



# **MULTI-STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AT BROWNFIELDS SITES IN SELECT U.S. CITIES AND U.S. EPA REGIONS**

**October 2002**

**Prepared by:  
THE PARTNERSHIP FOR SUSTAINABLE BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PART A</b>	<b>I.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>II.</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>III.</b>	<b>The Cities</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>IV.</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>V.</b>	<b>The Cities Research: <i>The Data and Research Results</i></b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>a.</b>	<b>The Acre Neighborhood</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>b.</b>	<b>Sustainable Technology Park and Conservation Area</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>c.</b>	<b>Avtex Fibers Site</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>d.</b>	<b>Summerset at Frick Park</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>e.</b>	<b>South End/Wilmore Neighborhood</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>f.</b>	<b>Merritt College</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>g.</b>	<b>Astor Gateway Master Plan</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>h.</b>	<b>Citywide and Neighborhood-Based Stakeholder Experiments</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>PART B</b>		<b>Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>PART C</b>	<b>I.</b>	<b>Additional Sites</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>a.</b>	<b>Mystic Valley, NY</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>b.</b>	<b>Bronx River Greenway, NY</b>	<b>31</b>
	<b>c.</b>	<b>Baltimore, MD</b>	<b>32</b>
	<b>d.</b>	<b>Clearwater, FL</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>e.</b>	<b>Provo, UT</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>f.</b>	<b>Gardena, CA</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>II.</b>	<b>Locations/Site Screened for Challenged Stakeholder Stories</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>a.</b>	<b>Bronx Paper Mill, NY</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>b.</b>	<b>Harvey, IL</b>	<b>34</b>

## ABOUT PSBR

The Partnership for Sustainable Brownfields Redevelopment (PSBR) is a national multi-stakeholder non-profit organization comprised of the leading organizations and institutions involved in the brownfields redevelopment effort.

As the focus of the brownfields redevelopment effort moves from the federal government to states and local communities, the Partnership serves as a resource for governments, community groups, nonprofits, environmental organizations, lenders, corporations and developers.

The Partnership for Sustainable Brownfields Redevelopment  
2510 St. Paul Street  
Baltimore, MD 21218  
Phone (410) 338-2512  
Fax (410) 338-2751

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Partnership for Sustainable Brownfields Redevelopment thanks the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee. This report could not have been developed without the assistance and contributions of Linda Garczynski, Rey Rivera and Kent Benjamin, of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). We also thank the numerous individuals we consulted for their input and contributions to this report.

### **Editor:**

#### **Executive Director, Partnership for Sustainable Brownfields Redevelopment**

Deeohn Ferris, Global Environmental Resources Inc.

### **Researcher:**

Alice Shabecoff

This report was developed under a Cooperative Agreement between PSBR and the U.S. EPA. The opinions in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. EPA.

# PART A

## **MULTI-STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AT BROWNFIELDS SITES IN SELECT U.S. CITIES/U.S. EPA REGIONS**

---

### **I. Introduction**

The Partnership for Sustainable Brownfields Redevelopment is a national not-for-profit organization whose members are stakeholders that have interests in brownfields redevelopment, for example, community development corporations, private developers, companies, environmental justice activists, elected officials and governmental agencies.

Successful, sustainable redevelopment is contingent upon stakeholders working together collaboratively toward common goals. The Partnership's objective is advancement of collaborative processes that result in the level and quality of multi-stakeholder involvement, which engenders sound decisions and sustainable brownfields redevelopment projects.

The Partnership is a resource for brownfields stakeholders, providing educational and training services as well as planning, facilitation and technical assistance to communities, lenders, government officials, property owners, environmental groups, nonprofits and corporations. The Partnership's research on sustainable brownfields redevelopment demonstrates the benefits and attributes of multi-stakeholder involvement. Our tools set out user-friendly, cost-effective best practices guidance on planning a multi-stakeholder involvement process, including implementation and process evaluation.

### **II. Background**

This report is one component of a multi-phase research study, funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response that is designed to assess multi-stakeholder involvement at brownfields sites around the U.S. The research results show that projects are successful, encounter fewer roadblocks and could proceed at a speedier pace where there is vigorous multi-stakeholder involvement at levels codified in ASTM Standard Guide 1985-1998 pertaining to the phases of brownfields redevelopment.

The chief goal of this document is to report on data that helps evaluate whether the process of multi-stakeholder involvement in brownfields redevelopment projects results in sustainable decisions and creates positive change in the condition of the community surrounding the site. The report reviews and examines data collected on eight cities around the U.S. that are involved in brownfields redevelopment projects.

### **III. The Cities**

These eight case stories are:

- A. The Acre Neighborhood, Lowell MA
- B. Sustainable Technology Park, Cape Charles, VA
- C. Avtex Fibers Superfund Site, Front Royal, VA
- D. Somerset at Frick Park, Pittsburgh, PA
- E. South End/Wilmore Neighborhood, Charlotte, NC
- F. Merritt College, North Oakland, CA
- G. Astor Gateway, Astoria, OR
- H. Citywide Revitalization, Portland, OR

The study shows that the process of multi-stakeholder involvement in brownfields redevelopment projects commonly results in sustainable decisions and positive change in the condition of the community surrounding the site.

These locations were selected with an eye to diversity. The sites vary geographically: north, south, west, northwest and northeast. Some are urban. Others are rural. They range from places where stakeholders are, principally, community groups to citywide stakeholders and even stakeholder groups that span multiple jurisdictions.

The stages of redevelopment at project sites vary as well. In some cases, projects are in the visioning phase while at others construction is either scheduled, already underway and, in some cases, the construction phase is complete. Similarly, some multi-stakeholder processes in this report are in early development while others have evolved and gathered experience over the long-term.

Who sponsors the stakeholder process is another variable. In these case stories, developers, community groups and cities have each assumed leadership roles in terms of instituting a multi-stakeholder process and ensuring that it's continuous, inclusive and vibrant.

### **IV. Executive Summary**

The premise underlying this report is that successful redevelopment is contingent upon the stakeholders working collaboratively toward common goals. These case examples document that the premise holds true at brownfields projects where multi-stakeholders are engaged and involved in structured redevelopment visioning, planning and implementation.

A significant finding is, that stakeholders who chose to establish a multi-stakeholder process did so because their experiences demonstrated the value of involving those affected by brownfields decisions. Invariably, stakeholders engage themselves in a

collaborative decision process for several reasons ranging from self-interest and economic or financial rationales to an interest in improving community quality of life. The developer of Summerset at Frick Park in Pittsburgh relates the story about how, when the City tried to short circuit the community process, dissenters "came out of the woodwork, and numerous meetings later, we put the cat back in the bottle, and set up a process of a committee meetings."

A corporate Vice President involved in the Front Royal site explains corporate interest: "You find out that two or three years down the road there's an objection to the remedy or the land use or some other element, and people go to an agency or the courts to delay the process."

An environmental expert working with the city of Lowell adds perspective on the importance of city involvement: "The potential for crisis is great in any brownfields redevelopment. The City has learned that if you're not out there engaging the community, you pay for it in the long run."

In addition, these case stories demonstrate that benefits derive from multi-stakeholder involvement in brownfields decisions. In places where projects were completed or fairly well along in their redevelopment, the cases show that participation has in fact led to sustainable outcomes for the community. These outcomes include jobs, housing, businesses, recreational space and parks.

For example, Astoria's community visioning resulted in a brownfields re-use that will revitalize its downtown core. In Charlotte, the stakeholder process has catalyzed beneficial re-use of contaminated properties in the South End-Wilmore neighborhood. Even where projects are in early stages of redevelopment, there are specific, positive outcomes. In Front Royal, the community decided on a 200-acre park and construction specifications.

The cases also show that early investment in the stakeholder process can shave time and reduce the cost of redevelopment. In North Oakland, for example, after spending years and a significant amount of money, the City had to go back to square one after the neighborhood resisted plans to demolish a cherished landmark building. In contrast, where there was upfront participation, plans and development moved forward more expeditiously. In every case, broad-based stakeholder participation created better decisions and results.

In contrast, there is no guarantee that even the most costly, inclusive process will end up supported by stakeholders. The multi-stakeholder process must be meticulously designed and carefully implemented. The case stories reveal several lessons. First, no matter how extensive the level of participation, there will still be dissenting voices. Second, disappointment and disaffection can occur if stakeholder involvement leads to expectations that are not or cannot be met.

Another third key issue is the cost (and duration) of stakeholder participation. For example, the brownfields project administrator in Cape Charles tells the story about the initial intense wave of participation that dwindled. He says that, with a staff that limited to two people, "As we got into the development grind in full swing, our focus had to shift from constant intensive engagement."

## **V. The Cities Research: The Data and Research Results**

### *A. EPA Region 1: Lowell, MA*

#### **THE ACRE NEIGHBORHOOD**

---

Lowell, Massachusetts, America's first industrial city and a city that suffered severely from loss of its industrial base, has a history since the mid-1990s of trying to rebuild its economy through brownfields redevelopment. Lowell's poverty rate is 18%, with a population that is 23 % minority. Fifty-eight percent of the manufacturing jobs have disappeared and the cityscape is dotted with derelict industrial sites.

To promote economic renewal and environmental improvement, the City selected an initial baker's dozen priority brownfields sites and developed creative approaches to attracting investors including the Lowell Development and Finance Corporation (a consortium of local stakeholder banks) and tax increment financing. Among the large-scale successes is the transformation of one brownfields property into a sports arena and baseball stadium.

Learning from this history, Lowell collaborated with a respected community development corporation, the Coalition for a Better Acre (CBA), in the assessment and cleanup of a State-designated Superfund site in the Acre neighborhood and in planning re-use of the site.

This commitment has resulted in a long-term community participation process driven by CBA and supported by Lowell, the State and U.S. EPA, drawing in the neighborhood's majority population of immigrant residents through outreach, education and discussion in three different languages.

"The community must be part of the process, not to derail or stop it, but to make this development as healthy and safe as possible," explained Frank Carvalho, for many years CBA's Executive Director. "The greater the level of participation, the better the quality of life in our neighborhood. The City is very well intended in trying to do what's right for everyone involved in developing a site that's contaminated. But because of its limits in time and money, there could be pressures to speed up the process and overlook important details."

The Acre neighborhood is the city's most impoverished, the area where successive generations of immigrants have located after arriving in the U.S. There are many residents who don't speak English in favor of Spanish and Khmer, the Cambodian language. Callers to CBA can select from a telephone menu that includes English, Spanish and Khmer.

The Acre brownfield, listed as a State Superfund site in the 1980s, covers 5.8 acres and numerous dilapidated buildings. Pollution sources include an abandoned old coal gasification plant, in service going back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The property still houses

petroleum and gas supply infrastructure. An EPA Brownfields Assessment Pilot grant funded the environmental site assessment.

The collaboration between the Lowell and CBA dates back to 1998, when the City started to prepare for redeveloping the Acre under the State's urban renewal program. The City created a community outreach strategy and set up a Citizen Advisory Committee for the Acre to involve the community in creating the Acre Urban Revitalization and Development Plan. Separately, CBA created its own task force of neighborhood stakeholders to generate home grown ideas for the revitalization.

Ten members from CBA's task force were folded into the City's Citizen Advisory Committee for the Acre. Other members included small business owners, an executive from the local supermarket, an historic commission member, an executive from the Lowell Housing Authority, and a representative from the National Park Service, which has jurisdiction over parts of the redevelopment area.

Consultants hired by Lowell's Planning and Development division worked on environmental aspects of the Acre revitalization plan and delivered the report to affected neighborhoods. The Citizens Advisory Committee met monthly and sometimes twice monthly. A number of neighborhood meetings were convened. CBA organizers got business and property owners and residents to the meetings. "This was a full blown attempt at community participation," according to Tom Galligani, the City's economic development director.

The need for a middle school emerged from the redevelopment planning process and the Acre neighborhood was chosen as the location since the largest population of middle school aged children lived there. School siting on brownfields is controversial. CBA was concerned about ensuring health and safety. The area was contaminated, the buildings were dilapidated and the site did not provide either jobs or ownership opportunities for the community.

The City translated materials for non-English-speakers. Translators and technical experts who were provided at meetings explained testing methodologies and risk issues. For each meeting, the City broke down the project into manageable topics. For just one meeting, the City spent over \$2,000 to run ads in the newspaper and cable TV, and to prepare flyers.

Three meetings focused on the environmental issues, the contaminants, hazardous wastes, testing and the remediation strategy. Since the re-use is a school, remediation will attain a Class A or highest level clean up paid for by a bond issue that is 90% reimbursable from the State. The State has awarded CBA a \$10,000 technical assistance grant to hire an environmental engineering firm that will evaluate the environmental impacts associated with the demolition, cleanup and will also meet with CBA regularly to keep them informed.

The Citizen Advisory Committee was scheduled to disband following the planning phase. CBA persuaded the City to create an advisory board that would carry on community involvement and follow-up on implementation. This advisory board consists of former Citizens Advisory Committee members, CBA's engineering consultant, an EPA-funded consultant to the Acre brownfields project, representatives from Lowell's Board of Health, the local teachers union, and CBA staffers.

To increase community participation in meetings, the City asked CBA to launch a community organizing campaign. CBA's staff organizer, Lindolfo Carballo, says, "We're picking things up now. We've held one open community-wide meeting already, and starting next week, will be holding neighborhood meetings probably once a month."

The City is also preparing an educational program about the contamination and work involved in the remediation and re-use. "We will redouble efforts at outreach once we start demolition, and expect a higher level of citizen response then," anticipates Steven Crane, Lowell's project manager.

"The City has learned that if you're not out there engaging the community, you pay for it in the long run," explains William Shutkin, a consultant on the Acre brownfields project. "The potential for crisis is great in any brownfields redevelopment, and especially so in a school project. In urban centers that face a crisis of land availability, these are the most important sorts of public goods -- brownfields sites on one hand, and the other hand, schools." The project is underway. The design of the school, to be called the Stoklosa School, is already done. The City is acquiring the properties on the site and relocating tenants.

## *B. EPA Region 3: Cape Charles, VA*

### **SUSTAINABLE TECHNOLOGY PARK AND CONSERVATION AREA**

---

There are three unique aspects of the stakeholder participation that began almost a decade ago in Cape Charles-Northampton County. One is its selection of the strategy of sustainable development to fight poverty and protect the environment; the second is the broad array and intense depth of the stakeholder participation; and the third is the unusual public-private-environmental partnership the work entails.

The centerpiece of this work is the redevelopment of a 200-acre area that contained the former town dump, a semi-abandoned rail yard in a dilapidated industrial area, and a decaying deep-water harbor front, in the town of Cape Charles, into an eco-industrial park and a conservation area. The first in the nation, the Sustainable Technology Park and revitalization plan for the town were conceptualized, designed, financed and built through the work of over sixty public and private stakeholder groups.

The strategy was based on the community's refusal to accept the tradeoff of harm to its abundant natural and cultural resources for short-term economic gains. Northampton County is a small county, where 27 percent of its 13,000 residents live in poverty, one of the most impoverished areas in the nation and the poorest in Virginia. African-Americans, who make up almost half the population, bear the brunt of the area's poverty.

The county is located on the Virginia Eastern Shore, a 70-mile long peninsula separating the Chesapeake Bay from the Atlantic Ocean. Cape Charles, formerly a bustling harbor and ferry terminus on the Bay, fell into an economic decline when the ferry relocated. It further suffered as dwindling seafood harvests and low commodity prices caused the collapse of the area's seafood and agricultural industries in the 1980s. Outsiders suggested a number of potentially harmful ventures, and rejected, as panaceas to cure its economy--from a maximum-security prison, to an asphalt-cleaning plant to be located over a groundwater recharge zone.

The eco-park is intended as an economic engine for Cape Charles and the southern end of the Shore, and is hoped to generate 1,500 jobs. It carries many other goals: innovative pollution prevention and water treatment compatible with the sensitive coastal environment, habitat protection and enhancement of green space, a showcase for green architecture, and the establishment of thriving eco businesses. Among the businesses that set up operations in the eco-park are: (1) a manufacturer of systems to convert seawater to fresh water; and (2) a German firm that manufactures wind turbines (plans are to build six in the park).

The story began in September 1993, when the county and town, to break the hold of poverty without harming the area's resources, launched what they named a Sustainable Development Initiative. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), because of its interest in preserving coastal areas, provided a grant to hire an

administrator, Tim Hayes, who would spearhead the work involved in holding the meetings and developing the strategy.

A Task Force was appointed by the County of over 40 citizens from a wide range of backgrounds plus numerous resource people. The group met frequently, researched various economic development approaches, provided information and ideas to the initiative, and ended up producing the Sustainable Development Action Strategy.

The strategy advocated the pursuit of sustainable economic activity in six different industry areas, including, for example, developing nature tourism, promoting agriculture and developing aquaculture and seafood products, while protecting water resources. County government unanimously approved the strategies and the Task Force disbanded.

The concept for an eco-park was one of the ideas that came out of the strategy sessions. Then, in 1995, to develop and manage the park, Northampton County and the Town of Cape Charles jointly set up a new local, quasi-public industrial development authority, the Sustainable Technology Park Authority. Key leaders from the community were appointed to its Board to dialogue with various stakeholder groups.

To develop ideas about what the park should be, community-wide charette was held that included urban planners, environmental engineers, businesses, politicians, water treatment experts and teachers and local citizens. Seven community meetings followed this activity. The Park Authority also met directly with all of the neighbors, Hayes explained. By involving all stakeholders, the initiative was able to generate a "powerful creative force" for the next steps.

The park, which had been selected in 1994 as one of four eco-industrial demonstration projects by the Clinton Administration's Council on Sustainable Development, won an U.S. EPA Assessment grant in 1995 and in 2000 a U.S. EPA Showcase Communities grant. The townspeople showed up for clean-up day of the town dump, removing trash such as tires. Hayes explained that there were no hazardous materials and no other remediation needed.

The creation of the eco-industrial park and its facilities reads like a who's who in sustainable technology. The University of Virginia's dean of the architecture school led an international team in a community design charette for the park. The Rocky Mountain Institute assisted with the design of the park; the law firm, McGuire Woods Battle & Boothe, helped to plan the park and develop its set of innovative park covenants; Cornell University's Work & Environment Initiative is involved in increasing green employment opportunities through the park. PowerLight Corporation installed North America's largest roof-integrated, thin-film solar electric system on Building One.

The public sector has invested a total of about \$6 million: \$3.5 million in financing has come from the U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. EPA, Virginia Coastal Program, USDA Rural Development, U.S. Economic Development Administration, and the Virginia Department of Transportation, among others. Northampton County funded the

construction of the park through a \$2.5 million general obligation bond. Private investment is said to have reached \$8 million to date.

However, the eco-park has fewer tenants than anticipated, a problem that some observers attribute to inadequate marketing in a competitive environment and an outcome of public sector rather than private management. A number of community stakeholders are frustrated since only the eco-park has been developed, while other important elements of the sustainable development action strategy have languished on the drawing board. Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore concludes, for example, that they "do not have a strong voice" in these efforts.

According to the local NAACP, "We have been invited to all the meetings, though we may not always have the time to go to all of them. We try to stay at the table, and try to be visible to address the problems that plague our communities, looking at not only racism and classism, but the total picture of the Eastern Shore."

Hayes explains the challenges of keeping up stakeholder participation with a staff of only two people. "The initial process had very intensive involvement to get momentum started and move ahead toward a common vision. But as we got into the development grind in full swing, our focus had to shift from constant intensive engagement." He adds that the Showcase Community grant is now helping to recharge the community engagement process.

Now the action expands to the other side of the peninsula, where the local landfill is scheduled to close next year, and its re-creation into a seaside ecological park. About one-half of the land in the park will be preserved as natural habitat, including a 30-acre area to preserve fragile coastal dunes and 60 acres of other natural areas. Here remediation will involve restoration of the habitat, including the wetlands and removal of non-native invasive species and maintenance of the existing mixed-hardwood forest.

To put together the master plan for landfill, a mini-charette gathered local groups and the Nature Conservancy, funded by the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife. The next steps are a federal partners workshop to determine the roles of government agencies and a community workshop to comment on the master plan and name the park. The area to be reclaimed could end up as a combination nature preserve, trails, recreation fields, a renewable energy wind farm, aquaculture, and a center that educates on the power of combining ecology with economy.

Steve Parker of the Nature Conservancy says that the disaffection of some formerly enthusiastic stakeholders is understandable. "If this work were easy, everybody would do it. It's never quite what the PR looks like." But, he adds, "never before have the government and private sector and environmental groups tried to work together to come up with win-win-win solutions for the community, the economy and the environment. Who's to say that in ten years the eco-park may not be a great success? In sum, the strategy has been very positive for the county."

### C. EPA Region 3: Front Royal, VA

#### **AVTEX FIBERS SITE**

---

At the Avtex Fibers Superfund site in Virginia, stakeholders are applying a multi-stakeholder decision framework sanctioned by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). This ASTM standard, which was formally adopted in 1998, was established via a negotiated process involving multi-stakeholders involved in brownfields redevelopment ([www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org)).

FMC, the chief corporate responsible party at this Superfund site, led the initiative to apply the ASTM standard. The local city/county development authority spearheaded the collaborative site cleanup effort. Redevelopment plans feature economic revitalization and community benefits. The objective is to place design of a 200-acre park in the hands of the stakeholders involving them in the cleanup and decisions about site re-use.

Jerry Prout, Vice President for Government Affairs at FMC, explains the motive for applying the ASTM standard, "Based on our experiences at other sites where we had not been as good in enlisting public local concerns, you find out that in two or three years down the road, there's an objection to the remedy or to the land use or to some other element, and people go to an agency or the courts to delay the process. Now, I think, there's an effort to address local public interest up front and the ASTM standard gives the process an order, which business people like. It gets everyone around the table with formal rules of the road."

The 440-acre site, in Front Royal, is Virginia's largest privately owned Superfund site and one of the largest in the nation. For nearly 50 years until 1989, the facility employed over 2,500 people to manufacture synthetic industrial fibers. In June 1986, it was listed on the Superfund program's National Priorities List. In 1989, Avtex Fibers filed for bankruptcy and the Commonwealth of Virginia ordered the plant closed.

The factory closing devastated the manufacturing heritage of the area, incomes of nearly 50 % of the working population in the county. The town's economic linchpin morphed into an abandoned highly contaminated waste site. Although FMC and U.S. EPA have already removed tons of debris, the cleanup plan calls for large-scale chemical decontamination, closure of 100 acres of solid waste pits, excavation of impacted soils, remediation of contaminated groundwater (that has affected residential drinking wells) and removal of 7 miles of underground sewers. Low and moderate-income neighborhoods, home to many former plant workers, border the Avtex Fibers site.

Estimated cleanup cost is \$150 million divided three ways. FMC will contribute \$80 million; government agencies implicated in site contamination, the U.S. Department of Commerce and NASA, will pay about \$35 million; U.S. EPA will draw \$35 million from the federal Superfund.

Outside the scope of Superfund, the local Economic Development Authority will spend approximately \$12 million to hire the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for asbestos

abatement and demolition. These funds derive from efforts by Virginia's Congressional delegation. A \$20 million funding shortfall remains to be addressed.

The town of Front Royal and Warren County are partners in the local Economic Development Authority (EDA) that purchased the property from the Avtex bankruptcy trustee, once the most toxic contaminants were removed and bankruptcy issues were resolved. Stephen Heavener, the Director, explains EDA's initiative to buy and redevelop the site, "If we had not been proactive, potentially the site would have been fenced in with dilapidated buildings in the middle of Front Royal forever."

In 1998, Front Royal and Warren County officials, along with FMC, began to transform their ideas for the site into reality. EDA hired a company to prepare a future use feasibility study, involving public and individual meetings and data collection. The plan that unfolded weaves together cleanup and economic renewal. Community benefit drives site re-use and becomes the standard for action.

The master plan envisions an eco-business park, on 165 acres, that will attract technology-based companies. The only former Avtex building to be left standing on the site is being renovated using sustainable principles; it will house EDA's administrative offices, rental space for growing companies, and what will be the Shenandoah Center for Heritage and the Environment at Front Royal.

The 240-acre waste disposal area along the Shenandoah River will become a Conservancy Park incorporating a wildlife refuge, wetlands area, riverfront park, and passive recreational parkland. Seven soccer fields and recreational facilities will be built on another 30-acre portion of land.

The master plan for the site was adopted in the spring of 1998. EDA and FMC applied the ASTM standard on community and stakeholder participation in the next redevelopment decisions. The ASTM standard, issued in 1998, was developed in a 2-year collaborative process involving representatives from cities, states, federal agencies, industry, bankers, developers, insurance companies, community and environmental groups and environmental justice activists. U.S. EPA, FMC, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and the local EDA are the sponsors of the stakeholder process underway in Front Royal.

Consistent with the ASTM standard, the sponsors created a formal Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) in 2000. The group spans a spectrum of interests: homeowners and tenants (many low-income) in the apartment complex in the abutting neighborhoods, Avtex retirees, property owners, business owners, local bankers, local schools, realtors, the town council, the County Board of Supervisors, the town planning department, the Virginia Economic Development Partnership, the Chamber of Commerce, and river enthusiasts.

Representatives were selected from these stakeholder groups to serve on the MSG. Community members could choose to represent themselves or form groups. Meetings

are scheduled in advance at regular intervals, held at convenient locales, publicized and open to the public.

FMC hired local and outside consultants to manage media relations as well as outreach and communications for the community including plans and agendas for the stakeholder meetings. Outreach incorporates techniques such as door-to-door visits, information booths at community events, school presentations and activities with local business and civic organizations.

Quarterly MSG meetings have been held since the fall of 1999 have covered a range of redevelopment issues. For example, FMC hired a national landscape architecture firm to help stakeholders visualize and design the planned Conservancy Park. The MSG process is also being used to plan the soccer complex, the 165-acre eco-business park, and the Shenandoah Heritage Center.

Although there are stakeholders who oppose aspects of the remedial plan, the outcome of their participation is tangible in Front Royal. "The stakeholder process managed the entire design and future use of the park. The process was very useful in eliciting ideas from the community, since they did not have any preconceived notions before the design charettes," Mr. Heavener explained.

Heavener also says that

"The community must have a vision for the re-use of the brownfields site. The vision must be created by a broad base of stakeholders and must be championed by local elected officials. The vision lends credibility to all development related efforts and proves to potential funding sources that the community is unified in its redevelopment efforts. Being actively involved with a broad section of the community assisted me with opening my mind and evolving as an economic development practitioner."

FMC's Jerry Prout sees the outcome similarly.

"While we were working with the EDA to vision what the site could be used for, enlisting the stakeholder group with a lot of discussion about what would be the best, most acceptable use out of so many possible alternatives was very helpful. For a corporation, you can discuss the impact in terms of self-interest. It puts you on a path going forward where there's less opportunity for either the remedy or the land use to go off the track."

Bonnie Gross, EPA project manager for Front Royal, adds a final word. "It's once the site is redeveloped, that's when you find out whether the stakeholder process really had an impact."

*D. EPA Region 3: Pittsburgh, PA*

**SUMMERSET AT FRICK PARK**

---

The \$243 million transformation of a 238-acre slag dump into Summerset at Frick Park-- a handsome, market-rate New Urbanism neighborhood of 713 homes, townhouses, and apartments, is Pittsburgh's largest residential development since World War II. It will take ten years to develop, over three phases, and will add 110 acres of park space to the adjoining Frick Park.

The slag dump land lies along the Monongahela River, adjacent to an affluent section of the city. For fifty years, local steel producers dumped more than 20 millions tons of slag from their blast furnaces onto the site, forming towers as high as 20-story buildings. Mayor, Tom Murphy, used to take morning runs through the site and ponder its potential.

The lead developer is Summerset Land Development Associates; its management partner, the Rubinoff Company, whose president once ran a Pittsburgh community development corporation (CDC), has spearheaded a years-long, massive and sometimes contentious community and stakeholder participation process, following on the city's series of multi-year community meetings.

Pointing out that the Pittsburgh's top elected officials, Mayor Tom Murphy and Deputy Mayor Tom Cox, are also former CDC executives, Rubinoff's president Mark Schneider says they learned as CDC directors that the private sector has to take the lead and take the risks when it comes to tough revitalization initiatives. And they re-learned that "you can't rush things and violate 101 of the community process." As Tom Cox puts it, "It takes a huge amount of communication to engage the neighborhood and, perhaps, from working in CDCs you learn the patience and acquire the history and, perhaps, some amount of additional skill to do it."

Though stakeholder participation has raised challenges, Schneider concludes, "It would have been more difficult had we not put the process in place." The result for the developer, he says, is a process, which surfaces dissent in an orderly way that can be dealt with. For the communities surrounding the site, the Summerset process, now going on for more than four years, has resulted in tangible outcomes.

Communities were involved in planning and development. Their concerns were translated into a set of conditions codified in the Planning Commission code for the project; the clean-up has been handled in more community-sensitive ways; and environmental and health experts have been hired or assigned as watch-dogs and advisors for the communities.

In 1995, the City's Urban Redevelopment Authority (headed by yet another CDC director) purchased the land and envisioned developing the property. Deputy Mayor Cox managed the site review process to figure out the best use of the site. Over the years of this stage, the City held meetings with every community in the surrounding areas. The

vision of a New Urbanist neighborhood emerged, and then the city selected a team of developers who could take that vision forward. At this point, as in others, stakeholder participation sometimes meant resistance. "For the years when we were creating the vision, even though it meant we were going to clean up a stream and inhabit a slag dump, there were people opposed, fearful of the new," Cox related.

At the next stage, when the developers and Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) met over a period of two years to work out the details, they opened the discussion through a series of weekly meetings "with a whole variety of people to bring them up to speed with what they were doing." Over the years of planning, there were at least 200 meetings held at night.

Stakeholders generated a list of 16 conditions that the Planning Commission then incorporated into the Final Land Development Plan. Thus, the stakeholders' wishes were actually codified. The first of the conditions required the developer to meet with representatives from each of the community associations from the surrounding areas as the project moved forward. Another condition required that community representatives have an opportunity to review and discuss any proposed changes before review by the Planning Commission.

Among other conditions: results of any studies must be shared with the community; the Planning Commission has to receive and consider public testimony for any revisions under review. At the neighbors' insistence, no blasting may occur on the site, and work may take place only on specified hours and days.

Because of their apprehensions about the possibility that toxins might be released during the cleanup, the neighbors were insistent that the county health department help represent their interests. The City directed the health department to that end. This staffer continues to participate in community meetings. The City also hired a third party environmental consulting company to represent the communities at the start of the process. This consultant reviews all environmental reports before they are submitted to the respective regulatory agencies.

There were some surprises during cleanup. Drums containing lead-based paint based were found during the digging; these were first set aside in a secured staging area, tested, and then taken off site. Site preparation also uncovered pieces of concrete bridge decking, which are currently being stockpiled and will be crushed for fill in future phases. The soil cleanup turned out to be engineering feat. The slag has been reprocessed to recover the iron ore.

To ease the neighbors' concerns, URA has spent over \$750,000 monitoring dust and airborne particulates. Grading 200+ tons of new topsoil spread over the reprocessed slag is one of the development's challenges. The project also involves restoring a polluted stream, the Nine Mile Run that flows through the development. The Army Corps of Engineers is putting \$5 million into this aspect of the restoration, and Pittsburgh's contribution is \$2.7 million.

Financing for the clean up included a U.S. EPA Assessment Pilot grant, city bond money, local foundation grants, and state capital funds. National City Bank participated as the developer's financing partner. Pittsburgh will have invested over \$20 million in site preparation work for Phase 1 and will collect revenues from lot sales on each home and annual property tax receipts.

The Rubinoff Company had done five major brownfields projects before Summerset. One of them was a joint venture with the Northside Civic Development Council, a CDC whose director at the time was Mark Schneider. "When we found contamination on that site, everyone went ballistic, the project shut down for three years, and we had to figure out how to restart it." That experience was a useful one when Schneider joined Rubinoff as president and they started the Summerset redevelopment.

Summerset continued the community and stakeholder participation that the City started. Upon occasion, it has proved difficult. At first, the City tried to move forward quickly with the redevelopment, approving a grading plan before the master plan was in place. So, at some of the early community meetings, held just when Mayor Murphy was in the midst of a reelection campaign, he and the participants engaged in some energetic disputes. "If you try rush things, you violate 101 of the community process," admits Schneider.

The people wanted to know the details: was it environmentally safe, what was the mix of apartments going to be, what about traffic? They were worried about a drop in their property values. Dissenters "came out of the woodwork. Numerous meetings later, we put the cat back in the bottle, and set up a process of committee meetings," Schneider recalls.

Three neighborhoods touch the site. The stakeholder participation that the URA/Summerset established included groups from each neighborhood. A long series of community meetings resumed, while the developer got the site rezoned. At that point, the neighborhood groups voted their support. Then the master plan was approved, followed by the grading plan, and grading work commenced.

Once the zoning passed, the developer and the Mayor set up a community Nine Mile Run Task Force, with representatives from each neighborhood, three at-large members, a few regulatory agency staffers (including from the health department and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and a member from the city-hired community environmental consulting company.

Monthly meetings of the Task Force are held at the project office over lunch. Usually involving 35 people, they're scheduled to accommodate job schedules. The Summerset project manager, Sally Pfaff, staffs the meetings. Minutes are recorded and distributed. Task Force members offer items for the agenda. Summerset/URA makes every environmental report submitted to DEP available to the Task Force, and also places a copy of these reports in the nearby branch of the public library.

Recently, community resistance on an issue generated created considerable pressure when URA's engineering consultant discovered that one of the four access roads turned out to be physically and financially infeasible and inaccessible to buses. "Though we delivered on everything, when we came back to say this wouldn't work, we found ourselves back to square one," facing neighborhood opposition because people were concerned about traffic loads on the other roads, Schneider related.

The Task Force met about this proposed change. Evening meetings were held in each community. After extensive discussion, most of the surrounding communities conditionally approved the necessary changes. Schneider sees the dissent that surfaces from stakeholder participation as something that cannot be separated from the benefits. He says:

"This is the business we're in as the developer. We have to do it. It would have been more difficult had we not put the process in place. It's satisfying when people who thought you were a lying scumbag show up and say this is really nice."

And they are showing up and saying Summerset is really nice. There is a waiting list of 750 people for the homes, which are sold through a lottery.

Schneider adds:

"A bigger issue is the resource issue. We have solved the scientific and technical problems, but not the financial/policy ones. The cost of recovering the sites is incredible. Nobody says that the homeowner and developer should bear the result of 60 years of steel that got shipped around the country. How can you take on a ten-year project such as Summerset when there's no ten-year financial program to recover brownfields?"

## E. EPA Region 4: *Charlotte, NC*

### **SOUTH END/WILMORE NEIGHBORHOOD**

---

The City of Charlotte created a nationally acclaimed community and stakeholder participation process to address seven brownfields sites and economic development issues in the City's poor, formerly industrial but gentrifying neighborhood of South End/Wilmore.

As a result of their involvement during the South End/Wilmore discussions, bankers, small business owners, local property owners and others learned about redeveloping brownfields. Many of the participants in these discussions took an active role in enacting a North Carolina Brownfields Property Reuse Act, which streamlines the redevelopment process and increases the likelihood of transforming these properties into beneficial re-use. Further, the participation process resulted in the Wilmore community development corporation (CDC) taking on its own redevelopment initiative.

In 1996, when Charlotte was awarded a U.S. EPA Brownfields Assessment Pilot Grant, the City set up a stakeholder process they called Brownfield Partners, bringing together a group of about 100, representing neighborhood residents, the Wilmore CDC, private developers, realtors, business and property owners, government agencies, the legal profession, bankers, engineers, environmentalists, consultants, staff from numerous city and state departments and U.S. EPA.

"The involvement of the developer community kept us on track so our projects could be market-driven. The real estate and appraisers helped us understand the context of the market," explains Tom Warshauer, the official in Charlotte's Neighborhood Development office who is in charge of the effort.

Neighborhood meetings were publicized, held every few weeks in a local church and childcare was available. User-friendly educational materials were prepared and made available in advance. The materials explained in plain terms what brownfields are, how their re-use can benefit an owner and a community, and how an owner could apply for an assessment grant. Minutes were recorded and distributed. An informative newsletter was circulated.

Stakeholders could serve on several committees: a site selection committee, another to deal with environmental issues, and a third to work with financial and regulatory institutions. Issues, such as crime, neighborhood boundaries, and water for the local park were also addressed.

The outreach efforts in this stakeholder involvement program won a national award and ICMA selected Charlotte for a peer-to-peer exchange program in community involvement. The information exchange with stakeholders, coupled with the new state law, resulted in action. Local property owners and developers are redeveloping brownfields sites.

For example, one family that owns a company specializing in boiler repair work is renovating their business quarters instead of relocating to a suburban, greenfield site.

There are other examples of progress. An old mill has been renovated as the Design Center of the Carolinas. Several sites will be re-built as office or mixed-use developments, and construction is about to begin on a new shopping center.

The Wilmore CDC has become more involved in property ownership. Charlotte funded the CDC to assess a parcel of land that was suitable for housing. The CDC bought the land, entered into a partnership with Boulevard Central, a developer, and the Charlotte Housing Partnership.

The stakeholder involvement process revealed tensions between developers and community residents. The process created a forum to help resolve them and promote working relationships. The residents learned about the risks that developers undertake and the developers are becoming educated about the negative consequences of gentrification and community displacement.

The Brownfield Partners site selection committee works with City staff to approve applicants for both the Brownfield Assessment Grant and the Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund. The committee has ten members; there are five community representatives, an environmental representative, an environmental attorney, a banker, and a developer.

The Brownfield Partners and the site selection committee have now evolved into citywide actors. The Partners group has grown to a list of about 300 organizations and individuals, ranging from environmental engineers to community representatives. The group meets at least twice annually to discuss issues, stay abreast of activities and exchange information.

## F. EPA Region 9: *North Oakland, CA*

### **MERRITT COLLEGE<sup>1</sup>**

---

In North Oakland, residents and other stakeholders engaged in a lengthy battle to delay or block an unwanted project--the City's plan to demolish an historic but run-down school building. The community's persistence in remaining engaged and vocal for over 20 years, and at one point in filing a lawsuit to halt city actions, forced the City to re-establish a planning process with improved community engagement. The community supported and exercised significant influence in the restoration, redesign and redevelopment of the Merritt College site. During the restoration, environmental contamination was uncovered and remediated in ways consistent with community-defined interests.

Re-use of the site, which was subsequently purchased by a hospital, reflects the community's interest in a senior center, an African American cultural center, housing, hospital expansion, and a community park. When the hospital was in negotiations with the city to buy the renovated building, the city made it clear that the community would have to be included in discussions about future development projects. Otherwise the projects would have a hard time getting through North Oakland's approval process, states Jens Hillmer, an urban economic analyst with the City.

North Oakland is a diverse community of about 40,000 people of mixed economic status, age, and ethnicity. On a nine-acre blighted site in the middle of the community stood Merritt College, an historic and still-attractive school building, abandoned and left to deteriorate when the school owners in 'white flight' left for the suburbs. The building roof and floors rotted, vandals graffiti on the walls, drug dealers moved in, fires were set, trash littered its rooms, and at one point, a dead body was discovered.

The City acquired the site in 1983, with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and then held 11 public meetings to establish plans for redeveloping the site. Despite strongly stated public desire to preserve and re-use the school, North Oakland attempted several efforts to demolish the building and construct in its place a mega strip shopping mall.

The neighbors organized and formed a neighborhood association, the North Oakland Voters' Alliance (NOVA) to challenge the City's plans. NOVA activists comprise a culturally and racially diverse group of professionals, homemakers, seniors and working class people. They collected signatures to support preserving the building, published a monthly newsletter, and held public meetings to share concerns.

---

<sup>1</sup> Background information for this case study is drawn from the publication, "Brownfields Redevelopment: Meeting the Challenges of Community Participation," Arlene K. Wong and Lisa Owens-Viani, published by the Pacific Institute, Oakland, May 2000.

Along with the interest in preserving the building, the neighbors want to address other areas of blight in the neighborhood--crime, local politics, and development issues. "The City wore us down by holding meetings of the council during the day, which is hard for people who hold jobs. We were always able to out-organize, but the toll was difficult on us personally. But we felt it was our neighborhood and we just didn't give up," says Bob Brokl, one of the original NOVA organizers.

NOVA joined forces with the nonprofit Oakland Heritage Alliance to protest the building's destruction. NOVA eventually filed a lawsuit against the City to prevent further deterioration of the building until an environmental assessment could be completed. In addition, NOVA did extensive precinct work, from fundraising to door-to-door canvassing, to elect a new city council representative who took on the preservation of the Merritt College as a central issue. In 1992, the City finally withdrew plans to demolish the building. Afterwards, NOVA secured historic designation for the school building.

The environmental assessment catalogued lead paint, asbestos, PCBs, an underground gasoline storage tank and other contaminants. North Oakland financed removal of the tank and surrounding soil, the lead paint, asbestos and PCBs, and installation of groundwater monitoring wells. The City also established a new redevelopment process with a participatory citizens' advisory committee that is involved in planning, site assessment and determining site reuse. The advisory committee's work continues in cooperation with the new site owner.

The advisory committee regularly received information about rehabilitation and construction plans and provided the broader community with opportunities to discuss how cleanup was handled. For example, responding to community concerns about asbestos releases, the City agreed to notify neighbors in advance of the removal work and advised them about safety measures.

The committee was consulted on details such as lighting, tree choice and planting, paint and light fixtures for the building. They also had a voice in the way a nearby hospital intended to reuse part of the building as a research center. As a result of community involvement in the redevelopment phase, minority contractors are engaged in the restoration and construction phases.

North Oakland collaborated with NOVA to select the nonprofit, Resources for Community Development, to build 13 units of slated in-fill housing around the site perimeter. For the proposed public park on the site, the City has asked the community to collaborate in decisions about recreational facilities and park design.

The City renovated the college building with \$16 million from a U.S. HUD Section 108 loan, a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) float loan and other sources, and developed the senior center with \$2.8 million from a bond issue. The new facility was sold to Children's Hospital. The City leased back the senior center for a 55-year term

with option to renew. The next step is securing the means to build the African-American cultural center, which would be located on the site.

North Oakland collaborated with NOVA to select the nonprofit, Resources for Community Development, to build 13 units of slated in-fill housing around the site perimeter. For the proposed public park on the site, the city has asked the community to collaborate in the decisions about recreational facilities and park design.

When the hospital purchased the site, the City proposed a continuing role for the community in new projects on the site. The hospital agreed. In a recent example of cooperation, the hospital included the community in its discussion of plans to construct a facility to house new medical equipment. Although NOVA objected and lost the argument, Bob Brokl says, "It's a matter of continuing to try to balance the power of this institution," stressing that the community will not voluntarily relinquish involvement.

## *G. EPA Region 10: Astoria, OR*

### **ASTOR GATEWAY MASTER PLAN**

---

In Astoria, Oregon, as in many other small Pacific-Northwest towns, an abandoned mill left a powerful environmental and economic blight on the town. In Astoria, it was the town's community development director who became the driving force in its rescue, bringing "citizen leaders" together as stakeholders over a number of years and pulling together the creative financing for the site's restoration and re-use. Astoria shows the advantage of giving the participation process the time and opportunity to build trust and allow what started as a plan for the brownfields site to expand into a common vision that sparked the rebirth of the town.

The town's major employer, a plywood mill, closed down in 1989 and left the 16-acre site, at the mouth of the Columbia River, polluted with PCBs and petroleum products, and as devastated as if hit by a bomb. An inter-tidal millpond on the site was carrying the toxics out with the tide twice a day and into the river. Since the site is immediately next to the town's central business district, its pollution became a barrier to any kind of capital investment in putting the land to new use.

The mill's biggest creditor, the U.S. Small Business Administration, seized and auctioned anything from the site that was saleable. The county seized other assets for non-payment of taxes. That left a site that had negative value: it would cost more to clean up and clear the remaining liens than the property was worth.

Yet Paul Benoit, Astoria's community development director, and other townspeople, City staff and elected officials could see possible ways to redeem the site, by first cleaning it up and then turning it over to the private sector for redevelopment. But there were several stumbling blocks to that plan. One was the estimated \$1.4 million bill for the cleanup. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) offered to cover half of the cleanup costs, bringing the city's share down to a level that might be recouped from the sale of the parcel. How would the city raise the money for their share?

Another stumbling block was how to take possession of a site burdened with \$5 million in liens held by the electric utility, Weyerhaeuser and Liberty Mutual Insurance, among others. As Benoit spoke to each, he found they responded with the attitude, 'what you're doing is great,' and unhesitatingly assigned their liens on the contaminated properties to Astoria. A private sector environmental attorney with a can-do attitude helped with this step.

But then the local bank was unwilling to make a loan on terms the town could accept. So Benoit approached ShoreBank Enterprise Pacific, a nonprofit organization that provides loans and business assistance to small, natural resource-based enterprises in the Pacific Northwest. ShoreBank was willing to undertake the detailed research needed on the risks, found that property offered adequate collateral and, with the Bank of Astoria as its partner, made a \$750,000 loan commitment to the venture.

With that commitment, DEQ was "back on the wagon," as Brooks Koenig, a policy analyst in the State's Department of Environmental Protection, put it, and cleanup got underway in 1996. The soil and oil-based pollutants were extracted and thermally treated ("a very expensive piece of equipment," says Benoit in an understatement).

Meanwhile in the early 1990s, Astoria convened a series of community brainstorming sessions focused on site re-use. About the same time, U.S. EPA provided a \$200,000 Brownfields Assessment Pilot grant to the Rural Development Initiative (RDI), a nonprofit spin-off of the State, to support an Oregon Mill Site Conversion Project that would help six small towns with the industrial re-use of abandoned mills.

Benoit convinced RDI to include Astoria in its program, even though the town was more interested in promoting development of a new neighborhood than in an industrial end use. With funds and technical assistance from RDI, the town was able to bring in facilitators and engage in a more formal stakeholder discussion.

"The City first notified all the adjacent and nearby property owners. Then we branched out to bring in the citizen leaders," explained Benoit. "Because it's a small town, everyone knows who they are. It may have been the basketball coach, the grocery store owner. Citizen leaders included the local hospital's CEO, the head of the school district. We had at least 30 people in this very diverse group. The daily newspaper owner was part of the group, and he reported on everything and made sure word was getting out about the discussions."

Explaining the process Benoit says, "Our workshops took over a year. In rural areas, change comes hard, so what we did with our stakeholders was not to push, but to let a concept evolve over time. As a result, there was no community upheaval, people grew very comfortable with the redevelopment concepts. Though we focused on the mill site, as we worked together, we began to realize that we were looking at the property too narrowly, that we should also be considering the land to the east and west and south."

Benoit adds:

"This is the advantage of giving the process time. A vision emerged for what happens around the mill site. It generated a lot of interest and excitement."

The Astoria town council agreed to support the next step and contracted with an urban planning consultant to work with the community on what ended up being called the Astoria Gateway Master Plan. The plan resulted in rezoning and rethinking all of the land use within this broader district, as well as a set of design standards to govern the whole site.

Then the town promoted green guidelines using native vegetation, and non-toxic materials, on the mill site in particular, but also throughout the whole new Gateway district. The vision included housing, commercial space, construction of an Aquatic

Center, and a branch of the Oregon State University devoted to research into new seafood products.

"The stakeholders have seen the fruits of their labor. Basically, the City incorporated the guidelines from the visioning process into a new section of the zoning ordinance that implements the master plan. One hundred people packed the council meetings as the code was discussed and adopted. This goes beyond trust, into law and regulation," Benoit summed it.

Some members of the stakeholder-visioning group, who grew interested in government and the planning process, have become active on the planning commission and design review commission. Astoria repaid the loan from ShoreBank when it sold the site to Venerable Properties, a private developer, under a development agreement to follow all prior guidelines. The developer has completed the first phase in the construction of a medium-density community of apartments, townhouses, and homes around the millpond, incorporating New Urbanism ideas. Sixteen units have been built of the 200 on the drawing board.

Further, powered by "the confidence and trust" engendered by the mill's cleanup, in addition to the aquatic center and Oregon State University research branch, other new commercial enterprises have now fulfilled the Astoria Gateway vision of a thriving downtown: a movie theatre, a new medical specialist building with sixty high-paying jobs, and a bank with additional new jobs.

U.S. EPA selected Astoria for a Phoenix Award for "its strong, well-developed public and partnerships, civic spirit, and perseverance to overcome many obstacles," said Denise Chamberlain, chair of the Phoenix Awards Executive Committee. "The use of community workshops to develop a vision for the site and the project's positive impact on the community are also truly impressive." Paul Benoit was honored by Oregon's governor as 1998 Economic Development Leader of the Year.

## *H. EPA Region 10: Portland, OR*

### **CITYWIDE AND NEIGHBORHOOD-BASED STAKEHOLDER EXPERIMENTS**

---

Portland's citywide brownfields action plan is the outcome of recommendations resulting from broad-based public involvement, launched after the City won a U.S. EPA Brownfields Assessment Pilot award in 1996. After winning a U.S. EPA Brownfields Showcase Community award in 1998, Portland experimented with a unique stakeholder participation process centered in its most distressed neighborhood, where the community advisory committee selected properties and developers for brownfields cleanup. Learning from the drawbacks of that effort, Portland is planning to create a citywide Community Advisory Committee.

Portland, the state's oldest and largest industrial, shipping, and commercial center, has worked on different ways to redevelop contaminated land since 1996, focusing on the city's North-Northeast neighborhood and Portland's riverfront along the Willamette River. In the North-Northeast, the unemployment rate is 10.4% and the poverty rate is 35%. The threat of contamination and liability inhibited reuse and redevelopment at several polluted sites (exacerbated by suburban sprawl).

After winning the Brownfields Assessment Pilot grant, Portland started to develop a set of specific, community-based Brownfield Action Plans, which began with establishing a Public Involvement Plan, "that increases community awareness of project goals, brownfields issues, and provides opportunity for participation in all stages of the Initiative." The key to public involvement was a series of Brownfield Roundtables, in which participants engaged in focused brainstorming and prioritized the opportunities and barriers associated with brownfields.

Participants consisted of a broad cross-section of people in the community, neighborhood associations, environmental consultants, environmental attorneys, environmental activist organizations, developers, state and federal governmental agencies. Deliberations from the sessions were recorded and consolidated into a brief summary document, which was integrated into the City's Brownfield Action Plans.

Another aspect of stakeholder process involved the creation of a model curriculum for high school and entry-level college students. The curriculum is available on the Internet on the Brownfields for Global Learners site, which was created due to pro bono efforts of staff of the Portland Public Schools, the Environmental Law Education Center and a local computer-consulting firm.

In 1998, when Portland won the Showcase award, brownfields officials asked the North/Northeast neighborhood to form a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), to design and implement outreach efforts and develop a unique community-based approach for selecting redevelopment projects, including soliciting participation of property owners.

In addition to neighborhood residents, stakeholders active in the North/Northeast CAC included small business owners, educators, the local community bank, environmental justice advocates, lawyers, planners, community development experts, representatives from job training and economic development organizations, a county commissioner, environmental health specialists, and the Portland Development Commission, the development arm of the city. People of color--African Americans, Native Americans, and Latinos--comprised the majority of the CAC.

The CAC held three community forums, all in the evening, at accessible community locations (a high school, a church, a cultural center). After interested property owners delivered presentations on their sites, the community residents voted on which sites to recommend for publicly funded assessments.

Both the Roundtable and CAC participation processes led to specific outcomes. First, the North/Northeast neighborhood convinced the City to spend its U.S. EPA assessment grant there (shifting it from another site on the southwest side of town). Secondly, the North/Northeast's site selection approach resulted in seven applicants among local property owners, from which three were selected.

One of these is the DeWolf property, a former automobile service station and repair shop. Level I and II site assessments revealed such minor amounts of petroleum contamination that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality is in the process recommending no further action. Renovation of the structure, which will house the DeWolf historical home restoration business and include office space for lease, is almost completed.

The community was solidly behind the cleanup and re-use plans.

"This was not an easy process, nor one that moved as quickly as the traditional, exclusive model," explained Alan Hipolito, a CAC member. "We are confident, however, that it is a better process. It is one that better ensures that the community members really benefit from brownfields activities and investments in their neighborhoods."

Although the participation process was vigorous, it had flaws. Portland determined that the extensive site assessment and selection process was not cost-effective. There was funding to cover assessment of up to eight sites, however, fewer were proposed. According to some Portland officials, most of the property owners in that neighborhood did not seek assessment because they perceived remediation as out of their reach due to limited access to capital, lack of development expertise, and liability. Property owners were also leery of government regulations and U.S. EPA and Oregon's reporting requirements.

Consequently, the City did not accomplish assessment of as many candidate sites as it considered was warranted by the outlay of money and effort. Since then, the City has since switched to an open door policy for assessment site selection --anyone is welcome to walk in and suggest a site.

Based on the lessons learned from the North/Northeast experiment, Portland plans to create a citywide CAC, once staffing and funding questions are resolved. In this new arrangement, the CAC will assist in recruiting participants and act in an advisory capacity to property owners and developers after they are accepted into the program. The City will handle the organizing and facilitation work in-house.

Portland "hopes to maximize cost-effectiveness in using the citywide CAC, in order for brownfields work to be continued with program involvement," according to Clark Henry, the brownfields project manager. By making it clear, through outreach efforts, that most of the sites turn out to be less polluted than perceived, the City is trying to alleviate the perception among property owners that brownfields redevelopment is too arduous a road.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The research identifies a number of multi-stakeholder approaches at brownfields sites around the U.S. These approaches include:

- ?? Organizing and informing stakeholders through government and corporate sponsored groups and community-based stakeholder groups;
- ?? Involving stakeholders in the environmental and economic development process by setting up educational venues and meetings; and
- ?? Participatory engagement by stakeholders in design, redevelopment planning and project implementation.

At many of the researched sites, stakeholders involved in decision making are either working towards or have accomplished stakeholder processes that coalesce the views and interests of a range of parties who have a stake in redevelopment outcomes. Generally stakeholders at the researched sites agree that (despite the challenges posed by frequently complex, site-specific economic, social and environmental issues and working with diverse groups) it is not only possible but successful redevelopment is often contingent upon working collaboratively toward common goals.

Another clear area of agreement among stakeholders involves investments, including new and expanded resources of funding. Advance investment in multi-stakeholder decision processes, as well as over the full term of the brownfields project, is essential to its success. Investment means adequate time to design and implement a multi-stakeholder process and sufficient financial, educational and technical resources to assist stakeholders in consensus building to reach common goals. Cases in the study demonstrate that early investment in the stakeholder process can reduce time and the cost of redevelopment.

Multi-stakeholder processes assist decision making by providing an integrated approach to addressing interests and overall problem solving. Consistent with their interests and views, stakeholders will interact and engage in activities occurring at varying stages in the redevelopment. Planned stakeholder processes provide mechanisms in which all stakeholders, including those legally responsible for the site, work together to ensure meaningful involvement in decision making on key aspects including environmental cleanup, reuse determinations and redevelopment.

## *I. Additional Sites*

### A. Mystic Valley, NY, EPA Region 1 TeleCom City Led by a Three-City Collaboration

This project is noteworthy due to the 3-city collaboration and the extent of community and stakeholder participation. The 200-acre, polluted industrial site in the Mystic Valley lies along the Malden River and spans the communities of Malden, Medford, and Everett. In the 1980s, Malden attempted to redevelop the area but was unsuccessful alone. Malden reached out to collaborate with Medford and Everett.

Together, after authorization by the New York State legislature, the cities formed the Mystic Valley Development Commission. Their goal is to reposition the area, which has experienced extreme job losses, for opportunities in high-tech industries. The name of the redevelopment is TeleCom City.

To develop a master plan for the area, the first step by the Commission involved establishing a 15-member citizens advisory board, with five members from each of the three cities, local business, neighborhood, and environmental groups. The Commission hired a local resident to coordinate the community and stakeholder participation.

Among the outcomes of the master planning process are: improved transportation, an education collaborative covering K-12 and adult education (to prepare people to enter the high tech job market), riparian improvements, bike and walking trails.

Developer candidates made presentations to the community. The developer with the strongest community support was selected as the master developer. Site assessment (U.S. EPA Brownfields Assessment Pilot funds) and a general development plan have been completed. Permit applications are pending for site clearance and building demolition.

### B. Bronx River Greenway, NY, EPA Region 2 Park Proposal Led by Community Residents

This project is a story about successful community organizing as a means to participation in brownfields sites. The project involves the multi-faceted revitalization of an 8-mile section of the Bronx River. Community groups working with the New York City Parks Department and the State Department of Transportation initiated the plan. The goal is to develop new parkland in place of brownfields.

C. Baltimore, MD, EPA Region 3  
Downtown Site Led by Developer

Twenty-seven acres -- "one of the best open sites left on the eastern seaboard, right on the water in downtown Baltimore, a peninsula jutting into the harbor, sits there right now, like the face of the moon," explains staff at Struever Brothers, a Baltimore-based development company. For a hundred years, the site was a chromium plant once owned by Allied Chemical, and purchased later by Honeywell. It's now listed as a Superfund site.

In 1989, Allied Chemical signed a Superfund consent degree. Allied Chemical and its successor-in-interest, Honeywell, are responsible for dismantling the plant and remediation. The cleanup plan is extensive and involves institutional controls. One hundred million dollars later, over 90% of the required work has been completed; all that remains are a one to two acre area left to remediate. The consent degree specifies that Allied (now Honeywell) is perpetually responsible for the environmental integrity of the site.

During the years of remediation, Honeywell involved community residents of the adjacent neighborhood of Fells Point and other stakeholders. Community outreach was interrupted a year-and-a-half ago, during General Electric's failed attempt to acquire Honeywell.

Anticipating redevelopment, Struever Brothers got involved in the project a decade ago. The company created the master plan for the site, including securing a Planned Unit Development (PUD) designation, which authorizes use of the cleaned up site (formerly zoned industrial) for commercial or housing purposes.

Struever Brothers is well known in development circles for emphasizing community and stakeholder participation. To secure PUD designation, the company was required to obtain broad community agreement. Struever Brothers has recently entered into an option to ground lease the area for 99 years with renewal options. The company has committed to develop the area and attract tenants.

The company has initiated a new community and stakeholder participation process, holding meetings with the Fells Point community as well as two other neighboring communities. The Baltimore Development Corporation, a quasi-government agency, is another major stakeholder

D. Clearwater, FL, EPA Region 4  
Downtown Site Led by City

About 100 potentially contaminated brownfields dominate the Clearwater's disinvested, derelict downtown area, which is 59% minority and has a 27% poverty rate. As a U.S. EPA Brownfields Assessment Pilot, the City has created a strategic environmental justice plan for the redevelopment of the area, bringing together community groups, investors, lenders, developers and other stakeholders.

U.S. EPA has awarded Clearwater supplemental assistance funds to support this effort. The Agency has also awarded the City another grant to fund green space. One brownfields project will result in cleanup of the local creek that flows through the heart of the town's largest minority neighborhood.

Clearwater also does brownfields redevelopment job training. U.S. EPA has awarded a Job Training & Development Pilot grant to a local job training organization that is targeting homeless and handicapped veterans and other unemployed residents in the downtown area.

E. Provo, UT, EPA Region 8  
City-Led Ironton Project

The Ironton project involves planned re-use of a nearly 300-acre brownfields site. This brownfield has been abandoned for decades and is the largest tract of undeveloped and under-utilized property in Provo. Formerly the location of a major iron and coke manufacturing plant (1923-1962) owned by US Steel (now USX Steel Corporation), after shutting down, the site was left contaminated with hazardous wastes, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons and heavy metals.

Provo was eager to put this large parcel into productive use, and approached the corporation in 1996 to cooperate in a voluntary cleanup. USX agreed, oversaw and paid for the environmental evaluation, as well as remediation and cleanup, with the proviso that the company would be repaid when the site was sold. Due to the cooperative nature of this agreement, the site was designated under the State Superfund, thus, it was not subjected to the more arduous federal Superfund process.

Provo initiated a stakeholder involvement process during the site assessment phase, forming oversight and advisory committees of local stakeholders chaired by the Mayor's office. The stakeholder process resulted in a redevelopment master plan including low-income housing, green space, and amenities. The City placed a well-known, trusted, skilled communicator in a key position to facilitate stakeholder involvement and buy-in.

F. Gardena, CA, EPA Region 9  
Public/Private Collaborative

To work on their Brownfields Assessment Pilot, the City of Gardena created a partnership with the California Center for Land Recycling (CCLR), a nationally known nonprofit organization that facilitates brownfields redevelopment. There is a community and stakeholder participation process underway including outreach meetings, technical assistance forums, newsletters, and a website. Gardena hired a local consulting firm to coordinate community outreach activities, which is collaborating with CCLR on outreach. Gardena is an ethnically diverse, medium-sized (60,000 pop.) South Bay city.

*II. Locations/Sites Screened for Challenged Stakeholder Stories*

A. Bronx Paper Mill, NY, EPA Region 2  
Led by Nonprofit Stakeholder and Local CDC

According to proponents, this potentially model brownfields redevelopment project was intended to combine the highest environmental and community development objectives. According to various stakeholders, corporate competitors, state waffling, failure to raise sufficient funding at crucial stages and impediments posed, when the key nonprofit stakeholder/environmental group was challenged by the local community, defeated the project.

B. Harvey, IL, EPA Region 5  
No Stakeholder Participation

In Harvey, the local neighborhood organization, which has a 32-year history of working in the community, has been unsuccessful in terms of efforts to become involved in the City's brownfields redevelopment decision-making. There are numerous brownfields sites in the neighborhood, which is African-American. The area is in a designated federal Enterprise Zone.