

Brownfields Advisory Committee Draft Meeting Agenda - REVISED

Monday, September 11, 2017 3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

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

Or via Conference Call to:

Please call: Dial-in Number: (641) 715-3200

Access Code: 933085

To access various documents referenced below, please visit:

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

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda** (Information, 2 minutes)
2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda** (Information, 2 minutes, longer if necessary)
3. **Review and action on July 10, 2017 meeting summary** (Action, 2 minutes)
4. **Action on Site Nominations/Assistance Requests** (Discussion, 30 minutes)

Initial review of request from Northwest RPC for funds to assist redevelopment at the sites below. See staff scoring of the Evaluation Criteria.

3 Canada Street, Swanton

14 Stebbins Street, St. Albans

The Committee will decide how much financial assistance to provide towards the submitted proposals from Chittenden County. See staff scoring of the Evaluation Criteria.

Sara Holbrook Community Center, 60 North Avenue, Burlington

5. **Project Updates** (Information, 5 minutes)

Updates on ongoing funded projects.

6. **Discuss Contract Overage** (Action, 15 minutes)

See attached memo

7. **Adjourn**

*In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext *17 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.*

Brownfields Advisory Committee Draft Meeting Minutes Monday, July 10, 2017

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>

Committee Members in Attendance		
Curt Carter, Chair – GBIC	Razelle Hoffman-Contois, VDH	Matt Vaughan - Lake Champlain Basin Program
Kristie Farnham – VT DEC, ex-officio (via phone)		
Others in attendance:		
Kurt Mueller, Johnson Company	Steve Larosa, Weston and Sampson	Miles Waite, Waite-Heindel Environmental Management
Sarah Bartlett, VT DEC	Lynda Provencher, VT DEC	
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht	Emily Nosse-Leirer	Regina Mahony

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

No changes to the agenda.

2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda

No public comments.

3. Review and action on April 10, 2017 meeting summary

There was no quorum. The minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting.

4. Presentation from DEC Staff on Final Proposed Investigation and Remediation of Contaminated Properties Rule (I-Rule)

Sarah Bartlett and Lynda Provencher attended the meeting to present on the I-Rule and answer questions. The rule can be found at this link:

<http://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/documents/IROCP.pdf>

Lynda shared that the Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules (LCAR) has approved the rule and it is expected to be signed by the Secretary of State during the next few weeks. After signing, it will go into effect after 15 days. The earliest it will happen at the end of July, though it is more likely that it would happen in August.

Lynda and Sarah presented on the rule via PowerPoint, and the presentation is available on the CCRPC

Brownfields webpage (see link above)

- Dan asked how the background values for lead, arsenic and PAHs compared to previous regulation. Lynda state that DEC has not previously established background levels. Miles stated that the new urban background level allows for easier development of urban sites.
- Curt requested that CCRPC take a look at the “urban” zone definition and ensure that it meets the areas one would expect in Chittenden County.

- For “other locations” that may be considered to have urban soils, a developer should go to the site project manager at DEC.
- Dan asked the difference between the new cleanup standards for PAHs (Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons), arsenic and lead.
- Razelle asked if PAHs in these rules refer to all PAHs, and Lynda responded that they are TEQs (Toxic Equivalency Quotient) [meaning potentially carcinogenic PAH are evaluated using TEQs]
- Razelle asked which screening values were used for the rule. Lynda stated that the screening values were the May 2016 version. Razelle stated that the rules should have used the June 2017 screening levels as they are the most current, which are less restrictive. It was noted that in some very limited instances, the 2017 version includes updated toxicity values that are less stringent than those used in the May 2016 iteration. Case in point is Benzo(a)pyrene. Lynda and Sarah explained that it was not possible for them to reference the most current table as adopted, and that they instead have to reference a specific iteration of the screening values. The rules will be updated periodically in the future to include the latest screening values.
- Kurt stated that the groundwater MCL (Maximum Contaminant Levels) is extremely low, and wanted to know if this could affect BAP levels. Razelle explained that the MCL for some chemicals may not solely be based upon health, but may reflect consideration of other factors can be changed based on things in addition to health effects, such as economic impact and feasibility. of the rules.
- Dan asked Lynda and Sarah to comment on how the new Vermont cleanup standards from the new rule compare to the cleanup standards in other states. Razelle stated one cannot look at a table of cleanup standards employed by different states and make comparisons across the board as each entity has its own process for developing values including, but not limited to, the fact that some employ a state-specific estimate of background as the cleanup value for certain chemicals and derive risk-based concentrations based on that state’s policies/practices/regulations for other chemicals. A detailed research effort would need to be conducted to determine the origin of each cleanup value in the table Dan presented to understand why they differ. —that this is comparing completely different issues, because all states use different background numbers, the total cleanup standards cannot be evaluated as equals. Some states only have background numbers, some states base their calculations on risk factors, etc.
- Several consultants in attendance expressed that they were pleased with the process and the new rules.
- On 7/11/17 R. Hoffman-Contois provided the following note to D. Albrecht and E. Nosse-Leirer which D. Albrecht agreed would be included in the minutes “I would just like to clarify for the group that the Vermont soil screening levels Lynda mentioned briefly at the BAC meeting yesterday, are not the set of values recommended for inclusion in the I-Rule by the Department of Health.”

5. **Review and Action on 339 Pine Street Project**

Miles Waite gave an update on work completed at 339 Pine Street (Railyard Enterprise Project). The site is a possible alternative for the route of a road connecting Pine Street and Battery Street. Miles explained that the site has a deed restriction due to its location next to the Barge Canal, and there was concern that the weight of the road might cause NAPL (Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid) migration if there were peat soils on site. The testing completed indicated petroleum contamination, likely from an asphalt plant formerly on the site, but no NAPL and no peat were found. This alleviates some concerns about the roadway, but not all. The site is better than everyone thought it might be. Unlike at neighboring sites, the site does not have filled wetlands. However, roadway compression could still be a concern because of the presence of soft clay. However, the land is already subject to quite a bit of stress due to the heavy uses (soil storage, precast

concrete storage, etc.) and so the new compression may not be a concern. More testing is proposed, for dissolved contaminants and other issues, but there is not currently funding for it. Samples have been taken, but not yet evaluated. Phase I and Phase 2A of the contract have been completed, but Phase 2B and 2C have not, and are not funded as part of the current committee approval. Now it will be necessary for the Railyard Enterprise Project partners to find the money to finish those phases.

6. **Project Updates**

- The Vaults (Pine and Howard Street, Burlington): Steve LaRosa stated that a Phase I was completed at the Vaults. There were 3 environmental conditions found on site, due to former dry cleaners, fires on site and 100+ years of industrial development. The property owner has forged ahead with the project on their own since they're in a hurry to start development.
- Waterfront Park (Burlington): Kurt Mueller stated that the Phase II at Alden Waterfront Park has been completed. Several areas of concern were found during the reconstruction of the bike path in the park. It was necessary to determine whether groundwater was contaminated and whether it was migrating to the lake. In the area where creosote soaked timbers were found, PAHs were found to have a limited extent and there was no groundwater contamination. VOC (Volatile Organic Compounds) and SVOC (Semi-Volatile Organic Compounds) contamination in the swale was found to exist but there was no groundwater contamination. CCRPC has reviewed the final report, but the City of Burlington needs to review still before it can go to DEC and EPA. Moving forward, there needs to be a CAP (Corrective Action Plan) to mitigate the exceedances found in the soil, probably a cap that isolates the contamination and fixes some of the site's drainage problems. Matt asked about the groundwater testing that occurred. Kurt stated that the groundwater table was high during the sampling due to it being in the spring, and that the contaminants were all at or above the water table levels. No exceedances of the groundwater enforcement standards were found.
- Strand Theater (62-70 Main Street, Winooski): The Corrective Action Plan process was begun in January. Final engineering design was delayed, hence little progress was made afterward, then on June 23, Redstone indicated that the work was on hold due to external factors and we have not been told to resume work.
- Winooski Hotel Project (4-12 Winooski Falls Way): The Phase II ESA field work was completed in May and the final report is being prepared. The data indicate that petroleum contaminated soils cover the western part of the property, and urban soils cover the entire property. Some of the soil gas has been impacted primarily by petroleum, mostly below DEC's shallow soil gas thresholds. Little to no groundwater contamination was found and there was nothing above standards in the groundwater. We expect to have the report completed by July 20.
- Development at Pine & Flynn, Burlington: LEE's work for the CCRPC is completed (ABCA (Analysis of Brownfields Cleanup Alternatives/CAP approved June 19, 2017). Construction and cleanup are underway with necessary environmental work funded by others.
- 3 Maple Street, Essex Junction: On hold pending progress with Village development review process.
- Work at City Market (207 Flynn) and 453 Pine Street continues.
- Lynda reminded CCRPC staff to include DEC staff on Phase I's so that site walks can be completed and to ensure that all parties are on the same page.

7. **Adjourn**

The next meeting will be held at the call of the chair. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



Northwest Region Brownfields Program

SITE NOMINATION FORM

SITE CONTACT INFORMATION			
Property/Site Name:			
Property Address:			
Current Property Owner:		Contact Info:	
Person Completing this Form and Interest in Property:		Contact Info:	
Work to be done:	Phase 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Phase 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Phase 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>		
<i>Please note: You may want to confirm your property's eligibility based on the questions on page 3 prior to filling out this application.</i>			
SITE DETAILS			
PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES IF NECESSARY			
1) Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfield? (<i>A real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants</i>) Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>			
2) Describe the property physically, including size of property; relationship to neighboring properties; number, size and location of buildings and other structures; and environmental features such as tree coverage, wetlands, streams, ponds, etc.:			
3) Describe the current use and operational history at the site:			
4) Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you think it is contaminated?			
5) Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property.			
6) Describe the level of community and municipal support for the redevelopment.			
7) Describe the site's relationship to any designated downtown, village center or growth center.			

INFORMATION ON LIABILITY AND DEFENSES/PROTECTIONS

8) How was the property acquired (or will it be acquired)?

- ☐ Negotiated purchase from a private individual
☐ Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
☐ Tax foreclosure
☐ Eminent domain
☐ Donation
☐ Other

9) What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)?

10) What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired?

11) Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the current or prospective property owner has with all prior owners or operators of the property:

12) Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the applicant acquired (or will acquire) the property?

Yes ☐ No ☐

13) Has the property owner or prospective property owner ever arranged for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site or transport hazardous substances to the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

14) Did the property owner or prospective property owner ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

15) Did the property owner perform for will the prospective property owner perform a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment prior to the purchase of the property?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, date of assessment: _____

16) If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed or any other environmental inquiry, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and attach a copy of all reports.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT COMPLIANCE

17) Is the property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark?

Yes ☐ No ☐

18) If not, is the property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places?

Yes ☐ No ☐

19) Is the property (site) part of a designated Historic District?

Yes ☐ No ☐

20) Will the project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures?

Yes ☐ No ☐

21) Does your project have the potential to impact archeological resources?

Yes ☐ No ☐

22) Has any work been completed on this property related to identification of historic or archeological resources, such as a National Register of Historic Places nomination or a Section 106 review? If so, please provide a copy of the report(s).

Yes ☐ No ☐

SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

IF YOU ANSWER YES TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, THE PROPERTY IS NOT ELIGIBLE

23) Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
24) Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decreed issued to or entered into by parties under CERLCA?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
25) Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the US government?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

SITES NOT ELIGIBLE WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION

IF YOU ANSWER YES TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, SPECIAL APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED

26) Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
27) Has your site/facility been issued a permit by the U.S. or an authorized state under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
28) Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 2004(u) or 3008(h))?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
29) Is your site/facility a land disposal unit that has submitted a RCRA closure notification under subtitle C of RCRA or is subject to closure requirements specified in a closure plan or permit?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
30) Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
31) Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

PETROLEUM ONLY SITE ELIGIBILITY

IF YOUR SITE HAS OR IS SUSPECTED OF HAVING ONLY PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION PLEASE FILL THIS SECTION OUT

IF A RESPONSIBLE PARTY IS IDENTIFIED WHO IS LIABLE FOR PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION AT THE SITE AND FINANCIALLY VIABLE TO PAY FOR ASSESSMENT AND CLEANUP COSTS THEN THE SITE IS NOT ELIGIBLE. IF THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY TOOK REASONABLE STEPS TO ADDRESS THE PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION AT THE SITE AND/OR IS NOT FINANCIALLY VIABLE TO PAY FOR ASSESSMENT AND CLEANUP, THE SITE MAY STILL BE ELIGIBLE.

32) Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination at the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
33) If the answer to question 17 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
34) If the answer to question 17 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
35) Is the site relatively low risk compared with other petroleum only sites in the state: Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies? Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
36) Has any responsible party been identified for the site through either:	
a) A judgment rendered in a court of law for an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or clean up the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
b) An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or clean up the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
c) A citizen suit, contribution action or other third party claim brought against the current or immediate past owner, that would, if successful, require the assessment, investigation or cleanup of the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
37) Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Brownfields Site Evaluation Criteria (Draft for final consideration at October 14 committee meeting)

Project Name: The Ballet School of Vermont/Northern Vermont Ballet Studio

Address/Project Location: 14 Stebbins St., St. Albans City, VT

See spreadsheet for CCRPC staff evaluation scores.

Applicant: St. Albans Studio Arts, LLC

Reviewer:

Required Characteristics	Score
Is the property owner willing to sign a Participation Agreement and Site Access Agreement?	Yes
Does the site meet DEC eligibility criteria for petroleum sites and/or EPA eligibility criteria for hazardous sites?	Yes
Is the planned use consistent with current zoning?	Yes
	Yes = continue No = Not eligible

Project Location (10 pts Total)

Is the project located in Burlington or Winooski?	No	(Yes=2, No=0)	#	0
Is the project located in a Center, Enterprise, Metro, Suburban or Village Regional Planning Area (as identified in the most recently adopted regional plan)?	No	(Yes=2, No=0)	#	0
Is the project located within a designated state center? (Including areas with pending applications)		(Yes=2, No=0)	#	2
	Yes, St. Albans Designated Downtown and Designated Growth Center	(Yes=2, No=0)	#	2
Does the project site have existing water, sewer, electric, transportation and/or natural gas infrastructure serving it?	Yes	(Yes=2, No=0)	#	2
Is the project located adjacent to another brownfields site?		(Yes=2, No=0)	#	2
	Yes, although not active in program. The site is within an the Catherine, Stebbins, Market Street Targeted Area Wide Plan.			

Project Location Economic Conditions (5 pts Total)

Is the project located in an area where the poverty rate is higher than the County-wide average?	Yes (15% vs. 9%)	(Yes=5, No=0)	#	5
--	------------------	---------------	---	---

Housing Potential (30 points total)

Will site cleanup enable housing development in an area planned for high density housing or mixed-use development by the municipality?	No	Up to 10 points	#	0
Will site cleanup contribute to alleviating identified housing need as identified in relevant adopted municipal documents?	No			
Will site cleanup allow multiple housing units (in excess of what is already on site) to be built?	No	1/2 point per unit, 20 points maximum.	#	0

Commercial Potential (20 points total)

Will site cleanup enable commercial development in an area planned for high density commercial or mixed-use development by the municipality and region?	Yes	Up to 20 points	#	?
Is the project a mixed-use project?	Yes, ballet studio with office space			

Open Space and Recreation Potential (10 points total)

Will site cleanup enable improvement or construction of a park in an area where it can be readily accessed by an underserved population?	No	Up to 10 points	#	0
Will site cleanup involve creating or improving open or recreational space as part of a housing or commercial project?	No			

Project Economic Impact (25 pts Total)

Does the project have the potential to create or retain jobs?		1 point per FTE job, up to 10 points	~	5
If no direct jobs are created or retained, does the project lead to indirect job creation?		Up to 15 points	#	?
Does the project have other economic development benefits?				

The project is a new location for an existing successful local business. It will allow this company to remain local and retain the jobs associated with managing the company, teaching dance and professional ballerinas. The project benefits the St. Albans economy by adding to its vibrant creative economy. The dance company provides ballet training for local children and gives back to the community with a free holiday Nutcracker performance. It will also help catalyze the revitalization of an area near the downtown that impacted by brownfields and associated blight.

Bonus Categories	
	1/2 point per percentage point affordable, up to 20 points.
If the project will enable housing unit construction, will a percentage of them be permanently affordable?	No
Is the developer/property owner willing to pay for the Phase I or pay for part of the Phase II or Corrective Action Plan?	(Yes=15, No=0)
Will site cleanup reduce contamination of surface water or groundwater?	Yes, for building materials
	Potentially.

Additional Notes:

Initial Score	0
100 points possible	
Bonus Score	0
45 points possible	
TOTAL SCORE	0



Northwest Region Brownfields Program

SITE NOMINATION FORM

SITE CONTACT INFORMATION

Property/Site Name:			
Property Address:			
Current Property Owner:		Contact Info:	
Person Completing this Form and Interest in Property:		Contact Info:	
Work to be done:	Phase 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Phase 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Phase 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>		

Please note: You may want to confirm your property's eligibility based on the questions on page 3 prior to filling out this application.

SITE DETAILS

PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES IF NECESSARY

- 1) Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfield? (*A real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants*) Yes ☐ No ☐
- 2) Describe the property physically, including size of property; relationship to neighboring properties; number, size and location of buildings and other structures; and environmental features such as tree coverage, wetlands, streams, ponds, etc.:
- 3) Describe the current use and operational history at the site:
- 4) Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you think it is contaminated?
- 5) Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property.
- 6) Describe the level of community and municipal support for the redevelopment.
- 7) Describe the site's relationship to any designated downtown, village center or growth center.

INFORMATION ON LIABILITY AND DEFENSES/PROTECTIONS

8) How was the property acquired (or will it be acquired)?

- ☐ Negotiated purchase from a private individual
☐ Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
☐ Tax foreclosure
☐ Eminent domain
☐ Donation
☐ Other

9) What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)?

10) What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired?

11) Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the current or prospective property owner has with all prior owners or operators of the property:

12) Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the applicant acquired (or will acquire) the property?

Yes ☐ No ☐

13) Has the property owner or prospective property owner ever arranged for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site or transport hazardous substances to the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

14) Did the property owner or prospective property owner ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

15) Did the property owner perform for will the prospective property owner perform a Phase 1 Environmental Assessment prior to the purchase of the property?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so, date of assessment: _____

16) If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed or any other environmental inquiry, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and attach a copy of all reports.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT COMPLIANCE

17) Is the property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark?

Yes ☐ No ☐

18) If not, is the property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places?

Yes ☐ No ☐

19) Is the property (site) part of a designated Historic District?

Yes ☐ No ☐

20) Will the project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures?

Yes ☐ No ☐

21) Does your project have the potential to impact archeological resources?

Yes ☐ No ☐

22) Has any work been completed on this property related to identification of historic or archeological resources, such as a National Register of Historic Places nomination or a Section 106 review? If so, please provide a copy of the report(s).

Yes ☐ No ☐

SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

IF YOU ANSWER YES TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, THE PROPERTY IS NOT ELIGIBLE

23) Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
24) Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decreed issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
25) Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the US government?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

SITES NOT ELIGIBLE WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION

IF YOU ANSWER YES TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, SPECIAL APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED

26) Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
27) Has your site/facility been issued a permit by the U.S. or an authorized state under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
28) Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 2004(u) or 3008(h))?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
29) Is your site/facility a land disposal unit that has submitted a RCRA closure notification under subtitle C of RCRA or is subject to closure requirements specified in a closure plan or permit?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
30) Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
31) Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

PETROLEUM ONLY SITE ELIGIBILITY

IF YOUR SITE HAS OR IS SUSPECTED OF HAVING ONLY PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION PLEASE FILL THIS SECTION OUT

IF A RESPONSIBLE PARTY IS IDENTIFIED WHO IS LIABLE FOR PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION AT THE SITE AND FINANCIALLY VIABLE TO PAY FOR ASSESSMENT AND CLEANUP COSTS THEN THE SITE IS NOT ELIGIBLE. IF THE RESPONSIBLE PARTY TOOK REASONABLE STEPS TO ADDRESS THE PETROLEUM CONTAMINATION AT THE SITE AND/OR IS NOT FINANCIALLY VIABLE TO PAY FOR ASSESSMENT AND CLEANUP, THE SITE MAY STILL BE ELIGIBLE.

32) Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination at the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
33) If the answer to question 17 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
34) If the answer to question 17 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
35) Is the site relatively low risk compared with other petroleum only sites in the state: Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies? Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
36) Has any responsible party been identified for the site through either:	
a) A judgment rendered in a court of law for an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or clean up the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
b) An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or clean up the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
c) A citizen suit, contribution action or other third party claim brought against the current or immediate past owner, that would, if successful, require the assessment, investigation or cleanup of the site.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
37) Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Brownfields Site Evaluation Criteria (Draft for final consideration at October 14 committee meeting)

Project Name: Swanton Ace Hardware Store

Address/Project Location: 1, 3, 5 Canada Street and Municipal Lot at Merchants Row

Applicant: MRM Company, LLC

Reviewer:

See spreadsheet for CCRPC staff evaluation scores.

Required Characteristics	Score
Is the property owner willing to sign a Participation Agreement and Site Access Agreement?	Yes = continue
Does the site meet DEC eligibility criteria for petroleum sites and/or EPA eligibility criteria for hazardous sites?	No = Not eligible
Is the planned use consistent with current zoning?	

Project Location (10 pts Total)		
Is the project located in Burlington or Winooski?	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 0
Is the project located in a Center, Enterprise, Metro, Suburban or Village Regional Planning Area (as identified in the most recently adopted regional plan)?	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 0
Is the project located within a designated state center? (Including areas with pending applications)	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 2
Yes, Swanton Designated Village Center	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 2
Does the project site have existing water, sewer, electric, transportation and/or natural gas infrastructure serving it?	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 2
Is the project located adjacent to another brownfields site?	(Yes=2, No=0)	# 2

Project Location Economic Conditions (5 pts Total)		
Is the project located in an area where the poverty rate is higher than the County-wide average?	(Yes=5, No=0)	# 5

Housing Potential (30 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable housing development in an area planned for high density housing or mixed-use development by the municipality?	Up to 10 points	# 0
Will site cleanup contribute to alleviating identified housing need as identified in relevant adopted municipal documents?	1/2 point per unit, 20 points maximum.	# 0
Will site cleanup allow multiple housing units (in excess of what is already on site) to be built?		# 0

Commercial Potential (20 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable commercial development in an area planned for high density commercial or mixed-use development by the municipality and region?	Up to 20 points	# ?
Is the project a mixed-use project?		

Open Space and Recreation Potential (10 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable improvement or construction of a park in an area where it can be readily accessed by an underserved population?	Up to 10 points	# 0
Will site cleanup involve creating or improving open or recreational space as part of a housing or commercial project?		

Project Economic Impact (25 pts Total)		
Does the project have the potential to create or retain jobs?	1 point per FTE job, up to 10 points	10
If no direct jobs are created or retained, does the project lead to indirect job creation?	Up to 15 points	# ?
Does the project have other economic development benefits?		

Initial Score	0
100 points possible	

Bonus Categories		
	1/2 point per percentage point affordable, up to 20 points.	# 0
If the project will enable housing unit construction, will a percentage of them be permanently affordable?	(Yes=15, No=0)	# 0
Is the developer/property owner willing to pay for the Phase I or pay for part of the Phase II or Corrective Action Plan?	(Yes = 10 No = 0)	# ?
Will site cleanup reduce contamination of surface water or groundwater?		

Additional Notes:	Bonus Score	0
	45 points possible	
TOTAL SCORE		0

**Chittenden County Brownfields Program
Site Nomination / Assistance Request Form**

*For information on types of assistance available and
CCRPC's protocol for deciding if, and to what degree to assist a request, see:
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/>*

Site Name: SARA Holbrook CENTER
Site's Street Address/Town/Zip Code: 66 North Ave Burlington, VT, 05401
Parcel Tax ID #: 043-3-199-000 Property Size (Acres): _____
Zoning District: Residential Medium
Describe current use(s): Preschool, Elementary and middle school after school programs, Summer school, Adult English classes, and food assistance.
Describe former use(s): 66 North Ave has been SHCL 56 + 5B North Ave are duplex buildings.
Are there plans for acquisition and/or redevelopment? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate one to two-page document describing the anticipated benefits of the redevelopment such as housing units, commercial development, jobs, economic impact, recreation, etc. (see Site Evaluation Criteria at link above for the types of information to provide).

Have studies been conducted to identify or assess contamination? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please identify the title, author and date of the report, and if available, send us a PDF: N/A

Potential contaminants include: ☒ Petroleum ☒ Other contaminants

What type(s) of site assessment or cleanup planning assistance are you seeking? Circle all that apply

☒ Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

☐ Phase II Environmental Site Assessment

☐ Soil Monitoring during Construction

☐ Archeological Site Assessment / Recon

☐ Historic Preservation issues

☐ Cleanup / Corrective Action Planning

☒ Other

Submission of application to the BRCCA Program

Property Owner Information:

Name: Sara Holbrook Center

Signature: [Signature]

Mailing Address: 66 North Avenue Burlington VT 05401

Phone: 802 862 0080

Email: lpollander@saraholbrook

Executive Director
cc. or ?

Nomination Submitted By:

Name or Office: W.M. Clavette - CEO

Date Submitted: 7/28/17

Mailing Address: 149 Church St. Burlington, VT, 05401

Phone: (802) 734-2612

Email: wclavette@burlingtonvt.gov

Please Return Site Nomination Form (via PDF is preferred) to:

Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission 110 West Canal St., Suite 202 Winooski, VT 05404

Phone: (802) 846-4490 Ext. *29; Email: dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org

Sara Holbrook Community Center Redevelopment Benefits

- The Sara Holbrook Community Center (SHCC) offers numerous programs that meet the needs of newly arrived and settled families throughout Chittenden County.
- 1,100 children come to Sara Holbrook Community Center each year for education, care, social and recreational development.



(Photo: Current Space that doubles as a toddler daycare facility and space for after school programs)

- Over 350 families utilize SHCC for English language classes, nutrition information, and emergency food assistance.
- In their current space, the Sara Holbrook Community Center cannot meet our neighbors' needs, yet they need us more than ever. We should not have to make choices between offering preschool or afterschool programs, when both are desperately needed.
- The Sara Holbrook Community Center has purchased the two adjacent properties just south of their current location and is planning on combining three lots into one 20,544 sf parcel. Their plan is to demolish these two existing duplex buildings at 56 and 58 North Avenue and build an addition to the existing Sara Holbrook Community Center.



(Photo: Street view of new Sara Holbrook Center post redevelopment)

- SHCC has decided to use the payment-in-lieu of option for the lost housing units, believing that housing and property management is not part of their mission. SHCC is prepared to pay over \$100,000 into the City of Burlington's Housing Trust Fund. This payment will be used to create new affordable housing units in Burlington.
- Demolishing two existing duplex buildings at 56 and 58 North Avenue, and redeveloping the existing Sara Holbrook Community Center, will allow for:
 - A true outdoor playground
 - A safe driveway and drop-off area
 - A gymnasium for year-round recreational activities
 - A teaching kitchen where children and their families can learn how to cook nutritional foods
 - New classroom space to accommodate a toddler program and all-day preschool
 - Afterschool programs and ELL classrooms



SARA HOLBROOK COMMUNITY CENTER
BURLINGTON, VERMONT

SCHEMATIC DESIGN

Duncan Wisniewski
ARCHITECTURE
BURLINGTON, VERMONT

- With the redevelopment, the SHCC will be **creating 10-12 full and part time jobs.**
- Expanding the SHCC will allow them to **add 8 full day, year-around, toddler spots.**
- They will be able to **increase their after school slots from 36-70.**
- SHCC currently about 100 folks annually in their Vermont Adult Learning program. The expansion will them to **add 25 slots for their Adult Learning Program.**



The City of Burlington's Community and Economic Development Office is strongly in favor of the Sara Holbrook Center Redevelopment Project. We believe that this project aligns with CCRPC's ECOS Plan, and furthers the plans education, knowledge, and skills goal: All Chittenden County children and adults have the education, skills, and opportunities necessary to meet their full economic and social potential and well-being. Redeveloping the Sara Holbrook Community Center will strengthen Burlington's continuum of accessible and affordable educational opportunities from early years through adulthood, in turn increasing the region's economic, social, and intellectual well-being. In conclusion, we believe that investing in redeveloping the Sara Holbrook Center is good for Burlington, and Chittenden County.

Brownfields Site Evaluation Criteria		
Project Name: Sara Holbrook Community Center		
Address/Project Location: 56-58 North Avenue, Burlington VT		
Applicant: City of Burlington on behalf of Sara Holbrook Community Center		
Reviewer: Emily Nosse-Leirer		
Required Characteristics	Possible Points	Scoring
Is the property owner willing to sign a Participation Agreement and Site Access		Yes
Does the site meet DEC eligibility criteria for petroleum sites and/or EPA eligibility criteria for hazardous sites?	Yes = continue No = Not eligible	Yes (EPA yes, waiting on DEC response)
Is the planned use consistent with current zoning?		Yes
Project Location (10 pts Total)		
Is the project located in Burlington or Winooski?	(Yes=2, No=0)	2
Is the project located in a Center, Enterprise, Metro, Suburban or Village Regional Planning Area (as identified in the most recently adopted regional plan)?	(Yes=2, No=0)	2
Is the project located within a designated state center? (Including areas with pending applications)	(Yes=2, No=0)	2
Does the project site have existing water, sewer, electric, transportation and/or natural gas infrastructure serving it?	(Yes=2, No=0)	2
Is the project located adjacent to another brownfields site?	(Yes=2, No=0)	0
Project Location Economic Conditions (5 pts Total)		
Is the project located in an area where the poverty rate is higher than the County-wide average?	Up to 5 points	5
Housing Potential (30 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable housing development in an area planned for high density housing or mixed-use development by the municipality?	Up to 10 points	3
Will site cleanup contribute to alleviating identified housing need as identified in relevant adopted municipal documents?		
Will site cleanup allow multiple housing units (in excess of what is already on site) to be built?	1/2 point per unit, 20 points maximum.	2
Commercial Potential (20 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable commercial development in an area planned for high density commercial or mixed-use development by the municipality and region?	Up to 20 points	20
Is the project a mixed-use project?		
Open Space and Recreation Potential (10 points total)		
Will site cleanup enable improvement or construction of a park in an area where it can be readily accessed by an underserved population?	Up to 10 points	10
Will site cleanup involve creating or improving open or recreational space as part of a		
Project Economic Impact (25 pts Total)		
Does the project have the potential to create or retain jobs?	1 point per FTE job, up to 10 points	10
If no direct jobs are created or retained, does the project lead to indirect job creation?	Up to 15 points	15
Does the project have other economic development benefits?		
Initial Score 100 points possible		73
Bonus Categories		
If the project will enable housing unit construction, will a percentage of them be permanently affordable?	1/2 point per percentage point affordable, up to 20 points.	5
Is the developer/property owner willing to pay for the Phase I or pay for part of the Phase II or Corrective Action Plan?	Up to 15 points	Unknown
Does proposed site cleanup mitigate impacts to surface water?	Up to 10 points	0
Additional Notes: While this project will lead to the destruction of 4 housing units, the SHCC will pay over \$100,000 into the Burlington Housing Trust Fund, which funds the construction of affordable housing. This is why some points were awarded for housing.		Bonus Score 45 points possible 5
TOTAL SCORE		78

Brownfields Site Evaluation Comparative Score through August 2017											
SCORES FROM INDIVIDUAL REQUEST SHEETS											
	City Market Lot TBD	City Market Store	Winooski Hotel	Burlington Waterfront	316 Pine	453 Pine	339 Pine	400 Pine	Sara Holbrook	3 Canada Street	14 Stebbins Street
Required Characteristics Is the property owner willing to sign a Participation Agreement and Site Access Agreement?	Scoring									Swanton	St. Albans
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (EPA yes, waiting on DEC response)	Yes	Yes
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does the site meet DEC eligibility criteria for petroleum sites and/or EPA eligibility criteria for hazardous sites? zoning?											
Project Location (10 pts Total) Is the project located in Burlington or Winooski?											
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
Is the project located in a Center, Enterprise, Metro, Suburban or Village Regional Planning Area (as identified in the most recently adopted regional plan)? Is the project located within a designated state center? (Including areas with pending applications)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2
Does the project site have existing water, sewer, electric, transportation and/or natural gas infrastructure serving it?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2
Project Location Economic Conditions (5 pts Total) Is the project located in an area where the poverty rate is higher than the County-wide average? (Yes but not as extreme as other neighborhoods)	0	0	5	3	3	3	5	4	5	5	5
Housing Potential (30 points total) Will site cleanup enable housing development in an area planned for high density housing or mixed-use development by the municipality? Will site cleanup contribute to alleviating identified housing need as identified in relevant adopted municipal documents? Will site cleanup allow multiple housing units (in excess of what is already on site) to be built?	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	10	3	0	0
	0	0	0	0	13.5	0	0	2	2	0	0
Commercial Potential (20 points total) Will site cleanup enable commercial development in an area planned for high density commercial or mixed-use development by the municipality and region? Is the project a mixed-use project?	???	15	15	0	20	15	0	20	20	20	10
Open Space and Recreation Potential (10 points total) Will site cleanup enable improvement or Will site cleanup involve creating or improving open or recreational space as part of a housing or commercial project?	???	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	10	0	0
Project Economic Impact (25 pts Total) Does the project have the potential to create or retain jobs? If no direct jobs are created or retained, does the project lead to indirect job creation? Does the project have other economic development benefits?	???	10	10	0	7.5	5	5	10	10	10	5
	???	10	15	5	5	10	10	15	15	15	5
Initial Score: 100 is maximum	8	44	55	23	62	41	28	69	73	58	33
	City Market Lot TBD	City Market Store	Winooski Hotel	Burlington Waterfront	316 Flynn	453 Pine Street	339 Pine Street	400 Pine Street	Sara Holbrook	3 Canada Street	14 Stebbins St.
	0	0	0	0	2.5	0	0	0	5	0	0
Bonus Categories If the project will enable housing unit construction, will a percentage of them be permanently affordable? Is the developer/property owner willing to pay for the Phase I or pay for part of the Phase II or Corrective Action Plan? Does proposed site cleanup mitigate impacts to surface water?	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	Unknown	0	15
	???	???	???	???	10	10	5	0	0	3	0
	15	15	15	15	27.5	25	20	15	5	3	15
	23	59	70	38	89.5	66	48	84	78	61	48

MEMORANDUM

To: Brownfields Advisory Committee

From: CCRPC Brownfields Staff

Date: September 11, 2017

Re: Contract Overages

On August 28, CCRPC staff was notified by from Waite-Heindel Environmental Management that the drilling completed at 339 Pine (Railyard Enterprise Project) caused the project to go over budget. The Brownfields Advisory Committee approved a budget of \$25,070, including 2.5 days of drilling for \$6,205. The drilling took almost four days and cost \$10,775. This caused the project to be \$4,600 over budget.

Waite-Heindel has requested that we pay for an overage of \$2,500. This request is concerning to staff because drilling was completed on 6/30/2017, but staff were not notified about the longer-than-expected drilling time or the contract overage until 8/28/2017.

Brownfields staff has concerns that funding Waite-Heindel's request would set a bad precedent due to its timing. Yes, projects can frequently run into complications. Had the contractor notified CCRPC in a timely manner, this would have been a relatively easy matter to address.

However, other RPC staff note that this type of overage is not unusual and that funding a portion of the overage would be appropriate.

Staff is requesting the input of the committee on how to proceed in this situation.