RE: FY2022 USEPA Brownfields Community-Wide Assessment Grant Application

Prairie Hills Resource Conservation and Development, Inc. (Prairie Hills) is pleased to submit this proposal for FY2022 Brownfields Assessment Grant funding. Requested information is provided below.


2. Federal Funds Requested
   a. Assessment Grant Type: Community Wide
   b. Federal Funds Requested: $500,000
   c. Site Specific Waiver: Not applicable

3. Location: Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough, and Warren Counties, Illinois with Target Areas and/or Priority Sites in the cities of Canton, Galesburg, Macomb, and Monmouth

4. Target Area and Priority Site/Property Information
   a. Target Areas (TAs) and Census Tracts (CTs): The South Canton TA includes portions of Fulton County, IL (CTs 9534, 9535, and 9536); the South Galesburg TA includes portions of Knox County, IL (CTs 8, 9, 10, and 11); the West Central Macomb TA includes portions of McDonough County, IL (CTs 104 and 105); the Southwest Monmouth TA includes portions of Warren County, IL (CT 8705).
   b. Addresses for Priority Sites: Former International Harvester Plant site (260 E. Elm St., Canton, IL 61520); 1309 Grand Avenue site (1309 Grand Ave., Galesburg, IL 61401); Former Haeger Pottery site (411 W. Calhoun St., Macomb, IL 61455; Former Monmouth Plow Co. property (620-632 S. Main St., Monmouth, IL 61462).

5. Project Contacts

   **Project Director:**
   David P. King, Executive Director
   PHRCD
   321 W. University Drive
   Macomb, IL 61455
   (309) 833-4747
   David.King@prairiehillsrcd.org

   **Chief Executive:**
   Alice Henry, President
   PHRCD
   24 Grandview Drive
   Macomb, IL 61455
   (309) 333-1231
   bobhenry@macomb.com
Prairie Hills Resource Conservation & Development, Inc. (Prairie Hills) is a regional economic development and conservation organization, established in 1976, with a six county “jurisdictional area” in west central Illinois that includes Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough, and Warren counties. This jurisdictional area covers 3,945 square miles of land and has a population of 158,017. We are a high-performing current USEPA brownfields assessment grantee, having just completed implementation of a $600,000 USEPA Coalition Assessment Grant awarded in FY2018. The initial grant was used to support a coalition that included four of our counties (Fulton, Knox, McDonough, and Warren) and two of our four largest cities (Macomb and Monmouth) as formal coalition members. However, funding was made available to communities throughout the six-county area, which contains 68 incorporated cities and villages – all but three of which have populations <10,000 residents.

Although coalition grants are not being offered as part of the FY2022 grant competition, we plan to continue the coalition approach used on the FY2018 grant if awarded new funding. One key outcome from the initial grant was recognition by representatives on our Brownfields Advisory Committee of the need for a long-term program to revitalize and redevelop brownfields and build on the collaborative approach established through the FY2018 grant project. To implement this vision, Prairie Hills is in the initial stages of efforts to establish and lead a regional land bank to support this effort and through which additional legal and financial tools will be available to address tax delinquent brownfields that are currently enmeshed in a dysfunctional tax deed sale process. FY2022 funding will be used to further build our program as we work towards establishing the land bank, and which we anticipate will become the first multi-county entity of this type in Illinois with a specific focus on brownfields revitalization.

Redevelopment challenges within our region are immense due to the small size and declining populations of our region, the long-term declines in our major industries, the distance and relative isolation of our region from major metropolitan areas, and the extremely weak financial condition of the State of Illinois. Despite these challenges, we had significant successes with our initial (FY2018) USEPA Assessment Grant, with over 60 parcels identified/prioritized; eligibility confirmed, and access secured for 35 sites; and site-specific assessment or reuse planning activities completed at 31 sites, in a total of 8 cities, and within 5 of our 6 counties. Anticipated outcomes are being achieved. For example, in Canton, a $2.5 million Arby’s restaurant construction is planned for the Spring of 2022 on a former gas station site that closed in the 1960s. In addition, the City of Canton purchased two parcels that were part of a remediated former manufactured gas plant site and a former bulk fuel depot. Both sites are currently being used by the City as public works facilities. In Galesburg, a grocery store (and LUST site) vacant/unoccupied and for sale for 12 years, was sold and is being redeveloped as a storage
facility. In Macomb, the owner of a major pottery complex closed since 2004 participated in a reuse planning study and subsequently self-funded abatement and demolition of the complex in 2020. The owner is actively collaborating with the City of Macomb to create a new city park in fulfillment of the reuse plans. In Monmouth, the city acquired a vacant and partially collapsed former dairy building, demolished the building with $70,000 provided by a local foundation, and redeveloped the site for parking and greenspace for the downtown library. Also in Monmouth, a former boat factory vacant and for sale since 2006 was sold to a local entrepreneur. In the City of Carthage, a former classroom building is being demolished to construct expanded facilities for a regional theatre, in fulfillment of a reuse plan developed using USEPA funds.

We look forward to continuing these successes and the highly effective regional collaboration approach used for the initial grant.

7. Other Factors Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Factors</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community population is 10,000 or less.</td>
<td>See narrative p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is, or will assist, a federally recognized Indian tribe or United States territory.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priority site(s) is impacted by mine-scarred land.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priority site(s) is adjacent to a body of water (i.e., the border of the priority site(s) is contiguous or partially contiguous to the body of water, or would be contiguous or partially contiguous with a body of water but for a street, road, or other public thoroughfare separating them).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priority site(s) is on a federally designated flood plain.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy; or will incorporate energy efficiency measures.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reuse of the priority site(s) will incorporate energy efficiency measures.</td>
<td>See narrative p. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or more of the overall project budget will be spent on eligible reuse/area-wide planning activities, as described in Section I.A, for priority brownfield site(s) within the target area.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The target area(s) is located within a community in which a coal-fired power plant has recently closed (2011 or later) or is closing.</td>
<td>See narrative p. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = Not applicable

8. Letter from the State or Tribal Environmental Authority: A letter of acknowledgement from the Illinois EPA is attached.

9. Releasing Copies of Applications: The application does not contain confidential, privileged, or sensitive information.
November 18, 2021

Prairie Hills Resource Conservation
Attn: David King
321 W. University Drive
Monmouth, IL 61455

Dear Mr. King,

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Illinois EPA) has received your request for a letter of acknowledgement for an upcoming Community-Wide Assessment application to the US EPA. Prairie Hills Resource Conservation & Development, Inc. is applying for a $500,000 Community-Wide Assessment Grant.

The grant will be a Community-Wide Assessment Grant for Petroleum and Hazardous Substances.

Illinois EPA acknowledges Prairie Hills Resource Conservation & Development, Inc. efforts to obtain federal Brownfields funds for this project. If you have any questions, I may be contacted at the above address or telephone number, or at Jenessa.N.Conner@illinois.gov.

Sincerely,

Jenessa Conner
Jenessa Conner, Project Manager
Voluntary Site Remediation Unit
Remedial Project Management Section
Division of Remediation Management
Bureau of Land
1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION & PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION

1.a. Target Area & Brownfields 1.a.i. Background & Description of Target Area: Prairie Hills Resource Conservation & Development, Inc. (Prairie Hills) is a regional non-profit economic development and conservation organization, established in 1976, that serves a 3,945-square mile area in western Illinois that includes 6 counties (Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough, and Warren) as well as 68 cities and villages—all but 3 of which (Galesburg, Macomb, and Canton) have populations under 10,000 residents. Nutrient-rich silt overlying shallow bedrock with thick coal seams gave rise to the initial dominant economic drivers of the region: agriculture and coal mining. After World War II (WWII), the United States (US) farm industry saw an explosion in production driven by new farming technology. Nearby large cities, including Moline (home to John Deere), Peoria (Caterpillar) and Chicago (International Harvester), served as farm equipment manufacturing hubs with many smaller manufacturing facilities located within the Prairie Hills region (including two of our priority sites). However, by the end of the 1970s, several crises ended the post-WWII growth period and brought new economic and social challenges to the region. The net result to the region has been a combined loss of over 16,000 jobs in agriculture, mining, and manufacturing since 1980 and a 16% decline in population.

The decline in coal mining industry has been absolute. By 1992, the region was down to only 4 active coal mines which employed fewer than 240 combined workers. In 2012, the last coal mine closed, and in December 2019, the last coal-burning power plant in the region also closed leaving behind 2 large coal ash impoundments1. However, the legacy of coal mining remains with 1,069 known abandoned or inactive mine sites and 114 square miles of land permanently scarred by strip mining. The decline in manufacturing is more recent, with manufacturing jobs in the 6-county area dropping from 19,582 in 1980 to 9,400 in 2018.

Target Area Descriptions: US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) community wide assessment (CWA) grant funding will be used to continue a successful brownfields program launched and initially funded through a Fiscal Year 2018 CWA grant awarded to Prairie Hills. Approximately 50% of the FY2022 grant funding will be allocated to projects in 4 target areas (TAs) located in the region’s 4 largest cities: 1) the South Canton TA in Canton, 2) the South Galesburg TA in Galesburg, 3) the West Central Macomb TA in Macomb, and 4) the Southwest (SW) Monmouth TA in Monmouth. The FY2018 grant focused on these same TAs which are all older commercial/industrial areas within or adjacent to the historic downtowns, each of which contains dozens of brownfields. Each TA has been the focus of recent planning projects, and all have a variety of funding mechanisms in place (tax incremental finance [TIF] districts, Enterprise Zones [EZs], Opportunity Zones [OZs], and/or loan programs) that can be leveraged to advance cleanup and redevelopment of brownfield sites targeted for assessment. In addition, the US Census Tracts (CTs) and Block Groups (BGs) within the TAs all have higher percentages of residents who are minorities and/or poor. Advancing redevelopment projects in the 4 TAs will not only benefit the residents in the region who are subject to the greatest environmental justice (EJ) concerns (and most in need of jobs, services, and public amenities that can be developed on brownfield sites), but residents throughout the region for which these cities serve as key employment and services hubs. The other 50% of grant funding will be focused on sites in the 64 smaller communities, all of which lack the financial, technical, and/or administrative resources to effectively spur the redevelopment of brownfield sites. This dual focus is a key strategy for leveraging the greatest positive impacts from the grant for both large and small communities throughout the region.

1.a.ii. Description of Priority Brownfield Site(s): Based on an initial inventory completed for the FY2018 grant several thousand brownfields are present in the 6-county area, including at least 1,069 former mine sites, over 1,000 former gas stations, an estimated 100-150 former schools, and 100 or more former industrial facilities. The types of sites prioritized for the FY2022 grant are expected to be similar in number/type to the sites nominated for FY2018 grant funding which included 15 dilapidated buildings (former restaurants, stores, dry cleaners, theaters, and hotels), 12 auto related sites (i.e., former gas stations, auto repair shops, or auto dealerships), 6 former manufacturing facilities, and 5 former public facilities (i.e., schools, a fire station, and a jail). Over 40 of these previously nominated sites have unmet assessment or reuse planning needs that could be addressed through the FY2022 grant. Details for 4 priority sites are provided below.

Former International Harvester (IH) Plant (260 E. Elm St., Canton, Fulton Co.): This 33-acre former manufacturing/assembly plant site is the largest brownfield in the South Canton TA. The plant manufactured farm implements and equipment from 1850 to 1983, when it closed eliminating nearly 3,000 jobs. Most of the complex was destroyed by an arson fire in 1997. Over the past 23 years, the city has expended over $6 million (M) on assessment, demolition, and cleanup, which has resulted in the successful redevelopment of the eastern portion of the site for a medical equipment manufacturer. However, the western 11-acres remains vacant with residual contaminants that include solvents, petroleum, lead, and other metals. It is anticipated that the final remedial activity required for closure (an engineered cap) can be most cost effectively implemented in conjunction with a redevelopment project. Two proposals have been made for senior housing developments, but neither advanced due to brownfields issues.

1309 Grand Avenue (Galesburg, Knox Co.): This 1.1-acre site, located in the South Galesburg TA, includes 4 parcels that have been vacant since at least 2005. The west parcel is a former gas station and leaking underground storage tank (UST) site that operated from the 1950s through 1999, when 4 USTs were removed. Remedial investigations and cleanup activities were completed during 2000-07, with the building demolished in 2005, and a No Further Remediation letter issued by Illinois EPA (IEPA) in 2008. The other parcels were historically occupied by residences but have been vacant lots for 30 or more years. Suspected contaminants include residual lead and petroleum impacts at the former gas station and potential asbestos and lead based paint in soil from former site buildings. The site is one of 4 sites identified in the City’s 2019 Comprehensive Plan update as a priority redevelopment site within the “Grand Avenue” planning subarea and includes 250 feet of frontage on US Highway 150. The already fully vacant

1 Duck Creek Power Station in Canton, IL.
site has the potential to serve as an initial catalyst site for desired new commercial, residential, and mixed-used development along this corridor. CWA grant funding will be used to complete Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) and cleanup and reuse planning.

**Former Haeger Pottery (411 W. Calhoun St., Macomb, McDonough Co.):** This 3.9-acre site, located within the West Central Macomb TA, was a major pottery complex that operated for 120 years until closing in 2004. It is located adjacent to a residential neighborhood near the Western Illinois University (WIU) campus. Documented environmental concerns include arsenic, lead, and petroleum contamination in soil and groundwater. After years of inaction, in 2020-21, the owner demolished the buildings and participated in a reuse planning study for the site funded by the FY2018 CWA grant. The owner is currently conducting additional assessment activities, and reportedly will conduct cleanup necessary to secure closure from the IEPA, with a stated goal of eventually donating the site to the city for development of a “Haeger Memorial Park.” The site is a priority for the City due to its large size, blighted condition, prominent location at a gateway to the WIU campus, and potential to be converted to a major community asset. EPA funding will be used to conduct future due diligence that will be required by the City as condition for acceptance of the site as a donation, as well as to prepare refined reuse plans that will be needed for redevelopment as a park.

**Former Monmouth Plow Co. Property (620-634 S. Main St., Monmouth, Warren Co.):** This 6.5-acre, 6 parcel site is located within the SW Monmouth TA. Industrial site use dates back to at least 1871, when the Weir Plow Works began operations. By 1892, nearly the entire site was occupied by a 15-building manufacturing complex. A major fire reportedly occurred in 1895 destroying many of the buildings. In 1902, the Monmouth Plow Co. constructed a new 1- to 3-story brick factory in the northern portion of the site, followed in 1915 by a 4-story brick office/warehouse. These multi-story brick buildings with an estimated combined floor area of 77,000 square foot (SF) are still present at the site. The southern portion of the site contains several 1-story metal storage buildings with a combined floor area of ~44,000 SF. The SE corner of the property contains a small (1,225 SF) former gas station and auto repair shop, that operated from at least the 1970s, and which was reported in 2000 to have a release from a 550-gallon waste oil UST, but for which no other records are on file. Use of the site for manufacturing purposes ended at least 50 years ago, and the site has since been used primarily for storage and for office space. Potential environmental concerns include regulatory building materials (RBMs) in the buildings, petroleum impacts associated with the former gas station, and arsenic, lead, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, total petroleum hydrocarbons, and other contaminants associated with the former plow works. The site is a priority due to its large size, prominent location (at the south entrance to downtown Monmouth), and the significant reuse potential of the historic multi-story brick buildings.

### 1.b. Revitalization of the Target Area 1.b.i. Reuse Strategy & Alignment with Revitalization Plans

The reuse strategy or specific plans for the 4 priority sites are summarized on the table below.

| Former IH Plant Site | It is desired for the western portion of the site to be redeveloped for a retirement or assisted living facility consistent with a recent (2017) development proposal. The development will advance a key land use objective in the Canton Comprehensive Plan (2008, p. 34) to “encourage infill residential development on vacant properties and redevelopment of underutilized or rundown properties to integrate new housing into existing neighborhoods.” The project, combined with past development on the eastern portion of the site, will support goals in the Central Canton Redevelopment Plan (2005) to redevelop this specific site as a mixed-use district. |
| 1309 Grand Avenue | This site is identified as the “Locust and Grand” redevelopment site on pages 106-107 of the January 2019 Galesburg Comprehensive Plan, with a stated redevelopment goal to “consolidate the 4 vacant lots at the corner of Haynor and Locust Streets and Grand Avenue and develop them as a larger multifamily building to help support the new commercial uses.” The site could likely accommodate a 20-25 unit building (assuming a 3-story apartment building), and thereby address a community need for healthy (i.e., “lead-free”) new housing. |
| Former Haeger Pottery Factory | 5 reuse options for the site were evaluated as part of an initial reuse study completed in 2021. The preferred park alternative includes a food truck court, a large open central lawn area, perimeter walking paths with a playground and art displays, a parking lot, and buffers along the railroad right of way to the south and private residences to the northeast. Use as a park is compatible with the anticipated need to construct an engineered cap across much of the property, and is also consistent the Macomb Comprehensive Plan (2007) as well as a Special Area Plan for the W. Jackson St. Corridor. |
| Former Monmouth Plow Co. | The 3- and 5-story brick buildings that front on Main Street are prime candidates for renovation and adaptive reuse. At least 4 acres of the property are vacant and suitable for a number of commercial or light-industrial uses. The project will advance key economic development goals in the City of Monmouth Comprehensive Plan2 (p. 25) to “expand industrial development” and to “diversify its industrial base” as well as land use goals of “encouraging development on vacant, undeveloped or underutilized land” and “focusing development in areas where infrastructure currently exists.” |

40 construction jobs over a 15-month period, and 25-50 new jobs. As detailed in Section 1.b.1, cleanup and redevelopment of the former Haeger Pottery would result in the creation of a major new neighborhood park, with amenities that would benefit residents throughout Macomb. All 4 of these projects would take place within the neighborhoods in the 6-county area that have some of the highest levels of economic distress, worst health conditions, and greatest environmental justice challenges. The projects would benefit these residents through enhanced job opportunities, improved access to healthy housing, and/or access to recreational amenities. The new buildings to be developed on the IH Plant Site and 1309 Grand Ave. site will incorporate energy efficiency measures required by the Illinois Energy Efficient Building Act for new commercial and residential buildings construction.

1.c. Strategy for Leveraging Resources 1.c.i. Resources Needed for Site Reuse: The FY2022 grant will continue a key focus for the FY2018 grant of using EPA-funded assessment and reuse planning activities to help strategically position sites for funding needed for cleanup, redevelopment, and reuse. A key funding need for many of the sites and for many of the communities is funding for abatement and demolition of dilapidated buildings. Of the 60 properties nominated for the FY2018 grant, 33 contained dilapidated buildings in need of demolition (at least 10 buildings were already partially collapsed). Due to the small size of the communities, nearly all are eligible for several US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA) grant and loan programs focused on rural communities. However, for sites to be eligible, the USDA/IHDA programs require that the municipalities obtain title to properties, complete environmental due diligence activities, obtain cost estimates, and develop specific reuse project plans. The FY2018 grant completed these prerequisite steps for a total of 8 sites in 3 of our communities. Access to USDA funding was facilitated by the active participation of the local USDA representative (Dwight Reynolds) in the brownfields advisory committee (BAC) meetings. A priority for serving the smaller communities during the FY2022 CWA grant will be refining/optimizing the process for smaller communities to secure USDA, IDHA, and other grant funding. All 4 of the priority sites are located within designated EZs (the Canton/Fulton Co., Galesburg, Macomb/Bushnell/McDonough Co., and Monmouth/Warren County), whereby redevelopment projects are eligible for State incentives (that include certain sales tax exemptions for EZ real estate, a tax credit on depreciable property, and a IL natural gas tax exemption), as well as local incentives that vary but generally include a ten-year property tax abatement on improvements made to real property in the zone and waived fees for certain local permits. The Former IH Plant and the Former Monmouth Plow Co. site are both located within TIF Districts (TIDs) enabling both cities to access funding as needed for assessment, abatement, demolition, and cleanup, as well as infrastructure improvements and select development costs. For the previous 2017 proposal for an assisted living/memory care facility at the Former IH Plant, the City executed a redevelopment agreement that committed up to $2M in funds for necessary engineering, subgrade work, and utility improvements. This level of financial support from the TID would be available for a future similar proposed development. In addition, to TID funding, Monmouth has an active municipal economic development revolving loan fund (RLF) that could support redevelopment of the Former Monmouth Plow Co. site. The Former Haeger Pottery site is not currently located within a TID but is directly adjacent to the West Side Redevelopment Area TID, which would facilitate amendment of the TID boundaries if needed to support a future development/reuse proposal. All 4 sites, due to their size, locations, brownfields status, and other factors are potential candidates for the newly established IL Shovel Ready Site Program, which can provide up to $1M grants for site acquisition, environmental site assessment, engineering design, site preparation, and infrastructure improvements. Finally, the IEPA has brownfields RLF funding from the EPA that could be used to support cleanup of one or more of the sites.

1.c.ii. Use of Existing Infrastructure: The priority sites and TAs, based their proximity to the centers of the region’s 4 largest cities, are among the locations in the 6-county area most favorably positioned to leverage existing infrastructure (including water, sewer, highway access, rail access, sidewalks, and public transit systems). The availability of local infrastructure and its capacity to support desired redevelopment projects has been and will continue to be a key factor in the prioritization of sites. No critical infrastructure needs have been identified for the priority sites referenced in Section 1.a.ii.

2. COMMUNITY NEED & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
2.a. Community Need 2.a.i. The Community’s Need for Funding: Of our 68 incorporated cities and villages, all but 3 (Galesburg, Macomb, and Canton) have populations under 10,000 residents. In addition to their small size, nearly all the municipalities suffer from declining populations (which is a chronic negative economic factor leading to increased vacancies, depressed property values, and declining property and sales tax revenues). Since 2000, all but 4 have experienced population declines, with 75% (51 of 68) experiencing declines of ≥10%. Due to their small size, the 65 smaller communities lack not just the financial but also the technical and administrative resources to effectively advance brownfields redevelopment on their own. The coalition structure for the FY2018 grant was specifically created and implemented with a goal of supporting these smaller communities, and over 55% of funding for site-specific assessment or reuse planning activities was expended on sites in communities with populations under 10,000 residents. We will continue this focus for the FY2022 grant. Even the 4 largest cities face significant financial challenges that further limit their ability to fund the types of assessment activities funded by the EPA grant. Galesburg, Monmouth, and Canton have per capita debt levels ($4,525, $3,715, and $1,146, respectively) that significantly exceed the median per capita debt level of $794 for IL cities. The financial challenges for all local governments are exacerbated by the extremely poor fiscal condition of the State. Illinois routinely ranks as one of the US states in the worst fiscal condition (ranking 50th worst in a 2018 study by George Mason University), as well as 50th in 2020 in short- and long-term fiscal

---

stability rankings by US News & World Report⁶). The state’s budget woes impact every municipality in the state, in part due to 1) cuts in segregated funding, 2) uncertainty regarding the timing for payments, and 3) lack of funding for “non-essential” state programs, such as the State’s Municipal Brownfield Incentive Program receiving no additional funding since 2010.

As shown on Table 1 below, both the TAs and the cities in which they are located are low income.

### Table 1. Economic Distress Data (American Community Survey [ACS] 2019 5-Year Estimates⁷)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>South Canton TA</th>
<th>South Galesburg TA</th>
<th>West Central Macomb TA</th>
<th>SW Monmouth TA</th>
<th>4 Largest Cities</th>
<th>6 County Area</th>
<th>State of IL</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$35,711</td>
<td>$22,945</td>
<td>$24,363</td>
<td>$41,579</td>
<td>$41,067</td>
<td>$49,465</td>
<td>$65,886</td>
<td>$62,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income</td>
<td>$19,612</td>
<td>$13,488</td>
<td>$14,983</td>
<td>$19,199</td>
<td>$22,961</td>
<td>$26,606</td>
<td>$36,038</td>
<td>$34,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold text** denotes values for which the target areas are significantly lower (income) or higher (unemployment rate) than the comparable values for the State of IL or the US as a whole. A) Combined data for Census Tract (CT) Block Groups (BGs) CT9534 BG1, CT9535 BG1, BG2, and BG4; and CT9536 BG3. B) Combined data for CT8 BG2; CT9, BG1, CT10, BG2 and BG3; CT11, BG1. C) Combined data for CT104 BG2 and BG3; and CT105 BG3. D) Combined data for CT705 BG3 and BG4. E) Canton, Galesburg, Macomb, Monmouth. F) In 2018 inflation-adjusted dollars. G) Civilian population in labor force ≥16 years, 1-year unemployment rate.

### 2.a.i.1 Threats to Sensitive Populations – Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations: As shown on Table 2 below, the TA’s disproportionately high numbers of residents who are minorities, who are living in poverty, and single female parent households with children under 18 years.

### Table 2. Disadvantaged Populations (ACS 2019 5-Year Estimates⁸)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>South Canton TA</th>
<th>South Galesburg TA</th>
<th>West Central Macomb TA</th>
<th>SW Monmouth TA</th>
<th>4 Largest Cities</th>
<th>6 County Area</th>
<th>State of IL</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female households w/ &lt;18 yrs</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate for individuals</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic population</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black only population</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The health of residents within the target areas is poor, as detailed on Table 3 which presents estimated 2020 prevalence rates for 14 chronic disease and health measures for adults from a study published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP)⁹ that includes data for all CTs in the US.

### Table 3. Health Measure Estimates for Target Area Census Tracts (CTs)¹⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Measure (see footnote 10 at bottom of this page for explanation of notes for Table A)</th>
<th>Average Prevalence in Target Area CTs</th>
<th>Average Prevalence in Illinois</th>
<th>TA Prevalence Percentile among all 3,114 IL CTs</th>
<th>Health Measure</th>
<th>Average Prevalence in Target Area CTs</th>
<th>Average Prevalence in Illinois</th>
<th>TA Prevalence Percentile among all 3,114 IL CTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis D</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>Kidney Disease (chronic) D</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma (current) D</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>Poor Mental Health D</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Blood Pressure D</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Obesity D</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer (excluding skin) D</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>Poor Physical Health D</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cholesterol D</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>Obstructive Pulmonary Disease D</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosed Diabetes D</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>Stroke D</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary Heart Disease D</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>All Teeth Lost D</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The target area CTs score worse (i.e., have higher prevalence rates) for all 14 health outcome measures than IL as a whole, and rank at the 80th percentile or above for 10 of the 14 measures. The study also includes estimates for 4 unhealthy behaviors and 9 health prevention measures, for which the target area CTs also score poorly, ranking above the 90th percentile for 4 measures (smoking rate, lack of cervical cancer and cholesterol screening and mammography use), and above the 80th percentile for 3 other measures (lack of leisure time for physical activity, dental visits, and use by women of a core set of preventative health services). Food access is both a health and a welfare concern in the TA, with 11 of the 15 block groups that form the TAs meeting one or more of the current USDA definitions for food deserts ¹¹.

The grant will be used to update the brownfield inventory within the TAs, a vital step to identify sites contributing to blight, crime, and public health issues. The grant will fund Phase I and II ESAs that will help to define exposure risks and contaminants at specific sites and increase community education and awareness. The grant will help further cleanup of contaminated sites, and the transformation of sites into safe housing, job-providing commercial or industrial businesses that increase wages and tax revenue,

---

⁷ Data downloaded from the US Census Bureau website on 11/1/2021. All data are 5-year estimates for 2015-19.
⁸ Data downloaded from the US Census Bureau website on 11/1/2021. All data are 5-year estimates for 2015-19. A) See Table 1 for CTs and BGs included in each TA.
¹⁰ Notes for Table 3. A) Data accessed from the CDCP website on 11/1/2021. B) The target area CTs include 9534, 9535, and 9536 in Canton; 8, 9, 10, and 11 in Galesburg; 104 and 105 in Macomb; and 8705 in Monmouth. C) Calculated based on data for all 3,114 CTs in IL. D) Model-based estimate for crude prevalence among adults aged ≥18 years, 2018. E) Model-based estimate for crude prevalence of all teeth lost among adults aged ≥65 years, 2018.
and/or community assets that provide improved opportunities for recreation, health, food access, or educational services.

2.a.ii.2 Greater than Normal Incidence of Disease & Adverse Health Conditions: As shown on Table 3, residents in the TAs have higher prevalence rates than the State of IL as a whole for asthma and cancer, which may be attributable in part for exposure from contaminants. As shown on Table 4 below, children in the TAs are also subject to high rates of lead poisoning. Table 4 presents the most recent (2019) childhood blood lead monitoring results by county published by the Illinois Department of Health.12 Blood lead levels of ≥4.5 micrograms per deciliter (µg/dL) are considered indicative of lead poisoning.

### Table 4: Childhood blood lead monitoring results (Illinois Department of Health)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Level in Blood (µg/dL)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fulton Co</th>
<th>Hancock Co</th>
<th>Henderson Co</th>
<th>Knox Co</th>
<th>McDonough Co</th>
<th>Warren Co</th>
<th>State of IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥5</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown on Table 4, the lead poisoning rates for 5 of the 6 counties in 2019 significantly exceeded the rate for the State of IL as a whole. The rates for Knox, Hancock, Warren, and Henderson Counties, ranked respectively, as the 4th, 8th, 10th, 11th, and 13th highest lead poisoning rates among the 102 total counties in Illinois.

The grant will be used to inventory, prioritize, and assess sites that may contain lead, asbestos, and other contaminants that contribute to the exposure risks for residents in the TAs who suffer from lead poisoning and/or asthma. Lead is a known or potential contaminant at all 4 priority sites. Abandoned buildings are a major concern, as evidenced by 33 of the 60 of the sites nominated for the FY2018 grant containing dilapidated buildings in need of demolition (at least 10 of which were already partially collapsed). FY2022 funding will be used to conduct RBM surveys in these types of buildings, as a key initial step before abatement/demolition, as well as other studies needed to help municipalities, in which they are located, secure funding. The grant will advance plans to create new healthy housing on 2 of the sites, and projects that will result in new jobs that help to address some of the financial inequities present in these communities.

2.a.ii.3. Promoting Environmental Justice: EPA’s EJSCREEN Tool was used to evaluate the 15 block groups forming the 4 TAs for 16 EJ demographic and environmental indices. The combined average percentiles for the 4 TAs are summarized on Table 5 below.

### Table 5. EJ SCREEN Data for Combined Target Area Block Groups13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EJ Demographic Indicators</th>
<th>Percentile in Region 5</th>
<th>EJ Environmental Indices</th>
<th>Percentile in Region 5</th>
<th>EJ Environmental Indices</th>
<th>Percentile in Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Demographic Index</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM2.5)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Lead Paint Indicator</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color Index</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Superfund Proximity</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Population</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>NATA Diesel PM</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>RMP Proximity</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistically Isolated Population</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NATA Air Toxics Cancer Risk</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Hazardous Waste Proximity</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &lt;5 Years Old</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>NATA Respiratory Hazard Index</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>WW Discharge Indicator</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population &lt;5 Years Old</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Traffic Proximity and Volume</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicators or indices with percentiles >50 are shown in bold font and >80 in red bold font. The combined TA block groups score at the 80th percentile or higher for 10 of the 11 environmental indices and for 5 of the 6 demographic indicators. EPA’s Toxic Release Inventory Program website was used to download detailed reporting data for 2019 for all reporting facilities located in the 6-county area. These data showed total on-site releases of 631,964 pounds of 26 toxic chemicals from 9 facilities, including 7,716 pounds of known carcinogens. The releases were overwhelmingly associated with 7 facilities located in the 4 cities where the TAs are located. Approximately 99.6% of the reported total on-site releases and 98.7% of the on-site carcinogen releases were associated with these 7 facilities located in these cities and in or near the TAs.

The grant will be used in the TAs and at select priority sites to: 1) identify legacy contamination, 2) identify remedial measures necessary to address those threats, and 3) position these sites for grants and other funding to advance their cleanup. The grant will support redevelopment initiatives that are working to provide new and safe housing, green spaces and jobs while also advancing projects that will eliminate blight and potential exposure of residents to lead and other contaminants associated with priority brownfield sites. Planned outreach measures will assure that residents in these neighborhoods are informed and provided with opportunities for input on cleanup and site reuse decisions.

2.b. Community Engagement 2.b.i/ii Project Involvement and Project Roles: Five groups of local organizations that will assist in implementation of the project. Contact information and their involvement/roles are summarized below.

---


providing financial and other assistance as necessary for sites to move beyond assessment to cleanup and reuse. They also have primary responsibility for informing and educating the public in their communities and the TAs regarding the EPA funded project, sites being assessed, and brownfields challenges, opportunities, and best practices.

**Other Local Governments – Names and Contacts:**
- **City of Carthage** (Jim Nightingale, Mayor, 217-357-3204);
- **City of Dallas City** (Kevin Six, Mayor, 217-852-3377);
- **City of Galesburg** (Peter Schwartzman, Mayor, 309-877-1988);
- **Hancock Co.** (Delbert Kreps, Co. Board Chair, 309-333-3414);
- **Henderson Co.** (Brad Flat, Board Chair, 309-867-3121);
- **La Harpe** (Katherine Hassen-Reed, Mayor, 630-854-3617);  
- **City of Canton** (Kent McDowell, Mayor, 309-647-0065, kmcdowell@cantoncityhall.org);
- **City of Galesburg** (Kent McDowell, Mayor, 309-647-0065, kmcdowell@cantoncityhall.org);
- **City of Galesburg** (Peter Schwartzman, Mayor, 309-877-1988);
- **Hancock Co.** (Delbert Kreps, Co. Board Chair, 309-333-3414);
- **Henderson Co.** (Brad Flat, Board Chair, 309-867-3121);

**Involvement/Roles:** These local governments were active participants and members of the FY2018 grant, and will continue in these roles in the FY2022 grant, if awarded. By serving on the BAC, they will be involved in site selection and funding decisions, and will have similar roles and responsibilities as the coalition members regarding sites being nominated or assessed in their communities. Representatives from the other 60+ local governments in the 6-county region will be encouraged and free to participate in the project and serve on the BAC if they have an interest and commitment to actively participate.

**Local Economic Development Organizations – Names and Contacts:**
- **Hancock County EDC (HCEDC)** (Samantha Harnack, Executive Director, 217-440-8909);
- **Carthage Community Development (CCD)** (Amy Graham, Executive Director, 217-357-3800, ccdc@carthage-il.com);
- **Knox County Area Partnership (KCAP)** (Ken Springer, Executive Director, 309-343-1190, kspringer@galesburg.org);
- **Macomb Area Economic Development Corporation (MAEDCO)** (Kim Pierce, Executive Director, 309-837-4684, director@maedco.org).

**Involvement/Roles:** All 4 local economic development organizations were participating in the FY2018 grant which will continue for the FY2022 grant. Their involvement includes serving on the BAC (site selection and funding decisions). They are the most knowledgeable regarding the needs and interests of local businesses and developers as they relate to brownfields, and are positioned to provide local financial assistance tools referenced in Section 1.c.i.

**Local Institutions – Names and Contacts:**
- **Illinois Institute of Rural Affairs (ILIRA)** (Chris Merritt, Executive Director, 309-298-2237, cmerritt@wiu.edu);
- **Western Illinois University (WIU) GIS Center** (Chad Sperry, Director, 309-298-1566, cs@wiu.edu).

**Involvement/Roles:** The ILIRA is a key entity in supporting economic development and prosperity in rural communities throughout IL and an ideal partner for the project. ILIRA is located within the same city as Prairie Hills, and within the W. Macomb TA. ILIRA will continue to serve as a member of the BAC and to collaborate as a partner for reuse planning projects performed in the smaller communities. The WIU GIS Center will provide technical expertise related to completion of the brownfield inventory and maintaining the data and integrating it with other GIS data for the region.

**Other Organizations – Names and Contacts:**
- **Galesburg Branch 3016** (Brittany Grimes, President, 309-431-1361, naacpgalesburg@gmail.com);
- **NAACP – McDonough Co. Branch 3022** (Byron Oden-Shabazz, President, 309-255-3469);
- **La Moine River Ecosystem Partnership (LAREP)** (Dana Walker, President, 309-833-3268, jami@larep.org).

**Involvement/Roles:** The NAACP branches will support the project through participation on the BAC and serve as a key conduit for sharing information and securing input from local African American residents living in Galesburg and Macomb/McDonough Co. The LAREP is a key local organization with an environmental focus, and through participation on the BAC, we will provide a voice for consideration of environmental/conservation issues in the site prioritization and reuse planning for individual sites.

### 2.b.ii. Incorporating Community Input:
Upon notice of award, we will update the previous Community Involvement Plan (CIP) that details methods for informing the community and incorporating community input into decisions. The BAC meetings are a key method through which we will communicate with the local organizations, entities, and groups that are involved with the project. We will maintain the meeting format and process that was effectively used during the FY2018 grant, with meetings held approximately every 4 months. Meeting invitations and agendas are sent out to BAC members and other project partners 2 weeks prior to each meeting. Each 90-minute meeting follows a standard format: 1) an update on project finances and the status of accomplishing the various outputs included in the Cooperative Agreement (CA) work plan; 2) updates from the EPA project officer and/or IEPA brownfields program representative; and 3) updates on assessment activities at individual sites, including “lessons learned” that may be of interest/value to the local government and other participants. More in depth presentations are made on priority sites and sites on which reuse planning was performed. Each meeting concludes with presentations on sites for which additional assessment or reuse planning activities have been requested by either property owners or local government partners. Each request includes a summary of the site and project, proposed activities and their estimated costs, and an analysis of how the project or site aligns with overall project goals. Following a discussion of each site and responses to any questions raised, a vote is then taken with the BAC members in attendance approving or denying each request. Copies of the meeting handouts, presentations, and minutes are posted on the Prairie Hills brownfields webpage, as well as sent by email to all BAC members.

BAC meetings are open to the public. Information on the program and individual projects is included in our quarterly newsletter which is sent to over 550 active subscribers. Local governments have primary responsibility for informing residents in their individual communities on the project. Typically, the work at individual sites is considered newsworthy and covered by local newspapers (i.e., Canton Daily Ledger, Galesburg Register-Mail, McDonough County Voice) and radio stations. Project information is typically included within community newsletters sent to their residents. Additional efforts will be made as part of the FY2022 grant to inform and involve residents within the 4 TAs, including collaboration with the Galesburg and McDonough Co. Chapters of the NAACP (through posting of information on their Facebook pages, which each has over 1,000 followers). In addition, Spanish language factsheets will be prepared and made available on our website and at meetings. Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives (ABCAs) and reuse planning studies to be completed as part of Tasks 4 and 6 will provide key opportunities for input.
by the local community (especially residents living in close proximity to the sites) on cleanup options and reuse planning decisions. Alternatives to in person meetings were used throughout the final 14 months of the FY2018 grant, which coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic and various periods of legally prescribed or voluntarily implemented restrictions on in person meetings. BAC meetings continued in a virtual format and all 5 reuse planning projects were also completed via virtual meetings and presentations using WebEx. For the BAC meetings in particular, these methods were effective with attendance increasing. For the FY2022 grant, we will return to in-person meetings whenever possible but will also maintain options for participation via WebEx or other on-line meeting platforms. This will enable us to quickly and efficiently return to a virtual format if necessitated by renewed social distancing restrictions or other short-term challenges such as unsafe winter weather driving conditions.

3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES & MEASURING PROGRESS

3.1. Description of Tasks/Activities & Outputs

Table 6. Summary of Tasks, Schedule, Leads, and Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1: Cooperative Agreement Oversight and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Implementation: This task includes: 1) quarterly progress reporting, 2) annual disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) reporting, 3) Property Profile Form submission and updates in the Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES), 4) preparation of a final report, and 5) expenses associated with grantee attendance at 2 brownfield conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Anticipated Schedule: It is anticipated that a contract will be executed with a Qualified Environmental Professional (QEP) prior to the anticipated 10/1/2022 project start date. Quarterly progress reports (QPRs) will be submitted by January 30th, April 30th, July 30th, and October 30th of each year. Annual DBE reports will be submitted by October 30th of each year. Initial information on sites will be entered into ACRES as eligibility is confirmed and updated upon completion of key outputs or other milestones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Task/Activity Lead: Prairie Hills Project Manager (David King) will lead this task and be responsible for completing grant-eligible programmatic and administrative requirements under the cooperative agreement (CA). Mr. King will track project progress and the budget to ensure funds are spent fully and in accordance with the CA and approved project work plan. The QEP will assist with reporting activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Outputs: a) 12 QPRs; b) 3 DBE reports; c) ACRES updates, as needed; d) one final closeout report; e) 2 brownfield conferences attended by 2 Prairie Hills staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2 – Inventory Update and Site Selection

i. Implementation: Prairie Hills will perform an update to an initial inventory of brownfield sites that was completed as part of Prairie Hills’s FY2018 grant. A focus will be on further identifying and prioritizing sites within the 4 TAs, as well as on tax delinquent parcels that are of relevance to the long-term plans to establish a land bank. |

ii. Anticipated Schedule: It is planned that the inventory update will be completed by 12/31/2022. |

iii. Task/Activity Lead: Prairie Hills’s QEP will work with the Prairie Hills Project Manager and staff at the WIU GIS Center (a project partner) to complete the inventory update. The BAC and other project partners will assist with site prioritization. |

iv. Outputs: (a) Inventory – GIS files, (b) updated inventory report w/ tables & maps (c) prioritization update memorandum. |

Task 3 – Phase I and II ESAs (including Regulated Building Material [RBM] surveys)

i. Implementation: This task includes completion of 14 Phase I and 6 Phase II ESAs on the priority sites identified in Section 1.a.i, and other sites prioritized for assessment by the BAC (including sites nominated from smaller communities). Phase I ESAs will comply with the All Appropriate Inquiry (AAI) and the ASTM E1517-13/E1527-21 standard (whichever is required by EPA). Phase II ESAs will comply with ASTM 1903-19. Many of the priority sites contain buildings targeted for either renovation or demolition. Therefore, budget is included for completion of up to 14 RBM surveys for buildings at priority sites. This task also includes: 1) preparation of eligibility determination (ED) forms for each site; 2) securing access agreements; 3) updating the existing approved quality assurance project plan (QAPP) (as well as annual updates, as required); 4) updating an existing approved “area-wide” Sampling & Analysis Plan (SAP) for RBMs, and used as an alternative to preparing individual SAPs for sites at which only RBM surveys were performed, 5) preparation of SAPs and Health and Safety Plans for Phase II ESAs; and 5) completion of National Historic Preservation Act §106 and Endangered Species Act §7(a)(2) submittals, as needed. |

ii. Anticipated Schedule: It is anticipated that an update to the QAPP will be completed by 12/31/2022. EDs, Phase I ESAs, SAPs, and Phase II ESAs will be completed as access is secured and eligibility confirmed. |

iii. Task/Activity Lead: The Prairie Hills Project Manager will coordinate work by the QEP, secure access agreements, and complete review of all reports and plans. The QEP will complete the EDs, Phase I and II ESAs, the QAPP, SAPs, and RBM surveys. |

iv. Outputs: a) 1 QAPP and 1 updated Area-Wide RBM SAP; b) 14 ED forms and 14 Phase I ESAs; c) 6 SAPs and 6 Phase II ESAs; d) 14 RBM surveys. In addition to site-specific SAPs for Phase I/II ESAs. |

Task 4 – Remedial Planning

i. Implementation: ABCAs or Response Action Plans (RAPs) will be completed for 4 priority sites. |

ii. Anticipated Schedule: Remedial planning will begin in 2022 as Phase I/II ESAs are completed at initial priority sites. |

iii. Task/Activity Lead: Prairie Hills’s QEP will prepare the ABCAs or RAPs. Prairie Hills Project Manager will coordinate work by the QEP and review the draft and final plans. The BAC (including the community partners identified in Section 2.b) will provide input on evaluated/recommended cleanup options. |

iv. Outputs: a) 4 ABCAs or RAPs. |
Task 5 – Community Outreach

I. Implementation: A detailed description of the planned methods for involving and informing the public is provided in Section 2.b. This task includes: 1) completion of an update to the existing CIP for the FY2018 grant; 2) organizing and hosting up to 9 meetings of the BAC; 3) hosting up to 6 public outreach meetings in the TA neighborhoods; 4) conducting meetings with individual property owners, as appropriate; 5) fact sheet and press release preparation; and 6) regular updates to the existing brownfields program webpage.

ii. Anticipated Schedule: An update to the CIP will be completed prior to 10/1/2022. BAC meetings will be held approximately every 4 months. Other outreach meetings will occur as needed to facilitate activities at individual priority sites. Updates to the webpage will be completed as needed (but at least quarterly). Updates on project activities will also be included in our quarterly newsletter which is sent by mail to 163 households and email to >400 active subscribers.

iii. Task/Activity Lead: Prairie Hills Project Manager will participate in and help coordinate all outreach activities. The QEP will assist with preparing materials and presentations for the meetings, participate in select meetings, and help prepare fact sheets, press releases, and materials to include on the webpage. BAC members will participate in the BAC and other meetings.

iv. Outputs: a) Updated CIP; b) 9 BAC meetings; c) 8 other outreach meetings; d) meeting agendas, notes, sign-in sheets; e) updates to the project webpage; f) project fact sheets and press releases; g) copies of news articles on the project or sites.

Task 6 – Reuse Planning

i. Implementation: A majority of the priority sites are large sites that could benefit from completion of site-specific reuse plans. 3 of the 4 priority sites would benefit from market studies that could help in securing developer interest and subsequent financing. Budget is included under this task for completion of up to 6 site-specific reuse plans and/or market studies. Prior to performing each study, a written scope of work and cost estimate will be prepared and submitted to the EPA project officer for approval.

ii. Anticipated Schedule: Reuse planning will begin in 2022 on select priority sites (for which the need for reuse planning was identified but not completed as part of the FY2018 grant project), and continue as additional sites are identified with this need.

iii. Task/Activity Lead: The QEP will complete the site-specific reuse plans and market studies. Prairie Hills Project Manager will direct the work and have significant involvement in scoping, conducting outreach (as part of these plans), and in reviewing the draft and final plans/studies.

iv. Outputs: a) 6 reuse plans and/or market studies and b) 6 associated work plans/cost estimates.

Notes: BF = brownfields; mtg = meeting

3. Cost Estimates: A summary of the overall proposed budget for grant funded activities is provided in Table 7 below, followed by an explanation for how cost estimates were developed and applied, including unit costs as applicable. As show below, a total of $307,650 (or 62% of the total project budget) is allocated for Phase I and II ESAs under Task 3. An additional $103,903 (or 21% of the project budget) is allocated to site-specific remedial or reuse planning at priority sites under Task 4 and Task 6.

Table 7. Budget Summary for Grant Funded Activities by Task and Budget Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Task 5</th>
<th>Task 6</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personnel/Fringe</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,435</td>
<td>$955</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$293,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$436,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>$29,600</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$329,300</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$25,635</td>
<td>$66,955</td>
<td>$476,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$1,480</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$14,650</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,282</td>
<td>$3,348</td>
<td>$23,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$31,080</td>
<td>$30,450</td>
<td>$307,650</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>$26,917</td>
<td>$70,303</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions for how the cost estimates for each task and budget category were developed including costs per unit where applicable are provided on Table 8. All costs were developed in part based on Prairie Hills’ experience in completing similar tasks and activities as part of its FY2018 Grant. Indirect costs ($23,810) equal to 4.8% of the total direct costs for each task are included in the budget. No direct administration costs will be charged to the grant. Our calculated overhead rate in 2020 was 21.4%, and we anticipate that our actual indirect costs will significantly exceed the amounts included in Tables 7 and 8. We will only seek reimbursement for indirect costs that do not exceed the 5% limit, and for which we anticipate further clarification will be provided by EPA at the time we prepare and submit the CA Work Plan to EPA for approval.

Table 8 — Cost Basis and Assumptions

Task 1 – Cooperative Agreement Oversight and Reporting: Total Budget = $31,080

Cost Basis and Assumptions: Personnel/Fringe Costs of $12,000 are budgeted for an estimated 240 hrs of work by Prairie Hills staff (@ $50/hr) in completing various CA oversight and reporting activities. Travel Costs of $5,000 are budgeted for 2 Prairie Hills staff to attend 2 EPA or State BF conferences. Costs are estimated at $1,250/person/conference based on costs incurred by staff attending other recent BF conferences. Contractual Costs of $12,600 are budgeted for an estimated 90 hrs (@ $140/hr) of work by the QEP in providing assistance in completing various required reports. The budget allocation for indirect costs = $1,480.

Task 2 – Inventory & Site Selection: Total Budget = $30,450

...
Cost Basis and Assumptions: Personnel/Fringe Costs of $8,000 are budgeted for 160 hours of work by Prairie Hills staff (@ $50/hr) in assisting with inventory and prioritization activities. Contractual Costs of $21,000 are budgeted for 150 hrs (@ $140/hr) of work by the QEP developing the inventory and assisting with the prioritization of sites. The budget allocation for indirect costs = $1,450.

Task 3 – Phase I and II ESAs: Total Budget = $307,650

Cost Basis and Assumptions: Contractual Costs of $293,000 include costs for the QEP to complete update(s) to the existing QAPP and RBM SAP ($5,000); 14 ED forms ($500 each = $7,000); 14 Phase I ESAs ($4,500 each = $63,000); 6 Phase II ESA SAPs ($3,000 each = $18,000); 6 Phase II ESAs ($24,000 each = $144,000); 14 RBM surveys ($4,000 each = $56,000). Indirect costs = $14,650.

Task 4 – Remedial Planning: Total Budget = $33,600

Cost Basis and Assumptions: Contractual Costs of $32,000 are based on completion by the QEP of 4 ABCAs or RAPs at an average cost of $8,000 each. The budget allocation for indirect costs = $1,600.

Task 5 – Community Outreach: Total Budget = $26,917

Cost Basis and Assumptions: Personnel/Fringe Costs of $6,000 are budgeted for an estimated 120 hrs of work by Prairie Hills staff (@ $50/hr) in leading outreach activities. Supply Costs of $1,435 are budgeted for printing costs ($475) and mailing costs for public notices ($960). Contractual Costs of $18,200 are budgeted for an estimated 130 hrs of work by the QEP (@ $140/hr) assisting with outreach activities. The budget allocation for indirect costs = $1,282.

Task 6 – Reuse Planning: Total Budget = $70,303

Cost Basis and Assumptions: Personnel/Fringe Costs of $6,000 are budgeted for an estimated 120 hrs of work by Prairie Hills staff (@ $50/hr) in leading various reuse planning activities. Supply Costs of $955 include $475 for printing and $480 for mailing costs. Contractual Costs of $60,000 are budgeted for completion by the QEP of 6 site-specific reuse plans or market studies (@ average cost of $10,000). The budget allocation for indirect costs = $3,348.

3.c. Measuring Environmental Results: Prairie Hills will utilize a variety of tools to track, measure, and evaluate progress in achieving various outputs listed in Table 6, as well as overall project results and desired outcomes. One tool for the FY2022 grant will be a detailed spreadsheet developed as part of the FY2018 grant, which will be used to track basic information (ownership, history, environmental concerns, etc.) for all nominated sites, as well as information for various assessment and reuse planning activities completed on sites for which eligibility is confirmed. The spreadsheet will be used to efficiently track and report progress to EPA on ACRES, incorporated into the quarterly progress reports, and posted on the project webpage. Key metrics that will be tracked and reported will include: 1) number of sites or parcels that are a) nominated for use of funds, b) approved for petroleum and/or hazardous substance eligibility, and c) for which access is secured; 2) number of Phase I ESAs completed; 3) number of Phase II ESAs and/or RBM surveys completed; 4) number of site-specific RAPs, reuse plans, or market studies completed. The metrics will be evaluated against the estimated numbers of each type of output or deliverable in the approved project work plan, as well as budget expended versus budget allocated for each type of output.

Prairie Hills will also track the various standard outcomes recorded in ACRES, including public and private funding leveraged, acres of land made available for reuse, number of jobs created, etc. Furthermore, Prairie Hills commits to continuing ACRES updates beyond the life of the grant to capture longer-term outcomes. Finally, Prairie Hills will document, track and evaluate the following additional results or outcomes for brownfield sites where assessment funding is used: 1) number of sites where off-site risks are identified, 2) number of sites where property sales are facilitated, 3) the specific sources and amounts of funding leveraged and utilized, 4) increased property value and property and sales tax revenue generated from redeveloped parcels, 5) the number of blighted or abandoned buildings demolished, and 6) the amount of funding utilized for priority sites in smaller communities that are a priority for the FY2022 grant. All sites on which assessments are performed will be linked to parcel identification numbers to allow for better tracking and documentation of the project outcomes using the GIS.

4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY & PAST PERFORMANCE

4.a. Programmatic Capability 4.a.i/ii. Organizational Capacity and Structure: Organizational Capacity and Structure: Prairie Hills has 3 staff who will help carry out the programmatic, administrative, and financial requirements of the project and grant, and who successfully carried out these same roles and responsibilities for the FY2018 grant which was completed on time and which met or exceeded all metrics in the approved project work plan. We are supported in our efforts by a 9-member governing Executive Board that includes representatives from 6 county boards and Soil and Water Conservation Districts, as well as representatives from other local governments, development agencies, non-profit organizations, businesses, and educational institutions. In addition, we have an 11-member Advisory Council that includes representatives from many local governments and potential stakeholders in projects related to environmental conservation and economic development. Representatives serving on the Prairie Hills Executive Board and the Advisory Council will provide specialized expertise, when needed, to supplement our capacity. Although coalition assessment grants are not being offered this year, we intend to utilize the same “structure” and project approach as was used to successfully implement the FY2018 grant. Prairie Hills will again serve as the project lead, with Fulton, Knox, McDonough, and Warren Counties and the cities of Macomb and McDonough serving as the other project members. The project members are expected to play a greater role in the project implementation, with the incentive of being able to prioritize the use of up to $30K of funding in Tasks 3, 4 and 6, for eligible sites and activities within their jurisdictions. With a jurisdictional area that extends across all 6 counties, Prairie Hills in addition to its programmatic role, will also represent the interests of the 2 counties and 66 cities and villages that are not formal project members.

Brownfields Advisory Committee (BAC): The BAC established for the FY2018 grant remains active (meeting every 4 months) and will continue to provide input on project priorities and to serve as the entity that approves allocation of funds for individual
brownfield sites or assessment activities. The BAC includes representatives from Prairie Hills and the 6 other coalition members, as well as 4 local economic development organizations listed as project partners on Table 4. BAC representatives have decades of combined experience managing and implementing a wide range of federal grants and will serve as a resource throughout all phases of grant implementation process to assure the project’s success.

4.a.iii. Description of Key Staff: Prairie Hills staff and their roles are described below:

Project Manager – David King, Executive Director, Prairie Hills: Mr. King served as the project manager for the FY2018 Grant and will continue in this role for the FY2022 grant. From 1977 through 2011, Mr. King worked as an employee of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. Beginning in 1986, he served as the Federal Coordinator for Prairie Hills, administering its rural development programs including developing its Small Business Loan Program which has provided 85 loans to date that have matched $3,020,000 in Prairie Hills funds with $2.5M in federal funds and leveraged $22.2M in private investment and created/retained 539 jobs. Under Mr. King’s tenure, Prairie Hills received its IRS 501(c)(3) designation and received 2 national recognition awards for community involvement from the Nat’l Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils.

Assistant Project Manager – Clare Kernek: Ms. Kernek is the Program Coordinator for Prairie Hills. She has bachelor’s degree in English, as well as a Juris Doctor in Environmental and Natural Resources Law and has worked for various law and policy organizations. She currently leads outreach and communications for Prairie Hills and for Prairie Land Conservancy, including planning events, designing, writing, and editing a quarterly newsletter, and managing the organizations’ social media and websites.

Other Project Support: The 9-member governing Prairie Hills Executive Board and 11-member Advisory Council includes members with diverse backgrounds who have contributed additional expertise where needed for implementation of the FY2018 grant, and who are available to provide support for the FY2022 grant. The BAC includes multiple representatives with extensive professional experience in economic development, grant management, and outreach.

4.a.iv. Acquiring Additional Resources: Prairie Hills routinely contracts engineering and consulting services and has expertise in complying with the requirements in 2 CFR 200.317-326 – having completed this process for the Prairie Hills’ recent FY2018 EPA CWA grant. We do not intend to award any subgrants but will retain a qualified consultant team to perform the environmental assessment, planning, and other support services required for the grant. Our systems include development of RFQ’s in house, with our attorney’s review prior to issuance. A 4-to 5-person review committee, that includes our executive director and 3 or more representatives from our 11-member advisory committee, reviews proposals. Interviews may be conducted depending on the size of the project and the quality and number of proposals received. Consultants are scored, ranked, and selected based on the scoring/selection criteria specified in the RFQ. Contracts are then executed with the selected firm subject to legal review.

4.b. Past Performance & Accomplishments (Previous EPA Brownfields Grant Recipient): Prairie Hills has received one previous EPA Brownfield Grant (FY2018 Grant; BF-00E02372; $600,000; 10/1/2018 to 9/30/2021).

4.b.1(1) Accomplishments: As of the project end date (9/30/2021), assessment and/or remedial/reuse planning activities have been performed at 31 sites entered in ACRES. Completed outputs at these sites included Phase I ESAs for 29 sites (vs a BF-00E02372 CA work plan goal of 24); SAPs and Phase II ESAs at 17 sites (vs goal of 16), RBM surveys on 18 buildings (vs goal of 6), ABCAs for 3 sites (vs goal of 6), and reuse plans for 5 sites (vs goal of 2). Except for ABCAs, all outputs exceeded the BF-00E02372 CA work plan goals.

Highlights of Accomplishments at Individual Sites: In Monmouth, Phase I/II ESAs, an RBM survey, and site-specific reuse plan resulted in the city moving forward with acquisition of a long vacant and partially collapsed former dairy building in the center of downtown. A local foundation provided a $70K grant to help pay for the abatement and demolition in 2020, and the site is now in use as a parking lot and green space for the adjoining Public Library. Also in Monmouth, grant-funded Phase I/II ESAs and an RBM survey were keys to the sale in 2021 of the former Glastex Boat Factory (large 8.5-acre former industrial property, vacant for nearly 15 years) to a local entrepreneur who is expanding their pallet business. La Harpe (population 1,175) and Dallas City (population 805) are moving forward with acquisition of 5 tax delinquent and partially collapsed abandoned buildings in the center of their downtowns. EPA funded Phase I ESAs, RBM surveys, structural analyses, and reuse plans are being used to help these cities apply for USDA grants and loans that can pay for abatement and demolition. In Canton, EPA funded Phase I ESAs advanced the purchase of 3 brownfield sites by the city – 2 parcels associated with a remediated former manufactured gas plant (600 W IL Route 9) will serve as a Canton Street Department headquarters, and a former bulk fuel plant (603 Grant Place) with a building that will serve as a public works garage. Also in Canton, EPA funded Phase I/II ESAs, RBM surveys, and an ABCA advanced the sale of a long vacant former gas station and auto dealership site (260 N. Main St.) on which construction of a $2.5M Arby’s restaurant is planned for the Spring of 2022. In Macomb, the owner of one of the City’s largest brownfield sites (the Former Haeger Pottery, which closed in 2005) cooperated with the City in completion of a reuse planning study funded by EPA. The owner completed abatement and demolition of the buildings in 2020. In Carthage (population 2,490), an RBM survey and reuse plan completed for the Legacy Theatre in Carthage helped advance demolition of a building and a planned $1M renovation/expansion.

4.b.1(2) Compliance with Grant Requirements: Prairie Hills has complied with all work plan, schedule, terms and conditions, and timely and acceptable reporting requirements associated with the referenced assistance agreement. The project period ended on 9/30/2021. As of 9/23/2021, $583,082.80 in funding was drawn down. Following receipt of the final invoice from our QEP, the remaining balance of $16,917.20 was drawn down, resulted in a current balance of $0 and expenditure of 100% of grant funds. We are in the process of completing the final project report and closeout of the grant. 87% of grant funds were expended on BF-00E02372 CA Work Plan Tasks 2 (Phase I ESAs) and 3 (Phase II ESAs). Information for all assessed sites is current in ACRES.
THRESHOLD CRITERIA
THRESHOLD CRITERIA RESPONSE

1. Applicant Eligibility

Prairie Hills Resource Conservation & Development, Inc. (Prairie Hills) is a regional government entity that is governed by representatives from the County Boards and Soil and Water Conservation Districts for six counties in west central Illinois (Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough, and Warren Counties). As such we meet the definition for a general purpose unit of local government as that term is defined in 2 CFR § 200.1.

In addition, we are a nonprofit organization as described in section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code. Therefore, we are eligible to receive USEPA funds for assessment of brownfields. Documentation is provided in Attachment A.

Please note that we also operate an accredited conservation land trust, the Prairie Land Conservancy, as one of our divisions (as noted on our organization’s letterhead).

2. Community Involvement

Community engagement with this grant will continue to be led by Prairie Hills with support from a highly effective Brownfield Advisory Committee (BAC) that was established for a previous (FY2018) USEPA Brownfields Coalition Assessment Grant that was awarded to Prairie Hills. The BAC will continue to focus on engaging the public, local project partners, the redevelopment community, local environmental groups, members of economically disadvantaged or sensitive populations, and residents within the neighborhoods surrounding the Target Areas. Outreach activities will engage stakeholders with traditional, targeted, innovative, and online outreach tools or a combination of these methods to reach a greater audience. Community members will be brought into the process early on where they can learn about critical brownfield details and provide informed feedback to influence the next phase of work.

Public engagement during the time of the COVID-19 pandemic is certainly unique but an opportunity to be more creative, inclusive, and innovative. Prairie Hills staff and representatives from the BAC will remove barriers for meaningful participation and effectively use participants’ time, while involving people who are traditionally underrepresented. We will make strategic use of traditional, targeted, innovative, and online outreach tools to reach a broad and inclusive audience.

Traditional – These are conventional public meetings, as well as use of newsletters and other traditional outreach methods. The BAC will continue to hold public meetings approximately every 4 months that are widely promoted and which rotate to locations throughout the six-county area. Teleconference access will continue to be provided for each meeting to encourage greater participation (given the up to 2-hour travel time from one end of the six-county region to the other). The hybrid meeting format (virtual and in-person) will continue and provide flexibility in responding to any pandemic, weather, or other restrictions that could impede use of in-person meetings alone. We will continue to present updates on the project within our quarterly newsletter which is mailed out or emailed to over 550 residents and stakeholders. Targeted – This will involve outreach to specific groups that may not otherwise participate in the brownfields project activities. Notable groups include the elderly, civic groups, Spanish-speaking communities. Examples of targeted outreach we will use include listening sessions (virtually or in-person), piggybacking on other meetings or gatherings, and community-based organizations to partner in our outreach efforts. Innovative – These are creative and unconventional outreach methods to help collect information, increase awareness of the project, and boost participation. Examples are bike or walk audits to collect data by photo or video,
pop-up events, demonstration projects, and scavenger hunts. These activities can be socially distanced but still encourage interactions in the Target Areas. Virtual – Internet-based outreach can help increase awareness and participation while helping to reach people who may not otherwise participate. GIS StoryMaps can be used as an “online equivalent” for public meetings since they bring participants through a story of the project that may include narrative, interactive and static maps, survey questions, videos, infographics, and more. We will create virtual tools – such as using Facebook Live – if more online options are preferable in these unprecedented times. We will also create regular content for the Prairie Hills website.

Hispanic residents represent approximately 2.8% of the residents 5 years or older in the six-county area as a whole, and over 8% of the residents in the Monmouth target area have Spanish as their first language. Therefore, a one-page summary of the program goals in Spanish will be prepared and available at all public meetings. Copies in Spanish will also be provided to municipal and non-profit representatives from the four largest cities in the area (Canton, Galesburg, Macomb, and Monmouth) where an estimated 76% of the estimated 6,846 Hispanic residents in the six-county area are located.

3. Named Contractors and Subrecipients
Not applicable – no contractors or subrecipients are named in this application.

4. Expenditure of Existing Grant Funds
We are still in the process of completing final close out activities for our FY2018 Coalition Assessment Grant, for which the project ended on September 30, 2021, and the final project report is due on December 30, 2021. As of October 1, 2021, 97.1% of grant funds were drawn down. After the receipt of the final invoice from the qualified environmental professional on October 26, 2021, the remaining $16,170.20 in funds were drawn down resulting in a $0 remaining balance of the application submittal deadline. Documentation is provided in Attachment B.

ATTACHMENTS TO THRESHOLD CRITERIA RESPONSE
A – Documentation of Applicant Eligibility
B – Documentation of Balance for FY2018 Grant