

**Brownfields Advisory Committee, Online only**  
**August 14, 2023**      **Scheduled Time: 11:00 a.m. – 12 Noon**

**APPROVED Meeting Summary**

**Held via Zoom:** Various documents referenced below are available for download at:  
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/economic-development/brownfields/#advisory-committee>

<b>In Attendance (all virtual unless otherwise noted)</b>	
<b>Committee Members:</b>	
Matthew Vaughn, Lake Champlain Basin Program	Amanda Froeschle, VT Dept. of Health
Sam Andersen, GBIC	Samantha Dunn, Burlington Community & Economic Development Office
<b>CCRPC-retained Qualified Environmental Professionals</b>	
Haley Grigel, KAS	Steve Shaw, Weston & Sampson
Erik Urch, Atlas Environmental	Daniel Voisin, Stone Environmental
<b>Guests</b>	
Kitter Spader, Briggs House LLC	
<b>CCRPC Staff</b>	
Dan Albrecht, Senior Planner	Darren Schibler, Senior Planner
<b>EPA and State Staff</b>	
Caitlyn Bain, VT DEC	

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

Vice Chair M. Vaughn called the meeting to order at 11:02 a.m. Participants introduced themselves.

**2. Public comments on items not on the Agenda**

There were no members of the public and no comments provided.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

D. Albrecht reviewed the minutes from three 2022 meetings (2/10/22, 4/25/22 and 6/16/22), which had never been approved, as well as the minutes for July 21, 2023. He noted that in the June 16, 2022 minutes there was an incorrect funding amount for the Phase 1 ESA for Howard Center.

*S. Dunn made a motion, seconded by S. Andersen, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2022. The motion passed 4-0.*

*S. Andersen made a motion, seconded by S. Dunn, to approve the minutes of April 26, 2022. The motion passed 4-0.*

*S. Dunn made a motion, seconded by S. Andersen, to approve the minutes of June 16, 2022 with corrections to the funding amounts for the Howard Center project noted by staff. The motion passed 4-0.*

*S. Andersen made a motion, seconded by A. Froeschle, to approve the minutes of July 21, 2023. The*

*motion passed 4-0.*

#### **4. Action on Proposals Received**

- a. BURLINGTON: Kitter Spater on behalf of Briggs House LLC, owner of 168 Archibald Street. Request: \$46,250 for Phase II ESA by KAS, Inc.

H. Grigel, consultant for the project, reviewed the plan for the proposed Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA). KAS, Inc. will investigate shallow soils with a hand auger, using 4 borings on the west side of the site and 3 on east. There is a chlorinated solvent plume from the adjacent Champlain Transmission site, so soil gas and sub-slab sampling will be done. There will be no groundwater assessment since it is known to be 90 feet below grade. Sub-slab sampling is required because the future use of the site includes residential.

K. Spater, applicant, provided more detail on plan for reuse of the property: conversion from a synagogue (currently vacant) to a minimum of 4 dwelling units and 2,000 square feet of commercial space (more than was noted in the staff recommendation). K. Spater has been in touch with Burlington Planning Commission about rezoning to allow additional commercial development. M. Vaughn asked to clarify whether the rezoning would allow only additional commercial, not additional residential? K. Spater clarified that the rezoning would allow for an additional dwelling unit as well as additional commercial space.

At D. Albrecht's question, K. Spater described the layout of the building. The basement area would include two 2-bedroom apartments. 2,000 square feet of the ground floor would be for commercial use, likely a food hall with multiple vendors operating 5 days a week. The third floor would be either an extension of the food hall (including seating / café) or two more apartment units. Either scenario would conform to zoning, including the 4 dwelling units.

D. Albrecht and K. Spater noted that there is an existing accessory structure that will be retained by the Jewish congregation for ritual washing of bodies.

D. Schibler presented the staff recommendation, which was based on the draft site selection principles (which we will talk about in more detail later in this meeting) with reference to the old ones, to fund 75% of the cost of the Phase II ESA. This is based on the fact that the applicant is a for-profit business and meets minimum thresholds for housing units and commercial floor area redevelopment, qualifying for base funding of 50%. An additional 25% in funding is recommended because the project provides additional public benefits through preservation of a historic landmark and reuse of a vacant site.

M. Vaughn asked a clarifying question about process: will the new principles replace the scoring criteria? D. Schibler responded that this is the staff's intent, which will better reflect the actual practice of the Committee's and CCRPC's approach to funding projects while maintaining better consistency with the goals of the funding sources.

*S. Anderson made a motion, seconded by S. Dunn, to accept the staff recommendation to fund a Phase II ESA for Briggs House, LLC at 168 Archibald Street at 75% (\$7,695) of the total costs. The motion passed 4-0.*

Staff thanked the applicant for attending and noted that there will be follow-up communications about funding authorization. At D. Albrecht's question, H. Grigel noted that there is a good chance a Corrective

Action Plan will be needed for this property, and staff asked to be kept informed of any needs for additional funding.

## **5. Continued Item: Revisions to Site Selection Criteria**

D. Albrecht reviewed the changes to the Site Selection Principles.

The first section now lays out the process for funding requests, including required forms and selection of consultants. At S. Andersen's question, D. Albrecht clarified that applicants still must utilize consultants from CCRPC's pre-qualified list, but CCRPC will honor requests by applicants to work with a preferred consultant if they are on that list.

The second section discusses base eligibility requirements for EPA and ACCD funding, which still need to be fine-tuned by staff. There were no comments from the Committee.

The third section provides basic threshold criteria for the types of projects that can be funded, with the priorities being housing and economic development. There were no comments from the Committee.

The fourth section discusses additional tangible public benefits, which better capture the bonus criteria used in the prior selection process. A. Froeschle appreciated inclusion of upstream health considerations in this section.

M. Vaughn noted that surface water quality improvements or correction from impairments had been a bonus criterion in the prior scoring sheet, and he had hoped to move it to a core goal. He also suggested adding consideration for whether projects would negatively impact water quality. D. Albrecht noted that most projects will improve water quality by default, so D. Schibler noted that this could be added to the threshold criteria and could either be a negative or positive score.

D. Albrecht reviewed the specific funding policies for each type of assessment (Phase 1, Phase 2, CAPs, and remediation). He noted that the committee may want to consider language about caps on funding, including caps on funding for a single project. He also noted that the document includes a policy against funding projects for individual property owners only for contamination that does not involve redevelopment to provide benefits consistent with the program's goals.

Finally, D. Albrecht had added anti-displacement policies based on information from the recent National Brownfields Conference that he attended last week. He noted the tension within the brownfields community about the role of funding and redevelopment which may unintentionally aid gentrification, and the Committee's desire to set aside some of the current funding to address this issue. The Committee agreed that these are important considerations that are difficult to describe / define, but it is good to be called out in the document. A. Froeschle noted that she can provide resources on gentrification and brownfields from a public health perspective. D. Albrecht will also share resources on gentrification from the National Brownfields Conference.

D. Schibler summarized the new role of the committee in the application review process based on this document, which would include 1) confirming staff's assessment of base criteria; 2) reviewing the merits of additional tangible public benefits, and 3) considering requests above the threshold amounts. M. Vaughn suggested clarifying the role of the committee within the document.

S. Dunn suggested adding the ability for the Committee to consider requests outside the housing unit thresholds (e.g. creation of duplexes or ADUs) since the City of Burlington is trying to encourage more small-scale development. D. Schibler agreed, noting that staff set the thresholds with the goal of spending the funding on the most high-impact projects, but had no objection to adding an option for the committee to consider such requests.

M. Vaughn summarized the committee's requested changes: surface water improvement / impacts; option for additional housing units; further work on displacement / gentrification issues.

D. Albrecht discussed staff's plan for outreach under the EPA grant this coming fall, including outreach to the planning commission of the Cities of Burlington and Winooski and the Vermont Development Conference.

**6. Updates: staff, members, guests**

D. Albrecht noted that the Vermont Environmental Consortium conference is coming up this fall.

M. Vaughn noted that the Lake Champlain Basin Program has opened an RFP for flood relief mini-grants up to \$75,000 for non-profits (not individuals) to assist with this effort.

The next meeting agenda will include further updates to the site selection criteria, any new funding requests, and election of a chair and vice chair.

**7. The meeting adjourned at 11:59 AM.**

*Respectfully submitted by Darren Schibler and Dan Albrecht.*