

## **Spokane Brownfields Site Selection Criteria Workshop Summary**

This is the summary of the Brownfields Site Selection Criteria Workshop held June 30<sup>th</sup> 2004 at Spokane City Hall.

The goals of the workshop were:

**Primary:** For participants to contribute to the development and prioritization of screening/ranking criteria for the selection of brownfields sites to be environmentally assessed using the City's EPA assessment grant funds.

**Leading to secondary goals:**

- Finding marketable sites that meet developer needs.
  - Determine sites that best promote economic development in Spokane.
- 

The workshop started with participant introductions and a review of the agenda and goals. There were then a few short presentations on Spokane's Brownfields program, the role of the environmental consultant (GeoEngineers), and a review of information gathered in stakeholder interviews. A presentation on the approach taken by two other communities that have performed a similar site selection criteria workshop was then followed by a brainstorming session. The object of brainstorming was to list criteria to apply to Brownfield sites when considering what properties to assess for their environmental condition. This information would then be used in marketing the site to prospective developers or in the formulation of a development plan for the property.

It was agreed that the following criteria automatically apply and should be used as threshold criteria to determine whether sites should be considered and then prioritized:

- Property is located within the target areas (Hillyard or West Central)
- Property owner is willing to redevelop the property.
- The site/property qualifies for EPA assessment grant funds.
- An environmental investigation or remediation is not complete or in-progress.

The potential criteria identified during the brainstorming session were recorded on flip chart paper. After the brainstorming session, participants were given three dots and one star to place on the criteria lists written on the flip chart paper. Dots were for the three criteria the participant found to be important and the star was for the one criterion that was most important. One point was given for each dot and two points for each star.

The chart on the following page lists the criteria in the order they were given during the brainstorming session along with the "scoring" given to each criteria according to the dot/star exercise:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Dots</b>	<b>Stars</b>	<b>Total points</b>
Perceived overall community value Job creation Benefits youth Aesthetics Historic preservation	3	1	5
Meets neighborhood planning goals & choice	4		4
Increased land value/ community benefit (economic evaluation)			
Site redevelopment stimulates other projects	4	1	6
Potential infrastructure improvements			
Compatibility with long-range plans (ex. Hillyard freeway)	3		3
Leverage through partnering			
Feasibility of cleanup; well-defined, achievable	2	2	6
Creates success story	1	5	11
Developer/Development plan in place	3		3
Innocent landowner (moved to assumed list)			
Foreclosure properties			
Project compliments area redevelopment			
Property owner means to cleanup; loans, grants ( <i>and/or</i> )	1		1
Property transfer potential (combined criteria)	1		1
Property meets eligibility for redevelopment funds (moved to assumed list)	1		1
Publicly-owned property		1	2

From these scores a list of the top 7 criteria was created. During the discussion following brainstorming, it was decided that the criteria “creates success story” was more of an overall goal rather than a criteria for selecting a property for redevelopment, though the group was in agreement as to the importance of that goal.

The following are the top 7 criteria in order of their scores/ranking:

**Overall Goal/Criteria:** Creates success story

1. Feasibility of cleanup; well-defined; achievable
2. Site redevelopment stimulates other projects (tied with #1)
3. Perceived public value (job creation, benefits youth, aesthetics, historic preservation, *crime reduction*)
4. Meets neighborhood goals and choices
5. Compatibility with long range plans (tied with #4)
6. Developer/development plan in place (*and fundable*)
7. Publicly-owned property

Several points were clarified during the criteria refinement discussion. The most noteworthy are listed here:

- “Property meets eligibility for redevelopment funds” was added to the list of assumed criteria.
- “Innocent landowner” was also moved to the list of assumed criteria.
- Crime reduction was added to the “perceived public value” criteria sub-criteria.
- The qualifier “and fundable” was added to the “developer/development plan in place” criteria.
- The two criteria “property owner (has the) means to cleanup, (access to) loans, grants” and “property transfer potential” that each received one point (dot) were brought together into one additional criteria with an “and/or” modifier.

At the conclusion of the workshop, it was explained that the Brownfields team will be actively identifying sites and potential partners over the next several weeks that meet the site selection criteria. City staff and the consultant team thanked the participants for their input and let them know that additional input is welcome regarding selection criteria, potential Brownfields sites, and possible partners. It was also explained that updates will be provided as sites are selected and properties assessed.