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Executive Summary

Brownfield and abandoned sites can be a drain on county and municipal governments from both an economic and environmental standpoint, but the benefits of redeveloping these properties is also of immense importance to address public health and aesthetic improvements, and potentially provide new local jobs. Federal brownfields funding programs are a key catalyst to starting redevelopment projects. There are resources that can assist county governments in identifying the particular funding program that will work best for their redevelopment project. Additionally, in order to maintain necessary levels of funding to support brownfield projects in the future, it is also important that county government and key stakeholders support federal legislation that continue and/or increase funding levels that support local brownfields projects.

Introduction

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) defines brownfields as an abandoned or under utilized industrial and commercial facility where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination. Why is it important for counties to redevelop vacant and potentially contaminated properties? And why is it important that federal funding programs for these projects continue especially as more of these sites crop up in unincorporated rural areas?

It is hard to estimate the actual number of under used or abandoned industrial complexes currently. U.S. EPA suggests that there are nearly 450,000 sites nationwide that show evidence of at least some contamination which could trigger regulatory concerns and ultimately inhibit their owners from selling the site, securing financing, or proceeding with reuse. These sites may include properties ranging from obsolete manufacturing complexes to abandoned corner gas stations.

This situation has posed a major challenge for counties seeking to revitalize distressed neighborhoods and attract new investment to sites with prior uses. The problems that typically plague these properties are structural deterioration and environmental contamination. Public officials and private leaders can identify specific properties that have these issues, but often don’t have the background information on the overall extent of the problem. Listings of vacant industrial and commercial space are usually available but they include only properties for sale or lease (not property withdrawn from the market, or simply mothballed) and the list would not pinpoint a property’s economic, social or historic value or if it’s necessarily contaminated.

Federal agencies, state and local governments, development organizations, and private entities are confronting these challenges, and it is clear that the benefits of redeveloping a site to another productive use may far outweigh the obstacles. For example, older structures in urban areas can provide affordable space for new and small enterprises that cannot pay for space in newly constructed suburban business parks or high-rent commercial areas.

Owners and developers are increasingly looking at reusing old factory complexes and abandoned shopping centers since they have the advantage of being located in areas already developed, often close to town centers. The advantages of redevelopment are:

• Helps reduce suburban sprawl. Redevelopment is consistent with the principles of smart growth in that it orients development in areas already served by existing infrastructure, water, sewer, and roads.

• Avoids costly new public investments since it takes advantage of existing infrastructure.

• Reduces the need to move into previously undeveloped areas and the potential for negatively impacting natural resources such as pristine groundwater and wetlands.

• Brownfields are often in areas served by mass transportation, which makes them more accessible to economically disadvantaged persons who may not be able to afford a car.

• Addressing safety or environmental concerns at these sites can also help improve public health concerns of a neighborhood [Note: for a more comprehensive discussion of the public health benefits from the redevelopment of brownfields and abandoned sites, please see the NACo publication “The Redevelopment of Vacant Sites and Protecting Public Health: A Primer for County Officials.”]

“Redeveloping brownfields and underutilized sites is a good way for county officials to reduce traffic growth, water pollution, and can reduce greenhouse air pollution by up to 25%.”

— Brett Hulsey
Dane County, WS
Supervisor, District 4
The purpose of this primer is to:
• Review the history and current status of the federal brownfields law,
• Describe how local governments can best utilize major federal brownfields funding programs, for redevelopment projects, and
• Offer a look at the status some of these funding programs and proposals that impact the future of these programs.

History of Federal Brownfields Law
A key development that provided opportunities for both county and municipal governments to move forward in the redevelopment of vacant/brownfields sites was the passage of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act on January 11, 2002, usually known as the Brownfields Law. The law amended the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund) (please see box) by providing funds to assess and clean-up brownfields; clarified CERCLA liability protections; and provided funds to enhance state and tribal response programs.

The law authorized up to $250 million in funds annually for brownfields project grants, including up to $50 million for the assessment and clean-up of low-risk petroleum contaminated sites. Basically, the law expanded the definition of what was considered a brownfield, so communities could use the funds to clean-up and redevelop sites contaminated with petroleum and lands scarred by mining. Since the signing of the law, annual funding made available for redevelopment of these sites more than doubled. More information on the law is available at www.epa.gov/brownfields/sblrبرا.htm.

CERCLA
The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund) was enacted in 1980, in the wake of several well-publicized environmental disasters. The goal of CERCLA was to clean up the nation’s most contaminated sites including those where parties who caused the contamination were no longer viable or could no longer be held accountable. Under CERCLA, any “potentially responsible party” can be held liable for the costs of cleaning up and restoring a polluted site in an action brought by EPA, the state, or a private party. “Superfund Liability – A Continuing Obstacle to Brownfields Redevelopment”
www.naco.org/Content/ContentGroups/Programs_and_Projects/Environmental1/Land_Use/SuperfundLiability.pdf

Cleanup Effort in Roberto Clemente Park in downtown Lancaster, PA
There are nearly two dozen federal programs that can help communities assess, clean-up and reuse brownfields. Although only a few federal agencies’ programs focus explicitly on brownfields (e.g. the U.S. EPA and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) other federal programs can assist counties in the redevelopment of abandoned sites if they apply some creativity in matching their project objectives to the federal program objectives. The following agencies offer such opportunities:

- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry,
- Appalachian Regional Commission,
- Department of Agriculture - Forest Service,
- Department of Agriculture - Rural Development,
- Department of Commerce - Economic Development Administration,
- Department of Commerce - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,
- Department of Defense - Army Corps of Engineers,
- Department of Defense - Office of Economic Adjustment,
- Department of Energy,
- Department of Health and Human Services,
- Department of Interior - National Park Service,
- Department of Interior - Office of Surface Mining,
- Department of Justice,
- Department of Labor,
- Department of Transportation — Federal Highway Administration,
- Department of Transportation — Federal Transit Administration,
- Environmental Protection Agency,
- Federal Housing Finance Board,
- General Services Administration,
- National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences,
- Office of Community Services, and
- Small Business Administration,

In 1985, the U.S. EPA released the Brownfields Program Guide [www.epa.gov/brownfields/partners/2005_fpg.pdf](www.epa.gov/brownfields/partners/2005_fpg.pdf) which provides a wide range of information about the numerous federal resources that can provide technical and financial assistance and also includes a quick reference matrix that identifies specific types of projects with specific federal funders. While there are many agencies with programs that can be applied to a range of brownfields clean-up and redevelopment settings, this matrix gives an overview of the programs that most closely align with specific clean-up and redevelopment objectives a county may have.

The guidebook recommends that the social, economic and environmental soundness of a redevelopment project be well thought out and planned in advance in order to create a vision for a project. The applicant must integrate the project with existing community and regional projects and think broadly about what sort of program (land use, transportation, education, public health, job creation and training, and/or community and housing development) the clean-up and redevelopment is initiating.

During the application process, it may not be essential to use the word brownfields (as defined earlier) and in some cases it may be advantageous not to use the term. For example, to redevelop a brownfields site that includes a former train station, the county should look first into federal programs that focus on improving transportation infrastructure through the Department of Transportation, or research the historical significance of the station that may be eligible for funds from the National Park Service to restore the structure.

These federal programs are imperative because various issues—enormous clean-up and redevelopment costs—can hinder private investment. These grants can stimulate interest from other technical and financial sectors that can help, for instance, pay for assessments or clean-up costs. When the federal government funds some of these initial costs, revitalization will ultimately be an economic stimulus that contributes tax dollars and other resources back to the community.

Most of these programs integrate federal, state and local government support with private investment. Public grant or loan funds aim to help local governments and private parties address financing concerns and better manage brownfields risks by providing an assortment of benefits such as financial tools which can reduce interest costs on project loans with tax-exempt financing or low-interest loans.

“We have many brownfields sites in our county, most of them small former businesses such as gas stations and dry cleaning establishments. We worked with many key partners in converting these sites to desirable uses, including our federal partners. Without funds from federal grants, these projects would not have happened.

For mountainous counties, it is important to explore ways to redevelop these sites. Many are on relatively flat and buildable land, a premium in the higher elevations.”

— Dr. Patricia Mitchell
Ashe County NC
Director of Economic Development
Case Studies

Case Study 1
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania Saves a Community Asset
Lancaster County Planning Commission (LCPC) combines county policies with federal and state planning responsibilities to support the application of county-wide plans for the future. The revitalization of the 3.5 acre Roberto Clemente Park, in the heart of downtown Lancaster, was one example of the LCPC’s efforts. The project’s goal was to transform this largely underutilized and misused inner-city park into a safe community asset for the surrounding residents, the majority of whom are minority and low-income. Led by the Inner City Group, a community development neighborhood consortium in the City of Lancaster, LCPC joined the effort utilizing their EPA Brownfield Pilot funds to assist in the assessment and clean-up, as well as public outreach. After five years of work, the Park was finally reopened in May of 2005. In addition to a state-of-the-art baseball diamond, the park includes a walking path, giving residents and visitors a safe communal place to play.

“The redevelopment of brownfields and abandoned sites has been a major part of revitalizing the urban core within our county. Grants from the U.S. EPA have been a major catalyst in seeing these projects through.”
— Mary Gattis-Schell
Senior Environmental Planner
Lancaster County, PA
Planning Commission

Case Study 2
Former Factory in Old Town, Maine
A former factory, located on a three-acre waterfront site along the Penobscot River in Old Town, Maine, is undergoing redevelopment activities. In the late 1980s, city officials became interested in acquiring the site for redevelopment as part of ongoing efforts to revitalize the downtown. After identifying landscaping as an important redevelopment need, the City of Old Town applied for and received $8,000 from the Forest Service for tree planting.

Case Study 3
Rainier Court in King County, Washington
The King County/City of Seattle Brownfields Program provides technical and financial assistance to eligible businesses, nonprofit organizations and municipalities in brownfields assessment and clean-up. The program is funded with assessment and clean-up grants from U.S. EPA, and has assisted a number of brownfields projects to move through assessment and clean-up to redevelopment and reuse. One project in particular is the Rainier Court project located in South Seattle. This formerly blighted dump, located in a low-income minority neighborhood, was purchased by SEED, a local nonprofit, to be redeveloped into affordable senior housing with ground level commercial space. The King County/Seattle Brownfields Program facilitated a range of assistance to SEED, including $300,000 in free assessment assistance from EPA Region 10, a $25,000 grant for ground-water sampling, a $25,000 grant for underground storage tank removal and a $440,000 low-interest Brownfields Clean-up Revolving Loan Fund loan. U.S. HUD provided grants and low-interest loans for site acquisition. The project is complete and SEED is continuing with three additional development phases, including affordable family housing and market rate town homes.

Case Study 4
Carver Park Neighborhood in Yuma, Arizona
The historic Carver Park Neighborhood is a 22-block area located in the older part of Yuma, Arizona. The neighborhood has a high rate of unemployment with nearly half of its residents living in poverty. Much of the housing was substandard and for many years Carver Park was severely blighted with few prospects for revitalization. In March 2000, Carver Park was declared a CDBG Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area. Significant housing improvements and additions have been made including: new town homes, rental housing, single-family homes; rehabilitated single-family units; and reconstructed homes. HUD also approved a Section 108 loan guarantee for homeownership activities. As part of the revitalization efforts, the Carver Park neighborhood opened the Dr. Martin L. King Neighborhood Community Center, a safe place for youth to gather. The improvements made in this neighborhood demonstrate grass roots community involvement and impressive leveraging of public and private funds and programs to maximize HUD CDBG funding. To date a total of $27.5 million has been leveraged for neighborhood revitalization from a total HUD investment of $4.1 million.

Case Study 5
Mead Paper Complex in Rumford, Maine
A property selected by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection for redevelopment included a four-story, 66,000-square-foot building that was once part of the Mead Paper complex. Working in partnership with the River Valley Growth Council, Mead realized the site could be reused as a facility to develop work skills and create new jobs for local citizens. The company donated the property and building to the River Valley Growth Council. Approximately $30,000 of the state’s EPA Brownfields grant was used to perform assessments on the property. This $2,000,000 site restoration project is funded by a $1,300,000 public works grant from the Economic Development Administration (EDA), with the Maine Department of Economic and Community Development funding the remainder.
What does the future hold for these federal programs? As stated earlier, there are a number of programs that can help support brownfields redevelopment projects. The National Brownfields Coalition, composed of 18 national groups, including NACo, have been involved for almost 20 years in following current federal legislation that affects technical and financial assistance for brownfields projects and have supported proposals that maintain or increase the level of resources that are available to support locally based brownfields redevelopment efforts. Major funding programs are:

**U.S. EPA**
- Brownfields Project Grants (Assessment and Clean-up),
- Brownfields Categorical Grants (directly to State and Tribes),
- Brownfields Environmental Program and Management (covers program and administrative costs), and
- Brownfields Funding Provided Through the Clean Water Act
  
  Contact: Megan Quinn, 202-566-2773
  
  Quinn.Megan@epa.gov

**U.S. Agency for Housing and Urban Development (HUD)**
- Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI), and
- HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program.
  
  Contact: David Kaminsky, 202-708-3484
  
  david_kaminsky@hud.gov

**The Economic Development Administration (EDA)**
- No specific brownfields funding program but usually included in programs dedicated to planning and public works and infrastructure improvements.
  
  Overall, EDA’s goal in brownfields redevelopment is to create value by returning non-productive, blighted and/or formerly contaminated real estate to local tax rolls while creating opportunities for capital investment and job creation. EDA is a long-standing partner with the U.S. EPA on brownfields redevelopment. Generally, the U.S. EPA focuses on the “front-end” or environmental aspects while EDA targets the “back-end” or real estate development components of transactions.
  
  Contact David R. Ives, AICP, 202-482-2900
  
  dives@eda.doc.gov

The president’s Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) budget proposal calls for level funding of $165.8 million for the U.S. EPA Brownfields Program. However, several other programs that are often used for brownfields-related assistance are proposed for cuts or are zeroed out. These include:

- No funds for HUD 108,
- No Funds for the HUD Brownfields Economic Development Initiative,
- Cut of $145 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) of the Clean Water Act, and
- Cut of funding at nearly $147 million for EDA.

The Role of the U.S. EPA Brownfields Project Grants (Assessment and Clean-up Cooperative Agreement Program) in Brownfields Redevelopment

EPA accepts applications for the grants and determines which ones to fund on a competitive basis.

**Brownfields Project Assessment Grants**

The U.S. EPA typically provides up to $200,000 each on a competitive basis to local governments, states, tribes, and such entities as redevelopment agencies, regional councils, and land clearance agencies to fund a variety of pre-cleanup activities needed to spur redevelopment for brownfields. Primary activities include site assessment, identification, characterization, and response; clean-up planning and design; and community outreach for education and planning.

**Brownfields Project Clean-up Grants**

The U.S. EPA typically provides up to $200,000 each to fund clean-up at brownfields sites owned by the recipient of a grant. Eligible recipients for clean-up grants include nonprofit organizations, as well as the governments and entities eligible for site assessment grants.

The president’s Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) budget proposal calls for level funding of $165.8 million for the U.S.
Since 1995, the U.S. EPA has invested approximately $1.3 billion in brownfields site assessment and clean-up leveraging $8.8 billion in clean-up and redevelopment dollars, a more than six-to-one return on public investment. The U.S. EPA has estimated that its brownfields programs have resulted in the assessment of more than 9,100 properties and helped to create more than 41,000 new jobs nationwide.

**The U.S. EPA’s Clean Water SRF program**

Another key funding opportunity for brownfields redevelopment is the U.S. EPA’s Clean Water SRF Program. U.S. EPA awards annual loan-fund capitalization grants to provide a long-term source of state financing for the construction of publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities, for the implementation of non-point water quality management activities, and for the development and implementation of estuary comprehensive conservation and management plans.

States are allotted funds determined by formula shares included in the Clean Water Act. States are required to provide a 20-percent match for each federal grant payment. In 2005, communities borrowed $4.9 billion in below-market loans from Clean Water SRFs. The program has provided more than $55 billion in financing since its inception.

Many states also use the SRF program to provide loans to clean-up brownfields properties. Brownfields clean-ups are eligible, provided that the clean-up contributes to water quality objectives and that the state list brownfields clean-ups in the state’s “Intended Use Plan.”

**Current Proposals for Programs**

On February 11, 2008 the FY09 budget request contained $7.1 billion in discretionary spending for the U.S. EPA, a $1.3 billion decline in discretionary spending since FY04. The request contained a total of $165.7 million for the three brownfields accounts, which is slightly under the current appropriation of $168.3 million. The Omnibus Appropriations Measure, proposed on January 16, 2008, contained $168.3 million for brownfields activities, which is $3.3 million over the FY 2007 level.

The budget request also reduced State and Tribal Assistance Grants from $2.9 billion to $2.6 billion. The Clean Water SRF was targeted for reduction: $555 million for the program, a cut of $145 million and nearly $800 million below the FY04 level of $1.35 billion. www.nado.org/legaffair/issupdate/brfndfield.php

H.R. 5336 was introduced by Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) and Representative James L. Oberstar (D-MN) on February 12, 2008. The bill makes three changes to the U.S. EPA Brownfields Program:

- Raises the authorization level for the site assessment and clean-up program from $200 million to $350 million;
- Eliminates the set-aside of 25% of assessment and clean-up for petroleum sites;
- Adds a ranking criterion to favor projects that “implement green building standards, including the use of energy efficient building standards.”

Waterfront Brownfields Pilots – H.R. 5469 has been introduced by Representative Louise M. Slaughter (D-NY). The $20 million pilot program would assist localities and other eligible entities with up to $500,000 to assess and clean-up waterfront brownfields. The bill would also establish an interagency taskforce on waterfront brownfields restoration to identify barriers and potential solutions to waterfront brownfields revitalization, and seek methods for federal interagency collaboration on such projects. www.nemw.org/BrownfieldsLegislativeUpdateApril08.pdf

The National Brownfields Coalition put together a comprehensive proposal to reauthorize the U.S. Brownfields Program. The 22 recommendations have been circulated with key congressional staff, as well as with other stakeholders. Some of the key proposals are: increase clean-up grant ceiling to $1 million per site; establish multi-purpose brownfields grants; pilot grants for sustainable reuse of brownfields sites; clarify that publicly-owned sites acquired before 2002 are eligible; allow nonprofits to be eligible for assessment and revolving loan fund grants; and encourage local and state governments to address mothballed sites by clarifying liability for state and local government. More information is available at www.nemw.org/Brownfields_Reauthorization_summary_9-07.pdf.

**The Role of HUD Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) and Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program in Brownfields Redevelopment**

The Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) is a key competitive grant program that HUD administers to stimulate and promote economic and community development. BEDI is designed to assist lo-
Current Proposals for HUD Programs

The president’s FY09 budget proposal requests no funding for the BEDI program. In Congress, potential changes to the HUD BEDI program include a proposed bill (H.R.644) to separate the BEDI program from HUD 108. This would allow BEDI grants to be used for more brownfields clean-up and development efforts and this would increase their use by local governments.

This bill passed the House in February, 2007, but it has not passed through the Senate. The National Brownfields Coalition is working to submit changes to the bill in the Senate, because the House version includes language that the coalition believes could become a barrier to using CDBG and BEDI funds if these funds result in reducing financial responsibility of the party responsible for the contamination (the polluter). This may apply even if the CDBG funds are used to acquire a site owned by a non-polluting party.

[www.nemw.org/BrownfieldsLegislativeUpdateApril08.pdf]

EDA’s Role in Brownfields Redevelopment

Within its broad mission to lead the federal economic development agenda by promoting innovation, competitiveness, and regionalism, EDA encourages market-driven brownfields reuse through its strategic grant investments. EDA investments range from planning and technical assistance to infrastructure development. Project examples include feasibility studies, revolving loan fund capitalization, infrastructure construction, and the development of brownfields inventories. As with most brownfields transactions, EDA’s successful involvement is dependent on the active participation of multiple partners, particularly the private sector. (Please see box for types of investment and investment guidelines).

In the last six years, EDA has invested approximately $225 million in more than 200 brownfields redevelopment projects. The average investment during this period was roughly $1.1 million. In FY06 alone, EDA invested more than $40 million in 27 brownfields-related efforts (average investment, $1.5 million). Since 2001, EDA investments in brownfields projects have helped community economic development activities in over 40 states and 150 communities. Investment recipients estimate that these brownfields projects will generate almost $6 billion in private investment and will create or retain over 100,000 jobs. Approximately 29 percent of the investments were made in rural communities.

[www.eda.gov/InvestmentsGrants/Investments.xml]
Current Proposals for EDA Programs
As of March 18, 2008, the administration’s FY09 budget request for the Department of Commerce provided funding for EDA at $132.8 million, a cut of nearly $147 million. The reduction comes primarily from a cut of $141 million to $7 million in the Public Works account. Funding for Planning would remain at $27 million, Technical Assistance would remain at $9 million, and Economic Adjustment would be reduced to $40 million ($2.3 million under FY08 funding).

On March 14, 61 members of the House of Representatives signed a letter urging leaders of the House, Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations Subcommittee to provide no less than level funding of $280 million for the EDA in its FY09 spending bill. The “Dear Colleague” letter was sponsored by Representatives Mike McIntyre (D-NC) and Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV).

Under the Omnibus Appropriations bill proposed a few months ago, near level funding of $280 million is to be provided for the EDA. Funding for some of the EDA programs included $148.05 million for Public Works ($12 million below current funding), $42.3 million for Economic Adjustment ($2.5 million below the FY 2007 level), $25.3 million for Planning (a cut of nearly $1.6 million), $9.4 million for Technical Assistance (an increase of $1 million).

www.nado.org/legaffair/issupdate/eda.php#reduced

Other Key Federal Program
Section 198 Brownfields Expensing Program
An additional program of interest to local brownfields re-development projects is Section 198. Section 198 of the IRS tax code makes clean-up expenditures deductible in the year that the expenses were incurred. This approach, originally adopted in the Community Renewal Act of 2000 treats clean-up of hazardous substances as a “repair” to the land, rather than a “capital expenditure” which must be depreciated over time. In other words, the expensing incentive allows developers to deduct clean-up costs in the year incurred as a repair rather than expensing the expenditures over 15 years as a depreciating capital cost.

www.epa.gov/swerosps/hf/brownfield_tax_incentive_fact%20Sheet%201-31-07%20Final.pdf

The president’s budget proposes making the brownfields expensing incentive (Section 198 deduction) a permanent incentive. H.R. 1753, sponsored by Representative Jerry Weller (D-IL), proposes to make the incentive permanent as well, along with eliminating the “recapture provision” (which requires the recapture of the deduction when the property is sold). The National Brownfields Coalition supports the Weller proposal.

Representative Michael Turner (R-OH) and Representative Stephanie Tubbs Jones (D-OH) have also co-sponsored a bill to establish a brownfields tax credit. H.R. 3080 would establish an income tax credit for up to 50% of qualified remediation expenditures. There would be a $1 billion cap on the program and credits would be distributed to states proportionately to population.

www.nemw.org/BrownfieldsLegislativeUpdateApril08.pdf

EDA

- Investments Types
  - Public Works
  - Economic Adjustment
  - Research and National Technical Assistance
  - Local Technical Assistance
  - Partnership Planning
  - Trade Adjustment Assistance

- Investment Guidelines
- Investment proposals are competitively evaluated on the following criteria:
  - Are market-based, results driven and have strong organizational leadership
  - Process is regionally-driven in order to advance regional competitiveness, innovation and entrepreneurship
  - Proposals must be based on a locally developed comprehensive economic development strategy
  - Eligible applicants must be a state, a political subdivision of a state, district organization, Indian tribe, institution of higher education, or a non-profit acting in coordination with a political subdivision of a state
  - Certain economic distress criteria must be met
  - Cost sharing or matching is required to demonstrate a high degree of commitment (i.e., additional public/private support)

Roberto Clemente, Jr. cutting the ribbon of Roberto Clemente Park; May 2005

Roberto Clemente, Jr. cutting the ribbon of Roberto Clemente Park; May 2005
Conclusion

The benefits of redeveloping brownfields and vacant sites are of immense importance to counties. These abandoned properties have posed a major challenge for counties and localities seeking to revitalize distressed neighborhoods and attract new investment to sites with prior uses. The problems that typically plague these sites are structural deterioration and environmental contamination. Several federal programs can assist county governments in moving these redevelopment projects forward and there are various resources that can help them identify the funding program that will work best for its program. County government and key stakeholders can track federal legislative developments and work with state and congressional delegations to help maintain funding of these vital federal programs.

Tools and Resources

- **NACo Land Reuse and Revitalization Project**
  www.naco.org/techassistance
  under…..Land Use

- **NACo Policy**
  www.naco.org/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm?ContentID=26289
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- **U.S. EPA Brownfields Website**
  www.epa.gov/brownfields/index.html

- **U.S. EPA Grants and Funding**
  www.epa.gov/brownfields/pilot.htm

- **Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act**
  www.epa.gov/brownfields/sblbra.htm

- **U.S. HUD Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI)**
  www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/economicdevelopment/programs/bedi/index.cfm

- **EDA Funding Opportunities**
  www.eda.gov/InvestmentsGrants/Investments.xml

- **National Association of Local Government Environmental Professionals Brownfields Revitalization**
  www.nalgep.org/issues/brownfields/

- **National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) Brownfields Awareness Project**
  www.nado.org/rf/innocenters/brown.php

- **NADO Legislative Issue Updates**
  www.nado.org/legaffair/issueupdates.php

- **The U.S. EPA Brownfields Program Guide**

- **Northeast-Midwest Institute Brownfields Program**
  www.nemw.org/brownfields.htm

- **Northeast-Midwest Institute Brownfields Legislative Update**
  www.nemw.org/BrownfieldsLegislativeUpdateApril08.pdf

- **“Recycling America’s Brownfields Act” - From the National Brownfields Coalition**