

Brownfields Advisory Committee Draft Meeting Minutes

**Monday, September 12, 2016
3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.**

MEETING HELD AT CONTOIS AUDITORIUM AT BURLINGTON CITY HALL

To access the documents referenced below, please visit:

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

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kirsten Merriman-Shapiro, CEDO
Curt Carter, GBIC
Pablo Bose, University of Vermont
Eric Howe, Lake Champlain Basin Program
Razelle Hoffman, Vermont Department of Health (via phone)
Kristi Hizer, DEC (ex-officio)

STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner
Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

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

The meeting began at 3:10 pm. The date of the agenda was changed to fix a mistake. A new agenda item was added after Agenda Item 7 to give Kirsti time to talk about ways in which DEC can be a partner to the project.

2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda

There were no public comments.

3. Review and action of August 8, 2016 meeting summary (see link above)

Curt motioned, Kirsten seconded and the minutes were approved.

4. SOQ's received for Assessment Services

Dan reviewed the SOQ evaluation criteria that were utilized by the consultant selection group. Dan, Kirsten, Justin Dextrateur and Emily comprised the Selection Committee and each of them reviewed the ten (10) SOQs received and scored various aspects of each SOQ. Dan contacted references for all applicants and scored their responses on five separate questions. The group met on Thursday, September 8, reviewed the sum of their scores out of a possible 100 points and recommended that the Brownfields Advisory Committee forward a recommendation to CCRPC that the top six consultants be selected. The six consultants with the highest scores were KAS, Johnson, LEE, Stone, Waite-Heindel/Dubois and King and Weston and Sampson (alphabetically listed).

Firms generally found the master contract included in the RFP to be acceptable, but several changes were requested. A mutual indemnification clause was requested. The committee determined the change to be acceptable. Another firm sought a change regarding the use of study results by other consultants. The committee determined that staff should seek the advice of a lawyer and EPA regarding that suggested revision.

Kirsten motioned that the committee approve the top six firms as listed above and recommend them to Charlie, with the proviso that if concurrence between CCRPC and a consultant could not be reached on an amended master agreement, that the 7th place firm be approached and so on to the firms if necessary. The motion was seconded by Eric and passed unanimously.

5. Finalize Site Evaluation Criteria document

Discussion ensued on the tradeoff between specificity in category ranking (ex. yes or no questions) versus the subjectivity allowed for by ranges (ex. commercial development potential = 0-10 points). Kirsten suggested that the housing component more clearly emphasize funding projects identified in relevant municipal plans. Eric suggested that projects that contribute to increased water quality be added to the bonus points. Curt suggested that the evaluation criteria give equal weight to economic impact and housing, while Razelle suggested that the housing should be weighted even more than in the current draft. Staff will continue to make revisions as suggested. Staff indicated that they would work to create a second draft and circulate it prior to the next meeting so it may be approved at the start of the next meeting.

6. Project Solicitation process

Dan gave a recap of the projects that have already asked for money.

- 4 Winooski Falls Way, a small hotel just west of the Champlain Mill which is known to be contaminated and would need a Phase II Assessment;
- The South End City Market in Burlington, which is requesting funds for soil monitoring during construction of the market on the front half of the lot;
- The Burt White Junkyard in Huntington, which may be bought by a private individual needs a Phase I and Phase II assessment prior to the building of a single family home and the establishment of a sugarbush operation.
- The northern end of Waterfront Park in Burlington, which may need more soil testing to determine whether additional capping is needed;
- The Gateway Block in Burlington, which will likely be completely redeveloped in the near future and will require more assessment. Memorial Auditorium is currently working to relocate tenants.
- Planning efforts in the Urban Reserve in Burlington (at which additional Phase II studies are recommended) are on hold for at least the rest of 2016.
- Burlington Town Center may be an applicant in the future.
- The Railyard Enterprise Project may be an applicant in the future.

Dan proposed adding additional details to the project solicitation form regarding what kind of assistance the applicant is seeking funding for.

7. Outreach methods

Dan gave an update on staff methods for outreach. Staff still intend to present to the Ward 2 and 3 NPA meeting, a Winooski Community Dinner and City Council meeting in Winooski and Burlington. Pablo suggested working with AALV and VRRP to provide information to the New American community, as well as RISPNET (Refugee Immigrant Service Provider Network). Pablo emphasized that reaching out to residents is key to a good public process, and Kirsten mentioned that residential knowledge about environmental hazards is key to public health and environmental justice.

8. DEC Partner Update

Kristi reminded the group that DEC should be included on all project work, including site walks and team meetings.

9. Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items

The next meeting will be during the week of October 10. The meeting will focus on reviewing the first round of site selection criteria.

10. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Nosse-Leirer and Dan Albrecht