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: HULA
Site’s Street Address/Town/Zip Code: 44-50 Lakeside Ave, BTV 05401
Parcel Tax ID #: 053-2-011-0000 Property Size (Acres):
Zoning District: Enterprise Zone / Light Manufacturing (EZ-LM)
Describe current use(s): Mostly vacant 9,200 SF office occupancy 135,000 SF vacant
Describe former use(s): Former Pepsi soft drink factory

Are there plans for acquisition and/or redevelopment? X 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? X Yes ___ No

If yes, please identify the title, author and date of the report, and if available, send us a PDF: See attached ESA performed by Stone Environmental

Potential contaminants include: __ Petroleum X Other contaminants

What type(s) of site assessment or cleanup planning assistance are you seeking? Circle all that apply
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Soil Monitoring during Construction
Archeological Site Assessment / Recon
Historic Preservation issues Cleanup / Corrective Action Planning
Other

Property Owner Information:
Name: Lakeside Ovens, LLC Signature: [Signature]
Mailing Address: 40 Scully Interactive, 688 pine St, BTV 05401
Phone: 802/540-1085 Email: russ@scullyinteractive.com

Nomination Submitted By:
Name or Office: John Caulo Date Submitted: 1/15/2019
Mailing Address: 61 Central Ave, BTV 05401
Phone: 802/233-6640 Email: john.caulo@gmail.com

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
Mr. Dan Albrecht, MA, MS  
Senior Planner  
Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission  
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202  
Winooski, VT 05404  

RE: CCRPC: Site Nomination / Assistance Request Form  
HULA Redevelopment: 44-50 Lakeside Avenue, BTV 05401  

Dear Dan:

On behalf of Lakeside Ovens, LLC, the Owner of the above-referenced Property, I enclose a completed application and supporting documents for funding under the CCRPC’s Brownfields Assistance Program. If approved, the grant funding will offset significant costs incurred by the Owner for environmental assessment and corrective action planning and implementation work to remediate negative impacts associated with the prior use of the Property. Upon completion of the remediation and redevelopment, the Property will be transformed into a job-creating “Innovation Hub” work/play environment for the 21st century economy. Details follow.

The Blodgett Pizza Oven factory was originally constructed on the Property in 1945 and over the past seventy years, has expanded several times at the site. In addition to the 79,500 square foot manufacturing facility located at 50 Lakeside Avenue, the Property also includes 32 Lakeside Avenue, a 2-story, 9,200 Square foot office building currently occupied by a 3rd party office user; and 44 Lakeside Avenue, a 57,000 square foot office building that, up until late 2018, was occupied by Blodgett senior management. With the exception of 32 Lakeside Avenue, approximately 136,000 square feet of space in #44 and #50 is currently vacant.

Under the proposed redevelopment plan (see attached plan), the existing vacant structures will be renovated and adaptively reused. We also anticipate a continuation of the historic pattern of land uses that have existing on-site since the mid-1940s. Specifically, the redevelopment program calls for:

- **32 Lakeside** – the existing office use will continue “as is”.
- **44 Lakeside** – the existing office space will be completely renovated as a multi-tenant facility, with upgrades to life safety and energy efficiency; an obsolete 700 Square foot loading dock will be removed.
- **50 Lakeside** – the pizza factory building will be adaptively reused and renovated as a job-creating “Innovation Hub” for the creative economy, resulting in a mixture of office and “maker space” uses with ancillary support services as required.
Seasonal Recreation Use will continue at the north end of the site with the creation of a new beach club providing lake access for non-motorized water activities.

Additional improvements to building and site include:
- Reduction in impervious surface area coverage of parking lot
- New storm water control and treatment system
- Protection of 20,000 square feet of Class 3 wetland
- Use of renewable energy resources including rooftop solar array and geothermal energy for heating and cooling
- Enhanced connections to the City transportation system, including bike path connections and public bus systems

Thank you for your consideration of this application and we look forward to discussing our plan in greater detail, at your earliest convenience. If additional information is required, please advise.

Sincerely,

John Caulo

Attachments as noted

cc. Russ Scully
### Brownfields Site Evaluation Criteria

**Project Name:** HULA (former Blodgett Ovens Property)  
**Address/Project Location:** 44-50 Lakeside Avenue, Burlington  
**Applicant:** John Caulo, on behalf of Lakeside Ovens, LLC  
**Reviewer:** Emily Nosse-Leirer

#### Required Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes = continue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = Not eligible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is the property owner willing to sign a Participation Agreement and Site Access?  
- Does the site meet DEC eligibility criteria for petroleum sites and/or EPA eligibility?  
- Is the planned use consistent with current zoning?

#### Project Location (10 pts Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project located in Burlington or Winooski?</td>
<td>(Yes=2, No=0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project located in a Center, Enterprise, Metro, Suburban or Village Regional Planning Area (as identified in the most recently adopted regional plan)?</td>
<td>(Yes=2, No=0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project located within a designated state center? (Including areas with pending applications)</td>
<td>(Yes=2, No=0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project site have existing water, sewer, electric, transportation and/or natural gas infrastructure serving it?</td>
<td>(Yes=2, No=0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project located adjacent to another brownfields site?</td>
<td>(Yes=2, No=0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Location Economic Conditions (5 pts Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project located in an area where the poverty rate is higher than the County-wide average?</td>
<td>Up to 5 points</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing Potential (30 points total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup enable housing development in an area planned for high density housing or mixed-use development by the municipality?</td>
<td>Up to 10 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup contribute to alleviating identified housing need as identified in relevant adopted municipal documents?</td>
<td>1/2 point per unit, 20 points maximum.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup allow multiple housing units (in excess of what is already on site) to be built?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commercial Potential (20 points total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup enable commercial development in an area planned for high density commercial or mixed-use development by the municipality and region?</td>
<td>Up to 20 points</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project a mixed-use project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Open Space and Recreation Potential (10 points total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup enable improvement or construction of a park in an area where it can be readily accessed by an underserved population?</td>
<td>Up to 10 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will site cleanup involve creating or improving open or recreational space as part of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Economic Impact (25 pts Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have the potential to create or retain jobs?</td>
<td>1 point per FTE job, up to 10 points</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no direct jobs are created or retained, does the project lead to indirect job creation?</td>
<td>Up to 15 points</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have other economic development benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bonus Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the project will enable housing unit construction, will a percentage of them be permanently affordable, up to 20 points.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the developer/property owner willing to pay for the Phase I or pay for part of the PI?</td>
<td>Up to 15 points</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does proposed site cleanup mitigate impacts to surface water?</td>
<td>Up to 10 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes:

- What is anticipated value of final investment, if known?  
- What is project timeline, if known?

#### Initial Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bonus Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Dan:
Thanks again for including the HULA project on the Brownfield Advisory Committee's agenda for Tuesday's meeting. We apologize for not being able to attend. However, please let this communication supplement my letter to you dated January 15th by responding to your request for additional information about the use of the Property once the renovation has been completed. Details follow:

Overview:
The HULA project hopes to leverage the unique attributes of the Property (i.e., Size; Lake Champlain frontage; Historical architectural fabric; Connectivity—both IT and physical, multi-modal transport) within Burlington, the economic engine of the State Vermont, to serve as a job-creating catalyst for the creative economy. Applying a business model that has been successful in other markets around the country and world, HULA is being developed as "co-working" space, providing shared workspaces for technology startup subculture communities, and services for entrepreneurs, freelancers, startups, small businesses and large enterprises. When completed, the Project will also include support spaces for other related activities, such as health and wellness, outdoor recreation, socializing and dining. In short, the goal of HULA is to create a premier work/play environment with broad market appeal that will generate positive economic and environmental benefits for the City, region and State. With regards to the specific questions contained in your email, I offer the following:

Maker Space
We do not anticipate a big demand for assembly/'maker' space within the Project. At #50 Lakeside Avenue, proposed floor area dedicated to assembly ("maker") use is about 5,000SF, which can be expanded based on demand. There is no dedicated 'maker' use proposed for #44 Lakeside.

Office Space
At #44 Lakeside, the 52,000 floor plate will be subdivided into four (4) office suites of similar floor area along with a central building core. At #50 Lakeside, approximately 68,000SF of space will be programmed for Office use, with a variety of sizes to accommodate a wide range of demand, including:

- Individual Desks
- Single Offices
- Double Office
- Intermediate Office Suite
- Large Office Suite

Marketing Status
To date, approximately twenty-seven (27) entities have committed to the HULA project. The goal is to open the Project with approximately 65% occupancy.

Anticipated Timeline
Local permits are in hand, and we expect an Act 250 permit by the end of this week. Construction will start immediately afterwards at #44 Lakeside, with renovation of #50 to be coordinated with CAP implementation. Initial occupancy is expected in the 4th quarter 2019.

Dan, I trust this provides some clarity to your questions. Please let me now if you need more context. Thanks! -john
Ok. I guess any clarity you can add as far as:

1. How many maker spaces or square footage dedicated to makers
2. How many individual offices or square footage dedicated to offices
3. Number of clients who have committed to renting spaces
4. Anticipated timeline for development

Thanks!

Dan Albrecht, MA, MS

CCRPC Senior Planner

(802) 846-4490 ext. *29

From: John Caulo <john.caulo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 2:43 PM
To: Dan Albrecht <dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org>
Cc: Emily Nosse-Leirer <enosse-leirer@ccrpcvt.org>
Subject: Re: RESEND, Brownfields Committee mtg (open to view agenda)

Dan-

Unfortunately, no; we all will be out of town. The cover letter I composed attempts to describe the "Co-Working / Innovation Hub" goals of the project. I can attempt to build on that in a more detailed narrative if you like. Let me know. -john

On Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 2:39 PM Dan Albrecht <dalbrecht@ccrpcvt.org> wrote:

Ok. is there anybody else affiliated with the project who can attend who can speak more closely to the planned end-use?
Hello Dan:

As I mentioned when we spoke earlier about this meeting, I will be out of town next Tuesday and will be unavailable to attend this meeting. However, I understand that Dan Voisin from Stone Environmental has been invited. To the extent Stone has prepared the Phase 1 / Phase 2 ESA reports, he is familiar with the project site and can speak knowledgeably about the challenges associated with the redevelopment.

Let me know if either of this presents a problem. Thanks. -john

--

John Caulo
61 Central Avenue
Burlington, VT 05401
Mobile: 802/233-6640
john.caulo@gmail.com
A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date: 01/15/2019

1. Grant number: BF00A00214

2. Grant recipient: Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

3. Person providing site information: John Caulo

4. Property/site name: HULA

5. Property address: 44-50 Lakeside Ave, BTV 05401

6. Current property owner: Lakeside Ovens, LLC

7. Work to be done: □ Phase I □ Phase II □ Phase III □ Other
   Explain Other: Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Planning and Implementation

B. SITES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

1. Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfields (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. Type of contamination present: □ Hazardous Substances □ Petroleum □ Co-Mingled
   (If the site has both hazardous substances and incidental petroleum contamination, check the box the “co-mingled” box. If the site has hazardous substances and distinguishable petroleum contamination, you must obtain approval from the State and EPA.)

3. Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The HULA site is the former Blodgett Pizza Oven factory which was in continuous operation between 1946 and 2018. With the exception of a 9,200SF building currently leased to a 3rd party office user, the site is vacant.

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?: Phase 2 ESA has uncovered the presence of low levels of “Urban
Soils” at the Site, which tie back to the early portion of the 20th century when PAHs from a smokestack economy became impregnated in the soil. Preliminary indications are that the Urban Soils can be remediated on-site. In addition, the Phase 2 ESA has also revealed the presence of PCBs in window caulking and concrete floor slab at the factory building located at 50 Lakeside. At the time of building construction, PCBs were present in window caulk. Floor slab contamination is most likely the result of machine lubricants containing PCBs leaching into the slab. CAP planning will evaluate alternate strategies to remediate impact.

5. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The proposed redevelopment plan is to completely renovate/adaptively reuse the 135,000 (+/-) square feet of floor area as a job-creating, work/play "Innovation Hub” for the 21st century creative economy. In addition, an existing private water-based recreational use at the north end of the Site will continue, providing seasonal Lake Champlain access to swimmers and non-motorized water craft.

C. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA? ☐ Yes ☒ No

3. Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control the US government? (Land held in trust by the US government for an Indian tribe is eligible.) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (C. 1-3) your property is not eligible.

D. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION:

Certain properties cannot be approved without a “Property Specific Determination”. Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. 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 (SWDA)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

3. Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 3004(u) or 3008(h))? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. 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  ✗ No

5. Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA? □ Yes  ✗ No

6. Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund? □ Yes  ✗ No

Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (D. 1-6), please call your Project Officer and she/he will explain how to prepare a property specific determination. Refer to Appendix 2, Section 2.5, of the Proposal Guidelines for additional information.

** For petroleum sites, please proceed to Section F – Petroleum Only Sites

E. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

1. Are there any known ongoing or anticipated environmental enforcement actions (at the federal, state or local level) regarding the responsibility of any party for contamination or hazardous substances at the site? □ Yes  ✗ No If yes, please explain:

Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient does NOT own the site:

1. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site? □ Yes  ✗ No

2. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site? □ Yes  ✗ No

3. Describe the assessment grant recipient’s relationship with the current owner and the owner’s role in the work to be completed: The CCRPC has no relationship with the owner nor their planned development other than that the owner has requested CCRPC's support via CCRPC's Brownfields Assessment grants.

Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient owns the site or will own the site during the grant performance period:

1. How was the property acquired (or how will it be acquired)?
   a. □ Negotiated purchase from a private individual
b. □ Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit  
c. □ Tax foreclosure  
d. □ Eminent domain  
e. □ Donation  
f. □ Other (explain):  

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

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

4. Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the assessment grant recipient has or has had with all prior owners or operators of the property:

5. Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the assessment grant recipient acquired (or will acquire) the property?  □ Yes  □ No

6. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site?  □ Yes  □ No

7. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?  □ Yes  □ No

8. Did the assessment grant recipient perform any environmental inquiry prior to the purchase of the property?  □ Yes  □ No

9. If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and indicate whether the applicant performed the pre-purchase inquiry in accordance with EPA’s All Appropriate Inquiry rule (or ASTM E1527-05, or its equivalent at the time of purchase):

F. PETROLEUM ONLY SITES - PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY

Petroleum-only sites are to be submitted to the state for eligibility determination. Please contact your state representative to obtain the information they require to determine site eligibility. As a courtesy, send a copy of the site eligibility information to your EPA Project Officer so he or she is aware of potential upcoming work. The assessment grant recipient must provide their EPA Project Officer with a copy of the state’s determination letter. The following questions are typical of the petroleum site information you may need to provide to the state:

1. Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination on the site?  □ Yes  □ No

Note: If the answers to question F.1 is no, the site may be eligible.
2. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on site? □ Yes □ No Explain:

3. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site? □ Yes □ No Explain:

Note: If question F.1 identified a responsible party who is liable for petroleum contamination at the site, and that party is financially viable to pay for assessment and cleanup costs, then the site is not eligible. If the identified responsible party took reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination at the site, and/or is not financially viable to pay for the assessment and cleanup costs, then the site may still be eligible.

4. Is the site “relatively low risk” compared with other “petroleum-only” sites in the state:
   
a. Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies? □ Yes □ No

   b. Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)? □ Yes □ No
   
Note: If the answers to questions F.4a and F.4b are no, the site would be considered to be of relatively low risk for purposes of determining eligibility.

5. Has any responsible party been identified for the site through, either:

   a. A judgment rendered in a court of law or an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site: □ Yes □ No

   b. An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site: □ Yes □ No

   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 □ No

6. Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act? □ Yes □ No

Note: If the answer to any of the questions in F.5 or F.6 is yes, the site is not eligible.

G. ACCESS

Does the assessment grant recipient have access or an access agreement for this property?
H. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) COMPLIANCE

Note: If you answer yes to any of the following questions you should contact your project officer to determine if any additional information is required.

1. Is your selected property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark? ☑ Yes ☐ No

2. Is your selected property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places? ☑ Yes ☐ No

In order to support your response, please provide any and all documentation from the federal Government and/or State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). (i.e., SHPO Determination Letter which you may obtain independent of the EPA process.

3. Is your selected property (site) part of a designated Historic District? ☐ Yes ☑ No

4. Will your project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures? ☐ Yes ☑ No

5. Does your project have the potential to impact archaeological resources? ☐ Yes ☑ No

I. SITE ELIGIBILITY

(To be filled out by EPA Project Officer.)

The site, at the above-described property, is eligible for assessment work: ☐ Yes ☑ No

----------------------------------  ----------------------------------
Project Officer                             Date

Need for Attorney Consultation: ☐ Yes ☑ No   Notes:

Additional Information: