

Letter of Transmittal
July 2, 2021

To:

Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control

From:

City of Lewiston Maine
27 Pine Street
Lewiston, ME 04240

Final Narrative Report
MELHD0306-17
Lewiston-Auburn Lead Program



Summary and Accomplishments of Lewiston-Auburn Lead Grant Program

Program Design - Creating Lead Safe, Green and Healthy Homes: The Lewiston-Auburn Lead Program (“Program”) was designed to reduce lead hazards in the targeted area homes through a comprehensive plan of lead hazard reduction, enforcement, economic development, job training, and outreach.

Target Area and Population:

Incorporated in the late 1790’s, the sister Cities of Lewiston-Auburn (L-A) are situated adjacent to each other and are located in central Maine. Lewiston’s downtown is comprised of low income and poorly maintained large multi-family tenement style housing built pre-1940 with 8-12 units. In Auburn the older housing stock consists of large homes that have been converted into 2-4 rental units that house low income families. In Lewiston, Census Tracts 201-204 and in Auburn, Census Tracts 101,103 & 105 comprises the LALP Target area. Starting in 2001, Somali refugee families began moving to L-A. Now L-A is home to 6,000 to 7,000 African refugees, immigrants and asylum seekers representing 11.2% of the overall population. Maps available from the Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention demonstrate that childhood lead poisonings are concentrated in the downtown L-A census tracts where the housing is the oldest, least maintained and where the poorest community members reside.

Families assisted by the program were made up of:

87 children under age 6
161 children ages 6-17, and
305 adults ages 18 or older

Income levels recorded based on MFI for Lewiston-Auburn Maine were:

55.5% of units **132** units at 50% MFI
 19.8% of units **47** units at 80% MFI

Commitment to rent to qualified tenants per Title X was required for the following rental units.

6.7% of units **16** units at Over-Income per Title X allowance
 18.8% of units **45** units vacant at enrollment due to Maine Lead Poisoning Prevention Laws (occupant updates are requested when units are filled)

Community Outreach:

Healthy Androscoggin (“HA”) is a community coalition of dedicated community members and organizations who work to improve the health and quality of life of residents of Androscoggin County, Maine and provide direct health prevention services in at risk communities in Lewiston and Auburn. As a sub-recipient, HA Community Outreach Worker **Heritier Nosso**, was funded under this grant. He has experience, conducting trainings, outreach and providing client referrals to the Program from various multilingual populations in the target area. His experience as an immigrant has connected him to the immigrant community for Somali and other African immigrant populations. Cleaning kit demonstrations and a Picture Flip Book have been valuable in reaching residents with language barriers and limited reading abilities.

Benchmark Activity	Target	Achieved
Resident Education for low income families, (Health Survey data collected when possible)	220 unit visits	121 Education visits (56 Health surveys)

Conduct/ Participate in Community Outreach Events	50 Events	62 Events
Community Outreach for Lead Poisoning Prevention	5,000 Residents	5,274 Residents

Program unit demographic information: *(Not all residents were willing to provide this)*

86	Female Head of Households
23	Disabled Head of Households
2	people identified with a Hispanic ethnicity

People self-identified as: *(Not all residents were willing to provide this)*

250	White individuals
210	Black-African American individuals
18	Black-African American & White individuals
28	Black-African American & American Native individuals
5	American Native individuals
4	Pacific Islander individuals
0	Asian and White individuals

Lead Poisoning Prevention:

The Program intends to dramatically reduce the risk of lead poisoning in the targeted community. Effective March 2015: Maine Center for Disease Control ("CDC") has **set the EBL action level at 5 ug/dL** matching the federal CDC level. ***For children less than 6 years old, providers should confirm all capillary blood lead levels >5 ug/dL with venous samples,*** and follow up on all venous blood lead levels >5 ug/dL. Effective September 2016: Maine CDC provides **a full lead investigation of a child's home environment** when a venous **blood lead test result is >5 ug/dL**.

Effective June 2019: Maine law **requires blood lead tests for all children at 1 and 2 years of age**. Practice has also included testing older children in the home if the child screened has an EBL level and found additional poisoned children.

The change in the EBL screening requirement and the more aggressive testing and investigation programs are revealing more children with an EBL level that were previously missed. This influences the appearance of the CDC Poisoned Child data identified below.

Maine CDC Lead Poisoning Data for Lewiston-Auburn:

Data Category (Children 0-<36 Months)	2017 Data	2019 Data
Population base of Children	2,228	2,155
Number of Children Screened for EBL	866	907
Percentage of Children screened for Lead	28.3%	32.5%
Confirmed children with EBL @ ≥ 5 ug/dL	36	28
Unconfirmed EBL at $5 < \leq 10$ ug/dL	24	22
<i>Estimated number of Children EBL @ ≥ 5 ug/dL</i>	45	36
<i>*Note: (#Confirmed + 0.38 x # Unconfirmed)</i>		
Estimated percent of Children screened @ ≥ 5 ug/dL	5.2%	4.0%

*Note: This is an estimated number and percent of children with a blood lead level at or above 5 micrograms per deciliter (ug/dL), among those screened. A blood lead test is considered a

“screening test” only when a child has no prior history of a confirmed blood lead ≥ 5 ug/dL. The estimated number of children with a blood lead level ≥ 5 ug/dL is the number with confirmed tests plus 38% of the children with unconfirmed 5- <10 ug/dL tests. A blood lead result is considered unconfirmed if it is a single capillary specimen ≥ 5 .

The Program conducted Lead hazard control work at 35 Properties (**194 units**) identified by the Maine CDC during **Environmental Lead Investigations**. Thirty-one (**31**) **children with a confirmed EBL were connected with these property investigations.**

Lead Safe Units:

The Program used an owner Affidavit that stipulated the following.

6.) When leasing Program Units during the three year term I agree to give priority to income eligible families with children under the age of six years. I agree to advertise vacant/vacated Program Units on the Maine Housing search.org website. www.mainehousingsearch.org I agree to include in the advertisement that the Program Unit has been made lead-safe and that families with children under the age of 6 years are encouraged to apply. I also agree that units cleared by the Lead Program may be listed on the www.lewistonauburnlead.org website as a property receiving lead grant funds and resources.

The State of Maine has control over the Maine Housing Search website and it is undergoing changes of ownership between departments and responsibility for maintenance. The LewistonAuburnLead.org website is maintained as a resource for the community by the Program. It is not dynamic in the sense that vacant units can be listed or removed at convenience. It is intended to be a list of properties known to be made Lead Safe by the program with the Lead Safe Date. It does state that “owners are responsible for safe maintenance practices; units are still likely to have some lead painted surfaces, and that tenants should inform owners anytime they have damaged paint”. We list property address and bedroom counts for units at each property. Most importantly, we want the public to know that there was paint testing data for these properties and that owners should be able to provide that for tenants, or potential new owners.

Benchmark Activity	Target	Achieved
Conduct Lead Inspection/ Risk Assessments	260 units	297 units
Conduct Lead Hazard control work to clear units	220 units	238 units
Deliver Lead Safe Maintenance Plans (Post Remediation)	220 Units	238 units
Healthy Homes Hazard Control Work with Lead units	160 units	219 units

Contractor/ Community Capacity:

During the period of this grant, we had 3 primary lead certified contractors willing to bid and complete program projects. One struggled with quality of work and performance issues and has now been dropped from bid invites. New contractors started bidding towards the end of the grant. One is weak in carpentry, and good for paint abatement. Another contractor is developing well to be one of the top 3. We still have 3 primary, and 2 smaller contractors that randomly bid projects.

Lead Worker Training was used to assist worker training as needed for the abatement level contractors. Since that pool was relatively small and had a focused impact on program projects, we also trained property maintenance people and property owners who did their own maintenance in the Lead Safe practices of EPA's Renovate, Repair, and Paint program ("RRP") that work on properties in our target area. Some of these people did also go on to take Lead Abatement level trainings to make rental housing in our target area lead safe with private funding. We **trained a total of 78 individuals** in the categories of EPA's RRP, and Lead Inspection, Lead Risk Assessment, and Lead Abatement Supervisor which is regulated by the State of Maine Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP").

A HEPA Vacuum Loan Program was established at the City Hall in Lewiston and in Auburn with a HEPA Vacuum at each location that a can be signed out for the cost of the cartridge, and used to conduct safe clean-up of particles that could contain Lead dust. For a property owner, this is valuable when doing RRP Lead Safe Maintenance since they may not normally have access to one. A tenant may have the same need, regarding their unit if property maintenance is not keeping up with it.

Benchmark Activity	Target	Achieved
Lead Worker Trainings	40 People	78 People
Establish HEPA Vacuum Loan Programs	2 programs	2 programs

The Program's Approach:

Multiple City and State agencies and community partners worked together to implement cost effective strategies that targeted where children at risk reside. State of Maine agencies for the DEP and CDC actively work with HUD grant programs to share information about properties in need of Lead Hazard work, and training events or contractors available to assist with the Lead work. Portland Maine, Maine State Housing Authority, and the City of Lewiston all have HUD Lead grants and actively share data and best practices with each other. **Every three months all HUD funded Lead programs in Maine meet with Maine CDC, Maine DEP, and the Community Action Programs** (which provide the technical Lead Services). We look at statewide information and practices to adjust our programs and work together when possible for better results.

Compliance and Enforcement:

The Program is strongly committed to providing a viable mechanism to translate code enforcement into tangible home renovation and lead hazard reduction that produces safer housing. The City's Code Enforcement department works with the Program to pursue the repair of rental properties through owner compliance assistance as well as the enforcement of City and State lead statutes against non-compliant owners that have outstanding lead or housing code violations. A city Code Enforcement officer visited each project that applied to the Lead Program for a Health and Safety visit and advised which properties would result in safe housing based on the scope of work the Lead Program would do. Properties that had hazards beyond the scope of our program were denied acceptance unless other resources were found to address these rehabilitation needs.

The Program incorporated components of both of the City's Consolidated Plan, Green & Healthy Homes Initiative, and its enforcement strategies to address the needs of at risk families and children. Combining lead hazard reduction work with housing rehabilitation, energy efficiency, and weatherization programs, allows the Program to create affordable lead safe homes and a more permanent transformation of deteriorated housing to sustainable lead safe and affordable housing.

Additional City rehab funding in for grant projects (**36 units**), amounted to **\$24,050.00** to pay for new roofs, heating systems, hot water systems, siding, entry steps, weatherization and basement drainage improvements. ***Green and Healthy Homes units included improving a component of weatherization and a Healthy Homes Hazard component, for a total of lead program 21 units.***

Benchmark Activity	Target	Achieved
Leverage Funded Rehabilitation work (roofs, heating systems, hot water systems, siding, entry steps, weatherization and basement drainage)	No Target	36 units
Leverage Funded Weatherization (GHHI Units)	40 units	12 units

Lead grant projects assisted included:

2 Single Family Homes (2 units),
19 Projects with 2-4 units per building (54 units),
26 Projects with 5 units or more per building (182 units)
47 Projects assisted by the Program including **238 units**

Applications that dropped:

1 Single Family Homes
5 Projects with 2-4 units
4 Projects with 5 units or more
10 Projects dropped (**41 units**)

- *One project dropped post Clearance/ Reporting and repaid grant funds. (2 units)*
- *Six projects were referred to other grant funding sources. (26 units)*

Grant Application, Work Plan, and Policy and Procedures:

The original work plan was effective. The City has limited in-house resources for application intake and project oversight, and relies heavily on our sub-grantee Community Concepts Inc. a non-profit CAP agency. We made minor changes to support the City having clear control as to which projects moved forward or were put on hold during different parts of the process, rather than only at the beginning.

We recognized that our program policy was to stop grant funding pre-contract at the average cost expected. This worked for many projects and it kept our average cost below the proposed average cost. We saw that some smaller properties with good intentioned owners were at risk of dropping out. We implemented a policy change as follows:

Grant Funding Limit Waiver (as of 3-13-2020)

The Lead Program Manager shall have the ability to grant more than the standard (per unit) grant funding amount for a specific project (going into contract) following these conditions:

- 1) the program wide average grant (per unit cost) is currently below that projected in the HUD budget,
- 2) the increased funding allowed will not exceed the thresholds required for HUD GTR approval,
- 3) there are special circumstances, or need documented to justify the decision for allowing a specific project more funding at contract. (Owners are still required to cover the 10% minimum match.)

This flexibility was key to saving a project that had gone under loan underwriting before the low bidder proved unreliable and a different contractor had to be secured. It also helped with program income from 2 units that dropped out unexpectedly and allowed us to get a replacement project contracted just a few days before the grant period of performance ended.

We obtain documentation from the Code Enforcement officer as to reasons why a property failed to be viable, so we could compel owners to invest in improvements prior to qualifying for grant funds. This has

compelled significant private funding property improvements on at least 3 projects that received LEAD grant assistance. We work to obtain Code sign-offs for projects once completed in cases which required “permitted” rehabilitation activities.

Unit Work Conducted:

Unit work involved addressing Lead Hazards on exteriors and common areas as they related to occupants of the units and potentially creating a Lead Dust that was tracking into the units or moving through the open windows. Exterior hazards were addressed on properties with historical significance according to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) consent. Methods used included scrape and paint encapsulation of siding, trim, porches, and roof overhangs.

Component Encapsulation was used when addressing Non-friction/impact Lead Paint surfaces and when required by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for exterior components. (Below)



Scrape to bare abatement methods were used for friction impact surfaces that could not be easily replaced. Door slabs were often replaced due to condition. (below)



Window sills where children could chew were identified. (below)



Window sills where children could chew scraped to bare substrate and repainted. (below)



Stair Treads were cut-out and replaced due to friction/impact conditions and the riser boards were covered with $\frac{1}{4}$ " plywood (Luan) with edges caulked and repainted to create a rigid enclosure. (below)



Exterior siding was enclosed with fan-fold insulation (with seams taped) and vinyl sided over. Exterior trim was covered with coil metal work to form a rigid enclosure. (below)







Component replacement was used when substrate deterioration would not hold paint and/or friction and impact hazards required it, such as porch components. (Below)



Tape and barrier precautions were used to control abatement activity areas. (Below)





Complete component removal was used for deteriorated components that were no longer required.
(Below)



Soil Hazards were addressed by bringing in new uncontaminated soil and mixing to lower the soil lead level. (Optional method to encapsulate the soil under asphalt or concrete was not used on program projects though contractors have been able to do that on private projects. Optional soil removal was not used since leaded soil is considered a hazardous waste and disposal costs were prohibitive.)

Healthy Homes (HH) Hazards:

HH hazards identified and addressed case by case were primarily under the following categories:

Entry by Intruders focused on broken entry doors and windows accessible from outside.

Lighting issues primarily focused on broken or missing lighting components replacement.

Falls on Level Surfaces focused on thresholds or damaged floor surfaces at room transitions.

Falls on Stairs focused on proper handrails and sometimes on proper stair design due to uneven rise and run measurements. Some entry steps needed a handrail due to rise to the platform exceeding 24".

Falls Between Levels focused on guardrail heights on raised platforms and porches.

Electrical Hazards had to do with GFI receptacle protection in wet areas and outlet boxes not secure in the wall.

Fire Hazards started with smoke detectors and decided to push them onto the owner for compliance and focused on Fire Rated Doors.

Structural Collapse and Falling Elements focused on deteriorated structural components for porches, and for loose building components overhead. (Such as loose chimney bricks, loose porch components and loose exterior trim, etc.)

Evaluations or Research

This topic does not apply to the Lewiston-Auburn Lead Program.

Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The Lead Program was able to look at 56 different properties in the community. The cities gained access to buildings that previously had not been inspected by City Code Enforcement. Of these properties, 47 successfully went through the lead program. Of the 10 properties that did not go through the program, 4 re-applied under the new Lewiston Lead Grant and are moving forward. The others were dropped by the owner's choice or were informed as to what they needed to complete in order to qualify for the program.

Owners that are not willing to work with the program up front have trouble with every step of the process. They may have trouble clearing tax or municipal debts, providing significant owner match money or timely documents and are always more work to manage. If I give an owner leeway to meet compliance, they usually do not come through anyway. If they commit to the program, I have to drag them through the process. They are not timely with their responsibilities. It is much more effective to be firm and fair up front and see who is willing to meet the time and commitment requirements with no exceptions. Down the road a proven responsible owner is someone you could work with if there was a program issue with their project.

Of the properties cleared, 31 children had been poisoned by hazards we have corrected. We continue to see children at program projects and with our resident education provider, we are helping tenants become aware of safety dealing with Lead Paint Hazards.

At least 8 owners have applied with more than one property for grant assistance. This has demonstrated a commitment from the community to improve safe housing before Lead violations were posted at one of their buildings. These properties have maintained affordable housing for low income families before and after the program work.

The most effective way to manage the grant is to rely on the people around you with institutional experience and a view of historic timelines for each part of the process. This needs to be considered and measured against the specific grant guidelines, which HUD shares on an ongoing basis. In reality I need to be looking at my deadlines 2 quarters ahead. Projects that just apply in my program need a first visit by Code Enforcement and the Program Manager to verify that the property is acceptable and will result in safe housing. Then the assessments, designs, and project bidding are scheduled. This takes a few weeks for multi-unit projects, which are the majority of housing in our city. The owner may also delay if they cannot easily provide the owner match required.

Reaching a contract within 1 quarter is routine for most cases. The contractor scheduling is a hard to predict. It is why we need to look 2 quarters ahead. With 3 proven reliable contractors for large projects and 3 newer or smaller contractors, we cannot always predict if the contractor will have other projects booked that delay the project by more than 30 days. Having extra work in the pipeline and monitoring contractor schedules is the only way we found to predict meeting grant targets.

Healthy Homes has been a great asset for addressing safety hazards outside of deteriorated lead paint. It is often not cost effective or reasonable to include some items in the Healthy Homes Scope of work. Excessive electrical or plumbing activities involve a separate licensed contractor and are more expensive. Some hazards identified need immediate attention and should not be delayed for a bid award and contract signing, such as smoke and carbon monoxide detectors, or defective exhaust systems on

combustion appliances. Items needing immediate attention, specialty licensed trades, or items that should be part of routine maintenance are referred to the owner for correction.

Performance Timelines:

We averaged **21.8 weeks from enrollment to clearance** for our majority multi-family housing projects (including multifamily buildings up to 16 units). This excludes 5 projects with outlier conditions such as contractors dropping contracts or massive match funding hurdles. Our biggest time commitment was getting full assessments, hazard control designs and federally acceptable bid out process. Our contractor timing varied by contractor, and we are seeing improvements as the contractor pool gets larger.

Financial Summary

Average costs per unit were based on the following:

Typical Full Lead Paint Inspection and Risk Assessment (LIRA & Labs)	Cost per unit \$ 909.00
Typical Lead Hazard Control Design and Bidding	Cost per unit \$ 500.00
114 Units Required Temporary Relocations	Average cost per unit \$ 1,041.00

238 Units Funded for Contractors (Hazard Control Work)

238 Units Funded: Lead Grant funds	Average cost per unit \$ 8,203.00
201 Units Funded: Private Match funds	Average cost per unit \$ 1,780.00
46 Units Funded: CDBG Match funds	Average cost per unit \$ 4,027.00
219 Units Healthy Homes Supplement	Average cost per unit \$ 1,715.00

Category	Original Budget HUD Portion	HUD Amount Required	Adjusted Balance
1. Personnel Direct Labor	\$193,272.25	\$190,895.50	\$0.00
Comments: HUD Funding was moved (\$2,376.75) to line category 5. for supplies and material costs. Additional Match Cost (\$6,369.00) was paid for using eligible city funding.			
2. Fringe Benefits	\$89,230.70	\$86,191.53	\$0.00
Comments: Funding was moved (\$2,847.05) to line category 5. for supplies and material costs. Funding was moved (\$192.12) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs. Additional Match Cost (\$3,144.63) was paid for using eligible city funding.			
3. Travel	\$33,305.40	\$19,781.50	\$0.00
Comments: Funding was moved (\$13,523.90) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs . Any Cost overage was paid for using eligible city funding.			
4. Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Comments: Sub-grantee Community Concepts owns the equipment necessary for the "Technical" Lead services. There was no need for equipment purchases.			

5. Supplies and Materials	\$2,221.00	\$7,444.80	\$0.00
Comments: Funding was moved into this category (\$5,223.80) from categories 1&2 for supplies and material costs. Any Cost overage was paid for using eligible city funding.			
6. Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Comments: The Lead Program did not require any specialized consultants.			
7a. Community Concepts Inc. (CCI) (Sub-grantee) (Intake & Application Processing; Lead Design; Construction Oversight & Management; Clearance Inspections)	\$ 296,401.60	\$315,239.22	\$0.00
Comments: Project Applications and Design work was paid for the 297 potential units we attempted to enroll. Project Oversight was paid for the 238 units that the program cleared. Funding was moved in (\$18,837.62) from line 7f. Education and Outreach (due to pandemic impact). Additional Match Cost (\$73,220.70) was paid for by CCI as a qualified indirect cost.			
7b. Lead Hazard Control Contractors	\$ 1,650,000.00	\$1,939,375.30	\$0.00
Comments: Lead Hazard Control work was awarded by sealed a sealed bid process with the requirement that the contractors attended the pre-bid walk though. Funding was moved into this category (\$289,375.30) for direct project hazard control costs (exceeding target by 18 units). Additional Match Cost (\$357,688.25) was paid for by private owner funding. Additional Match Cost (\$187,172.00) was paid for using CDBG Rehab lending. Additional Match Cost (\$12,874.55) was paid for using other eligible city funding.			
7c. State of Maine Environmental Testing Lab	\$100,800.00	\$66,660.00	\$0.00
Comments: Maine CDC paid for project lab clearance samples on projects they had posted for Lead Paint Hazards. They also paid for related lab costs on their initial investigations (Lead Inspection/ Risk Assessments) and referred those projects to our program. Funding was moved (\$34,140.00) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs. Additional Match Cost (\$34,068.00) was paid for State of Maine (CDC and Environmental Testing Lab).			
7d. Lead Worker Training	\$60,000.00	\$24,784.06	\$0.00
Comments: Lead Worker Training focused on workers that would be part of the Lead Abatement industry as a top priority. Second to that we trained property owners and property managers that have rental units in our target area with the EPA RRP level training. Some of them also took Lead Abatement Training. Education for Lead Safe Maintenance Practices at rental housing was viewed as a mechanism to prevent unsafe conditions in housing units and reduce the chance of a child poisoning, outside of grant projects. Funding was moved (\$35,215.94) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs.			

7e. Community Clinical Services	\$21,201.04	\$0.00	\$0.00
Comments: Original plans to conduct Blood Lead Level testing were found to be unworkable. Funding was moved (\$21,201.04) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs.			
7f. Healthy Androscoggin (HA) (Sub-recipient)	\$270,000.80	\$99,000.00	\$0.00
Comments: Pandemic Restrictions caused this activity to be shut down 1 year early with no viable work-around. Funding was moved (\$171,000. 80) to other category 7. Budget lines.			
7g. Lead Inspection-Risk Assessments	\$123,000.00	\$129,675.00	\$0.00
Maine CDC paid for Lead Risk Assessments prior to and during program enrollment for program properties. Funding was moved in (\$6,675.00) from line 7f. Education and Outreach (due to pandemic impact). Additional Match Cost (\$65,800.00) was paid for by State of Maine CDC. Additional Match Cost (\$3,000.00) was paid for using eligible city funding.			
7h. City of Auburn (Environmental Reviews, Tax and Title searches, CDBG Loan underwriting for Auburn projects)	\$7,198.00	\$2,201.09	\$0.00
Comments: Funding was moved (\$4,996.91) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs. Additional Match Cost (\$1,394.70) was paid for by the City of Auburn.			
8. Construction (Not Eligible)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9. Other Direct Costs (Demonstration Cleaning Kits Cost and Temporary Relocations)	\$169,240.00	\$118,752.00	\$0.00
Comments: Funding was moved (\$51,617.31) to line 7b. for direct project hazard control costs. Additional Match Cost (\$1,196.88) was paid for using other eligible city funding.			
9z. Healthy Homes Initiative	\$400,000.00	\$400,000.00	\$0.00
Comments: Due to contractor capacity and some projects that failed to materialize in time, we could not use all of the allocated funds before the close of our grant cycle.			
10. Indirect Costs (Not used)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

A grant repayment (program income in the amount of \$19,557.50 in Lead funds and \$3,210.00 in healthy homes funds) was accepted. The funds were returned to the original accounts to fund activities under another project at the end of our grant. This money was not included in the \$ totals above, though it is reflected in 2 additional units cleared.

Institutional experience plays a huge role in understanding the budget process, carefully planning spenddown to meet or exceed targets, and to plan enough in advance to achieve budget optimization. As the program manager, I am familiar with this. Our grant accountant changed during the grant cycle and we are still working with on a learning curve that should be progressively better.

Matching Funds

Lewiston is confirming the commitment identified on HUD 1044 (executed 12-20-17) for the recipient match amount of \$ 823,004.00 was met and exceeded in the total amount of **\$ 869,278.88**

Healthy Androscoggin (Central Maine Community Health Corporation), a non-profit CAP agency, is our sub-grantee. They have conducted community outreach and education with non-federal funds on behalf of the Lead Program. This amount was not billed to the Lead program. It was invoiced for match documentation only. This amounted to **\$123,350.17**.

Community Concepts Inc., a non-profit CAP agency, is our prime sub-grantee. They were able to document indirect costs related to their activities for the Lead Program and provided it on a per unit basis for units that to clearance by the program. This amount was not billed to the Lead program. It was invoiced for match documentation only. This amounted to **\$73,220.70**.

State of Maine Center for Disease Control (CDC), Child Lead Poisoning Prevention Program paid for Lead Inspection/ Risk Assessments at 36 Properties. This was related to 190 units which amounted to Lead Program cost savings of **\$65,800.00**. This is noted on the invoices where we normally would pay for Risk Assessments. Further documentation is on file with the sub-grantee CCI.

Lewiston local funding covered additional Lead Technical Services in the amount of **\$3,000.00**.

State of Maine Center for Disease Control (CDC), Child Lead Poisoning Prevention Program paid **\$36,068.00** in direct cost match for Lab Testing Fees for Lead Risk Assessments and for project Clearances. This is noted on the invoices where we normally would pay for Risk Assessments. Further documentation is on file with the sub-grantee CCI.

City Staff, salaries and benefits for the program director, administrative assistants, and loan underwriters was tracked in relation to lead program activities. (City of Auburn had \$1,394.70 and the City of Lewiston had \$9,513.63) This match amounted to **\$10,908.33** and was tracked by the grant accountant using timesheets.

Match funds from the City CDBG programs for Lead rehabilitation loans or related directly attributed to the Lead hazard control scope of work costs amounted to \$ 110,865.00 from Auburn and \$ 76,307.00 from Lewiston resulting in **\$187,172.00** combined.

Owner matching funds for the hazard control activities amounted to **\$357,688.25** during this grant cycle.