

**RE: FY 2026 EPA Brownfields Community-Wide Assessment Grant Application**

The City of Richmond is pleased to submit this proposal for FY 2026 Brownfields Community-Wide Assessment Grant funding. Below we provide the information requested.

**1. Applicant Identification:**

City of Richmond  
450 Civic Center Plaza, Second Floor  
Richmond, CA 94804

**2. Website URL:** <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/>**3. Funding Requested:**

- (a) Assessment Grant Type: Community-Wide Assessment
- (b) Federal Funds Requested: \$500,000

**4. Location:**

- (a) City: Richmond
- (b) County: Contra Costa
- (c) State or Reservation: California

**5. Target Area and Priority Site Information:**

- Target Areas:
  - Richmond
- Addresses of Priority Sites:
  - Transit Village Metro Walk Phase II – 19th Street & Macdonald Avenue
  - 1101 Macdonald Avenue
  - 1203 Macdonald Avenue
  - 1208 Macdonald Avenue
  - 333 12<sup>th</sup> Street
  - 288 Vernon Avenue

**6. Contacts:****(a) Project Director:**

Name: Lina Velasco, Director of Community Development  
Phone: (510) 620-6841 | Email: [lina\\_velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us](mailto:lina_velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us)  
Mailing Address: 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804

**(b) Chief Executive/Highest Ranking Elected Official:**

Name: Eduardo Martinez, Mayor

Phone: (510) 620-6503 | Email: eduardo\_martinez@ci.richmond.ca.us  
Mailing Address: 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA 94804

**7. Population:**

- Population of the City of Richmond: 115,353
- Population of Target Area: 44,870
- Population of Contra Costa County: 1,173,000

**8. Other Factors:**

<b>Other Factors</b>	<b>Page #</b>
Community population is 15,000 or less.	N/A
The applicant is, or will assist, a federally recognized Indian Tribe or United States Territory.	N/A
The priority site(s) is impacted by mine-scarred land.	N/A
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).	N/A
The priority site(s) is in a federally designated flood plain.	N/A
The reuse of the priority site(s) will facilitate renewable energy from wind, solar, or geothermal energy.	3
The reuse of the priority site(s) will incorporate energy efficiency measures.	3
The proposed project will improve local resilience to the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters.	3
At least 30% of the overall project budget will be spent on eligible reuse/area-wide planning activities, as described in Section 3.A(2), for priority site(s) within the target area(s).	N/A
The target area(s) is impacted by a coal-fired power plant that has recently closed (2015 or later) or is closing.	N/A

**9. Letter from the State or Tribal Environmental Authority:** A letter of acknowledgement from the California Department of Toxic Substances Control is attached.

**10. Releasing Copies of Applications:** Not applicable, this application does not contain any confidential business information.



**Yana Garcia**  
Secretary for  
Environmental Protection



**Department of Toxic Substances Control**

---

Katherine M. Butler, MPH, Director  
700 Heinz Avenue  
Berkeley, California 94710-2721  
<https://dtsc.ca.gov/>



**Gavin Newsom**  
Governor

**LETTER SENT VIA EMAIL**

January 9, 2026

Lisa Hanusiak  
Regional Brownfields Coordinator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, California, 94105  
[hanusiak.lisa@epa.gov](mailto:hanusiak.lisa@epa.gov)

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND SUPPORT OF A UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FY26 BROWNFIELD ASSESSMENT GRANT APPLICATION FOR \$500,000**

Dear Ms. Hanusiak:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) of the California Environmental Protection Agency acknowledges and supports the City of Richmond's application for a United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Brownfield Assessment Grant (USEPA Grant) for two target areas located in Richmond, Contra Costa County, California. The City of Richmond is requesting a funding amount of \$500,000 to cover the cost of environmental assessment activities at the two priority areas.

The two target areas are comprised of the community of North Richmond and the five major neighborhoods in Central Richmond (Belding Woods, Coronado, Iron Triangle, Richmore Village/Metro Square, and Santa Fe). There are five priority sites in the two target areas:

- 1101 Macdonald Avenue: one-acre site historically occupied by an office building and has been vacant since 2008.
- 333 12<sup>th</sup> Street: 0.6-acre site is an unused and dilapidated multi-story parking garage historically attached to the former office building at 1029 Macdonald Avenue and has been vacant since 2008.
- 1203 Macdonald Avenue: one-acre site historically occupied by commercial businesses and has been vacant since 2008.
- 1208 Nevin Avenue: vacant, unused parking lot historically attached to former businesses at 1203 Macdonald Avenue.
- Transit Village/Metro Walk Development site: 5.8-acre site adjacent to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Amtrak commuter rail stations: the southern portion of the property is occupied by soil stockpiles placed during construction of the nearby Metro Walk I development project and the northern portion of the property is occupied by unused former parking lots for the BART station.

Each of the census tracts comprising the two target areas are identified as disadvantaged using CalEnviroScreen. Per-capita income in these census tracts are approximately half of the United States as whole, and the effective spending power in these communities is impacted by their location in a metropolitan area with some of the highest living costs in the country. Therefore, residents in the target areas and the City of Richmond itself lack the resources to effectively spur the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields without outside funding. The locations of the priority sites near the BART/Amtrak commuter station make them prime candidates for additional sources of funding tied to transit-oriented development, and additional leveraged funding from Community Development Block Grants may be applied to one or more of the redevelopment projects.

With the USEPA Grant funding, the City of Richmond will conduct environmental assessment activities of the priority sites in the two target areas. The USEPA Grant will provide opportunity to address real or perceived environmental liabilities associated with historical brownfield sites, removing roadblocks to redevelopment. This work will help the City of Richmond expand affordable housing opportunities within the city and address the negative health and social impacts that abandoned properties have on the city's residents.

DTSC looks forward to the possible award of the USEPA Grant to the City of Richmond to facilitate the success of the environmental assessment of the two target areas. DTSC is ready to provide the necessary technical support and regulatory oversight, as needed, for the work covered by the USEPA Grant.

Lisa Hanusiak  
January 9, 2026  
Page 3 of 3

If you need further information or assistance regarding specific brownfield sites, or any of DTSC's brownfields programs, please feel free to contact me via phone at (510) 540-3314 or by email at [Nicole.Yuen@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Nicole.Yuen@dtsc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nicole Yuen', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nicole Yuen, EIT  
Regional Brownfield Coordinator  
Site Mitigation and Restoration Program

cc: Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi  
Brownfield Development Manager  
Site Mitigation & Restoration Program  
[Maryam.Tasnif-Abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:Maryam.Tasnif-Abbasi@dtsc.ca.gov)

# **NARRATIVE PROPOSAL**

## **1. PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION & PLANS FOR REVITALIZATION**

### **Target Area & Brownfields**

**1.a. Overview of Brownfield Challenges and Description of Target Area:** The communities of Richmond and North Richmond are located in Contra Costa County, California (CA), in the San Francisco Bay Area (16-22 miles northeast of San Francisco). Combined, the municipalities contain approximately 33 miles of shoreline along San Pablo Bay and have a shared history of industrial buildup during the first half of the 20th century. The **City of Richmond** (population 115,353) was an early industrial hub with a long legacy of petroleum refining operations and was home to four major shipyards during World War II. **North Richmond** is a census-designated place (population 4,175) in unincorporated Contra Costa County, immediately north of Richmond. The community was historically a popular landing point for minority workers who came west from the South and Midwest for jobs in the Richmond shipyards.

Richmond and North Richmond experience challenges related to an abundance of brownfields and a lack of quality affordable housing. Despite being located in the San Francisco Bay Area, which overall has some of the highest housing costs in the nation, the two communities collectively have hundreds of vacant abandoned properties that are unused, in various states of disrepair, and regularly require civic resources in the form of law and code enforcement. The City of Richmond estimates an annual cost of approximately \$7,000 per property incurred by City staff and contractors cutting weeds, boarding up windows, responding to police and fire department calls, and removing illegally dumped items. In addition to the drain in municipal resources, the abandoned properties most severely affect immediate neighbors who are exposed to boarded up and broken windows, peeling paint, dislodged gutters, graffiti, trash, abandoned vehicles, unkempt landscaping and trees, and insect and rodent infestation. The abandoned and derelict properties also impact neighborhood safety, morale and quality of life, and result in increased crime on blocks compared to blocks without blighted properties, as well as negative public health impacts. Abandoned and vacant properties also contain environmental impacts from the uncontrolled demolition of old structures containing asbestos and lead paint.

The proposed grant project will serve the **Richmond target area** (TA), which comprises approximately 5 square miles of the City of Richmond and the entirety of adjacent unincorporated North Richmond (~ 1.4 square miles). The TA corresponds to census tracts (CTs) 3650.02, 3730, 3750, 3760, 3770, 3790, and 3810. The Richmond TA includes five historical predominantly residential neighborhoods (Belding Woods, Coronado, Iron Triangle, Richmore Village/Metro Square, and Santa Fe) that occupy a triangular area bordered on the east by San Pablo Avenue, on the west by Richmond Parkway, and on the south by Interstate 580. These neighborhoods comprise one of the first developed areas of the City and are among the oldest, with over 28,000 residents living in a 2.2 square mile area. Brownfield funding will provide critical resources for assessing contamination at brownfield properties and planning for their productive reuse. Returning blighted and abandoned properties to productive use has the effect of removing sources of contamination from residential neighborhoods, eliminating nuisance conditions such as dumping and unauthorized occupation, increasing overall home values in the surrounding neighborhood, and providing safe, affordable housing to residents.

**1.b. Description of the Priority Brownfield Site(s):** The City has identified six priority sites in the Richmond TA, five of which are located in close proximity to the combined Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART, light rail) and Amtrak (commuter rail) station and Metrowalk (Phase I of a multiphase residential and mixed-use project centered around the rail station), making them prime locations for transit-oriented development (TOD). The **Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II Development Site** (19<sup>th</sup> Street/Macdonald Ave.) is a 5.8-acre site immediately east of the BART commuter rail station. The southern third of the property is unpaved with no structures and is occupied by soil piles. The northern two thirds of the property is occupied by unused parking lots. Historically, prior to construction of the BART line in the early 1970s, the property was occupied by a mix of commercial and residential uses. Suspected contaminants include lead and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). The site is a priority for redevelopment as it is the best candidate for transit-oriented development in the City. Four additional priority sites are vacant and/or underutilized brownfields clustered along Macdonald Avenue between 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Streets. They have a shared history of residential and more recent commercial development, and all sites have been vacant/undeveloped following demolition activities in 2008. Similar to the Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II Development site, these four properties represent a significant opportunity to expand housing options in close proximity to a major public transit hub. **1101 Macdonald Avenue** and **1203 Macdonald Avenue** are each 1-acre vacant lots. **1208 Nevin Avenue** is a 0.6-acre lot previously used for parking, and **333 12<sup>th</sup> Street** is an existing unused multi-story parking garage that previously provided parking for the 1101 Macdonald Avenue property. Each of these four vacant properties attract illegal dumping and occupation by unhoused individuals. Additional contamination may exist from lead and asbestos associated with demolition of historical buildings, and lead and PAHs sourced from automobile emissions along Macdonald Avenue (a major arterial route) and the historical heavy rail alignment located approximately 900 feet to the east. The 4.8-acre priority brownfield site at **288 Vernon Avenue** in North Richmond has long been planned for affordable housing.

The property was occupied by an automobile wrecking and salvage yard from the 1940s to the 1960s. Initial assessment performed in 2005 identified lead and petroleum hydrocarbon contamination in soil. Additional environmental assessment is critical to position the site for reuse as affordable housing.

**1.c. Identifying Additional Sites:** The City has created detailed brownfield inventories as part of their ongoing brownfield redevelopment program that began with its receipt of a fiscal year 1996 EPA brownfield assessment grant. In selecting additional brownfield sites for assessment, the City will consult the inventory to identify high-priority redevelopment sites that align with existing City and community initiatives. As described in Sections 2.e/f/g, additional sites will also be selected via nominations from the community as part of the public outreach and engagement process. Criteria for site selection may include a site's potential to attract development, enhance existing neighborhoods, advance the availability of quality and affordable housing, promote public health, address socioeconomic concerns, and leverage redevelopment resources.

### **Revitalization of the Target Area**

**1.d. Reuse Strategy and Alignment with Revitalization Plans:** Reuse strategies or plans for the six priority sites are summarized below. Each of the proposed or anticipated projects will advance multiple goals and priorities identified in the City's 2030 General Plan, particularly those associated with the Housing and Economic Development Elements<sup>1</sup>. The developments will all advance one of the City's primary housing goals (H-1: "Promote a balanced supply of housing types, densities, and prices to meet the needs of all income groups."). The project sites are all located within two of the priority redevelopment areas (Central Richmond and North Richmond) identified in the General Plan.

**Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II Development Site (19th Street/Macdonald Ave.):** The project constitutes Phase II of the Transit Village-Metrowalk project and will activate unused property immediately adjacent to a major regional transit hub and revitalize the downtown Richmond area. Phase I included development of 27,250 ft<sup>2</sup> of retail space, a 3,700 ft<sup>2</sup> inter-modal transit station, an 800-space multi-level parking garage, and 132 units of housing. Phase II of the project proposes construction of at least 520 units of housing, including 209 low-income units. Phase II will complete the vision and goals for the site as detailed in the Richmond 2004 Comprehensive Station Plan prepared for the transit center area.

**1101 Macdonald Ave/1203 Macdonald Ave/1208 Nevin Avenue/333 12<sup>th</sup> Street:** This cluster of priority sites along Macdonald Avenue are being considered for mixed residential and commercial use in the immediate vicinity of the transit hub (located approximately 800 feet to the northeast). Redevelopment of these properties will directly advance Housing Goal H-2 of the General Plan: "Preserve and enhance Richmond's residential neighborhoods; specifically promote high quality living environments, address substandard conditions, preserve and modernize public housing, and conserve affordable housing at risk of converting to market rates." The City has completed significant outreach centered around redevelopment of the Macdonald Avenue corridor, and neighborhood and stakeholder priorities were codified in the *Charrette Summary Report* prepared for the City's Richmond Livable Corridors study (July 2012). Redevelopment of these vacant sites for residential/commercial use aligns with community priorities for new housing opportunities through incremental infill with diverse building types, re-establishing street level access to local businesses, and breaking down the long, linear experience of the Macdonald Avenue corridor.

**288 Vernon Avenue:** The City and its affordable housing partners envision 288 Vernon Avenue as being redeveloped for approximately 50 units of affordable housing. The City previously entered into an exclusive negotiating agreement with Community Housing Development Corporation to implement this plan; however, the agreement expired without significant action due to uncertainty regarding the precise parcel boundary. Redevelopment of the project site for affordable housing is consistent with several goals in the Housing Elements of the 2030 General Plan, including facilitating different housing types to accommodate the needs of moderate and lower-income households, removing constraints to the development of housing, and promoting fair housing access and opportunities for all persons.

**1.e. Outcomes and Benefits of Reuse Strategy:** The proposed or anticipated projects for the priority sites are all large multi-family residential or mixed-use redevelopment projects that will have significant direct economic benefits resulting from the large amount of private and public investment for construction work. The estimated development cost for the Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II project (the only priority site with an active development proposal) is >\$250 million. Collectively, these projects will support several thousand construction jobs (based on standard economic impact model estimates predicting 5 to 10 jobs created per \$1M of construction related spending). Additionally, the Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II project (and redevelopment projects at the other five priority sites) will be subject to: (a) the Richmond City Business Opportunity Ordinance whereby 25% of the total contract amount for all eligible contracts must be allocated to Richmond businesses, (b) the Richmond Local Employment Ordinance whereby 25% of the total project hours must be performed by

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/2608/General-Plan-2030>

Richmond residents, and (c) the Richmond Minimum Wage Ordinance (currently \$19.18/hour, and adjusted annually for inflation). These ordinances will greatly increase the local economic impact from the construction work associated with the redevelopment projects.

The California Energy Commission requires new single-family and most multi-family homes to include solar photovoltaic systems. Therefore, transformation of vacant brownfield sites to residential use will facilitate generation and use of renewable energy along with installation and use of energy-efficient appliances, improving local resilience to power disruptions from natural disasters (such as wildfires) and extreme weather events (such as windstorms).

### **Strategy for Leveraging Resources**

**1.f Resources Needed for Site Reuse:** Redevelopment plans for the priority sites are focused on expanded access to affordable housing and TOD. The City has broad access to a number of funding sources intended to support redevelopment of brownfield sites or brownfield-impacted areas including the federal Surface Transportation Program. Additional leveraged funding may come from Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds and HOME Investment Partnership Program funds from US Housing and Urban Development administered via Contra Costa County. CDBG funding is currently available for acquisition and rehabilitation of real property and economic development activities. The Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program is a component of the CDBG program that provides financing for large-scale physical and economic development projects capable of renewing entire neighborhoods. The City has historically invested a significant amount of its annual CDBG allocation to redevelopment and revitalization projects in the TA. The City also has access to the CA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) monies through partnership with the Richmond Community Foundation and low-interest cleanup and environmental assistance loans through the CLEAN loan program (up to \$2.5M for cleanup). In combination with EPA brownfield funding, the City has ample access to the funding needed to complete cleanup and support redevelopment of priority sites.

Due to its status as a high-impact housing development project, additional specific funding sources have been identified for the Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II site. Funding for this project will include tax-exempt bond funds, low-income housing tax credits, conventional construction debt, Federal National Mortgage Association loans, and California Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program funding. Additionally, \$5 million in Real Property Tax Trust Fund funding from the accounts of the former Richmond Community Development Agency (dissolved in 2012) have been allocated for the project.

**1.g. Use of Existing Infrastructure:** The TA and the priority brownfield sites are in long-established neighborhoods fully served by existing roads, sidewalks, sewers, water lines, power lines, and other infrastructure. Infill or adaptive reuse projects in these neighborhoods will facilitate the reuse of an array of existing infrastructure. One of the sites (Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II) has been prioritized due to exceptional proximity to public transit infrastructure. The project will leverage significant previous investments made in the adjacent rail transit station bordering the site. No critical infrastructure needs have been identified for the high priority brownfield sites identified in Section 1.b.

## **2. COMMUNITY NEED & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

### **Community Need**

**2.a. The Community's Need for Funding:** As illustrated in Table 1 below, the TA is a low-income community with per capita income that is half of that in Contra Costa County as a whole. **Poverty is especially prevalent, with the individual poverty rate in the TA of 22.6% being almost three times the county rate (8.3%) and almost twice the rate across California (12%) and the US (12.4%).** The median household income in the TA is significantly less than the median income in the City, county, and state. The effective spending power of these communities is heavily impacted by their location in the San Francisco Bay Area with some of the highest living costs in the US (i.e., median home values roughly double and triple the national average). High housing costs are also apparent in the rental sector, where the percentage of those paying more than 35% of their gross income for rent is higher in the TA (47.7%) than in the county, state and US. Residents in the TA lack the resources to address the problems posed by the large number of abandoned properties and brownfields without outside funding.

**Table 1. Economic Distress Data (American Community Survey [ACS] 2023 5-Year Estimates<sup>2</sup>)**

Data Type	Richmond TA	City of Richmond	Contra Costa County	State of California	United States
Median household income (MHI)	\$83,737	\$90,038	\$125,727	\$96,334	\$78,538
Per capita income	\$30,356	\$41,898	\$61,727	\$47,977	\$43,289
Median value of owner-occupied housing units	\$528,186	\$650,000	\$830,800	\$695,400	\$303,400
% Gross Rent ≥35% of Household Income (GRAPI)	47.74%	49.40%	45.80%	45.30%	41.20%
Poverty rate (for individuals)	22.6%	13.6%	8.3%	12.0%	12.4%
Unemployment rate	7.0%	7.0%	5.9%	6.4%	5.2%

The City of Richmond faces significant financial challenges that have limited its ability to draw on existing sources of funding for completing assessments, cleanup, and reuse planning needed to support the redevelopment of brownfields. The most recent Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for the City published at the end of the 2024 fiscal year<sup>3</sup> shows improved financial standing from prior years’ budgets, with the general fund having increased by 5.8% or \$12.1M; however, this gain was offset by a concurrent increase in expenditures of 10.3% or \$18.6M.

**2.b. Health or Welfare of Sensitive Populations:** The adverse economic conditions identified in Section 2.a are affecting TA residents who are already vulnerable as members of sensitive populations. As summarized in Table 2 below, the TA census tracts have higher percentages of children under the age of 18 compared to the state and national average, and a higher percentage of women aged 15-44 years. These demographics compound the potential adverse health effects of contaminated brownfield sites, as children and women of child-bearing age are uniquely vulnerable to exposure from pollutants. The percentage of housing units built before 1980 in the TA is 73.3%, a rate far exceeding county (53.8%), state (56.7%), and national (48%) rates. Aged housing stock is a significant source of lead exposure to children due to the historical use of lead-based paint, and many TA residential buildings are in poor condition and likely contain lead paint, asbestos, mold, insect/rodent infestations, and other unhealthy conditions.

**Table 2: Sensitive Populations in the Target Area (ACS 2023 5-Year Estimates)**

Data Type	Richmond TA	City of Richmond	Contra Costa County	State of California	United States
Under 18	28.8%	21.6%	22.2%	22.2%	22.2%
Women 15-44 yrs (% of residents)	22.2%	21.4%	19.1%	20%	20%
% of housing built before 1980	73.3%	67.2%	53.8%	56.7%	48%

Health conditions in the TA (as detailed in Section 2.c below) include high rates of asthma, obesity, frequent mental distress, and housing insecurity, all of which sensitize individuals to chemical stressors. Many of these conditions are specifically related to or exacerbated by the presence of brownfields and a lack of quality affordable housing. Assessment and reuse of brownfield sites for affordable housing will alleviate this insecurity, and assessment and cleanup of brownfield sites will in turn reduce adverse health impacts associated with contaminated sites.

**2.c. Greater Than Normal Incidence of Disease and Adverse Health Conditions:** Table 3 summarizes prevalence rates for eleven chronic disease and health indicators for residents living within the TA, as well as average prevalence for all 27 census tracts (CTs) in the City, based on estimates developed by the Centers for Disease

<sup>2</sup> Notes for Table 1. Data downloaded 01/20/26. All data are American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates for 2023.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/2969/Annual-Comprehensive-Financial-Report-AC>

Control and Prevention (CDC). The average prevalence rates for the TA are also compared to all reporting CTs in CA evaluated as part of the CDC study.

**Table 3. Health Measure Estimates for Target Area Census Tracts (CTs)<sup>4</sup>**

Health Measure	Prevalence in North Richmond/Richmond TA CTs <sup>B</sup>	Average Prevalence in Contra Costa County <sup>C</sup>	Combined TA Average Prevalence Percentile among all CA CTs <sup>D</sup>
Asthma <sup>E</sup>	10.5%	9.4%	85%
Diagnosed Diabetes <sup>E</sup>	14.2%	11.3%	82%
Obesity <sup>E</sup>	37.9%	28.0%	92%
Stroke <sup>E</sup>	3.6%	3.0%	75%
Frequent Mental Distress <sup>F</sup>	20.6%	15.3%	90%
Frequent Physical Distress <sup>F</sup>	16.7%	12.1%	82%
Lack of Health Insurance <sup>E</sup>	21.5%	7.8%	89%
Received food stamps in the past 12 months <sup>G</sup>	32.5%	11.1%	89%
Lack of reliable transportation in the past 12 months <sup>G</sup>	17.6%	7.5%	91%
Housing Insecurity <sup>G</sup>	29%	11.5%	92%
Crowding <sup>G</sup>	19.3%	5.3%	100%

TA scores are worse (i.e., have higher prevalence rates) than Contra Costa County for all eleven health measures, and the overall prevalence of each health measure ranks between the 75<sup>th</sup> and the 100<sup>th</sup> percentile relative to all reporting CTs in California. Asthma prevalence is higher than in 85% of California’s CTs. According to the California Department of Public Health (CDPH), Contra Costa County ranks 7<sup>th</sup> among CA counties for age-adjusted **asthma deaths** for 2024<sup>5</sup>. According to the California Cancer Registry, Contra Costa County has an age-adjusted rate of 424.45 cases per 100,000 people for **all cancers** vs. the California rate of 393.75; higher incidence rate of **lung and bronchial cancer** (37.2 vs. California’s 36.2); and it has the **5th highest incidence rate of mesothelioma** among California counties (1.17 cases per 100,000 people<sup>6</sup>). Mesothelioma is a rare cancer caused by exposure to asbestos.

Elevated blood lead levels (BLLs) in TA children are documented by the CDPH Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (CLPP) Data (2022)<sup>7</sup>, showing that three of the CTs (3730, 3750, 3790) are above the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (with BLLs ranging from 2.52% to 3.57%), and four of the CTs (3760, 3810, 3650.02, 3770) are above the 50<sup>th</sup> Percentile (with BLLs ranging from 1.48% to 1.99%). These elevated BLLs are indicative of early childhood exposure to lead likely associated with aged and low-quality housing. Lead exposure is also considered a risk factor for low weight births (Contra Costa County has a low birth rate of 7.68% compared to the CA average of 7.51%) and preterm births (Contra Costa County has an elevated risk, 9.65% of births are preterm vs. the CA average of 9.12%<sup>8</sup>). As documented in Section 2.b, most housing in the TA was constructed prior to 1980, with the result that TA residents (including sensitive populations) are therefore subject to increased risk for residential exposure to lead-based paint (LBP).

The grant will help to identify, assess, and remediate abandoned properties and structures that are having the greatest negative impact on the health and well-being of residents in the TAs. Assessment and cleanup of these properties will eliminate the threats to public health, safety, and welfare presented by these properties in their current condition. The cleanups will eliminate potential sources of airborne contaminants which may

<sup>4</sup> Notes for Table 3. A) Data accessed from the CDC website on 01/20/26. B) The Target Area CTs include 3650.02, 3730, 3750, 3760, 3770, 3790, and 3810. C) Average of values for all 27 City of Richmond CTs. D) Ranking of the average value for the Target Area CTs versus those for all 9,070 CTs in CA included in the study. E) Model-based estimate for crude prevalence among adults aged ≥ 18 years, 2019 to 2023. F) Model-based evidence for crude prevalence of poor mental or physical health for ≥14 days among adults aged ≥18 years, 2023. G) Social determinants of health data from 2017-2019.

<sup>5</sup> <https://skylab.cdph.ca.gov/communityBurden/>

<sup>6</sup> Note: All rates are per 100,000 residents. Rates are age-adjusted to the 2000 U.S. Standard Population. Data accessed January 23, 2026. Based on Dec 2019 data. <https://www.cancer-rates.info/ca/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDC/DEOD/CLPPB/Pages/data.aspx>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CFH/DMCAH/surveillance/Pages/Preterm-Birth.aspx>

contribute to high asthma rates as well as exposure to asbestos and remove sources of LBP contributing to lead poisoning of children.

#### **2.d. Economically Impoverished/Disproportionately Impacted Populations**

As described in Section 2.a and 2.b, TA residents are economically impoverished and susceptible to cumulative health effects posed by brownfields. Additionally, sensitive populations in the TAs are at significantly higher risk of being exposed to a broad range of cumulative pollution sources. The California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen 4.0) draws on pollution burden and population sensitivity data to create a composite score ranking CTs in comparison to all other California CTs. Four of the seven CTs comprising the TA rank above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, two rank above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, and one ranks in the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile. These scores indicate that TA residents have a significantly higher pollution burden (and associated adverse economic impacts) relative to other California CTs<sup>9</sup>.

The TA community is also at elevated risk (77<sup>th</sup> to 87<sup>th</sup> percentile among CA CTs) for toxic releases from local facilities and diesel particulate matter (solid particles from automobile, train, and ship exhaust) which is above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for six of the seven CTs. Diesel particulates contribute to heart and lung diseases. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease among adults has a prevalence of 5.7% in the TA compared to 4.7% in Contra Costa County. Contra Costa County has elevated rates of soft tissue cancers including heart cancer (3.89 cases per 100,000 people vs. 3.65 cases per 100,000 people in California<sup>10</sup>). The risks associated with living in TA neighborhoods near large industrial sites was highlighted by a July 26, 1993 industrial accident during which a ruptured rail tanker car at the General Chemical Corp. facility in Richmond (1/4-mile west of the Iron Triangle neighborhood) released a cloud of sulfuric acid that spread across the surrounding neighborhoods and sent more than 3,200 residents to area hospitals. Similarly, a refinery fire in August 2012 resulted in a huge plume of black smoke migrating over Richmond, prompting 15,000 residents to seek medical attention, mostly for breathing problems.

These rankings clearly demonstrate the environmental burdens on economically impoverished populations in the TA. EPA grant funding will facilitate assessment and cleanup of contaminated brownfields, removing or controlling chemical contamination and leading to improved health outcomes for the impacted populations. Funding will also reverse harm done historically to economically impoverished populations via ‘redlining’ and similar government policies and practices.

#### **Community Engagement**

**2.e. Project Involvement/2.f Project Roles:** The FY2026 grant, if awarded, will continue to support City priorities for development of affordable housing. The City’s two most recently implemented EPA brownfield grants (FY2016 and FY2021) similarly focused on housing challenges. A major component for the success of the earlier grants has been the partnership with a local not-for-profit, RCF Connects, which led community outreach under the FY2016 grant and developed several of the properties assessed under the FY2021 grant. RCF Connects subsequently obtained their own EPA brownfield assessment grants in FY2021 and FY2025. Based on the success of this collaboration, the City intends to leverage the existing relationship with RCF Connects to conduct project outreach and solicit community input, particularly as it pertains to interacting with the five Neighborhood Councils represented in the TA. Additional information for key project partners is provided below.

**RCF Connects.** Contact: Jim Becker, President, [jbecker@richmondcf.org](mailto:jbecker@richmondcf.org). **Mission statement:** RCF Connects works with local residents, nonprofits, and city leaders to solve problems and create more opportunities for everyone. **Role:** RCF Connects played a pivotal role in assisting with community outreach for the City’s previous EPA grants and will play a similar role for outreach under the FY2026 grant due to their ongoing work with Neighborhood Councils located in the project TA.

**Four TA Neighborhood Councils (NCs):** **Belding Woods NC** (AJ Jelani, President, 510-932-2072, [REDACTED]); **Coronado NC** (Joe L. Fisher, President, 510-253-8712, [REDACTED]); **Iron Triangle NC** (Doris Mason, President 510-730-6749, [dorismason@pogopark.org](mailto:dorismason@pogopark.org)); **Santa Fe NC** (Vernon Whitmore, President, 510-459-4730, [REDACTED]). Representatives of two of the NCs serve on the brownfields advisory committee for the City’s FY2016 Grant and helped with identification of sites prioritized for funding. **Role:** The NCs will serve in a similar capacity for the FY2026 grant. Other support will include hosting outreach meetings in individual neighborhoods and sharing information with residents via email updates and newsletters.

**California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).** Abraham Serrato, Regional Brownfield Coordinator, [abraham.serrato@dtsc.ca.gov](mailto:abraham.serrato@dtsc.ca.gov). **Mission statement:** To safeguard California’s people and environment from toxic substances by cleaning up contaminated sites, enforcing hazardous waste laws, reducing waste, and promoting safer

<sup>9</sup> Data downloaded from website on 1/22/26 <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40>

<sup>10</sup> Note: All rates are per 100,000 residents. Rates are age-adjusted to the 2000 U.S. Standard Population. Data accessed January 23, 2026. Based on Dec 2019 data. <https://www.cancer-rates.info/ca/>

consumer products, ultimately aiming for economic vitality through land restoration and healthier communities. Role: DTSC will assist with regulatory oversight (as needed) and site categorization, cleanup plans, and site entry into voluntary cleanup programs.

**2.g. Incorporating Community Input:** The community involvement plan (CIP) developed by the City and implemented for the FY2016 and FY2021 grants will be adapted for continued use on the FY2026 grant. The CIP strives to provide meaningful engagement by identifying essential project and community stakeholders and developing the means to reach them. The cornerstone of the engagement program is the brownfields advisory committee (BAC), which will be facilitated by RCF Connects and will include representatives from the City and from neighborhood councils (NCs) identified in Section 2.e/2.f. The BAC will continue to provide effective leadership, assist with community outreach, and help facilitate selection and assessment of priority brownfield properties. Over-arching goals of the BAC are to assist the public in understanding the decision-making process, provide accurate and timely information on grant milestones, ensure adequate time, opportunity and feedback, and to ensure community concerns are addressed. Outreach will be conducted using a variety of tools including public meeting and engagement opportunities, information repositories (project websites, etc.), fact sheets, mailers, and social media. It is anticipated that eight BAC meetings will be held during the project performance period at times and locations convenient for the community. One strategy successful under previous grants was to conduct outreach and update activities during regularly scheduled NC meetings, and this strategy will continue under the FY2026 grant. The ‘information out, feedback in’ approach to outreach meetings will be codified by meeting minutes drafted and circulated to interested parties following each meeting. All public announcements will be published in English and Spanish and the City will work closely with the BAC to communicate project progress to members of the targeted communities. The City will provide translation services as necessary to encourage participation from communities in the TA. Furthermore, all City literature allows for citizens to request alternative formats or special accommodations, and all City programs, services, and meetings are Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and accessible to those who rely on public transportation.

**3. TASK DESCRIPTIONS, COST ESTIMATES & MEASURING PROGRESS**

**Description of Tasks/Activities & Outputs**

**3.a Project Implementation/3.b Anticipated Project Schedule/3.c Task/Activity Leads/3.d Outputs:** Table 4 below provides a detailed description of the proposed project activities and tasks, the anticipated schedule, task/activity leads, and outputs.

**Table 4. Summary of Tasks, Schedule, Leads, and Outputs**

<p><b>Task 1: Cooperative Agreement Oversight and Reporting</b></p> <p>i. <u>Implementation:</u> This task includes: 1) quarterly progress reporting, 2) annual federal financial reports (FFRs), 3) Property Profile Form submission and updates in the EPA Assessment, Cleanup and Redevelopment Exchange System (ACRES), 4) preparation of a closeout report, 5) expenses associated with grantee attendance at two brownfield training conferences, and 6) contracting (in accordance with 2CFR Part 200 and 2CFR Part 1500 requirements) with a firm with environmental/planning expertise to serve as the qualified environmental professional (QEP) for the grant.</p> <p>ii. <u>Anticipated Schedule:</u> A contract between the City and the selected QEP will be executed prior to the anticipated 10/1/2026 start date. Quarterly progress reports (QPRs) will be submitted by January 30<sup>th</sup>, April 30<sup>th</sup>, July 30<sup>th</sup>, and October 30<sup>th</sup> each year. Annual FFRs will be submitted by October 30<sup>th</sup> each year. Initial information on sites will be entered into ACRES as eligibility is confirmed and updated upon completion of key outputs or milestones.</p> <p>iii. <u>Task/Activity Lead:</u> City staff will lead this task and be responsible for completing grant-eligible programmatic and administrative requirements under the cooperative agreement (CA). City staff will track project outputs and the budget to ensure funds are expended in accordance with the CA and approved work plan. The QEP will assist with reporting and ACRES updates.</p> <p>iv. <u>Outputs:</u> a) 16 QPRs; b) four FFRs; c) ACRES updates; d) final closeout report; e) attendance at two brownfield conferences.</p>
<p><b>Task 2 – Community Outreach</b></p> <p>i. <u>Implementation:</u> A detailed description of the planned methods for involving and informing the public is provided in Sections 2.e-2.g. This task will continue outreach efforts performed by the City during implementation of the FY2016 and FY2021 brownfield assessment grants and will utilize outreach materials and processes developed as part of that project. The CIP will be reviewed and updated as part of this task.</p> <p>ii. <u>Anticipated Schedule:</u> The CIP will be reviewed and updated by 1/30/2027. Outreach meetings will be held on a biannual basis. Outreach activities and preparation of updated materials will be ongoing throughout the project.</p> <p>iii. <u>Task/Activity Lead:</u> City staff will coordinate and lead 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.</p>

iv. **Outputs:** a) Updated CIP; b) biannual outreach meetings (eight total); c) other outreach events; d) meeting agendas, notes, sign-in sheets; e) project fact sheets and press releases; and f) website updates.

**Task 3 – Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)**

i. **Implementation:** Assessment activities will be completed at an estimated 13 sites. The initial activity will be completion of eligibility determination (ED) forms for the six priority sites identified in Section 1.b. At an estimated additional seven sites within the TA, ED forms will be prepared for Phase I ESAs in conformance with the All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) Final Rule and the ASTM International E1527-21 standard. A quality assurance project plan (QAPP) will be completed in accordance with EPA guidelines prior to any Phase II ESA activities. An ‘area-wide’ sampling and analysis plan (SAP) will be completed for use at sites for which Phase II ESA assessment activities are limited to surveying, sampling, and analyzing samples of regulated building materials (RBMs). Site-specific SAPs will be prepared for sites where there is a need to assess soil, soil vapor, and/or groundwater. National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) §106 and Endangered Species Act §7(a)(2) submittals will be completed as necessary. It is estimated that up to eight Phase II ESAs and up to seven RBM surveys will be completed at eligible sites.

ii. **Anticipated Schedule:** It is anticipated that the QAPP and area-wide SAP for RBM surveys will be completed by 1/30/2027. ED forms, Phase I ESAs, site-specific SAPs, and Phase II ESAs will be completed as site eligibility is confirmed, site access is secured, and scoping documents are approved by EPA.

iii. **Task/Activity Lead:** City staff will coordinate access and timing for activities that require on-site access. The QEP will complete the ED forms, Phase I and II ESAs, the QAPP, SAPs, and RBM surveys.

iv. **Outputs:** a) one QAPP; b) one ‘area-wide SAP’ for RBM surveys; c) ED forms for 13 sites; d) 13 Phase I ESAs and completed AAI Phase I ESA checklists; e) RBM survey reports for up to seven sites; f) up to eight ‘site-specific’ SAPs; g) Phase II reports for up to eight sites.

**Task 4 – Remedial and Reuse Planning**

i. **Implementation:** Site-specific reuse plans will be prepared for Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II and 288 Vernon Avenue. An area-wide plan will be prepared for a four-block stretch of Macdonald Avenue (approximately 1,000 feet between Marina Way and Harbour Way), incorporating the four priority sites clustered in this area. Site-specific remedial action plans (such as Analysis of Brownfield Cleanup Alternatives [ABCAs]) and/or reuse planning documents will be completed at up to three additional sites with contamination issues requiring a site-specific approach.

ii. **Anticipated Schedule:** It is anticipated that remedial and reuse planning will begin in 2027/2028 after Phase I and II ESAs are completed at initial priority sites. The site-specific reuse plans for Transit Village-Metrowalk Phase II and 288 Vernon Avenue and the Macdonald Avenue area-wide plan will be completed initially, and up to an estimated three additional site-specific plans will be prepared as sites with specific planning needs are identified.

iii. **Task/Activity Lead:** The QEP will complete the plans with input from City staff and community outreach groups.

iv. **Outputs:** a) one area-wide plan; b) two site-specific reuse plans; c) up to three site-specific remediation and/or reuse plans (including ABCAs).

**3.e. Cost Estimates**

**Budget Table & Development/Application of Cost Estimates:** A summary of the overall proposed budget for grant funded activities is provided in Table 5 below. **Approximately 83% of the proposed budget is programmed for tasks directly associated with site-specific assessment and planning work.** The City is not proposing any indirect costs associated with implementation of the grant.

**Table 5. Budget Summary for Grant Funded Activities by Task, Budget Category, and Funding Type**

Line #	Budget Categories	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Totals
		CA Oversight & Reporting	Community Outreach	Phase I/II ESAs	Remedial/Reuse Planning	
1	Personnel	\$16,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$26,000
3	Travel	\$6,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,800
4	Supplies	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$1,500
5	Contractual	\$40,000	\$8,000	\$310,500	\$106,000	\$464,500
5	Other Costs (Conference Registration Fees)	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,200
6	Total Direct Costs	\$64,000	\$19,500	\$310,500	\$106,000	\$500,000
7	Indirect Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$64,000</b>	<b>\$19,500</b>	<b>\$310,500</b>	<b>\$106,000</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>

Descriptions for how the cost estimates for each task and budget category were developed, including costs per unit where applicable are provided in Table 6 below.

**Table 6 – Summary of Cost Assumptions**

<p><b>Task 1 – Cooperative Agreement Oversight and Reporting: Total Budget = \$64,000</b></p> <p><b>Cost Basis and Assumptions:</b> <u>Personnel Costs</u> of <b>\$16,000</b> are budgeted for an estimated 320 hrs of work by City staff (@ \$50/hr) in completing various Cooperative Agreement oversight and reporting activities. <u>Travel Costs</u> of <b>\$6,800</b> are budgeted for two City staff to attend two EPA/State brownfields (BF) conferences. Travel costs are estimated at \$1,700 per person per conference based on the following assumptions: \$600 airfare, \$800 hotel, \$200 meals and per diem, and \$100 car/ground transport. <u>Other Costs</u> of <b>\$1,200</b> are budgeted for BF conference registration fees (\$300 per conference per staff member). <u>Contractual Costs</u> of <b>\$40,000</b> are budgeted for an estimated 200 hrs (@ \$200/hr) of work by the QEP in providing project management, assistance with quarterly reporting, ACRES updates, standing meetings with the EPA project officer, and final closeout reporting.</p>
<p><b>Task 2 – Community Outreach: Total Budget = \$19,500</b></p> <p><b>Cost Basis and Assumptions:</b> <u>Personnel Costs</u> of <b>\$10,000</b> are budgeted for an estimated 200 hours of work by City staff (@ \$50/hr) performing various outreach activities. <u>Supply costs</u> of <b>\$1,500</b> are budgeted for printing and mailing expenses. <u>Contractual Costs</u> of <b>\$8,000</b> are budgeted for an estimated 40 hrs (@ \$200/hr) for work by the QEP in assisting with outreach activities.</p>
<p><b>Task 3 – Phase I and II ESAs: Total Budget = \$310,500</b></p> <p><b>Cost Basis and Assumptions:</b> <u>Contractual Costs</u> of <b>\$310,500</b> are budgeted for the environmental consultant to complete one QAPP (<b>\$3,000</b>); one ‘area-wide’ Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) for RBM surveys (<b>\$3,000</b>); 13 ED forms (\$500 each = <b>\$6,500</b>); 13 Phase I ESAs (\$6,000 each = <b>\$78,000</b>); seven RBM surveys (\$5,000 each = <b>\$35,000</b>); eight ‘site-specific’ SAPs for Phase II ESAs (\$3,125 each = <b>\$25,000</b>); eight Phase II ESAs for soil, soil vapor, or groundwater sampling (\$20,000 each = <b>\$160,000</b>).</p>
<p><b>Task 4 – Remedial and Reuse Planning: Total Budget = \$106,000</b></p> <p><b>Cost Basis and Assumptions:</b> <u>Contractual Costs</u> of <b>\$106,000</b> are based on completion by the environmental consultant of one area-wide plan (\$55,000), two site-specific reuse plans (\$15,000 each), and up to three site-specific remedial action or reuse plans at an average cost of \$7,000 each.</p>

**4. PROGRAMMATIC CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE**

**Programmatic Capability**

**4.a. Organizational Capacity/4.b. Organizational Structure/4.c. Description of Key Staff:** As a recipient of FY2016 and FY2021 EPA brownfield assessment grants, the City has significant expertise managing and fulfilling programmatic, administrative, and financial requirements of EPA grants. The City’s community development department staff will be responsible for all programmatic and financial tasks associated with the grant-funded project including quarterly, annual, and final reporting in compliance with the EPA requirements. The City’s project management team is identified below. These personnel participated in the previous two EPA grants and have obtained approval to participate and are fully committed to supporting the project for the entire term of the grant.

**Lina Velasco**, City of Richmond Community Development Director, will serve as Project Director, overseeing all phases of the project. Ms. Velasco has more than 23 years of professional experience in city and regional planning. Her experience and skills include land use planning, zoning regulation development, historic preservation planning, grant writing, management and administration of federal, state, and regional grants, sustainable development, policy development and design review. Ms. Velasco also has extensive experience in preparing and managing consultants in the preparation of environmental documents in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and Section 106.

**Charice M. Duckworth**, City of Richmond Development Senior Planner, will serve as Project Manager. She has over 30 years of grant administration and project management experience as it relates to housing and community economic development and has served as the principal housing development lead for the City since 2007. As Housing Division Senior Planner, Charice has been responsible for an array of new construction, rehabilitation, and supportive housing development projects for seniors and lower income households throughout the City. She is serving as project manager for the City’s FY2021 brownfields assessment grant, served as project manager for the City’s FY2016 EPA grant, and managed the closeout phase of the RCRDA’s FY2004 EPA Brownfield RLF Grant, \$4.8M in Neighborhood Stabilization Program grants, and \$1.1M in Housing Trust Funds.

**Maggie Choi**, Senior Accountant/Grants Management Specialist, will provide fiscal oversight of the FY2026 grant. Ms. Choi has over 28 years accounting experience including 18 years at the City of Richmond where she manages all internal and external financial and reporting for the Planning & Building Dept, including the FY2016 and FY2021 EPA grants.

**4.d. Acquiring Additional Resources:** As detailed in Sections 4.a/4.b/4.c, the City has all of the technical and administrative resources in-house to effectively manage and implement the grant. Additionally, the City employs GIS coordinators, planning, engineering, legal, financial services, and administrative staff to support project implementation and complete required reporting, ACRES database updates, and financial documents. The City has a fully staffed human resources department with the resources, experience, and expertise to recruit qualified replacements for any key project staff that depart during the project. The City routinely contracts out for engineering and consulting services and has all management and procurement procedures in place to secure services through competitive processes compliant with 2CFR Part 200 and 2CFR Part 1500 requirements (as was done for implementation of the FY2016 and FY2021 grants). City staff also have the experience and expertise needed to manage contractors as they complete assignments on behalf of the City.

#### **Past Performance and Accomplishments**

**4.e. Currently Has or Previously Received an EPA Brownfields Grant:** The City is currently implementing a \$600,000 FY2021 brownfields coalition assessment grant, previously implemented a \$400,000 FY2016 community-wide assessment grant, and has managed eight additional EPA assessment and job training grants. Successful implementation of both recent grants included project reporting, community outreach, site selection and inventory activities, site assessments (Phase I/II environmental site assessments), and cleanup planning.

#### **4.e.(1) Accomplishments:**

**2016 EPA Community-Wide Assessment Grant: Purpose/Accomplishments:** The City's FY2016 assessment grant focused on assessment and reuse of vacant residential parcels throughout the City. Under the grant, the City completed 24 Phase I ESAs, 10 Phase II ESAs (including RBM surveys), and two ABCAs. The completed activities helped to significantly advance reuse at nine of the sites assessed. The City's project partner, RCF, purchased seven of the distressed parcels to renovate the properties and sell them to first-time homebuyers. Each of the seven parcels was remediated and renovated for residential reuse, and in the process RCF leveraged \$2.8 million in grants and private donations to support cleanup and redevelopment activities. All awarded funding was utilized. All site-specific details, deliverables, costs, and outcomes were recorded in the EPA ACRES database and updated at the time of project close-out. The City will continue to update ACRES as assessed sites undergo cleanup and/or reuse activities.

**2021 EPA Brownfield Coalition Assessment Grant: Purpose/Accomplishments:** The City's FY2021 coalition assessment grant built on successes of the FY2016 grant and again focused on housing by partnering with two non-profit housing developers. Under the grant, the City has completed 14 Phase I ESAs, five Phase II ESAs, four RBM surveys, and two ABCAs. Assessment and cleanup planning for four vacant housing sites has positioned one of the project partners (Community Housing Development Corporation) to apply for cleanup funding during the FY2026 EPA brownfield grant competition. All site-specific details, deliverables, costs, and outcomes have been recorded in the EPA ACRES database and will be updated at the time of project close-out. The City is committed to updating ACRES as assessed sites undergo cleanup and/or reuse activities.

#### **4.e.(2) Compliance with Grant Requirements:**

**2016 EPA Community-Wide Assessment Grant:** The City complied with the project work plan, schedule, and terms and conditions of the agreement. Additionally, the City met all requirements for quarterly, annual, and close-out reporting; financial expenditure; and timely submittal of deliverables related to all EPA awarded funds. Due to significant disruptions caused by the COVID 19 pandemic, the grant term was extended by two years. There were no compliance issues and no corrective actions necessary. All awarded funding was utilized. All site-specific details, deliverables, costs, and outcomes were recorded in the EPA ACRES database and updated at the time of project close-out.

**2021 EPA Brownfield Coalition Assessment Grant:** The City's FY2021 EPA coalition assessment grant is currently open, with a project performance period of October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2026. The City has complied with the project work plan, schedule, and terms and conditions of the agreement. Additionally, the City has met all requirements for quarterly and annual reporting; financial expenditure; and timely submittal of deliverables related to all EPA awarded funds. Due to delays associated with availability of appropriate sites and the timing of administrative actions pertaining to site access and control, the grant term was extended to October 2026. Although the grant is still active, all remaining funding (approximately \$50,000 as of January 2026) has been programmed for a Phase II ESA and cleanup planning for an eligible priority housing site owned by CHDC, in addition to quarterly progress reports, completing ACRES updates, and preparing final performance and financial reports. All remaining grant funding will be expended by the end of the performance period in accordance with 2 CFR § 200.1. There have been no compliance issues and no corrective actions necessary. All site-specific details, deliverables, costs, and outcomes have been recorded in the EPA ACRES database, and the database will be updated at the time of project close-out. The City is committed to continuing to update ACRES as assessed sites undergo cleanup and/or reuse activities.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Threshold Criteria Responses**

# Threshold Criteria for Community-Wide Assessment Grants

## **1. APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY:**

The City of Richmond is a “general purpose unit of local government” as defined in 2 CFR 200.64 and, therefore, eligible to receive EPA Brownfields Assessment Grant funding. If funding is awarded by EPA, the City of Richmond Community Development Department will administer the grant. The City of Richmond is not except from Federal taxation under section 510(c)(4) of the IRC.

## **2. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:**

The FY2026 grant, if awarded, will continue to support City priorities for development of affordable housing. The City has previously implemented two EPA brownfield grants (FY2016 and FY2021) similarly focused on housing challenges in the City. A major component for the success of the earlier grants has been the partnership with a local not-for-profit, RCF Connects, which led community outreach under the previous grants. Based on the success of this collaboration, the City intends to leverage the existing relationship with RCF Connects to conduct project outreach and solicit community input, particularly as it pertains to interacting with the five Neighborhood Councils represented in the target area. The community involvement plan (CIP) developed by the City and implemented for the FY2016 and FY2021 grants will be adapted for continued use on the FY2026 grant. The CIP strives to provide meaningful engagement by identifying essential project and community stakeholders and developing the means to reach them. The cornerstone of the engagement program is the brownfields advisory committee (BAC) which will be facilitated by RCF Connects and will include representatives from the City and representatives from five neighborhood councils (NCs) in the target area. The BAC will continue to provide effective leadership, assist with community outreach, and help facilitate selection and assessment of priority brownfield properties. Over-arching goals of the BAC are to assist the public in understanding the decision-making process, provide accurate and timely information on grant milestones, ensure adequate time and opportunity and feedback, and to ensure community concerns are addressed. Outreach will be conducted using a variety of tools including public meeting and engagement opportunities, information repositories (project websites, etc.), fact sheets, mailers, and social media. It is anticipated that 8 BAC meetings will be held during the project performance period at times and locations convenient to the community. One strategy successful under previous grants was to conduct outreach and update activities during regularly scheduled NC meetings, and this strategy will continue under the FY2026 grant. The ‘information out, feedback in’ approach to outreach meetings will be codified by meeting minutes drafted and circulated to interested parties following each meeting. All public announcements will be published in English and Spanish and the City will work closely with the BAC to communicate project progress to members of the targeted communities. The City will provide translation services as necessary to encourage participation from communities in the TA. Furthermore, all City literature allows for citizens to request alternative formats or special accommodations, and all City programs, services, and meetings are Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and accessible to those who rely on public transportation.

## **3. EXPENDITURE OF EXISTING GRANT FUNDS:**

## **Threshold Criteria for Community-Wide Assessment Grants**

As detailed in Section 4.e.(2) of our proposal narrative, the City of Richmond is in the final year of implementing our FY 2021 coalition assessment grant. As of October 1, 2025, the City has drawn down \$450,753.48 (or 75%) of our \$600,000 FY 2021 coalition assessment grant. Documentation of account balance from September 26, 2025 is provided in Attachment B and shows a total remaining balance of \$149,246.52. Remaining funds are fully programmed for use to complete Phase II site assessment activities and cleanup planning at a priority housing site, prepare quarterly progress reports, complete ACRES updates, and prepare a final performance report and final financial report. Formal project closeout will occur during third quarter 2026, in advance of the grant closure date.

### **4. CONTRACTORS AND NAMED SUBRECIPIENTS:**

Not applicable; the City has not procured a contractor for federal grant implementation. Should grant funding be awarded, the City will procure a contractor for grant implementation in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200, 2 CFR Part 1500, and 40 CFR Part 33. There are no subrecipients names in the grant application.