

Agenda
Village Board Meeting
Tuesday, February 13, 2018 at 7:30 p.m.
Jackson Village Hall
N168 W20733 Main St
Jackson, WI 53037

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Village Citizen Comment on an Agenda Item (Please sign in.)
4. Public Hearing – Planned Unit Development Amendment – Oversized Garage – Lakeside Contracting – Jason Rose – English Oaks
(Approval Recommended by Plan Commission)
5. Public Hearing – Planned Unit Development Amendment – Sign – Schensema, CPA
(Approval Recommended by Plan Commission)
6. Public Hearing – Planned Unit Development Amendment – Sign – Bartlein Barrels
(Approval Recommended by Plan Commission)
7. Approval of Minutes for the Village Board Meeting of January 9, 2017
8. Approval of Licenses
 - Operators Licenses:
East Side Mart: Lacy L. Luber, Bobby Jo Parbs
Jackson Pub: Richard A. Lally
Latest Edition: Michael T. D'Angelo, Jennifer A. Thetford
Walgreens: Jennifer L. Diels, Rina Ristic
9. Jackson Fire Department
 - Importance of CPR Instruction and the Recognition of Past Participants Who Saved a Life Using Their Training Received in the JFD CPR program
 - Resolution #18-02 – Resolution to Adopt the Washington County All Hazard Mitigation Plan
9. Budget & Finance Committee
 - Pay Request #3 – SCADA System Project – LW Allen
 - Review of Bids replacing WWTP Lab Room Cabinets
 - Jackson Fire Department – Equipment Purchases
10. Plan Commission
 - Concept Plan – Cobblestone Builders – Single Family Homesites
(Approval Recommended by Plan Commission)

11. Board of Public Works
 - Resolution #18-03 – Resolution Establishing Rates for Septic and Holding Tank Waste for 2018
(Approval Recommended by Board of Public Works)
12. Brownfields Assessment Coalition Memorandum of Agreement between Washington County and the Village of Jackson
13. Joint Parks & Recreation
 - ADRC Cooperative Agreement
14. Action on 2017 real estate property tax assessment claim filed by Premier Jackson Condo Lots LLC
15. Consideration of Administrative Correction – Property Assessment – Use Value – Jackson Emery Investments, LLC
16. Ordinance #17-03 – Annexation of Paloroma Farms, LLC
17. Proposed Public Safety Building – Update
18. Departmental Reports
19. West Bend School District – Liaison Report
20. Greater Jackson Business Alliance Report
21. Citizens to Address the Village Board
22. Closed Session pursuant to Wis. Stats. §19.85(1)(g) Conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is involved, specifically Jackson Town Residents Against JTRAA Attachment et al vs. Village of Jackson – Case No. 14-CV-897; and 19.85(1)(e) Deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.

Reconvene in Open Session
23. Adjourn

Persons with disabilities requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the Village Hall at least one (1) business day prior to the meeting.

**DRAFT MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday – January 25, 2018 – 7:00 pm
Jackson Village Hall
N168W20733 Main St
Jackson, WI 53037**

- 1. Call to Order & Roll Call.**
Pres. Schwab called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
Members present: Peter Habel, Tr. Kruepke, Steve Schoen, Jon Weil, and Tr. Emmrich.
Members Absent: Jeff Dalton (excused).
Staff Present: Brian Kober, Jim Micech, and John Walther.
Others Present: Tr. Kurtz.
- 2. Minutes – December 28, 2017 Plan Commission Meeting.**
Motion by Peter Habel, second by Tr. Emmrich to approve the minutes of the December 28, 2017 meeting.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- 3. Planned Unit Development Amendment – Oversized Garage – Lakeside Contracting – Jason Rose – English Oaks.**
Motion by Peter Habel, second by Steve Schoen to recommend to the Village Board approval of the PUD amendment for the oversized garage, per staff comments.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- 4. Concept Plan – Cobblestone Builders – Single Family Homesites.**
Dirk Wildt from Cobblestone Builders was present to describe the concept plan for twenty-two single family homesites on the 8.59 acre site north of his original condo development east of South Glen Brooke Drive. Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Peter Habel, to recommend to the Village Board approval of the concept plan per the presentation and subject to staff comments. After discussion, Pres Schwab amended his motion to include photocell-controlled coach lamppost lighting. The second concurred with the amendment.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
- 5. Planned Unit Development Amendment – Sign – Schensema, CPA.**
Motion by Peter Habel, second by Jon Weil, to recommend to the Village Board the approval of the PUD Amendment for the sign, per staff comments.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

6. **Planned Unit Development Amendment – Sign – Bartlein Barrels.**
Motion by Peter Habel, second by Tr. Emmrich to recommend to the Village Board the approval of the PUD Amendment for the sign, per staff comments.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.
7. **Citizens to Address the Plan Commission.**
There were no citizens to address the Board.
8. **Adjourn.**
Motion by Peter Habel, second by Tr. Emmrich to adjourn.
Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by John M. Walther, Administrator.

DRAFT MINUTES
Village Board Meeting
Tuesday, January 9, 2017 at 7:30 p.m.
Jackson Village Hall
N168W20733 Main Street
Jackson, WI 53037

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

President Michael Schwab called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Members Present: Trustees Kufahl, Olson, Emmrich, Kruepke, Kurtz, and Lippold.

Members Absent: None

Staff present: John Walther, Brian Kober, Jim Micech, Kelly Valentino, Police Chief Dolnick, and Fire Chief Swaney.

2. Pledge of Allegiance.

President Schwab led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Any Village Citizen Comment on an Agenda Item.

Larry Hatke and Casey Latz requested to speak under agenda item 13 – West Bend School Presentation. President Schwab will allow discussion after the presentation.

4. Ceremonial Swearing in of Police Officer Andrew Mueller.

Police Chief Dolnick introduced newly hired Police Officer Andrew Mueller.

Administrator Walther conducted the oath of office.

5. Public Hearing:

Planned Unit Development – CNR Group Addition – Alcan Drive.

President Schwab opened the public hearing. No one spoke. President Schwab closed the public hearing. The item was recommended by Plan Commission per staff comments.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Tr. Emmrich to approve the Planned Unit Development – CNR Group Addition – Alcan Drive, per staff comments.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

6. Approval of Minutes for the Village Board Meeting of December 12, 2017.

Motion by Tr. Emmrich, second by Tr. Lippold to approve the Village Board Minutes of December 12, 2017.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

7. Approval of Licenses.

- Entertainment Licenses:
Jackson Pub, Coffeerville
- Operators Licenses:
Walgreen's: Laurie A. Till, Stacy M. Tykac
Village Mart: Magdeline R. Balistreri

Motion by Tr. Kurtz, second by Tr. Lippold to approve the Entertainment and Operators Licenses.

Vote: 6 ayes, 0 nays, 1 abstain (Tr. Kruepke). Motion carried.

8. Appointment of Election Officials.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Tr. Kufahl to approve the list of election officials for 2018.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

9. Committee Member Appointment and Administration of Oath of Office.

Pres. Schwab recommended filling vacancies on the Plan Commission and Park and Rec Committees. Motion by Pres. Schwab to appoint Jon Weil to fill the vacant Plan Commission Committee position until April, 2018, second by Tr. Lippold.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

Village Administrator conducted the oath of office.

Motion by Pres. Schwab to appoint Susan Rank to fill the vacant Joint Parks and Rec Committee position until April, 2020, second by Tr. Kufahl.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

The oath will be conducted prior to the next Joint Parks and Rec Committee meeting.

10. Budget & Finance Committee.

- No Recommendations.

11. Park & Recreation

ADRC Cooperative Agreement

Kelly Valentino reported to the Board on the proposed ADRC Cooperative agreement after meeting with Washington County staff. She is waiting for a revised agreement from Washington County, and recommends review at the next Village Board meeting.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Tr. Emmrich to refer the item to the next Village Board meeting.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

12. Ordinance #17-03 – Annexation of Paloroma Farms, LLC.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Tr. Emmrich to refer Ordinance #17-03 – Annexation of Paloroma Farms, LLC to the next regular Village Board meeting.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

13. West Bend School District - Presentation.

Dave Ross was present to tell the Board how and when the School District is going to proceed with a new Elementary School in Jackson. The School District has been delayed in making a decision since progressing through two School Superintendents and forming a new building committee. The committee has met several times and is proceeding with a recommendation to the School Board in April, 2018. The committee has reviewed the existing site in Jackson and is now set on developing the new site.

Tr. Lippold asked when there may be a referendum. Ross suggested a possible November, 2018 timeline.

Tr. Olson asked if the referendum question would be separate or joint with another project in the School District. Ross stated that is a School Board decision.

Casey Latz would like just a referendum for Jackson. Larry Hatke would like to see just one question asked.

Tr. Kufahl asked if any other School District facilities need updating. Ross answered a Needs Facilities Plan Study was completed by the School District in 2012, and the School Board still follows the plan. The Jackson Elementary School is a high priority. This is something we need to do. A citizen survey is being considered.

President Schwab thanked the School District representatives for coming to the meeting.

This was an information item only, so no action was necessary.

14. Proposed Public Safety Building – Cedar Corp. – Discussion

Cory Scheidler of Cedar Corp gave a presentation to the Board on building plan details by redefining construction elements until the plans are ready for construction. Contact has been made to WisDOT on accessing STH 60. Mr. Scheidler and Fire Chief Swaney presented the proposed plan of the new Safety Building to the Town Board on December 14th.

Tr. Kurtz spoke directly to the Developer and stated the STH 60 land is no longer for sale.

Tr. Lippold stated nothing is being done by the School District and the Village should not wait. Tr. Emmrich stated the longer we wait, the higher the construction cost will be. Tr.

Kufahl recommended setting a deadline on the purchase of the STH 60 property. Pres.

Schwab stated where to build the Safety Building is the issue. Tr. Olson does not want to

box the school in on their site, and would like an update of the STH 60 property purchase at

the next meeting. Pres. Schwab stated both projects are important to the Village. The

Village needs to hold to their promise to the West Bend School District. Tr. Kruepke would like to have the site property study revisited to see if another site would work.

Cory Scheidler will work with the Chiefs to develop the building plans and relook at the site property study. A report will be developed for the next Village Board meeting.

Discussion continued regarding land purchase and building on the existing site.

Motion by Tr. Lippold, Second by Tr. Kurtz to set a ninety day deadline for the April, 2018 Village Board Meeting to make a decision on a property site to build the new Public Safety Building.

Vote: 3 ayes (Lippold, Kurtz, Emmrich), 4 nays (Kufahl, Kruepke, Schwab, Olson).

Motion failed.

15. Resolution Extending Mediation Period for Mediated Cooperative Plan Agreement with Town of Jackson.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, second by Tr. Kufahl to approve Resolution Extending Mediation Period for Mediated Cooperative Plan Agreement with the Town of Jackson.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

16. Departmental Reports.

County Supervisor Robert Hartwig was present to give a Washington County Board update.

Kelly Valentino reported on the next Park and Rec Department fundraiser, Monte Carlo Night, which is being held on Saturday, February 3, 2018.

Chief Aaron Swaney's department is working on a staff promotion procedure.

Administrator Walther reported that the Village is interviewing candidates for the vacant Clerk/Treasurer position.

17. Greater Jackson Business Alliance Report.

The next meeting is Wednesday, January 17th at the Jackson Community Center.

18. Discussion of Circulation of the Jackson Quarterly Newsletter – Liturgical Publications Inc.

Tr. Kruepke introduced Liturgical Publications Inc. that gave a short presentation on the circulation of the Jackson Quarterly Newsletter. The cost of mailing is an extra expense. All other costs are covered by advertising in the publication. Design and layout would be done by the Village of Jackson.

Motion by Pres. Schwab, Second by Tr. Emmrich to have the Village enter into a contract with Liturgical Publications Inc. to publish the Jackson Quarterly Newsletter, and use Hotel/Motel Room Tax to pay for the mailing.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

19. Citizens to Address the Village Board.

No one addressed the Board.

20. Adjourn.

Motion by Tr. Emmrich, second by Tr. Kurtz to adjourn.

Vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays. Meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Brian W. Kober, P.E., Director of Public Works/Village Engineer

DRAFT

Operators Licenses: February 22, 2018 Village Board Meeting

Name	Establishment	Police Chief Recommendation
Lacy L. Luber	East Side Mart	Approval
Bobby Jo Parbs	East Side Mart	Approval
Richard A. Lally	Jackson Pub	Approval
Michael T. D'Angelo	Latest Edition	Approval
Jennifer A. Thetford	Latest Edition	Approval
Jennifer L. Diels	Walgreens	Approval
Rina Ristic	Walgreens	Approval

RESOLUTION #18-02

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY ALL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Village of Jackson recognizes the threat that natural hazards pose to people and property; and

WHEREAS, undertaking hazard mitigation actions before disasters occur will reduce the potential for harm to people and property and save taxpayer dollars; and

WHEREAS, an adopted all hazard mitigation plan is required by FEMA as a condition of future grant funding for mitigation projects under FEMA pre- and post-disaster mitigation grant programs; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Jackson participated jointly in the planning process with Washington County, SEWRPC and other local units of government to prepare an All Hazard Mitigation Plan, which was made available for review and will reside permanently in the Washington County Office of Emergency Management; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management Agency, Region V, officials have reviewed the 2017 plan and approved it contingent upon this official adoption of the participating governing body;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Jackson hereby adopts the 2017 Washington County All Hazards Mitigation Plan as an official plan, and hereby endorses and agrees to participate in the implementation of the Washington County All Hazard Mitigation Plan as it applies to this jurisdiction.

Passed this _____ day of _____, 2018

Introduced by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Vote: _____ ayes _____ nays

Approved: _____

Michael E. Schwab – Village President

Attest: _____

John M. Walther – Administrator

Proof of Posting:

I, the undersigned, certify that I posted this Resolution on bulletin boards at the Village Hall, Post Office, and one other location in the Village.

Village Official

Date



ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT
Joshua Schoemann, County Administrator

432 E. Washington St.
West Bend, WI 53095-7986
Phone (262) 306-2200
FAX (262) 306-2201
WI 1-800-616-0446
joshua.schoemann@co.washington.wi.us

For Immediate Release – April 14, 2015

Contact:

Rob Schmid, Washington County OEM (262) 335-4399

Debora Sielski, Washington County Planning and Parks (262) 335-4445

Washington County Develops First All Hazards Mitigation Plan

Local officials are working together to help develop a plan which aims to reduce Washington County's overall risk from future hazard events such as flooding, tornados and winter storms. The plan will be funded by a FEMA grant and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and will be the first of its kind for Washington County. The plan is being coordinated in a joint effort between the County's Office of Emergency Management and the Planning and Parks Department.

"We are very excited to develop a plan that will identify goals, action items and resources designed to reduce risk in our County," said Rob Schmid, Emergency Management Coordinator for Washington County. "Every dollar spent on mitigation saves three to five dollars on future disaster relief costs."

The first step in the planning process forms a multi-discipline, multi-jurisdictional Local Planning Team including participation from numerous County departments and all 20 Washington County local jurisdictions. The group will guide the planning process and identify/prioritize hazards, risks and mitigation strategies within the plan. The first meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2015 from 2-5 p.m. in room 3011 of the Sheriff's Department.

"The response from local communities has been extremely encouraging. The local officials know best what projects/mitigation measures will most effectively address existing situations within their communities. The plan will be approved by the local jurisdictions and will allow them to be eligible for future grant opportunities that require a formally adopted plan," added Schmid.

Engaging in mitigation provides jurisdictions with a number of benefits. Benefits include reduced loss of life, property, essential services, critical facilities and economic hardship and reduced short-term and long-term recovery and reconstruction costs. The community also gains increased cooperation and communication through the planning process, and increased potential for state and federal funding for mitigation projects.

If you have questions regarding the All Hazards Mitigation Plan process, please contact the Office of Emergency Management.

###

HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM

What is the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)?

The HMGP is authorized in Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act of 1988, and assists state and local communities in implementing long-term hazard mitigation measures following a major disaster declaration. The State Division of Emergency Management administers the HMGP, and projects are 75 percent federally funded through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 12.5 percent state funded through the Wisconsin Emergency Management (WEM), and the remaining 12.5 percent is a local match requirement. The HMGP is only available after declaration of a major disaster by the President.

Program objectives are:

- To prevent future losses of lives and property due to disasters;
- To develop and implement state or local hazard mitigation plans;
- To enable mitigation measures to be implemented during immediate recovery from a disaster, and
- To provide funding for previously identified mitigation measures.

Who is eligible?

- State and local governments;
- Certain private, non-profit organizations or institutions; and
- Indian tribes or authorized tribal organizations and Alaska Native villages or organizations.

What types of projects can be funded?

The HMGP can be used to fund projects to protect either public or private property. Examples include:

- Acquisition, demolition, and relocation of structures from hazard prone areas;
- Retrofitting such as floodproofing and elevation to protect structures from future damages;
- Minor localized structural hazard control or protection projects such as detention ponds;
- Wind resistant retrofitting or construction
- Construction of residential and community safe rooms

- Development of state and local mitigation standards; and
- Development of comprehensive hazard mitigation programs with implementation as an essential component; and
- Development or updates of all-hazards mitigation plans

How do communities apply?

Eligible applicants (as identified above) must apply for the HMGP through the State Division of Emergency Management since the state is responsible for administering the program. The applicant should contact the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for specific details.

What is the deadline for applying for funds?

The State submits a letter of intent to FEMA to participate in the HMGP within 60 days of the disaster declaration. The State will solicit pre-applications statewide.

Applicants are encouraged to apply for mitigation projects as soon as possible after a disaster occurs so that opportunities to do mitigation are not lost during reconstruction. Contact the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for specific application dates.

How much money is available in the HMGP?

The 75% federal funding under the HMGP is based on 15% (20% with a State Enhanced Mitigation Plan approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency) of the federal funds spent on FEMA Public Assistance and Individual Assistance programs for each disaster.

How are potential projects selected for funding?

Proposed projects must meet certain minimum criteria:

- Have a beneficial impact upon the designated disaster area, whether or not located in the disaster area.
- Conform with 44 CFR Part 9, Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands, and 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Considerations.
- Solve a problem independently or constitute a functional portion of a solution where there is assurance that the project as a whole will be completed. Projects that merely identify or analyze hazards or problems are not eligible.
- The project must be cost-effective and substantially reduce the risk of further damages, hardship, loss, or suffering resulting from a major disaster. Wisconsin

Emergency Management, using data and information supplied by the applicant, will have to demonstrate this to FEMA by documenting that the project:

- Addresses a problem that has been repetitive, or a problem that poses a significant risk if left unsolved.
- Will not cost more than the anticipated value of the reduction in both direct damages and subsequent negative impacts to the area if future disasters were to occur. Cost-benefit analyses will be conducted on applications submitted to determine cost effectiveness of the proposed project.
- Has been determined to be the most practical, effective, and environmentally sound alternative after considering a number of options.
- Contributes, to the extent practicable, to a long-term solution to the problem it is intended to address.
- Considers long-term changes to the areas and entities it protects, and has manageable future maintenance and modification requirements.

These criteria are designed to ensure that the most cost-effective and appropriate projects are selected for funding.

To be eligible for HMGP project funds, the applicant must have a FEMA approved all hazard mitigation plan with the proposed project identified in the plan.

How can I obtain further information?

Regulations for the HMGP are published in Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 206, Subpart N. Additional information can be found at the following web sites:

<http://emergencymanagement.wi.gov/>
<http://www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-grant-program-hmgp>

or contact the State Hazard Mitigation Officer at:

Wisconsin Division of Emergency Management
2400 Wright Street, P.O. Box 7865
Madison, WI 53707
608-242-3232 or 1-800-943-0003



FEMA

The Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grant Programs



Hazard Mitigation Assistance

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) programs present a critical opportunity to reduce the risk to individuals and property from natural hazards while simultaneously reducing reliance on Federal disaster funds.

A Common Goal

While the statutory origins of the programs differ, all share the common goal of reducing the risk of loss of life and property due to natural hazards.

Funding Disaster Recovery Efforts

The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) may provide funds to States, Territories, Tribal governments, local governments, and eligible private non-profits following a Presidential major disaster declaration.



The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)



is authorized by Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended (the Stafford Act), Title 42, United States Code (U.S.C.) 5170c. The key purpose of HMGP is to ensure that the opportunity to take critical mitigation measures to reduce the risk of loss of life and property from future disasters is not lost during the reconstruction process following a disaster. HMGP is available, when authorized under a Presidential major disaster declaration, in the areas of the State requested by the Governor. The amount of HMGP funding available to the Applicant is based upon the total Federal assistance to be provided by FEMA for disaster recovery under the Presidential major disaster declaration. Tribal governments can submit a request for a major disaster declaration within their impacted areas.

The Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM)



program is authorized by Section 203 of the Stafford Act, 42 U.S.C. 5133. The PDM program is designed to assist States, Territories, Tribal governments, and local communities in implementing a sustained pre-disaster natural hazard mitigation program to reduce overall risk to the population and structures from future hazard events, while also reducing reliance on Federal funding from future disasters.

The Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA)



program is authorized by Section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (NFIA), 42 U.S.C. 4104c, with the goal of mitigating flood damaged properties to reduce or eliminate claims under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Program Comparisons

Cost Sharing

In general, HMA funds may be used to pay up to 75 percent of the eligible activity costs. The remaining 25 percent of eligible costs are derived from non-Federal sources.

The table below outlines the Federal and State cost share requirements.

COST SHARE REQUIREMENTS

Programs	Mitigation Activity Grant (Percent of Federal/ Non-Federal Share)
HMGP	75/25
PDM	75/25
PDM (subgrantee is small impoverished community)	90/10
PDM (Tribal Grantee is small impoverished community)	90/10
FMA (NFIP insured)	75/25
FMA (repetitive loss property with repetitive loss strategy)	90/10
FMA (severe repetitive loss property with repetitive loss strategy)	100/0

Available Funding

PDM and FMA funding depend on the amounts Congress appropriates each year.

HMGP funding is usually 15 percent of the amount of Federal assistance provided in a state following a presidentially declared disaster.

General Requirements

All mitigation projects must be cost-effective, technically feasible and effective, and meet Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation requirements in accordance with HMA Unified Guidance. In addition, all mitigation activities must adhere to all relevant statutes, regulations, and requirements including other applicable Federal, State, Tribal, and local laws, implementing regulations, and Executive Orders.

All Applicants and subapplicants must have hazard mitigation plans that meet the requirements of 44 CFR Part 201.

Eligible Applicants and Subapplicants

States, Territories, and Tribal governments are eligible HMA Applicants. Each State, Territory, and Tribal government shall designate one agency to serve as the Applicant for each HMA program. All interested subapplicants must apply to the Applicant.

The table below identifies, in general, eligible subapplicants.

ELIGIBLE SUBAPPLICANTS

Subapplicants	HMGP	PDM	FMA
State agencies	✓	✓	✓
Tribal governments	✓	✓	✓
Local governments/communities	✓	✓	✓
Private non-profit organizations (PNPs)	✓		

✓ = Subapplicant is eligible for program funding

Individuals and businesses are not eligible to apply for HMA funds, however, an eligible subapplicant may apply for funding to mitigate private structures.

Eligible Activities

The table below summarizes eligible activities that may be funded by HMA programs. Detailed descriptions of these activities can be found in the HMA Unified Guidance.

ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Mitigation Activities	HMGP	PDM	FMA
Property Acquisition and Structure Demolition or Relocation	✓	✓	✓
Structure Elevation	✓	✓	✓
Mitigation Reconstruction			✓
Dry Floodproofing of Historic Residential Structures	✓	✓	✓
Dry Floodproofing of Non-Residential Structures	✓	✓	✓
Minor Localized Flood Reduction Projects	✓	✓	✓
Structural Retrofitting of Existing Buildings	✓	✓	
Non-Structural Retrofitting of Existing Buildings and Facilities	✓	✓	✓
Safe Room Construction	✓	✓	
Wind Retrofits	✓	✓	
Infrastructure Retrofit	✓	✓	
Soil Stabilization	✓	✓	
Wildfire Mitigation	✓	✓	
Post-Disaster Code Enforcement	✓		
Generators	✓	✓	
Advance Assistance	✓		
5% Initiatives	✓		
Hazard Mitigation Planning	✓	✓	✓
Management Costs	✓	✓	✓

✓ = Mitigation activity is eligible for program funding

Management Costs

For HMGP only: The Grantee may request up to 4.89 percent of the HMGP allocation for management costs. The Grantee is responsible for determining the amount, if any, of funds that will be passed through to the subgrantee(s) for their management costs.

Applicants for PDM and FMA may apply for a maximum of 10 percent of the total funds requested in their grant application budget (Federal and non-Federal shares) for management costs to support the project and planning subapplications included as part of their grant application.

Subapplicants for PDM and FMA may apply for a maximum of 5 percent of the total funds requested in a subapplication for management costs.

National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Participation

There are a number of ways that HMA eligibility is related to the NFIP:



SUBAPPLICANT ELIGIBILITY: All subapplicants for FMA must currently be participating in the NFIP, and not withdrawn or suspended, to be eligible to apply for grant funds. Certain non-participating political subdivisions (i.e., regional flood control districts or county governments) may apply and act as subgrantee on behalf of the NFIP-participating community in areas where the political subdivision provides zoning and building code enforcement or planning and community development professional services for that community.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY: HMGP and PDM mitigation project subapplications for projects sited within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) are eligible only if the jurisdiction in which the project is located is participating in the NFIP. There is no NFIP participation requirement for HMGP and PDM project subapplications located outside of the SFHA.

PROPERTY ELIGIBILITY:

Properties included in a project subapplication for FMA funding must be NFIP-insured at the time of the application submittal. Flood insurance must be maintained at least through completion of the mitigation activity.

Application Process

Applications for HMGP are processed through the HMGP system (formerly known as National Emergency Management Information System (NEMIS)). Applicants use the Application Development Module of HMGP System, which enables each Applicant to create project applications and submit them to the appropriate FEMA Region within 12 months of disaster declaration.

Applications for PDM and FMA are processed through a web-based, electronic grants management system (eGrants), which encompasses the entire grant application process. The eGrants system allows Applicants and subapplicants to apply for and manage their mitigation grant application processes electronically. Applicants and subapplicants can access eGrants at <https://portal.fema.gov>.

FEMA Review and Selection

FEMA will review all subapplications for eligibility and completeness, cost-effectiveness, technical feasibility and effectiveness, and for Environmental Planning and Historical Preservation compliance. Subapplications that do not pass these reviews will not be considered for funding. FEMA will notify Applicants of the status of their subapplications and will work with Applicants on subapplications identified for further review.



Details about the HMA Grant Application process can be found in the Hazard Mitigation Assistance Unified Guidance, which is available at www.fema.gov/hazard-mitigation-assistance

Hazard Mitigation Assistance Unified Guidance

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program, and Flood Mitigation Assistance Program
July 12, 2013



Federal Emergency Management Agency
Department of Homeland Security
500 C Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20472

GovDelivery Notifications

Stay up-to-date on the HMA Grant Programs by subscribing to GovDelivery notifications. Have updates delivered to an e-mail address or mobile device. To learn more, visit www.fema.gov

Contact Information

HMA Helpline: 866-222-3580

Contact information for FEMA Regional Offices is provided at www.fema.gov/regional-operations

Contact information for each State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) is provided at www.fema.gov/state-hazard-mitigation-officers



FEMA

COMMITTEE REPORT

To: Public Safety Committee

From: Rob Schmid – Emergency Management

Date: 11/2/17

Re: Resolution – Adopt Hazard Mitigation Plan for Washington County, Wisconsin

POLICY QUESTION:

Should Washington County adopt the Washington County Hazard Mitigation Plan?

DISCUSSION:

Hazard mitigation is a nationwide program designed to reduce overall risk to people, property and infrastructure from future hazard events, while also reducing the costs of future disaster aid programs, (see attached FEMA document for more details). Experience has shown that for every \$1 spent on mitigation, \$3-\$5 are saved on future disaster relief costs.

After a federal disaster declaration, a percentage of the total disaster funding is allocated to state wide mitigation projects under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP). To be eligible for HMGP grants, a local unit of government must have an approved all hazards mitigation plan in place. The state of WI, which administers this grant program for FEMA, has determined that counties must create and maintain the all hazards mitigation plan for the benefit of the local cities, villages and towns. So, while this program ultimately benefits municipalities and townships, the county is responsible for the first critical step of developing the plan. Without a plan in place, no mitigation project grant applications will be considered.

With this in mind, on June 10th, 2014, the Washington Co. Board approved a FEMA Pre Disaster Mitigation Grant to fund 75% of the costs of developing the Washington Co. Hazard Mitigation Plan. With the assistance of staff from the Office of Emergency Management, Planning & Parks and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC – who covered the other 25% of the project cost) the plan was developed over the past 2-1/2 years. A planning team was formed at the beginning of the project to guide the development of the plan and review the sections of the plan as they were created. The Local Planning Team (LPT) was made up of county and municipal officials as well as interested community members/agencies. The LPT met twice in 2015, once in 2016 and once in 2017. All of the meeting presentations, agendas, minutes, the draft plan itself and other related documents are available on the SEWRPC website <http://www.sewrpc.org/HMP>

As a condition of the planning process, two public meetings were held - in August of 2016 and July of 2017. There was an informational component presented and feedback from the public was solicited at both sessions.

Submit this form in WORD format to CLKagenda_dg@co.washington.wi.us ONE CALENDAR WEEK PLUS 3 WORK DAYS prior to the Committee meeting WITH the Committee Agenda Preparation Form.

Rev. 12/2015

The final draft of the plan (currently 700+ pages) was submitted to Wisconsin Emergency Management (WEM) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) on 8/22/17. In late September Washington Co. received word that our plan had been preliminarily approved by both entities (see attached letters). Final approval will be granted once the Washington County Board approves the plan. After that, adoption/approval by the cities/villages/townships will be the final step of the project.

The Washington Co. Hazard Mitigation Plan will need to be reviewed, evaluated, revised and adopted every 5 years going forward. Federal grant funds currently exist for this purpose and will be applied for if available. SEWRPC may assist in future update processes.

FISCAL EFFECT:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution – Adopt Hazard Mitigation Plan for Washington County, Wisconsin

FEMA - The Unified Hazard Mitigation Assistance Grant Programs

Washington County Meets Requirements FEMA Letter

Washington County Meets Requirements WEM Letter

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion to adopt the Washington Co. Hazard Mitigation Plan and advance the resolution to the Washington Co. Board.

**Submit this form in WORD format to CLKagenda_dg@co.washington.wi.us
ONE CALENDAR WEEK PLUS 3 WORK DAYS prior to the Committee meeting
WITH the Committee Agenda Preparation Form.**

Rev. 12/2015



FEMA

December 21, 2017

Ms. Katie Sommers
State Hazard Mitigation Officer
Wisconsin Emergency Management
2400 Wright Street, P.O. Box 7865
Madison, WI 53707-7865

Dear Ms. Sommers:

Thank you for submitting the adoption documentation for the Washington County Hazard Mitigation Plan. The plan was reviewed based on the local plan criteria contained in 44 CFR Part 201, as authorized by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Washington County met the required criteria for a multi-jurisdiction hazard mitigation plan and the plan is now approved for the county. Please submit the adoption resolutions for any remaining jurisdictions that participated in the planning process.

The approval of this plan ensures continued availability of the full complement of Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) Grants. All requests for funding, however, will be evaluated individually according to the specific eligibility and other requirements of the particular program under which the application is submitted.

We encourage Washington County and the participating jurisdictions to follow the plan's schedule for monitoring and updating the plan, and continue their efforts to implement the mitigation measures. The expiration date of the Washington County Plan is five years from the date of this letter. In order to continue project grant eligibility, the plan must be reviewed, revised as appropriate, resubmitted, and approved no later than the plan expiration date.

Please pass on our congratulations to the county for completing this significant action. If you or the communities have any questions, please contact Christine Meissner at (312) 408-4460 or christine.meissner@fema.dhs.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Melissa A. Janssen".

Melissa A. Janssen
Chief, Risk Analysis Branch
Mitigation Division



STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS
DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

Brian M. Satula
Administrator

Scott Walker
Governor

December 22, 2017

Mr. Robert Schmid, Director
Washington County Emergency Management
500 Schmidt Road
West Bend, WI 53095

Dear Rob:

It gives me great pleasure to inform you that the *Washington County Hazard Mitigation Plan* has officially been approved by FEMA for Washington County! Approval for the participating municipalities is contingent upon receipt of their adoption resolutions.

The plan complies with the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Washington County is eligible to apply for funding through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, Pre-Disaster Mitigation program, and Flood Mitigation Assistance program through December 20, 2022, for projects identified in the Plan. Per regulation, the Plan must be updated and resubmitted for approval every five years to remain eligible for mitigation funding.

Along with the FEMA Meets Requirements letter, you received the Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool, which includes recommended revisions for the five-year update.

Congratulations on the approval of your Plan! Our office commends the County for its commitment to mitigation and reducing future disaster losses, and we look forward to working with you in the future.

If you have any questions, please call me at (608) 242-3222 or Sean Rausch at (608) 242-3214.

Sincerely,

Katie Sommers, CFM
State Hazard Mitigation Officer

Enclosure

Cc: Deb Sielski, Washington County Assistant Administrator for Planning
Ben Schliesman, Southeast Regional Emergency Management Director
Mary Zahn, Southeast Regional Office Operations Associate
Joe Boxhorn, Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

**DRAFT Board of Public Works Meeting
Tuesday, January 30, 2018 –7:00 p.m.
Jackson Village Hall
N168W20733 Main Street**

1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

Chairman Tr. Olson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: Brian Heckendorf, Gloria Teifke, Tr. Kufahl, and Tr. Lippold.

Members absent (excused): Linda Granec and Scott Thielmann.

Staff present: John Walther, and Brian Kober.

Others present: Tr. Emmrich and Tr. Kurtz.

2. Approval of Minutes for November 28, 2017, meeting.

Motion by Brian Heckendorf, second by Tr. Lippold to approve the minutes of the November 28, 2017 Board of Public Works meeting.

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

3. Septic Receiving Rate Study Presentation – Town & Country.

This item was referred from the last meeting. Greg Dressler of Town and Country gave an update of the Rate Study. He gave options of a possible increase for the Septic Receiving Rates. There was discussion of the rates and covering Village expenses. The rates would be reviewed again at the January 2019 meeting.

Motion by Tr. Olson, second by Tr. Kufahl to direct staff to create a resolution for the septic hauling rate increase as submitted. Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

4. Pay Request #3 – SCADA System Project – LW Allen.

The project is in the final stages of completion. Greg Dressler of Town and Country gave a project update. He reported that LW Allen has found additional rotted conduit. The data formatting program and the order work program is scheduled for installation and training in the next month.

Motion by Tr. Olson, second by Brian Heckendorf to recommend approval of the pay request #3 – SCADA System Project LW Allen in an amount not to exceed \$213,138.20.

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

5. Discussion of New Construction Water Meters in Stonewall Heights.

Tr. Lippold had requested this item be placed on the agenda after receiving a phone call, and wanted a better understanding of the issue. Board member Gloria Teifke asked if this item had anything to do with the past Cranberry Creek water and sewer bill problems. Brian Kober explained the current practice when a development is proposed. The Jackson Water Utility requires a meter room to be installed for multi-family buildings. There can be a single meter or the units can be individually metered. The Utility prefers individually metered units.

Stonewall Heights Condo member Ron Stuebs read a letter to the Board and stated that their meter setup will be changed to a single meter arrangement. Stonewall Heights Condo President Diane Stuebs stated the Condo Association held a meeting and voted on the change. Gloria

Teifke questioned why the Condo Association wouldn't separate the water and sewer bill payments per the meter layout?

Diane Stuebs stated that would be difficult and the Association voted on the change. The item was for information only; so no action was taken.

6. Review of Bids replacing WWTP Lab Room Cabinets.

Brian Kober reviewed with the Board the lab cabinets at the WWTP proposed for replacement. The cabinets are the original cabinets from the 1980 plant construction. Four local cabinet makers were requested to give quotes and two were received. The recommendation is to hire RJ Woods Industries, Inc. for a cost of \$22,558.00. The Sewer Replacement Fund will be used for the funding of cabinets.

Motion by Brian Heckendorf, second by Tr. Kufahl to recommend approval of the quote from RJ Woods Industries, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$22,558.00.

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

7. Update on land transfer of old Park-n-Ride lot.

Brian Kober read the email received from Wisconsin Department of Transportation on the land transfer of the old Park-n-Lot. The email read, "The intersection of CTH P and STH 60 is the "lynchpin". We do not want to sell land as excess only to buy it back again (at a higher price) when the final design is determined." Washington County has encouraged the Village to contact the State Representatives as this continues to be in their hands.

The item was for information only, so no action was taken.

8. Director of Public Works report.

Brian Kober gave the report. Motion by Tr. Kufahl, second by Tr. Lippold to place the Director of Public Works report on file.

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Motion carried.

11. Citizens/Village Staff to Address the Board.

None.

12. Adjourn.

Motion by Tr. Lippold, second by Tr. Olson to adjourn,

Vote: 5 ayes, 0 nays. Meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Brian W. Kober, P.E., Director of Public Works/Village Engineer

RESOLUTION #18-03

**A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING RATES FOR SEPTIC
AND HOLDING TANK WASTE FOR 2018**

The Village Board of the Village of Jackson, Washington County, Wisconsin, does resolve as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Village hereby establishes Septic and Holding Tank Waste Rates for the Septic Receiving Station at the Waste Water Treatment Facility as follows:

Holding Tank	\$ 8.00 per 1,000 gallons
Septic System	\$ 45.00 per 1,000 gallons
Septic Decant	\$ 25.00 per 1,000 gallons
Grease Decant	\$ 40.00 per 1,000 gallons
Grease	\$100.00 per 1,000 gallons

Introduced by:_____

Seconded by:_____

Vote:___ Aye ___ Nay

Passed & Approved:_____

Signed:_____
Michael E. Schwab, Village President

Attest: _____
John M. Walther, Administrator

Proof of Posting:

I the undersigned, certify that I posted this Resolution on bulletin boards at the Village Hall, Post Office, and one other location in the Village.

(Village Official)

(Date)

BROWNFIELDS ASSESSMENT COALITION
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING PARTIES:

WASHINGTON COUNTY
and
VILLAGE OF JACKSON

This Memorandum of Agreement documents the roles and responsibilities of the various parties involved in the Assessment Coalition with regard to FY2017 US EPA Cooperative Agreement No: BF-00E02304-1.

1. On October 11, 2017 the EPA awarded the Cooperative Agreement to the Lead Coalition Member Washington County, Wisconsin. A copy of the Cooperative Agreement is included in Attachment A. The grant period is October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2020. Washington County is responsible to the EPA for management of the cooperative agreement and compliance with the statutes, regulations, and terms and conditions of the award, and ensuring that all members of the coalition are in compliance with the terms and conditions.
2. It is the responsibility of Washington County to provide timely information to the other Coalition Partners regarding the management of the cooperative agreement and any changes that may be made to the cooperative agreement over the period of performance.
3. The Coalition Partners include the City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Jackson, Village of Slinger and Village of Richfield. Washington County and the Coalition Partners have already implemented or completed several key steps that will ensure the successful completion of the project including the creation of the Site Redevelopment Steering Committee (SRC), which is a formal committee responsible for site selection and oversight of the Brownfield Assessment Grant. The contact information is as follows:

Washington County
Debora Sielski, Deputy Planning & Parks Administrator
Project Manager for Assessment Grant
333 East Washington Street, Suite 2300
P.O. Box 2003
West Bend, WI 53095-2003
262-335-4445

and

Village of Jackson
John M. Walther, Village of Jackson Administrator
N168W20733 Main Street
Jackson, Wisconsin 53037
262-677-9001

4. Activities funded through the cooperative agreement are outlined in the EPA approved Implementation Work Plan included in Attachment B and may include inventory preparation, site selection criteria development, assessments, planning (including cleanup planning) relating to brownfield sites, and outreach materials and implementation, and other eligible activities. Washington County has retained Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. as the prime consultant under 40 CFR 31.36 to undertake various activities funded through the cooperative agreement. Vandewalle & Associates and Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) are serving as subconsultants to Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

Attachment C, Roles and Responsibilities for Activities to be Performed as Part of U.S. EPA Brownfields Grant Implementation details specific tasks that must be completed by Coalition Partners (City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, Village of Richfield and Village of Jackson), Washington County, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., Vandewalle & Associates, and the EDWC. Washington County may work with other local government partners as part of the Brownfield Grant.

5. As part of advancing Washington County's Site Redevelopment Program and coordination of the SRC and Coalition, the County advanced a qualifications-based procurement process in 2013 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. 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. which included the potential application for future brownfield assessment grants. In 2016, the County legal department reviewed the completed procurement process for consistency with EPA's updated procurement rules as detailed in CFR 200.317-326, and determined that the process used for the initial procurement was fully compliant with the updated requirements. The County reviewed the procurement process and scope for the initial request for qualifications with the EPA Project Officer, who confirmed that the process appeared to be compliant with the updated procurement requirements applicable to the FY17 grant. The contract with Stantec Consulting Services was amended through the execution of a new task order obligating the consultant to comply with the requirements of the FY2017 work plan and Cooperative Agreement.
6. The Lead Coalition Member, Washington County in consultation with the SRC, Coalition Partners, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., EDWC and Vandewalle & Associates, has developed a site selection process during the FY2014 Brownfield Assessment Grant. A minimum of five sites will be assessed over the life of the cooperative agreement. Selected sites will be submitted to the EPA for prior approval to ensure eligibility. The Implementation Work Plan, Attachment B identifies the number of Phase I ESAs, Phase II ESAs, asbestos/hazardous building material surveys, remedial action plans and site/area-wide reuse/redevelopment sites to be completed for this grant.

As part of developing the grant, meetings were held with Coalition partners to discuss priority redevelopment areas for possible future assessment. Each of the Coalition partners selected the site or area that was their highest priority in need of assessment. Assessment needs for these sites are expected to utilize approximately one-third (\$200,000) of the grant funds, with \$40,000 allocated for each of the Coalition partners. Additional sites will be selected based on the previously completed inventory and prioritization, as well as updates to be completed as part of the FY17 grant.

7. Upon designation of the specific sites for assessment or remedial/reuse planning, it will be the responsibility of Washington County to work with the coalition member in whose geographic area the site is located to finalize the scope of work for Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. It will be the responsibility of this Coalition partner to obtain all required permits, easements, and/or access agreements as may be necessary to undertake assessments at the selected site. If this member does not have the capacity to perform these activities Washington County may assist in securing necessary site access agreements and permits. As described in Attachment C, Washington County will assist Coalition partners to complete site access agreements.
8. The Lead Coalition Member, Washington County, is responsible for ensuring that other activities as negotiated in the Implementation Work Plan (Attachment B), such as community outreach and involvement, are implemented in accordance with a schedule agreed upon by Washington County and the Coalition partner in whose geographic area the site to be assessed is located.

Agreed:

Mr. Mark T. McCune, County Board Chairperson
Washington County
Lead Coalition Member

Date:_____

Ms. Ashley Reichert, County Clerk
Washington County

Date:_____

Mr. John M. Walther, Village Administrator
Village of Jackson
Coalition Partner

Date:_____

Attachments:

Attachment A – U.S. EPA Cooperative Agreement BF-00E02304-1

Attachment B – Implementation Work Plan, FY2017 U.S. EPA Grant for Community-Wide Assessment of Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Brownfields

Attachment C - Roles and Responsibilities for Activities to be Performed as Part of FY2017 U.S. EPA Brownfields Grant Implementation

	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY Assistance Amendment		GRANT NUMBER (FAIN): 00E02304	DATE OF AWARD 10/11/2017	
			MODIFICATION NUMBER: 1 PROGRAM CODE: BF		
			TYPE OF ACTION No Cost Amendment		MAILING DATE 10/11/2017
			PAYMENT METHOD: ASAP		ACH# 50920
RECIPIENT TYPE: County			Send Payment Request to: LAS VEGAS FINANCE CENTER		
RECIPIENT: Washington County 333 E. Washington St., Ste 2300 PO Box 2003 West Bend, WI 53095-2003 EIN: 39-6005754			PAYEE: Washington County 333 E. Washington St., Ste 2300 PO Box 2003 West Bend, WI 53095-2003		
PROJECT MANAGER Debora Sielski 333 E. Washington St., Ste 2300 PO Box 2003 West Bend, WI 53095-2003 E-Mail: deb.sielski@co.washington.wi.us Phone: 262-335-4772		EPA PROJECT OFFICER Stephanied Ross 77 West Jackson Blvd., SB-5J Chicago, IL 60604-3507 E-Mail: ross.stephanied@epa.gov Phone: 312-886-0913		EPA GRANT SPECIALIST Kendra Kozak Assistance Section, MC-10J E-Mail: kozak.kendra@epa.gov Phone: 312-353-8834	
PROJECT TITLE AND EXPLANATION OF CHANGES Community Wide Assessment for Haz and Pet- Washington Co. WI This cooperative agreement will provide funding for Washington County to characterize, assess, and conduct cleanup planning and community involvement related activities for Brownfield sites in Washington County, Wisconsin. The Washington County site redevelopment program is a county-led coalition of governments including the City of Hartford, City of West Bend, and the Villages of Slinger, Jackson, and Richfield. The County will utilize the county-wide brownfields inventory in conjunction with assessment and planning activities to encourage revitalization and reuse of brownfield sites. The purpose of this amendment is to revise programmatic terms and conditions to reflect Fiscal Year 2017 revisions and to update General Terms and Conditions.					
BUDGET PERIOD 10/01/2017 - 09/30/2020	PROJECT PERIOD 10/01/2017 - 09/30/2020	TOTAL BUDGET PERIOD COST \$600,000.00	TOTAL PROJECT PERIOD COST \$600,000.00		
NOTICE OF AWARD					
Based on your Application dated 08/30/2017 including all modifications and amendments, the United States acting by and through the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) hereby awards \$. EPA agrees to cost-share 100.00% of all approved budget period costs incurred, up to and not exceeding total federal funding of \$600,000. Recipient's signature is not required on this agreement. The recipient demonstrates its commitment to carry out this award by either: 1) drawing down funds within 21 days after the EPA award or amendment mailing date; or 2) not filing a notice of disagreement with the award terms and conditions within 21 days after the EPA award or amendment mailing date. If the recipient disagrees with the terms and conditions specified in this award, the authorized representative of the recipient must furnish a notice of disagreement to the EPA Award Official within 21 days after the EPA award or amendment mailing date. In case of disagreement, and until the disagreement is resolved, the recipient should not draw down on the funds provided by this award/amendment, and any costs incurred by the recipient are at its own risk. This agreement is subject to applicable EPA regulatory and statutory provisions, all terms and conditions of this agreement and any attachments.					
ISSUING OFFICE (GRANTS MANAGEMENT OFFICE)		AWARD APPROVAL OFFICE			
ORGANIZATION / ADDRESS U.S. EPA Region 5 Mail Code MCG10J 77 West Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604-3507		ORGANIZATION / ADDRESS U.S. EPA, Region 5 Superfund Division 77 West Jackson Blvd., S-6J Chicago, IL 60604-3507			
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY					
Digital signature applied by EPA Award Official Sharon Green - Chief, Assistance Section				DATE 10/11/2017	

EPA Funding Information

BF - 00E02304 - 1 Page 2

FUNDS	FORMER AWARD	THIS ACTION	AMENDED TOTAL
EPA Amount This Action	\$ 600,000	\$	\$ 600,000
EPA In-Kind Amount	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Unexpended Prior Year Balance	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Other Federal Funds	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Recipient Contribution	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
State Contribution	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Local Contribution	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Other Contribution	\$ 0	\$	\$ 0
Allowable Project Cost	\$ 600,000	\$ 0	\$ 600,000

Assistance Program (CFDA)	Statutory Authority	Regulatory Authority
66.818 - Brownfields Assessment and Cleanup Cooperative Agreements	CERCLA: Sec. 101(39)	2 CFR 200 2 CFR 1500 and 40 CFR 33

[illegible]

Budget Summary Page: Community-Wide Assessment of Hazardous Substances and Petroleum Brownfields Budget Detail

Table A - Object Class Category (Non-construction)	Total Approved Allowable Budget Period Cost
1. Personnel	\$0
2. Fringe Benefits	\$0
3. Travel	\$5,900
4. Equipment	\$0
5. Supplies	\$1,900
6. Contractual	\$592,200
7. Construction	\$0
8. Other	\$0
9. Total Direct Charges	\$600,000
10. Indirect Costs: % Base	\$0
11. Total (Share: Recipient <u>0.00</u> % Federal <u>100.00</u> %.)	\$600,000
12. Total Approved Assistance Amount	\$600,000
13. Program Income	\$0
14. Total EPA Amount Awarded This Action	\$0
15. Total EPA Amount Awarded To Date	\$600,000

Administrative Conditions

The following administrative term and condition is updated:

1. GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The recipient agrees to comply with the current EPA general terms and conditions available at :
<https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-general-terms-and-conditions-effective-october-2-2017-or-later>
 These terms and conditions are in addition to the assurances and certifications made as a part of the award and the terms, conditions, or restrictions cited throughout the award.

The EPA repository for the general terms and conditions by year can be found at
<http://www.epa.gov/grants/grant-terms-and-conditions>

All other administrative terms and conditions remain the same.

Programmatic Conditions

The following programmatic terms and conditions replace all previous programmatic terms and conditions.

R5 FY17 Assessment Terms and Conditions

Please note that these Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) apply to Brownfields Assessment Cooperative Agreements awarded under CERCLA § 104(k).

I. GENERAL FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

NOTE: For the purposes of these Terms and Conditions the term “assessment” includes, eligible activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) § 104(k)(2)(A)(i) such as activities involving the inventory, characterization, assessment, and planning relating to brownfield sites as described in the EPA approved workplan.

A. Federal Policy and Guidance

1. a. Cooperative Agreement Recipients: By awarding this cooperative agreement, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has approved the proposal for the Cooperative Agreement Recipient (CAR) submitted in the Fiscal Year 2017 competition for Brownfields assessment cooperative agreements.

By awarding this cooperative agreement, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not approved/conditionally approved the proposal for the Cooperative Agreement Recipient (CAR) submitted in the Fiscal Year 2017 competition for Brownfields assessment cooperative agreements. The CAR may not expend (“draw down”) funds to carry out this agreement until EPA’s award official approves the workplan.

- b. In implementing this agreement, the CAR shall ensure that work done with cooperative agreement funds complies with the requirements of the CERCLA § 104(k). The CAR shall

also ensure that assessment activities supported with cooperative agreement funding comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

- c. The CAR must comply with federal cross-cutting requirements. These requirements include, but are not limited to, DBE requirements found at 40 CFR Part 33; OSHA Worker Health & Safety Standard 29 CFR 1910.120; the Uniform Relocation Act; National Historic Preservation Act; Endangered Species Act; and Permits required by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; Executive Order 11246, Equal Employment Opportunity, and implementing regulations at 41 CFR 60-4; Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, as amended (40 USC § 327-333) the Anti-Kickback Act (40 USC § 276c) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as implemented by Executive Orders 11914 and 11250.
- d. The CAR must comply with Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements and associated U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) regulations for all construction, alteration and repair contracts and subcontracts awarded with funds provided under this agreement. Activities conducted under assessment cooperative agreements generally do not involve construction, alteration and repair within the meaning of the Davis-Bacon Act. However, the recipient must contact the EPA Project Officer if there are unique circumstances (e.g. removal of an underground storage tank or another structure and restoration of the site) which indicate that the Davis-Bacon Act applies to an activity the CAR intends to carry out with funds provided under this agreement. EPA will provide guidance on Davis-Bacon Act compliance if necessary.

II. SITE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Brownfields Site Determinations

- 1.
 - a. The CAR must provide information to EPA about site-specific work prior to incurring any costs under this cooperative agreement for sites that have not already been pre-approved in the CAR's site-specific workplan by EPA. The information that must be provided includes whether or not the site meets the definition of a brownfield site as defined in § 101(39) of CERCLA, whether the CAR is the potentially responsible party under CERCLA § 107 and/or has defenses to liability (i.e., an eligibility determination).
 - b. If the site is excluded from the general definition of a brownfield, but is eligible for a property-specific funding determination, then the CAR may request a property-specific funding determination. In their request, the CAR must provide information sufficient for EPA to make a property-specific funding determination on how financial assistance will protect human health and the environment, and either promote economic development or enable the creation of, preservation of, or addition to parks, greenways, undeveloped property, other recreational property, or other property used for nonprofit purposes. The CAR must not incur costs for assessing sites requiring a property-specific funding determination by EPA until the EPA Project Officer has advised the CAR that the Agency has determined that the property is eligible.
- 2.
 - a. For any petroleum contaminated brownfield site that is not included in the CAR's EPA

approved (site-specific) workplan, the CAR shall provide sufficient documentation to EPA prior to incurring costs under this

cooperative agreement which documents that:

- (1) a State has determined that the petroleum site is of relatively low risk, as compared to other petroleum-only sites in the State,
- (2) the State determines there is “no viable responsible party” for the site;
- (3) the State determines that the person assessing or investigating the site is a person who is not potentially liable for cleaning up the site; and
- (4) the site is not subject to any order issued under section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

This documentation must be prepared by the CAR or the State, following contact and discussion with the appropriate petroleum program official. Refer to EPA’s FY17 Proposal Guidelines for Brownfields Assessment Grants, EPA-OLEM-OBLR-16-08 for discussion on this element.

- b. Documentation must include (1) the identity of the State program official contacted, (2) the State official’s telephone number, (3) the date of the contact, and (4) a summary of the discussion relating to the state’s determination that the site is of relatively low risk, that there is no viable responsible party and that the person assessing or investigating the site is not potentially liable for cleaning up the site. Other documentation provided by a State to the recipient relevant to any of the determinations by the State must also be provided to the EPA Project Officer. A copy of the State’s determination must be provided to the EPA Project Officer.
- c. If the State chooses not to make the determinations described in Section II.A.2.a. above, the CAR must contact the EPA Project Officer and provide the necessary information for EPA to make the requisite determinations.
- d. EPA will make all determinations on the eligibility of petroleum-contaminated brownfields sites located on tribal lands (i.e., reservation lands or lands otherwise in Indian country, as defined at 18 U.S.C. 1151). Before incurring costs for these sites, the CAR must contact the EPA Project Officer and provide the necessary information for EPA to make the determinations described in Section II.A.2.a. above.

III. GENERAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS

A. Term of the Agreement

1. The term of this agreement is three years from the date of award, unless otherwise extended by EPA at the CAR’s request.
2. If after 18 months from the date of award, EPA determines that the CAR has not made sufficient progress in implementing its cooperative agreement, the recipient must implement a corrective

action plan approved by the EPA Project Officer. Alternatively, EPA may terminate this agreement under 2 CFR 200.339 for material non-compliance with its terms, or with the consent of the CAR as provided at 2 CFR 200.339 if EPA determines that insufficient progress was not the fault of the CAR. For purposes of assessment cooperative agreements, the CAR demonstrates “sufficient progress” when 35% of funds have been drawn down and obligated to eligible activities; for assessment coalition cooperative agreements “sufficient progress” is demonstrated when a solicitation for services has been released, sites are prioritized or an inventory has been initiated if necessary, community involvement activities have been initiated and a Memorandum of Agreement is in place, or other documented activities that demonstrate to EPA’s satisfaction that the CAR will successfully perform the cooperative agreement.

3. Assessment funding for an eligible brownfield site may not exceed \$200,000 unless a waiver has been granted by EPA. Following the granting of a waiver, funding is not to exceed \$350,000 at the site.

B. Substantial Involvement

1. EPA may be substantially involved in overseeing and monitoring this cooperative agreement.
 - a. Substantial involvement by EPA generally includes administrative activities by the Project Officer such as monitoring, reviewing project phases, and approving substantive terms included in professional services contracts.
 - b. Substantial EPA involvement also includes brownfields property-specific funding determinations described in Section I.B. If the CAR awards a subaward for site assessment, the CAR must obtain technical assistance from EPA on which sites qualify as a brownfield site and determine whether the statutory prohibition found in section 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV) of CERCLA applies. This prohibition does not allow the subrecipient to use EPA funds to assess a site for which the subrecipient is potentially liable under § 107 of CERCLA. (See Section III.C.3. for more information on subawards.)
 - c. Substantial EPA involvement may include reviewing financial and environmental status reports; and monitoring all reporting, record-keeping, and other program requirements.
 - d. EPA may waive any of the provisions in Term and Condition III.B.1. with the exception of property-specific funding determinations. EPA will provide waivers in writing.
2. Effect of EPA’s substantial involvement includes:
 - a. EPA’s review of any project phase, document, or cost incurred under this cooperative agreement, will not have any effect upon CERCLA § 128 *Eligible Response Site* determinations or rights, authorities, and actions under CERCLA or any federal statute.

- b. The CAR remains responsible for ensuring that all assessments are protective of human health and the environment and comply with all applicable federal and state laws.
- c. The CAR and its subrecipients remain responsible for incurring costs that are allowable under 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart E.

C. Cooperative Agreement Recipient Roles and Responsibilities

1. The CAR must acquire the services of a qualified environmental professional(s) to coordinate, direct, and oversee the brownfields assessment activities at a particular site, if they do not have such a professional on staff.
2. The CAR is responsible for ensuring that contractors and subrecipients comply with the terms of their agreements with the CAR, and that agreements between the CAR and subrecipients and contractors comply with the terms and conditions of this agreement.
3. Subawards are defined at 2 CFR 200.92. The CAR may not subaward to for-profit organizations. The CAR must obtain commercial services and products necessary to carry out this agreement under competitive procurement procedures as described in 2 CFR Part 200.317 through 200.326. In addition, EPA policy encourages awarding subawards competitively and the CAR must consider awarding subawards through competition.
4. The CAR is responsible for ensuring that EPA's Brownfields assessment funding received under this cooperative agreement, or in combination with any other previously awarded Brownfields Assessment cooperative agreements does not exceed the \$200,000 funding limitation for an individual brownfield site. Waiver of this funding limit for a brownfields site must be approved by EPA prior to the expenditure of funding exceeding \$200,000. In no case may EPA funding exceed \$350,000 on a site receiving a waiver.
5. CARs expending funding from a community-wide assessment cooperative agreement must include this amount in any total funding expended on the site.

6. Competency of Organizations Generating Environmental Measurement Data:

In accordance with Agency Policy Directive Number FEM-2012-02, Policy to Assure the Competency of Organizations Generating Environmental Measurement Data under Agency-Funded Assistance Agreements, the CAR agrees, by entering into this agreement, that it has demonstrated competency prior to award, or alternatively, where a pre-award demonstration of competency is not practicable, the CAR agrees to demonstrate competency prior to carrying out any activities under the award involving the generation or use of environmental data. The CAR shall maintain competency for the duration of the project period of this agreement and this will be documented during the annual reporting process. A copy of the Policy is available online at http://www.epa.gov/fem/lab_comp.htm or a copy may also be requested by contacting the EPA Project Officer for this award.

D. Quarterly Progress Reports

1. In accordance with EPA regulations 2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500 (specifically, 200.328 *monitoring and reporting program performance*), the CAR agrees to submit quarterly progress reports to the EPA Project Officer within thirty days after each reporting period. These reports shall cover work status, work progress, difficulties encountered, preliminary data results and a statement of activity anticipated during the subsequent reporting period, including a description of equipment, techniques, and materials to be used or evaluated. A discussion of expenditures and financial status for each workplan task, along with a comparison of the percentage of the project completed to the project schedule and an explanation of significant discrepancies shall be included in the report. The report shall also include any changes of key personnel concerned with the project.

Quarterly progress reports must clearly differentiate which activities were completed with EPA funds provided under the Brownfield assessment cooperative agreement, versus any other funding source used to help accomplish project activities.

In addition, the report shall include brief information on each of the following areas: 1) a comparison of actual accomplishments to the anticipated outputs/outcomes specified in the cooperative agreement workplan; 2) reasons why anticipated outputs/outcomes were not met; and 3) other pertinent information, including, when appropriate, analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs. The CAR agrees that it will notify EPA of problems, delays, or adverse conditions which materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the cooperative agreement workplan.

2. The CAR must submit progress reports on a quarterly basis to the EPA Project Officer. quarterly progress reports must include:
 - a. Summary and status of approved activities performed during the reporting quarter, summary of the performance outputs/outcomes achieved during the reporting quarter, a description of problems encountered or difficulties during the reporting quarter that may affect the project schedule and a discussion of meeting the performance outputs/outcomes.
 - b. An update on project schedules and milestones; including an explanation of any discrepancies from the approved workplan.
 - c. A list of the properties where assessment activities were performed and/or completed during the reporting quarter.
 - d. A budget recap summary table with the following information: current approved project budget; costs incurred during the reporting quarter; costs incurred to date (cumulative expenditures); and total remaining funds. The CAR should include an explanation of any discrepancies in the budget from the approved workplan.
3. If the CAR makes any subawards under this agreement, then it becomes a pass-through entity under the "Establishing and Managing Subaward" General Term and Condition of this agreement. As the pass-through entity, the CAR must report to EPA on its subaward monitoring activities under 2 CFR 200.331(d), including the following information on subawards as part of the CAR's quarterly performance reporting:
 - a. Summaries of results of reviews of financial and programmatic reports.
 - b. Summaries of findings from site visits and/or desk reviews to ensure effective subrecipient performance.

- c. Environmental results the subrecipient achieved.
 - d. Summaries of audit findings and related pass-through entity management decisions.
 - e. Actions the pass-through entity has taken to correct any deficiencies such as those specified at [2 CFR 200.331\(e\)](#), [2 CFR 200.207](#) and the [2 CFR Part 200.338 Remedies for Noncompliance](#).
4. The CAR must maintain records that will enable it to report to EPA on the amount of funds disbursed by the CAR to assess specific properties under this cooperative agreement.
5. In accordance with 2 CFR 200.328(d)(1), the CAR agrees to inform EPA as soon as problems, delays, or adverse conditions become known which will materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the approved workplan.

E. Property Profile Submission

1. The CAR must report on interim progress (i.e., assessment started) and any final accomplishments (i.e., assessment completed, cleanup required, contaminants, institution controls, engineering controls) by completing and submitting relevant portions of the Property Profile Form using the Brownfields Program on-line reporting system, known as Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES). The CAR must enter the data in ACRES as soon as the interim action or final accomplishment has occurred, or within 30 days after the end of each reporting quarter. EPA will provide the CAR with training prior to obtaining access to ACRES. The training is required to obtain access to ACRES. The CAR must utilize the ACRES system unless approval is obtained from the regional Project Officer to utilize and submit the Property Profile Form instead.

F. Community Outreach

1. The CAR agrees to clearly reference EPA investments in the project during all phases of community outreach outlined in the EPA-approved workplan, which may include the development of any post-project summary or success materials that highlight achievements to which this project contributed. Specifically:
- a. The CAR agrees to notify the EPA Project Officer listed in this award document of public or media events publicizing the accomplishment of significant events related to construction or site reuse projects as a result of this agreement, and provide the opportunity for attendance and participation by federal representatives with at least ten (10) working days' notice.
 - b. To increase public awareness of projects serving communities where English is not the predominant language, recipients are encouraged to include in their outreach strategies communication in non-English languages. Translation costs for this purpose are allowable, provided the costs are reasonable.
 - c. Project Outreach Materials
 - i) If any document, fact sheet, and/or web material are developed as part of this

cooperative agreement, then they shall include the following statement: "Though this project has been funded, wholly or in part, by EPA, the contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of EPA."

- ii) If a sign is developed, as part of a project funded by this cooperative agreement, then the sign shall include either a statement (e.g., this project has been funded, wholly or in part, by EPA) and/or EPA's logo acknowledging that EPA is a source of funding for the project. The EPA logo may be used on project signage when the sign can be placed in a visible location with direct linkage to site activities. Use of the EPA logo must follow the sign specifications available at: <http://www.epa.gov/ogd/tc.htm>.

G. Final Technical Cooperative Agreement Report with Environmental Results

1. In accordance with EPA regulations 2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500 (specifically, 200.328 *monitoring and reporting program performance*), the CAR agrees to submit to the EPA Project Officer within 90 days after the expiration or termination of the approved project period a final technical report on the cooperative agreement and at least one reproducible copy suitable for printing. The final technical report shall document project activities over the entire project period and shall include brief information on each of the following areas: 1) a comparison of actual accomplishments with the anticipated outputs/outcomes specified in the assistance agreement workplan; 2) reasons why anticipated outputs/outcomes were not met; and 3) other pertinent information, including, when appropriate, analysis and explanation of cost overruns or high unit costs. The CAR agrees that it will notify EPA of problems, delays, or adverse conditions which materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the cooperative agreement workplan.

H. Conflict of Interest

1. The CAR shall establish and enforce conflict of interest provisions that prevent the award of subawards that create real or apparent personal conflicts of interest, or the CAR's appearance of lack of impartiality. Such situations include, but are not limited to, situations in which an employee, official, consultant, contractor, or other individual associated with the CAR (affected party) approves or administers a subaward to a subrecipient in which the affected party has a financial or other interest. Such a conflict of interest or appearance of lack of impartiality may arise when:

- (i) The affected party,
- (ii) Any member of his immediate family,
- (iii) His or her partner, or
- (iv) An organization which employs, or is about to employ, any of the above, has a financial or other interest in the subrecipient. Affected employees will neither solicit nor accept gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value from subrecipients. Recipients may set minimum rules where the financial interest is not substantial or the gift is an unsolicited item of nominal intrinsic value. To the extent permitted by State or local law or regulations, such standards of conduct will provide for penalties, sanctions, or other disciplinary actions for violations of such standards by affected parties.

IV. FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

A. Eligible Uses of the Funds for the Cooperative Agreement Recipient

1. To the extent allowable under the workplan, cooperative agreement funds may be used for eligible programmatic expenses to inventory, characterize, assess, and conduct planning and outreach. Eligible programmatic expenses include activities described in Section IV. of these Terms and Conditions. In addition, eligible programmatic expenses may include:

- a. Determining whether assessment activities at a particular site are authorized by CERCLA § 104(k);
- b. Ensuring that an assessment complies with applicable requirements under federal and state laws, as required by CERCLA § 104(k);
- c. Using a portion of the cooperative agreement funds to purchase environmental insurance for the characterization or assessment of the site. Funds may not be used to purchase insurance intended to provide coverage for any of the ineligible uses under Section IV.B.; and
- d. Any other eligible programmatic costs including direct costs incurred by the recipient in reporting to EPA; procuring and managing contracts; awarding and managing subawards to the extent allowable under Section IV.B.2.; and carrying out community involvement pertaining to the assessment activities.

2. **Local Governments only- Applicable only if included in approved work plan:** No more than 10% of the funds awarded by this agreement may be used by the CAR itself as a programmatic cost for brownfield program development and implementation (including monitoring of health and institutional controls) as described in the Task of the EPA approved workplan. The CAR must maintain records on funds that will be used to carry out the Task of its EPA approved workplan to ensure compliance with this requirement.

B. Ineligible Uses of the Funds for the Cooperative Agreement Recipient

1. Cooperative agreement funds shall not be used by the CAR for any of the following activities:
 - a. Cleanup activities;
 - b. Site development activities that are not brownfields assessment activities (e.g., construction of a new facility);
 - c. Job training unrelated to performing a specific assessment at a site covered by the cooperative agreement;
 - d. To pay for a penalty or fine;

- e. To pay a federal cost share requirement (for example, a cost-share required by another federal grant) unless there is specific statutory authority;
- f. To pay for a response cost at a brownfields site for which the CAR of the cooperative agreement or subaward recipient is potentially liable under CERCLA § 107;
- g. To pay a cost of compliance with any federal law, excluding the cost of compliance with laws applicable to the assessment; and
- h. Unallowable costs (e.g., lobbying and fund raising) under 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart E.

2. Under CERCLA § 104(k)(4)(B), administrative costs are prohibited costs under this agreement. Prohibited administrative costs include all indirect costs under 2 CFR Part 225 for state, local and tribal governments, as applicable.

- a. Ineligible administrative costs include costs incurred in the form of salaries, benefits, contractual costs, supplies, and data processing charges, incurred to comply with most provisions of the *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit requirements for Federal Awards at* 2 CFR 200 and 2 CFR 1500. Direct costs for cooperative agreement administration, with the exception of costs specifically identified as eligible programmatic costs, are ineligible even if the CAR is required to carry out the activity under the cooperative agreement. Costs incurred to report quarterly performance to EPA under the cooperative agreement are eligible.
- b. Ineligible cooperative agreement administration costs include direct costs for:
 - (1) Preparation of applications for brownfields grants;
 - (2) Record retention required under 2 CFR 1500.6;
 - (3) Record-keeping associated with equipment purchases required under 2 CFR 200.313;
 - (4) Preparing revisions and changes in the budgets, scopes of work, program plans and other activities required under 2 CFR 200.308;
 - (5) Maintaining and operating financial management systems required under 2 CFR 200.302;
 - (6) Preparing payment requests and handling payments under 2 CFR 200.305;
 - (7) Non-federal audits required under 2 CFR 200 Subpart F; and
 - (8) Close out under 2 CFR 200.343.

3. Cooperative agreement funds may not be used for any of the following properties:

- a. Facilities listed, or proposed for listing, on the Priorities List (NPL);
- b. Facilities subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, and administrative orders on consent or judicial consent decree issued to or entered by parties under CERCLA;
- c. Facilities that are subject to the jurisdiction, custody or control of the United States government except for land held in trust by the United States government for an Indian tribe; or
- d. A site excluded from the definition of a brownfields site for which EPA has not made a property-specific funding determination.

C. Interest-Bearing Accounts and Program Income

1. In accordance with 2 CFR 1500.7, during the performance period of the cooperative agreement the CAR is authorized to add program income to the funds awarded by EPA and use the program income under the same terms and conditions of this agreement. Program income for the assessment CAR shall be defined as the gross income received by the recipient, directly generated by the cooperative agreement award or earned during the period of the award. Program income includes, but is not limited to, fees charged for conducting assessment, site characterizations, clean up planning or other activities when the costs for the activity is charged to this agreement.
2. The CAR must deposit advances of cooperative agreement funds and program income (i.e. fees) in an interest bearing account.
 - a. For interest earned on advances, CARs are subject to the provisions of 2 CFR 200.305(b)(7)(ii) relating to remitting interest on advances to EPA on a quarterly basis.
 - b. Interest earned on program income is considered additional program income.
 - c. The CAR must disburse program income (including interest earned on program income) before requesting additional payments from EPA as required by 2 CFR 1500.8.

V. ASSESSMENT ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Authorized Assessment Activities

1. Prior to conducting or engaging in any on-site activity with the potential to impact historic properties (such as invasive sampling), the CAR shall consult with EPA regarding potential applicability of the National Historic Preservation Act and, if applicable, shall assist EPA in complying with any requirements of the Act and implementing regulations.

B. Quality Assurance (QA) Requirements

1. When environmental data are collected as part of the brownfields assessment, the CAR shall comply with 2 CFR 1500.11 requirements to develop and implement quality assurance practices sufficient to produce data adequate to meet project objectives and to minimize data loss. State law may impose additional QA requirements.

C. All Appropriate Inquiry

1. As required by CERCLA § 104(k)(2)(B)(ii) and CERCLA § 101(35)(B), the CAR shall ensure that a Phase I site characterization and assessment carried out under this agreement will be performed in accordance with EPA's all appropriate inquiries regulation. The CAR shall utilize the practices in ASTM standard E1527-13 "Standard Practices for Environmental Site Assessment: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process," or EPA's All Appropriate Inquiries Final Rule (40 CFR 312). A suggested outline for an AAI final report is provided in "All Appropriate Inquiries Rule: Reporting Requirements and Suggestions on Report Content", (Publication Number: EPA 560-F-14-003). This does not preclude the use of cooperative agreement funds for additional site characterization and assessment activities that may be necessary to characterize the environmental impacts at the site or to comply with applicable State standards.
2. All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) final reports produced with funding from this agreement must comply with 40 C.F.R. Part 312 and must, at a minimum, include the information below. All AAI reports submitted to EPA Project Officers as deliverables under this agreement must be accompanied by a completed "All Appropriate Inquiries Final Rule: Reporting Requirements Checklist for Assessment Grant Recipients" (Publication Number: EPA 560-R-10-030) that EPA's Project Officer will provide to the recipient. The checklist also is available to CARs on EPA's website at www.epa.gov/brownfields.
 - a. An **opinion** as to whether the inquiry has identified conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, and as applicable, pollutants and contaminants, petroleum or petroleum products, or controlled substances, on, at, in, or to the subject property.
 - b. An identification of "**significant**" **data gaps** (as defined in 40 C.F.R. 312.10), if any, in the information collected for the inquiry. Significant data gaps include missing or unattainable information that affects the ability of the environmental professional to identify conditions indicative of releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances, and as applicable, pollutants and contaminants, petroleum or petroleum products, or controlled substances, on, at, in, or to the subject property. The documentation of significant data gaps must include information regarding the significance of these data gaps.
 - c. **Qualifications and signature** of the environmental professional(s). The environmental professional must place the following statements in the document and sign the document:
 - "[I, We] declare that, to the best of [my, our] professional knowledge and belief, [I, we]

meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in §312.10 of this part.”

“[I, We] have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. [I, We] have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.”

Note: Please use either “I” or “We.”

- d. In compliance with §312.31(b), the environmental professional must include in the final report an ***opinion regarding additional appropriate investigation*** , if the environmental professional has such an opinion.
3. EPA may review checklists and AAI final reports for compliance with the AAI regulation documentation requirements at 40 CFR part 312 (or comparable requirements for those using ASTM Standard 1527-13). Any deficiencies identified during an EPA review of these documents must be corrected by the recipient within 30 days of notification. Failure to correct any identified deficiencies may result in EPA disallowing the costs for the entire AAI report as authorized by 2 CFR 200.338 through 2 CFR 200.342. If a recipient willfully fails to correct the deficiencies the Agency may consider other available remedies under 2 CFR 200.342.

D. Completion of Assessment Activities

1. The CAR shall properly document the completion of all activities described in the EPA approved workplan. This must be done through a final report or letter from a qualified environmental professional, or other documentation provided by a State or Tribe that shows assessments are complete.

VII. PAYMENT AND CLOSEOUT

A. Payment Schedule

1. The CAR may request payment from EPA pursuant to 2 CFR 200.305.

B. Schedule for Closeout

1. Closeout will be conducted in accordance with 2 CFR 200.343. EPA will close out the award when it determines that all applicable administrative actions and all required work under the cooperative agreement have been completed.
2. The CAR, within 90 days after the end date of the period of performance or the termination of the cooperative agreement, must submit all financial, performance, and other reports required as a condition of the cooperative agreement or 2 CFR Part 200.

a. The CAR must submit the following documentation:

(1) The Final Technical Cooperative Agreement Report as described in Section III.G. of these Terms and Conditions.

(2) A Final Federal Financial Report (FFR - SF425). Submitted to:

US EPA, Las Vegas Finance Center
4220 S. Maryland Pkwy, Bldg C, Rm 503
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Fax: (702) 798-2423
<https://www.epa.gov/financial/grants>

(3) A Final MBE/WBE Report (EPA Form 5700-52A). Submitted to the regional office.

b. The CAR must ensure that all appropriate data has been entered into ACRES or all Property Profile Forms are submitted to the Region.

c. The CAR must immediately refund to EPA any balance of unobligated (unencumbered) cash advanced that is not authorized to be retained for use on other cooperative agreements.

VI. OTHER PROGRAMMATIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

A. Cybersecurity - All Other Recipients Besides States & Tribes

(a) The recipient agrees that when collecting and managing environmental data under this assistance agreement, it will protect the data by following all applicable State or Tribal law cybersecurity requirements.

(b) (1) EPA must ensure that any connections between the recipient's network or information system and EPA networks used by the recipient to transfer data under this agreement, are secure. For purposes of this Section, a connection is defined as a dedicated persistent interface between an Agency IT system and an external IT system for the purpose of transferring information. Transitory, user-controlled connections such as website browsing are excluded from this definition.

If the recipient's connections as defined above do not go through the Environmental Information Exchange Network or EPA's Central Data Exchange, the recipient agrees to contact the EPA Project Officer (PO) no later than 90 days after the date of this award and work with the designated Regional/Headquarters Information Security Officer to ensure that the connections meet EPA security requirements, including entering into Interconnection Service Agreements as appropriate. This condition does not apply to manual entry of data by the recipient into systems operated and used by EPA's regulatory programs for the submission of reporting and/or compliance data.

(2) The recipient agrees that any subawards it makes under this agreement will require the subrecipient

to comply with the requirements in (b)(1) if the subrecipient's network or information system is connected to EPA networks to transfer data to the Agency using systems other than the Environmental Information Exchange Network or EPA's Central Data Exchange. The recipient will be in compliance with this condition: by including this requirement in subaward agreements; and during subrecipient monitoring deemed necessary by the recipient under 2 CFR 200.331(d), by inquiring whether the subrecipient has contacted the EPA Project Officer. Nothing in this condition requires the recipient to contact the EPA Project Officer on behalf of a subrecipient or to be involved in the negotiation of an Interconnection Service Agreement between the subrecipient and EPA.

B. Leveraging

The recipient agrees to provide the proposed leveraged funding, including any voluntary cost-share contribution or overmatch, that is described in its proposal dated **08/30/17**. If the proposed leveraging does not materialize during the period of award performance, and the recipient does not provide a satisfactory explanation, the Agency may consider this factor in evaluating future proposals from the recipient. In addition, if the proposed leveraging does not materialize during the period of award performance then EPA may reconsider the legitimacy of the award; if EPA determines that the recipient knowingly or recklessly provided inaccurate information regarding the leveraged funding the recipient described in its proposal dated **08/30/17** EPA may take action as authorized by 2 CFR Part 180 as applicable.

C. Voluntary Cost-Share or Overmatch

This award and the resulting federal funding of \$600,000 is based on estimated costs requested in the recipient's application dated 8/30/17. Included in these costs is a voluntary cost-share contribution of \$94,162 by the recipient in the form of a voluntary cost-share or overmatch (providing more than any minimum required cost-share) that the recipient included in its proposal dated 08/30/17. The recipient must provide this voluntary cost-share contribution during performance of this award unless the EPA agrees otherwise in a modification to this agreement. While actual total costs may differ from the estimates in the recipient's application, EPA's participation shall not exceed the total amount of federal funds awarded.

If the recipient fails to provide the voluntary cost-share contribution during the period of award performance, and does not provide a satisfactory explanation, the Agency may consider this factor in evaluating future proposals from the recipient. In addition, if the voluntary cost-share contribution does not materialize during the period of award performance then EPA may reconsider the legitimacy of the award; if EPA determines that the recipient knowingly or recklessly provided inaccurate information regarding the voluntary cost-share or overmatch the recipient described in its proposal dated **08/30/17** EPA may take action as authorized by 2 CFR Part 180 as applicable.

D. Geospatial Data Standards

All geospatial data created must be consistent with Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) endorsed standards. Information on these standards may be found at www.fgdc.gov.

IMPLEMENTATION WORK PLAN
United States Environmental Protection Agency Grant
for Community-Wide Assessment of Hazardous Substance and Petroleum
Brownfields

Washington County, Wisconsin Assessment Coalition
October 1, 2017

Grant Recipient: Washington County, Wisconsin
333. E. Washington St., Suite 2300
P.O. Box 2003
West Bend, WI 53095-2003

Project Contact: Debora M Sielski
Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator
Washington Co. Planning and Parks Dept.
Telephone: 363-335-4445 Fax: 262-335-6868
E-mail: deb.sielski@co.washington.wi.us

Project Period: October 1, 2017 – September 30, 2020 (3 Years)

CFDA: 66.818; The Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act

CERCLA Authority: 104(k)(2)

DCN: STX

Budget FY: 2017

Appropriation: E4

Budget Org: 05F

Object Class: 4114

Prog. Results Code: 301D79 (Haz) and 301D79XBP (Petro)

RFP: EPA-OLEM-OBLR-16-08: Request for Proposals for Brownfields Assessment Grants

This project supports the following goals or objectives in EPA's 2014-2018 Strategic Plan:

Goal 3: Cleaning up communities and advancing sustainable development.

Objective 3.1: Promote Sustainable and Livable Communities.

Specifically, the Washington County Site Redevelopment Program in partnership with five local government coalition members will work together to carry out assessment activities on sites countywide that will serve as catalysts for area revitalization and reuse of Brownfield Sites.

1.0 PROJECT

Washington County, Wisconsin was awarded grants for community-wide assessment of petroleum and hazardous substance brownfields. Washington County Site Redevelopment Program is a County led coalition of local governments including the City of Hartford, City of West Bend, and the Villages of Slinger, Jackson and Richfield. The funds will be used to inventory, prioritize and assess brownfield properties, and perform brownfield area-wide planning within the County. The County intends to achieve these goals by utilizing the county-wide inventory of potential redevelopment sites that was completed in 2015 using the FY2014 Brownfield Assessment Grant. The inventory will be used in conjunction with assessment and planning activities to encourage revitalization and reuse of brownfield sites.

2.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSED OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

The Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act was signed into law on January 11, 2002. The Act amends the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended, by adding Section 104(k). Section 104(k) authorizes the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to provide funding to eligible entities to inventory, characterize, assess, conduct cleanup and reuse planning, remediate, or capitalize revolving loan funds to remediate eligible brownfields sites. Entities are selected from proposals prepared in accordance with the "FY17 Guidelines for Brownfield Assessment Grants," and submitted in a national competition. Washington County, Wisconsin (the County), as a general purpose unit of local government, was selected for Assessment funding in the FY 2017 Competition. The County applied as the lead applicant for an Assessment Coalition that also included the City of Hartford, Village of Jackson, Village of Richfield, Village of Slinger, and City of West Bend.

The project to be funded by this grant will advance the goals for the County's Site Redevelopment Program and continue successes achieved to date through implementation of a previous EPA Brownfields Assessment Grant awarded in 2014. The target area for funding initially will be six high priority brownfield sites or areas that were identified by the five city/village coalition members as part of the County-wide inventory and prioritization completed in 2015. The inventory was developed using a five-step process that included an initial comprehensive list of "potential" brownfield sites that was ranked by the Site Redevelopment Steering Committee (SRC) and further culled to a list of 15 priority "sites" (which included individual brownfield parcels as well as clusters of parcels). The top 15 ranked sites were presented to the SRC for consideration and initial allocation of grant funding, subject to confirmation of eligibility. As sites were identified by the Coalition members, the inventory was updated. This approach will be used for any additional sites identified in the target areas as part of the FY17 grant. The sites are generally located within the oldest portions of each urban area (several with development dating to the mid-1800s). The target areas in four of the communities are coincident or adjacent to some of the oldest residential neighborhoods, and now contain the greatest concentrations of residents who are economically distressed, or minorities or members of other sensitive population groups.

Building on the success of the FY14 Assessment Grant, all five of the original Redevelopment Coalition members have committed to continuing their support for the County Site Redevelopment Program and will enter into updated memorandum of agreements. As part of developing the grant, meetings were held with Coalition members to discuss priority redevelopment areas for possible future assessment. Each of the Coalition members selected the site or area that was their highest priority in need of assessment. Assessment needs for these sites are expected to utilize approximately one-third of the grant funds. Additional sites will be selected based on the

previously completed inventory and prioritization, as well as updates to be completed as part of the FY17 grant. Priority sites within the Coalition communities include:

- The City of Hartford's Downtown Revitalization Area initial redevelopment sites include 31 parcels of which five sites were identified in the City's adopted 2016 Downtown Strategic Development Plan. All of the priority sites are within a block of the Rubicon River and are near or immediately adjacent to residential neighborhoods that contain some of the highest percentages of low income or minority residents of any census tract in the County.
- The Village of Jackson adopted their Opportunity Analysis & Redevelopment Plan in March 2017. The Plan prioritizes key locations for redevelopment along the historic community main street corridor of Highway 60. Within the key redevelopment areas are a former gas station site, and the historic downtown/railroad corridor which contains 9 parcels that contribute to blighted conditions that detract from some of the community's strongest assets.
- The Central Downtown area of the Village of Slinger contains 16 parcels in about a 30-acre area for which development dates back to the 1860s including some of the oldest buildings in the Village.
- The Northeast Corridor as outlined in the Village of Richfield Redevelopment Opportunities Analysis completed in 2016 contains 12 parcels in the original commercial center of the Village bordering State Hwy 175 and the former railroad right-of-way for the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific railroad.
- The City of West Bend has two priority sites including the Barton Village Area with at least three parcels within one block of the Milwaukee River and the Eisenbahn State Trail located near a residential neighborhood and a park. The other priority site for the City of West Bend is the South Eisenbahn Trail Area containing five parcels. This site is an industrial corridor developed adjacent to a former rail line. Five of the 11 highest ranked sites prioritized during the County's FY14 grant are in this area.

Funding will also be made available to support brownfield projects in other areas of the County that score high on the prioritization criteria so that EPA funding can benefit smaller communities that are not formal members of the Redevelopment Coalition.

Funding will be used to continue assessment activities at additional brownfield sites that were identified and prioritized as part of the FY14 grant. The goals of the project to be funded by this cooperative agreement are to: (a) continue to integrate new sites into the inventory completed in 2015 and removing sites that have been redeveloped as well as to transition the inventory, site selection, and prioritization process to a form such that it can be sustained and provide continued value beyond the end of FY17 project, (b) perform Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments (ESAs) on priority brownfields sites, (c) complete additional site investigation, remedial action plan development, or other grant eligible reuse planning activities, for select sites for which Phase II ESAs are completed, (d) perform "area-wide" redevelopment planning for at least three areas containing multiple brownfield sites where there is a need to integrate revitalization of brownfield sites with major infrastructure projects that will serve as a catalyst for redevelopment, (e) perform community outreach and education related to brownfields, and (f)

better connect potential business and other end-users with brownfield sites that can be a focus for redevelopment and reuse by continuing to update the Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) Site Redevelopment Project Tool. The County looks forward to working with the Coalition members, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), the EPA, the Washington County Health Department, EDWC, the Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC), and other project partners, community-based organizations and stakeholders towards a shared goal of improving economic and environmental conditions, and building a better and more sustainable future for the residents of Washington County.

Progress towards achieving outcomes and outputs will be reported to EPA via the quarterly progress reports and the Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES).

3.0 MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

The County and five Coalition members have already successfully implemented the FY14 Assessment Grant and this project will build on those successes. The Site Redevelopment Program has had exceptional results to date; by mid-2017 it is anticipated that four projects in the County, worth a combined \$41 million in construction investments, will be underway for which assessment and redevelopment planning was supported through the initial FY14 EPA grant. The County's partnership with the Redevelopment Coalition members, WDNR, EDWC, and WEDC will ensure not only the successful completion of the Project within three years, but the achievement of the desired revitalization outcomes. These steps include continued implementation oversight by the Site Redevelopment Steering Committee (SRC), which is a formal committee authorized by the full County Board of Supervisors, and subject to all public meeting, public records, and other requirements. The SRC is a legal entity with specific responsibilities in terms of site selection and oversight of this or other grants and includes elected officials and municipal administrative and planning staff which ensures that the Program from its inception has the support of elected officials who will be responsible for approving funding for additional public expenditures needed to move most priority sites beyond assessment to successful redevelopment and reuse.

Debora M. Sielski, Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator, Washington County Planning and Parks Department, will serve as the Project Manager and primary point of contact for the Project. Ms. Sielski is the Project Manager for the County's FY14 EPA Grant. She will be responsible for implementing grant funded activities in accordance with the approved Work Plan. Ms. Sielski will also approve all contracts and reports; coordinate SRC and T/CAS meetings; secure assistance from other County staff as needed, and oversee work by the environmental and other consultants, as well as manage project finances.

Project Manager Profile:

Ms. Sielski has more than 25 years of professional experience in public administration, urban and regional planning and landscape architecture, of which the last 20 years have been with Washington County. She holds a Master's Degree in Urban Planning as well as a Bachelor's Degree in Landscape Architecture. She is currently responsible for all planning work at the County including leading numerous long-range planning efforts such as the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County, the Bike and Pedestrian Plan, the Farmland Preservation Plan, and the Park and Open Space Plan. She has extensive experience in grant writing and administration, public administration, urban planning, statistical analysis, technical writing, public speaking, project management, intergovernmental collaboration, public participation, stakeholder engagement, and park acquisition, design and development.

4.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The schedule for the projects as outlined below assumes that the Cooperative Agreement (CA) with EPA will be formally executed by October 1, 2017.

4.1 TASK 0 – Programmatic Activities

Management of the CA will be the responsibility of the County's Project Manager. This task includes preparing grant quarterly progress reports, quarterly ACRES reporting and general communications about the CA to EPA. This task also provides for two County staff or SRC members to attend two- EPA-sponsored National Brownfields conferences (or alternative relevant conferences if the EPA conferences are not held as anticipated).

As part of advancing the County's Site Redevelopment Program and coordination of the SRC and Coalition, the County advanced a qualifications-based procurement process meeting the requirements of 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. The procurement process resulted in six proposals. Three firms were interviewed, and based on the interviews and previously submitted qualifications, a contract was executed which included the potential application for future brownfield assessment grants. This completed step enabled the County, SRC, and Coalition members to immediately begin assessment activities upon execution of the CA. In 2016, the County legal department reviewed the completed procurement process for consistency with EPA's updated procurement rules as detailed in CFR 200.317-326, and determined that the process used for the initial procurement was fully compliant with the updated requirements. The County reviewed the procurement process and scope for the initial request for qualifications with the EPA Project Officer, who confirmed that the process appeared to be compliant with the updated procurement requirements applicable to the FY17 grant. The contract with the current environmental consultant will be amended through execution of a new task order that will obligate the consultant to comply with the requirements of the new work plan and CA. As part of grant implementation, the County will submit documentation associated with this procurement process. The County, with assistance from Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., will update ACRES quarterly. All environmental reports completed during a quarter will be submitted on digital media (CD or flash drive) by the quarterly reporting date. For each report completed, the County will submit up to 5 digital pictures of the site. If the environmental report is a Phase II then the pictures will include sampling work, if feasible.

Table 1: Activities/Deliverables for Task 0

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables	Status or Target Completion Date
The County Attorney's Office determined 2013 procurement process was fully compliant with updated regulations CFR 200.317-326.	Documentation associated with procurement process	Completed in 2016
Amend Contract with Environmental Consultant (<i>Washington County</i>)	Execute Contract (Task Order for Grant Implementation)	September 2017
Oversee site/project activities of environmental consultant ¹ (<i>Project Manager</i>)	Routine correspondence with consultants, review of monthly invoices and processing payments	Ongoing
Prepare and review required quarterly reports, quarterly ACRES reporting and	Quarterly reports, quarterly updates to ACRES database,	Ongoing ²

other correspondence with EPA Project Officer (<i>Project Manager</i>)	annual audit reports, final reports, other correspondence	
1 Project Oversight includes managing the consultant activities, reviewing Phase I and II ESAs, Site Investigation Reports and Remedial Action Plans. 2 Quarterly reports for quarters ending December 31, March 31, June 30, and September 30 of each year will be prepared within 30 days of the end of each quarter. The quarterly reports will describe cumulative progress on each defined task in this work plan. The annual financial report and the annual DBE report will be prepared in October of each year. Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. will be assisting the Project Manager with the quarterly and annual reporting requirements and quarterly updates to the ACRES database.		

4.2 TASK 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

The County will work with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. (Stantec) and Vandewalle & Associates (Vandewalle) to build from the successful inventory and prioritization process completed in 2015, by integrating new sites into the inventory and removing sites that have been redeveloped. The grant will fund ongoing site inventory and prioritization updates using the process developed in 2015. The County will integrate the Sanborn Fire Maps (purchased as part of the FY14 grant) into the County Web Application Gallery. In an effort to create a sustainable redevelopment inventory and prioritization process, the County will work with Stantec and Vandewalle to develop a GIS Web-based tool for local governments to update inventory and prioritize potential redevelopment sites within their community. This will streamline the current review process for the Site Redevelopment Steering Committee when determining funding priorities. As part of the FY14 grant, EDWC created an online Redevelopment Intelligence Tool connecting potential investors to brownfield sites that are primed for redevelopment. This grant will allow for enhanced systemization to EDWC's Brownfield Site Readiness Certification process, including the continued updates to the online Redevelopment Tool including additional database geographic information system (GIS) layers by the EDWC and a qualified consultant. In addition, the redevelopment inventory will be integrated into the County's GIS to make information gathered as part of the FY14 and FY17 grants accessible to both the public and local governments throughout the County, within a framework that can leverage all relevant property, zoning, and historic information accessible through the GIS.

Table 2: Activities/Deliverables for Task 1

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables:	Status or Target Completion Date
Update Brownfields Inventory and Prioritization (<i>Consultant, County Staff</i>)	Updated Brownfields GIS Database	Ongoing
Develop a sustainable GIS web-based application for local governments to track priority redevelopment sites (<i>Consultant, County Staff</i>)	Creation of online application	Ongoing
Complete Integration of Redevelopment Inventory and Sanborn Fire Maps into County GIS (<i>County Staff</i>)	Creation of County GIS Redevelopment Inventory layer	Ongoing
Update and Enhance EDWC online Brownfield Redevelopment Tool (<i>Consultant, EDWC, County Staff</i>)	Enhancement of EDWC Redevelopment Tool	Ongoing

4.3 TASK 2 - Conduct Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)

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 EPA (for hazardous substance brownfields) or WDNR (for petroleum brownfields) for approval. Upon confirmation of eligibility, the County will execute access agreements for each parcel to be inspected as part of the Phase I ESAs, or potentially subject to Phase II ESAs as part of Task 3. 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.

The process for securing access will vary depending on whether sites are currently owned by local governments versus private parties, whether sites are currently tax delinquent, and whether sites are subject to specific development proposals or sales agreements at the time of assessment. In all instances, it is anticipated that the local governments within which the site(s) are located, in cooperation with the County and Stantec, will have primary responsibility for securing access. This is in recognition that those local officials will have the best understanding of access challenges, and will choose to nominate sites for which securing access is a process versus a hope or impossibility. All Coalition members have experience negotiating access for these types of sites. The County and Stantec will provide guidance and expertise when local governments are discussing access agreements with landowners. For sites that are tax delinquent, the County has the ability, under Wisconsin law, to obtain an environmental inspection warrant that can be used to secure access for testing in circumstances where the current property owner is unwilling to provide access. However, the preferred option for all sites (including those that are tax delinquent) will be to secure the willing and legal consent of the property owner through the execution of an access agreement.

Table 3: Activities/Deliverables for Task 2

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables:	Status or Target Completion Date
Prepare Site and Property Owner Eligibility Determination Request Forms (<i>Consultant, County Staff</i>)	Site and Property Owner Eligibility Determination Request Forms	Ongoing
Obtain WDNR/EPA Eligibility Letters (<i>Consultant, Project Manager</i>)	WDNR/EPA Eligibility Letters	Ongoing
Conduct Phase I ESAs (Consultant)	Phase I ESA reports	Ongoing
Execute Property Access Agreements (<i>Individual Coalition Members in which Sites are Located, County, Consultant</i>)	Copies of Property Access Agreements	Ongoing

4.4 TASK 3 - Conduct Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations, and Remedial/Reuse Planning Activities

On sites that meet the site-specific eligibility requirements, and are approved for use of EPA funds, by the EPA (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 EPA 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 budget includes costs for completion of annual updates to the existing approved QAPP. Eligibility determinations (EDs) and/or access agreements may also be completed for Task 3 for any properties for which these were not performed as part of Phase I ESAs conducted as part of Task 2. It is anticipated that the scope of work and deliverables for this task to be completed by the environmental consulting firm will include:

- Annual update (3) of existing QAPP (QAPP was submitted to EPA in July 2015 as part of FY 2014 grant and conditionally approved in November 2015);
- Completion of EDs and/or access agreements for select sites (if not already completed as part of Task 2);
- Preparation of approximately eight (8) site-specific sampling and analysis plans (SAPs) and health and safety plans (HASPs);
- Completion of approximately fifteen (15) Phase II ESAs;
- Completion of eight (8) asbestos and hazardous materials pre-demolition or renovation surveys;
- Preparation of six (6) remedial action options reports (ROARs) and/ or remedial action plans (RAPs) or site specific reuse plans to tee sites up for redevelopment in accordance with site environmental issues.

Table 4: Activities/Deliverables for Task 3

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables:	Status or Target Completion Date
Update the Existing QAPP (<i>Consultant</i>)	QAPP	Fall/Early Winter 2017
Prepare SAPs for each site (<i>Consultant</i>)	8 - SAPs	Ongoing
Prepare OSHA-compliant HASPs for each site (<i>Consultant</i>)	8 - HASPs	Ongoing
Conduct Phase II ESAs (<i>Consultant</i>)	15 - Phase II ESA Reports	Ongoing
Complete Asbestos and Hazardous Building Material Surveys and Sampling (<i>Consultant</i>)	8 - Asbestos Survey Reports; Pre-Demolition/Renovation Survey Reports	Ongoing
Prepare Remedial Action Option Reports (RAORs), Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) or reuse plans (<i>Consultant, County Staff, Coalition Member Staff</i>)	6 – RAORs, RAPs or Reuse Plans	Ongoing
Complete eligibility determinations and/or access agreements for select sites (<i>Consultant, County Staff</i>)	Eligibility Determination Request Forms / Copies of Access Agreements	Ongoing

4.5 TASK 4 – Community Brownfields Area- wide Redevelopment Planning

There are at least six large sites or clusters of contiguous smaller sites within the target areas for which it is anticipated that area-wide planning will be a key to advancing sites beyond assessment to redevelopment. The community areas and specific sites on which reuse planning will be performed will be determined by the County and SRC in response to development proposals and/or requests from the coalition members. It is anticipated that the scope of work and deliverables for this task to be completed by the consulting firm will include 2 smaller area-wide plans and 1 larger area-wide plans. Areas will be determined by the Coalition and relate to high priority sites as identified in the site prioritization process and community needs.

Table 5: Activities/Deliverables for Task 4

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables:	Status or Target Completion Date
Complete Area-wide Redevelopment Plans (Consultant, County Staff, Coalition Member Staff)	Area-wide Redevelopment Plans	Ongoing

4.6 TASK 5 - Community Outreach and Involvement

Since 2010, the County has proactively involved Washington County communities in development and advancement of a brownfields-focused Site Revitalization Program (Program). To lead this effort, in early 2013, the County established a Site Revitalization Committee to guide and advance brownfield redevelopment, community outreach and involvement, reuse planning and site assessment. The ten representatives on the SRC (www.co.washington.wi.us/SRP) include two County Board Supervisors (Raymond Heidtke, Town of Jackson Chairperson and County Board Supervisor; Mike Miller, County Board Supervisor, representing Co. Public Works Committee), the current administrators from three of the Coalition members (John Walther, Village of Jackson; Jessi Balcom, Village of Slinger; and Jim Healy, Village of Richfield), and two City Planners (Justin Drew, City of Hartford; and Mark Piotrowicz, City of West Bend), the Coordinator for County's Workforce Development Center (Lisa Maylen), the Executive Director of the County's lead economic development organization (Christian Tscheschlok, Economic Development Washington County), and a commercial real estate professional (Curt Pitzen, NAI MLG). Subsequent to the award of the County's FY14 EPA Assessment Grant, the Site Revitalization Committee was renamed the Site Redevelopment Committee (SRC) to more clearly express the focus of the project and County leadership on redevelopment and economic development. All references to the SRC in this Work Plan refer to the Site Redevelopment Committee.

The Coalition plans to convene the SRC on at least a quarterly basis, with the public meetings widely promoted encouraging participation by our partnering organizations and public. Targeted outreach has occurred and will remain important for each target area. To maximize the extent to which community residents and other stakeholders can provide meaningful input to the project, the SRC comprehensive community outreach program will continue, with elements that include SRC public meetings (occurring quarterly), County-wide and community specific public meetings and forums, print and web-based communication tools including the development and distribution of marketing and informational materials, and joint outreach and education efforts with community partner organizations.

The Coalition will seek to build on relationships with community based organizations (CBOs) developed in implementing the FY14 EPA grant. To increase participation by CBOs in the project, a Technical/Community Advisory Subcommittee (T/CAS) will be convened with representatives from the CBOs, the Washington County Health Department (WCHD), and other stakeholder groups. The T/CAS will provide input to the SRC on site selection, reuse planning, and other considerations.

A key ingredient to the Coalition's historically successful transformation of brownfield sites into higher and more productive uses is its unique ability to get deals done. Sustainably sourcing and partnering both private and public funds for generating job-creating results requires all involved parties have confidence that (1) the Coalition can maneuver complex deals to fruition and (2) their investment is getting real return. The Coalition will thus enhance its capabilities in demonstrating ROI and securing investment resources by building an ROI generator designed

to evaluate various proposed development deals and weigh them against return for public and private participants. Additionally, the Coalition will deploy the latest in marketing technologies to develop project wins into compelling, easy-to-share success stories and case studies. These will be packaged for both recruitment and educational purposes, extending the program's reach and attracting more qualified projects and redevelopers.

Key lessons learned from past revitalization projects that guide the outreach approach for this Project include: 1) interactions should be framed around the effects brownfields have on communities, rather than the brownfields themselves; 2) it is important to employ a number of communications strategies tailored to the audience, including meetings, social media, traditional media, direct mail, and other methods; and 3) a successful outreach program must be multi-tiered to engage all stakeholders in meaningful ways. The following is a summary of the planned multi-tiered engagement approach.

Following the grant award announcement, the County will draft a press release for circulation in the local newspapers. The County will also place advertisements on local radio stations, as well as local access television. SRC members and Coalition Partners will assist in outreach to their constituents.

The County will report on Project progress at open forums, such as municipal board/council meetings. The County will also distribute information through the existing Site Redevelopment Program website (www.co.washington.wi.us/SRP) which will serve as the foundation for ongoing web-based communication. The County and SRC members will also distribute information through their websites, newsletters, LinkedIn, Twitter, and blog posts as well as direct notice to community organizations and local newspapers.

Although it is anticipated that most Project communications will be in English, it is important that non-English speaking households are aware of environmental activities that directly impact them, and as a result the County will work with Casa Guadalupe Education Center to develop and distribute information in Spanish as well as offer translation and interpretation services as needed, as impacted families are identified.

Table 6: Activities/Deliverables for Task 5

Activities/Responsible Party	Deliverables:	Status or Target Completion Date
ROI Generator and Impact Analysis	Analysis for Projects with Major Public Support	Ongoing
Media / Social Media Partnerships (Consultant/County)	Newspaper /Media Articles	Ongoing
Meeting outreach, facilitation and management of SRC, public/community and property owner meetings (Consultant/County)	Meeting Summary Notes and Agenda	Ongoing
Preparation of project fact sheets, press releases, agendas, minutes, newsletter submissions, etc. (Consultant/County)	Fact Sheets, Press Releases, etc.	Ongoing
Preparation of website updates and other on-line communications (Consultant/County)	Website updates	Ongoing
Development of targeted marketing materials including success stories and case studies (Consultant/EDWC/County)	Case studies and success story docs	Ongoing

5.0 BUDGET FOR EPA FUNDING AND LEVERAGING OTHER RESOURCES

Table 7 below presents a budget summary for the two assessment grants.

Table 7: Budget

Budget Categories	Task 0	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Totals
	Program-matic Activities	Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization	Phase I ESAs	Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations, and Remedial Action/Reuse Planning	Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning	Community Outreach and Involvement	
	Budget for Community Wide Assessment Grant for Hazardous Substance Brownfields						
Personnel							
Travel	\$2,550					\$400	\$2,950
Equipment							
Supplies		\$500				\$450	\$950
Contractual	\$8,100	\$14,500	\$48,000	\$170,500	\$25,000	\$30,000	\$296,100
Other							
SUBTOTALS	\$10,650	\$15,000	\$48,000	\$170,500	\$25,000	\$30,850	\$300,000
	Budget for Community Wide Assessment Grant for Petroleum Brownfields						
Personnel							
Travel	\$2,550					\$400	\$2,950
Equipment							
Supplies		\$500				\$450	\$950
Contractual	\$8,100	\$14,500	\$48,000	\$170,500	\$25,000	\$30,000	\$296,100
Other							
SUBTOTALS	\$10,650	\$15,000	\$48,000	\$170,500	\$25,000	\$30,850	\$300,000
	Budget Summary (Both Grants Combined)						
Personnel							
Travel	\$5,100					\$800	\$5,900
Equipment							
Supplies		\$1,000				\$900	\$1,900
Contractual	\$16,200	\$29,000	\$96,000	\$341,000	\$50,000	\$60,000	\$592,200
Other							
TOTALS	\$21,300	\$30,000	\$96,000	\$341,000	\$50,000	\$61,700	\$600,000

ESA = environmental site assessment, RAP = remedial action plan, SI = site investigation

Please note that for all budget items described below, it is assumed that the referenced budget will be divided evenly between the hazardous substance and petroleum grant funding.

Task 0: Programmatic Activities (\$21,300)

The budget for Task 0 includes travel costs (for airfare, hotel, meals and conference fees) for two County staff or SRC members to attend two EPA-sponsored National Brownfields conferences (or alternative relevant conferences if the EPA conferences are not held as anticipated). Travel costs are estimated at \$1,275 per person per conference based on discussions with previous EPA Brownfield Grant managers/conference attendees and average costs they reported (Per person costs include \$350-flight, \$200-registration, \$200-food/expenses and \$525-hotel). The

contractual budget includes \$16,200 (120 hrs @ \$135/hr – ave blended rate) for the consultant, for assistance to be provided with quarterly reporting, ACRES reporting and other eligible programmatic activities.

Task 1: Brownfield Inventory and Site Prioritization (\$30,000)

In this grant, the Coalition will refresh the FY14 Brownfield Redevelopment Inventory led by consultants and the County. In addition, the County and consultants will develop a sustainable GIS web-based tool to track priority sites for the SRP (\$24,000). As part of this process, the County will integrate the Sanborn Fire Maps and the Brownfield Redevelopment Inventory into the County GIS as part of the County's in-kind contribution. As the sustainable GIS web-based tool is created, there will be numerous meetings with local governments related to training. Supplies for this outreach include \$500 for printing and \$500 for display boards and graphic displays for meetings.

Work will also be conducted to upgrade and systematize EDWC Brownfield Redevelopment "Select Sites" web-based tool and will include the addition of 6 new sites at an average cost of \$500 each (totaling \$3,000). Additional GIS layers will be constructed to target specific interests of redevelopers and growth-oriented businesses into EDWC's online Brownfield Redevelopment Intelligence Tool at an approximate cost of \$2,000.

Task 2: Phase I ESAs, Site Eligibility Determinations, and Access Agreements (\$96,000)

Under the direction of the County, the environmental consulting firm will complete Phase I ESAs at 24 brownfield parcels at an average cost of \$4,000 per parcel. Costs for completing ED's and access agreements are included under this task.

Task 3: Phase II ESAs, Environmental Site Investigations, Remedial/Reuse Planning (\$341,000)

The budget for Task 3 is based on the following assumed project deliverable and representative costs:

- Annually update quality assurance project plan (QAPP) at an estimated cost of \$2,000;
- 8 asbestos/hazardous building material surveys at an average cost of \$3,250 (\$26,000 total);
- 11 Phase II ESAs at small brownfield parcels at an average cost of \$15,000 (\$165,000 total);
- 4 Phase II ESAs at large brownfields parcels at an average cost of \$25,000 (\$100,000 total);
- 6 remedial action /reuse plans at an average cost of \$8,000 (\$48,000 total);

The budgeted costs for the asbestos/hazardous building surveys and Phase II ESAs include \$750 per site for preparation of site-specific sampling and analysis and health and safety plans. Eligibility determinations (EDs) and/or access agreements may also be completed for Task 3 for any properties for which these were not performed as part of Phase I ESAs conducted as part of Task 2. Please note that there is \$16,200 budgeted under Task 0 for assistance to be provided by the consultants to prepare quarterly and annual reports, and other planning activities.

Task 4: Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning (\$50,000)

The sites on which reuse planning will be performed will be determined by the County and SRC in response to development proposals and/or requests from the coalition members. It is

anticipated that there will be 2 smaller area-wide plans at an average cost of \$15,000 each and 1 larger area-wide plan at a cost of about \$20,000.

Task 5: Community Outreach and Involvement (\$61,700)

To maximize the extent to which community residents and other stakeholders can provide meaningful input to the Project, a comprehensive community outreach program will be performed that will include public meetings and forums, development and distribution of marketing and informational materials, and joint outreach and education efforts with community partner organizations. The estimated costs for specific outreach activities or outputs to be performed by the consultant(s) under contract are summarized below. (Rates include salary plus overhead.)

- Meeting outreach, facilitation and management including SRC, public/community, property owner meetings (Consultant - Vandewalle 100 hours @ \$100/hour = \$10,000 total);
- Document preparation, including project fact sheets, press releases, agendas, minutes, newsletter submissions, etc. (Consultant - Vandewalle 180 hours @ \$100/hour = \$18,000 total); and
- Meeting outreach, facilitation and management including SRC, public/community, property owner meetings (Consultant – Stantec 80 hours at an average rate of \$125/hr = \$10,000)
- EDWC to enhance its capabilities in demonstrating ROI and securing brownfield redevelopment investment resources by building an ROI generator designed to evaluate various proposed development deals and weigh them against return for public and private participants. (Consultant – EDWC - \$4,000 – 60 hrs.@ \$66.67/hr. ave blended rate.)
- EDWC to deploy the latest in marketing technologies to develop project wins into compelling, easy-to-share success stories and case studies aimed at generating sustainable levels of public and private program engagement and extend targeted reach into the redeveloper community. (Consultant – EDWC - \$18,000 – of which \$505 is based on ave blended rate of \$63.16/hr. for 8 hrs and \$17,495 is based on a lump sum estimate from subconsultant based on previous similar projects.)

Budgeted supply costs for Task 5 of \$900 include \$300 for printing costs, \$100 for mailing expenses associated with public notices, and \$500 for display boards and graphic displays at public meetings. Travel costs allocated under this task in the grant application for participation in EPA or other brownfields conferences have been included under Task 0. Travel costs for mileage of \$800 related to travel by County staff to meetings throughout the County has been added to the budget for this task.

6.0 MEASURES OF SUCCESS

Washington County Site Redevelopment Program has identified the following measures of success that will be tracked and documented in the quarterly reports by the Project Manager.

- Number of completed Phase I and Phase II environmental site assessments (ESAs) on priority brownfield sites.

- Number of completed additional site investigations and remedial action plans developed for select sites for which Phase II ESAs are completed.
- Number of successful projects where grant was used to leverage additional funding for redevelopment projects.
- Number of success story profiles and case studies developed to further market the Site Redevelopment Program in order to connect potential investors and other end-users with brownfield sites that can be a focus for redevelopment and reuse.
- Development of County GIS application for local governments to update inventory and prioritize potential redevelopment sites.

SUMMARY OF LEVERAGED FUNDS
IN-KIND COMMITTED BY WASHINGTON COUNTY, LOCAL GOVERNMENT COALITION
PARTNERS AND EDWC FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF FY 2017 U.S. EPA BROWNFIELDS ASSESSMENT GRANT

Name	Title	Est. Hours over 3 year grant cycle	Salary/Benefits per hour	Total In-Kind Contribution
Washington County In-Kind Contribution				
Deb Sielski ¹	Deputy Administrator	600	\$ 65.46	\$ 39,276.00
vacant ²	Planning Intern	110	\$ 11.70	\$ 1,287.00
Tyler Betry ³	Planning & Parks Analyst	100	\$ 41.03	\$ 4,103.00
Mike Vander Sanden ⁴	GIS Coordinator	70	\$ 48.00	\$ 3,360.00
Fay Fitts ⁵	Administrative Secretary	20	\$ 28.76	\$ 575.00
Chris Ohlis ⁶	Deputy County Attorney	70	\$ 62.89	\$ 4,403.00
Total Washington County In-kind				\$ 53,004.00
City of Hartford In-Kind Contribution⁷				
Justin Drew	Dir. of Community Development	20	\$ 61.20	\$ 1,224.00
Village of Slinger In-Kind Contribution⁷				
Jessi Balcom	Village Administrator	25	\$ 57.43	\$ 1,435.00
Jim Haggerty	DPW Dir/V. Engineer	2	\$ 69.29	\$ 138.00
Village of Richfield In-Kind Contribution⁷				
Jim Healy	Village Administrator	25	\$ 59.31	\$ 1,483.00
City of West Bend In-Kind Contribution⁷				
Jay Shambeau	City Administrator	42	\$ 72.73	\$ 3,055.00
Mark Piotrowicz	City Planner/Operations Manager	51	\$ 41.01	\$ 2,091.00
Ashley Mukasa	Economic Development Manager	51	\$ 23.31	\$ 1,189.00
Village of Jackson In-Kind Contribution⁷				
John Walther	Village Administrator	8.5	\$ 65.00	\$ 553.00
Brian Kober	Dir. Of Public Works/ Engineer	5.5	\$ 60.00	\$ 330.00
Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) In-Kind Contribution⁸				
Christian Tscheschlok	Executive Director	405	\$ 61.44	\$ 24,883.00
Deborah Reinbold	Bus. Solutions Specialist	150	\$ 31.85	\$ 4,777.00
Total Coalition Partner In-kind				\$ 41,158.00
1755			Total: \$	94,162.00

Note: 1 - Estimated In-Kind Contribution as Project Manager including contract administration, grant reporting, coordinating coalition, staffing SRC and T/CAS meetings, and overseeing work performed by environmental or other consultants contracted to implement the grant. 2- Estimated In-Kind Contribution for assisting Project Manager. 3 -Estimated In-Kind Contribution including minutes, agendas and media postings for SRC and T/CAS. 4 - Estimated In-Kind Contribution for managing County GIS database. 5 - Estimated In-Kind Contribution for assisting Project Manager. 6 -Estimated In-Kind Contribution for reviewing EPA Cooperative Agreement, agreements with Coalition members and site access agreements. 7 - Estimated In-Kind Contribution includes attendance at SRC meetings, community public meeting, securing access to sites, and reviewing reports. 8 - Estimated In-Kind Contribution includes attendance at SRC and T/CAS meetings, public meetings, redevelopment consulting and contribution to area-wide plans and remedial action plans.

Attachment C

Roles and Responsibilities for Activities to be Performed as Part of the U.S. EPA FY2017 Brownfields Grant Implementation

(Project Period starting October 1, 2017)

This memo was prepared to outline specific roles and responsibilities for Stantec Consulting Services Inc. (Stantec), Vandewalle & Associates, Inc. (V&A), Washington County (the County), Economic Development Washington County (EDWC) and Coalition Partners (City of West Bend, City of Hartford, Village of Slinger, Village of Richfield and Village of Jackson) as part of the implementation of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) Fiscal Year 2017 Brownfield Assessment Grant. Vandewalle & Associates, Inc. and EDWC are contractual subconsultants to Stantec Consulting Services Inc. responsible for completing portions of the scope of services described below.

The following scope of services will be made part of the services detailed and referenced as part of the Master Services Agreement Task Order No. 6 and outlined in the Implementation Work Plan.

Stantec Roles and Responsibilities

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

- Reporting: Stantec staff (David Holmes) will lead with assistance from the County Project Manager (Debora Sielski) in preparing grant progress reports, quarterly reports (ACRES), annual audit reports, final reports, and general communications about the Cooperative Agreement (CA) to the EPA. Each report will include a summary of all work completed to date (not just for the quarter).

Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

The County will work with Stantec and V&A to build from the successful inventory and prioritization process completed in 2015, by integrating new sites into the inventory and removing sites that have been redeveloped. The grant will fund ongoing site inventory and prioritization updates using the process developed in 2015.

- Inventory Tasks – Stantec will assist as the County Project Manager and County GIS Division will work with V&A to transfer the existing GIS database into the County application for a County-managed Brownfields GIS Database and associated layers.
- Site Selection and Prioritization – Stantec will assist V&A in completion of any updates to the site ranking and prioritization process.
- Integration of Redevelopment Inventory and Sanborn Fire Maps: The County will integrate, with assistance from Stantec and V&A, the Redevelopment Inventory and Sanborn Fire Maps (purchased as part of the FY14 grant) into the County Web Application Gallery.
- Brownfield Site Readiness Process: Stantec will assist EDWC as needed in enhancing systemization to EDWC's Brownfield Site Readiness Certification Process including

additional database geographic information system (GIS) layers by the EDWC and a qualified consultant.

Task 2 – Conduct Phase I ESAs

- Site and Property Owner Eligibility Determination Requests: Stantec will lead work on preparing and obtaining site eligibility determination letters. County to provide site specific information for letters/forms.
- WDNR/EPA Eligibility Letters: Stantec will lead work on obtaining WDNR/EPA eligibility letters. County to provide site specific information for letters/forms.
- Conduct Phase I ESAs: Stantec will conduct all Phase I ESAs.
- Execute Property Access Agreements: Stantec, along with the County, will assist in guiding individual Coalition members in which sites are located to execute property access agreements.

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

- QAPP: Stantec will lead preparation of the update to the existing QAPP.
- Prepare SAPs for each site: Stantec will lead preparation of SAPs for each site.
- Prepare OSHA Compliant HASPs for each site: Stantec will lead preparation of HASPs for each site.
- Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations and Remedial Planning - Stantec to complete all Phase II ESAs, Site Investigation and Remedial Planning work under Task 3. Stantec to direct work of V&A regarding their assistance in remedial action planning.
- Eligibility Determinations and Access Agreements (if not already completed for individual sites or parcels as part of Task 2): Stantec will lead site eligibility determinations and assist the County as necessary in drafting access agreements.

Task 4 – Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning

The community areas and specific sites on which reuse planning will be performed will be determined by the County and SRC in response to development proposals and/or requests from the coalition members.

- Reuse/Redevelopment Planning – Stantec to provide oversight as V&A leads in the preparation of brownfields site or area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans in cooperation with the County and EDWC.

Task 5 – Community Outreach and Involvement

- Stantec will prepare presentations as appropriate for meetings as necessary regarding the US EPA brownfields grant program, implementation status and solicit input from committee members on specific sites or revitalization needs. If requested, Stantec will provide input on meeting agendas and materials.
- Stantec will contribute to quarterly fact sheets for distribution to the SRC and public, to be prepared by V&A.
- Stantec staff (David Holmes) will attend the following:
 - All individual meetings with Coalition partners to confirm priority sites.
 - All SRC Committee meetings to be held on approximately a quarterly basis.

- EDWC hosted meetings regarding the development and implementation of the Countywide Site Redevelopment Program pages and communications on its website.
- Participate in monthly “check-in” in-person or tele/web conferences with Project Management Team.

V&A Roles and Responsibilities

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

- Reporting: V&A will provide updates for activities that they participate in as requested for grant reporting.

Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

- Inventory Tasks: V&A will lead the Brownfields inventory update process (update FY2014 data) with the assistance of County Project Manager and the County GIS Division to create a Brownfields GIS Database.
- Site Selection and Prioritization: V&A will lead any additional site selection, ranking and prioritization of sites using the established three-tiered site identification and prioritization process with the SRC. V&A, working cooperatively with County GIS utilizing the Brownfield GIS database, will complete the analysis and map preparation for this Task.
- County GIS Application: V&A will assist the County in integration of the redevelopment inventory into the County’s GIS to make information gathered as part of the FY14 and FY17 grants accessible to both the public and local governments throughout the County, within a framework that can leverage all relevant property, zoning, and historic information accessible through the GIS. V&A will lead in development of a GIS Web-based tool for local governments to update inventory and prioritize potential redevelopment sites within their community. This will streamline the current review process for the Site Redevelopment Steering Committee when determining funding priorities.
- Outreach - Conduct ongoing community outreach and involvement as outlined in Task 4.

Task 2 – Phase I ESAs

- No role anticipated.

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

- Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations and Remedial Planning – With oversight from Stantec, as directed by the County, V&A to assist in remedial action planning.

Task 4 – Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning

- Reuse/Redevelopment Planning: V&A will lead, as directed by the County, with oversight from Stantec, in the preparation of brownfields site or area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans in cooperation with the County and EDWC. It is anticipated that the scope of work and deliverables for this task to be completed will include 2 smaller area-wide plans and 1 larger area-wide plan. Areas will be determined by the

Coalition and relate to high priority sites as identified in the site prioritization process and community needs.

Task 5 – Community Outreach and Involvement

- V&A to implement EPA grant outreach objectives focused on ongoing SRC meetings.
- Assist in coordinating all SRC priorities with work to be performed under the EPA grant.
- V&A to assist in SRC meeting preparation including review and input on agendas and follow-up “to-do” lists with assignments and responsibilities.
- Prepare progress reports for and conduct periodic meetings with the Project staff/County and community leadership to discuss progress, evaluate options, and receive direction. Work with EDWC to integrate progress reports into its Site Redevelopment Program pages on its website and branded communications.
- V&A to provide meeting outreach, facilitation and management including SRC, public/community, and property owner meetings.
- V&A will prepare presentations as appropriate for the SRC meetings and public community meetings as necessary regarding site selection, ranking, prioritization and reuse/redevelopment planning.
- V&A will prepare quarterly fact sheet for distribution to the SRC. Fact sheets will be made part of the EPA reporting requirements and EDWC dashboard. The fact sheets will integrate information from other team members.
- V&A will draft press releases for review and release by County and EDWC.
- V&A staff will attend the following:
 - All SRC Committee meetings: Attendance and participation in SRC meetings to advance EPA grant project including presenting and providing input, reviewing progress, discussing options, and receiving direction to be held approximately quarterly.
 - Participate in monthly “check-in” in-person meetings or tele/web conferences with Project Management Team.
 - EDWC hosted meetings regarding the development and implementation of the Countywide Site Redevelopment Program website.

County Roles and Responsibilities

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

- Administration/Reporting - County Project Manager is responsible for the administration of the EPA Cooperative Agreement.
 - County Project Manager is responsible for project oversight including managing the consultant activities, reviewing environmental site assessments, reports and plans, and preparing required reports and other correspondence with the EPA Project Officer. Such reports include preparing and submitting grant progress reports, quarterly reports (ACRES), annual audit reports, final reports, tracking cost information allocated by site and general communications to the EPA. Stantec will be assisting in preparing quarterly and annual reports and updating the ACRES database for individual sites as necessary.

- County Project Manager is responsible for compiling an administrative log of meetings, deliverables, etc. as related to the grant.
- County Project Manager will work with the County Attorney and local governments to complete coalition agreements.
- The County will track all hours spent by County staff participating in the Site Redevelopment Program, for use in tracking and reporting in-kind services being provided as part of the assessment project.
- Site Access - County Project Manager will work with the County Attorney and local governments to complete site access agreements.

Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

- Inventory Tasks – The County Project Manager and County GIS Division will work with V&A to transfer the existing GIS database into the County application for a County-managed Brownfields GIS Database and associated layers.
- Site Selection and Prioritization - The County will assist V&A in completion of any updates to the site ranking and prioritization process, providing the GIS analysis utilizing the Brownfields GIS database.
- Integration of Redevelopment Inventory and Sanborn Fire Maps: With assistance from V&A, the County will integrate the Redevelopment Inventory and Sanborn Fire Maps (purchased as part of the FY14 grant) into the County Web Application Gallery.
- Brownfield Site Readiness Process: The County will assist EDWC as needed in enhancing systemization to EDWC's Brownfield Site Readiness Certification Process including additional database geographic information system (GIS) layers by the EDWC and a qualified consultant.

Task 2 – Conduct Phase I ESAs

County Project Manager to provide project oversight on all work in Task 2. County Engineer may assist Stantec in identifying and resolving infrastructure challenges at sites as necessary.

- Site and Property Owner Eligibility Determination Requests: County to provide site specific information for letters/forms.
- WDNR/EPA Eligibility Letters: County to provide site specific information for letters/forms.
- Execute Property Access Agreements: The County will work with individual Coalition members in which sites are located to develop and execute property access agreements for all parcels on which Phase I ESAs will be performed.

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

- Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations and Remedial Planning - County Project Manager to provide project oversight on all work in Task 3. County Engineer may assist Stantec in identifying and resolving infrastructure challenges at sites as necessary.
- Eligibility Determinations and Access Agreements (if not already completed for individual sites or parcels as part of Task 2): County to provide site specific information as Stantec leads site eligibility determinations. County to work with individual Coalition members and Stantec in developing and executing property access agreements for all parcels on which Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations or other remedial/reuse planning

activities will be performed that include on-site inspections, testing, or the physical entry onto the properties.

Task 4 – Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning

- Reuse/Redevelopment Planning – County to assist V&A in preparation of brownfields site/area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans in cooperation with Stantec and EDWC.

Task 5 – Community Outreach and Involvement

- The County will have primary responsibility for all components of the SRC meetings, except those identified for EDWC, Stantec and V&A including preparing and distributing agendas and minutes. The Coalition plans to convene the SRC on approximately a quarterly basis.
- County Project Manager will widely publicize SRC meetings and community meetings using social media, traditional media, direct mail and other methods as appropriate and available.
- County to report on program progress to SRC and appropriate County Committee and encourage coalition partners to distribute the information through websites, newsletters, newspapers, LinkedIn, Twitter and blog posts as available.
- County will work with Casa Guadalupe to develop and distribute project information in Spanish as well as offer translation and interpretation services as requested or as needed when impacted families are identified.
- County will update the County Site Revitalization Program website at www.co.washington.wi.us/srp to provide current information throughout the grant implementation.
- County Project Manager will attend the following:
 - Individual meetings with Coalition partners to confirm priority sites.
 - All SRC Committee meetings to be held on approximately a quarterly basis.
 - EDWC hosted meetings regarding the development and implementation of the Countywide Site Redevelopment Program pages on its website and other branded communications.
 - Schedule and participate in monthly “check-in” in-person meetings and/or tele/web conferences with Project Management Team.
 - US EPA National Brownfields Conference (Anticipated to be scheduled in 2019).

EDWC Roles and Responsibilities

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

- EDWC to assist with ongoing remediation and redevelopment reporting to EPA ACRES system, with focus on quantitative and qualitative assessment and tracking direct and indirect economic impacts related to site redevelopment and reuse. For the purposes of measuring and assessing specific impacts (jobs, wages, new investment, sales revenue, etc.) EDWC will utilize its own proprietary databases and external databases to which it subscribes. Additionally, it will lead utilization of external databases (ESRI, WorkNet, etc.) provided through its partners (Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation,

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, Department of Workforce Development, etc.) in developing and communicating impact information.

- EDWC staff will track hours they spend participating in the Site Revitalization Program, and report hours to the County on a quarterly basis to enable the County to track and report in-kind services being provided as part of the assessment project.

Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

- Inventory Tasks – EDWC will contribute to content as needed related to the County Project Manager and County GIS Division work with V&A to transfer the existing GIS database into the County application for a County-managed Brownfields GIS Database and associated layers.
- Site Selection and Prioritization – EDWC will contribute as needed related to assisting V&A in completion of any updates to the site ranking and prioritization process for integration into the County GIS database.
- Brownfield Site Readiness Process: EDWC will lead in enhancing systemization to EDWC's Brownfield Site Readiness Certification Process including additional database geographic information system (GIS) layers by the EDWC and a qualified consultant.

Task 2 – Conduct Phase I ESAs

- No role anticipated.

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

- Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations and Remedial Planning – EDWC to review and add input related to V&A-led remedial action planning in cooperation with Stantec and the County.

Task 4 – Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning

- Reuse/Redevelopment Planning: EDWC will review and provide input into V&A-led brownfields site or area-wide reuse/redevelopment plans in cooperation with Stantec and the County.

Task 5 – Community Outreach and Involvement

- EDWC will advance ROI Generator and Impact Analysis for brownfield redevelopment projects impacted by the EPA and state funding.
- EDWC will assist in community outreach as appropriate to better connect potential businesses, developers and other end-users with brownfields sites that can be a focus for redevelopment and reuse.
- EDWC will continue to utilize the EDWC website focused on connecting prospective end users and local stake holders with information on redevelopment sites and associated reuse opportunities.
- EDWC will continue to advance the website Site Revitalization Program Dashboard and site profiles.
- If requested, EDWC will provide input on meeting agendas and prepare presentations for the SRC meetings and public community meetings as necessary.
- EDWC staff will attend the following:

- Individual meetings with Coalition partners to confirm priority sites.
- All SRC Committee meetings to be held on approximately a quarterly basis.
- EDWC will participate in monthly “check-in” in-person meetings and/or tele/web conferences with Project Management Team.
- US EPA National Brownfields Conferences (scheduled in 2017 and anticipated to be scheduled in 2019).

Coalition Partner Roles and Responsibilities

Task 0 – Programmatic Activities

- Partners will assist the County in securing access agreements for privately owned parcels targeted for assessment within their jurisdictional area.
- Partners will provide access for parcels they own that are targeted for assessment within their jurisdictional area.
- Partners will track hours logged by their staff in participating in the Site Redevelopment Program, and report hours to the County on a quarterly basis to enable the County to track and report in-kind services being provided by Coalition members as part of the assessment project.
- Partners will assist in the eligibility determination process for sites targeted for assessment within their jurisdictional areas, by providing information where available, relevant to past and current ownership, past assessment activities, known or suspected environmental liabilities, and reuse plans.

Task 1 – Brownfields Inventory and Site Prioritization

- Site Inventory – Partners will work with the County, EDWC, Stantec and V&A on development of the inventory.
- Site Selection and Prioritization – Partners will assist in the process of selecting and prioritizing sites for use of EPA funding.

Task 2 – Conduct Phase I ESAs

- Partners will assist in obtaining property owner cooperation for privately owned parcels within their jurisdiction for which Phase I ESAs are being performed, and complete required owner questionnaires for any parcels for which they are the owner.
- Partners will provide copies of any past environmental reports that they have in their possession for sites targeted for assessment within their jurisdictional area.
- Partners will provide information necessary for Stantec to complete eligibility determination forms (and specifically, municipal or other City records not otherwise accessible to Stantec).
- Partners will have primary responsibility for securing signatures from private property owners necessary to execute access agreements for those parcels, as well as any parcels targeted for assessment for which they are the owner. (The access agreement forms will be developed by the County with assistance from Stantec).

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

- Partners will assist in clearing of public utilities as appropriate for utility clearance performed prior to intrusive subsurface sampling activities for parcels targeted for assessment within their jurisdictional area.
- Help secure access (and fully executed access agreements) for any properties targeted for Phase II ESAs, Site Investigations, or Remedial/Reuse Planning and for which access agreements were not completed as part of Task 2.

Task 4 – Community Brownfields Area-wide Redevelopment Planning

- Partners will assist in providing input in redevelopment planning efforts.

Task 5 – Community Outreach and Involvement

- Partners will attend the following:
 - Individual meetings with Coalition partners, County, Stantec and EDWC to confirm priority sites.
 - All SRC Committee meetings to be held on approximately a quarterly basis.

Approach to Initial Grant Implementation

The PMT will work with the Coalition partners to develop and implement strategies that will help to jump start the project and accelerate use of funding and achievement of projects goals and expected benefits. Four initial strategies include:

- Detailed review of the 40 or more previously prioritized sites for the purpose of identifying sites where factors are now in place to enhance the prospects for quickly moving forward with assessment activities.
- Detailed review by the PMT with the individual Coalition members of the recently completed plans for the target areas identified in the grant applications, with a goal of identifying action items that are ready to be advanced and which could be supported via US EPA grant funding.
- Developing incentives to motivate Coalition representatives to more proactively advance assessment activities for sites within their target areas.
- Conducting targeted outreach to the real estate and lending community to increase the identification and nomination of sites by these key stakeholder groups.
- 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 city/village Coalition partners.