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This study examines the relationship between the federal government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the effectiveness of this partnership when addressing environmental justice (EJ) issues for vulnerable populations. The principal objectives of the study were: (1) examining the techniques an NGO utilizes to influence public policy from the bottom-up; (2) examining the techniques an NGO utilizes to educate, bring awareness, and increase testing of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia, and (3) analyzing the effectiveness of a government and NGO partnership. For many years, people-of-color and low-income populations have shared a lack of trust for the federal government, therefore grassroots organizations have been the voice for these populations. For the first time, the CDC Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention
Branch partnered with an EJ organization to influence policy, increase lead testing, and education of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia. The methodology utilized for this research was a multi-method, descriptive, explanatory, case study. The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) conducted a 6 month intervention with 40 head start parents to increase their knowledge of childhood lead poisoning and lead testing. A control group, located in the same demographic area who did not participate in the intervention, was also tested on their knowledge of childhood lead poisoning. The average test score for the experimental group was higher than the control group. The research shows that lead testing rates for the demographic area increased during the study period, and the EJ group organized a political task force comprised of elected officials and community members to influence the Savannah lead law. Eighty-two percent (82%) of the children within the experimental and control groups were tested for the first time, as a result of the CFEJ lead campaign. A limitation of the study includes the administration of the test. The conclusions drawn from the qualitative and quantitative findings suggests the federal government is more effective resolving environmental disparity issues for vulnerable populations, when partnering with EJ organizations that have a relationship with the community. Implications for future research include extrapolating the Whitehead Model to other federal government / NGO partnerships, and policies such as education, housing and transportation that impact the life of underserved populations inequitably. This study contributes to the political science literature by examining the social and economic occurrences that impact low income social groups, while applying public health and environmental justice concepts, to advance policy implementation for impoverished populations.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This research examines the relationship between the federal government, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the effectiveness of this partnership when addressing environmental justice (EJ) issues for vulnerable populations.

Environmental Justice is defined as “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, national origin or educational level with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no population, due to policy or economic disempowerment, is forced to bear a disproportionate burden of the negative human health or environmental impacts of pollution or other environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local and tribal programs and policies.”

Although the above definition of environmental justice is referenced by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a broader definition, that supports human rights, has been embraced by well known scholars.

1 Partnership – For the purpose of this research, partnership is defined as a legal relation, contractually associated between individuals and organizations with each entity having specific rights, roles, and responsibilities. Rules defined between the partners are documented in the contract between Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Citizens For Environmental Justice (CFEJ).

Collaboration - For the purpose of this research, collaboration is defined as individuals and organizations working together to accomplish common goals.

Trust – For the purpose of this research trust refers to assured reliance on the character, ability, and strength of the specific organization to communicate the needs, challenges, and barriers of the community.


3 Environmental Justice defined by Dr. Bunyan Bryant - refers to those cultural norms and values, rules, regulations, behaviors, policies, and decisions that support sustainable communities, where people can interact with confidence that their environment is safe, nurturing, and productive.
This analysis rests and builds upon theoretical frameworks concerning social injustice issues for people-of-color and low-income communities, political power, and the dynamics of social change between the federal government and NGO collaborations. The principal objectives of the study are to: (1) examine the techniques an NGO utilizes to influence public policy from the bottom-up; (2) examine the techniques an NGO utilizes to educate, bring awareness, and increase testing of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia, and (3) analyze the effectiveness of a government and NGO partnership.

For many years, people-of-color and low-income populations have shared a lack of trust for the federal government, therefore grassroots organizations have been the voice for these populations. Over the years partnerships between the federal government and NGOs have formed. Studies have shown that once these partnerships between the federal government and NGOs take place, they can be effective; however, research conducted on partnerships between the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and EJ organizations are limited, and therefore will be the focus of this case study,

---

Environmental justice is served when people can realize their highest potential without experiencing race or sex or age discrimination. Environmental justice is supported by decent paying and safe jobs, quality schools and recreation, decent housing and adequate health care, democratic decision-making and personal empowerment, and communities free of violence, drugs, and poverty. These are communities where both cultural and biological diversity is respected and highly revered, and where distributive justice prevails.


while also examining the distribution of services transferred from the federal government to the state government.

Federalism, the division of power between the states and the national government, has been a major force throughout U.S. history. Federalism disperses power, but many argue that it contributes to inequality in the distribution of services when this power from the federal level is transferred to the state. This shift of power contributes to disparate outcomes when states are without adequate funds, and are deficient in the appropriate infrastructure to effectively manage social programs. Distributed resources unevenly across the state, coupled with the lack of policy implementation from the state government, this affects quality of life issues such as education, healthcare, and housing, the power of federalism permits inequity. Over the years, the federal government has transformed from a centralized to a decentralized unit returning more responsibility to the states. This time period deemed as “devolution” not only handed responsibility to the states, but liability as well.\(^7\)

The Environmental Justice Movement emerged in the 1980s rooted in the highly organized Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s, 1960s, and the 1970s. The movement focused on achieving social justice, while also accomplishing political goals during this movement. Motivated by human rights, injustice, and alleviating the disproportionate burden of environmental hazards shouldered by people-of-color and low-income communities, organizing efforts of NGOs played a vital role on the battleground of environmental justice. Disadvantaged populations in Savannah, Georgia experience a vast number of disproportionate environmental hazards and disparities, including

childhood lead poisoning. The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) of Savannah, Georgia have played a critical role in providing data that was used to advocate against environmental hazards. CFEJ has also been engaged in mobilizing and organizing the community on public policy issues to enforce environmental laws and statues.8

The Environmental Justice Framework embraces a holistic approach to promoting an optimal quality of life, and sustainable communities for all populations. Although not directly stated in the environmental justice framework, this paradigm rests on the political questions of “who gets what, when, why, and how much.”9,10 The Overlap Model recognizes collaboration between the community and the government as a critical element of a constructive social change process. This case study will introduce the Whitehead Framework; a blended model of the Environmental Justice Framework, the Overlap Model, and original theories.

Statement of Problem

Disadvantaged populations have experienced disproportionate health disparities for many years and this inequality still persists.11 Although, children from all socioeconomic backgrounds can be affected by lead poisoning, children who live at or below the poverty line (low-income children) in older housing, and African-American

---


children are at the highest risk for childhood lead poisoning. Savannah has one of the highest concentrations of pre-1950 residential housing in the state of Georgia. Most children in these high-risk areas have not been tested for lead poisoning. Testing children for lead poisoning is important because it often occurs without noticeable symptoms, and most of the time it is unrecognizable. Preventing lead poisoning before it occurs is the goal of CDC and the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP). Once the lead exposure is identified, stopping children from coming in contact with lead and removing this hazard is important to the health of the child.

Various sectors in Savannah have downplayed the importance of childhood lead poisoning for years. House Bill 1043 was passed by the Georgia State Legislature in 2008 and amended the Georgia Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1994. Changes to the existing legislation are statewide and give the GACLPPP authority to enforce lead hazard abatement throughout the state. The city of Savannah, Georgia has an ordinance that dates back to 1973 which is more stringent than the new legislation that was passed in 2008 by Georgia legislators; yet this ordinance has never been enforced. Savannah’s ordinance addresses the presence of lead hazards in the building yet it fails to focus on children. This means with or without a child in the house the ordinance focuses on lead

---


hazards and not the health of the child. Educating political representatives in Savannah, Georgia is valuable and critical in order to influence the enforcement of the Lead Poisoning Prevention Legislation with the hope that this would help to achieve optimal health for this vulnerable population.

This research study will examine the influence CFEJ has on modifying the legislation for Savannah by partnering with the federal and state government. The federal government cannot change a city ordinance if it is stricter than the federal statute; therefore the federal government is utilizing its relationship with CFEJ as a tool to change the ordinance, making this is a bottom-up public policy making by the federal government relying on a NGO to affect change.

EJ asserts that everyone has a right to live in a safe and healthy environment. Decreasing health disparities such as childhood lead poisoning will contribute to creating an optimal environment for this vulnerable population. Although federalism separates the power between the federal and state government, and ultimately affects the distribution of services, NGOs have made an impact on social health programs and policy for disparate populations. The partnership of NGOs and the federal government have created effective outcomes.

Background

*The Organizational Power of NGOs and Partnerships between Federal / State Governments*

NGOs have made a valuable impact on federal and state government programs. Partnerships between NGOs and the government have demonstrated beneficial success in

---

health, housing, national and international public policy, and social programs. Many would argue that NGOs have the power to accomplish objectives that the federal government cannot.\textsuperscript{16} Often, these organizations have the skill to articulate the needs of the community, (defined as people with common interests living in a common location) and provide services that encourage change in racial and class discrimination, redressing threats to the environment, and providing a vehicle to mobilize in the interest of the community.\textsuperscript{17,18} Researchers believe the reasons NGOs have been able to successfully execute their goals include, but are not limited to: (1) community trust in the NGO, but a public distrust for the federal government; (2) the connection an NGO has with the community to understand disparate quality of life issues; (3) a single focus on the objective where the government has various components of a program to facilitate; (4) advocacy for the community where the government is constrained against advocating; and (5) less influence from the industry.\textsuperscript{19}

Saul Alinsky, a sociologist known as the “master organizer” applied a sociological perspective to communicate urban social structure, shared community problems, and identifying solutions through pluralism and local democratic, community


organizations. While Alinsky asserted that many communities can be politically powerless to create change by challenging national problems that are beyond local resources, he also believed that a regimented community organization with shared goals is the catalyst for successful social change. Alinsky asserted that most low-income communities have the common 'economic' goal of better housing, education, transportation, jobs, healthcare, and safe neighborhood environments. Although Paul Speer, a scholar of community organizing regards community organizing as a very powerful tool, he also believes there must be a connection to the macro-level processes that affect micro-level conditions, such as resource stipulations of the government.

Many NGOs feel that the government does not recognize the contributions that NGOs make, and the vital role they play in successful programs. NGOs are able to create community networks in an environment with limited capacity and constrained resources. Studies show that on most occasions NGOs and state agencies are equally dependent upon one another for resources that include political support, legitimacy, information, and access. Recommendations have been made for governments to distribute an equal amount of power to NGOs during a partnership between the two entities. Stable government funding is a significant element to the partnership.

---


Civil Rights and the Environmental Justice Movement

NGOs have been influential during various time periods. The civil rights movement represented an era where NGOs provided a voice for poor communities. During the 1950s, African Americans pioneered the Civil Rights Movement. African-Americans organized car pools, ride-shares, walked to enforce boycotts to end racial discrimination in public transportation systems, and marched to communicate the need for equality. By 1964, the Civil Rights Act was passed to outlaw racial segregation. In the 1970s, people-of-color began to link civil rights with racial, class, and environmental injustices. With the goal of protecting the right to vote, dismantling segregation and racism, and improving basic human, civil, and environmental rights, the Civil Rights Movement trail blazed through the 1980s. This began a movement to improve environmental conditions.24

Environmental Justice is a political, passionate movement that seeks environmental integrity for vulnerable populations, and lays a foundation to address social injustices. During the early 80s, an increasing number of both national and local studies began to find that race followed by income, were the strongest predictors in the location of toxic waste sites.25,26 In 1994 President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order


12898 “Federal Actions to address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations”; requiring that “federal agencies make achieving environmental justice part of their mission.” This includes analyzing the environmental effects on human health, economic, and social effects.  

Although the Executive Order was an important milestone, the EJ movement didn’t start with the Clinton Administration, nor did it begin with the EPA’s definition in 1992.

There is an explicit link between public health, the environment, and social injustice. The Environmental Justice Movement began as a response to environmental inequities and is explicitly connected to health, safety, the environment, and quality of life for people-of-color and low-income populations. Grassroots organizations challenged hazardous waste being placed in their community and through environmental justice movement, this activism has influenced environmental policy and social justice holistically. The activism that took place for grassroots organizations inspired a movement and created an impetus for change. These organizations have made an impact inside and outside of the government.

---


The Impact of Environmental Justice Organizations

The Environmental Justice movement was initiated to remedy disproportionate exposure to environmental hazards for people-of-color and low-income communities. Voiced by people-of-color and low-income populations the vision of environmental justice organizations has been an extremely influential for advocating. Environmental justice has come a long way since the Civil Rights Act of 1964. When Linda Bullard filed a lawsuit for a majority African-American neighborhood in Houston (Bean vs. Southwestern Waste Management), it was the first lawsuit in the United States that charged environmental discrimination under the Civil Rights Act due to waste-facility citing. From this first case in 1979, to the 1982 Warren County protests that resulted in a 25 million dollar remediation cost 15 years later to detoxify PCB landfills, African-Americans, civil rights and environmental activists have staged numerous demonstrations, and advocated for years. Although, environmental justice organizations have been successful, the federal government response has been diverse.

The Federal Government Response to Environmental Justice

National and local studies continue to reveal the disproportionate exposure of disenfranchised populations to environmental hazards; coupled with the advocacy of grassroots organizations provide the impetus for the federal government to respond. In 1990, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) held the National Minority Health Conference that focused on contamination in minority communities. In 1992, after meeting with community and civil rights leaders, EPA administrator, William K. Reilly established the Office of Environmental Equity (presently Office of...
Environmental Justice); that same year EPA produced one of their first studies on environmental hazards and equity entitled "Environmental Equity: Reducing Risk for All Communities". In 1993 the Environmental Justice Act was introduced by Congressman John Lewis (D-GA) and Senator Max Baucus (D-MT). Despite the fact that the legislation was not enacted, this same year EPA established the 25-member National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); The NEJAC is comprised of members from community-based groups, business, industry, academia and educational institutions, NGOs, environmental groups, state, local, and tribal governments, and indigenous organizations in order to reflect the diversity of various stakeholders. The council was created to give recommendations on achieving environmental justice.\textsuperscript{31, 32}

At the request of environmental justice advocates Congress introduced various bills to address environmental justice. The Environmental Equal Rights Act of 1993 was proposed to provide the federal government with information on the most contaminated areas in order for the federal government to respond; the Environmental Health Equity Information Act, amending the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) would have required ATSDR to collect information on race, age, education, and other demographics of populations living in proximity to toxic substances; and the Waste Export and Import Prohibition Act of 1994, was introduced to


prevent waste facilities from being built in disenfranchised communities.\textsuperscript{33, 34} While none of these bills were passed, they provided the impetus for the 1994 Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” The federal government has made strides to implement various policies that reflect environmental justice, but there is still much work to do. In 2005, the General Accountability Office (GAO) released a report stating that EPA did not consider EJ issues between the years 2000-2004 when developing clean air rules.\textsuperscript{35} Although the advocacy of EJ groups has been a fraction of the motivation for the federal government to introduce environmental policies that prohibit environmental hazards, federalism continues to affect the distribution of services for the population.

\textit{Federalism and National Environmental Policy}

Thomas Dye describes public policy as “what the government chooses to do, or not to do”. The lack of action may still constitute an action or a policy. American federalism has undergone many changes since the founding of the U.S. Constitution. Within the context of federalism and devolution, the federal government has transformed from a centralized to decentralized unit and handed down more liability and service implementation to the states. While devolution has changed the relationship of the

\textsuperscript{33} A Civic Project to Track Congress. \url{http://www.govtrack.us/} (accessed July 1 – July 30, 2009).


federal and state government, the disbursement of this power has been given and taken away. Many times when the federal government distributes funding, there is a limitation on the services the states can provide. When programs are limited due to funding, communities endure the negative outcome. It is suggested that states adopt a systematic budget practice to make useful state-by-state comparisons that will lead to effective policies. Researchers believe that funding formulas to allocate funds for states should be improved by creating a research agenda to fit program objectives for states.

Under President Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal programs, the federal government intervened on public programs controlled by the state. President Reagan made an effort to reduce federal involvement in domestic programs, providing the path for states to undertake policy initiatives themselves and thus, giving more responsibility to the states. As a part of Reagan’s national agenda, environmental policies were to be reassessed and eventually weakened to reduce the function of the federal government. Reagan had a strategy to carry out his agenda by appointing new personnel who would agree on his tactics of defunding regulatory agencies. EPA administrator Anne Burford was forced to resign and was replaced by William D. Ruckelshaus in 1983. The United


States Secretary of Interior, James G. Watt resigned in 1983 and was replaced by William P. Clark. Eventually some of these efforts of Reagan failed and Congress renewed several environmental statutes that were scheduled in the 1980s, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) in 1984, Superfund, the Safe Drinking Water Act in 1986, and the Clean Water Act in 1987.40

While Clinton increased spending on environmental programs, Bush renounced Clinton’s environmental policies when entering office. Bush had a priority to increase oil and gas drilling, supporting industry and prioritizing with economics over environmental protection. The Democratic Senate blocked Bush’s proposals in 2001 and 2002 to drill for oil and gas, as well as to cut EPA’s budget. Eventually, after the 2002 re-election, the President succeeds when the Republican Party held the majority in the House and Senate.

National environmental policies implemented by the federal government often deliver outcomes that the community is displeased with. Planning for the community can compete with the political economic power within that same community, while decisions made by the federal government affect this process as well. Political power influences the decisions and outcomes of the community; the agenda of the residents is often different of the elected officials.

Political Economic Power vs. Community Planning

Too often, EJ organizations have to ‘create’ openings within the political process to be a part of the decision-making procedure. EJ organizations have gone beyond the state to voice national environmental issues, but the political economic

process can never be disregarded. Historically, the states’ authority on developing policies has weakened and the corporations, who pollute, dictate the regulations because they hold the economic power. On many occasions, NGOs are left to negotiate with these same corporations, utilizing what one may call a ‘cost-benefit analysis’ or a ‘market-dynamics theory’; assessing the private costs to the corporation vs. the social benefit to the population? One may also view this as making a “deal with the enemy”, when corporations negotiate jobs for health. Even in those negotiations, low-income communities still lose, where it is likely that only a very small number of individuals are employed.  

Although EJ organizations have imposed themselves in the policy process to influence environmental equity, the questions of who gets what, why, and how much have always played a vital role in inequitable distribution. This process very often, contributes to health disparities for vulnerable populations.  

**Health Disparities on Minority Communities**  

Based on past and current data, there is a notable difference in morbidity and mortality in health across racial, cultural, and socioeconomic populations.  

---


rates are significantly higher for the Black and Hispanic population. A solid body of evidence suggests that the disproportionate disparity of environmental exposures among minority and low-income groups contributes to detrimental health. To address world challenges a global partnership facilitated by the United Nations, created the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), that consists of eight goals that are to be achieved by 2015. One of the MDGs includes eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, and ensuring environmental sustainability. A component of achieving these particular goals includes, researching the nature of poverty and the underlining connection between social inequality, public health, and the environment that present opportunities to develop interventions that address the root causes of health inequities. The research includes


health disparities and the role that policy plays for empowering communities, distributing resources, and addressing the social determinants of health. By examining the politics of power and governance, priorities of the government can be one of the key factors for a successful initiative to address the social determinants of health. Low-income families need collaborative support from the government and community organizations in obtaining a better quality of life.\(^{52}\)

Scientists have to understand the outcomes of health and social inequalities on low-income, politically powerless, vulnerable populations. When scientists are open to linking the data with environmental inequities, community organizations and scientists will work better together to obtain the same goal, a better quality of life for disparate populations. The link between environmental science and environmental justice is fundamental when scientists understand that social and racial disparities are determinants of health that always should be considered in advancing public health.\(^{53}\) Policy implementation that reflects the quality of life for the urban population and considers health inequities may result in a more sustainable environment and promote environmental justice.

*Childhood Lead Poisoning*

Childhood lead poisoning is one of the many health disparities that low-income children face. After the CDC was authorized to initiate program efforts to eliminate


childhood lead poisoning in the United States, the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch was created; with a primary responsibility to: “develop programs and policies to prevent childhood lead poisoning; educate the public and health-care providers about childhood lead poisoning; provide funding to state and local health departments to determine the extent of childhood lead poisoning by screening children for elevated blood lead levels; helping to ensure that lead-poisoned infants and children receive medical and environmental follow-up; developing neighborhood-based efforts to prevent childhood lead poisoning, and to support research to determine the effectiveness of prevention efforts at federal, state, and local levels.”  

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed federal activities in 1999 to ensure at-risk children receive the proper screening and treatment for lead poisoning. Medicaid children make up the majority of this at-risk population. In the report the GAO identified two major barriers: (1) state screening policies were not in-line with federal policy, and (2) poor monitoring by providers for lead screening activities.  

Progress has been made in reducing children's blood lead levels in the United States. However, according to the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III (NHANES), geometric mean blood lead levels remain disproportionately high among non-Hispanic black children in comparison to Mexican American and non-Hispanic white children. Dominant risk factors for higher lead levels are older housing, poverty, 


and being non-Hispanic black.\textsuperscript{56} Many children with elevated blood lead levels are also disproportionately affected by other environmental health issues within their community.\textsuperscript{57} Childhood lead poisoning and asthma are among adverse health conditions that are related to common housing deficiencies. Many low-income and minority populations live in inadequate housing units with severe or moderate physical problems.\textsuperscript{58} These populations also have less access to a healthy environment that promotes a safe quality of life. Children living in lead-safe housing units are 4.5 times less likely to have elevated blood lead levels than children living in units with lead hazards.\textsuperscript{59} Eliminating disparities in access to healthy, safe, and affordable housing is essential to building sustainable communities that improve the quality of life for disparate populations.

The combination of residential segregation, urban housing quality, lack of policy and regulation, and racism make these vulnerable populations less likely to receive equitable protection. Low-income children do not choose to live in toxic environments; however residential segregation and the lack of affordable housing for these families increase the chance of toxic exposure. Lead reduction policies can be complex

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{58} National Center for Healthy Housing. Creating Healthy and Safe Homes for Children Through Practical and Proven Steps. \url{http://www.nchh.org/Home.aspx} (accessed on July 2009).
\end{itemize}
depending upon the political climate of the state. Interest groups, various agencies, civic organizations, and politicians play a vital role in the implementation and enforcement process. Segregated neighborhoods influence the health of children and their quality of life in its entirety.

The Citizens for Environmental Justice

Environmental justice organizations, such as the CFEJ, have been influential in decreasing health disparities for low-income children and local public policy. The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) was established in 1991 to provide a vehicle for community members to work for environmental and economic justice at the local level and participate in the formation of the national Environmental Justice movement. The geographical focus has primarily been in Georgia, South Carolina, and the Southeast Region. CFEJ was formed as a community response by African-American citizens in Savannah, Georgia to oppose activities related to nuclear weapons production at the Savannah River Site and to increase the participation of the community in the environmental movement in the Southeast region. While monitoring corporations whose production activities have created environmental hazards in the community, CFEJ has also been engaged in public policy advocacy to hold the government accountable for ensuring environmental safety.

CFEJ works with federal government agencies and other organizations to identify and seek support from scientists and technical experts who are committed to assisting the community in remediation, clean-up, and the public policy-making process.

This organization has developed programs to educate, organize, and mobilize communities of color to actively work to protect human, water, air, land, and cultural resources. For the past two years, CFEJ has established a partnership with the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (LPPB), the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP), and the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. CFEJ will continue this partnership for an additional year; with a goal to empower the community through education and advocacy, address environmental health issues, and provide outreach on childhood lead poisoning prevention.  

Theoretical Framework

This research utilizes a blended theoretical model, ‘The Whitehead Framework’. The Whitehead Framework is a blended model derived from a combination of the Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice framework, while also addressing the undergirding concepts of political science. Each model below describes its theoretical concepts and the proposed Whitehead Framework. The Whitehead framework blends the essential elements of the Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice Framework that describe and compliment the case study, but adds original theories to advance the research such as political economic issues and accountability of the appropriate agency to formulate public policy. The Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice framework do not address all concepts within the case study therefore the Whitehead Framework is utilized to guide and focus the research.
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The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was designed to eliminate poverty by assisting poor families in developing employment programs, community action programs, and other social services for disenfranchised populations. On May 1, 1965, the local government of Topeka, Kansas, Office of Economic Opportunity was funded by a planning grant from the federal government, the National Office of Economic Opportunity. In 1966 five community action proposals were submitted and approved for federal funding. As a result, collaboration between the government and various community organizations partnered to facilitate social change within local communities was formed.

The Overlap Model, created by Frank Riessman, demonstrated in the Topeka Office of Economic Opportunity, is a theoretical model for social change that calls for:

(1) The community to be involved in the decision-making process on quality of life issues and within these roles leadership takes place in the community.

(2) A ‘Within-System’ community setting that encourages collaboration between the government and community organizations to meet the needs of the poor. The Overlap model displays collaboration, which overlaps the federal and state government along with community organizations; and establishes involvement for community members, towards social change.

The Overlap Model calls for collaboration to influence optimal quality of life changes within the community such as reduced poverty levels and health disparities.

---

affordable and safe housing, and better education. Community leaders are the voice for the respective community.

The Overlap Model is a platform for the case study, which examines the effectiveness of this same partnership to reduce the disparity of childhood lead poisoning and modify public policy to increase an optimal quality of life for low-income populations in Savannah, Georgia.

**Environmental Justice Framework**

The Environmental Justice framework rests on the basic questions of “who gets what, why, and how much.” This framework:

1) *“Incorporates the principle of the right of all individuals to be protected from environmental degradation”*. Average blood-lead levels remain disproportionately high among non-Hispanic black children when compared to Mexican-American and non-Hispanic White children of any socioeconomic income. High-risk factors for lead poisoning include older housing, poverty, and being non-Hispanic Black. All children should be protected from lead poisoning. Statistics for Savannah, Georgia show that more low-income, people of color populations reside in substandard housing when compared to any other population. All individuals should be protected from disparities regardless of race or income.

2) *“Adopts a public health prevention model as the preferred strategy”*. Although progress has been made in decreasing lead poisoning, there is still a disproportionate disparity for black children. The public health model of primary prevention is to take preventative action or eliminate the threat before harm occurs. The CDC Childhood Lead
Poisoning Prevention Branch has expanded its mission from a sole focus on childhood lead poisoning prevention to a more holistic approach designed to decrease home-related adverse health effects and promote housing factors that enhance the quality of life for disparate populations. The integration of healthy homes into the lead branch and the abatement of lead in the home before the child resides is an example of primary prevention. This case study examines the influence an environmental justice organization has in modifying the Savannah lead law to prevent childhood lead poisoning. If the ordinance in Savannah is modified, rental properties in Savannah will be lead free before the child resides in the home. Lead poisoning is a preventable disease.

(3) "Shifts the burden of proof to polluters / dischargers who do harm, who discriminate, or who do not give equal protection to people of color, low-income persons, and other "protected" classes". Currently when individuals challenge the industry (chemical plants, refineries, smelters, etc...), proof of harm must be presented with the case. The environmental justice framework shifts the burden of proof and challenges the polluters to prove that these operations are not harmful and do not impact vulnerable populations disproportionately. Rental property owners cannot prove that lead poisoning is not harmful. Data continues to show that lead poisoned housing is the number one source for lead poisoned children, which leads to ill health effects. Policymakers have been challenged within this case study to design policies that protect low-income populations living in lead poisoned homes. This shifts the responsibility back to the respective authority.
(4) "Allows disparate impact and statistical weight or an "effect" test, as opposed to "intent", to infer discrimination". To prove purposeful discrimination can be almost and most of the time is impossible. Various lawsuits have been lost by individuals challenging industries because of the lack of proof of discrimination for low-income and/or minority populations. The environmental justice framework relies on the data and the inequitable impact. The data shows that lead poisoning is more prevalent among low-income and black children than any other race and has been historically.

(5) "Redresses disproportionate impact through "targeted" action and resources". In general, this strategy would target resources where environmental and health problems are greatest. Resources are applied where they are needed the most. This case study demonstrates that the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch has encouraged targeted lead testing for all states. 63

The Whitehead Framework

The Whitehead framework blends the essential elements of the Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice Framework to describe and compliment the case study, but also adds original theories to advance the research with fundamental concepts such as political economic issues and the accountability of the appropriate agency to formulate public policy. The Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice framework do not

---

address all concepts within the case study, therefore the Whitehead Framework is utilized to guide and focus the research.

(1) *Addresses the health disparities (lead poisoning, chronic disease, HIV, etc..) through collaborative partnerships of the federal and state government, and a non-governmental organization (NGO). (Overlap Model)*

This partnership is utilized to facilitate positive social change in the community, while resources are applied where they are needed most to reduce or eliminate the disparity. Each entity within the partnership has a role to address, reduce, and/or eliminate the disparity. This mechanism allows the NGO to voice the needs of the low-income population, expand involvement of community members, and address other quality of life issues such as housing, education, and employment, while using resources provided from the federal and state government. CFEJ will use resources from CDC to educate low-income, at-risk populations on childhood lead poisoning, increase lead testing for children six and under at a higher risk for lead poisoning, and influence policy change for the Savannah Lead Law.

(2) *Examines the accountability of the appropriate agency to formulate public policy for the issue at-hand. (Whitehead Model)*

This component addresses the appropriate organization responsible for formulating and implementing the law. The Whitehead framework examines the obstacles for the lack of formulation, implementation, and the accountability of the appropriate party to develop, modify, and/or formulate the respective policy; examines the authority of the federal, state, and local government, and the partnership with the NGO to voice the requested changes of the law to political representatives. The
Whitehead framework also addresses the lack of enforcement and consequences of the law, while examining the stakeholders who could be affected by changes in the law and the role of local authorities to modify the current policy.

(3) *Examines who gets what, why, and how much. (Whitehead Model)*

This component examines the role of the federal and state governments, the community, and addresses the unequal protection of the affected population. The willingness to act on the current policy, to develop, and implement new policies depends upon the political climate of the state. Who gets what, why, and how much examines the undergirding factors for the lack of law or enforcement; who holds the power in the state or city to make decisions for change, how these decisions disseminate unequal protection for low-income populations, and why these identical populations are not protected as other populations are. According to current data, lead poisoning is still an issue in the United States. The Savannah ordinance was developed in 1973, but has demonstrated a lack of enforcement. Although a policy exists in Savannah, this policy is at a gridlock where enforcement should begin. The Whitehead framework challenges the respective agencies to enforce the current policy, while exploring the dynamics of the indifference to lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia such as: (1) failure to inform constituents about the lead poisoning problem; (2) the lack of action from the District Director of Health or his / or her respective representative in Chatham county; (3) community members and activists participation in the decision-making process to break boundaries between the vulnerable population and the government, and (4) the unwillingness to protect low-income populations from lead poisoning. This component of the model will also research
the role of the appropriate agency to modify the Savannah ordinance. Lead laws vary by state sometimes CDC utilizes the NGO to influence the change needed.

(4) *Addresses the underlying political economic issues associated with reducing the disproportionate disparity.* *(Whitehead Model)*

This component examines the challenges of costs and benefits to reduce the disparity. Currently, the Savannah lead law requires rental property owners to abate the lead. This method is very costly. Many rental property owners do not have funding for this method, and Georgia is currently not receiving U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding. The framework addresses the resources allowable for the policy requested and how this may impact the affected population.

(5) *Adopts the public health model of primary prevention.* *(Environmental Justice Framework)*

The public health model of primary prevention and the precautionary principle looks at how much harm is preventable, rather than how much is allowable. Precautionary measures are taken even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully scientifically established. This principle asserts the responsibility to intervene and protect the public from environmental exposure to harm before risks are discovered, and anticipate harm before it occurs. Within this element, the environmental justice framework asserts that under the precautionary principle, it is the responsibility of the polluter to establish that the proposed activity will not (or is very unlikely to) result in significant harm.
Research Questions

1.) What techniques are utilized by NGOs to influence bottom-up policy?

This question will be examined to describe the techniques CFEJ utilizes to influence changes in the Savannah ordinance. The effectiveness will be measured by the number of meetings between various political representatives such as city council members, the mayor, the senator, housing authorities, and CFEJ. Local newspaper articles, direct observation by the principle investigator, agendas of the city council meetings, and proposed changes in the ordinance from the city council members will also be measured to address this research question. Meetings that lead to additional meetings and dialogue to promote action and changes in the Savannah ordinance will be measured as short and long term outcomes; while meeting exchanges and presentations will be examined as process measures and techniques described to influence bottom-up policy.

2.) How does an NGO educate, bring awareness, and increase testing of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah? This question will be examined to describe and measure the techniques the NGO utilizes to educate and increase testing of childhood lead poisoning. Blood lead testing rates for childhood lead poisoning in Savannah has been very low for the past ten years. Historically, community organizations have more trust with the community than the government. The NGO will be utilized to educate the community on the importance of having the child tested and therefore the parent may express the concern to the doctor. This question will examine the lead testing rate in Savannah and the knowledge increase of the parents after outreach events are conducted by CFEJ to test children for lead poisoning; lead trainings and educational presentations will be
conducted over a six month period with educational questionnaires disseminated for two groups of parents. The lead testing rate of children in Savannah will be compared from the last ten years to the current partnership with CFEJ. Awareness will be informed by qualitative interviews conducted by the principal investigator.

3.) How effective are federal government and NGO partnerships? This question is the central theme for the research paper. If successful, this paper will serve as a model for the federal government agency and community organizations who work for environmental justice. This question will examine the objectives of the federal government and the objectives of the NGO to define “effectiveness”, while addressing the benefit and barriers of the collaboration. Is the federal government better with the community organization partnership or without?

Assumptions:

- CFEJ will increase the blood testing rate of children in Savannah, Georgia, bring awareness to vulnerable communities, and create an “issue” of the Savannah Lead Law that was not present before.

- The federal government is more effective resolving environmental disparity issues for vulnerable populations, when partnering with environmental justice organizations. The federal government is not as effective without the NGO, because the NGO has more credibility with the community.
Methodology

Study Location and Population

The targeted population for this project will be African-American and Hispanic children six years of age or less whose families are participants of Medicaid, WIC, and/or Head Start programs; living in pre-1978 housing in Chatham County, Savannah, Georgia. Medicaid, Head Start, and WIC provide services to low-income families with gross incomes no more than 100% of the federal poverty level. Children that reside in zip codes 31415, 31401, 31404, and 31405 in Savannah, Georgia are at a very high risk for lead poisoning due to pre-1978 housing. Many of these children have not been tested for lead poisoning. Within these zip codes 5,799 children are Medicaid children. In 2008 in Savannah, Georgia, 80% of the housing was built before 1978 and 27% was built before 1950. According to the 2007 U.S. Census Bureau, in Savannah, Georgia (Chatham County), Whites made up 55.7% of the population while minorities made up 48.0% of the population. According to the 2005-2007 Census Bureau data sets, whites in Chatham County made up 4.2% of the population living below the poverty level while minorities made up 48.6% living below the poverty level. For the same year female headed households were comprised of 15.1% of white women compared to 72.2% of minority women.64

The methodology utilized for this research will be a multi-method, descriptive, explanatory, case study. A case study can be described as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly
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evident.” A multi-method study uses multiple sources of evidence for the research; descriptive studies describe the phenomenon and population being studied, while the explanatory component builds on descriptive evidence identifying reasons why various events may occur to enrich a theoretical explanation.\textsuperscript{65} Allowing the principal investigator to capture the events in its real-life context, while providing multiple sources of data, which will contribute to the analytic generalization of the theory proposed, is the justification of the case study method for this specific research.

The strengths of a case study include:
(1) Allows the investigator to research the present social phenomena, without relying on the past;

(2) Allows direct observation of the events being studied and individuals involved in the events, or individuals who have certain significance to the case study;

(3) Allows a full variety of evidence such as documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations; and

(4) Explains the presumed causal links in real-life interventions that may be too complex for surveys or experimental strategies.

Weaknesses of a case study include:
(1) Informal manipulation of the data from the researcher that allows the investigator to create or dismiss data because of individual bias;

(2) No control over the events;

(3) Case study investigator may have a lack of skill for investigating, and

(4) Investigator may hold bias views that influence the direction of the findings/conclusion.

**Techniques**

This research will utilize data triangulation. Data triangulation allows the researcher to converge multiple sources of evidence to address a broader range of historical and behavioral issues while converging all the data to support the same facts to address each research question. This technique will advance the research and will include documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and surveys. While case studies are used to gain insight to underlying explanations, surveys may provide additional explanations for case being studied.
**Documentation**

Documentary information for the case study will be relevant and may be useful in providing broad, unobtrusive evidence that supports other data within the case study. The documents for this case study will include agendas, announcements, reports, and minutes of meetings that have taken place between CFEJ and CDC, the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, and other individuals or organizational meetings that communicate changes to the Savannah Lead Law. Administrative documents such as proposals, progress reports, evaluations, and newspaper clippings in the community newspaper will also be used in addition to published documents and the internet.

*The advantages of documentation include:*

1. A broad coverage of many events, within many settings, over long time spans;
2. Verification of organizations that have been mentioned in interviews; and
3. Provides specific details to corroborate information from other sources that may lead the investigator to ask new questions, and can be reviewed repeatedly.

*Disadvantages of documentation include:*

1. Retrievable information may be difficult to find;
2. Access from the organization (may be withheld deliberately); and

**Archival Records**

U.S. Census data will be used in the case study to assess the location of high-risk area outreach events conducted by CFEJ. The zip codes of 31415, 31401, 31404,
and 31405 in the Chatham County in Savannah Georgia will be examined, and variables such as income, housing age, and race will be used.

*The advantages of archival records include:*

(1) Provides specific details to corroborate information from other sources, leads the investigator to ask new questions, and can be reviewed repeatedly.

A disadvantage of archival records is its potential for biased selectivity.

**Interviews**

Interviews are an essential source of a case study. All interviews will be guided conversations with open-ended questions conducted by the researcher. Questions will be asked in an unbiased manner and will be in-depth as well. Historical interviews will be taken from community members who have resided 15 - 30 years in the area; CFEJ employees; Savannah elected officials to gain their viewpoint on the influence of a non-governmental organization on public policy, the relaxation of the Savannah Lead Law, their history with CFEJ, and the engagement of the community in the policy decision-making process. Political representatives such as the mayor, city commissioners, city managers, community leaders, city council members, and environmental justice advocates will be interviewed by the researcher. “Snow-ball sampling”, also known as *respondent-driven* and *chain-referral sampling* is a technique that will be attempted. This method leads the researcher to additional interviews. Snow-ball sampling is defined as “having individuals in a limited group or organization identify their friends and associates, until the researcher observes a constellation of friendships converge into some
kind of complete social pattern". The initial interviewees or sample group grow like a rolling snow ball. This technique is often used in hidden populations where the researcher has less access. 66

Disadvantages of snowball sampling include.67

(1) Verifying the eligibility of potential respondents;
(2) Engaging the respondents; and
(3) Monitoring the data quality.

Advantages of conducting an interview include:

(1) A focus on the case study topic; and
(2) Gaining insightful, causal explanations.

Disadvantages of conducting interviews include:

(1) Response bias from interviewee (interviewee tells interviewer what they want to hear);
(2) Inaccuracies due to poor recall from the researcher; and
(3) Questions articulated poorly from the researcher.

Informants will be used in the study (anonymous individuals) that chooses not to be identified or be recorded, but would like to provide information to the researcher. Informants assist the researcher in bridging the gap of unanswered questions and may add additional information to the case. Requests from individuals who ask for anonymity or


confidentiality will be accommodated. This provides an in-depth understanding of political dynamics within the community that the researcher may not be able to access.

Each interviewee will be educated on the study by the Principal Investigator, given a consent form to participate in the study, and recorded on tape by the Principal Investigator. Any participant who refuses permission for audiotape will not be recorded. Participants will not be identified on audio tape. Interviews will be kept confidential and will be kept for a period of ten years.

Direct Observation

The researcher will document observations of meetings such as ‘The Hungry Club Forum’ (meetings that are attended by political representatives such as the Mayor, County Manager, City Manager and other political representatives in Savannah to discuss city issues), various presentations to political representatives and other organizations conducted by CFEJ, and outreach activities. The direct observation will capture responses for the proposal of the lead law modification, and the relationship between CFEJ and various individuals / organizations within these settings. Additional observations may also be documented within neighborhood settings to capture the poverty of the housing areas being studied.

Advantages to direct observation include:

(1) Useful in providing additional information on the topic;

(2) May contribute to understanding the context of the organization; and

(3) Covering the events in “real time”.
Disadvantages to direct observation include:

1. The time it takes to capture these events;
2. Coverage of events may be difficult without a ‘team’ of observers; and
3. The event may proceed differently when participants know they are being observed.

Participant-observation

Participant observation takes place when the researcher assumes a variety of roles within the case study by participating in the events being studied. These roles may range from casual social interactions within neighborhood settings or roles within organizations such as being a key decision maker in an organizational setting, a staff member, or some other functional role. In this case study, the researcher has a unique advantage to document participant observation that otherwise may be inaccessible; such as participating in meetings between CFEJ, CDC, and the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. Another advantage of participant-observation in this study is that the researcher gains a viewpoint of the case being studied internally and not externally. This is invaluable in producing an accurate depiction of the case study. The researcher also has the ability to convene meetings with individuals who are in the case.

Disadvantages to participant-observation include:

1. Potential biases of manipulating events to the researchers advantage;
2. Time-consuming; and
3. The observer may become a ‘supporter’ of the group which may affect their judgment.
Surveys

Selection Process

A total of three groups in Savannah, Georgia will be selected for the case study. A comparison will be made between two groups to examine the differences of mean scores for educational tests; if differences of the test scores are detected between the groups, the association between demographic variables and the test scores will be assessed to examine where the differences are. If elevated blood lead levels (EBLLs) are found in children six years of age and under within the groups, a comparison will be made between the three groups to assess the relationship between educational interventions and the blood lead levels of the children in the study. Each group (parents with children ages six and under) was selected from high-risk areas in Savannah, Georgia according to the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP) Director and the Executive Director of CFEJ, Dr. Mildred McClain. High-risk areas are considered areas with housing built before 1978, low-income neighborhoods, and majority African-American and Hispanic neighborhoods. Groups one and two consist of Head Start families.

Potential biases related to the selection process may include the selection of Head Start families from groups one and two. Head Start is a “national program that promotes school readiness by enhancing the social and cognitive development of children through the provision of educational, health, nutritional, social and other services to enrolled children and families.” Families that qualify for Head Start are at the poverty level according to the U.S. Census Bureau income requirements with children ages six
years and under. Head Start families are taught health and nutritional needs. These families may have prior knowledge of childhood lead poisoning because of the Head Start educational program for parents. Another potential bias is the accessibility of health information provided for Head Start families in comparison to other low-income groups. The researcher will compare the high-risk areas from the U.S. Census data by race, housing factors, and income, to the areas selected by the GACLPPP manager and Dr. McClain.

Group one will consist of fifty Head Start families with children 6 years of age and under in Savannah, Georgia. Parents will complete a general knowledge survey test on childhood lead poisoning while waiting for children at the end of the day or when bringing children to school in the morning. CFEJ will administer the general knowledge survey test to the parents to test their knowledge of childhood lead poisoning. Each participant will be provided with an assistant to explain the survey and answer any questions. These parents will have their children tested for lead poisoning within one to two weeks or the same day, after the first survey has been filled out. A Chatham County nurse will test children at the Head Start school on a weekly basis or during outreach events. Group one will be educated on childhood lead poisoning through a series of educational outreach events from CFEJ. The educational events will include a Train-the-Trainer curriculum for lead education, comprised of education on lead prevention, testing, cleaning, and trainings on writing lead applications to apply for various grants that will provide additional education on childhood lead poisoning for community
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members. A post knowledge educational assessment will be administered to group one within a six month time frame to re-test their knowledge of lead after they have completed the educational interventions. Parents will receive a consent form administered by CFEJ or the Head Start director to participate in the study. All Head Start children are mandated by the state to receive lead testing. GACLPPP will collect all blood test results, and CFEJ will collect all educational assessments. Each participant will be identified by number only to the Principal Investigator.

Group two will consist of fifty Head Start parents who will fill out a post knowledge educational assessment (identical to the test of group one), and also have their children tested for childhood lead poisoning within the same time frame as Group one. Group two will not participate in any educational events. Parents will complete the post knowledge educational assessment while waiting for children at the end of the day or when bringing children to school in the morning. Each participant will be provided with an assistant to explain the post knowledge educational assessment and answer any questions. These parents will have their children tested for lead poisoning within one to two weeks or the same day, after the post knowledge educational assessment has been filled out. A Chatham County nurse will test children at the Head Start school on a weekly basis or during outreach events. Parents will receive a consent form administered by CFEJ or the Head Start director to participate in the study. GACLPPP will collect all blood test results, and CFEJ will collect educational assessments. Each participant will be identified by number only to the Principal Investigator.
Group three will serve as the baseline group and will not experience educational interventions from the Citizens for Environmental Justice, nor will they fill out any general knowledge survey tests or post knowledge educational assessment post tests. The GACLPPP director will extract 100 lead tests for children within the same age group and demographic location in Savannah, Georgia. This group will not consist of Head Start children. Group three will have no direct involvement in the study or be identified in any way. The GACLPPP Program Director will send blood test results within a database to the researcher with de-identifiers. Each participant will be identified by number only to the researcher.

*Survey Questions*

The questionnaires are designed to assess the knowledge, behaviors, and viewpoints of Head Start parents related to childhood lead poisoning prevention and local environmental and social justice issues. Questionnaires will be administered to one parent during the yearly Head Start mandatory orientation, before the first day of school. Everyone in attendance will be given a general knowledge questionnaire on childhood lead poisoning prevention. The questionnaire will collect information on the race and education of the parent, housing age, number of children and birthdates, their general knowledge of childhood lead poisoning prevention and the participant’s outlook on local environmental and social justice issues.

Two questionnaires will be distributed to the participants. The first questionnaire is a general knowledge test, with a total of 5 questions and will be only taken by Group 1, the experimental group. Nominal values will be assigned for five questions for the
answers to the questionnaire. Each question will be given a value of 25 points each, graded at 0, 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100% grading levels.

The second questionnaire, knowledge/behavioral assessment, will have a total of 7 questions and will be taken by Groups 1 and 2, the experimental and control groups. The second questionnaire will test the participant’s general knowledge of childhood lead poisoning prevention, behaviors, and the respondent’s outlook on local environmental and social justice issues. Nominal values will be assigned for five of the seven questions, and each question will be given a value of 20 points, and will be graded at 0-100%.

Survey questions were created by the Principal Investigator. Questions were created for a general, lay audience. The survey will allow the researcher to examine the level of differences between each group. Self-reporting is a weakness of the survey method. Self-reporting may lead to inaccuracies in the data from poor memory and a misunderstanding of the survey. These weaknesses do not contribute to the causal explanations of the case.
1. What is lead
   - A disease
   - A make-up
   - A toxic-metal

2. What is the main source of lead?
   - Old houses
   - Old furniture
   - Toys
   - Water Pipes

3. What are the health effects of lead?
   - Brain damage
   - Behavioral problems
   - Headaches and Damage to kidneys
   - All of the above

4. How can lead poisoning be prevented?
   - Lead hazards in a child’s environment must be removed
   - Calling the exterminator
   - Having the doctor make a house visit
   - Call the Health Department

5. What can the public and parents do to reduce blood lead levels? (Open-ended question)
### Post Knowledge Educational Assessment Test (Survey #2)

**ID#1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Age</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Highest Level of Education Attained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children and Birthdates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Data Analysis

The quantitative data will be analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows version 19.0. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) will be conducted to examine the differences between mean post knowledge educational assessment test scores between groups one and two. The distribution of covariates (demographic variables) will be examined utilizing ANOVA. Race, Education Level, Number of children, and Housing age will be categorized for the analysis. The independent variables will consist of the parents’ race, education level, number of children, and housing age. Knowledge of lead poisoning will be scored from post knowledge educational assessment test scores between groups one and two. The dependent variable will consist of the test scores for each group. If significant differences of the test scores are detected between the groups, the association between demographic variables and the test scores will be placed into the model to examine where the differences are. If elevated blood lead levels (EBLLs) are found in children six years of age and under within the groups, a comparison will be made between the three groups to assess the relationship between educational interventions and the blood lead levels of the children in the study.

Qualitative data will be collected from interviews with political representatives, past and present health department employees, community leaders, community members, and CFEJ; this data will be described for the final dissertation.
Significance of the Study

The proposed study identifies the environmental health disparity of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah as an issue for low-income and minority populations, and gives an empirical examination of the Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice framework; which introduces the Whitehead Framework that addresses the underlying political issues. If successful, the study can serve as a model for the federal government and community organizations to address and reduce environmental injustice by partnership efforts. Moreover, this proposed study will test the Whitehead Framework and document a partnership between the CDC Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch and an environmental justice organization. For the purpose of this study, an environmental justice organization is defined as an organization that advocates and seeks to bring justice against all environmental hazards that threaten the health of individuals, including but not limited to, discriminatory land-use zoning, hazardous waste dumps, equity and equal protection in environmental enforcement, industrial facility siting and permitting, pollution monitoring, brownfields redevelopment, and transportation investments. Environmental Justice holistically improves the quality of life for populations. Environmental Justice Organizations can be found in the “2000 People of Color Environmental Groups Directory” compiled by the Clark Atlanta University (CAU), in the Environmental Justice Resource Center.

Limitations of the Study:
Limitations of this study include:

- Interviewees’ response to questions may be unreliable or bias.
- Investigator may not capture all information from the observation data.
• Access of information from CFEJ may be withheld from the investigator.

• Survey knowledge may be unreliable due to any misunderstandings of the survey.

• Population for the study is known as a hard-to-reach population; therefore the suggested number of participants for the study may not be collected.

• Principal Investigator relying on CFEJ to administer tests could have inaccurate outcomes in data collection and method for the research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The compilation of research presented illustrates federal government housing policies that were created during the 1930s - 1960s, the political dynamics of environmental justice, and the historical representation of NGOs for people-of-color. The literature denotes the origin of racial segregation created by national housing policies put in practice by the federal government. National policies were implemented to address national economic problems; however, problems and recommendations for the urban population were addressed more as a reactive measure, and not as a preventive course of action for this population. The representation of economic decisions that shape the nation are constructed by those who hold the power; for this reason, various examples of the political and economic conditions that are concealed from the general population are also presented within the literature. As a consequence of segregation, African-Americans lacked essential amenities needed for sufficient and optimal living.

The literature informs the current case study by examining the origin of racial segregation and the detrimental, historical environmental effect these policies have on African-American families today. These historical decisions contribute to the unfavorable, environmental injustices that people-of-color and low-income populations are subjected to at present, such as childhood lead poisoning, as a result of isolated,
dilapidated housing. The literature presented speaks to an era when the federal government recognized the benefit to further a working relationship with NGOs. However, there is a lack of research describing a distinct partnership between the federal government and an environmental justice organization to address environmental disparities; therefore the case study continues to pose the research question of, how effective are federal government and NGO partnerships?

This collection of historical and current research informs the case study in analyzing environmental injustices for people-of-color from a political, economic, and public health lens, the role of the federal government in influencing racial disparities, and the relationship between the federal government and environmental justice organizations.

U.S. Federalism

U.S. Federalism has evolved over the years. During the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), the U.S. suffered from serious economic failures. This was a time when the federal government increased their activity by intervening into public programs controlled by the state. This period of federalism was considered a “crisis oriented” period. The federal government was reactive to the economic crisis of the nation. During the administration of Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) in the 1960s, the federal government responded to demands made by states and its citizens, while working with state and local governments. Despite the working relationship of the federal and state governments during the 1960s, many were skeptical of a “concentrated cooperation”; a relationship where the federal and state government would work together to resolve quality of life issues for citizens. State representatives believed that their decisions should be strengthened by national initiatives, instead of developing or implementing
those initiatives themselves. As a concerted effort between the federal and state government took place, and demands made by citizens increased with legitimate reasons, such as poverty, deprivation of education, housing, jobs, and access to healthcare, many believed that federalism should begin to encompass a more ‘community-defining’ agenda to solve problems of the urban population.¹ For the duration of these periods of U.S. Federalism, government was not able to resolve community problems without involving the community. The subsequent research strengthens this conception.

Professors Stephen David and Paul Kantor question the intention and consequences of urban policies implemented by the federal government and their effect on vulnerable populations. These scholars assert that as urban policies have evolved, there has been a bias in the federal government implementing policies that have a shared, systemic interest with other levels of government. The policy decisions made from the federal government depends more on the economic development or political economy of the nation, than assisting low-income populations, which in turn may affect these same populations negatively.² Utilizing the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) as one measure of policy implementation from the federal government and the effect on vulnerable populations, Joe Soss and his colleagues contend that racial disparities are often influenced by government policies through an unequal distribution of services across the states. While devolution has played a leading role in negative social consequences for marginalized populations, these same scholars support empirical


findings that expound upon racial disparities created, and tolerated under federal government policies.  

Deliberate or inadvertent, policies implemented by the federal government have been a major factor for inequalities experienced by vulnerable populations. Several decisions made by the federal government for poor, people-of-color, have been the result of various economic failures of the nation. Historically these populations have not possessed the power to participate in decisions that directly impact their lives. Many politicians deem poor groups as ‘non-voters’; just as the federal government may not contemplate this same population resisting inequitable decisions that shape their life. Therefore due to the lack of political power, and economic stability, these populations have received an unequal and deficient distribution of services. Within the deficiency of services allocated for this population, damaging quality of life issues become a continuing cycle and may not be addressed efficiently by the government sector.

The problems of low-income populations are more than often addressed subsequently, when harmful events have disturbed the nation in its entirety. For example, when former first lady Barbara Bush, was asked to comment on the Katrina victims living in the Houston superdome, she communicated to journalists that their current living state is better than what their conditioned to. This symbolic occurrence exemplifies the classist, racist views, and a lack of comprehensive understanding for diverse cultures and concern for poor populations, by many individuals who represent the federal government. Understanding quality of life issues from an urban politics lens,
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yields itself to address the questions of who gets what, why, and how much from a political, economic and an environmental justice view.

Urban Planning and Urban Politics

The underpinning of urban politics accentuates informal partnerships, alliances, public power, private resources, and the outcome of racial and class differences. After World War II national policies took place that encouraged urban development. Although these national initiatives were meant to revitalize the cities from poverty, racial segregation, and physical dilapidation, the outcomes did not transpire as planned. Most policy improvements didn’t take place until the 1930s. Policies from the 1930s to the 1970s focused on solving problems for the cities, but the same federal policies began to cancel one policy out after another. Urban residents begin to complain about issues which affected their quality of life, such as water polluted by human and animal waste causing typhoid epidemics, sewage collected in gutters, and pollution traveling from one place to the other. Of course poor neighborhoods were effected the most. For urban leaders, there was a crisis when the economic status of the cities began to deteriorate. Elites and business leaders supported public services to avoid a regretful outcome. Urban leaders’ demonstrated political tension as most urban cities didn’t have adequate representation, and urban residents lacked the political power to voice their concerns. Most government leaders did not take action to decrease the detrimental effects on the urban populations. For various reasons, the national policies had a negative result for
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urban communities. Residential segregation was visible during the 19th century and by the 20th century many cities were densely populated and were considered to be urban.  

_The Evolution of the Federal Government_

A myriad of policies employed, coupled with extensive engagement, were significant factors in the evolution of the federal government. During the Hoover Administration two programs were initiated to provide relief for unemployment, the President’s Emergency Committee for Employment and the President’s Organization on Unemployment Relief. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act gave funds to mortgage institutions, and the Emergency Relief and Construction Act provided assistance to impoverished people. Most governors declined the assistance from the federal government and would not work with them.

The position of the federal government changed during the Great Depression (1930s). The Great Depression was a time when the federal government reacted to the economic crisis and government centralized at all levels. When the New Deal was initiated a relationship between the federal and city government began. In the past, a direct relationship between the federal and city government didn’t exist, but now there was a social and economic crisis in the cities. City officials desperately needed the federal government for financial relief, and looked to the federal government to

---

5 (Judd 2003, chap. 3)


7 (Judd 2003, chap. 5)
overcome any unresponsiveness from the states. Although Roosevelt signed a number of bills to stabilize the economic downfall of the economy, the New Deal seemed to assist the economic lending institutions more than the poor, helping the middle-class population with mortgages.\footnote{8}

The lack of representation for the urban population caused an indifference to their needs. Urban residents suffered from traffic congestion, slum housing, inadequate park space, air pollution, and other environmental hazards that didn’t interest, nor get the attention of rural and small-town legislators, or governors. Judd asserts that the federal government response to this crisis was designed to deal with a national disaster, not an urban disaster. The New Deal federal programs were administered through the states, but the ratification put local officials in charge. The National Resources Committee, comprised of federal administrators and experts appointed by the president, published “Our Cities: Their Role in the National Economy”\footnote{9}; this document expressed concern for urban problems, such as slums and urban blight. Federal experts felt that urban problems would threaten the economic recovery of the nation, therefore federal action recommendations to improve the cities was suggested within this publication.\footnote{10}

The cities were treated as a separate entity. The apparent title of the document “Our Cities: Their Role in the National Economy” illustrates this. The problems of the urban population were looked upon as a dilemma for a national economic recovery;

\footnote{8} Ibid.


\footnote{10} (Judd 2003, chap. 5)
therefore a prescription was given as an afterthought, not in conjunction with the majority of the nation. The urban problems then, match the urban problems of today; traffic congestion, slum housing, inadequate park space, and air pollution to name a few; unchanging disparities for the same population. These same environmental hazards and insufficient urban policies stimulate the health disparities of today.

**Urban Policies**

Judd and Swanstrom state that urban policies reinforced discrimination. In 1932, Congress created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) that broadened loans to private developers to construct low-income housing in slum areas. It became impossible for blacks to secure federal home loans while local developers and financial institutions enforced restrictions that prohibited housing from being sold to them. The supply of housing available to blacks was reduced; therefore many low-income blacks were forced to live in public housing projects, while middle-class blacks struggled for older housing left in urban neighborhoods. A 1933 report submitted to the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), created by the National Housing Act of 1934 by a consultant, offering his view on the most favorable racial populations to the least favorable was listed as:


12 (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)


In 1938, the underwriting manual for banks directed loan officers to avoid blending racially mixed neighborhoods. The statement written in the manual:

“Areas surrounding a location are to be investigated to determine whether incompatible racial and social groups are present, for the purpose of making a prediction regarding the probability of location being invaded by such groups. If a neighborhood is to retain stability, it is necessary that properties shall continue to be occupied by the same social and racial classes. A change in social or racial occupancy generally contributes to instability and decline in values.”\(^\text{16}\)\(^\text{17}\)\(^\text{18}\)

The Housing Division of Public Works (PWA) was charged with carrying out a provision within the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933\(^\text{19}\) that authorized “construction, alteration, or repair, under public regulation or control, of low-rent housing

\(^{14}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)


\(^{16}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)


\(^{19}\) *National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933*, Public Law 73-67, 72nd Cong. 1933.
and slum clearance projects.” However, more low-income units were torn down from slum clearance than built. There was a flight of the middle class to the suburbs. 20 21

The Public Housing Act of 1937, also called the Wagner-Steagall Public Housing Act 22 succeeded the PWA program. The Wagner-Steagall Housing Act was designed to clear slums for cities, build public housing and serve affordable housing needs for low-income populations. In 1941, the “Action for Cities: A Guide for Community Planning” prepared by the National Resources Planning Board recommended that cities create local plans to reduce blight, utilizing federal government assistance. 23 A program to build public housing and clear slums in the inner cities was passed by Congress in 1949. 24 Real estate investments were threatened by the current state of the cities and caught the attention of local business elites. 25 Urban renewal was supported by both political parties to reduce dilapidated housing, overcrowding, and increase public housing. The waiting list was very long for poor blacks and whites to apply for housing through the 1949 Housing Act. Urban renewal funds destroyed neighborhoods while displacing residents

20 (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)


22 The United States Housing Act of 1937, Public Law 75-412, 75th Cong. 1937


25 (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)
and public housing projects became segregated ghettos. Federal highway programs also separated blacks from suburban whites and the middle class from the poor. Racial segregation and racial tensions increased as many of the funds that were intended to aid the cities, were obligated to building suburban housing and highways for middle-class families.  

The plight of the poor illustrated a failure of the social fabric and economic system of the nation. Restrictions enforced by financial institutions left blacks with little or no options for decent housing. Loan officers unambiguously publicized to banks that the racial and social status makeup of a community should be uniform. If these neighborhoods were “invaded” by certain groups, of dissimilar racial and social classes, there would be a decline in the value of the housing. The racist categorical listing held by the past loan officers, of the most favorable populations was deplorable, pronounced, and realistically communicated the thoughts of the federal government describing specific race groups. Blacks and Hispanics were placed at the bottom of this listing category. Although this recommendation was eventually taken out of the manual, this didn’t erase the belief held by many loan officers then and today. The practice of excluding selected races and social classes out of specific neighborhoods continues; today we remain to have a division of ethnic and impoverished populations segmented away in areas that lack quality housing and other living amenities.

26 ibid.
Housing and Poverty

By the 20th century most blacks were living in the most dilapidated housing and worst areas of the cities. Due to the proximity of these areas to the central businesses, many areas were displaced by clearance projects initiated by federal urban renewal programs. Most blacks weren’t able to afford housing options that were available to whites and were segregated; therefore public housing was the only option. The housing projects were segregated and built on slum land. James Baldwin, a well-known writer from Harlem, describes the housing projects as “colorless, bleak, high, and revolting”. Most hallways were always dark and elevators were always broken. The quality of life for populations that were housed in these areas was impoverished, futile, and isolated from society.27

In 1950, the Federal Housing Administration modified the underwriting manual to dismiss negative recommendations against racially mixed areas, but actions against prior policies that reflected these recommendations were not addressed. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 196828, outlawed racial discrimination in housing, however many blacks were still discriminated against. Red lines drawn around neighborhoods that were considered a poor investment or one that lacks economic and social stability for insurance companies, known as the redlining regime, was another barrier for poor black communities to receive housing, while the suburbs were looked at as an improvement in

27 Ibid.

social class.\(^{29}\) From 1959 - 1961, President Eisenhower eliminated public housing requests from the federal budget. The Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Act of 1968\(^{30}\) required a majority of housing built for low-income families, but only 51% of the new units in urban renewal areas were set aside for low-income populations.\(^{31}\)

The government became more involved in response to demands from the states. President Lyndon Johnson conveyed to the nation that the implementation of the War on Poverty would attempt to redress economic inequalities and end poverty in the U.S. The Great Society programs were a declaration to initiate this goal and take action on health care, education, welfare assistance, and employment. Public housing and urban renewal programs were increased and a Model Cities program was also initiated, but at the same time racial segregation increased and by the 1970s the perception that urban policies had failed was well-accepted nationally. Cities were isolated from the suburbs and a ‘white-flight’ that separated whites from low-income neighborhoods was acceptable.\(^{32}\)

The Great Society program became identified as only assisting blacks. In order for states to qualify for Great Society programs, agencies were to be established in the states for federal funding acceptance. These agencies were directed to encourage community residents in planning and participating in the programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity qualified local anti-poverty programs for funding, on the basis of

\(^{29}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 8)


\(^{31}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 5 and 6)

\(^{32}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 7)
poor communities being involved with community planning from the beginning. Planning, implementing, and policy-making were a part of the development of these programs. Administrators expressed problems with conducting the programs, and skeptics against the programs claimed they increased poverty. Much of the grant programs initiated by Democrats were eliminated during the Johnson administration.33

The housing policies implemented by the federal government produced different outcomes. One of many environmental hazards that results from dilapidated housing is childhood lead poisoning. Impoverished families living in these detrimental conditions with limited alternatives to healthier housing is a consequence of historical federal policies put in place. The government's intentions regarding the welfare of low-income communities are still questioned today. At present, people-of-color and low-income families continue to be segregated from viable communities. The strenuous and challenging process of attaining quality housing persists today.

Political costs can be treated as a benefit or a liability, depending on the support or the resistance they produce.34 Much of the urban programs produced in the 1960s were not politically supported due to other political agendas and the perception of who gained the benefits from the programs; therefore social objectives were challenged. The population on the receiving end can make a difference in the consensus or lack of consensus in how administrators distribute funding. National policies have influenced the levels of racial and residential segregation, poverty, health disparities, and quality of

33 Ibid.

life inequities. NGOs have advocated alleviating these issues for disadvantaged populations. From the 20th to the 21st century, the government has realized that NGOs are a vital element of positive transformation for these same populations.

The Federal Government Needs NGOs

During the 1960s, the problems in the cities such as poverty, unemployment, inadequate housing, crime, and the educational systems intensified. Urban life during that time reflected a routine high population density, traffic congestion, and air and water pollution. Local governing authorities can make it possible for a town or city to enact a zoning code, which may have the effect of keeping out the poor. Many blacks were confined to the cities during that time, and state and local governments were very dependent on the federal government money. Generally cities felt that state governments were not very helpful in assisting with city problems and local governments were constantly competing for state and federal money. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) initiated policies for the poor to alleviate poverty. The states began using neighborhood, community, non-governmental organizations on city-wide committees to represent the poor, and communicate their needs to government. This influenced community-action programs for the poor. Cities also begin to support non-governmental organizations. NGOs were able to perform outreach and connect with the poor. This was something the government could not accomplish.

The government realized it would be a benefit to work with NGOs. NGOs lead several neighborhood programs created by the OEO and were not taken over by city hall. NGOs informed people of their entitlement to public welfare. Community action
programs became more popular as politicians realized the support NGOs expanded within their own voting constituencies; therefore the demands for better services in low-income areas and funding for the groups caught the attention of politicians.\(^{35}\)

NGOs became a part of local politics, voicing the social issues of the community, and assisting in paving the way for African American mayors to be elected. Neighborhood NGOs pressured the government for neighborhood revitalization, and better housing. Community Development Corporations (CDCs) were created in the late 1960s to deliver services and rehabilitate housing in their local neighborhoods where residents were affected. The corporations evolved from community action agencies and contracted with the federal, state, or local government to deliver services such as day care, job training, health clinics, and other social services to impoverished populations. Senator Robert Kennedy formulated the idea of CDCs after visiting a very poor housing project in Brooklyn, New York. CDCs were conducted by local residents, not the government, and they empower and encourage the community to maximize their participation in solving quality of life issues as well. CDCs may rely on the government, foundations, and corporations for their funding, which can be a limitation sometimes in maximizing their efforts.\(^{36}\)

The government has been able to effectively change several quality of life issues for disadvantaged populations by involving NGOs. The government may perceive effective policies to be national in scope, to be successful, but these policies also have to
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\(^{36}\) (Judd 2003, chap. 14)
address issues for everyone and accomplish equity. Cities are limited in what they can accomplish. The power of national policies that have influenced racial disparities, whether intentional or not, have to promote and distribute more power to eliminate the same disparities. Politics may rear its ugly head when communities are seeking justice to eliminate quality of life inequities.

The Politics of Environmental Justice

The dynamics of environmental justice are political. Race, income, class, and political economics take part in the discrimination and distribution of environmental services. The legacy of racial segregation that we continue to see today results from the politics and polices of the past. Politics play a key role, and structural inequalities through political agendas and various laws that do not protect vulnerable populations. The motivations for these political agendas vary. The laws that are put in place or not put in place at times steered by political economics, such as zoning laws or relaxed environmental regulations, more than often, position inequitable policies that impact these populations. These decisions can stimulate environmental injustices that are experienced by disadvantaged communities. Several studies offer additional, credible indicators that drive these injustices.

Racial and Income Discrimination

A historical record of increasing evidence demonstrates that race and low income levels create environmental hazards at a disproportionate rate for vulnerable
populations. Many communities comprised of African-American, Hispanic, and Asian populations show a greater estimated placement of Toxic Storage and Disposal Facilities (TSDFs) within their neighborhoods. Research suggests that other environmental hazards will be hosted within these same communities. Critics have responded to minority discriminatory claims and the correlation of “race and hazards” as an argument of “which came first”, the “chicken or the egg”? Were the facilities disproportionately sited in minority and low-income communities or did these populations move in after the facilities were placed? Over three decades of data in a research study found that the presence of TSDFs in minority neighborhoods were more significant, than minorities moving in after TSDFs were placed in the communities. The same research study concluded that after controlling for household income and home values, minorities attract TSDFs, and TSDFs do not attract minorities. Communities that were documented within the study were considered politically weak. Political weaknesses within the study were considered to be “a higher presence of minorities, a lower presence of home owners, or a significant degree of ethnic churning” (racial transition). The study conducted by Pastor et al concludes that residents should organize on a multiracial basis to oppose these environmental hazards. The recommendation reflects on the Southern California Air Quality Management District’s decision to reduce polluted air, and create a task force on environmental justice after getting pressure from grassroots activists. The role of
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urban and environmental policies, within the context of the study illustrated, may be confined to the revision of zoning and permitting laws, when the problem of disproportionate exposure is due to race.

Manuel Pastor and colleagues emphasize that because race and other variables are factors that motivate environmental injustices, underrepresented communities should be participating in policy decisions that motivate environmental regulation and zoning laws; because zoning laws effect industrial land use, this can be a detrimental health effect for minority neighborhoods that receive multiple sources of pollution at a disproportionate rate. Increased residential segregation strengthens racial inequalities and the health risks associated with industrial land use. In a 2010 similar study to measure the location of Toxic Release Inventory Facilities (TRIFs) for Maricopa County Arizona, which also contains Phoenix, the fifth largest state in the U.S., racial and ethnic discrimination was documented for Asians. Researchers utilized independent variables of economic and compensation costs, to measure the costs to locate TRIFs and potential lawsuit costs; political and collective action, to measure the chance of homeowners engaging in political action against the TRIFs location; and of course race /ethnicity and poverty level over a three decade period in Maricopa County Arizona. The comprehensive empirical analysis indicates a strong statistical significance for TRIF locations in Asian


40 Manuel Pastor, Jr., Rachel Morello-Frosch, and Jim Sadd, “The Air Is Always Cleaner On the Other Side: Race, Space, And Ambient Air Toxics Exposures In California,” Journal of Urban Affairs 27, no. 2 (2005): 127-148.

communities. The results also indicate that these same communities would be less likely to engage in political action. The Asian populations that were found to be discriminated against were residentially segregated from the majority of other Asian populations. Race and politically powerless communities are strong indicators of TRIF placement.42

Various researchers have explored a critical race theory, which includes the conclusion of racially segregated neighborhoods lacking a “white privilege” that equates to dominance in policy, power, social privilege and a better quality of life.43 44 A wealth of consistent literature in urban planning, Geographical Information Systems (GIS), social and political science, and public health contend that racially segregated, racial and ethnic minorities, marginalized, and low-income populations have a heightened probability to experience psychosocial stress, infrastructure disparity, exclusion of political involvement, and higher levels of environmental hazards that constitute environmental injustices.45 Environmental enforcement has shown to be insubstantial in


low-income, minority populations as well. The association of demographic characteristics and the risk of incidental U.S. chemical industry accidents retrieved from a six-year history report, documented 15,083 more chemically concentrated U.S. industrial facilities in low-income, African American neighborhoods. Further unfavorable, suboptimal conditions, in minority and low-income communities many times are routinely coupled with environmental hazards; such as drug-related crimes, and a mass quantity of liquor stores and bars, that may lead to other social ills for these same populations. While race can be a constant predictor of environmental injustices, the persistent role of politics in maintaining these injustices is an essential element.


Social and Political Economic Processes

The stratification of power, resources, stakeholders, political hierarchies, and private capital intersect each other and play decisive roles for social and political marginalization of vulnerable populations. Each of these factors can produce environmental inequities. The motivation and desire of private capital and less social conflict from the community speaks volumes in how environmental decisions are made.

In the late 1980s John Christopher operated a construction and demolition waste company, KrisJon Construction Company. Christopher assiduously worked to find places where the waste could be dumped at a very low price. Christopher began dumping the waste in a low-income African-American and Latino neighborhood in Chicago. To guarantee less interference from City Hall or any appropriate authorities, Christopher paid local alderman cash bribes. It was found that Christopher paid $5000.00 per month to an alderman in Chicago's 24th ward in return for Christopher operating the site and creating dumps in the same neighborhood. Each alderman that was bribed was also African-American or Latino. Local community-based organizations soon discovered that Christopher didn’t have any permits for operating the company and petitioned against the illegal dumping. The court and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency issued no citations for this site, and allowed the company to continue to operate. Residents felt that there was an alliance between the government and the polluters. The fact that some residents united with Christopher in neighborhood “beautification projects” where they were provided with grass, flowers, and other gardening enhancements, didn’t help. Christopher secured the support of a local pastor who applauded his efforts to “give

back” to the community. The federal government was aware of the illegal dumping and initiated an investigation on political corruption, Operation Silver Shovel. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) had Christopher operating undercover for the U.S. Attorney’s Office. Christopher again bribed alderman in 1992 and the transactions were secretly videotaped. The public however was not informed until the case was exposed by the media. Because of the economic instability, lack of political resources, influence, and poverty this community faced, Reverend Jesse Jackson and community residents organized “Operation PUSH” to bring this illegal company to justice. This politically powerless community was an easy target for corrupt elected officials and industrial companies.51

The social, economic, and political processes that promote environmental injustice continue to be all too familiar today. When researchers collected qualitative data in Atlanta Georgia, it was found that community displacement, neighborhood disinvestment, speculative development, and poor housing conditions all contribute to environmental inequities for McDaniel Glenn residents, a low-income, African-American community in Atlanta. Participants communicated concerns of city officials not investing in basic services for the residents, but devaluing the land because of a redevelopment plan by investors to attract upper-income buyers. The “Beltline” multibillion dollar project surrounds their neighborhood.52 In the meantime housing conditions such as
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mold, dampness, community trash, and rats continue to plague these residents.\textsuperscript{53} Atlanta, now identified as the first major city in the U.S. to demolish all of its housing stock,\textsuperscript{54} is not surprising when urban planning in the past for this city reflects much of the same scheme. For example in 1952, the Atlanta Metropolitan Planning Commission was concerned about blacks moving into neighborhoods close to flourishing business districts. As a result of the report entitled “Up Ahead” the commission concluded that “colored housing” in outlying areas would be better for these residents. According to recommendations given by the commission, this would reduce blighted areas and make the best use of central planning areas. Black leader’s provided support in exchange for the promise of housing built for blacks, out of federal funds under Section 221 of the 1949 Housing Act. Years later, clearance of the downtown Atlanta area continued.\textsuperscript{55}

Industries have a motivation to maximize profits while seeking the path of least, political resistance from the community. There are social, economic, and political explanations for environmental injustices.\textsuperscript{56} The undergirding elements of the Environmental Justice framework give salient explanations for environmental disparities; however, a multidimensional focus which includes a more direct, political economic


\textsuperscript{55} (Judd 2003, chap. 2)

factor may open the window to transform environmental politics, although fighting for environmental justice in court has been a struggle for many.

*Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act as a Response to Environmental Justice*

Environmental justice was not enthusiastically implemented by the Bush Administration. Political scientist Brian Gerber presents findings that demonstrate a decline in the affirmative use of Executive Order 12898 during this administration. The same study suggests that when it comes to administrative responses to environmental justice concerns, bureaucratic action depends on the president.\(^{57}\) The Supreme Court ruling of Alexander V Sandoval changed the application of achieving environmental justice from the Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964. In 2001, Justice Scalia held that there is "no private right of action to enforce regulations promulgated" under Section 602 of Title VI. The court dismissed prior Supreme Court rulings as mere opinions. This decision closed the door for individuals having any chance to bring environmental justice claims under Title VI Section 602, leaving Section 601 of Title VI which requires proof of discriminatory intent. Under Section 602 recipient agencies of federal funding cannot discriminate on the count of race, color, or national origin.\(^{58}\) Sandoval brought this suit to litigation against the Department of Public Safety's decision to administer driver's
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license in English only. Justice Scalia concluded that individuals had no private rights included under Section 602 of Title VI.  

The decision of Justice Scalia changed the way environmental justice claims are examined. This historic verdict dismissed future individuals challenging environmental injustices. Although the decision changed the effectiveness of Title VI, the cast of doubt for environmental justice cases didn’t start in Justice Scalia’s court. Opposing perceptions of environmental justice, the methods utilized, and the movement itself has been conveyed for some time now.

Opposing Views on Environmental Justice

Anderton et al. challenged the quantitative methods utilized on environmental justice findings; “Environmental Equity: The Demographics of Dumping” disputes previous studies to determine the correlation between the location of hazardous waste landfills and the racial and economic status of surrounding communities. Authors challenged the seminal 1987 United Church of Christ study, “Toxic Wastes and Race”, and the U. S. General Accounting Office (GAO) 1983 study. In 1987, the United Church of Christ (UCC) Commission for Racial Justice (CRJ) published Toxic Wastes and Race in the United States to expose the placement of toxic waste landfills in low-income and people of color communities. This report served as one of many catalysts for


environmental injustice cases. Charles Lee and Reverend Benjamin Chavis, from the UCC, called attention to industries selectively choosing communities of color for waste disposal sites and polluting facilities. The 1987 report examines the placement of hazardous waste sites, landfills, incinerators, and polluting industries in communities composed of majority minority populations.

The findings of the 1987 report indicate that race is the strongest variable and the number one factor for exposure to environmental contamination. In 1983, The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) conducted a study that reports the correlation between hazardous waste landfills and the racial and economic characteristics of communities in southeastern states. The U.S.GAO focused the review on offsite landfills found in eight southeastern states. The report indicates that four offsite hazardous waste landfills were found in the eight states. African-Americans were found to make up the majority of the population in three out of four communities where the landfills were located.

Anderton et al. disagree with environmental racism claims that facilities for treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes (TSDFs) are located disproportionately in minority neighborhoods. They challenge these studies by utilizing census-tract data vs. the zip code data used in previous studies, claiming that census tracts, in area units are smaller and more refined than zip code areas. Researchers conducting this study report that no consistent national-level association exists between the location of TSDFs and neither minority or disadvantaged populations. Within the

---

61 Toxic Wastes and Race, United Church of Christ Justice & Witness Ministries. 2007.

study, census tracts are described as “a small statistical subdivision of a county with clearly identifiable boundaries and a relatively homogeneous population of about 4,000 persons”; comparing the census tracts containing TSDFs to the tracts without TSDFs, but within standard metropolitan statistical areas. Authors conclude that Hispanics are at a higher rate when living near TSDFs, but the difference is not that significant; more Hispanic populations surround the TSDFs because they are employed in precision manufacturing. Authors claim that “the truth is lacking and the higher percentages of minority and disadvantaged persons living near industrialized areas might reflect some pattern of inequity inherent in the structure and pattern of growth in urban areas”. The authors state that further research is needed to make this claim. 63

Despite evidence from the UCC and the GAO study, Douglas Anderton and colleagues continue to challenge environmental justice claims. Anderton debated Bullard’s 1994 book “Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color”. Questioning Bullard's assertion that policy encourages economic inequities, lower income populations, social status, and political power encourage disproportionate environmental hazards, Anderton states that the balance of social externalities should be taken into account, such as zoning and geographical constraints. The author asserts that studies on community environmental burdens confront limited statistical techniques and countervailing research is not addressed.64


Davidson and Anderton authored part two of the infamous 1994 “Demographics of Dumping” article. The authors use a national survey of facilities administered by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) to examine the sociospatial distribution of hazardous material handlers that challenge previous environmental justice studies. According to the authors, the analysis shows that these facilities are located in primarily working-class neighborhoods. However, the study also indicates that “because of the heterogeneity of industrial activities, local geographies, and unique residential area histories, facilities certainly will be sited in predominantly minority or disadvantaged areas”, although the author still claims that this does not merit the claim that minorities and disadvantaged populations are disproportionately exposed. The same study also states that RCRA governed facilities are close to neighborhoods with a higher percentage of minority residents, and in non-metropolitan areas they are likely to be located in neighborhoods with a higher percentage of black residents.65 Egan, Anderton, and Weber also challenge Massey and Denton on claims of residential segregation on minority groups, disagreeing with the indices and techniques used for the spatial concentration.66

Christopher Foreman has questioned the progress and objectives of the environmental justice movement and has not been reticent to communicate his reservations. In Foreman’s book, “The Promise and Peril of Environmental Justice” the author claims that EJ advocates have not pursued policy effectively to make notable,


specific changes, EJ is more about empowerment, and is unreasonable in that citizens can make demands not considering the costs, tradeoffs, and a stronger sense of priorities. Foreman states that while EJ advocacy has been the impetus for Federal Initiatives such as the CERCLA act, mainstream environmental groups have the same goals for everyone, not excluding African Americans and other minorities.

Foreman asserts that EJ is not just about environmentalism, but about everything, and therefore doesn’t have any boundaries. Therefore the author maintains the argument that this leaves the movement with no agenda, and a lack of thorough analysis and data. The author concludes that EJ advocates have not confronted the tradeoffs between economic opportunity and environmental risks, and that everyone must learn that there must be a regulatory policy process, “although the government has a viable role to play, we cannot simply litigate, legislate, regulate, or protest our ways toward healthy communities”.

Several refuting debates for these studies include, but are not limited to the research from Been and Mohai that respond to Anderton et al. study results, noting significant methodological differences. Anderton didn’t consider rural areas in the analysis, the UCC did; the UCC study included all metropolitan areas while Anderton did not. Mohai also found that for Anderson et al.’s study, the driving indicator of industrial


activity, employment in manufacturing, was not discernible between metropolitan areas that sited TSFS and the areas that did not. Been and Mohai concluded in both studies that Anderton et al.’s findings do not counter the 1987 UCC results.

Even with opposing views on environmental justice and the challenges that may appear, environmental justice organizations have proved to tackle quality of life issues in the community and make an impact on disparate populations.

The Impact of Environmental Justice Organizations

Environmental justice organizations have created mechanisms and strategies to involve citizen participation that transform marginalized communities, and have changed the thinking of mainstream environmental organizations to respond to low-income communities. Environmental justice organizations have not only caught the attention of federal agencies to redress injustices, but they have changed the way the world views the environment. Most success for these organizations have been at the local level, however environmental justice policies that have been made nationally is the effect of these same organizations.

The local victories of environmental justice organizations have been prominent, and have changed the tactics of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), local environmental agencies, and industrial corporations. Moreover, these organizations have empowered communities. (Please view the following cases as abstract examples that mirror other countless environmental and social justice success stories Appendix A).
The Future of the Movement

David Pellow and Robert Brulle suggest that the movement must not only address issues of race and class, but also political bureaucrats that steer the movement. They also assert that grouping most injustices to all “racism” does not give the movement justice, but to rearticulate the frame and exploit political opportunities by confronting the political economic schemes, may lead to national and international successes. When comparing the environmental justice movement to the Civil Rights Movement, Bryant and Hockman assert that the movement has to bring itself to a more international level to have a comparable impact to the Civil Rights Movement. Confronting structural underlying causes will better address the multiple forms of injustice. Gottlieb suggests that the movement should look at the “possibility of breaking free from a bounded environmentalism to become a broader, more socially inclusive movement capable of challenging the very structure and logic of a capitalist social order”, one that looks at the political economic framework. Capturing a wider political audience will allow the movement to “transform the way corporate money and power dominate electoral policy-making processes and eliminating the root causes of hazards for all Americans. The struggle for environmental justice must be about the politics of capitalist production per se and the elimination of the ecological threat, not just the “fair” distribution of ecological hazards, via better government regulation of inequities in the marketplace”.70

The distribution of environmental hazards on people-of-color and low-income populations has shown to be at a disproportionate rate within vulnerable, low-income

---

communities. Politics not only compliments the degradation, but it's also the premise of the struggle. The political processes guide decisions that affect disadvantaged populations throughout the nation in urban and rural areas. The political hierarchies conflict justice for vulnerable populations. Similar to other political issues, every so often, the success of the environmental justice movement depends on the present state of the world and the messages the media is portraying. Is EPA creating an environmental policy presently, and what's the main agenda of the presidential EPA appointed administrator? All of these elements play a role in the EJ movement.

The historical literature presented affords the opportunity to examine past policies and the impact on disadvantaged populations today. The government distinguished the benefit of NGOs conveying positive change for the community. Yet still today, the government is apprehensive in giving NGOs, the common man, too much power or control. Not by choice, poor populations were detached from the nation and decisions for these populations were treated as an afterthought. The past policies are symbolic and have played a key role in the past, and today in the discrimination and distribution of environmental services and the health effects on vulnerable populations, such as childhood lead poisoning. The movement has made a notable cultural and organizational growth; however the optimal future of the environmental justice movement will consciously link the global systems of governance that integrate an urban analysis and a political economic model. The dynamics of environmental justice are political, and a multidimensional focus which includes a political economic element could transform the political legacies impacted on these populations today.
CHAPTER III

GEORGIA AND CHILDHOOD LEAD POISONING

The research in this chapter illustrates the national, state of Georgia, and Savannah, Georgia childhood lead poisoning data; the political dynamics of the social inequalities; and the implication of the non-issue of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah. CDC's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) data is presented comprising the last 20 years of lead data and the progress CDC has made in decreasing high blood lead levels of children. Although the lead levels have decreased within the last 10-20 years, the pattern of the inequitable prevalence of childhood lead poisoning on African American children remains the same.

The chapter informs the current case study by examining the accountability of the appropriate agency to modify and enforce the current lead ordinance in Savannah; who holds the power in the city to influence modification of the ordinance; the underlying political economic obstacles for the lack of enforcement and advancing the policy, and how these decisions or lack of action disseminate unequal protection for low-income populations. The chapter concludes with addressing the undergirding factors for the non-issue of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia, and the competing agendas of elected officials and community priorities.
Historical and Present Data of Childhood Lead Poisoning

The CDC's National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) is an ongoing sequence of health and nutritional assessments of the general population in the United States (U.S.), conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics. This survey has been one of the primary sources for monitoring the levels of lead in the blood, and identifying the distribution of high, blood lead levels (BLLs) in the U.S. population of children ages 1-5 years old. A household interview and a physical examination are conducted for each survey participant; however the survey data does not provide an estimate for specific populations or small areas. Lead poisoning is easily absorbed into the growing systems of young children, and often goes unrecognized, with no symptoms occurring. Blood lead levels (BLLs) can adversely affect the behavior, I.Q, and development of children.¹

NHANES data taken from the 1991-1994 assessments indicate that, although the BLLs in the U.S. population decreased dramatically from the 1988-1991 survey data, children ages 1-5 who were poor non-Hispanic black, living in large metropolitan areas, with a population greater than or equal to 1 million or living in older housing, maintained above normal, elevated blood lead levels (EBLLs).² According to the NHANES data, BLLs for children aged 1-5 years declined from an 88.2% prevalence rate during the 1976-1980 survey, to an estimated 2.2% rate during the 1999-2000 survey. The estimates of the NHANES data are variable because of the limited sample size. The NHANES data


collected during the 1999-2002 survey indicate that BLLs decreased among all age and racial/ethnic groups, including non-Hispanic black children; however, BLLs for non-Hispanic black children continued to remain higher in comparison to non-Hispanic white and Mexican-American children.3

In addition to NHANES being used to provide a national sample for monitoring the trends of BLLs, the survey also provides the national baseline data. NHANES cannot effectively determine the local risk for EBLLs; however, state and local data can effectively monitor the progress, prevention, and risk measures. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have been charged with monitoring and directing state childhood lead poisoning prevention programs.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

The CDC has tasked their Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch (HHLPPB) with guiding state childhood lead poisoning prevention program (CLPPPs) initiatives. The CDC’s HHLPPB has accomplished many objectives, including, but not limited to, funding 40 state childhood lead poisoning prevention programs to develop, provide technical assistance, and evaluate prevention activities to reduce and mitigate childhood lead poisoning for the population. After the Lead Contamination Control Act of 1988 authorized the CDC to implement health programs to eliminate childhood lead poisoning in the United States, state and local programs were established. The CLPPPs

are tasked with screening children from 12 months, up to age 6 for EBLLs and implementing program activities to reduce and mitigate childhood lead poisoning.\(^5\)

In 1997, CDC recommended that states use data to develop plans that will increase screening, and environmental and medical services for affected children.\(^6\) CDC’s state and local programs utilize data from surveillance systems to target high-risk children for interventions that reduce and prevent childhood lead poisoning, and unlike the national CDC report, state and local system programs report blood lead tests from laboratories to CDC on an annual basis for children ages 6 years and younger. High levels of lead are considered 10 micrograms of lead per deciliter (ug/dL) in the bloodstream; which is a confirmed elevated blood lead level (EBLL) according to the CDC guidelines. CDC traces children’s BLLs in the United States using the baseline data of NHANES and state and local surveillance reports. The state and the national NHANES data are needed to determine the disparity of lead exposure and elevated blood lead levels (EBLLs) in children among various populations and communities in the United States.\(^7\)

\(^4\) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, “Screening Young Children for Lead Poisoning: Guidance for State and Local Public Health Officials,” Screening is defined as a method, usually involving a physical examination or a laboratory test, to identify asymptomatic individuals as likely, or unlikely, to have a particular problem. BLL screening for lead poisoning is the routine measurement of BLLs in asymptomatic children. 1997.

\(^5\) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. [http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/about/program.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/about/program.htm) (accessed October 30, 2010).


Urban Areas and Childhood Lead Poisoning

Despite the ban of lead paint in 1978, lead-based paint that has deteriorated into paint chips and lead dust in a residence, reflected from older housing, continues to be the most common source of lead exposure to children. Most of this housing stock is located in urban areas where we find a concentration of black children, exposing low-income, populations at a disproportionate rate. In addition, soil and dust contamination contribute to exposure while these concentrations are also highest in central urban areas.\(^8\)

According to CDC state data, from 1997 to 2001, the known race or ethnicity for children with EBLLs (range: 74.3% in 1997 to 63.6% in 2001), were 17% non-Hispanic whites, 60%, non-Hispanic blacks, 16% Hispanic, and 70% were of other ethnicities. The majority of children with confirmed EBLLs were non-Hispanic black, for states that reported the race / ethnicity. Although EBLLs have decreased for each of these populations, black children maintain more than their share of childhood lead poisoning.\(^9\) Even more striking is the high incidence of EBLLs in Medicaid children, who were found to represent 60% of childhood lead poisoning between the years 1991-1994.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) Ibid.

CDC state data confirms EBLLs decreased 43% from 1998 to 2003 and decreased 54% from 2004 – 2008 (Figure 1). From 1991 to 2008, confirmed EBLLs for children ages 6 and under reduced from 27.57% to 0.86%.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Figure 3.1} Number of Children Tested for childhood lead poisoning and Confirmed EBLLs Nationally by Year and Percentage for Children < 72 Months Old\textsuperscript{12}

---

\textsuperscript{11} Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC’s Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. \url{http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/about/program.htm} (accessed October 30, 2010).

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
CDC has managed to decrease the prevalence of childhood lead poisoning for the nation. The incidence rate for this disease has taken a dramatic decline over the years. Unfortunately the health of the nation does not solely rest upon the decisions that could have a constructive impact in optimal health for all populations. The prevention of childhood lead poisoning may compete with the political dilemmas of the elected officials and the industry.

**Politicizing Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention**

Authorized by Congress, since the 1970s, the CDC has relied upon independent scientists and policy consultants, who are experts in the field to provide guidance on protecting the public’s health from a variety of toxic hazards. While the advisory committees do not possess the actual power to implement a policy, their role is important in regard to scientific knowledge and technical developments that prevent disease. The Advisory Committee on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (ACCLPP) advises and guides the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the Director of the CDC on implications for childhood lead poisoning prevention efforts, and recommends improvements on national efforts. The committee consists of 12 members, selected by the HHS Secretary, from authorities knowledgeable in the fields of pediatric lead screening and public health. The committee also represents non-voting federal representatives.\(^\text{13}\)\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{13}\) Ibid.

In 2002, the committee was prepared to begin discussions on stringent federal standards for lead poisoning, stricter than the standards that were recently set in 1991, where the threshold for lead exposure was reduced to 10 micrograms per deciliter. A few weeks before the committee's meeting, the George W. Bush administration interceded. For the first time for the committee, Tommy Thompson, former secretary of HHS, rejected the nominees selected by the CDC staff and appointed individuals who were closely tied to the lead and paint industry. These recommended nominees included an expert witness for the Sherwin-Williams paint company in a lead poisoning case and individuals with financial ties to the paint industry. Dr. Michael Weitzman, chief of pediatrics at the University of Rochester School of Medicine and executive director of the American Academy of Pediatrics Center for Child Health Research, a lead expert who had served for four years on the panel was dismissed by Secretary Thompson's office.\(^{15}\)

Democrats in the house at the time opposed the Bush administration nominees, arguing that these individuals share the industry’s position on the risks of lead paint, would more than likely oppose new regulations, and share the industry’s position on lead paint risks.\(^{16}\)

Although in 2000 the federal government estimated that a minimum of $2.4 billion would be needed to address lead paint hazards in housing, funding reductions were proposed by the Bush Administration in 2006. Former President Bush proposed $115 million dollars for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) lead hazard control and healthy homes program, below the $175 million appropriated in prior


years, out of a total HUD budget of over $30 billion. Officials stated that economic development programs needed consolidation to be more effective. A HUD survey of the nation’s housing stock (conducted in 2000) shows that the estimated number of homes with lead paint declined from 64 million in 1990 to 38 million in 2000, out of a total of 100 million houses. Low-income families with children under 6, the population most at risk, represented 1.6 million of these families and would be most affected by the cut.

The Bush administration made an effort to curtail the process in which appointments to the committee are traditionally conducted, and further the administration’s well-known political, anti-regulatory agenda. The effects of childhood lead poisoning are acknowledged by elected officials, and scientists. When committee members have direct ties with the industry, this has the potential to influence economic decisions that will impact Congress, while the health process becomes a political process, and the goals change. Families depend upon CDC officials to create the best recommendations and influence the regulation and policy that will keep them safe. Political processes guide decisions for the public; the social advantages may be defeated by the political economic agendas.

Housing plays a significant role to one’s health. The intersection of poverty and environmental hazards determine health outcomes and influence health disparities.

---


According to the 2009 Surgeon General’s Call to Action a healthy home is “sited, designed, built, renovated, and maintained in ways that support the health of residents.”\textsuperscript{20} Illnesses such as childhood lead poisoning, injuries, asthma, and other environmental disparities have been linked to more than 6 million substandard housing units nationwide. Residents of these units are also at an increased risk for other quality of life issues such as fire, rodent bites, and exposure to pesticide residues, indoor toxicants, tobacco smoke, and combustion gases.

The response of CDC appears to be appropriate in addressing childhood lead poisoning. CDC has examined the data, and extended recommendations into actions. However, childhood lead poisoning is entirely preventable. The disparity of childhood lead poisoning rests upon public health, social, and political issues. Residency in older housing and poverty continue to be high-risk factors for childhood lead poisoning. Although large declines in BLLs have shown, the risk for lead exposure remains disproportionately high for children who are poor, non-Hispanic blacks. The issue of lead poisoning exists within a large-scale of quality of life problems that remain a constant challenge for effected populations. Public health professionals must continue to challenge themselves to address and mitigate the etiology of disease. As CDC has transitioned to a holistic agenda, a comprehensive agenda that examines and addresses the source of the inequality and injustices, while creating partnerships from diverse sectors must be put into action.


Acknowledging and approaching the politics in a state can be a fundamental part of reducing and mitigating health disparities. Maintaining a status quo position in addressing the health problems of vulnerable populations does not serve justice to the agency, nor the individuals in need of public health care. A national federal law for rental and owner-occupied property owners to abate lead does not exist. The effectiveness of childhood lead poisoning prevention in the state depends upon several features of the state; the existence of a lead law and the political atmosphere are key elements.

The Georgia Lead Law

The Georgia Department of Human Resources, Division of Public Health (GDPH), Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP) was created to address lead poisoning in Georgia. In 1992 the program was awarded a five year grant from CDC. As a result of the awarded grant, the Lead Advisory Committee (LAC) was established. LAC consists of entities such as federal and state agencies, professional and private organizations, academic institutions, businesses, and individuals that focus on reducing and eliminating childhood lead poisoning. The program did not apply for another CDC grant from 1997-1999, reapplied for the grant in 2000, and currently the program is receiving CDC funding.21 Previous to 2008, the 1994 Georgia Lead Poisoning Prevention Act did not order property owners to abate lead hazards; with the

---

exception of property owners who owned buildings with 12 or more residential units. This exempted much of the housing in Georgia.\textsuperscript{22}

State laws are administered differently for childhood lead poisoning. The GACLPPP director in the past worked for the Kentucky childhood lead poisoning prevention program, which had very effective laws. When arriving to Georgia, he made it a priority in working to change the Georgia law. The current House Bill 1043 was passed by the Georgia State Legislature in 2008 and amended the Georgia Lead Poisoning Prevention Act. Changes to the existing legislation are statewide and give the GACLPPP authority to enforce lead hazard abatement throughout the state for rental property owners if a child is found with an EBLL at 20 (ug/dL) or more.

Although these recent changes have been made to the Georgia lead law, rules and procedures have been developed to detail the enforcement process for the Georgia Lead Law and are awaiting approval from the Georgia Department of Community Health Board. Penalties for violating the Georgia law are designed to reduce childhood lead poisoning and increase testing in Georgia. Property owners that do not abide by the Georgia lead law will be found to be in contempt of court; each case assessed and penalties disseminated at the discretion of the judge.\textsuperscript{23} The Georgia lead law did not pass without some debate. Advocates for the law included, but were not limited to various national medical academies, state Medicaid groups, HUD, the Georgia Head Start association, and community organizations. Those in opposition of the law included the Apartment Owners Association, and the Atlanta Landlord Association because of the

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.

costs to the rental property owner to abate lead from the properties, due to the lack of funds from the city.\textsuperscript{24}

\textit{Georgia Poverty and Childhood Lead Poisoning}

Medicaid children are at a high-risk for childhood lead poisoning and are required to be tested. All lead tests for children were not reported to the state before 2004, therefore previous testing before 2004 was very low. The number of children less than six years of age tested in Georgia has steadily increased; 43\% from 2005 to 2009. In 1998 there were 679,689 children under 6 years of age in the state, 49\% representing Medicaid children, 6.7\% tested for lead poisoning, and 7.9\% of those children were found to have elevated blood lead levels.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, for the state of Georgia in 1999, the percentage of individuals below the poverty level was 13.0%, with related children less than 6 years of age at 18.2%, compared to the U.S. poverty rate of 12.4%. In the year 2000, out of the 351,157 Medicaid children in Georgia, 7% were tested for lead, with 4% representing children with elevated blood lead levels.

---

25 Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program 2010.
In 2005 for Georgia, there were 830,197 children under the age of six, with 49% representing Medicaid children. In 2006, the poverty level for white families in the state of Georgia was 6.7%, compared to black families at 20.4%, and Hispanics at 20.5%. Female householders with no husband present below the poverty level represented 23.5% for whites, 35.3% for blacks, and 41.6% for Hispanics in Georgia. Children under 18 years of age below the poverty level, ranged from 16.6% – 20.2% between the years 2006-2008. For the state of Georgia in 2009, there were an estimated total of 900,000 children under six years of age, with 49% of those children representing Medicaid children.

The social and demographic characteristics described above are directly connected to the gap between childhood lead poisoning for poor children and the general population. The blight of poverty in Georgia is correlated to children who are most at risk for lead poisoning; Medicaid, black children, and those who reside in older housing. The reporting of EBLLs for the state of Georgia has increased through the years, but is still very low compared to the number of children in the state, and the number of Medicaid children. Although all tests were not reported to the state during previous years, assuming that many high-risk children were not tested would probably hold true by viewing the numbers. Judging from the language of the previous Georgia lead law the lead legislation was ineffective in reducing EBLLs for children. Opposing views of the current Georgia lead law from the Atlanta landlord and apartment associations were mainly due to economics. Economics have a vital role in the implementation of laws and regulations. The costs to the city or the state of implementing and enforcing the law are always closely examined. A law is only as good as the enforcement of the law. The city
of Savannah, Georgia upholds the Lead Poisoning Prevention legislation in the form a local ordinance.

The 1973 Lead Poisoning Ordinance for Savannah, Georgia

Even though Georgia has the authority to enforce lead hazard abatement, the city of Savannah, Georgia upholds the Lead Poisoning Prevention legislation in the form a local ordinance; the city of Savannah adopting the Georgia law will initiate and influence enforcement in Savannah.\(^{26}\) For years the city of Savannah has held the local authority to enforce the ordinance, but the city has not put this into effect. Savannah has one of the highest concentrations of pre-1978 residential housing in the state.\(^{27}\) The local legislation focuses on the presence of lead hazards and not of elevated blood lead levels in children caused by older housing. The strength of the ordinance is requiring the abatement of lead for all buildings that are covered by lead-based paint. The weaknesses of the local ordinance include the limitation to the city of Savannah, while county wide coverage would be more effective; lack of enforcement that will protect children who are lead poisoned; and the relaxation of landlords refusing to rent to families with children (unlike the state legislation) which makes them exempted from the ordinance targeted at child-occupied units.

Along with the recent changes made to the Georgia lead law, the GACLPPP director has made recommendations in the local legislation, by the state of Georgia to: (1) Broaden the jurisdiction of the ordinance to countywide; (2) Ensure adequate enforcement by adopting the state legislation but with a broader focus to all property.


including owner occupied properties; (3) Hold landlords accountable for the refusal of renting to families with children; (4) Follow state guidelines of one lead test at 20 μg/dL (micrograms per deciliter) for enforcement purposes; (5) Emphasize lead hazard reduction techniques over requiring total abatement as per HUD recommendations, and (6) Recommend all landlords to voluntarily participate in the newly designed compliance program to check for lead hazards in pre 1978 rental properties which would allow lead hazard reduction techniques to be used but with yearly monitoring of the property.\textsuperscript{28}

\textit{The Savannah Lead Ordinance and Anti-Poverty Initiative (See Ordinance in Appendix-)}

The Savannah lead ordinance was implemented in 1973, before lead-based paint was banned in 1978 by the federal government. The original language of the ordinance prohibits the use of applied lead paint to the exterior and interior surfaces in any facility or dwelling occupied or used by children (14 years of age or less). In 1973 the ordinance required a 15 day notice given to the owner or occupant to abate the lead, however additional time may be given at the discretion of the district director of public health. The District Director of Public Health is also directed to determine the presence of lead paint. The ordinance states that it prohibits the eviction of certain tenants in order to avoid corrections of hazardous conditions, but doesn't specify who 'certain tenants' are. Since 1976, the requirements of the lead ordinance have changed.

In the years 1976, 1981, and 1986 the ordinance deleted the language of prohibiting the eviction of certain tenants in order to avoid corrections of hazardous conditions; modified the 15 day notice issued to the owner of the occupancy to abate lead, to a 30 day notice given to the owner, and granted extra time by the district director.

\textsuperscript{28} State of Georgia Recommendations for Lead Legislation.
of public health if “good cause is shown” by the owner; allowed the district health
director to make his or her own determination of imminent hazards, by posting a notice of
violation and making a declaration that the building is unfit for occupancy that will
remain effective until the violation is abated.29

It is the responsibility of the District Health Director to post notices on the
buildings and notify rental property owners of their non-compliance when the ordinance
is violated. With or without a child in the house, the ordinance focuses on lead hazards
and not the health of the child.30 The federal government cannot change a city ordinance
if it is stricter than the federal statute. The economic development of a city has an
important role in policies and regulations of a city. The city councilman of Savannah has
the authority to amend the current lead ordinance and adopt the Georgia law, and the
mayor would have to approve the recommendations. The city of Savannah is not
currently receiving a HUD grant, therefore rental property owners would have to pay to
abate lead from their buildings.

that he would address the poverty issues in Savannah. He appointed Arthur A. Don
promised voters that he would address the poverty issues in Savannah. With the political
support from the mayor, Mendosa was able to lead the Savannah, Georgia Anti-Poverty
initiative in 1970. This on-going initiative has been in place well over 35 years. Initially


30 Ibid.

1 – July 30, 2010).
this project focused on eliminating the physical and quality of life disparities between poor African-American neighborhoods and other neighborhoods in the city. The agenda has developed over the years and still exists today. Elected city leaders have been able to expand the agenda from a city-led initiative originating from the city economic development department, into a community-wide initiative that includes city leaders out of government, community and business leaders, and public and private partnerships.32

The Savannah Poverty Reduction Initiative, originally housed in the city’s economic development department, is now staffed by the chamber of commerce. The leadership board includes the mayor, the chairman of the Chatham County Commission, the presidents of Savannah electric and economic development authority, the Savannah area chamber of commerce president, the United Way of Coastal Empire executive director, two neighborhood association members, and the superintendent of Savannah Chatham County Schools.33

Phases of the Anti-Poverty Initiative

The original 1970 poverty agenda was divided into three phases. City officials implemented the first phase in 1970, which focused on physical infrastructure improvements and general neighborhood revitalization for various dilapidated areas of the city. This included paving streets, improving drainage systems and infrastructure in inner-city neighborhoods for neglected and blighted communities resulting from a legacy

---


33 Ibid.
of residential segregation, and fixing dilapidated buildings.\textsuperscript{34} In 1974 Savannah initiated the Responsive Public Services Program (RPSP). The RPSP incorporates a citywide effort to survey conditions of the city, including but not limited to housing conditions, land use, street signs, and environmental safety such as flood hazards. This evaluation was developed by the International City Management Association. This evaluation was conducted on Savannah in 1974 to measure the effectiveness of the services provided to each neighborhood, examine areas with inefficient services, develop a plan to improve upon the services, and determine the resources needed. In 1976 among the recommendations disseminated for Savannah, realigning and reallocating funds for the city was a recommendation in order to clean up all neighborhoods where necessary. This same year, the ordinance was amended to delete the language of prohibiting the eviction of certain tenants in order to avoid corrections of hazardous conditions. If property owners were able to avoid renting to families with children, this could save the property owners money, and the city as well; leaving more money for other economical development projects within the city.\textsuperscript{35}

The second phase began in the late 1980s with social infrastructure, asset building, citizen empowerment and engagement, and public/private partnerships. The gaps in service and infrastructure between lower-income and middle-income neighborhoods were identified during the second phase of the initiative. The city manager was able to gain political support from the mayor after measuring these disparities, to fund a multi-year project to target infrastructure and service improvements.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.

to underserved neighborhoods. This became known as the Showcase Savannah Neighborhood Program to create focus on better neighborhoods, including dilapidated housing, and infrastructure.\(^{36}\) The steady poverty level for Savannah over a 30 year period\(^ {37}\) prompted the third phase of the initiative in 2004 to focus on economics and workforce development efforts.\(^ {38}\) In 1986 the City Manager submitted a briefing to the Savannah City Councilman’s office on a variety of issues in the city, including, meeting financial needs in the city for the future, housing needs of low-income families, the city’s role in economic development, and financial environmental services such as water and sewer needs.\(^ {39}\) The same year, the 1986 amendment to the lead ordinance allowed the district health director to make his or her own determination of imminent hazards, giving the director a choice on whether to post a notice of violation and make a declaration that the building is unfit.

The 2005 Poverty Action Reduction Plan was put together by the Savannah’s Anti-poverty Task Force and the University of Georgia's Initiative on Poverty and the Economy. The purpose of the report is to serve as a blueprint to reduce poverty and build economics in Savannah. The identical report is used for the 2010 Poverty Action Reduction Plan, adding the subtitle “Step Up Savannah.” The report consists of income growth in regard to poverty, social determinants of the disparity, recommended actions,

\(^{38}\) Ibid.
\(^{39}\) City of Savannah. City Manager’s Briefing. October 30, 1986.
and key points that include the disparity of race related to poverty, the lack of progress from the female head of household population, and the low educational attainment.\footnote{Savannah’s Poverty Reduction Initiative, U.S. Mayors, \url{http://stepupsavannah.org/}, \url{http://www.usmayors.org/CHHS/savannahpovertyplan.pdf}. (accessed July 1 - July 30, 2010).}

\textit{Chatham County Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program}

The childhood lead poisoning prevention program in Savannah, Georgia is responsible for testing children for lead poisoning, performing environmental investigations, and finding the source of the lead. In most cases, the child’s residence is the source of lead. The district public health director has the responsibility to provide the written notice to the owner of the property of violating the Savannah lead law. The childhood lead poisoning prevention program in Chatham County receives funding from the state of Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP) to provide health education, prevention strategies, and testing of children in Savannah.\footnote{Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program 2010.}

It was discovered that previous to 2004, the local childhood lead poisoning prevention program was not using lead funding from the state for any lead activities. Savannah received a HUD grant in the early 1990s; however the grant was dismissed by HUD early due to alleged misuse of funds and missing records according to HUD standards. The district environmental health director at the time was asked to step down from his position because of claims of stolen funds for his own personal use.\footnote{Confidential Interview, The Name of Interviewee is Withheld by Mutual Agreement, Savannah, Georgia. December 3, 2009.} The infrastructure of the health department has changed frequently for the department over
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the years. The staff has been very small and the limitation of funds has been challenging, but according to the past and present health directors, this hasn’t affected the work.\textsuperscript{43}

Although Savannah has some of the highest concentrations of pre-1978 housing in the state of Georgia, according to local records of the program, from fall of 2004 up to the summer of 2009 there were 18 home inspections completed for children (2-3 children housed) with elevated blood lead levels. Two inspections were for private homes and 16 were for rental properties. If additional environmental investigations were conducted, they were not recorded.\textsuperscript{44} In addition, within the last thirty years, only one rental property owner has been challenged for lead hazards in a building and he was able to win his case.\textsuperscript{45}

The Savannah lead ordinance has been in place since 1973, but has failed to enforce the law. The impetus for the lead ordinance derives from the Savannah Anti-Poverty Initiative and economic development goals of the city. The amendments made to the ordinance were a part of meeting the goals of the city. With a disregard for protecting children from environmental hazards, the ordinance became more relaxed as time progressed. The economic development in Savannah was shown to be a priority over the health of children. Unorganized HUD records and the blatant disregard for the Savannah ordinance from the district health directors demonstrate a lack of concern for affected

\textsuperscript{43} Chris Rustin, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 3, 2009.

\textsuperscript{44} Chatham County Health Department Regional Lead Coordinator, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 4, 2009.

\textsuperscript{45} Confidential Interview, The Name of Interviewee is Withheld by Mutual Agreement, Savannah, Georgia, December 3, 2009.
vulnerable populations. Based on the demographics of the city, Savannah certainly has quality of life challenges.

**Demographic Data of Savannah, Georgia**

The struggle for social and environmental justice is a continuous struggle. A significant element of environmental justice is to inform the work that addresses quality of life challenges, as a result of poverty. The demographic characteristics of Savannah have a direct connection to the social inequalities for low-income populations and are directly correlated to childhood lead poisoning.

There is a greater difference when comparing the state poverty level to the city of Savannah. From the U.S. census report of 1980 through 2000, the percentage of persons in poverty in Savannah has declined from 22.4% to 21.8%, compared to a decrease in Georgia, from 16.6% to 13%. White and Asian children are 5 times less likely to live in poverty compared to African American and Hispanic children in Chatham County. In 1999, 41% of children under the age of 18 were a part of impoverished families compared to 37% nationally. In 2000, for the city of Savannah, whites were 40% of the population and constituted 20% of the population in poverty, while African Americans were 58% of the population yet constituted 76% of the poverty level. Testing children for lead poisoning in Savannah steadily decreased between 1998 and 2003. In 1998 only 26% of Medicaid children were tested for childhood lead poisoning, and in 2003, 20% of the total Medicaid population was tested for childhood lead poisoning (Figure 3 and 4).46
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Fig. 3.3 Savannah, Georgia data report of Medicaid children 6 years of age and under tested for childhood lead poisoning and confirmed percentages of elevated blood lead levels nationally from 1998-2009. The full height of each bar (blue) represents the number of children tested for childhood lead poisoning, and total number of Medicaid children 6 years of age and under in the state (purple). The line graph (red) represent percentages of confirmed elevated blood lead levels 10 micrograms per deciliter, and confirmed elevated blood lead levels 20 micrograms per deciliter (green).
Figure 3.4 Savannah Region Surveillance Summary

Fig. 3.4 Savannah, Georgia data report of children 6 years of age and under tested for childhood lead poisoning and confirmed percentages of elevated blood lead levels nationally from 1998-2009. The full height of each bar (blue) represents the number of children tested for childhood lead poisoning, and the line graph (purple) represents percentages of confirmed elevated blood lead levels by year.

In 2004, with a total of 9,046 Medicaid children in Savannah 37% were tested for lead poisoning, while 52% of Medicaid children in 2007 were tested. Whereas the testing of Medicaid children has increased in recent years, the testing for this population still remains low; in 2008, almost half of the Medicaid children in Savannah were tested for lead poisoning at 42%. Poverty status estimates for Savannah, Georgia in 2006-2008 were 6.7% for white families, with 10.2% for female householders with no husband.
present; and 24.9% for black families, representing 40.9% of female householders. Estimates for Hispanic families are not available, however Hispanic individuals below the poverty level represented 27.8% of Savannah. Families in Savannah for the same time period below the poverty level constituted 36.7% of families receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and/or cash public assistance income, with 44.0% of those families representing female householders. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of householders below the poverty level in Savannah held less than a high-school diploma, while individuals below the poverty level represented 30.3% of those without a diploma. Savannah families with 3 or 4 children represented 44.1% of the poverty level, while 20.2% were represented by families with 1 or 2 children. Single mothers represented 68.5% of those in poverty with 3 or 4 children and mothers with 1 or 2 children represented 34% of the poverty ratio.\(^{48}\)

In Chatham County, estimates for the 2005-2007 census survey report a poverty rate of 4.2% for whites, 20.7% for blacks, and 15.3% for Hispanic families. Female householders represented 15.1% of the poverty level for whites, 36.9% of the poverty level for blacks, and 35.3% for Hispanic women. Families in Chatham County for the same time period below the poverty level constituted 26.6% of families receiving Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and/or cash public assistance income, with 35.0% of those families representing female householders. The individuals that did not hold a high-school graduate diploma represented 30.0% of families in poverty, and 54.9% of female householders. The representation of single mothers below the poverty level was 31.6% for those with 1 or 2 children, 58.1% for those with 3 or 4 children, and 100% for those with 5 or more children. For the same time period, the unemployment rate for

\(^{48}\) Ibid.
whites were 3.4%, blacks at 8.1%, and Hispanics at 4.2%. Public transportation included a rate of 9.5% for whites, 86.3% for blacks, and 2.7% for Hispanics.\textsuperscript{49}

Low income populations often do not own cars and are limited to public transportation, which may or may not be available. The 2000 U.S. census bureau reports that 30% of Savannah’s residents did not own a vehicle, compared to 8% of Georgia residents and 10% nationally in the U.S.\textsuperscript{50} Estimates for the 2006-2008 census survey, report 9.3% of whites used public transportation, while blacks used 85.4% of transportation and Hispanics at a 3.3%. Unemployment rates for this time period were 3.1% for whites and 6.7% for blacks.\textsuperscript{51}

Education in the black community has been a significant concern for Savannah. According to a local Savannah publication, in 2008 black males made up 65% of the male student population and constituted 85% of the suspensions. Many in the black community believe the low test scores, coupled with the high dropout rates, and incarceration rates, demonstrate the adverse effect of excessive suspensions for young black men. In 2009, youth advocates accompanied by Mayor Otis Johnson and social service representatives, communicated to public school representatives that the procedures are hurting the students, not advancing the students.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.

The issue of childhood lead poisoning cannot be separated from poverty, and the unfortunate rate of social inequalities in Savannah is more than troubling. The low rate of education, coupled with quality of life challenges such as transportation and unemployment, all have a layering effect with childhood lead poisoning in Savannah. The priorities of the community may compete with the political power and agendas of the city. Many times the economics and business priorities attribute to impoverished outcomes and negative health consequences.

Political Power and Community Priorities

The scope of the debate in Savannah has been limited to economics. Approaching the subject may be different to each entity, but the dialogue is almost identical. When the Anti-poverty initiative started in 2004 the faith-based community and Savannah school leaders were not a part of the larger initiative. Leaders in these organizations believed race was a huge element that had not been addressed. Although, there exist a disproportionate rate of poverty based upon race and ethnicity, this aspect of the issue has not been publicly discussed often by political leaders, until the 2005 version of the Poverty Reduction initiative was released. Since the release of the Poverty Reduction initiative, Savannah has developed a platform in the city to discuss various issues that impact the community.

The Hungry Club Forum of Savannah, (HCFS) Inc. was created to provide a public forum for education, economics, and cultural issues to advance and enrich the community. The club meets once a month over breakfast. Members of the club include community leaders, politicians, and educators. The goal of the club is to identify
strategies and solutions to ongoing issues in Savannah. Founded in 2006, the forum is modeled after the former Atlanta forum from previous decades ago. The forum provides an opportunity for the community and its partners of various organizations to exchange ideas and create solutions for Savannah.53

In 2009, the forum launched “The Covenant with Black Savannah”; a community-wide development initiative modeled after Tavis Smiley’s book “The Covenant with Black America.” Among the ten covenants to be studied for The Covenant with Black Savannah are: Chapter (1) Securing the Right to Health Care and Well Being; Chapter (2) Establishing a system of Public Education in which all children Achieve at High Levels and Reach their full potential; Chapter (3) Correcting the System of Unequal Justice; Chapter (4) Fostering Accountable Community Policing; Chapter (5) Educational Leaders for Change Collaborative; Chapter (6) Reclaiming Our Democracy; Chapter (7) Correcting the system of Injustice (8) Accessing good jobs, wealth and economic prosperity; Chapter (9) Assuring Environmental Justice For All; and Chapter (10) Closing the Racial digital divide.54 Although the Covenant with Black Savannah looks at various issues and ways to approach change, the meetings seem to focus on economics and the lack of power in the community.55
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Political Power in Savannah

While in office in 2003, Floyd Adams, the former first black mayor of Savannah, publicly complained, as reported by the Savannah Morning News, about the lack of power the mayor holds in Savannah. Adams sought a city charter change twice that would give his office more control over department heads and the city manager in Savannah, Georgia; Adams stated “The city manager has too much power - this is nothing against Michael Brown (present city manager at the time) or anyone else. It’s just that the base of the power should be in the elected officials.” Adams proposed additional power, such as supervising the city government, as oppose to limited administrative authority. Susan Weiner, Adams predecessor challenged the city for more power as well.\(^{56}\)

Savannah homicides were high when former mayor Adams entered the mayoral office. Adams opening speech concentrated on crime, unemployment, and economic vitality for the city. Within the ten minute speech of Savannah’s new mayor, the economy dominated the speech most. Adams didn’t speak on too many race issues, as he stated in a local speech that he is the mayor of ‘everyone’, not just the black community. Even though many complained about Adam’s tactics in his performance of mayoral duties, and a few formal complaints from employees were filed, he served two-terms as mayor and sought a third term to the mayor’s office.\(^{57}\)

Mayor Otis Johnson, who’s been Savannah’s mayor since 2004, has been a fundamental part of the anti-poverty initiative and is currently on the executive board of
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the initiative. The anti-poverty initiative and equity agenda has shown a top-down orientation, where the community has weighed in indirectly after the decisions have been made. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs have been the main source of funding for improving the physical infrastructure of Savannah’s blight communities. Much of the funding within the last few years was generated through the Chatham County Special Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) and various grants for the city. In 1987 after the city of Savannah was awarded a $10 million dollar grant, the Savannah Youth Futures Authority (YFA) program was established. The YFA focused on the city’s poorest neighborhoods and built community-based support that included a family resource center for a wide range of health and social services. For the 2007 YFA community profile publication, the issues of concern were education, unemployment, and juvenile crime. Health issues were limited to low birth weight, teen pregnancy, and infant mortality. Members of the YFA organization include politicians, doctors, community leaders, and child advocates.\textsuperscript{58}

The Non-issue of Childhood Lead Poisoning

The District Health Director has a responsibility to assure rental property owners are aware of the Savannah lead ordinance, and building notices are sent to property owners for non-compliance. According to sources of the environmental health department, notices sent to rental property owners have been very limited and only one rental property owner has been taken to court for non-compliance of the Savannah lead ordinance. The ordinance hasn’t been enforced nor has an attempt been made for modification, until recently. The lack of action from Savannah authorities disseminate a

\textsuperscript{58} Chatham-Savannah Youth Futures Authority. \url{http://www.youthfutures.com/}, (accessed March 15, 2010).
lack of protection and further the disparity of childhood lead poisoning for poor children in Savannah.

When elected officials were asked if they would support the ordinance in Savannah, although the city doesn’t have a HUD grant currently, 50% of the elected officials stated they would support it and the other elected officials stated that they would keep an open mind if the resources were there to support the ordinance (money for property owners). A couple of elected officials did not directly answer the question.

When asked what the political obstacles were in modifying the ordinance where property owners would comply by enforcement, all of the elected officials’ responses included the costs to the businesses and the city; property owners complaining of the unfunded mandate; and the idea of public officials not wanting to displease their constituents, in turn an economic rivalry could take place. With the exception of one elected official, all were aware of the health effects of childhood lead poisoning and the negative impact of the disease. ⁵⁹

The environmental health department in Savannah have a responsibility to health educate the public and assure children are tested for lead poisoning, especially children most at risk, African-American, low-income, Medicaid children. Environmental health directors and the current nurse for the childhood lead poisoning prevention program in Savannah did not view the past infrastructure changes (changes in directors) in the health department as a barrier on the activities of the childhood lead poisoning prevention program for the public. ⁶⁰ According to documentation of the Youth Futures Authority

(YFA), the Chatham County health department has partnered with this organization for years, but currently there is no partnership in place with the childhood lead poisoning prevention program in Savannah. The YMCA director also currently partners with the health department on other health issues, with the exception childhood lead poisoning. The health department partnering with community-based organizations also presents opportunities for additional strategies and dialogue exchanges on mitigating the disease.\textsuperscript{61} The low testing rates of Savannah do not help advance the enforcement needed to support the appropriate policy that has the potential to reduce and mitigate childhood lead poisoning in Savannah.

The issue of childhood lead poisoning has been a ‘non-issue’ for Savannah. Most of the dialogue from politicians in Savannah is restricted to a discussion of economics. To say economics is significant for a city to flourish is an understatement; however, the limited dialogue in Savannah on childhood lead poisoning is more wounding than beneficial to the impoverished families. The community has spoken out on several issues of concern, but most of the leadership comes from politicians. When concerns such as education and crime are voiced by the community, the interchange of discussion is directed back to economics.\textsuperscript{62} When former Mayor Adams frequently spoke on bringing more businesses to the Savannah community, the discussion is centered on advancing the economic vitality for Savannah, which may lead local community members to think this will directly affect or reduce their poverty levels. When education is discussed in the

\textsuperscript{60} Environmental Health Directors / Nurse. Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 3, 2009.

\textsuperscript{61} YMCA, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. November 19, 2009.

\textsuperscript{62} Hungry Club Forum Meeting, Observation of LaToria Whitehead, 2009.
Hungry Club Forum, community members address concerns of educational extracurricular activities for the young black males, which are guided back to the discussion of funding.  

There are several reasons that the childhood lead poisoning rates has not been made an issue in Savannah. Although all of the elected officials interviewed were aware of the negative consequences of childhood lead poisoning, and the disproportion between black children and their counterparts, economics seem to be a political obstacle and one of the undergirding factors of enforcing this 1973 lead ordinance. The city manager of Savannah seems to have a great influence on decisions for the city, although he doesn’t have to approve the requested changes to the lead ordinance, he influences the law. Many community members may be totally unaware of childhood lead poisoning and are oblivious to the effect on the child’s life. Although the ordinance in Savannah has been in place since 1973, if no one is holding the city responsible to enforce the ordinance, how do community members present the problem to politicians?

The concentration of poverty in Savannah has led the discussion of economics throughout the years and while health has been discussed, it’s been partial to the status quo issues of teen pregnancy and low birth weights. There is a top-down orientation on how most decisions are made for the city. The community weighs in on the discussion after politicians have set the agenda, with the exception of community leaders who may have an ongoing relationship with politicians in the city. The political atmosphere of Savannah takes a direct effect on the lack of discussion around childhood lead poisoning.

Organizations such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice have been viable in the community on various quality of life issues. Dr. Mildred McClain, executive director
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for the CFEJ is the chair of the “Environmental Justice for All” covenant section. She has presented the issue of childhood lead poisoning to the Hungry Club Forum. This forum has the potential to lead to dialogue on lead poisoning coupled with the issue of poverty. Partnering with community organizations that are entrusted and have longstanding relationships with the community, and are educated on various quality of life concerns has the potential for change in Savannah.
CHAPTER IV
HARAMBEE HOUSE INC.
THE CITIZENS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The research presented in this chapter will expound on the activities demonstrated by grassroots organizations to achieve environmental justice for vulnerable populations. The chapter illustrates the current projects for the Citizens for Environmental Justice, specific accomplishments for the organization, their relationships with local citizens, political representatives, and their relationship with CDC and other federal agencies. The literature displays the connection that grassroots organizations have with the community, and the potential advantages for the federal government when partnering with these organizations, while attempting to accomplish justice for underserved populations. The elements of the strategies utilized to achieve the goals of CFEJ, as well as the mission and vision of the federal government are described. Discussions of the nuance between the government and grassroots organizations objectives are included in the chapter.

This chapter informs the current case study by examining the relationships CFEJ has developed with elected officials and community residents in Savannah, Georgia and the importance of these relationships in regard to the current partnership with CDC. The chapter also examines the current partnership with CDC in addressing childhood lead poisoning for children in Savannah.
History of Organization

Grassroots organizations have worked for democracy for many years. Representing populations without a voice, these organizations have been a conduit for disenfranchised groups on various quality of life issues. The power of these organizations is more than notable, and an important voice to vulnerable populations achieving equity. The leaders of these organizations have stood for justice on a variety of quality of life issues for people-of-color, and continue to emphasize the undergirding themes that influence inequitable outcomes. Dr. Mildred McClain is one of many grassroots organization leaders that have guided these organizations. Dr. McClain has been a human rights activist for over 40 years, and started the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) to address environmental issues in the community. The reasons for the establishment of CFEJ are best stated by McClain:

“Citizens for Environmental Justice was started back …..the seeds were planted in 1990. By 1991, we had begun to organize ourselves as a small focus group primarily because when I returned to Savannah there was a middle class subdivision called Weather Wood that had been built on contaminated soil that contained methane gas…. how could we as residents in this area not be engaged with what was going on ………. that was the catalyst that said to us that there was very serious environmental issues in the south, the southeast, in Georgia but more importantly there was some serious environmental justice issues; because if they would allow a white middle class neighborhood to be built on contaminated soil, then what would they allow to happen to marginalized and disenfranchised communities like the African Americans here in Savannah? So we decided to organize the group. That’s how we started. Those were the two issues that catapulted (to drive or push) us.”

Originally from Savannah, Dr. McClain resided in Boston for over 30 years while earning her degrees from Harvard Graduate School of Education, and came back to
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Savannah after completing her doctorate. Dr. McClain felt that it was her responsibility to return and work for the community.

"...my intent was always to come back. I never saw myself not living in Savannah. It did take longer than I had anticipated (living in Boston and finishing school), but my goal (coming back to Savannah) ... being reared in the public schools, in segregated public schools of Savannah, was a great asset because the teachers really invested in the students...... We were privy to that, so one of the undergirding factors was that when you become educated, and when you become experienced, it is your responsibility to come back to your community, to come back to your roots to give back ......that's the cycle of building community; is the community sends certain people out to get the skills and the knowledge and they're responsibility is to come back and (teach the others).....But it's also a fundamental value of the Environmental Justice movement that whole central building capacity, coming back to the community and giving back to your community."2

Located in Savannah, Georgia, CFEJ is a nonprofit community-based organization founded in 1991 to create a healthier environment and promote environmental justice for the Savannah population. The organization serves communities at the local, state, regional, national, and international level. CFEJ has a goal to build capacity support for marginalized communities to address social, economic, and environmental issues, through environmental education and training. The organization believes that empowering the community is built on engagement in environmental decision-making and partnering with local, state, and federal government, academic institutions, civic and community organizations, and elected officials. CFEJ deems this as a vital component in meeting the needs of the community. According to CFEJ, creating a system of collaboration through community and capacity building, and citizen participation for policy decisions has the potential and is an essential component to
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environmental and social change for marginalized groups. The organization has an objective that focuses on environmental leadership through the community and youth development, and works to educate the community on environmental hazards and multiple pathways of exposures.

From the beginning, the staff started off with two employees, Dr. McClain and one other person, who volunteered with a local mainstream environmental organization that delegated a grant to them. The staff currently consists of eight employees and volunteers, including Dr. McClain. The staff consists of a worker education and job training (WEJTP) program developer/lead awareness program coordinator, a WEJTP assistant, a black youth leadership development coordinator, a physical education and wellness consultant, a resource development and program consultant, and an administrative assistant. During the course of time that CFEJ has worked, the goals have been set to accomplish multiple objectives for the community.

**Accomplishments and Objectives**

What is generally found with environmental justice organizations is an initial single-issue focus that develops into a multi-issue agenda for the community over time.
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Employing diverse tactics and strategies that challenge inequitable decisions impacting vulnerable populations, is a component of accomplishing environmental and social justice objectives. CFEJ has set an objective of building healthy communities, homes, schools, and people, while partnering with human rights activists in the U.S. and internationally. The organization supports groups such as youth, college students, parents, residents, health professionals, and entrepreneurs to achieve this endeavor. Providing technical assistance to public policy makers, elected officials, and industry leaders, while mobilizing residents to take action against environmental injustices is a method CFEJ uses to achieve environmental equity for local residents.7

The origin of CFEJ began with a sentiment of moral obligation to the community, which is parallel to the starting point of numerous environmental justice organizations nationally. CFEJ has expressed a sense of responsibility to populations that are uninformed on how to advocate or feel they have a strong voice in the community. When communities can understand and decipher the issues that have an impact on them, they are better equipped to empower themselves to challenge injustices. Strategies have been put in place by the organization to educate community members, policy makers, local politicians, and federal government agencies that build the capacity to create innovative solutions to environmental issues. This tactic is a reflection of bringing environmental justice to the population at hand. The perseverance of CFEJ has resulted


in what the group deems as successful outcomes and an accomplishment within itself. The projects that the group has initiated speak to an assortment of environmental justice issues the community encounters.

CFEJ's expansion of work around environmental justice includes workforce development, educating the community on research methods to study health topics, such as relationships between exposure to environmental pollutants and dysfunctional behavior, and building long-term partnerships with federal government agencies around environmental justice. Preparing the community with a skill set that is action oriented to meet the needs of the community, is considered an accomplishment to the organization.8 A common critical accomplishment with grassroots organizations is maintaining a lengthy existence. CFEJ considers this a success, in addition to, sustaining environmental justice, transitioning into a national organization with some international focus, engaging residents in multiple environmental areas, and initiating community recommendations for environmental justice.

Current Projects

CFEJ was awarded an Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem-Solving (EJ CPS) grant from years 2004-2006, from the Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Under this grant, the organization created a comprehensive action plan for the Hudson Hill community in Savannah and documented the community's history and concerns on the environment. CFEJ eventually expanded this work to the Woodville community in Savannah, developing the Savannah Community Environmental
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Collaborative. This work was an introduction to the Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) grant awarded from EPA.

The Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) is a competitive grant program offered by EPA. The goal of the CARE Program is to reduce exposures to toxic pollutants for the community by providing financial and technical assistance to the grantee. CFEJ was awarded a CARE Level I grant in 2006 (2006-2008). The objective of the CARE Level I grant was to engage the citizens of the Hudson Hill and Woodville communities in risk assessment activities and create a broad stakeholder partnership. A component of the CARE program is to assist communities in creating partnerships to address these environmental issues. There are two levels over a two-year period of funding and activities required for CARE grantees. The expectations of the EPA program include the grantee building capacity by forming partnerships with various entities, identifying the problems and solutions in the community, and implementing the solutions while reducing risks to maintain the environmental work, while empowering the community. A successful completion of Level I is not required for an organization to be granted a level two award.9

Hudson Hill and Woodville communities conveyed their concerns of environmental toxins to CFEJ. During the time of the grant the Hudson Hill and Woodville neighborhoods consisted of 1600 people, 97% of whom were people-of-color, and 76% of the residents lived below the poverty level. The neighborhoods were surrounded by 17 chemical industries and the Savannah River front; therefore toxic

pollutants were a primary concern for these citizens of Savannah. Long standing practices such as gardening, were discontinued due to the air quality and concerns regarding toxic chemicals. With the expansion of Bay Street in Savannah, two concerns were raised; increased traffic and the increased diesel fuel.

Through the CARE Level I grant, CFEJ developed and conducted a risk assessment in both neighborhoods while including citizens in the process. The Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Registry (ATSDR) obtained data conducted from two health consultations on the potential risks within these two communities. The project allowed CFEJ to create a broad partnership with stakeholders, such as elected officials, government agencies, residents, business representatives, and industry to create solutions for the environmental problems in the area. The organization was provided with tools such as the Geographical Information System (GIS) technique for the communities to identify environmental health data in the disparate neighborhoods, and residents were hired as community coordinators to organize meetings.

In 2008, CFEJ received a National Environmental Justice Achievement award from the EPA as a result of the outcomes from the CARE grant. This award is based on excellence in partnerships that address local environmental justice concerns, with positive health impacts for the community and awarded a CARE Level II grant in 2009. The CARE Level II grant focused on mobilizing local resources, utilizing voluntary programs to conduct risk reduction activities, building long-term community capacity, including, present and past partnerships, and integrating other projects into the grant. With the goal of creating a self-sustaining community, and solutions that address the environmental
hazards and reduce environmental risks, CFEJ and the residents partnered with scientific experts, academicians, and elected officials. CFEJ considered working with local elected officials an important part of the process, and had the potential of allowing the community’s voice to be heard. Mayor Otis Johnson of Savannah, Georgia committed to assist in identifying public funding, as a result of the work of CFEJ, to address lead abatement for housing, improvement in community drainage systems, and address the impact of increased traffic. Additional resources to support solutions for the environmental issues in Savannah were secured by CFEJ, from the mayor, a city councilman, a city alderman, the Chatham County Commissioner, and a U.S. Congressman.

A community-based participatory project to conduct the community health surveys and convey the data to the residents was initiated during the period of the CARE project. For the duration of the project, CFEJ established a Resource Development Team to develop proposals and projects to influence additional technical and financial resources to assist the community in reducing environmental hazards. As a result, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded CFEJ a $225,000 three-year grant to conduct community-based participatory research.10

Research is utilized by CFEJ to prioritize and evaluate the tasks of the organization. Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is a promotion of collaborating scientific researchers and members of the community to design interventions that target underserved and racial /ethnic minorities to reduce health

disparities. "Tools for Change" is a project designed to engage the Savannah community in CBPR. The project is funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in collaboration with the Southeast Community Research Center (SCRC), the Research Center on Health Disparities (RCHD) at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, and CFEJ. After CFEJ was awarded the three-year grant from W.K. Kellogg, an Elected Officials Media Briefing was held to communicate the goals and significance of the project. As violence and a high crime rate have been the leading causes of death for African American males in Savannah according to CFEJ, the objective for this project is to examine the relationship of violence and exposure to environmental hazards in Savannah. Information is provided to the public on environmental hazards and their effect on the community. CFEJ considers the efforts of CBPR a significant element to achieving environmental objectives.

CFEJ has constructed joint mechanisms for youth, adults, parents, and community-based organizations collaboratively for training and employment in the environmental field. The Worker Education and Job Training Program (WEJTP) is funded by the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) in collaboration with the Environmental Justice Resource Center at Clark Atlanta University, the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice at Dillard University, and CFEJ. Local Savannah government, businesses, contractors, and industries support


employment opportunities for the program’s trainees. In 2006, CFEJ initiated the program to provide adult men and women environmental remediation training to gain skills to obtain employment. The training program provides basic and technical skills for environmental remediation to youth and young adults. Certifications in basic construction, Hazardous Materials Safety (HazMat), lead abatement, mold remediation, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and asbestos removal have been earned by the graduates. The Black Youth Leadership Development Institute (BYLDI) was created to educate and build youth in becoming environmental leaders, while raising their awareness of environmental health problems. The BYLDI training is conducted in three phases, consisting of environmental education, public policy, and an international phase that focus on environmental issues and projects. BYLDI has been in existence for 21 years.\textsuperscript{13}

The projects that are lead by CFEJ focus on improving the lives of underserved populations, while training potential leaders of the future to address environmental injustices. Environmental justice is overarching; therefore it is almost impossible to speak of one issue, without speaking of another. It can be difficult to speak of optimal environmental health, without speaking of accessible amenities such as sidewalks and grocery stores with fresh fruits and vegetables, transportation access, policy initiatives that assist disparate populations, future leadership to influence environmental policy, and scientific research participation from the community to address environmental hazards. CFEJ has focused on all of these elements that are instrumental to health, while building local relationships in the city. The power of these organizations can greatly depend upon

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
their influence in the community and the connection with political representatives in the city. The political relationships that are established by grassroots organizations can determine the success of the group’s endeavors. The organization has gained support from political figures in Savannah on a number of environmental initiatives.

**Relationship with the Savannah community and City Representatives**

CFEJ has established an ongoing relationship with local leaders and city representatives in Savannah, which have assisted in creating environmental justice initiatives to address the needs of vulnerable populations. CFEJ has included industry leaders and elected officials in meetings designed to inform the representatives of concerns from the community.

Local politicians and community leaders have worked with CFEJ collaboratively to create solutions for various populations in Savannah. According to these leaders, CFEJ has made an impact in the city. Mayor Otis Johnson has known Dr. McClain for 20 years and has worked with her on several projects; according to him and other political representatives, her methods have been effective on raising the awareness of environmental justice topics and the community is very receptive to her; “She’s a very charismatic person, and she has been able to organize a good group of supporters and that’s why it’s successful.”

Savannah’s assistant city manager has worked on a range of initiatives with CFEJ, and believes the projects have been “successful, filled with energy, well-attended, and also very receptive from people”. The group’s ability to

---

continuously convey critical issues has been considered to have made a major impact for the city, according to city representatives.\textsuperscript{15} The former first black mayor, Floyd Adams, has been a part of several meetings, along with other politicians, hosted by CFEJ that focused on bringing resolution to issues in the city. While CFEJ has managed to maintain relationships with the politicians, they have been able to keep the community’s issues on the agenda; “She doesn’t get involved in politics, but she’s well-connected....people know who she is; we’ve agreed and disagreed on projects, but overall the organization has done an excellent job of bringing messages to the community.”\textsuperscript{16} The local district 2 senator works with CFEJ closely and has known of their existence throughout his political career. The senator has assisted CFEJ in several meetings conveying the importance of the local lead ordinance and the requested changes from the state.\textsuperscript{17}

Community leaders in Savannah view CFEJ as a steadfast advocate for residents and the main voice for the local community; they have completed a number of projects with CFEJ; “What they teach is invaluable, as far as educating the youth on leadership and advocacy for the community.... I couldn’t imagine where my organization would be without the group raising these issues.”\textsuperscript{18} These community leaders and educators in Savannah also identify CFEJ as a highly respected organization in the community,

\textsuperscript{15}Assistant City Manager for Savannah, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 5, 2010.


\textsuperscript{17}Senator Lester Jackson, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. November 18, 2009.

\textsuperscript{18}Director of Youth Authority, interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 3, 2009.
assisting them on a variety of issues; while 20 years ago Dr. McClain was known as “the crazy lady” when she spoke of environmental hazards impacting poor communities, currently the community participates in the activities that are lead by CFEJ. A Head Start director recalls years ago when young men were expelled for a food fight and placed in jail until a local pastor volunteered to be responsible for the high school level boys. The school informed the pastor that the ten boys would not be able to graduate. McClain volunteered to teach the boys for 6 months of the school year. If they were able to keep their records good during that time, they would be allowed back in school and able to graduate. Five of the young men received scholarships for college.\textsuperscript{19}

According to local politicians, CFEJ has kept environmental justice issues on the forefront and on the radar in Savannah. The local politicians feel that keeping the issues on the radar and focusing on target populations keeps the group successful in communicating messages to impacted neighborhoods. CFEJ is known to use tactics such as placing local residents on committees, knocking on resident doors, and persistently reiterating the issues until action has taken place, to keep the interest of the communities who are impacted. Meetings that are hosted by CFEJ take place in the houses of residents.\textsuperscript{20}

Individuals, who view CFEJ as accepted by neighborhood residents, speak to the tactics developed that maintain the interest of the residents. When individuals are able to understand how environmental issues impact their lives personally, it creates a reality for


\textsuperscript{20}Clifton Jones and James Holmes, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 14, 2009.
the individual that may transition dialogue into action. Grassroots organizations have been able to craft and maintain relationships with local politicians to create solutions for underserved populations, seeking democracy in the process, while corresponding the community findings to government agencies, and generating multiple pathways to partner. These emerging partnerships have the potential to create a level of trust for the organization from the community. Given the historical lack of trust of the federal government from the black community and other communities of color, trusted grassroots organizations create beneficial outcomes that accomplish goals of the federal government agency and meet the needs of the underserved population. The power that reputable, community-based organizations have should be invaluable to government agencies. This power represents an accessible and confiding partnership between non-governmental organizations and the community; an improbable connection the federal government agency will ever achieve.

"....I think we’ve grown in the trust and the respect because we’ve been doing this for 20 years, raising the same issue, and now they’ve finally got it. And they talk about it in public...you know they didn’t know what we were talking about 20 years ago but so thankful that we stayed on the case. Of course the trust level changes. As communities become more empowered and as they began to get more access to resources, sometimes that mentality that we can get sometimes that when you’re just at the point of getting what you want, you revert back into that suspicious, untrusting frame of mind because you know that’s just how it is....overall I think our reputation across the country is a pretty good one."21

The Goals of CFEJ and the Goals of CDC

CFEJ has a value statement, a vision statement, and a mission statement to represent the organization’s goals, objectives, and the platform in how the group operates

holistically. The group’s vision statement includes the practice and value of African history, culture, human rights, and environmental justice; empowering community residents to speak in their own voice and engage in the public policy process while the community is engaged in creating and sustaining economic activities that are green, and sustainable so families may live, work, and play in communities free of environmental hazards.22 The goals of CFEJ are determined in a number of different ways. Focus groups are formed in different sectors of the community where issues are identified and considered, if they are equivalent to CFEJ’s overall mission and vision; this is determined from the CFEJ board and staff. The mission and the vision of the organization has remained the same, modifying and shaping it by the needs of the community, while using the mission as a guiding tool to determine which issues to tackle. Residents and organizations are welcome to come to CFEJ and voice the environmental challenges they are experiencing. CFEJ provides technical assistance and technical support to diverse entities. Based on the individual or group needs, and CFEJ’s ability to respond to that need, the request may be a short-term objective. A comprehensive, strategic planning process allows the organization to review, analyze and adjust the mission and vision as needed and periodically.23

CFEJ’s mission is adjusted according to what the political area is, within the economic context of the national and international arena. According to the organization, the consistent focus is to create healthy, safe, clean, sustainable communities.


Occasionally one area is focused on more than the other, depending on the state of the national Environmental Justice movement and the current state of the world, the national atmosphere. As the social context of the work shifts, so does CFEJ. The fundamental goal is to ensure environmental justice for all, a goal that never changes for the organization.24

As most federal agencies do, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) also has a vision, mission, value, and pledge statement. The 21st Century vision for the agency is “Health Protection...Health Equity.” Within CDC’s vision and mission of the agency, collaborating and providing tools that communities need to protect the health of people, while working with partners throughout the nation is also included. In the most recent years, CDC has centered on healthy communities, and everything that encompasses a healthy individual, such as a healthy home and a healthy environment.25 CDC / ATSDR does not have a special focus on achieving environmental justice for all, an important part of healthy communities.

CFEJ has a goal to achieve environmental justice for all communities; partnering with federal government agencies is a fundamental component of this agenda. While federal government agencies have their mechanism of collaboration with organizations outside of the agency, the objectives may appear to align, but the end goal is different. When grassroots organizations fashion themselves to achieve democracy, optimal health, and human and civil rights for marginalized populations, the strategies are diverse;

24 Ibid.

however this is the end goal, the purpose, and the continued vision for most of these organizations. While federal agencies such as CDC have a mission to promote and protect health, protecting underserved populations is not included in CDC’s mission, vision, values, or pledge statements. “Health protection....Health equity” would appear to examine and address these disparate foreseen issues; however this is a remote assumption based on CDC’s supporting principals to achieve healthy communities; this is more reason for federal government agencies to partner with grassroots organizations who have developed a rapport with many communities and have the ability to articulate their challenges.

Relationship with CDC and other federal government agencies

For years, CFEJ has partnered with federal government agencies such as, EPA, the Department of Energy (DOE), and the CDC /ATSDR with the goals of addressing public health inequities and achieving environmental justice. The organization currently maintains partnerships with each agency. The evidence of a long-term commitment from federal government agencies for community-based organizations to continue and maintain the work has not been shown. Within the context of this position, if the federal government had a long-term commitment to NGOs and grassroots organizations there would be a direct funding mechanism set; the organizations would be included in the decision-making processes from the beginning; and the partnerships of these organizations with state, local departments, and academic institutions would be required.
Since 2007, CFEJ has partnered with the Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention branch. The purpose of the project is to provide a strategic design to address and advance local legislation in Savannah, cultivate childhood lead poisoning prevention education and awareness for hard-to-reach populations, and increase the testing of lead in children, while building the capacity to develop environmental solutions to the concerns and issues of Savannah residents. CFEJ has a contract with CDC, and not a grant award. The Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning prevention branch awards state and local childhood lead poisoning prevention programs, and not community-based organizations directly. This partnership is the first time the CDC branch has partnered with an environmental justice organization directly through a funded contract (See Contract in Appendix -).  

The partnership of CDC and CFEJ has the potential to be successful due to the goals of CDC and CFEJ in helping the community reduce and mitigate childhood lead poisoning. CFEJ has utilized resources from CDC to educate low-income, at-risk populations on childhood lead poisoning, increase lead testing for children six and under at a higher risk for lead poisoning, and influence policy change for the Savannah Lead Law. CFEJ has guided and participated in prior projects with the populations at risk, and know many of the residents. They are able to communicate with the neighborhood residents more frequently than CDC is able to; therefore they have a greater chance increasing the lead testing of the children, and educating the residents more on childhood lead poisoning. In turn, CFEJ also has the ability to voice and examine other

---

environmental concerns of the residents while conducting the CDC lead project to the elected officials, including the recommended changes from the state on the Savannah lead ordinance.

**Relationship with Federal Agencies**

Grassroots organizations have been partnering with federal government agencies for many years. The positives may lead to great outcomes and the negatives can be major barriers for the organizations. Major barriers for NGOs funded by federal agencies can include the bureaucracy, rigid protocols and policies, and demanding reporting mechanisms. This greatly hinders the work of the organization to accomplish the tasks given by the federal government agency. Although certain federal government agencies address environmental justice issues, many staff members are not trained on these issues, or trained on working with environmental justice communities.

"How you all (federal government agencies) work is evident, science-based driven. You don't value an intimate relationship with community. You work from your cubicles. You don't work across cubicles, so you're in your little silos doing your little thing, and you don't want to come out and have that personal interaction and listen to the voice of the community, because often the federal staff members describe the voice of the community as irate, too passionate, too emotional."27

Staff members of federal government agencies can lack a cultural competence for the communities and be culturally insensitive. Organizations such as CFEJ feel that this may result in a cultural clash for some communities; such as indigenous populations who practice specific customs, and cultures; and Spanish-speaking communities who are limited to the Spanish language. Grassroots organizations may view the federal

---

government as unappreciative of the different cultures and lack the requisite to understand. Training and education in environmental justice would be more than a benefit for the agencies, but should be required.

Funding state and academic entities directly while giving them the choice to fund or not to fund NGOs is another barrier for these organizations; regarding academic and other institutions as having a prepared infrastructure, this results in stringent protocols for NGOs. Grassroots organizations are more than often under funded by federal government agencies, but are still expected to perform an excellent job as the task calls for by the agency. These organizations are left without a choice, but to perform the work at the best of their ability, working with the resources given. The work may start off with a level of anxiety, when funds are minimal to perform a quality job once the organization has committed to resolving the issues for the community.

In contrast, CFEJ recognizes that federal government agencies bring a skill set to the organization and the community that is needed. Risk assessments, data analysis, and other scientific expertise influence and encourage the organizations to have an even better scientific understanding to articulate various problems, creating strategies that mitigate these issues. McClain has been delighted to work with individuals within the agency that are community driven, and have assisted in sustaining positive relationships with the NGO and the federal agency.28

The origin of CFEJ derives from a sense of responsibility to the community. During the 20 years this NGO has worked, the interaction that the organization has established with the community and city officials in Savannah have been significant to

28 Ibid.
their accomplishments achieved. The projects the group has taken on speak to the needs of the community and are proactive in achieving an optimal quality of life for vulnerable populations. Relationships with the community that are developed by grassroots organizations are invaluable to educating, creating awareness, and delivering environmental services to marginalized populations. When these organizations create and maintain a connection with political representatives and the local community, this has the potential to produce strategies that meet the needs of the community. The influence of a community group to gain the trust of local residents is very powerful. A trusted, on the ground relationship is an experience federal government agencies will never be able to achieve with the community. An understanding of the everyday challenges these communities undergo can be difficult to comprehend for federal agencies. Agencies may think they recognize and empathize the challenges of the community, but may only be able to conceive these things. When an organization has knowledge of the political conditions of the city, this has the potential to influence positive outcomes for the population at hand.

Moreover, this knowledge saves the government time in attempting to uncover the political atmosphere of the city or state, and government agencies have an advantage in partnering with grassroots organizations. This partnership provides a path in developing a relationship with the community that has the potential to achieve environmental justice and democracy.
CHAPTER V

DATA RESULTS

The methodology utilized for this research is a multi-method, descriptive, explanatory, case study. This chapter provides data results from multiple sources of evidence to address each research question. The data converged within the study includes the documentation reports of CFEJ based on the CDC contract requirements, test score differences between the experimental and control group participants, in addition to their political and social justice views; qualitative interviews, and observations of the author.

The documentation reports of CFEJ required from CDC, describe the techniques used by CFEJ to influence modification and enforcement of the 1973 Savannah lead ordinance; the educational events described demonstrate the techniques used by CFEJ to educate, bring awareness, and increase lead testing within the high-risk areas of Savannah, while also guiding the experimental group in a series of educational events that test their knowledge before and after the intervention. The qualitative data describes the relationship CFEJ has with specific community members and leaders, elected officials, and the awareness of the CDC lead campaign conducted by the organization. The observations of the author informs the research by recording local events and the receptiveness of the community to CFEJ, and successful and unsuccessful techniques employed during the events. The qualitative data in the study examines the barriers to
enforcing the 1973 Savannah lead ordinance in the perspective of the elected officials and a broader range of historical issues regarding the ordinance; including the quality of life challenges within the city of Savannah. These methods advance the research by presenting a broad range of evidence to answer the research questions.

CDC Contract Requirements (Appendix H-1)

For the first time, the CDC Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch partnered with an environmental justice organization to modify policy and increase testing and education of childhood lead poisoning. CDC contracted out the services of CFEJ from May 2008 – June 2009, and August 2009 – September 2010. The first year contract focused on education, outreach, awareness, and increased lead testing of children in Savannah. The contract also required the organization to conduct meetings with elected officials and other appropriate stakeholders to create awareness and strategic plans to encourage the modification of the Savannah lead ordinance. The second year contract focused more on policy. CFEJ was required to lead and attend political meetings throughout Savannah to advance prior policy strategies, and continue to encourage communication of the enforcement and modification of the Savannah lead ordinance. The second year contract also required CFEJ to continue conducting education, outreach, awareness, and increased lead testing in Savannah. CFEJ are required to conduct evaluations for all events both years of the contract. The CFEJ contract is written by the CDC project officer, and the events are a compromise between the project officer and Dr. McClain, the director of CFEJ. Each year of the contract, three members of CFEJ are
paid out of the contract, and a 10% fee is given to the contracting company who issues the checks and monitors the budget.

Policy

CFEJ were required to conduct various meetings with local Savannah, Georgia elected officials during the first and second year contract, and attend local Hungry Club Forum meetings. Meetings were lead and attended by the organization over a two year period, including presentations to various stakeholders and organizations within Savannah, and Atlanta. During this two year period CFEJ conducted meetings with the city manager, assistant city manager, Georgia state senator, county commissioner, city councilman, and the mayor of Savannah. In addition to meeting with the elected officials, CFEJ also met with the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus; the state of Georgia Legislation Assembly in Atlanta; presented the requested policy modifications on Savannah Day (a legislative invite for Savannah residents to speak with state legislators in Atlanta) and several local Hungry Club Forum meetings; and presented at the Healthy Savannah initiative. The SMART WALK is an annual event CFEJ conducts to communicate awareness of environmental issues. Senator Lester Jackson delivered a kick-off speech about the lead campaign and the awareness of the issue. Over the two year contract period CFEJ conducted 23 policy meetings with various elected officials and stakeholders. Elected officials are now aware of the requested changes for the Savannah lead ordinance and CFEJ has established a Political Lead Task Force for the city of Savannah. The Political Lead Task Force was created to discuss and implement
strategies to modify the Savannah lead ordinance which include public officials, community leaders, community members, and business owners in Savannah. Meetings are held on a monthly basis and the first meeting was called by the assistant city manager in December 2010.

*Education, Awareness, Lead Testing*

The two year contract tasked CFEJ with increasing education, awareness, outreach, and childhood lead testing to reduce the effects of ongoing lead exposure for children ages 1-5 years of age. The goal of the outreach events were to increase testing of lead in children and provide community outreach by informing and creating awareness, while also testing the children. The train-the-trainer modules provides education on childhood lead poisoning for community members and leaders, daycare teachers/workers, heads of neighborhood associations, real estate associations, educators, realtors, landlords, parents, and other stakeholders, while identifying additional trainers to continue the training. CFEJ was also required to create local newsletters that inform political representatives and community members on the progress on the requested changes for the Savannah lead law. Attending Healthy Homes conferences to train the organization on current health and housing issues, was also required by CDC.

The first year contract required CFEJ to conduct 5-7 train-the-trainer sessions; identify 15-20 trainers that would continue the training; create a module for the local trainings; conduct 6 community outreach events where children would be tested for lead poisoning; coordinate with Health Providers in Savannah to provide awareness for the
Pediatric community; and develop an evaluation model for all activities with the assistance of the CDC project officer who oversees the contract. CFEJ conducted 6 outreach events; 5 train-the-trainer sessions, with a total of 200 participants; identified 10 trainers to continue the training; created two PSA media announcements for the lead campaign; created a partnership with the Economic Opportunity Authority (EOC) Head Start center and the Savannah College of Arts and Design (SCAD) who created and held poster sessions for the lead campaign, and had at least 332 children tested.

The second year contract required CFEJ to conduct 2 community outreach events to test children for lead poisoning; conduct 3 train-the-trainer sessions; identify trainers that would continue the training; create 2 local newsletters, and attend 2 Healthy Homes conferences. According to the progress reports for CFEJ during the second year contract with CDC, the organization conducted 4 outreach events; 5 train-the-trainer sessions, including one for policy makers; identified 12 trainers to continue the training, while also training workers on lead abatement in the city, created 2 newsletters, and attended 2 Healthy Homes conferences. CFEJ established partnerships with the Youth Future Authority of Savannah, the Healthy Savannah initiative, and Parents United Against Lead.

Results

Participants were recruited from the EOC Head Start center in Savannah, Georgia. Informed consent was obtained from all parents who participated in the intervention and responded to a questionnaire about their general knowledge of childhood
lead poisoning. Demographic information and the individual's perspective on local social justice, and environmental issues, were also collected from the participants in the knowledge assessment. Head Start parent participants were divided into two groups, an experimental group and a control group.

**Descriptive Statistics (Table 5.1)**

For the purpose of the statistical analysis, education was coded into 5 groups: Less than high school, GED completion, some high school, High school Diploma, and College. For those who indicated their educational level, the mean education level for Group 1 and Group 2 was an attainment of a high school diploma. For the race/ethnicity category 98% of the participants were African-American, 1% White, and 1% indicated African-American and Hispanic mixed. Housing age was pooled into two categories for this analysis, housing built before 1978 and after 1978. For those who indicated their housing age, 35.6% of the participants had houses built before 1978 and 64.4% of the participants lived in houses built after 1978. Participants also listed their total number of children and their birthdates. The mean number of children for parents of Group 1 was 2.41 and 2.25 for Group 2; a mean of 2 children for each group.
### Table 5.1: Demographic Characteristics and Test Scores for Groups 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics and Test Scores</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Experimental Group and Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>Group One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18 (20.0%)</td>
<td>16 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td>2 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25 (27.8%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17 (18.9%)</td>
<td>6 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14 (15.6%)</td>
<td>10 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>2 (3.1%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED Completion</td>
<td>8 (12.3%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>20 (30.8%)</td>
<td>9 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>34 (52.3%)</td>
<td>15 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1978</td>
<td>16 (35.6%)</td>
<td>11 (47.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1978</td>
<td>29 (64.4%)</td>
<td>12 (52.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Child</td>
<td>30 (34.5%)</td>
<td>12 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Children</td>
<td>22 (25.3)</td>
<td>12 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Children</td>
<td>18 (20.7%)</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Children</td>
<td>12 (13.8%)</td>
<td>6 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Children</td>
<td>4 (4.6%)</td>
<td>2 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Children</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 represents demographic characteristics and test scores for the experimental and control group (various participants did not fill out all of the information on the questionnaires).

1 Experimental group indicates the intervention group that participated in educational events with CFEJ.

2 Control group indicates group that did not participate in educational events with CFEJ.

3 Test Scores for each group ranging from 0-100%.

4 Education level for each group ranging from less than high school to any level of college.

5 Housing age of each participant categorized by housing built before 1978 and housing built after 1978.

6 Number of kids for each participant ranging from 1 - 6 children.
The total number of parents who responded to the questionnaire was 100 out of 400 total parents (25% response rate). The questionnaire collected information on the race and education of the parent, housing age, number of children and birthdates, their general knowledge of childhood lead poisoning prevention and the participant's outlook on local environmental and social justice issues.

**Experimental group #1**

Group 1 participated in four educational events on childhood lead poisoning during a 6 month period with CFEJ and the Chatham County Health Department, including the presentation on childhood lead poisoning prevention the day the test was given. Food was given for every event, with the exception of event one. The second education event consisted of an October fall festival where the parents of group 1 were required to attend with children, listen to various presentations on childhood lead poisoning, and have children tested for lead the same day, or sign children up for a lead test on a future date where children would be tested at their school. For educational event 3, parents were in a classroom setting among teachers and daycare workers for a train-the-trainer session on childhood lead poisoning prevention. The duration of the training was four hours, parents were given breakfast and lunch, and a cash incentive was given to the 40 parents. Daycare was also provided for the children. The last educational event took place in a classroom setting consisting of various educational presentations on childhood lead poisoning. Each participant was given a $10.00 Wal-Mart gift certificate for participation in completing each educational event that was provided by CDC. After
the participants completed educational events, the second questionnaire, knowledge / behavioral test, was taken by group 1.

**Control group #2**

Group 2 consisted of fifty Head Start parents who did not participate in any educational events given by CFEJ. Group 2 Head Start parents were recruited from the same Head start center as Group 1 and completed the identical second questionnaire, knowledge / behavioral test, while bringing and picking up children from school. Group 2 completed the questionnaire in the lobby of the school, with an assistant available for any questions while children were tested for lead poisoning at school.

**Group #3**

The GACLPPP director extracted 100 lead tests for Group 3 within the same age group and demographic location in Savannah, Georgia as groups 1 and 2, to serve as a baseline group. No demographic or contact information was taken from the group. Group 3 did not participate in any educational activities and had no contact with CFEJ for the study. The children for Group 3 were not Head Start children.

**Statistical Analysis**

The experimental and control groups completed an identical knowledge / behavioral test, test#2. The average test score for the experimental group, group 1, was 47.00% and 58.80% for group 2, the control group. Out of all three groups (190 lead
tests), there were four elevated blood lead levels (EBLLs) found; group 1, with one EBLL, and group 3 with 3 EBLLs. The number of EBLLs was not large enough to determine an association between the knowledge of the parents, and EBLLs, therefore an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical procedure was performed for only 2 groups; groups 1 and 2, the experimental and control groups.

**ANOVA**

The dependent variable consisted of the scores for each group and the independent variable consisted of group assignment. Test for statistical significance was conducted at the .05 p-value level of significance. The differences and variability between the mean test score of each group were not found to be statistically different. *(P = .124).*

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

A Kruskal-Wallis statistical procedure was also performed to determine whether there were differences in the mean test scores between the groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test was performed as a backup of the ANOVA. This test does not assume normal distribution, while the ANOVA does assume normal distribution. The conclusion is the same as that reached by the analysis of variance test.

**Experimental Group Paired Sample T-test**

A paired sample T-test was performed for group 1 to examine the differences between tests taken before the intervention and the test taken after the intervention. The differences between the pre and post test scores were not found to be statistically
significant at a .5% probability level ($P = .078$). The mean score for Test #1 was 63.12%, this test was taken before the intervention; and 47.00% for Test #2, which was taken after the intervention.

**Environmental and Social Justice Views of groups**

The first questionnaire taken by the experimental group on the general knowledge of childhood lead poisoning prevention was assessed through the use of five questions. Participants were also asked “What can the public and parents do to reduce blood lead levels?” The open-ended question was categorized into: (a) “Have child tested for lead,” (b) “Lead paint tested on house /Removal of lead /Remediation,” and (c) “Performing hygiene / health activities,” Seventeen percent (17%) of the participants responded (b) “Lead paint tested on house /Removal of lead /Remediation,” 15% responded (a) “Have child tested for lead”, .075% responded (c) “Performing hygiene / health activities”, and .025% responded “Beware of Lead.”

The second questionnaire taken by the experimental group asked participants if they agreed, disagreed, were not aware, or had no opinion of the community’s safety from most environmental hazards including lead; 60% of the participants responded; 12.5% agreed, 75% disagreed, and 12.5% stated that they didn’t know. Sixty percent (60%) of the participants responded to question 7, “I feel that the public officials and politicians in my community have represented the community well on social justice issues, including the health of the community,” 17% agreed, 50% disagreed, 29% answered don’t know, and 4% didn’t have an opinion.
Ninety-six (96%) of the control group participants responded to questions 6 and 7 for questionnaire 2. When participants were asked if they agreed, disagreed, didn’t know, or had no opinion of the statement “I feel that my community is safe from most environmental hazards including lead,” 4% of the participants agreed, 25% disagreed, 23% didn’t know, and 12% had no opinion. Thirty-three (33%) of the participants agreed, 20% disagreed, 31% didn’t know, and 16% had no opinion when responding to the statement “I feel that the public officials and politicians in my community have represented the community well on social justice issues, including the health of the community.”

Qualitative Interviews

There were 25 one-on-one interviews conducted for the case study analysis to determine the knowledge base of the interviewees on topics related to CFEJ, the relaxation of the lead ordinance and political obstacles of enforcement, awareness of childhood lead poisoning, and the challenging quality of life issues in Savannah. A series of questions were asked of each population. Most interview questions are specific to the respondent’s responsibilities and others are general to the city of Savannah. All interview questions are found in the Appendix K.

Twenty-four (24) of the interview participants resided in Savannah, Georgia during the time of the interview. Participants included members of CFEJ, community leaders and elected and appointed officials of Savannah, community residents who have resided in Savannah for more than 50 years, local health department employees, and
Peggy Shepard, executive director for WE ACT; a historical environmental justice community-based organization located in New York. The snow-ball sampling technique was utilized to interview long-standing community members, after observations of a local community meeting and interviewing one community member.
Table 5.2: Demographic Characteristics for Qualitative Interviews in Savannah Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Representatives and the Director of Housing Authority</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>78% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant City Manager</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former first black mayor</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Mayor</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>78% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commissioner Chairman</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commissioner</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Councilman</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Housing Authority</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Department Employees</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Health Director</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham County Environmental Health Director / 2007-2009</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham County Environmental Health Director / 1990s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GACLPPP Director</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>83% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Poisoning Prevention Control Nurse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Chatham County Environmental Health Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Chatham County Youth Authority</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>67% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of YMCA</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Head Start school</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit community developer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Residents</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident for 30 years</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident for 58 years</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ)</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>% of Race and Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of CFEJ</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>100% Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33% Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Shepard / WE ACT Director</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67% Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Demographic characteristics collected on 25 interviews
Awareness of Childhood Lead Poisoning in Savannah

One of the general questions asked was whether the respondents were aware that childhood lead poisoning was a health issue in Savannah. Among the officials, 88% responded ‘yes’, and knew of the health effects, and 13% indicated that they were somewhat aware of the health issue, while a few of the elected officials felt that the issue had been resolved in the past. For example, the director of the Savannah housing authority thought that lead poisoning had been resolved when the Federal lead law was enacted. When the director came in contact with Dr. McClain she learned that the problem continues to exist. When officials gave their viewpoint on the general population’s awareness of childhood lead poisoning fifty percent (50%) of the officials didn’t think the general population had knowledge of childhood lead poisoning, in addition, elected officials stated that no public announcements had been made about childhood lead poisoning in the city. Thirty-seven (37%) of the elected officials thought that there was a fair amount of knowledge in the general population, while 13% of the elected officials thought that the general knowledge of the population was due to specific abatement projects in the past. Two elected officials indicated that the awareness of the issue had not been present for many years until the recent lead campaign conducted by CFEJ; however, fifty percent (50%) of the community residents interviewed were not aware of the issue of childhood lead poisoning, while the other 50% were aware due to information disseminated from the city.
Awareness of CFEJ

Most interviewees were familiar with CFEJ and their work in the city of Savannah. Seventy-five (75%) of the elected officials have successfully worked with CFEJ on local environmental issues, such as the placement of power plant and chemical industries in local neighborhoods, clean water for the residents, the Savannah lead ordinance, and the communication of health risks to the general population; while 25% of the elected officials had never worked with CFEJ because of their individual time limitations. The director of the housing authority wasn’t aware of the group. Sixty-two percent (62%) of the elected officials also thought that CFEJ made an impact in the city by keeping the public aware of the environmental issues, and forming community meetings and committees. As a result of CFEJ’s techniques, the officials who were aware of the lead campaign, thought that the campaign was effective. One respondent noted that CFEJ was only effective in certain areas in Savannah by distributing literature, and consistently communicating.

While fifty percent (50%) of the community leaders reported good outcomes while working with CFEJ on health and job training projects, the other 50% of community leaders who were interviewed had not worked with CFEJ. The director of the Chatham County youth futures authority stated that his experience with CFEJ brought a greater presence on the health issues for residents in specific neighborhoods. This specific project gave residents a sense of advocacy and a voice that was hopeful in local politicians and community leaders hearing their concerns. Of community leader respondents who indicated they worked with CFEJ, 25% stated they were unsure of how
effective the group is in Savannah, and the remaining 25% were unaware if the group had
been effective or not; although one community leader felt that CFEJ had a positive
impact on low-income residents by raising their awareness on various issues, challenging
environmental hazards over the years, and teaching residents to challenge environmental
injustices.

Awareness of the Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Campaign

Respondents were asked of their awareness of the childhood lead poisoning
prevention campaign lead by CFEJ. While 75% of the community leaders were aware of
the lead campaign, and 25% of the community leaders were not, 25% of those who were
aware of the campaign were unsure of the message.

None of the residents were aware of the lead campaign lead by CFEJ. Sixty-two
percent (62%) of the elected officials thought that the community was receptive of CFEJ,
but the lack of resources made a difference in how broad of a public audience the
organization could reach. For example, one elected official noted that not enough had
gone into the campaign, while another thought that the group needed more funding and
resources to make the environmental campaigns city and county wide. One elected
official was unsure if CFEJ had made an impact in the city or not.

Sixty-six (66%) of the Chatham County health department employees thought that
the community was receptive of the activities CFEJ conducts, and 16% had not witnessed
the community engaging with CFEJ, therefore had no knowledge. The Chatham County
employees expressed gratitude for the group for bringing significant issues to the
forefront of the community. For example, the GACLPPP director was very appreciative of CFEJ and expressed that his organization would not have been able to deliver the education or awareness in Savannah without the group (18% of the participants response was inaudible and could not record).

For community leaders, 25% of the respondents felt that the community was somewhat receptive of the activities that CFEJ conducts; 25% noted that the audiences may not understand the information because of the lack of education; where another 25% felt that the public was very receptive of CFEJ; in addition the remaining respondents stated that CFEJ has to attract the community, with an incentive first to gain their attention, due to individuals struggling to meet every day needs.

Savannah Environmental Health Employees

The Chatham County employees and the GACLPPP director were asked additional questions in regard to the response of the health department to childhood lead poisoning, and their knowledge of CFEJ. One of the general questions asked was whether the environmental health department had conducted enough health education or awareness on childhood lead poisoning. Fifty percent (50%) of the respondents thought that health education had been conducted in the past, and minimal education for the city was done from 2000 until 2006. Sixteen percent (16%) of the respondents thought that childhood lead poisoning education is conducted quite frequently; while 17% stated that health education is conducted on a weekly basis.
Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the Chatham County employees were aware of past HUD funding for the city of Savannah, and 33% were not aware. Respondents had a different understanding of the outcome of the past HUD funding. A previous environmental health director believed the HUD grant made an improvement with eliminating lead hazards in the community, while another past director believed the funds just went away due to program issues between the city of Savannah and the health department. From what the GACLPPP director recalls, the city of Savannah was reprimanded for the lack of reporting to HUD. Respondents also thought that the lack of coordination and misuse of funds in the past was a disservice to the department. For example, respondents could recall the health department partnering with the city of Savannah on a HUD grant in the 90s; however 17% of the respondents asserted that there was no coordination and a fragmentation in the past, with 3 different lead programs not utilizing funds for childhood lead poisoning prevention.

The most current environmental health directors were asked if any organizational issues within the health department affect educating the public on childhood lead poisoning prevention. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the directors did not think the infrastructure of the department hindered educating the public on childhood lead poisoning, while another 33% thought that the department was fairly active on the issue. The district health director felt that the ability of the department to conduct the activities was not a problem, but the main obstacle was the interest of the public.
Political Obstacles in modifying the 1973 Savannah Lead Ordinance

Elected officials were asked of the political obstacles to changing the 1973 lead ordinance, if the requested law would pass in the political arena, and reasons of the lack of enforcement. All of the elected officials stated that funding would be the political obstacle in changing the ordinance. Reasons stated were the costs to the businesses and the city, the complaining of property owners of the unfunded mandate, and the economic rivalry for those involved, such as the business community and public officials. For example, one elected official stated that public officials would not want to pass it off to their constituents. Twenty-five (25%) of the officials thought the ordinance would pass, while other elected officials noted that it should be pursued, but enforcing it would be a problem. The former mayor was doubtful that the ordinance would ever pass due to economic matters in the city, while the current mayor stated that he wouldn’t be able to speak on the requested changes, because they were not presented to his office. Fifty-percent (50%) of the elected officials said they would support the ordinance without current HUD funding, with property owners paying for the abatement. Economics seem to be the dilemma for the remaining elected officials supporting the ordinance. For example the assistant-city manager stated that she would be open-minded with funding available, while the county commissioner chairman would also support the lead ordinance if the resources were available. Sixty-two (62%) of the elected officials stated that no previous changes had been made to the lead ordinance; 25% were not aware of any changes; and 13% didn’t answer the question.
Lack of Enforcement on the Savannah Lead Ordinance

Interviewees were given an abbreviated history of childhood lead poisoning, including the progress and the population this disease impacts at a disproportionate rate, African-American children. After the interviewees were given this information, another general question posed to the respondents were whether they thought that part of the reason the ordinance had not been changed or enforced, and the health disparity of childhood lead poisoning had not been made an issue in Savannah was due to the population it effects, majority black children.

Thirty-seven percent (37.5%) of the elected officials didn't think that the population made a difference, but interestingly enough, 12% of the elected officials and the director of the housing authority had no doubt that race was definitely an issue; the director of the housing authority stated that authorities who control the changes and demonstrate the lack of action for the ordinance don't relate to the problem, because it doesn't impact their lives.

Thirty-three (33%) of the Chatham County employees responded yes, when asked if the population affected the most, had any impact on the lack of enforcement of the ordinance; 33% responded no, the population did not make a difference in the lack of enforcement to the ordinance; 17% of the respondents were not sure, while the remaining 17% hoped that this was not the case. One of the past Chatham County environmental directors stated that there was a need for public health professionals to educate politicians and the community to demonstrate the urgency of the issue; he also added that CFEJ is useful in advocating for the community.
One hundred percent (100%) of the community leaders believed that the population it affects, majority black children, had an impact on the lack of enforcement of the ordinance. Respondents seem to think that modifications of the ordinance would have been made if the health problem would have impacted the counterparts of black children. For example, the head start director stated that the ordinance issues would have been resolved, while the YMCA director expressed felt that communities of color never get the response they need. Fifty percent (50%) of the community residents agreed the disproportionate rate of childhood lead poisoning on African-American children in Savannah impacted the lack of changes in the ordinance, and that racism plays a substantial part in the decisions made for the city. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of residents stated that race did not play a role in the decision; money was the dilemma. The members of CFEJ agreed with the majority of the respondents, stating that Black children are seen as an expendable, and a politically powerless population. Members of CFEJ also stated that they believe the Assistant City Manager’s office and the city is committed to finding resources to assist property owners in abating lead in Savannah, although they still believed that funding will be an ongoing issue.

CFEJ and CDC

Members of the Citizens for Environmental Justice were interviewed to gain knowledge on their goals compared to CDC’s goals; the techniques used to communicate between the federal government and the community; conducting projects and activities for the community; and the lead law. All members of CFEJ stated their goals were in
align with CDC goals in that part of their mission is to create healthy communities, increasing the level of awareness to environmental hazards, modifying policy to prevent environmental disparities, and engaging parents specifically to prevent childhood lead poisoning. The organization also added that they are planning to create a national lead campaign for childhood lead poisoning prevention.

One general question posed to the organization was the types of tactics CFEJ utilizes to communicate between the federal government and the community to gain the trust of the community. Tactics included community dinners and luncheons, public meetings, and meetings held at the residences of the community. These tactics are used to communicate between the local community and the federal government. While raising the same issues within the community, CFEJ members stated that the community’s trust and respect has grown for the group within the 20 years that the group has been advocating.

Members of CFEJ noted that after they have gotten the community’s perspective on the issue at hand, they will speak for the community when they are given permission. According to the organization, everything is community-driven and the group believes they are a tool utilized to communicate those issues, while the neighborhood drives the process of those issues.

Quality of life issues for the Savannah population

When respondents were asked to rank health on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest) compared to other quality of life issues for the Savannah population and the
issues that rank ahead of health, 62% of the elected officials thought that health ranked high on a scale from 1-10, and 38% of the officials ranked health at a 6 or 7. Due to many other challenging quality of life issues the Savannah population is faced with, one of the respondents added that health wasn’t very high on the scale. For example, 100% of the officials ranked economics and employment as the number one issue for the population because of the poverty challenges in the city, while members of CFEJ listed better air quality, mitigating health disparities, and education as significant needs of the community.

Education seem to be thought of by the respondents as a vital need in Savannah; 100% of the community residents agreed that education and access to healthcare were critical needs for the community, just as 100% of the community leaders agreed that education was a desperate need for Savannah. In addition, community leaders felt that the lack of education in the African-American community specifically, has resulted in negative consequences. For example, the director of the Chatham County youth authority communicated that the increase in juvenile crime, teen pregnancy, and unemployment were due to the lack of education, while the YMCA director expressed that holistic education is needed for the community to gain life skills, adding that Savannah is a racially divided city. Housing, jobs, accessibility to fresh foods and medical care, transportation, safety, and a business plan to accomplish the needs of the residents came to thought as well for the community leaders. The head start director was able to provide her perspective on the key quality of life needs for Head Start families. Economics was stated as the major challenge due to many of the families being under or unemployed.
The director also expressed that the families want the same thing as other families do, the best for their children; witnessing hyperactive behavior of many of the children, she believes this behavior may be correlated with childhood lead poisoning.

**Changes in Savannah**

Community leaders identified negative and positive changes in the city of Savannah as elected officials prioritizing specific neighborhoods to address significant quality of life issues; green space, parks, sustainability, and accessibility has been an important topic of discussion. Another positive change noted was the reduction of chemical plant companies, and more accessibility to fresh fruits and vegetables, in addition to regulation for hazardous waste sites. A decrease in jobs has been a negative impact for the city, and the lack of techniques to communicate significant matters to the public were also noted. Chemical plant companies, excessive trash, and challenges of clean air and water were and sometimes remain as environmental issues for the city of Savannah according to the community leaders.

According to 50% of the community resident respondents, many of the Savannah residents lost their homes and moved away due to the increase of gentrification; however many properties had also been restored. Positive environmental changes stated by the residents included properly running water, clean neighborhoods, and more discussions of clean air.
Observations

Observations were taken from the local Savannah Hungry Club Forum Meeting on September 12, 2009. The goal of the club is to identify strategies and solutions to ongoing issues in Savannah. In 2009, the forum launched “The Covenant with Black Savannah”; a community-wide development initiative modeled after Tavis Smiley’s book “The Covenant in Black America”. CFEJ was scheduled to present that day, but there presentation was rescheduled for a later date. The Hungry Club agenda on this day was Covenant II, “Establishing A System of Public Education in Which All Children Achieve At High Levels and Reach Their Full Potential”, and Covenant V, “Educational Leaders for Change Collaborative.” The meeting took place at a building behind a Head Start center. That morning, I signed in at the front desk and sat in the back of the room.

Although education was the agenda for this day, housing and economic opportunities were emphasized and first on the agenda. Elected officials attending were Pete Liakakis, the county commission chairman, and Floyd Adams, the former first black mayor. There were two presentations that took place. The first presentation emphasized issues and opportunities of economic development, transportation, jobs, housing, and black entrepreneurship. Community Land Trust, a community-based non-profit organization conducted a presentation and disseminated information on access to land, and affordable housing opportunities in conjunction with Land Banks. The audience was invited to join the bank with a $100.00 annual membership fee. Floyd Adams, the city’s former mayor spoke about the need for economic development around Savannah, Georgia. There were no questions or comments from the audience on affordable housing or economic
opportunities. The presenter gave her contact information out to the audience and sat down.

The next presentation was given by Dr. Philip Cooper Jr., the executive director of 'Parent University', a grassroots organization that started in 1998 with a goal of attributing to the educational success of children. There were many parents in the audience that brought their children to the meeting with them. At least five different parents stood and made comments about the failing public school system in Savannah, Georgia. Parents complained of the lack of time the teachers were taking with the students, the cruel discipline measures, and made comments of black teachers as the majority teachers in the school system with too many children in one class. Another parent complained of her boys getting suspended for unwarranted reasons. The parents stated that they wanted to address the school superintendent. It was announced that the school superintendent came to the meeting that morning, but left early. The parents were very angry and stated they wanted to write letters to the superintendent. Dr. Patricia Harris, a local doctor, made statements of the importance of the children's mental and physical health, and the gap between black children and their counterparts because of health disparities. Dr. Harris announced that she would stay after the meeting and give her contact information for parents who had questions. Sleeping disorders, the lack of Medicaid services, African-American males not diagnosed appropriately, and children not equipped for school caused by health disparities were also presented by Dr. Harris.

At the end of the meeting, brochures and surveys were passed out. The woman passing out the documents overlooked me each time; I then had to ask someone to get the
documents and surveys for me. The documents consisted of annual data for Savannah’s educational rates compared to the nation, the suspension rate of African-American boys in Savannah, and a survey to gain knowledge of the expectations of the audience from the forum meetings. Audience members seemed very suspicious of me, and a few individuals asked of my purpose there that day, and where I was from.

Although health wasn’t technically on the agenda for that day, the topic was presented. There were no comments or questions from the audience on health issues, or economic development, but many parents were concerned about their children’s education. Parents seem to leave the meeting frustrated with unanswered questions. Members of the audience seem to be suspicious of ‘unfamiliar’ individuals, such as myself. Once again the former mayor, Floyd Adams managed to speak about economic development, but made no comments on the education dialogue, although he is a member of the school board. Pete Liakakis left the meeting early that day. Education seems to be at the forefront of community needs according to individuals in Savannah. The lack of discussion from the audience on health issues, with a doctor readily available, speaks to the lack of concern or connection the parents fail to make between health and education. Without health, education suffers and the individual’s quality of life entirety suffers.

Participant Observation

The CDC project officer conducted various conference calls for the duration of the two year contract and five face-to-face meetings. CDC meetings were held to discuss past and present events, and the expectations of CDC. In addition to meetings conducted
by CDC, the project officer was able to participate in two community events and one meeting attended by the elected official and CFEJ.

Participation of the first community event took place in 2007 and participation of the second community event took place in 2008. The 2007 event was a kick-off event for the childhood lead poisoning prevention campaign, in conjunction to an EPA event hosted by CFEJ. The attendance was very low, due to another school event taking place at the same time. The children and parents that attended were familiar with CFEJ and were very happy to see members of the group. Most of the residents that attended the event knew each other. There were representatives from CDC/ATSDR, and EPA. Other health issues were discussed, such as asthma, and chronic disease. Food was served to the participants and children were tested for lead poisoning. Posters were displayed from the Savannah School of Arts and Design (SCAD), and games were out for the children. Neither I, nor Dr. McClain thought this first event was successful due to the attendance, and other events taking place in the city. However, community members were very comfortable with the organization, and were very receptive of the health presentations CFEJ gave. Better planning took place for the second event.

The second event I was able to participate in was the October fall festival at the EOC. Many families attended the event, and many children were tested that day. I enjoyed speaking with some of the families. The process was very organized and nurses from the health department were able to test the children. The event was scheduled to end at a specific time, but CFEJ and the nurses continued to take the children for lead testing.
CFEJ scheduled a meeting with the assistant city manager of Savannah to discuss specific changes requested for the lead ordinance. The assistant city manager was very direct when asking me exactly what needed to be done. I was able to explain the requested changes for the ordinance and the need of enforcement. Dr. McClain had already spoken to her prior to this meeting about the ordinance. While in the meeting, Dr. McClain mentioned another issue that she and the city manager were having discussions on. The assistant city manager requested the specific changes of the ordinance in writing; I assured her that she would have the document along with the 1973 original ordinance. The assistant city manager made plans to discuss the requested changes of the ordinance on the agenda at the first political task force meeting.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

This research study examined the relationship between the federal government, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the effectiveness of a partnership when addressing environmental justice (EJ) issues for vulnerable populations. This chapter provides an analysis of the generated data from this case study, while describing the application of the Whitehead Model utilized in the study; examines the advantages and disadvantages of the partnership and the limitations of the study; draws conclusions based upon the data presented; and recommends future strategies for a constructive partnership between the federal government and an NGO. The chapter also provides a depiction of other quality-of-life issues within Savannah that present challenges for the population.

For many years, NGOs have been able to successfully implement their goals in vulnerable communities; due to the trust they have gained from those communities, an understanding of the challenges faced by those populations, and the advocacy these organizations have demonstrated for vulnerable populations. CFEJ has partnered with the CDC for three years to educate and bring awareness to vulnerable communities, increase lead testing for their children, and influence the modification and enforcement of the Savannah lead law. In addition to an analysis of the case study, the chapter describes the goals of CFEJ and how they align with CDC’s objectives.
Summary

The historical housing policies implemented by the federal government have a direct correlation to the inequality of childhood lead poisoning experienced by vulnerable populations today. The act of residential segregation coupled with poor housing quality enhances negative environmental exposures and inequitable protection. The practice of segregating these populations continues today. During the 20th century, the federal government identified NGOs as a fundamental factor in attributing positive outcomes to the well-being of society, specifically low-income populations. Over the years, NGOs have been successful in delivering social services such as education, public health outreach, housing, childcare, and healthcare; however, politics play a key role in the distribution of services disseminated and the inequitable outcomes encountered by low-income populations.

The lack of enforcement of environmental laws stimulates environmental injustices for the most vulnerable. Political science informs the work of environmental justice and public health when presenting a framework of social, economic, and political explanations that have the potential to mitigate disproportionate environmental health outcomes. The incidence of childhood lead poisoning has made a dramatic decrease over the years; however, black children continue to bear more than their share of this preventable disease. Unfortunately the prevention of this disease competes with political agendas. The effectiveness of childhood lead poisoning depends upon various factors in the state, including a lead law and the political atmosphere of the state.
The 1973 Savannah lead ordinance has not been enforced in Savannah. Officials in Savannah have not taken the responsibility to address, nor enforce this lead law. The Savannah lead ordinance directs property owners to abate the lead for any premise where lead hazards exist; this may include apartments, homes, and daycares. This will present costs to the property owners in the city of Savannah. The incidence of childhood lead poisoning impacts black children in Savannah disparately. CDC has developed a partnership with CFEJ to assist in alleviating this health issue.

The Whitehead Framework

The Whitehead framework blends the essential elements of the Overlap Model and the Environmental Justice Framework, in combination to the framework's original theories to guide and focus the research. This model was applied to the current case study.

(1) Addresses the health disparities (lead poisoning, chronic disease, HIV, etc...) through collaborative partnerships of the federal and state government, and a non-governmental organization (NGO). (Overlap Model)

CDC has provided a contract to CFEJ to increase lead testing for children six and under, provide awareness and education of childhood lead poisoning, and influence policy modification of the Savannah lead ordinance. In addition to partnering with CDC, CFEJ has partnered with state government agencies; the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP) and the Chatham County childhood lead poisoning prevention program to accomplish these objectives. The resources to meet the objectives required have been supplied by the CDC. The role of the GACLPPP within
the partnership was to provide CFEJ with the needed language and the requested changes of the Savannah lead ordinance; attend local meetings with Savannah elected officials organized by CFEJ; provide health literature to communicate childhood lead poisoning prevention messages to the Savannah community; and conduct lead training events or presentations for various audiences when necessary. The Chatham County’s role in the project was to provide a nurse to test children for lead poisoning and present at local events when needed. The CDC project officer oversees the entire project and evaluates CFEJ in comparison to the contract requirements. CFEJ has used the resources to meet the objectives of CDC; in addition they have provided lead abatement training for local Savannah residents, and integrate the childhood lead poisoning health messages into their EPA grant. The barriers of the partnership according to CFEJ were the limited resources of CDC and the lack of communication from the two state agencies. CFEJ was not informed of significant meetings held in Savannah with local leaders and decisions that could impact the outcome of the work; affecting communication within the partnership. The organization also noted that they were not respected as a community-based organization, in comparison to a University or a state agency. The Whitehead model concludes that the collaboration of the federal and state governments, and the NGO addressed the issue of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, Georgia.

(2) Examines the accountability of the appropriate agency to formulate public policy for the issue at-hand. (Whitehead Model)

According to the Savannah lead ordinance, the district health director has a responsibility to assure that property owners are aware that lead must be abated from the
premises, by the placement of building notices to non-compliant property owners. Over the years, notices sent to rental property owners have been very limited and only one rental property owner has been taken to court for refusal to meet the terms of the Savannah lead ordinance. The lack of action from the district health directors expresses a lack of concern and furthers the disparity of childhood lead poisoning for poor children in Savannah. The ordinance clearly states that after the rental property owner is found to be non-compliant, it is in the discretion of a judge to take further action; however, the limited number of notices given to the rental property owners prevents the judge from ever reviewing the case. The environmental health department in Savannah have a responsibility to health educate the public and assure children are tested for lead poisoning, especially children most at risk; African-American, low-income, children. The historical low testing rates in Savannah do not help advance the enforcement needed to support the appropriate policy that has the potential to reduce and mitigate childhood lead poisoning for the city. The employees of the health department in the past were not utilizing lead funds for lead activities. Not only did the employees ignore their basic responsibilities, but clearly, they did not feel an obligation to take the necessary actions of influencing policy changes to the Savannah lead ordinance. The ordinance hasn’t been enforced nor has an attempt been made for modification, until recently. The current mayor and city councilman are aware that childhood lead poisoning is an issue in the city; however the respondents stated that they were never presented with the requested changes until the lead campaign. Elected officials not receiving requested changes does not excuse needed or routine evaluations of city ordinances. The city councilman and the
mayor are the state elected officials that are held responsible to ensure the Savannah lead ordinance is enforced and evaluated. The Savannah lead ordinance has been relaxed for some time now; penalties and enforcement were never put into place. The Whitehead model concludes that the city councilman, mayor, and the district health director are accountable for the lack of enforcement of the Savannah lead ordinance, and evaluating appropriate penalties for the ordinance.

(3) Examines who gets what, why, and how much. (Whitehead Model)

The issue of childhood lead poisoning has been a non-issue in Savannah for a number of years. The state health employees have not taken responsibility for their job; the elected officials, the mayor and the city councilmen, have a responsibility and the power to ensure enforcement and adopt the requested changes of the Savannah lead ordinance. There have been no previous attempts to change the ordinance. The city faces many impoverished quality of life challenges, but health doesn’t appear to be on the top of the agenda. Most respondents stated that health was somewhere in the middle or at the bottom of the list compared to other quality of life issues. Respondents were asked whether they thought that part of the reason the ordinance had not been changed or enforced was due to the population it impacts disproportionately, poor black children. Forty-six percent (46%) of the total respondents thought that race did make a difference. The district health director stated that the employees of the health department do their job, however the reception of the audience varies; although past employees of the health department did not use funds obligated for lead poisoning activities, but for other means.
Past records show that HUD funds obligated for Savannah were not employed appropriately. Funds from the local childhood lead poisoning prevention program are obligated to reduce lead poisoning for impacted populations. Community members are a part of the political task force lead by CFEJ and elected officials are also members of the task force. Hopefully community members will be a part of the decision-making process to reduce this disease. Research from the Whitehead Model concludes that the issue of childhood lead poisoning was not a high priority for public policy makers in the city of Savannah, therefore low-income populations have not been protected; further research drawn from the model suggests that race and socioeconomic factors played a role in the absence of enforcement.

(4) Addresses the underlying political economic issues associated with reducing the disproportionate disparity. (Whitehead Model)

During the time of this research, the city of Savannah was not receiving a HUD grant. If the lead ordinance was enforced, property owners would be responsible for the expenses of abating the properties. When elected officials were asked if they would support the ordinance in Savannah, although the city didn’t currently have a HUD grant, 50% of the elected officials stated they would support it, and all of the respondents named economics as the political obstacle to enforcing and modifying the ordinance; including the costs to the businesses and the city, the complaint from property owners of the costs, and displeasing the constituents of public officials. With the exception of one elected official, all were aware of the health effects of childhood lead poisoning and the
negative impact of the disease. The Whitehead model concludes that the officials in Savannah have placed business ahead of health; costs to the property owners have taken priority over the health of poor children. This directly impacts poor children and the unlikely chance of reducing childhood lead poisoning.

(5) Adopt the public health model of primary prevention. (Environmental Justice Framework)

The current health department employees in Savannah conduct health education activities on a weekly basis to inform public audiences of childhood lead poisoning prevention. Environmental health directors and the current nurse for the childhood lead poisoning prevention program interviewed did not view the past infrastructure changes in the health department as a barrier in delivering activities for the public. The health department has partnered with various youth organizations around the city; unfortunately the childhood lead poisoning prevention program hasn’t been as present as other health department programs. According to the data presented, minimum health education was conducted in the city until 2006. The health department currently partners with CFEJ, and indicates the organization has been effective. Enforcement and changes in the current ordinance will exercise primary prevention for the impacted population.

Assumptions

- CFEJ will increase the blood testing rate of children in Savannah, Georgia, bring awareness to vulnerable communities, and create an “issue” of the Savannah Lead Law that was not present before.
The federal government is more effective resolving environmental disparity issues for vulnerable populations, when partnering with environmental justice organizations. The federal government is not as effective without the NGO, because the NGO has more credibility with the community.

Research Questions

(Question 1) CFEJ utilized various techniques to influence the modification and enforcement of the 1973 Savannah lead ordinance. From 2008-2010, CFEJ conducted and attended at least 23 meetings with various elected officials; this includes the mayor, various city councilman, city and assistant city manager, state senator, and the county commissioner. CFEJ also met with the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus; the state of Georgia Legislation Assembly in Atlanta and presented the requested policy modifications of the city lead ordinance on Savannah Day (a legislative invite for Savannah residents to speak with state legislators in Atlanta). CFEJ attended and presented the requested policy changes at the Hungry Club forum meetings; Healthy Savannah meetings; and communicated health messages on childhood lead poisoning during their SMART WALK event in Savannah; an annual environmental health outreach event. The organization was able to secure Senator Lester Jackson as the key note speaker to communicate the awareness of childhood lead poisoning. Over the two year contract period, CFEJ met with business owners in the city, landlords, and conducted trainings for this same population to convey the needed changes of the policy and the impact on children in Savannah. Elected officials are now aware of the requested changes for the Savannah lead ordinance and CFEJ has established a Lead Political Task
Force for the city of Savannah. The task force is comprised of a number of city officials, community leaders, business owners, and community residents. The Lead Political Task Force was created to discuss and implement strategies to modify the Savannah lead ordinance. The assistant city manager held the first meeting in December 2010 to discuss the requested changes for the lead ordinance.

The qualitative data collected describes the existing relationships CFEJ had with elected officials before requesting the needed modifications of the lead ordinance. Seventy-five (75%) of the elected officials revealed that they had worked with the organization previously on successful, local environmental projects, and the lead campaign; 62% of the elected officials perceived CFEJ as making an impact in the city by maintaining environmental awareness to the public and conducting meetings around the city, and also viewed the community as receptive of CFEJ; although one elected official noted that CFEJ was only effective in certain areas. Among the officials interviewed, 88% were aware that childhood lead poisoning was an issue in Savannah; however elected officials also indicated that an awareness of the issue had not been made for some years now until the recent campaign lead by CFEJ, and were not aware of previous attempts to modify the policy.

Although CFEJ communicated with elected officials for the past three years, the previous relationships the organization had with the officials gave some validity to the present request of modifying the Savannah lead ordinance. The outcome of the techniques CFEJ utilized to influence policy modification, is an awareness of the needed policy changes to reduce childhood lead poisoning in Savannah, and a political task force
that is now in place to possibly further this goal. While the policy modification has not yet occurred, the request is now on the agenda for the political task force to address.

(Question 2) CFEJ conducted numerous educational, outreach, and training events for the studied demographic areas, and additional areas in Savannah to educate, bring awareness, and increase testing of childhood lead poisoning in Savannah. In addition to the events CDC required from CFEJ, the organization was able to create PSA media announcements; develop effective partnerships with the head start center, SCAD, the Healthy Savannah initiative, the Parents United against Lead; and broaden the partnership with the Youth Futures Authority regarding the lead campaign. Children were tested for childhood lead poisoning at various events. The lead testing rate in the study areas increased during the period CFEJ were conducting activities. When members of CFEJ were asked what tactics they use to communicate between the federal government and the community, the respondents' description included dinners, luncheons, public meetings, and phone calls. According to CFEJ, everything is community driven and the community is addressed first on any issue, before the organization speaks for the community. Respondents were interviewed on their awareness of the lead campaign conducted by CFEJ; among the elected officials who were aware (75%) of the campaign, viewed the campaign as effective. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the community leaders were aware of the lead campaign, and 25% of those aware were unsure of the message. None of the community residents were aware of the lead campaign, and 66% of the local childhood lead poisoning department employees viewed the community as receptive of the activities CFEJ conducts.
CFEJ conducted an intervention for a period of 6 months to increase the knowledge of childhood lead poisoning and lead testing of children for the study population. The control group who did not participate in any of the activities with CFEJ scored higher on the identical test, taken by the experimental group who participated in the intervention with CFEJ. The average test score for the experimental group was 47.00%, and 58.80% for the control group. The experimental group also scored higher on their test taken before their intervention, at 63.12%, than the test taken after the intervention, where the average test score was 47.00%. The number of elevated blood lead levels found within all the groups was not significant enough to measure their association with the knowledge of the parent before and after the intervention. However, although head start requires all parents to test their children for childhood lead poisoning, many of the children had never been tested until CFEJ recruited the participants for the lead study.

(Question 3) The data suggests that the effectiveness of an NGO and federal government partnership depend upon the existing relationship the NGO has with the community, the alignment of the goals for all organizations included within the partnership, and adequate funding for the organization. The director of the housing authority wasn’t aware of the lead issue in Savannah until she came into contact with Dr. McClain, as well as elected officials stating that outreach awareness of the issue had not existed for many years until CFEJ’s lead campaign. Over 50% of the community leaders, elected officials, and health department employees thought that CFEJ was effective and made an impact in the city; however two elected officials thought the presence of the
campaign was lacking and the organization needed more funding to create the environmental campaigns city and county wide. The same respondents also noted that the resources of the organization made a difference in the expansion of audiences captured. The health department employees were very appreciative for CFEJ and thought the group presented vital issues for the community; just as well as the GACLPPP director expressing CFEJ achieving an objective that he could not accomplish, without the group; delivering health messages to hard-to-reach populations, and receiving the receptiveness of this population. CFEJ was also able to introduce the GACLPPP director to several elected officials, giving the director an opportunity to discuss the needed changes for the lead law. Several community leaders viewed CFEJ as a voice for impacted populations. According to the organization, a vital component of their goal is to create healthy communities and prevent childhood lead poisoning; which is parallel to the mission of HHLPPB.

*The Environmental Justice Movement*

Although negative and positive environmental changes in Savannah were expressed from the respondents, environmental safety continued to be a concern. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents representing the experimental group did not feel that their community was safe from environmental hazards, and 50% of the respondents in that group disagreed that they were represented well on social justice issues by the public officials and politicians. In the control group, 40% of those participants did not feel that their community was safe from environmental hazards, and 20% did not feel that they were represented well on social justice issues by the public
officials and politicians. The impact of the environmental justice movement was a question posed to Dr. McClain and how effective the movement has been from her perspective, she explained:

“There have certainly been a number of victories. But when you look at, for example the kinds of national dialogues that are going on around environment justice, around exposures, some of the same dialogue is from 15 - 20 years ago. So you’re saying then okay if we’re having the same dialogue has anything changed? And I do know some things have changed; there are initiatives that have been put in place by federal agencies that are significant...... an initiative is good, but the enforcement of the law is better. We want laws that actually would protect communities, would preserve communities. But for some reason the enforcement part, the compliance part, the rules and regulations haven’t changed too much; enforcement has been the weakest, and that’s where the communities have been advocating to bring their voice out at the greatest level..... Yes, we’ve had significant victories. But the quality of life for most people that we started working with 20 years ago is the same....We have to review those standards and change those standards....”

WE ACT, located in Harlem New York has been greatly successful in accomplishing environmental justice for underserved populations over the years. The organization is well-respected nationally. Peggy Shepard, the executive director of WE ACT, noted that the federal government has asked her to attribute a great amount of work to health disparity projects without many or often any resources. Ms. Shepard also asserts that this is not a partnership; “The federal government will never have the capacity to really engage and hear the voices of the people if you are not planning to support them and support them coming to talk to you.” Ms. Shepard noted that you will

1 Dr. Mildred McClain, Interview by author, Savannah, Ga. December 3, 2009
find more EJ groups moving into policy and the movement has made an amazing impact, especially with limited resources.²

Discussion

Based on the research presented, the partnership made an impact on public policy. The data suggests that the partnership has been effective in bringing awareness of childhood lead poisoning and an awareness of the requested policy modifications of the Savannah lead law. The findings show that the lead testing percentages of the study areas in Savannah increased at a double rate from 2006 to 2009. CFEJ started the contract with CDC in 2008, but began partnering with the federal government agency in 2007, before the contract was put into place. Although the testing rates increased, it is difficult to conclude the totality of the increase was due to the activities of CFEJ; however, according to the multiple data collected, the organization made an impact in the improvement of lead testing in those areas during the contract period. Although the control group scored higher on the lead questionnaire when compared to the experimental group, the effectiveness of the intervention is difficult to measure. The first educational intervention took place during a mandatory meeting for all head start parents, where participants were recruited. There is a very high probability that the control group, who did not participate in the interventions with CFEJ, attended the mandatory head start meeting as well. If so, the control group was able to sit in and listen to the presentation on childhood lead poisoning, increasing their chance of a passing score on the test. The experimental group participants took the post test before all of the interventions were

² Peggy Shepard, Interview by author, Harlem, NY. July 2010.
completed. The administrators of the test were doubtful that all of the participants, a hard
to reach population, would return and complete all four interventions. Many participants
were called by phone to be reminded of their participation of the educational events.
Therefore, quite a few of the participants took the post test before completing all four
educational activities. Although none of the community members were aware of the lead
campaign, the community members were interviewed to gain an understanding of the
historical changes in Savannah; furthermore, over 50% of community leaders, past and
present health department employees, and elected officials were aware of the lead
campaign.

The data in the study concludes that the federal government is more effective
resolving environmental disparity issues for vulnerable populations, when partnering with
environmental justice organizations that have a relationship with the community. The
advantages of this partnership include the federal agency utilizing the NGO as a conduit
to reach the community, and a building of trust between the population and the agency to
further the goals of the agency, while resolving quality of life issues for the population.
CFEJ has a historical relationship with the residents of Savannah, including the
stakeholders in the city. Qualitative and observational data demonstrate the receptiveness
of the community for this organization; a trait very difficult for the federal government to
achieve. This makes a great difference in influencing policy to reduce health disparities
for vulnerable populations. While the federal government cannot advocate, CFEJ has
been able to not only create a dialogue among the elected officials, but organize a task
force that includes the county commissioner, two city councilmen, the assistant city
manager, senator, the mayor of Savannah, and community members; this has created an issue of childhood lead poisoning among the elected officials that wasn’t there prior to the lead campaign.

Although the study concludes that the partnership was effective, there are disadvantages to this partnership. CFEJ receives funding from CDC through a contract mechanism, where the budget is evaluated on a year-by-year basis. The organization is not written into the budget automatically. The funding that CFEJ receives from CDC obligates three employees, activities required by CDC, and a 10% fee the contracting company receives upfront before CFEJ receives their funding. CFEJ has to complete the activities of the contract, and then receive reimbursement after the activities are completed. CFEJ completed additional activities that were not required under the CDC contract in order to be effective. The activities required of CFEJ are not simple, and the funding is limited. There is also a period of time where the organization has to wait on the contract to begin again; therefore they are not funded during break. The organization continues to work while waiting on the next contract period to begin to maintain the attention of the population. Due to the limited resources received from the federal government, the organization integrates various health messages into various projects. The disadvantage of this mechanism is the potential dilution of some messages or possibly all, due to combining the health messages; where a few of the respondents interviewed were aware of the campaign, but unaware of the message.
Limitations

Limitations of the study include a small study population where results could have a different outcome if the study groups were larger; the administration of the post test; and possible biases of the interviewees.

Implications for Future Research in Political Science and Environmental Justice

Implications for future research include extrapolating the Whitehead Model to other federal government / NGO partnerships, and policies such as education, housing and transportation that impact the life of underserved populations inequitably. Applying the model to future partnerships and current public policies will further examine and assist with the scrutiny of the political economic factors and the accountability of public policy makers for implementing and enforcing policies that reduce health disparities for underserved populations. This model is also useful for other demographics such as the Hispanic population, when addressing quality-of-life issues. This study contributes to the political science literature by examining the social and economic occurrences that impact low income social groups, while applying public health and environmental justice concepts, to advance policy implementation for impoverished populations. The application of the Whitehead Model contributes to the political science literature by demonstrating its usefulness in elucidating the dynamics of the partnership between the federal agencies and NGOs in addressing the issues that impact vulnerable communities and helping with designing better public policies. It also has the potential to provide a roadmap for mitigating inequities experienced by underserved populations.
Recommendations

Federal government agencies will advance their agenda of mitigating health disparities by increasing their partnerships with environmental justice organizations. The trust of the community for the NGO will assist the government in reaching and delivering services to the community. Direct, sufficient, and required funding provided by the agency for the organizations will be more effective to serve underserved populations and enhance the goals of the federal government. This funding mechanism will decrease the resource difficulties many of the organizations encounter when partnering with federal agencies. The organizations should also be a part of the decision-making process from the beginning of the partnership. Environmental justice advocates applying a multiple framework where political economics is closely examined and working with the stakeholders in the city or state, has the potential to initiate sufficient policies and mitigate health inequalities, which attribute to the environmental justice movement. Environmental justice training for federal government employees has the potential to create a better understanding of the quality of life challenges for poor populations, and create effective communication between the impacted population, the NGO, and the federal government agency.
APPENDIX A

Script of Invitation to Participate in Study

Script for invitation/eligibility to participate in study
(Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level: 6.4)

Study title: The Influence of a non-governmental organization on Public Policy: A Case Study on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention in Savannah, Georgia.

"Hi, my name is LaToria Whitehead and I am a student at Clark Atlanta University (Political Science Department) conducting my dissertation research. The purpose of the study I am conducting is to research the influence a non-governmental organization such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) has on public policy, education, and awareness for childhood lead poisoning prevention for disenfranchised communities in Savannah, Georgia. I know Dr. McClain, the executive director of CFEJ has met with you and educated you on the detrimental effects of lead poisoning on the children in Savannah, Georgia. I know you have been in meetings with her organization about the lead law here in Savannah. Is it okay if I tell you more about the study and interview you to get your perspective on the lead law, the relaxation of the law, your viewpoint on the environmental history of this community, and what you think the needs of the community are? If you agree to participate, this interview will be taped. The only person that will have access to the interview will be I, LaToria Whitehead the Principal Investigator and my Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be confidential. The tape will be destroyed after one year. You will also have to sign a consent form to participate in this interview. Would you like to participate?" (Political Representatives or Public Officials)

"Hi, my name is LaToria Whitehead and I am a student at Clark Atlanta University (Political Science Department) conducting my dissertation research. The purpose of the study I am conducting is to research the influence a non-governmental organization such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) has on public policy, education, and awareness for childhood lead poisoning prevention for disenfranchised communities in Savannah, Georgia. Is it okay if I tell you more about the study and interview you to get your perspective on the needs of the community, the detrimental environmental hazards within the community, and the changes you have seen within the time frame that you have resided in this community? If you agree to participate, this interview will be taped. The only person that will have access to the interview will be I, LaToria Whitehead the
Principal Investigator and my Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be confidential. The tape will be destroyed after one year. You will also have to sign a consent form to participate in this interview. Would you like to participate?" (Long-Standing Community Members)

"Hello Dr. McClain, I would like to interview you on the goals of the Citizens for Environmental Justice, your various tactics, accomplishments, future endeavors, and how your goals relate to childhood lead poisoning prevention? If you agree to participate, this interview will be taped. The only person that will have access to the interview will be I, LaToria Whitehead the Principal Investigator and my Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be confidential. The tape will be destroyed after one year. You will also have to sign a consent form to participate in this interview. Would you like to participate?" (Dr. Mildred McClain, Executive Director and founder for the Citizens for Environmental Justice)
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form for Participants

CONSENT FORM (Elected Officials)

I agree to participate in the research titled "The Influence of a non-governmental organization on Public Policy: A Case Study on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention in Savannah, Georgia". This research will be conducted by LaToria Whitehead, PhD candidate at Clark Atlanta University (Political Science Department) 223 James P. Brawley Drive, SW (404) 880-8718. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and can have the results of my participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the record, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:

1. The reason for the research is to study the influence a non-governmental organization such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) has on public policy, education, and awareness for childhood lead poisoning prevention for disenfranchised communities in Savannah, Georgia.

2. The results of my participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior written consent, unless otherwise required by law. Data will be stored electronically, in a password-protected system.

3. Part of the study is to see if there is a relationship between the educational intervention activities that the Head Start Parents undergo, and the blood lead level of the child.

4. LaToria Whitehead will be interviewing me on my perspective of the lead law, the relaxation of the law, my viewpoint on the environmental history of this community, and what I think the needs of the community are.

5. Participation involves the following risks: Information you disclose that you feel is risky. Benefits will include education on the known effects of lead and the disproportionate disparity for disenfranchised populations and participation in a study that will attribute to the attention of policy modification on childhood lead poisoning for a
optimal quality of life for these same populations in Savannah, Georgia.

6. Non-participation will not result in loss of any services.

7. The results of my participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior written consent, unless otherwise required by law. Data will be stored electronically, in a password-protected system.

8. The only person that will have access to this interview will be LaToria Whitehead the Principal Investigator and her Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be audio taped.

7. The investigator will answer any questions I have about the research, now or during the course of the study.

I may contact both LaToria Whitehead / ceg6@cdc.gov (404) 310-4176, or Dr. William H. Boone / wboone@cau.edu (404) 880-8719, 223 James P. Brawley Drive, SW (404) 880-8718 in the Political Science Department, at Atlanta, Georgia if I have any questions about my rights as a subject in this study.

“I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board Human Subjects in Research, Clark Atlanta University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects; rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Georgianna Bolden, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (404)880-6979.”

I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below.

Subject’s Name print
Date
Subject’s Signature / Date

Principal Investigator / Print / Date
Date /

Principal Investigator / Signature /

Witness Signature
Date

PLEASE SIGN BOTH COPIES OF THIS FORM. KEEP ONE COPY AND RETURN THE OTHER TO THE INVESTIGATOR.
CONSENT FORM (Community leaders and members)

I agree to participate in the research titled "The Influence of a non-governmental organization on Public Policy: A Case Study on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention in Savannah, Georgia". This research will be conducted by LaToria Whitehead, PhD candidate at Clark Atlanta University (Political Science Department) 223 James P. Brawley Drive, SW (404) 880-8718. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and can have the results of my participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the record, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:

1. The reason for the research is to study the influence a non-governmental organization such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) has on public policy, education, and awareness for childhood lead poisoning prevention for disenfranchised communities in Savannah, Georgia.

2. The results of my participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior written consent, unless otherwise required by law. Data will be stored electronically, in a password-protected system.

3. Part of the study is to see if there is a relationship between the educational intervention activities that the Head Start Parents undergo, and the blood lead level of the child.

4. LaToria Whitehead will be interviewing me on my perspective on the needs of the community, the detrimental environmental hazards within the community, and the changes I have seen within the time frame that I have resided here in this community.

5. Participation involves the following risks: Information you disclose that you feel is risky. Benefits will include education on the known effects of lead and the disproportionate disparity for disenfranchised populations and participation in a study that will attribute to the attention of policy modification on childhood lead poisoning for a optimal quality of life for these same populations in Savannah, Georgia.

6. Non-participation will not result in loss of any services.
7. The results of my participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior written consent, unless otherwise required by law. Data will be stored electronically, in a password-protected system.

8. The only person that will have access to this interview will be LaToria Whitehead the Principal Investigator and her Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be audio taped.

9. The investigator will answer any questions I have about the research, now or during the course of the study.

I may contact both LaToria Whitehead / ceg6@cdc.gov (404) 310-4176, or Dr. William H. Boone / wboone@cau.edu (404)880-8719, 223 James P. Brawley Drive, SW (404) 880-8718 in the Political Science Department, at Atlanta, Georgia if I have any questions about my rights as a subject in this study.

“I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board Human Subjects in Research, Clark Atlanta University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects; rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Georgianna Bolden, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at (404)880-6979.”

I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I have been given a copy of this consent form.

If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below.

Subject’s Name print

Date

Subject’s Signature / Date

Principal Investigator / Print / Date

Date /

Principal Investigator / Signature /

Witness Signature

Date

PLEASE SIGN BOTH COPIES OF THIS FORM. KEEP ONE COPY AND RETURN THE OTHER TO THE INVESTIGATOR.
CONSENT FORM (CFEJ members)

I agree to participate in the research titled “The Influence of a non-governmental organization on Public Policy: A Case Study on Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention in Savannah, Georgia”. This research will be conducted by LaToria Whitehead, PhD candidate at Clark Atlanta University (Political Science Department) 223 James P. Brawley Drive, SW (404) 880-8718. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time without penalty and can have the results of my participation, to the extent that it can be identified as mine, returned to me, removed from the record, or destroyed.

The following points have been explained to me:

1. The reason for the research is to study the influence a non-governmental organization such as the Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) has on public policy, education, and awareness for childhood lead poisoning prevention for disenfranchised communities in Savannah, Georgia.

Part of the study is to see if there is a relationship between the educational intervention activities that the Head Start Parents undergo, and the blood lead level of the child.

LaToria Whitehead will be interviewing me on my organization CFEJ, and the various tactics, accomplishments, future endeavors, and how our goals of the organization relate to childhood lead poisoning prevention.

Participation involves the following risks: Information you disclose that you feel is risky. Benefits will include education on the known effects of lead and the disproportionate disparity for disenfranchised populations and participation in a study that will attribute to the attention of policy modification on childhood lead poisoning for a optimal quality of life for these same populations in Savannah, Georgia.

1. Non-participation will not result in loss of any services.

2. The results of my participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without my prior written consent, unless otherwise required by law. Data will be stored electronically, in a password-protected system.

3. The only person that will have access to this interview will be LaToria Whitehead the Principal Investigator and her Committee Chair, Dr. William H. Boone from Clark Atlanta University. This interview will be audio taped.

4. The investigator will answer any questions I have about the research, now or during the course of the study.
I may contact both LaToria Whitehead / ceq6@cdc.gov (404) 310-4176, or Dr.
William H. Boone / wboone@cau.edu (404)880-8719, 223 James P. Brawley Drive,
SW (404) 880-8718 in the Political Science Department, at Atlanta, Georgia if I have
any questions about my rights as a subject in this study.

"I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the
Institutional Review Board Human Subjects in Research, Clark Atlanta University.
For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the
Institutional Review Board through Dr. Georgianna Bolden, Office of Research and
Sponsored Programs at (404)880-6979."

I have read and understand the explanation provided to me. I have had all my questions
answered to my satisfaction, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I have been given a copy of this consent form.

If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below.

________________________________________  ____________________________
Subject's Name print / Date Subject's Signature / Date

________________________________________
Principal Investigator / Print / Date
Date / Principal Investigator / Signature / Date

________________________________________
Witness Signature Date

PLEASE SIGN BOTH COPIES OF THIS FORM. KEEP ONE COPY AND RETURN THE
OTHER TO THE INVESTIGATOR.
### APPENDIX C

**Non-Governmental Organizations Fighting for Environmental Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Issue / Nature of Problem</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Outcomes / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice (DWEJ)</td>
<td>The Henry Ford Medical Waste Incinerator was installed in the early 1980s. This incinerator was located on the premises of the Henry Ford Hospital in a mixed business and residential area in Detroit, Michigan. Citizens made repeated complaints of foul smells, thick black smoke, nausea, chronic headaches, stomach aches, and the release of poisons such as mercury, lead, cadmium, and dioxins which penetrated the Virginia Park neighborhood on a daily basis.</td>
<td>Low-income, African American</td>
<td>DWEJ partnered with the Health Care Without Harm Campaign, and received national attention hosting a press conference in Detroit demanding the closing of the waste incinerator. DWEJ declared a national state of emergency on environmental racism and economic injustice.</td>
<td>The Henry Ford Hospital medical waste incinerator was shut down 2000¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Action</td>
<td>Known historically as the &quot;Fighting Cheyennes,&quot; Native Action embodies the spirit and hope of the Cheyenne</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Native Action works to bridge the racial justice barriers in Montana by establishing long-</td>
<td>Native Action successfully challenged the largest federal coal lease in history (the Powder River Coal Sales) that resulted in the voiding of all coal leases, and mandated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice. [http://www.dwej.org/contact.htm](http://www.dwej.org/contact.htm). (accessed on October 1, 2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Issue / Nature of Problem</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Outcomes / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA)</td>
<td>The largest coal strip-mines and gasification complex in America lies just 15 miles from the Cheyenne reservation. The Cheyenne people are living on one of the poorest reservations in the country, surrounded by toxic waste, strip mining, oil drilling, and nuclear contamination. Historically, multinational energy corporations have transformed southeastern Montana from a rural ranching community into an industrial wasteland.</td>
<td>Female Asian immigrants</td>
<td>Term alliances with traditionally hostile non-Indian ranchers, unions, townsfolk, and other organizations. Native action is funded entirely by grants and contributions from foundations and individuals, and do not accept any government support.</td>
<td>that a cultural impact analysis be a component of all Federal Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) on or near Indian reservations while enforcing federal environmental laws to protect the reservation homeland from environmental harm caused by coal strip-mining, coal railroads, power plants, groundwater loss, and the illegal taking of coal bed methane gas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Issue / Nature of Problem</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Outcomes / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen for Environmental Justice for All (CEJA)</td>
<td>Unhealthy working conditions. AIWA discovered that electronic assembly workers suffered from miscarriages and were exposed to lead and solvents while assembling printed circuit boards. Most were unaware of their rights due to language barriers. Workers who try to file for workers' compensation face a challenging government system.</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Margaret L. Jones, director for the CEJA wrote a formal complaint in October 2009 to the EPA's region 4 acting regional administrator.</td>
<td>On October 27, 2009 in Atlanta, Georgia community leaders from around the eight-state region met with the EPA's region 4 acting regional administrator to voice concerns of the Scarboro community and other communities surrounding the eight-state region. No decision has been made about the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarboro, Margaret L. Jones, director for the CEJA wrote a formal complaint in October 2009 to the EPA's region 4 acting regional administrator.</td>
<td>The Scarboro community in Oak Ridge have been exposed to multiple contaminants from the U.S. Department of Energy Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR), commonly known as the &quot;plant&quot;. Community members have complained of cancers, neurological disorders, memory loss, extreme numbness, kidney disorders, asthma, tumors, and premature deaths. Margaret L. Jones, director for the CEJA, wrote a formal complaint in October 2009 to the EPA's region 4 acting regional administrator.</td>
<td>School of Medicine and School of Nursing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Issue / Nature of Problem</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Outcomes / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Against Pollution (CAP)</td>
<td>In their community the residents have two superfund caliber sites, a polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB), and Lead site.</td>
<td>Mixed residential area</td>
<td>They have two governing orders to address these sites. These residents' concerns have been given to EPA's region 4 administrator, but have not been addressed to the community's satisfaction. They have a Consent Decree (CD) to address PCB's and an AOC to address lead in the community. The community has concerns regarding the Lead Site Administrative Order of Consent (AOC).</td>
<td>No decision has been made about the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Against Toxic Exposure</td>
<td>The Escambia Treating Company (ETC) Superfund site located in residential area labeled &quot;Mount Dioxin&quot; because of the 60-feet high mound of contaminated soil dug up from the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Mixed residential area</td>
<td>Organized against EPA to relocate residents.</td>
<td>The EPA nominated the Escambia Treating Superfund site as the country's first pilot program to help the agency develop a nationally consistent relocation policy that would consider not only toxic levels but also welfare issues such as property values, quality of life, health and safety. / EPA relocated 358 households 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CATE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People for Community Recovery (PCR)</td>
<td>Community surrounded by polluting industries, landfills, incinerators, smelters, steel mills, chemical companies, paint manufacturing plants, a municipal sewage treatment facility, and more than 50 abandoned toxic waste dumps.</td>
<td>Low-income, African-American</td>
<td>Organized residents, pressured polluters, and city and state officials. Conducted health surveys of residents and learned of illnesses.</td>
<td>Chicago Housing Authority and Chicago Board of Education removed asbestos from the homes and schools; Shut down a nearby hazardous waste incinerator; Health clinic placed in neighborhood. / recipient of the President's Environmental and Conservation Challenge medal / 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Issue / Nature of Problem</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Outcomes / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James Citizens for Jobs and the Environment</td>
<td>Shintech Inc. proposed to purchase land and discharge 600,000 pounds of wastewater into the Mississippi river on a daily basis</td>
<td>Low-income, African-American</td>
<td>Received services of Tulane University's Environmental Law Clinic to protest and contest the company in court. Dr. Beverly Wright of the Deep South Center for Environmental Justice conducted an independent study of the area for the residents</td>
<td>Shintech withdrew its plan to build a polyvinyl chloride plastics plant in St. James Parish. / 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Organized in Defense of Earth and her Resources (PODER) / El Pueblo (The Peoples Network)</td>
<td>Hazardous industries in community / Land policies</td>
<td>Low-income, Latino, African-American</td>
<td>Met with City of Austin's Environmental Board, Planning Commission and City Council members</td>
<td>City Council voted to place a conditional overlay on selected industrial and commercial lots in East Austin that were part of the land-use study, the East Austin Overlay Combining District Ordinance (EAO). Residents must be notified any time certain industrial and commercial facilities seek to locate or expand their operation in East Austin and have a right to a public hearing process. / 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucsonians for a Clean Environment (TCE)</td>
<td>Heavy Groundwater and soil contamination; residents drinking contaminated water / Declared Superfund site by EPA</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>Collected approximately 30,000 to 40,000 health survey forms of the local residents; Class action personal injury lawsuit against the City of Tucson</td>
<td>Settled out of court for $84.5 million with 1600 plaintiffs / 1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Issue / Nature of Problem</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Outcomes / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities for a Better Environment (CBE) / LA CAUSA (Los Angeles Comunidades Asambleadas Unidas para un Sostenible Ambiente)</td>
<td>Concrete and asphalt recycling business in community / Chrome facility located near school.</td>
<td>Latino, working-class</td>
<td>Through funding support from the National Institute of Environmental Health Science (NIEHS), CBE built a collaboration with the UCLA Center for Occupational and Environmental Health in the School of Public Health, the Labor Occupational Safety and Health division of UCLA’s Center for Labor Research and Education, and local health care providers. / Built awareness of environmental justice issues, researched cumulative exposures for the region, educated healthcare providers on environmental health risks and threats to public health.</td>
<td>City officials closed the La Montana recycler company, relocated two class recycler companies, with a negotiated engineering design for the new facility of one to capture the glass dust which was causing serious respiratory problems in the community. The community forced the EPA to close down an incinerator in the neighborhood and pressured the city not to renew the Conditional Use Permit of a facility that produces methyl bromide adjacent to homes. The chrome plating operations closed and school contamination investigated./ 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A coalition of California environmental, social justice, and civil liberty groups / Matthews vs. Coye</td>
<td>Failure of the state of California to conduct federally mandated lead testing</td>
<td>Low-income, people of color</td>
<td>Collaborated with the Natural Resources Defense Council, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Education fund (NAACP) the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Legal Aid Society of Alameda California</td>
<td>Out-of court settlement for $20 million for a blood lead-testing program / 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Issue / Nature of Problem</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Outcomes / Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles residents and the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund Labor/Community Strategy Center vs. Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Inequitable federal funding (raising costs to low-income residents and reducing quality) and the operation of bus transportation</td>
<td>Low-income, people of color</td>
<td>Residents filed class action lawsuit represented by the Labor/Community Strategy Center, the Bus Riders Union, the Southern Christian Leadership conference, and the Korean Immigrant Workers Advocates.</td>
<td>Plaintiffs won case, bus pass concessions, and forced the Los Angeles MTA to spend $89 million on 278 new clean-compressed natural gas buses. / 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Against Nuclear Trash (CANT) CANT vs. LES</td>
<td>Louisiana Energy Services (LES) Uranium enrichment plant producing 17 percent of the nation’s enriched uranium in the community</td>
<td>Low-income, African-American</td>
<td>Blacks and whites placed articles in the newspapers, educated the community on the environmental risks, and was represented by a Sierra Club Legal Defense attorney to challenge the site</td>
<td>Court concluded that “racial bias played a role in the selection process.” Company was reprimanded for not addressing the provision called for under Executive Order 12898. Victory reported in the London Sunday Times “Louisiana Blacks Win Nuclear War,” / 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Citizens of Tillary (CCT)</td>
<td>Industrialized hog operations replacing small family farms and posing environmental health risks to the community</td>
<td>Low-income, African-American</td>
<td>Collaborated with University of North Carolina researchers conducting community-based participatory research to focus on policy change and optimal health for the community (door-to-door surveys conducted by residents); educating policymakers, conducting community meetings, workshops, and presentations.</td>
<td>County Commissioners passed the Intensive Livestock Operation (ILO) ordinance in 1997⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Issue / Nature of Problem</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Outcomes / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives for Community Environment (ACE) / Boston and New England expanded area</td>
<td>Disproportionate exposure to dumpster storage lots, junkyards, and recycling facilities</td>
<td>Main focus on Roxbury neighborhood, primarily low-income, people of color</td>
<td>Collaborated with cross-boundary coalitions, and providing the community with environmental education to empower the community.</td>
<td>State officials enacted stricter regulations on dumpster storage lots, junkyards, and recycling facilities to end health code violations / 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio Boca residents /</td>
<td>Intensive pesticide use. Health problems ranging from bronchial spasms, asthma, skin disorders, and partial paralysis of the extremities plagued the residents</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>The community videotaped the spraying activities. Air blasts went into the backyards and homes of the local residents.</td>
<td>EPA claimed nearly $600,000 in fines for over 40 violations. The company must submit weekly itineraries of their spraying activities to the community and government agencies and is restricted from using high-pressure spray blasters in the sectors that border the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harlem Environmental Action, Inc. (WE ACT)</td>
<td>The North River Sewage Treatment Plant distributed foul odors and residents suffered from respiratory problems; the siting and operation of 6 out of 7 New York City diesel bus depots in Northern Manhattan; the operation of only one 24-hour Marine Transfer Station in the city of Manhattan (in this community), the use of excessive hazardous dumping, and the exclusion of communities of color from democratic decision-making</td>
<td>Predominately African-American and Latino</td>
<td>WE ACT sued the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for operating the North River Sewage Treatment Plant as a public and private nuisance; Met with numerous City and State officials through the years in an effort to specify a plan of action for correcting the plant's operational flaws; Increased public awareness about the dangers of diesel fuel and its link to asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, heart attacks, lung cancer and premature death.</td>
<td>Mayor David N. Dinkins pledges $55 million to fix the North River Sewage Treatment Plant; a lawsuit was settled in 1994 for $1.1 million for a community fund towards environmental health and quality of life issues; In 1998 an announcement that the Manhattanville bus depot would be converted to natural gas as part of his Clean Fuel Bus program. WE ACT's Executive Director is elected chair of EPA's National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) in 2001; WE ACT serves as the first community-based co-editor of a special issue of Environmental Health Perspectives, a peer reviewed scientific journal of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in 2002; Executive Director Peggy Shepard wins 10th Annual Heinz Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Issue / Nature of Problem</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Outcomes / Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>informed the public and the media on issue; enlisted members of the impacted community in a campaign; and focused attention on politicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Map – Chatham County Study Zip Codes Housing Data

Chatham County Target Zipcodes
Medicaid Children Represented
N = 5,717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zipcode</th>
<th>Medicaid Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31401</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31405</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31416</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Block Groups

- < 15%
- 15 - 30%
- 31 - 50%
- 51 - 70%
- > 70%

---

[Map showing Chatham County with zip codes highlighted and corresponding Medicaid children counts]
APPENDIX E

Map – Chatham County Medicaid Children Represented for Study Zip Codes
APPENDIX F

Map – Study Zip Codes Housing Data vs. Rest of Savannah
### APPENDIX G

**HHLPPB National Numbers 1991-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Children Tested</th>
<th>Total Cases</th>
<th>Confirmed EBLLs as % of Children Tested</th>
<th>Number of Confirmed Children by Highest Blood Lead Level (µg/dL) at or Following Confirmation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 µg/dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>22,883,900</td>
<td>18,228</td>
<td>5,025</td>
<td>27.57%</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>23,201,996</td>
<td>87,175</td>
<td>20,412</td>
<td>23.41%</td>
<td>7805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23,446,710</td>
<td>307,367</td>
<td>51,299</td>
<td>16.69%</td>
<td>22,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>23,567,760</td>
<td>503,537</td>
<td>80,357</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td>30,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>23,556,596</td>
<td>1,127,682</td>
<td>111,815</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>58,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>23,341,190</td>
<td>1,214,387</td>
<td>112,633</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>57,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>23,123,858</td>
<td>1,361,163</td>
<td>142,100</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
<td>75,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>22,939,438</td>
<td>1,696,874</td>
<td>129,647</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>74,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>22,836,724</td>
<td>1,850,603</td>
<td>108,139</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>63,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23,156,903</td>
<td>2,559,671</td>
<td>104,431</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
<td>61,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>23,270,252</td>
<td>2,769,650</td>
<td>91,148</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>53,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23,387,880</td>
<td>2,924,094</td>
<td>82,534</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>49,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23,612,242</td>
<td>3,358,502</td>
<td>73,858</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>45,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23,903,723</td>
<td>3,663,854</td>
<td>61,002</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>37,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>24,204,520</td>
<td>3,861,134</td>
<td>57,453</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>34,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24,507,506</td>
<td>3,886,895</td>
<td>50,016</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>30,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>24,761,587</td>
<td>3,642,197</td>
<td>35,974</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>21,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

CFEJ Contract 2008-2009

STATEMENT OF WORK
“For Our Children, We Care”
The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ)

Background:
Healthy People have a goal to eliminate childhood lead poisoning by 2010. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is committed to providing support to state and local childhood lead poisoning prevention programs to address housing and environmental issues. The Chatham County Health Department, Division of Environmental Health has administered a childhood lead poisoning prevention program for the county through a grant from the State of Georgia. The purpose of this program is to identify and test children ages 1-5 that have been exposed to lead hazards. In addition, identified children will receive follow-up, medical case management, environmental intervention, reduction of hazards, and educational efforts to reduce the effects of ongoing lead exposure.

The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) was established in 1995 to provide a vehicle for community members to work for environmental and economic justice at the local level and participate in the formation of the national Environmental Justice movement. The geographical focus has primarily been in Georgia, South Carolina, and the Southeast Region. CFEJ was formed as a community response by African-American citizens in Savannah, Georgia to oppose activities related to nuclear weapons production at the Savannah River Site and to increase the participation of the community in the environmental movement in the Southeast region. Disadvantaged populations in Savannah, Georgia have experienced a vast number of disproportionate environmental hazards and disparities. The Citizens for Environmental Justice have played a critical role in providing research for the community to advocate against environmental hazards. CFEJ has a goal to empower the community through education and advocacy, address environmental health issues, and provide outreach on childhood lead poisoning prevention. CFEJ has been engaged in mobilizing and organizing the community on public policy issues to enforce environmental protection laws and statues.
Description of Problem:

Disadvantaged populations have experienced disproportionate environmental disparities for many years. Although children from all socioeconomic backgrounds can be affected by lead poisoning, children who live at or below the poverty line in older housing, and minority children are at the highest risk for childhood lead poisoning. The targeted population for this project will be minority, Medicaid, WIC, and children living in pre-1970 housing. Children that reside in zip codes 31415, 31401, 31404, 31405 in Savannah, Georgia are at a very high risk, and many have not been tested for lead poisoning. For this hard-to-reach population there is a great need for testing, awareness, and education to prevent an increase in environmental health disparities. Lead poisoning can affect nearly every system in the body. Lead poisoning often occurs with no obvious symptoms and frequently goes unrecognized. Lead poisoning can cause learning disabilities, behavioral problems, and, at very high levels, seizures, comas, and even death. Awareness for all populations is needed.¹

Purpose:
The purpose of this project is to establish a tactical partnership that will cultivate childhood lead poisoning awareness in Savannah, Georgia for hard-to-reach populations, increase testing of lead in children, and provide a strategic design to address policy modification in Savannah. The partnership will enhance the community’s levels of education and awareness and build the capacity to engage in developing solutions to concerns and issues.

Objectives and Activities:

Educational Activities
Develop a Train-the-Trainer module to provide education on childhood lead poisoning for community members.

- The Citizens for Environmental Justice will develop and conduct a Train-the-Trainer session for parents, daycare teachers/workers, heads of neighborhood associations, and other community leaders which will be followed by selecting leaders of the community to expand and teach the curriculum.
- CFEJ will identify 15 – 20 trainers to conduct 5-7 Train-the-Trainer sessions throughout the year in Savannah.

Date Due: March 2008 / Train-the-Trainer Module will be conducted on a quarterly basis.

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/nceh.
Outreach Activities
Identify hard-to-reach communities to increase testing of lead in children and provide community outreach by informing and creating awareness of childhood lead poisoning for the communities of Savannah. Literature utilized will be culturally sensitive for the community.

- The Citizens for Environmental Justice will identify children in Savannah neighborhoods who have not been tested for lead with the assistance of data from the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, Medicaid, WIC, and Head Start.
- CFEJ will conduct six community outreach events per year for parents, children, and other members of the community to increase awareness, provide education, and increase the testing of children. Community events will include, but are not limited to testing children (with the assistance of Chatham County Health Department), and providing education of childhood lead poisoning. CFEJ will also coordinate with Health Providers in Savannah, Georgia to provide awareness for the Pediatric Community.

Date Due: Community Outreach Events: March, May, July, August September, and November 2008

Policy:
- The Citizens for Environmental Justice will attend political meetings throughout the city of Savannah and develop strategic plans to encourage the modification for the Savannah Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Law. CFEJ will create summary reports documenting action steps, and develop plans for legislative and regulatory strategies. CFEJ will update the Georgia Lead Advisory Committee in 2008.

Date Due: Meetings will be conducted throughout the year for legislative sessions to encourage policy modification, and to influence remediation of lead poisoned houses. Local meetings will include presentations to and interactions with the City Council and the County Commissioners. Tentative dates are February, April, June, September and November, 2008.

Evaluation Model:
- CFEJ and the CDC Project Officer will develop an evaluation model for educational, outreach, and policy activities. The evaluation model will include process and outcome evaluation; this includes, but is not limited to
measuring the number of participants reached at community events, the number of children tested, and the impact of meetings to change policy.

**Date Due:** Evaluation models will be conducted throughout the year based upon the discretion of the Environmental Health Director and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Project Officer.

#### Year One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Train-The Trainer Module</td>
<td>March 2008 (will be conducted on a quarterly basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>March, May, July, August September, November 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policy Meetings</td>
<td>Throughout year 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation Model</td>
<td>End of year 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Reports</td>
<td>Detailed Reports</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFEJ will create summary reports of activities for documentation of contract and will be monitored by the Environmental Health Program Director and the CDC Project Officer. Summary Reports at a minimum will include:

- Number of participants attending trainings
- Number of community events conducted
- Number of children tested at events
- Number of policy meetings conducted and attended
- Accomplishments / Outcomes
- Comments, Misc. Etc...

**Template will be provided for assistance.**
Executive Director: The Executive Director will supervise the overall project and subcontract of the Lead Awareness Campaign. Supervision will include monitoring staff, project activities and interfacing with the Chatham County Health Department. The Executive Director will serve as the liaison with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Project Officer and other participating partners. In addition the Executive Director will insure fiduciary responsibility and accountability as well as the achievement of specified deliverables and outcomes, including projected evaluations.

Project Coordinator: The Project coordinator will plan and coordinate all activities associated with the Lead Awareness Campaign. The Project Coordinator will work closely with the staff and community to implement activities outlined in the work plan according to the designated time frame. The Project Coordinator will develop a collaborative partnership with other organizations, groups and neighborhood associations to assist in conducting activities; including elected officials and various sectors of the Chatham County Health Department. The Project coordinator will supervise the outreach workers, interns and volunteers.

Administrative Assistant: The Administrative Assistance will maintain all records, assist with design of outreach materials, coordinate communication systems and activity schedules. The Administrative Assistant will provide administrative support to the Executive Director and Project Coordinator as needed.

LaToria Whitehead, MPH
Public Health Advisor
State of Georgia Project Officer
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
National Center for Environmental Health / Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch
Office 770-488-3633
Fax 770-488-3635
lwhitehead1@cdc.gov
Blackberry 404-200-8287
APPENDIX I

CFEJ Contract 2009-2010

Statement of Work

Title of Project: Savannah Environmental Justice Project

C.1 Background and Need:

Healthy People have a goal to eliminate childhood lead poisoning by 2010. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is committed to providing support to state and local childhood lead poisoning prevention programs to address housing and environmental issues. The purpose of this project is to influence the modification of Lead Poisoning Prevention legislation in Savannah, Georgia, and to identify and test high-risk children ages 1-5 that have been exposed to the disproportionate disparity of lead hazards. This project will aim to develop and revise current policy, educate, and identify resources for the elimination of lead hazards. In addition, identified children will receive follow-up, medical case management, environmental intervention, reduction of hazards, and educational efforts to reduce the effects of ongoing lead exposure.

The Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ) was established in 1995 to provide a vehicle for community members to work for environmental and economic justice at the local level and participate in the formation of the national Environmental Justice movement. The geographical focus has primarily been in Georgia, South Carolina, and the Southeast Region. CFEJ was formed as a community response by African-American citizens in Savannah, Georgia to oppose activities related to nuclear weapons production at the Savannah River Site and to increase the participation of the community in the environmental movement in the Southeast region. Disadvantaged populations in Savannah, Georgia have experienced a vast number of disproportionate environmental hazards and disparities. The Citizens for Environmental Justice have played a critical role in providing research for the community to advocate against environmental hazards. CFEJ has a goal to empower the community through education and advocacy, address environmental health issues, and provide outreach on childhood lead poisoning prevention. CFEJ has been engaged in mobilizing and organizing the community on public policy issues to enforce environmental protection laws and statues.
C.2 Project Objective:
The purpose of this project is to resume and sustain a tactical partnership that provides a strategic design to address and advance local legislation in Savannah, Georgia, cultivate childhood lead poisoning awareness in Savannah for hard-to-reach populations, and increase testing of lead in children. The partnership will enhance the community's level of education and awareness and build the capacity to engage in developing solutions to concerns and issues. For the past two years, CFEJ has established a committed relationship with the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention / Healthy Housing Branch, Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP), and the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program.

C.3 Scope of Work:
Disadvantaged populations have experienced disproportionate environmental disparities for many years. Although children from all socioeconomic backgrounds can be affected by lead poisoning, children who live at or below the poverty line in older housing, and minority children are at the highest risk for childhood lead poisoning. The targeted population for this project will be minority, Medicaid, WIC, and children living in pre-1970 housing. Children that reside in zip codes 31415,31401,31404,31405 in Savannah, Georgia are at a very high risk, and many have not been tested for lead poisoning. House Bill 1043 was passed by the Georgia State Legislature in 2008 and amended the Georgia Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1994. Changes to the existing legislation are statewide and give the Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GCLPPP) unprecedented authority to enforce lead hazard abatement throughout the state. Savannah has one of the highest concentrations of pre-1950 residential housing in the state. The city of Savannah, Georgia upholds Lead Poisoning Prevention legislation in the form of local ordinances. The local legislation focuses on the presence of lead hazards independently of elevated children.

The CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention / Healthy Housing Branch, Citizens for Environmental Justice (CFEJ), Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP), and the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program have a goal to: (1) Broaden the jurisdiction of the ordinance countywide; (2) Ensure adequate enforcement by adopting the state legislation with a broad focus of all property, including owner occupied properties; (3) Modify landlord law of exemption from ordinance for refusal to rent to families with children less that age 6; and (4) Follow state guidelines of lead hazard enforcement at one elevated blood lead level test (ebll) of 15 μg/dL. Educating political representatives in Savannah, Georgia is valuable and beneficial to influence modification for the Lead Poisoning Prevention Legislation, and will attribute to optimal health for this disenfranchised population. For this hard-to-reach population, there continues to be a need for testing, awareness, and education to prevent an increase in environmental health disparities. Lead poisoning can
cause learning disabilities, behavioral problems, and, at very high levels, seizures, comas, and even death. Improvement of local legislation and awareness for all populations is needed.¹

C.4 Technical Requirements:

Policy:
The contractor will lead and attend political meetings throughout the city of Savannah and Atlanta, Georgia to develop strategic plans that encourage the modification for the Savannah Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Law. The contractor will conduct presentations on the law for various political representatives in the city of Savannah and Atlanta. The contractor will create summary reports documenting action steps, develop plans for legislative and regulatory strategies, and update the Georgia Lead Advisory Committee in 2009.

Meetings will be conducted throughout the year for legislative sessions to encourage policy modification, and to influence remediation of lead poisoned houses.

Deliverables:
- The contractor will sit on the agenda of ‘The Hungry Club Forum’ for monthly and bi-monthly meetings in Savannah, Georgia. These meetings are attended by political representatives such as the Mayor, County Manager, City Manager, the Assistant City Manager and other representatives within the Savannah, Georgia area to discuss and address issues and concerns within the Savannah area. Local meetings will also include presentations to and interactions with the City Council and the County Commissioners.
- The contractor will travel to Atlanta twice during the year to meet with representatives from the general assembly and the state senate.
- The contractor will attend two Healthy Housing Conferences and training for up-to-date public health information on health and housing. In addition, the executive director for the organization will sit on the Environmental Justice Expert Panel Meeting hosted by the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention / Healthy Housing Branch and present with the GACLPPP Program Director at the 2009 National Environmental Public Health Conference.
- Two newsletters will be developed by the contractor to inform political representatives and community members on the progress of the Savannah Lead Law.

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/nceh.
**Educational:**

The Contractor will continue to conduct Train-the-Trainer sessions to provide education on childhood lead poisoning for landlords, real estate associations, community members, parents, daycare teachers/workers, heads of neighborhood associations, and other community leaders.

**Deliverable:**

The contractor will conduct three Train-the-Trainer sessions for landlords, real estate associations, community members, parents, daycare teachers/workers, heads of neighborhood associations, and other community leaders which will be followed by selecting leaders of the community to expand and teach the curriculum.

- The contractor will identify trainers to conduct Train-the-Trainer sessions throughout the year in Savannah.
- Evaluations and reports for each training.

**Outreach Activities**

The contractor will identify hard-to-reach communities to increase testing of lead in children and provide community outreach by informing and creating awareness of childhood lead poisoning for the communities of Savannah. Literature utilized will be culturally sensitive for the community. The Citizens for Environmental Justice will not test children for lead. The Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP) will be testing the children for lead, with the assistance of the Chatham County Health Department.

- The contractor will identify children in Savannah neighborhoods who have not been tested for lead with the assistance of data from the GACLPPP, the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, Medicaid, WIC, and Head Start.
- The contractor will conduct two community outreach events during the year for parents, children, and other members of the community to increase awareness, provide education, and increase the testing of children. Community events will include, but are not limited to testing children (with the assistance of Chatham County Health Department), and providing education of childhood lead poisoning. CFEJ will also coordinate with Health Providers in Savannah, Georgia to provide awareness for the Pediatric Community. The Citizens for Environmental Justice will pass out questionnaires to members of the community with no identification of the participants.
Deliverables:

Outreach Event #1 Assessment of Lead Knowledge and Testing (Community Knowledge Assessment)
Children will be tested at this event. A survey will be issued to assess the community’s knowledge on lead to track behavioral changes, awareness, and an understanding related to lead for the duration of the project. Educational Assessments will also be issued for parents after all training events. The Citizens for Environmental Justice will pass out questionnaires to members of the community with no identification of the participants.

Outreach Event #2 Testing Children for Lead (Testing Kids)
Children will be tested at community event with a baseline number noted for previously tested children. Children tested will be recorded and home visits will also be scheduled at event. The Citizens for Environmental Justice will not test children for lead. The Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program will be testing the children for lead, with the assistance of the Chatham County Health Department.

Evaluation Model:
The contractor and CDC will develop an evaluation model for policy, educational, and outreach activities. The evaluation model will include process and outcome evaluation; this includes, but is not limited to measuring the number of participants reached at community events, the number of children tested, and the impact of meetings to change policy.

Evaluation models will be conducted throughout the year based upon the discretion of the Project Officer.

Deliverables:
The evaluation model will assess the political representative’s and the community’s:
- Awareness and perception of the Savannah Lead Law to address new laws and enforcement; (Political Representatives, County Commissioners, and City Council)
- Knowledge of general lead hazards in the homes and environmental and the impact on the quality of life;
- Awareness of health impact of lead levels in population;
- Blood lead levels in children before and after interventions;
- Number of children tested before and after interventions;
- Behavioral Changes related to lead and other environmental health factors;
- Detection of lead hazards in homes and knowledge of resources for clean up;
- Parents’ perception of lead hazards in relation to health disparities.
### C.5 Reporting Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Train-The Trainer Sessions</td>
<td>August / October 2009 and February 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Community Events / CFEJ will not test children for lead. The Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program will be testing the children for lead, with the assistance of the Chatham County Health Department.</td>
<td>August 2009 and March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policy Meetings / Newsletters</td>
<td>August 2009 – May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation Model</td>
<td>End of year 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Reports</td>
<td>Detailed Reports</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contractor will create summary reports of activities for documentation of contract and will be monitored by the Environmental Health Program Director and the CDC Project Officer. Summary Reports at a minimum will include:

- Number of policy meetings conducted and attended
- Number of participants attending trainings
- Number of community events conducted
- Number of children tested at events
- Accomplishments / Outcomes
All reports and deliverables shall be made to CDC PGO for official record keeping, with a courtesy copy to the CDC Project officer. All reports will be in electronic format in MS Word and Excel formats, with two hard copies each of the Final Report to the CDC Project Officer. All materials provided will be the property of the CDC.

The following outline will also serve as the QASP – Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan.

C.5 Reporting Schedule:

- Deliverable 1: Provide Project Plan for approval by CDC – Shall include 1) recommended format of the report including a draft outline of expected content, and 2) brief outline of separate tasks and deliverables within the overall period of performance of this project, including time frames.

- Monthly Status Report

- Deliverable 2: First Interim Progress Report – Summary progress towards completing the report, including any changes in the project plan, deliverables, or expected format of the report.

- Deliverable 3: Second Interim Progress Report – Shall include draft report including all major elements of the final report, for CDC review and comment back to the vendor. The progress report will include a description of any barriers or issues toward completing the project.

- Deliverable 4: Final report due (also described as 1f above), with brief summary of recommendations or lessons learned through this project.

NOTE: The Citizens for Environmental Justice will not test children for lead. The Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program will be testing the children for lead, with the assistance of the Chatham County Health Department. / The Citizens for Environmental Justice will pass out questionnaires to members of the community with no identification of the participants.

The final report will be due within 12 months of award of contract. All material must be provided electronically, MS Word compatible. The final report shall suitable for submission to CDC clearance and follow CDC guidelines for reports and documents.

Period of Performance:

12 months from effective date of contract/award of Purchase Order, estimated May 15, 2009 through May 14, 2010, pending award date of contract.
The Contractor agrees to include (as a minimum) the following information on each invoice:

(1) Contractor’s Name & Address
(2) Contractor’s Tax Identification Number (TIN)
(3) Purchase Order/Contract Number and Task Order Number, if Appropriate
(4) Invoice Number
(5) Invoice Date
(6) Contract Line Item Number and Description of Item
(7) Quantity
(8) Unit Price & Extended Amount for each line item
(9) Shipping and Payment Terms
(10) Total Amount of Invoice
(11) Name, title and telephone number of person to be notified in the event of a defective invoice
(12) Payment Address, if different from the information above.
(13) DUNS + 4 Numbers

In accordance with 5 CFR part 1315 (Prompt Payment), CDC’s Financial Management Office is the designated billing office for the purpose of determining the payment due date under FAR 32.904.

Once a correct and complete copy of the invoice(s) have been forwarded to the appropriate CDC Office and/or Individual, PLEASE CALL THE CDC Financial Management Office (FMO) HELP DESK 770-498-4050 TO INQUIRE ABOUT PAYMENT STATUS.

*FAILURE TO FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS WILL RESULT IN DELAYED or DENIED PAYMENT.*

C.6 Special Considerations
For the past two years, CFEJ has established a committed relationship with the CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention / Healthy Housing Branch, Georgia Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (GACLPPP), and the Chatham County Health Department Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program. This is a continuation of an ongoing project.
Technical Monitor:

LaToria Whitehead
Public Health Advisor
Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch
Division of Emergency and Environmental Health Services
Mail Stop F-60
4770 Buford Highway
Atlanta, Georgia 30341-3724
Telephone: (770) 488-3633
Fax: (770) 488-3635
Email: ceq6@cdc.gov
Question: Okay, today is December 3rd. I'm here with Dr. Mildred McClain. Thank you Dr. McClain.

Answer: You're welcome.

Question: Why did you start CFEJ?

Answer: Citizens for Environmental Justice was started back -- the seeds were planted in 1990. By 1991, we had begun to organize ourselves as a small (focus group) primarily because when I returned to Savannah there was a middle class, white subdivision called Weather Wood that had been built on contaminated soil that contained methane gas. And the methane gas had seeped up into the housing of the residents. And they were up in arms, and they challenged the County because the land actually originally belong to the County and it was sold to the developers and no cleanup occurred. So that was the local event that was going on.

Around the same time, I met a gentleman from [Inaudible] of Georgia and they had been working around some landfill and dump issues. And we met and he asked me about the Savannah River site. And I had been involved in a lot of anti-nuclear work, but I hadn’t really done any specific work around that particular federal facility, which is located in (Akon, South Carolina). And he essentially ask how could we as residents in this area not be engaged with what was going on there because it was a former nuclear weapons production site that still had very serious current missions. So we started kind of thinking about that.

And then in 1991, the day after Christmas, there was an accidental release of tritium from the Savannah River site that made it all the way down to the Savannah River. About 20,000 [inaudible], which in of itself is not a dangerous level, but it can be particular because the Savannah River serves as the backup water for Chatham County as well as (Ulysses and Jackson County). And that was the catalyst that said to us that there was very serious environmental issues in the south, the
southeast, in Georgia but more importantly there was some serious environmental justice issues because if they would allow a white middle class neighborhood to be built on contaminated soil, then what would they allow to happen to marginalized and disenfranchised communities like the African Americans here in Savannah. So we decided to organize the (group). That's how we started. Those were the two issues that catapulted us.

And I think the overall framework was as we began to look at that, there was already an effort underway. There was a planning committee that was organizing the first People of Color Leadership Summit that was going to be held in D.C., and we were able to get a seat on that planning committee. So that allowed us to become a part of the national environmental justice movement representing our local community. We were able to become a part of that planning committee through the efforts of Connie Tucker, who was with the (Southern Organizing Committee) and Pat Brian who was with the (Gulf Coast) Tenants Association. We participated in our first meeting out in Texas. That's when Dana Austin was still alive. Ben (Schafer was very actively involved) as well as Charles Lee. So those three sort of steered the work were the impetus for forming the Citizens for Environmental Justice.

And how we got the name is we were in New York preparing to attend the first summit and we were trying to kick around a name. What should we call ourselves. And there was three of us. And we were saying well (one we got to have something about environmental justice in the title). And then someone said well now and we got to make sure that we focus on the citizens. And so one was like what about Citizens for Environmental Justice. And just like that, that's the name we had chose.

**Question:** So you're the director of CFEJ. And you started off with two employees?

**Answer:** Actually we started off with no employees. It was just myself and a gentleman from Sparta, Georgia. As I said, he and I sort of -- we were volunteering trying to kind of figure out what we could do, but we weren't paid staff. As a matter of fact, the first grant we applied for was from the [Inaudible] Island Research Foundation and we were rejected. But we were working here with a local white group called Citizens for Clean Air and Water. And what we did is we formed a partnership, and they applied for the grant the next year from
[Inaudible] Island, received the grant, and so turned it over to us. That’s how we got started.

Question: How long had you been in Savannah [inaudible]?

Answer: Well I’m originally from Savannah, but I went away and I came back as a young adult after I finished all of my schooling and family raising. So --

Question: [Inaudible] from Savannah?

Answer: Well I was born in Georgetown, Georgia, but my mom moved here when I was three-years old. I was raised here. I went to school here. I my second upbringing though was in Boston, MA because I recollected there when I was 16 on a scholarship.

Question: How long were you in Boston?

Answer: About 30 plus years.

Question: And you went to school in Boston?

Answer: Yes I did. As a matter of fact, I finished high school in Boston. And I attended college in Boston.

Question: And what school did you attend?

Answer: At the high school level, I attuned --

Question: No college level.

Answer: Oh okay, the University of MA. That’s where I got my undergraduate degree. And then I got my masters from Harvard Graduate School of Education as well as Antioch College. I got a masters in education from that university as well. And then I got my doctorate from Harvard.

Question: So one would say you got a great education [inaudible] Harvard University. So you still choose to come back and do your work in Savannah.

Answer: Oh yeah, my intent was always the come back. I never saw myself not living in Savannah. It did take longer than I had anticipated, but my goal -- being reared in the public schools, in segregated public schools of Savannah, was a great assets because the teachers really invested in
the students. They had a real stake in the achievement of their students. And so we were actually push to strive to function a level of excellence that I didn’t see around the country. We were privy to that, so one of the under-girding [inaudible] was that when you become educated, and when you become experienced, it is your responsibility to come back to your community, to come back to your roots to give back because that’s how -- that’s the cycle of building community is the community sends certain people out to get the skills and the knowledge and they’re responsibility is to come back and (teach the others). So it’s really that whole notion around [inaudible], reaching back to the past to bring us toward the future and also the saying each one teach one, each one reach one because that I think is a fundamental value of the African American community throughout the country. But it’s also a fundamental value of the Environmental Justice movement that whole central building capacity is in coming back to the community and giving back to your community.

**Question:** How are the goals of CFEJ determined?

**Answer:** It happens in a number of different ways. We have for lack of a better word, we have focus groups where we relate to different sectors of the community, and they raise and identify a certain issue that we take under consideration from our board level and our staff level to see if that’s something that fits in with the overall mission and vision of the organization. The mission and the vision of the organization has been set for years. Now we kind of tweaked it, but essentially, that is the guiding tool that helps us determine what issue we might address, what problem we might try to tackle. The other way our goals and objectives are shaped is by the needs of the community because the community can come to us. Residents can come to us. Organizations can come to us. Neighborhoods can come to us and say we’re experiencing problem X. We need your assistance. And that’s pretty much how we have functioned over the past 20 years is that we have provided technical assistance, technical support so practically building for neighborhoods and communities throughout the country because they called us. Somebody got word of mouth and said oh well you know Citizens for Environmental Justices they know a lot about landfills. They know a lot about nuclear issues. They’ve done a lot of work around nuclear weapons. We’ve done a lot around transportation of [inaudible]. They do know how to do assessments. They know how to create you know educational material, so they come to us for assistance. And based on what their needs and our ability to respond to that need, that might become a short-term objective. But we go through a pretty rigorous strategic planning process that helps us
review, analyze and adjust our mission and vision as needed. We do that periodically. We just completed our last review of mission purpose, niche.

Question: You say adjust your mission. You adjust some of your objectives sometimes. According to what?

Answer: According to what the political area is, with the economic context that we’re functioning in because sometimes have to shift depending on what the national and international landscape of things are. We are rooted and creating -- being a part of creating healthy, safe, clean, sustainable communities. That’s our bottom line principal. But sometimes we’ve got to focus more on a particular area because for example right now the recession helps to dictate what we do because we may have to frame our environmental work and its link to what’s happening [inaudible]. So some of our work takes on a different shape because we’re looking at to have -- we’re looking at what the social context of the work is and as that shifts, we shift. What’s happening in the Environmental Justice movement nationally? That helps shift -- sort of shape-shifting because if we have been successful on changing the policy and the process as it relates to for example maybe a landfill, then that’s no longer something that you need to be working on. You have to take on the next issue. But the next issue may be addressing asthma as a result of being exposed to various chemicals. So it really depends on like I said national landscape, what’s happening in the world. But we try not to stray from our fundament. And our fundament is to ensure environmental justice for all that irrespective of your color, your class, your ethnic origin, your economic status, all of that irrespective of that, you have a human right to clean air, clean water, clean land. You have a right to preserve your culture and your traditions. You have a right to be self-determining. You have a right to have a healthy and well neighborhood. So like I said we don’t stray away from the fundamentals, but we have to keep up with what’s going on.

Question: What do you feel are the accomplishments and future endeavors of CFEJ?

Answer: I think our most critical accomplishment is that we’re still here that the organization is alive. It’s well. It’s getting ready to transition into a national organization with some international focus. We have expanded our work around environmental justice to include or workforce development, to include using community [inaudible] research methods, to look at the relationships that [inaudible] our
community particularly between exposure to environmental pollutants and our behavior -- violent behavior, criminal behavior, dysfunctional behavior. We have been able to build sustentative partnership with most all of the federal agencies that are prominent around environmental justice: Environmental Protection Agency, the Centers for Disease Control, the Agency for [Inaudible] and Disease Registry, and the Department of Energy. So we’ve built long-term relationships with those federal family members. We have built sustentative partnerships at the local and the state level. We have been recipients of multiyear grants from both ETA, DOE, subcontract of [Inaudible] and CDC. We have raised the level of awareness of our local residence around the myriad of environmental issues that we face, and we categorized those [inaudible] problems, long-term problems that we’ll be working on for some time. We have been able to raise the level of awareness in our residents around lead poisoning prevention strategies. We have been able to organize at the national level a presence around federal facilities looking at the legacy of nuclear weapons waste, the transportation of the waste, the storage of the waste, the disposal of the waste. We have actually built the capacity of residents being able to engage in those -- the environmental impact statement process, which is based on science. And they built their capacity to be able to decipher and analyze very complex data that is used to support their position on the recommendations that they make around environmental justice and environmental solutions. We have been able to provide technical assistance to well over hundreds local communities throughout the country. We’ve trained over 2,000 young people as community leaders working in the environmental justice movement, the social justice movement, the youth movement. We have --

Question: You’ve done a lot.

Answer: Yeah we have successfully participated in many international [inaudible] on the environment including on climate change and sustainable development. We have been the recipient of a number of awards for the work that we’ve done across the country. We have been successful in raising money from the foundation specific to do this work. And we’re one of the few African American -- actually the only African American environmental justice organizations that addresses nuclear energy, nuclear power, and nuclear weapons. And that’s been our core case. We’re one of the national leaders in that area.

Question: (What [inaudible] for the future of CFEJ)
We’re transitioning, as I said, to a national organization with a national focus on environmental justice. We’re going to expand our workforce development work because you cannot ask communities to address environmental issues and problem and concerns in isolation of what their economic (plight) is. So if you’re not helping people improve their quality of life starting with their economic base, you’re not going to get them engaged in the type of policy and strategy work that is going to be required to create a sustainable plan.

Question: Do you think your goals align with the goals of CDC for the lead project?

Answer: Oh absolutely. I think that it was a perfect fit because in Savannah, being one of the older cities on the coast, a lot of our housing is pre-1978. We have a number of homes that we know are probably still lead-filled. We know that there are a number of children that have not been tested for lead. We have a high incidence of African American incarceration and we believe that that is linked primarily to lead exposure. We have as a part of our mission this whole piece of our creating healthy homes of individuals and healthy communities, and that is what CDC is about and this lead prevention program. We are about raising the level of awareness, changing policy, engaging parents in particular to prevent lead poisoning. Lead prevention we feel is a low-hanging fruit that is achievable not just in our lifetime but in the next couple of years. We plan to make that a national campaign. As a matter of fact, in the last six months, every national symposium that we have participated in we have raised this issue around people uniting for lead prevention. The goal was to be lead-free by 2010. The new goal is 2012. We want to work with CDC to ensure that that occurs because it’s doable [inaudible]. So our goal around becoming a lead-free zone, a lead-free city align quite well with CDC’s moving in the direction of creating these healthy homes and eliminating lead cause in 2010 there’s no reason why children should not have been tested, medical intervention [inaudible], and property abated. That’s just [inaudible]. How do we get this property abated? How do we get these old buildings abated? Homes, office condos [inaudible] that are in this community, schools. So I think the alignment is (simple).

Question: What are the major barriers partnering with a federal government agency?

Answer: The bureaucracy. You have a set of protocols and policies and regulations and rules that are in place that are not flexible enough to encompass this new environmental justice set of principal of how
federal agencies work with communities, how federal agencies work with residents, how federal agencies work with community-based organizations. There was a barrier particular around particularly the funding mechanisms, how the federal government is able to provide funds at the local level to communities without having to go through a university or an academic institution that the federal agencies recognized as community-based organizations and neighborhood associations many times do have the capacity, the financial capability and the capacity and the infrastructures to handle money and to handle sizable money. But often the requisites of getting that money is so stringent that it’s serves as a barrier. And then a lot of time the reporting requirements are so tedious and just too much. It’s too complicated to have to report sometimes and the way in which the reports are requested. And that’s not to say that that CDC is doing that. But I’m looking at the overall federal family. And that’s an area where they can certainly improve that process.

I think another challenge is the fact that the staffing of the federal agencies -- the staff members are not really trained to understand operating in an environmental justice community or operating in a community that’s dealing with environmental justice issues.

Question: In what way?

Answer: How you all work is evident, science-based driven. You don’t value an intimate relationship with community. You work from your cubicles. You don’t work across cubicles, so you’re in your little silos doing your little thing, and you don’t want to come out and have that personal interaction and listen to the voice of the community, because often the federal staff members describe the voice of the community as irate, to passionate, to [inaudible], to emotional, lack -- based on antedotal evidence and not rooted in science. And that kind of culture is a cultural class because you come as a suit if you know what I mean. You get the suit that’s coming in with the briefcase and you know your way of working, and there isn’t an appreciation or a recognition that my people skills may have to be [inaudible] (a notch) in order to be able to listen in a way that I haven’t before, to be able to be culturally sensitive to use that word that I don’t like to be culturally competent to work for example in indigenous communities where the languages, and the traditions, and the customs are very different. To work in Spanish-speaking communities and not feel that English should be the only language that’s used to communicate where the federal family understands the need for translation, for translators. Working in African American communities understanding that this is not a
homogenous community, but it is made up of different values and different sectors of belief and different approaches to how we develop our community because the African community reflects thousands of tribes that they came from when they came from Africa. And they didn’t all assimilate in the same way. So how does the federal family look at engaging those communities with those particular kind of sensitivities that they’ve gone through some type of environmental justice training, that talks about how you engage community or how you talk with community or some type of cultural competence training where you know you have an appreciation that you’re going into a different culture, so you may have to think a little different in order to get at resolving the problem. But it’s all around problem solving. Communities don’t just raise hell for the hell of it. It’s that it’s a problem. It has an impact on their quality of life, and they’re looking for change.

Question: You said earlier about the funding. And you said the process of funding, so I got that. When you actually do get the funding, do you think that the funding is fit for what you all do?

Answer: I think that there’s always less because even when you start out thinking about you may get $200,000, by the time you get it, you’re only getting $50,000, but you still have to try to achieve the same scope of work. Because the allocation has been reduced doesn’t mean that now you have to go and reduce what you’re doing because if you’re really committed to the problem, you’re going to try to work with the resources that you have and you’re going to try to leverage them in some way. But you start off with objectives, and it creates a stress level in the work that shouldn’t be there. There should be enough funds allocated to actually do a quality job. When you look at the funding in the white community, for example, they don’t get underfunded. They get what they ask for. If it is reduced, it’s reduced by a very small percentage. But when you see grants agreements coming to the communities of color, it’s somehow that formula can always be shifted. And I guess maybe because our culture says that if you give us $5, we’re going to work as if we had 5,000. If you give us 5,000, we’ll work as if we had $50,000. So I think that we’ve got to break that cycle and be able to say as a community, I can’t do this for $10. I need the $100.

Question: Why are you doing this? And you know you’ve been doing this for a long time, so you’re going to exactly what you need [inaudible] half of what you need, but you still [inaudible] the work. Why do you do it?
(Well at this time mainly because) we’re looking out for the future generations. The indigenous people say seven generations down the road. African people say every generation down the road we have to look out for. And so whether or not you have all of the resources and finances that you need to do the job, you have a moral obligation to go through a plight that sometimes is not in their hands. And if you are blessed to have received the kind of training that our staff has to have the experiences at the various levels that we have, we have a responsibility to the community to give back. Our name is Harambee House. Harambee stands for let’s build together. And that has been our mission since our inception. We pull together with whomever to try to improve the quality of life for the least of us so we’re rooted in a spiritual position that says that indeed we are our brother and sister’s keepers. If we didn’t have any money, we’d still do the work. We’d still do the work. Now we’d probably be working Burger King or something like that and we’d have to do the work at night and (when we’re sleep), but we’ll still do the work.

Question: Now your doctorate is in education Dr. McClain, so your knowledge and I’ll just call you an expert in environmental justice, how do you gain the knowledge [inaudible]? Were you always studying environmental justice? When you came here, you took it on cause I know you’re one of the pioneers. People consider you one of the pioneers of the environmental justice movement. I would consider you one of the pioneers of the environmental justice movement --

Answer: Well you know prior to 1990, the term environmental justice was not really being used. That came out of the People of Color Leadership Summit. But I’ve been involved in the disarmament movement since I was a teenager. I mean I’m an antiwar person. I’m antinuclear weapons, so that’s my root into the environmental movement. We were part of the anti-(freeze -- the freeze movement), which was antinuclear weapons. My training is in education. I’m a teacher, but [inaudible] and training. The field gave me the expertise if you will in environmental justice. It came from the ground. It came from the trenches. I have never taken an environmental justice course. I’ve been to numerous workshops and trainings and conferences, but as a discipline, that’s not my training. My training came from responding to critical problems that were being identified in numerous communities across the country. So it came from the field.

Question: What are some of the positives?
Answer: I think they bring a set of skills and competencies to the community that’s really needed. I think that as we look at ourselves moving to the future, we should be more focused on hard skills like science or being able to engage in rigorous analysis, like being able to engage the community in doing risk assessments and things like that, which you don’t ordinarily think about. So the federal staff actually brings that level of engagement. It pushes the envelope for regular citizens. It influences us to become more capable of articulating what’s going on in our community and helping to [inaudible] the strategy that will eliminate the problem and accent the positive. So what you bring is something that we don’t have. What’s really exciting is the federal agencies have two types of staff people. They have people who are really rooted in community, and then they have people who are rooted in the institution, the agency. Those people who are rooted in communities really serve as a great asset to the residents because they serve as door-openers where communities can access information and resources. If they community-rooted people were not there, we would not be able to have a positive relationship with the federal agencies because the suit would prevent it. They’re so wrapped up into the bureaucratic ways of doing things and that separation between community and professionals that it precludes anything really getting done because you get tied up into process and procedure. And so arrogant and unappreciation of people who may not be PhD folk or may not have masters. They’re just regular people trying to survive, trying to have a good life. But I do think that the federal agencies do bring -- I know they bring (headaches), but they bring challenges that sharpen us. I guess sometimes they say iron sharpens iron, so the federal agency comes with their solutions, and we have to become better at -- as they say in the old days smashing [inaudible]. Smash it and that’s what we have to do. I think that if I look back on our history, there’s been sometimes when we just didn’t want to talk to federal agencies, but there was one person in that agency that could see beyond what we could see and say no, don’t [inaudible].

Question: Do you feel you have the trust of the community? If not, why not?

Answer: I think we do. I think we’ve grown in the trust and the respect because we’ve been [inaudible] for 20 years, raising the same issue, and now they’ve finally got it. And they talk about it in public [inaudible] that you know they didn’t know what we were talking about 20 years ago but so thankful that we stayed on the (case). Of course the trust level changes. As communities become more empowered and as they began to get more access to resources, sometimes that mentality that we can get sometimes that when you’re just at the point of getting what you
want, you revert back into that suspicious, untrusting frame of mind because you know that's just how it is. We have a legacy of internalized oppression that sometimes causes us to not trust each other in the way in which we should. But overall I think our reputation across the country is a pretty good one [inaudible].

**Question:** What types of tactics are used to communicate between the federal government and the community and to gain the trust of the community? (How do you accomplish the goals of CFEJ and assist the community)

**Answer:** We use a number of different ways to communicate with the communities. I think our best way of communicating is through meetings, our community meetings, our house meetings. We do a lot of house meetings because it's a much more setting.

**Question:** Is that here?

**Answer:** No, in somebody's home in the community. We serve as the bridge between the agency and the community for the translating of what the community is saying so many times and then translating with the agency is saying. We do have a website, so we use that as a form of communication. We do move letters. We attend a lot of the neighborhood association meetings. We create meetings, but they're meetings that are already organized that has a population already that we can go to and take the message or introduce the project or introduce the agency. We use the media to get the word out. We use young people as ambassadors to get the word out. We try to have sessions between the federal agencies and the communities where there's an open dialogue. And we make sure that everything's done in a transparent manner. They're not hidden agendas. And really if the agency has asked us to introduce [inaudible] community, that's one thing. But if the community had said we need the agency to come in, that's another message that we'll have to use to communicate. So it would depend on what you're trying to do and who asked you to do it. But communication is very important because right now we have a community that we're working in, and they're getting a lot of recognition for a lot of groups and agencies are trying to get to them because they know the outcome of this project is going to be very positive. But they're doing things without communicating directly to the neighborhood or to us as an organization. And that creates a problem because as an organization, we don't speak for the neighborhood unless they give us that permission. We don't [inaudible] anything unless they give us prior approval. These other groups don't understand that so they'll you know include them in a
proposal or include them in something that they haven’t gotten prior permission for that. They shouldn’t even use our name. We’re a little bit more flexible, but the neighborhood, they speak for themselves. And therefore without having proper pathways of communication, you can destroy great work because only one person has to get disgruntle and say well I didn’t know what you was doing. I didn’t agree with that.

Question: You say you all don’t speak for the community unless you’re given permission. And once you all have communicated with communities and talked to them and say okay this is how we feel about. This is what you need to be saying. This is our [inaudible].

Answer: Right.

Question: And that’s when you take it to the federal government agency or whoever you need to take it to political representatives to communicate that. But until you get that --

Answer: Right. Now we can speak as an organization. We can say our organization feels dah, dah, dah, and based on our work with dah, dah, dah this is what we -- but I cannot say Woodville feels like or the issues of Woodville are until I meet with Woodville and they say you can say this. Here’s what we want you to say. Here’s how we want you to say. Here’s what we want you to bring back as a result of saying it.

Question: How much input do you receive from the community; do you see the problem and decide, do you get input from the community first? How do you go about deciding?

Answer: Everything is community-driven.

Question: So you don’t see the problem and then you decide. You [inaudible] them --

Answer: Ninety percent come from the communities. We do reserve the right to recognize a problem and try to address it ourselves. But it’s better if you’re trying to work at a neighborhood issue to have that neighborhood driving the process and you’re simply a (tool of that).

Question: How do you decide what you’re going to take on and what you’re not going to take on? When we first started the interview, you said that [inaudible]. Do you take on everything the community brings to you?
Answer: Oh no, we can’t. We don’t have that many resources. No [inaudible]. Sometimes there maybe a small period where we’ve done that, but again we look at the capacity of our staff. We look at the access to resources to get something. Sometimes you have to get done without money, without resources, [inaudible]. But then we try to use our mission and our vision to drive the work that we take on. Now for example right now the whole country, the whole planet is green jobs and green economy and green training. Well no community has come to us and said we want that. That’s what we need because we know that as an organization we’ve got to be a part of that. And so we’ve insinuate ourselves in that debate. No community has come to us except some of the federal communities and said that you all need to address [inaudible]. We know that’s an international issue. That’s a planetary issue. But we have to address climate change, so that’s not [inaudible] going to come from the community per say, but we know that as a credible organization we’ve got to address that issue because it impacts everything that’s going on at the local level in these neighborhoods, in these communities. See there’s different ways that (when we take on the issues). Sometimes most [inaudible] come from the community because we want to be saying we’re working with the community in this. But then there’s a national issue, some international issues that just comes with the territory of the work of environmental justice. You cannot say you’re an environmental justice organization if you’re not speaking to climate change [inaudible]. You cannot say you’re an environmental justice organization if you’re dealing with issues of sustainability. So part of our work is building the capacity of the local neighborhoods to understand all of these big, big issues and how they [inaudible] to the small issues in their neighborhoods. So we don’t want the community to stay at the same level. We want residents to be able to say yeah we understand what [inaudible] (trade) is and [inaudible] look at an approach of dealing with climate change. We understand what the [inaudible] means. We understand what [inaudible]. What understand how some people can be seeing nuclear power or nuclear energy as a solution to climate change. So those type of complex issues is our responsibly to build the capacity of those communities to understand that. They may not ask for it, but we know that that has to be done and so we do that.

Question: In your perspective has childhood lead poisoning been a problem in the city of Savannah in the past before you partnered with CDC within the last 2 ½ years?

Answer: Oh yeah, cause we had a few years, and I don’t really remember the initial year off the top of my head, but we can find out, where
elementary schools was identified by EPA as having significant levels of lead in the building as well in the soil around the building and the neighboring community park. And that was well before this [inaudible].

Question: Did you all take any part in that?

Answer: Yes, we actually organized the community to respond. We hosted several town hall meetings. We were part of a community coalition that was put together to supervise the cleanup and the outreach to the community. We were actually working with the school board and the school officials, the elected the officials.

Question: What was the outcome of that?

Answer: They did the cleanup and they’re not restoring the trees in the community park. But one of the things that has been raised with us is there is a teacher at East (Broad) currently who says that the behavior of the children is much more violent and she believes that it’s because they have been exposed to lead in the building. And she’s asking that we come and test those children and some type of initiative around just the elementary school itself because the cleanup was completed maybe about two or three years ago. But nobody has gone back in to do any monitoring or update on what -- did that cleanup -- was that satisfactory, has any more testing been done with the children because there is a rise and increase in inappropriate behavior.

Question: You all might be [inaudible] (working with her)?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Has it been made an issue in this city in the past?

Answer: Oh yes, oh yes. Two weeks ago we did a presentation to the Senate, House, special subcommittee that came to Savannah.

Question: Before you started working with CDC?

Answer: No, this was just last week. And Senator Jackson acknowledged that prior to our work with CDC it wasn’t a real issue here in Savannah [inaudible] not only to the policymakers but the general population. And we have many more parents now that are begging for their children to be tested.
Question: So before you all came along [inaudible] lead poisoning you don't think it was an issue?

Answer: If it was, it was very quiet. If it was an issue, it just wasn't being dealt with. There was no recognition, no acknowledgement. Parents didn't even know that they should have their children tested. (And many of the officials) didn't even know we had a problem.

Question: If childhood lead poisoning has not been an issue in Savannah, why hasn't it and what do you feel are the major health issues in Savannah, if any?

Answer: Nobody raised the issue. They didn't know. If you don't I mean -- I mean no awareness and no understanding of connections and links and relationships. You just think that your child is acting out and they had too much sugar. Maybe he didn't sleep last night. Maybe he's just mad. Maybe somebody talked about him. They didn't see that there was a possibility of Johnny's behavior being linked to the fact that [inaudible] some paint chips cause they didn't know. They just [inaudible] send the child home, (suspend the child). And nobody ever said [inaudible] we need to try to trace why this is. So people just were contributing it to something else.

Question: In your perspective, what are the major quality of life issues in Savannah and why?

Answer: Asthma is number one. It is asthma and all respiratory-related diseases. That's the primary. I want to say attention deficit [inaudible] attention deficit, developmental disorders. There's a lot of slow learners in Savannah. And I have the most recently proof of that is I was over 100 applicants to the work education job training program. We took the basic skills test --

Question: [Inaudible].

Answer: A significant percentage of those young people did not pass that test.

Question: And it's a basic skills test.

Answer: It's just basic reading.

Question: So [inaudible] is a major issue here.

Answer: Yes.
Question: Are you training them? What are you doing with the applications today? [Inaudible].

Answer: Well what they’re doing is they’re taking an application. They’re going to be tested and the outcome is entry into our training program. We have 100 applicants. We only have 20 slots. And they’ll be trained in lead abatement, asbestos removal, mold remediation, handling hazardous materials, OSHA, [inaudible].

Question: To help them get a job.

Answer: To get a job, yeah.

Question: And I think you answered this earlier how your goals at CFEJ relate to childhood lead poisoning.

Answer: Well our goal is to help particularly Savannah and Chatham County to become lead-free. And we want to move the community towards to being able to have healthy homes using the healthy homes criteria.

Question: And overall [inaudible].

Answer: Oh absolutely. Yeah, we want to be a part of the national effort to eliminate lead in the U.S. and prevent lead poisoning of our children because as I said earlier it’s [inaudible] doable. And it would change the fabric of our neighborhoods because it will first of all decrease the number of young people being suspended and warehoused in the prisons and jails.

Question: What do you feel are the major quality of life of issues? It doesn’t have to be health.

Answer: It is health. Health and poverty. If you ain’t got good health, you ain’t got nothing. And then if you poor, you ain’t got no good health.

Question: This issue impacts blacks and Hispanics more than any other race; Childhood lead poisoning affects more Black and Hispanic children in the country, including Savannah, than any other race. What effect does this have or do you think, in your opinion, that this hinders the ordinance in any way?

Answer: Oh absolutely. I think that if it was white kids [inaudible] affected [inaudible] suspended out of schools this way [inaudible] behaviors that
we see in our children, there definitely would have been a different
culture. We do not have a substantial Latin population in Savannah, so
it’s primarily African American children. Because this is seen as the
(expendable) population, this is not the predominate [inaudible] that’s
why there’s been no issue raised. There was at one time [inaudible] grant
to address lead abatement in the home, but that wasn’t really a
community initiative. And we don’t know what happened with that
money. We know that for a while there wasn’t anything being done
around lead until we had [inaudible] CDC saw an opportunity to work
with our community. So it has really taken lead and put it front and
center where it should be.

Question: And the major issues and the needs of community are education,
awareness --

Answer: Well first of all we needed that policy changed because -- we have to
have a policy in place that says if we find lead in a house, it is the
responsibility of both the policymakers and the owners of the property
to abate that property period so that anybody who lives in there whether
they are a family or an individual with children or whatever, they do
not have the potential of being exposed to lead. That’s number one.
That [inaudible] you have to have that in place. Then you have to
[inaudible] more of awareness because we are a city of 150,000 people
[inaudible]. And if you can only reach 1,000 you haven’t done
anything. So increasing an awareness especially among the parents, the
daycare providers, head start, the churches who have daycare
[inaudible], that kind of massive education is needed. And
collaborative and partnerships between different sectors of the city are
needed to address eliminating lead.

Question: Besides lead, what do you think the needs of the community are,
quality of life issues at the community level from your experience?

Answer: Well it depends on what part of the city because for example if you’re
on the Westside and you are there encircled by all of those industries,
then the air quality is the central issue. [Inaudible] across the board, the
indoor air quality is a major concern. What is that we have in our
homes that maybe contributing to the demise of our health. I think the
issue of [inaudible] or just [inaudible] behavior had contributed in a
number of behavior like talking back, like belligerent like anger and all
of that. That’s a major problem in the community. And that’s an
element of quality of life. Those kind of things that [inaudible].
Question: (Explain the law) It appears that the ordinance has no consequences to it. But the law does allow City Councilman and the Mayor to change the ordinance. Do you think this will happen?

Answer: [Inaudible] would. I know they turned this over to the Assistant City Manager’s office and she is committed. Even though there may not be the resources I think that what they want to do is they want to support finding those resources to assist those property owners to be able to abate that lead. [Inaudible] they know the other cost that it would bring as far as the wear and tear on the back end of being exposed to lead. How much is that going to cost you in terms of finances, in terms of health, in terms quality of life of people, in terms of all [inaudible] social determinants of health.

Question: What type of negative and positive changes have you seen in the city of Savannah related to the environment? Such as new buildings, parks, grocery stores with fresh veggies / fruits, transportation, clean water, reduction of hazardous dump sites...

Answer: I think the most important change I’ve seen that I stated earlier is that people now recognize what an environmental problem is, what an environmental concern is. And there’s ways to problem-solve [inaudible] around those issues and concerns. And things that they thought of in the past that didn’t have a label now have a label. I think [inaudible] and they’re engagement around trying to do something about those issues and concerns is [inaudible] than what it was before. So the investment that we’ve made has certainly paid off.

Question: Do you think the Environmental Justice movement has made a major impact on regulation and laws? How effective has this movement been from your perspective?

Answer: There’s certainly been a number of victories. But when you look at for example the kinds of national dialogues that are going on around environment justice, around exposures, some of the same dialogue [inaudible] 20 years ago. So you’re saying then okay if we’re having the same dialogue has anything changed. And I know some things have changed. There are initiatives that have been put in place by federal agencies that have significant [inaudible]. But overall [inaudible] and committee concepts and all of that [inaudible]. Change. [Inaudible] changed. You know if something -- an initiative is good, but the enforcement of the law is better. We want laws that actually [inaudible] would protect communities -- would preserve communities. But for some reason the enforcement part, the compliance part
[inaudible] and that’s been where the communities have been to bring their voice the greatest. So it’s good to have a care project. It’s good to have a lead campaign. All that’s good and you do have some good results, but fundamentally, are they going to change (the process). Yes, we’ve had significant victories. But the quality of life for most people that we started working with 20 years ago (the same).

Question: [Inaudible] being enforced.

Answer: And I think that we have to look at how do you change the revelation to upgrade the model that -- the standard that was used to say okay you can be exposed to this amount and it’s safe. We have to review those standards and change those standards because the model that was used was a healthy 140 pound white man who has access to healthcare and everything else. We’re talking about vulnerable populations who don’t have that. So that standard needs to be revisited because then that standard would then change some of the regulations and the rules because you’ll have a different standard.

Question: Does that go back to the [inaudible] government agencies?

Answer: Yes. Yes.

Question: Okay. Anything you’d like to add Dr. McClain?

Answer: No.

Question: End of Tape
APPENDIX K

Political Representatives
(City Councilman, Senator, first Black mayor in Savannah, current Mayor, County Commissioner)

1. Are you aware that childhood lead poisoning is a health issue in Savannah, Georgia? If yes, what do you know about this issue?

2. Do you think the general population in this city knows or is aware of this health problem? Or has it been made an issue in this city?


4. Have you ever worked with CFEJ? What issues have you worked with them on?
   If not, why not? How did that Project turn out?

5. Do you think they have made a major impact in the city of Savannah or been effective? How and why?

6. What type of issues have CFEJ worked on?

7. How receptive is the community of the activities that CFEJ conduct, in your opinion?

8. Are you aware of the CFEJ lead campaign? If so what do you know about it?

9. Right now, CFEJ is working with the GACLPPP to change the Savannah ordinance. (Explain the law) It appears that the ordinance has no consequences to it. But the law does allow City Councilman and the Mayor to change the ordinance. Do you think this will happen?

10. In your opinion what are the political obstacles to changing this ordinance? Do you think this law would pass in the political arena? Why or Why not?

11. Are you supportive of this ordinance even if Savannah is not currently receiving HUD funding / even if property owners had to pay? It could cost rental property owners a lot of money.

12. Have previous efforts been made to change this ordinance?

13. This issue impacts blacks and Hispanics more than any other race; Childhood lead poisoning affects more Black and Hispanic children in the country, including Savannah, than any other race. What effect does this have or do you think, in your opinion, that this hinders the ordinance in any way?

14. Do you think this is part of the reason the ordinance has not been changed or this health disparity has not been made an issue; because of the population it affects?
Community Leaders

1. Are you aware that childhood lead poisoning is a health issue in Savannah, Georgia? If yes, what do you know about this issue?
2. Do you think the general population in this city knows or is aware of this health problem? Or has it been made an issue in this city?
4. Have you ever worked with CFEJ? What issues have you worked with them on? If not, why not? How did that Project turn out?
5. Do you think they have made a major impact in the city of Savannah or been effective? How and why?
6. What type of issues have CFEJ worked on?
7. How receptive is the community of the activities that CFEJ conduct, in your opinion?
8. Are you aware of the CFEJ lead campaign? If so what do you know about it?
9. This issue impacts blacks and Hispanics more than any other race; Childhood lead poisoning affects more Black and Hispanic children in the country, including Savannah, than any other race. What effect does this have or do you think, in your opinion, that this hinders the ordinance in any way?
10. What do you think the needs of the community are?
11. Do you think environmental hazards such as clean air, water, etc… has been an issue in Savannah? Such as hazardous waste sites, housing, etc…
12. What type of negative and positive changes have you seen in the city of Savannah related to the environment? Such as new buildings, parks, grocery stores with fresh veggies / fruits, transportation, clean water, reduction of hazardous dump sites…

Head Start teacher / Youth Authority Director / YMCA Director – continued from previous questions on this page

You teach and / or communicate with youth on an everyday basis. What do you feel are the major quality of life issues for these families?

Have you seen health behaviors that might be a result of childhood lead poisoning?
The Citizens for Environmental Justice

1. Why did you start CFEJ? Or how long have you been a member of CFEJ?

2. How are the goals of CFEJ determined?

3. What do you feel are the accomplishments and future endeavors of CFEJ?

4. Do you think your goals align with the goals of CDC for the lead project?

5. What are the major barriers partnering with a federal government agency?

6. What are some of the positives?

7. Do you feel you have the trust of the community? If not, why not?

8. If yes, why and what types of tactics are used to communicate between the federal government and the community and to gain the trust of the community? (How do you accomplish the goals of CFEJ and assist the community)

9. How much input do you receive from the community; do you see the problem and decide, do you get input from the community first? How do you go about deciding?

10. In your perspective has childhood lead poisoning been a problem in the city of Savannah in the past before you partnered with CDC within the last 2 1/2 years? Or has it been made an issue in this city in the past?

11. If childhood lead poisoning has not been an issue in Savannah, why hasn’t it and what do you feel are the major health issues in Savannah, if any?

12. How do your goals of CFEJ relate to childhood lead poisoning?

13. In your perspective, what are the major quality of life issues in Savannah and why?

14. This issue impacts blacks and Hispanics more than any other race; Childhood lead poisoning affects more Black and Hispanic children in the country, including Savannah, than any other race. What effect does this have or do you think, in your opinion, that this hinders the ordinance in any way?

15. What do you think the needs of the community are?

16. Do you think environmental hazards such as clean air, water, etc... has been an issue in Savannah? Such as hazardous waste sites, housing, etc...

17. What type of negative and positive changes have you seen in the city of Savannah related to the environment? Such as new buildings, parks, grocery stores with fresh veggies / fruits, transportation, clean water, reduction of hazardous dump sites...

18. Do you think changes for the lead law will be supported and modified by political representatives in Savannah? Why or why not?

19. Do you think the Environmental Justice movement has made a major impact on regulation and laws? How effective has this movement been from your perspective?
1. Why did you start WE ACT?
2. How are the goals of WE ACT determined?
3. What do you feel are the accomplishments and future endeavors of WE ACT?
4. Do you think your goals align with federal government agencies, such as CDC / ATSDR, EPA, etc... within the context of health?
5. What are the major barriers partnering with a federal government agency?
6. What are some of the positives? Do you think the government is better with EJ NGOs?
7. Do you feel you have the trust of the community? If not, why not?
8. If yes, why and what types of tactics are used to communicate between the federal government and the community and to gain the trust of the community? (How do you accomplish the goals of WE ACT and assist the community)
9. How much input do you receive from the community; do you see the problem and decide, do you get input from the community first? How do you go about deciding?
10. How do your goals of WE ACT relate to the National Conversation you’ve been working on with CDC?
11. In your perspective, what are the major quality of life issues in Harlem, New York and why?
12. Do these issues impact blacks and Hispanics more than any other race? If so, what effect does this have or do you think, in your opinion, that this hinders the policies and laws in New York in any way?
13. What do you think the needs of the community are?
14. Do you think environmental hazards such as clean air, water, etc... has been an issue in New York? Such as hazardous waste sites, housing, etc...
15. What type of negative and positive changes have you seen in the city of NY related to the environment? Such as new buildings, parks, grocery stores with fresh veggies / fruits, transportation, clean water, reduction of hazardous dump sites...
16. Do you think the Environmental Justice movement has made a major impact on regulation and laws? How effective? Have effective have EJ NGOs been with the EJ movement?
17. Where is the movement going or where should the movement be going? What could it be doing better?
ORDINANCE
To be Entitled
AN ORDINANCE TO ENACT CHAPTER 225 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA (1958) AS AMENDED TITLED "Hazardous Substance Control," TO DEFINE CERTAIN TERMS USED THEREIN; TO PROHIBIT THE USE OF LEAD PAINT AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES HAVING LEAD PAINT OR INTERIOR PAINT OR INTERIOR OR EXTERIOR SURFACES IN EXCESS OF ONE-HALF PERCENT (0.5%) OF LEAD BY WEIGHT, CALCULATED AS LEAD METAL OR AS A LIQUID OR AS A DRIED MATERIAL APPLIED TO THE INTERIOR OR EXTERIOR SURFACES OR AS A LIQUID OR AS A SOLUTION OF THE LEAD IN SOLUTION; TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND THE AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN SUBSTANCES; TO PROVIDE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES IN ORDER TO AVOID CORRUPTIONS OF HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS, TO REQUIRE REPORTS; TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Passed by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting assembled.

Pursuant to the code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1958) as amended, be amended, be amended, and the following shall be designated as Chapter 225 and be titled "Hazardous Substance Control.

§ 101. DEFINITIONS. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them by this section:

1. Satisfactory compliance as defined by the District Director, Department of Health.

2. District Director. That person who heads the Public Health Department or his designated representative.

3. Dwelling unit, rooming house and rooming unit. A building or structure which is partly used or intended to be used for living, sleeping, cooking or recreation.

4. Property, any building or structure therein.

5. Paint, any pigmented, liquid substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or similar means in which the total non-volatile ingredients contain more than one-half percent (0.5%) of lead by weight, calculated as lead metal either as a liquid or as a dried material applied.

6. Lead paint, paint or paint containing lead in excess of one-half percent (0.5%) by weight to interior surfaces of one—half percent (0.5%) or more of lead in solution.

7. Lead, shall include but not be limited to lead bearing putty, cements, plaster, and similar items.

8. Lead, shall include but not be limited to such areas as window sills, window frames, door frames, walls, ceilings, porches, stairs, handrails, floors, furniture, food and other appurtenances.

9. Person, a person who is fourteen (14) years of age or less or a person who is mentally and physically incapable of caring for himself to the extent that his intelligence or understanding is that of a person fourteen years of age or less.

10. Prohibited use of lead paint. It shall be unlawful for any person in the City to cause or assist to cause or to use or applied lead paint, as defined in this ordinance, or any paint or paint containing lead in excess of one-half percent (0.5%) by weight to interior surfaces of one—half percent (0.5%) or more of lead in solution.

11. Prohibited distribution of toys, furniture, food containers, utensils and tableware.

12. To sell, transfer, give or deliver any food container, eating or drinking utensil or tableware having extractable or leachable lead on it or.

13. Labeling of substances having lead content.

AN ORDINANCE TO ENACT CHAPTER 225 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA (1958) AS AMENDED TITLED "Hazardous Substance Control," TO DEFINE CERTAIN TERMS USED THEREIN; TO PROHIBIT THE USE OF LEAD PAINT AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF ARTICLES HAVING LEAD PAINT OR INTERIOR PAINT OR INTERIOR OR EXTERIOR SURFACES IN EXCESS OF ONE-HALF PERCENT (0.5%) OF LEAD BY WEIGHT, CALCULATED AS LEAD METAL OR AS A LIQUID OR AS A DRIED MATERIAL APPLIED TO THE INTERIOR OR EXTERIOR SURFACES OR AS A LIQUID OR AS A SOLUTION OF THE LEAD IN SOLUTION; TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AND THE AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN SUBSTANCES; TO PROVIDE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CERTAIN PRACTICES IN ORDER TO AVOID CORRUPTIONS OF HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS, TO REQUIRE REPORTS; TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Passed by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting assembled.

Pursuant to the code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1958) as amended, be amended, be amended, and the following shall be designated as Chapter 225 and be titled "Hazardous Substance Control.

§ 101. DEFINITIONS. For the purpose of this ordinance, the following words and phrases shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them by this section:

1. Satisfactory compliance as defined by the District Director, Department of Health.

2. District Director. That person who heads the Public Health Department or his designated representative.

3. Dwelling unit, rooming house and rooming unit. A building or structure which is partly used or intended to be used for living, sleeping, cooking or recreation.

4. Property, any building or structure therein.

5. Paint, any pigmented, liquid substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or similar means in which the total non-volatile ingredients contain more than one-half percent (0.5%) of lead by weight, calculated as lead metal either as a liquid or as a dried material applied.

6. Lead paint, paint or paint containing lead in excess of one-half percent (0.5%) by weight to interior surfaces of one—half percent (0.5%) or more of lead in solution.

7. Lead, shall include but not be limited to lead bearing putty, cements, plaster, and similar items.

8. Lead, shall include but not be limited to such areas as window sills, window frames, door frames, walls, ceilings, porches, stairs, handrails, floors, furniture, food and other appurtenances.

9. Person, a person who is fourteen (14) years of age or less or a person who is mentally and physically incapable of caring for himself to the extent that his intelligence or understanding is that of a person fourteen years of age or less.

10. Prohibited use of lead paint. It shall be unlawful for any person in the City to cause or assist to cause or to use or applied lead paint, as defined in this ordinance, or any paint or paint containing lead in excess of one-half percent (0.5%) by weight to interior surfaces of one—half percent (0.5%) or more of lead in solution.

11. Prohibited distribution of toys, furniture, food containers, utensils and tableware.

12. To sell, transfer, give or deliver any food container, eating or drinking utensil or tableware having extractable or leachable lead on it or.

13. Labeling of substances having lead content.
SECTION 29B-106 EXEMPTIONS. Except from this ordinance (or chapter) shall be furnished in a building or structure which is not accessible to guests, invitees or licensees be children or accompanied by children and which is not defined in Section 29B-101.

SECTION 2: This ordinance shall be effective on the date of its adoption and shall be in the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1958) as amended as "Chapter 29B," of all.

SECTION 3: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1973.

(Ordinance read for the first time December 7, 1972; amended, read a second time, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved January 4, 1973.)

Ordinance read for the first time December 21, 1972; read a second time, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved January 4, 1973, upon motion of Alderman Chambers, Alderman Center and unanimously carried.

AN ORDINANCE

AN ORDINANCE TO BE ENTITLED THE "DERELICT MOTOR VEHICLE ORDINANCE"; TO DEFINE A DERELICT MOTOR VEHICLE; TO PROVIDE FOR THE REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF DERELICT MOTOR VEHICLES; TO PROVIDE THAT THE CITY OF SAVANNAH MAY CONTRACT WITH THIRD PARTIES TO REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF DERELICT VEHICLES; TO PROVIDE FOR NOTICES TO BE GIVEN TO THE OWNERS OF DERELICT VEHICLES; TO ESTABLISH A CRIMINAL PENALTY FOR OBSTRUCTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ORDINANCE; TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREBIT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES,

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, in Council assembled, and it is hereby ordained by the authority thereof, that:

SECTION 1: That this ordinance is adopted pursuant to the authority created by Ga. L. 1971, p. 670 (Ga. Code Ann. Chapter 23-33) which authorizes municipalities to provide by ordinance for the removal and disposal of any discarded, dismantled, wrecked, scrapped, ruined or junked motor vehicles or parts thereof, when the same are in a condition that they constitute a health hazard or unsightly nuisance. It is hereby declared that derelict motor vehicles, as herein defined, when left unattended on a public street, road or highway or other public or private real property within the corporate limits of the City of Savannah, Georgia, for a period of at least ten (10) days constitute a health hazard or unsightly nuisance in that they provide a place for insects, rodents and other nuisance animals to exist, attract children, vagrants and other individuals and may cause injury to them and obstruct the streets and ways on and in which they may be found. It is the further purpose and intent of this ordinance to provide for the removal and disposal of said vehicles and the procedures pertaining thereto.
PROCEEDINGS OF CITY COUNCIL JANUARY 22, 1981

ORDINANCES


AN ORDINANCE

PAGE TO AMEND THAT ORDINANCE ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1976 ENTITLED "CHAPTER 3-HEALTH AND SANITATION, SECTION 9-3009 SAME; PROHIBITED USE OF LEAD PAINT." TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HERETOFEE.

BE IT KNOWN

That Chapter 3-Health and Sanitation, Section 9-3009 of said Code be amended by deleting therefrom any language contained therein setting forth "Same; Prohibited Use of Lead Paint" and substituting in its place the new language as follows:

Section 9-3009-Same: prohibited use of lead paint.

It shall be unlawful for any person in the City of Savannah to use or apply or cause to be used, or allow to exist lead paint, or any substance containing lead as defined in this section, of one-half percent (0.5%) by weight or 0.7 milligrams per square centimeter (0.7 mg/cm²) as determined by x-ray fluorescence lead paint analyzer (XRF Lead Paint Analyzer), to interior surfaces and exterior surfaces accessible to children which becomes accessible to children by peeling, chipping, or peeling of the exterior surfaces of any premises, dwelling dwelling unit, rooming house, rooming unit or property regularly used or regularly used by children.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

APPROVED January 22, 1981

AN ORDINANCE

PAGE TO AMEND THAT ORDINANCE ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1973 ENTITLED "CHAPTER 3-HEALTH AND SANITATION, SECTION 9-3012 SAME; HAZARDOUS CONDITION AND NOTICE OF ABATEMENT." TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREFEE.

BE IT KNOWN

That Chapter 3-Health and Sanitation, Section 9-3012 of said Code be amended by deleting therefrom any language contained therein setting forth "Same; Hazardous condition and notice for abatement" and substituting in its place the new language as follows:

Section 9-3012 Same; hazardous condition and notice for abatement.

When the District Director of Public Health or his designated representative determines that the presence of lead paint, or lead bearing substance upon any premises creates a health hazard to children or other persons he shall issue a thirty (30) day notice to the owner or occupant to eliminate the hazard; however, upon good cause shown to the District Director of Public Health, additional time may be granted to remove, abate or remedy such condition.

Lead paint shall be completely removed from any surface which can be chewed or eaten by children, loose, chipped, blistered, scaling lead paint or other accessible lead bearing substances shall be completely removed. In lieu of removal of the lead paint, the accessible surfaces shall be covered with a durable protective material with a lead content not greater than permitted by Section 9-3009. The methods used for the removal of lead paint shall not present a hazard to health from dusts, fumes, or vapors by inhalation or absorption through the skin and mucous membranes and shall be in accordance with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and safety standards.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

APPROVED JANUARY 22, 1981

AN ORDINANCE

PAGE TO AMEND THAT ORDINANCE ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1973 ENTITLED "CHAPTER 3-HEALTH AND SANITATION, SECTION 9-3008 CONTROL OF LEAD PAINT: DEFINITIONS," TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREFEE.

BE IT KNOWN

That Chapter 3-Health and Sanitation, Section 9-3008-Definitions- of said Code be amended by deleting therefrom the language contained therein paragraph (E) Lead Paint and substituting in its place new language as follows:

(E) Paint. Any pigment, liquid, substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or other means in the total non-volatile ingredients, contain more than one-half percent (0.5%) of lead by weight or 0.7 milligrams per square centimeter (0.7 mg/cm²) as determined with an x-ray fluorescence lead paint analyzer, calculated on a volatile or as dried film basis either as a liquid or as dried film already applied.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

APPROVED JANUARY 22, 1981

AN ORDINANCE

PAGE TO AMEND THAT ORDINANCE ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1973 ENTITLED "CHAPTER 3-HEALTH AND SANITATION, SECTION 9-3004 CONTROL OF LEAD PAINT: REMOVAL," TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREFEE.

BE IT KNOWN

That Chapter 3-Health and Sanitation, Section 9-3004-Control of Lead Paint: Removal of lead paint, of said Code be amended by deleting any language contained therein paragraph (E) Lead Paint and substituting in its place new language as follows:

(E) Removal. Any pigment, liquid, substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or other means in the total non-volatile ingredients, contain more than one-half percent (0.5%) of lead by weight or 0.7 milligrams per square centimeter (0.7 mg/cm²) as determined with an x-ray fluorescence lead paint analyzer, calculated on a volatile or as dried film basis either as a liquid or as dried film already applied.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

APPROVED JANUARY 22, 1981

AN ORDINANCE


BE IT KNOWN

That Chapter 3-Health and Sanitation, Section 9-3006-Control of Lead Paint: Storage, Handling and Disposal, of said Code be amended by deleting any language contained therein paragraph (E) Lead Paint and substituting in its place new language as follows:

(E) Storage, Handling and Disposal. Any pigment, liquid, substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or other means in the total non-volatile ingredients, contain more than one-half percent (0.5%) of lead by weight or 0.7 milligrams per square centimeter (0.7 mg/cm²) as determined with an x-ray fluorescence lead paint analyzer, calculated on a volatile or as dried film basis either as a liquid or as dried film already applied.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

APPROVED JANUARY 22, 1981
Ordinance read in Council for the first time November 4, 1976, then by unanimous consent of Council, read a second time, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved, upon motion of Alderman Rossiter, seconded by Alderman Jackson and unanimously carried.

AN ORDINANCE

AN ORDINANCE TO REZONE CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM ITS PRESENT R-4 ZONING CLASSIFICATION TO A PNM-25 ZONING CLASSIFICATION: TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT THERETO AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah in Council assembled:

SECTION 1: The following described property be rezone from its present zoning classification which said property is presently zoned: R-4 to a zoning classification of PNM-25:

Beginning at the intersection of the centerlines of East Waldburg and Paulsen Street; thence in a westerly direction along the centerline of East Waldburg a distance of approximately 80 feet to a point, said point being the point of beginning; thence in a southerly direction along a line perpendicular to the centerline of East Waldburg a distance of approximately 170 feet; thence in a westerly direction along a line parallel to the centerline of East Waldburg a distance of approximately 150 feet; thence in a northerly direction along a line perpendicular to the centerline of East Waldburg a distance of approximately 170 feet; thence in an easterly direction along the centerline of East Waldburg to the point of beginning.

SECTION 2: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED, NOVEMBER 4, 1976

Ordinance read in Council for the first time November 4, 1976, then by unanimous consent of Council, a second time, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved, upon motion of Alderman Rossiter, seconded by Alderman Jackson and unanimously carried.

AN ORDINANCE

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 22-302 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA (1958) AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE THAT PARKING ON BROUGHTON STREET BETWEEN MONTGOMERY AND WEST BROAD STREETS SHALL BE LIMITED TO THE HOURS BETWEEN 8:00 A.M. AND 6:00 P.M., EVERY DAY EXCEPT SUNDAY AND PUBLIC HOLIDAYS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting of Council assembled, and it is hereby ordained by authority thereof, that:

SECTION 1: That Section 22-302 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1958) as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following:

THAT PARKING ON BROUGHTON STREETS BETWEEN MONTGOMERY AND WEST BROAD STREETS SHALL BE LIMITED TO THE HOURS BETWEEN 8:00 A.M. AND 6:00 P.M. EVERY DAY EXCEPT SUNDAY AND PUBLIC HOLIDAYS.

SECTION 2: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ADOPTED AND APPROVED, NOVEMBER 4, 1976

Ordinance read in Council for the first time November 4, 1976, then by unanimous consent of Council, a second time, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved, November 4, 1976, upon motion of Alderman Rossiter, seconded by Alderman Jackson and unanimously carried.

AN ORDINANCE

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THAT ORDINANCE ADOPTED AND APPROVED JANUARY 4, 1973, ENTITLED "HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES CONTROL ORDINANCE," TO AMEND SECTION 29 B-101(a) AND SECTION 29 B-102, TO REPEAL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HERETWITH AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES:

BE IT ORDAINED, by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting of Council assembled, and by lawful authority therefor:

SECTION 1: That the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1958), as amended, be amended by amending Chapter 29, said Chapter being that ordinance adopted and approved January 4, 1973, entitled "Hazards Substances Control Ordinance" by amending the caption thereof to delete the language "TO PROHIBIT THE EVICTION OF CERTAIN TENANTS IN ORDER TO AVOID CONSEQUENCES OF HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS"

SECTION 2: That Section 29 B-101 of said Code of the City of Savannah (hereinafter referenced as "Code") be amended by deleting sub-section (e) of said section which defines "lead paint" and substitute in its place a new definition of "lead paint" as follows:

LEAD PAINT. Any pigment, liquid substance applied to surfaces by brush, roller, spray or means, in which the total non-volatile ingredients contain more than one half per centum (0.5) of lead by weight or 1.2 milligrams per square centimeter (1.2 mg/cm²) as determined with an X-ray fluorescence lead paint analyzer, calculated as lead metal either as a liquid or an old film already applied.

SECTION 3: That Section 29 B-102 of said Code be amended by deleting therefrom the language containing the sentence: "If any building or structure in the City of Savannah is found to contain lead paint in excess of the above quantities, it shall be unlawful to use or occupy the said building or structure in such condition until the lead paint has been removed, and the Lead Paint Ordinance of the City of Savannah shall be followed and enforced to the fullest extent of the law to the end that the health and safety of all persons shall be protected against the dangers of lead paint..."

SECTION 4: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Adopted and Approved November 4, 1976
At the request of Vincent Helmy for Board Member M. Vickers, requesting to rezone two parcels representing 1.82 acres of property located west side of Middleground Road, north of Peachtree Drive, from R-4 (Four-Family Residential, Small Lot Subdivisions). The Metropolitan Planning Commission recommends approval after finding that the P-R-4-6 district was created to address this request and would be an extension of the adjacent small-lot development. No one appeared in opposition. Upon motion of Alderman Center, seconded by Alderman Adams, this was approved by a vote of 9-0.

An Ordinance to amend Section 9-3008 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1977) pertaining to hazardous substances - lead paint; to repeal all Ordinances in conflict therewith and for other purposes.

Ordinance read in Council for the first time, October 9, 1986, and a second time October 22, 1986, placed upon its passage, adopted and approved upon motion of Alderman Robinson, seconded by Alderman Stillwell and carried.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 9-3008 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA (1977) PERTAINING TO HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES - LEAD PAINT; TO REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT THEREWITH, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES:

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular session, that said Ordinance be approved and pursuant to law same is hereby adopted and enacted:

SECTION 1: That Section 9-3008 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1977), herein referenced as "Code", be amended as follows:

DELETE

9-3008(3): DWELLING, DWELLING UNIT, ROOMING HOUSE, ROOMING UNIT:
A building or structure which is wholly or partly used or intended to be used for living, sleeping, cooking or recreation by human occupants.

REPLACED WITH

9-3008(3): DWELLING, DWELLING UNIT, ROOMING HOUSE, ROOMING UNIT:
A building or structure which is wholly or partly used or intended to be used for living, sleeping, cooking or recreation by human occupants, collectively referred to as a building.

SECTION 2: That Section 9-3012 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1977), herein referenced as "Code", be amended as follows:

DELETE

When the District Director of Public Health or his designated representative determines that the presence of lead paint, or lead-bearing substance upon any premises creates a health hazard to children or other persons, he shall issue a thirty-day notice to the owner or occupant to eliminate the hazard, however, upon good cause shown to the District Director of Public Health, additional time may be granted to remove, abate or remedy such condition. Lead paint shall be completely removed from any surface which can be chewed or eaten by children; loose, cracked, blistered, peeling lead paint or other accessible lead-bearing substances shall be completely removed, in lieu of removal of the lead paint, the accessible surfaces shall be covered with a durable protective material with a lead content not greater than detailed in Section 9-2009. The method used for the removal of lead paint shall not present a hazard to persons assemblers by inhalation or absorption through the skin and mucous membranes and shall be in accordance with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and safety standards. (Ord. of 1-4-73, Sect. 5; Ord. of 1-22-81, Sect. 1).
ENACT

(a) The District Director may make a determination of imminent hazard that all or any portion of a building shall be vacated or not occupied until compliance with this section is accomplished. If such a determination of imminent hazard is made, the building shall be posted with a notice so stating and the owner and each tenant of the owner of the building shall be given written notice of the determination. The failure of the District Director to make such a determination of imminent hazard shall not be deemed a finding that no hazard or danger exists.

(b) No owner of a building shall be permitted to use this section to cause a tenant to be evicted or to vacate the building or to terminate a lease if the purpose of such act by the owner is to avoid compliance with this section. A prima facie showing of such prohibited "purpose" shall be made if the owner has caused such vacation or eviction to have occurred and has not commenced work to meet the condition(s) causing a violation of this section within 30 days of the determination or vacation with such work being continued until completed except for cause beyond the control of the owner, or the owner has permitted subsequent occupancy of the building without abating the condition causing the violation. If the District Director has made a determination of imminent hazard in accordance with subsection (a) above, this subsection shall not become applicable.

(c) No building which is in violation of this section which is subject to a determination of imminent hazard in accordance with subsection (a) or which has been vacated without violating subsection (b) shall be occupied by a tenant or guest of the owner until the violation has been abated.

(d) If the owner of a building does not remove, replace, or securely and permanently cover the condition in violation of this section within 30 days of the date of notice to the owner, the District Director may cause to be posted upon the building a notice of the violation and a declaration that the building is unfit for habitation of persons. Such a notice shall remain effective until the violation is abated.

Resolved: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

AN ORDINANCE TO BE ENACTED

AMEND APPENDIX II, SECTION 219 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

WHEREAS, Section 7-1028 of said Code to provide through street traffic be prohibited on street from Bay to Division Streets and Division Street from Albion to Fair Streets; All Ordinances in Conflict Herewith; and for other purposes;

NOW, Therefore, be it resolved by the Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting of the Mayor and Alderman and pursuant to lawful authority thereof

Resolved, That Appendix II, Section 219 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1977) pertaining to Section 7-1028 of said Code, as amended, shall be amended by adding thereto the following:

AMEND SECTION 219, COMMERCIAL VEHICLES PROHIBITED

ALBION STREET AND DIVISION STREET

Albion Street, from Bay Street to Division Street. Division Street, from Albion Street to Fair Street.

AND APPROVED: October 23, 1986.

AN ORDINANCE TO BE ENACTED

AMEND APPENDIX II, SECTION 222 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

WHEREAS, Section 7-1071 of said Code to provide that the street named herein shall be closed, stopping, standing and parking at all times: To repeal all ordinances in conflict herewith; and for other purposes;

NOW, Therefore, be it resolved by the Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah, Georgia, in regular meeting of the Mayor and Alderman and pursuant to lawful authority thereof

Resolved, That Appendix II, Section 222 of the Code of the City of Savannah, Georgia (1977) pertaining to Section 7-1071 of said Code, as amended, shall be amended by adding thereto the following:

COMMITTEE: 9-20-12
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