

Lead Safe Housing Advisory Council September 20th 2010 Minutes

1) Participants:

- Co-Chairs: Sam Churchill and Anita Weinberg
- Members: Anne Evans, ChaNell Marshall, Cortland Lohff, Burton Hughes, Steve Brooks, Barbara Brooks, Connie Sullinger, Helen Binns, John Bartlett, Dale Clarkson, LaTrice, Porter-Thomas, Michael Scobey, Nick Peneff, Amy Zimmerman, Kert McAfee, Patrick MacRoy, Claudia Bodley, Dave Jacobs, and Mary Burns

2) Housekeeping:

- All members must fill out the Advisory Council Membership form and submit to Jennifer (jlmcgow@uic.edu)
- All members are responsible for taking the State Ethics Course, more information will come from Sam
- Leslie Nickels and Jennifer McGowan (UIC) are responsible for the administration of the meetings. Any information about logistics, materials, reimbursements, etc should be requested through Jennifer.

3) History of LSHAC:

- See timeline of evolution of CLEAR-WIN
- 2007 Report from Lead Safe Housing Advisory Council can be made available to members
- CLEAR-WIN
 - Goal: pilot sites up and running within the next 6 months
 - 5 million was appropriated from legislature. Sam is waiting to hear about funding for administrative oversight—which should happen shortly.
 - The CLEAR-WIN Advisory Council will consult with IDPH for the establishment of the CLEAR-WIN Program, including advising on selection of pilot communities
 - Not a lead hazard abatement program—although we won't ignore hazards if visible
 - Goals:
 - pilot sites up and running within the next 6 months
 - show impact on these communities and bring back information to the legislature
- National perspective
 - Reduction in window sill dust lead
 - This project can have impact on the nation, because window repair efforts are key but haven't been widespread

4) Establishment of communities:

- Downstate location
 - Peoria
 - Community is committed; PCCHD has been successful with their HUD grant and community partnerships. There is a task force established within the community of Peoria and ability to carry out this program. Capacity is already there. Infrastructure is established and resources have been committed for training. Key legislators in the community helped push funding through
 - Legal council is behind too (supported by the board of health)
Can the decision be final by the time HUD grant needs to be submitted?
Can be the AC recommendation
 - Discussion

- Makes sense to use a community that is well established, in the future we should try and use communities that need the capacity building
 - Macon county—having difficulties, static, infrastructure is not there
 - CLEAR WIN evaluation tied to HUD grant evaluation might be helpful for the grant application
 - Can the decision be final by the time HUD grant needs to be submitted?
 - Can be the AC recommendation
 - Asthma rates in Peoria?
 - IDPH will use asthma and other health homes indicators through evaluation. Peoria's rates exceed average of the State
 - Prevalence of single pane windows?
 - Useful indicator, has impact on lead and asthma
 - **Let minutes show that Peoria is identified as pilot community**
 - Chicago Pilot community
 - CNT
 - Experience throughout Chicago, capability and infrastructure to do this work. Broader presence than a Chicago neighborhood community group—ability to partner with other agencies. CNT provides potential to leverage other dollars.
 - CNT currently works with multifamily affordable housing, energy efficiency, radon, and moisture.
 - Discussion:
 - Should the effort be concentrated or spread more widely? What's the goal? Are there neighborhoods with community groups that are active? In healthy homes also?
 - CNT has a matrix of green and/or healthy homes initiatives in the city
 - Focusing on south Chicago seems too narrow. There is a lot of need in other areas of Chicago.
 - If possible, would be best to include the west side as well because so much has been focused on south Chicago.
 - The contract for administering the Clear-Win program does not need to go out for bid.
 - Might need to provide some framework for which communities to work in, specifically for political reasons.
 - Strongest proponent was Rep. Osterman; in working with members to get this past Englewood became an important factor. If Englewood isn't a focus, people might be upset.
 - Some concern in Englewood about actually providing jobs and training. CNT would work to partner with all the networks in Englewood and do marketing, outreach, etc.
 - What kind of housing are we targeting?
 - Lead money in Chicago is mostly directed to smaller units (home owner occupied and non-home owner occupied)
 - Target rental housing
 - Multifamily homes will reduce cost per unit
 - Whatever housing we target, it's important to do all the windows
 - **The Advisory Council recommends the second pilot community will be the Englewood/West Englewood communities, with the ability to expand pursuant to requirements established in the contract with IDPH.**
 - **The Advisory Council also recommends that the Center for Neighborhood Technology be the delegate agency for Chicago.**

5) Housing Criteria:

- Discussion
 - Units for pilot period: 500 units between both communities
 - 250 dwellings in each pilot area
 - 2.5 mil per pilot area (minus administrative costs) of work for each community
 - Should picture windows be a priority?
 - Focus on operable windows because the focus is dust lead exposure
 - Buying windows in bulk
 - IDPH/delegate agencies will try to partner with Illinois window manufacturer or assembler to hopefully reduce costs
 - IDPH has begun to look into potential partners
 - USDOE is trying to get people to always buy energy efficient windows, so there are bulk purchasing programs, such as weatherization programs
 - Replacements should include doors (especially rear doors)

6) Firm (contractor) Criteria:

- Discussion
 - Can they provide training?
 - Create jobs in these communities. Training in lead abatement/mitigation and basic carpentry skills (youth built program, recently incarcerated programs)
 - Urban Weatherization Initiative (Commerce and Economic Opportunity) has a large training component. Directed to local community people—provide training and stipends. The contractors are responsible for applying for the grant. Training carpentry skills in the community
 - Caution with using workers from communities because people in the community know each other, might not trust each other
 - May not be necessary to use training dollars because there is other funding for training right now
 - Use for on the job training because work experience is valuable
 - The firm should commit to making an effort to train and hire community members to do this work
 - Part of effectiveness of pilot project
 - Has to be a requirement (in the subcontract)
 - Might not be necessary to hire “new” workers, they might already be hiring out of the community
 - RRP, US EPA Renovation Repair Paint rule
 - CLEAR WIN could pay for certification of contractor (\$300 to US EPA)
 - Consensus: Shouldn’t pay for the certification because it is required already
 - Contractors already in business should hire local employees and they must be RRP trained
 - Fund training for individuals (additional to contractors) for RRP
 - Having more people trained could be useful for the job site
 - Could be counterproductive making it more expensive for contractors in the pilot
 - Pay contractors for on the job training for local employees, partner with workforce development agency with good case management to find employees
 - **The Advisory Council recommends that delegate organizations (Peoria Health Department and CNT) contract with local firms to do window replacement work. The firms will be encouraged to hire workers from the community (if they don’t already). The firms should also already be RRP**

certified. The firm must also be willing to report on their workforce and payment.

7) Insurance:

- Special liability insurance not required. Certain amount of insurance should be required (standard insurance and license to do that work)
 - Peoria has standard insurance plus bonding
 - Cover insurance for specific projects only

8) Lead Safe Housing Maintenance Standards:

- Establish committee to develop standards:
 - **The Advisory Council appoints Michael Scobey , Kert McAfee, John Bartlett, Steve Brooks, Nick Peneff and Dale Clarkson as committee participants.**
- Document created by the Lead Housing Task Force will be made available for the development of standards.
- Objective is to create a document that outlines the standards for maintaining the properties that receive CLEAR-WIN funds.
- Standards should be somewhat measurable and include how owners can document compliance. Review of existing documents by HUD and EPA and other sources is encouraged
- Toll free conference call line through Lead Program at IDPH will be available for committee meetings
- Draft Recommendations to the Advisory Council should be made at the next meeting (about 3 weeks)

9) Grants/Loans:

- CLEAR-WIN should consider a match program
 - Gives incentive to property owners
- There will likely be enough units in Chicago that would qualify for a full grant
- To the extent that the money can be spread the better however, if there are enough properties eligible for the grant, that should be the priority
- A loan program is not mandated through the CLEAR-WIN legislation, the consideration of a loan program is stated.
- Delegate organization should consider what might work for them (grants vs. loans vs. matching)
 - Sam will facilitate discussion with Dale, Anne and Jeff Gordan re: grant/loan program.

10) Additional Criteria:

- Delegate organizations must certify that tenants/owners receive standards, rent for no less than 5 years and maintain property as lead safe.
- Income eligibility:
 - 80% of poverty line (same as HUD)
 - 60% of the poverty line
 - Rental cost: Rent of the unit can be certified as opposed to the income of the tenant
 - Self-certification of tenant income should be sufficient
 - Investor-owner might require a match, if the owner is low-income, the match may be waived
 - **The Advisory Council recommends that income eligibility be set at 80% of community area income**
- Type of properties

- 2 bedroom and more because families with children often live in at least a 2 bedroom apartment
 - Opposition to requiring 2 or more bedrooms
 - Occupied or unoccupied
 - All units where a child has been identified as lead poisoned
- Units to be covered in a property
 - All units
 - Might scare landlords away if they have to do all units
 - Income eligibility will likely be the same for all units
- **Sam will continue this discussion on specifics and bring back to the Advisory Council.**

11) Wrap-up:

- Members should fill out the Advisory Council membership form and submit to Jennifer (jlmcgow@uic.edu)
- Sam will relay information on ethics training
- Next meeting:
 - **October 13th 9 am to 2 pm, site TBD.**