1. PROJECT PROGRESS

Progress reported in this section will clearly identify only those activities performed during the reporting period that were undertaken with EPA funds, and will relate EPA-funded activities to the objectives and milestones agreed upon in the grant workplan.

1.1 Status of Activities During the Reporting Period

Task 1 – Program Development

Activity 1 Establish Advisory Committee – Recruited and established a Brownfields Advisory Committee to guide the Brownfields program. The committee met 2 times in CY2006, 9 times in 2007, 6 times in 2008, 5 times in 2009 and 3 times in 2010. Meetings agendas included: an orientation to brownfields and the assessment grant; an overview of EPA and state brownfield programs and staff; developing a program brochure; selection of on-call consultants; adoption of site selection guidelines; approval of site nomination forms and participation agreements; overview of All Appropriate Inquiry; overview of Phase II investigation process; and updates on specific projects. The following subcommittees were established to meet as needed: Consultant Selection Committee; Technical Project Oversight Committee; and Marketing Committee. The Brownfields Advisory Committee was provided email status reports when meetings were
Activity 2 Training and Development – CCRPC staff attended the national Brownfields Conference in 2006. Staff attended 4 Vermont Brownfields Roundtable meetings and a Vermont Brownfields Conference.

Activity 3 Reporting and Compliance – CCRPC staff submitted quarterly reports.

Task 2 – Community Outreach

Activity 1 Develop Public Information Materials – With Advisory Committee oversight, CCRPC staff prepared a program brochure for distribution and posting on CCRPC’s website. The brochure was updated 3 times over the course of the grant. Information about the program and links to the program brochure and other brownfields information was put on the CCRPC website and updated as needed. Prepared articles for the CCRPC newsletter.

Activity 2 Outreach and Education – CCRPC staff conducted outreach meetings with municipal staff and municipal legislative bodies for 12 municipalities and various private developers and realtors. Made presentation for Chittenden County Regional Planning Commissioners.

Activity 3 Targeted Site Outreach – Worked with Brownfields Advisory Committee, property owner, and environmental consultant to conduct targeted site outreach. For Brown’s Court, a fact sheet about the Phase II work was hand-delivered to all adjacent properties and mailed to non-resident property owners. Additionally, a sandwich board sign was prepared (and sign permit obtained) and put at the property entrance to inform pedestrian and users of the parking lot. Answered questions and responded to concerns about Phase II work at this site. Brief summaries of projects were included on the CCRPC website. Prepared press release about field work at Browns Court. Met with Village Planning Director to discuss work at 3 Maple Street site. Prepared flyer with information about field work at 3 Maple Street for property residents. Met with Town Administrator and Town Planner to discuss Phase II findings for Richmond Creamery and implications for site redevelopment. Coordinated meeting between Richmond Creamery site owners, their planning consultant, and VT DEC to discuss issues related to redevelopment planning.

Task 3 – Site Identification and Selection

Activity 1 Identify Potential Sites for Assessment – Leads for potential sites were identified through municipal outreach, developer outreach, and property owner outreach. Leads were followed up on to discuss program participation benefits and requirements and site suitability and eligibility. Hired consultant to screen VT DEC Active Sites List for potential petroleum brownfield sites.


Activity 3 Develop Standard Assessment and Access Agreements – The Brownfields Advisory Committee approved standard assessment and access agreements in 2007; the agreement language was modeled on that used by other RPCs in Vermont.

Activity 4 Site Selection – The following sites were selected, and an eligibility determination obtained from Vermont Dept. of Environmental Conservation obtained for each: 0 Brown’s Court; Richmond Creamery; 3 Maple Street. One other site was selected and determined eligible, however the property owner decided not to participate in the program.
Task 4 – Site Assessments and Studies

Activity 1 Short-list Qualified Environmental Consultants – CCRPC staff prepared and published a Request for Qualifications in 2007. Nine consulting firms submitted statements of qualifications. A Selection Committee recruited from the Advisory Committee worked with staff to review the SOQs, based on technical qualifications, cost review and interviews. Three firms were selected and Master Agreements were executed with each.

Activity 2 Conduct Phase I Assessments – Phase I Environmental Site Assessments were conducted for the following sites: 0 Brown’s Court; Richmond Creamery;

Activity 3 Conduct Phase II Assessments – Obtained QAPP approval and conducted Phase II investigations of the following sites: 0 Brown’s Court (Generic and Site Specific QAPP); Richmond Creamery (Site Specific QAPP). To meet Section 106 historic preservation requirements, Archeological Resource Assessments were also conducted for each of these sites.

Activity 4 Corrective Action Planning and Redevelopment Assistance – Met with Town Administrator and Town Planner to discuss Phase II findings for Richmond Creamery and implications for site redevelopment. Coordinated meeting between Richmond Creamery site owners, their planning consultant, and VT DEC to discuss issues related to redevelopment planning.

1.2 Modifications to the Workplan

Minor modifications to the budget were requested and approved by the EPA Project Officer. CCRPC requested and received a one-year extension to the grant in order to complete a Phase II environmental site assessment at the 3 Maple Street site.

1.3 Site-Specific Products

0 Browns Court


- Site Specific Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum RFA 08053, 0 Browns Court. Heindel & Noyes, revised April 16, 2008.


- RFA 08053 0 Browns Court Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. Heindel & Noyes, revised November 12, 2008.


- Press release for Browns Court Phase II field work.

- Flyer for Browns Court neighboring businesses and residences.

Richmond Creamery

• Archaeological Resources Assessment for the Former Richmond Creamery, #125 Bridget Street and #74 Jolina Court, Richmond, Chittenden County, Vermont. University of Vermont Consulting Archaeology Program, January 2009.


• Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Former Richmond Creamery. The Johnson Company, revised April 19, 2010.

3 Maple Street


• Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum for Subsurface Site Investigation, 3 Maple Street, LLC. KAS, Inc. December 2009.

• Archaeological Resource Assessment, #3 Maple Street, Essex Junction, Chittenden County, Vermont. University of Vermont Consulting Archaeology Program, January 2010.

• Brownfields Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, 3 Maple Street, Essex Junction, VT. KAS, Inc., revised September 2010.

1.4 Other Deliverables/Work Products

Program brochure

Brownfields Advisory Committee meeting summaries

Chittenden County Brownfields Site Identification. KAS Inc., August 4, 2008.

CCRPC Newsletter article.

2. PROJECT FUNDS EXPENDED

Table 1: Summary of Costs Incurred for Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Approved Budget</th>
<th>Costs Incurred as of 9/30/10</th>
<th>Costs Incurred after 9/30/10</th>
<th>Costs Incurred to Date</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$29,735.00</td>
<td>$31,636.71</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$31,636.71</td>
<td>$(1,901.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$10,528.00</td>
<td>$10,356.68</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,356.68</td>
<td>$171.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$8,704.00</td>
<td>$2,985.38</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,985.38</td>
<td>$5,718.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$1,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$149,683.00</td>
<td>$154,796.70</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$154,796.70</td>
<td>$(5,113.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$199,950.47</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$199,950.47</td>
<td>$49.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Cumulative Expenses by Task and Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Fringe Benefits</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Supplies</th>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>$8,006.00</td>
<td>$10,095.37</td>
<td>$5,007.00</td>
<td>$4,554.18</td>
<td>$3,614.00</td>
<td>$4,238.42</td>
<td>$13,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>$2,610.00</td>
<td>$3,932.27</td>
<td>$1,928.00</td>
<td>$1,333.72</td>
<td>$1,394.00</td>
<td>$1,262.10</td>
<td>$4,596.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$2,761.40</td>
<td>$1,602.00</td>
<td>$173.88</td>
<td>$601.00</td>
<td>$24.46</td>
<td>$501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,716.00</td>
<td>$16,864.04</td>
<td>$9,187.00</td>
<td>$6,061.78</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$6,114.89</td>
<td>$141,683.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total expenses shown in Table 1, $199,950.47, is the amount reported in the Federal Financial Report. The 2 cent difference between the two tables is a result of the two tables being tracked differently as a financial check; given the very slight difference the two tables are considered a match.

### 3. BUDGET AND OVERALL PROJECT STATUS

CCRPC requested minor budget modifications which were approved by the EPA Project Officer. Overall, grant activities were essentially on-target; less than $50 of grant funds were unspent. CCRPC was overbudget for contractors and slightly overbudget for personnel, and correspondingly underbudget for travel and supplies.

### 4. SCHEDULE

CCRPC requested and received a one-year extension to the grant in order to complete a Phase II environmental site assessment at the 3 Maple Street site. All grant activities, with the exception of closeout reporting were complete by end of September 2010.

### 5. MINIMUM REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List ALL Properties associated with this grant</th>
<th>Has this Property been approved by EPA? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Has work started on this property yet? (Y / N / N/A)</th>
<th>Has this Property been put into ACRES? (Y / N / N/A)</th>
<th>Has work been done on this property THIS quarter? (Y / N / N/A)</th>
<th>Has this property been updated in ACRES this quarter? (Y / N / N/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Browns Court</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Richmond Creamery</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 3 Maple Street</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>