



Copyright © 2011, the Environmental Council of the States. Permission is granted for our members to copy for state government purposes.

**COMMUNICATING LAND REVITALIZATION SUCCESSES:
A STATE TOOLBOX FOR ENSURING QUALITY DATA COLLECTION AND
PROMOTING A COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIP WITH REPORTERS
June 2011**

By the ECOS Workgroup on Land Revitalization Measures

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Although many states are making strides in measuring and communicating the success of land revitalization activities, they face a series of hurdles. The following Phase II report of the ECOS Workgroup on Land Revitalization Measures is designed to provide states with the tools needed to successfully quantify the positive outcomes of their land revitalization program efforts. This report has two main objectives.

The first objective is to create a comprehensive toolbox for states that offers methods to assist in the collection and reporting of land revitalization data. These data are critical to states as they try to quantify the outcomes of state efforts to encourage the cleanup and reuse of contaminated property. The second objective is to provide guidance to states on how to create cooperative relationships with data reporters. Such relationships will ensure more timely and accurate reporting. This report will recommend methods that can facilitate reporting and collection of data, yielding quality data that can be used by states to quantify success in land revitalization programs.

Over the past decade, most states have developed land revitalization programs to provide important technical, financial, and liability incentives to help parties overcome the obstacles that impede the cleanup and redevelopment of underutilized contaminated sites. While differing somewhat in nature, state land revitalization programs have two key goals: promoting the cleanup of contaminated sites to eliminate risk to human health and the environment, and encouraging the reuse of underutilized land to create economic opportunities and improve quality of life for residents. Given the dual goals of state land revitalization programs, program success must be measured using both environmental and economic development indicators. However, many state environmental agencies struggle to collect and compile meaningful data, and in particular economic data, that adequately measure program success.

States that have been able to compile meaningful land revitalization data have made great progress in using that information to gain support and funding for state land revitalization programs. In Rhode, for example, data on job creation and tax revenue generation from redevelopment projects were used to illustrate the merit of state programs to state and county officials. In Massachusetts, job creation data generated from a project

funded by the state were used to justify further investment in that program. As Governors and state legislators prioritize job creation and economic prosperity, state environmental agencies make the best case for their land revitalization programs by presenting the benefits of their efforts in this context.

The Phase I report of the workgroup, *Measuring the Benefits of Land Revitalization: State Successes and Challenges* (http://www.ecos.org/files/4282_file_November_2010_Green_Report.pdf), analyzed 29 land revitalization case studies from 13 state agencies, illustrating the utility of land revitalization data in demonstrating the value of state programs to high-level state officials, local communities, and state residents.

While these data are useful, many states struggle to compile the information due to the “three Rs:” resources (or lack thereof), reluctance (of developers), and reliability (of information collected). The Phase II reports looks in-depth at these challenges facing states and suggests tools for land revitalization program managers to use to measure the success of their efforts in economic terms.

MEASURES

From the case studies examined in the Phase I report, it is apparent that there are four categories of measures that are being used by states to illustrate the success of their land revitalization efforts:

- (1) **Tax Measures:** Increases in real estate value and property taxes as a result of cleanup and redevelopment.
- (2) **Leveraged Resources/Investment Measures:** Financial and other federal, state, local, and private resources leveraged to make the project work.
- (3) **Job Creation Measures:** Number and types of jobs created and retained as a result of site reuse.
- (4) **Community Impact Measures:** Other impacts from state land revitalization efforts that benefit communities and neighborhoods. These benefits include the creation of open space, recreational lands, cultural attractions, and renewable energy sites, in addition to ecological restoration.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

States have explored a variety of ways to collect data that support these measures, with varying degrees of success. One way to collect data is by using a survey. Several states, including Virginia and Idaho, have surveyed property owners/developers to gather important data specific to projects that were assisted by land revitalization programs. Survey questions can address the number and type of jobs created, project costs and estimated investment, taxes generated, and other outcomes of reuse. In Idaho, interviews of property owners were conducted to gather additional data, generating better information than from surveys alone. States should note that surveys are resource-intensive and may yield spotty information. To avoid these pitfalls, they might wish to consider collecting data as projects progress through a periodic survey or online database.

Another way to collect data is through online tax records, which have proven to be an easier source of data to collect given the availability of that information to the public. This information is a powerful tool in illustrating direct economic benefit of land revitalization efforts on specific sites. It is easiest collected when a locality has data available online. However, in some cases, political considerations prevent municipalities from publishing this information online, making it more challenging to obtain. There are many other sources of land revitalization data to be covered later in this report that can be used by states to collect information. For example, employment commissions and economic development agencies may track jobs creation and other economic indicators that can help states measure the success of their land revitalization efforts. State departments of commerce, county governments, regional planning commissions, and municipal associations may also have important economic data. Park agencies may have information related to open space creation that can help measure community benefits. And data from law enforcement agencies and police departments can be used to quantify community benefits in terms of crime reduction.

OVERCOMING THE THREE Rs: RESOURCES, RELUCTANCE, AND RELIABILITY

Resource Challenges

Few state land revitalization programs have staff members who are economists, developers, sociologists, or labor experts. However, in order to fully identify, quantify, and validate all potential land revitalization measures applicable to a redevelopment project, state land revitalization program staff must access a wide variety of data sources which are not normally associated with environmental remediation or environmental agencies. Many of the measures sought are not necessarily provided in a willing and transparent manner, especially when working with private, for-profit developers and businesses. Even when the measures are collected, it is difficult for an environmental professional to determine the validity and reliability of data generated from entities outside the environmental realm. The discussion below addresses some strategies for overcoming these challenges.

1. Enlist College Students and/or Faculty

Identification, collection, and validation of the economic and/or social benefits of land revitalization are probably best left to those who are versed in those subjects. Unfortunately, there simply aren't enough resources in state land revitalization programs to keep economists and sociologists on staff for the purpose of collecting and analyzing revitalization measures. Yet public agencies and universities have developed symbiotic relationships in the past for other environmental programs, so there is reason to believe that such relationships can be forged for the purpose of collecting and analyzing land revitalization measures. There exists an opportunity for undergraduate and graduate students from the disciplines of economics, planning, public administration, construction management, business management, and sociology to collect and analyze data on the benefits of land redevelopment. Such research could easily translate into a senior thesis, Master's thesis, or internship, depending on the scope of the project, as was done in Virginia.

By working with content experts (professors), land revitalization program managers could formulate templates for students to utilize while attempting to collect, analyze, and validate revitalization measures. Efficiencies should be gained from the students as they become "specialists" in this form of research, a luxury state land revitalization staff do not presently enjoy. While the formulation and initial implementation of such a program might come with a high initial time investment, it is conceivable that a training manual for this type of research could be developed and refined as students and interns cycle in and out of the project. Development of such a manual would decrease the time it takes for new researchers or interns to become proficient in the collection of revitalization data while increasing the internal consistency of the effort. Since turnover rate of university faculty tends to be low, additional consistency could be gained if land revitalization programs sought out and maintained the involvement of faculty advisors for the student researchers and interns. Given the grim forecast for most state budgets, use of an educated and largely cost-free cadre of researchers and interns is an attractive option for resource-starved state programs.

2. Hire a Contractor

Private contractors may be of great assistance in efforts to collect reliable data, and some states have made strong pushes to privatize work. Once the land revitalization program develops a template of measures to collect, the contractor would be responsible for developing the procedures, resources, and contacts for collecting the desired information. Even if a contractor does not have all of the in-house expertise it needs, outside assistance could easily be subcontracted. Generally speaking, procurement for contractors is much less onerous than for state agencies, so bringing on new and/or temporary staff to complete the project would be more efficient for a private contractor than for a state agency.

Use of private contractors would also tend to increase efficiency over the life of the research project. Most state land revitalization programs will devote a limited and inconsistent amount of time to measures collection due to workload and lack of resources. Consequently, it is highly possible that there will be inconsistencies inherent in the data collection process due to infrequent collection activities. A contractor working under a specific scope of work for a specific period of time would likely avoid this pitfall, as there would be a consistent level of effort over a defined period of time with clearly defined outcomes and expectations.

Another benefit of utilizing a contractor is the potential for tasking contractors with the development and population of standardized data sets. These data sets could be in the form of spreadsheets or databases and used to provide customized reports for legislatures, senior management, the press, and funding agencies such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). Finally, private contractors may be able to overcome reluctance on the part of private developers and businesses to share their measures. In some instances, developers and businesses are more willing to share information with other for-profit entities than a government agency.

Despite the benefits of employing the services of a contractor, contracts do come at a cost in terms of time to procure a contract and money to fund it.

3. Develop Relationships with Entities that Have Access to Data

Since most state land revitalization programs are not staffed with individuals who normally work with economic and social metrics that can define the success of a redevelopment project, it may be beneficial for programs to develop relationships with other agencies and organizations that have regular access to such information.

Job creation is a fairly popular measure of success for redevelopment projects. However, environmental agencies don't have ready access to employment data for construction projects and extant businesses. Labor/employment commissions, commerce departments, and local economic development agencies are excellent sources of employment data. State programs should enlist the assistance of these types of organizations in their pursuit of jobs data. Developing relationships with these organizations could have secondary benefits as well. Many state programs already work with labor, commerce, and economic development agencies to address sites which could be assessed, remediated, and redeveloped to provide additional employment. Maintaining relationships with these types of agencies after a project is completed could be very beneficial for generating jobs data. This becomes increasingly important as time passes and business on redeveloped sites expands and/or additional sites in the area redevelop after the initial "catalyst" project is successful. Commerce, small business development, and economic development agencies can also be a good source of information regarding indirect measures of redevelopment success, as they have ready access to the types, number, and timing of businesses that open in the near vicinity of redevelopment projects. Increased interagency communication and collaboration cannot be overlooked and in the long run will benefit the state and ultimately taxpayers.

Non-profit organizations and project partners can also be a potential source of land revitalization measures. Neighborhood organizations and project partners tend to be very involved in their individual neighborhoods and redevelopment projects. While some of the information they provide might be anecdotal, they can certainly speak to the relative success of a program based on their direct experience with redevelopment areas before, during, and after assessment, cleanup, and redevelopment take place. Other potential sources of information include local government agencies such as parks departments, code enforcement, and law enforcement. Creation of additional green space has an impact on the rest of a municipality's park services. More green space tends to lessen public pressure on existing public parks, which could lead to less vandalism, graffiti, and wear-and-tear on park services and infrastructure. Moreover, revitalizing property for

parkland can mean a significant increase in tourism revenue for a community. If there is a green space or park component to a redevelopment project, this type of data can be obtained from the parks department. Along the same lines, if a redevelopment project is completed in a blighted area, it is possible that incidence of code violations and crime will decrease. Code enforcement and police departments usually track these data at the neighborhood level and readily disseminate the information to neighborhood associations and neighborhood watch groups, so obtaining these measures should be relatively easy.

4. Tap into Expertise within Your Agency

Land revitalization programs generally are part of a larger state environmental authority. While it is true that state agency budgets face cuts across the country, there are still some potential assets within a program's own state agency that can be utilized to collect land revitalization measures. Administrative assistants routinely conduct research on specific properties with respect to ownership to assist waste and remediation programs with enforcement actions. That research experience could be employed to gather tax information for land revitalization sites to show year-by-year increases/decreases prior to and following revitalization efforts. Administrative and outreach staff could be utilized to help develop and maintain relationships with the organizations mentioned in #3 above and could also aid in the collection and compilation of revitalization measures provided by those organizations.

Reluctance on the Part of Developers to Report

A number of states have discovered that one of the most challenging aspects of developing a pool of data is the reluctance of developers and other parties involved to respond to requests for information. Based on the experiences of staff assigned to collect and manage these data, there doesn't seem to be any one reason which can be pinpointed. Rather, a combination of factors leads to developers' reluctance to answer questions or respond to surveys. The issues of economic indicators and collection of data were spotlighted during the recent Brownfields 2011 conference in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, sponsored by U.S. EPA and others.

One of developers' major concerns is confidentiality of the information submitted, in that the vast majority of information held in a state agency is subject to Freedom of Information Act requests. Developers may not want their "secrets to success" available to the public or, for that matter, information that might indicate problems if the project is undergoing economic challenges or is attempting to weather the current economic "storm." Another area of concern for developers could be that the results of the actual development are not nearly as impressive as benefits touted during the planning and approval stages.

1. Seek Early Agreement to Provide Economic Data

Many voluntary cleanup programs are not self-sustaining based on the funds the programs' users pay for the services, reviews, and benefits provided. Property owners who are the beneficiaries of assistance provided by land revitalization programs frequently do not fully cover the agency costs of review of reports, such as the All Appropriate Inquiry, and development of comfort letters, such as the Bona Fide Prospective Purchaser status letters. Development of comfort letters is often completed with little or no charge in order to facilitate redevelopment. While owners of properties enrolled in state voluntary cleanup programs often do not cover the full costs of agency project oversight and management, however, increasingly these costs (which are much more significant than review and preparation of comfort letters) are being covered by fees or direct billing for time. A summary of fees, costs, and program setup can be found at: http://epa.gov/brownfields/state_tribal/update2009/bf_states_report_2009.pdf.

Nonetheless, many land revitalization programs struggle to obtain economic data, and these very data are extremely important to documenting and justifying state and federal funding of these programs. What can

states and organizations do to facilitate the development of this critical data? For one, states should consider adding an agreement to their statutes and regulations (if possible) that project developers will provide economic feedback on projects that are: under review by the program for bona fide prospective purchaser/comfort letters; participating in voluntary cleanup programs; or recipients of revitalization grants or loans. This approach is a good means to front-load these expectations, which ensures an understanding on the part of all parties that this information is needed, expected, and critical. However, enforcing the requirement to provide feedback would be difficult at best and certainly is not something an agency would want to undertake in the situation where a project developer fails or refuses to respond. Thus it remains important to continue to “sell” the benefits of providing feedback.

Some state legislatures and agencies have developed land renewal policies to facilitate redevelopment by “removing barriers and providing incentives.” These policies can be powerful tools both for the landowner and for the environmental or economic development agency and are probably underutilized by both the developer and the state. These policies should include provisions to encourage the completion and submittal of the economic development data, especially as these projects are shepherded through state programs.

2. Provide Incentives to Report

Favorable publicity and recognition programs are two approaches for encouraging developers to provide timely and accurate information. For example, proposing to develop web-based success stories and state and federal newsletters on a project (see http://www.epa.gov/reg3hwmd/bf-lr/lr_newsletters.html) could be a way to entice developers to participate in the surveys, as it provides free advertising. Agencies often have internal newsletters or weekly reports developed for upper-level officials such as cabinet secretaries which would be excellent forums for showcasing project successes. As another incentive to report, successful project developers could be invited to participate in state and federal economic development and land revitalization conferences to showcase their projects. Another strategy could be the establishment of an environmental excellence award for sites completing land revitalization projects and providing the necessary feedback. In addition, property owners who have successful projects ready to market and have provided the valuable feedback could be included in state environmental and economic development agency online databases and web-based GIS.

3. Conduct In-Person Interviews and Engage in Regular Dialogue

Perhaps one of the most reliable solutions for overcoming reluctance to submit economic data is an in-person interview at an agreed-upon date (if the contact for the project is local) or a conference call (if the project developer is not in-state). Developers may have some additional comfort to provide data when follow-up questions are asked verbally rather than when they are asked to put project-specific data into a written form or database. Also, shadowing the project during its various stages of development via occasional informal calls to discuss progress or offer further assistance could help facilitate completion of a written or verbal survey. A project debriefing at points such as the completion of the voluntary cleanup and the issuance of the completion certificate or closure document may be good milestones on which to meet and gather data.

A number of states facilitate site redevelopment by assigning either formal or informal teams to assist with permitting for various air, water, waste, and onsite soils management issues. Another component of this assistance could be to communicate expectations for the collection of the economic data. States might also wish to consider collecting data as projects progress through a periodic survey or online database.

Although we may not know all the reasons behind developer reluctance to report economic data, it is very important to overcome this hesitation. One of the best means is the development of trust between the parties involved, and familiarity breeds trust.

4. Enlist Outside Organizations in Collecting Data

Finally, it is possible that the collection and compilation of economic data could be handled by another organization which is not subject to freedom of information requests. Economic development agencies may not be subject to the same freedom of information laws to which a regulatory agency is subject. This would provide additional comfort to the developer that its information would be handled confidentially.

Reliability of Information

When measuring the success of land revitalization projects, it is important to consider the reliability of the available information, especially when the information comes from multiple sources. Questions one should ask include: What is the purpose of the information being collected, and how will it be used? Why does your source have that information, and how does that person use it? Does the information gathered from a particular source tell the full story, and is the information biased in some way? Bias may not be intentional misrepresentation, but rather the result of that source's emphasis on a specific portion of the overall information that is most useful for its own purpose. Reliability problems also may result from unwillingness of some sources to disclose information. Throughout the process, keep in mind that there may be an element of subjectivity associated with information that can be collected.

1. Cast a Wide Net

Seeking information from multiple sources helps ensure accuracy and reliability. Casting a wide net allows comparison of similar information gathered from sources with different perspectives or interests in the project. Ideally, information should be gathered from as many different sources as can be identified, and should include a mix of public and private sources. Suggested sources of relevant information were provided earlier in this document.

Try to collect the information in a manner that allows for comparison with information from other sources. For instance, a developer's claims for increases in property value should be checked against county or city tax records. When evaluating the information, differences in similar information should be noted, keeping in mind whether the difference is explained by the respective interest that each source has in the information, or by a known or suspected reluctance by some sources to fully disclose information. Significant differences that cannot be explained raise questions about the reliability of the information and may indicate a need for additional information gathering efforts.

2. Align Measures with the Project and Local Situation

To effectively represent the benefit of a revitalization project, it is important to customize the measures used to fit both the project and the local situation. Understanding the benefit the project proponents intended to achieve from the project is helpful. Some projects may be designed to make property available and ready for reuse for a variety of purposes, and some are designed to provide a community benefit, such as parks or recreational facilities. Projects often would be expected to create new jobs, create new resources, or improve the desirability of a community. The impact of the benefit should be considered in the context of the surrounding community. It may be possible to show that the project, even if rather small, may have provided a significant overall benefit to the community. For instance, a revitalization project may have created five acres of new parks. If the surrounding community had only five acres of parks to begin with, the revitalization project doubled the community's park resources. Either actual or projected community utilization of the park facilities would also be helpful information to show the project benefit.

3. Beware of Bias

Because every revitalization project is unique, it is important to consider how various stakeholders with different viewpoints may see it. Always be aware that stakeholders may view the benefits and success of the project very differently, depending on their specific interest in the project. Within a community, the parks manager may view a project that added new or improved parkland as a great success yielding significant benefits, while the tax assessor may not view the project as such a success if the assessor's interest is in increasing tax revenue. Information that would allow comparison of expected project benefits with actual outcomes helps show whether the initial expectations were met.

4. Remember That Measures and Data Will Change Over Time

Keep in mind that any measures of a revitalization project should be viewed as a snapshot taken at that time, and that it will change over time. A number of factors may affect how the project is viewed; how that view changes with time may vary depending on the perspective of any given stakeholder. For example, the perceived positive impacts of a revitalization project could change due to local economic conditions, unrelated projects in the vicinity, or a change in community leadership or priorities. Be aware of local circumstances at the time information is collected. If the collection occurs during an economic downturn, the job benefits may be low. Assessments made during times of economic downturn may not show benefits as strongly as those taken during better economic conditions. It may be useful to associate the information collected with a date reference. For instance, the information may be captured as "the county-appraised value in April 2011 was...." A complicating factor can be the timing for changes that are made to databases such as county tax records. Smaller counties may not update their information as quickly as larger counties, and therefore the information would not reflect the improvements made as a result of a cleanup and redevelopment. Some measures are valid regardless of economic conditions, even if a revitalized property is underutilized. In such a case, the cleanup at least has yielded an environmental benefit and the property may be primed for reuse in the future.

A meaningful and truly long-term measurement of the positive impacts of a project may require going back to take another snapshot by reassessing the impacts at a different time. As previously discussed, repeating this task will require effort and resources that may not be readily available.

CONCLUSION

This Phase II report of the ECOS Workgroup on Land Revitalization Measures provides states with the tools needed to successfully quantify the outcomes of their land revitalization program efforts.

States have many options for the collection and reporting of land revitalization data. These data are critical to states as they work to quantify the results of state efforts to encourage the cleanup and reuse of contaminated property. To assist state agencies in the collection of economic data, the ECOS Workgroup on Land Revitalization Measures has developed a streamlined template questionnaire for developers ("Economic Data on Property Reuse"). Please see Addendum 1.

When developing the best approach for their own needs, states need to be cognizant of the three Rs that will surface along the way: resource constraints, reluctance to report, and reliability of information.

Resource limitations could be overcome by working with academic institutions, hiring contractors, developing and strengthening relationship with other agencies that use the data more directly, and tapping into expertise within one's own environmental agency.

Reluctance to report data could be overcome by seeking an early agreement with the developer to provide the information, providing incentives to report, easing the reporting process by conducting in-person interviews, and enlisting outside agencies to collect data.

Reliability of information could be addressed through implementing processes that obtain information from multiple sources, aligning measures with local conditions and the context of the project in the community, watching out for bias, and understanding that economic data change over time.

This report contains guidance for states on how to create cooperative relationships with data reporters. Such relationships will ensure more timely and accurate reporting. It is also important to facilitate reporting and collection of data in order to yield information that can be used to quantify success in land revitalization programs.

No one approach is applicable for all states. This report recommends some tools and options for states to consider when developing their own programs. Effective collection and presentation of this information can quantify the significant economic impacts of state efforts to encourage the cleanup and reuse of contaminated property and will complement the more traditional environmental measures used to demonstrate the value of these programs.

ADDENDUM 1*

*Workgroup Note: States may wish to collect the survey data below in spreadsheet or database format in order to facilitate data collection. To ensure responsiveness and accuracy, states should also consider collecting data at various stages of a project rather than only upon project completion.

**Template Questionnaire for Developers:
*Economic Data on Property Reuse***

The intent of this survey is to contribute to a database to assist the [insert name of state environmental agency] in assessing the economic impacts of land revitalization and redevelopment across the state. While the information provided through this survey *cannot be classified as confidential*, it will be presented *anonymously* and will certainly not be used toward any form of enforcement. Thank you for your assistance and support in this effort. ***Please complete the following survey, providing estimates where applicable, and return it to [insert name of agency contact] at [insert email address] by [insert date].***

A. Property Details

1. Site name:
2. Current owner:

B. Site Location

1. Mailing address:

C. Reuse Project Details

1. Which of the following best describes the reuse of the site (circle one):
 - i. Industrial
 - ii. Commercial
 - iii. Office
 - iv. Mixed use
 - v. Residential
 - vi. Public
 - vii. Greenspace
 - viii. Other (please explain)
2. What, if any, infrastructure from previous use of the site was incorporated into the current use of the site?

D. Jobs Located at the Development Site

1. Estimated number of full-time jobs located at the reused site:
 - i. Estimated annual combined sum of the salaries and wages of these jobs:
2. Estimated number of part-time jobs intended to be created by the reuse:
 - i. Estimated annual combined sum of the wages of these jobs:
3. Estimated number of temporary jobs resulting from the assessment, remediation, and construction at the site:
 - i. Estimated annual combined sum of the wages of these jobs:
4. Estimated number of full-time jobs projected at year five following construction completion of the project:
 - i. Estimated annual combined sum of the salaries and wages of these jobs:

E. Investment Estimates- Please provide the following costs in the space provided.

Site Preparation Costs This estimate should include the costs of demolition, on-site construction, public improvement construction, tenant improvement, and other site preparation.	
Environmental Risk Management	

This estimate should include the cost of environmental consultants, environmental remediation, environmental monitoring, environmental insurance, and institutional controls for the project.	
Operating Costs This estimate should include the cost of utilities, supply purchases, etc. (Please exclude the cost of salaries, wages, and benefits.)	
<i>Please provide a detailed description (and/or breakdown) of these operational costs (if known).</i>	

F. *Financing Estimates - Please provide estimates of the costs (provided in the table above) that were financed through each of the following options.*

Public	
Private	
Development Subsidies/Grants (Please provide a description of the costs financed through these means.)	
Tax Credit	
Other (Please explain.)	

G. *Taxes*

- What was the assessed value of the property prior to assessment and/or cleanup?
- What was the assessed value of the property prior to construction/redevelopment?
- What is the assessed value (or projected) value of the property upon completion of redevelopment?
- What was the annual tax liability of the property prior to assessment and/or cleanup?
- What was the annual tax liability of the property prior to construction/redevelopment?
- What is the annual tax liability of the property upon completion of redevelopment?

H. *Other Indicators*

- How many residential units were developed as part of this project?
- Describe the types of infrastructure you were able to reuse (sewer, power, parking, roads, etc.).
- Describe any secondary development that has occurred or may occur which is linked to the success of the project.
- Does/will your property have any type of non-profit use such as park space, green belt, or ecological restoration?
- Does/will your property offer other community benefits such as cultural attractions or renewable energy?
- Does it appear that this project has resulted in positive effects to the neighborhood as a whole, such as reduced crime?

I. *Comments*

- How would you recommend streamlining this survey?
- What are your general comments on the land revitalization/voluntary cleanup process?

ADDENDUM 2

ECOS Workgroup on Land Revitalization Measures – Phase II Project Participants

Members

Co-Chair – J. Meade R. Anderson, Brownfields
Program Manager
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
j.meade.anderson@deq.virginia.gov
(804) 698-4179

Co-Chair – Terry Gray, Assistant Director for
Air, Waste, and Compliance
Rhode Island Department of Environmental
Management
terry.gray@dem.ri.gov
(401) 222-4700 x7100

Gary Baughman, Director, Hazardous Materials
and Waste Management Division
Colorado Department of Public Health and the
Environment
Gary.baughman@state.co.us
(303) 692-3338

Catherine Finneran, Brownfields Coordinator
Massachusetts Department of Environmental
Protection
Catherine.finneran@state.ma.us
(617) 556-1138

Cindy Hafner, DERR Chief
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Cindy.Hafner@epa.state.oh.us
(614) 644-2274

Aaron Scheff, Brownfields Program Manager
Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
Aaron.Scheff@deq.idaho.gov
(208) 373-0420

Staff

Lia Parisien, Senior Project Manager
Environmental Council of the States
lparisien@ecos.org
(202) 266-4931