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I. PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of activities completed by Washington County, Wisconsin (the County) during the 1st Quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (October 1 through December 31, 2015) for implementation of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Community-Wide Coalition Assessment Grant for Hazardous Substance & Petroleum Brownfields awarded to the County by the USEPA in 2014. Washington County Planning and Parks Department is responsible for administering the grants which are being used to provide initial funding for a County-wide Site Redevelopment Program (SRP) that was created in 2013. The County is the lead for a coalition that includes the City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, Village of Richfield, and the Village of Jackson.

The County’s USEPA-approved Implementation Work Plan describes five (5) tasks that are to be completed using funding from the grants. This report describes the status of each task as of December 31, 2015, provides an estimate of the degree of completion of each task, and provides a list of deliverables associated with each task. The tasks are described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Programmatic Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conduct Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations and Remedial/Reuse Planning Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Outreach and Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. BUDGET OVERVIEW

The USEPA awarded a total grant of $600,000 to the County including $300,000 for Hazardous Substance Brownfields Assessment and $300,000 for Petroleum Brownfields Assessment. The Assessment Grant budget includes $8,500 for direct expenses for the County (travel and supplies) and $591,500 for contracted services provided by environmental and other consulting firms. The total budget period cost is $662,463.00 of which $62,463 is the local in-kind contribution that will be provided by staff from the County, City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, Village of Richfield and EDWC.
On Oct. 21, 2015, a request was made of the USEPA Project Officer to reallocate $35,000 of the $40,000 allocated to the Village of Richfield to complete a reuse/redevelopment plan for the area encompassing the northwest corner of the Interstate 41/Hwy45 and Hwy 167 Interchange. On January 18, 2016, two requests were made to reallocate funds to offset costs for completing the Countywide Inventory and Site Selection/Prioritization Process and to allow consultants to continue to participate in regular PMT and SRC meetings as the project moves forward. All three requests were approved by the USEPA Project Officer and are detailed below.

### Budget Reallocation Requests 4 & 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$37,500 - Inventory &amp; Site Selection / Prioritization - Request to shift $37,500 of grant funds from Task 3 (Phase II ESAs) to Tasks 1 for cost of completing the countywide inventory and site selection / prioritization process work that was completed by Vandewalle &amp; Assoc. The original budget for work by Vandewalle &amp; Assoc. for the countywide inventory and site selection / prioritization process was $14,000. The total cost for their work on this task was $50,000. The original budget for work by Stantec for the countywide inventory and site selection / prioritization process was $6,000. The total cost for their work on this task was $7,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$7,000 - Meeting Participation and Outreach - Request to shift $7,000 in grant funds from Task 3 (Phase II ESAs) to Task 4. The $7,000 will be split $3,500 for Vandewalle &amp; Assoc. and $3,500 for Stantec to continue to participate in regular PMT and SRC meetings as the project moves forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Approved Budget as of 10/21/15 with requests 1 - 3*</th>
<th>Re allocation Requests 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Current EPA Approved Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Programmatic Activities</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization</td>
<td>$21,700.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td>$59,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phase I ESAs</td>
<td>$96,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$96,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations, and Remedial/Reuse Planning</td>
<td>$410,650.00</td>
<td>($44,500.00)</td>
<td>$366,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Outreach and Involvement</td>
<td>$57,650.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$64,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total U.S. EPA Grant</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EPA Approved Budget Reallocation Requests:

**Request 1 - $20,000** Request to shift funds from Task 3 to Tasks 1 and 4 for general community outreach. EPA approved on 7/31/15.

**Request 2 - $350** Request to shift funds from Task 3 to Task 4 for Site Redev. Brand/Logo for ongoing marketing of the Site Redevelopment Program. EPA approved on 7/31/15.

**Request 3 - $35,000** Request to shift funds within Task 3 from Phase II ESAs to Reuse/Redevelopment Planning for Village of Richfield. EPA approved on 10/21/15.
III. MODIFICATIONS TO THE WORK PLAN

Based on the budget reallocation requests approved by the EPA in January 2016, Task 3 deliverables as outlined on page ten of the Work Plan will be reduced as described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ESA</th>
<th>No. of ESAs in Original Implementation Work Plan</th>
<th>Current No. of ESAs with Approved Reallocation Requests 3, 4 &amp; 5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase II ESAs at small sites</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II ESAs at large sites</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Village of Richfield Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy will be a new deliverable for Task 3.

IV. STATUS OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

This section of the report provides a summary of the status for each task as of December 31, 2015, including a summary of projects and activities approved, completed, or in progress. Also summarized are deliverables for each task, an estimate of the percent complete, and a summary of scheduled activities to be performed during the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016.

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

A. Task Description

This task includes preparing grant progress reports, and general communications about the Cooperative Agreement to the USEPA. This task has a current budget of $14,000 which includes travel costs to attend USEPA-sponsored National Brownfields conferences and for work by the environmental consultant to provide assistance with reporting and other eligible programmatic activities.

B. New Activities or Projects Approved for Implementation by USEPA During the Fiscal Quarter

None.

C. Completed Activities or Projects

As part of advancing the County's Site Redevelopment Program and coordination of a coalition prior to the grant application, in 2013 the County advanced a qualifications based procurement process meeting the requirements of 40 CFR 31.36, in order to obtain the services of a consultant to assist with public meetings, evaluation, and initial scoring and prioritization of sites including services for grant writing and implementation. The procurement process resulted in six proposals. Two firms were
interviewed, and based on the interviews and previously submitted qualifications, a contract was executed with Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec).

2nd Quarter of FY 2015
During the 2nd Quarter of FY 2015, the County worked with the Project Team (Stantec, Vandewalle and EDWC) and finalized detailed roles and responsibilities as part of the contract with Stantec for grant implementation services on February 17, 2015. The contract with Stantec was signed on March 18, 2015.

The County drafted a Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs) and worked with coalition partners throughout March and early April to finalize.

3rd Quarter of FY 2015
During the 3rd Quarter of FY 2015, all MOAs were signed by coalition partners and submitted to the USEPA on April 23, 2015. No grant funds could be expended until all five coalition partner MOAs were signed and provided to the USEPA.

Contract agreements were finalized between Stantec, and Vandewalle and EDWC. As part of the Project Team, Vandewalle will assist the County, Stantec and the EDWC with the inventory process to create a Brownfields GIS Database, lead the site selection, ranking and prioritization of sites using a two-tiered site identification and prioritization process with the SRC, prepare area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans and conduct ongoing community outreach. As part of the Project Team, EDWC will assist the County, Stantec and Vandewalle with the inventory process, determining redevelopment potential and marketability of redevelopment sites, preparing area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans and ongoing community outreach. The contract with EDWC will also utilize the services of Ady Advantage, a WBE firm that will help develop webpages integrating redevelopment sites within the EDWC website for the purpose of connecting prospective end users and local stakeholders with information on redevelopment sites and associated reuse opportunities.

The County provided coalition partners with a method of tracking local in-kind contribution hours. The Project Manager will compile all local in-kind contribution hours completed and report hours as part of upcoming USEPA Quarterly Reports. The Project Manager submitted the 2nd Quarter Report to the USEPA on April 27, 2015 and has had ongoing communication with the USEPA Project Officer.

4th Quarter of FY 2015
- During July, the quarterly report for Q3 was completed by the County with assistance from Stantec and Vandewalle, and submitted to USEPA.
- On 9/1-4/15, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle, and County staff attended the USEPA brownfields conference in Chicago.
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1st Quarter of FY 2016
During October 2015, 4th Quarter FY 2015 was completed by the County with assistance from Stantec and Vandewalle, and submitted to the USEPA including the required MBE/WBE Annual Reporting Form. The Project Manager continued ongoing communication with the Project Management Team (PMT), coalition partners, the Site Redevelopment Committee (SRC) members and the USEPA Project Officer. The Project Manager reviewed and approved numerous consultant invoices for payment processing.

D. Activities or Projects in Progress

The Project Team (County, Stantec, Vandewalle and EDWC) is in the process of finalizing a detailed Project Timeline that outlines specific tasks, deadlines and responsible parties for each of the five main Project Tasks outlined in the Implementation Work Plan. This document will be used by the Project Team to stay on task throughout the grant period and to track progress during the monthly Project Team meetings.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
Stantec and the Project Manager are finalizing a site specific tracking table for all assessment activities to be sent to coalition partners and SRC members on a regular basis.

E. Deliverables

Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs) signed by the coalition partners (City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Jackson, Village of Richfield and Village of Slinger) were submitted to the USEPA Project Officer on April 23, 2015.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
None for this Quarter.

F. Percent Complete and Scheduled Activities

This task is currently 50% completed.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
Scheduled activities for the 1st quarter of FY 2016 (October 1 through December 31, 2015) include overseeing site and project activities of consultants and preparing required reports and correspondence with the USEPA Project Officer.

2nd Quarter of FY 2016
Scheduled activities for the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016 (January 1 through March 31, 2016) include overseeing site and project activities of consultants and preparing required reports and correspondence with the USEPA Project Officer.
On December 10, 2015, the SRC completed the Countywide Inventory and Site Selection/Prioritization Process and approved the use of the EPA Brownfield Assessment Grant funds for Site K in the Village of Germantown. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs) was completed and sent to the Village for review. It is scheduled for approval at the February Village Board meeting.

**Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization**

**A. Task Description**

This task includes preparing a community-wide brownfields inventory and prioritization of brownfields sites within the County. As part of the inventory, the County will acquire digital copies of approximately 73 historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps to be integrated into the County GIS system. This task had a budget of $21,700 which includes preparing the inventory, development of the GIS brownfields database, acquisition of historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and executing property access agreements.

On January 18, 2016, the EPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation of $37,500 from Task 3 to Task 1 to offset costs of the Countywide Inventory and Site Selection/Prioritization Process. The current budget for Task 1 is $59,200.

**B. New Activities or Projects Approved for Implementation by USEPA During the Fiscal Quarter**

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**

On January 18, 2016, a request was made to reallocate funds to offset costs of the Countywide Inventory and Site Selection/Prioritization Process. The request was approved by the USEPA Project Officer. See Section II – Budget Overview for further detail.

**C. Completed Activities or Projects**

As part of developing the coalition, meetings were held with representatives of 12 municipalities which included two cities, five villages and five towns. Nominations were obtained from five communities, each of which subsequently committed to participating in the coalition. An initial prioritization process was used to evaluate 13 nominated target sites or areas that included 47 parcels. At the final stage of this process, each of the coalition partners selected the site or area that was their highest priority in need of assessment based on site selection criteria. Assessment needs for these sites are expected to utilize approximately one third ($200,000) of the grant funds. Initial target sites include WB Place, a 3.8-acre parcel in the City of Hartford that has been in use as a tannery since the 1840s, former Praefke Brake Manufacturing in the City of West Bend which dates back to the 1920s, the Center Street Redevelopment Area which includes 10 parcels within the historic center of the Village of Jackson, the historic Hwy 175/Village of Richfield Area which includes 12 parcels bordering State Hwy 175 and the former railroad right-of-way for the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad, and the former Niphos Coating
facility in the Village of Slinger which was subject to an emergency removal action by the USEPA to address more than 8,800 gallons of hazardous chemicals that were abandoned in the building.

The grant will be implemented using a parallel track approach with two major strategies progressing simultaneously. The two tracks will be implemented as described below:

1. Approximately one-third ($200,000) of the grant will go toward the implementation of the five high priority brownfield sites or areas that were identified by the five coalition partners as part of the inventory and prioritization completed in 2013. Meetings were held with coalition partners in the 3rd Quarter of FY 2015 that confirmed or requested an amendment to the high priority sites. The funds will be utilized to perform assessment or reuse/redevelopment planning activities.

2. Complete a comprehensive county-wide inventory and prioritization of brownfield sites providing opportunity for participation by all communities in the County that may have assessment needs not identified as part of the outreach conducted in 2013.

**2nd Quarter FY 2015**
During the 2nd Quarter FY 2015, the County met with the City of West Bend, Stantec, and EDWC to discuss priority sites within the City of West Bend.

**3rd Quarter of FY 2015**
During the 3rd Quarter of FY 2015, the Project Team met with all five coalition partners to discuss and reconfirm their high priority redevelopment sites. Further discussion will continue with the Village of Jackson to define their high priority sites in the 4th Quarter of FY 2015. The City of West Bend is considering changing their priority site. The Project Team met with the City of West Bend numerous times during this quarter to discuss changing their priority site. Upon completion of the coalition partner meetings, work began on preparing eligibility determination requests for several priority brownfield sites including WB Place in the City of Hartford and the former Niphos Coating facility in the Village of Slinger.

The County purchased 73 historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps through Historical Information Gatherers.

**4th Quarter of FY 2015**
During the 4th Quarter of FY 2015 the SRP Project Management Team (PMT) began the site inventory and prioritization process. First, the Team created an inventory of sites. The Team determined which data points were most important to include—based on brownfield identification best practices—to identify potential brownfield sites. From these discussions a three-level data collection system was created to filter sites to determine a manageable number of high probability brownfield sites. From this process a comprehensive countywide list of sites was identified and mapped utilizing GIS. With the map and the accompanying data table the PMT was able to
further focus inventory efforts on a manageable number of sites to score in the prioritization process.

Next the PMT developed a system to score and prioritize the brownfield inventory. The system applies a three-level analysis consisting of redevelopment feasibility, environmental conditions, and community goals. Under each area of analysis there are several criteria that an expert or group of experts will use to score each site on a multipoint scale. Once this process is complete the scores will be totaled and a site prioritization ranking determined.

The PMT worked with SRP Coalition partners to further refine their priority sites. Hartford and West Bend have confirmed their priority sites that will provide them with maximum redevelopment potential. West Bend has determined the riverfront Bermico property and an adjacent City-owned property as the highest priority site area to health, safety and environmental concerns and redevelopment potential.

On July 6, 2015, the County acquired 73 historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps through Historical Information Gatherers. The maps were geo-referenced and integrated into the County GIS system.

On July 22, 2015, the Project Team met with the City of West Bend and the USEPA Project Officer to discuss the new priority site for the City located near the Milwaukee River and the Eisenbahn State Trail. A list of action items were developed to move forward with the new priority site. The Project Team also discussed the former Niphos Coating facility in the Village of Slinger with the County Attorney and developed a list of action items to move the project forward.

Stantec worked with County staff to develop an access agreement form (draft completed by Stantec on July 24, 2015) and an attachment with information for property owners on various types of assessment activities that could be performed (draft completed by Stantec on August 14, 2015). The agreement was reviewed by the County Attorney and City of West Bend. On September 14, 2015, an access agreement was executed by the County with the owner of the former Bermico property in West Bend.

Stantec completed a review and screening of approximately 1,200 sites in the County that are included on the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Bureau of Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS).

On August 11, August 24, September 8 and September 21, 2015, meetings were held by the PMT to work on the inventory and prioritization.

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**

During the 1st Quarter of FY 2016 the SRP Project Management Team (PMT) completed the site inventory and prioritization process. Attached to this quarterly report are various documents that summarize the inventory and prioritization process activities that were completed during this reporting period.
• **September 29, 2015** – The SRC completed a brainstorming session facilitated by the University of Wisconsin-Extension to gather thoughts on the potential impacts that may occur as a result of redeveloping brownfields in Washington County communities. The results of the SRC brainstorming session are attached.

• **October 15, 2015** – Washington County hosted an SRP Countywide Community Workshop to engage the public in the Site Redevelopment Program, review the site inventory and prioritization process, discuss and consider community goals and gather input for priority areas. As part of this workshop, attendees participated in a 3-part community priorities brainstorming exercise to provide input into the development of community goals for scoring of identified redevelopment sites. The community priorities were developed using the community outreach expertise of the PMT, the UW-Extension facilitated brainstorming exercise at the September SRC meeting, and the EPA’s Livability Principles. For more information, please reference the attached documents:
  o Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Flyer
  o Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Exercises
  o Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Results Summary

• **November 12, 2015** – The November SRC meeting provided an overview of the Oct. 15 Community Workshop results, updated the committee on the completed inventory process and discussed the prioritization process and criteria. The completed inventory consisted of 117 parcels making up 55 potential redevelopment areas in the County. Vandewalle staff facilitated a discussion of the three-tiered ranking system consisting of redevelopment feasibility, ability to advance community goals, and environmental conditions which was approved by the SRC. Each tier was composed of criteria based on industry standards for gauging the level of effort and likelihood that a brownfield site would be and/or should be redeveloped. For more information, please reference the attached documents:
  o Nov. 12, 2015 SRC Meeting Flyer
  o Nov. 12, 2015 SRC Meeting Minutes
  o Redevelopment Feasibility and Environmental Criteria

• **November 16 – December 2, 2015** - Site scoring and ranking was completed by the PMT. Redevelopment feasibility and community goals were scored by Scott Harrington, Vandewalle & Associates; Christian Tscheschlok, EDWC; and Debora Sielski, Washington County. Each PMT scorer produced his or her own scores for all 51 sites comprised of 115 parcels. Environmental conditions were scored by David Holmes of Stantec Consulting Services. Mr. Holmes scored each of the 115 parcels individually.

• **December 10, 2015** – The December SRC meeting provided a review of site scoring and rankings, a discussion of additional consideration factors and the selection of 2-3 sites for assessment funding. There were 115 parcels making up 51 sites. Some parcels and sites were grouped into 11 clusters that consisted of two or more parcels where redevelopment would likely involve all or most of the parcels. For the purposes of scoring and ranking, it made sense to look at them as a group. The committee reviewed the final scoring
and raking of the 51 sites. Local representatives discussed the top raking sites in terms of six factors including potential to obtain site access, site eligibility, owner cooperation, project complexity and local government capacity. The SRC took action to provide assessment funding for 5 sites:

- Cluster Site H in West Bend—former Gehl industrial property now mostly owned by the City with significant resources invested in assessments and clean-up; the City is in need of final site closure and reuse planning assistance as the next steps toward redevelopment.
- Cluster Site B in Slinger—situated at the gateway to the Village in an area identified as critical for redevelopment. The site includes historic auto repair and industrial at the southwest and active gas station on the northeast.
- Cluster Site K in Germantown—needs limited phase II work for final site closure on the northeast portion of site before redevelopment as multi-family housing.
- Site #3 (WB Place) in Hartford and Site #138 (West Bend Economic Development Corporation Site) in West Bend—both sites were selected to receive services limited to Phase I assessments, as long as funding is available.

For more information, please reference the attached documents:

- Dec. 10, 2015 SRC Meeting Flyer
- Dec. 10, 2015 SRC Draft Meeting Minutes
- Dec. 10, 2015 SRC Power Point of Top Ranked Sites (Includes maps of the top ranked sites.)
- SRP Inventory and Prioritization Summary Memo (Includes an overview of the inventory process, a map of sites, overview of the site prioritization process, final scoring and ranking of sites and program principles & considerations.)

D. Activities or Projects in Progress

4th Quarter of FY 2015

During the beginning of 1st Quarter of FY 2016, several meetings have been held for the purpose of completing the inventory of brownfield sites, finalizing the criteria and process to be used for prioritizing the sites, and then completing the prioritization.

1st Quarter of FY 2016

During the 1st Quarter of FY 2016, the County prepared draft access agreements for the eight parcels of the Northern Bookend sites in the City of Hartford. These are currently being reviewed by the parcel owners. Access agreements were also prepared by the County for the parcel owners of Site K in the Village of Germantown, awaiting Village Board approval of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOAs) that is scheduled for review at the February Village Board meeting.
E. Deliverables

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**
During the 1st Quarter of FY 2016, as described above, the Countywide Inventory and Prioritization Process is complete and described in the attached document titled SRP Inventory and Prioritization Summary Memo.

F. Percent Complete and Scheduled Activities

This task is currently estimated to be approximately 80% completed.

**4th Quarter of FY 2015**
Scheduled activities for the 1st Quarter of FY 2016 (October 1 through December 31, 2015) include the Project Team determining variables and datasets to develop a GIS Brownfields database for analysis during the site prioritization process with the SRC. This process will also consider EDWC dashboard measures and location center tools for the EDWC website creation. Outputs of this process include completing a county wide brownfields inventory.

The Project Manager and EDWC will work with the Village of Jackson to further discuss and define their high priority site(s). Site and property owner eligibility determination requests will be completed for the three remaining high priority coalition site(s) including the City of West Bend, Village of Richfield and Village of Jackson.

The Project Manager and County Attorney will work with coalition partners to complete and execute property access agreements on the five high priority sites.

During the 1st Quarter of FY 2016, the PMT will conduct the prioritization of the brownfield inventory. This process will utilize the previously described three-level scoring system. Stantec—as the environmental expert—will score all environmental conditions criteria. The PMT will draw on its expertise in economic development/redevelopment to score the redevelopment feasibility criteria. Finally, the community goals criteria will be scored by the SRC members. The results of the prioritization process will be presented at an SRC meeting in December 2015.

**2nd Quarter of FY 2016**
Scheduled activities for the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016 (January 1 through March 31, 2016) includes the County preparing draft access agreements for those sites approved by the SRC in December for assessment funding.

The County Project Manager will work with the County GIS Department to integrate the completed inventory into the County GIS system.
Task 2 – Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)

A. Task Description

This task is described in the USEPA approved Implementation Work Plan as follows:

“Under the direction of the County, the environmental consulting firm will complete Phase I ESAs at 24 sites. Prior to performing Phase I ESAs, eligibility determination request forms will be prepared and submitted to USEPA (for hazardous substance brownfields) or WDNR (for petroleum brownfields) for approval. Upon confirmation of eligibility, Phase I ESAs will be completed in accordance with the All Appropriate inquiries Final Rule and the standards set forth in the ASTM E1527-13 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process.”

This task has a current budget of $96,000 which includes the environmental consulting firm, Stantec, under the direction of the County Project Manager, completing Phase I ESAs at 24 sites at an average cost of $4,000 per site.

B. New Activities or Projects Approved for Implementation by USEPA During the Fiscal Quarter

1st Quarter of FY 2016

Eligibility Determinations were approved by the EPA Project Officer for the Former Niphos Coating Site in the Village of Slinger on Nov. 18, 2015 and the Northern Bookends Site in the City of Hartford on January 14, 2016.

C. Completed Activities or Projects

4th Quarter of FY 2015

During the 4th Quarter of FY 2015, work was initiated on completing eligibility determinations (EDs) for high priority brownfield sites in Slinger, West Bend, and Hartford. A draft ED was completed by Stantec for the WB Place site in Hartford, but put on hold after a determination was made that the site was being more fully utilized by a new occupant, and also that some environmental assessment activities had in fact been completed for the property. As a consequence, the City selected an alternative site to serve as its initial high priority site.

On September 9, 2015, ED’s for two sites (the former Niphos Coating facility in Slinger, and the former Bermico facility in West Bend) were completed and submitted to USEPA for review. The eligibility for the Bermico site was confirmed by USEPA via email on September 22, 2015.

During September 2015, work began on preparation of ED’s for a 7 parcel redevelopment site in Hartford (North Bookend site).

1st Quarter of FY 2016

Numerous eligibility determinations (ED) were completed for this quarter for the following sites:
• **Former Niphos Coating Site** – Village of Slinger – The ED was completed by Stantec and reviewed by the County Project Manager and the Village of Slinger in Sept, 2015. The site was determined eligible by the USEPA Project Officer on November 18, 2015. The Statute of Limitations date had expired regarding any outstanding cleanup costs and therefore any enforcement actions for recovery of such costs has been closed out by the USEPA. On December 21, 2015, the County took possession of the property as part of a tax delinquency process.

• **Northern Bookends Site** – City of Hartford – The ED for the eight sites were completed by Stantec on Oct. 21, 2015, reviewed and approved by the County Project Manager on Oct. 21, 2015 and the City of Hartford on November 10, 2015. The ED was sent to the EPA Project Officer on Nov. 11, 2015. The site was determined eligible by the USEPA Project Officer on January 14, 2016.

• **Former Blaine Property** – City of West Bend – The ED was completed by Stantec on Oct. 1, 2015, reviewed and approved by the County Project Manager on Oct. 2, 2015 and the City of West Bend on Oct. 6, 2015. The ED was sent to the USEPA Project Officer for review on Oct. 6, 2015. On Oct. 21, 2015 the USEPA responded that the site is currently not eligible.

Stantec completed the Phase I ESA for the former Bermico property in West Bend on Dec. 7, 2015. After review by the County Project Manager and the City of West Bend, the Phase I ESA was finalized and the sent to the EPA Project Officer on January 19, 2016 along with a signed All Appropriate Inquires Checklist.

D. Activities or Projects in Progress

**4th Quarter of FY 2015**
An ED for an additional site in West Bend (the Blaine property) was completed and submitted to USEPA on October 6, 2015. Approval of eligibility for the Blaine property is pending a review by USEPA legal staff. Approval of eligibility for the former Niphos Coating site in Slinger is also pending closeout related to the removal action completed by USEPA several years ago (which is anticipated to occur during the 1st Quarter of FY 2016). The Phase I ESA for the former Bermico property is in progress.

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**
Eligibility Determination (ED) Forms are in progress for the following sites:

- **Site #138 (West Bend EDC Site)** - West Bend – The ED is being developed for this site.

- **WB Place Site** – City of Hartford – the ED was updated by Stantec on Jan. 14, 2016. The County Project Manager approved this on Jan. 14, 2016 and it is currently being reviewed by the City of Hartford.

- **Cluster H (Former Gehl Property – Sites 97-100, 170-172)** – City of West Bend – initial data gathering for completion of ED’s for this 7 parcel redevelopment area is underway. Completion of the ED’s will follow.
additional discussions with the City of West Bend regarding specific assessment/reuse planning needs for each parcel.

- **Cluster B (Hwys 175/60 Redevelopment Area – Sites 20-26)** – Village of Slinger - initial data gathering for completion of ED’s for this 7 parcel redevelopment area is underway.
- **Cluster K (Saxony Village)** – Village of Germantown - initial data gathering for completion of ED’s for this 3 parcel redevelopment area is underway.

Stantec is beginning the Phase I ESAs for the parcels owned by the City of Hartford as part of the Northern Bookends Site. Phase I ESAs for the remaining parcels will be started once the access agreements are signed.

**E. Deliverables**

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**

Stantec completed the Phase I ESA for the former Bermico property in the City of West Bend on Dec. 7, 2015. After review by the County Project Manager and the City of West Bend, the Phase I ESA was finalized and the sent to the USEPA Project Officer on January 19, 2016 along with a signed All Appropriate Inquires Checklist.

**F. Percent Complete and Scheduled Activities**

This task is estimated to be approximately 15% complete.

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**

It is anticipated that the Phase I ESA for the former Bermico site will be completed during November 2015. It is anticipated that EDs will be submitted for additional sites, and (subject to confirmation of eligibility) that Phase I ESA will be completed for the Blaine, Niphos Coating, and North Bookend sites.

**2nd Quarter of FY 2016**

Scheduled activities for the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016 (January 1 through March 31, 2016) include preparing Eligibility Determinations for those sites approved by the SRC in December for assessment funding.

The initial Phase I ESA for the Bermico site was higher cost due to its complex issues and large size. However, with the planned assessment of several multi-parcel sites (for which per parcel costs will be significantly lower) it is anticipated that the number and type of deliverables for this task will meet or exceed those required under the Work Plan.

Stantec will continue with the owner interviews, on-site inspections, and report preparation for the Phase I ESAs for all of the parcels that make up the Northern Bookend Site in the City of Hartford once the access agreements are signed. Stantec also anticipates beginning the Phase I ESA for WB Place in the City of Hartford upon
the approval of the ED by the City of Hartford and the USEPA Project Officer and obtaining a signed access agreement.

It is anticipated that the PMT will meet with local representatives to determine the scope of work necessary for Site 138 – the West Bend EDC Site in the City of West Bend. It is anticipated that a Phase I ESA for the West Bend EDC property (Site #138) will be completed this quarter.

Task 3 – Conduct Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, Site Investigations, and Remedial/Reuse Planning Activities

A. Task Description

This task is described in the USEPA approved Implementation Work Plan as follows:

“On sites that meet the site-specific eligibility requirements, and are approved for use of USEPA funds, by the USEPA (hazardous substance brownfields) and/or WDNR (petroleum brownfields), the County may use the assessment funds to conduct Phase II ESAs, site investigations, remedial planning and other brownfield reuse planning activities. Phase II site investigation activities are likely to include soil and groundwater sampling and may include magnetometer surveys, trenching to confirm anomalies, asbestos surveys and sampling for other hazardous building materials. Additional field services provided by USEPA may include geophysical characterization, such as ground penetrating radar or electro-magnetic surveys. Greener and Sustainable Remediation principles will be incorporated into project tasks using the ASTM Greener Cleanup Standard Guide.”

The original budget for Task 4 was $410,650 which includes a QAPP, four asbestos/hazardous building material surveys, seven Phase II ESAs, eight remedial action plans and two brownfield area-wide reuse plans.

On October 21, 2015, the USEPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation of $35,000 within Task 3 from Phase II ESAs to Reuse/Redevelopment Planning for the Village of Richfield. On January 18, 2016, the USEPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation of $44,500 from Task 3 to Task 1 ($37,500) to offset costs of the Countywide Inventory and Site Selection/Prioritization Process and Task 4 ($7,000) to allow consultants to continue to participate in regular PMT and SRC meetings as the project moves forward. The current budget for Task 3 is $366,150.

B. New Activities or Projects Approved for Implementation by U. S. EPA During the Fiscal Quarter

1st Quarter of FY 2016

On October 21, 2015, the USEPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation of $35,000 within Task 3 from Phase II ESAs to Reuse/Redevelopment Planning for the
Village of Richfield in an area encompassing the northwest corner of the Interstate 41/Hwy45 and Hwy 167 Interchange.

On November 11, 2015, the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) was conditionally approved by the USEPA.

C. Completed Activities or Projects

3rd Quarter of FY 2015
During the 3rd Quarter of FY 2015, the County and Stantec completed the pre-QAPP conference call meeting with Jan Pels, USEPA Brownfields Quality Assurance Reviewer on May 5, 2015.

In early June 2015, Stantec solicited bids from multiple labs for use on the project. Four labs were selected (Test America Laboratories, Inc.; CT Laboratories; Environmental Monitoring and Technologies, Inc. [EMT] and Legend Technical Services, Inc.). CT Laboratories and Legend Technical Services, Inc. are both Woman-Owned Business Enterprises (WBEs). EMT is a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise (SDVOSBE). Solicitation of bids from these firms, and inclusion in the QAPP, were performed as part of the Six Good Faith Efforts to ensure participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) in the project.

4th Quarter of FY 2015
Revision 0 of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), which was submitted to USEPA on July 15, 2015.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
None.

D. Activities or Projects in Progress

4th Quarter of FY 2015
Revision 0 of the QAPP is currently under review by USEPA staff. The PMT has drafted a scope of work for the City of West Bend’s priority redevelopment area.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
Stantec worked on completing a draft Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for the former Bermico site in the City of West Bend. The SAP was completed on January 25, 2016. Stantec is also working on completing a draft Sampling and Analysis Plan for the former Niphos site in the Village of Slinger. The SAP was completed on January 25, 2016.

Vandewalle is working on completing the Village of Richfield Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy. Work completed during this quarter included conducting background/due diligence research, a full-day site visit including
a tour and five focus group meetings on December 9, 2015, preparing base maps, conducting stakeholder interviews over the phone, a structural conditions analysis, and coordinating the project with the Village Administrator. For more information, see attached Scope of Services.

Vandewalle and the County Project Manager met with officials from the Village of Jackson on December 17, 2015 to discuss plans to produce an opportunity analysis for the Village as part of their ongoing strategic planning efforts.

Stantec is working on completing Revision 1 of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) based on comments received from the USEPA review of Revision 0 of the QAPP.

E. Deliverables

4th Quarter of FY 2015
Revision 0 of the QAPP was submitted to USEPA for review.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
On January 18, 2016, the USEPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation that changed the Phase II ESA and Reuse/Redevelopment Planning deliverables in Task 3. See Section II – Budget Overview and Section III – Modifications to the Work Plan above for details.

F. Percent Complete and Scheduled Activities

This task is currently estimated to be approximately 10% complete.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
During the 1st Quarter of FY 2016, it is anticipated that the QAPP will be finalized. In addition, it is anticipated that site specific sampling and analysis plans (SAPs) will be completed for the former Bermico property, and potentially for additional sites (subject to determinations of eligibility)

2nd Quarter of FY 2016
Scheduled activities for the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016 (January 1 through March 31, 2016) include submittal and approval of the SAPs for the former Bermico site in the City of West Bend and the former Niphos site in the Village of Slinger.

It is anticipated that the Village of Richfield Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy will be completed during the 2nd quarter of FY 2016 and presented to the Village Board for action. In March, the Village will host a community charrette where Vandewalle & Associates will present the identified opportunities in the study area. Attendees will be given the opportunity for interactive discussion and to provide feedback on the suitability of the development scenarios and identified opportunities in each of the four project subareas. The
feedback from attendees will be used to polish the recommendations for each sub-area and to inform the final Strategy and Implementation Action Plan. In early April the Site Redevelopment Program PMT and the Village of Richfield will meet for a final review of the deliverables before the final Plan is given to the Village.

Vandewalle and the County Project Manager will continue to meet with officials from the Village of Jackson to discuss their opportunity analysis for the Village. It is expected that this work will be similar to the work being in done in the Village of Richfield with a focus on the downtown area, which contains several brownfield clusters that scored high in the site ranking process. The Village believes there would be more value in beginning with this type of an effort than with individual site assessments/reuse plans. A request to the USEPA Project Officer will be forthcoming.

It is anticipated that the PMT will meet with local representatives to determine the scope of work necessary for the following sites:
- Site H - Former Gehl Site - City of West Bend
- Site B – Hwy 175 and Hwy 60 Intersection – Village of Slinger
- Site K – Village of Germantown

Revision 1 of the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) will be completed and sent to the USEPA for approval.

It is anticipated that asbestos and pre-demolition sampling will be completed at the Bermico property this quarter. Similar testing as well as soil and groundwater sampling should be completed for the Niphos Coating property as well, including completion of a Supplemental Phase II ESA report.

**Task 4 – Community Outreach and Involvement**

**A. Task Description**

Since 2010, the County has proactively involved Washington County communities in the development and advancement of a brownfields-focused Site Redevelopment Program (SRP). To lead this effort, in early 2013, the County established a Site Redevelopment Committee (SRC) to guide and advance brownfield redevelopment, community outreach and involvement, reuse planning and site assessment.

The coalition plans to convene the SRC on at least a bi-monthly basis, with the public meetings widely promoted. In addition to SRC meetings, the County will hold public meetings annually, inviting residents and other stakeholders to participate in the site selection process, cleanup decisions, and reuse planning performed as part of the grant-funded Project. To provide additional technical expertise as well as outreach to community organizations, a Technical/Community Advisory Subcommittee (T/CAS) with representatives from community based organizations, the Washington County Health Department, and other stakeholder groups, is being formed. The T/CAS will
provide input to the SRC, and provide input on site selection, reuse planning, and other considerations.

This task had a budget of $57,650 which included public, community and property owner meetings, development of fact sheets, press releases and other appropriate communications and development of webpages that will integrate the redevelopment sites within the EDWC website focused on connecting prospective end users and local stakeholders with information on redevelopment sites and associated reuse opportunities.

On January 18, 2016, the USEPA Project Officer approved a budget reallocation of $7,000 from Task 3 to Task 4 to allow consultants to continue to participate in regular PMT and SRC meetings as the project moves forward. The current budget for Task 4 is $64,650.

B. New Activities or Projects Approved for Implementation by U. S. EPA During the Fiscal Quarter

None.

C. Completed Activities or Projects

1st Quarter of FY 2015
During the 1st Quarter of FY 2015 the County completed a press release for circulation in local newspapers, radio stations and three major television stations serving Southeastern Wisconsin. An article was also written for the Planning & Parks Department newsletter that was sent to over 3,100 households in Washington County. The County met with the Project Team to detail the roles and responsibilities for Task 4 - Community Outreach and Involvement.

2nd Quarter of FY 2015
During the 2nd Quarter of FY 2015, as part of the development of detailed roles and responsibilities, the Project Team finalized the community outreach and involvement component to engage the public throughout the grant.

3rd Quarter of FY 2015
During the 3rd Quarter of FY 2015, the Project Team had a conference call meeting with sub consultant Ady Advantage regarding design of the EDWC website integration.

4th Quarter of FY 2015
The PMT has prepared for and conducted the initial SRC meeting under the grant, which was held on September 28, 2015. During preparation for the meeting, substantial effort was put in to developing outreach material and a strong recognizable brand for the program. This included preparation of: public meeting notices and a press release; an updated program factsheet; website upgrades; program letterhead; a program flyer; and meeting agendas and minutes. The first SRC meeting
was well received. During proceedings the committee revisited the program overview and was updated on the Team’s progress to date. Each member also updated the group on their priority redevelopment site. During the meeting UW-Extension’s Paul Roback facilitated a group exercise to stimulate thought on how brownfield redevelopment benefits communities.

Additional preparation and outreach has gone into preparing for the first countywide community workshop on October 15th. This included preparation of: public meeting notices and a press release; an updated program factsheet; website upgrades; program letterhead; a program flyer; meeting agendas; and interactive exercises.

Additional outreach activities completed during the 4th Quarter of FY 2015 include:

On July 8, 2015, a meeting was held by the PMT with the City of West Bend to review the grant program, and the status of the City’s highest priority sites.

One July 17, 2015, a meeting was held by the PMT to discuss the project.

On July 22, 2015, a meeting was held with USEPA, the County, City of West Bend, Vandewalle, and Stantec staff to discuss the Bermico property. A separate meeting was held with the Village of Slinger, the County attorney, and Stantec/Vandewalle staff to discuss the former Niphos Coating property.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
The PMT had numerous meetings throughout the 1st Quarter of FY 2016 to discuss the status of assessment funded projects, community outreach and the countywide inventory and prioritization process. Meeting dates for the quarter include October 13, October 19, November 10 and December 1, 2015.

A Countywide Community Workshop was held on Oct. 15, 2015. See Section IV Task 1, Section C – Completed Activities or Projects above for details.

As part of the Site Redevelopment Program to revitalize and market brownfield sites within the County for redevelopment, Ady Advantage was hired to determine what information about each site needs to be communicated in order to best reach the redeveloper market. Ady Advantage contacted leading developers throughout September 2015. A report of their results was completed on October 7, 2015 and presented at the November SRC meeting. For more information, see attached Summary of Developer Research Related to Criteria Identification and Prioritization.

Two meetings of the Site Redevelopment Committee were held in this quarter on November 12, 2015 and December 10, 2015. For more information, see attached meeting minutes.

Stantec and the County Project Manager attended a Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WI DNR) Green Team meeting on November 11, 2015 in Milwaukee to discuss the status of Site K in the Village of Germantown and determine possible assessment needs.
Vandewalle and the County Project Manager met with officials from the Village of Jackson on December 17, 2015 to discuss plans to produce an opportunity analysis for the Village as part of their ongoing strategic planning efforts.

The EDWC held a two-day economic development conference in West Bend on October 5-6, 2015, which included a lunch program with over 50 attendees focused on brownfields redevelopment. The program included: (a) a status update on a study in progress by the State of Wisconsin on the economic impacts of the State of Wisconsin brownfield funding programs, (b) a presentation by County and EDWC staff on the SRP, and (c) a presentation by a developer (Cobalt Partners LLC) on a 65-acre brownfields development in suburban Milwaukee that included >$9 million of environmental cleanup on a site that included 6 former industrial facilities, but which has resulted in $125 million in new development projects that are creating >500 jobs and providing housing for >500 residents. The program was attended by representatives of nearly every municipality in the County, and was followed a 3-hour “Economics 101” training course focused on how municipalities can better attract economic development projects, including those focused on brownfields.

D. Activities or Projects in Progress

4th Quarter of FY 2015
The Project Team is currently developing a detailed schedule for Task 4 regarding countywide inventory and prioritization of sites. The first countywide community workshop was held on October 15th. During this workshop participants learned about the program and helped develop the community goals criteria used to score/prioritize the brownfield sites inventory for redevelopment.

Work by Ady Advantage was partially completed, with the initial task focused on conducting a series of interviews with local developers with a track record of successfully developing brownfields. The interviews were used to help identify how the developers identified potential target sites for development, factors that made it more or less likely that they would pursue development of a brownfield site, and factors that most frequently led to projects becoming derailed prior to successful development. The developers were educated and asked for feedback regarding the County’s USEPA funded project. A 60-page report was completed and will be used to help better market brownfield sites for redevelopment.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
As part of the Village of Richfield Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy additional public outreach will be completed during the 2nd quarter of FY 2016 as well as a presentation to the Village Board for action.
E. Deliverables

1st Quarter of FY 2016

Ady Advantage contacted leading developers throughout September 2015. A report of their results was completed on October 7, 2015 and presented at the November SRC meeting. For more information, see attached Summary of Developer Research Related to Criteria Identification and Prioritization.

F. Percent Complete and Scheduled Activities

This task is currently estimated to be 50% complete.

1st Quarter of FY 2016

In November and December two SRC meetings will be held. The November meeting is intended to provide the committee with the final inventory of sites and a rationale for their selection, introduce the SRC members to the scoring process, and present the community goals criteria for them to score the sites with.

In December of 2015 the SRC will reconvene for the quarterly SRC meeting. The SRC will receive updates on SRP progress and the team will present the results of the scoring and a prioritized sites list.

2nd Quarter of FY 2016

Scheduled activities for the 2nd Quarter of FY 2016 (January 1 through March 31, 2016) include quarterly meetings of the SRC unless additional meetings are deemed necessary. It is anticipated that the next SRC meeting will be held at the end of February or early March, 2016. At the next meeting of the SRC, they will be provided a status update on current projects and a grant budget report.

Ady Advantage will continue their work on the SRP objective to market brownfield sites within Washington County for redevelopment. Anticipated tasks for the 2nd Quarter FY 2016 include creating property profile sheets and creating content for a new web page on the EDWC website under “Incentives/Resources,” which will provide website content to explain the program from a marketing standpoint. In addition, they will create online property listing sheets and suggest additional layers to add on the EDWC website mapping feature to communicate unique information designed to appeal to redevelopment experts.

The County Project Manager will continue to update the County Site Redevelopment Program website at www.co.washington.wi.us/srp to keep current with the SRC meetings and SRP community workshop events. Additional information related to assessment work on project sites will be added in the 2nd Quarter FY 2016.

The SRC will also be updated on upcoming funding opportunities that could be used to further required assessment, cleanup, and redevelopment activities at priority sites targeted for assessment or reuse planning.
G. Community Outreach Handouts

4th Quarter of FY 2015
See attached handouts that were provided to the public as part of the Community Outreach.
- Site Redevelopment Program 2013 Newsletter
- Flyer for October 15, 2015 SRP Countywide Community Workshop

1st Quarter of FY 2016
See attached handouts that were provided to the public as part of the Community Outreach. In addition, two West Bend Daily News articles are attached that describe the Oct. 15, 2015 Community Outreach Event and the Dec. 10, 2015 SRC action to fund assessment sites.

V. PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED/ASSISTANCE NEEDED

On October 15, 2014, the County requested an amendment to USEPA Cooperative Assistance Agreement BF00E01347 to correct the percentage calculations for the Recipient Share and Federal Share of the grant. Numerous requests have been made to the USEPA Grant Specialist for an updated agreement.

1st Quarter of FY 2016
None this quarter.
VI. SCHEDULE AND PROJECT MILESTONES

A partial summary of major milestones achieved during the project to date are summarized on the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity or Milestone Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>Issued request for proposals for professional services from environmental consulting firms following 40 CFR 31.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/16/2013</td>
<td>Selection of Stantec as environmental consulting firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/19/2014</td>
<td>Official Grant Award date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10/1/2014</td>
<td>3-year project period begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sept. 2013</td>
<td>Formation of Site Redevelopment Committee to oversee development and implementation of the grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nov - Dec 2013 &amp; Jan. 2014</td>
<td>Formation of Brownfields Coalition including Washington County, City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, Village of Jackson and Village of Richfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/6/2014</td>
<td>Selection of high priority sites by coalition partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/28/2014</td>
<td>Press release completed and sent to media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>Article in Planning &amp; Parks Department newsletter regarding brownfield assessment grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity or Milestone Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/29/2015</td>
<td>Submitted 1st Quarterly Report for FY 2015 to USEPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/17/2015</td>
<td>Finalized detailed roles and responsibilities with Project Team (County, Stantec, Vandewalle and EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/17/2015</td>
<td>Project Team finalized roles and responsibilities for community outreach and involvement. (County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/9/2015</td>
<td>Finalized Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs) for distribution to coalition partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/13/2015 - 4/14/2015</td>
<td>Project Manager held meetings with coalition partners regarding MOAs. (County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/18/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with the City of West Bend to discuss priority sites. (County, Stantec, EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/18/2015</td>
<td>County and Stantec finalized and signed contract for environmental services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>3rd Quarter FY 2015 Activity or Milestone Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/21/2015</td>
<td>All coalition partner MOAs signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/23/2015</td>
<td>Project Manager sent signed MOAs to USEPA Project Officer. (County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/27/2015</td>
<td>Project Manager submitted 2nd Quarterly Report for FY 2015 to USEPA Project Officer. (County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/5/2015</td>
<td>Pre-QAPP Conference Call Meeting with Jan Pels, USEPA (County, USEPA and Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/5/2015 – 6/30/2015</td>
<td>Worked on writing QAPP (Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6/8/2015 – 6/12/2015</td>
<td>Solicited bids from multiple labs and selected four labs. Solicitation of bids from these firms, and inclusion in the QAPP, were performed as part of the Six Good Faith Efforts to ensure participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) in the project. (Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/10/2015 - 6/23/2015</td>
<td>Meetings with coalition partners to discuss/confirm high priority redevelopment sites. (County, EDWC, Stantec and Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6/23/2015</td>
<td>Conference call meeting with sub consultant Ady Advantage regarding design of EDWC website integration and content development focused on connecting prospective end users with information on site redevelopment sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6/1/2015 – 7/1/2015</td>
<td>Contract agreements were finalized between Stantec and Vandewalle and with EDWC. The contract with EDWC will utilize the services of Ady Advantage, a WBE firm representing another positive outcome of compliance with the Six Good Faith Efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/29/2015</td>
<td>Work began on preparing eligibility determination requests for several priority brownfield sites including WB Place in Hartford and the former Niphos Coating facility in Slinger.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>4th Quarter FY 2015 Activity or Milestone Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/6/2015</td>
<td>The County acquired 73 historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps through Historical Information Gatherers. The maps were geo-referenced and integrated into the County GIS system. (County, Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/8/2015</td>
<td>Meeting held by County, Stantec, Vandewalle and EDWC staff with City of West Bend staff to discuss high priority sites and the grant program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7/15/2015</td>
<td>QAPP submitted to USEPA for review. (Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/17/2015</td>
<td>Meetings to finalize detailed Project Timeline (County, Stantec, Vandewalle and EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 and 1</td>
<td>7/22/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with City of West Bend, Village of Slinger, County, Stantec, Vandewalle and USEPA Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/5/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to discuss Ady Advantage work on outreach to developers and SRC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on inventory and prioritization of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8/24/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on inventory and prioritization of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9/2-3/2015</td>
<td>Attend Brownfields Conference in Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/8/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on inventory and prioritization of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/9/2015</td>
<td>ED submitted to USEPA for former Niphos Coatings property (Slinger) and former Bermico property (West Bend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/14/2015</td>
<td>Access agreement signed by owner of former Bermico property (West Bend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/21/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on inventory and prioritization of sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/22/2015</td>
<td>Eligibility confirmed by USEPA for Bermico property (West Bend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/28/2015</td>
<td>Initial SRC meeting held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1st Quarter FY 2016 Activity or Milestone Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/2/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with City of West Bend – Bermico property (County, Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/5-6/2015</td>
<td>County 2-day economic development conference, including session focused on brownfields redevelopment with &gt;50 attendees (County, Stantec, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/6/2015</td>
<td>ED submitted to USEPA for the former Blaine property (West Bend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>Ady Advantage completes Executive Summary of Developer Research Related to Criteria Identification and Prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/13/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on prioritization and scoring criteria (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>Community Outreach Event (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>Site Inspection for ESA - Bermico property– City of West Bend (County, Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with V. Richfield re: Infill Strategy Plan (County, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/19/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to work on prioritization and scoring criteria (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10/21/2015</td>
<td>USEPA Project Officer approved budget reallocation request #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/10/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to discuss prioritization and scoring (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/11/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with DNR Green Team re: V. Germantown – Saxony Village (County, Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11/11/2015</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Project Plan was conditionally approved by the US EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11/12/2015</td>
<td>SRC Meeting – (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/18/2015</td>
<td>Eligibility confirmed by USEPA for Niphos Coating Site in V. Slinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/23/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with EDWC – inventory scoring (County, EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 and 1</td>
<td>11/25/2015</td>
<td>Conference Call – invoices &amp; scoring (County, Stantec, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/1/2015</td>
<td>Meeting of PMT to discuss inventory scoring (County, Stantec, Vandewalle, EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/9/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with V. Germantown re: Saxony Village (County, Stantec, EDWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/9/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with V. Slinger re: Niphos site (County, Stantec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/9/2015</td>
<td>Facilitated focus groups – V. Richfield Infill Strategy Plan (Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/9/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with V. Richfield focus groups – V. Richfield Infill Strategy Plan (County, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/10/2015</td>
<td>SRC Meeting – discuss scoring and approval of sites for funding (County, Stantec, EDWC, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/17/2015</td>
<td>Meeting with V. Jackson re: redevelopment planning (County, Vandewalle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12/21/2015</td>
<td>County took possession of Niphos property as part of tax delinquency process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/14/2016</td>
<td>Eligibility confirmed by USEPA for Northern Bookends Sites in City of Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/18/2016</td>
<td>USEPA Project Officer approved budget reallocation requests #4 and #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/19/2016</td>
<td>Phase I ESA sent to US EPA Project Officer with signed All Appropriate Inquires Checklist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional milestones for the project will be added to this table as part of the next Quarterly Report.

**VII. BUDGET SUMMARY**

Summary of Grant Expenses by Category for the Reporting Period 1st Quarter of FY 2016
A summary of grant expenses by category is provided below, including the current budget, amounts previously expended, amounts expended during the 1st Quarter of FY 2016 (October 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015), total amounts expended through December 31, 2015, and the budget remaining as of December 31, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Previously Expended</th>
<th>Expenses this Quarter</th>
<th>Total Cumulative Expenses</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 5,300.00</td>
<td>$ 125.00</td>
<td>$ 1,588.04</td>
<td>$ 1,713.04</td>
<td>$ 3,586.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$ 3,200.00</td>
<td>$ 1,695.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,695.00</td>
<td>$ 1,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$ 591,500.00</td>
<td>$ 24,103.48</td>
<td>$ 140,008.64</td>
<td>$ 164,112.12</td>
<td>$ 427,387.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>$ 25,923.48</td>
<td>$ 141,596.68</td>
<td>$ 167,520.16</td>
<td>$ 432,479.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Current Budget Status by Task as of December 31, 2015

The following is a summary of the current budget status by task as of December 31, 2015. Please note that the approved budget reflects the USEPA approved allocation requests as of January 18, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No.</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Approved Budget as of 1/18/16</th>
<th>Cumulative Amount Expended (through 12/31/15)</th>
<th>Budget Remaining as of 12/31/15</th>
<th>Percent of Budget Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Programmatic Activities</td>
<td>$ 14,000.00</td>
<td>$ 9,822.09</td>
<td>$ 4,177.91</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization</td>
<td>$ 59,200.00</td>
<td>$ 59,164.67</td>
<td>$ 35.33</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phase I ESAs</td>
<td>$ 96,000.00</td>
<td>$ 19,471.68</td>
<td>$ 76,528.32</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations, and Remedial/Reuse Planning</td>
<td>$ 366,150.00</td>
<td>$ 37,109.88</td>
<td>$ 329,040.12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Outreach and Involvement</td>
<td>$ 64,650.00</td>
<td>$ 41,951.84</td>
<td>$ 22,698.16</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total USEPA Grant</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>$ 167,520.16</td>
<td>$ 432,479.84</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. PERFORMANCE OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

This section summarizes performance outputs and outcomes for the Washington County Community-Wide Coalition Assessment Grant for Hazardous Substance & Petroleum Brownfields. Proposed outputs and outcomes include:
• Completion of a community-wide inventory and prioritization of brownfields sites within the County.
• Performing Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments (ESAs) on priority brownfields sites.
• Completion of additional site investigation and remedial action plan development for select sites for which Phase II ESAs are completed.
• Performing community outreach and education related to brownfields.
• Connecting potential business and other end-users with brownfield sites that can be a focus for redevelopment and reuse.

**1st Quarter of FY 2016**

Several performance outputs and outcomes were accomplished in the 1st Quarter of FY 2016 including:

• **Countywide Inventory and Prioritization** - One significant output for this quarter was the completion of the countywide inventory and prioritization of brownfield sites. A performance outcome of this completed inventory was demonstrated at the December SRC meeting as the committee utilized the inventory scoring and ranking to determine which brownfield sites would obtain funding as part of the $600,000 US EPA Brownfield Coalition Assessment Grant. The action taken by the SRC to fund specific sites was not done arbitrarily, but instead the action was based on:
  1. A rigorous three tiered scoring and ranking process where each tier was composed of criteria based on industry standards for gauging the level of effort and likelihood that a brownfield site would be and/or should be redeveloped.
  2. Discussion from local representatives considering each site in terms of six factors including the potential to obtain site access, site eligibility, owner cooperation, project complexity and local government capacity to oversee the project.

This decision process will be followed by the SRC when determining which sites will obtain grant funding in the future. Also part of this work included the community outreach and education related to brownfields as part of the October 15, 2015 countywide outreach event.

• **Phase I ESAs** - Completion of the Phase I ESA for the former Bermico Site in the City of West Bend. Submitted to the EPA on January 19, 2016.

• **Developer Research** – The Research completed by Ady Advantage is the first step in the development of a marketing plan to connect potential business and other end-users with brownfield sites that can be a focus for redevelopment and reuse.

**IX. IN – KIND CONTRIBUTION**

Summary of In-Kind Contribution reported for the 1st Quarter of FY 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Budgeted In-kind Contribution</th>
<th>Previous In-kind Contribution</th>
<th>Total In-kind - 1st Qtr. FY 2016</th>
<th>Total Cumulative In-kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Sielski</td>
<td>Deputy Administrator</td>
<td>$22,131.20</td>
<td>$10,801.60</td>
<td>$13,720.95</td>
<td>$24,522.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Strausberger</td>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$5,267.60</td>
<td>$318.26</td>
<td>$504.01</td>
<td>$318.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Wagner</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>$1,887.50</td>
<td>$1,680.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,184.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Damkot</td>
<td>IS Manager</td>
<td>$1,408.80</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Long</td>
<td>GIS Analyst/Technician</td>
<td>$2,431.20</td>
<td>$1,277.40</td>
<td>$2,191.87</td>
<td>$3,469.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Schmidt</td>
<td>Highway Commissioner</td>
<td>$1,447.44</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Nass</td>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td>$5,610.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Cisar</td>
<td>Accounting Supervisor</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Braithwaite</td>
<td>Real Property Lister</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$15.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fay Fitts</td>
<td>Administrative Secretary</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$121.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$485.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Drew</td>
<td>Dir. of Comm. Devel.</td>
<td>$2,964.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessi Balcom</td>
<td>Village Administrator</td>
<td>$1,405.50</td>
<td>$176.07</td>
<td>$252.27</td>
<td>$428.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Haggerty</td>
<td>DPW Dir./Village Engineer</td>
<td>$118.30</td>
<td>$85.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Healy</td>
<td>Village Administrator</td>
<td>$571.20</td>
<td>$248.75</td>
<td>$323.38</td>
<td>$572.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ Justice</td>
<td>City Admin./Devel. Dir.</td>
<td>$1,717.98</td>
<td>$344.96</td>
<td>$344.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Piotrowicz</td>
<td>City Planner/Operations Mgr</td>
<td>$778.32</td>
<td>$77.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Mukasa</td>
<td>Economic Devel Mgr</td>
<td>$79.11</td>
<td>$79.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Reinke</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td>$73.50</td>
<td>$73.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guenn Soldner</td>
<td>Building Inspection Super.</td>
<td>$41.65</td>
<td>$41.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Tscheshlok</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$9,096.63</td>
<td>$4,051.32</td>
<td>$6,217.12</td>
<td>$10,268.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Reinbold</td>
<td>Business Solutions Specialist</td>
<td>$5,626.92</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$62,463.09  $17,211.04  $25,785.15  $42,996.20
Attachments

1. Sept 29, 2015 SRC Brainstorming Exercise notes
2. Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Flyer
3. Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Event Exercise
4. Oct. 15, 2015 Community Workshop Event Summary
5. Nov. 12, 2015 SRC Meeting Flyer
6. Nov. 12, 2015 SRC Meeting Minutes
7. Washington Co. Draft Criteria and Scoring for Redevelopment and Environmental
8. Dec. 10, 2015 SRC Meeting Flyer
10. Dec. 10, 2015 SRC Meeting Power Point – Top Inventory Sites
11. Washington County SRP Site Inventory & Prioritization Process Summary
12. Village of Richfield Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy
   Proposal
13. Executive Summary of Developer Research Related to Criteria Identification and
    Prioritization – Ady Advantage
15. Dec. 11, 2015 West Bend Daily News Article
Brainstorming Question:
What are the potential impacts that may occur as a result of redeveloping brownfields in our communities?

- Conversion of a liability to an asset
- Potential for business and job development
- Increase tax base in communities
- Relieve fear in the community that the contamination at the site will spread throughout the community
- Help cultivate community pride and sense of place
- Improve blighted areas for re-use
- Beautification
- Uniquely competitive sites with little to no infrastructure costs
- Direct development inwards to old city core
- Health and safety improvements
- Potential to reduce crime
- Enhance long-term economic sustainability
- Align long-term land use with modern community development
- Improving community image
- Spur more development
- Provides another site for economic development
- Improve property value of neighborhood
- Unique affordable space for growth companies
- Increase in housing and entertainment options
- Re-engaging communities in planning and visioning what downtowns and blighted areas could be
- Multi-generational opportunity to transform strategic center city sites
- Improve perception internal/external of community and neighborhood
- Foster community ownership of its own legacy

If you have any questions, please contact me at 262-335-4480.

Sincerely,

Paul Roback
Department Head & Community Development Educator
UW-Extension, Washington County
WASHINGTON COUNTY
SITE REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Purpose of this workshop is to:
1. Engage the community in the Site Redevelopment Program
2. Review the site inventory and prioritization process
3. Discuss and consider community goals and gather input for priority areas

The Site Redevelopment Program:
In 2014, the USEPA announced that Washington County was successful in securing a Countywide Coalition Brownfield Assessment Grant totaling $600,000. The grant funds will be used to complete a community-wide inventory and prioritization of sites that have redevelopment potential within the County, perform Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments on priority sites, complete remedial action plans and redevelopment plans for select sites and perform community outreach and education related to redevelopment opportunities.

For more meeting information please contact
Deb Sielski, Deputy Planning & Parks Administrator
Phone: 262-335-4445 • Email: Deb.Sielski@co.washington.wi.us
Washington County www.co.washington.wi.us/srp
Introduction
The Washington County Site Redevelopment Program Committee and Team is seeking your input about COMMUNITY PRIORITIES which will help inform the Site Redevelopment Program now and in the coming years. We want to be sure that the SRP provides meaningful results for Washington County residents and property owners.

Step 1: Individual Priorities: 15 minutes
On the back of this page is an initial list of priorities that could be addressed in some way through the assessment, clean-up, and reuse of sites that may be considered brownfield sites. Please take about 15 minutes to look them over and do the following:

1. Add to the list anything else that you would like to see addressed.
2. Make notes next to those that you think need more explanation.
3. Revise the description on those you think are important but need clarity.
4. Select the six to ten (including any that you’ve added) that you think are the most important.
5. Prioritize your top selections by either ranking them in order or breaking them into three groups such as high, higher, and highest.

Step 2: Small Group Priorities: 40 minutes
As a small group, take about 40 minutes to complete the following exercise:

1. Select someone to record the discussion outcomes on the large flip chart. Write legibly and leave space between priorities.
2. Select someone from the table to present these to the rest of the participants at the meeting in Step 3.
3. Each group member shares two of their top priorities, giving a brief explanation why they think they are important. Recorder lists each on the flip chart. Briefly discuss each. Keep moving so everyone has an opportunity to provide ideas. Avoid repeating someone else’s selections by offering any others that you’ve identified as priorities.
4. After everyone has had a chance to provide their two priorities, the recorder reviews the list. If needed, go around the table one last time giving each person the opportunity to add one more priority to the list.
5. Once the list is completed, tear off the flip chart pages and lay them on your table.
6. Everyone at the table should then place their yellow-green stickers next to their top five priorities. Each person should select five priorities — do not use more than one of your five stickers on a particular issue.
7. Once everyone has placed their stickers, the recorder tabulates the results and re-writes the top eight priorities in order on a new flip chart sheet. Use only one sheet.

Step 3: Final Priorities: 20 minutes
1. Return to the Auditorium where the spokesperson from each group will report their group’s top priorities.
2. Once each group’s list is on the wall, duplicate priorities will be eliminated by the moderator.
3. After that, everyone at the meeting will use their blue stickers to rank their top five priorities. You may place multiple stickers on your highest priority.
4. The moderator will then quickly tabulate the results and share them back with a brief wrap-up discussion.
**Community Priorities**

Consider what is of most importance to you in advancing the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program.

"It is important to me that redevelopment/reuse of these sites _____________. Meeting this criteria should result in higher prioritization of the site(s)."

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelops properties quickly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves blighted areas for re-use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases property tax base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protects groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases environmental sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces the spread of pollutants to other properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces potential human contact with pollutants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserves historic buildings or sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves safety and reduces crime and vandalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to civic development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases the diversity of housing choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates new entertainment venues or opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates new shopping choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates new recreational amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates or maintain livable neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates new cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Builds neighborhood unity and identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides opportunities for community uses or activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides opportunities for youth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides opportunities for seniors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides sustainable and lasting development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhances long term economic sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalyzes development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves community image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please write-in any other important priorities you think should be included on the blanks below:

___ _____________________________
___ _____________________________
___ _____________________________

Washington County Site Redevelopment Program Community Meeting: 10.15.15
Countywide Community Meeting Summary:
On October 15, 2015, the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program Committee and Team held a countywide community meeting to provide an overview of the SRP and to gather insight into the COMMUNITY PRIORITIES Washington County residents view as key for the redevelopment of sites in their communities. Around 20 Washington County residents attended the meeting.

The meeting began with the SRP Team spending about 30 minutes presenting an overview of the USEPA program. The Team explained the initial application/award process and detailed the goals and expected outcomes/outputs and their long term positive impact on redevelopment and economic growth in Washington County. A brief Q&A followed.

Next, residents participated in a 3-part community priorities brainstorming exercise to provide input into the development of community goals for scoring of identified redevelopment sites. This input is key to informing the Site Redevelopment Program now and in the coming years.

Community Priorities Exercise Summary:
Before the exercise began, participants were given a worksheet with instructions on one side and a list of 26 community priorities on the back. Priorities related to a wide range of community development goals including economic development, blight remediation, neighborhood identity, safety, and more. To ensure a complete list—addressing all facets of community development and quality of life—all priorities were developed using: the community outreach expertise of the Team, a UW-Extension facilitated brainstorming exercise at the September 2015 Site Redevelopment Committee Meeting, and the Environmental Protection Agency’s Livability Principles. Additionally, space was provided for participants to write-in their own responses.

Step 1: Individual Priorities
Over the first 15 minutes, participants were asked to use the list of community priorities to fill in the blank in the following sentence, “It is important to me that redevelopment/reuse of these sites _________________. Meeting this criteria should result in higher prioritization of the site(s).”

- Redevlops properties quickly
- Improves blighted areas for re-use
- Increases property tax base
- Protects groundwater
- Increases environmental sustainability
- Reduces the spread of pollutants to other properties
- Reduces potential human contact with pollutants
- Preserves historic buildings or sites
- Improves safety and reduces crime and vandalism
- Creates opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses
- Creates new jobs
- Contributes to civic development
- Increases the diversity of housing choices
- Creates new entertainment venues or opportunities
- Creates new shopping choices
- Creates new recreational amenities
- Creates or maintain livable neighborhoods
• Creates new cultural activities
• Builds neighborhood unity and identity
• Provides opportunities for community uses or activities
• Provides opportunities for youth
• Provides opportunities for seniors
• Provides sustainable and lasting development
• Enhances long term economic sustainability
• Catalyzes development
• Improves community image

From the list of 26 community priorities, plus any additional priorities that participants wanted to include, individuals selected and ranked their top 6 to 10 choices for discussion in step 2.

Step 2: Small Group Priorities
In small groups consisting of about 6-7 individuals, participants took about 40 minutes to brainstorm and share the top priorities from their individual lists with one another. Each person was given a chance to share their top 2-3 priorities and explain their importance. During the discussion, all priorities were recorded on a flipchart—resulting in a list of between 12 and 16 priorities. Next, each group voted to select the top 6-8 priorities WITHIN their group only. This reduced list was then written on a new flipchart page for presentation to the reconvened large group in the auditorium.

Step 3: Final Priorities: 20 minutes
In the final step, the small groups returned to the auditorium—sticking their list of 6-8 community priorities on the front wall. A selected spokesperson from each small group presented their priorities and a brief explanation of why each was chosen. After this the moderators removed duplicate priorities from across the lists. All participants were then asked to take a sheet of 5 stickers and place them next to their top priorities in a final vote—no limit was put on the number of stickers each voter could allocate per priority. Moderators then tallied the number of votes for each community priority and reported back for a brief group discussion.

Community Priority Exercise Results:
As a result of the Community Priorities Exercise at the Countywide Community Meeting, Washington County residents in attendance identified 12 community priorities as important when prioritizing sites for redevelopment and investment. These priorities—in no particular order—are:
1. Provides opportunities for youth
2. Creates new jobs
3. Improves blighted areas for re-use
4. Increases property tax base
5. Creates opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses
6. Protects groundwater
7. Creates new recreational amenities
8. Improves community image
9. Enhances long term economic sustainability
10. Creates new entertainment venues or opportunities
11. Creates or maintains livable neighborhoods
12. Creates tourism/Keeps money in the County

Meeting Conclusion:
After the final results were shared, members of the Team explained the next steps in the site inventory and prioritization process and invited participants to attend the SRC meeting on November 12th and to visit the project webpage. The meeting then adjourned.
16 Respondents

1. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with the Site Redevelopment Program Countywide Community Meeting?
   - Mean: 8.0

2. What were the most significant outcomes of this meeting for you?
   - Seeing common goals in Wash Co Population;
   - Information on program; community input on sites;
   - Variety of ideas;
   - Learning about issues of interest and concern;
   - Sense of community around exercise;
   - Hearing others input and ideas.

3. How could we have improved this meeting?
   - I think you did great;
   - All was well;
   - It was well run;
   - Need more attendees with varied views;
   - More advertising of upcoming meetings;
   - Everyone should only get one vote for final priority selection;
   - Do not allow multiple votes per person for a priority—off-road riders skewed the results with votes.

4. Other Comments:
   - Nice Job—very professional;
   - Nice to be able to provide feedback into the process;
   - Exceptional effort in seeking public input—very rare.
Purpose of meeting is to review and discuss:

- Site Inventory and Prioritization Process
- Site Inventory Ranking Criteria
- Leveraging Grant Resources

For more meeting information please contact
Deb Sielski, Deputy Planning & Parks Administrator
Phone: 262-335-4445 • Email: Deb.Sielski@co.washington.wi.us

Washington County www.co.washington.wi.us/srp
WASHINGTON COUNTY
SITE REDEVELOPMENT STEERING COMMITTEE

MINUTES
November 12, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Heidtke at 7:37 a.m. in room 3224 of the Public Agency Center. Affidavit of posting was read.

Members Present: Ray Heidtke, Mike Miller, TJ Justice, Lisa Maylen, Curt Pitzen, Christian Tscheschlok, John Walther

Members Excused: Justin Drew, Jessi Balcom, Jim Healy

Also Present: Debora Sielski – Deputy Planning and Parks Department Administrator, Jay Shambeau – Planning and Parks Department Administrator, Joanne Wagner - Office Manager, David Holmes - Stantec Consulting, Jorian Giorno -Vandewalle and Associates, Inc., Scott Harrington - Vandewalle and Associates, Inc.

Visitors: Marvin Kolbach – ATV Club, Rick Welch – ATV Club, Mark Piotrowicz – City of West Bend Planner.

REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2015
Motion by Mr. Miller, seconded by Mr. Justice to approve the minutes of September 29, 2015 as presented with no additions or corrections. Motion carried.

SITE REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TIMELINE
Ms. Sielski referred the Committee to the program timeline handout and reviewed the details (see attached).

OVERVIEW OF OCTOBER 15TH 2015 COUNTYWIDE COMMUNITY WORKSHOP
Mr. Harrington gave a brief overview of the purpose of the workshop, and described the three step process that was used (see attachments). The workshop produced a list of 12 community priorities as important when prioritizing sites for redevelopment and investment.

SITE INVENTORY PROCESS
Mr. Harrington reviewed the three-step site inventory approach and process. At the completion of the inventory process, there were 117 parcels making up 55 potential redevelopment areas in the County for review in the site prioritization process (see handout attached).

REVIEW AND APPROVE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA
Mr. Harrington reviewed the site prioritization approach and process including the three criteria that will be used to rank the sites. The three criteria include environmental conditions, redevelopment feasibility, and community goals (see attached). Hr. Harrington clarified that the inventory process is completely separate from the coalition priority sites.
Mr. Tscheschlok provided a brief overview of the services Janet Ady from Ady Advantage has provided in this process. Via conference call, Ms. Ady reviewed the results of the redeveloper interviews (See attached).

Mike Miller left the meeting at 8:15 a.m. in order to attend another meeting.

**FACILITATED DISCUSSION – PROGRAM PRINCIPLES FOR DECISION MAKING - SCOTT HARRINGTON**

Mr. Harrington discussed the Committee’s role in using funds based on development interest and need. The Project Management Team will spend the next few weeks scoring each parcel against the 3 criteria and will provide the Committee with a prioritized list of sites for potential funding at the December meeting.

Mr. Justice inquired as to whether there are any sites where the property owners have not granted access or have not appeared to be cooperative. Mr. Harrington stated that, with over 100 sites to assess, site access was not part of the inventory process.

At this time, voting was done on the following items:

Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria with seven sub criteria each having a five point scale. Motion by Mr. Pitzen, seconded by Ms. Maylen to approve this scoring criteria. Motion carried.

Environmental Criteria with six sub criteria each having a three point scale. Mr. Holmes will modify criteria #5 to consider Federal and State Brownfield Assessment cleanup funding assistance potential. Motion by Mr. Justice, seconded by Mr. Tscheschlok to approve as modified.

Mr. Harrington asked that each Committee member vote for the top six community criteria from the twelve criteria that were determined at the community workshop. There was a tie vote for one of the criteria, so Mr. Walther changed his vote from “improves community image” to “enhances long term economic sustainability.” The priority community criteria selected include:

- Creates new jobs
- Improves blighted area for re-use
- Increases property tax base
- Creates opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses
- Enhances long term economic sustainability
- Creates or maintains livable neighborhoods

Motion by Mr. Justice, seconded by Ms. Maylen to approve the six criteria selected, including the change by Mr. Walther. Motion carried.

**NEXT STEPS IN SCORING PROCESS**

The Project Management Team members will now begin the process of scoring each parcel against the 3 criteria and will provide the Committee with a prioritized list of sites for potential funding at the December 10th meeting.
DISCUSSION OF DECEMBER SITE REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
The next meeting is Thursday, December 10th at 7:30 a.m. in rooms 1113A and B of the Public Agency Center. The planned agenda activities include:

- Review site scoring and rankings
- Review additional consideration factors
- Select 2-3 sites for funding
- Ask each coalition member to give a brief update on their priority sites

Mr. Tscheschlok suggested that two additional steps be added to the Redevelopment Program timeline. The first would be to provide the results of the work by Ady Advantage on the redeveloper interviews and the second is providing redeveloper outreach tools and materials separate from the planned EDWC website work.

Mr. Justice asked how many counties in Wisconsin have been recipients of this round of funding. Ms. Sielski stated that for the cycle of funding we are in, she believes Sheboygan County is the only other County. Ms. Sielski highlighted that Washington County is unique in being the only one in the State to have a County led coalition. Mr. Justice suggested the possibility of some news releases or a public relations campaign in order to get newspaper or television coverage to reach additional developers. Further discussion ensued regarding effective press releases and targeting the best audiences with public relations outreach.

Mr. Harrington stated that one of the things that differentiates Washington County is the comprehensive system for site selection and detailed inventory being created. This is a unique system that you don’t find in other communities and sets Washington County apart. The EPA really prefers this kind of approach and it will serve Washington County well.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
None.

ADJOURNMENT
Motion by Mr. Justice, seconded by Mr. Pitzen to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 a.m. Motion carried.

Debora Sielski
Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator
Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria

The following are criteria to be considered for rating the redevelopment feasibility of sites based on their potential to implement existing plans and remove blight, their probable costs, and levels of market interest. These are a refined group of criteria—consolidated to keep them to a manageable number. In so doing, however, many of these criteria include a combination of factors (such as the level of market interest and the potential magnitude of redevelopment) which increases the complexity of applying them. The PMT will apply the criteria. As a result, a 5-point scale is used to more clearly differentiate the potential circumstances for each of criteria.

1. **Potential for near-term redevelopment**: Based on projected market interest to redevelop the site—consistent with existing plans—assuming it was already assembled—cleared and remediated and the potential magnitude of redevelopment.
   - 5 High level interest for significant redevelopment
   - 4 Some interest for significant redevelopment
   - 3 High level of interest for limited level of redevelopment
   - 2 Some interest for limited level of redevelopment
   - 1 Little to no interest for redevelopment of any magnitude

2. **Potential cost of assembly and redevelopment (and therefore cost of redevelopment as a function of the potential exponential growth once redeveloped)**: Based on anticipated cost to assemble, clear and remediate all or most of the site and the level of effort/complexity required of municipality/potential buyer to negotiate purchases, obtain permits, and coordinate clearing and remedial activities.
   - 5 Low cost and low level of effort
   - 4 Either cost or level of effort is low with the other being moderate
   - 3 Moderate cost and moderate level of effort
   - 2 Either cost or level of effort is high with the other being moderate
   - 1 High cost and high level of effort

3. **Potential to catalyze redevelopment on other properties**: Anticipated ability of site redevelopment to catalyze redevelopment on neighboring properties based on the site’s size and specific location and the existing and planned uses and activities in the surrounding area (e.g., extent of site’s isolation/proximity to other sites with significant redevelopment potential).
   - 5 Excellent
   - 4 Good
   - 3 Fair
   - 2 Poor
   - 1 None

4. **Potential to assemble entire site**: Anticipated ease of assembling all or most of a site for redevelopment based on the extent of public ownership, vacancy status, and tax delinquency status.
   - 5 Entire site under public ownership
   - 4 Majority of public ownership/delinquency/vacancy
   - 3 Mix of public ownership/delinquency/vacancy and private ownership
2 Limited public ownership/delinquency/vacancy
1 No public ownership and no tax delinquency

5. **Inclusion in special plans and districts:** Includes inclusion in any plan other than the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (i.e. Parks and Open Space Plan, Downtown Plan, Riverfront Plan, etc.) and any special district (i.e. Historic District, TIF district, etc.).
   5 Site is within a specific financial incentive district such as a TIF district
   4 All or portion of the site specifically identified in a plan or district
   3 Site adjacent to a site specifically identified in a plan or district
   2 Site in a special district or plan but not specifically identified
   1 Site not included in a special plan or district

6. **Potential to eliminate blight:** Extent of blight based on physical deterioration and appearance of buildings and sites.
   5 Entire site is blighted
   4 Extensive presence of significant blight
   3 Limited presence of significant blight
   2 Limited presence of minor blight
   1 Minimal or no blight

7. **Potential to replace existing inappropriate or marginal uses:** Inappropriate uses include those that are inconsistent with existing codes (like floodplain), zoning and/or the comprehensive plan. Marginal uses are those that are developed or operated in a manner that makes them somewhat undesirable and/or makes their long-term viability questionable (such as inappropriate of conversion of structures originally built for another purpose).
   5 Entire site consists of vacant/inappropriate/marginal uses
   4 Extensive presence of significant vacant/inappropriate/marginal uses
   3 Limited presence of significant vacant/inappropriate/marginal uses
   2 Limited presence of minor vacant/inappropriate/marginal uses
   1 Minimal or no vacancies/inappropriate/marginal uses
Environmental Criteria

The following are criteria to be considered for rating the environmental conditions of sites based on the potential level of contamination, potential for human contact with contaminants and the ability of contaminants to migrate off-site, and ability to obtain state funding assistance with assessment and clean up. These are prepared to get a more complete idea of environmental conditions and their impacts on human health and the environment.

To arrive at the scores Stantec will review past and existing activities on the sites. It’s important that only one entity/person be responsible for the environmental scoring to ensure the criteria are applied consistently across all sites, however, assistance from the PMT will be needed to determine whether a viable causer for each site may exist. A 3-point scale is adequate to meaningfully differentiate potential site conditions.

1. Potential level of contamination
   Based on information contained in available state environmental files as well as past and current uses and the types of hazardous/petroleum substances typically involved with such uses.
   - 3 High
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 Low

2. Potential for human contact with contaminants
   Based on past site activities and the nature of the suspected/documentcd contaminants (e.g., potential for contaminants to be on or just below the surface, emit vapors, etc.).
   - 3 High
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 Low

3. Potential to contaminate groundwater
   Based on past site activities and the nature of the suspected/documentcd contaminants.
   - 3 High
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 Low

4. Potential for a change in land use requiring a higher level of remediation (e.g., change from industrial to residential or a park).
   - 3 High
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 Low

5. Potential for state funding assistance
   - 3 High
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 Low

6. Potential existence of a viable causer who would be responsible for assessment and clean up
   - 3 Low
   - 2 Medium
   - 1 High
You’re Invited

Washington County Site Redevelopment Committee Meeting
December 10, 2015 at 7:30AM
Public Agency Center
333 E Washington Street, Rooms 1113 A&B
West Bend, WI 53095

Purpose of meeting is to review and discuss:
• Final Site Scoring and Rankings
• Additional Consideration Factors
• Selection of Sites for Initial Assessment
• Updates on Coalition Member Priority Sites

SRC Committee Members:
Ray Heidtke, County Board Supervisor/Town of Jackson Chairperson
Mike Miller, County Board Supervisor - Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee Chairperson
TJ Justice, City Administrator - City of West Bend
Justin Drew, City Planner - City of Hartford
Jessi Balcom, Administrator - Village of Slinger
Lisa Maylen, Workforce Development Center
Curt Pitzen, NAI MLG Commercial
Christian Tscheschlok, Executive Director - EDWC
Jim Healy, Administrator - Village of Richfield
John Walther, Administrator - Village of Jackson

For more meeting information please contact
Deb Sielski, Deputy Planning & Parks Administrator,
Phone: 262-335-4445 • Email: Deb.Sielski@co.washington.wi.us
Washington County www.co.washington.wi.us/srp
The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Heidtke at 7:33 a.m. in room 1113 A & B of the Public Agency Center. Affadavit of posting was read.

Members Present: Ray Heidtke, Mike Miller, T.J. Justice, Justin Drew, Jessi Balcom, Curt Pitzen, Christian Tscheschlok, Jim Healy, John Walther.

Members Excused: Lisa Maylen

Also Present: David Holmes, Jorian Giorno, Scott Harrington, Deb Sielski, Joanne Wagner

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 12, 2015
Motion by Mr. Walther, seconded by Mr. Justice to approve the minutes of November 12, 2015 with no additions or corrections. Motion carried.

OVERVIEW OF SITE SCORING AND RANKING METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND ANALYSIS
Mr. Harrington stated that we ended up with 115 parcels comprising 51 sites, so there were 11 clusters that consisted of two or more parcels where redevelopment would likely involve all or most of the parcels. Rather than evaluating them as individual parcels, it made more sense to look at them as a group. Mr. Harrington reviewed the process of applying the criteria, scoring and the list of sites (per packet enclosed).

Mr. Miller asked if a cluster gets more points for being a cluster than individual sites. Mr. Harrington stated that clusters did not get higher points.

Mr. Harrington referred the Committee to the packet where the sites were ranked by community (see packet enclosed).

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM PRINCIPLES FOR DECISION MAKING
Mr. Harrington referred the Committee to the memo enclosed in the packet (see attached). This memo summarizes information covered at the last meeting. There were a wide variety of factors that went into ranking and scoring the sites. The timing in redevelopment is a major component. Many factors can change over time, therefore the rankings and scorings are sort of a static measurement of a site’s potential. The next step is deciding what sites would bring the quickest returns, in moving it back into some kind of productive re-use. The six factors that will need to be considered:

1. Potential to obtain site access
2. Potential to obtain site eligibility
3. Potential to obtain property Owner/Developer interest and cooperation
4. Potential Level of Local Government Interest and Capacity
Today’s goal is for the Committee to select 2-3 sites for initial site assessment activities. The Committee will want to choose from the top 15 sites.

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION – SELECTION OF 2-3 SITES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

Ms. Sielski requested that the local government representatives provide a review of each of their priority sites in terms of the six considerations.

- Justin Drew described Site #3 in Hartford. Formerly a tannery and is still considered a priority site for Hartford. The anticipated use would be for park/recreation use due to its location being along the Rubicon River Trail.
- John Walther described Site #76 in the Village of Jackson. The site is adjacent to the Village Hall. The property was at one time a food processing plant, but has had several other uses, and a portion eventually became a condominium subdivision. There was a tremendous amount of materials buried on this site, but this issue was worked through. This was originally master planned as a park adjacent to the Village Hall. The site is currently vacant. The Village Board will be looking at this site as part of their upcoming visioning process. Paul Roback of UW Extension is facilitating this visioning series.
- Mr. Walther also described Site G in the Village of Jackson. This site is along the west side of the railroad tracks from Main Street (or Highway 60) north. It is currently privately owned, and the Jackson Motel is part of the site. The Village is looking at the potential for redevelopment in this area. The property owners in the area would be somewhat receptive to allowing access to their properties. Mr. Heidtke asked about the viability of the railroad tracks in that area. Mr. Walther stated that trains in that area are sporadic, and serves the industrial park to Rusco Road in the City of West Bend. It would be up to the railroad as to whether they will continue to use these tracks.
- Mr. Walther described Site E in the Village of Jackson (south of Site G). This is also along the railroad tracks, but is south of Main Street. It was an old fertilizer plant / feed mill. The area that was a fertilizer plant is changing ownership. The individual who is in the process of purchasing that is using it for equipment and equipment repair for his company. The village is looking for redevelopment all along the railroad tracks in that area.
- Ms. Balcom described Site B in the Village of Slinger. She stated that property is located at Highway 60 and 175 in the Village and described previous uses. Ms. Sielski inquired about owner receptiveness. Ms. Balcom stated that there has been some turnover in property owners, and it is possible that the current owners would be receptive. The redevelopment authority and the Village Board has decided to dedicate time, effort and money to trying to redevelop within the Village and feels that there would be community support as well Village Board and staff support.
- Ms. Balcom described Site C, located along West Washington Street and Oak Street. There would be multiple property owners with different degrees of receptiveness.
- Mr. Piotrowicz described Site H in the City of West Bend. This is the former Gehl Corporation site. One parcel was their main offices and manufacturing since the early 1900’s. The parcel on the other
side of Forest Avenue was their engineering building. This is ready for a redevelopment plan. The City has done Phase I, II and III and are close to completing remediation on the bigger site. There is environmental work to be done on the engineering building site. There is no environmental work other than a portion of the parking lot area. This site is more in need of redevelopment planning rather than Phase I or Phase II. Right now, the site is zoned as a mixed use district. This site is probably within 12-18 months of environmental closure. Anticipated use would be multi-family residential, as that would provide the highest value per acre. The north edge could be business use due to its proximity to the downtown.

- Mr. Piotrowicz described Site 88 in the City of West Bend. This is about 1 mile south of the other site. This one is on Decorah Road, on the East side of the Eisenbahn State Trail. The majority of this site has been vacant for 19 or 20 years. This is directly adjacent to the Eisenbahn State Trail and Main Street is about ½ mile to the west. Good location for commercial uses. Parcel to the south is the WE Energies maintenance and storage area. The site is on the old industrial corridor that was formerly the railroad corridor.

- Mr. Piotrowicz described Sites 92, 93, and 94 (3 parcels) in the City of West Bend. The 3 sites are north of Decorah Road, and west of the Eisenbahn Trail. Each of the sites is privately owned by different owners. Mr. Piotrowicz mentioned that there are potentially high impacts on the area due to prior storage and distribution of petroleum products on the property. He stated that there is potential for redevelopment.

- Mr. Piotrowicz described Site 96 in the City of West Bend. This is the former Prafke Brake and Clutch location, and is located immediately south of Oak Street and ¼ mile east of Main Street. There is a recycling company there now and is in violation of City ordinances. It will likely be on the market soon. This would be good for possible residential use. Mr. Justice stated that this site (#96) would likely be of higher interest than Site #88. At this point, however – Site H is still ranked as the highest over site #96.

- Mr. Justice described Site #138 in the City of West Bend. This is on Hi-Mount Road in Barton, just east of the Eisenbahn Trail Corridor. This is currently listed on the market with one or two tenants still on the property. The owner is the West Bend Economic Development Corporation. It has been used as an incubator in recent years. This would make sense to be part of this program. Not sure of whether there has ever been any environmental work done on this site. Has been industrial since approximately the 1930’s.

- Mr. Piotrowicz described Site #144 in the City of West Bend. This is the old West Bend Company site located west of the Eisenbahn State Trail, East of the Milwaukee River. This is a 27- acre redevelopment site, owned by Hendricks Development. Have an environmental agreement with the former owners. Mr. Piotrowicz stated that he is not sure that there would be anything gained for this site being in this program. River Shores has committed heavily to redevelopment in this area.

  Suggested removing this from the list. The Committee was in agreement with removing Site #144 from the list.

- Mr. Retzlaff provided an overview and background of the parcels they wish the committee consider funding in the Village of Germantown (see attachment). There is a redevelopment proposal for the site called “Saxony Village”, 172 apartment units. This site includes 3 parcels, approximately 24
acres total. Owners of all three sites have agreed to site assessments and are ready to move forward with redevelopment and construction in the spring of 2016. The developer, Scott Bence presented the history of the three parcels being presented.

Mr. Miller left the meeting at 8:52 a.m.

Based on the activity on these sites, Mr. Tschenschlok stated support in considering these sites to be added to the project, as it meets the six criteria for site consideration.

Ms. Sielski added that today the committee will only be selecting 2-3 sites. At the next meeting (approximately March), she will come back with a detailed budget of where we are with the program and then the Committee will be able to refer back to the list, depending on the funding that is left in the grant, and possibly select a couple more sites. In addition to spending all of the funds we have on the specific sites, our intent with this program is to seek further funding.

**SITE PRIORITIES**

Ms. Sielski asked the representatives from the Villages of Jackson and Slinger who have multiple sites to prioritize those sites (City of West Bend has already done this).

- **City of Hartford:** Site #3
- **Village of Slinger:** Site B (Highway 60 & 175)
- **Village of Jackson:** Site G (site #76 could be included easily)
- **City of West Bend:** Site H (redevelopment plan only) or #138 as second priority.
- **Village of Germantown:** Main Street - Site/Cluster “K”

At this time, Mr. Justice requested that Site #96 be removed from the list for the City of West Bend’s sites, as there are outstanding matters between the City and the property owner that should be resolved prior to requesting any type of public assistance.

Mr. Walther stated that at this time, from an overall County perspective, it makes sense to prioritize some of the sites in other communities first and to wait a few months to see where they are at with the six criteria for the sites in the Village of Jackson consider these in the next round.

**Motion by Mr. Healy, seconded by Ms. Balcom to recommend the Main Street – Site/Cluster “K” sites in the Village of Germantown, Site H in the City of West Bend, and Site B in the Village of Slinger on Highway 60 and 175. Motion amended by Mr. Tschenschlok to allow the Project Management Team to include site #138 (City of West Bend) and Site #3 (City of Hartford) for Phase 1 services only if funding is available. Motion carried as amended.**

**STATUS UPDATE ON COALITION TARGET SITES**

Mr. Justice stated that both the City and the County have received the draft of the Phase 1 Environmental Assessment of this site, which is being reviewed. From a public safety perspective, the City has a raze order recorded with the County Register of Deeds. As a result of that, we have boarded
up the facility and all occupants and contents have been removed. The locks have been changed as well to restrict access as much as possible. The property owner has been highly cooperative.

Mr. Drew stated this site is for mixed development use, primarily residential. Lost a potential developer, but First National Bank and the Department of Community Development want to make this project work so they are trying to find a new developer and complete the development project. Ms. Sielski stated that she will check back with her contact at the EPA regarding the status of the eligibility determination.

Ms. Balcom stated that the County is taking this parcel for unpaid taxes and the outcome will be decided on December 18th. At that time, the County will have control of it and we can begin work Mr. Healy stated that there was a focus group/roundtable meeting yesterday regarding the future of this northeast corridor of the Village of Richfield. They also had a lengthy discussion with the property owner who owns the 208 contiguous acres to the East of Highway 175.

Mr. Walther provided an update on their target sites. They are kind of lagging behind because they have been consumed with some other issues, but they will be moving along as soon as they can.

**DISCUSSION OF NEXT SRC MEETING**
Ms. Sielski stated that she would anticipate that we will be meeting quarterly.
Ms. Sielski stated that she would send out a date request in February for a March meeting. Future meetings will start at 8:00 a.m. rather than 7:30 a.m., and she requested that the meetings rotate throughout our coalition partners. The location chosen for the March meeting is the Village of Slinger Board Room.

**ADJOURNMENT**
Motion by Mr. Justice, seconded by Mr. Walther to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 a.m. Motion carried.

Debora Sielski
Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator
Site Redevelopment Committee Meeting

December 12, 2015
7:30AM
Agenda

1. Call to Order & Affidavit of Posting
2. Minutes of November 12, 2015
3. Overview of Site Scoring and Ranking Methodology, Results and Analysis
4. Overview of Program Principles for Decision Making
5. Discussion and Action - Selection of 2-3 Sites for Environmental Assessment
   1. Discussion of Top Ranked Sites by Local Government Representatives
   2. Consideration of 2-3 Sites for Environmental Assessment
6. Status Update on Coalition Target Sites
7. Discussion of Next SRC Meeting
8. Public Comment
9. Adjourn
3. OVERVIEW OF SITE SCORING AND RANKING

- Methodology
- Results
- Analysis
Methodology

Red – Countywide Inventory Sites

Total – 115 parcels
51 sites

• PMT members score independently

• Add for Composite Score
Applying the Criteria

- Environmental Conditions
  - Dave Holmes; All 115 sites scored individually

- Redevelopment Feasibility and Community Goals
  - Deb, Christian, Vandewalle; parcels in clusters scored as a whole
Results

– High level of concurrence among PMT for redevelopment and community goals scores/rankings
– Only one of the 10 highest-ranked sites for environmental conditions is not in the overall top 15 sites
– The top 15 sites all make sense but should generally be viewed as a group instead of an absolute order
# Washington County Site Redevelopment Program

## Composite Scoring & Rankings

### Listing by Site Ranking

**December 2, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID #</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Redevelopment Composite Score</th>
<th>Community Goals Composite Score</th>
<th>Environmental Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Total Composite Score</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>31 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>35 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>24 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>26 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>82 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>28 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>21 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>79 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>18 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>25 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>76 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>23 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>22 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>25 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>25 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>23 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>33 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>19 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>23 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>22 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>27 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>73 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>23 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>17 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>27 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>21 (Max 35, Min 7)</td>
<td>29 (Max 36, Min 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66 (Max 107, Min 31)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. PROGRAM PRINCIPLES FOR DECISION MAKING

1. Use of USEPA funds for environmental assessments on SRC-selected Sites

2. SRC discretion to use funds based on development interest/need
OTHER FACTORS

1. Potential to Obtain Site Access
2. Potential to Obtain Site Eligibility
3. Potential Level of Property Owner / Developer Interest
4. Potential Level of Local Government Interest and Capacity
5. Presence of Clusters
6. Potential Complexity and Cost of Assessment
5. DISCUSSION & ACTION

1. Discuss Top Sites
2. Select 2-3 Sites for Environmental Assessment
City of Hartford – Site 3

Rank # 14
Location - 368 W. Sumner St.
Owner - Privately Owned
Village of Jackson – Site 76

Rank # 5
Location – N168 W20753
Main Street
Owner- Village of Jackson
Village of Jackson– Site E

**Rank # 13**
**Location** – W208 N16670, N16710, N16730 S. Center Street
**Owner** - Privately Owned
Village of Jackson – Site G

Rank # 10

Location – N168 W20788
Main Street,
W208 N16831, N16840,
N16900 N. Center Street

Owner- Privately Owned
Village of Slinger – Site B

Rank # 6
Location – Hwy 60 & Hwy 175
Owner- Privately Owned
Village of Slinger – Site C

Rank # 7
Location – W. Washington St, Kettle Moraine Dr. and Oak Street
Owner: Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site H

**Rank # 1**

**Location** - 145 S. Forest Ave, Water Street, N. Forest Ave, Wisconsin Street

**Owner** - City of West Bend, Redevelopment Authority
City of West Bend – Site H

**Rank # 1**
**Location** - 145 S. Forest Ave, Water Street, N. Forest Ave, Wisconsin Street
**Owner** - City of West Bend, Redevelopment Authority
City of West Bend – Site 88

Rank # 2
Location – 103 E. Decorah Road
Owner- Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site 92

Rank # 10
Location – 106 W. Decorah Road
Owner: Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site 93

**Rank** # 8
**Location** – 102 W. Decorah Rd.
**Owner**– Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site 94

**Rank # 10**  
**Location** – 108 W. Decorah Road  
**Owner**- Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site 96

Rank # 3
Location – 133 Oak Street
Owner - Privately Owned
City of West Bend – Site 138

**Rank # 15**

**Location** – 603 Hi Mount Road

**Owner** - West Bend Economic Development Corporation
City of West Bend – Site 144

Rank # 9
Location – Riverbend Drive
Owner- Privately Owned
Village of Germantown– Site K

Rank # 4
Location – Squire Drive, Main Street
Owner- Privately Owned
6. COALITION TARGET SITES

UPDATE
Coalition Target Sites

City of West Bend – Former Bermico & Former Blaine Properties
Coalition Target Sites

City of Hartford – Northern Bookends
Coalition Target Sites

Village of Slinger – Niphos Property
Coalition Target Sites

Village of Richfield – Northeast Corridor
Coalition Target Sites

Village of Jackson
7. Next SRC Meeting

Discuss:

• Date
• Time
• Location
• Tentative Agenda
8. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
9. ADJOURN
## Washington County Site Redevelopment Program (Countywide Portion of Grant - $400,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalize roles &amp; responsibilities of PMT members</td>
<td>1st Q 2nd Q 3rd Q 4th Q</td>
<td>1st Q 2nd Q 3rd Q 4th Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County finalizes contract with Stantec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County finalizes MOA with coalition partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete background tasks for grant implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with coalition partners to finalize target sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT meetings to discuss Countywide workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT initiates work on site redevelopment inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ady conducts redeveloper interviews &amp; finalizes report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT initiates work on site prioritization &amp; scoring criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Workshop held on Oct. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC meeting (Nov.) to approve prioritization process &amp; criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC review scoring/ranking and select sites for funding (Dec.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC meeting - prioritize sites for funding (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWC develops webpages to integrate sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government finalizes site access with owners (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility determinations submitted to EPA (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assess (ESAs) (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct sampling &amp; analysis plans (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Phase II ESAs (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct asbestos &amp; haz material pre-demol surveys (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete remedial action plans (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inventory Development

- Include individual community identified sites/areas of concern
- Gather relevant data to compile a countywide site list
- Eliminate sites with no Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs)
Sources for Sites for Inventory Consideration

Step 1

1. Community identified sites
2. Xcelligent database
3. Tax delinquency records
4. Municipally/county-owned
5. Landfills
6. DNR historic waste disposal sites
7. TIF parcel data
8. DNR BRRTs records
9. WI DATCP database
Data Gathering
Step 2

1. Acres
2. Site assessed value
3. Parcel tax delinquent
4. Vacant site (no building)
5. Generalized Zoning
6. Existing Land Use
7. Planned Future Land Use
Data Gathering

Step 3

1. Property currently available (for sale)
2. Railroad access
3. Railroad ID
4. Hwy access
5. HWY ID
6. Priority in Community Redevelopment Plans
7. Building on site for reuse or demo needed
8. Square footage of building for reuse
9. Code violations
10. Historic Land Use from Sanborn Maps
SITE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS
Levels of Analysis

Ranking the sites based on criteria:

- Environmental Conditions
- Redevelopment Feasibility
- Community Goals
Environmental Conditions Criteria

1. Potential Level of Contamination
2. Potential for Human Contact with Contaminants
3. Potential to Contaminate Groundwater
4. Land Use Change Requiring Higher Remediation
5. Potential for State & Federal Funding Assistance
6. Potential Existence of a Viable Cause
Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria

1. Potential for Near Term Redevelopment
2. Potential Cost of Assembly and Redevelopment
3. Potential to Catalyze Redevelopment on Other Properties
4. Potential to Assemble Entire Site
5. Inclusion in Special Plans and Districts
6. Potential to Eliminate Blight
7. Potential to Replace Existing Inappropriate or Marginal Uses
Community Goals
Criteria
1. Improves Blighted Areas for Reuse
2. Creates New Jobs
3. Increases Property Tax Base
4. Creates Opportunities to Retain/Expand/Recruit New Businesses
5. Enhances Long-Term Economic Sustainability
6. Creates or Maintains Livable Neighborhoods
In 2015, the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program (SRP) Project Management Team (PMT) and Site Redevelopment Committee (SRC) kicked off the Coalition program working closely to build an inventory of potential brownfield sites, prioritize that inventory, and ultimately select the first sites to begin environmental assessments and remedial/reuse planning. During each phase of this first programmatic task, the PMT applied a meticulous approach that involved high degrees of collaboration and critical analysis in decision-making to maximize program outcomes for Washington County.

As a coalition grant, each member of the coalition was allocated $40,000 to address the top priority redevelopment site in their community. These sites were included in the final county-wide inventory of redevelopment sites, but were not scored in the prioritization process since each site already had dedicated funding.

This summary document provides an explanation of the steps taken from inventory assembly through initial site selection to accomplish the defined outcomes under the first task for the USEPA Site Assessment Grant Program. Included are attachments with a map of the county wide inventory and documents providing further details for each phase.

Phase I: Developing an Inventory of Redevelopment Sites

The Project Management Team (PMT) approached creating a county wide redevelopment site inventory as the foundation to building a comprehensive county wide redevelopment program for Washington County over the next several years. This program will address redevelopment needs for the foreseeable future.

It was important to be detail oriented and systematic in the initial inventory process in order to provide a solid foundation for a redevelopment program. The PMT held regular meetings and delegated tasks between meetings with tight deadlines and clear parameters. As a firm with successful experience creating brownfield inventories in other communities, Vandewalle & Associates led the process with important contributions from Washington County, Economic Development/Washington County, and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

The process involved taking a three step approach to data gathering along with a significant GIS effort to organize and map the inventory. The PMT worked together using standard practices to define the different data points that are common to redevelopment sites. Each data collection step further filtered the inventory to sites that most closely fit the definition of a redevelopment site.
For a detailed explanation of the inventory methodology see Attachment A, *Overview of the Site Inventory Approach and Process*.

The map in Attachment B shows the distribution of sites throughout the County that were included in the inventory deliverable. The initial inventory includes 115 potential redevelopment sites (red points) throughout Washington County and several coalition target sites (green points). This list was derived by examining all areas of the County regardless of population or geographic area. The team knew that examining all communities was of the utmost importance in order to honestly call the program a county wide coalition effort. As the program continues to grow the intention is for the inventory to be dynamic. New sites will be added when discovered and redeveloped sites will be indicated as such using a redevelopment site geographic information system (GIS) to track and display redevelopment progress and potential.

**Phase II: Prioritizing Sites for Redevelopment**

The next step after the completion of the redevelopment site inventory was to prioritize the sites in order to display a rational analytical approach to compare sites against one another. The prioritization methodology the PMT utilized consisted of three levels of criteria to score redevelopment potential, environmental factors, and community vision for each of the redevelopment sites. This methodology is a proprietary process Vandewalle & Associates has successfully utilized on other USEPA-funded brownfield site assessment projects in the past.

Understanding the long-term nature of brownfield redevelopment, the site scoring and rankings are meant to provide a *static*, broad-based and objective measure of each site’s redevelopment potential relative to all of the other sites in the inventory. Until and unless the scoring criteria change, the scores and rankings are designed to remain valid over a fairly long period of time. Typically, the inventory and scores are not revisited for at least five years, and even this would be more of an overview than a full scale reassessment.

**Methodology:** All sites were scored using a three-tiered ranking system consisting of redevelopment feasibility, ability to advance community goals, and environmental conditions. Each tier was composed of criteria based on industry standards for gauging the level of effort and likelihood that a brownfield site will be and/or should be redeveloped. For a detailed overview of the site scoring process see attachment C, *Overview of the Site Prioritization Approach and Process*.

Redevelopment feasibility and community goals were scored by three PMT members with extensive expertise in planning, redevelopment, and economic and community development (Scott Harrington, Vandewalle & Associates; Christian Tscheschlok, EDWC; and Debora Sielski, Washington County). Each PMT scorer produced his or her own scores for all 51 sites comprised of 115 parcels. All scores were recorded on spreadsheets for the two distinct categories of criteria that linked to a third spreadsheet that automatically summarized the scores and rankings for quick comparison.

Environmental conditions were scored by PMT member and environmental expert David Holmes of Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.—a firm with extensive expertise in environmental services and engineering. Due to the unique environmental considerations for each individual parcel, Mr. Holmes scored each of the 115 parcels individually. After all 115 sites were scored, composite scores were compiled for each of the 11 site clusters. This approach provided the most accurate results on the environmental conditions for the sites and site clusters since environmental conditions can vary significantly from parcel to parcel. All environmental scores were recorded on a spreadsheet.

**Results:** After all sites were scored, Vandewalle & Associates compiled the individual spreadsheets into a master workbook to aid in the analysis of the results. Summaries of the results are included as
Attachment D, *Washington County Site Redevelopment Program Composite Scoring & Rankings* listing the sites by:

- Site ranking
- Community location
- Site number

Note that several site numbers are not shown as these were either dropped from consideration earlier in the process, are previously identified coalition member priority sites, or sites that are part of a cluster.

**Analysis:** Analysis was conducted in two parts. First, basic analysis of the scoring results was conducted by Vandewalle & Associates to examine scores across sites and between scorers to check for consistency and accuracy. Second, the PMT discussed the scoring outcomes and the findings of the analysis to further verify the accuracy of results.

The PMT discussion examined the list of top sites as well as the few sites with significant scoring divergences between PMT members. For each of these sites, PMT members explained their rationale for scoring a site in a particular way allowing for comparison of individual scoring techniques. The end result, however, was that the top 5 sites of each reviewer ended up in the top 15 sites overall, and on average, only 5 of each reviewer’s top 15 sites did not make the overall list of the top 15 sites. As result, the PMT members did not see a need to make changes to their individual scores or to final rankings.

Other significant outcomes of the analysis included:

- There was remarkable consistency in the scores applied by each PMT scorer across redevelopment feasibility and community goals criteria
- PMT scorers approached deciding on a score in very similar ways
- With the exception of the top ranked site, the top 10 sites are each separated by only one or two points
- The environmental conditions scoring impacted the movement of a couple sites into or out of what otherwise would have been the top 10 sites based on redevelopment feasibility and community goals alone
- Only one of the top ten environmental sites fell outside the top 15 sites overall

In conclusion, the analysis of site scores provided the PMT with confirmation that the scoring and ranking process resulted in an accurate list for presentation to the SRC.

**Phase III: Selecting Sites for Initial Environmental Investigation**

At its December 10th meeting, the SRC was asked to choose 2 to 3 sites to focus initial environmental assessment efforts on over the next phase of the program (early 2016) with additional sites to be added over time as program staff and consultants have capacity, and as budget allows.

A memo was included in the meeting packet that discussed how to use the results of the prioritization process and apply additional considerations for making the ultimate site selections. This included a request that each SRC member be prepared to discuss the top-ranked sites in their community and the extent of their readiness to move forward with initial site investigations and reuse planning.

Additionally, the memo included a set of principles to guide the process of selecting the initial sites to pursue action on. These guiding principles were intended to give flexibility in pursuing action for sites that are most ready at present to maximize the effectiveness of assessment and reuse planning budget and effort.

These temporal considerations were:

- Potential to obtain site access
• Potential to obtain site eligibility
• Potential to obtain Property Owner/Developer interest and cooperation
• Potential level of local government interest and capacity
• Presence of groupings
• Potential complexity and cost of assessment

See Attachment E, Program Principles and Considerations for a more detailed explanation of each principle or consideration.

Outcomes: Program Recommendations and Next Steps

On December 10, 2015, the SRC selected three sites for initial advancement of full site assessment activities beginning with eligibility determination as well as two sites for Phase I assessments as funding is available. In making the selection, the Committee looked at the PMT’s rankings and then discussed each of the sites, applying the above factors to the top 15 sites. To assist, the PMT recommended that each coalition partner provide an overview of their top-ranked sites and whether they believe the site is ready for program assistance based on the above considerations. At that time, each community also was given the option to propose sites that perhaps did not score as high but are sites the community believes are ready for immediate action.

As a result, the sites that were ultimately selected did not exactly match the order of the rankings—but were close. This did not change the rankings, it just meant that other sites were determined to be riper for action at this time. Further, it should be understood that one or more of the sites that were selected may not pan out. For example, site access or site eligibility of a selected site ultimately may not be able to be obtained. In such cases, the plan would be skip that site (at least for now) and move on to the next selected site.

During the site selection deliberations, the SRC demonstrated a high level of cooperation amongst its members. All SRC members came well prepared—several even brought staff with specific expertise as it related to the sites for discussion—which contributed positively to the selection of the best possible set of sites for the first round of assessment and/or remedial/reuse planning. The approach to and understanding of the bigger picture that each SRC member displayed during this program was a model for how a coalition program and grant should work.

The initial sites selected for future action were:

• Site H in West Bend—former Gehl industrial property now mostly owned by the City with significant resources invested in assessments and clean-up; the City is in need of final site closure and reuse planning assistance as the next steps toward redevelopment.
• Site B in Slinger—situated at the gateway to the Village in an area identified as critical for redevelopment. The site includes historic auto repair and industrial at the southwest and active gas station on the northeast.
• Site K in Germantown—needs limited phase II work for final site closure on northeast portion of site before redevelopment as multi-family housing.
• Site #3 (WB Place) in Hartford and Site #138 (West Bend Economic Development Corporation Site) in West Bend—both sites were selected to receive services limited to Phase I assessments, as long as funding is available.

Finally, it’s important to remember that the sites selected through this process were those that the SRC and the corresponding local government were willing to take a proactive approach on in order to bring about redevelopment. As time goes on, there will definitely be instances where a property owner/prospective developer will seek funding assistance for projects they are leading. Depending on the proposed project, this may be a worthy expenditure regardless of the site’s ranking, and additional information will be provided at a future SRC meeting on how to evaluate such requests.
ATTACHMENT A

Overview of the Site Inventory Approach and Process

The Washington County Site Redevelopment Program, in order to be most effective in targeting limited grant resources to sites with the highest potential for redevelopment, began with a countywide site inventory process. Led by the Site Redevelopment Program Project Management Team (PMT), the following three-step data gathering and analysis effort was conducted to identify sites and areas of potential concern and redevelopment potential throughout the County. This effort led the way for the Site Redevelopment Committee to review and consider parcels for the next level of analysis in the Site Prioritization process that followed.

**Step 1:** The first step in the inventory process was to determine sites/areas of potential concern throughout Washington County. Areas of potential concern stemmed from their status as high priority redevelopment sites/areas and/or “known or potential brownfields.” Some communities identified areas (over individual parcels) of high concern where they would like to focus redevelopment efforts for maximum impact. The Step 1 query sought to answer the questions: What sites do we know or suspect to be of environmental concern and what sites have already been identified as potential redevelopment sites in Washington County?

Step 1 data gathered to compile a Master Sites List included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 Data Gathered for Development of Master Sites List</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRC site nomination process: information gathered during first discussions with communities and in grant preparation</td>
<td>Information from community interviews in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xceligent database for sites currently listed/available for sale or lease. Parcels developed before 1978 (included all industrial and commercial)</td>
<td>Xceligent Database subscription EDWC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax delinquency by parcel</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipally- or county-owned properties</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with history as a landfill</td>
<td>DNR Landfills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF parcel data for communities with TIF districts</td>
<td>Community TIF District Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI DNR - BRRTS Records: DNR Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS) database of open and closed site files for environmental contamination</td>
<td>WI DNR: over 1300 parcels ID’d, Stantec screened to under 100 based on relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal sites</td>
<td>DNR Registry of Waste Disposal Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI DATCP database of open and closed petroleum storage tanks</td>
<td>WI DATCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2:** Next, data typical of redevelopment sites was gathered for parcels throughout Washington County. Each member of the PMT was tasked with gathering data related to their specific area of expertise. The purpose of this round of data gathering was to determine if the sites identified in Step 1 as having environmental concerns and/or redevelopment potential should be considered for grant investment. Beyond general parcel data, other important indicators of potential for redevelopment—in particular environmental data—were assembled and reviewed for these sites including:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step 2 Data</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value improvements-Assessed</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value land-Assessed</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value total-Assessed</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel tax delinquent greater than 2 years</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant site based on assessed improvements value = zero</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized zoning</td>
<td>County Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing land use</td>
<td>County Overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan: Planned future land use</td>
<td>County Overlay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, the project team then eliminated those sites/areas that were not relevant to the program such as residential sites, improved publicly-owned sites, and those that were not known to have one or more Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC).

**Step 3:** Through Steps 1 and 2, more than 200 parcels were identified. Using the Tax ID as a common attribute for each, the project team filtered the sites to only those with one or more REC in addition to attributes that would align them with potential redevelopment opportunities. This process took the total down to 115 parcels. Within this list of parcels there were 51 redevelopment areas for review in the Site Prioritization Process (as relevant parcels were clustered into grouped redevelopment areas). In addition, there are three redevelopment areas from the Coalition Community Target Sites – Hartford, Slinger, and West Bend – that were already selected for environmental investigation and redevelopment advancement, and therefore did not go through the Site Prioritization scoring process.

In Step 3 of the Inventory development process, the following additional criteria was applied to the remaining 115 parcels as additional data to aid in the Site Prioritization scoring process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step 3 Data</strong></th>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Community Redevelopment Plans</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site available/listed for sale or lease</td>
<td>Xceligent via EDWC &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If site available/listed, is there a building or is site vacant</td>
<td>Xceligent via EDWC &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of Interstate 41 interchange</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of Hwy 45 interchange</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within half mile of Hwy 60</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within half mile of Hwy 33</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abutting railroad</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If abutting railroad, railroad ID (WSOR or FVW)</td>
<td>County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site/building code violations for parcel</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the above, individual sites were reviewed against historic Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps as available and necessary to further define historic use on sites under consideration for redevelopment.

Some of these sites were individual properties while others were “clusters” of parcels. In all, 11 clusters were formed with two or more adjacent parcels where their location in the community maximized their potential redevelopment benefits.
Map: Distribution of Redevelopment Sites
ATTACHMENT C

Overview of the Site Prioritization Approach and Process

Following the Washington County Site Inventory process of the Site Redevelopment Program (SRP), the next step was to score each site/area based on the following three levels of analysis: Redevelopment Feasibility, Environmental Conditions, and Community Goals. Within each of these levels several criteria had been developed by considering factors identified as important by the USEPA, developers, and site redevelopment industry professionals. With input from the Site Redevelopment Committee (SRC) on the final criteria and process, Project Management Team (PMT) members, having expertise in each level of analysis, scored all sites during the ranking process. The following is a brief summary of each of the criteria areas and scoring for the Site Prioritization process.

Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria

**Purpose:** The Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria took into consideration a site’s potential to implement existing plans and remove blight, the probable costs, and levels of market interest. Considerations such as level of market interest and potential magnitude for redevelopment were key.

**Scoring:** There were seven Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria to be scored by the PMT following SRC sign off on the criteria. A 5-point scale was used to differentiate the potential circumstances for each criteria yielding 35 possible points for each site.

Environmental Conditions Criteria

**Purpose:** The Environmental Conditions Criteria were based on the potential level of contamination, potential for human contact with contaminants, the ability of contaminants to migrate off-site, and ability to obtain state funding assistance for assessment and clean up. These are intended to address the potential magnitude of environmental conditions and their impacts on human health and the environment.

**Scoring:** There were six Environmental Conditions Criteria to be scored by Stantec, the project team’s environmental expert. A 3-point scale was used for this criteria to meaningfully differentiate potential site conditions. Scores for each site were then doubled yielding 36 possible points for each site. This was roughly equal to the maximum number of possible points in the other two evaluation categories thereby giving equal weight to each of categories.

Community Goals Criteria

**Purpose:** Draft community priorities for the SRP were prepared by the PMT, SRC, UW-Extension, and in consideration of USEPA livability principles. The draft criteria were discussed and prioritized at the SRP Countywide Outreach Event on October 15, 2015, by the Washington County residents in attendance. The purpose of the Community Goals Criteria is to look at the site prioritization process through the lens of community priorities for redevelopment and reuse of sites that were involved in the SRP.

**Scoring:** The SRC narrowed the final community goals criteria to six. The PMT will use these criteria to score each site on a 3-point scale. Scores for each site will then be doubled yielding 36 possible points for each site.
Scoring and Site Prioritization Process

- After scoring has been conducted for each level of criteria, a total score was then summed for each level of analysis and a combined score for all three levels was produced to arrive at a final score and ranking for all sites. These rankings were packaged in an easy to read table.
- This table segregates sites into three priority tiers: high, medium, and low to better help the SRC determine how the individual sites rank against one another.
- Rankings serve as a guide for expenditures in the grant program, but will be supplemented by an agreed upon process to allow flexibility—and thus efficiency—in how funds are spent.
- This process will allow the SRC as a group to determine if real world conditions such as site access and equitable distribution of funds should determine if a site receives funding sooner than the ranking would allow.
- The SRC may decide that grant funds will be available for other sites/developers that may come forward with specific redevelopment proposals, but the ranking process will determine which sites the SRP will proactively pursue.
## ATTACHMENT D

**Washington County Site Redevelopment Program**

**Composite Scoring & Rankings**

**Listing by Site Ranking**

**December 2, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID #</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Redevelopment Score Max 35 Min 7</th>
<th>Community Score Max 36 Min 12</th>
<th>Site Score Max 36 Min 12</th>
<th>Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Total Composite Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kewaskum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
Final inventory consisted of 40 parcels (sites) and 11 clusters consisting of two or more adjoining sites. Missing site numbers were either dropped from consideration, coalition priority sites, or part of a cluster. Clusters were scored as a single "site."
Composite scores are an average of the scores by Project Management Team members. Adjusted environmental scores provided by Stantec.
### Washington County Site Redevelopment Program
### Composite Scoring & Rankings
### Listing by Site Location
### December 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID #</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Redevelopment Composite Max 35 Min 7</th>
<th>Composite Max 36 Min 12</th>
<th>Environment Adjusted Score Max 107 Min 31</th>
<th>Total Composite Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 K</td>
<td>Additon</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>24 28 27 80 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>18 22 24 64 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12 19 14 45 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>14 19 12 45 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12 19 14 45 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12 19 12 43 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>12 19 12 42 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>19 23 32 73 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>14 19 22 55 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>15 21 16 52 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>11 17 12 40 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>28 21 30 79 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kewaskum</td>
<td>20 24 17 61 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>10 18 18 46 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>21 29 16 66 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22 34 22 78 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22 36 18 76 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>31 35 26 92 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>23 29 30 82 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>24 26 32 82 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>21 25 30 76 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
Final inventory consisted of 40 parcels (sites) and 11 clusters consisting of two or more adjoining sites. Missing site numbers were either dropped from consideration, coalition priority sites, or part of a cluster. Clusters were scored as a single "site."
Composite scores are an average of the scores by Project Management Team members. Adjusted environmental scores provided by Stantec.
# Listing by Site Number

**December 2, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID #</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Max 35</th>
<th>Min 7</th>
<th>Max 36</th>
<th>Min 12</th>
<th>Max 36</th>
<th>Min 12</th>
<th>Max 107</th>
<th>Min 31</th>
<th>Top 1 Bot 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Slinger</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kewaskum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**

Final inventory consisted of 40 parcels (sites) and 11 clusters consisting of two or more adjoining sites. Missing site numbers were either dropped from consideration, coalition priority sites, or part of a cluster. Clusters were scored as a single "site."

Composite scores are an average of the scores by Project Management Team members. Adjusted environmental scores provided by Stantec.
ATTACHMENT E

Program Principles and Considerations

The purpose of the inventory and scoring process was to help select sites for further action as part of the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program where the Committee took a proactive role in the assessment and redevelopment planning. Specifically where the USEPA grant is concerned, the next step was to conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (Phase 1 ESA’s) on the selected sites, the results of which provided a baseline for additional environmental assessments (i.e., Phase II ESA’s) and remedial and reuse planning. Each coalition partner had already identified a priority site for initial assessment and planning, but there was capacity within the program to take on 2-3 additional sites over the next couple of months. As staff has capacity, we will seek the Committee’s guidance on selecting additional sites with the goal to spend all of the current grant funds by the end of the grant cycle in the fall of 2017. However, we also anticipate pursuing additional federal and state grants funds so site rankings will be used as a guide beyond the scope of the current grant and as a basis for obtaining and using future assessment grants.

Understanding the long-term nature of Brownfield redevelopment, the site scoring and rankings are meant to provide a static, broad-based and objective measure of each site’s redevelopment potential relative to all of the other sites in the inventory. Until and unless the scoring criteria change, the scores and rankings are designed to remain valid over a fairly long period of time. Typically, the inventory and scores are not revisited for at least five years, and even this will be more of an overview than a full scale reassessment.

Time-based considerations, however, also play a critical role in selecting sites for further proactive assessment and planning. These include factors such as property ownership, local government capacity, and developer interest, among others. Accordingly, the final step in the site selection program is to apply these temporal considerations to the higher ranking sites.

As shown in the final scoring and rankings, the top 15 sites – which comprise approximately 30% of all sites – generally are separated by only a few points out of a possible total points of 107. Accordingly, the top-ranked sites should be viewed more so as a group rather than on their specific score or rank. To narrow the final list to begin site assessments, the following additional factors will need to be considered.

1. **Potential to Obtain Site Access**
   Site assessments cannot be conducted without the written consent of the property owner. Owners who are satisfied with their current operations are often dis-interested. Even owners who may have some interest in redevelopment become fearful of what an assessment may uncover and the liability that may come with it. As a result, it can sometimes take an extensive and long term education process to obtain property owner consent.

2. **Potential to Obtain Site Eligibility**
   The EPA must approve each site before grant funds can be spent. The eligibility for use of hazardous and petroleum assessments are different. In general, though, if the current owner has had the property for a long time and is likely to have caused or contributed to potential
contamination, then the site may be deemed to be ineligible – at least for the use of USEPA funds. In such cases, state funds may be an option.

3. Potential to Obtain Property Owner/Developer Interest and Cooperation
   Even if a property owner grants consent for a Phase 1 assessment, they need to have a significant interest in redevelopment and/or be willing to sell the property to someone else who does. This includes having a realistic expectation of the property’s likely sales price. Even better is having a potential developer already identified and at the table ready to move forward.

4. Potential Level of Local Government Interest and Capacity
   Redevelopment of any type, and Brownfields in particular, almost always requires a public-private approach in order to make projects feasible. Accordingly, a big determinant in project success will be the local government’s and the SRC’s capacity to engage with property owners and prospective developers and utilize a wide range of economic development tools to bring projects to fruition. This usually entails a significant time commitment by local government staff and officials and a need for sustained political and community support over what could be a several-year effort to fully redevelop a site.

5. Presence of Groupings
   While the redevelopment scoring criteria look at the potential of each site to be catalytic in promoting redevelopment of neighboring sites, they still don’t fully account for the redevelopment potential that a group of sites in relative close proximity could have. Where inventory sites are immediately adjacent to one another, we have already created and evaluated them as a “cluster.” However, there are instances where sites are somewhat near one another where their general proximity also should be considered.

6. Potential Complexity and Cost of Assessment
   Sites that are, or are suspected to be, highly contaminated are likely to be fairly expensive to assess and clean-up. Where the risks to human health and the environment are high, these are probably worthwhile investments. However, where such risks are low, then the program may be able to achieve a greater return on its investment (i.e., use of grant funds) by selecting sites with lower potential costs.

Putting it All Together
At the December 10th SRC Meeting, the Committee selected 2-3 sites for initial proactive site assessment activities. In making the selection, the Committee first looked at the rankings and then applied the above factors to the top 10 or so sites. To assist with this, we recommended that each coalition partner provide an overview of their top-ranked sites as whether they believed the site was ready for program assistance based on the above considerations. At that time, each community had the opportunity to propose sites that perhaps did not score as high but were sites that the community believes were ready for immediate action. As a result, the sites that were ultimately selected did not necessarily match the order of the rankings. In such cases, this did not change the rankings, it just meant that other sites were determined to be more ripe for action at that time. Further, it was understood that one or more of the sites that were selected may not pan out. For example, we ultimately may not be able to obtain site
access or site eligibility of a selected site. In such cases, the plan would be to skip that site (at least for now) and move on to the next selected site.

Finally, it’s important to remember that the sites selected through this process are those that the SRC and the corresponding local government are willing to take a proactive approach in order to bring about redevelopment. There will definitely be instances where a property owner / prospective developer will seek funding assistance for projects they are leading. Depending on the proposed project, this may be a worthy expenditure regardless of the site’s ranking, and we will provide additional information at a future SRC meeting on how to evaluate such requests.
Scope of Services
Village of Richfield
Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy

Our approach to preparing the Northeast Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy will take advantage of our existing knowledge of Richfield and the region; make efficient and effective use of the Village’s time and resources; and focus on strengthening partnerships, building consensus, and creating momentum around the Village’s land use and economic goals, and community character as identified in the recently-adopted comprehensive plan.

The study area for this project generally includes the northeast corner of the Village with a focus on the following sub-areas as shown on the attached map:

1. The historic village center/downtown roughly along State Hwy 175 from the fire station on the north to Depot St. on the south;
2. The industrial area roughly bordering both sides of the railroad tracks from Pleasant Hill Rd. on the north to the downtown on the south;
3. The highway commercial frontage roughly along both sides of Holy Hill Rd. from I-41 on the east to Mayfield Rd. on the west; and
4. The future residential and business mixed use area on the existing agricultural/undeveloped lands between State Hwy 175 and I-41.

Vandewalle & Associates’ (V&A) approach will be guided by Village staff and the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program (SRP) Project Management Team (PMT) who, together, will provide us with insights and guidance, review and comment on draft work products, and help identify organizations and individuals to be interviewed. Specifically, our approach will consist of the key elements described in more detail in the scope of work that follows. Work would begin immediately upon authorization and take about 3-4 months. All work would be performed on a time and materials basis with a cost not to exceed $40,000 (for planning and necessary environmental due diligence as required). Of course, once we have a more complete picture of the Village’s needs, we will be happy to revisit the scope and fees to ensure whatever work we perform will be of the greatest value to the Village.

Phase 1: Existing Conditions and Asset Analysis

Our work will begin with an analysis of existing conditions, relevant studies, reports, and trends that relate to the Village’s economic assets, future opportunities, community character, and Site Redevelopment Program site inventory. This will include qualitative research based on interviews, site visits, and previous studies and reports, as well as quantitative analysis based on key demographic and economic trends.

Task 1.1: Review and Assess Existing Development Plans and Programs
V&A will work with the Village to collect and evaluate all past plans and documents that relate to the project. This will likely include a careful review of the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, Buildout Analysis, zoning code, utility studies, county and regional economic development reports, etc. Additionally, we will review existing economic development activities and programs in the Village and Washington County to understand what programs and services are currently offered.

Task 1.2: Base Map Preparation
Using information from the County GIS and data collected from the Washington County Brownfields inventory, V&A will prepare base maps of the study area including roads, public lands, parcels, utilities, existing land uses, environmental constraints, etc.
Task 1.3: Site Visit #1

A. Staff and Engineering Consultant Meeting
V&A will lead a work session with the Village administrator, public works, utilities, and engineering staff/consultants in order to understand how the Village’s future growth may be shaped by opportunities and constraints in the current utility system, transportation infrastructure, environmental context, community desires, and other factors.

B. Community Tour
V&A will tour the Village and study area with Village staff in order to better understand the area’s economic, land use, and character context.

C. Stakeholder Interviews
Vandewalle & Associates will conduct 4-6 interviews with key public and private sector stakeholders. This will likely include elected officials, major employers, real estate professionals, business and property owners, the Chamber of Commerce, County economic development officials, and others as directed by the Village.

D. Village and SRP PMT Meeting #1
We will work with Village leadership and the SRP PMT throughout the project beginning with a kick-off meeting to introduce the preliminary work completed as part of Phase 1 and to discuss larger development opportunities and constraints.

Task 1.4: Asset Inventory and Key Sites Identification
All of the research and input gained in the previous steps will be summarized into a series of two to four “asset and opportunities maps” of the study area including an identification of key sites with growth potential for downtown and highway commercial, industrial uses, and residential development, consistent with the community’s defined goals. More than maps, these will be highly-illustrative and compelling communication tools showing the economic geography of the area and its economic role in the greater region. Sites that may require further review based on past use (potential for contamination based on historical use) will be considered for site eligibility determination and potential Phase I environmental site assessment.

Task 1.5: Demographic and Market Data Analysis Summary
Vandewalle & Associates will collect and analyze key pieces of data that will help us in understanding existing economic strengths, growth areas, and trends in the community. This will likely include demographic benchmarks collected from the U.S. Census, employment data by industry from the U.S. Bureau of Labor and Wisconsin’s Workforce Development, traffic counts, and our proprietary resources. Further, we also will use ESRI BIS to conduct a retail gap analysis for the greater Richfield trade area. Rather than an exhaustive data analysis focused on past and current conditions, this work will be a highly-targeted effort to identify the data points that are most relevant to Richfield’s economic future.

Phase 1 Result
The Village, its partners, and the consultant team will have a clear understanding of the unique assets and potential for the study area, which will be the foundation for the recommendations and strategies of the strategy and action plan.
Phase 2: Potential Redevelopment and Infill Opportunities

The outcomes of Phase 1 will be used to identify the study area’s economic opportunities, including catalytic project opportunities and target clusters and businesses consistent with the community’s goals. The opportunity analysis will be presented using engaging graphics that help explain ideas and opportunities. The opportunity analysis along with the outcomes of Phase 1 will be reviewed and discussed with the public to ensure their consistency with the community’s larger vision and goals for its future.

Task 2.1: Potential Catalytic Projects and Programs
V&A will identify potential catalytic projects and programs that can help enhance economic vitality throughout the study area and areas of focus in the short-term. This will include strategies for integrating the existing tools and programs the Village offers into a coherent strategy, as well as the identification of additional specific site opportunities.

Task 2.2: Potential Business Targets and Growth Opportunities
Building off of Phase 1, V&A will provide insight into the potential types of industries and businesses Richfield could focus on in its economic development efforts and include ideas for how to cultivate these businesses locally in addition to attracting development from outside.

Task 2.3: Site Visit #2

A. Key Sites Tour and Property Owner Meetings
V&A will tour key sites identified in Tasks 2.1 and 2.2 and meet with property owners to understand their future plans for their properties and gauge their interest in sales and/or development.

B. Village and SRP PMT Meeting #2
This team meeting will be an opportunity for the Village leadership and PMT to review and comment on work completed in Phases 1 and 2 and strategize the next steps in the process.

Task 2.4: Community Charrette
V&A will organize and facilitate a community charrette consisting of a brief overview of general study area findings and opportunities and a quick question and answer period. Following that, attendees will split up and rotate through four stations – one for each sub-area – spending approximately 20 minutes at each to provide feedback on the appropriateness of the identified opportunities. All information gathered will be incorporated into the materials prepared in Phase 3.

Phase 2 Result
The Village will see specific opportunities and strategies emerge and gain insight into the types of businesses and economic activities to focus on to achieve long term economic strength consistent with the community’s vision and goals. The Village will have an overall “vision” for the economic future of the community that is backed by specific projects and earlier analysis.
Phase 3: Strategy and Implementation Action Plan

Implementation is the core of V&A’s planning and economic development expertise and philosophy. Without a realistic implementation strategy, even the most well researched and inspiring economic plans will have little value.

Task 3.1: Brownfield Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy
Based on input from the Village leadership, SRP PMT and public in Phase 2, V&A will finalize the catalytic projects and programs and business targets into a comprehensive Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy that provides a further description of the various opportunities.

Task 3.2: Implementation Action Plan
The core of the Infill Growth Strategy will be one or two implementation matrices and graphics that clearly and concisely list and prioritize the primary redevelopment and infill opportunities to provide Richfield with clear direction for how to translate the ideas developed in the Opportunity Analysis into direct action to achieve the community’s vision. Further, this matrix will identify key partners and roles for each recommendation.

Task 3.3: Funding Sources
Vandewalle & Associates will prepare a comprehensive table that links implementation actions with potential funding sources, leverages an array of public and private resources to make projects affordable, and summarizes potential grant opportunities web links where more information can be found.

Task 3.4: Village and SRP PMT Meeting #3
This will be the final team meeting to review all of the final work products and recommendations prior to forwarding them to the Village Board.

Task 3.5: Site Visit #3

A. Implementation Partners Meeting
V&A will organize and facilitate a meeting with Village officials and various partner organizations identified in the action plan who can provide the resources and expertise needed to fully implement the Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy.

B. Public Open House
V&A will present the Redevelopment and Infill Growth Strategy and Implementation Action Plan in an informal open house format to be held immediately prior to Village Board action on the final plans.

C. Village Board Meeting
V&A will present and discuss the final work products with the Village Board.

Phase 3 Result
The Village will have a clear direction and the tools needed to translate the opportunities into real projects.
Optional Implementation Assistance

Vandewalle & Associates frequently provides a wide array of ongoing services to our clients for whom we’ve prepared economic development strategies. Below is a “menu” of these services. The specific nature of work to be performed will be determined by the projects identified in the final strategy and action plan and the needs and capabilities of the Village and its economic development partners. Typically, this work is performed on a time and materials basis with a set level of monthly effort/expense, with all work performed only as requested and agreed to by the Village.

- Provide overall implementation project management including the preparation and monitoring of project action steps, timelines, and budgets.
- Coordinate and prepare marketing and promotional materials in a variety of hardcopy and electronic formats to address specific targets identified in the plan.
- Coordinate with Village staff and other consultants including but not limited to TIF/financial analysts, civil engineers, environmental engineers, and attorneys as necessary to advance economic development initiatives.
- Coordinate public/private financing with the Village’s Municipal Advisor including the identification and prioritization of funding sources, the preparation of grants, and the tracking and distribution of funds.
- Work with local, state, and federal agencies to identify economic development grant opportunities and prepare grant applications.
- Execute strategies to expand existing businesses and recruit new ones to the community as highlighted in the plan.
- Execute strategies to attract development to the catalytic sites identified in the plan.
- Prepare concept and schematic plans and economic impact expectations for proposed public and private redevelopment projects.
- Advise and assist in negotiating development agreements and prepare development agreement “term sheets.”
- Coordinate planned public improvements with efforts to attract new businesses/development and execute funding and implementation strategies accordingly.
- Amend, as necessary, the Comprehensive Plan, Urban Service Area Boundary and development codes.
- Review and comment on specific development proposals.
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Executive Summary
Executive Summary

The focus of the research outlined in this report is to provide insight on what information about each site needs to be communicated in order to best reach the redeveloper market.

Factors Influencing Developers' Project Decisions

Factors that pique developers' interest in a project include ownership, use, land characteristics, community characteristics, community capacity, infrastructure amenities, and redevelopment incentives. Other factors that respondents cited as important were cost, including hidden costs; yields; incentives, including TIDs and TIFs; and location. In deciding which development opportunities to pursue, respondents cited established relationships and/or past experience with the municipality; community reputation; the availability of current market studies demonstrating demand/market conditions for the specified development; the availability of documented evidence of neighborhood/community support for the proposed project; and the availability of TIF or other funding. Respondents also indicated that risk assessment is important.

Most respondents stated that their project review process is informal, and half reported having a defined project pipeline.

Respondents agreed that the attitude of the municipality and community support are critical during each phase of a redevelopment project.

Problems with Projects

Respondents indicated that there are many factors that can derail a project, including unanticipated environmental liabilities; opposition by neighbors; no incentives; changes in market conditions; and failure to obtain financing.
Executive Summary

**Area-Wide Redevelopment Planning**

Respondents indicated that this would be of limited use due to the long time frame and the failure of planners to look beyond the individual parcel. When creating an area-wide plan, respondents indicated that timeline, a community view, vision, and visibility of parcels are important. An area-wide plan could be useful if it provides certainty for future uses or helps with the grant-writing process.

**Issues Specific to Brownfield Site Development**

When assessing whether to take on a typical brownfield redevelopment project, respondents cite the following criteria as important: potential liability; the willingness of the municipality to assist if problems arise; property ownership factors; and community buy-in. Some of the biggest challenges in redeveloping brownfield sites include total cost; availability of financing; and change in leadership. Suggestions and recommendations for increasing the likelihood that successful brownfield redevelopment will take place include creating a “tool kit” that includes TIF, bonds, risk sharing, etc.; consulting brownfield redevelopment experts; and holding a round table with brownfield developers and then setting up follow-up meetings.

**Issues Specific to the Washington County Project**

After hearing a description of the Washington County project, respondents had questions on property ownership; who the negotiator would be; what the process would be for getting an offer approved; and what the process for getting entitlements would be.

Respondents noted that the $600K grant provides a myriad of opportunities, including incentives for otherwise unmarketable land.

One respondent is concerned that the sites may not be viable if they don’t fit market needs. Another respondent noted that the initial grant money will probably not be enough and suggested trying to expand the program each year.
Executive Summary

**Reaching Developers**

Top sources of leads cited by respondents include referrals from other developers; referrals from site owners; and informal leads from professional or other contacts. Other methods respondents use for gathering leads are networking; brokers; municipalities; word of mouth; and tenants.

When asked about the best way to reach them and their peers with information about redevelopment opportunities, respondents agreed that direct mail/email was a good way to get the word out, but were split on the effectiveness of real estate databases, conferences, and redevelopment associations. Other suggestions included using brokers and creating an in-house list of brownfield developers and reaching out to them regularly.

When asked what other input or marketing advice they would have for Washington County, respondents suggested making sure to communicate the County’s willingness to support and partner with developers on these projects; working closely with local communities; and contacting the city of Beaver Dam to get their insights on their experience with brownfield developments.
County considers ways to spend brownfield development grant

$600K from EPA to clean and revitalize contaminated sites

By ALEX ZANK

About 20 Washington County residents and leaders gathered Thursday evening at the Moraine Park Technical College auditorium to give input on how a $600,000 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency brownfield redevelopment grant should be used in the community.

A coalition of municipal and government officials, formed to determine where the EPA brownfields grant should go, met earlier in the fall to determine where the money should be invested.

The Site Redevelopment Committee then set this public hearing to gather input from residents on what they would like to see come out of projects associated with the grant.

“Cleaning up and reinvesting in these properties protects the environment, it reduces blights in the area and it takes development pressure off of green spaces,” said Deb Sielski, deputy administrator for the Washington County Planning and Parks Department and head of the SRC.

After an overview of the site redevelopment program’s objectives, attendees broke out into three groups to discuss what they wanted to prioritize as end products of the site developments.

After creating a top list for each site, event organizers put a list to the front of the auditorium. People then had five blue stickers to “vote” on their highest priorities from that list.

The top of the list included developing areas for recreational use, increased tourism, providing opportunities for youth and senior activities, creating jobs and quickly turning around blighted areas for development.

A few attendees during the breakout session drove home their desire to see more people utilizing Washington County as a destination for outdoor recreation.
Others, especially appointed municipal/county officials, saw opportunity in growing the tax base and bringing in new jobs.

The municipalities involved in the SRC identified priority sites that would receive a $40,000 of the grant. This accounts for $200,000 of the grant total.

The other $400,000 will go toward redevelopment sites countywide. This includes taking inventory of brownfields sites, assessing and redeveloping them and engaging in community outreach.

A brownfield is an abandoned property with real or perceived contamination that prevents its reuse.

The SRC applied for the grant in January 2014, Sielski said. This marked the first time an entity in Wisconsin received the grant.

And committee members do not plan on this being the only grant they will receive to deal with brownfields.

Jolena Presti, principal planner with Vandewalle & Associates Inc. and who is working with the SRC, said she hopes this sparks more grants after the program gets rolling.

“So really you’re at the ground floor of this program with this grant,” she said to attendees Thursday evening.

Executive Director of Economic Development Washington County Christian Tscheschlok said a key point to emphasize is these sites are for redevelopment, meaning new investment and economic growth in the county.

The next SRC meeting is slated for 7:30 a.m. Nov 12, where members will dive into the inventory process.

*Reach reporter Alex Zank at* azank@conleynet.com.
3 more sites chosen for environmental exam

By JOE VANDELAARSCHOT

Daily News

A Washington County panel has agreed to fund environmental assessments of three suspected contaminated sites in the county. The work will be another phase in the possible cleanup and redevelopment of properties in West Bend, Slinger, Germantown and elsewhere in the county.

The Site Development Steering Committee, during its meeting Thursday at the county’s Public Agency Center, approved spending federal grant money to assess the projects. The SRC is made up of representatives from the county: West Bend, Hartford, Slinger, Richfield and Jackson.

“The county received a $600,000 grant last year,” said Debora Sielski, Washington County Deputy Planning and Parks administrator. “Of that, $200,000 was to be evenly divided between the five cities and villages. They’ll each receive $40,000 to conduct the required environmental assessment.”

The Project Management Team spent several weeks using criteria to rank other sites and come up with a prioritized list that was presented Thursday. The projects selected by the SRC after discussion include:

- Site H in West Bend is in the area of Forest Avenue and Water Street. The property, near downtown, was home for the Gehl Co.

- Site B in Slinger is adjacent to the intersection of highways 60 and 175.

- Site K in Germantown includes three parcels totaling about 24 acres on Main Street. Each has different owners.
The committee hired Vandewaller and Associates to conduct an assessment of 115 brownfield parcels in the county for possible access to steering committee funds. Site H in West Bend was ranked the top property with 92 points — 10 points more than the second-ranked property, also in West Bend.

“The former Gehl property is vacant,” said West Bend Administrator T.J. Justice. “We would move on the third phase — coming up with a development plan. The city has already spent a significant amount of money on the other phases.” The city owns the property which has been vacant for several years. The main structure was demolished in 2011, but a small storage building remains east of Forest Avenue.

Slinger Village Administrator Jessi Balcom said the Site B project is important because it is a main corridor into the village.

“It’s a good place for possible development,” Balcom said. “At one time a portion of the property had been purchased as a possible Walgreen’s, but the plans fell through.”

Slinger Village Engineer Jim Haggerty said the site should be easier to develop, making it a high priority. Germantown Community Development Director Jeff Retzlaff called the Site K project in his village “lowhanging fruit.”

“It will be easy to pick,” Retzlaff said. “Contamination in the third parcel, farther from Main Street, probably came from the other two parcels.”

The SRC gave the go ahead earlier this year to five other higher priority brownfield projects at an earlier meeting. They were to share the initial 1/3 of the grant money. They include:

■ West Bend officials moving ahead on a possible cleanup of the former Bermico property. An environmental assessment draft was completed as part of phase-1.

■ In Hartford, the project is called the “Northern Bookends.” It includes about nine parcels north of highways 60 and 83 and of downtown.

■ In Slinger, the project calls for the cleanup of the former Niphos site, which has already been the location of an emergency cleanup of dangerous chemicals by the Environmental Protection Agency.

■ Richfield officials chose to focus on redevelopment of a specific area in the northwest corner of property adjacent to highways 41 and 167.

■ Jackson officials are taking an approach similar to Richfield. They’re targeting a few sites for redevelopment.

Reach reporter Joe VanDeLaarschot at jvan@conleynt.com.