CITY OF JANESVILLE
Wisconsin's Park Place

To: Brownfield Advisory Committee and Health Monitoring Committee Members

From: Janesville Brownfield Project Management Team

Date: June 15, 2012

Re: Joint Meeting Agenda for June 22, 2012

Attached please find an agenda (1) for the joint committee meeting on Friday, June 22 from 10:00 to noon to be held in the 4th Floor Conference Room of City Hall. Also attached is a summary of the joint meeting held on May 18 (2). Below is a brief discussion of each agenda item with additional information attached as indicated. Note that the file name for each attachment begins with the number shown in parentheses following the introduction of the attachment in the text of this memo.

1. Welcome and Introductions
A complete list of members for each committee is attached (3).

2. Results from June 6 public meeting
Attached is a summary of the public meeting format and the results (4).

3. Overview of Brownfield Sites Inventory Data and Methodology
The Project Management Team is in the final stages of the brownfields inventory and prioritization process. The inventory of sites within the four priority areas of the community has been finalized. Attached are three maps (5A, 5B, 5C) showing all of the sites and a master sites list (6). As shown on the master sites list, nearly all of the "sites" are comprised of anywhere from 2 to 16 different parcels, most of which have different owners. These sites have been created for purposes of this study, as any significant redevelopment of them (where appropriate) would likely require this type of an aggregation of adjoining parcels.

Please keep in mind that the USEPA definition of the term "brownfield" is: an abandoned or underutilized property with real *or perceived* contamination that often prevents redevelopment or productive reuse of the property. Accordingly, the inclusion of a specific parcel on the list of sites does automatically mean that it is contaminated. What it does mean is that one or more parcels that comprise the site has some type of historic or existing use that *may* have resulted in some type of contamination and/or that the state Department of Natural Resources has some type of record of past or existing environmental conditions. Because of this, redevelopment of the site may be hindered without an environmental assessment to document the site's true condition and to identify appropriate remedial actions where necessary.

A significant amount of readily-available data concerning historic and current land uses, environmental conditions, and previous planning efforts has been collected and entered into the City's Geographic Information System (GIS) for each site for use in evaluating them. A brief presentation of this information will be made at the meeting.

4. Sites Inventory and Prioritization Progress Report
A comprehensive progress report on the site evaluation process will be provided at the meeting on June 22. As reminder, each site will be evaluated on three levels of analysis – redevelopment feasibility, environmental analysis, and community issues. The purpose of this process ultimately is to identify priority sites for assessment and redevelopment, with the priority sites being those that best meet all of the defined criteria. Once a priority site is

identified, the City would approach the property owners to discuss the owners' long-term plans and to determine if the City Brownfields grant program can be of assistance. Participation in the program will be strictly voluntary on the part of every individual property owner.

The following is a brief summary of the specific criteria that are being used to score the sites at each level of analysis.

Redevelopment Feasibility Criteria

Members of the Brownfields Project Management Team (PMT) and several other members of City staff will individually score each site against the criteria shown below, and the total score for each site from all of the evaluators will be averaged. Any significant differences in evaluations will be reviewed and discussed with adjustments made where appropriate.

1. Inclusion in special plans and districts
2. Potential to assemble entire site
3. Potential to eliminate blight
4. Potential to replace existing inappropriate or marginal uses
5. Potential to catalyze redevelopment on other properties
6. Potential cost of assembly and redevelopment
7. Potential for near-term redevelopment

Each of the above criteria will be scored on a 5-point scale, with a 5 indicating a high potential of the site to meet the criteria and a 1 being a very low potential. Therefore, each site has a maximum possible score of 35 and a minimum possible score of 7.

Environmental Criteria

Ayres Associates will complete the environmental scores for each site based on a review of diverse data including historic and existing land uses, state environmental files, the past or current existence of oil/petroleum storage tanks and/or spills, and the potential presence of environmental contaminants based on the above. The specific environmental criteria to be applied to each site include:

1. Potential level of contamination
2. Potential for human contact with contaminants
3. Potential to contaminant groundwater
4. Potential for a change in land use requiring a higher level of remediation (e.g., change from industrial to residential or a park).
5. Potential existence of a viable causer who would be responsible for assessment and clean up

A 3-point scale will be used for each of these criteria, with a score of 3 indicating a high potential for the site to meet the criteria and a 1 being a low a potential. As a result, each site has an initial maximum possible score of 15 and minimum possible score of 5. These scores are then multiplied by 2.33 and rounded to whole numbers to create a total possible score of 36 in order to be on par with the total possible points from the redevelopment analysis.

Community Issues Criteria

The following community issues were selected at a public meeting held on June 6, 2012, that involved individual, small group, and large group exercises to narrow a list of more than two dozen issues down to those that the participants felt were of the highest priority to be addressed by the City's brownfield program.

1. Create opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses

2. Enhancement, improvement, and quality protection of the Rock River
3. Redevelop properties quickly
4. Create and maintain walkable, livable neighborhoods
5. Fix up/remove rundown properties

These issues are then used as criteria for scoring each site on a 3-point scale, with a score of 3 indicating a high potential for the site to meet the criteria and a 1 being a low a potential. As a result, each site has an initial maximum possible score of 15 and minimum possible score of 5. These scores are then multiplied by 2.33 and rounded to whole numbers to create a total possible score of 36 in order to be on par with the total possible points from the redevelopment analysis and the environmental analysis.

Note that these community issues also will be used by the Health Monitoring Committee in Step 1 of the ATSDR Action Model (7), which is an identification of the key community issues. The other steps in the Action Model include a more detailed description of these issues, how brownfield development can work to address them, the benefits to the community from redevelopment, and the additional data needed to measure change over time.

Final Scores and Rankings
As indicated above, the scores for each level of analysis will be adjusted to give them an approximate equal weighting. The scores for each level of analysis are then added together to provide a total score for each site, and the sites will then be ranked based on their total scores.

5. HMC and BAC Break-out Discussions
Following presentations and discussions of the above (which is expected to take about 30 minutes), the rest of the meeting will be dedicated to discussion of the following among members of each committee. **Note that we would like to select a regular monthly meeting date for each committee, so please bring your calendar.**

Health Monitoring Committee
  i.   Brief overview of the ATSDR Action Model
  ii. Discussion of results of public meeting and issue outcomes
  iii. Discussion of further public participation in the development of the Action Model
  iv. Review and discussion of the Janesville ATSDR Matrix (copies to be provided to each member at the meeting)
  v.   Discussion of agenda items for meeting with ATSDR staff on July 16
  vi. Selection of monthly meeting date

Brownfield Advisory Committee
  i.   Brief overview of *Downtown Vision and Strategy* and *Downtown Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan* (copies of both will be provided to each member at the meeting)
  ii. Discussion of sites and redevelopment options
  iii. Discussion of outreach strategies to property owners
  iv. Brief overview of site environmental assessment processes
  v.   Discussion of next steps for the BAC
  vi. Selection of monthly meeting date

CITY OF JANESVILLE
Wisconsin's Park Place

ATTACHMENT (1)

Janesville Brownfields Advisory Committee
and
Health Monitoring Committee
Joint Meeting Agenda
June 22, 2012

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Results of the June 6th public meeting

3. Overview of Brownfield Sites Inventory Data and Methodology
   - Purpose
   - Focus areas
   - Data and Methodology

4. Sites Inventory and Prioritization Progress Report

5. HMC and BAC Break-out Discussions

   - HMC
     i. Brief overview of the ATSDR Action Model
     ii. Discussion of results of public meeting and issue outcomes
     iii. Discussion of further public participation in the development of the Action Model
     iv. Review and discussion of the Janesville ATSDR Matrix
     v. Discussion of agenda items for meeting with ATSDR staff on July 16
     vi. Selection of monthly meeting date

   - BAC
     i. Overview of *Downtown Vision and Strategy* and *Downtown Neighborhoods Revitalization Plan*
     ii. Discussion of sites and redevelopment options
     iii. Discussion of outreach strategies for property owners
     iv. Brief overview of site environmental assessment process
     v. Discussion of next steps for the BAC
     vi. Selection of monthly meeting date

CITY OF JANESVILLE
Wisconsin's Park Place

ATTACHMENT (2)

Janesville Comprehensive Brownfields Program
Summary of the Joint Brownfields Advisory Committee and
Health Monitoring Committee Initial Meeting
May 18, 2012

The initial BAC/HMC joint meeting was held on Friday, May 18th from 10:30am until 12:20pm at the Janesville Police Services building. In all, about 24 people were at the meeting, including City staff, HMC members, BAC members, as well as three consultants. Specific members of the Brownfields Project Management Team that were present included:

- Al Hulick, City of Janesville
- Terry Nolan, City of Janesville
- Scott Wilson, Ayres Associates
- Scott Harrington, Vandewalle & Associates
- Celia Benton, Vandewalle & Associates

The meeting was held as an introduction to the Comprehensive Brownfields Program, and included:

- A review of the brownfields program goals, focus areas and priority brownfields sites;
- A review of the BAC and HMC roles in the brownfields program (note, the BAC is also referred to as the Downtown Revitalization Committee, and it was mentioned that the BAC role is the initial role the Downtown Committee would have towards revitalizing the area);
- A review of the redevelopment, environmental, and potential community criteria;
- An introduction to the ATSDR Action Model; and
- A review of the Inventory and Prioritization schedule.

Scott Harrington was the lead presenter for the meeting and raised questions to the attendees on whether one public meeting would suffice for this portion of the project and whether weighting was necessary for the different criteria categories. There was general agreement that one public meeting for this process would suffice, but there was no resolution on confirming the community goals criteria for public review. Scott H. asked everyone to both spread the word of the project and to act as a representative for community members they discuss the program with.

Below is a summary of the attendee questions that were asked, comments that were given and discussions that followed:

- The Department of Health Services staff commented on their knowledge of the ATSDR Action Model, and mentioned that they were in part financed by the ATSDR. They were also involved in the Baraboo ATSDR project.
- A BAC member mentioned his concern with using the brownfields program to implement the Janesville Comprehensive Plan and wanted to make sure the work aligned with the goals of the Plan. Everyone agreed with this comment, and Scott H. reinforced that the inventory and prioritization process was just the initial step towards implementing the Plan.

- Another BAC member wanted to ensure the work followed the land use maps as outlined in the Downtown Plan. Scott H. agreed that it does and referred to question 4 of the redevelopment criteria, which discusses replacing inappropriate or marginal uses.
- An HMC member asked about whether or not the project has sustainability aspects, such as hydrology maps, to align with the redevelopment goals. Also, he mentioned plans to create a Rock River trail and other recreational goals. Scott Wilson mentioned that no hydrology maps are currently being used, but issues of environmental contamination in waterways and other potential environmental effects were being considered as part of the environmental criteria. He referred to questions 2 and 3 for the environmental criteria scoring, which address hazards in both waterways and other environments. The goals of the HMC were also discussed as relevant to the comment.

ATTACHMENT (3)

Janesville Comprehensive Brownfields Committees Roster

Name	Organization	Email
Brownfields Advisory Committee		
Allison Rollette	Sustainable Janesville	zythia13@gmail.com
DuWayne Severson	City Council	seversonda@ci.janesville.wi.us
John Beckord	Forward Janesville	johnb@forwardjanesville.com
Kathy Voskuil	City Council	voskuilk@ci.janesville.wi.us
Larry Squire	Johnson Bank	lsquire@johnsonbank.com
Lisa Furseth	Community Action	lfurseth@community-action.org
Mick Gilbertson	DDA & Armory	mickg@janesvillearmory.com
Neil Deupree	Neighborhood Action Team	deupreen@charter.net
Rich Gruber	Mercy Health Systems	rgruber@mhsjvl.org
Tim Weber	Webco Inc.	timw@webcogc.com
Health Monitoring Committee		
Angela Flickinger	UW Extension	angelaflickinger@ces.uwex.edu
Cheryl Maveety	ECHO Janesville	cmaveety@echojanesville.org
Cristina Parente	UW Extension	cristinaparente@ces.uwex.edu
Frank Schier	Rock River Times	frank.schier@rockrivertimes.com
Jean Randles	Health Net of Rock County	executive-director@healthnet-rock.org
Karen Cain	Rock County	cain@co.rock.wi.us
Liz Evans	Dept. of Health Services	liz.evans@wisconsin.gov

ATTACHMENT (4)

**Janesville Comprehensive Brownfields Program
Community Issues Inventory and Prioritization
Public Meeting
June 6, 2012**

The initial public meeting for the Janesville Comprehensive Brownfields Program was held on Wednesday, June 6th from 6:00pm until 7:30pm in the Janesville Council Chambers. In all, 18 people signed-in; however, about 25 people attended the meeting in total including City staff, Committee members and three consultants. Specific members of the Brownfields Project Management Team that were present included:

- Al Hulick, City of Janesville
- Terry Nolan, City of Janesville
- Duane Cherek, City of Janesville
- Vic Grassman, City of Janesville
- Scott Wilson, Ayres Associates

- Scott Harrington, Vandewalle & Associates
- Celia Benton, Vandewalle & Associates

The purpose of the meeting was to identify the priority community issues to be addressed by the Brownfields Program. Specifically, the priority issues will be used as criteria to score brownfield sites during the site inventory process and as the primary issues of focus by the Health Monitoring Committee in setting up its Action Model to track changes in community health over time as brought about by brownfield redevelopment.

The meeting agenda included four tasks: a brief introduction to the brownfields program; individual inventory and ranking of issues; small group rankings; and a large group final ranking. During the individual inventory and ranking session, people were asked to review a list of possible community issues, add to or edit them, and rank their top 6-10. The results of the individual ranking exercises are varied, but show a great deal of interest in the preservation of the Rock River and its use as a destination, as well as more economic issues such as the expansion of businesses. This information is based on a total of 17 collected individual worksheets.

In the group session, participants were asked to narrow issues into their top 6-7 through combining individual rankings with group voting (see corresponding worksheet). During both the individual and group sessions, several participants wrestled with the prioritization of issues because of the distinct needs and characteristics of each of the four brownfields focus areas. In addition, several groups indicated that protection of human health and the environment was very important to them but that they assumed these would inherent in the Brownfield program and therefore they did not specifically include them on their list/rank them very high. However, all groups seemed satisfied with their ultimate selections as well as the final selections at the end of the meeting. Following are the results of the group rankings:

1

Group One:
- Fix up/remove rundown properties
- Create new jobs
- Create opportunities to retain/expand business
- Contribute to civic development
- Protect River
- Create new entertainment venues
- River as a destination
- Provide opportunities for County uses
- Create livable neighborhoods
- Create natural areas
- Enhance use of River
- Reduce spread of pollution

Group Two:
- Redevelop properties
- Fix up/remove rundown buildings
- Preserve historic sites
- Protect River and water quality
- Create opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses
- Create new entertainment venues or opportunities
- Provide opportunities for community uses or activities

Group Three:
- Redevelop properties quickly
- Fix up/remove rundown properties
- Improve safety and reduce crime and vandalism
- Create opportunities to retain/expand/recruit business
- Increase property tax base
- Create new jobs
- Create or maintain livable neighborhoods
- Build neighborhood unity and identity

Group Four:
- Protect groundwater
- Reduce human contact with pollutants
- Protect river, improve water quality
- Create/maintain livable neighborhoods
- Create new jobs
- Preserve historic buildings/sites
- Retain/expand/recruit businesses

Group Five:
- Protect groundwater
- Create/maintain livable, walkable neighborhoods
- Increase diversity – housing choices
- Build neighborhood unity/identification
- Protect River – water quality
- Reduce pollution spreading to other properties
- Create diversity of use: residential, commercial, recreation
- Fix and remove rundown properties

CITY OF JANESVILLE
Wisconsin's Park Place

Group Six:
- Health
- Reduce human contact with pollutants
- Protect groundwater
- Reduce spread of pollutants
- Protect river, increase water quality
- Preserve historic buildings or sites
- Create/maintain livable neighborhoods
- Create new jobs
- Retain/expand/recruit businesses

Group Seven:
- Redevelop properties quickly
- Fix up/remove rundown properties
- Increase property tax base
- Improve safety and reduce crime and vandalism
- Create opportunities to retain/expand recruit business
- Create new jobs
- Create or maintain livable neighborhoods
- Build neighborhood unity and identity
- Preserve historic buildings and sites
- Continue to civic development
- Increase diversity of housing choices

Near the conclusion of the meeting, each group shared their outcomes with all other groups. All participants were then asked to select their top five priorities from the lists prepared by all of the groups, with the results shown below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of participants who selected the issue as being among their top five. Note that several similar or identical issues were included by multiple groups and these were combined and slightly rephrased as appropriate.

1. Create opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses (14)
2. Enhancement, protection, and quality improvement of the Rock River (13)
3. Redevelop properties quickly (11)
4. Create or maintain livable, walkable neighborhoods (11)
5. Fix up/remove rundown properties (9)
6. Increase diversity of housing choices (6)
7. Preserve historic buildings or sites (5)
8. Reduce the spread of pollutants to other properties (4)
9. Provide opportunities for community uses or activities (4)
10. Protect groundwater (3)
11. Increase property tax (2)
12. Reduce potential human contact with pollutants (2)
13. Create new entertainment venues or opportunities (2)
14. Improve safety and reduce crime and vandalism (1)
15. Create new jobs (1)
16. Contribute to civic development (1)
17. Build neighborhood unity and identity (1)
18. Preserve and increase natural areas (1)

Following is a copy of the worksheet that was handed out at the meeting.

Introduction

The City is seeking your input about which community issues should be a focus of our new Brownfields Program. Through the extensive public outreach we conducted with our many planning efforts over the last several years, we have a good understanding of the community's general issues of concern. In fact, the creation of the Brownfields Program itself is a direct result of that previous input. We want to be sure, however, that the program achieves meaningful results to residents and property owners.

Step 1: Individual Priorities – 10 minutes

On the back of this page is an initial list of issues that could be addressed in some way through the assessment, clean-up, and reuse of brownfield sites. Please take about 10 minutes to look them over and do the following:

- Add to the list anything else that you would like to see addressed
- Make notes next to those that you think need more explanation
- Revise the description on those you think are important but need clarity
- Select the six to ten (including any that you've added) that you think are the most important
- 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

Once everyone at your table has completed their individual review and ranking of the issues, select someone to record the discussion outcomes on the large flip chart. Be sure to write legibly and leave some space in between issues. Begin the discussion by going around the table and having each person share two of the priority issues they identified on their worksheet and a brief explanation as to why they think they are important. Allow some time for discussion but keep moving so everyone has an opportunity to provide their ideas. Try to avoid repeating someone else's selections by offering any others that you've identified as priorities. After everyone has had a chance to provide their two issues, review the list and go around the table one last time giving each person the opportunity to add one more issue that they believe strongly should be included.

Once the list is completed, tear off the flip chart pages and lay them on your table. Everyone at the table should then place their yellow stickers next to their top five priorities. Each person must select five issues – do not use more than one of your five stickers on a particular issue.

Once everyone has placed their stickers, tabulate the results and re-write your top eight issues on a new flip chart sheet (use only one sheet) and, again, be sure to write legibly and leave some space in between issues. Select someone from the table to present these to the rest of the participants at the meeting in Step 3.

Step 3: Final Priorities – 25 minutes

The spokesperson from each group will read their top priorities and then stick their sheet on the wall for everyone to see. Once each group's list is on the wall, duplicates will be eliminated by the moderator. After that, everyone at the meeting will place their red stickers next to their top five priorities (again, place only one of your stickers next to a particular priority). The moderator will then quickly tabulate the results and share them back with a brief wrap-up discussion.

CITY OF JANESVILLE
Wisconsin's Park Place

Community Issues

_____ Redevelop properties quickly   _____ _____

_____ Fix up/remove rundown properties

_____ _____

_____ Increase property tax base

_____ Protect groundwater   _____ _____

_____ Protect the river and improve water quality

_____ _____

_____ Reduce the spread of pollutants to other properties

_____ _____

_____ Reduce potential human contact with pollutants

_____ Preserve historic buildings or sites   _____ _____

_____ Improve safety and reduce crime and vandalism

_____ _____

_____ Create opportunities to retain/expand/recruit businesses

_____ _____

_____ Create new jobs

_____ Contribute to civic development   _____ _____

_____ Increase the diversity of housing choices

_____ _____

_____ Create new entertainment venues or opportunities

_____ Create new shopping choices   _____ _____

_____ Create new recreation amenities

_____ _____

_____ Create or maintain livable neighborhoods

_____ Build neighborhood unity and identity   _____ _____

_____ Provide opportunities for community uses or activities

_____ _____

_____ Provide opportunities of youth

_____ Provide opportunities for seniors

_____ _____