

Brownfields Advisory Committee Draft Minutes

Tuesday, November 15, 2016 2:30 p.m – 3:15 p.m.

CCRPC Main Conference Room, 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT

To access various documents referenced below, please visit:

<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/#advisory-committee>

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Curt Carter, GBIC
Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO
Matt Vaughan, Lake Champlain Basin Program

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 2:42pm. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda

There was no public comment.

3. Review and action of October 28, 2016 meeting summary

Adoption of the minutes from 10/28/2016 was deferred until the next meeting, as neither Kirsten nor Matt attended that meeting.

4. Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests

Dan gave an overview of the grant workplan, which estimates that the Petroleum grant and the Hazardous Grant would each pay for three (3) Phase Is, five (5) Phase II and three (3) archaeological assessments totaling \$145,100 and five (5) Corrective Action Plans totaling \$25,00. The workplan is not a commitment, but is important to keep in mind while funding decisions are being made.

The projects were all ranked based on the site selection Evaluation Criteria adopted by the committee in October 2016 and scored as follows: Winooski Hotel-55 points; City Market-44 points, and Alden Waterfront-23 points. The three projects requested specific amounts of money and discussion ensued over the correct amount of money to grant to each project, based on the degree to which each project meets the guidelines for site selection adopted by the committee. Dan suggested that the projects be granted funding based solely on their site selection scores rather than as a percentage of the overall need. Curt mentioned that he thinks funding should be prioritized for projects that would not be able to move forward otherwise. Matt made the point that if all these project requests were fully funded, almost 1/3 of the money would be gone. Kirsten made the point that determining the amount of money that should be allocated based on the amount requested may not be fair, because some applicants request 100% of their budget and some only request part of it to begin with. Eleni made the point that even if funding is not awarded in exact proportion to the scores given to the projects, the ranking of the amount of funding awarded should match the ranking of the scores. Matt wanted to confirm that

