

FY2011 EPA Clean Up Grant Template

Transmittal Letter

1. Applicant identification: Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle
Weirton, WV
2. Applicant DUNS number
3. Funding request
 - i. Grant Type: Clean-up Grant
 - ii. Amount: \$200,000 Cost Share: \$40,000 (**NO Waiver Requested**)
 - iii. Contamination: Hazardous (Arsenic, etc)
4. Location

Town/Locality –	Chester
County –	Hancock
State –	West Virginia
5. Contacts: Project Director: **Patrick Ford**

Phone number:	304.748.5041
Fax number:	304.748.0241
Email address:	pford007@gmail.com
Mailing address:	3174 Penn Avenue, Suite 1 Weirton, WV 26062

Elected Official:	Ken Morris, Mayor
Phone number:	
Fax number:	
Email address:	
Mailing address:	
6. Date Submitted:
7. Project Period: Three years (October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2015)
8. Population: 2400

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

1. Applicant Eligibility

a. Eligible Entity

Applicants must demonstrate how they are an eligible entity for a cleanup grant. Refer to the description of applicant eligibility in Section III.A., *Who Can Apply*. For entities other than cities, counties, tribes, or states, please attach documentation of your eligibility (e.g., resolutions, statutes, etc.). **If you are a nonprofit organization, you must provide documentation, as an attachment to the proposal, indicating nonprofit status. Failure to do so may render your proposal ineligible for review.**

The Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle (hereafter, “BDC”) is a government entity created by the State of West Virginia Code (WV § 7-12) and qualifies as an eligible entity as a land clearance authority. The BDC has the authority to enter into contracts with the USEPA to carry out Brownfield projects

b. Site Ownership

To receive a cleanup grant, the applicant must be the sole owner of the property that is the subject of its cleanup grant proposal by October 15, 2010. The grantee must maintain such sole ownership until all of the cleanup work funded by the grant has been completed and the grant is closed out. **An applicant must own the site at time of proposal submission.** For the purposes of eligibility determinations in these guidelines only, the term “own” means fee simple title through a legal document, for example a recorded deed. EPA will find applicants that do not meet this requirement ineligible. Affirm that you own the subject property.

The Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle possesses fee simple title to the property the 8.54 acre parcel known as the Former TS&T Pottery Site. The property was purchased by the BDC on June 30, 2011. The deed is recorded at the Hancock County Courthouse in New Cumberland, West Virginia and can be provided upon request. The Authority will, at a minimum, remain the sole owner of the property until all of the cleanup work funded by the grant has been completed and the grant is closed out.

2. Letter from the State or Tribal Environmental Authority

For an applicant other than a state or tribal environmental authority, attach a **current** letter from the appropriate state or tribal environmental authority acknowledging that the applicant plans to conduct cleanup activities and is planning to apply for federal grant funds. Failure to submit this letter will result in the rejection of the proposal for further consideration.

Officially Requested

3. Site Eligibility and Property Ownership Eligibility

If the site is a hazardous substances site, please respond to items a–h.

Site Eligibility:

a. **Basic Site Information:** Site name, address, zip code, current owner (if not current owner, state the date you plan to acquire ownership)

Current Owner: Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle
Site Name: Former TS&T Pottery Site
Address: 8th and Plutus Streets
Chester, 26034

b. Status and History of Contamination at the Site:

The Site was used as a pottery manufacturing facility from approximately 1900 to 1982. Taylor, Smith and Taylor (TS&T) operated the facility from 1900 to 1972. Anchor Hocking Corporation (Anchor Hocking) merged with TS&T in 1972 and operated the facility through 1982 when operations were ceased. Anchor Hocking sold the subject property as well as several neighboring properties to Hans Dietz in 1984. At that time, the subject 8.568-acre property was part of a larger 9.524-acre parcel that included the 0.299-acre rectangular parcel that contains two former TS&T office buildings the along 8th Street (one of these buildings has been converted to an apartment and is currently occupied and the other remains vacant), and the 0.657-acre triangular parcel that contains the two existing frame buildings (one is used for storage and the other as a crematorium). Mr. Dietz utilized the 0.657-acre parcel and portions of the 0.299-acre and 8.568-acre parcels for storage of materials and supplies related to a barge cleaning business. Mr. Dietz passed away in 1989, and Marian and Robert Deitz and Jan and Primo DiCarlo received the property (the 9.524-acre parcel and several residential parcels across 8th Street) intestate. Rock Springs Enterprises, Inc. (Rock Springs) purchased the 9.524-acre parcel later in 1989. Following Mr. Dietz's death in 1989, DTC Environmental Inc. (DTC Environmental) utilized the 0.657-acre parcel through the 1990s for continued operation of the barge cleaning business. The 9.524-acre parcel was subdivided in 2002 to include the 0.299-acre rectangular parcel, the 0.657-acre triangular parcel, and the 8.568-acre subject property. The two smaller sub-parcels were sold to Hans Dietz Apartments LP following the subdivision in 2002, who subsequently sold the parcels to Douglas Arner (the current owner) in 2006. With the exception of the barge cleaning business operations, the various site investigation/remediation activities performed between 1998 and 2010 and recent demolition activities, the subject property has remained vacant since 1982.

The Site is contaminated with hazardous and petroleum substances including potential releases of petroleum products to soil and groundwater in the vicinity of the former AST area; ceramic debris and lead-contaminated soil beneath the footprint of the former manufacturing building and along the steep riverbank at the northern end of the Site; and asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in the remaining on-site buildings and debris piles.

c. **Sites Ineligible for Funding:** Affirm that the site is (a) not listed or proposed for listing on the National Priorities List; (b) not subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA; and (c) not subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the United States government.

- a) The former TS&T Pottery Site is not listed or proposed for listing on the National Priorities List.
- b) The site is not subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA.
- c) The site is not subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the United States government.

d. **Sites Requiring a Property-Specific Determination.**

A site specific determination is not necessary for this site as it does not meet the special class category as described in the grant guidelines.

e. **Environmental Assessment Required for Cleanup Proposals.**

A Phase I site assessment report of the former TS&T property was completed on June 23, 2011 by David Olson of Civil and Environmental Consultants, Inc of Export, PA.

A Phase II site assessment equivalent was completed through multiple assessments, re-assessments, and supplemental assessments and sampling of the site by the US EPA between 1998-201. Those assessments are listed below.

- 1998 – The WVDEP inspected the Site at the request of the City of Chester. Piles of ceramic chards and debris were observed throughout the Site. One soil sample was collected for analysis, which revealed a lead concentration of 61,000 parts per million (ppm). The results were provided to the USEPA Region III Removal Section.
- June 2001 – WVDEP performed a second Site reconnaissance and collected 18 samples; 10 from outdoor ceramic debris piles and 8 from residues within the on-site buildings. Lead concentrations in the ceramic debris samples ranged from 688 ppm to 158,000 ppm. The indoor residue samples were analyzed for arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, selenium, and asbestos. One sample of pipe insulation was found to contain asbestos. None of the other inorganic constituents, with the exception of lead, were found at concentrations above the WVDEP removal action levels.

- May 17, 2002 the USEPA Superfund Technical Assessment and Response Team (START) and WVDEP conducted a reconnaissance of the property.
- 2003 – USEPA performed concurrent Site Inspection (SI) and Removal Assessment activities. As part of the SI, START collected 16 soil/sediment/waste samples. As part of the Removal Assessment, Techlaw (USEPA’s contractor) collected 22 soil/debris samples and two surface water samples from Marks Run. The samples were analyzed for Target Compound List (TCL) pesticides/PCBs and Target Analyte List (TAL) inorganics plus hexavalent chromium. Lead was detected in soil and ceramic debris samples at concentrations ranging from 32 ppm to 69,800 ppm. Other inorganics were detected, but at concentrations that were below levels of concern. PCBs were detected at concentrations ranging 0.036 ppm to 21 ppm. START also collected waste oil samples from three electrical transformers located within the courtyard area of the former manufacturing building and screened for PCB content using field test kits. Only one of the transformers contained oil with a PCB concentration greater than 50 ppm based on the field screening.
- March 12, 2004 – USEPA Action Memorandum was issued which summarized the results of the 2003 removal assessment and concluded that a threat to public health/welfare and the environment existed due to elevated levels of lead and the presence of PCBs at the Site.
- October 6, 2005 – A Health Consultation report prepared by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry provided a review the existing Site data and concluded that the Site posed a public health hazard due to the potential for exposure for nearby residents/trespassers exposure to lead in on-site soils.
- 2005-2006 – A Response Action Plan (RAP) was initially submitted by Newell Holdings and was approved by USEPA on March 29, 2005. The RAP was amended on September 27, 2005 to identify an approach for characterizing the property west of the Route 30 bridge and was approved by USEPA on November 25, 2005. The RAP documented the previously completed fencing/signage work and presented a work plan for an Extent of Contamination Study (ECS). The ECS was implemented in 2005 and was documented in a Removal Action Implementation Plan (RAIP) that was originally submitted to USEPA in January 2006. A revised RAIP was submitted on June 28, 2007 and was approved by USEPA via letter dated August 1, 2007. A copy of the RAIP is contained on the CD in Appendix G.

The ECS included extensive soil and sediment sampling and analysis (both field and laboratory) to delineate the extent of contamination. Lead was found to exceed the 400 ppm screening criteria at numerous locations, with the highest concentrations associated with ceramic chards/debris. Arsenic was the only other inorganic constituent found to exceed its screening level (19 ppm), with the majority of the exceedances occurring in the southeastern portion of the Site. The laboratory analytical results for

PCBs in soil were all below the screening criteria of 10 ppm. Oil samples were collected from six on-site electrical transformers (three pole mounted and three pad-mounted) and none contained detectable concentrations of PCBs. The ECS concluded that sediment in Marks Run and the Ohio River had not been adversely impacted by lead (or other constituents) from the Site. The ECS also included a survey of drums located on-site. A total of 73 drums (40 empty) were identified in three accumulation areas (refer to Figures 11 and 12 in the RAIP in Appendix G). All these drums were believed to be associated with the former barge cleaning business described earlier. Several other drums were scattered throughout the former manufacturing building. All but one of these drums were empty (the full drum contained a black granular materials). Eight areas of accumulated residue were also identified within the former manufacturing building. Samples were collected and analyzed for waste characterization (TCLP metals, reactivity, corrosivity and ignitability). Two of the samples (IB-1 and IB-6 shown on Figures 11 and 12 in the RAIP in Appendix G) exceeded the TCLP regulatory criteria for lead. Finally, a composite sample of the clay residues contained within the on-site storage silos was collected for waste characterization analysis. The analytical results indicated that all of the analyzed constituents were below the TCLP regulatory limits. The estimated quantity of clay residue in the silos is 730 tons.

- October 2008 through August 2009 – USEPA and its contractor TechLaw, Inc. performed a Site Reassessment to: 1) evaluate groundwater quality beneath the Site and potential impacts to a nearby public groundwater supply source; and 2) evaluate surface soil and sediment in areas that were not sufficiently assessed during the removal action activities. Areas where surface soil was assessed included the steep riverbank north of the former manufacturing building, the open area (former railroad spur) located between the residential structure on 8th Street and the former manufacturing building, and several areas adjacent to the subject property. The assessment also included a boat reconnaissance of the Ohio River shoreline to identify potential seeps or former outfalls where hazardous substances may have discharged to the Ohio River, and a reconnaissance of the former manufacturing building to identify sumps or drains that may have the potential to discharge to the Ohio River. No sumps or drains with connection to the Ohio River were identified. Two terra cotta sewers were identified along the Ohio River shoreline, but there was no evidence of current or historical discharges. The results of the reassessment were presented in a report dated August 2, 2009 entitled “Supplemental Site Inspection Report, 8th & Plutus Pottery Site” and subsequent addendum dated September 16, 2009. Copies of the August 2 report and September 16 addendum are provided on the CD in Appendix G. Investigation results relevant to the subject property are summarized below.

Groundwater monitoring wells were installed and groundwater samples collected at five locations within or immediately adjacent to the subject property and analyzed for TCL VOCs, TCL SVOCs, TAL metals, and PCBs. The analytical results were compared to the USEPA Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) for tap water and the federal Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for safe drinking water. Manganese and boron were detected at concentrations above the screening criteria. It is not clear whether elevated concentrations of these constituents is related to Site activities or is indicative of

background conditions. Only one VOC (1,1,2-trichloroethane) was detected at a low concentration below the screening criteria and no SVOCs were detected.

Water samples were also collected from the City of Chester's municipal water supply well located approximately ½-mile northeast of the Site and the City's backup water supply well located approximately 1-mile southwest of the Site. The samples were analyzed for TAL metals. The sample results revealed no indications of impacts from the Site.

Sediment samples were collected along the Ohio River shoreline at six locations within the subject property and one background location approximately 150 feet upstream of the eastern property boundary. The samples were analyzed for TAL metals, TCL SVOCs, and PCBs. Lead, mercury, benzo(a)pyrene, and dibenzo(a,h)anthracene exceeded their RSLs at the most upstream (eastern) on-site sample location (SD11). The most notable exceedance was lead, which was detected at a concentration of 45,200 ppm.

Surface soil samples were collected from the steep bank along the Ohio River north of the former manufacturing building at nine locations within the subject property. Samples were analyzed for TAL metals, TCL SVOCs, and PCBs. Several metals, SVOCs, and one PCB (Aroclor 1260) exceeded their RSLs at several locations. Lead exceeded its RSL of 400 ppm at several sample locations. The most notable exceedance was near the eastern Site boundary (just upslope from the sediment sample with elevated lead concentrations described above) at sample location SS52 where lead was detected at 199,000 ppm.

An updated Phase I Site Assessment in compliance with ASTM Standard E1527-05 was performed by Triad Engineering prior to the purchase of the property.

Property Ownership Eligibility:

EPA grant funding may not be used to pay for response costs at a brownfield site for which the recipient of the grant is potentially liable under CERCLA §107. The following items are intended to help EPA ensure that you are not liable under CERCLA for response costs at the site designated in your proposal, or determine, if necessary, that your site is eligible for funding as a petroleum site. **Please respond to the following items fully and in the order that they appear** (note that based on your responses, EPA may need to obtain additional information to make this determination).

f. **CERCLA §107 Liability.** Affirm that you are not potentially liable for contamination at the site under CERCLA §107 (e.g., as a current owner or operator of a facility, an owner or operator of a facility at the time of disposal of a hazardous substance, a party that arranged for the treatment or disposal of hazardous substances, or a party that accepted hazardous substances for transport to disposal or treatment facilities at the site) by establishing that you are eligible for one of the CERCLA liability protections or defenses (see Section III.B.3) **and explain why.** 1

The Business Development Corporation is not potentially liable for contamination at the site under CERCLA §107 as the BDC meets the criteria of a Bona Fide Prospective Purchaser (BFPP). The BDC performed All Appropriate Inquiry, etc.

g. **Enforcement Actions.** Identify known ongoing or anticipated environmental enforcement actions related to the brownfield site for which funding is sought. Describe any inquiries or orders from federal, state, or local government entities that the applicant is aware of regarding the responsibility of any party (including the applicant) for the contamination or hazardous substances at the site. The information provided in this section may be verified, and EPA may conduct an independent review of information related to the applicant's responsibility for the contamination or hazardous substances at the site.

- In September 2004 of USEPA Issued an Administrative Order on Consent (Docket No. CERC-03-2004-0255DC) to Newell Holdings Delaware, Inc. (f/k/a Anchor Hocking Corporation), the former owner and operator of the facility, to perform a Removal Action as required in USEPA's March 12, 2004 Action Memorandum. The Administrative Order required Newell Holdings to:
 - On June 5, 2007 the September 2004 Administrative Order on Consent was amended to select engineering controls (soil cap) as the primary remedy based on the large volume of pottery waste (approximately 117,000 cubic yards) identified during the ECS.
 - On January 23, 2008 the Technical Specifications for the Removal Action Implementation Were submitted to USEPA and were subsequently approved in April 2008 The remediation activities October 6, 2008 – Newell Holdings submitted a Removal Action Final Report to USEPA to satisfy the requirements of the 2004 and 2007 Administrative Orders. USEPA provided comments to the report by letter dated March 2, 2009 and AECOM (Newell Holdings' Consultant) responded by letter dated April 15, 2009. USEPA issued a second comment letter dated July 15, 2009. AECOM submitted a response to those comments, along with a revised Removal Action Final Report to USEPA on August 31, 2009. USEPA approved the Removal Action Final Report via letter dated November 4, 2009. The Removal Action Final Report also included a Post-Removal Site Control Plan.
- USEPA submitted a letter to WVDEP providing an update on USEPA's final decision regarding Superfund response actions at the Site. The letter states that EPA has reviewed and accepted that final Removal Action Report and that Newell Holdings will be responsible for post-removal site control, including maintenance of the soil cap and fencing. The letter also transmits the September 29, 2009 RASD, and reiterates that USEPA has determined that further site assessment is not warranted.

The site is not listed or proposed for listing on the National Priorities List. The site is not currently subject to any unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to/entered into by parties under CERCLA. The site is not subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the United States government. There are no on-going or anticipated enforcement actions from federal, state, or local authorities.

h. Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections.

i) Information on the Property Acquisition.

The site was purchased on June 30, 2011 by a negotiated purchase from a private corporation (Rocks Springs Enterprises) in a fee simple transaction. The BDC is the sole owner of the property. The BDC does not have any familial, contractual, corporate, or financial relationships with Rock Springs Enterprises.

ii) Timing and/or Contribution Toward Hazardous Substances Disposal.

All disposal of hazardous substances at the site occurred before the BDC acquired the property. The BDC did not cause or contribute to any release of hazardous substances at the site. The BDC has not, at anytime, arranged for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site or transported hazardous substances to the site.

iii) Pre-Purchase Inquiry. Describe any inquiry by you or others into the previous ownership, uses of the property, and environmental conditions conducted prior to taking ownership. Please include in your description:

A Phase I Site Assessment in compliance with ASTM E1527-05 was completed for the Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle on June 23, 2011 prior to the June 30, 2011 purchase of the property in order to take advantage of the bona fide prospective purchaser provision. The Site Assessment was completed by David Olson with Civil and Engineering Consultants, Inc of Export, PA. Mr. Olson is a Licensed Remediation Specialist in West Virginia, and meets the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in § 312 10 of 40 CFR 312. Sampling and site investigation data from all previous Phase II equivalent site assessments performed by EPA and WVDEP between 1998 and 2011 were also reviewed by the purchaser prior to acquiring the property.

iv) Post-Acquisition Uses. Describe all uses to which the property has been put since you acquired ownership (or the uses that you anticipate once you acquire the property) through the present, including any uses by persons or entities other than you. Please provide a timeline with the names of all current and prior users during the time of your ownership; the dates of all uses; the details of each use, including the rights or other reason pursuant to which the use was claimed or taken (e.g., lease, license, trespass); and your relationship to the current and prior users.

The perimeter fencing has been maintained and the new locks have been installed on the fence to maintain security. The BDC has been the only current user since the purchase of the property. The only use of the property since acquisition has been predevelopment in nature (preliminary design work and activities related to remedial planning), and related to site control and safety.

v) Continuing Obligations. Describe **in detail** the specific appropriate care that you exercised (or if you have yet to acquire the property, that you will exercise upon acquiring the property) with respect to hazardous substances found at the site by taking **reasonable steps** to:

- Stop any continuing releases;
 - Prevent any threatened future release; and
 - Prevent or limit exposure to any previously released hazardous substance.
 - Please confirm your commitment to:
 - Comply with all land-use restrictions and institutional controls;
 - Assist and cooperate with those performing the cleanup and provide access to the property;
 - Comply with all information requests and administrative subpoenas that have or may be issued in connection with the property; and provide all legally required notices.
-
- On May 10, 2011 – An Environmental Covenant for the subject property was filed with Hancock County Activity and land use restrictions contained in the Environmental Covenant that must be adhered to current and any future owners of the property. The BDC will work to limit access to the site via fencing prior to and during the remediation of the site. After the remediation is complete any future use restrictions placed on the site through the Voluntary Remediation Program will be recorded as land use covenants for the BDC to comply with along with any future owners of the property. There are no continuing releases that have been identified on the site. BDC is committed to working with all appropriate environmental regulatory agencies to prevent any threatened future release and prevent or limit exposure to any previous released hazardous substance. The BDC will Comply with all land-use restrictions and institutional controls, and assist and cooperate with those performing the cleanup and provide access to the property. The BDC will also comply with all information requests and administrative subpoenas that have or may be issued in connection with the property; and provide all legally required notices.

4. Cleanup Authority and Oversight Structure

a. Describe how you will oversee the cleanup at the site. Indicate whether you plan to enroll in a state or tribal response program. If you do not plan to enroll in a state or tribal response program, or an appropriate state or tribal response program is not available, you will be required to consult with U.S. EPA to ensure the cleanup is protective of human health and the environment. Therefore, if you do not plan to enroll in a state or tribal response program, provide a description of the technical expertise you have to conduct, manage, and oversee the cleanup and/or whether you plan to acquire additional technical expertise. If you do plan to acquire additional technical expertise, discuss how, consistent with the competitive procurement provisions of 40 CFR 31.36 (for eligible government entities) or 40 CFR Part 30 (for nonprofit organizations), you will ensure that this technical expertise is in place prior to beginning cleanup activities.

Upon the notification of the grant award, the BDC will enter into discussions with the WVDEP to determine a timeline to enroll the site in the West Virginia State Voluntary Remediation Program (VRP). The VRP risk analysis will guide cleanup goals and final planning. Upon

completion of the VRP risk analysis and final planning, a scope of work for a remediation contractor will be developed with free technical assistance from the Northern West Virginia Brownfields Assistance Center at West Virginia University. The BDC will then employ a competitive procurement (Request For Proposals) process to retain a qualified cleanup contractor for the successful performance of this project. The Executive Director, will oversee all procurement and remediation activities conducted at the site. As prescribed by the WV VRP, a licensed remediation Specialist will be contracted through a competitive procurement (RFP) process to oversee onsite remediation activities.

b. Cleanup response activities often impact adjacent or neighboring properties. For example, access to neighboring properties may be necessary to conduct the cleanup, perform confirmation sampling, or monitor offsite migration of contamination. If this type of access is needed, provide your plan to acquire access to the relevant property.

Access to adjacent property is not expected to be needed to implement the proposed cleanup activities. If plans change and adjacent access is needed, the adjacent property owners (Arner Crematorium, and the Hanz Dietz Apartments, Chaney's Bait Shop.) are willing partners in the project (evidenced by their participation on the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Committee). All other potentially impacted property owners will be provided with project updates and invited to participate in the project planning process.

5. Cost Share : Cleanup grant recipients are required by the Brownfields Law to provide a 20 percent cost share. This cost share is calculated as 20 percent of the total federal cleanup funds awarded. For example, if you are applying for \$200,000 of federal cleanup funds, you must provide a cost share of an additional \$40,000. The cost share may be in the form of a contribution of money, labor, material, or services from a non-federal source. If the cost share is in the form of a contribution of labor, material, or other services, it must be incurred for an **eligible and allowable expense** under the grant and not for ineligible expenses, such as administrative costs

Cleanup grant applicants may petition EPA to waive the cost-share requirement if it would place an undue hardship on the applicant. EPA will consider hardship waiver requests on a case-by-case basis and will approve such requests on a limited basis. In considering such requests, EPA will look for indicators such as low per-capita income, unemployment rate significantly above the national average, or unemployment or economic adjustment problems resulting from severe short-term or long-term changes in economic conditions.

a. Demonstrate how you will meet the required cost share, including the sources of the funding or services, as required for this cleanup grant.

If the Clean-up Grant is awarded to BDC by EPA, the BDC is prepared to provide the 20% cost share associated with the project. The BDC will satisfy the cost share through a combination of in-kind services (materials used during the outreach and reuse planning tasks) and contributions of money from the BD set aside for the cleanup and redevelopment of the site.

b. Not Applicable

6. Community Notification: The community of Chester has received notification through an ad placed in the local paper (WHICH PAPER) on (DATE). This notification stated that a copy of the draft proposal was located in (WHERE), that public comments could be accepted through (WHO), and that the draft proposal would be discussed at the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Committee meeting on November 16th at 6:00pm in the Chester City Hall. Appendix (WHICH) contains a copy of the community notification ad, a summary of the public comments, the BDC's response to the comments, and an agenda and meeting summary from the RSRRRC meeting held on November 16th.

NARRATIVE RANKING CRITERIA

1. Community Need

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated on the applicant's description of the health, welfare, environmental, and financial needs of the targeted community as it is affected by the presence of brownfields. Responses should clearly identify the sources of information used in this section.

a. Health, Welfare and Environment [8 Points]

i) Describe the effect brownfields currently have on your targeted community by providing information on the number and size of the brownfields and the health, welfare, and environmental impacts of these sites. Provide information describing the health and welfare of sensitive populations such as minorities, children, and women of child-bearing age in the targeted community. Provide any information or data showing that residents of the targeted community are disproportionately impacted by environmental problems.

The City of Chester is located at the northern tip of the northern panhandle of West Virginia along the Ohio River. The former Taylor Smith & Taylor (TS&T) Pottery site is a prime example of the many abandoned former industrial brownfield sites located along the Ohio river throughout the panhandle. The former TS&T Pottery is an 8.54 acre site adjacent to a residential neighborhood, comprised largely of families and retired citizens, and located on block behind the historic main street of Chester. Due to the on-site buildings' decaying status, materials have frequently fallen into the street and onto neighbors' property. Asbestos contained within the buildings has been the most immediate health and welfare concern for the residents living next to the site and has been the focus of concerns discussed at City Council meetings and with the property owners. The leaching of lead into the ground from the historical disposal of imperfect pottery pieces had negative impacts on the surface and subsurface soils and concerns the adjacent neighborhood and interested stakeholders.

The City of Chester's population includes 21.7% women of child-bearing age and 24.2% elderly (62+).

b. Financial Need [7 Points]

i) Describe the economic impact of brownfields on the targeted community. Provide information about that community such as rates of poverty, household income, unemployment rate, or other widely available demographic information that demonstrates the economic needs of the targeted

community's residents. Describe factors such as fiscal condition or population size that limit your ability to draw on other sources of funding for the cleanup of brownfield sites. If you already have a brownfields grant(s) from EPA, describe why you need additional funding.

Hancock County and Chester have a long history with steel manufacturing and pottery industries and are now working to address the impact of the decline of those industries. Hancock County's median household income is over 20% below the national average (\$39,779 compared to \$50,221). The County's poverty rate is 14.6% and 21% for individuals under 18 years old. In addition, the unemployment rate in Chester is 12.7%

Chester has a population of under 2,500 in a small county in West Virginia. The County and state are managing limited funding and have little to no capacity to provide discretionary funds for additional projects.

2. Project Description and Feasibility of Success

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on the feasibility of the project to be funded under this grant. Specifically, proposals will be evaluated on whether the applicant demonstrates a reasonable approach to the project, sufficient resources to complete the project, and a capability to complete the project in a timely manner. Proposals that can demonstrate firm commitments for additional funding for cleanup will be viewed more favorably. Proposals that demonstrate the site has been sufficiently characterized to allow for cleanup planning will be viewed more favorably than those who cannot demonstrate cleanup readiness.

a. Project Description [10 Points]

i) The project to be funded is the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Project. This involves the cleanup of the former TS&T pottery site including lead contaminated soils which are a result of the historical pottery production at the site. There are also asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in the dilapidated industrial structures on the site. These asbestos-containing materials in the structures will be segregated from the demolition waste and will be disposed separately at a permitted off-site facility. There are also debris piles that contain ACM that will be removed and disposed as asbestos waste at a permitted off-site facility. Segregation of the ACM from the debris would not be practical.

Additionally, funding is sought to address the lead-contaminated soil along the river bank at the north end of the site. Under this project, the localized area of contaminated sediment near the Ohio River shoreline will be removed and a porous synthetic/vegetative cover would be installed over the existing river bank to prevent potential exposure to lead-contaminated soil and to prevent future erosion/migration of contaminated soil into the Ohio River.

Previous clean-up activities: Past remedial measures (clean-up activities) included re-grading and placing a one foot soil cap with vegetative cover over areas with lead concentrations in the soil exceeding 400 parts per million; with the exception of the steep river bank along the northern property boundary where elevated lead concentrations were identified but cap installation was not feasible.

Past remedial measures have also included the installation of a perimeter fence to restrict the site access; particularly along the steep river bank. Newell Holding Company is required to perform ongoing inspections and maintenance of the cap and fencing; with periodic reporting to USEPA.

ii) Describe the proposed cleanup plan, including specific institutional or engineering controls, and potential end use for the site.

Proposed cleanup plan: The project to be funded will be the cleanup of the former TS&T pottery site. The EPA has previously conducted site assessment and cleanup on the site to address lead concentrations in the soil exceeding 400 parts per million. This work has resulted in re-grading and placing a one foot soil cap with vegetative cover over areas with lead concentrations in the soil exceeding 400 parts per million; with the exception of the steep river bank along the northern property boundary where elevated lead concentrations were identified but cap installation was not feasible.

The owners (Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle) contracted for a Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment of the site in May and June 2011 (Phase 1) and June and October 2011 (Phase 2). The Phase 1 Site Assessment identified several potential environmental conditions that warranted further characterization; including (1) potential releases of petroleum products to soil and groundwater, (2) the potential existence of ceramic debris and lead-contaminated soil beneath the footprint of the former manufacturing building, (3) the extent of ceramic debris and lead-contaminated soil along the steep river bank, and (4) the potential existence of asbestos-containing materials in the remaining on-site buildings and debris piles. The Phase 2 Site Assessment included (1) soil and groundwater sampling in the former AST area, (2) soil sampling within the footprint of the former manufacturing building, and (3) soil sampling along the steep river bank. The results of the Phase 2 samplings found that cleanup of the AST area is not required, a cap will need to be maintained to prevent exposure to contaminated soils beneath the concrete floor slab, and remediation will be required to use the river bank in an unrestricted manner in the future.

The past remedial measures (clean-up activities), that included re-grading and placing a one foot soil cap with vegetative cover over areas with lead concentrations in the soil exceeding 400 parts per million, will be maintained.

The asbestos-containing materials in the buildings/structures will be segregated from the demolition waste and will be disposed separately at a permitted off-site facility. There are also debris piles that contain ACM that will be removed and disposed as asbestos waste at a permitted off-site facility. Segregation of the ACM from the debris would not be practical.

Also, the localized area of contaminated sediment near the Ohio River shoreline will be removed and a porous synthetic/vegetative cover would be installed over the existing river bank to prevent potential exposure to lead-contaminated soil and to prevent future erosion/migration of contaminated soil into the Ohio River.

Potential site end uses will be a variety of uses in a master plan setting. Planned uses include commercial, residential, light industrial, public, and green space. The focus of any re-use option is on job creation and improving the health, quality, and value of adjacent uses. Re-use plans include developing the riverfront through the creation of a raised riverfront boardwalk to be incorporated into the eventual end use. Additionally, access roads and sidewalks will connect the site to Chester's historic downtown main street.

Future re-uses of the site will not utilize on-site ground water and will instead connect to city water and sewer infrastructure already available on-site.

The property owners have worked closely with its community partners, including local city councilmen, county officials, local business people, and community members, to create a site re-use vision. A public "Community Visioning Workshop" was held on October 1st which brought together 56 local stakeholders to discuss potential site re-uses. Community members proffered their concerns about the current and future status of the site as well as their vision of a new and exciting use for the property. The workshop concluded with a variety of opinions for re-use, although a consensus was reached that job creation should be a major goal of the re-use and that the revitalization of the TS&T property will be a significant boon for the entire community of Chester.

Institutional controls on the site include the current non-permeable cap on portions of the site, which will be maintained during all additional cleanup activities. In addition, access has been limited to portions of the riverbank which are too steep to remediate. Finally, future re-uses of the site will not utilize on-site ground water and will instead connect to city water and sewer infrastructure already available on-site.

Potential site re-uses include commercial, residential, mixed-use, light industrial, public facility, government, educational, and green space. The focus of any re-use option is on new job creation and local job enhancement. Re-use plans include developing the riverfront through the creation of a raised riverfront boardwalk to be incorporated into the eventual end use. Additionally, access roads and sidewalks will connect the site to Chester's historic downtown main street.

The property owners have worked closely with its community partners, including local city councilmen, county officials, local business people, and community members, to create a site re-use vision. A public "Community Visioning Workshop" was held on October 1st which brought together 56 local stakeholders to discuss potential site re-uses. Community members proffered their concerns about the current and future status of the site as well as their vision of a new and exciting use for the property. The workshop concluded with a variety of opinions for re-use, although a consensus was reached that job creation should be a major goal of the re-use and that the revitalization of the TS&T property will be a significant boon for the entire community of Chester.

b. Budget for EPA Funding and Leveraging Other Resources [10 Points]

i) Use the table format below to identify specific tasks for which EPA funding will be used. Show the costs (by budget category) associated with each task. **Applicants requesting hazardous substance and petroleum funding in the same proposal must provide either two separate budget tables, or two separate line items within one budget table**, that shows the planned petroleum and hazardous substance funded activities. In addition to the budget table, describe each task in detail, including the basis for the estimated cost as well as the projected outputs where possible.

PROPOSED TS&T CLEAN-UP GRANT BUDGET

	<u>Task 1</u> Programmatic Oversight	<u>Task 2</u> Community Involvement	<u>Task 3</u> Site Cleanup	<u>Task 4</u> Reuse Planning	Category Totals
Personnel	\$9,000	-	-	-	\$5,000
Travel ¹	\$1,000	-	-	-	\$1,000
Supplies	-		-	-	\$5,000
Equipment ²	-	-	-	-	-
Contractual ³	-		\$190,000		\$189,000
EPA Total	\$10,000	\$0	\$190,000	\$ 0	\$200,000
Cost Share	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$40,000
Project Total	\$15,000	\$5,000	\$210,000	\$10,000	\$240,000

1 Travel to brownfields-related training conferences is an acceptable use of these grant funds.

2 EPA defines equipment as items that cost \$5,000 or more with a useful life of more than one year. Items costing less than \$5,000 are considered supplies.

3 Applicants must comply with the procurement procedures contained in 40 CFR 31.36, or for non-profits, with 40 CFR 30.40 through 30.48.

Task 1- Programmatic Oversight:

The application requests \$9,000 (less than 10 percent) of the total funding budget to support project oversight by the BDC including educating the Development Corporation Board about brownfields initiatives, and utilizing this project as a showcase for other northern panhandle communities in our jurisdiction. The BDC will contribute \$5000 in in-kind staff time for the development of project materials, presentations, and meeting space. We have also included a cost of \$1,000 to travel to the Annual West Virginia Brownfields Conference as well as the EPA National Brownfields Conference under this task. The total amount budgeted for this task including cost share is \$15,000.

Task 2-Community Involvement

The Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle is working directly with the Town of Chester and the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Committee on this project. The BDC will continue to serve as an ex-officio member of the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Committee which is made up of local private citizens, local businesses leaders,

City council members, civic group representatives, adjacent residential property owners, and development professionals. The BDC will continue its efforts to garner community support and input via media announcements, personal communications with local stakeholders, as well as hold events such as the one-day workshop held about the project on October 1, 2011. The BDC will post information about the redevelopment project on their website and at local establishments including, but not limited to, the city building, and the public library. The BDC will contribute cash and/or in kind services for the development of informational materials, and to assist with outreach and community development. Community involvement will incorporate meetings for consensus building and soliciting comments on the end use design of the new library. Public feedback gathered in meetings as well as comments submitted in writing will be recorded, evaluated and addressed by the BDC. Cost Share Funds totaling \$5,000 will be utilized or the completion of this task.

Task 3 Site Cleanup

Qualified contractors will be selected through a competitive bid process (RFP) to complete the remediation of the site according to the remedial action plan. Remedial Plan alternatives were developed as part of the Analysis of Brownfields Clean-up Alternatives completed in Fall of 2011. The cleanup will include the removal/remediation of leadcontaminated soils, and asbestos contaminated materials in buildings, and debris piles. The clean-up will also include installing engineering controls, such as soil capping, and applying institutional controls to protect the environment and site users. Estimated costs received from the BDC by a contractor indicate remediation of the contaminants to cost up to \$500,000. A post remedial risk assessment will be performed, as required under the VRP, and a certificate of completion will be requested from WV DEP. The BDC will contribute cash toward contract services to complete the remediation. The total grant funds expended (including cost share) for Task 3 Site Clean-up is \$210,000.

Task 4 Reuse Planning

The BDC is working with the Rock Springs Riverfront Redevelopment Committee on possible site end uses, with an emphasis on mixed use development. Under this task, the grant would provide funds to assist in the professional refinement of development plans, conceptual drawings, identifying “green” building materials and technologies for use during redevelopment and to enhance existing community involvement in the reuse planning. Grant funds of \$10,000 to complete this task will be exclusively cost share.

ii) Leveraging. If you determine that additional work (e.g., cleanup) may be required, describe the funding or resources (public and private) you have or will seek to complete the additional work. Describe other sources of funding or resources that you have or are seeking to ensure the successful revitalization of the brownfield site **cleaned up** with this grant.

The Business Development Corporation will work to identify stakeholders to raise additional funds and potentially create a public-private partnership to encourage developers and investors to promote the re-use of the site.

The Business Development Corporation has used funds from the following sources to perform an (1) asbestos building survey, (2) Phase 1 Site Assessment, and (3) Phase 2 Site Assessment. Furthermore, the following sources have also been used to purchase the site, pay for legal

representation and counsel during the acquisition of the site, pay for back taxes assumed from the previous owner, survey the site, and conduct preliminary master planning and traffic engineering.

- Hancock County Commission
- Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle
- Northern Brownfields Assistance Center (Benedum Foundation)
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Economic Development Administration

The BDC will continue to use these sources to successfully revitalize the site; particularly the Hancock County Commission, Business Development Corporation of the Northern Panhandle, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

c. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance [20 Points]

i) Programmatic Capability

Describe the management system you will have in place to direct activities under the grant. Include a description of your project manager and staff and a discussion of their expertise, qualifications, and experience. Discuss the means you will use to retain project leadership or recruit qualified staff should employee turnover occur. Describe the system(s) you have in place to acquire additional expertise and resources required to perform the proposed project. If you intend to contract for the necessary expertise, describe the system you have in place to acquire that expertise.

a) **Patrick B. Ford, Executive Director (Project Manager)**

Mr. Ford has 25 years of experience project management, land development, and economic and community development. Ford has worked as a development executive in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and Florida.

Ford holds a Bachelors Degree in City Planning and Masters Degree in Planning from the University of Virginia is a graduate of Leadership West Virginia, was selected as one of “Who's Who Top Entrepreneurs in West Virginia” by the *West Virginia Business Journal* and, was selected as in instructor in the Governor’s Honors Academy. Mr. Ford also serves on the board of the Northern West Virginia Brownfield’s Assistance Center, the Eastern West Virginia Community Foundation, and the Brooke-Hancock-Jefferson Planning & Development Council.

Ford’s breadth of professional accomplishments includes awards from the American Planning Association for innovative and collaborative community revitalization strategies. His professional endeavors also earned him design excellence awards from the

Association of Consulting Engineers, a community service award from the Press Association, Entrepreneur of the Year for his business initiatives, and academic achievement awards for accomplishments in college.

Marvin Six, Assistant Director (Assistant Project Manager)

Mr. Six has thirty five years of experience in corporate management and fifteen years in economic and community development in West Virginia. Mr. Six holds a Bachelors Degree in Business Management and Masters Degree in Industrial Safety from West Virginia University and a graduate from the University of Pittsburgh Katz Graduate School Entrepreneurial Fellows Center.

Amber Nest, Office Manager

Ms. Nest has worked simultaneously with the Business Development Corporation and the Weirton Chamber of Commerce for over 6 years handling day-to-day operations and finances for both organizations. Ms. Nest completed the Dale Carnegie Course Effective Communications and Human Relations in 2007. In addition, she obtained an Associate's Degree, with Honors, in Business Management emphasizing Marketing from The Eastern Gateway Community College.

- b) Mr. Ford and Mr. Six are cross trained and have sixty years of experience in land development, and economic and community development. Their collective experience allows them to seamlessly share responsibility for project management, land development, business recruitment, business retention, deal structuring, finance structuring, marketing, and consensus building.

Furthermore, Mr. Ford and Mr. Six have the active participation of its Board of Directors, in general, and Executive Board, in particular. Collectively, the skill sets possessed by the Board of Directors of the Business Development Corporation (BDC) include banking and financing, industrial development, land development, arts and culture, corporate management, marine engineering and development, multimodal transportation planning and traffic impact assessment, contract law and real estate law, strategic planning, community and economic development, political science, real estate sales, education, sales, and law enforcement.

Beyond the skill sets possessed by the staff and board of the BDC, the BDC regularly retains the skills of professionals for a variety of contractual services for project development, civil and structural engineering, site assessment, planning, accounting, and contract

law. These services, including the hiring of staff, are handled via standard procurement and thorough vetting procedures.

- c) The BDC has retained and a number of professional over the years via standard procurement procedures. Summarily, the procedures include soliciting statements of qualifications and price proposals that are reviewed by the staff and executive board of the BDC (which includes a balance of professionals from the private sector and public sector).

For the development of the former TS&T site, the BDC has already retained the services of a law firm with expertise in contract, real estate, and environmental law. The BDC has also retained the services of an environmental engineer, surveyor, and traffic engineer.

- d) If the BDC were to contract necessary expertise, beyond that which has been currently retained, it would contract such professionals via standard procurement procedures that have been employed in the past. Summarily, the procedures will include soliciting statements of qualifications and price proposals that will be reviewed by the staff and executive board of the BDC.

ii) Past Performance If you have ever received an EPA brownfields grant, please respond to item **1**. If you have never received an EPA brownfields grant, but have received other federal or non-federal assistance agreements (an assistance agreement is a grant or cooperative agreement and not a contract) please respond to item **2**. If you have never received any type of federal or non-federal assistance agreements please indicate this in your proposal and you will receive a neutral score [6 Points] for this factor. [Failure to indicate anything in response may result in zero points for this factor.] In evaluating an applicant's response to this factor, in addition to the information provided by the applicant, EPA may consider relevant information from EPA files or from other federal or non-Federal grantors to verify or supplement information provided by the applicant. [12 points]

1. Currently or Has Ever Received an EPA Brownfields Grant

- Identify the EPA Brownfields grant(s) you currently have or have received in the past. Please provide information on no more than five of your most recent grants. Demonstrate how you successfully managed the grant(s), and successfully performed all phases of work under the previous or existing grant(s) by providing information on:

- Funds Expenditure: the balance of grant funds not drawn down (funds remaining).
- Compliance with grant requirements: information regarding your compliance with the work plan, schedule, terms and conditions, timely reporting (e.g., quarterly reports, financial status reports, Assessment, Cleanup, Revolving Loan Fund Exchange System (ACRES), and any other

required submittals), and reporting on whether you were making progress towards achieving the expected results under the grants and if not whether you explained why not.

o **Accomplishments:** Describe your success using EPA grant funds to assess, clean up, and redevelop brownfield sites, including whether you reported accomplishments to EPA in ACRES, or alternatively, via the Property Profile Form.

Describe any adverse audit findings.

2. Has Not Received an EPA Brownfields Grant but has received other federal or non-federal assistance agreements

a) USEDA Planning Grant (Economic Adjustment Strategy)

Market Cluster Identification
Site Identification
Site Planning and Engineering
Marketing and Branding

b) USEDA Planning Assistance Grant (Economic Development)

Market Based Feasibility
Brownfield Redevelopment
Entrepreneurial Development and Business Incubator
Development
Port Development
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

c) USEPA Brownfield's Assessment Grant (Performance of Phase I and Phase II environmental assessments)

The Brooke Hancock Jefferson Planning & Development Council was awarded an assessment grant that they use to work with the BDC to identify sites for assessments. Sites in Brooke and Hancock Counties include:

Barkhurst North (Phase I, II)
Barkhurst South (Phase I, II)
Brooke Glass (Phase I)
Cove School (Phase I, II)
Follansbee East (Phase I)
Newell Porcelain (Phase I, II)
Starvaggi Freedom (Phase I, II)
Starvaggi Machine (Phase I)

d) WVDO Marketing Grant

Business Recruitment and Retention

Website Design
Marketing Brochures

e) WVDO Planning Grant

Assistance from the State for Strategic Planning

f) WVDO Economic Assistance Grants

Local Economic Development Grant

g) Annual investments from local governments (Brooke County, Hancock County, City of Weirton, Beech Bottom, and private investors)

All Grants to the BDC have been managed properly, without adverse audit findings. The BDC has met all quarterly progress reports, contract information, financial status reports, and all other data required for these grants.

3. Community Engagement and Partnerships

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated based on: 1) the applicant's plan for engaging the targeted community in the project to be funded under this grant; 2) the extent to which the applicant has identified and established relationships with the partners necessary to achieve the project's goals; and 3) the extent to which the support letters provided by community-based organizations involved with the project demonstrate specific and valuable commitments to the project.

a. Discuss your plan for involving the affected community (e.g., neighborhood organizations, citizens' groups, borrowers, developers, and other stakeholders) in cleanup decisions or reuse planning, including activities that have already occurred. Describe your plan for communicating the progress of your project to citizens, including plans for communicating in languages commonly used in the community. [5 Points]

The community of Chester has formed a local group known as the Rock Springs Riverfront Revitalization Committee (RSRRC) comprised of local city officials, community members, business people, and civic leaders. The BDC attends and participates in every RSRRC meeting, shares its activities related to site redevelopment, and utilize a feedback/concerns loop with Committee members. Through this group the BDC is able to maintain full transparency on this project. Local media representatives frequently attend the Committee meetings and report to the greater community on its progress.

The RSRRC recently hosted a Community Visioning Workshop on October 1st, attended by 56 local citizens, to present the progress of the BDC and Committee on the revitalization of the TS&T site and discuss re-use visioning options.

b. Describe your efforts and/or plans to develop partnerships with your local/state/tribal environmental and health agencies and other relevant governmental agencies to ensure your brownfields project is successful. [5 Points]

c. Provide a **description of, and the role of, the key** community-based organizations involved in your project. These organizations may include, but are not limited to, local citizen or business groups, environmental or civic organizations, educational institutions, and local labor organizations. If Community-based organizations do not exist in your area, please provide background affirming the lack of such organizations. Then, demonstrate how the community is engaged and involved in your project, which can be demonstrated by resident support letters, letters to the editor, attendance at public meetings, etc. Attach letters from all community-based organizations mentioned that describe their roles and affirm any referenced commitments. [5 Points]

4. Project Benefits

Under this criterion, proposals will be evaluated on the extent to which the project's anticipated outcomes promote general welfare through the improvement of the public health and safety, economy, and environment of the targeted community and how these outcomes will contribute to your overall community "vision" for the revitalization of brownfield sites. Consideration will be given to how public health issues are addressed during the project, the anticipated benefits of redevelopment, and the incorporation of sustainable practices.

a. **Welfare and/or Public Health** Describe the environmental, social, and/or public health benefits anticipated from the redevelopment of the site cleaned up under this grant. Describe how nearby and sensitive populations in your targeted community will be protected from contaminants during cleanup work conducted on the brownfield site under this grant. [10 Points]

The former TS&T site is located immediately adjacent to a residential neighborhood and one block behind Chester's main street. Successful cleanup and re-use of the site will address significant environmental health risks to the area, including asbestos concerns voiced by local residents. In addition, the successful redevelopment of an 8.54 acre brownfield site in downtown Chester and along the Ohio River will strengthen the social and public health of the town and County.

b. **Economic Benefits and/or Greenspace** Explain how the grant will produce [5 Points]:

i) **Economic benefits**, such as increased employment and expanded tax base, through the redevelopment of the site cleaned up under this grant. Provide quantitative estimates where feasible; **and/or**

ii) **Other non-economic benefits associated with the site to be reused for** greenspace or other not-for-profit activities. Greenspace includes areas redeveloped for uses such as parks, recreation areas, greenways, or environmental buffers. Other not-for-profit activities include the work of governmental or charitable organizations.

The future re-use of the site will bring additional jobs and support the local economy and help ensure the long term sustainability of the region. Local land values will also increase due to the cleanup of the site and further by the re-development of the site into a productive use. In addition, site re-use visions include greenspace development on the site to be incorporated into the re-use in order to enhance the aesthetics and value of the site. Salvage and reuse of materials during cleanup will be conducted as thoroughly as is financially feasible. Finally, the re-use of the site will connect to the residential neighborhood and downtown by the enhancement and development of access roads and walking paths.

c. Environmental Benefits from Infrastructure Reuse/Sustainable Reuse [10 Points]

Describe any anticipated environmental benefits, beyond the remediation of contaminants, associated with the **sustainable redevelopment** of the site cleaned up under this grant, including the use of existing infrastructure, such as utilities and public transit, green buildings, energy efficiency, water management, green remediation, construction and demolition materials recycling, diesel emissions reductions, and renewable energy on brownfields

The site re-use will include utilizing existing on-site utilities, including city water and sewer, on-site gas, and electricity. Renewable and energy efficient options, including local building materials renewable energy, will be included in site redevelopment plans. Finally, the salvage and reuse of materials on site will be conducted during cleanup and demolition of on-site buildings.

d. Describe your plan for tracking and measuring your progress towards achieving the expected short term and long term project outcomes and outputs. [5 Points]

The BDC is charged with guiding the TS&T clean-up to successful completion. The group meets monthly and reports directly to the Board of Directors.

There will be specific timelines and milestone required to achieve the clean-up standards in the Voluntary Remediation Program. A Licensed Remediation Specialist and dedicated Project Manager will be contracted to guide and track the environmental remediation and cleanup process and overall project development. This, combined with the dedicated steering committee, will ensure task completion and continued progress toward the projects short and longer outcomes and outputs.

Project milestones will be closely tracked and celebrated. Project success will be measured in stages, such as cleanup start and end, re-use visioning, identification of developers and investors, creation of public-private partnerships, and the successful redevelopment of the site.