

CLEAR-WIN
November 15th 2010

Participants: Anita Weinberg, Mary Burns, Nick Peneff, Dale Clarkson, Patrick MacRoy, LaTrice Porter-Thomas, Cort Lohff, Kert McAfee, Sam Churchill, Steve Brooks, Barbara Brooks, Connie Sullinger, John Wohl, and Mike Scobey

Correction to minutes:

- Barbara and Steve Brooks attended the last meeting
- CDPH will give a presentation in an upcoming meeting (demographics, services, etc.)
- **Advisory Council decisions are in bold**

Housekeeping:

- Decisions or recommendations made by the Advisory Council are reflected in bold in the minutes.
- The Peoria City/County Health Department and Center for Neighborhood Technology both made presentations at the last meeting. The Chicago Department of Public Health will have the opportunity to make a similar presentation at a later meeting.

Update from Sam:

- Two positions are being filled to assist in implementation of CLEAR-WIN program: a Project Manager and an Office Associate. Project Manager will report directly to Sam.
- Project manager for CLEAR-WIN announcement is out, closes at “close of business” 11/15/10 and Sam will receive the list of applicants shortly
- Because of seniority, the new appointee could be someone who does not have knowledge of lead; the position is posted as an “Environmental Health Specialist”
- The new project manager will take about 2 weeks to 30 days to get up to speed on CLEAR-WIN and related projects.
- Manager will be in charge of running the program, working with CLEAR-WIN Advisory Council, and working with CNT and Peoria City/County Public Health Department to ensure program is implemented as planned. Program Manager will be involved in overseeing implementation of the Program from start to finish including licensed lead risk assessors and supervisor school and RRP class, work with Jen
- Depending on the skills of the applicants, the AC will play an important role, setting strong guidelines and being clear. AC can play a bigger role. AC should be in a position in 1.5-2 years and ask for more money from the State. Show involvement in Healthy Homes

Report of Maintenance Standard Ad Hoc committee:

- Committee met last Monday (11/8)

- Copy of maintenance standards developed by the Committee and Advisory Council will be handed to each participant
- Reference the RRP handbook in maintenance standard and say see booklet (give RRP handbook with standard as well)
- The home shall be maintained in a lead-safe condition
 - Discussion of Committee recommendation:
 - This implies that the home will be left lead safe after work is done
 - “The renovated area shall be maintained”
 - Would like to determine whether there are enough buildings CLEAR-WIN could work on that could be completely lead safe after renovation.
 - Open to interpretation of what else might be necessary to abate the lead issues
 - Chicago lead risk assessors can promote the programs through the same process as they are doing now.
 - This would require a lead abatement contractor because one must be used after a risk assessor has tested a house
- Clearance will be done after the work is done
 - Lead contractor is responsible for cleaning up if clearance fails
 - Discussion of Committee recommendation:
 - Don’t really know where the hazards are because there won’t be an assessor before the window replacement
 - Peoria:
 - Other lead issues within those properties that are waiting to be renovated
 - All have lead issues other than just the windows (doors, porches, etc.)
 - Agency can use other money to apply to these other issues (CDBG, Weatherization, etc.)
- Homeowners are required by CLEAR-WIN statute to use lead safe work practices, but are exempt from RRP.
 - Require best practices even though they are exempt from RRP
 - They need to know if the rule applies, and then follow RRP if applicable
- The tenant and owner will both sign agreement regarding maintenance of property worked on through CLEAR-WIN
 - Draw attention to why this document is important. Awareness of why its important to have the work done
 - Document could serve as a lease addendum
 - Discussion of Committee Recommendation:
 - One for tenant, one for owners
 - I agree to call landlord if there is cracking or chipping paint
 - If you change tenants, you have to give notification to tenant of Standards
 - Could do 3
 - Owner, landlord, tenant

- Even though you are exempt from RRP, we still require you to follow these work practices when the situation is applicable
- Additional discussion:
 - Funding came from the understanding that windows are the most influential on whether a child is lead poisoned
 - Need to show that there is an effect on childhood lead poisoning
 - The law in Chicago is already that home will be maintained in a lead safe condition
 - Enroll participants in both programs (Torrance, other funds, etc.)
 - Use lead abators for the risk assessment portion and replace the windows through CLEAR-WIN

RRP vs. Lead Abatement Discussion

- Using RRP as a prevention program might be most beneficial
 - Change the way the city spends CDBG funds, to focus on windows rather than roofs, etc.
- RRP vs Abatement: Cost
 - If there is a large gap between the cost of a window in abatement and the cost of the window in RRP then the decision will have to be made as to how to spend the money
 - Dave Jacobs might have an idea about this cost
 - The actual windows being used might change the cost
 - Average lead abator probably makes more than the average RRP workers
 - Other States that might have an idea?
 - Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio
 - **Sam will call these folks and ask about cost comparison**
 - If the cost is the same, what should we use?
 - If we say abatement, are we broadening the scope from windows?
 - Addressing every “hazard” that exists
 - Would be funding for windows, and “some” for other hazards. More funding can be leveraged through other funds (Peoria = county, Chicago = Torrance)
 - Peoria is currently doing EBL and pregnant woman
 - All remediation including all windows
 - Cost = varies on the scope but the average is about \$13,000
 - Using abatement contractors
 - Peoria can save money using RRP contractors to do the same work in the same way
 - Chicago
 - Average cost about \$10,000
 - Using abatement contractors
- RRP vs. Abatement: Legal issues
 - Can’t get around using abatement

- Liability with RRP
 - We need clearance so one must use abatement
- Everything up to clearance is RRP
 - Using RRP is focusing on this new way of prevention
 - Is there a possibility to get a “program wide variance”
 - Sam can check and see if a variance is possible
- Lets do it the way we want people to do it (RRP) and then lets see how it works (clearance evaluations)
- After clearance, if failed, a lead abator should be used
 - Certified lead abatement cleaning crew could be used to align with State statute for lead abatement
- Additional Discussion
 - Window replacements could be done under RRP practices
 - If there is an EBL child, all lead hazards have to be fixed
 - Any unit other then EBL child would have window work done and any other additional work we’re able to do using RRP
 - Any hazards involved with a window should be done
 - Other hazards are on a case by case basis
 - Have RRP cleaning and clearance done
 - Another suggestion is to Leave it up to CNT and Peoria to say whether they need to use a lead abator or RRP contractor to do the work
 - Based on the resources available in the community
 - **Further discussion is needed on RRP vs. lead abatement.**

Goals of CLEAR-WIN

- As part of the discussion on the recommendations of the Maintenance Standards Ad Hoc committee and consideration of whether abatement should be required or whether/when it would be sufficient to follow the RRP Rule, the Advisory Council discussed the goals of the CLEAR WIN project and how money could be leveraged to allow for lead hazard removal beyond window replacement:
 - Goal is reduction of risks.
 - Possible approaches were discussed:
 - CLEAR-WIN could cover the cost of the windows + 10% for other lead hazards (rest falls to other community resources and homeowner)
 - Peoria and CNT can pick and chose the hazards that they are able to cover
 - CLEAR-WIN should cover the window replacement cost and the other lead hazards that are putting a child at risk right now. Owner is responsible for the other aesthetic changes (painting, etc.)
 - Absence of this program, owners will continue to have windows full of lead. With the program, you have lead free windows, which is quite a benefit.
 - If those are the pieces that create the most risk—we should do more of those then completely abating fewer houses
- **Consensus: a little bit of money to address other obvious issues. Not a cap per unit but an average amount for the program.**

- **Anita and Sam work on wording of the Standards/agreement**
 - **Provide a framework of what constitutes above and beyond possible lead hazards**
 - Window replacement for sure
 - Potential lead hazards other than window (justification)
 - Lead maintenance standards will wait until further information (guidelines) are worked out

Contract update:

- Sam will send final candidate for program manager to Jen to send out to AC
- Jeff Gordan: Sam will get in touch with him
- RFPs are not yet out for the window suppliers and specs will be reviewed at the next meeting
- CNT and Peoria contracts are currently being developed

Update on IDPH

- Environmental Health and Case Management grantees: IDPH will recommend approval, should be able to pay delegate agencies (who haven't been paid since July)
- CDC application: Notice of Funding Availability should be out next month. 3 years. Must address some healthy homes issues. Didn't expand the field for this NFA probably because they weren't prepared to expand.
- RRP: Sam recommends about 30 employees would be needed for enforcement. As currently structured, if it's taken over en masse, the program won't be changed.
- Report on Lead Poisoning Prevention week in October 2010:
 - 14 booths at the Thompson Center
 - Conference: 189 participants