

Group Input on Scoring Criteria for Prioritizing Sites

- Include a way to score potential sites based upon their proximity to locations where there are currently or anticipated higher levels of economic/redevelopment activity occurring
 - An alternative perspective related to this comment was presented regarding the value of providing stimulation for the redevelopment of sites that are **not** immediately adjacent to economic “hot spots”, in order to provide benefit to the community as a whole
 - It was also mentioned that given the small size of the geographic area being addressed, all sites are adjacent to areas with potential for rapid economic growth
- Scoring related to the “Regulatory Record” needs to account for more complexity, beyond simply open and closed cases: for example, an “Open” case may involve a type of contamination that is not easily remediable, yet would still score one point.
- The scoring system needs to include some kind of criteria that would measure the level of community benefit that a project on a potential site would provide: for example, a site that has prospects for being redeveloped as a public park would rank higher on this measure than a site slated for commercial development
- Representatives of community residents expressed the importance of focusing on sites in need of environmental cleanup, in terms of improving neighborhood quality of life
 - In relationship to this comment, the group discussed the limitation of funds to assessment of contamination, and the need to make this clear to residents in order to manage expectations
- An interest was expressed in identifying the cost-benefit ratio for potential sites, and the importance of identifying sites where a small investment could have the largest impact

Group Input on Strategy for Public Meetings

- It was suggested that the first meeting take place in early November to avoid conflict with preparations for the Thanksgiving holiday
- There was consensus in the group regarding the importance of holding the meetings at a location in the Roseland community, and that the Library would be an optimal site
- Information at the meeting should clearly inform participants that the Brownfields Assessment grant does not include funding for cleanup of toxic sites—this funding would need to be secured as the next stage of the process, either as the responsibility of the property owner, or identifying grants of other funds for sites that are publicly owned

- The group discussed promoting the meeting in a positive way, with local sponsorship and hosting (versus a “government” meeting) in order to encourage greater local participation
- Duane Dewitt suggested including food and music at both the November and January meetings, and that he would assist in planning this aspect of the two events.

Next Steps:

1. Based upon the input from the BAC, Stantec will share a revised version of the scoring matrix with BAC members by Friday, October 6
2. Per a suggestion from the group, CDC will work towards having the website for the project translated into Spanish (forms have already been translated)
3. The next meeting will be a community-wide meeting to be held in early November. Duane Dewitt and Caroline Banuelos from the Latino Democratic Club are interested in assisting with planning the logistics of the celebratory meeting in January.
4. CDC will send out a notice for the next BAC meeting, to be held during the first or second week of December