

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

CARE Grantee Final Report

Grantee: Muskegon County Environmental Coordinating Council

Project location: Muskegon County, Michigan

Project title: MCECC/EPA CARE project

Grant period: [Date of award/end of funding]

Project Manager: Coleen Boyer/Jill Montgomery

EPA Project Officer: Margaret Millard

I. Your Partnership

Please describe your CARE partnership and explain how it operated. Please make sure that your description includes the following:

- a. What environmental problems does your community face that brought people together?

From your workplan:

Through the completion of a two-year community based environmental health assessment project ending in 2004, Muskegon County residents have identified and prioritized their concern over several toxic environmental issues. Among an extensive list, lead based paint, drinking water/septic systems, air quality, contaminated fisheries, and recycling efforts were targeted as overwhelming concerns. All of the identified concerns can be impacted local community action.

Historically known as a logging and manufacturing based economy, the Muskegon community has an extensive history of environmental contamination. While the economy has begun to diversify and industry pollution has substantially decreased over the years, the legacy continues to influence the health of current residents.

As remediation and pollution prevention efforts in the County continue, some of known environmental issues are (1) the County contains at least 203 known contamination sites and eight Superfund sites where pollutants are fouling soil or groundwater; (2) contamination of Muskegon and White Lake is so extensive that these lakes are on the Area of Concern (AOC) International Joint Commission list for toxic hot spots on the Great Lakes; (3) eleven zip code areas in the County have been identified as high risk areas for lead poisoning by the Michigan Department of Community Health; (4) several streams and creeks have been identified as some of the most toxically polluted water systems in the State (Ryerson, Ruddiman, and Little Black Creek); (5) wide spread air quality problems exist due to air transport and local emission issues causing high asthma rates and Muskegon's EPA non-attainment status; (6) fish are contaminated with mercury and other toxins; and (7) unchecked growth patterns, which destroy wetlands, increases air pollution, accentuates community stress and diminishes the sense of community.

While all these issues are important to the health of the community, the community environmental health risk reduction prioritization process identified a number of issues that had higher priority to residents.

- b. How many individuals and their organizational affiliations were involved? Please review and add to the attached list and please add a contact name for each organization.

Organization	Type of Organization (non-profit, business, small business, industry, business organization, academic institution, local government, state government, federal government, consultant, individual, other)	Contact Name(s)
1. Chamber of Commerce	Local government	Cindy Larsen
2. City of Muskegon	Local government	Cathy Brubaker-Clarke
3. City of Norton Shores	Local government	Nancy Crandall
4. Community Foundation for Muskegon County	Non-profit	Arn Boezaart
5. Consumers Energy		Roger Morgenstern
6. Crystal Anderson Realtors		Dave Wendtland
7. CWC Textron		Bob Meacham
8. Department of Agriculture		Greg Mund, Gale Nobes
9. Employer's Association of West Michigan		Cheryl Swinehart
10. Grand Valley State University	Academic institution	Janet Vail
11. Hackley Hospital		Gordon Mudler
12. Howmet Corporation		Keith Shell
13. Lake Michigan Federation		Tanya Cabala
14. Laketon Township	Local government	Roland Crummel
15. Michigan Dept. of Environmental Quality		Tom Berdinski, Laura Rauwerda
16. Muskegon Area Intermediate School District		June Au, Dave Krebs
17. Muskegon Chemistry Council		Dave Peden
18. Muskegon Co. Health Dept.	Local government	Jill Montgomery
19. Muskegon Community College		Theresa VanVeelen-Lauber
20. Muskegon County Cooperating Churches	Non-profit	Delphine Hogston
21. Muskegon Lake PAC	Non-profit	Al Bell
22. Muskegon River Watershed Assembly	Non-profit	Gary Noble
23. Parmenter O'Toole		Eric Gielow
24. Resource Recovery Corporation of West Michigan		Michael Lenahan
25. Superior Environmental Corporation		Scott Miller
26. Timberland Resource Conservation and Development Area Council		Kathy Evans
27. Trace Analytical		Bill Schroeder
28. West Michigan Region Environmental Network	Non-profit	Cynthia Price
29. West Michigan Shoreline		Amy Haack

Redevelopment Commission		
30. West Shore Engineering		Jerry Garman

- c. Did this project bring any new partners into your work? How did the new partners aid the partnership and project? Yes. We now have representation from MSU Extension on our executive board. In addition, we were able to recruit the Mona Lake Watershed Council and SAPPI (paper mill) as members of our group.
- d. What role did your organization play in this partnership? What skills were most important from your organization to implement the project? Because of the nature of our membership, we had a considerable amount of expertise on air, water, and environmental contaminates.
- e. Which partners were most active? How?
 Grand Valley State University’s Annis Water Resources Institute – expertise on air and water quality
 West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Commission’s Ozone Action and Air quality division –
 MSU Extension – provided a project manager and experts on contaminated fisheries and drinking water contaminate reduction
- f. What resources and strengths did each organization bring to the project?
 Professional staff that was knowledgeable in all fields.
- g. What efforts did you make to ensure that the most vulnerable community members were included in the partnership?
 All of the projects were targeted at educating local vulnerable populations on environmental hazards and teaching them how to protect themselves.
- h. What role did your EPA Project Officer play in the partnership?
 Acted as liaison between our organization and the EPA. She often helped us find expertise in fields where we were lacking.
- i. What barriers did your partnership experience and how did you overcome them (distrust, unequal power, control over money, differing priorities, process for reaching consensus, etc.)?
 Our organization had the most difficulty with agreeing on the prioritization of activities. Each had their own concern and wanted us to prioritize that particular item; however, we were always able to come to consensus after some debate.
- j. How has this partnership improved relationships among those involved? Please describe the working relationship that has improved the most and those that may still need work.
 This project has really shown membership priorities and assisted us in refining the purpose and mission of our organization.
- k. Has your organization engaged in a similar process to CARE in which you had a similar role? Please describe briefly. Not at this time.
- l. Is there anything else about your partnership that you would like to share?

II. Your Project

Please describe your CARE project and provide copies of important materials that you developed. Please make sure that your description includes the following:

- a. What toxic risks did your project address?

Air quality and ozone related difficulties related to former heavy use of coal furnaces at energy plants. The importance of eating fish from the Great Lakes but the risks involved from mercury and other pollutants. Lead poisoning of young children caused by the use of lead-based paint in older homes and a lack of knowledge of this hazard as well as other sources of lead poisoning in communities, particularly the urban community. The contamination of drinking water supplies through improper use of fertilizers and herbicides.

b. What toxic reduction strategies did you pursue?

The main purpose was to provide educational programs and strategies for individuals to use in reducing their contact with the identified toxic risks. We also were able to provide lead abatement in homes where lead-based paint was an issue. Citizens were invited to learn about the potential hazards in our community and implement methods for reducing their contact with these hazards through hands on learning activities, historical documentation, workshops and displays as well as through individual lessons provided to families of the Food Stamp Nutrition Program and the Women Infant Children Program.

c. How did you reach agreement on implementation decisions?

A committee consisting of members of the Muskegon County Environmental Coordinating Council worked together to identify educational programs and projects that would provide the information needed for citizens to address the hazards they could face in a number of situations.

d. Did you reshape your partnership in any way to address strategy implementation? Please explain. Yes, a number of things changed 1) we changed project managers twice. This meant that we had to reeducate and get the new person up to speed each time. Also, each project manager had their own ideas on how projects should be implemented. While we had a general plan in the beginning, the execution changed a number of times.

e. What outside resources (e.g., people, programs, approaches, etc.) were most important to your project? We have a number of festivals here that made it convenient to reach the public.

f. Was there any environmental issue that EPA seemed to lack the tools or means (e.g., Partnership Programs, data tools, other expertise) to address? If so, please describe the situation or need you had. No problems in this area. EPA was very helpful every time they were contacted.

g. How did you build momentum over the course of your project? Did you secure any “early wins” to help build momentum? Did you look for additional funding early on? What was acquired? Initially, contacts were made with organizations and agencies that were already doing work in the areas of concern. Some programs had already been developed at MSU Extension that were adapted for use with this project, particularly the fish program and the Conservation District and Groundwater Stewardship program helped with presentations to groups using some of their own tools and written bulletins that related particularly to groundwater contamination. Early on, a newsletter was produced and distributed and youth were involved through a hands-on demonstration of fish cleaning, working through a local school summer program. Drawings from the youth were used in the signs that were developed and posted at the various boat launchings and posters/placemats were made to be displayed wherever fishing licenses were sold.

h. What were the significant *outputs* of your project (meetings held, materials developed, people trained, etc.)?

You listed the following outputs in your workplan. The bulleted items are the updates you included in your most recent progress report.

Output 1: Recruit Project FISH (MSU Extension) for information on cooking/ cleaning/ health benefits of eating fish targeting all populations including women of child bearing age, children, and non-English speaking residents/visitors

- Completed: Now full partner in projects due to the collaboration between the MCECC mission and the MSU Extension mission/objectives.

Output 2: Develop signage on how to clean fish and post at known fishing areas and in license establishments based on Michigan Department of Community Health recommendations.

- Completed. Signs have been distributed to Muskegon County Parks Department, posting 5 signs thru out the county at Blue Lake County Park, Meinert County Park, Moore County Park, Pioneer County Park and Twin Lake County Park. Five signs were given to City of Muskegon, Leisure Services, and scheduled to be put up in Spring '08 at Grand Trunk Launch Ramp, Cottage Grove Boat Launch, Hartshorn Boat Launch, Fisherman's Landing and Great Lakes Marina. Three signs were distributed and mounted in the City of Whitehall at Mill Pond Peninsula, Goodrich Park and Covell Park, Sullivan Township took 2 signs to be place at boat launches, also, Egelston Township took 1 sign, Whitehall is posting 2 signs on the Channel, and Norton Shores will post 2 signs at different locations at Lake Harbor Park.

Output 3: Develop presentation on fish cleaning, contaminates, and nutritional benefits of fish eating using recommended materials

- Completed
- Five nutrition instructors at the Muskegon MSU Extension office were trained on materials showing their WIC and Food Stamp Nutrition Education families the important of eating fish in a healthy diet and how to clean and prepare fish to avoid the harmful contaminants. Each nutrition instructor works with approximately 50 families per year one-to-one and teaches a 15 minute lesson on Fish consumption with each family. In addition, there are often nutrition education series provided to special groups in the community and the Fish lesson is provided in these settings as well. This effort will continue indefinitely as it has been added as a permanent component of the nutrition education program in our county. This lesson has also been shared within the state-wide network and may be used in all 83 counties in Michigan. To date, 193 families have received this educational program one-on-one in Muskegon County.
- 350 Project Fresh participants received information on the benefits of eating and the safe handling of fish.
- 215 Parents receiving back to school back packs received information on same consumption of fish at the event.
- Two hand's on demonstrations of proper cleaning of fish were presented to a total of 43 youth along with the support of 15 adult volunteers who helped the youth use the knives provided to clean their fish.
- Information on the proper cleaning of fish was handed out at the Salmon Shoot out on Muskegon Lake. The fish caught in the tournament was donated to a shelter.

Output 4: Contact community government representatives to share concerns and recommend ordinance/legislation to reduce contaminants and continue prevention education in West Michigan communities

- A total of sixty-six township, city, county and state officials received letters informing them of the efforts being performed through the EPA grant to educate the public of safe fish consumption and where the new signs on Safe Fish Consumption are located in their area. A survey was included in the mailing and 33 of the 66 were returned. They indicated satisfaction with the efforts being made to make everyone aware of the benefits of fish consumption and the information on how to avoid contaminants by posting signs around the county at logical sights. They indicated they felt this was a real benefit to the community.

Output 5: Contact local neighborhood associations and local fishing clubs for distribution of educational materials and presentations

- Contacted Muskegon Angler's Association to help distribute materials and countertop signage at local bait and tackle shops. Approximately twenty-five countertop signs are distributed throughout the county in local stores and bait shops.

Outputs 6 & 7 & 8:

6: Develop community presentation to educate on the hazards of fertilizer misuse, neglected septic systems, and drinking water well protection showcasing homes with zeroscaping and state of the art fertilizing techniques.

- Fertilizer Information Expo held in partnership with the Conservation District and the Groundwater Stewardship program. Four presentations were offered related to 1) Recent laws and phosphorus, 2) Storm water and excess nutrients, 3) Best management practices for lawn care. Information was distributed on wells and septic systems and best practices in maintaining these systems.
- A display was set up at Mayfest held at the Muskegon Community College in spring 2008. Handouts were available on septic systems, fertilizer usage around lakes and streams, and lawn care. Over 300 individuals stopped by the booth to pick up information and ask questions about this topic. Cloth bags were distributed with the EPA/Care Grant logo and a Reduce, Reuse, Recycle symbol. The bags were to help reduce the use of plastic by providing a grocery bag that was recyclable.

7: Educate the at risk community on phosphorus loading and alternatives through advertisements in local newspapers, presentations, and newsletter.

8: Develop PSAs for local newspapers and radio stations on septic care, phosphorus loading, and prevention of contamination of water supplies

- Partnering with Digital Spectrum Enterprises, we will be developing a half hour documentary on two of the locally identified objectives, being lead contamination and air quality.
- The documentary on Air Quality has been completed along with a discussion guide. This will be made available to all agencies, organizations and libraries in the county for reference as well as for the local schools. This can be used to supplement the Michigan Environmental Education Curriculum Support, Air Quality Curriculum for Middle School now being used in local classrooms.

Output 9: Meet with high-risk area, already established, neighborhood associations to inform on lead hazards and inform on availability of home inspections.

- With assistance from this grant, 63 homes were able to undergo risk assessments for lead. To date 26 of these homes have been abated and cleared of lead hazards. All inspected homes received education and demonstrations on how to reduce exposure to lead.
- A documentary is in the works on the hazards of lead poisoning using local families who have been affected by this. The 30 minute documentary is being filmed by Digital Spectrum Enterprises, a local organization and should be completed for distribution in August. There have been challenges in finding the families and working with the agencies and organizations that identify homes in need of abatement. When completed, the documentary will be made available to government, social service agencies and others that work with families particularly those in neighborhoods having older homes. It will also be placed in libraries and with local neighborhood associations for us by any group that would like to view or educate others on this hazard. A discussion guide is in the process of being developed to go along with this program. The Get the Lead Out coalition is actively involved with us on this effort.
- With additional funding and volunteers from Alcoa, staff support from Health Plan of Michigan and Muskegon County Health Department, and equipment support from a national XRF manufacturer, we were able to hold a lead toy testing/child testing day in Muskegon the week before Christmas. We were able to test 137 children and 150 toys at this particular event. 4 of the tested children were found to have elevated blood lead levels greater than 10 ug/dL. 8 of the toys tested were determined to contain lead and other contaminants such as cadmium and mercury.

Output 10: Increase the number of children ages 6 months to 6 years tested for lead poisoning to 30% from current 23% figures

- While current lead testing numbers are above project projections, the State of Michigan is not assisting with funding in WIC. Because of State budget issues, lead testing in WIC will not be an option this year, nor will it be restored prior to the end of this grant period (medicaid/non-medicaid clientele funding issues). While funding was available for lead testing in WIC, we saw an increase of 31% in the number of children tested for lead, with an increase of 22% in the WIC program alone. Our assessment is that WIC clientele are somewhat of a “captive audience” and this facilitates the community’s ability to find children and test them. Since loss of original funding for lead testing, WIC has been working with local Medicaid providers to resume lead testing in WIC with some success. Providers are now putting together programs to assist in covering the cost of lead testing. As of this past June, clients of Health plan of Michigan are being tested for lead in WIC. WIC is currently working with Molina to develop a testing plan.

Output 11: Recommend improvement of home/rental testing in high-risk areas through local ordinance changes

- The Muskegon County Health Department is partnering with Berrien County (through an EPA grant) to develop a guidebook on ordinance development for local governments. The creation of this document will assist all local governments in developing a variety of different ordinances, with special focus on environmental health issues such as lead. Two meetings have occurred to coordinate this grant effort. Target date for ordinance introduction into Muskegon County is September of 2008.

Output 12: Deliver brochures from the MDEQ and Michigan Department of Community Health on lead to all Muskegon Area Head Start locations

- 3,000 EPA issued nutrition related lead brochures were delivered to Muskegon Area Head Start Locations. 500 of these were in Spanish.

Output 13: Conduct targeted risk inspections for homeowners in need.

- 63 of the targeted 63 are complete (see output 9 for more information).

Output 14: Submit information on lead poisoning to homeowners/renters through water bills and municipal newsletters

- After some review, it was decided that delivering information on water bills was not necessarily the best way to reach urban populations with lead information since many of the homes in Muskegon and Muskegon Heights are rental units. Instead, a group of town meetings were coordinated by a local grass roots lead coalition and information was presented throughout Muskegon County in a series of 5 meetings. Muskegon’s CARE project was able to fund incentives for the meetings and with the assistance of EPA region 5, were able to get knowledgeable speakers to educate attendees.

Output 15: Educate local medical offices on the importance of lead testing in high-risk areas and Medicaid requirements/ reimbursement

- With the assistance of Mercy Health Partners, a local hospital in Muskegon, we were able to arrange for Dr. Hryhorczuk to appear at a Michigan physician Osteopathic Association seminar in Muskegon in the spring of 2008. Because of CEU credit, his session was very well attended – educating approximately 50 local physicians on the importance of lead testing. According to reports from the Public Health Nursing section at Muskegon County Health Department, there has been a significant increase in referrals from doctor’s offices since Dr. Hryhorczuk’s presentation. We understand that he will be continuing to work with the Osteopathic Association, appearing at their next conference in Traverse City in the fall of 2008.

Output 16 & 17: Gather and distribute information on pollutants (TRI data) generated by local industry and transport to local residents through presentations, newsletters, and email messages. Including information contributed by facilities in question.

- The Air Quality documentary is completed and will be made available, along with a discussion guide, to agencies, organizations, schools, libraries and other interested members of the community. The history of air pollution is highlighted in the documentary that shows steps that concerned citizens have taken in Muskegon to have the current, much improved, air quality. It is also instructional and gives suggestions of ways that citizens can minimize the amount of air pollution as well as planning for minimizing the effects it can have on each of them.

Output 18: Track preventable hospitalization rates for Muskegon County to measure impact of awareness campaign

Ambulatory Care Sensitive Hospitalization data for Asthma to 2006 (most current data)

Michigan Department of Community Health

	All ages	< 18	18 – 44	45 – 64	65 and older
2006	156	76	37	30	13
2005	211	106	46	35	24
2004	165	69	51	23	22

2003	205	71	63	39	32
2002	163	62	46	30	22
2001	157	64	51	28	14
2000	196	90	60	26	20

- i. What were your project’s most significant *outcomes* (changes in policy, behavior, and practice, e.g., auto shops’ shift to less toxic materials, ban adopted on school bus idling, change in local agencies’ policy or procedures, school district commitment to IPM for pest control, etc.)? Actually, we are hoping that the most significant outcomes will appear years after this project. The specific objectives targeted in this project marked only the beginning of a long-term project to reduce toxic exposure in Muskegon County.
- We are looking for even greater reductions in air pollution than have already been achieved;
 - Further reductions in lead exposure for the youth in Muskegon County.
 - Substantial decrease in surface and drinking water pollution due to passage of a phosphorus laden fertilizer ban in Muskegon County in 2006.
 - A decrease in surface water pollution and less contaminated fish.
- j. What specific reductions in environmental risks did your project achieve?
- A reduction of exposure to mercury and other contaminants in locally caught fish
 - A reduction in exposure to air contaminants due to education on air quality concerns
 - A reduction in exposure to lead among residents due to risk assessments, education, and abatement
- k. Were there differences between your original plan and what actually occurred in your project? Did you achieve your objectives? Please explain. What objectives were not met and why?
- Nearly all original objectives were met in this project. However, there were some environmental changes during the grant period that somewhat changed our targets for air quality and drinking water. 1) SAPPI paper mill closed their pulp making portion of the plant. This has significantly reduced contaminants in Muskegon’s air (TRI). 2) BC Cobb, the local power plant, has gotten a clean corporate citizen award from the State of Michigan for their efforts to reduce toxins. 3) Funding for lead testing of children has significantly decreased in the State of Michigan. This has made it more of a challenge to reduce exposure among children who are already at risk.
- l. What other resources (not already covered in your discussion of your partnership or outside resources above) did your project mobilize, both financial and in kind?

From your progress reports:

Organization	Support you received	
	Financial (amount)	Other
Muskegon County Health Department		Data, staff time, risk assessment, abatement coordination

MSU Extension		Developed materials for the teaching of nutrition value of eating fish and proper ways of preparing and cooking. Additional educators for safer fish consumption, nutrition educators and program associates, additional educators for fishing and phosphorus, new project coordinator. Continued education on fish safety after the ending of the grant.
Digital Spectrum Enterprises		TV airtime on local cable station
West Michigan Anglers Association		Distribution of signs
Muskegon County		Posting of 5 signs
City of Whitehall		Posting of 3 signs
City of Muskegon City of Norton Shores Egelston Township Sullivan Township City of Whitehall City of Montague		Posting of signs Posting of 2 signs Posting of 1 sign Posting of 2 signs Posting of 2 signs on Channel Posting of 2 signs
Muskegon Sportsfisherman Association		Presence and distribution of materials during their annual event
Consumers Energy		Information on air quality
Project FISH		Information on local fishing practices and contacts
GVSU		Technical assistance on local air quality issues
WMSRDC		Technical assistance on local air quality issues
Lead Coalition		Helping with presentations and locating residents most in need of services
Mona Lake Watershed Council		Development of fish consumption materials
MDCH, MDNR		Development of fish consumption materials, speakers/experts on lead
Alcoa	\$2,000	Funding and volunteers for lead testing day
Volunteer Muskegon		Volunteers for lead testing day
University of Chicago/EPA region 5		Dr. Dan Hryhorczuk
Success Enterprises		Risk Assessment and Abatement coordination

III. Reflection

- a. How likely is it that the progress achieved could have been made without your CARE partnership?

This grant provided the support needed to maximize the ability of partnering agencies to provide the necessary educational information on these health risks in Muskegon County. Lead abatement was made possible through the financial support provided. The educational programs developed as a result of this grant project will continue working long beyond the end of this cycle now that the materials have been created. The documentaries will be used to expand the knowledge and give background on the progress made in Muskegon County and what efforts need to continue in order to improve the air quality and the risks to families of lead poisoning and what can be done about it.

- b. What do you consider your project's greatest achievement?

The creation of new partnerships within the community.

- c. What was your greatest challenge and how did you deal with it?

The greatest challenge we have and continue to face is working with the company providing the documentaries. They have progressed very slowly and will finally both be completed in the next month. In addition the turn over of project managers and the additional retraining time they took.

- d. What would you do differently next time in terms of organizing and structuring your partnership to achieve your project objectives?

Probably would not outsource project management. Would have made it much easier if project was run internally.

- e. How might you have been more strategic in designing or implementing your project?

Would not do much differently. We had to continue to redesign during the project to fit environmental and staffing changes.

- f. If you chose to create one, did you find using a logic model or other goal-driven model helpful? Please explain. Did the model change over time? If so, how?

See (e) above.

- g. To what extent did your CARE community communicate or engage with other CARE communities and how was that interaction helpful?

Have had some limited contact with the Grand Rapids project and WMEAC.

- h. Did media coverage play a role in your project? If so, please explain.

Other than broadcasting small individual events through PSAs, we were not targeted by the press.

- i. In what ways did you rely on EPA for assistance (assessing risks in your community, conflict resolution, partnership support, voluntary programs, such as Tools for Schools or Pollution Prevention)? Technical assistance

- j. What role did your Project Officer and other EPA staff play in your work? What would you have liked more of or less of? They offered technical assistance.

- k. To what extent do you think that this project increased the capacity of your organization? Your partnership? Your community? Please provide examples.

This project redefined the Muskegon County Environmental Coordinating Council objectives and overall mission. Based on the priorities set during this project, we were able to determine the agencies' future and direction.

- l. Did your project produce any new "community leaders?" Please describe. No.

- m. What advice would you offer to other communities undertaking similar work?

Remember that the work you are doing can include moving targets. You will need to be flexible enough to adapt to changes and incorporate them into your planning.

IV. What Next?

- a. Will members of your partnership continue to work on these issues? Yes. Many of the organizations already work on reducing targeted toxins on a daily basis.
- b. How will this work be sustained? This grant supplemented a lot of the work already going on in the Muskegon area and fit nicely with grants that other local partner agencies hold. We will continue to seek funding for toxin reduction.
- c. If neither your organization nor the members of the partnership plan to continue the work, please describe why.
- d. Please describe a continuing or next source of funding you have for your work or other groups in your community that have continued the work and have found funding.

V. Feedback and Follow up

- a. Please share any thoughts you have about what EPA could do to improve the CARE program. Already see that the program is improving with time and development of the program.
- b. We want to keep in touch and learn about the work that you do after your grant with CARE. Would it be okay for someone from the headquarters CARE team to contact you in the future to talk about how your work is progressing? Are there others we should contact instead of or in addition to you? If so, please provide their contact information.

Jill Montgomery Keast
Muskegon County Health Department
209 E. Apple Ave
Muskegon, MI 49442
231-724-1293
montgomeryji@co.muskegon.mi.us

- c. Would you be willing to be interviewed for a more in depth case study? Sure.