \$110.00, remove/reinstall toilet with wax ring \$77.00, commode gasket flange \$25.00
	,		Total Disallowed Costs \$1,216.00 *disallowed costs included in the questioned costs. If/when questioned costs resolved, disallowed costs will remain.
N167-09	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Wrong filter size at HVAC system.
			Disallowed Costs: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 2.0 ton replacement unit. Installed component is a 3.5 ton unit \$4,207.00. Mobile home door and entry knob set not included in the MHEA audit \$365.00

			Total Disallowed Costs: \$4,572.00
N213-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Atmospheric vented gas space heater "Empire RH 50" not endorsed by manufacturer for mobile/manufactured home installation. 2. Unvented gas space heater at bedroom rated at 15,000 Btu.
			Questioned Cost: 1. According to Department Of Energy "Weatherization Program Notice 08-4", related to space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on subject residence.
•			Questioned Cost, \$3,226.05
			*Disallowed Costs: 1. Solar screens did not rank with a 1 or above SIR on the energy audit \$234.15.
			Total Disallowed Costs: \$234.15 *disallowed costs included in the questioned costs. If/when questioned costs resolved, disallowed costs will remain.
N190-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed Costs: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 2.0 ton replacement unit. Installed component is a 2.5 ton unit \$4,497.00. (NEAT audit allowed expenditures for HVAC replacement \$3,115.00) 2. Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: 1x6x8 #2 YP \$167.50, H Type 2 1/8 window/door trim FJ \$280.00, cove molding \$360.00, 3/4" CD plywood inlay 48"x48" \$120.00, outside corner trim \$40.00, screen door latch \$18.00, 1x4x8 #2 YP \$36.00, 2x4x8 #2 YP \$24.00, colonial style interior trim FJ \$56.00 3. Door replacement and associated hardware did not rank in the NEAT audit, \$162.00
			Total Disallowed Costs: \$5,760.50
N173-09	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Multiple unvented gas space heaters with no oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present. Bathroom unvented gas space heater CO reading 37ppm—Health and Safety Issue.

2009 WAP Unit Inspection Report Greater East Texas community action program

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u></u>		
			2. Attic, no insulation shield at vents.
			3. Attic no insulation certificate.
			4. No rulers at attic insulation.
			Questioned cost:
			1. According to Department Of Energy
			"Weatherization Program Notice 08-4" related to
			space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on
			subject residence.
			2. Whole house did not rank with a 1 or above SIR on the energy audit
			and the charge and the
			Questioned Cost, \$9050.58
A117-10	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following:
			1. Water lines at water heater not insulated.
			Disallowed Costs:
			1. Following measures construed as remodel work
	,		not as weatherization measures: 1x4x8 treated
			\$275.00, 1x4x8 #2 YP \$321.00, ceiling SR-full
	}		sheet \$426.00, 1x6x8 #2 YP \$90.00, 1x2x8 YP
			\$205.80, 2x4x8 #2 YP \$14.10, wall sheetrock —
			24"x24" \$180.00, wall sheetrock 48"x48"
			\$360.00, wall sheetrock - full sheet \$180.00, no
			evidence of rafter vents and none needed \$80.00,
			1x8x8 YP \$2.80, ½" CD plywood overlay-
			24"x48" \$49.00, 34" CD plywood overlay-
			48"x48" \$68.00
			2. Following measures did not rank with a 1 or above
			SIR or were not included in the energy audit:
			metal door \$320.00, peep hole viewer \$25.00,
			entry knob sets \$160.00, dead bolt latch \$13.00,
			passage knob \$36.00, solar screens \$200.00
		•	
A066-06	ARRÁ	No	Total Disallowed Costs: \$2,991.60
A150-8	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following:
			1. HVAC, loose tape and mastic resulting in
			condition air loss.
			*Disallowed Costs:
			2. Entrance door did not rank with a 1 or above SIR
			on the energy audit 295.00.
.			
A109-09	ADDA	37	Total Disallowed Cost: \$295.00
ATUY-UY	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. 11,000 Btu unvented gas space heater with no

			oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present at bathroom.
			Questioned Cost: 1. According to Department Of Energy "Weatherization Program Notice 08-4", related to space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on subject residence.
			Questioned Cost, \$2,298.78
N234-10	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Unit below Building Tightness Limit (BTL) at time of inspection. Disallowed Cost: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 1.5 ton replacement unit. Installed component is a 3.5 ton unit \$5,451.00
			Total Disallowed Cost \$5,451.00
N199-10	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Attic, no insulation shield at vents. Disallowed Cost: 1. Solar screens did not rank with a 1 or above SIR on the energy audit \$920.00
N200-10	ARRA	Yes	Total Disallowed Cost \$920.00
14200-10	AKKA	res	 Return and address the following: Address necessary air infiltration at residence to be at or near the Building Tightness Limit. Unvented gas space heater with no oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present at residence. Questioned Cost: According to Department Of Energy "Weatherization Program Notice 08-4", related to space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on subject residence.
			Questioned Cost, \$8,308.00
			*Disallowed Cost: 1. Solar screens did not rank with a 1 or above SIR

	1		
			on the energy audit \$259.93 2. Wall mounted gas heater 10,000Btu not identified in the NEAT audit, \$275.00 3. Window A/C unit BWR cost (\$2,350) exceeds the NEAT audit cost (\$755.00) by \$1,595.00 4. Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: tub surround \$325.00, install tub \$160.00 Total Disallowed Cost \$2614.93 *disallowed costs included in the questioned costs.
	·		If/when questioned costs resolved, disallowed costs will
NO20 10	ADDAGITEDAD	<u>-</u>	remain.
N220-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	 Return and address the following: Address necessary air infiltration at residence to be at or near the Building Tightness Limit. Disallowed Costs: Per homeowner statement at time of inspection, the central HVAC system has not been operational for approximately ten months prior to replacement and the home was being cooled with a window A/C unit. Disallowed cost \$3052.00 Remove and clean existing window unit, \$35.00, unit not present at residence. Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: wall sheetrock 24x24 \$340.00, sheetrock 48x48 \$270.00, sheetrock full size \$36.00, 2x4x8 #2- YP \$14.10, 1x4x8 #2 YP \$64.20, enlarge door height and width \$120.00, 2x6x8 YP \$48.00, 1x2x8 YP \$22.05, remove install storm door \$75.00 Entrance door, entry knob set and peep hole viewer not included in the energy audit \$425.00 Total Disallowed Cost \$4501.35
A116-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	 Disallowed Costs: Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates less than a 2.0 ton replacement unit to be installed. Electric furnace installed is 5.0 ton. \$2,331.00 Solar screens did not rank with a 1 or above SIR on the energy audit \$582.00 Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: tub surround \$325.00, sheetrock 1,659.00, inside corner trim \$403.20
			Total Disallowed Cost \$5,300.20
			Page 0 -612

A109-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	Voc	Deferm and All and Car
A109-10	ARRAVLINEAP	Yes	 Return and address the following: Address necessary air infiltration at residence to reach target and/or be at or near the Building Tightness Limit. Unvented gas space heater with no oxygen-depletion sensing safety shut-off system present at residence.
	,		Questioned Cost: 1. According to Department Of Energy "Weatherization Program Notice 08-4", related to space heaters, DOE funds cannot be used on subject residence.
			Questioned Cost, \$9102.20
			*Disallowed Cost: 1. Solar screens did not rank with a 1 or above SIR on the energy audit \$574.65 2. Following measures construed as remodel work not as weatherization measures: tub surround \$325.00, sheetrock \$504.00, furring strips \$112.00, tub faucet \$160.00 3. Window replacement allowed under audit \$1338.00, window replacement invoiced \$2303.04. disallowed cost \$965.04
			*disallowed Cost \$2,640.65 *disallowed costs included in the questioned costs. If/when questioned costs resolved, disallowed costs will remain.
A126-09	ARRA	No	
1MH17-10	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. No filter at HVAC system.
Special Control			Disallowed Costs: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 14,438.3 btu, (less than a 1.5 ton) replacement unit to be installed. Installed system is 3.0 ton. \$5,142.00 (as well the amount allowed in the audit for HVAC replacement is \$3,517.00)
	PA or a Committee of the Committee of th		Total Disallowed Cost \$5,142.00
AMH16-10	ARRA	No	Disallowed Costs: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 11,051.6 btu, (less than a 1.0 ton) replacement unit to be installed. Installed system is

			3.0 ton condenser unit, 3.5 ton furnace, 5.0 ton coil. \$5,030.00 (as well the amount allowed in the audit for HVAC replacement is \$4,308.00)
			Total Disallowed Cost \$5,030.00
A132-09	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed Costs:
		210	1. Solar screens included in the neat audit as Health and Safety (H&S) \$350.00
		·	2. Metal entry door and entry knob set not on energy audit, \$400.00
			Total Disallowed Cost \$750.00
·			Questioned Costs:
			1. No justification for roof replacement. Pictures of
			the previous roof does not provide justification for
		-	roof replacement.\$3,990.00
			2. BWR, cut 2 holes for vent pipe, under H&S \$75.00
ı			3. BWR, deck tile roof jacks, under H&S \$135.00
			Questioned Cost, \$4,200.00
A121-07	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following:
			1. HVAC, missing mastic at taped joints.
			2. Partially missing insulation at condensing unit pressure line.
	•		3. HVAC, flex gas line through the appliance
			housing,
			4. Entry door does not close/lock as intended.
·			Questioned Costs:
			1. No justification for HVAC replacement. \$3,795.00
			Questioned Cost, \$3,795.00
A112-10	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following:
			Damaged vapor barrier at HVAC duct work.
			2. HVAC duct work in contact with the ground.
			3. Old (replaced) condensing unit on site after weatherization work completed.
			Disallowed Costs:
			1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement
_			indicates 13,685.0 btu, (less than a 1.5 ton)
			replacement unit to be installed. Installed system is 3.5 ton. \$4,620.00
			Total Disallowed Cost \$4,620.00

N126-09	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. No filter at HVAC system.
			Disallowed Costs: 2. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 21527.8 btu, (less than a 2.0 ton) replacement unit to be installed. Installed system is 4.0 ton. \$5,815.00
			Total Disallowed Cost \$5,815.00
N155-09	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1. Collapsed air filter at HVAC unit. Install filter rack or two filters on each side of coil.
	·		Disallowed Costs: 1. Manual – J Calculation for HVAC replacement indicates 13,951.0 btu, (less than a 1.5 ton) replacement unit to be installed. Installed system is 3.0 ton. \$4,454.00
			Total Disallowed Cost \$4,454.00
N215-10	ARRA	No	

GETCAP must return and address all units as indicated and include in it's response to this response to this report a summary of all actions and measures taken to address the units indicated above.



Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber Executive Director

October 15, 2010

BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

Ms. Pauletta Hines Executive Director Community Services, Inc. P.O. Box 612 Corsicana, TX 75151-0612

Re:

DOE/ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #16090000769 Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program Contract #81100000906

Dear Ms. Hines:

Enclosed is a report that details the unit inspection review of Community Services, Inc's Weatherization Assistance Program contracts with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (The Department). This information is provided to ensure that compliance with the contracts is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The monitoring report includes six (6) findings. Please submit a response to this report to this office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter.

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact Doug Misenheimer, Senior Program Officer, at (512) 475-3852. The cooperation provided to Mr. Misenheimer by the agency is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sharon Gamble

Manager

Energy Assistance Section

Community Affairs Division

Cc: Mr. Larry West, Board Chair

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009 (ARRA) WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (WAP) CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Dates of Review:

August 16-18, 2010

Focus of Review

CONTRACT NAME	CONTRACT NUMBER	CONTRACT AMOUNT	CONTRACT DATES
DOE ARRA	16090000660	\$9,778,693	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE ARRA	16090000756	\$748,195	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE ARRA	16090000757	\$294,106	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE ARRA	16090000758	\$603,588	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE ARRA	16090000759	\$869,039	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011
DOE	56100000949	\$198,734	4/1/2010 to 3/31/2011
LIHEAP	81100000905	\$1,800,706	4/1/2010 to 3/31/2011

Program Evaluation

The evaluation of the Community Services, Inc's (CSI) American Recovery Reinvestment Act Weatherization Assistance Program consisted of client file reviews, on-site inspections, interviews with clients, and analysis of both quality of subcontractor workmanship and final inspection techniques.

The following was noted during the review:

- Assessments conducted on some of the buildings miscalculated the number of windows that were present. The contractor was overcompensated for replacing windows
- Refrigerators were replaced primarily due to age. There were at least two observed that may have been overlooked
- Manual J calculations are not being done to properly size replacement heating units
- > The Building Weatherization Reports (BWR's) contain a miscellaneous labor charge from \$60.00 to \$75.00. These are questioned costs.

Financial Review

EXPENDITURES AS OF JULY 2010

CONTRACT	YEAR-TO-DATE	% OF ORIGINAL	# UNITS	# UNITS IN
NUMBER	EXPENDITURES	CONTRACT	COMPLETED	PROGRESS
		AMOUNT *		
16090000660	\$1,759,168.00	18%	309	156
16090000756	\$43,323.00	5.8%	10	5
16090000757	\$9,588.00	3.3%	2	3
16090000758	\$23,258.00	3.85%	7	4
16090000759	\$55,227.00	6.35%	11	6
56100000949	\$0.00	0%	0	0
81100000905	\$129,762.00	7.21%	24	50

^{*} At the time of monitoring

Finding #1:

Inadequate Production Levels: CSI's current program expenditures are at 15.3% for DOE ARRA while 50% of their contract has expired. If production levels continue at this rate CSI may face de-obligation.

Action Required:

In response a Notice of Possible Deobligation, CSI has submitted a Mitigation Action Plan to the Department which describes actions the CSI will take to increase its production levels. To ensure that it achieves adequate expenditure levels, CSI must continuously review and update the Plan as necessary in order to complete DOE ARRA weatherization activities within the contract time-frame. Reference: OMB A-110, Texas Administrative Code §5.141, §5.902, and §5.903

Client File Review

Note #1:

Invoicing Procedures

A review of CSI's client files seemed to indicate that there are no invoices from the contractors. It was later learned that CSI and its contractors have agreed on a system of invoicing where CSI prints out the form that includes the amounts to be paid for labor and materials and the contractors agree to the amounts. This form serves as the official request for payment that includes labor and material costs as procured, and is part of CSI's contract with its contractors.

Reference: DOE/ARRA/WAP Contract Section 13 (B) # 5 and 6.

Finding #2:

Manual J calculations not being performed

CSI replaced 96 heating units at the Woodside Village Apartment complex in Palestine, TX. There were no Manual J heat load calculations performed to determine the proper sizing of the new units. The cost for the 96 units is considered questioned cost. **Reference: IRC M1401.3**

Action Required:

As part of the response to this report, CSI must provide accurate and complete Manual J calculations for each unit replaced at the Woodside Village Apartment complex. For any unit that CSI is unable to justify the size of the replacement unit, the difference in price between the units is subject to disallowed cost. CSI must provide the Department a written procedure indicating how the agency will ensure that Manual J heat load calculations are performed on all replacement HVAC equipment in the future.

Finding #3:

Miscellaneous labor charge

The BWRs list a "miscellaneous labor charge," which is a charge for travel to the respective job sites by the contractors. It is not clear why these costs are \$60.00 per unit in some buildings and \$75.00 per unit in others. While it may be reasonable to charge a labor charge on per unit basis, on a multi-family project where all the units are concentrated in the same place charging each unit is not reasonable.

Action Required:

CSI must provide justification for the \$2,640.00 in miscellaneous labor charges for the 42 units monitored during the review. These are questioned costs. If proper justification is not provided, these costs could become disallowed.

Performance Review

Finding #4:

Inadequate Assessment/Final Inspection Techniques: \$1869.00 Disallowed costs. In several units there were window air conditioners replaced according to the Building Weatherization Report (BWR). These units were not present during the on-site unit monitoring. Additionally the McCollum Construction Co. was compensated for 8 new windows that did not get installed.

Reference: Office of Management and Budget Circular 600.121(3) and 600.220

Action Required:

The ARRA funds used for the replacement of the window A/C units and the replacement windows must be reimbursed to TDHCA. Evidence of this reimbursement, in the form of a journal entry and/or general ledger transfer showing the costs removed from the ARRA WAP grant and charged to another funding source, must be submitted as part of the response to this report. The BWR for each of these units should be updated to show that the measures were not installed.

Finding #5:

Minimum Air Leakage Reductions Not Met: On several units the initial Blower Door readings required a minimum reduction. These reductions were not accomplished. On a couple of units there were some discrepancies between the readings acquired during the agency's final inspection and those found during TDHCA's monitoring.

Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule 5.530

Action Required:

CSI must return to the units identified in Attachment A and perform additional air sealing work to bring below required reduction and/or as close to the Building Tightness Limit possible.

Finding #6:

Refrigerator replacement procedure: In two of the monitored units, the refrigerators appear to be identical to the ones that CSI replaced based on the manufacture date of pre-1993. Since the tenants do pay their own electric it would be prudent to replace these refrigerators as well. Reference: Texas

Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5;

Subchapter E; Rule 5.606

Action Required:

CSI must return to the units and evaluate the refrigerators for replacement

The following was a great effort on behalf of CSI's staff:

The agency leveraged funds of \$53,185 from the apartment complex for the installation of new heating units. This represents 41% of the cost of all the replacement furnaces.

The apartment complex gave each resident a \$100 gift card as an in kind contribution. The apartment complex pays the gas portion of the utility bill on behalf of the tenants. The total financial contribution to the tenants was \$10,000.

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs representative, Doug Misenheimer participated in an exit conference with CSI representatives: Pauletta Hines, Tim Boyd.

		10.00	/ /
Signature:	0	TWO WE	10/15/10
	Doug Mise	heimer, Sr. Program Officer	Date
W/C	,,		

ATTACHMENT A

DOE-WAP Units Inspected – 0 DOE/ARRA Units Inspected – 1 ARRA/LIHEAP Units Inspected – 41			DOE/ARRA Unit Returns 0 ARRA/LIHEAP Unit Returns 8
Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
09A403	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	 Return and secure furnace vent stack.IRC G2427.10.10 Weather-strip attic access hatch. IECC 402.2.3 Unit did not meet target reduction (2,850 CFM50 pre and 2,291CFM50 monitoring visit). The target reduction is 1,995 CFM50 After weather-stripping the attic access hatch perform a new blower door test and confirm unit meets target reduction. Include results
09A404	ARRA/LIHEAP	77-	with your response. TAC 5.530
09A405	ARRA/LIHEAP ARRA/LIHEAP	No No	Initial blower door was estimated due to electric off in unit. In the future do not estimate air leakage, either run an extension cord from an adjacent unit or document
09A406	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	electric was off and could not perform test.
09A407	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A408	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A409	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A410	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Blower door reading is + 187 CFM50 highe during monitoring visit than CSI staff got during unit final. CSI's initial Blower Door 2,555CFM50 and final is 2,447CFM50. Blower Door during monitoring is 2,634CFM50. Please explain the difference.
09A411	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	1
09A412	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A413	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	The state of the s
09A414	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	W.
09A415	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A416	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A417	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A418	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Evaluate refrigerator for replacement. Simila year, make, and models were replaced in other units.
09A419	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Evaluate refrigerator for replacement. Simila

· .			year, make, and models were replaced in other units.
09A420	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Did not meet target reduction. Initial Blower Door 3,127CFM50. Target 2,188CFM50. CSI's final 2,524CFM50. Monitoring 2,352CFM50. TAC 5.530
09A421	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Did not meet target reduction. Initial Blower Door 3,322CFM50. Target 2,325CFM50. CSI's final 3,056CFM50. Monitoring 2,650CFM50. TAC 5.530
09A422	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Did not meet target reduction. Initial Blower Door 2,975CFM50. Target 2,082CFM50. CSI's final 2,340CFM50. Monitoring 2,250CFM50. TAC 5.530
09A423	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A424	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A425	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Did not meet target reduction. Initial Blower Door 3,028CFM50. Target 2,119CFM50. CSI's final 2,880CFM50. Monitoring 2,500CFM50. TAC 5.530
09A426	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
09A489	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A490	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A491	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A492	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A493	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A494	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A495	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	
09A496	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	WANA CARE CARE CARE CARE CARE CARE CARE CAR
09A497	ARRA	No	
09A498	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window A/C not present in unit. \$460.84
09A427	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00
09A428	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	 Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00 Disallowed cost for window A/C not present in unit. BWR shows 2 replaced only 1 present in unit. \$410.84 OMB 600.121(3) and 600.220
09A429	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00
09A430	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9

			replaced. \$233.00
09A431	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00
09A432	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00
09A433	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00
09A434	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	Disallowed cost for a window replacement. Only 8 windows in unit but BWR shows 9 replaced. \$233.00

Community Services Incorporated must return and address all units as indicated and include in your response a summary of all actions and measures taken to correct the deficiencies indicated above.

	,			
•				
		·		



TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

October 18, 2010

Ms. Mary K. Suhm City Manager City of Dallas 1500 Marilla, 4EN Dallas, Texas 75201 BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

Mr. Jerry Killingsworth Director Housing/Community Services 1500 Marilla Street, 6DN Dallas, Texas 75201

Re:

DOE/ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #16090000747

Dear Ms. Suhm:

Enclosed is a report that details the unit inspection review of City of Dallas' Weatherization Assistance Program contracts with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (the Department). This information is provided to ensure that compliance with the contracts is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The monitoring report includes six (6) findings related to the City of Dallas' administration of the Weatherization Assistance Program. Included in this report are findings identifying \$32,824.59 in disallowed costs that must be reimbursed to the program, and \$22,779.60 in questioned costs that, if the City of Dallas cannot justify, will be disallowed.

Please submit a response to this report to this office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter. If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact Rosy Falcon, Program Officer, at (512) 936-7810. The assistance provided to the Program Officer by the agency is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael DeYoung

Director

Community Affairs Division

Cc: Brett Wilkinson Rosa Fleming

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

Dates of Review:

August 16-20, 2010

FOCUS OF REVIEW

CONTRACT NAME	CONTRACT NUMBER	CONTRACT AMOUNT	CONTRACT DATES
DOE/ARRA	16090000747	\$766,683.00	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011

On-site review of City of Dallas' implementation of the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP).

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The evaluation of the program consisted of interviews with the City of Dallas personnel, review of client files, and on-site unit inspections.

The following was noted during the review:

- Client File Deficiencies in Assessments and Record Keeping
- Lead Safe Work Practices and Lead Safe Work Measures not followed
- Onsite Inspection Deficiencies Inadequate Assessments, Inadequate Final Inspections, Unacceptable Workmanship

The Department has discussed this report with members of the City of Dallas Weatherization Program management and staff. Through our conversations and through targeted training and technical assistance, the Department has seen progress in the City's program. The Department has been assured that many of the practices that lead to the findings in this report have been revised. The Department will continue to closely monitor the City's program, and will provide training and technical assistance as requested by the City of Dallas.

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

Financial Review

PERFORMANCE AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2010

CONTRACT NAME	YEAR-TO-DATE EXPENDITURÉS	% OF ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT *	% OF CONTRACT PERIOD PASSED	# UNITS COMPLETED	# UNITS IN PROGRESS
DOE ARRA	\$2,079,113.48	15.6%	50%	318	109

Finding #1:

<u>Inadequate Production Levels:</u> City of Dallas' current program expenditures are at 15.6% for DOE ARRA while 50% of their contract has expired. If production levels continue at this rate, City of Dallas may face de-obligation of funds.

Action Required:

In response a Notice of Possible Deobligation, City of Dallas has submitted a Mitigation Action Plan to the Department. While the Plan does not ensure that City of Dallas will meet unit production and expenditure benchmarks required by the contract, the Plan does describe actions the City will take to increase its production and expenditure levels. To ensure that it achieves adequate production and expenditure levels, the City of Dallas must continuously review and update the Plan as necessary in order to complete DOE ARRA weatherization activities within the contract time-frame. Reference: OMB A-110, Texas Administrative Code §5.141, §5.902, and §5.903

Client File Review

Finding #2:

Client File Deficiencies

A client file review of 21 client files revealed deficiencies in the following areas:

- Missing landlord agreement form.
- Refrigerator inspection forms incomplete, blank, or not in the file
- Inadequate assessments and missing assessments for domestic hot water heaters, refrigerators, and unvented and vented space heaters.
- Improperly completed Building Weatherization Reports blank, missing vital information, having contradictory information, and/or contained massive and irrelevant information.
- Improperly completed Blower Door Data Sheet forms were found incomplete and/or with incorrect information.

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

• No documentation present documenting that lead safe work practices and the EPA RRP Rule was followed (for those homes completed after 4/22/10).

The Department is highly concerned with the level of deficiencies in the documentation related to the assessment and invoicing process. The lack of attention that was paid to documenting the assessments has left the City of Dallas with both questioned and disallowed costs and with clear violations of the Texas Administrative Code and 10 CFR 440. Please see Attachment A for specific deficiencies in the client files reviewed.

Action Required:

The Department requires that the City of Dallas send appropriate weatherization staff to the Weatherization Management course offered by the Weatherization Training Academy. Once this training is received, the City of Dallas must develop and implement client file documentation standards. After such procedures are developed the City of Dallas is expected to train all relevant weatherization staff. City of Dallas must ensure that the documentation in all client files meets program requirements.

As part of the response to this report, the City must provide to the Department a sign in sheet, agenda of the training provided, and written documentation of the client file documentation standards and processes. Reference: 10 CFR 440.24, Texas Administrative Code §5.524, §5.526, §5.527, and §5.529, EPA RRP, DOE ARRA Contract Section (13).

Performance Review

Finding #3:

Inadequate Assessments

Review of the client files and inspection of completed units indicated that City of Dallas was not conducting whole house assessments. In order to aid the City in their production needs, the Department allowed City of Dallas-to-proceed-with-the-narrow-assessments-they-had-for-the-inspected-lot of houses (please refer to Attachment D.) This allowance was made expectation that as of June 4, 2010 whole house assessments would be performed and did not excuse the poor assessments.

Upon client file review and onsite inspections it was evident that poor assessments and poor documentation of such assessments led to the improper use of the priority list, resulting in the disallowed and questioned costs included in Attachment B. Proper training of City staff would have helped them in the performance of their duties as they completed assessments and inspections, and documented their actions. Staff would have noticed that they exceeded air infiltration expenditure maximums, miscellaneous repairs expenditure maximums, and that they installed items prohibited under the priority list such as windows, doors, storm door

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

repairs, and a dishwasher, which is never an allowable measure under the weatherization program. Carbon monoxide testing was not properly documented, therefore it is not evident that staff took the necessary precautions with health and safety issues of the home and might have left possible hazards unaddressed.

Action Required:

The Department requires that the City of Dallas send appropriate weatherization staff to the Weatherization Management course offered by the Weatherization Training Academy. Once this training is received, the City of Dallas must develop whole house assessment standards and implement a whole house assessment process. After such standards and procedures are developed, the City of Dallas is expected to train all relevant weatherization staff. City of Dallas must ensure that the whole house assessment standards and processes meet program requirements. As part of the response to this report, the City must provide to the Department a sign in sheet, agenda of the training provided, and written documentation of the whole house assessment standards and processes.

City of Dallas must reimburse the ARRA WAP \$32, 824.59 in disallowed costs as indicated in Attachment B. Evidence of this reimbursement, in the form of a journal entry and/or general ledger transfer showing the costs removed from the ARRA WAP grant and charged to another funding source, must be submitted as part of the response to this report

As part of the response to this report, City of Dallas must submit documentation justifying the measures installed that resulted in \$22,779.60 in questioned costs, as indicated in Attachment B. If the City is unable to submit documentation justifying the questioned costs, the costs will be considered disallowed. Reference: 10 CFR 440, Texas Administrative Code §5.524, §5.526, §5.527, §5.528, §5.529, §5.530, §5.606, §5.607 and EPA RRP, DOE ARRA Contract Section 11 (b).

Finding #4:

-Inadequate-Final-Inspections-

The 19 onsite unit inspections revealed that City of Dallas was performing inadequate final inspections, leading to inspectors' not identifying problems in the units; such as weatherization measures that the contractors failed to install; the poor workmanship of the contractors; and the contractors' failure to meet the air reduction target set for each unit regardless of the large amount of money spent on air infiltration measures. The combination of the above listed deficiencies led to the accrual of questioned costs for CO Dallas.

Action Required:

The Department is greatly concerned with the quality of work that City of Dallas weatherization staff is approving for payment. The Department requires that the City of Dallas send appropriate weatherization staff to the Weatherization Management course offered by the Weatherization

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

Training Academy. Once this training is received, the City of Dallas must develop final inspections standards and implement a final inspections process. After such standards and procedures are developed, the City of Dallas is expected to train all relevant weatherization staff. City of Dallas must ensure that the final inspections standards and processes meet program requirements. As part of the response to this report, the City must provide to the Department a sign in sheet, agenda of the training provided, and written documentation of the final inspections standards and processes. Reference: 10 C.F.R. §440.21, 10 C.F.R. 440 §18

Finding #5:

Unacceptable Workmanship

An onsite review of 19 units revealed that return visits are required for 18 of the 19 units. The City of Dallas cannot return to 1 unit due to the misuse of the priority list, which lead them to exceed the air infiltration maximum. The unit inspections revealed inadequate or improper installation of the following weatherization materials:

- Loose or missing weather-stripping and air sealing;
- Unvented space heaters;
- Inadequate attic insulation;
- Inadequate wall insulation;
- Missing attic rulers and insulation certificate;
- Gas cook stoves with carbon dioxide (CO) readings above the allowable limit and not addressed

Action Required:

The Department requires City of Dallas to return to all units listed on Attachment C of this report and to address all measures identified as a return. As part of the response to this report, the Department requires the City to submit all corrected Building Weatherization Reports and invoices as supporting documentation verifying corrective measures. It is highly recommended that photographic documentation be included as well. Failure to provide requested documentation will result in disallowed costs.

Reference: 10 C.F.R. 440 Appendix A, Texas Administrative Code §5.524, Texas Administrative Code §5.528

Finding #6:

Program Deficiencies

The Department is concerned about the City of Dallas' operation of the Weatherization Assistance Program under the ARRA contract. Review of attendance registers for the TDHCA Training Academy revealed that the Manager and Director of the City's program have not attended any of the Department's trainings. The Assistant Director has signed up for Basic Weatherization training on two separate occasions, however failed to complete either course. The Department does take note that two of the City's senior assessors have attended and successfully completed various TDHCA Training Academy courses. Nevertheless, WAP must attend all relevant trainings in order to gain a better understanding of the program.

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

Reference: ARRA Contract Section 4, Texas Administrative Code §5.1 General Provisions.

Action Required:

In order to ensure program compliance with state and federal laws that govern the Weatherization Assistance Program, the Department requires that the City of Dallas send the managers charged with program operation and supervision of the staff to the training courses offered by the Weatherization Training Academy. At a minimum, the City staff charged with program operation and supervision of the staff must attend the Basic Weatherization. Advanced Weatherization. Weatherization Management courses. In addition to the afore mentioned courses, City staff should take advantage of Multifamily Weatherization, NEAT Audit, and other courses as they become available in order to be up to date with program techniques, requirements, and best practices. Finally, it is suggested that the Assistant Director and Director take advantage of the training provided by the Academy in order to increase their familiarity with the program and its requirements.

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs representative, Rosy L. Falcon, participated in an exit conference with City of Dallas representatives Nana Owusu, Carolina Valdez, Rowena Zhang, and Terry Williams.

	· ·
Signature: Signature:	10/13/10
	10110110
Rosy'L. Falcon, Program Officer	Date ,

2009 Unit Inspection Report City of Dallas

ATTACHMENT A - CLIENT FILE DEFICIENCIES

File	Fund	Comments
Reviewed	Source	
W-213	ARRA	 Assessment – it is more of a work order than an assessment; it does not have the completion date; it was submitted by the contractor that performed the weatherization work. CO testing was not properly documented therefore it is not evident that staff took precaution with the health and safety issues of the home and might have left potential hazards unaddressed. No refrigerator metering performed and no assessment of it that determined the need for replacement. Building Weatherization Report - was incomplete: it had the wrong square footage, was missing the pre/post CO levels. Needs to only list items that were installed in the home. Window repairs were charged under regular WAP measures and it should have been placed under miscellaneous repairs. Blower Door Data Sheet – the final assessment was performed
		prior to the work being completed.
W-965	ARRA	 Assessment – it is more of a work order than an assessment; it does not have the completion date; submitted by the contractor that performed the weatherization work. CO testing was not properly documented therefore it is not evident that staff took precaution with the health and safety issues of the home and might have left potential hazards unaddressed. No refrigerator metering performed and no assessment of it that determined the need for replacement. Building Weatherization Report – need to only list items that were installed in the client's house. Form was incomplete; it was missing the pre/post CO readings for all gas-appliances in the home.
W-873	ARRA	3. Blower Door Data Sheet — has incorrect target reduction percentage. 4. Attic Inspection Form - Dated 6/30/10 after work was completed. 5. Signed Lead Information - signature date after work-begin date. a. Home was built on 1950 and there was no evidence that Lead Safe work practices or that EPA RRP rule (work completed after 4/22) was followed. 1. Assessment — it is more of a work order than an assessment; it
77.07.3	7 Huu 1	does not have the completion date; submitted by the contractor that performed the weatherization work. a. CO testing was not properly documented therefore it is not evident that staff took precaution with the health and safety issues of the home and might have left potential hazards unaddressed

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

	·, ·	
		 Blower Door Data Sheet – worked out wrong target reduction, assessment listed a 30% target reduction necessary, however the actual should have been 45%.
		3. Building Weatherization Report – has no work start and work end
		date and it is missing the client certification page.
	ŀ	a. Incomplete form, it is missing square footage and final
		blower door reading, and shows wrong categories are
		being charged for the items installed.
		4. Blower Door Data Sheet - was incomplete, it was missing the
ĺ		building tightness limit calculations, square footage, and no target reduction was indicated.
		5. Signed Lead Information - signature date after work-begin date.
		a. Home was built on 1935 and there was no evidence that
		Lead Safe work practices or that EPA RRP rule (work
		completed after 4/22) was followed.
W-292	ARRA	1. Assessment - it is more of a work order, does not have the date it
ļ		was completed, and it is coming from the contractor that
		performed the work.
		a. replaced a vented wall heater reading 45ppm
		b. No refrigerator metering and no assessment on file to
		determine the need for replacement.
		 Building Weatherization Report – has no work begin and work end date.
		a. Form is incomplete; it is missing the client certification
		page, square footage, final blower door reading, and has
		charges to incorrect categories.
		b. Miscellaneous repairs measures were charged under
	-	regular WAP measures 3. <u>Landlord Agreement</u> – missing
		4. Signed Lead Information – pamphlet signed after work start date.
		a. Home built 1936 and there is and there was no evidence
		that Lead Safe work practices or that EPA RRP rule (work
		completed after 4/22) was followed.
W-356	ARRA	1. Building Weatherization Report - does not have work begin and
,	.	work end date; only list the items that were installed in the home.
		2. Blower Door Data Sheet - initial and final blower door readings
337.070	ADDA	were performed on the same day.
W-972	ARRA	1. Assessment - is more of a statement of work than an assessment,
		performed the day the work was completed, and it is coming from
		the same contractor that performed the work. a. No refrigerator metering and no assessment in the file to
		support the need for replacement,
	<u> </u>	2. <u>Building Weatherization Report</u> has different square footage
		from the blower door data sheet; needs to only list the items that
		were installed in the home.
,		a. Form incomplete; missing the pre/post CO readings.
·		3. Blower Door Data Sheet - initial and final readings were done on
111 000	1	the same day, the day the work was completed.
W-077	ARRA	1. Assessment – CO levels were sporadically listed in the file,
<u>.</u>	<u> </u>	however attaching the tapes for the showing the readings will

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

		strengthen the assessment process. a. No refrigerator metering performed and no assessment of it that determined the need for replacement. b. Attic and Wall assessment form performed 6/25/10 after the work completed date (as per date and signature). 2. Building Weatherization Report — has different square footage from the blower door data sheet; the form was incomplete it was missing the final blower door reading and pre/post CO readings. a. Needs to only have the measures that were installed in the home. 3. Blower Door Data Sheet — has correct target reduction percentage issues, directly impacting the air infiltration measures performed. 4. Signed Lead Information — signature date after work begin date a. Home was built on 1949 and there was no evidence that Lead Safe Work practices or the EPA RRP Rule (work
W-850	ARRA	completed after 4/22) was followed. 1. Assessment – it is more of a work order that an assessment, it does not have the date completed, and the assessment is coming from the same contractor performing the work; needs more information to justify replacement of measures.
	•	 a. No refrigerator metering performed and no assessment of it that determined the need for replacement. b. CO testing was not properly documented therefore it is not evident that staff took precaution with health and safety issues of the home and might have left possible hazards unaddressed. c. Attic and Wall inspection form took place after the work was completed.
		 2. Building Weatherization Report – has different square footage from the blower door data sheet. a. Need to only list the measures that were installed in the home. b. Wrong square footage listed; missing certification page (later accounted for, however it was not considered as necessary part of the BWR by the staff)
		3. Blower Door Data Sheet - has correct target reduction percentage
		issues. Initial and final inspection took place on the same day. a. Listed target reduction as Optional Air Sealing but it should have been a 45% reduction target; missed final target by 979 CFM.
		 Signed Lead Information signature date after work-begin date. a. Home was built on 1955 and there was no evidence that Lead Safe Work practices or the EPA RRP Rule (work completed after 4/22) was followed.
W-1060	ARRA	 Assessment – CO testing was not properly documented therefore it is not evident that staff took precaution with health and safety issues of the home and might have left possible hazards unaddressed. No refrigerator metering and no assessment of it showing the need for replacement.

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

missing pre/post
duction percentage
hor source
een 1196; missed
,
work completion.
1949 and there was
he EPA RRP Rule
assessment; does
neasures installed.
s for work start and
wer door data
ost CO readings
ormed the same
on percentage
1
4 and there was no
EPA RRP Rule
erformed
ment in file to show
_
lete; square
et, missing final
ings.
on measures
oven but stove was
Over our stove was
nent to note the
THE PARTY OF THE P
ction percentage
olete;_no_work_start
e and final blower
and there was no
EPA RRP Rule
4/22) was
4 ' 4
order than an
found in the files
measures installed;
he need for
olete – missing

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

ate that k e 10) ed the
that k e e
e 10)
e 10)
e 10)
10)
10)
10)
10)
10) ed the
10) ed the
ed the
ea tne
was
Rule
-
ction
CO
_
talled
<i>-</i>
f
-
be be
, 00
ge
50
pegin
nggill
the
∕-tne
_
ork
no
110 e
- C C L

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

	17-7	
		3. BWR - miscellaneous repair items categorized as regular
		weatherization measures.
		 a. Charged repair measures to regular weatherization
		measures - roof air hawks and sub floor soffit.
		b. Charged deadbolt under health and safety -
 	1 1	4. Signed Lead Information - home was built in 1940 and there was
		no evidence that Lead Safe Work Practices or the EPA RRP Rule
		(work began and was completed after 4/22) was followed.
W-866	ARRA	1. Assessment - wall and attic inspection performed after work start
		date.
	l	2. Building Weatherization Report - Incomplete form; no post CO
		readings.
	i	3. Blower Door Data Sheet - final inspection completed prior to
		work end date.
İ		
		4. Signed Lead Information - pamphlet received after work began.
		a. home was built in 1925 and there was no evidence of Lead
		Safe Work Practices or BPA RRP Rule (work completed
		after 4/22) was followed.
W-989	ARRA	1. Assessment - Inadequate to justify measures installed; no
		refrigerator metering or assessment in file justifying replacement
		2. Building Weatherization Report – incomplete/incorrect form,
		square footage different from blower door data sheet, missing
		pre/post readings.
,]	a. Only list measures installed in the home.
	1	3 Player Deer Dete Sheet initial and final immediations of
		3. Blower Door Data Sheet - initial and final inspection performed
		on the same day, after work start date and prior to work complete
W 060	1001	date.
W-853	ARRA	1. Assessment - it is more of a work order than an assessment; does
	1	not have date completed; inadequate to justify measures installed.
		2. Building Weatherization Report — missing dates for work start and
		work completed; different square footage from blower door data
		sheet; missing pre/post CO readings and no heating units listed as
		present.
		3. Blower Door Data Sheet – initial and final inspections performed
		on the same day.
]	
		4. Signed Lead Information - home-was-built 1941 and there was no
		evidence that Lead Safe Work Practices or the EPA RRP Rule
		(work started after 4/22 – assessment performed 5/11) was
	f I	performed.

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

ATTACHMENT B - QUESTIONED AND DISALLOWED COSTS

File	Fund	Comments
Reviewed	Source	
W-213	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$2,880.00.
		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
Ì		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement. \$905.00
i		ii. Domestic Hot Water Heater: replaced as a regular
		WAP measure under the priority list - \$1,975.00
W-965	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$2,969.88
		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement. \$905.00
		ii. Domestic Hot Water Heater: replaced as a regular
		WAP measure under the priority list - \$1,975.00
		b. Exceeds Air Infiltration cap for Zone 3 by \$89.88
j		Questioned Cost \$170.00
i		a. 2 nd Assessment Fee \$170.00
W-873	ARRA	1. Incorrect use of priority list - repair items and air infiltration
		measures were charged under regular WAP measures.
		Disallowed Cost \$136.89
:		a. Gaskets \$136,89
		Questioned Costs \$308.48
		a. Carpentry for window frame \$70.00;
		b. Drywall repair and replacement \$47.52;
		c. Carpentry for bathroom window \$70.00;
		d. Drywall repair and replacement to seal joints \$12.96;
		e. Fix dry-wall-for-wall-heater \$108:00
		2. <u>Inadequate Final Inspections</u> - measures charged but not
J		addressed or measures installed inadequately.
1		Questioned Costs \$1,477.92
		a. Missing 1 door weatherstrip \$27.00
		b. Remove and cap 3 space heaters \$180.00
		c. 1246 SQ FT wall insulation (1224 sq ft of total living
	3 90 10 1	space) \$1,270.92
W-292	ARRA	1. Missing Landlord Agreement
ľ		Questioned cost \$5,503.51
	·	If the City is unable to provide the Landlord Agreement for this
		unit, the entire cost will be disallowed.
İ		Providence City is the control of the city
į		Even if the City is able to provide the Landlord Agreement mentioned
		above, the following remain:

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

"····································	7	
		2. Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of priority list.: Disallowed Cost \$1,021.13
	1	a. Refrigerator - no refrigerator metering performed and no
		assessment of it that determined the need for replacement.
		Unit has been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		\$673.75
	1	b. Unit exceeds the miscellaneous repairs expenditure
		maximum by \$58.00.
		c. Unit exceeds the air infiltration expenditure maximum by
•		\$289.38
		Questioned Cost \$3,265.00
		a. Replaced a vented wall heater with CO reading 45ppm -
		\$2,865.00
		b. Miscellaneous repairs measures were charged under
		regular WAP measures, \$400,00
		3. <u>Inadequate Final Inspections</u> : unvented space heater in bathroom
}		charged but not addressed.
W 070	4554	Questioned Cost \$80.00
W-972	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and Incorrect use of the priority list.
	i	Disallowed Cost \$2,880,00
		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
1		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement \$905.00.
		ii. Gas water heater: replaced under regular WAP measures \$1,975.00.
W-077	ARRA	1. Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$2,880.00
		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement \$905.00.
		ii. Gas water heater: replaced under regular WAP
	Į l	measures \$1,975.00.
<u> </u>		2. 2 nd assessment fee
377.050		Questioned Cost \$170.00
W-850	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$2,880.00.
		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement \$905.00.
		ii. Gas water heater: replaced under regular WAP
W-1060	ARRA	measures \$1,975.00.
11-1000		Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of the priority list. Disallowed Cost \$2,221,50
!		a. Units have been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
	<u> </u> _	no assessment of it that determined the need for

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

		replacement. \$1,150.00
		b. Exceeded miscellaneous repair expenditure maximum
		\$1,071.50.
		Questioned Cost \$3,959.00
		a. Inadequate to determine need for installation
		i. Double Sided Wall Furnace \$2,340.00
		ii. Gas Leak and bringing lines up to code \$1,425.00
		iii. Plumbing Permit \$150.00
		b. Did not address UVWH in bathroom. \$44.00
W-848	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$419.35
		a. Exceeded Air Infiltration expenditure maximum by
İ		\$314.35
		b. Exceeded Miscellaneous Repair expenditure maximum by
		\$105.00
		Question Cost \$60.00
i	•	
W-962	ARRA	a. Gas Line Repair \$60.00
VV -304	AMA	1. Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$1,053.75.
		a. Unit has been disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement. \$673.75
		b. Exceeds Miscellaneous Repair expenditure maximum
		\$380.00
		2. <u>Inadequate Final Inspections:</u> measures charged but not addressed
		or measures installed inadequately
		Questioned Cost \$247.20
		a. missing 3 turbines \$204.00
i		b. missing threshold \$43.20
W-039	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$971.67
		a. Unit has been disposed of and testing is not available.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
İ		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	replacement \$675.00
Ì		b. Solid Core Door Replacement \$270.27
		c. Unit exceeds the miscellaneous repair expenditure
ļ.		maximum \$26.40
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00
		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on
- Auditor and Auditor		Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00
W-796	ARRA	Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00 ii. Missing weather strip. \$27.00 iii. Floor heater left behind. \$160.00
W-796	ARRA	Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00 ii. Missing weather strip. \$27.00 iii. Floor heater left behind. \$160.00 Incorrect use of Priority List
W-796	ARRA	Questioned Cost \$3,052,00 a. Sizing of the wall heater i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat source; no input rating for the item; not found on price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00 ii. Missing weather strip. \$27.00 iii. Floor heater left behind. \$160.00

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

		b. Replaced back door \$270.27
W-1007	ARRA	Inadequate Assessments and incorrect use of priority list.
•		Disallowed Cost \$2,941.51
		a. Unit was disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Replaced domestic hot water heater as a regular
		weatherization measure and there was no assessment
		of the CO readings \$1,975.00
		b. Unit exceeded miscellaneous repairs expenditure
		maximum \$150.00
		c. Exceeded air infiltration expenditure maximum \$816.51
		Questioned Cost \$170.00.
		a. 2 nd assessment fee \$170.00
W-259	ARRA	Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of the priority list.
** 207	711001	Disallowed Cost \$367.68
		a. Unit exceeded miscellaneous repairs expenditure
		maximum \$367.68
		I
		Questioned Cost \$3,538.75.
		a. Sizing of the wall heater
		i. No determination of which heater is the primary heat
		source; no input rating for the item; not found on
		price list found in procurement packet. \$2,865.00
		b. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and no
		assessment of it that determined the need for replacement.
·		Old refrigerator not removed from home (must be
		removed!), so City of Dallas must meter the old
		refrigerator. \$673.75
		2. <u>Inadequate Final Inspections:</u> measures charged but not addressed
	`	or measures installed inadequately.
		Questioned Cost \$957.48
·	1	a. Missing CO detector \$64.80
		b. 3 UVSH left in the home \$240,00
		c. Missing block for knob and tube wiring \$652.68
W-760	ARRA	Incorrect use of the priority list - installed measures under regular
		weatherization measures that are not allowed under the priority
		list.
		Disallowed Cost \$2,700.00
		a. Domestic Hot Water Heater: Replaced domestic hot water
	ĺ	heater as a regular weatherization measure. \$1,975.00
	ĺ	b. Replaced Dishwasher \$725.00
W-424	ARRA	Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of the priority list.
** 121	711001	Disallowed Cost \$625.00.
		a. Unit disposed of and testing is not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
WI 606	ADDA	replacement \$625,00
W-626	ARRA	1. Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$1,641.40
		a. Window replacement (1 window was never installed)
		\$1,203.00
	1 .	b. Back Door Replacement \$349.00

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

		c. Replaced pump on screen \$27.00
		d. Replaced Storm Chain (actually never replaced but charged) \$21.00
		e. Replaced Lock and Hatch on Storm Door (Screen Door)
		\$39.00
1	}	f. Unit exceeds air infiltration measures \$2.40
		Questioned Cost \$1,253.00
		a. Replaced vented wall heater reading 14 PPM -\$1,253.00
		2. <u>Inadequate Final Inspections:</u> measures charged but not addressed
		or measures installed inadequately.
	1	Questioned Cost \$136.64.
		a. Rood air hawks \$57.00
		b. Replace gable vent \$55.00
}		c. Only 4 out of the 8 floor access, exterior side molding
W-866	ARRA	installed \$24.64 1. Incorrect use of Priority List
1 44-000	AKKA	Disallowed Cost \$469.00.
		a. Unit exceeded air infiltration expenditure maximum
		\$339.00
	1	b. Unit exceeded miscellaneous repairs expenditure
		maximum \$130.00
		2. Inadequate Final Inspections; measures charged but not addressed
1		or measures installed inadequately.
		Questioned Cost \$55.00.
		a. Missing 20 attic dams \$55.00
W-989	ARRA	1. Inadequate Assessment and incorrect use of the priority list.
		Disallowed Cost \$3,396.93
]	a. Unit was disposed of and testing was not possible.
		i. Refrigerator: no refrigerator metering performed and
		no assessment of it that determined the need for
		replacement, \$905.00
		ii. Replaced domestic hot water heater under regular
	'	weatherization measures \$1,975.00
		b. Installed Pre-hung door \$415.00
		c. Exceeded air infiltration expenditure maximum \$101.93 2. Inadequate Final Inspections: measures charged but not addressed
		 Inadequate Final Inspections: measures charged but not addressed or measures installed inadequately.
		Ouestioned Cost \$1,720.62.
		a. 1422 sq. ft attic insulation in 1080 sq. ft home. \$1,720.62

CO Dallas must include the client certification page (page 3 of the BWR) with the BWR in its appropriate location. CO Dallas is strongly urged to not alter any of the Department's forms so as to try to minimize the errors in reporting and documenting. All units of measurement must be clearly listed in the BWR in order to properly account for all charges and measures installed.

CO Dallas must immediately re-train all pertinent staff/contractors in the use of all of the Department's forms specially the Blower Door Data Sheet as having correct information is directly related to meeting air reduction targets and ensuring that the client's home is left with a healthy indoor air quality and not below its building tightness level.

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

CO Dallas must ensure that proper lead safe, RRP procedures are followed for all homes built pre-1978, and that documentation in the files supports that the informational pamphlet is delivered to the client or an adult (18 years of age or older) member of the household prior to initiating of any work.

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

ATTACHMENT C - UNIT RETURNS

DOE W	AP Units Insp	pected - 0	DOE WAP Units Returns – N/A					
DOE ARI	RA Units Insp	pected - 19	DOE ARRA Units Returns - 18					
LIHEA	P Units Inspe	ected - 0	LIHEAP Units Returns – N/A					
TOTAL U	Units INSPE	CTED - 19	TOTAL Returns - 18					
Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments					
W-213	ARRA	Yes	1. Address stove – Oven is reading 606 ppm at					
W-215		I ¢8	time of monitoring					
			2. Seal Plumbing Penetrations in the HVAC					
			closet					
			3. Block pipes in the attic (fireplace, DWH,					
			Stove) to provide adequate clearance from					
			combustible materials and to prevent					
			insulation from entering the conditioned					
	ŀ		space.					
	ľ		4. Seal inside HVAC closet to prevent					
			insulation from coming in.					
			5. Address weatherstrip to the back door -					
			existing was cracked					
			6. Gas line flex pipe needs to have a hard metal					
			pipe at entry to HVAC unit					
	.		7. Sealing around plumbing fixtures in the water heater closet					
	-		1					
			8. Address water damage on ceiling in the water heater closet					
ĺ			Final 2294 CFM ₅₀					
	*****		Monitoring 1782 CFM ₅₀					
W-965	ARRA	Yes ·	1. Seal around electric panel					
			2. Weatherstrip water heater closet and adjust					
			escutcheon plate					
			3. Seal inside hall bathroom linen closet as it is					
			open to the plumbing					
•			4. Attic has inadequate blocking around the					
	ŀ		hatch and needs appropriate blocks/dams to					
			the pipes in the attic, there are no insulation					
			rulers present					
			5. Add insulation to all the edges of the house					
	1		to meet R-30 value.					
			6. Address the unvented space heaters left in the home					
			Final 1911 CFM ₅₀					
			Monitoring 3867 CFM ₅₀					

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

W-873	ARRA	Yes	1. Add insulation to bring to R-30 and remove
			insulation done over patio
}			2. Add wall insulation above the window in the
			front room
			3. Adjust sweep in back room.
			Final 5646 CFM ₅₀
			Monitoring 6554 CFM ₄₁
W-292	ARRA	Yes	Add insulation over hallway
,			
	1		Final 9246 CFM ₅₀
			Monitoring 10890 CFM ₅₀
	l		*Missed target reduction.
W-356	ARRA	Yes	Seal top of water heater closet
			2. Need blocking/barrier and clearance from
			combustible materials in attic
	1		3. Fix escutcheon plate inn water heater closet
İ			4. Address opening in the furnace closet -
			insulation coming in
	-		Final 2076 CFM ₅₀
•			Monitoring 2147 CFM ₅₀
W-972	ARRA	Yes	Hall bathroom needs a box around recess
, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	''''	X 0.5	lighting/vent
			2. Need additional insulation to bring to R-30
			3. Address air infiltration measures (keep the
			air infiltration maximum under the priority
			list)
			Final 3606 CFM ₅₀
XX 077	ADDA	***	Monitoring .4256 CFM ₅₀
W-077	ARRA	Yes	1. Return to add more attic insulation
			2. Blocking in attic needed
			3. Sealing in HVAC closet (insulation entering
			the conditioned space)
-	- -		Final Not Listed_CFM ₅₀
	<u> </u>		Monitoring 1136 CFM ₅₀
W-850	ARRA	Yes	Seal plumbing in master bathroom
			Sealing around washer and dryer plumbing
	'		penetrations
			3. Missing insulation certification
			4. Address missing insulation in Attic
] [5. Old vents throughout living space need to be
			addressed (insulation entering the home)
			6. Address unvented wall heater
			7. Address opening in HVAC Closet – opening
			to the attic allowing insulation to come in
			8. Re-Do caulking on windows – not a proper
L			application (see Attached Picture)

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

•			Final 4082 CFM ₅₀				
			Monitoring 4775 CFM ₅₀				
W-1060	ARRA	Yes	1. Seal around penetrations				
	1		2. Install Wall Insulation (Agency stated client				
	1		denied measure, however the client said she				
	1		did not deny the measure and she did not				
	i		sign the omission form)				
	1		3. Address back door (currently being closed				
			with a wad of paper used to jamb up the				
			door)				
			4. Seal around wall furnace (insulation entering				
			the conditioned space)				
			5. Seal DWH and add escutcheon plate				
			Final 4492 CFM ₅₀				
·			Monitoring 2159 CFM ₅₀				
W-848	ARRA	No	No Return Required				
			Agency missed air infiltration target, however their				
			misuse of the priority list lead them to exceed the				
			\$400.00 air infiltration cost and therefore made it				
			impossible for them to return and address additional				
		•	air infiltration measures.				
			Final 2274 CFM ₅₀				
•	•		Monitoring 2650 CFM ₅₀				
W-962	ARRA	Yes	Address air infiltration in water heater and				
:			washer plumbing				
			2. Address window caulking				
			3. Address lack of insulation in the attic				
		•	4. Address damaged turbine				
			Final 1600 CFM ₅₀				
			Monitoring 1630 CFM ₅₀				
W-039	ARRA	Yes	1. Address stove; At time of monitoring the CO				
11-055	ZIICICI	1 62	1. Address stove, At time of monitoring the CO				
			readings were as follows:				
			a. Front Right burner 224 ppm				
			b. Front Left burner 30 ppm				
•	,		c. Back Right burner 32 ppm				
		•	d. Back Left burner 60 ppm				
	İ		2. Address missing gaskets				
			3. Address gaps around front door				
			4. Address missing dual gasket rigid weather				
	j		strip				
	ļ		5. Address the floor heater left behind				
			6. Determine which the primary heat source is				
			and submit to the Department as part of their				
			response to this report the input rating for the				
	İ		item along with a copy of the price list found				
			in your procurement packet for such heater.				

2009 WEATHERIZATION MONITORING REPORT City of Dallas

			Final 3412 CFM ₅₀ Monitoring 3372 CFM ₅₀
W-796	ARRA	N/A	Client not home; client file review only
W-1007	ARRA	Yes	 Address stove; at time of monitoring the oven was reading 207 ppm Assess the primary unvented space heater left in the home and address appropriately Address inadequate insulation levels Address attic hatch Pinal 2856 CFM₅₀
W-259	ARRA .	Yes	Monitoring 3025 CFM ₅₀ 1. Address missing dams in the attic 2. Address missing CO detector 3. Address the 3 UVSH left in the home 4. Determine which the primary heat source is and submit to the Department as part of their
			response to this report the input rating for the item along with a copy of the price list found in your procurement packet for such heater. 5. Address missing block for knob and tube wiring 6. Meter Refrigerator
		•	Final 5355 CFM ₅₀ Monitoring 5401 CFM ₅₀
W-760	ARRA	N/A	Client not home only client file review
W-424	ARRA	Yes	 Address missing CO detector Address stove; at time of monitoring the front right burner was reading 74 ppm Final 2012 CFM₅₀ Monitoring 2432 CFM₅₀
W-626	ARRA	Yes	Address Stove; at time of monitoring front left burner read 37 ppm Address dams in attic as insulation is coming.
			in through the kitchen ceiling fan and water heater closet 3. Address missing insulation certificate 4. Address missing insulation in front side wall 5. Provide assessment and formula used to determine the need for additional ventilation.
W-866	ARRA	Yes	 Address attic block for hatch Address back door – does not close properly Address 20 attic dams – none installed
W-989	ARRA	Yes	 Assess unvented space heater and address appropriately. Add an attic block Address inadequate sidewall insulation

2009 UNIT INSPECTION REPORT City of Dallas

		·	 (bottom section of walls missing insulation – about 4' from the floor was missing insulation) 4. Address caulk stained windows in back bedroom. 5. Provide documentation for the need for 1422 sq. ft. of attic insulation in a 1080 sq. ft. home \$1,720.62 6. Interior kitchen wall (adjacent to the closet) was insulated. Provide sq. ft. of the walls accounting for all windows and doors.
W-853	ARRA	Yes	Address stove; at time of monitoring the oven was reading 195 ppm Address attic hatch – it is broken

City of Dallas must return and address all units as indicated and include in it's response to this report a summary of all actions and measures taken to address the units indicated above.

						·	
							•
	. •						
				•.			
					•		
			·				
	·						



Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

www.tdbca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber Executive Director BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

August 13, 2010

Ms. Merita Sandoval Community Development Director City of Odessa 119 W. 4th Street, Suite 104 Odessa, Texas 79761

Re: ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #16090000749

Dear Ms. Sandoval:

Enclosed is a report that details the monitoring review of your Weatherization Assistance Program contract with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs. This information is provided to ensure that compliance with the contract(s) is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The Department has identified six (6) findings for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP). Please submit a response to this report to this office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter.

If we can be of any assistance, please contact Jason A. Seale, Program Officer, at (512) 463-0172. The assistance provided to the Program Officer by City of Arlington is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sharon Gamble

Manager

Energy Assistance Section

Cc: Mr. Michael Marrero, Assistant City Manager

Directory of Monitoring Sections

Section I. Financial Review

Section II. Travel and Timesheets

Section III. General Liability and Pollution Occurrence Insurance

Section IV. Property Management

Section V. Procurement

Section VI. Audit

Section VII. Personnel Policies and Procedures

Section VIII. Performance Review/Onsite Inspections

Section IX. Administrative

Section X. Client File/Multifamily Review

Section XI. Denied Files

Dates of Review:

August 2, 2010 - August 5, 2010

Focus of Review

CONTRACT NAME	CONTRACT NUMBER	CONTRACT AMOUNT	CONTRACT DATES
ARRA	16090000749	\$1,175,064.00	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011

On-site review of City of Odessa's implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP). Specific areas of review included Financial Reporting, Contract Agreements, Procurement, Personnel and the Management of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 contract.

Program Evaluation

The evaluation of the program consisted of: Interviews with the City of Odessa personnel, analysis of the fiscal system, review of programmatic records, on-site inspections, client file reviews and inventory review.

The following was noted during the review:

- Missing Contract Provisions
- Missing Personnel Policies Provision
- Whole House Assessments
- Lack of Client File Documentation
- On-Site Unit Inspection Returns
- Missing/Inadequate Insulation Markers

Section I. Financial Review

EXPENDITURES AS OF JUNE 2010

CONTRACT NAME	YEAR-TO-DATE EXPENDITURES	% OF ORIGINAL CONTRACT AMOUNT	# UNITS COMPLETED	# UNITS IN PROGRESS
ARRA	\$617,745.68	52.57%	103	5

Section V. Procurement

Finding #1:

Missing Contract Provisions

Review of the current vendor contract revealed four (4) provisions that are required to be included in the contractor agreement but were missing. The four (4) provisions that weren't included in the current agreement are:

- A) For contracts in excess of \$10,000, compliance with Executive Order 11375 Amending Executive Order 11246 "Equal Employment Opportunity"
- B) Prevention of fraud and abuse
- C) Three year record retention
- D) For contracts in excess of \$100,000, compliance with Clean Air and Clean Water Acts

Action Required:

The procurement reviewed at the time of monitoring was for a specific multifamily project completed by the City of Odessa. The City of Odessa shall submit an amendment to current contracts to include the aforementioned provisions. The completed amendment shall be submitted to the Department in the response to this report. Any future procurement for goods or services shall include the aforementioned provisions, in addition to all required contractual provisions. Reference: OMB Circular A-110 Appendix A, ARRA Contract Section 13 (D), 10 TAC §5.10

Section VII. Personnel Policies and Practices

Finding #2:

Missing Personnel Policies Provision

At the time of monitoring, a provision was missing from the City of Odessa's Equal Opportunity policies. Although the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age and disability were disclosed, a provision prohibiting discrimination based on political affiliation or belief was noted as missing.

Action Required:

As a response to this report, the City of Odessa must submit an updated section in the Personnel Policies reflecting the addition of the political affiliation or belief provision. Reference: ARRA Contract Section 32

Section VIII. Performance Review/Onsite Inspections

Finding #3:

Whole House Assessments

During the client file review process, it was noted that a whole house assessment was not conducted on the units reviewed in the multifamily complex. Missing measures from the assessment include no window specifications and a lack of evaporative cooler information. These measures, although noted as missing specifications in the assessment, were input into the NEAT audit and installed as ranking and allowable measures. Further review of NEAT audit data showed information put into the audit that was not noted in the client file assessment. By not completing an accurate assessment, a complete list of weatherization measures to be installed into each unit was unattainable. It is noted that during the monitoring review, Program Officer Jason A. Seale provided City of Odessa ARRA staff with the Department's Energy Audit Collection Form, located on the TDHCA website. This process was done in order to allow City of Odessa staff to implement the Department-provided assessment form immediately.

Action Required:

In order to ensure that all eligible clients receive a complete and accurate assessment of their dwelling unit, the Department is requiring City of Odessa to submit a plan of action to assure that all future ARRA clients receive a whole house assessment. Reference: TAC §5.529, 10 CFR §440.21, ARRA Contract Section 13 (F)

Finding #4:

Unit Returns

On-site unit inspection of weatherized units at the Landmark Apartments revealed that of fifteen (15) units inspected, five (5) units would require a return to address deficiencies in workmanship. Deficiencies include, but

PY09 ARRA WAP MONITORING REPORT FOR

THE CITY OF ODESSA

are not limited to, installation of a draft diverter, additional air sealing to protect insulation and attic accessibility.

Action Required:

City of Odessa must return to the client units listed in Attachment A, and address the deficiencies noted on each unit. City of Odessa must also assure the Department in its response to this report that proactive measures will be taken to prevent future instances of poor workmanship from its subcontractors. Those measures at a minimum should include periodic visits to client units while work is in progress, to ensure that the quality of work that is being performed meets City of Odessa requirements, and the Department's expectations. The Department will also require City of Odessa to submit a Quality Control Procedure to ensure compliance with WAP regulations. These procedures should entail, at a minimum, the necessary steps taken by City of Odessa to ensure all weatherization measures completed on the eligible units are verified at the time of final inspection. Reference: 10 CFR Part 440; §440.16 (g)

Finding #5:

Missing/Inadequate Insulation Markers

A review of fifteen (15) multifamily units noted deficiencies in insulation markings and certifications. During the unit inspection process, it was discovered that insulation markers were provided, yet weren't affixed to trusses or joists in order to allow the marker to stay erect within the insulation, thus potentially showing an inaccurate depth of insulation. In addition, only one (1) marker was located within each unit inspected.

Action Required:

As a response to this report, the City of Odessa must return to the units mentioned in Attachment A to permanently affix and, as needed, install additional insulation markers in order to adhere to International Residential Code (IRC) guidelines. These guidelines require that one (1) marker is needed for every 300 square feet throughout the attic space. In addition, photographic documentation must be submitted as a response to this report to verify the action was completed. Reference: IRC 2006, N1101.4.1

Section_X. Client File Review

Finding #6:

Lack of Client File Documentation

A review of sixteen (16) multifamily client files noted deficiencies in record keeping requirements as required by the ARRA contract. All files reviewed contained a Certification of Completion form, yet the Building Weatherization Report (BWR) contained no work end date. All files reviewed were missing final blower door readings. Client revealed missing income documentation. Client contained no billing consumption history.

Action Required:

As a response to this report, the City of Odessa must assure the Department that the work end date on all client files is consistent with the Certification of Completion form. In addition, income documentation must be obtained for Client in the form of a Declaration of Income Statement (DIS) if no income documentation is available. documentation for income verification is not submitted in the response. weatherization measures provided for Client will be subject to disallowed cost. Also, a complete billing consumption history for Client must be obtained and submitted in the response to this report. In addition, the units listed in Attachment A must be returned to in order to obtain a final blower door reading. The completed blower door data sheets must be submitted in the response to this report. A plan of action must also be submitted to the Department to ensure that all contractual record keeping requirements will be adhered to for the remainder of the contract period. Reference: ARRA Contract Section 13 (B)(4), Section (B)(3), Section (B)(2)

Program Officer Jason A. Seale conducted an exit interview with the following:

Mr. Michael Marrero, Assistant City Manager

Ms. Merita Sandoval, Community Development Director

Mr. Alex Ocon, Housing Construction Coordinator

Mr. Chad LaRoque, Program Assistant

Mr. Carl Karas, Housing Rehab Specialist

Jason A. Seale

Energy Assistance Program Officer

Date 10

ATTACHMENT A

ARRA Units Inspected - 15

ARRA Unit Returns - 5

Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to re-cut attic access to ensure proper seal
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to seal vent chase above kitchen vent hood Return to install new attic access (too small for scuttle) Return to change out vent pipe due to hole
	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to seal vent chase above kitchen vent hood
	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to seal vent chase above kitchen vent hood
	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to install draft diverter on hot water heater Return to seal vent chase above kitchen vent
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary
	DOE ARRA	No	No returns necessary

Action Required: Return and address. Upon completion, verification of returns must be submitted to the Department within thirty (30) days of this report.

•



Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

www.tdhca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber Executive Director BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

August 12, 2010

Mr. Bill Powell
Executive Director
South Plains Community Action Association
PO Box 610
Levelland, TX 79336

Re:

LIHEAP Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #81100000919

DOE/ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract #16090000676

Dear Mr. Powell:

Enclosed is a report that details the unit inspection review of South Plains Community Action Association's Weatherization Assistance Program contracts with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (The Department). This information is provided to ensure that compliance with the contracts is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The monitoring report includes three (3) findings and two (2) recommended improvements. Please submit a response to this report to this office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter.

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact Kevin Glienke, Program Officer, at (512) 475-3852. The assistance provided to the Program Officers by the agency is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sharon Gamble

Energy Assistance Manager

Community Affairs Division

Cc: Henry Tarango, Weatherization Coordinator

2009 WAP UNIT INSPECTION REPORT SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (WAP) CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Dates of Review:

July 19-22, 2010

FOCUS OF REVIEW

CONTRACT NAME	CONTRACT	CONTRACT	CONTRACT DATES
	NUMBER	AMOUNT	
LIHEAP	81100000919	\$619,600.00	4/1/2010 to 3/31/2011
DOE/ARRA	16090000676	\$1,643,044.00	9/1/2009 to 8/31/2011

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The evaluation of the South Plains Community Action Association's (SPCAA) program consisted of client file reviews, on-site inspections, interviews with clients, and analysis of both quality of subcontractor workmanship and final inspection techniques.

The following was noted during the review:

- SPCAA is not following required Lead Safety for Renovation, Repair, and Painting documentation procedures
- Subcontractor workmanship deficiencies on seven (7) client units inspected.
- Questioned costs for energy audits in client files reviewed.

Client File Review

Recommended Improvement #1: A review of SPCAA client files revealed lack of income documentation for household members over the age of eighteen (18) in seven (7) of the thirteen (13) files reviewed. SPCAA was able to collect all required documentation during monitoring visit from respective outreach centers. SPCAA is reminded that income for all household members over the age of eighteen (18) must be calculated in the total household income, and supporting documentation of the income for all applicable household members must be kept in the client file. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.507 (d)

2009 WAP UNIT INSPECTION REPORT SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION

Finding #1:

<u>Lack of RRP Documentation</u>: Review of client files revealed a lack of required RRP documentation being retained in the appropriate client files.

Action Required:

The Department recognizes that SPCAA is both a Lead-Certified Firm, as of May 19, 2010, and has multiple certified Lead Renovators on staff, as of April 7, 2010. As part of the response to this report, SPCAA must submit to the Department a plan of action detailing how the agency will document that Lead Safe Work Practices are being followed and proper records retained. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.524; Weatherization Program Notice 09-6; EPA Final Rule

Performance Review

Finding #2:

<u>Inadequate Final Inspection Techniques</u>: Onsite home inspection of weatherized units revealed that seven (7) of the thirteen (13) units inspected would require a return to address deficiencies in subcontractor workmanship. Deficiencies included: lack of attic insulation tags or rulers, insulation levels not even throughout attic, leaving raw wood exposed without sealing with primer or sealant, not sealing around an evaporative cooler, and insufficient roof repair.

Action Required:

SPCAA must return to the client units listed in Attachment A, and address the deficiencies noted on each unit. SPCAA must also assure the Department in its response to this report that proactive measures will be taken to prevent future instances of poor workmanship from its subcontractors. Those measures at a minimum should include periodic visits to client units while work is in progress, to insure that the quality of work that is being performed meets SPCAA's requirements, and the Department's expectations. Reference: 10 CFR Part 440; §440.16 (g)

Finding #3:

Inadequate Energy Audit Procedures: \$71,194.83 Questioned Costs on energy audits reviewed during monitoring visit. Review of NEAT audits in thirteen (13) client files revealed that weatherization measures were being installed without ranking on the energy audit with a savings-to-investment ratio (SIR) of 1.0 or greater; additional 'incidental repair' measures were being installed despite the lack of proper justification support from the energy audit.

Client File	NEAT Investment Total	BWR Investment Total	Questioned Cost		
10-LA-A0001 \$1,432.00 \$2,766.60 \$1,488.60					
attic insulation (\$1,189	ed above a 1.0 on audit even volume of the control	(\$62) and dryer vent (\$27)	installation not		

2009 WAP Unit Inspection Report South Plains Community Action Association

	SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY	ACTION ASSOCIATION		
10-LA-A0004	\$1,085.00	\$3,738.60	\$3,676.60	
Ranking measures from	audit were not installed. CC	detector installation (\$62) r	not questioned	
	safety measure. Remaining 1	measures installed in home n	ot justified by	
audit.			•	
10-LA-A0006	\$2,900.00	\$4,762.80	\$4,625.80	
The evaporative cooler t	that ranked was not installed	and the wall insulation was	listed as a health	
& safety measure. Costs	of CO (\$62) and 3 smoke d	letectors (\$75) not questioned	d because they are	
health & safety measure	s. Remaining measures insta	alled in home not justified by	audit.	
10-LA-A0009	\$1,624.00	\$4,131.56	\$3,547.56	
Attic insulation ranked of	on audit but with inaccurate	costs (\$522); only remaining	balance for this	
measure is questioned. C	CO detector installation (\$62) not questioned because it i	s a health and	
safety measure. Reconst	ruct attic hatch is not a healt	th & safety measure and shou	ald be included as	
repair item and included	in total house SIR. Remain	ing measures installed in hor	ne not justified by	
the audit.		3,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
10-LA-A0002	\$155.00	\$2,942.20	\$2,880.20	
Ranking measure from a	udit not installed. CO detec	tor installation (\$62) not que	stioned because it	
is a health & safety meas	sure. Remaining measures in	nstalled in home not justified	by the audit	
10-TE-A0003	\$4,675.00	\$8,027.30	\$4,165.30	
Window replacement (\$		34), and attic insulation (\$1,	336) all rank on	
audit but with inaccurate	costs: only remaining balar	nce for those measures are qu	sestioned Costs of	
CO (\$62) and smoke det	tector (\$25) not guestioned h	because they are health & saf	etv meagureg	
Remaining measures ins	talled in home were not just	ified by the audit	ory mousures.	
10-TE-A0009	\$5,555.00	\$11,409.20	\$9,113.20	
		audit but with inaccurate cos	te: only remaining	
Attic (\$1,091) and wall (\$1,118) insulation rank on audit but with inaccurate costs; only remaining balance for those measures are questioned. Costs of CO (\$62) and smoke detector (\$25) not				
questioned because they are health & safety measures. Remaining measures installed in home not				
justified by the audit.	and meaning of baroly integral	o. Itomaning moastres mad	med in nome not	
10-TE-A0008	\$2,820.00	\$8,156.05	\$6,952.05	
			ng halange for this	
Wall insulation (\$1,117) ranked on audit, but price was inaccurate; only remaining balance for this measure is questioned. Costs of CO (\$62) and smoke detector (\$25) not questioned because they				
are health & safety meas	sures. Remaining measures i	nstalled in home were not ju	etified by the	
audit.			stiffed by the	
10-TE-A0006	\$3,211.00	\$12,543.80	\$10,003.80	
		audit but with inaccurate cost	rs: only remaining	
balance for those measur	res are questioned. Costs of	CO (\$62) and smoke detecto	r (\$25) not	
questioned because they	are health & safety measure	es. Remaining measures insta	illed in home not	
justified by the audit.	are meaning to builty measure	os. Remaining measures mata	med in nome not	
10-TE-A0002	\$3,549.00	\$8,501.60	\$6.964.60	
		the audit, but prices are inacc	\$6,864.60	
remaining halance for the	ase measures are questioned	l. Costs of CO (\$62) and smo	drate, only	
not questioned because t	hev are health & safety mea	sures. Remaining measures i	nstalled in the	
home were not justified t	by the audit	saics. Remaining measures i	nstaned in the	
		es were installed in a room o	f the home that	
was 'zoned off' and deer	ned outside the living space	: \$512 of sheetrock repair, no	uie nome that	
new door installation.	nos osisteo mo nymg space	. worz or ancentock repair, no	aw willidow and	
MAN GOOD HISTORIANUIL,				
·				

2009 WAP UNIT INSPECTION REPORT

	SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY	ACTION ASSOCIATION					
10-HO-A0009							
User-spec ceiling ranked	i above a 1.0 on audit even	with higher measure cost; co	st from BWR for				
attic insulation (\$1,407)	not questioned. Window rep	olacement (\$757) ranked on	the audit, but price				
was inaccurate; only ren	naining balance for that mea	sure is questioned. Costs of	smoke detector				
(\$25) not questioned bed	cause it is a health & safety i	measure. Remaining measure	es installed in				
home not justified by au	dit.						
	10-HO-A0001 \$5,393.00 \$8,800.48 \$ 6,299.48						
Window replacement (\$	1,650) and attic insulation (S	826) ranked on the audit, bu	it prices were				
inaccurate; only remaini	ng balance for those measur	es are questioned. Smoke de	tector cost (\$25)				
not questioned because i	it is a health & safety measu	re. Remaining measures inst	alled in home				
were not justified by the	audit.	-					
10-HO-A0006 \$5,626.00 \$11,955.35 \$6,163.40							
User-spec ceiling ranked above a 1.0 on audit even with higher measure cost; cost from BWR for							
attic insulation (\$1,718)	not questioned. Wall insulat	tion (\$1,502) and window re	placement (\$514)				
ranked on the audit, but	with inaccurate costs; only r	emaining balance for those i	neasures are				
questioned. Costs of nev	v water heater (\$774), smoke	e detector (\$25), and electric	al repairs				
(\$1,258.95) not question	ed because they are health &	k safety measures. Remainin	g measures				
installed in home not jus	tified by audit.	-	•				

Action Required:

As part of the response to this report, SPCAA must return to the energy audits for the files reviewed, and revise the audits with all the measures listed. Copies of the revised audits must be provided to the Department in the response to this report. Any measures that do not rank on the submitted audits, or are not paid for with the local funds that were leveraged on these homes, are subject to disallowed costs. SPCAA must also assure the Department that proper procedures are followed to ensure the proper inputting of information into the energy audits. The Department does appreciate SPCAA's effort to begin working with the NEAT audit. Reference: ARRA Contract Section 11 (B); DOE and LIHEAP Contracts Section 9 (B); 10 CFR Part 440; §440.21 (d)

Recommended Improvement #2: A review of SPCAA client files revealed that seven (7) of the fourteen (14) files had energy audits that were conducted after weatherization work had finished on the homes. Upon further review, SPCAA was able to confirm that audits were initially run after the initial assessment and before weatherization work began. SPCAA is reminded that the initial energy audit, from which the initial work order is generated, should be kept in the client file. Reference: Texas Administrative Code; Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter E; Rule §5.526

2009 WAP UNIT INSPECTION REPORT SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs representative, Kevin Glienke, participated in an exit conference with South Plains CAA representatives: Chip Low, Henry Tarango, Chris Cristan, and Jeremy Martinez.

		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	,
Signature:	<u> </u>	/) — ta	8/12/10
	Kev	. ~	enke, Program Officer	Date

2009 WAP UNIT INSPECTION REPORT SOUTH PLAINS COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION

ATTACHMENT A

DOE/WAP Units Inspected - 0 DOE/ARRA Units Inspected - 13 LIHEAP Units Inspected - 13			DOE/WAP Unit Returns – N/A DOE/ARRA Unit Returns – 7 LIHEAP Unit Returns – 7
Units	Fund Source	Return	Comments
Inspected			
10-LA-A0006	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-LA-A0009	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-LA-A0004	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-LA-A0001	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-LA-A0002	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-HO-A0001	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to install water heater T&P valve drain line
10-TE-A0002	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to seal raw wood trim on exterior of home;
	*.		fill in insulation back to R-38 level
10-TE-A0003	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to seal raw wood trim on exterior of home
10-TE-A0009	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to replace stove because of high CO reading.
	,		seal raw wood trim on exterior of home; seal around
			evaporative cooler; repair roof shingles that have
10.000			blown off roof
10-TE-A0008	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to seal raw wood trim on exterior of home
10-TE-A0006	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to seal raw wood trim on exterior of home:
	ļ	`	fill insulation back to R-38 level; repair roof shingles
10.770			that have blown off roof
10-HO-A0009	ARRA/LIHEAP	No	No Return Required
10-HO-A0006	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to fill insulation back to R-38 level

SPCAA must return and address all units as indicated and include in it's response to this response to this report a summary of all actions and measures taken to address the units indicated above.





Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs

www.tdbca.state.tx.us

Rick Perry GOVERNOR

Michael Gerber
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
September 3, 2010

BOARD MEMBERS
C. Kent Conine, Chair
Gloria Ray, Vice Chair
Leslie Bingham Escareño
Tom H. Gann
Lowell A. Keig
Juan S. Muñoz, Ph.D.

Mr. Rafael Trevino Jr.
Executive Director
Community Action Corporation of South Texas
PO Drawer 1820, 78333
Alice, Texas
78333-1820

Re: DOE Weatherization Assistance Program Contract # 56090000454 LIHEAP Weatherization Assistance Program Contract # 81090000487

ARRA Weatherization Assistance Program Contract # 16090000656

'Dear Mr. Trevino:

Enclosed is a report that details the monitoring review of Community Action Corporation of South Texas (CACORP) Weatherization Assistance Program contracts with the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs (The Department). This information is provided to ensure that the compliance with the contracts is maintained and that services to the poor, elderly, and disabled are offered in the most expeditious and economical manner.

The monitoring report includes eight (8) findings and zero (0) recommendations. Please submit a response to this report to the office within thirty (30) days of the date of this letter. A copy of this monitoring report will be provided to your board chair.

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to contact Brian P. Fayhee, Program Officer, at (512) 475-3822. The assistance provided to the Program Officer by the agency is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely.

Sharon Gamble

Manager

Energy Assistance Section

cc. Nora B. Accevedo

Directory of Monitoring Sections

Section I. Financial Review

Section II. Travel and Timesheets

Section III. General Liability and Pollution Occurrence Insurance

Section IV. Property Management

Section V. Procurement

Section VI. Audit

Section VII. Personnel Policies and Practices

Section VIII. Performance Review

Section IX. Administrative

Section X. Client File Review/Multifamily Review

Section XI. Denied Files

Section XII. Summary

WEATHERIZATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (WAP) CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUIRED AND RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Dates of Review:

March 1st - March 5th 2010

Programmatic Year

PY 09

Contract Number

56090000454

Contract Number

81090000487

Contract Number

16090000656

Contract Amount:

\$10,913,796.00

Contract Period:

4/1/09-3/31/10

Contract Period:

9/01/09-9/01/10

Focus of Review

On-site review of Community Action Corporation of South Texas (CACORP) implementation of the Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) in accordance with the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (LIHEAP) and the 2009 WAP contract. Specific areas of review included Financial Reporting, Contract Agreements, Procurement, Personnel, and the Management of the Service Delivery Plan Components.

Program Evaluation

The evaluation of the program consisted of interviews with personnel, analysis of fiscal system and review of programmatic records.

The following issues were noted during the review:

Improper documentation of Income
Improper documentation of required contractor licensing
Inconclusive reconciliations
Lack of documentation of items for annual inventory
Improper installation of energy efficiency measures
High Carbon Monoxide readings

Section I Financial Review

Finding #1: Inconclusive Program Reconciliations

At the time of the monitoring CACORP displayed inconclusive reconciliations on their final financial statement for WAP program year 2009. CACORP displayed un-reconciled funds at the time of the monitoring which prevented the opportunity to determine if the Fiscal Year 2009 was correctly reconciled. CACORP has moved to a different financial reporting system which has slowed the process of reconciliation of funds at the end of the fiscal year.

Action Required: CACORP is expected to provide documentation that the end of year funds have been reconciled to match the general ledger. As part of the response to this report, CACORP must submit the first two months expenditures of WAP fiscal year 2010, to show that the financial software is working adequately. Reference: OMB Cir. A-110, Att. C .21 (b) (2) (3) (4) & OMBCir.A-102 (2) (b)

Section IV. Property Management

Finding #2: Missing items on annual inventory

At the time of the monitoring three (3) infrared cameras that were purchased with 2009 LIHEAP funds were not accounted for on the annual inventory sheet. At the time of the exit interview CACORP staff members provided necessary proof that the infared cameras were accounted for and added them to the inventory sheet.

Action Required: CACORP currently has a policy that requires them to perform annual inventory reporting. The Department requires CACORP to conduct biannual inventory reports and submit them to the department prior to program monitoring visits, Reference 10 CFR 600 134

Section V. Procurement

Note:

During fiscal year 2009, LIHEAP funds were used to purchase two (2) vehicles and three (3) infrared cameras. Procurement was considered satisfactory by the department and used adequately throughout the program during fiscal year 2009.

Finding #3: Missing provisions in contract

CACORP's contract with subcontractors does not contain required provisions of prevention of fraud and abuse in their current contract. The current contract states the punishment if fraud and abuse takes place, but does not list measures of prevention.

Action Required: CACORP must amend their contract and implement levels of prevention to section (h) of their contract. The amended contract must be provided with the response to this report: Reference TAC Rule §5.10

Section VIII Performance Review

Finding #4: Inadequate Lead Safe Work (LSW) procedures

During onsite inspections, the Department verified with clients that LSW was not being implemented by the contractor. Clients stated to Program Officers that contractors were not wearing the EPA required white suits and laying down plastic over the furniture of homes that required EPA LSW performed.

Action Required: The Department requires CACORP to provide training for all WAP staff regarding the required procedures for LSW. The Department requires CACORP to provide written documentation of this training and a roster of those in attendance as part of the response to this report. CACORP must submit its plan for requiring that onsite inspections are performed and documented by CACORP weatherization staff while weatherization work is being completed on residences and multifamily units that require Lead Safe Renovation practices. Reference: **TAC Rule §5.524**

Section IX Client File review

Finding #5: **Incomplete documentation**

- A). Missing income documentation for client file SP0910081, which did not include documentation for two (2) adults in the household. CACORP did not provide documentation for one (1) adult in the client file JW0910095.
- B). CACORP did not provide the attic inspection for or wall inspection form for client file SP0910016.
- Actions Required: A). CACORP must acquire income documentation from the two (2) individuals listed in the application and provide the corrected documentation to the Department with their response. The Department requires that CACORP implement in their Standard Operating Procedures that it is mandatory to acquire all income documentation necessary prior to weatherization work to begin.

Reference TAC Rule §5.19

B). CACORP must return to the client's address and acquire signatures for the Attic and Wall Inspection Forms. A copy of the signed forms must be provided with the response to this report. The Department requires that CACORP implement in their Standard Operating Procedures that it is mandatory to sign all documentation necessary prior to weatherization work to begin. Reference TAC Rule §5.703

Finding #6: Incomplete documentation on assessment forms

A). CACORP did not provide adequate documentation for heat load calculations in the client file. These calculations provide the HVAC contractor with adequate condenser and furnace size to each single family and multi-family units. Client files H0910225, H0910179, H0910270, H1011075, H0910097, H1011013, H1011065 did not provide documentation on the required assessment form to properly justify why the HVAC unit was placed in the residence. Client file H1011045 was missing the HVAC assessment at the time of the unit inspection. Total questioned costs for improper documentation is \$26.851.67.

Action required: If CACORP did not receive documentation of the heat load calculations for the above units, from the assessor and cannot provide documentation support the replacement of the units, the costs for the units will be disallowed. The Department requires CACORP to provide a written plan of action detailing how CACORP will ensure adequate heat load calculations in the future in order to justify HVAC unit replacement in the residence. Reference TAC Rule §5.529

Finding #7: Health and Safety Issues

Onsite inspections revealed three (3) health and safety issues requiring attention. A). File # H0910080 indicated that the residence was below the calculated Building Tightness Limit (BTL). The recorded BTL is 1140, but onsite inspections indicated that the CFM was 988 at 50.0 Pascals.

B). File H09100128 and JW091005 had Carbon Monoxide (CO) detectors placed in the home inadequately. Onsite inspection revealed that CACORP has placed a CO detector in the residence instead of a smoke detector for client file H09100128. CACORP had originally placed a CO detector in the residence of client file JW091005, but removed the CO detector from the home due to inadequate performance. CACORP did not replace the detector and did not remove the detector form the invoice.

Actions Required: A). CACORP must return to the unit and install mechanical ventilation. CACORP must implement a departmental policy which clearly states processes and procedures for the final inspector to address Building Tightness Levels. Reference TAC Rule §5.528 (b)

B). CACORP must return to the units and install a smoke detector for client file H09100128 and install a properly functioning CO detector for client file JW091005. Reference TAC Rule §5.528 (d)

Finding #8: Onsite Inspections requiring return to units

Onsite review revealed that CACORP was not conducting thorough final inspections of units weatherized. A total number of 43 units were inspected during the monitoring. Of these 36 require a return to address deficiencies. Please refer to Attachment A, in this report to list the deficiencies of each 36 unit inspected that required attention. Throughout the onsite inspections the Department has observed the aggregate amount of questioned cost to be \$31,014.67.

Actions Required: CACORP must return to the units listed in Attachment A, and address each issue listed. Once the issue has been addressed CACORP must place documentation in the client file and submit this documentation with this report.

Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs representative, Brian P. Fayhee, Doug Misenheimer, and Anne Miller participated in an exit conference with Rafael Trevino, Jorge Zamora, Baldo Cantu, and Robert Alviar.

Signature: B. P. Fayhee, TDHCA Program Officer Date

Signature: Doug Misenheimer, TDHCA Program Officer Date

ATTACHMENT A

Units		<u> </u>	
Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
H0910104	DOE/LIHEAP	No	No Return.
H0910266	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to install a door sweep on the zoned-off area door.
H101167	DOE ARRA	No	No return.
H0910241	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to patch hole in bottom bathroom. Caulk pipe penetration in upstairs bathroom. Patch hole under bathroom sink upstairs. Block the attic hatch. Weatherstrip windows in the upstairs bathroom.
H0910059 H0910101	DOE/LIHEAP DOE/LIHEAP	No No	No return. No return.
H0910171	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to replace stove with high carbon monoxide on top burners. Block the second attic hatch.
H0910128	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to install a smoke detector and take back the co detector that was installed by error. Apply mastic to a/c
H0910100	LIHEAP	No	plenum. No return.
H0910132	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to address the duct connections in the attic because they are producing moisture. Seal the registers correctly. Nail the trim on the attic hatch.
H1011124	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to add ventilation to attic.
H1011017	DOE ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to add door sweep and jamb up to front door. Install trim to back door. Address the return air by enclosing it better.
H1011163	DOE ARRA	Yes	Return to address the belly insulation and add more over the ducting system because it is creating moisture. Seal registers in kitchen and back bedroom.
H09101916	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return to seal plenum correctly. Seal register in bathroom.
H0910108	LIHEAP	No	No return.

ATTACHMENT A

Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
H1011045	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Attic, install insulation shield at vents. 2) Install attic rulers. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed costs: 1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a 2.5 ton central Air Condition system on a 1083 square feet home. Disallowed cost: \$3,200.00 2) Window pane replacement under Health and Safety measures.
			Disaflowed cost: \$150.00
H0910187	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Belly insulation falling off. 2) Missing solar screen at east side. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
H0910225	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Belly loose insulation and support (chicken wire). Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed costs: 1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a 4 ton central Air Condition system on 1008 square feet manufactured home. Disallowed cost: \$4,200.00

H101139	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Oven CO reading 183ppm. Replace under Health and Safety measure. 2) Missing insulation at exterior wall. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
H0910267	ARRA/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Blower door data sheet, Target CFM reading improperly calculated. Target CFM reading should be 2491. Inspection CFM reading is 3906 @ cfm50. Did not reach target. Return and address air infiltration to achieve target reduction. 2) Install proper side panels at window AC located at living room area. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
H1011013	DOE/ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Water at HVAC secondary condensation drain line. Primary drain might be clogged. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed cost: 1) Residential Heat Loss and Heat Gain Calculation dated 6/11/2010 does not appear to contain sufficient and/or accurate information to justify installation of 3 ton central Air Condition system on a 1150 square feet home. Disallowed cost: \$3,675.00

H0910080	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Blower door data sheet, Building Tightness Limit (BTL) calculated at 1140 @ cfm50. Inspection CFM reading is 988 @ cfm50, indicating residence is BTL. Return and install mechanical ventilation to bring residence at or above BTL. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed cost: 1) Water heater TPRV drain line installed under Health and Safety measures. Disallowed cost: \$20.00
H0910153	DOE/LIHEAP	No	
H0910179	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) Install attic rulers. 2) Water at HVAC secondary condensation drain line. Primary drain might be clogged. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed cost: 1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a 4 ton central Air Condition system on a 1302 square feet home. Disallowed cost: \$2,734.00
H0910270	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) HVAC filter collapsing. Install preventive measures. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601 Disallowed cost: 1) Residential Heat Loss and Heat Gain Calculation dated 6/11/2010 does not appear to contain sufficient and/or accurate information to justify installation of 4 ton central Air Condition system on a 1344 square feet manufactured home. Disallowed cost: \$3,800.00

H1011075	ARRA	Yes	Return and address the following: 1) HVAC filter not properly secured. Install preventive
			measures.
			Reference:
			Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1;
			Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
	·		Disallowed cost:
			1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a 3
			ton central Air Condition system on a 1,344 square feet
			manufactured home.
770010007	7000 ft trans		Disallowed cost: \$3,600.00
H0910097	DOE/LIHEAP	Yes	Return and address the following:
		·	1) HVAC ducts at attic not properly supported, partially
			collapsing and placed on top of attic insulation. Install
			preventive measures.
			2) Secondary condensation drain line terminating inside attic area.
	Î		Reference:
		•	Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1;
			Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5,601
,			Disallowed cost:
		٠	1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a
			central Air Condition system.
	ļ		Disallowed cost: \$2,127.67
H0910178	DOE/LIHEAP	No	
H1011065	ARRA		Return and address the following:
	·		1) CO reading at oven 177ppm.
·			Repair/replace under Health and Safety measures.
			2) Attic, install insulation shield at vents.
			3) Damaged vapor barrier at HVAC ducts.
			4) Attic insulation inside HVAC secondary condensation
			drain pan.
,			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10;
			Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
			Disallowed costs:
]			1) No proper documentation to justify installation of a central Air Condition system.
			Disallowed cost: \$3,515.00
			2) Window pane replacement under Health and Safety
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			measures.

Units Inspected	Fund Source	Return	Comments
SP0910069	ARRA/Li-HEAP	Yes	Return and address the following items:
		·	Attic: 1) Seal large by-pass around wall unit flue pipe, install insulation shield
		,	2) Insulation levels are very low. Near the hatch especially. Bring to actual R-38 at no additional cost. Access hatch needs insulated to R-38. Weather-strip charged on BWR but not installed, install at no additional cost.
			3) Due to location of hatch, there is little room to install attic hatch baffle, use a flexible material such as un-faced batt insulation.
			Sidewalls: 1) Assessment improperly identifies sidewalls as stucco and brick. More than half of the walls are wood composite. Walls could have received insulation. Re-evaluate walls and add insulation with customer's permission.
			2) Blower Door conducted during monitoring visit is 2,224CFM ⁵⁰ . Target reduction is 2,098CFM ⁵⁰ . Continue air sealing until house is brought below target reduction.
·			Appliance replacement: 1) Two new window units were replaced, labor cost seems excessive \$220.00 per unit. Please provide a copy of agency's procurement.
			2) Material for clean and tune on window unit seems excessive. Please provide the process the contractor follows to perform clean and tunes on window units.
			3) A heat load calculation was not present in file for the wall unit replacement. Please provide heat load calculation.

SP0910086	ARRA/Li-HEAP	Yes	Return and address the following:
			Appliance installation: 1) New furnace combustion air intake originates in the attic space. Ensure this is allowed by the allowed by the manufacturer. No heat load calculation done. Please provide with your response.
			2) A new water heater was installed because the previous one was "old and the pilot kept going out". The new tank flue pipe was not properly installed and is in a confined space. The pilot frequently goes out still. Install proper combustion air, correct draft diverter to manufacturer specifications, ensure flue pipe extends proper distance above roof. The justification for replacing was not appropriate.
	·		3) Spray foam installed against flue pipe. Clearance to combustible materials not maintained. Clean off as much as possible or replace pipe this is a fire hazard. Use high temp spray foam or similar product in the future.
			4) New central air installed without proper diagnosis. Provide documentation.
			Sidewalls: 1) Walls between the conditioned space and garage are not insulated. Additionally a sliding glass door was removed and a new door installed. The new wall space next to the door did not get insulated during the installation process.
			Additional repairs: 1) Interior door replacement. Please provide valid reason this procedure was done or the total cost will be disallowed. (\$255.00)

SP0910081	ARRA	Yes	Appliance replacement: 1) New electric furnace and central air replaced, no heat load conducted. The reason stated for the replacement was "coils leaking on the floor" and "unit mismatched and inefficient". This is not a valid reason to replace entire system. Disallowed costs \$3,400.00
SP0910067	ARRA/Li-HEAP	Yes	Attic: 1) Low insulation depths in far corners of attic not an R-38. At no cost to the agency bring to an R-38. Appliance procedures: 1) Large openings where furnace plenum enters attic. Seal off openings at ceiling level and add sufficient combustion in accordance with the International Residential Code.
JW0910095	ARRA/Li-HEAP	Yes	Return and address the following: Attic: 1) Insulate attic hatch lid to R-30. R-sticks or rulers were installed, ensure this is done in the future. Appliance installation: 1) New window heat/cool unit installed at a cost of \$599.00 material and \$335 labor. Please provide procurement documentation for this retrofit. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601

KL091008	DOE/Li-HEAP	Yes	Return and address the following:
			Appliance measures: 1) A new central heating system was installed to replace an un-vented space heater. The furnace was enclosed and sealed off. There is no access to the furnace. Install a door or make the furnace accessible for servicing. Ductwork was installed after attic had been insulated leaving low compacted insulation in the attic. 2) Water heater (exterior) is missing vent rain cap. The flue pipe had to be re-connected during
			monitoring. Water heater extremely rusted out and could start leaking at any moment. Refer to CEAP for possible replacement.
			3) Three new window a/c units installed. No valid reason to replace these units are provided. Labor to install was \$65.00ea, Please provide procurement documentation for this measure. Disallowed costs
		,	Sidewall procedures: 1) Sidewalls did not get insulated. The reason stated was that the agency does not drill through aluminum siding. This is not a valid reason to not insulate walls. Re-assess and provide insulation.
·			2) New sheetrock was installed under paneling in living room at \$268.00. With no wall insulation added this is a disallowed cost.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601

KL0910027	Li-HEAP	Yes	Cidoviall aggaggment
KLU71002/	LI-TEAF	I es	Sidewall assessment: 1) Assessment form says the walls are stone and vinyl and client did not want interior walls done. The majority of the sidewalls can be done from the exterior. Re-assess sidewalls and add insulation.
			Attic procedures: 1) Attic was insulated with AEP funds. The coverage is low in several spots in rear attic. Ceiling joists are visible. It is recommended to return and bring to proper levels.
			2) The attic access is not sealed or insulated. Insulate and weather strip to maximize insulation work.
1			Appliance measures: 1) New furnace and central air replaced under AEP. New furnace combustion air intake originates in the attic space. Ensure this is allowable per the manufacturer. Provide manufacture documentation.
			2) No heat load calculation done. Please provide with your response.
·			3) Duct work in attic is very leaky and dumping conditioned air into unconditioned space. Seal all ductwork to maximize efficiency of furnace and central air.
			Window replacement: 1) Framing for window replacement accounted for \$617.76 of material. Please explain the necessity for this much additional material.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601

JW0910032	DOE/Li-HEAP	Voc	Annliana nagardunan
JW0910032	DOE/L1-HEAP	Yes	Appliance procedures: 1) Water heater is located in a confined space and under certain conditions is back drafting. Install proper combustion air and ensure water heater drafts properly at all times.
,			Sidewall procedures: 1) Billed to AEP. Drilled several test holes to check for proper density. The contractor could have done a better job of dense packing the wall cavities. The agency may want to request
			training on best practices of dense packing sidewalls.
		-	Attic procedures: 1) Attic received insulation according to the BWR. Attic could not be accessed during the visit as it was nailed shut. In the future ensure attic space is accessible for inspection purposes.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
JW0910022	DOE	Yes	Appliance assessment:
			Furnace needs proper combustion air. Provide adequate combustion air per the International Residential Code.
			2) Water heater located in confined space. Provide adequate combustion air or client education on keeping window open to covered porch for adequate combustion air. Provide documentation acknowledging that customer is aware of the need for proper combustion air to prevent back drafting of water heater.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601

JW091005	DOE/Li-HEAP	Yes	Health and Cafaty
1 M O A 1 O O 2	DOE/LI-HEAP	Y es	Health and Safety: 1) Client says a carbon monoxide detector was installed but was removed by agency staff due to not working. The client was promised a new one but never got it. Please provide a carbon monoxide detector.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1;
	·		Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
JW0910029	DOE/Li-HEAP	Yes	Health and Safety: 1) Water heater flue was disconnected when the monitoring visit was conducted. The pipe was reconnected during the visit. Water heater is leaking. Replace under Health and Safety or refer to Comprehensive Energy Assistance Program.
			Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
JW0910041	DOE/Li-HEAP	Yes	Insulation assessment: 1) Mobile home belly not assessed and did not get insulated. Return and assess the belly and insulate it.
			2) Central HVAC system not working. Refer to CEAP for repair/replacement. Reference:
			Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1; Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
JW0910103	ARRA/Li-HEAP	Yes	Insulation procedures:
			 Mobile home belly received insulation. The contractor left access holes unsealed. At no cost to the agency, return and patch all holes in the belly to prevent rodents and moisture issues. Reference: Texas Administrative Code (TAC); Title 10; Part 1;
			Chapter 5; Subchapter F; Rule § 5.601
JW101136	ARRA/Li-HEAP	No	No returns. Good Job!!