

## **DRAFT for Public Meeting**

### **IV.E Narrative**

#### **1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION AND PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION**

##### **a. Target Area and Brownfields**

###### *i. Background and Description of Target Area*

The proposed remediation site is located in Crescent Mills California, a census-designated place within Plumas County. Plumas County lies at the intersection of the northern Sierra Nevada and southern Cascade mountain ranges and is revered for its clean air and water, beautiful natural surroundings and geologic wonders. The county has rich history of diverse land users including; various Native American Tribes such as the Mountain Maidu peoples, multi-generational families whom make a living off of the landscape by means of logging or ranching, as well as the other numerous residents who moved from urban areas to enjoy more peaceful, mountain settings to raise their families. With over a million acres of forestland, roughly 80% of which is federally-owned, this area forms the headwaters of the Feather River Watershed, a critical water source for the State Water Project which serves approximately 27 million Californians and 750,000 acres of farmland.

Rural communities of Plumas County have been heavily impacted by the compounding effects of the declining timber, mining, and building industries, as well as the Great Recession of 2008 which further hampered the socioeconomic development of the area. These factors have been exacerbated by stressors such as climate change, drought, and catastrophic wildfire. A century of reduced woody biomass utilization, coupled with intense fire suppression has created a landscape with dense, insect and disease prone forests that are highly susceptible to catastrophic wildfire and are noticeably resulting in decreasing forest, watershed, and socioeconomic health. The California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) estimated that 129 million trees died between 2012 and 2017 in California as a result of prolonged drought, higher temperatures and altered forest conditions. To address these dire conditions, California has made efforts through the Emergency Proclamations of 2015 and 2019, Senate Bill 901, and other regulatory processes; however, rural communities such as those in Plumas County lack the capacity to advocate for and utilize these tools at the pace and scale necessary to address environmental and socioeconomic stressors in a timely manner.

The targeted area for this project is the small, predominantly ranching, community of Indian Valley, home to approximately 2,500 people. The populated area includes the census designated places of Greenville, Crescent Mills, and Taylorsville. Historically, the primary economic drivers of Indian Valley and the rest of Plumas County have been mining and logging; however, the sharp reduction of resource extraction activities since the mid-1980's lead to the closure of many processing facilities and diminished need for auxiliary support (such as work in the woods or hauling) - many of the operations that persist today struggle to maintain status quo. Consequently, Indian Valley residents must navigate the struggling local economy with limited job opportunities and scarce chances to pursue new industry development.

In addition to the challenges brought forth by lack of social and financial capital, efforts, local revitalization and redevelopment efforts are further compromised by a lack of new or existing sites suitable for development. A majority of the land within Plumas County is publicly owned and privately-owned parcels are either situated on rough terrain or are located far from primary transportation routes, making development logistically and economically infeasible. For these reasons, rural and remote areas, such as the communities of Indian Valley, rarely garner support from investors and have been continuously challenged to improve socioeconomic development since the mid-1980's. However, Plumas County's extensive wood industry history also provides opportunities for community and industry revitalization in the form of abandoned industrial sites formerly home to sawmill and other wood product manufacturing operations, which have remained vacant since they closed over 25 years ago. Although seemingly ripe for use, these abandoned mill sites often require remedial actions prior to redevelopment- a time and monetary intensive process which many rural communities lack the capacity to pursue.

The proposed location for this Brownfield Cleanup site is a 27-acre property formerly owned by Louisiana Pacific (LP) and operated as a sawmill until it closed in the mid-1980s. The site lies immediately off of Highway 89 in the small census designated place of Crescent Mills, within the greater Indian Valley community. Specifically, the site is located at 15690 Highway 89, Crescent Mills, California, 95934. The geographic coordinates for the approximate center of the Site are 40° 05' 39" North Latitude and 120° 54' 37" West Longitude. The Site includes 26.27 acres of land within Assessor's parcel numbers 111-050-065, 111-050-066, and 111-050-067.

The site is registered in the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) EnviroStor database as "Louisiana Pacific Corp-Crescent Mills," but is referred to as the "Crescent Mills site" in this application. The Site is located at 15690 Highway 89, Crescent Mills, California, 95934. The geographic coordinates for the approximate center of the Site are 40° 05' 39" North Latitude and 120° 54' 37" West Longitude. The Site includes 26.27 acres of land within Assessor's parcel numbers 111-050-065, 111-050-066, and 111-050-067.

*ii. Description of the Brownfield Site(s)*

Describe the property(ies) targeted for cleanup, characterizing known contamination and site conditions (including structures), and relevant past and current land uses.

The Crescent Mills site is an industrial zoned lot which was formerly owned and operated as a sawmill by Louisiana Pacific until it was closed in the mid-1980's. Although no structures remain from the sawmill operations, the site contains a significant amount of surface and subsurface structural remnants including asphalt, concrete footers, and railing. The site is located within Crescent Mills, a small community of Indian Valley situated along Highway 89 approximately four miles south of Greenville. The Crescent Mills site runs parallel between Indian Creek, a tributary of the North Fork of the Feather River, and Highway 89 through the Crescent Mills. A BNSF rail line and spur track runs between the Crescent Mills site and Highway 89. The populated area of Crescent Mills is located primarily west of the site, with some houses abutting the railroad line that separates them from the site. The eastern edge is bordered by a wetland mitigation site owned by CalTrans, the state transportation department, whom are currently working to restore

wetland habitat along Indian Creek. The site is bordered to the south by the Mount Huff Golf Course and to the north by a storage facility, both of which are on separate parcels.

The focus of this grant application is two areas within the eastern half of the property: area one is an approximately two-acre unit beginning at the PG&E substation and continuing north, area two is an approximately one-acre unit on the northern most border of the property.

Site assessments completed to date include the following:

- Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection Report (California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC], 1990)
- Property Transfer Site Assessment (CH2M Hill, Inc. [CH2M Hill], 1991)
- Supplemental Site Investigation Report (Geocon Consultants, Inc. [Geocon], 2002)
- Phase I ESA (E&E, 2014)
- Targeted Brownfield Assessment (Ecology & Environment Inc. [E&E], 2014)
- Targeted Site Investigation (Geosyntec Consultants, 2017)
- Site Characterization, Removal Action Workplan and Appendices (Sierra Institute for Community and Environment [SI], Sierra Streams institute [SSI], and EKI Environment & Water Inc.).

These assessments established that the arsenic and total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) contamination present on the site is a result of mill practices such as spreading oil and incinerator ash on the roadways, and chemical treatments of wood products. Historical searches performed for the Phase I assessment indicated that some tanks were removed and wells installed for inspection and monitoring involving the California State Water Resources Control Board, but no continued oversight was deemed necessary.

The 2017 TSI identified that arsenic in soil appears to be the most widespread soil contaminant. Groundwater tests indicate that the arsenic in the soil has not resulted in groundwater impacts at the site. The source of arsenic that is present throughout the Crescent Mills site may be related to lumber mill operations as identified above, but could also have been present in the import fill material brought to the site to raise the surface grade. It is possible that the import fill was derived from off-site gold mining operations which historically had a larger presence in Crescent Mills and surrounding areas; these gold deposits are commonly associated with the presence of arsenic. Regardless of source, the reported level of arsenic concentrations in shallow soil exceed the established background concentration across several areas of the site.

A portion of the eastern half of the site lies in a 100-year flood plain directly adjacent to Indian Creek, a tributary of the North Fork of the Feather River, which drains to Lake Oroville. Historical and recently documented flooding events establish that a majority of the site has been flooded, with some parts flooded numerous times, suggesting contaminated soil has repeatedly washed into the creek and the Feather River since mill operations ceased in the 1980s. The Feather River Watershed and Lake Oroville are part of the California's State Water Project, delivering water to over two thirds of California's population and on average provides 3.2 million acre-feet of water per year to downstream urban, industrial, and agricultural users in California. Overall brownfield

sites in Plumas County lie within the critical Upper Feather River Watershed, a watershed that has become increasingly pressured in the face of climate change and decreasing forest and watershed health to balance and to maintain water supplies for its numerous beneficiaries and a multitude of diverse ecosystems. The latter underscores the importance of remediating contaminated sites in order to minimize the amount of toxins washing downstream and negatively impacting beneficiaries and critical habitats.

In September 2019 Sierra Institute initiated Phase I remediation efforts focusing on three two to three-acre units located on the western half of the site.

Given contaminants found, the [-----] Area of the property requires cleanup before redevelopment can begin.

**b. Revitalization of the Target Area**

*i. Reuse Strategy and Alignment with Revitalization Plans*

Describe the reuse strategy, or projected reuse, for the brownfield site(s) to be remediated in the target area. Discuss how the reuse strategy/projected reuse aligns with the local government's land use and revitalization plans; and if applicable, how the strategy/projected reuse takes into account that the site is in a federally designated flood plain. Describe how the public and project partners were involved in the development of the reuse strategy/projected reuse.

Sierra Institute has been working to redevelop the Crescent Mills site into an integrated wood products campus for the past X years. This campus will utilize a variety of technologies to generate value-added wood products out of low-value woody material coming out of the forest from restoration and fire risk reduction efforts. Site reuse has already been initiated in the form of a wood chip storage and processing yard which supplies chips to a boiler at the Plumas County Health and Human Services building in Quincy, California. Future businesses to be developed include a dried and packaged firewood operation, a cross-laminated timber production facility, a community-scale bioenergy facility that will sell electricity to Pacific Gas & Electric pursuant to the Bioenergy Market Adjusting Tariff program. This project builds on the forest industry, still a major employer in Plumas County and the northern Sierra region, and directly addresses the critical need of increasing biomass utilization and enabling forest restoration and hazardous fuels thinning.

The reuse of this brownfield site aligns with the Plumas County General Plan (General Plan), which calls for greater utilization of biomass to reduce forest fuel buildup and to increase use of renewable fuels while reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The continued remediation and redevelopment of the Crescent Mills site will help to achieve the goals of the General Plan: 1) create and retain jobs, and reinvest wealth through our economy, community, and natural resources; 2) improve health and well-being of all Plumas County residents; and 3) promote a future for Plumas County citizens in which land use decisions balance social, economic, and natural resource health (*Plumas County Planning Department, Plumas County Draft General Plan*). As a result, the project is supported by the Plumas County Board of Supervisors and the its Community Development Commission.

In addition to achieving the goals of the Plumas County General Plan, the proposed reuse for the property is also in line with California Governor Brown's October 2015 Emergency Proclamation on tree mortality as it addresses the need for increased forest restoration efforts and also provides an outlet for dead tree material. The site has already launched a chip sorting and storage operation which is accepting small diameter trees and other woody biomass from local forest restoration and wildland-urban interface (WUI) fuels reduction projects. The ability to utilize this material has the additional benefit of reducing the number of pile burns that occur in the forest, therefore improving air quality for Plumas County residents. The proposed reuse is also in line with the "Recommendations to Expand Wood Products Markets in California" report, released in 2017 by the California Natural Resources Agency and California's SB 859 Wood Products Working Group. This report outlined three goals: 1) Remove state barriers and create pathways to success, with a focus on the challenges inherent in redeveloping sites, permitting both new manufacturing operations and the use of new wood materials, and gap financing to incentivize broader investment, 2) Promote innovation, with a focus on building the institutional infrastructure necessary to bring new wood products to market, and 3) Invest in human capital, with a focus on assuring that the necessary workforce is available and trained appropriately to staff new wood products operations, and that the building blocks of innovation in this sector exist in the California's public technical and higher education systems.

Plumas County is considered within the sphere of influence of the Sierra Economic Development Corporation (SEDCorp). In its 2014-15 Annual Performance Report, SEDCorp identified biomass utilization as one of two "very clear value-added region wide development priorities." In this report SEDCorp called for "the continued exploration of the economic, environmental and triple bottom-line benefits of managing our forest by-product material (BIOMASS)" (page 8). Sierra Institute intends to prioritize sustainable development practices while redeveloping the Crescent Mills site. The proposed reuse of a wood products campus will support efforts to improve air quality as the businesses will generate a local outlet to forest biomass material, which is otherwise burned in piles in the woods, resulting in harmful emissions. This outlet will also facilitate an increase in the pace and scale for forest restoration and fuels reduction activities that aim to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire – which has repeatedly resulted in detrimental social, economic, and environmental impacts throughout California.

The wood products campus at full build-out will generate between 15 and 25 permanent jobs for local residents, therefore helping retain residents of Indian Valley who might otherwise leave due to lack of employment opportunities. DTSC will not allow business operations or site development without an appropriate remediation strategy. The brownfield assessment and cleanup process was not anticipated when site planning first commenced, and has significantly derailed the timeline for site development. This has prevented timely forest restoration and economic development, challenging business development in an impoverished area desperately in need of industry and jobs. Thus, Sierra Institute is applying for a US EPA Cleanup Grant to advance this cleanup work and allow redevelopment of the Crescent Mills site to proceed.

*ii. Outcomes and Benefits of Reuse Strategy*

Describe the potential of the proposed project or revitalization plans to stimulate economic development in the target area upon completion of the

cleanup of these properties, and/or how the grant will facilitate the creation of, preservation of, or addition to a park, a greenway, undeveloped property, recreational property, or other property used for nonprofit purposes. Describe how the proposed project or revitalization plans will help spur economic growth within an Opportunity Zone. If applicable, describe how the reuse of the proposed site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy; or will incorporate energy efficiency measures.

Remediation of the Crescent Mills site will enable the development of the wood utilization campus. As previously mentioned, the proposed operations include an assortment of business that will generate value-added products out of low value woody material coming from forest restoration and fire risk reduction activities. The campus will promote increased forest restoration and will create a number of jobs for the local community, spurring economic development. Jobs resulting from the campus build out and operations will require a diverse range of skill sets including but not limited to; work in the woods, social and environmental specialists, haulers, facility operators, and a variety of managerial and administrative positions. This range of new positions will help to facilitate growth in local employment diversity and availability. At full build out, the proposed Crescent Mills wood utilization campus will: 1) provide an outlet for dead trees from prolonged drought and beetle kill that are currently widespread across the Sierra Nevada, posing a fire hazard to surrounding communities; 2) increase the capacity of and incentive for forest managers to conduct forest and watershed restoration efforts and hazardous fuels reduction treatments, thereby improving forest health, reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire, and increasing carbon sequestration in northern Sierra Nevada forests; 3) improve air quality for local residents by reducing the amount of forest biomass openly burned 4) strengthen the local economy in Indian Valley through development of new wood-product businesses; and 5) develop between 10 and 25 much needed jobs for the socioeconomically-depressed communities of Indian Valley and Plumas County—the cleanup itself will generate a temporary work opportunity for at least 3-4 people.

#### Welfare, Environmental, and Public Health Benefits:

Remediation of the Crescent Mills Site will reduce or eliminate air and water transport of identified surface chemicals. The surrounding homes of Crescent Mills will directly benefit. Remediation will also reduce transport of chemicals by surface water flow into adjacent Indian Creek and the Feather River watershed. Indian Falls, downstream, is a popular swimming area for local residents and tourists. Indian Creek, Feather River and the reservoirs are popular fishing locations for diverse populations. Reduction of chemical and compound movement into these waters can reduce human threat through direct exposure and through ingestion by aquatic species. Successful cleanup of this site will allow for site redevelopment to occur, which will then provide a stronger local market for forest biomass, thus increasing the capacity of and incentive for forest managers to implement increased forest restoration treatments. Healthier forests and watersheds will be at lower risk of catastrophic wildfire, therefore reducing the potential of catastrophic wildfires burning through communities and destroying infrastructure and community wellbeing. Other public health benefits will include improved air quality through reduction of black carbon emissions (see footnote #2) and fine particulate matter by providing a disposal alternative to the commonly used open pile burning of biomass slash piles.

**c. Strategy for Leveraging Resources**

*i. Resources Needed for Site Reuse*

Describe the applicant’s eligibility for monetary funding from other resources and how the grant will stimulate the availability of additional funds for environmental assessment or remediation, and subsequent reuse (e.g. demolition, redevelopment activities, etc.) of the proposed site(s).

[\_\_\_\_\_] Identify key funding resources that have been secured for use in the remediation and reuse strategy for the proposed brownfield site(s).

Attach documentation that substantiates secured commitments of leveraged funding. (Do not duplicate sources discussed in 3.b. *Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs* or sources used to meet the cost share.)

Much funding has already been secured from a variety of sources to support site assessment efforts and redevelopment planning. Funding has been secured to complete a number of site assessments including a human health risk assessment and remedial action workplan under a 2017 Brownfields Assessment Grant. While remediation efforts have been initiated under a 2017 Brownfield Cleanup Grant, additional funding is needed to proceed with additional site cleanup up in order to ensure successful and safe redevelopment of the Crescent Mills site and its wood utilization campus. Sources of funds leveraged to support site redevelopment include:

**Table X: [Title]**

Source	Funding Name	Purpose/Products	Amount	Status
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Targeted Brownfields Assessment 2014	Phase I, Phase II, and Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives	> \$150,000.00	Secured, completed
USDA Rural Development	Rural Business Development Grant 2015	To support Crescent Mills site buildout and provide support to potential business owners, increase capacity for site reuse	\$65,000.00	Secured, in progress
Sierra Nevada Conservancy	Proposition 84 Grant Program 2015	Site development and mechanical work for wood chip operations	\$350,000.00	Secured, in progress
U.S. Forest Service	Wood Innovations Grant 2016	Site engineering and planning for development of a bioenergy facility and wood utilization campus at the Crescent Mills site	\$250,000.00	Secured, in progress

Private donor funds, coordinated by Northern Sierra Partnership	2017	For purchase of Crescent Mills site	\$191,500.00	Secured, completed
Ca Department of Toxic Substance Control	Targeted Site Investigation 2017	Crescent Mills site characterization	\$149,000.00	Secured, completed
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Brownfields Assessment Grant 2017	Crescent mills site characterization and cleanup planning	\$200,000.00	Secured, in progress
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Brownfields Cleanup Grant 2017	Funding to clean up three brownfields sites in Crescent Mills, Ca	\$600,000.00	Secured, in progress

ii. *Use of Existing Infrastructure*

Describe how this grant will facilitate the use of existing infrastructure at the proposed site(s) and/or within the target area(s). [\_\_\_\_] If additional infrastructure needs are key to the revitalization plans for the proposed site(s), describe the infrastructure needs and funding resources that will be sought to implement that work.

Due to the Crescent Mill site’s history as a sawmill, cleanup efforts will be able to build upon existing infrastructure (asphalt pads, semi-graded laydown yards, etc.) and reduce development efforts associated with permitting, design, grading, and construction of an entirely new industrial site. The development of the site will utilize existing roads and utilities (sewer, water, power) to the extent feasible. Phase I remediation efforts under the 2017 Brownfield Cleanup Grant included the remediation of preexisting utility trenches along the Old Mill Road to facilitate easier development of future businesses on the site.

Subsequent to the remediation of the site, revitalization efforts as described in Section 1(a)(i) may proceed. Sierra Institute is actively seeking additional funds to support infrastructure, workforce, and business development needs, some of which are identified in **Table X** above.

**2. COMMUNITY NEED AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

**a. Community Need**

i. *The Community’s Need for Funding*

Describe how this grant will meet the needs of the community that has an inability to draw on other initial sources of funding to carry out

environmental remediation and subsequent reuse of the target area because of the small population and/or low income of the community.

i. **Demographic Information and Indicators of Need:**

<b>Table 1:</b> Selected Demographic Info for Target Area, Plumas County, California, and U.S.	Greenville CDP (primary CDP in target area)	Plumas County	California	National
Population:	997	18,966	38,421,464	316,515,021
Unemployment:	12.2%	15.2%	5.3%	4.6%
Poverty Rate:	17.6%	14.5%	16.3%	15.5%
Hispanic Percent of Population:	7.7%	8.3%	38.4%	17.1%
Percent Racial Minority:	6.9%	6.6%	38.2%	26.4%
Median Household Income:	\$26,481	\$47,333	\$61,818	\$53,889
Percent American Indian:	9.1%	5.1%	0.7%	0.8%
Free & Reduced-Price Meals eligibility (2014-15) <sup>1</sup> :	60%	49.4%	58.6%	--

*Source: 2015 American Community Survey Estimates*

Roughly the size of Delaware, Plumas County is sparsely populated and has been designated as one of the fifteen “frontier counties” of California due to its small population and geographic isolation. The majority of the county’s 18,966 residents live in or near the four small communities of: Portola, the county’s only incorporated city; Quincy, the county seat; Greenville, the largest community in Indian Valley; and Chester. Like other rural counties in California and the U.S., Plumas County struggled economically even before the Great Recession of 2008, and mirrors the stagnant timber industry in the Pacific Northwest. The county’s timber-based economy is seasonal, and forest workers are traditionally laid off in winter. Winter months typically have the highest rates of unemployment during the year—commonly above 20%. The 2015 unemployment rate of 15.2% for Plumas County is greater than the rates for most counties in the state, and considerably higher than California and the United States, at 5.3% and 4.6%, respectively. With the erosion of jobs, Plumas County’s population has been decreasing over the past decade. The housing vacancy rate has increased from 33% in 2000 to 47.6% in 2015.

Greenville, the largest census designated place in Indian Valley, at 997 people, is one of the more impoverished communities in the county. The 2015 American Community Survey estimates a poverty rate of 17.6% (compared to 14.5% for Plumas County and 16.4% for California). Eligibility among children K-12 for Free or Reduced Price Meals is 60% for the 2014-2015 school year. Median household income in Greenville in 2015 is \$26,481, which is 55% of the county-wide median of \$47,333 and 42% of statewide median of \$61,818. **Table X** compares Greenville CDP demographics, with Plumas County, California, and U.S. totals.

ii.

**Economic Conditions:** The Indian Valley community, including Greenville CDP identified in **Table X**, is one of the most impoverished in an already-struggling Plumas County. Plumas County

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ed-data.org/school/Plumas/Plumas-Unified>

has no economic development agency, and it is difficult to raise sufficient capital for developing business opportunities and attract experienced entrepreneurship to promote business development.

Beginning in the late 1980s and mid 1990s, a series of events led to a decline in the timber industry in California and throughout the American West. Increased environmental legislation made harvesting timber on public lands more difficult, a change in building materials decreased the demand for dimensional lumber, and more recently, a sharp decline in the housing sector combined to reduce timber production in Plumas County from over 350 million board feet in the 1980s to 177 million board feet (MMbf) by 1999, and only 89 MMbf in 2011. Mill closures led to thousands of lost jobs throughout California, and population decreased as families left in search of employment elsewhere.

Until recently, the impacts of the declining timber industry were softened by a coinciding increase in tourism and construction of second homes. Plumas County retained some timber industry due to the presence of two mills, but the local economy shifted from being resource-based to one dependent on construction and service industry jobs. The Great Recession worsened economic condition in Plumas County, and unemployment reached a high point of 16.8% in 2010, with some communities experiencing rates over 20%.

Beyond the impoverished nature of Plumas County, this funding is needed because the applicant, Sierra Institute for Community and Environment is a non-profit, 501(c)(3) organization and therefore does not have the reserves needed to complete this work. The only way work has been completed on site to date is because the Sierra Institute has written proposals to secure assessment support. Without this work, this site would have remained vacant, unused, and not assessed/characterized.

This property has not been used since Louisiana Pacific left in the mid-1980s nor was the previous owner able to sell the property before Sierra Institute purchased it because there is no demand for a former mill site with environmental liabilities. This underscores the importance of this work: without additional support and site characterization, this property will likely sit for another several decades because of the time and money needed for site remediation.

*iii. Threats to Sensitive Populations*

Describe how this grant will address or facilitate the identification and reduction of threats to:

1. Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations  
The health or welfare of children, pregnant women, minority or low-income communities, or other sensitive populations in the target area(s).
2. Greater Than Normal Incidence of Disease and Adverse Health Conditions Populations in the target area(s) that suffer from a greater-than-normal incidence of diseases or conditions (including cancer, asthma, or birth defects) that may be associated with exposure to hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or petroleum.

- 3. Disproportionately Impacted Populations  
Populations in the target area(s) that have environmental justice challenges and/or disproportionately share the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, governmental, and/or commercial operations or policies. [\_\_\_\_\_] Please refer to the FY20 FAQs for information on welfare, sensitive populations, and environmental justice (also defined in Section I.E.).

**b. Community Engagement** *To conserve space, you may present information for 2.b.i. and 2.b.ii. in the same response and/or use the suggested table format below.*

*i. Project Partners*

Identify the local partners that will be involved in the project. The local project partners may include community organizations (e.g., neighborhood groups, citizen groups, business organizations, etc.), as well as property owners, lenders, developers, and the general public.

*ii. Project Partner Roles*

Describe the role each identified partner will have in the project and how it will be involved in making decisions with respect to the cleanup and future reuse of the proposed brownfield site(s).

Partner Name	Point of Contact (name, email, & phone)	Specific Role in the Project

*iii. Incorporating Community Input*

Discuss your plan to communicate project progress to the local community, project partners, and residents/groups impacted by the site(s), including the frequency and by what method(s) you will use and how input will be solicited, considered, and responded to.

**3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES, AND MEASURING PROGRESS**

The cost share is calculated as 20% of the total EPA funds requested must only include costs associated with eligible activities under the grant.

*Local government applicants* may use up to 10% of the total grant award for health monitoring activities. The health monitoring activities must be associated with brownfield sites at which at least a Phase II environmental site assessment is conducted and is contaminated with hazardous substances. Partnership with the local health agency is required. Please review the Health Monitoring Fact Sheet for more information.

Agreements with successful applicants under this RFA will be subject to the administrative cost limitation described at CERCLA § 104(k)(5)(E). Successful applicants may only use up to 5% of the total amount of EPA funds for their own administrative costs (direct costs for grant administration and indirect costs). The limitation on administrative costs does not apply to otherwise allowable programmatic costs (including indirect costs) charged by procurement

contractors. Note that EPA considers costs for performance and financial reporting to be allowable programmatic costs that are not subject to the 5% limitation. Costs must be classified as direct or indirect consistently and applicants may not classify the same cost in both categories.

Do not include activities that are ineligible uses of funds under EPA’s Cleanup Grant (e.g., land acquisition; building demolition that is not necessary to remediate contamination at the site; building construction for future redevelopment).

Please refer to the FY20 FAQs for additional examples of eligible and ineligible uses of funds (including administrative costs). For questions not covered by the FY20 FAQs, contact your Regional Brownfields Contact listed in Section VII.

**a. Proposed Cleanup Plan**

Outline the cleanup plan(s) proposed for the site(s). Briefly describe the contaminated media to be addressed, cleanup method(s) and disposal requirements. *This description can use the same language as submitted in the draft ABCA attachment(s), but the description must be included in the applicant’s narrative.*

**b. Description of Tasks/Activities and Outputs**

Provide a list and description of the tasks/activities required to implement the proposed project. You may respond to this criterion using the sample format for each task/activity.

Task/Activity	
i.	Project Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of EPA-funded activities</li> <li>• Non-EPA grant resources needed to carry out task/activity, if applicable:</li> </ul>
ii.	Anticipated Project Schedule:
iii.	Task/Activity Lead(s):
iv.	Output(s):

**i. Project Implementation**

Discuss the EPA-funded activities that will take place to address the proposed brownfield site(s).

Examples include procuring a Qualified Environmental Professional, submitting and obtaining approval of Quality Assurance Project Plan, enrollment of site in the State's Voluntary Cleanup Program, certifying cleanup is complete, coordination with the local health agency on health monitoring activities, etc.

If applicable, identify tasks and/or activities that are necessary to carry out the grant that will be contributed by sources other than the EPA grant; such as in-kind resources or funding contributed by your organization. (For example, the applicant does not charge the EPA grant for salary dollars and therefore contributes its own resources to carry out programmatic oversight activities or grant

administration. Do not duplicate sources listed in *I.c.i. Resources Needed for Site Reuse* or sources used to meet the cost share.)

- ii. 

Anticipated	Project	Schedule
-------------	---------	----------

Discuss the anticipated schedule and timing for the EPA-funded activities outlined above in *3.b.i. Program Implementation* during the 3-year period of performance.
  
- iii. 

Task/Activity	Lead
---------------	------

For each task/activity, identify the lead entity(ies) overseeing the various activities (i.e., the applicant, qualified environmental professional, or other identified entity).
  
- iv. 

Outputs	Identify, and quantify as appropriate, the anticipated outputs/deliverables for each activity/task. Outputs may include, but are not limited to, cleanup plans, community involvement plans, final ABCA documents, administrative records, and cleanup completion report or letter. (Refer to <a href="#">Section I.D.</a> for an explanation of outputs.)
---------	--

**c. Cost Estimates**

Describe how cost estimates for each task were developed (per budget category; including the cost share), and, where appropriate, present costs per unit. (*Per the evaluation criterion in [Section V.A.3.c.](#), responses will be evaluated against three sub- criteria.*)

*SEE SAMPLE FORMAT*

**Only include costs to be covered by EPA grant funds and the required cost share in this table.** Leveraged resources should not be included in the budget table.

If you are requesting hazardous substances and petroleum funding, provide either two separate budget tables, or two separate line items within one budget table, that distinguish hazardous substances funds from petroleum funds.

If you are seeking funding to remediate multiple sites, provide either a separate budget table for each site, or separate line items within one budget table, which distinguish each site.

Examples of costs per unit may include:

**Task 2, Tank Removal**

- *Personnel Costs:* 20 hours at average rate of \$50/hr = \$1,000
- *Contractual Costs:* 5 tank pulls at cost of \$13,000 per tank pull = \$65,000

**d. Measuring Environmental Results** Discuss how you plan to track, measure and evaluate your progress in achieving these project outputs, overall project results,

and eventual project outcomes to ensure the grant funds are expended in a timely and efficient manner. (Definitions of outputs and outcomes are provided in Section I.D.)

#### 4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE

**Provide responses for the organization that is applying for funding (i.e., the applicant).**

##### **a. Programmatic Capability**

*To conserve space, you may present information for 4.a.i. and 4.a.ii. in the same response.*

##### *i. Organizational Structure*

Describe the organizational structure you will utilize to ensure the timely and successful expenditure of funds and completion of all technical, administrative and financial requirements of the project and grant.

##### *ii. Description of Key Staff*

Provide a brief discussion of the key staff that will work together to successfully implement the grant, including their roles, expertise, qualifications, and experience.

##### *iii. Acquiring Additional Resources*

Describe the system(s) you have in place to appropriately acquire any additional expertise and resources (e.g. contractors or subrecipients) per grant requirements to successfully complete the project. (Refer to Section IV.G. regarding the difference between contractors and subrecipients.)

##### **b. Past Performance and Accomplishments**

If you have ever received an EPA Brownfields Multipurpose, Assessment, Cleanup, Revolving Loan Fund Grant, and/or 128(a) Grant please respond to **item i.** below. (Do not include information on Targeted Brownfields Assessments, Area-Wide Planning Grants, Environmental Workforce Development & Job Training Grants, and subawards from another Brownfields Grant recipient.)

If you have never received an EPA Brownfields Grant, but have received other federal or non-federal assistance agreements (such as a grant or cooperative agreement), please respond to **item ii.** below.

If you have never received any type of federal or non-federal assistance agreements, please indicate this in response to **item iii.** below.

##### **i. Currently Has or Previously Received an EPA Brownfields Grant**

Identify and provide information regarding each of your current and/or most recent EPA Brownfields Grant(s) (no more than three). Demonstrate how you successfully managed the grant(s), and successfully performed all phases of work under each grant by providing information on the items listed below.

##### **a. Accomplishments**

Describe the accomplishments (including specific outputs and outcomes) of the current/prior grant(s), including at a minimum, the

number of sites assessed and/or cleaned up. Discuss whether these outputs and outcomes were accurately reflected in the Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES) at the time of this application submission; and if not, please explain why.

b. Compliance with Grant Requirements

Discuss your compliance with the workplan, schedule, and terms and conditions under the current/prior grant(s). Include whether you have made and have reported on, or are making and reporting on, progress towards achieving the expected results of the grant in a timely manner. If not, discuss what corrective measures you took, or are taking, and how the corrective measures were effective, documented and communicated.

Discuss your history of timely and acceptable quarterly performance and grant deliverables, as well as ongoing ACRES reporting.

For all open EPA Brownfields Grant(s) indicate the grant period (start and end date), if there are funds remaining, and the plan to expend funds by the end of the grant period.

For all closed EPA Brownfields Grant(s), indicate if there were funds remaining when the grant closed, the amount of remaining funds, and a brief explanation of why the funds were not expended.