

**Illinois EE Stakeholder Advisory Group
Policy Manual Subcommittee**

**Wednesday, April 19, 2023
9:30 am – 12:30 pm
Teleconference**

Attendees and Meeting Notes

Meeting Materials.....1

Attendees (by webinar).....1

Opening & Introductions2

Diverse Contracting Reporting3

Income Qualified Policy Principles7

Single Family IQ Eligibility Verification Guidelines8

LIEEAC Facilitator Independence Policy10

SAG Financial Conflict of Interest Policy11

Organizing IQ Policies in Policy Manual.....12

Closing and Next Steps.....12

Meeting Materials

Posted on the [Policy Manual Subcommittee page](#).

- [April 19, 2023 Policy Manual Subcommittee Agenda](#)
- Follow-up on IQ Reporting from March Policy Manual Subcommittee Meeting:
 - [Diverse Contracting Reporting Principles – Utility Edits](#)
 - [Equity and Affordability Reporting Principles – Utility Edits](#)
- [Income Qualified Program Principles Policy – LIEEAC Collaboration and Partnering](#) (Ameren Illinois)
- [Single Family IQ Eligibility Verification Guidelines Policy \(Stakeholder Edits\)](#)
- [LIEEAC Facilitator Independence Policy \(ComEd Edits\)](#)
- [Follow-up to March Meeting: Updated SAG Conflict of Interest Policy](#)
- [Organizing IQ Policies in Policy Manual](#) (SAG Facilitator Track Changes Edits – starting on page 52)

Attendees (by webinar)

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator
Caty Lamadrid, Inova Energy Group (SAG Meeting Support)
Andrew Cottrell, Applied Energy Group
Andrey Gribovich, DNV
Andy Vaughn, Leidos
Annette Beitel, Future Energy Enterprises (IQ South Facilitation)
Billy Davis, Bronzeville Community Development Partnership
Cassidy Kraimer, Community Investment Corp.
Charles Ampong, Guidehouse
Cheryl Watson, Equitable Resilience & Sustainability LLC

Chris Neme, Energy Futures Group, representing NRDC
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas
Christian Koch, MEEA
Chris Vaughn, Nicor Gas
David Brightwell, ICC Staff
David Kilgore, Ameren Illinois
Deb Perry, Ameren Illinois
Deondre Rutues, Future Energy Enterprises (IQ South Facilitation)
Elizabeth Horne, ICC Staff
Erin Dopfel, Aiqueous
Gregory Norris, Aces 4 Youth
Jarred Nordhus, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Jean Gibson, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Jonathan Skarzynski, Nicor Gas
Kalee Whitehouse, VEIC (IL-TRM Administrator)
Karen Lusson, National Consumer Law Center (NCLC)
Katherine Elmore, Community Investment Corp.
LaJuana Garret, Nicor Gas
Laura Agapay-Read, Guidehouse
Laura Goldberg, NRDC
Leanne Jossund, ComEd
Mike King, Nicor Gas
Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois
Michael Brandt, Elevate
Molly Lunn, ComEd
Omayra Garcia, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Philip Halliburton, ComEd
Philip Mosenthal, Optimal Energy, representing IL AG's Office + NCLC
Randy Opdyke, Nicor Gas
Ronna Abshure, ICC
Scott Eckel, ICC
Stephen Robinson, Northwest Austin Council
Sy Lewis, Meadows Eastside Community Resource Org.
Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, representing Nicor Gas
Thomas Manjarres, Peoples Gas & North Shore Gas
Tina Grebner, Ameren Illinois
Travis Hinck, GDS Associates
Victoria Nielsen, Applied Energy Group
Zach Ross, Opinion Dynamics

Meeting Notes

See **red text** for a summary of next steps.

Opening & Introductions

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

Purpose of meeting: Discuss proposed policies for consideration in the Policy Manual Version 3.0 update process; identify feedback and questions. The April meeting focused on income qualified policy follow-up.

- Additional information: [SAG Facilitator Presentation: Introduction to April Meeting and Policy Background](#)

Diverse Contracting Reporting

Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - The diverse contracting reporting principles policy was last discussed at the March meeting, with additional edits suggested. This is a proposal from NCLC.
 - The goal is to discuss additional edits shared by the utilities, and determine if additional discussion is needed.
 - Metrics will be further developed through the SAG Reporting Working Group in 2023, in coordination with the IQ North and IQ South Committees (joint Working Group?)
- **Materials:** [Diverse Contracting Reporting Principles – Utility Edits](#)

Policy Discussion

- This policy was originally proposed by a stakeholder group and then a utility group suggested some revisions with succinct policy objectives, recognizing we are all working towards increasing diverse contracting in portfolios and looking for ways utilities can show efforts in a meaningful way.
- Utilities have made minimal edits since the last time the group met in March. Only one sentence was stricken, and language on “trade allies” was added.

Annette Beitel: One suggestion related to location: there are sections of the state where there are not any/many diverse trade allies. Adding reporting by location would help utilities and stakeholders understand where trade allies need to be developed to serve underserved populations. Second suggestion is on the second sub-bullet, to add language to the effect of “including but not limited to” because that would allow nurturing of small business, and other diverse trade allies such as language-diverse, or LGBTQ.

Karen Lusson: The language uses many vague words like “may include”. Remind me why the language is so flexible.

Matt Armstrong: During our March meeting we had agreed that these are areas where utilities are reporting but that we do not want to put language in the Policy Manual that would box utilities to report on something that may not be feasible. The idea behind our edits was to keep this policy at a high level to allow us to have discussions beyond this process about what we can metrics can be reported on in a feasible and meaningful way. It is a balance to ensure resources are being spent on the customers and not on reporting costs.

Karen Lusson: I take issue with the notion that reporting on this would be burdensome and costly. Ratepayers are entitled to understand what is happening with the dollars spent on their program. We have an obligation to detail what is happening with diverse spending.

Matt Armstrong: The idea is to present objectives and principles, and then follow-up with additional discussions in later processes. I understand from your perspective reporting may not be burdensome, but for the utilities this is complex.

Phil Mosenthal: It would be helpful to understand, if metrics are not going to be included in the Policy Manual, then where will they reside and what is the timeline for development.

Celia Johnson: The idea of putting metrics in a separate process gives us flexibility if a metric in the future does not make sense. This would be done through a separate working group in a process to take place this year and that would have metrics ready before 2024 since that is a planning process year.

Chris Neme: Two proposed edits that may be consistent with what utilities are trying to accomplish but address some of Karen's concerns. First: the "which may include" language at end of first bullet, I would suggest it should simply say "diverse spending for energy efficiency portfolio in each diverse category of contractors". The second sub bullet should be its own primary bullet. I would strike the "trade allies". And I think there should be a third bullet that says something to the effect of "participation levels in programs by diverse trade allies". I think trade allies deserve their own separate bullet.

- *Celia Johnson captured changes in tracked edits.*

Phil Mosenthal: Important that we report not just on diverse trade allies and contractors but the total as well so there is context. I think it would be helpful to understand the broad categories of contractors and their functions (marketing vs studies etc.)

Annette Beitel – via chat: It would be helpful to have definitions for "Program Allies/Trade Allies" and "Implementation Contractors." We seem to be conflating two very different categories of contractors. Implementation Contractors typically have contracts with the Program Administrators whereas the entities that do field work (that may be referred to as "Program Allies or Trade Allies" do not. We want to make sure that any diverse reporting includes the Program Allies/Trade Allies.

Karen Lusson – via chat: There is very specific information in the current Policy Manual about reporting. Why can't we do the same here for Diverse Contracting?"

Laura Goldberg: The discussion of high-level principles vs metrics stemmed from the multi-family discussion. I think we need to find balance in the need to not overly prescribe metrics but also find places where we can agree on principles. This policy feels more straightforward than some of the multi-family reporting, so to the degree that we can be more specific that would be beneficial. It is a balance because I also agree that we should keep other specifics on the metrics through a separate process.

Annette Beitel: Expanding on Phil's comment, we want this information specifically for Environmental Justice and disadvantaged communities (comparing against totals). This is important because it can be challenging if you are a small business to meet utility requirements.

Phil Mosenthal: Perhaps as a principle we can add language about reporting on geographic distribution and by program.

Karen Lusson: I think that utilities should not just report on the count of diverse contractor but also on the percentage of budget awarded to them. If utilities are objecting to listing of dollar value of contracts, then I think that is necessary to get a better idea of how utilities are sharing opportunities for contracting.

Annette Beitel – via chat: Agree with Karen . . . as a community, we know that several diverse contractors were trained as IL Solar for All contractors then only got 3% of jobs (from total dollars). We need to track total dollars going to diverse contractors, not just number of diverse contractors.

Diverse Contracting Reporting Principles Next Steps:

- Ameren Illinois will propose additional edits, considering adding metrics. Small Group will discuss on **Thursday, April 27**.
- This policy will be presented for input at the May 10 SAG Equity Subcommittee / Joint IQ EE Committee meeting.

Equity and Affordability Reporting Principles

Ted Weaver, First Tracks Consulting, representing Nicor Gas

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - The equity and affordability reporting principles policy was last discussed at the March meeting, with additional edits suggested. This is a joint stakeholder proposal.
 - The goal is to discuss additional edits shared by the utilities, and determine if additional discussion is needed.
 - Metrics will be further developed through the SAG Reporting Working Group in 2023, in coordination with the IQ North and IQ South Committees (joint Working Group?)
- **Materials:** [Equity and Affordability Reporting Principles – Utility Edits](#)

Policy Discussion

- Utilities tried to make the proposal speak at a higher level. Preamble was removed as was agreed by the group at the last meeting. Also rearranged the information into items we consider to be about reporting and items we consider to be analysis.
- The bullets themselves were arranged in three categories. The first three bullets fall into objective data and utilities agree with these points. The second group contains items we interpret as analysis instead of reporting and believe that performing periodic analysis would be most helpful.
- On the second page, the first bullet is now covered by first section.
- Last two bullets got into cross-referrals between credits and collections and energy efficiency program departments. We propose creating a new bullet that combines those two into one. This bullet needs to start as a study because it is unclear what metrics are tracked by the credits and collections departments and how they can be used.

Karen Lusson: Concerned about using "may include..." It should be "shall" include.

Annette Beitel – via chat: Why is language limited to "weatherization" and not all IQ Programs? For example, we've had several discussions about the need for cooling in IQ households, not just heating. We likely need cooling program, particularly for vulnerable populations such as elderly, young, disabled who are particularly sensitive to increasingly high heat indices that can lead to serious health consequences up to an including death. We would want reporting on any cooling programs even if they are not considered "weatherization."

Chris Neme: To the extent that cooling is being addressed, there is no separate low-income energy efficiency program, it is covered through the core programs. That is why the focus is weatherization.

Annette Beitel: Some context on the cooling: there are two members of IQ South EE Committee, that are seeing issues where seniors who don't have access to cooling. This is also a problem in Chicago, and there is now a working group for IQ South that is developing a cooling program for these populations. I don't want to limit the language to weatherization because the IQ South is going to propose a program about cooling.

Chris Neme: If we want to keep it as a principle we could say "in whole building weatherization and/or any other program incorporating major measures for low-income communities."

Phil Mosenthal: I disagree with Ted that his second bullet fully covers the ones that got deleted. The second bullet now relates to effectiveness. I think the language needs to be clear that we want the actual quantities not just whether they are working or not (Edits made by Celia in document).

Ted Weaver: My understanding is the scripts of credit and collections, and energy efficiency call centers include cross-referral language. But these calls get complicated, and it is not clear that everything is tracked the way it would be needed for reporting purposes. We don't even know what metrics we would use.

Katherine Elmore – via chat: I think there is a better term than "weatherization." We are looking for whole-building retrofits. It should exclude direct-install but include all other measures.

Laura Goldberg – via chat: Agreed with Katie. Weatherization is confusing, given the state/federal Weatherization Assistance Program. I also want to uplift the presentations we had from the Energy Equity Project and Leading with Equity Initiative - which will lead to additional ideas and metrics to be discussed/added later.

- *Celia edited to reference "whole building retrofit programs" instead of "weatherization."*

Karen Lusson: As part of implementation of energy efficiency programs we should have a question about whether a person participates in discount rates or bill assistance programs. This should be flagged in a person's account. I am proposing this be added to one of the bullets. We are asking for specificity. We want to know if the customer participates in LIHEAP or PIPP to get an idea of how many of those customers are being served by the utility. When an implementer goes to a home, they probably have a checklist or questions where they verify whether a customer is on LIHEAP or PIPP, and they should be able to share information on those programs making it easy for utilities to report on.

- *Celia edited to reference LIHEAP and PIPP.*

Ted Weaver: My understanding is that information is getting provided to customers through program process. All of it can be reported on but this lives somewhere else currently.

Cheryl Watson: Did you discuss indicators of equity?

Ted Weaver: There has been some discussion, it would include environmental justice communities.

Laura Goldberg – via chat: Federal disadvantaged communities (DACs) as defined via Justice 40 would be another one. I want to note, too, that it takes less than 30 seconds to determine if an address is in an environmental justice community. There is a website that allows you to type in the address.

Cheryl Watson: I think there are too many individual distinctions, so I would request that due diligence is made. Urban heat islands is a hot topic in Chicago. Where would utilities be targeting to get a better sense of what is a vulnerable heat island. Urban heat islands are still being defined so they may not be in pre-existing maps.

David Kilgore – via chat: Urban heat islands may be most closely related to Tree Equity Score. I know the tree inventory map in Peoria is a decade old. otherwise, I do not have insight on maps at census tract level.

- <https://treeequityscore.org/>

Karen Lusson – via chat: EJ community identifier (which incorporates federal identifying information):

- <https://elevate.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=cfd020c99ed844668450c6b77eachb411>

Equity and Affordability Reporting Principles Next Steps:

- SAG Facilitator circulated ‘clean draft’ to interested participants for review. Small Group will discuss on **Thursday, April 27**.
- This policy will be presented for input at the May 10 SAG Equity Subcommittee / Joint IQ EE Committee meeting.

Income Qualified Policy Principles

Matt Armstrong, Ameren Illinois

SAG Facilitator Background:

- Annette Beitel proposed that Income Qualified Policy Principles be developed for the Policy Manual. This was discussed at the February meeting and Annette Beitel and Matt Armstrong worked together to draft it.
- **Materials:** [Income Qualified Program Principles Policy – LIEEAC Collaboration and Partnering](#)

Policy Discussion

- There were several proposals made early in the Policy Manual process by the IQ North leadership team, and we thought it was important that some of the ideas be captured.
- This policy includes that utility administrators are going to continue to collaborate with Community Action Agencies (CAAs) and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for capacity building, increase diverse businesses.

Laura Goldberg: I’m trying to understand what the intent is of this proposal. I think some of this is embedded by CEJA and LIEEAC language to get more CBOs and CAAs

involved in energy efficiency matters. Have CBOs/CAAs looked at this language, has it been vetted through LIEEAC?

Sy Lewis – via chat: We the IQ North have never seen this or had any input in this language.

Matt Armstrong: I don't think the statute goes far enough, it just calls electric utilities to being participants and fund the LIEEAC and this proposal tries to go further and ensure that there is representation, and we take into consideration those voices.

Laura Goldberg: I think CEJA does have metrics and maybe it's worth adding here as a reminder that those discussions are meant to influence utility programs. A question for the group: should this proposal go beyond LIEEAC? To ensure that CBOs/CAAs are incorporated for participation through various processes.

Karen Lusson: I support the concept of more collaboration. The issue I have is with the introductory language and a title is that based on recent experience: I recently presented information about affordability and actions that need to be taken by utilities for the IQ South EE committee's consideration. Basically, the response was that the utility would continue to listen to CBOs/CAAs but the problem is that these organizations don't often participate in rate issues. I would want to add something in intro paragraph about "low-income consumer and environmental advocates through direct engagement."

Laura Goldberg: Consumer and environmental advocates have more power and access to these spaces. May not need to be reference; looks like the policy is meant to be focused on CBOs and voices that have been historically underrepresented. We need to recognize there are other groups working on these issues. To Sy's point: it is telling that if the policy is focused on the LIEEAC then that should not be the only way to engage CAAs/CBOs - it should be broadened.

Gregory Norris: How do we ensure that CBOs are actually being involved? This has been a concern for several years. What can I do to find out who is the CBO in my specific area that is involved in that process?

Deb Perry: Will follow-up.

Income Qualified Policy Principle Next Steps:

- Due to feedback shared April 19th, the SAG Facilitator recommends this draft policy to be discussed in the future outside of the current Policy Manual process with the IQ North and IQ South EE Committees.
- Deb Perry (Ameren Illinois) will follow-up with Gregory Norris (Aces 4 Youth) regarding the question on CBO participation.

Single Family IQ Eligibility Verification Guidelines

Laura Goldberg, NRDC

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - This is an Ameren Illinois policy proposal on single family IQ eligibility verification guidelines
 - The Policy Manual already includes eligibility verification guidelines for multi-family

- In Sept., Ameren requested interim resolution of this policy, to help address customer eligibility verification challenges in their single family IQ EE programs
- A Policy Manual Small Group meeting was held in October to discuss edits
- At the October Policy Manual meeting, participants reached consensus on an interim policy resolution, with the understanding there would be further refinement of policy language, including identifying additional single family IQ eligibility pathways
- The [interim policy resolution](#) is posted on the [Policy page](#) of the SAG website
- At the December Policy Manual meeting, ComEd and IL AG/NCLC proposed edits to the “interim resolution” version of the policy
- Additional proposed stakeholder edits will be discussed today
- **Materials:** [Single Family IQ Eligibility Verification Guidelines Policy \(Stakeholder Edits\)](#)

Policy Discussion

- Stakeholders have a few questions and a specific area to have a discussion on. There are also some minor edits to how the policy is described (this will not be part of policy manual but rather part of preamble).
- Other small edits to rework sentences and cleaning up language. Most comments are on tenant-occupied SF homes.

Matt Armstrong: Most of this original language came from the multi-family policy. If we agree on these language changes, we should think about how those carry over to the existing multi-family policy.

Laura Goldberg: Consider if it makes sense to keep for consistency or change multi-family policy.

Karen Lusson: Utility shareholder-funded programs (which for the most part no longer exist) are within the control of the utility in terms of what they look like. I think we just want to be general and say “energy assistance programs or utility-funded” that way we capture programs that address energy and affordability.

Matt Armstrong: I’m going to look at how the interim policy is now applied and make sure that the proposed language does not preclude any customers that are currently participating.

Katie Elmore: I wanted to add specificity because the language just says location within Census Tract and the multi-family definition has more detail. This should mirror the multi-family criteria.

Phil Mosenthal: I agree. It probably needs a definition of what qualified Census Tract can include.

Elizabeth Horne: 4 units will be considered single family homes and if its located in IQ Census Tract there are two issues to consider for the home to completely qualify: (1) in some cases two-unit homes both are home-owner and tenant occupied, what happens if you have two income brackets within the same home? is eligibility determined based on owner or tenant’s income? (2) In some LI Census Tracts there are many renovations where homes are selling for \$500K and they are tenant-occupied. Are we comfortable with having a \$500K home in a low-income area automatically qualify for IQ program participation?

Phil Mosenthal: These are good points and there are certainly situations where this will happen and I kind of see this as “free ridership”. I was erring on the side of not leaving homes out because of the turnover that happens with rentals.

Katie Elmore: Agree with Phil on the second issue. I think that Elizabeth’s point about owner/tenant occupied property requires clarity. Maybe you default to the owners’ status or income.

Sy Lewis: What I’ve been noticing in south side communities, is that because of gentrification property values going up 10-20% but income is not going up and neither are the conditions of the properties. Developers are going to come in and take advantage of the fact that the home is in a Census Tract. We don’t want this to happen, because someone that is not IQ could move into this perfectly retrofitted home.

Elizabeth Horne: For multi-family there is a workaround where administrators require that 80% of building should be IQ. Whereas with Single Family there isn’t that cap where we say there might be 100 homes in census tract that are IQ vs 80 that are not. I don’t know that there is a policy that can encompass this, but that would be one way of targeting those homes.

- Laura Goldberg: some additional questions on further defining retrofit projects. And then there is some may/will language. Propose using “whole building retrofit” to be consistent with the weatherization issue discussed earlier.

Molly Lunn: There are two different processes, and I was trying to say that this process can also be used. That is why the language is not limiting.

Karen Lusson – via chat: Can you define “non-comprehensive”? Give an example of such a service.

Molly Lunn: The ComEd Home Energy Assessments program is an example.

Single Family IQ Eligibility Verification Guidelines Policy Next Steps

- Ameren Illinois and other interested participants to review edited policy. Discuss any additional comments on **Wednesday, May 3**.
- This policy will be presented for input at the May 10 SAG Equity Subcommittee / Joint IQ EE Committee meeting.

LIEEAC Facilitator Independence Policy

Molly Lunn, ComEd

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - ComEd presented a policy proposal regarding LIEEAC (IQ EE Committee) facilitator independence at the March meeting; a few edits were suggested
 - LIEEAC facilitator independence is currently referenced in Ameren and ComEd 2022-2025 EE Plan stipulated agreements
- **Materials:** [LIEEAC Facilitator Independence Policy \(ComEd Edits\)](#)

Policy Discussion

- ComEd summary of edits, to follow-up on March Policy Manual meeting:

- Added Ameren language regarding the timeframe for review of contracts by the Commission
- ICC Staff can submit the contract if they hold it, or the utility can submit the contract if they hold it
- The utility will submit the fully executed contract in the relevant / most current Policy Manual docket
- Updated the term “party” to “LIEEAC Committee member”
- Kept the reference to “Regional Subcommittee” in the policy

LIEEAC Facilitator Independence Policy Next Steps

- No concerns were raised about the edits presented by ComEd. SAG Facilitator posted policy as “final draft” on the Policy Manual Subcommittee webpage.
- This policy will be presented for input at the May 10 SAG Equity Subcommittee / Joint IQ EE Committee meeting.

SAG Financial Conflict of Interest Policy

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - SAG has a “Process Guidance” document describing various processes related to how the SAG operates and SAG participation
 - This document is updated annually, as needed
 - It includes a “SAG Financial Conflict of Interest policy” that describes several situations where participation is limited to utilities and non-financially interested stakeholders
 - At the Feb. meeting, the IQ Committee Facilitator introduced a proposed change to non-financially interested party participation that was requested by the IQ North Committee Leadership Team in 2022, to include participation by community-based organizations
 - Edits were discussed at the March meeting, with a few additional suggestions
 - Today will include discussing additional edits prepared by SAG Facilitator, to follow-up on March meeting
 - Also discuss whether this policy should be added to the Policy Manual, or remain in the SAG Process Guidance document
- **Materials:** [Follow-up to March Meeting: Updated SAG Conflict of Interest Policy](#)

Policy Discussion

- At the last meeting, it was suggested a definition of “implementation” should be added to the policy language addressing CBOs participating as non-financially interested parties.
- The proposed definition of “implementer” was removed, as well as the sentence referencing CBOs that act as implementers not being eligible to participate. Participants commented it was not necessary to exclude CBOs that act as implementers when they receive a small budget (the policy limits CBO participation as non-financially interested parties to contracts with utilities totaling \$75,000 per year).
- Consensus reached that this policy does not belong in the Policy Manual, and should remain in where it currently exists, in the SAG Process Guidance Document.

SAG Financial Conflict of Interest Policy Next Steps

- Participants discussed and agreed on edits, removing the definition of “implementation” as unnecessary. Agreement reached the policy should remain in the “SAG Process Guidance” document, and will not be added to the Policy Manual.
- Even though this policy will not be added to the Policy Manual, it will be presented for input at the May 10 SAG Equity Subcommittee / Joint IQ EE Committee meeting.

Organizing IQ Policies in Policy Manual

Celia Johnson, SAG Facilitator

- **SAG Facilitator Background:**
 - IQ Committee Facilitator submitted a proposal there should be a new section in the Policy Manual referencing or summarizing IQ policies, using accessible language
 - Stakeholders submitted a [joint proposal](#) that there should be a new section in the Policy Manual related to processes of the IQ Committee
 - SAG Facilitator organized a new section of the Policy Manual to reference IQ policies
- **Materials:** [Organizing IQ Policies in Policy Manual](#) (SAG Facilitator Track Changes Edits – starting on page 52)

Policy Discussion

- There are several different ways to organize a section on IQ policies. SAG Facilitator proposal is to reference excerpts of IQ policies that appear throughout the Policy Manual in a new section at the end of the manual, and add introductory language where policies may need explanation.
- A second option is to include all IQ policies in one section of the manual.
- A third option is to create a new section that would simply cross reference existing IQ policies that appear throughout the manual.

Zach Ross: We need the IQ Committee to understand the policy section; if we go down the path of explaining various policies to make them accessible, that should be reviewed by the IQ Committee for feedback.

Molly Lunn: Could this be an appendix to the Policy Manual, where the low income policies are separately explained elsewhere? Also, the current low income policies should be preserved in their current location in the Policy Manual. They should not be moved to a separate section.

Organizing IQ Policies in Policy Manual Next Steps

- Due to feedback shared April 19th, the SAG Facilitator recommends the creation of a new section summarizing income qualified policies be discussed in the future outside of the current Policy Manual process with the IQ North and IQ South EE Committees.

Closing and Next Steps

- **Next Policy Manual Subcommittee Meeting:** Wednesday, May 3 (teleconference)
- **SAG Equity Subcommittee Meeting (Joint with IQ EE Committee) to Introduce and Request Input on IQ-Related Policies:** Wednesday, May 10 (teleconference)