

TOPIC 1: Definition of “project workforce”

Background

The IPA adopted several definitions of key terms in Section 1-75(c-10) and Section 1-10 of the IPA Act in developing the program requirements for the Equity Accountability System. The current definition of “project workforce” as included in the 2022 Long-Term Plan is:

Employees, contractors and their employees, and subcontractors and their employees, whose job duties are directly required by or substantially related to the development, construction, and operation of a project that is participating in or intended to participate in the IPA-administered programs and procurements under Section 1-75(c) of the IPA Act. This shall include both project installation workforce and workforce in administrative, sales, marketing, and technical roles where those workers’ duties are performed in Illinois. (2022 LTP at 328).

The Agency adopted this definition to ensure the greatest access to the diverse range of economic opportunities created by solar development in Illinois. In addition, the IPA currently interprets the Minimum Equity Standard as a percentage of the number of persons in the workforce – whole persons, regardless of the number of hours worked on that project.

Questions

1. If the Agency were to refine or change the definition of project workforce, what factors should it consider? Are there types of work that should be excluded?

We don’t believe that there is work that should be excluded. If the point of Minimum Equity is about ensuring that all people are being given jobs and opportunities, it seems it would be counter-productive to essentially indicate that some jobs are not as useful.

2. What would be the benefits or risks of moving to a hours-worked basis instead of a total number of individuals basis for the MES?

Moving to an hours-worked basis would be incredibly cumbersome for the Approved Vendor, as we would still have to keep track of the total number of individuals and then would have to add on keeping track/reporting hours. This would not end up being about using “either/or” so much as it would be requiring both.

a. Would some combination of hours-worked and number of individuals be possible or

preferable?

No, again this would just complicate the process further and would be more burdensome than the process already is.