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Introduction and Overview

This report provides an annual evaluation of technical assistance and outreach services provided by the Kansas State University (KSU) Technical Assistance to Brownfields (TAB) program between July 1, 2018 and June 30, 2019 under two Cooperative Agreements (CAs):

TR-83684001, July 2016 to June 2021, (Regions 5-8, National, & E-tools), and TR-83910001, July 2017- June 2022, (Tribal TAB).

When possible, data are reported by the designated CA and encompass four quarters of the grant reporting cycle. This report provides an evaluation of each of four tasks that comprise the TAB Program: site-specific service, workshops and webinars, online e-tools and resources, and participatory evaluation. As summarized in this report, TAB’s goals were generally met or exceeded.

Multiple sources of data were used in evaluating the TAB Program. They include service provider documentation, participant surveys, quarterly reports, and website usage reports. Sources of data and analysis techniques are more fully described in the sections below.

Task 1. Site-specific Technical Assistance to Communities

Site-specific technical assistance is the main activity of the TAB program. Sources of data for documenting services provided are quarterly reports produced by TAB program staff, based on reports from service providers. Quantitative goals for site service are listed in the table below, along with actual levels of service and an indication of whether the target goals were met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals for Site-Specific Services Provided</th>
<th>2016-2021 TAB CA</th>
<th>2017-2022 Tribal TAB CA</th>
<th>Annual Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist 100-180 Communities and 50-90 assists to Tribes</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>103 assists to 45 tribes</td>
<td>411 assists to 173 communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site/state/year</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% with population less than 100k</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population less than 10k</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% tribal or environmental justice</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, TAB exceeded its goal of communities served for each CA, with a total of 173 communities receiving technical assistance across the two CAs. The number of tribal/environmental justice communities provided site services in the reporting period was 45, which is 26% of total communities served. For a regional view of target goals and outcomes for site-specific services, see Appendix A.

Detailed information was available about site-specific services provided to the communities served during this grant year. An overview of these communities served is presented in Appendix A. Support to over 84 communities served during the project period is ongoing, and 26 sites involved sustainable reuse initiatives. Sites served comprise over 1,400 acres.
TAB provides a range of services to communities in its 21-state service area and nationally. Table 2 provides an overview of the types of services provided to communities during the reporting period, based on information available about support provided to 173 communities across the two CAs. While all site services that TAB provided were delivered during the reporting period, the most common services included answering EPA and other grants questions, document review, and identification of resources. For an overview of services provided in each region, please see Appendix A.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service provided</th>
<th>2016-2021 TAB CA</th>
<th>2017-2022 Tribal TAB CA</th>
<th>Total Site Services Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend community/stakeholder meetings or conference calls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education and engagement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of resources</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging or planning to engage in visioning process</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide fact sheets or sample documents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate stakeholder communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of redevelopment options</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP/Q Development/Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered EPA and other grants questions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT Assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAB EZ assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>411</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report summarizes information about over 400 site services provided to 173 communities in 2018-2019. Under the 2016-2021 TAB CA, approximately 308 site services were provided to communities. Under the 2017-2022 Tribal TAB CA, about 103 site services were provided.

**Task 1 Summation**

TAB exceeded four of its goals for site services in the project period for each of the Cooperative Agreements: total number of communities served, communities with populations of less than 100,000, communities with populations of less than 10,000, and environmental justice communities.

A range of sites are being served including assessment, cleanup and area-wide planning. Services to about 50% of communities served will continue into the next reporting period. The types of services being provided most frequently (answering EPA and other grants questions, document review, and identification of resources) indicate that a number of sites are in early stages of the brownfield redevelopment process, where TAB support is useful in helping communities develop the capacity for engaging in redevelopment projects.
Task 2. Workshops and Webinars

Workshops, webinars, and invited presentations provide additional opportunities for TAB to provide communities with information and education about the brownfield redevelopment process. This section provides an overview of these activities, as well as evaluation of their effectiveness. Sources of data from this section are quarterly reports produced by TAB program staff and quantitative and qualitative data from surveys administered at workshops and webinars.

Workshops

Goals for educational workshops were to participate in 32 regional, 6 national, and 6-10 Tribal workshops cooperatively with others, with one in each state if possible. During the reporting cycle, TAB was involved in a total of 31 workshops: eight workshops occurred in Region 5; five workshops occurred in Region 6; six workshops occurred in Region 7; and two workshops occurred in Region 8. Five National Grant Brownfields workshops were held in four states (California, Nebraska, North Carolina, and Washington). Additionally, five Tribal Grant workshops occurred during the reporting period. A total of 1,097 participants attended these workshops. The tables below provide a more detailed overview of workshops conducted per CA in this reporting cycle.

Table 3
Overview of workshops and participants (TR-83684001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Topic</th>
<th>Number of Workshops</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Revitalization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Grant Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Revitalization and Grant Writing Combined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: A significant portion of a National Workshop in Seattle, WA was devoted to a second national workshop topic (Leveraging Resources), and a TRP workshop planned in Florida was unexpectedly cancelled by others outside of the event committee two weeks before the event. If these were counted as 2 additional workshops, the total for National workshops delivered would be 7, which meets the annual goal of 6-10 National workshops per year.

Table 4
Overview of workshops and participants (Tribal TR-83910001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Topic</th>
<th>Number of Workshops</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging Tribal Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement &amp; BF Redevelopment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data below discusses the evaluation results from the 24 workshops where surveys were conducted during the reporting period and represents feedback received from 437 participants. Data was collected using a retrospective pre-post survey instrument. This type of instrument is administered at the end of an event yet asks questions about knowledge or perception prior to the event. This is believed to produce a more accurate reporting of participants’ perceived changes than the traditional pre/post survey, as well as provides paired samples for more robust statistical analysis.

**Population served.**
Participants were asked to indicate the size of the communities they represent. The figure below shows the populations of the communities served by workshop participants.

![Figure 1. The sizes of populations served by workshop participants.](image)

Workshop participants represented a range of stakeholders in the brownfield process. While participants were able to select multiple categories that applied, the most frequently selected stakeholder titles were city or county staff/representative (107), consultant (89), non-profit organization (57), economic development specialist or staff (55), community development (51), and Tribal Government (50). For a more detailed overview of participant representation, please see Appendix B.

**Workshop outcomes.**
Workshop participants were asked to complete a retrospective pre-post survey form at the completion of the workshop. The survey asked questions that measure changes in participants’ knowledge about brownfields, their readiness to participate in brownfield redevelopment or grant writing, and perceptions of available resources before and after the workshop.
Useful experience.
Participants were asked to what degree they thought they would be able to use what they learned in the workshop in their jobs or communities, using a scale of one to five, where one equals not useful and five equals highly useful. The average response to this question was 4.37 on a 5-point scale. About 86% of participants rated the degree of usefulness at four or higher, with nearly half of participants indicating the experience was highly useful. More detail on responses is presented in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Level of usefulness of workshop information.](image-url)
**Readiness.**
Participants were asked how ready they were to participate in brownfield redevelopment. Before the workshop, 51% reported their level of readiness to be somewhat or very ready. After the workshop, 78% of participants reported their level of readiness to be somewhat or very ready. Analysis indicates that the participants’ level of readiness increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance. The figure below provides more details about the responses to this question.

![Bar chart showing changes in participants' readiness](image)

Figure 3. Changes in participants’ readiness to participate in brownfield redevelopment. Pre-workshop mean: 2.45 (SD=1.196), post-workshop mean: 3.03 (SD=1.118), 4-point scale, $p < .001$. 


Available resources.
Participants were asked about their perception of resources available to help with brownfield redevelopment. Before the workshop, 25% of participants reported they felt their cup to be at least three-fourths full. After the workshop, 61% of participants reported their cup of resources to be at least three-fourths full. Analysis indicates that the participants’ perception of available resources increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance. See Figure 4 for more details.

Figure 4. Changes in participants’ perception of available brownfields redevelopment resources. Pre-workshop mean: 2.51 (SD=1.333), post-workshop mean: 3.50 (SD=1.327), 5 point scale, p < .001.
Knowledge change.
At the workshops, participants were asked a series of questions to measure their perceived knowledge change about brownfields.

Participants were asked to rate their understanding of what a brownfield is on a scale of one to five, where five equals a very high level of understanding and one a very low level. Before the workshop, 52% of participants rated their level of understanding what a brownfield is at four or higher. After the workshop, 89% rated their level of understanding of brownfields at four or higher. Analysis indicates that participants perceived that their level of understanding about brownfields increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance. The figure below provides more details about the responses to this question.

![Figure 5. Changes in the level of understanding about what is a brownfield. Pre-workshop mean: 3.40 (SD=1.445), Post-workshop mean: 4.33 (SD=.991), 5-point scale, p < .001.](image-url)
Participants were asked about the number of brownfield sites they thought were located in their communities. Before the workshop, 68% of participants reported they thought there were five or more brownfield sites in their communities. After the workshop, 82% reported they thought there were five or more brownfield sites in their communities. Analysis indicates that participants’ awareness of the number of brownfields located in their communities increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance. The figure below provides more details about the responses to this question.

Figure 6. Changes in participants’ awareness of the number of brownfields in their communities. Pre-workshop mean: 3.11, post-workshop mean: 3.38; \( p < .001 \).
Participants were asked to identify how many state or federal brownfield assistance programs were available to help communities with brownfield redevelopment. Before the workshop, 33% of participants reported they knew of five or more programs that provide support to brownfields. After the workshop, 74% reported they knew of five or more programs. Analysis indicates that the number of programs participants knew about increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance. The figure below provides more details about the responses to this question.

![Figure 7. Changes in number of assistance programs participants knew about. Pre-workshop mean: 2.26, post-workshop mean: 2.92; $p < .001$.](image)

**Open-ended questions.**
Workshop participants were also asked open-ended questions on workshop surveys to encourage them to provide additional helpful feedback. In general, most responses were positive in nature and participants indicated they appreciated the opportunity to attend KSU TAB workshops and benefited from the information and resources gained. A brief summary of participant responses to those questions follows.

When workshop participants were asked “How will you use the information you learned today,” many responses centered around three areas 1) application of knowledge and resources, 2) grants/funding, and 3) sharing with and assisting others. In general, participants often expressed they would be using the knowledge and resources gained specifically for brownfield projects they are currently involved with or to build program capacity and plan for/execute future projects. Participants also described using the information they learned to prepare current and prospective grant applications as well as to leverage funding. Additionally, participants indicated the importance of disseminating the information gained during the workshop to their community, clients, and other stakeholders so they are educated about brownfield resources and best practices and to encourage more meaningful partnerships.
When workshop participants were asked “What did you like best about the workshop,” most responses fell into the following categories: speakers; presentations; general information provided; resources gained; networking opportunities; and success stories/case studies. Participants conveyed they enjoyed the diversity of speakers and described them as engaging, enthusiastic, and very knowledgeable. Participants also appreciated the variety of information offered during presentations as well as the pace and flow. They indicated that the presentations were interesting, useful, and easy to understand. Participants also claimed they liked receiving a variety of resources and practical tips that would help them in various areas of brownfield redevelopment and grant funding, and also appreciated the opportunities to network with peers and colleagues in their fields. Additionally, participants expressed enjoying the success stories offered and described them as good examples of what’s worked for others.

When workshop participants were asked “What did you like least,” responses were wide-ranging. Many participants indicated that there was nothing they didn’t like, describing the workshop as great, offering a broad variety of topics and diverse presenters. Some participant responses indicated issues with the venue, such as temperature of the room (i.e., too cold or too warm), uncomfortable chairs, technical difficulties, or the distance traveled to attend. Participants also indicated some presentations as their least favorite, describing the information as not relevant to their community, repetitive, and unorganized. Some other responses indicated there were not enough breaks or time to network, and there were specific requests for more in-depth information on particular topics (e.g., developer’s perspective, funding sources, brownfield basics).

When workshop participants were asked “If you were designing this workshop, what other topics or activities would you include,” there were again a wide variety of answers. Participants most often stated the workshop was a good mix and there was nothing they would add. Other participant responses included providing printed copies of particular documents such as resources, participant contact information, and PowerPoint presentation slides; offering more case studies, site visits, and examples of successful Brownfield project sites; providing additional information on funding and successful grant applications; and, more hands-on activities and opportunities for networking/participant interaction.

When workshop participants were asked “Is there anything else you would like to tell us,” the majority of respondents showed appreciation for the presenters and the opportunity to attend the workshop, describing it as an enjoyable experience, very informative, and well-executed.

Webinars
TAB’s goal is to conduct 4 regional, 4 national and 4 tribal webinars per year. State level webinars are conducted upon request and webinars are advertised through TAB’s network in each region. A total of 23 webinars were held during the project period - five state/regional webinars, eleven national webinars, and nine tribal webinars/invited presentations. Nearly 2,000 participants connected to these webinars.

Due to lower than expected demand for regional workshops, but higher demand for invited regional in-person presentations, we are including and counting the in-person presentations against work plan goals for webinars as they are similar in effort and cost and meet regional needs. Please note that for reported numbers of webinar attendees, only the actual connections are counted yet more than one attendee may participate from the same connection location. A list of the webinars and invited presentations is below.

- R6: co-hosted “Brownfields” webinar with NMED on August 20, 2018. 64 participants.
• R6: co-hosted “Brownfields” webinar with Rio Grande COG and the City of San Elizario on December 13, 2019. 16 participants.
• R6: webinar/invited presentation at the Acadiana Planning Commission opportunity Zone Forum was held in Lafayette, LA on February 6, 2019. Over 200 participants.
• R6: webinar “Brownfields Tools for Community Enhancement and Development” was held in Louisiana on May 30, 2019. 30 participants.
• R7: webinar/invited presentation “Opportunity Zone Investment for Community Revitalization and Brownfields Redevelopment” was held in Omaha, NE on March 28, 2019. 25 participants.
• National: LISC and KSU TAB webinar “Brownfields Redevelopment,” was held on August 13, 2018. 49 participants.
• National: webinar “New Grantees: First Things First” was held on September 13, 2018. 78 participants.
• National: webinar “Brownfields Inventory Tool (BiT) and BiT Mobile App” was held on September 18, 2018. 76 participants.
• National: webinar “Opportunity Zones Updated – What’s New” held on October 4, 2018. 369 participants.
• National: webinar “Getting a Contractor on Board” for new ARC Grantees held November 14, 2018. 29 participants.
• National: webinar “MAC Grant Writing and TAB EZ” was held December 18, 2019. 292 participants.
• National: webinar “Tech Basics for EPA Brownfields Grantees” was held on February 20, 2019. 71 participants.
• National: webinar “Site Investigation for EPA Brownfields Grantees” was held on May 2, 2019. 113 participants.
• National: webinar “Opportunity Zones – Community Strategies” was held May 21, 2019. 271 participants.
• Tribal: webinar/invited presentation “Environmental Contracting” was held at TLEF in Spokane, WA on August 14-16, 2018. 50 participants.
• Tribal: webinar/invited presentation “Tribal Sustainable Environmental Planning – NEPA & HUD Requirements” was held at the TLEF in Spokane, WA on August 14-16, 2018. 50 participants.
• Tribal: webinar/invited presentation “E-Tools for Tribal Response Programs/Brownfields” was held at TLEF in Spokane, WA on August 14-16, 2018. 50 participants.
• Tribal: webinar/invited presentation “Household Hazardous Waste” was held at TLEF in Spokane, WA on August 14-16, 2018. 50 participants.
• Tribal: webinar “New Tribal ARC & 128(a) Grantees: Getting a Contractor on Board” was held November 15, 2018. 15 participants.
• Tribal: webinar for Alaska Native TRPs on the TRP 4 Elements and TRP Work Plan Preparation was held December 7, 2018. 35 participants.
• Tribal: webinar/invited presentation to tribes, Spokane, Washington, State Brownfields Conference May 29-30, 2019. 20 participants.
The data below details evaluation results from the five webinars where surveys were conducted during the reporting period. These data represent feedback received from approximately 320 participants. It is important to note there were some discrepancies in survey questions between the webinars, therefore data reported may not be from every survey and represents questions that were consistent across workshop evaluations.

**Usefulness**
Webinar participants were asked about the usefulness of the knowledge gained from the webinar. The majority of participants (77%) rated the usefulness of knowledge gained by attending the webinar as a 4 or higher (5 = highly useful). See Figure 8 for more details.
**Understanding**

Participants were asked about their understanding of the topic before and after completing the webinar. Before the webinar, less than one-third (31%) of participants felt they had a high or very high level of understanding about the topic. After the webinar, most participants (71%) indicated they had a high or very high level of understanding (See figure 9). Analysis illustrates that participants’ perception of understanding increased as a result of attending the workshop and that the change was not due to chance.

![Bar chart showing understanding before and after the webinar](chart.png)
Readiness
Participants were also asked about their readiness to undertake the topic of each webinar (e.g., apply for a MARC grant or leverage Opportunity Zone funds) before and after completing the webinar. Before the webinar, a little over a quarter of participants (27%) indicated they were ready or very ready to proceed. After the webinar, over half of participants (55%) indicated they were ready or very ready to proceed (See figure 10). Analysis illustrates that participants’ perception of readiness increased as a result of attending the webinar and that the change was not due to chance.

Invited and Other Presentations
TAB representatives routinely provide education on brownfields to a variety of organizations and events nationally and in the 21-state service area. During the reporting period, TAB participated in invited presentations at over 21 separate events, making more than one presentation at a number of these events. This includes presentations at national, regional and state conferences and workshops, as well as individual organizations interested in learning more about brownfields. Specific details on the invited presentations provided during the reporting period can be found in Appendix B, Table 2.

Task 2 Summation
Although the total number of workshops offered in the reporting period (31) was less than the yearly goal (44), KSU TAB provided nearly double its goal in webinars/invited presentations in response to requests by states, regions and tribes. A total of 22 workshops were held in KSU’s 21–state regional service area. Five national and five tribal workshops were completed; two contained topics that would have normally been offered in three additional, separate workshops, and one additional workshop was unexpectedly cancelled. The yearly goal is 32 regional workshops, 6 national workshops, and 6-10 Tribal workshops.

TAB provided nearly double its goal of 12 webinars (4 regional, 4 national and 4 tribal). A total of 23 webinars/invited presentations were held during the project period. There appears to be lower interest in
workshops from individual states and regions, but more interest in invited presentations by TAB at state and EPA Regional business meetings and conferences. Although goals for webinars were met, demand for national webinars was higher than those for individual EPA Regions, so KSU collaborated with NJIT and CCLR TABs more than initially planned and archived the webinars to make them available for national audiences.

In terms of the workshops TAB delivered in the reporting period, evaluation data suggests that they were successful on many levels. First is in terms of the population goals that TAB has for its site service. The population of workshop attendees completing evaluation surveys nearly met TAB’s site service population goals, as shown in Table 6 below. (For a regional view, please see Appendix B, Table 1.) The second indicator of success is the types of participants attending workshops. The participants in the workshop are also representative of the range of stakeholders that need to be involved in successful brownfield redevelopment.

**Table 5**
**Population levels of workshop evaluation participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>Held in 16 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*This includes workshops held in other regions (e.g., NC, WA, CA)*

The third indicator of success is related to the evaluation results. There were high levels of agreement among participants that the knowledge gained by attending the workshop was useful (86% ranked 4 or higher on a 5-point scale). Their stated intentions for using the knowledge gained indicate plans to apply it in advancing brownfield redevelopment efforts. Measures of retrospective pre-post responses to questions related to perceptions were rather dramatic, as shown in Table 7 below. Each measure was also shown to be statistically significant (not due to chance).

**Table 6**
**Changes in retrospective pre-post measures related to readiness (somewhat to very prepared) and resources (at least ¾ cup full)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Retrospective</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>( p &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>+36%</td>
<td>( P &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 3. Online E-Tools and Resources**

K-State TAB continues to grow its online E-Tools and resources, providing multiple paths for its target audiences to access brownfield information. The K-State TAB website is at [www.ksutab.org](http://www.ksutab.org). During the reporting period, the site was visited on the order of 6,000 times by 3,000 different users. As part of Task 2 of the Tribal TAB Program, the Tribal Brownfields Forum (TBF) was created. The TBF is an online, password-protected interactive forum for Tribal Response Program (TRP) and other tribal environmental professionals. More information on the TBF is in this section below.
There were 6,657 active registered users on www.ksutab.org (users who have accounts, which are required to register for workshops and webinars and to access TAB EZ, BIT and online training). As seen below in table 7, 5,342 users provided data on the types of organizations they represent. As of June 30, 2019, 318 users were from tribes and 495 from micro-communities (population under 10,000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Group</th>
<th>Percentage of Users Providing Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Official &gt; 100,000 People</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Official 10,000 - 100,000 People</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Official &lt; 10,000 People</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning/Economic Development (Govt.)</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Not-For-Profit</td>
<td>12.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Development or Consulting</td>
<td>20.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAB EZ usage data indicates that approximately 40 proposals were drafted in TAB EZ, and that approximately 100 other proposals were drafted outside of TAB EZ in a separate word processing program, while users viewed TAB EZ as a reference.

KSU does not currently have the ability to track BIT usage due to software upgrades and interfaces with Google Analytics. We believe usage has remained the same or increased from past years’ levels, which was approximately 1,600 visits by about 500 users, 50 of which were regular users from cities and tribes.

As part of Task 2 of the Tribal TAB Program, the Tribal Brownfields Forum (TBF) was created. The TBF is an online, password-protected, interactive forum that TRP and other tribal environmental professionals can communicate with peers, KSU-Tribal TAB Network experts, subject matter experts, and others. The TBF includes: 1) membership profiles and a directory, 2) a forum for discussion and communication, and 3) a topical Information Library. Mike Brook, lead IT Manager for ANTHC (a KSU TAB partner) launched Version 1 of the TBF in November 2018 at the Alaska Tribal Conference on Environmental Management (ATCEM). During the reporting period a number of behind the scenes accomplishments were made:

- Migrated to the production infrastructure, which is generally much faster.
- Certain back-end processes were automated, such as the daily notification messages.
- Important updates to the search engine to act more intuitively under real-world situations were made (such as searching for plural versions of things, etc.).
- Better behavior of the website on mobile devices and iPads.

There are currently 32 members of the forum. Growing the membership and evaluation will be a focus of next steps.
The KSU TAB Online Training Program Series consists of pre-recorded webinar modules, supplemental materials and review questions. A certificate is issued upon successful completion of each program and contact hours credit is available.

- We now have eight online training programs. Online training programs are available at https://www.ksutab.org/education/training.
  - Brownfield Basics (*Additional module on leveraging funds to be added at a later date)
  - Environmental Planning/NEPA: Using Federal Processes to Promote Local Objectives
  - Greener Cleanup for Brownfields
  - Harvesting Energy: Including Performance Contracting
  - Historic Preservation and Brownfield Redevelopment
  - Green Infrastructure as an Economic Development Tool
  - Transit Oriented Development
  - Tribal TRP 128(a) Brownfields Training Program (Alaska and lower 48 US versions)
- Future potential program:
  - Economic Development, Economic/Fiscal Impact Analysis, and Public Finance

**KSU TAB Website User Survey**

In spring 2019, a website user survey was sent to 6,570 registered users of the KSU TAB website to gauge their experience using the website and to evaluate its effectiveness. When the survey was sent out to registered users, 959 of the emails bounced back. Approximately 185 website user surveys were completed, and the results generated from the completed surveys were analyzed and provided to KSU TAB. The survey was comprised of general questions about the site as well as questions specific to TAB events, Brownfields Inventory Tool (BiT), TAB EZ grant application tool, resources, online training modules, and technical assistance contacts. There were also a few open-ended questions to allow for any additional comments.

Overall, website survey participants were generally positive about their experiences using the KSU TAB website. More specifically, many survey participants indicated it was straightforward and easy to find what they needed on the site, including access to online tools, resources, and information about TAB events. While the majority of survey participants indicated they had not utilized the BiT or TAB EZ online tools, those that had used them described both as high-quality tools that were easy to use. The majority of survey participants had not used the website to identify TAB technical assistance contacts, but those that had identified their technical assistance contacts using the website described it being easy to do.

Website users were asked several open-ended questions throughout the survey. In general, website users communicated that the website was user friendly and the online tools and resources were helpful in preparing grant applications. Areas for improvement mainly focused on style and visual appeal of the site. See Appendix D for complete survey results.
Task 3 Summation
The use of the www.ksutab.org website has increased from the last reporting period, with an increase in use of the site by TAB’s target audiences. TABEZ continues to be a valuable resource for users preparing Brownfields grant applications.

Task 4. Participatory Evaluation
TAB’s goal is to develop the Community Renewal Readiness Assessment (CoRRA) for measuring, tracking and evaluating the long-term impact of Site-Specific Technical Assistance. This rubric will allow TAB to capture service providers and recipient perspectives on progress at sites to more accurately measure needs and gains. The tool was developed by a working group comprised of representatives from major stakeholders in the TAB program (communities, state environmental agencies, EPA, and TAB service providers).

The rubric began being piloted in summer 2019. Both communities and Tribes were offered the opportunity to participate. Currently, five key community contacts have completed the rubric and data is in the process of being analyzed. The pilot process is scheduled for completion in fall 2019. A version of the piloted rubric is available in Appendix D.

Task 4 Summation
While progress on the development and piloting of the rubric has been slower than anticipated, goals will be achieved within the next project period.

Conclusions
Table 8 below shows the overall anticipated TAB Program outcomes and outputs. As the above review of program activities revealed, significant progress was made in achieving or exceeding program outputs on most of the items listed in the table below. TAB far exceeded goals of total communities assisted (173). Although states and EPA Regional partners were generally not as interested in webinars, the number of webinars and webinar-like events (i.e., invited in-person Regional presentations) during the reporting period increased to 23 events, when invited presentations are included. Continued, steady increase in communities assisted, workshops/webinars attended, and e-tools used, compared to previous years, suggests that awareness of availability of TAB assistance is increasing. As Oral Saulters departed the Tribal TAB program for another employment opportunity, activities related to the National Tribal Brownfields Working Group was deferred until a replacement was hired. Plans are to make the Community Capacity Rubric available for use nationally during the last two years of the current TAB project period. In addition to offering an opportunity for tribes to participate in the Community Capacity Rubric pilot, the Tribal Community Engagement and Brownfields Redevelopment workshops included indigenous models for participatory evaluation and goal setting for brownfields activities in their communities. A special project or two may also be completed during the last two years of the project period.
### Table 8
**Overall program outcomes and outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased recognition, assessment, cleanup, and sustainable reuse of brownfields to reduce environmental contamination</td>
<td>• Site specific Technical Assistance to communities: 100-180 communities/year for TAB CA and 50-90 assists for Tribal TAB CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better inform and equip communities to effectively address and be involved in brownfield activities</td>
<td>• 38 Regional/National and 6-10 Tribal workshops; and, 8 Webinars/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater knowledge of environmental and human health conditions in micro, environmental justice, tribal, and newly created brownfield communities</td>
<td>• Facilitate the <em>NTBWG</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater community involvement, communication, and partnerships among differing stakeholders; leveraging partnerships for funding</td>
<td>• Update and maintain On-line E-tools and Resources (BIT/TABEZ/Additional Resources)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enable communities to stimulate economic and other (such as social) beneficial reuses of brownfield sites to improve environmental conditions and human health</td>
<td>• Create and Manage <em>Tribal Brownfields Forum</em> with integrated online E-tools and Resources, for Tribal TAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Additional Outcomes for Tribes, under Tribal TAB:</strong></td>
<td>• Increase awareness of availability of TAB Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased capacity of tribes to establish and/or enhance their Tribal Response Program to provide proper oversight to brownfield sites enrolled in their programs</td>
<td>• Implement Participatory Evaluation Strategies (including the Community Capacity Rubric available in every EPA Region; and with Tribes, in combination with indigenous models)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Note: online e-tools are national in scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation results indicate that program outputs are supportive of addressing outcomes.

**Outcome 1: Increased Recognition, Assessment, Cleanup, and Sustainable Reuse of Brownfields to Reduce Environmental Contamination**

With respect to site specific services provided, over 1,400 acres of brownfield property are being addressed. Most of the sites are related to assessment and/or cleanup activities and 15% involve at least one element of sustainable reuse. This count does not include the many acres associated with area-wide
assessment, coalition assessment, and planning proposal initiatives that TAB assisted communities and tribes with this year.

With respect to workshops, participants indicated their intentions to take action related to assessing and cleaning up property. Many participants reported they were likely to investigate possible redevelopment opportunities for brownfields in their communities and tribal lands, and potentially apply for assessment or cleanup grants.

**Outcome 2: Better Inform and Equip Communities to Effectively Address and Be Involved in Brownfield Activities**

TAB’s site-specific services provide opportunities for local and tribal stakeholders to learn about the brownfield redevelopment process through real world application and involvement in their own projects. During this reporting cycle, 173 communities received technical assistance that helped them develop the capacity to engage in brownfield redevelopment.

Workshops and webinars are also pathways of providing education and capacity building to communities involved in brownfield activities. Participants in TAB events reported increased knowledge of brownfields and brownfield-related topics and resources, as well as increased readiness for taking action. Workshop participants reported significant changes in their readiness to participate in brownfield redevelopment (+27%) and in their awareness of resources available to them (+36%).

**Outcome 3: Greater Knowledge of Environmental and Human Health Conditions in Micro, Environmental Justice, Tribal, and Newly Created Brownfield Communities**

TAB is increasing its focus on underserved communities who generally have greater resource deficiencies. TAB exceeded its goals in serving micro communities (39%) and environmental justice/tribal communities (26%).

TAB’s workshops and webinars also provide underserved communities with the opportunity to increase their knowledge. During the project year, 26% of workshop participants who completed an evaluation were from micro-communities and just over 10% were representatives of Tribal governments. TAB provides these target communities with access to online resources and training programs. TAB also presents, exhibits, and provides a help desk for the Brownfields Inventory Tool (BiT) at the annual Tribal Lands Forum, in partnership with EPA’s ACRES database staff.

**Outcome 4: Greater Community Involvement, Communication, and Partnerships Among Differing Stakeholders; Leveraging Partnerships for Funding**

Site specific service often provides opportunities for community involvement and relationship building. TAB attended community/stakeholder meetings in 36 communities, worked with 15 communities on addressing community education and stakeholder needs, with 23 communities in re-use visioning sessions, and 20 communities on local workshops. All of these activities bring stakeholders together to focus their efforts on advancing redevelopment projects.

TAB workshops, particularly the Community Engagement and Brownfields Redevelopment workshop for tribes, provide targeted instruction on how to foster this in communities and also provide opportunities for stakeholders to network and develop relationships. Representatives from several stakeholder groups attended workshops. Many participants also reported that they are more ready to
involve, communicate and partner with their stakeholders, and intend to share knowledge learned at the workshops with others in their community.

**Outcome 5: Enable Communities to Stimulate Economic and Other Beneficial Reuses of Brownfield Sites to Improve Environmental Conditions and Human Health**

During the reporting period, TAB worked with 64 communities to identify resources to assist with brownfield redevelopment efforts. TAB also engaged 20 communities in evaluating redevelopment options.

Workshops that were offered also increased participants perception of the resources available to them and their readiness to participate in brownfield redevelopment efforts (see outcome 2 above).

**Outcome 6: Increased capacity of tribes to establish and/or enhance their Tribal Response Program to provide proper oversight to brownfield sites enrolled in their programs**

Evaluation results from Tribal Response Program workshops indicate an increase in understanding, knowledge and readiness for attendees to either establish or enhance their Tribal Response Programs.

**Recommendations/Action Steps**

TAB made progress on all tasks and achieved or exceeded many of its goals in the reporting period. Specific areas of focus for next year are listed below.

**Workshops and Webinars**

- Review and revision of existing workshop evaluation instruments.
- Continue to offer at least one workshop in every state or that at least serves every state in KSU’s 21-state regional service area; and increase the number of state-specific webinars/invited presentations, if state and local partners are interested.
- Online E-Tools and Resources
- Complete revision and posting of Tribal Online Training Modules (for Alaska and non-Alaskan Tribes).
- Continue to promote the availability of online training programs.
- Re-establish the ability to track usage and promote the availability of the BIT – ACRES interface and the BIT mobile Smartphone App.
- Begin collecting usage data on the Tribal Brownfields Forum evaluation parameters.

**Participatory Evaluation**

- Complete pilot testing of Community Renewal and Readiness Assessment (CoRRA) rubric and analyze data. Continue to offer this opportunity to tribes.
- Complete any needed revisions to capacity rubric that resulted from pilot testing.
- Take the capacity rubric full-scale to communities serviced by KSU TAB.
Appendix A: Site-specific Technical Assistance to Communities

Table 1
Target goals and outcomes for site-specific service: Regional perspectives
Tribal TAB (2017-2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-90 assists to tribal communities/year</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Target goals and outcomes for site-specific service: Regional perspectives
TAB (2016-2021)

Region 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-45 communities/year (2016-2021 TAB)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site/state/year</td>
<td>3-11 per state</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-45 communities/year (2016-2021 TAB)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site/state/year</td>
<td>3-14 per state</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-45 communities/year (2016-2021 TAB)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site/state/year</td>
<td>1-8 per state</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-45 communities/year (2016-2021 TAB)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One site/state/year</td>
<td>0-16 per state</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Overview of information provided for 173 communities served: All regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sustainable Reuse</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago - Englewood</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>775 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago -1807-15 Kimball Ave</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posen</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Falls</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn County</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Madison Ave Corridor</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Terre Haute</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Indiana Economic Development District</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegan County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durand</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Lake - Prudenville</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne County</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaska</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeville</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula County</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barberton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance and Henry Counties</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry County</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Troy</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha County</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowoc</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Allis</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski County</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayou TECHE Project</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaux Bridge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Regional Planning Commission, Baton Rouge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denham Springs</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- **CWA** indicates a Clean Water Act project.
- **ongoing** indicates ongoing work.
- **completed** indicates the work is completed.
- **yes** indicates a specific condition or check.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo County</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>coalition</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deming</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>coalition</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucumcari</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth or Consequences</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadarko</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boynton</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron County</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison (Grayson College)</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Campo</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatesville</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Elizario</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texarkana</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>coalition</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinton</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coralville, City of</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Bluffs</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Dodge</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oskaloosa</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit Riverfront</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Rapids</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Center</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herington</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City KS and MO</td>
<td>KS/MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayti</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howardville</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Counties in SE Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Sun Valley Ecodistrict</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle County Shops (former)</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction Group Home</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cleanup</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Springs</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont Sugar Beet Plant</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nederland</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo County</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda Former Hotel</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls-Miracle Mile Site</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena (Site for Sale)</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Tier</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot (Souris Basin)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper (Public Housing Complex)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne (Historic Building)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RLF</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne (Steam Plant)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow County (Little Medicine Bow River)</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan County</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Nation</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Regis Mohawk Tribe</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamunkey Indian Tribe</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw Bay Indian Community</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Sioux Indian Community</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment, RFP</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana Pueblo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochiti Pueblo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake Chapter - Navajo Nation</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuque Pueblo</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne &amp; Arapaho Tribes</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, Macy</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>both, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute Mountain Ute Tribe</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle Mtn. Band of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104 Grant</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Peck Tribe</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104 grant</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MHA Nation (3 Affiliated)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104 Grant</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfeet Tribe, (Browning)</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Cheyenne Nation (NCT)</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisseton Wahpeton Oyate Nation</td>
<td>ND/SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128(a)</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oglala Sioux Tribe (Pine Ridge)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Salish &amp; Kootenai Tribes</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yankton Sioux Tribe</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104 Grant</td>
<td>completed yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Lake Tribe</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128(a), 104 Grant</td>
<td>completed yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ute Mountain Ute Tribe</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Apache Tribe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohono O'odham Nation</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Apache Tribe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>cleanup</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>both, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe Tribe</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>128a Inventory</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yerington Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>128a</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Village of Gakona</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>redevelop</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickaloon Native Village</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128a</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham (Bristol Bay Native Association)</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>brownfield inventory</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Village of Tulusak</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz Tribe</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>assessment, 128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squaxin Island Tribe</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>128(a)</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Typical community-specific services provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of service provided</th>
<th>Number of communities receiving service 2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend community/stakeholder meetings or conference calls</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education and engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging or planning to engage in visioning process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of redevelopment options</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate stakeholder communication</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of resources</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide fact sheets or sample documents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP/Q Development/Review</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered EPA and other grants questions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT Assistance</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAB EZ assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Workshops and Webinars

Table 1
Workshop goals: Regional perspectives

Region 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>3 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>4 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>3 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Region 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>2 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regions 9 & 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target goals</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Target met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% with population of less than 100K</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% with population of less than 10K</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One workshop/state/year</td>
<td>3 states</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAB participation in invited and other presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On July 22, 2018, Maggie Egberts, KSU TAB, presented to the Energy and Environmental Committee (approximately 20-30 members) at the Southern Legislative Conference held in St. Louis, MO July 21-25, 2018. The focus of Maggie’s presentation was how brownfields redevelopment can be another economic revitalization tool and TAB resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On August 23, 2018, Martha Faust and Joe Mahowald (Minnesota Brownfields, KSU TAB Partner), presented on Brownfields Basics to 41 attendees at a brownfields redevelopment workshop in Duluth, MN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the Upper Midwest Regional Planning Conference held in Rochester, MN on September 26 - 28, 2018, Hava Blair and Joe Mahowald (Minnesota Brownfields, KSU TAB Partner) presented on the Brownfield Health Indicator Tool and How to Plan for Brownfield Redevelopment Opportunities, respectively. Approximately 20 to 30 attendees were present during each presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On August 14, Mark Walker was invited by the Pueblo County Commissioner to present a brief introduction to Brownfields and identification of resources to a community stakeholder group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On September 21, 2018, Margaret Renas (Delta Institute, a KSU TAB Partner) presented on “Tackling Economic Redevelopment of Vacant Properties” to approximately 35 attendees of the Illinois Municipal League’s annual conference held in Chicago, IL. The presentation included several minutes on the TAB program and free technical assistance and tools (TAB EZ and BIT) available through the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On September 27, 2018, Maggie Egberts, KSU TAB, presented on “Making Sense of Institutional Controls” during the Oklahoma Regional Brownfields Conference held in Oklahoma City September 26 - 28, 2018. Approximately 20-30 were in attendance during the session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On November 13, 2018, Maggie Egberts, KSU TAB, presented on TAB services and capabilities during the Flint Hills Regional Council Coalition Assessment Grant kickoff meeting. Sabine Martin, a KSU TAB partner also attended. The FHRC is a FY18 grantee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey Hartnett and Mike Brook (local partner) participated in Sessions at the November Alaska Tribal Conference on Environmental Management (ATCEM) in coordination with the Alaska Native tribal Health Consortium (ANTHC), a KSU TAB Partner. Ms. Cynthia Annett participated for KSU TAB via remote zoom access. Information was provided on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
establishment and enhancement of the TRP and TAB assistance; use of E-Tools and the new Brownfields Forum and Brownfields APP online. The conference was interrupted by an Earthquake on Nov. 30 so the scheduled work session in coordination with EPA Region 10 staff on 128(a) TRP Grant Work Plans could not be held. (the hotel was evacuated) In lieu of that session KSU TAB and Mickey Hartnett, in coordination with Mary Goolie of EPA Region 10 and the ANTHC hosted a webinar on Dec. 7 for the Alaska Native TRPs on the TRP 4 elements and TRP Work Plan Preparation. A recording of the webinar is available online at the KSU TAB web site.

In March, KSU TAB in partnership with Emily Rhodes, Delta Institute, and Mel Pins, IA Brownfields Coordinator, submitted a proposal to the Growing Sustainable Communities Conference in Dubuque, IA in October 2019. Selected proposals will be announced around May 15, 2019.

Mickey Hartnett was invited to speak at a meeting of the TSWAN on March 27. The meeting was attended by 35 representatives of EPA Region 10 tribes as well as EPA Region 10 staff. A presentation was provided on the 128(a) Tribal Response Program (TRP) and addressing the problems of “Open Dump Sites”.

Maggie Egbarts and Mark Walker, KSU TAB, and Jennifer Clancey, KSU TAB Partner, will present at the R8 Brownfields Grantees Conference to be held April 23-25, 2019 in Denver, CO.

Maggie Egbarts and Mark Walker, KSU TAB, and Jennifer Clancey, KSU TAB Partner, participated at the R8 Brownfields Grantees Conference held April 23-25, 2019 in Denver, CO. Egbarts and Clancey gave a joint presentation titled *Brownfields Basics for Non-Environmental Professional* April 23, 2019. Walker and Clancey also served as moderators for three other sessions during the conference. Approximately 75 were in attendance.

KSU TAB partner, Beth Grigsby attended the Environmental Infrastructure Working Group (EIWG) Compass Conference on May 21, 2019. The conference provided an opportunity for various technical assistance providers to educate communities on the various types of services offered. Grigsby gave an overview of the TAB program and distributed program brochures to 20 attendees.

KSU TAB partner, Sabine Martin co-presented with Taryn Serwatowski, Nebraska brownfields coordinator, at the Nebraska Economic Developers Association on June 13, 2014. The presentation highlighted the brownfields redevelopment process and provided information about the state’s brownfields and KSU TAB programs. Approximately 15-20 conference attendees were present during this presentation.

KSU TAB collaborated with Delta Institute, and Iowa Brownfields Program to submittal a proposal to the Growing Sustainable Communities Conference in Dubuque, IA being held in October 2019. TAB will present *What’s in Your Toolkit?: Planning for Resilient Communities* on October 24, 2019.

Maggie Egbarts, KSU TAB, will be presenting on the KSU TAB program and how various entities leverage the program during the Great Lake Environmental Remediation and Redevelopment Conference in Lansing, MI, October 2019.

Maggie Egbarts, KSU TAB, was invited to present at the Missouri Brownfields Workshop on July 15, 2019 to highlight the brownfields redevelopment process and areas where TAB offers assistance.
Mickey Hartnett, KSU Tribal TAB, was invited to participate in a 128(a) Tribal Response Program training and workshop in Yerington, NV on June 4 and 5, 2019 by EPA Region 9. 4 Tribes and 6 tribal staff attended the workshop.

Mickey Hartnett and Scott Nightingale were invited to attend an EPA Region 2 Tribal RTOC meeting and conduct 128(a) TRP Training and meet with Region 2 tribes May 20-22, 2019.

Mickey Hartnett was invited to make a presentation on the Tribal TAB and participate on a tribal panel at the Washington State Brownfields Conference hosted by Washington Dept. Of Ecology on May 29-30, 2019.

KSU Tribal TAB has had several conference calls with EPA Regions 2 and 3 staff to plan for future Tribal TAB attendance at Regional tribal events and/or plan a tribal specific brownfields workshop. The Region 3 event would specifically include new federally recognized tribes.
Appendix C: KSU TAB Website User Survey Results

How did you learn about the ksutab.org website? (please check all that apply)

- At a workshop/webinar/conference: 76
- Referred by a government agency or other entity: 50
- Email communication from TAB: 35
- Social media: 5
- A colleague or peer: 42

Please rate how easy it is to find what you need on the ksutab.org website.

- 5 (Very easy): 42
- 4: 79
- 3: 28
- 2: 5
- 1 (Very hard): 2
Have you recommended the ksutab.org website to anyone else?

Yes: 107
No: 50
TAB Events

Have you used ksutab.org to register for a TAB workshop or webinar event?

Please rate how easy it is to register for a TAB event, get information, and download related material.
Brownfields Inventory Tool (BiT)

Have you used the Brownfields Inventory Tool (BiT), available at ksutab.org?

Yes: 53
No: 102

Please rate how easy it is to use BiT.

5 (Very easy): 11
4: 28
3: 9
2
1 (Very hard)
Please rate the quality of BiT.

Please rate how easy it is to use the BiT Smartphone App.
Please rate the quality of the BiT Smartphone App.

- 5 (Very high quality): 6
- 4: 13
- 3: 14
- 2: 1
- 1 (Very low quality)

TAB EZ Grant Application Tool

Have you used the TAB EZ Grant Application Tool available at ksutab.org?

- Yes: 60
- No: 92
Please rate how easy it is to use the TAB EZ Grant Application Tool.

- 5 (Very easy): 17
- 4: 29
- 3: 10
- 2
- 1 (Very hard): 1

Please rate the quality of the TAB EZ Grant Application Tool.

- 5 (Very high quality): 19
- 4: 25
- 3: 12
- 2: 2
- 1 (Very low quality): 1
Resources

Have you used the Resources Section available at ksutab.org?

- Yes: 79
- No: 71

Please rate how easy it is to use the Resources Section.

- 5 (Very easy): 24
- 4: 44
- 3: 5
- 1 (Very hard): 1
Please rate the quality of the Resources Section.

Online Training Modules

Have you used the online training modules available at ksutab.org?
Please rate how easy it is to use the TAB training modules.

Please rate the quality of the training modules you have used.
Technical Assistance Contacts

Have you used ksutab.org to identify TAB technical assistance contacts?

No: 86
Yes: 61

Please rate how easy it was to contact a TAB technical assistance contact.

5 (Very easy): 34
4: 22
3: 3
2: 1
1 (Very hard): 1
KSU Website User Survey Open-Ended Questions:

1. **Do you have any comments or suggestions for making ksutab.org a more user-friendly website?**

In general, survey participants indicated the KSU TAB website is already user-friendly - straightforward and easy to use.

Areas for improvement include:
- The site’s graphic design is basic and outdated
- Site text is too heavy
- Navigation is somewhat difficult
- Redundancy between education, online tools, and resources
- Initial login can be hard to find

Specific recommendations often focused on style and visual appeal of the site:
- Use larger text size
- Create a more concise home page with less text
- Use more engaging graphics, such as actual brownfield project images and photos from TAB events
- Provide better differentiation between resources

Some survey participants also requested improving the search function, make grant-writing more user-friendly, and the process easier for uploading the BiT tool.

2. **Do you have any comments about BiT or the BiT Smartphone App or suggestions for improvement?**

Most survey participants indicated they have not used BiT or the BiT Smartphone App.

While some users described BiT as good, others’ experience was that it was not user-friendly. Areas that could be better include:
- Difficult to see when using the phone
- Photos don’t save correctly on the app
- When using “show all” it places all sites from all lists on top of each other
- Not able to transfer a site and its data from one list to another

Recommendations that were offered to make BiT and the BiT Smartphone App better:
- Advertise the App more; create a fact sheet to share with communities detailing what it can and can’t do
- Make it easier to attach photos in the App
- Make data publicly available
- Be able to view a map on the App after taking inventory
3. **Do you have any comments about the TAB EZ Grant Application Tool or suggestions for improvement?**

Survey participants offered a fair number of positive comments about TAB EZ, indicating it’s a great tool and easy to use. More specifically, participants detailed how useful TAB EZ is in preparing grant applications, describing the tool as helpful with organization, searching and indexing, providing hints and tips, as well as pre-populated required grant proposal sections.

There were also some areas for improvement mentioned by survey participants. For instance, they described TAB EZ as confusing to navigate and difficult to transfer to another format. Users detailed that it is easier to create and edit proposals outside of TAB EZ and in Word. Survey participants also mentioned the character commands (bold, italics, font size) are not responsive.

Recommendations to improve Tab EZ include:
- Enhancing the interface and client interaction to make it easier to generate reports
- Fixing the formatting issues when copying or transferring to other platforms like Word
- The ability to save content or add an auto-save feature
- Provide examples of text from winning applications
- Be able to have KSU TAB review grant applications from the platform

4. **Do you have any comments about the Resources Section or suggestions for improvement?**

In general, survey participants described the Resources section as excellent, user-friendly, and useful. It was also noted by some participants that the resources and education sections are sometimes confusing to navigate and contain redundant material.

Recommendations to make the Resources section better include:
- Make it easier to find resources; consider organizing the section by particular categories (e.g., webinars, fact sheets, workshop slides)
- Provide more citizen briefs on Phase II assessments
- Include more information about interpreting different closure levels
- Offer more regional information
- Consider adding a place for users to make recommendations for additional resources needed or even upload documents/links to materials

5. **Do you have any comments about the TAB Online Training Modules or suggestions for improvement?**

Not many responses were given for this question. Most survey participants had no comments or indicated they haven't used the training modules in a while. Some users stated they know the
training modules will work well and be of quality, while other users indicate some modules are too general and videos weren't available. One recommendation given was to organize the modules based on user experience level.

6. **Do you have any comments about identifying TAB Technical Assistance Contacts or suggestions for improvement?**

There were also not many responses given to this question. Generally, survey participants indicated that technical assistance contacts are knowledgeable, helpful, and respond to requests in a reasonable amount of time. It was recommended that photos of technical assistance contacts be added to the website.

7. **Do you have anything else to tell us about ksutab.org?**

Most survey participants indicated they had nothing else to say, they haven't used the site, or need to explore the site more. Other survey participants indicated valuing their partnership with KSU TAB. More specifically, there were several areas that participants mentioned:

- **Home page:** Participants noted there is too much content and the text is too small. Suggestions included simplifying the page and making information about what TAB does more prominent.

- **Resources:** Participants indicated there are a lot of useful resources offered on the site, such as access to grant applications, which helps create a resource roadmap for users.

- **Technical Assistance:** Survey participants described their appreciation for the excellent technical assistance contacts who are supportive and do an outstanding job assisting communities. Participants indicated the technical assistance contacts give great feedback and insight that helps strengthen grant applications.

- **Marketing:** A couple of participants suggested that KSU TAB needs to communicate more, especially online, and promote TAB services more regularly.
Appendix D: Participatory Evaluation: Community Renewal & Readiness Assessment (CoRRA)

CoRRA for Leadership: A process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Envisioning possibilities:</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td>Identifying and refining redevelopment goals for potential properties or areas.</td>
<td>Using a broader context in planning (site vs. community-wide vision).</td>
<td>Creating an environment for acceptance and incorporation of new approaches for addressing future brownfield properties (ex. TIF, downtown development authority, brownfield program).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain in discussions about potential properties and the possibility of engaging in brownfield redevelopment.</td>
<td>Discussing potential properties and the possibility of engaging in brownfield redevelopment programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Building relationships:</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td>Creating connections with relevant stakeholders and resources within the community.</td>
<td>Extending circle of contacts and connections to a broader network (local, state, federal, non-profit).</td>
<td>Putting mechanisms in place for new connections to continue to emerge with diverse sectors/stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seeing ways that my organization is solving common problems and engaging with others</td>
<td>Showing an attitude of wanting to solve a common problem and willingness to engage with others to create solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Financial/Willingness to contribute:</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hesitant</td>
<td>Presence of a brownfield redevelopment champion or change agent willing to step up and be involved in creating change.</td>
<td>One source (business, community, local government, state, regional or federal) invests through sweat equity or financial means.</td>
<td>Multiple sources of investors (business, community, local government, state, regional and federal).</td>
<td>Community/business model that puts environmental issues on par with economic and social issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to explore a possible brownfield redevelopment champion or change agent willing to be involved in creating change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CoRRA for Partnerships: An association between two or more entities in which resources are pooled & successes and failures are shared.

A. **Distributed/Shared Power**: Power, authority, and influence related to redevelopment projects is shared among stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to include stakeholders in brownfield redevelopment</td>
<td>Increased awareness of stakeholder roles and responsibilities.</td>
<td>Positive and productive communication and collaboration among diverse stakeholders.</td>
<td>Advisory board that meets regularly to provide input on redevelopment projects.</td>
<td>Governing board comprised of diverse stakeholders empowered to make decisions, set goals, and determine success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Trust**: Reliance on the integrity, strength, ability, surety, etc., of a person or thing; confidence in people and process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties seeing and acknowledge diverse viewpoints.</td>
<td>Acknowledge that diverse viewpoints are valid.</td>
<td>Disagreements focus on issues and don't sidetrack process. Growing ability to compromise.</td>
<td>Value diverse viewpoints—For example, spoken and written language utilize words and phrases aligned with others' perspectives.</td>
<td>Multiple viewpoints incorporated into overall approach and demonstrated willingness to make concessions for the greater community good.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **Evolving role**: The capacity or power of persons to be a compelling force on or affect the actions, behaviors, or opinions of others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling unsure about being involved in a partnership.</td>
<td>Recognizing the need to explore relationships with other organizations who could bring value to project.</td>
<td>Willingness to step up and be involved in creating change.</td>
<td>Utilizing community organizing and involvement strategies that promote engagement and communication.</td>
<td>Networking and sharing ideas with other communities; Long term relationships and partnerships continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoRRA for Education: Systematic, organized events intended to bring about learning.

A. Community-at-Large (citizens, organizations, businesses): Community entities (citizens, organizations, and businesses) directly (adjacent to sites) or indirectly impacted by brownfields and redevelopment efforts. Includes participants with a range of prior experience as well as novices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community entities are unsure if they are ready to engage in redevelopment efforts.</td>
<td>Community entities are attending informational meetings and events.</td>
<td>Community entities excited by process (i.e., positive conversations).</td>
<td>Community entities are actively participating in process (committees, task forces, events).</td>
<td>Community entities propose projects to advance redevelopment goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Working Committees: Citizens and government staff engaged in redevelopment efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens and government staff are hesitant to be involved in redevelopment efforts.</td>
<td>Attending webinars, workshops, and/or conferences related to brownfield redevelopment.</td>
<td>Entering into a network of peers who provide mentoring and resources.</td>
<td>Ongoing, reciprocal exchange of experience and knowledge for project implementation with peer network.</td>
<td>Sharing expert knowledge with communities beyond peer network (i.e., mentoring and serving as resource to others).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Elected Officials: Local government representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No involvement from local representatives.</td>
<td>Attending webinars, workshops, and/or conferences related to brownfield redevelopment.</td>
<td>Exploring city ordinance possibilities from successful redevelopment projects in other communities.</td>
<td>Putting forward new city ordinance possibilities for public discussion and local application.</td>
<td>Enacting policies/ordinances that advance sustainable redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoRRA for Tangible Change: Real, actual differences occurring in communities.

A. **Assessment:** Exploration of perceived or actual contamination of property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not assessing property contamination.</td>
<td>Awareness that community may have brownfield properties.</td>
<td>Preliminary identification of potential brownfield properties.</td>
<td>Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCA) complete.</td>
<td>Developing plans for additional assessments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Cleanup:** Contamination issues identified by Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not engaging in cleanup.</td>
<td>Seeking funds for cleanup activities.</td>
<td>Cleanup funds secured and developing request for qualifications (RFQ) for contractor.</td>
<td>Cleanup complete and property ready for redevelopment.</td>
<td>Additional properties in pipeline for assessment/cleanup cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **Redevelopment:** Property returned to productive reuse addressing community-identified economic, social, or environmental needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not engaging in redevelopment.</td>
<td>Developing a vision for redevelopment.</td>
<td>Property(ies) returned to productive reuse.</td>
<td>Redevelopment vision incorporates master plan, community input, and stakeholder needs; identifies partners/potential funding sources; and included conceptual scenarios and diagrams.</td>
<td>Addressing brownfield properties part of long-range redevelopment and master plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoRRA for Project Management: Capacity to get things done.

A. **Planning a Project:** Key elements in developing successful projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not engaging in project planning.</td>
<td>Determine objectives and goals with stakeholder input.</td>
<td>Identify activities, tasks, and partners.</td>
<td>Determine resources needed and timelines.</td>
<td>Getting partners and resources on board and successfully implementing project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Grant-funded Project Experience:** Track record and experience with grant-funded projects. Successful projects meet all goals and reporting requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applying for grants for redevelopment projects.</td>
<td>Applying/reapplying for Targeted Brownfield Assessments or grants.</td>
<td>Currently managing EPA or other grant-funded projects.</td>
<td>Successfully completed EPA or other grant-funded projects.</td>
<td>Successfully completing multiple projects from multiple grant sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **Contracting:** Securing agreements with environmental professionals for services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### D. Working with regulatory agencies: Interactions with state and/or federal agencies with missions related to brownfield redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No interaction with state/federal agencies. Low level of trust with respect to their involvement in projects.</td>
<td>Displays a level of trust and willingness to engage with state/federal agencies?</td>
<td>Increased level of trust and willingness to engage with state/federal agencies.</td>
<td>Readily seeks advice and interaction of state/federal agencies in developing projects or solving problems.</td>
<td>Strong advocate for the involvement of state/federal agencies in project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. Staff/Volunteers: Human resources capable of meeting the technical, administrative, and financial requirements of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not identifying or incorporating human resources.</td>
<td>Identifying human resources needed for accomplishing project.</td>
<td>Developing human resources through training or hiring experienced staff or utilizing volunteers.</td>
<td>Staff/Volunteers currently involved in brownfield redevelopment project.</td>
<td>Staff/Volunteers have past expertise and experience as well as ongoing involvement in successful brownfield redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoRRA Sustainability: Creating and maintaining the conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony to support present and future generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Environmental: Environmental/human health as a consideration in redevelopment priorities.</th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of the connection between environmental/human health and redevelopment.</td>
<td>Recognize the possibility of connections between environmental/human health and redevelopment.</td>
<td>Evaluate the link between environmental/human health and redevelopment priorities when scoping projects.</td>
<td>Implementing redevelopment that addresses environmental/human health concerns.</td>
<td>Employ a community/business model that puts environmental/human health on par with redevelopment priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Economic: Economic health as a consideration in redevelopment priorities.</th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of the connection between brownfield redevelopment and economic growth/potential.</td>
<td>Recognize the possibility of the economic potential of brownfield redevelopment opportunities.</td>
<td>Evaluate the economic potential of brownfield redevelopment.</td>
<td>Implementing a project that generates a positive economic benefit (i.e., incentives for sustainable practices, grants, creation of local jobs, and increase local tax base).</td>
<td>Creating and implementing a plan for community/regional sustainability and resiliency - needs vs. wants, -tax incentives, -TIFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Social: Public/community well-being (e.g., environmental justice, lack of green space, access to resources, public input) as a consideration in redevelopment priorities</th>
<th>Hesitant</th>
<th>Displaying</th>
<th>Establishing</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Institutionalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsure of the connection between brownfield redevelopment and community well-being.</td>
<td>Recognize the possibility of the connection between brownfield redevelopment and community well-being.</td>
<td>Utilize input to identify issues that impact community well-being.</td>
<td>Educate and empower citizens to take part in the brownfield redevelopment process.</td>
<td>Creating and implementing policies/ordinances to address community well-being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>