

Background

CFI Group, an independent consulting and market research firm, conducted this study on behalf of the Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program (DOE WAP). Founded in 1988 and headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan, CFI Group serves global clients from a network of offices worldwide and utilizes the science of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI). The ACSI is the national indicator of customer evaluations of the quality of goods and services available to U.S. residents. It is the only uniform, cross-industry/government measure of customer satisfaction. Since 1994, the ACSI has measured satisfaction, its causes, and its effects, for seven economic sectors, 41 industries, more than 200 private-sector companies and has measured more than 100 programs of federal government agencies since 1999. This allows benchmarking between the public and private sectors and provides information unique to each agency on how its activities that interface with the public affect the satisfaction of customers. The effects of satisfaction are estimated, in turn, on specific outcomes.

The program objective for DOE WAP was to measure the customer satisfaction of Sub-Grantees from the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program. Specifically, DOE WAP wanted to measure how well DOE WAP and the State WAP Agencies are delivering services to Sub-Grantees, and how well the State WAP Agencies are supporting local agencies in their mission to assist low-income households with their energy needs. The survey was fielded via email from January 10 to January 31, 2017. A total of 740 surveys were sent and 579 were completed nationally, resulting in a response rate of 78% which is excellent. Measures of this nature typically achieve a response rate of 20-30%.

Results

Each State Report Workbook is comprised of 3 Tabs: Tab 1. Overview of Results; Tab 2. Scores and Impacts; Tab 3. State Specific Verbatim Comments. While Tab 1 and Tab 3 are self-explanatory, Tab 2 includes the following: the lowest and highest national scores in the study, the national average scores, state specific scores and national impacts.

Definitions

Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) - Tab 2. Row 42

The CSI is the weighted average of three questions that ask directly about customer satisfaction. These three questions are the same for each entity that measures customer satisfaction, whether public or private.

1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by the State WAP Agency?
2. How well do the services from the State WAP Agency meet your expectations?
3. How do the services from the State WAP Agency compare to an ideal grant awarding agency?

Drivers (of Satisfaction) - Tab 2. Rows 4, 8, 12, 19, 24, 31, 35

The aspects of the customer experience measured in the survey by a series of rated questions. Drivers for this study include:

1. Development of the WAP Plan
2. Distribution of Funds
3. Technical Assistance
4. Training Provided by Third Parties
5. Monitoring and Corrective Action
6. Partnerships
7. Communication

Driver Scores - Tab 2. Rows 4, 8, 12, 19, 24, 31, 35

- Each driver score is the weighted average of several questions within the survey asked on a 1 to 10 scale which is then converted to a 0 to 100 scale.
- For example, the driver score for Development of the WAP Plan is made up of rated questions for extent of involvement, caliber of opportunities and degree to which the plan reflects your input.
- Scores are an index, similar to reporting a temperature. Scores are not percentages.

Question Score - Tab 2. Rows 5, 6, 7, etc.

- Average respondent score for questions asked in the survey.
- Questions are asked on 1-10 scale and translated to 0-100.

Future Behavior - Tab 2. Rows 46, 48

- Represents the desired behaviors that results from changes in CSI.
- Future Behaviors in this study include:
 1. How confident are you that the State WAP Agency is committed to supporting local agencies in their mission to assist low-income households with their energy needs?
 2. How much do you trust the State WAP Agency to work with you to meet your organization's needs?

Future Behavior Score - Tab 2. Rows 47, 49

Average respondent score for each rated future behavior.

Impact

Impacts, shown in the last column of Tab 2, are derived from a statistical analysis of the relationship between the drivers and satisfaction using the science of the ACSI methodology. Impacts quantify the relationship between each driver and the Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI). The impact is the predicted change in the CSI score that results from a 5-point change in a driver's score. For example, if the Communication driver has an impact of 2.0, we would expect CSI to increase by 2.0 points when the Communication driver score increases 5 points. In other words, high impact means greater leverage on customer satisfaction, which translates to increased confidence that the DOE WAP is fulfilling its mission of supporting local agencies in their mission to assist low-income households with their energy needs. Note that the impact values were calculated for DOE WAP as a whole in order to provide the most reliable data for all the States in the network as sample sizes were too small to calculate impacts at the State level.

Future Behavior Impact - Tab 2. Column H. Rows 46, 48

This number shows the expected change in respondent behavior for every 5-point increase (or fraction thereof) in Satisfaction.

Confidence Interval

- A confidence interval is a range around a sample score that is likely to contain the true population score.
- For this study, the confidence level used is 80%.
- Michigan's Confidence Interval is +/-2. The confidence interval of 2 means that there is an 80% probability that the CSI falls between 72 and 76.

Interpreting Scores

CFI Group recommends that scores be viewed on a continuum and each agency use the results to identify strengths and areas of opportunity. To answer the question on how to interpret a particular score, one can use the below general guideline.

Exceptional: 90-100
Excellent: 80-89
Good: 70-79
Average: 60-69
Below Average: Less than 60

Additionally, Tab 2 contains the National Minimum Score in Column B and the National Maximum Score in Column C for this study. The overall average Customer Satisfaction Index for the Federal Government is 68.

Highlights

1. The Michigan Customer Satisfaction Index is 74, compared to the DOE WAP National Customer Satisfaction Index of 67. The Federal Government average for 2016 is 68.
2. Scores for drivers of satisfaction range from 50 to 75, with Development of the WAP Plan scoring the lowest and Distribution of Funds scoring the highest.

2017 Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance Program - Sub-Grantee Satisfaction with the States Survey
State - Michigan
Overview

3. Communication is the driver with the highest impact and therefore the most influence on satisfaction at this time. Overall, Michigan's Communication score is moderate, at 71. However, the areas relating to the "clarity of communications" (68), and the "frequency of communication" (69) score relatively lower; focus improvement efforts here to further strengthen Michigan's Communication.

4. Technical Assistance is also a high-impact area with a considerable amount of influence on overall satisfaction. Michigan's Technical Assistance is moderate, at 70. Focus on the "clarity and consistency of assistance provided" (66) and the "timeliness of receiving requested information" (68) to drive Technical Assistance improvements moving forward.

5. The comments received provide additional specific feedback that may be helpful in suggesting other improvements the state might undertake.

Department of Energy [DOE] - DOE WAP Sub-Grantee
2017
Score Table

Sample Size	National Min	National Max	National		Michigan		National Impact
			Scores	Sample Size	Scores	Sample Size	
			579		24		
Development of the WAP Plan	0	80	44	532	50	23	0.5
Extent of involvement in developing Plan	0	78	43	509	49	23	--
Quality of opportunities to participate in developing Plan	0	89	48	519	53	23	--
Degree to which Plan reflects input	0	78	42	502	48	22	--
Distribution of Funds	21	97	64	572	75	24	0.7
Timing of distribution funds ensured no service interruption	11	100	57	568	78	24	--
Quality of Agency process for executing grant awards	22	93	63	566	72	24	--
Timely payment from Agency once award is made	22	100	71	562	74	24	--
Technical Assistance	26	96	70	575	70	24	0.9
Ability to answer questions	33	95	72	575	74	24	--
Timeliness of receiving requested information	26	96	69	574	68	24	--
Ability to direct you to useful resources or information	37	96	72	573	71	23	--
Responsiveness to tech assistance requests	20	100	73	570	73	24	--
Clarity and consistency of assistance provided	17	96	65	575	66	24	--
Effectiveness of tech assistance provided	19	97	70	572	71	24	--
Training Provided by Third Parties	29	85	66	567	58	24	0.1
Accessibility of training	25	87	64	566	51	24	--
Scheduling of training	25	89	61	565	54	24	--
Cost of training	6	98	63	553	54	23	--
Quality of training	33	93	74	557	71	22	--
Monitoring and Corrective Action	37	100	70	570	73	24	0.4
Consistency of monitoring across Network	27	100	65	530	70	22	--
Adherence to monitoring plan for on-site visit	31	100	73	563	75	24	--
Usefulness of monitoring visits	40	100	69	569	74	24	--
Clarity of feedback in monitoring report	35	100	71	568	74	24	--
Timeliness of feedback in monitoring report	0	100	68	567	72	24	--
Clarity of Corrective Action-Quality Improvement Plan process	38	100	71	548	72	20	--
Partnerships	29	91	58	528	58	23	0.6
Awareness of efforts to serve eligible households	25	88	59	524	58	23	--
Sufficiency of Agency partnerships with other entities	31	100	58	507	58	23	--
Effectiveness of partnerships created to better serve clients	30	92	59	511	57	23	--
Communication	33	99	69	576	71	24	2.0
Sufficiency of communication about WAP policies-regulations	33	100	70	572	72	24	--
Usefulness of feedback about work plans-performance-monitoring	28	94	68	570	74	23	--
Frequency of communication	31	100	68	573	69	24	--
Clarity of communications	30	100	67	574	68	24	--
Responsiveness of Agency staff to info requests	33	100	72	574	74	24	--
Consistency of responses received	33	100	68	570	76	23	--
Customer Satisfaction Index	33	96	67	579	74	24	N/A
Overall satisfaction	33	100	69	579	75	24	--
Compared to expectations	30	94	66	579	72	24	--
Compared to the ideal	35	94	64	579	74	24	--
Mission Fulfillment	41	100	75	566	77	23	4.7
Confidence in fulfilling mission to assist low-income families	41	100	75	566	77	23	--
Meet Organization Needs	30	100	71	576	75	24	5.1
Trust in WAP to help meet organization needs	30	100	71	576	75	24	--

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

Q4. How could the process of the developing the Plan be improved?
Task group to evaluate what we have done in the past and what is allowable by DOE regulations. Possibly incorporate new ideas.
Training on new regulations
If local agencies could be better informed about the considerations that the State must consider when developing the plan. I'm not very aware of all the extra considerations they must address when developing the plan. If I'm to give meaningful input it seems like I should better understand the plan requirements. / I think a session every year at the State held Wx training conference on the Wx plan development would be a good chance to educate local agencies in person.
Michigan's BCAEO could provide more oppourtunities for local WAP providers input by holding public forums, dicussion meetings, survey's seeking provider input, and conversatoins with other key stakeholders.
More inclusion of WAP program staff, managers and directors.
The process could be improved by having several work groups where participants would have face to face dialog
The state could allow for oppourtunities to participate in the development of the Plan. As a subcontractor, I am not aware of being asked for input in the development of the Plan. In the past there was a comment period but only after the plan had been developed.
Input from actual providers as to how budget category allocations should be adjusted based on geographic differences and changes in measures classification.
Direct involvement with the local WAP agencies delivery the services.
Our state does a great job incorporating a diverse group of folks. Leadership professionals from utility programs, LWO's, and State representatives start the process, then all LWO's get to read it and add their input. I feel our process has purpose and makes sense.
Areas of the state with the highest heating degree days should get more funding.
More Transparency
Not really sure since I am not involved in developing it. Only get to see it for the comment period and do not know what comments are submitted as to whether or not they are considered.
Longer time frame to reseach facts and foresee outcomes of any changes. Fully understanding the long term effects a change may have and there impacts.
More local agency input, and agency involvement into the process.
It seems to be efficient the way it is.
I feel the state has done an adequate job of utilizing the information we provided them for developing the Plan.
Present plan details at a regional or state meeting for state-wide input
Q5. What training and technical assistance for developing the Plan would you recommend DOE WAP provide to the State?
If not provided already, a list of what other States are doing and possible oppourtunities that may not be being done currently by our State.
More direct questions and input from the agencies performing the work
New regulations
not sure. I would assume that the state is allowed to spend T/TA dollars on plan development. if not that would be good. the DOE should run a webinar or conference session on plan development for states.
It was our understanding that DOE required MI BCAEO to competatively bid and open up the proposal process to any interested entity across the State of Michigan, including local WAP providers, as well as, competitors. This lead to much confusion, distrust with the State WAP office, and lack of formalized input on the actual State WAP plan and process. DOE could provide more strealined guidance to the State and set clearer expecations.
The plan should encourage input from the inception. The T and TA team could form work groups around the state and solicit input from participants in WX services in the very early stages of development
If it is the expectation that sub-grantees are supposed to be involved in the development of the plan, then technical assistance could be offered to educate the State regarding a process to do so.
State sessions to review with local WAP's for direct input.
DOE upcoming changes and potential proposals should be given to QCI's and LWO's in advance to have time to provide feedback prior to adding it to the plan.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

Training and technical assistance should be done regionally in the state to cut down on travel time.
Not Sure since not involved in the planning or development of the Plan.
There have been way to many changes over the years. Those changes have added more staff time to reporting and documenting activities and taken away from the time spent providing the services to the public. Stop making changes!
The entire application process is burdensome. Make the application process easier.
More budget training
From our prospective the State seems to be well trained and is able to transfer this information to use in a precise and timely manner.
Q9. What recommendations do you have for your State WAP Agency that would allow you to efficiently bill and/or pay contractors for work on in-progress units completed and inspected prior to the unit being final?
Paying for units prior to the unit being final may create confusion at all ends. Possibly increase the initial payment to agencies so that they can cover payments until warranty call backs or final paperwork could be completed.
Most of the untis we try to complete as quickly as possible for payments to all contractors issuing to the mechanical contractor first they are the ones waiting the longest period of time, since wx takes place after mechanical, to pay another QCI to approve mechanical work would be a strain on support funding for contract QCI
None
I would recommend that the state understand the relationship that we have with our Weatherization contractors. Most contractors have worked for the Wx program for many years. If we are required to not process invoices for contractors until work is 100% complete (usually when minor corrections are needed) it delays and complicates our process. All Wx contractors will perform go-back or corrective work. This has been my experience for more than a dozen years. The contractors are invested in the program, if they should suddenly refuse to perform corrective work then their contract with the agency would be terminated. Withholding payment from a brand new contractor makes sense, but not for a contractor that I've work with for years. These are small contractors for the most part with tight cash flow operations. I find it unnecessarily punitive and inefficient to hold up payments for minor workmanship issues.
Provide the ability for Agencies to draw down funds in advance.
MI BCAEO in the past provided advance payments which would allow local WAP providers to hit the ground running and begin serving clients without a delay.
for out of travel use federal Per Diem vs. state required rate. / permitted advance of grant reward
I would like for the contractors to be paid once their work is completed. We work with small businesses and they often cannot afford to carry debt for the wx programs.
The State could offer each agency an initial payment so that the beginning operations are not dependent on reimbursements and production would be uninterrupted.
Clarification on when contractors can be paid and if that applies to units in progress or completed only.
It should be allowed and not questioned, if the client qualifies then payment should be allowed to be made.
The current process is working for us.
None, We pay our contractors when the job is considered final not as in-progress.
None at this time
Allow for the payment to the General Contractor if workmanship is acceptable, while waiting for the Mechanical Contractor to complete the ASHRAE compliance.
Current process works fine for our agency.
I have no recommendations but just a comment. I feel that in the rural areas where the need is great that cooperation and close contact with the contractor is essential. Payment for services as they are completed is fair. I think that contractors should only be compensated when services have been satisfactorily performed.
Allow for an 80/20 or 90/10 payment plan withholding the smaller amount until a post inspection has been completed. Many smaller contractors may not be able to carry a job cost over \$2,000 until a post inspection is completed.
Q10. What technical assistance would you recommend DOE WAP provide to the State regarding its grant award process?

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

N/A
This was a challenging year due to the changes in the closing out process changes, continue to train contractors, QCI and auditors.
Training in grant writing
not sure
None
Award funds on a multi-year contract basis with quarterly targets. Rebooting production every July due to annual funding disrupts and significantly delays production. This is evidenced by low production every first quarter. Annual allocations that overlap contract periods would also assist with maintaining a steady flow of production.
The process has improved tremendously! Our state has listened to the local operators and made numerous improvements. We receive our payments in a timely fashion
Recommended technical assistance would be train in Excel 2013 so that the spreadsheet that we need to utilize is compatible to our system.
Simplify the grant and award process a lot of items do not change unless there were significant changes with DOE or state.
Continue to allow CARRYOVER. Sometimes changes occur that are mandated by DOE that causes a program delay. Sometimes funds are left on the table but the need is still there. When Carryover funds are available, it provides stability in the program.
Crew leader and weatherization measure installer training in all regions of the state.
Training on being consistent makes the process smoother
Nothing at this time.
none at this time
Whatever training & technical assistance's currently being provided.
Current system works fine for us
None, it seems fairly streamline to us.
Q17. What additional technical assistance needs would you like the State WAP Agency to address?
Technical assistance has been provided sufficiently.
I would like to see a better State Conference with more training not the same each year
None
Training for General Weatherization contractors would be very helpful.
MI BCAEO currently utilizes DBAFac's Pro to enter data related to WAP jobs. This software is very cumbersome and the State struggled and was unable to provide ongoing support and clarification with software issues. MI BCAEO WAP staff on other matter regarding policy and implimentation were good.
It seems that the TA staff are overwhelmed, I would like to think that is that case. Our program has urgent and dire need of receiving TA as we have had multiple changes in significant program staff. We have been asking for assistance for almost 6 months. We have gotten support from sister programs, but would benefit most if there was assistance from our grant managers and TA contacts in ensuring our program is operating adequately.
Our state has had challenges with staffing. This is unanticipated so they are trying to maintain the same level of support in T and TA
None at this time. The technical assistance provided has been great. The programmatic assistance has not been comprehensive and lacks substance.
Clearer definition of when a job becomes more than the scope of the program.
Contradiction of the SWS and state codes, ex, Foundation insulation and ASHRAE home calculation in relation to the foundation.
Crew Leader and weatherization measure installer.
Getting more experience
Would like a clear interpretation of policies and procedures and regulations. It seems that everyone has a different interpretation of what the rules are and they are changed to a different interpretation depending on who you are speaking to.
Local training within the state.
The QCI training should be hands on for all inspectors.
BPI Certified training within the State.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

Multiple training locations strategically placed throughout the state. (Even if only temporary)
have more frequent in-state access to Energy Auditor and QCI trainings.
Q22. What recommendations do you have for improving the accessibility and quality of technical training provided by third-party sources?
A local training center would be beneficial.
Most of our training that has been provided was over three hours away and that is hard for contractors to attend especially if more than one day is required. More on line training.
Monthly updates on recommended trainings in state and out of state
There are no good third party sources in Michigan. We rely on trainers located in Indiana and Ohio for most of our technical training. I know that Michigan is working on developing training centers.
The current required QCI training needs to be modified and take into account state by state rules and regulations. Testing on information on WAP provided in other states is a waste of time and effort for staff who recieve the training and go through the required testing to become certified. The availability and cost of testing is also a factor.
The third party sources must honor the training needs of all trainees and preference should not be given to people in their immediate service area.
Our third party sources have done well with us.
The addition of a State training center will be helpful, but trainers need to be accredited in this State so they teach what our State plan allows and import things from their own State and leave out stuff from ours.
Make it more readily available and closer.
It would be better, if it was done in each region of the state to cut down on travel.
We need in-state training centers
Would like to see training provided more locally rather than having to send staff to another state for training.
We need more third party sources. Get some local collages accredited to do the BPI stuff. We also need more access to free ceu's.
None
I believe this is being addressed by our current State representative.
We would like to see the State have the ability to provide its own training programs.
That the third party resource respond to requests for training information in a timely manner.
Q23. What, if any, additional training and technical assistance needs do you want the State WAP Agency to address?
None.
Health and Safety and Deferral issues that are facing many agencies.
None /
Contractor training would be helpful, preferably contractor training that can travel to the local agency and train contractors on a job site. better communication on all other sources of training, ASHRAE, LSWP, IAQ, OSHA 10 etc. a page on the State website could summarize availability of these training locations or websites.
State providing QCI training, testing, and certifications at a more local level.
I have received and planned all needed trainings
None identified at this time.
Entry and advanced level shell measures training.
Foundation insulating and ASHRAE calculation
Indoor Air Quality and Weatherization Lead Work Safe Training done locally.
Best practices for measures aligned with the SWS
Not sure at this time our Staff have already received the up-to-date training's and qualifications necessary to run the Weatherization Program.
The whole thought makes me sick.
QCI hand on.
BPI Certified Trainings
I feel they do a very good job of keeping the network informed and trained.
Q30. What, if any, suggestions do you have for how to improve the monitoring process?
None.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

I feel the files are not fully reviewed, all documentation cannot be uploaded for file review. I feel agency visits are still very important spend time with an agency, do file reviews listen to the issues.
More audits for contractors
Sharing the monitoring checklist in advance would be helpful.
WAP is a program that is monitored on a constant basis, which leads to ineffectiveness of staff time and talents. We agree that monitoring is important to ensure quality but could be done on an annual basis.
Notice of scheduled/conducted desk audits. / Quarterly monitoring reports have begun to share statewide progress toward goals- this should continue. / Sharing of monitoring tools used with agencies to inform internal monitoring. / Standard templates for Corrective Action/QIP should be created. More timely follow up response to Corrective Action/QIP submitted in reference to next steps for providing follow up/review toward close out of CA/QIP /
na
The technical monitoring process is done pretty well and is systematic because the information is included in our database system. The programmatic monitoring is less consistent and timely. Each process allows for reciprocal learning.
NA, I know that it is necessary to ensure quality work.
The current process works good.
Would like to see more real time monitoring (monitoring during the program year instead of at the end of the program year). Also once a monitoring visit is complete would like to receive the report in a shorter time span than 30 days so that corrective action can be addressed more immediately.
none at this time
The monitor should be trying to replicate the QCI testing results. if so much stock is to be held in the QCI ability they should be checked for accuracy and completeness.
No suggestions
None, we feel the monitoring process has evolved into providing assurances that meet the goals of this program.
Q31. What technical assistance would you recommend DOE WAP provide to the State regarding the grant monitoring process?
None.
Do some reviews of deferred files see what is actually going on at the agency level.
None
not sure
Making the process less time consuming.
na
None at this time.
Allow more time to gain access to clients.
The current process works good.
Better Clarification of the policies, procedures and regulations so that all Monitor's have the same interpretation of them. It seems to be a guessing game as to what is a rule and what is a guide. Each individual interprets the policy, procedure or regulation to their own thinking.
None
None
Current assistance is sufficient.
None that we are aware of.
Q35. What would you like to see the State WAP Agency do to increase partnerships with other government/non-government entities to serve eligible households?
Not sure if you are referencing collaboration to increase services offered or partnerships to perform weatherization? Increased collaboration between entities would benefit all.
The different agencies need to have more open communication a lot of time different department have the training scheduled at the same time as other training, conferences and meetings.
None
not sure
This truly is a local level issue not a State issue.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

Partnership with utility providers for sharing longitudinal data related to client energy savings post-weatherization. Partnerships with workforce development and other entities to ensure future supply of qualified Weatherization contractors, auditors, QCI, etc. Partnerships with government entities that promotes leveraging weatherization with other state/local community development efforts.
na
At this point in time we do not know if any efforts so if the state has partnerships with government/non-government entities, then it would be nice to be aware of their efforts.
In rural areas, collaboration efforts are diminished and often are neglected due to limitations of the programs available in these areas.
More money to address more H&S concerns using LIHEAP/Utility funds that cannot be addressed by DOE. Rather than walking away from a job due to the measure being present, allowing us to use other funds during the WX project to remedy the situation.
It would be better, if the state would have the utility companies give the energy optimization money directly to the agencies that provide the weatherization services.
Would like to see other government/non-government entities to be on board to assist in all communities not in just some of them. Example if a Local DHHS office has SER funds and works with a local agency then all DHHS offices should be assisting with all local WAP Agencies in the state the same way.
nothing
Advocate for funding to help with the Health & Safety aspect of the WX program which is a large portion of the job with (ASHRAE) and other required H&S measures.
Have more flexibility with guidelines
We would like to see the State work closer with the utility companies. We feel that is an area that might need to be re-evaluated for additional leveraging funds.
Create consistency of qualification between government/non-government entities-create a partnership of common guidelines and qualifiers
Q36. What technical assistance would you recommend DOE WAP provide to the State regarding its efforts to build linkages with government/non-government entities to serve eligible households?
N/A
None
not sure
None
na
Technical assistance on how to build linkages would be helpful.
Share information from State to State... best practices, things that are working for others. More statewide regional work.
None.
Not sure if the DOE WAP would be able to assist with building the linkages with local communities.
none
Create networking opportunities to become more familiar with other available programs.
None, we feel that they are doing an adequate job.
Q43. What kinds of information, if any, would you like to receive from the State WAP Agency staff that you are not now getting?
None.
None
I would be curious about overall spending for all local agencies. Which agencies are underspent, which are at 100% spending etc. The state is pushing to maintain production and threatening to take funds away from underperforming agencies. so it would be good to know where different agencies are lagging behind. This info has not historically been share except indirectly.
Better software update explanations that impact day to day operation of the WAP program.
Support and response to requests for TA and general understanding of processes. WX has changed over the years, and our agency experienced a staffing change that has created an emergent need for training. Emails are answered promptly, but our needs really require a conference call at least, if not an in person training.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

Continue state level quarterly progress towards overall state goals. Previously, information provided was only agency specific.
na
We would like to receive information regarding quarterly progress as a state, federal updates from DOE, sharing of best practices, and training opportunities within the DOE realm but perhaps not necessarily in the State.
Communication is pretty good in our state.
Memos whenever changes are made.
Better clarification on the Federal Policies, Procedures and Regulations so that the interpretation is the same for everyone.
All is well here.
None
None
We feel we receive ample information from the State.
Q44. What technical assistance would you recommend DOE WAP provide to the State regarding its communication efforts?
None.
None
The state WAP website is pretty basic
None
na
Technical assistance regarding communication should center around clarity and consistency.
Recommend LWO quarterly regional meetings within the state and have an avenue to report the meeting information to the state.
E-mail memos whenever there are technical changes.
Clarification/interpretation of policies, procedures and regulations.
None
DOE WAP communication efforts appear to be consistent
None
None, we feel the DOE is clear and concise with its communications.
Q50. What more could DOE WAP do to help the State and local agencies meet the needs of low-income people in the State?
Increase funding.
More money
When the State is facing a decision to add a rule or regulation to the program I'd like them to strongly consider how the new rule will complicate the Wx operation at the local level. If the rule is designed to maintain quality final service to our clients then good. If the rule is designed to please someone at DOE or address some rarely occurring minor concern but would alter large parts of the operation I would like to think that the considerations of quality service would win out.... So I guess, only adding well developed and necessarily regulation would help local agencies be successful.
Allow for more local decision making on needed measures to be installed, as well as, the time period in which a home can be re-weatherized. i.e. to be able to replace a broken window.
More opportunities for connecting face-to-face. Use of T & TA funds to support those connections as opposed to national conferences that are a major financial burden on agencies; as they often exceed the allowable T & TA expenses.
More flexibility in moving away from traditional waiting lists to more targeted, bundled service approaches. / /
secure additional funding so more families can be served
The State DOE WAP could be more supportive in their communications, their availability to us, and their commitment to us.
Programs for rural areas are being cut left and right. This will leave the housing stock for low income and workforce families in dire need, further increasing the housing shortage. Assistance with lobbying for these areas in order to achieve greater successes would be much appreciated.
Listen to the concerns at a local level. Some things are very difficult to comply with, understand and make changes, allow for flexibility.

2015 Office of Community Services (OCS) - Eligible Entities Satisfaction with the States Survey
Verbatims by State - Michigan

More money to weatherize more homes.

Provide the necessary funding to help low-income people live in safe affordable housing. Would like to see more funds to assist more families that are in need of making their homes more energy efficient.

Give us more funding and let us do our jobs. Stop with all the mandates and changes.

Move the current prior Weatherization date (Sept 1994) forward to something more realistic. Provide additional funding to help additional households.

Be more flexible with guidelines

Evaluate the end date of Previously Weatherized homes from 9/1994. The measures that were installed from 1994 to 2008 were substantially less than todays. We feel that there is group of homes that were not able to reap the benefits of some of the modern testing and evaluations. Thus not as energy efficient as todays funding would allow.

To raise the Previously Weatherized date from 9/1994 to 9/1997 or newer. Many measures have outlived their usefulness since 1994, or measures were not installed that could have benefited the homeowner at the time. If we are to install to a 10 year SIR, the Previously Weatherized date should be reviewed at least every two years. It has been at least 8 years since the date has been reviewed. This would allow for a continually renewing housing stock allowing smaller agencies to maintain a viable program. It would also allow those who remain in their homes a greater benefit to go back to weatherize their home if they were an earlier client (1990's) where very simple measures were allowed, not looking at the entire house as a sealed envelope.