



**Workplan for the 104(k)(2) &(3) Assessment Cooperative Agreement
Hazardous Substances**

Project Performance Period: Aug 01, 2010 – Jul 31, 2013

City of Sidney, Ohio

CFDA: 66.818 - Assessment, Cleanup, and Revolving Loan Fund Grants

CERCLA Authority: 104(k)(2)&(3)

DCN: STX

Budget FY: 2010

Appropriation: E4

Budget Org: 05F0AG7

Object Class: 4114

Program Results Code: Hazardous Substances – 402D79E (Action Code: NY)

This project supports:

Environmental Results Goal 4: Healthy Communities and Ecosystems;

Objective 4.2: Communities – Sustain, Clean up, and Restore Communities and the Ecological Systems that Support Them

Sub objective 4.2.3: Assess, Clean up and Redevelop Brownfields

Specifically, the Cooperative Agreement (CA) recipient will characterize, assess, and conduct cleanup and reuse planning and community involvement activities associated with the Former Wagner Manufacturing & Master Vision Polishing Plant (the project site).

The City of Sidney will have the following outputs/outcomes:

- conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the project site
- conduct a Phase II ESA of the project site
- conduct a hazardous materials assessment of the project site
- prepare Clean Ohio Fund Documents and/or a Cleanup and Redevelopment Plan for the project site
- coordinate and conduct community outreach and participation

Project Contact: Bill Gosciwski, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Sidney, OH
Telephone: 937-498-8141
Facsimile: 937-498-8119
E-mail: bgosciwski@sidneyoh.com

I. Background:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has awarded the City of Sidney (the City) Brownfields Assessment Cooperative Agreement (CA) funds for the site-specific hazardous substance assessment of the Former Wagner Manufacturing & Master Vision Polishing Plant (the project site). The CA includes \$185,000 for planned assessment activities, cleanup planning, and community outreach and involvement. The City, as a general purpose unit of local government, was selected for assessment funding based on their proposal submitted in the FY 2010 nation-wide competition.

The City of Sidney was founded in 1820 on the banks of the Miami River as the county seat for Shelby County in western Ohio. The construction of the Miami-Erie Canal between 1825 and 1837 connected Sidney in a north/south direction with the major trade centers in Ohio and, from the 1840s to the early 1900's, canal boats carried products from Sidney to Cincinnati or Toledo. In the 1850's, railroad lines were constructed in Sidney with rail lines extending from east to west and north to south, further connecting Sidney to major trade centers in the region. Today, both the east to west and north to south rail lines that pass through Sidney are owned and operated by CSX Transportation. In the late 1950's, a third transportation innovation came to Sidney, the interstate highway system. Sidney is bisected by Interstate Highway 75 in western Ohio, between Dayton and Toledo.

Sidney's geographic location, historic association with major modes of transportation and high degree of connectivity led to the development of a significant manufacturing base in the city. The high degree of connectivity facilitated importation of raw materials and the export of manufactured goods. Through the early 1940's, Sidney's industry dictated the direction of development, with the construction of factories near transportation routes followed by residential development surrounding the factories to house employees. This pattern of development resulted in a number of industrial sites "embedded" within residential neighborhoods, one of which is the former Wagner Manufacturing site.

The former Wagner Manufacturing site is an approximate 6-acre parcel developed with industrial buildings that is adjoined by the CSX railroad to the east and is surrounded by residential properties to the north, south, and west. For over a century, the buildings on the property housed a variety of manufacturing processes, including iron and aluminum foundries. The site was developed for cast iron cookware production in 1891 with additions to the original building in 1920, 1921, 1946, 1959, 1966, 1971, 1981, and 1982. By the 1990's, cast iron and aluminum cookware production continued at the site but at a much smaller scale and within only a small portion of the factory. A number of buildings in the complex fell into disrepair. By 2001, cookware production at the site had ceased and the site was listed for sale. The site was purchased by Master Vision Polishing, which conducted aluminum polishing operations in a small portion of the complex. The deterioration of the buildings on the property continued. In April 2008, following collapse of a 3-story section of an exterior wall, the City forced Master Vision Polishing to vacate a portion of the site due to unsafe building conditions. A few weeks later, Master Vision Polishing ceased operations and vacated the entire facility.

II. Project Specific Objectives

City residents in the neighborhoods adjacent to the former Wagner Manufacturing site will realize tremendous benefits from this site-specific USEPA Assessment Grant. By providing money not available in the City budget, the grant will allow the City to assess contamination at the project site; plan for remediation of contamination and demolition of the dilapidated, dangerous buildings; and take an active role in improving the neighborhood by restoring the former Wagner Manufacturing site to a productive, tax-generating use while protecting the Starrett Run and Miami River ecosystems and directing development towards a previously developed site with existing infrastructure. With the effects of the downturn in manufacturing, rising unemployment, and decreased revenue sharing from the state on the City's budget, the City does not have the resources to take these proactive steps; therefore, this Assessment Grant is a key component of the City's strategy to reclaim this brownfields site and protect its citizens from deleterious health effects associated with exposure to toxic contaminants.

The City will retain a qualified environmental consultant (QEC) to assist in administering the CA and implementing the planned assessments of the project site and community outreach activities. The project site will be evaluated initially through performance of Phase I and Phase II ESAs. After completion of the assessment activities, the City and their QEC will disseminate the assessment results to the community and develop cleanup and redevelopment strategies for the project site.

This Assessment Grant will allow the City to begin to address a prominent, contaminated and dangerous eyesore that looms over the downtown area and negatively impacts the adjoining residential neighborhood. The assessment of this site will allow remediation/redevelopment planning and create an incentive for new development on this brownfields site, returning it to a productive tax-generating use, re-using the existing infrastructure, and removing the threat to the health and welfare of nearby residents and the environment.

III. Management and Coordination

The City has formed an administrative project team to manage this Assessment grant. The team includes City staff from the Department of Public Works, Community Services Department, and City Manager's office. The City Department of Public Works will take the lead and manage the grant and report to the USEPA. The Department of Public Works has a competent staff that understands procedures and requirements associated with federal and non-federal assistance agreements. Mr. William Gosciewski, P.E., Director of Public Works, will be the project manager for this Assessment Grant project. A project manager profile of Mr. Gosciewski is provided in Section VI.

The City will endeavor to maintain the grant management team in place during the entire grant period. The City's plan for management continuity in the event of loss of the project manager relies on ready availability of an experienced project manager on staff in the City and an experienced environmental consultant. Ms. Barbara Dulworth, Community Services Director, has been involved in the grant operations for the CDBG grants. She will be involved and

become intimately familiar with the USEPA Assessment Grant operations so she can immediately step in as either interim or replacement project manager in case of loss or re-assignment of the project manager.

The City also understands that additional technical expertise and resources will be necessary to perform the project effectively. The City will prepare a Request for Qualifications and Proposal (RFQP) to retain a QEC to assist in managing the activities funded by the Assessment Grant. The City will select the QEC through a qualifications-based selection process in accordance with their procurement protocols and applicable federal procurement rules (40 CFR 31.36).

The City will establish and maintain an administrative record in accordance with USEPA protocol. The administrative record will contain all project related documents and be maintained at a location convenient for City staff and residents, such as City hall or the public library.

IV. Workplan Tasks

TASK 1: Programmatic Activities

The City will provide in-kind staff resources associated with the majority of the programmatic costs, including coordinating and conducting operational meetings and other activities associated with grant assessment functions. These activities will include preparing a RFQP for a QEC, evaluating the responses, and selecting and hiring a QEC. These activities will also include completing the required quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports and maintaining grant records. The grant manager anticipates travel to up to three USEPA Brownfields Conferences over the course of the grant to network with brownfields professionals and developers to market the site for redevelopment. Summaries of the anticipated activities, deliverables, and schedules are presented on the following table.

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
Retain QEC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare RFQP, evaluate applications, conduct interviews, retain QEC • Conduct annual performance evaluations on consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFQP; documentation of open competition; and contract for scope of services • Performance evaluation reports, and applicable corrective actions 	Jun 2010 – Aug 2010
Reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare progress reports, MBE/WBE and FSR forms • Enter site data in ACRES • Prepare final report and grant closeout material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly reports and other forms • updated ACRES database • final report and closeout forms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly reports are submitted every quarter • MBE/WBE forms are submitted semi-annually • ACRES updated when site activities occur
Records: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain grant files • Maintain site project files • Maintain financial records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and complete files suitable for audit purposes 	Continuously throughout grant period

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend USEPA Brownfields Conferences and other related workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfields conference materials and notes 	TBD

TASK 2: Community Involvement and Outreach

Community involvement will begin with public announcements of grant award and requests for public comment on the draft project Work Plan. During the course of the Assessment Grant project, additional public notices of activities and solicitation of public comment will occur at the conclusion of assessment activities and at the point of redevelopment plan consideration and review. The results of assessments will be disseminated to the community through public meetings and notification to community organizations. If health threats are identified, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) and the Sidney-Shelby County Health Department (SSCHD) will be notified and their involvement requested. Community involvement will continue through future site activities, if needed, and the site redevelopment planning and approval processes. The City will involve specific partners and stakeholders, such as potential developers, lenders, and local business leaders, who are critical to the success of brownfield redevelopment, in discussions of the following: highest and best redevelopment uses of the site in light of market conditions, identification and solicitation of potential developers, and financial options and mechanisms for funding future site preparation activities. Summaries of the anticipated activities, deliverables, and schedules are presented on the following table.

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
Community Notification of Award: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create press release/public notice of award and distribute to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City’s website ○ Local newspaper ○ Local radio and television stations ○ Various community organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public notices and press releases 	May 2010
Public Review of Draft Workplan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish notice and request for comments on draft Workplan • Publish draft Workplan • Publish notice of public meeting to discuss Workplan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public notice • Draft Workplan • 1 Public meeting, presentation material, attendance list 	May 2010

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
<p>Community Involvement and Outreach during Assessment Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project kick-off meeting prior to assessment • Notification of assessment results • Notification of identified health threats (if any) • Seeking public input on cleanup and/or redevelopment plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 public notices and informational bulletins • At least 3 public meetings, presentation material, and attendance lists • Draft data packages and figures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kick-off meeting is anticipated in Aug 2010 • Notification of assessment results will occur after completion of data collection and evaluation • Cleanup and redevelopment planning will occur after completion of assessment activities
<p>Project Close Out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notification of assessment results • Make copies of reports available at City’s website, offices, and library • Prepare summaries for dissemination by partnered community groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public notice • Final reports 	<p>At conclusion of the project</p>

TASK 3: Site Assessment

The project site will be evaluated initially through performance of Phase I and Phase II ESAs. The Phase I ESA will be conducted according to the requirements of All Appropriate Inquiry (ASTM Standard E1527-05) and the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) 3745-300-06 for the Ohio Voluntary Action Program (VAP) for investigating current, historical, and regulatory issues associated with the site and nearby properties to identify recognized environmental conditions that may indicate the presence of contamination. A Property Profile Form for the site will be entered into the Assessment, Cleanup, and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES). The QEC retained by the City will design a Phase II ESA in general accordance with ASTM Standard E1903-97 and the Ohio VAP to further evaluate the areas of potential subsurface environmental impact and also plan a hazardous materials assessment of the buildings on the property. The assessment goals will be to evaluate current conditions for the purpose of evaluating the extent of soil and groundwater impact on the property, evaluate environmental liability, evaluate due care (human health) and other safe use issues, evaluate potential off-site health effects, and support development and implementation of environmental response activities necessary to facilitate redevelopment.

Prior to conducting the Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment, the QEC will prepare a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and submitted it to the USEPA for approval. After QAPP approval, a Health and Safety Plan (HASP), and Sampling and Analysis Plan(s) (SAPs) for the Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment will be submitted to the USEPA for review. Depending on project timing, the QEC may prepare one SAP for both the Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment, or a separate SAP for each. Upon USEPA approval of the SAP(s) and HASP, the environmental consultant will conduct the Phase II ESA and hazardous

materials assessment. The Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment may be done at the same time, or conducted independently. Upon receipt of the Phase II and hazardous materials assessment results, the QEC will prepare separate Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment reports. Summaries of the anticipated activities, deliverables, and schedules are presented on the following table.

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
Update ACRES Database	Online Property profile form	Sep 2010
QAPP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QAPP preparation • Pre-QAPP conference call w/EPA and consultant 	QAPP, as completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft QAPP submitted to the USEPA by Oct 2010 • Final QAP submitted to the USEPA by Nov 2010
Phase I ESA (ASTM and VAP Compliant)	Phase I ESA Report	Sep 2010 – Nov 2010
HASP	Site-specific HASP	Nov 2010
SAP(s) (Hazardous Materials Assessment and Phase II ESA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft • Final, as needed to incorporate USEPA comments 	SAP(s), as completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft SAP submitted to USEPA by Nov 2010 • Final SAP submitted by to USEPA by Dec 2010
Hazardous Materials Assessment	Hazardous Materials Assessment Report	Dec 2010 – Feb 2011
Phase II ESA	Phase II ESA Report	Dec 2010 – Mar 2011
Update ACRES Database	Online Property profile form	After completion of the Phase II ESA and Hazardous Materials Assessment

TASK 4: Cleanup Planning

After completion of the Phase II ESA, the QEC will work with the City, community partners, and potential developers to formulate a liability management plan, prepare cleanup plans to support inclusion of the property into Ohio’s VAP, and develop site use strategies that support redevelopment efforts and improve the health of nearby residents and the environment. After completion of initial assessment activities, additional safe use or remedial investigations may be needed to further define the nature and extent of contamination and design environmental response actions for cleanup and safe future use of the site. The following are examples of documents the City may have their QEC prepare to support cleanup planning and additional funding for cleanup activities: Remedial Action Plan (RAP), Risk Assessment (RA), Clean Ohio Assessment Fund (COAF) grant application, Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF) grant application, etc. Summaries of the anticipated activities, deliverables, and schedules are presented on the following table.

Activities	Deliverables	To Be Completed By:
Meetings to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss possible redevelopment strategies • Gather community input • Meet with potential developers 	Meeting minutes	On as needed basis throughout CA cycle.
Cleanup Planning Documents	RAP, RA, COAF grant application, CORF grant application, or other cleanup documents as necessary	After completion of Phase II ESA and hazardous materials assessment.

V. Project Quality Assurance

Prior to undertaking the Phase II ESA and the hazardous materials assessment, the City will have their retained QEC prepare and submit a QAPP to the USEPA that meets their approval. The QAPP will describe the sampling and analytical strategies and procedures that will be used in all environmental data collection, analyses, and evaluation. The QAPP will be prepared by the QEC and submitted and approved by the USEPA prior to performing any field sampling activities.

VI. Project Manager Profile

Mr. William Gosciwski, P.E., Director of Public Works, who has over 25 years of project management experience, including the management of environmental consultants and contractors, will manage this Assessment Grant project. Mr. Gosciwski has several years experience in environmental stewardship and remediation. In his role as Director, Mr. Gosciwski has managed annual operations budgets of \$2,700,000 and combined capital projects of over \$10,000,000 per fiscal year.

Mr. Gosciwski received his BSME from Ohio Northern University in 1971 and became registered as a Professional Engineer in Ohio in July of 1976. Since September 1997, he has worked for the City of Sidney as its Public Works Director. He was responsible for managing all activities for Engineering, Streets, Traffic, Capital Improvement Projects, Contracts, Cemetery, Urban Forestry and Utilities Divisions. He directed individuals responsible for grant applications from agencies such as ODOT, OPWC, ODNR, etc. He has managed projects with approved grant funding over \$3 million.

Prior to 1997, Mr. Gosciwski worked in private industry, including 23 years with Stolle Corporation (past Division of ALCOA) as Central Engineering Manager, Environmental Manager and various technical supervisory positions for the company. Environmental responsibilities included daily environmental operations at two divisions, along with initial involvement and documentation required for an OEPA “clean closure” approval of a RCRA landfill and independent surface impoundment.

VII. Budget

The total CA funding is \$185,000 (plus \$9,000 in-kind City services).

	Task 1 Programmatic Activities	Task 2 Community Outreach	Task 3 Site Assessments	Task 4 Cleanup Planning	Total Grant Budget
Personnel					
Fringe Benefits					
Travel	\$3,000				\$3,000
Equipment*					
Supplies					
Contractual		\$1,500	\$172,000	\$8,500	\$182,000
Other (in-kind)	\$3,000	\$6,000			\$9,000
Total	\$6,000	\$7,500	\$172,000	\$8,500	\$194,000

* USEPA defines equipment as items that cost \$5,000 or more. Items costing less than \$5,000 are considered supplies.

VIII. Budget Summary

The Site-specific Hazardous Substance Assessment CA award is for \$185,000. The budget is summarized by task and budget category in Section V. Additional detail for the budget categories are provided below.

Task 1: Programmatic Activities

The City will provide in-kind staff resources associated with the majority of the programmatic costs, including coordinating and conducting operational meetings and other activities associated with grant assessment functions. These in-kind services are estimated to be valued at \$3,000.

The Assessment Grant proposal budget includes travel costs of \$3,000 for the grant manager to travel to two USEPA Brownfields Conferences (~\$1,500 per year). Estimated detailed costs per trip would include \$500 flight cost, \$150 per day motel stay (3 days), \$70 per day meals (3 days) and \$350 registration).

The City will not use Assessment Grant funds to support costs associated with administrative functions such as salaries and benefits.

Task 2: Community Involvement and Outreach

The City anticipates community outreach contractual costs of approximately \$1,500 for coordinating and conducting community involvement, outreach programs and meetings. The City will also provide \$1,000 of in-kind value for costs of preparing, printing, and mailing/distributing project and site information and marketing pamphlets, documents, etc. and in-kind additional staff labor, estimated to be valued at \$5,000, needed to conduct environmental outreach meetings, draft press releases, update the City website as new information is generated, and other activities to complete the community outreach programs.

Task 3: Site Assessment

The City anticipates site assessment contractual costs of approximately \$172,000. These costs are based on conducting an ASTM Standard E1527-05 and the Ohio VAP certified Phase I ESA at \$15,000, preparing a QAPP at \$4,000; preparing a HASP at \$1,500, preparing SAPs at \$5,000, conducting a Phase II ESA at \$110,500, and conducting a hazardous materials assessment of the buildings on the site at \$36,000.

The estimated \$110,500 cost for the Phase II ESA is based on 10 days of field activities with drill rig/direct push boring services at \$1,800 per day; environmental consultant field services and management at \$1,200 per day; installation of 15 groundwater sampling wells at \$1,000; installation of 10 soil vapor monitoring points at \$500 each; analysis of 80 soil and/or groundwater samples for USEPA target compound list metals, volatile and semi-volatile organic compounds, and polychlorinated biphenyls at \$600 per sample; analysis of 10 soil vapor samples for volatile organic compounds at \$100 per sample and analytical data review, report preparation, and consulting services at \$11,500.

The estimated \$36,000 cost for the hazardous materials assessment is based on 15 days of environmental consultant field services and management at \$1,600 per day; 500 asbestos analyses at \$10 per sample; 50 lead analyses at \$10 per sample; and analytical data review, report preparation, and consulting services at \$6,500.

Task 4: Cleanup Planning

The City anticipates cleanup planning contractual costs of \$8,500. This budget will be used for cleanup planning meetings, investigating additional funding sources, and preparing cleanup planning documents. These may include a RAP, RA, COAF grant application, CORF grant application, or other cleanup documents.

The estimated \$8,500 cost for cleanup planning is based on 2 cleanup planning meetings with the OEPA at \$500 per meeting; cleanup planning consulting at approximately \$1,500 (approximately 10 hours at \$150 per hour); and the preparation of cleanup planning documents. The specific cleanup planning document will depend on the results of the Phase II ESA. At this time, the budget is based on preparing a RA or RAP at \$6,000.