

1-1-2008

Best Practices: Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing a Lead Remediation Program

Claudette Robey

Cleveland State University, c.robey@csuohio.edu

Daila Shimek

Cleveland State University, dailashimek@gmail.com


Michael McGoun

Kara Chernet

Christopher Gollan

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub

 Part of the [Natural Resources and Conservation Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Robey, Claudette; Shimek, Daila; McGoun, Michael; Chernet, Kara; and Gollan, Christopher, "Best Practices: Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing a Lead Remediation Program" (2008). *Urban Publications*. 0 1 2 3 290.

https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub/290

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.



Prepared for:
**Greater Cleveland Lead Advisory Council
Infrastructure and Sustainability Subcommittee**

Prepared by:
**Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs
Cleveland State University**

June 2008

**Best
Practices:
Innovative
Funding
Mechanisms
for Financing
Lead
Remediation
Programs**

UUP

The Ohio Urban University Program

2121 Euclid Avenue, UR 120 Cleveland,
Ohio 44115
<http://urban.csuohio.edu>



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Introduction.....	7
Case Studies of Approaches to Funding Lead Remediation	10
Traditional Funding Sources for Lead Clean-up and Remediation	32
Appendices.....	37
Appendix A: Telephone Interview Protocol	38
Appendix B: Resources	41

The project staff of the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center (GLEFC) of the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University contributed to the development of this report. Authors of the report were Claudette Robey, Assistant Director; Daila Shimek, Project Manager; and Michael McGoun, Research Assistant. Staff conducting supporting research were Kara Chernet and Chris Gollan, Graduate Assistants.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The elimination of childhood lead poisoning is a national health policy objective to be attained by the year 2010. A full understanding of the poisoning risks that lead poses for young children and infants evolved as more research focused upon its effects. Some of the first warnings of the potential dangers associated with lead began with studies conducted as early as the 1940s and 1950s. Over time, the link between exposure to lead and reduced cognitive function and impulse control in young children was firmly established. Numerous studies since have linked high blood lead levels to serious learning disabilities, lower IQs, behavioral problems, and even death.

With greater public attention focused on lead, U.S. oil companies began phasing out lead in gasoline in 1975. Subsequent reports indicated that airborne lead concentrations have declined by as much as 96 percent between 1980 and 2005. In 1978, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (16 Code of Federal Regulations CFR 1303) banned paint containing more than 0.06 percent (600 ppm) lead content for residential use in the United States. While this ban is credited for dramatically reducing the number of children in the U.S. with elevated blood lead levels, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) has reported that as recently as 2002 there were still an estimated 24 million housing units in the U.S. that contained substantial lead paint hazards. Low-income families with young children occupied 1.2 million of these units.

The dangers of lead poisoning are especially prevalent in Cleveland, with an aged housing stock that was built during the first half of the 1900s. Records from the Cuyahoga County Auditor's office indicate that 1920 is the median year to which residential structures date back to in the city. For much of this housing stock, lead paint was used in many homes built before 1978, and in almost all homes built prior to the 1950s.

While the specific dangers associated with lead paint are relatively easy to identify and measure, tracking and testing the children who are most at-risk can be difficult. Families living in lead-contaminated dwellings tend to be low-income and somewhat transient. Often when they move, it is among older housing units that may be in varying states of neglect or deterioration, with many of these dwellings having some degree of lead-based paint contamination. In this regard, the lead poisoning problem could accurately be described as a housing issue.

Given the widespread geographic nature of potential lead-based paint hazards in an older city like Cleveland, securing adequate funding to address this problem often

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

becomes a challenge. With other needs competing for state and municipal resources, targeting funding that is available to those areas where the need is greatest becomes critical. Some federal grant funds have been awarded for local lead hazard remediation efforts, and foundation funding has also played a key role in these efforts. But, meeting the national goal of eliminating childhood lead poisoning by 2010 – or any time in the near future – will require unique and creative ways to provide dedicated funding for local lead poisoning programs. Assessing and rehabilitating all of the local housing units with lead contamination will require a substantial commitment of resources.

The most common resources of funding relied upon are the traditional sources – federal funding grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), and the CDC. The most successful cities have accessed and leveraged federal and state dollars for lead remediation. Innovation in funding has occurred as cities have leveraged those federal and state funds with new state and locally-derived sources, or new uses of existing non-lead federal sources (Medicaid, for instance). Cities have also leveraged the traditional resources with grants from other entities, such as public private partnerships that work toward the eradication of lead poisoning across America.

With such a significant challenge remaining, states, jurisdictions and organizations have implemented programs with efforts focused on preventing, reducing and/or remediating childhood lead poisoning. In addition to utilizing existing resources, communities are seeking mechanisms to address the funding of lead remediation efforts. A review of various methods utilized to fund programs that address lead-based paint hazards in older residential housing has identified several different types of approaches and mechanisms:

- **Creation of a special fund dedicated to providing resources for lead hazard remediation** -- Examples of this approach include New Jersey's Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund and Missouri's Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Adoption of new legislation or ordinance is frequently used to authorize fees of some type to various housing-related activities, including rental housing inspections and/or real estate transactions or license renewals. Fines for code violations or non-compliance with existing statutes are also sometimes used to generate revenue for lead hazard remediation programs. Another example is Rhode Island's program, where the state has authority to use Medicaid funds for targeted case management services and window replacement.

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

- **Issuance of tax credits to individuals for lead hazard remediation work --** The state of Massachusetts amended its existing lead law in 1987 to include a tax credit program that could be applied to costs incurred for removal of lead-based paint or other work performed to control lead poisoning hazards. The tax credit is available to anyone who has an income tax liability and pays for lead hazard abatement services performed by a certified contractor. However, one limitation to this approach is that the maximum tax credit that is currently available (\$1,500) is not a particularly strong incentive, as lead remediation projects in Massachusetts usually cost several thousand dollars.
- **Adoption of legislation or municipal ordinances that specifically address lead hazards and/or enforce code violations --** Milwaukee has adopted a municipal code that is designed to remediate lead based paint hazards in older housing. With the original ordinance that was passed in 1991, health department officials were granted the authority to issue legally mandated work orders to property owners if a lead-poisoned child was residing on the property. Subsequent amendments to the law that were later adopted included setting specific standards for lead hazard reduction projects and lead hazard reduction contractors who perform this work.
- **Formation of strategic partnerships to leverage additional funds for lead hazard programs --** The Delta Redevelopment Institute (Delta REDI) is an economic development and real estate affiliate of the Delta Institute, and has partnered with Chicago's Department of Public Health and the Illinois Lead Safe Housing Task Force to expand resources for lead hazard abatement services for low-income housing. A loan program was established where half of the funding for lead abatement is derived from private capital raised by Delta REDI through the New Markets Tax Credits Program, while the other half is provided through grant funds from the city. Once a borrower pays back half the loan plus interest, Delta REDI will use the city's grant funds to forgive the remaining amount of the loan repayment. This approach allows participating property owners to receive lead abatement services at half price, while Chicago leverages its grant funding to double the number of units that receive lead abatement services.

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

There are several locally based programs that address lead poisoning hazards in residential housing, including programs administered through the Cuyahoga County Board of Health, the Cleveland Department of Public Health, Cuyahoga County's Lead Safe Program, and Invest in Children. Much of the funding utilized by these programs and initiatives comes through traditional sources, including grants from HUD and the U.S. EPA. Within the last year alone, the Cuyahoga County Board of Health has received approximately \$7 million in HUD funds to be targeted for low-income households that are most likely to have young children exposed to and at risk from lead-based paint hazards.

INTRODUCTION

The Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center of the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University conducted an examination of approaches utilized by states and communities through the productive use of public and private funds for effectively reducing the incidence of childhood lead poisoning. This analysis of financial strategies will become important for local, state and national stakeholders in lead elimination efforts, enabling them to better focus funding resources to areas of greatest success.

The purpose of this research was to identify innovative financing tools and uses of funds applied to eliminate childhood lead poisoning. Research objectives were to identify successful uses of public funds and identify successful uses of non-governmental funds (public, private, not-for-profit, and foundation) in efforts to eliminate childhood lead poisoning.

This report focuses on approaches that state and city governments have applied in recent years to fund lead remediation efforts and lead poisoning prevention activities. In particular, an effort was made to identify alternative and innovative funding mechanisms designed to provide dedicated financial resources for lead poisoning prevention initiatives. Trends in public efforts to provide funding to address lead hazards were examined along with other strategic approaches that address the dangers of lead in older residential housing units. These efforts involve enacting new legislation or amendments to existing lead laws, adoption of taxes or fees to help provide funding streams for lead programs, utilizing Medicaid funds for lead poisoning prevention activities, and collaborative efforts from multiple government agencies and community partners to address lead hazards. In addition, traditional funding sources for lead remediation programs are described, as well as recent grant awards for these sources.

Methodology

Research for this study involved a scan of existing literature pertaining to the subject of funding/financing for lead remediation programs. Reports, program documents, academic journal articles and essays, press releases, and news articles from various government agencies, nonprofit organizations, scholarly publications, and public advocacy groups were utilized to gather information pertaining to unique and innovative approaches to funding lead hazard remediation efforts.

The research utilized the grantee performance reports of the U.S. Department of

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, which oversees the largest pool of public funds addressing lead hazards in housing. Grant performance reports from the Center for Disease Control (CDC), which focuses on primary prevention activities, and from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), which focuses on funding for lead hazard control, prevention and remediation activities, were also used for direction to the locations with the greatest success toward the national goal.

The first section of this report outlines a variety of best practices utilized by other states and communities to help fund programs that address lead-poisoning risks. Reports produced by government agencies and nonprofit organizations, state and municipal level program documents describing specific lead remediation programs, and documents and reports from community development organizations, housing advocacy groups, and public health organizations were examined during this phase of the literature review. News articles and press releases from various sources were also included in the information review and literature search.

Several case studies of innovative funding tools were identified from the literature review. Telephone interviews were conducted with each of the case studies to identify the methods, procedures and processes used to develop and implement the funding mechanisms and gain insight on the issues, challenges and successes encountered, and their overall experiences (see Appendix A for telephone interview protocol). In particular, interviews with program officials examined the specific factors that led to the implementation of their respective programs, details regarding the operations, guidelines, and structure of their programs, progress that these programs have made with regard to addressing lead hazards, and specific issues or challenges that may have evolved during the course of implementing these programs. The following individuals were interviewed during the interview phase of the study:

- Veronica D'Alessandro, New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund
- Mark Allen, Alameda County, California, Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program
- Scott Bradway, Portland Water Bureau, Portland, Oregon, Lead Hazard Reduction Program
- Wayne Durand, Los Angeles Housing Department, Los Angeles, California
- Paul Hunter, State of Massachusetts, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program
- Sharon Kernan, Center for Child and Family Health, Rhode Island Department of Human Services

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

The second section of the report describes traditional funding sources for lead remediation programs and local level programs that utilized these funding sources. A review of funding documents pertaining to federally funded programs that address lead-based hazards was conducted, including a review of documents and information from the HUD, the U.S. EPA, the CDC, and the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA). Documents and information pertaining to local programs that address lead hazards through the Cuyahoga County Board of Health, the Cleveland Department of Public Health, and other initiatives such as Cuyahoga County's Lead Safe Program and Invest in Children were also reviewed and examined as part of this effort. An information review among other organizations, including local public health and housing advocacy groups was additionally conducted as part of this process.

CASE STUDIES OF APPROACHES TO FUNDING LEAD REMEDIATION

A primary goal of this inquiry was to identify specific lead hazard remediation programs that have utilized innovative approaches to fund and sustain lead-based paint remediation services. After identifying several programs that fit this description through an extensive literature review, executive interviews were conducted with key individuals from several of these programs. A key objective of the interview phase of this study was to explore and assess the overall effectiveness of these particular programs, and to learn if these particular programs were generally viewed as having a positive impact in addressing lead-based paint hazards within their communities.

Interviews with lead program officials from several of the identified best practice case studies suggest that the programs examined were generally successful and having a positive impact upon lead poisoning hazards within their jurisdictions. While one respondent indicated that work still needs to be done and a few others candidly discussed the challenges that their programs encountered, all felt that their programs were having a positive impact upon lead hazards within their communities. In a few cases, respondents indicated that their programs were efforts to address lead paint hazards more effectively than previous programs.

In some ways, gauging the full impact of a lead remediation program can be somewhat difficult. In one case, a program director stated that their program remediated approximately 1,400 low-income residential units and had case-managed more than 4,000 lead-poisoned children and their families. However, he added that the total number of individuals served through all elements of the program – including its training workshops, website, public information line, on-site technical assistance, and education and outreach to homeowners, tenants, medical providers, and other community partners -- was not available.

Another official interviewed from a program that provides low-interest loans for reducing lead-based paint hazards stated that while their program was still new and “you can’t call us great yet,” their program’s impact has been substantial. She cited the fact that the number of loan applications received has steadily increased in three years, as well as the number of poisoned children the program has relocated. Her perception of the program’s progress was optimistic stating, “in about a year or two, we’ll have bragging rights.”

Still another lead program official who was interviewed pointed out that the goals of their program have changed as the specific programs and initiatives they fund have

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

changed and evolved over time. He added that grantees from their program are given specific goals to accomplish over the course of a 12-month period. Another interview respondent added that the Community Lead Centers created through their program have essentially become “community resources” in that they can also secure funding through other sources, and thus broaden their array of services to the families and children they serve.

California: Fixed Fees on Annual Property Tax Bills

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1991
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Alameda County Community Development Agency, Lead Poisoning Prevention Program
CONTACT:	Mark Allen, Director 510-567-8282

Overview

One method utilized in California to generate funding for local or regional lead poisoning prevention initiatives is through the addition of a fixed fee to annual property tax bills. In 1991, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution officially establishing the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP). The resolution allowed cities in the county to participate in and support the program by assessing an annual \$10 fee on all residential dwellings constructed before 1978, the first year that the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) banned lead in paint for residential use. The cities of Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda were the first to participate in the program, and the city of Emeryville eventually joined the program in 1992.

The Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program is governed by a Joint Powers Authority Board of Directors. The board is comprised of one representative from each participating city, a member of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors, and a community representative.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Base funding for the ACLPPP is provided through the annual \$10 per unit service fee charged on all pre-1978 residential units in the four participating cities. In addition to the annual fee, the ACLPPP received federal funding from HUD, the CDC, and the U.S. EPA. It also receives approximately \$435,000 per year from the State Department of

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

Public Health to provide case management and other services to the families of all lead poisoned children in Alameda County. The program used the annual fees and the state funding to leverage eight competitive federal grants from HUD to address lead hazards in low-income communities.

The ACLPPP provides information to the public on how to identify and test for lead hazards. The program also provides other resources, such as classes on lead-safe painting and remodeling, and loaning high efficiency particulate air filter (HEPA) vacuum cleaners to property owners. Information on health care services, including direct case management services for lead poisoned children and their families, is also provided.

Additional Findings and Program Details

A new state law passed in 1996 made it difficult for additional cities to join the four cities already participating in the program's county service area. The new law further stipulated that the funds from the \$10 annual fee could only be used to provide services to the property owners that pay the fee.

In an informational interview session for this study, Program Director Mark Allen stated that having a consistent core or base funding source is an advantage, and it allows a program to leverage additional outside resources, such as federal or state grants. However, each new grant also brings with it new requirements and demands that can strain existing resources. According to Allen, if new permanent staff is brought in to handle the additional workload "organizational trauma and disruption" can occur when the grant funding cycle ends. He also added that for a program like this one, where the base funding is fee-driven, it would be better to have some kind of "escalator clause" or adjustment mechanism that would allow fees to keep pace with inflation and program costs.

California and New Jersey: Dedicated Funding for Code Enforcement

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	California (1998), New Jersey (2004)
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Los Angeles Housing Department, Code Enforcement Division New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Division of Codes and Standards
CONTACT:	Los Angeles - Domingo T. Saucedo, Director 213-808-8502 Wayne Durand, Chief Inspector (North and East Offices) 818-756-1401 New Jersey - Bureau of Housing Inspection Hotel & Multiple Dwellings 609-633-6219

Overview

Some jurisdictions have utilized code enforcement activities to generate revenue for programs and activities designed to remediate lead hazards. This approach usually involves a local government adoption of an ordinance that imposes either minimal annual fees or per-unit inspection fees on multi-unit dwellings.

In New Jersey, the Bureau of Housing Inspection is the enforcement agency for housing code violations in buildings with three or more rental units. All buildings with three or more rental units must comply with the regulations for the Maintenance of Hotels and Multiple Dwellings, and must be registered with the Bureau of Housing Inspection. If lead hazards are found to be present, a local board of health has the authority to order the removal of lead paint from the interior of a dwelling unit.

In California, the Los Angeles Housing Department's Code Enforcement Division does not specifically undertake lead-based paint abatement activities, but the housing inspectors do work with lead outreach advocates. Inspectors have also assembled a list of pre-1978 buildings that can be targeted for inspection. In addition, the department also administers several HUD grants that specifically target the removal of lead-based paint hazards for low-income renters and owners. The Code Enforcement Division makes referrals to the group that administers these grants when potential

candidates are identified.

Criteria and Funding Structure

In Los Angeles, the Systematic Code Enforcement Program (SCEP) is funded through an annual fee of \$35.52 that is assessed to rental property owners, whether or not their units are inspected during that year. The fee is paid to the Los Angeles Housing Department, and covers one rental housing habitability inspection and one re-inspection if a Notice to Comply is issued. Additional fees may be charged to owners who fail to comply and cause the housing department to incur additional staff time and costs for services.

Under New Jersey's Hotel and Multiple Dwellings Law, buildings with three or more units, hotels, and motels are required to be inspected a minimum of once every five years. Every five years, owners are assessed a per-unit inspection fee according to a sliding scale, depending upon the number of units to be inspected:

- \$43 per unit for one to seven units
- \$27 for eight to 24 units
- \$23 for 25 to 48 units
- \$16 for 49 units or more

The state also collects approximately \$4 million in annual penalties, enough to cover program costs when combined with revenue from inspection fees. The Department of Community Affairs (DCA) has the authority to adjust fees to cover the cost of the program. In January 2008, state legislation was passed and signed into law that expanded inspection requirements mandated under the Hotel and Multiple Dwellings Code. The new law requires the DCA to inspect every single-family and two-family rental dwelling for lead-based paint hazards at least once every five years. Prior to this new legislation, one- and two-unit dwellings were exempt from lead hazard inspections.

Additional Findings and Program Details

In the Los Angeles Housing Department, the Code Enforcement Division began as a pilot program that focused on the older, low-income districts of the city. It has since been expanded to include the entire city and is now a permanent function. In an interview conducted for this study with Wayne Durand, Chief Inspector for the Housing Department, Durand stated that the department was initially reluctant to take on the extra responsibility of identifying possible buildings with lead-based paint and enforcing lead safe work practices. Over time, however, Durand said this process went smoothly, and the gains that were made with health advocates also proved to be beneficial.

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

Collaborating with community-based organizations and the health department has generated an interest in providing a “Healthy Home Environment” and has also raised awareness of mold issues and getting referrals to the appropriate health department section, said Durand.

Illinois: Cook County's Lead Program

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	2005 (Start of Funding Cycle)
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Cook County Department of Public Health Lead Poisoning Prevention Unit (708) 492-2076

Overview

This case study examines how local officials have used their share of federal grant funding to address lead-based paint hazards within the community. In the state of Illinois, Cook County allocated \$6.5 million in funds to provide assistance for costs associated with lead abatement and mitigation activities for fiscal years 2005 through 2007. These funds were targeted for lead hazard control efforts in residential dwellings where children were exposed to the greatest risk of lead poisoning.

In 2005, the U.S. EPA recognized the Cook County Department of Public Health with a Children's Environmental Award for lead poisoning prevention efforts in Chicago and suburban Cook County. The department's Lead Poisoning Prevention Unit administers financial support to local communities and organizations for lead abatement and mitigation services.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Eligible applicants for these funds include state recognized health departments, local government agencies, and nonprofit organizations in Cook County. Multiple nonprofits or units of a local government or governments are eligible to apply as a consortium, provided a single lead agency is identified as the applicant. Governmental entities may not apply for funding outside their jurisdiction without justification, and all applicants must demonstrate prior ability to successfully abate or mitigate lead-based paint hazards in residential dwellings.

Illinois: The Delta REDI Model

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1998 (Delta REDI), 2000 (New Markets Tax Credit Program)
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Chicago Lead Safe Window Services
CONTACT:	Gary Jenifer (773) 446-7803 Ron Spielman (773) 446-7801

Overview

It's estimated that, in Chicago alone, 88,000 housing units pose lead-poisoning hazards to young children. The Delta Redevelopment Institute (Delta REDI) is an economic development and real estate affiliate of the Delta Institute. Delta REDI provides a range of financing and services to help revitalize blighted properties and communities. The organization has worked with other community partners toward environmental remediation and redevelopment of brownfields.

Delta REDI is working with the Chicago Department of Public Health and the Illinois Lead Safe Housing Task Force to expand resources for lead abatement in low-income housing units. This approach combines \$6 million in private capital raised by Delta Redevelopment Funds through the federal New Markets Tax Credits Program with a \$6 million grant from the city. This strategy has provided \$12 million in funds to replace windows in more than 1,700 affordable housing units.

Criteria and Funding Structure

In essence, the grant funds from Chicago provide loan forgiveness on lead abatement costs. Chicago Lead Safe Window Services provides and finances lead abatement services for owners of multi-family buildings (four or more units) in low-income Chicago communities. Half of the loan amount is provided through Delta Redevelopment Funds, while the remainder is derived from the city grant. If a building owner borrows \$100,000 for abatement services and subsequently pays back half the loan plus interest, Delta REDI will then use the city grant funds to forgive the other \$50,000 remaining on the loan repayment. This approach thus allows property owners to receive lead abatement services and energy-efficient windows at half price, and the city of can leverage its \$6 million in grant funds to double the number of units that receive abatement services.

Massachusetts: Assessing Fees on Real Estate Transactions and Related Professional Licenses

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1993
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Massachusetts Department of Public Health (Center for) Environmental Health, Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program
CONTACT:	Paul Hunter, Director 617-624-5757 paul.hunter@state.ma.us

Overview

Beginning in 1993, Massachusetts imposed surcharges on the annual fees for a variety of professional licenses. Funds generated through the surcharges are deposited into a retained revenue account known as the Lead Paint Education and Training Trust Account, which was formally created through legislative passage of Chapter 482, Section 22, of the Acts of 1993. Subsequent amendments to this law were also enacted through passage of Chapter 184, Section 154 of the Acts of 2002. These funds are then used by the Department of Health for lead poisoning prevention activities, including primary prevention efforts. Individuals affected by the surcharges include real estate brokers, property and casualty insurance agents, mortgage brokers, mortgage lenders, small loan agencies, and individuals licensed to perform lead inspections.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Specific surcharges levied by the above law include \$25 surcharges to individuals licensed by the Department of Labor and Industries to perform de-leading services, individuals licensed by the Department of Public Health to perform lead inspections, and a \$25 annual surcharge on the licensing fee paid by property and casualty insurance brokers and property and casualty agents of direct writers registered with the Division of Insurance. A \$100 surcharge on the annual licensing fee paid by mortgage brokers, mortgage lenders, and small loan agencies registered with the Division of Banks is also assessed. The Trust Account typically has \$1.25 to \$1.5 million in funds annually. These funds are used for training, licensing of inspectors, and public education purposes.

Additional Findings and Program Details

This program is now in its 15th year of operation and has permanent status. While this program is not integrated with other departments or agencies, it does work closely with HUD lead grantees. In an interview conducted for this study with Director Paul Hunter, Hunter indicated there were some initial challenges involved in setting up the accounts and making sure that all licensing agencies were aware of the fees. Hunter said that the “glitches” were worked out and that the program now works smoothly and efficiently.

Massachusetts: Lead Paint Tax Credit Program

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1994
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Massachusetts Department of Revenue Lead Paint Tax Credit Program Commonwealth of Massachusetts Boston, MA 02204 (617) 887-MDOR

Overview

The Lead Paint Tax Credit Program was established in 1994 through an amendment to Massachusetts' existing lead law. The program allows residents who have an income tax liability to subtract the cost of lead remediation work from the amount of taxes owed at the end of the year. The credit toward the state's personal income tax is equal to the amount spent, up to \$1500 for complete removal of paint or up to \$500 for controlling lead hazards.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Anyone who has an income tax liability and pays for measures to control or abate lead hazards can qualify, including owner-occupants, renter-occupants, or rental property owners. The process of qualifying for the credit involves 1) obtaining an inspection from a certified inspector to document the lead hazard; 2) hiring a certified contractor (listed as a "de-leader" in the statute language) to perform the work; and 3) scheduling a re-inspection to establish compliance. Window replacement costs are allowed if done for the purposes of lead control. Work performed by uncertified contractors is not eligible as a deduction.

One limitation or problem that has been cited with the program is that the relatively modest size of the tax credit (\$1,500) is not a strong incentive to undertake lead hazard abatement activities. Because lead remediation projects in Massachusetts typically cost several thousand dollars, the tax incentive is usually not seen as the deciding factor in financing the cost of lead hazard removal. A suggested improvement to the program is to target higher dollar amounts in income tax credits to lower income tax payers, thus making the program more attractive and beneficial to lower income households.

Michigan: Clean Michigan Initiative Bond Funds

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1998
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Michigan Department of Community Health Lead and Healthy Homes Section
CONTACT:	Wes Priem Division of Environmental and Occupational Epidemiology (517) 335-9390 pickelmanB@state.mi.us

Overview

Voters in Michigan have twice approved bond initiatives for environmental projects, the first for \$800 million in 1988 and another for \$675 million in 1998, called the Clean Michigan Initiative. In particular, the Clean Michigan Initiative included \$5 million to address lead-based paint hazards in homes throughout the state.

In July 2003, the state of Michigan reported that Clean Michigan Initiative bond funds had been used to abate lead hazards in 250 homes (to date, at that time) at a total cost of more than \$1.9 million. Additional funds from this source were also used to pay for project oversight at the local health department level, as well as laboratory services.

The last remaining funds from the Clean Michigan Initiative have recently been expended, and there is now talk among public officials of putting together a new bond proposal similar to the Clean Michigan Initiative. A new bond issue would likely need to be approved by the state legislature in time to be included on the November ballot.

Criteria and Funding Structure

In addition to the bond funds, a more traditional source of funding – two grants from HUD – was also used to fund lead abatement of 581 homes (to date, at that time) at a cost of nearly \$3.3 million. Additional funds from this source were also used for project oversight at the local health department level, laboratory services, and state administrative costs.

Missouri: The Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF)

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	2001
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	St. Louis Affordable Housing Commission
CONTACT:	Angela Conley Executive Director (314) 622-3400, ext. 329

Overview

St. Louis adopted an ordinance in 2001 to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF). This ordinance established the 11-member St. Louis Affordable Housing Commission, whose members are appointed by the mayor and represent different stakeholders and interests throughout the city. The revenue source for the AHTF is provided through a 2.625 percent sales tax on out-of-state purchases over \$2,000.

The AHTF authorizes loans and grants for the rehabilitation, modification, construction, and preservation of affordable and accessible housing. This program also provides grants for accessibility modifications, lead-based paint abatement, emergency assistance for home repairs, transitional housing, homelessness prevention, and similar uses.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Under the AHTF, Homeless Prevention, Construction/Rehabilitation, Rental Assistance, Home Repair, and Operating/Match funds are the specific funding priorities administered through the program. Lead hazards can be addressed through the program's Home Repair funds, which can be used for "remediation of environmental hazards including lead-based paint, radon, asbestos and removal of underground oil tanks." Home Repair funds may be used by existing homeowners for repair, rehabilitation, or reconstruction of owner-occupied single family home units.

More than 250 local jurisdictions in over 30 states have now created housing trust funds to support affordable housing development. The St. Louis AHTF has approximately \$5 million available each year. The St. Louis Housing Commission provides grants and loans to nonprofit agencies and developers that provide housing-related services or construction/rehab housing for city residents earning 80 percent or below the area median income.

New Jersey: Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	2004
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Department of Community Affairs, Division of Community Resources, State of NJ Lead Hazard Control Assistance (LHCA) Fund (609) 633-6286 http://www.state.nj.us/dca/dcr/
CONTACT:	Veronica D'Alessandro vdalessandro@dca.state.nj.us OR lhcaapplication@dca.state.nj.us (609) 292-2528

Overview

The state of New Jersey passed legislation in 2004 to create the Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund. This program provides a pool of grants and low-interest loans for landlords and homeowners who are unable to afford the costs associated with removing lead-based paint from aging buildings. Funding revenue for the program is generated through a set-aside of taxes levied on the sale of paint, with a portion of the amount from each can sold going to the program. The program also generates revenue through inspection fees.

Criteria and Funding Structure

Loans of up to \$150,000 are available to landlords based on financial need and outright grants are made available to homeowners. Eligible housing includes owner-occupied and investor-owned properties that were built before 1978 and contain lead hazards. The Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund provides loans at an interest rate of three percent. Property owners from all income levels are eligible to apply for repayable loans, with some opportunities for forgivable loans reserved for low-income households. Funds are awarded directly to property owners on a first come, first served basis. There are, however, some regulations in place to safeguard against having a few large projects consume the majority of the funding available for that fiscal year. One stipulation in place puts a limit on how much an individual property owner can receive in any given fiscal year.

This legislation additionally creates a fund to relocate lead-poisoned children and establishes a statewide registry of lead-safe housing. Funding for this program is

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

provided through \$20 in fees charged for the inspection of each apartment for lead-based paint hazards, and also from a set-aside of tax revenue on paint sales. In the current budget, the program has approximately \$5 million for lead remediation and health expedited abatement, \$2 million for the relocation program, \$1 million for lead hazard outreach, \$500,000 for a lead registry, and \$200,000 for GIS work. Other initiatives and new aspects for the program are also currently being planned.

Additional Findings and Program Details

In an interview with Veronica D'Alessandro, Program Administrator, it was revealed that one advantage of having a program such as this versus solely relying on federal funding for lead remediation is that there is a dedicated source of funding with no federal funding mandates and restrictions required. D'Alessandro said that the program's impact has been substantial, and in another year or two, they'll have "bragging rights." Progress has been made in addressing lead hazards, as evidenced through the steadily increasing number of loan applications to the program, and the increasing number of lead-poisoned children who have been relocated. While the program has had a positive impact, D'Alessandro stated that several rule revisions are being considered that would allow more needed flexibility in some areas and could help expand the reach of the program. One such change being considered would allow less costly and less time consuming treatment methods for removing lead hazards, which in turn could reduce the number of people who opt out of the program due to costs.

D'Alessandro said that another challenge involved is the fact that there are 112 local health departments and just the sheer number makes working with them difficult. She said varying levels of available resources and services among health departments also compound this challenge. Some health departments may have a nurse who works with lead poisoned children, while some may not; and others may do dust-wipes, while others don't. However, the Lead Hazard Control Assistance Fund will provide \$1 million to purchase new equipment, and some of this funding will allow local health departments to purchase new equipment such as XRF equipment and x-ray tube technology equipment, which can be used in the field for plastic and metal analysis. Local health departments typically find it difficult to come up with funds for purchasing this type of equipment.

Oregon: Water Bureau Lead Hazard Reduction Program

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1997
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Portland Water Bureau
CONTACT:	Multnomah County Health Department (503) 988-3816 (503) 988-4000 (Leadline) leadline@co.multnomah.or.us Portland Water Bureau Tricia Knoll, Public Information 503-823-7510 Scott Bradway, Education and Outreach Manager (503) 823-1951 City of Portland Water Bureau Lead Hazard Reduction Program Customer Service 503-823-7770

Overview

In the early 1990s, Portland was required to optimize the treatment of its drinking water to address the source water's ability to leach lead and copper into water in home plumbing systems. While the city's source water contained no detectable levels of lead and lead was not present in the distribution pipes, the water's softness and naturally low pH and alkalinity levels allowed for the possibility of lead, copper, and other metals to leach into standing water in home plumbing systems. This action was taken as part of the city's efforts to attain compliance with the U.S. EPA's Lead and Copper Rule, a drinking water regulation required by the Safe Water Drinking Act.

However, proposed water treatment strategies were also problematic in that they would have produced unacceptable levels of chlorine disinfection, thus resulting in non-compliance with drinking water standards for those compounds. As the ultimate solution, the Portland City Council and the Portland Water Bureau chose a strategy that included design of water treatment facilities to control corrosion and to work with other stakeholders to develop a lead hazard reduction program targeting potential lead hazards beyond drinking water – in part due to the recognition that water is often not the primary source of children's exposure to lead. As a result, the Home Lead Hazard

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

Reduction Program (HLHRP) was jointly developed in 1997 among the Portland Water Bureau, the Multnomah County Health Department, and the Oregon Health Division.

Designed specifically in response to the Lead and Copper Rule, the HLHRP includes four separate components:

- 1) Corrosion control
- 2) Lead in water testing
- 3) Home lead hazard reduction, and
- 4) Education and outreach

Prior to the LHRP, the Portland Water Bureau did not have an established lead remediation program, although free lead in water testing was offered, along with a program to remove lead components in water systems.

Criteria and Funding Structure

The program is managed by the Multnomah County Health Department, with its primary purpose being to prevent children from being exposed to lead-based paint and dust hazards in the home. Annual funding for the program is provided through approximately \$500,000 from the Portland Water Bureau and an additional \$100,000 from the Corporation for National Service's funding for CLEAR Corps – Community Lead Education and Reduction Corps. This program targets neighborhoods where lead hazard risks are greatest, with particular housing units selected through health department referrals of families with a poisoned child, referrals from the city's rehab program, and inquiries resulting from program outreach. The services provided by the LHRP are free to all customers of the Portland Water Bureau and local water providers who receive water from Portland. A free lead in soils test is also offered to households that have an income of \$33,000 or less for a family of four. A HUD funded lead hazard reduction program is also offered to households that meet an income limit of 80 percent.

Further, the Portland Regional Lead Hazard Control Program (PRLHCP) was started in 1998. This program provides grant funds and loans to property owners for the renovation of lead contaminated homes. The PRLHCP is a partnership between the Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development and the Portland Development Commission. Funding is provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development Lead Hazard Control Grant Program. Through this program, individuals are given a free evaluation of the home to identify any lead based paint and potential hazards. Funding for reduction or removal of lead hazards is also provided, with the work performed by an Oregon certified contractor. The program is available for

qualified low and moderate income households, with preference given to families that have a child under age six or a pregnant female living in the home.

Additional Findings and Program Details

In an interview conducted as part of this study with Scott Bradway, Education and Outreach Manager of the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, Bradway stated that the goals of the HLHRP have changed as the programs it funds have also changed and evolved. Currently, HLHRP grantees are given specific goals to accomplish over a 12-month period, with some examples including teaching lead-safe practices to 500 families, providing blood-lead testing to 1,400 at-risk children and adults, and replacing lead-painted playground equipment in 98 parks (over a five-year period). HLHRP funds also currently serve as matching funds for a HUD-funded lead hazard control grant managed by the Portland Development Commission.

Rhode Island: Utilizing Medicaid Resources for the Rhode Island Window Replacement Program

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	1998
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Rhode Island Department of Human Services
CONTACT:	Sharon Kernan Assistant Administrator, Family and Children Services Center for Child and Family Health (401) 462-3392

Overview

In Rhode Island, Rite Care is the state's managed care program for Medicaid, for the state Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and for certain uninsured resident groups. In 1998, Rhode Island became the first state granted permission to use Medicaid funds to cover the cost of replacing or fixing lead painted windows in the homes of lead-poisoned children who are enrolled in the Rite Care Program. The replacement of lead painted windows, removal of lead-tainted surfaces surrounding windows, and instruction on specialized cleaning techniques for families are among the services offered through a "lead center" – the first of which opened in 1998 – named the Providence Lead Center. Rhode Island now has a total of four Comprehensive Lead Centers (CLCs) operating within the state. With window casings being reported as the source of 80 percent of the lead in affected homes, the state expects to significantly reduce future incidences of lead poisoning through this program.

Criteria and Funding Structure

The Rhode Island Department of Human Services (DHS) manages the Comprehensive Lead Centers. The program has authority to use Medicaid funds for targeted case management services and window replacement. The program essentially bills for these services through the Medicaid agencies, using a "fee for service" arrangement. DHS has also announced plans to certify additional providers and hopes to open lead centers in other parts of the state.

This program has been credited with not only protecting affected children from further lead exposure, but also protecting siblings and future occupants from exposure. Certified lead centers provide several valuable services that are eligible for Medicaid-reimbursement. Case management, coordination and facilitation of housing inspection

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

and any necessary family relocation, and lead education and training for families of affected children are some of the services provided. Window replacement or refurbishing is also included among available services.

There is a blood-lead level threshold for participation, but no income threshold. Participation in the program is restricted to families with children who are Medicaid eligible.

Additional Findings and Program Details

In an informational interview session conducted as part of this study, Sharon Kernan, Assistant Administrator, Family and Children Services Center for Child and Family Health, described the Lead Centers as “community resources.” She stated that in addition to the funds the centers receive from this program for window replacement, the centers are also able to obtain funds from other sources for additional services.

Kernan said that challenges and difficulties encountered with the implementation of the program included taking on a specific focus – replacing windows in homes where lead hazards were identified. This can be an area where a health-focused agency may have little direct experience, and working with contractors and other requirements involved introduce a new role for the agency. Kernan said this was an issue especially with one of the lead centers in its early years of the program. Other challenges involved, she said, stem from the nature of the demographic groups most often affected by lead poisoning hazards. Kernan noted that poverty can be a difficult issue to deal with, and its challenges often exacerbate conditions for families and children exposed to lead hazards. These conditions can also force families to move frequently, sometimes from one deteriorated dwelling to another, stated Kernan. Affected individuals also may be from a different culture, said Kernan, where a language difference may be an additional issue to deal with.

Tennessee: Shelby County's Lead Program

DATE IMPLEMENTED:	2003 (Funding Award Date)
PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY:	Shelby County Dept. of Housing
CONTACT:	Shelby County Health Department (901) 544-7450

Overview

This particular case study examines how a local community has utilized a traditional funding source for lead hazard remediation (a federal grant) to address the needs of local citizens with regard to lead poisoning.

In October 2003, Shelby County, Tennessee received \$3 million in HUD grant funds to remediate 191 houses as lead safe and expand the pool of contractors available to perform lead hazard control work. Blood lead testing on children under age six and efforts to increase awareness of lead-based paint hazards were also included in the Shelby County lead program. The Shelby County Department of Housing (SCDH) and the Shelby County Health Department (SCHD) are also involved in the efforts, along with another local organization – Buehler Affordable Homes – who partners with SCDH to make affordable rental property in the Memphis Renewal Community lead-safe. Shelby County also provides just over \$1.8 million in local matching funds. In addition to the Shelby County award, Memphis received approximately \$2.6 million in HUD funds to build upon its recent successes and expand lead hazard awareness and abatement efforts through the creation of a new program, the Lead Hazard Risk Reduction Initiative (LHRRRI).

Criteria and Funding Structure

The Shelby County Department of Housing (SCDH) has seven state-certified lead-based paint risk assessors on staff. For a fee, staff assessors can conduct lead-based paint testing and risk assessments in pre-1978 homes. This service is available to homeowners, realtors, contractors, and developers who need lead-based paint inspections, risk assessments, or clearance tests on a home. Inspectors certified by the state of Tennessee provide all lead-based paint services.

Additional services are also provided through a partnership between the SCDH and the Memphis Division of Housing and Community Development, through the

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

implementation of the Memphis/Shelby County Lead Safe Communities Program. This program provides lead hazard inspections and risk assessments on eligible housing units within Shelby County. If lead hazards are identified within a unit, action is taken to make the home lead safe. This collaborative partnership also provides educational services for Shelby County residents, addressing the risks and hazards of lead-based paint and how to maintain a lead safe environment.

TRADITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR LEAD CLEAN-UP AND REMEDIATION

This section of the report discusses the more traditional programs and funding sources that cities have utilized to address lead-based paint hazards, including those funded through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In addition to the newer funding strategies and approaches described earlier in this report, the programs and initiatives described in this section provide a valuable source of funding for state and local efforts to remediate lead hazards, and protect young children from the dangers of lead poisoning.

HUD's Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control Programs

September 2007 Funding Awards

In September 2007, HUD announced nearly \$143 million in grants to dozens of state and local communities, public health organizations, and scientific research institutions to help protect children and families from lead-based paint hazards, along with other home health and safety risks. Grant funds issued through the programs administered by HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control are targeted to low-income, privately owned homes that are most likely to have children exposed to lead-based hazards. In addition to helping directly eliminate dangerous lead-based paint hazards in low-income housing, program funds also support public education, compliance assistance, and regulatory enforcement to prevent childhood lead poisoning.

It's anticipated that the funding provided in the 2007 award cycle would help reduce or eliminate lead exposure in more than 10,500 homes nationally, and reduce levels of allergy inducing substances in more than 780 homes. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the 2007 funds.

Table 1

Program	Amount Awarded (Sept 07)
Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control in Privately Owned Housing	\$76,400,000
Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant Program	\$54,700,000
Healthy Homes Demonstration	\$4,986,974
Lead Technical Studies	\$3,499,997
Healthy Homes Technical Studies	\$2,000,000
Lead Outreach Grants	\$1,187,519

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

In northeast Ohio, funding awards from this grant cycle were made locally to Cuyahoga County (\$4 million from the Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration program, \$3 million from the Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control program); and Case Western Reserve University (\$359,197 from the Healthy Homes Technical Studies Grant program).

The \$7 million in grant funds received by the Cuyahoga County Board of Health were used to address lead paint hazards in 500 Greater Cleveland-area homes. Grant funds were made available to families in Cleveland and the inner-ring suburbs who have children under the age of four. These families were able to apply for up to \$10,000 for repairs to their homes.

September 2006 Funding Awards

In this funding cycle, the Cuyahoga County Board of Health (CCBH) was awarded \$1 million in federal funds to partner with existing weatherization programs, managed by the Cleveland Housing Network and the Cuyahoga County Department of Development to provide an integrated approach to asthma trigger reduction. Low income families qualified for weatherization assistance as well as lead hazard control. Lead interventions were conducted in conjunction with Cleveland's and Cuyahoga County's Lead Hazard Reduction programs. This federal funding award was made through HUD's Healthy Homes Demonstration Grant Program.

Also, the Cleveland Department of Health was awarded \$4 million in federal funds to conduct lead hazard control interventions in 333 private housing units for low or very low-income families with children under the age of six. The Cleveland Department of Health and the Cuyahoga County Board of Health combined resources to effectively protect children throughout Cuyahoga County from lead poisoning by the end of the decade.

U.S. EPA's Great Cities Partnership

As part of an ongoing project, Cleveland's Department of Public Health has used a \$250,000 grant from the U.S. EPA's Great Cities Partnership Program to conduct a lead assessment and abatement program in four low-income city neighborhoods. This grant award was also helpful in leveraging additional funding from other community groups to form the Lead-Safe Cleveland campaign, which was officially started in October 2004 with a news conference at an elementary school in one of the effected neighborhoods. It has since been reported that more than 550 homes have been inspected (as of Fall 2005), with Lead Safe Cleveland's ultimate goal being listed as assessing and rehabilitating lead hazards in 1,500 homes. Under the city's Lead Safe

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

program, lead hazards found during assessments were rehabilitated using either HUD funds or by enforcing the city's lead ordinance requirements. Housing cleared of lead hazards were also certified as such.

Cleveland's Department of Health was selected in 2007 by the U.S. EPA to receive a Targeted Lead Grant, one of 58 recipients receiving funding through this award cycle of the program. While specific details concerning the size of the grant award were not released, plans called for grant funds to be targeted within areas of the city that have the highest rates of childhood lead poisoning. Specific uses of these funds will include:

1. Providing training to child care center staff members to collect blood samples from children;
2. Providing education and outreach materials to parents and caregivers; and
3. Educating parents about grant and loan programs available to assist with home repairs, lead hazard control measures, and available lead-safe work practices training.

The National Community-Based Lead Grant Program is a program administered through the U.S. EPA's Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. In 2007, the program awarded more than \$3.1 million in grants. A primary goal of this program is to provide lead poisoning outreach to low-income communities and support activities that help identify lead hazard risks to children. The U.S. EPA is currently soliciting grant proposals from eligible entities for FY 2008 funding awards. Local governments, community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, faith-based organizations, trainers, and environmental consultants are all eligible to apply for funding.

Cuyahoga County Programs to Address Lead Hazards

Cuyahoga County's Lead Safe Program

The Cuyahoga County Department of Development offers the Lead Safe Program to eligible low and moderate income homeowners and renters in targeted suburban areas outside of Cleveland. This program enables eligible recipients to make changes in their homes to provide a lead safe environment for young children. Grants are offered to income-eligible homeowners and renters with a child age three or younger living in the home or regularly attending day care in the home.

All children under age six either living or often spending time in the home must be tested for blood lead levels within six months before remediation begins. Landlords

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

must also agree to give preference in renting assisted units to families with children under the age of six for three years after work is finished, and may not raise tenant-paid monthly rents for one year after the remediation work is completed.

Additional program eligibility guidelines based on household size and household income limits for tenants and homeowners are listed on the Cuyahoga County Department of Development's website at the following link:
<http://development.cuyahogacounty.us/en-US/lead-safe-program.aspx>.

Commercial Redevelopment Fund Program

Another program offered through the Cuyahoga County Department of Development is the Commercial Redevelopment Fund program, which has three respective components:

1. Municipal Redevelopment Program
2. Private Redevelopment Program
3. Local Parking Needs Program

Municipal Redevelopment Program

Local municipal corporations of the county are eligible for this program, which provides loan funds for the redevelopment of former commercial, industrial, or institutional properties targeted within urban or first-ring suburban communities. As a requirement, recipients must own the property or have a development agreement in place with a private or not-for-profit entity. Either party may be the borrower.

Eligible applicants may apply for up to \$800,000 in funding to support locally sponsored projects, with maximum loan terms ranging up to 15 years. Vacant or under-utilized sites with prior commercial, industrial or institutional usage that may be impacted by the actual or presumed presence of asbestos or lead paint qualify for the program. Sites may include adjacent parcels formerly used for housing if the local community approves the zoning change and the property is vacant at the time of application. Eligible uses for program funds include expenditures for property appraisals, property acquisition, environmental site assessments, asbestos and/or lead paint remediation, renovation and modernization, and site clearance and demolition.

Private Redevelopment Program

Eligible applicants for this program include private developers, businesses, and non-profit community development corporations. The applicant is the borrower and also must own the property. In addition, a firm commitment from an end-user for the

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

redeveloped property must be provided at the time of application, with the proposed end-use meeting approval from the county.

The applicant and project site must be current with all Cuyahoga County tax liabilities, and this program cannot be used for big box, retail mall development, lifestyle centers, or other large scale retail projects. Other stipulations require that the borrower must own and operate the project for a minimum of five years after completion, and a specified number of jobs must be created and/or retained at the site. Eligible uses for programs funds, loan amounts, and terms are similar to those specified in the Municipal Redevelopment Program.

Local Parking Needs Program

For this program, project sites that support commercial or industrial development by increasing the availability of parking qualify. Projects with environmental contaminants other than asbestos and lead paint are not eligible for program funds.

Invest in Children

Invest in Children is a community-wide public/private partnership among government agencies, community-based service providers, and other organizations working together to “help increase the development, funding, visibility, and impact of early childhood services in Cuyahoga County.” This initiative is administered through the Board of Cuyahoga County Commissioners.

As part of Invest in Children, it was recently announced that Cleveland’s Department of Public Health will use \$125,000 in funds secured through the EPA’s Great Cities Partnership program to launch a pilot program designed to benefit families with pregnant women and newborns. This project will examine if intervention at the early stage of a child’s life is an effective means to reduce lead hazards faced by an at-risk family.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Telephone Interview Protocol

Appendix B: Resources

APPENDIX A: TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Telephone Script for Initial Contact

Hello, I'm (name) with the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center at Cleveland State University. We're conducting research to identify innovative financing efforts that have been implemented to help eliminate childhood lead poisoning in the United States. We've identified your program through our research as being one of the more innovative for its efforts to help reduce or eliminate childhood lead poisoning, and would like more information. We'd like to gather feedback on your program through a telephone interview at a time and date convenient to you to get a sense of how the program came together, who was involved, and the overall impact of your program to your area. We'd also like you to share any difficulties or challenges you may have encountered, as well as the things about your program that went extremely well.

Would you be interested in talking with us about your program? If so, what is the best time and date for me to phone you? I can send you some background (below) on our project and the interview questions in advance by email, if you'd like, to help better prepare you for our interview.

Project Background/Overview

The Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center (GLEFC) of the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University is conducting a review of the innovative financing of efforts to eliminate childhood lead poisoning in the United States. The project is being conducted for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 Office (Chicago).

The research will highlight the most innovative uses of public, private, not-for-profit and foundation funds, and financial tools in the fight against childhood lead poisoning. The goal and objectives of the project are as follows:

Goal

To identify innovative financing tools and uses of funds in the efforts to eliminate childhood lead poisoning.

Objectives

1. Identify successful uses of public funds in efforts to eliminate childhood lead poisoning.

2. Identify successful uses of non-governmental funds (public, private, not-for-profit, and foundation funds) in efforts to eliminate childhood lead poisoning.

The GLEFC’s work is framed by the recognition that lead hazard control and primary prevention activities are ongoing, but that the national strategy goal of elimination of lead poisoning in children by the year 2010 is fast approaching. This analysis of financial tools will become important for local and national stakeholders in the elimination strategy, enabling them to better focus financial tools to the areas of greatest success.

Interview Questions

Name:	
Title:	
Organization:	
Phone:	Date:

1. **What is it that led you to develop and employ this innovative funding mechanism (for example, a lack of federal and state funds, bond failures, etc.)?** What problems or issues did you experience that led to the creation of this funding mechanism? What prompted you to develop this new method of financing lead remediation efforts?
 - a. **How did this funding fit into your lead remediation program?** Did this replace an existing effort, and if so, please describe.

2. **Please describe your housing market.** Was the predominant housing in your city built before World War II? Is the housing stock in your city aged or a combination of new and older housing?

***Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing
Lead Remediation Programs***

3. **Please describe the overall operations, guidelines and structure of the program.** What are the criteria for participation? Was the program created by legislation or ordinance? *(ask for a copy of their legislation and/or ordinance)*
4. **Please describe how funds are awarded.** How did you structure the financial aspects of the program? Is there a dedicated stream of funding? What is the likelihood of the sustainability of your funding?
5. **Is your program a pilot program or does it have permanent status?** Is this program subject to a sunset provision where it will end at some point? Was this program modeled after a similar program in another state or community?
6. **How did you integrate your program with building departments and housing departments within your community?** Are there functions and responsibilities of the program (e.g. code inspections, homeowner/resident assistance) that are shared by different agencies or departments?
7. **How has your program helped to reduce/remediate lead problems?** What methods are in place to gauge results? How many individuals have been served through your program to date? How many homes or dwellings have been remediated of lead paint hazards?
8. **Please describe your overall experience in developing your program, particularly any issues or challenges you encountered.** In hindsight, is there anything you would have done differently?
9. **Do you have anything that you'd like to add?**

I thank you for your time in responding to our research questions. If you would like to receive an electronic version of our report when our research is complete, please provide me with a current email address. Thanks again for your participation!

APPENDIX B: RESOURCES

Affordable Housing Commission, City of St. Louis. (2007). Information accessed August 21, 2007 online at:
<http://stlouis.missouri.org/501c/affordablehousingcommission/>

Alameda County Community Development Agency. (2007). *Lead Poisoning Prevention Program*. Information accessed August 22, 2007 online at:
<http://www.aclppp.org/index.htm>

Alliance for Healthy Homes. (2005). *Building Blocks for Primary Prevention: Protecting Children from Lead-Based Paint Hazards*. Report produced by the Alliance for Healthy Homes, Washington, DC. Produced for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, October 2005. Accessed online at:
<http://www.afhh.org/buildingblocks/docs/BuildingBlocksforPrimaryPrevention.pdf>

Alliance for Healthy Homes. (2007). *Federal Funding: Agency Budget Overviews*.

Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning. *Action Plan to Make High-Risk Lead Housing Safe*.

Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning. *Innovative Strategies for Addressing Lead Hazards in Distressed and Marginal Housing: A Collection of Best Practices*.

Cook County Department of Public Health. (2005). *Cook County Lead-Based Paint Hazard Control Grant Program Guidelines*. May, 2005. Information accessed online August 30, 2007 at:
www.cookcountypublichealth.org/programs/family/lead/index.shtml

Cook County Department of Public Health. (2005). *Cook County to Provide On-Going Financial Assistance for Correction of Lead Hazards in Homes*. May 25, 2005. News Release accessed online August 30, 2007 at:
<http://www.cookcountypublichealth.org/news/PDFs/lead/torrens%20may%2005.pdf>

Cuyahoga County Department of Development. (2007). *Commercial Redevelopment Fund Program Description*. Information accessed online October 5, 2007 at:
<http://development.cuyahogacounty.us/en-US/CRF-program-description.aspx>

Cuyahoga County Department of Development. (2007). *Lead Safe Program*.

Innovative Funding Mechanisms for Financing Lead Remediation Programs

Information accessed online July 9, 2007 at:

<http://development.cuyahogacounty.us/en-US/lead-safe-program.aspx>

Illinois Lead Safe Housing Task Force, and the Loyola University Child Law Center. (2005). *Lead Safe Illinois. A Newsletter on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention, Winter/Spring 2005*. Information accessed online August 30, 2007 at: http://www.luc.edu/law/academics/special/pdfs/leadnews_winspr2005.pdf

McCarty, M.; Perl, L.; Foote, B.E.; Boyd, E.; & Peterson, M. (2007). *The Department of Housing and Urban Development: FY 2008 Appropriations*. May 29, 2007. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2003). *Martinez Announces \$147 Million to Protect Children and Families From Dangerous Lead and Other Home Health and Safety Hazards*. News Release, HUD No. 03-002, Thursday, October 2, 2003. Accessed online at: <http://www.hud.gov/local/tn/news/pr2003-10-02a.cfm>

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2007). *Working Toward a Lead-Safe Cleveland: Assessment and Abatement*. Region 5 Great Cities Partnership Program. Information accessed online March 18, 2008 at: <http://www.epa.gov/region5/greatcities/cleveland/project1.htm>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2007). *Invest in Children Primary Prevention Project*. Region 5 Great Cities Partnership Program. Information accessed online March 18, 2008 at: <http://www.epa.gov/region5/greatcities/cleveland/project3.htm>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2008). *National Community-Based Lead Outreach and Training Grant Program Request for Proposals (RFP) FY 2008*. U.S. EPA, Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances. Document accessed online March 18, 2008 at: http://www.epa.gov/oppt/lead/rfp_2-8-08.pdf.