

A Study of End-use of Brownfield Redevelopment Projects in Ohio

Maoqi Sun

Advisor: Dr. Tomas Koontz

Committee:

Dr. Earl Epstein

Dr. Kristi Lekies

School of Environment and Natural Resources

The Ohio State University

2013

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	1
ABSTRACT.....	2
INTRODUCTION.....	3
METHODS.....	8
RESULTS & DISCUSSION.....	10
CONCLUSION.....	15
LITERATURE CITED.....	17
APPENDIX A: Complete List of CORF Projects.....	19

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my great thanks to those who helped make my project possible. I would thank Dr. Tomas Koontz for helping initiate my project topic and design. I would also appreciate Dr. Tomas Koontz, Dr. Earl Epstein, and Dr. Kristi Lekies for serving on my honors thesis defense committee. Furthermore, I would thank Lillian Majidzadeh for her great help and advice for my project.

ABSTRACT

Brownfield is defined as real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. In Ohio, there are thousands of abandoned or under-utilized properties with environmental contamination. These abandoned properties may cause environmental degradation due to lack of maintenance. In Ohio, there are several types of fund programs aiming to redevelop these brownfield sites in order to make the properties in productive use. This paper examines the brownfield redevelopment projects that received Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF). Specifically, it examines the end-uses of these projects. I draw case study data from documents analysis and interviews with municipalities' officials.

INTRODUCTION

In Ohio, brownfields are defined as abandoned or underutilized properties, including but not limited to industrial and commercial facilities, where redevelopment or expansion may be complicated by possible environmental contamination (Ohio EPA Toolbox, 2007). Examples of brownfields would be abandoned gas stations, old factories, junkyards, foundries, warehouses, power plants and other under-utilized or abandoned properties (Ohio EPA Toolbox, 2007). The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that there are more than 450,000 brownfield sites across the nation (EPA, 2012). However, some sites still await evaluation or discovery, which makes it more difficult to track and define the brownfield problem. The high concentration areas of brownfields are in the Midwest and Northeast of the country because of their industrial heritage (Hudak, 2002). However, the brownfield issues are not only referred to the old industrial heritage. Those abandoned warehouses, gas stations, dry cleaning businesses also become the brownfield sites, which pose a serious problem across the United States (Hudak, 2002).

Brownfields can be found in urban, suburban, or rural areas. Most of the existing brownfields are located in economically depressed districts. The contamination level at a brownfield is varied by sites (Beal & Koontz, 2007). Some of them have no contamination while others may have high amounts of contamination. For example, some abandoned commercial use buildings may have no contamination. On the other hand, such as gas stations they may have potential pollutants underground, which cause high level of contamination. The different levels of contamination at brownfields also affect the redevelopment of these sites. About 1,300 brownfield sites are the worst hazardous waste sites with high

contamination-on the US EPA's Superfund National Priorities List of properties that warrant federal action (Lange& McNeil, 2004). Thirty-one of these toxic brownfield sites are located in Ohio.

Since there are severe brownfield issues across the country, there is a need to solve and redevelop these sites. Brownfields properties are often abandoned with no maintenance. In result, these abandoned sites become eyesores, and have the potential to attract vandalism and illegal dumping, which will make the community's environment even worse and put the public health in danger (Ohio EPA Toolbox, 2007). The cleanup and redevelopment of brownfield sites can bring many benefits, including improving blighted neighborhoods, making use of communities' existing infrastructure, and creating jobs. The redevelopment of the brownfield sites may play the main role in the community's comprehensive revitalization. Cleaning up and reusing these properties reduce the current pressure development, and reduce the unsustainable city development such as urban sprawl. It also largely improves and protects the environment of the local community (Ohio EPA Inventory Guide, 2009). In other words, the remediation and redevelopment of brownfield sites can bring substantial environmental, social and economic benefits (Hudak, 2002). Reuse of these brownfields can increase environmental quality, revitalize neighborhoods, and economically benefit the entire community. One of the principal benefits is the improvement of environmental quality. Reuse of the brownfield sites will slow the consumption of undeveloped lands called green field. The development of the green field will cause more loss of farmland and open spaces, leading severe environmental pollutions such as water and air pollution. These pollutions will severely degrade the quality of community environment and lead damages to public health.

Redeveloping abandoned properties can also encourage local economy. Reuse of brownfield sites may create new job opportunities, halt neighborhood deterioration, and reduce crime rates. Then more private sectors will reinvest, and government interest will also gain from the tax rolls. The property values will increase, which will attract more business to the community.

In Ohio, the Voluntary Action Program (VAP) was created in 1994 to remove the barriers in the brownfield redevelopment (Ohio EPA). The program provides a method for interested parties to voluntarily undertake the cleanup without direct oversight from Ohio EPA (Ohio EPA, 2001). The VAP offers a streamlined procedure, specific cleanup standards, liability protection in the form of a covenant not to sue, financial incentive, and penalties for system abuse. There are five funding sources in Ohio for the brownfield redevelopment. Clean Ohio Assistance Fund (COAF) and Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF) are the two principal financial incentives for brownfield projects. As December of 2011, 198 sites received COAF and 150 sites received CORF (Ohio DOD, 2011).

Brownfield redevelopment involves many initiatives, progress in redevelopment of brownfields is still measured as a way to stimulate local economic development. The social and environmental aspects of brownfield redevelopment in the community are under lower consideration (De Sousa, 2005). A survey was conducted in Perth Amboy, New Jersey about future use preference of brownfield redevelopment projects in previous research. The study found that residents have preferences for recreation, cultural, and other community facilities as the end-use of brownfield development rather than industrial and new business (Greenberg & Lewis, 2000). However, the fact that US brownfield redevelopment has been promoted to

bring industry and commerce back to inner-city neighborhood (Greenberg & Lewis, 2000). Given the different preferences of end-uses among residents/citizens and developers, it is not known whose preferences are most often followed. This is an important knowledge gap because public funds are spent on these local developments, and we need to understand what end-uses are being promoted through the redevelopment program.

Research Questions

The brownfields sites could be redeveloped into new end-uses such as commercial, industrial, residential, or green infrastructure. Previous studies have focused on brownfield redevelopment policy, public participation and involvement and its benefits/drawbacks. However, few studies have focused on the end-uses of these brownfields projects. Therefore, the objective of my research is to examine the end-uses of these brownfield projects that received Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund in Ohio. The paper is guided by the following questions:

- 1) What types of end-use those projects had?
- 2) What proportion of each type of end-use was?
- 3) What was the primary factor that has influenced the end-use of those projects?

Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund

The study only focused on brownfield redevelopment projects in Ohio that received Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF). CORF is a statewide competitive grant program governed by the Clean Ohio Council in which local communities compete for grants to acquire, demolish, cleanup, and improve infrastructure on brownfields properties (Ohio DOD,

2012). CORF is a part of Clean Ohio Fund. Clean Ohio Fund is a \$400 million state bond initiative first approved by Ohio voters in 2000. It was renewed with another \$400 million bond in 2008 (Ohio DOD, 2012). Clean Ohio Fund has four separate sections: Brownfield Revitalization, Farmland Preservation, Green Space Conservation, and Recreational Trails. CORF is one of the funding sources under Brownfield Revitalization Section.

1. Clean Ohio Brownfield Revitalization Fund
 - Clean Ohio Assistance Fund
 - **Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF)**
2. Clean Ohio Agricultural Easement Purchase Program
3. Clean Ohio Green Space Conservation Program
4. Clean Ohio Trails Fund

CORF requires applicants to have a known end user, upon which the objective of the study will focus. The eligible applicants for CORF are local municipalities (cities, township, and county), port authorities, and conservancy districts (Ohio DOD, 2012). Local governments and port authorities may also partner with private developers or non-profit organizations (Beal & Koontz, 2007). The Clean Ohio Council uses a scoring process to determine fund recipient. The fund will be awarded to the application with the most scores. In terms of CORF, it has three tracks for applicant to apply based upon their project situations.

Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF)

- **Known End User: projects with a committed end user ready to develop**

- Redevelopment Ready: projects to prepare a site for redevelopment
- **Sustainable Reinvestment Pilot Track: projects incorporating sustainable infrastructure**

In terms of the three tracks, Known End User and Sustainable Reinvestment Pilot Track require a committed end-user ready to develop. Therefore, I focused on brownfield projects under these two tracks.

METHODS

This research used qualitative methods to conduct the study to explore the end-uses and factors that influenced end-uses. There are three main qualitative methods: 1) in-depth open-ended interviews, 2) direct observation, and 3) written documents (Patton, Michael Quinn 1990). I used the first and third method for my research. CORF program has completed 11 rounds of application from 2002 to 2011. One-hundred and fifty projects have received funding since 2002. The one-hundred and fifty projects were my research cases I have analyzed.

The information and data for the research included two phases. The first phase involved collecting evidence through Ohio's agencies' websites and documentation (i.e. Ohio EPA, Ohio Department of Development). A list of projects and contacts was obtained from the online database and documentation.

The second phase involved qualitative interview. There are three basic approaches to collect qualitative data through open-ended interviews: 1) informal conversational interview, 2) general interview guide approach, and 3) standardized open-ended interview (Patton,

Michael Quinn 1990). The standardized open-ended interview was applied for this research. It consisted of a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each interviewee the same questions (Patton, Michael Quinn 1990). Criteria applied for selecting projects for interview was: 1) projects must have received Clean Ohio Revitalization Fund (CORF); 2) projects must have a clearly-defined end-user.

Qualitative inquiry typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples, even single case that selected purposefully (Patton, Michael Quinn 1990). Purposeful sampling was used to select information-rich projects for interview. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research (Patton, Michael Quinn 1990). In order to understand the third research question, I have conducted twenty phone interviews with local municipalities' officials to gather information. I spent three weeks interviewing local officials of the twenty projects I selected. Most of the phone interviews were about ten minutes. In order to get the most accurate evidence, I made several phone calls with the same local officials of some projects. The following questions were asked during the interview:

1. Is there an end use of the property or a planned end use for the future?
2. How have you been involved in the project?
3. What would you say has been the primary reason the property ended up being a _____
(e.g. retail center, manufacturing facility, etc.)?
4. Would you say the most important factor that has influenced the end-use of the project is

_____?

5. Are there other people that you would recommend I speak with?
6. Thank you so much for your time. If I have questions in the future, can I contact you again?

Since the objective of the research was to examine the factors that influenced the end-uses, the data of question 1-4 were analyzed in the results.

Phase-one: analysis of one-hundred and fifty projects from CORF

- research question 1 & 2

Phase-two: twenty phone interviews of projects with different end-uses

- research question 3

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The phase one analysis studied the official reports of the one hundred and fifty projects of CORF. Table 1 shows the number of projects of each track and its proportion.

Table 1: Number of projects of each track and %

Type of track	Number of projects	Proportion
Known End User	104	70%
Redevelopment Ready	40	27%
Sustainable Reinvestment Pilot Track	4	3%
	Total 148	

Note: Among the 150 projects, only 148 projects are listed with specific type of development.

Table 1 clearly shows information about the number of projects that each track has. The majority group of projects is under Known End User track. Since only Known End User and Sustainable Reinvestment Pilot Track are required to have end-uses, the analysis of type of end-uses focused only on these two tracks. In order to examine the research question 1 and 2, I selected these one-hundred and eight projects of the two tracks to study the end-uses. Table 2 illustrates the type of end-uses and its proportion.

Table 2: Number of project of each type of end-use and %

Type of end-use	Number of projects	Proportion
Commercial/Office	48	44%
Industrial/Manufacturing	30	28%
Institutional	14	13%
Residential	12	11%
Green Infrastructure	4	4%
	Total 108	

Note: mixed-use property is categorized based upon its majority type of end-use.

Table 2 illustrates the different type of end-uses and number of projects of each type of end-use. During the analysis of the one hundred and eight projects, I found that many projects had more than one type of end-uses. In other words, these projects were mixed-uses. In order

to categorize these properties, I used the score criteria of CORF application to determine the type of end-use of the mixed-uses sites. Therefore, mixed-uses properties were categorized based upon the majority type of end use of the properties. Table 2 also illustrates the five main types of end-uses: 1) commercial/office, 2) industrial/manufacturing, 3) institutional, 4) residential, and 5) green infrastructure. As the Table 2 shown above, commercial and industrial are the two main end-uses among most of the brownfield redevelopment. According to the online formation of CORF, the one-hundred and fifty projects are all former commercial and industrial properties. The existing property condition is one of the factors that influence the end-use of these properties. However, I also have three other types of end-uses. In order to study the reasons behind these end-uses, the datum for research question 3 were analyzed.

Table 3: Number of project of each type of end-use for the interview

Type of end-use	Number of projects
Commercial/Office	6
Industrial	7
Institutional	2
Residential	2
Green Infrastructure	3
	Total 20

Table 3 illustrates projects with different end-uses I selected for interview. In order to

understand the factors behind the different end-uses, I randomly selected certain number of cases from each category of end-use to interview. Since the eligible applicant must be governmental entities, all the interviewee I have spoken with are local officials. The cases I have interviewed have various end-uses and backgrounds. For example, some of them are a part of the big redevelopment plan while some of them are in small size related to specific community.

Table 4: Primary reason of each type of end-use

Type of end-use	Primary reason		
	Site Location	Project Driver's Interest	Property Condition
Commercial/Office	4	1	1
Industrial	3	3	1
Institutional	1		1
Residential	1		1
Green Infrastructure	3		
	Total 12	Total 4	Total 4

Table 4 presents the main factor behind the end-use mentioned by the local officials. Based upon the answers provided by local officials from the interview, I summarized the primary reason into three parts: 1) site location, 2) project driver interest, and 3) property condition. The table above indicates that site location is the most-mentioned primary reason

that influenced the end-uses. There are also some cases involved with project driver interest and property condition.

For the green infrastructure end-use, all three interviewed cases indicated that the primary reason was site location. The former uses of the properties were commercial such as gas stations. The redevelopment of these sites considered its natural site condition and surrounding environment. For example, the project Lick Run is a part of the Project Groundwork in Hamilton County. The site is close to the natural waterway. Based upon its site location, the local municipality decided to redevelop this property into a green infrastructure integrated with the entire Project Groundwork to reduce and eliminate sewer overflows into local creeks and rivers. Another fact of these green infrastructure projects is that all the properties are owned by the local municipality.

Besides green infrastructure, some projects with different types of end-uses also indicated location was the most significant factor that has influenced the end-uses. For example, the project Lake East Hospital is located in the transitional district defined as a residential area by the Downtown Master Plan of City of Painesville. Therefore, the location of this site is the most important factor that has made the property end up being a residential project. In some cases, project driver's interest played an essential factor in determining the end-use of the property. For example, the Former Goodyear Power House Property is owned by a private developer. The developer wanted to reuse the property into commercial use. Property condition is another primary factor behind the end-uses of the brownfield redevelopment. An example would be the CEMEX Town Plant Redevelopment project. This project was ended up being a training facility of National Center for Medical Readiness due

to its built environment and site condition. The condition of the property provides great training opportunities without building new infrastructures.

CONCLUSION

This study identifies the different type of end-uses and potential factors behind the end-uses. Analysis indicates that commercial/office is the most end-use in the redevelopment projects under CORF program. The research also provides an overview of different types of end-uses under CORF program in Ohio. While commercial and industrial uses stay as the top two of the end-use, sustainable infrastructure is growing under the pilot program to provide a sustainable redevelopment choice for the brownfields in Ohio. Brownfield redevelopment includes several factors in determine the end-uses. The analysis from the interview with local officials indicates the three main primary reasons. Site location was considered as the most common factor that influenced the end-uses during the redevelopment process.

This study of Ohio brownfield redevelopment has broader implications. On the question of whose preferred end use is pursued, residents/citizens or developers, it is clear that developers are the driven forces behind the end-uses. Commercial and industrial are the main types of end-uses of brownfield redevelopment now in the U.S. The only projects where recreation or cultural end uses were provided were four green infrastructure projects (4 % of the total projects I analyzed). Certainly, commercial, industrial, and institutional projects are not necessarily against residents/citizens interests, since they promote economic growth, but these end uses were not most preferred by residents/citizens responding to surveys in prior studies.

This study has some limitations. It only focused on the one-hundred and fifty projects from 2002 to 2011 under CORF program. More projects have been awarded the funding to redevelop after 2011. It is necessary to capture those new projects for a complete analysis. CORF is a part of Clean Ohio Fund program. Besides Clean Ohio Fund, there are also other funding sources for brownfield redevelopment in Ohio. Further research could be done to generate a more comprehensive analysis.

LITERATURE CITED

- Beal, Sarah; Koontz, Tomas M (October, 2007). *The Role of Citizens and Nonprofit Organizations in Clean Ohio's Brownfield Redevelopment Program*. ECARP Working Group
- DeSousa, Christopher. (May 01, 2005). *Policy Performance and Brownfield Redevelopment in Milwaukee, Wisconsin*. *The Professional Geographer*, 57, 2, 312-327.
- Geltman, Elizabeth Glass. (2000). *Recycling land: Understanding the legal landscape of brownfield development*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Greenberg, M., & Lewis, M. J. (December 01, 2000). Brownfields Redevelopment, Preferences and Public Involvement: A Case Study of an Ethnically Mixed Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, 37, 13, 2501-2514.
- Hise, Rhonda & Nelson, Arthur, C. (1999). Urban brownfields: Strategies for promoting urban brownfield re-use at the state and local level. *Economic Development Review*, 16(2): 67-72.
- Hudak, T. A. (2002). *Addressing barriers to Brownfield redevelopment: An analysis of CERCLA and the Voluntary Cleanup Programs of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan*. Blacksburg, Va: University Libraries, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Lange, D., & McNeil, S. (June 01, 2004). Clean It and They Will Come? Defining Successful Brownfield Development. *Journal of Urban Planning & Development*, 130, 2.)
- Kessler, Thomas G. (1997). The Land recycling and environmental remediation standards act: Pennsylvania tells CERCLA enough is enough. *Villanova Environmental Law Journal*, 8: 161-204.
- Ohio Department of Development (Ohio DOD) (March 2012). *Clean Ohio Fund Fact Sheet Funding Sources*
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) (November 2007). *Ohio Brownfield Redevelopment Toolbox*
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) (November 2009). *Guide to the Ohio Brownfield Inventory*
- Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA) (July 2001). Fact sheet: Ohio's voluntary action program. Columbus, OH: Division of Emergency & Remedial Response.

Punch, K. (2006). *Developing effective research proposals*. London: SAGE.

Patton, M. Q., & Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.

US Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. "Brownfield Cleanup and Redevelopment."
<http://www.epa.gov/brownfields>

APPENDIX A: Complete List of CORF Projects

All CORF Projects Funded To Date

Project ID	Grantee	Project Name	Grant Funded	Type of Development
2002-003	Southern Ohio Port Authority	Steel Mill(New Boston St.)	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2002-004	City of Hamilton	Former Mosler Safe Plant	\$ 2,383,500	Commercial
2002-005	Village of Wellsville	Main Street Project	\$ 67,100	
2002-006	City of Springfield	Former D&H Facility	\$ 1,900,000	Industrial
2002-009	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	Arena Project	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2002-010	City of Toledo	Marina Project	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2002-012	Village of Lockland	Former American Tissue Mill	\$ 2,104,000	Commercial
2002-013	City of Akron	Former Beech Street Plant	\$ 3,000,000	Governmental
2002-014	City of Dayton	Former GHR Property	\$ 2,005,323	Industrial
2002-017	City of Akron	Middlebury Project	\$ 2,800,000	Commercial
2002-019	City of Cleveland	Hemisphere Industrial Park	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2002-020	North College Hill	Galbraith Road	\$ 193,825	Governmental
2002-021	Cuyahoga County	Youth Intervention Center	\$ 3,000,000	Governmental
2002-022	Port of Cincinnati	Kemper Street Project	\$ 1,500,000	Commercial
2002-023	Lake County	Lakeview Bluffs Development	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2002-024	City of Columbus	Jeffrey Place	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2002-026	City of Cleveland	MidTown Technology Center	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial
Project Total: 17			CORF Round 1 Grant Total \$ 39,953,748	
2003-002	City of Canton	Kresge Block	\$ 996,027	
2003-003	City of Chillicothe	Former CSXT Chillicothe Yard	\$ 1,033,381	Governmental
2003-004	City of Cincinnati	Queensgate South Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2003-006	City of Cleveland	Pneumatic Company Site	\$ 2,800,000	Industrial
2003-007	City of Columbus	Harrison West/A.C. Humko	\$ 3,000,000	Residential
2003-008	City of Dayton	GM Delphi Harrison Radiator Facility	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2003-011	City of Lancaster	Former Anchor Hocking Plant #2	\$ 2,837,448	Industrial
2003-013	Mahoning County Bd. of Commissioners	CASTLO Industrial Park	\$ 201,091	Industrial
2003-014	City of Middletown	The Aeronca Project	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Industrial
2003-015	City of Mount Vernon	Woodward Opera House Restoration	\$ 191,400	Governmental
2003-016	City of Napoleon	Napoleon Commerce Park	\$ 2,737,700	Commercial/Industrial
2003-017	City of Piqua	Fort Piqua Hotel Project	\$ 1,358,546	Governmental
2003-018	Port of Greater Cincinnati Devl. Auth.	4000 Red Bank Road	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2003-019	City of Sandusky	Bayfront Paper District Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2003-020	City of Springfield	Greenawalt/Trenor Complex Redevelopment	\$ 1,809,917	Governmental/Commercial
2003-022	City of Toledo	Maumee Riverfront Improvement	\$ 2,999,717	Commercial/Residential
2003-023	City of Warrensville Heights	Warrensville Heights Town Center	\$ 1,637,017	Commercial
Project Total: 17			CORF Round 2 Grant Total \$ 36,602,244	

All CORF Projects Funded To Date

Project ID	Grantee	Project Name	Grant Funded	Type of Development
2005-002	City of Cincinnati	Millworks Redevelopment	\$ -	
2005-006	Columbus Regional Airport Auth	Gowdy Field	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2005-007	Cuyahoga County	Flats East Bank Neighborhood	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2005-008	Cuyahoga County	Ameritrust	\$ 3,000,000	Governmental
2005-010	City of Dayton	Techtown (GM/Delphi)	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2005-011	City of Dayton	UD Riverfront Development (NCR West)	\$ 2,540,743	Commercial/Residential
2005-013	City of Gahanna	Bedford Landfill I	\$ 2,999,990	Commercial/Industrial
2005-014	City of Greenville	Former Corning Glass Facility	\$ 2,020,637	Industrial
2005-015	City of Hamilton	RiversEdge Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Residential
2005-016	Jackson County	JISCO Redevelopment	\$ 2,303,775	Industrial
2005-017	Lake County	Lakeview Bluffs Former Coke and Cement Plants	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2005-020	Port of Cincinnati	Hamilton County Regional Business Park	\$ 2,882,130	Industrial
2005-021	City of Sandusky	Bayfront Paper District West	\$ -	
2005-022	City of Springfield	Haucke Block	\$ 901,401	Commercial
2005-023	Summit County Port Auth	HAA Akron Airdock Remediation Project	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial
Project Total: 13		CORF Round 3 Grant Total	\$ 34,648,676	
2007-001	Ashtabula County Port Authority	Plant C Revitalization	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial
2007-002	Butler County Port Authority	Middletown Regional Hospital	\$ 1,800,000	Residential
2007-003	City of Canton	Former Bison Corporation Site	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2007-004	City of Canton	Former Hercules Engine	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Residential
2007-005	City of Cincinnati	MetroWest Commerce Park	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2007-006	City of Cleveland	Morgana East	\$ 2,946,713	Residential
2007-007	City of Columbus	TechCenter South	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Light Industrial
2007-008	City of Columbus	Former Columbus Coated Fabrics Site	\$ 3,000,000	Residential
2007-010	City of Cuyahoga Falls	High Bridge Glens	\$ 2,381,440	Commercial/Residential
2007-011	City of Dayton	University of Dayton REDI	\$ 2,997,873	Institutional
2007-012	City of Ironton	Ironton Iron Inc. Property	\$ 2,499,200	Commercial/Industrial
2007-013	City of Lorain	Former Lorain Ford Assembly Plant	\$ 2,996,165	Commercial/Light Industrial
2007-014	City of Sandusky	Deep Water Development Project	\$ -	
2007-015	Village of Sebring	Royal Sebring Properties	\$ -	
2007-016	City of Springfield	Former International Lagonda Assembly Plant	\$ 2,248,986	Commercial/Light Industrial
2007-017	City of Toledo	ACME Powerplant	\$ 3,000,000	Residential
Project Total: 14		CORF Round 4 Grant Total	\$ 38,870,377	
2008-001	City of Akron	Future Goodyear Headquarters and IRG Hotel Property	\$ -	
2008-002	Cuyahoga County	Great Lakes Towing	\$ 2,148,450	Office, Industrial
2008-005	City of Dayton	NIBCO Foundry Remediation	\$ 896,048	Industrial Ready
2008-006	City of Fremont	Former Clauss Cutlery Company	\$ 2,000,000	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2008-007	City of Grandview Heights	Grandview Yard Development	\$ 847,753	Office, Residential, Commercial
2008-008	City of Toledo	Tower on the Maumee	\$ 3,000,000	Office, Hotel, Residential, Retail
2008-009	City of Youngstown	Former YBM Property	\$ 854,935	Industrial/Commercial Ready
Project Total: 6		CORF Round 5 Grant Total	\$ 9,747,186	

All CORF Projects Funded To Date

Project ID	Grantee	Project Name	Grant Funded	Type of Development
2009-001	City of Akron	Goodyear Building 116 Property	\$ 956,049	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-002	City of Barberton	888 Wooster Rd Redevelopment/Former PPG	\$ 1,512,889	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-003	City of Canton	Former Canton Drop Forge Property	\$ 1,661,348	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-006	Cuyahoga County Board of Commissioners	Tri-C Expansion/Metrohealth	\$ 3,000,000	Education Facilities
2009-007	City of Cuyahoga Falls	Buckeye Mixed-Use Redevelopment Project	\$ 1,827,722	Commercial/Residential
2009-008	City of Cuyahoga Falls	Former State Road Shopping Center	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Residential Ready
2009-009	City of Dayton	Monument Avenue Gateway Project	\$ 1,004,430	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-010	City of Fairborn	CEMEX Town Plant Redevelopment	\$ 2,800,000	Education/Training Center
2009-011	Franklin County Board of Commissioners	Columbus Heliport/N. Gowdy	\$ 3,000,000	Medical Office
2009-013	Southern Ohio Port Authority	Former Diesel Repair Shop Property	\$ 958,659	Industrial
2009-015	City of Warren	Former MahoningSide Property	\$ 1,358,607	Industrial/Commercial Ready
Project Total: 11		CORF Round 6 Grant Total	\$ 20,079,704	
2009-016	City of Akron	Landmark Building	\$ 1,915,050	Commercial/Residential Ready
2009-017	City of Cincinnati	Former NuTone Property	\$ 3,000,000	Office, Retail
2009-019	Cuyahoga County	Ben Venue Laboratories Expansion Project	\$ 2,494,800	Industrial
2009-020	City of Elyria	Garden Street Redevelopment	\$ 1,896,539	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-021	City of Grandview Heights	Grandview Yard/Former Big Bear Warehouse	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Residential Ready
2009-022	City of Hamilton	550 North Third Street Redevelopment	\$ 2,032,905	Industrial - Energy Facility
2009-023	Hocking County	Former General Clay Property	\$ 623,679	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-024	City of Lyndhurst	Penguin Cleaners	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial
2009-025	City of Marion	Linden Place	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Residential Ready
2009-026	City of Middletown	STM Redevelopment Property	\$ 1,606,817	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-027	City of Newark	Former Newark Processing Company Property	\$ 2,000,000	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-028	City of Norwalk	Norwalk Foundry Redevelopment Project	\$ 535,846	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-029	City of Painesville	Lake East Hospital	\$ 2,052,408	Residential
2009-030	City of Steubenville	Cools Hoagie Property	\$ 297,318	Park, Commercial/Industrial Ready
2009-031	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	Port Authority Industrial Park at Beazer	\$ 1,999,980	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2009-032	City of Youngstown	Former YS&T Office Building	\$ 631,343	Industrial Ready
Project Total: 16		CORF Round 7 Grant Total	\$ 28,086,685	
2010-001	City of Akron	Imperial Electric/XXth Century	\$ 1,230,000	Commercial/Industrial Ready
2010-002	City of Cincinnati	Providence North Redevelopment Project	\$ 3,000,000	Brewery, Warehousing
2010-003	City of Columbus	Former Kimball Midwest Site	\$ 3,000,000	Residential
2010-004	Cuyahoga County	American Industrial Buildings & Art Metals Site	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial - Energy Facility
2010-005	Village of Cuyahoga Heights	Grant Avenue Redevelopment Project	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial/Industrial
2010-006	Hamilton County	Former Kahn's/Sara Lee Site	\$ 3,000,000	Light Industrial
2010-007	City of Huron	ConAgra Redevelopment Project	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Residential Ready
2010-008	City of Urbana	Former Fox River Paper Mill Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial, Manufacturing
2010-009	City of Wilmington	Redevelopment of the Textron Inc. and United Brothers c	\$ 1,850,753	Industrial - WWTP
2010-010	City of Youngstown	Former Asphalt Plant	\$ 569,859	Commercial/Industrial Ready
Project Total: 10		CORF Round 8 Grant Total	\$ 23,650,612	

All CORF Projects Funded To Date

Project ID	Grantee	Project Name	Grant Funded	Type of Development
2010-011	City of Chardon	Former Chardon Rubber Property	\$ 1,439,027	Industrial - Rubber Manufacturing
2010-012	City of Cincinnati	Blue Ash Airport	\$ 1,087,500	Park, Public Space, City Offices
2010-013	City of Cleveland	St. Vincent Charity Medical Center	\$ 1,950,909	Hospital
2010-014	City of Columbus	Former 3M Site	\$ 3,000,000	Residential/Retail
2010-015	City of Dayton	Former Howard Paper Facility	\$ 1,184,169	Education, Commercial/Retail Ready
2010-016	City of Hamilton	1550 Grand Boulevard Redevelopment Project	\$ 1,932,527	Commercial/Retail Ready
2010-017	Hamilton County	Former Stearns and Foster	\$ 1,808,202	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2010-018	City of Kenton	Former King Ohio Forge Property	\$ 969,826	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2010-019	City of Lancaster	Former Frick-Gallagher Property/Ray-O-Vac	\$ 1,477,238	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2010-020	City of Lorain	Former RTI	\$ 1,030,111	Waste Water Treatment Plant
2010-021	City of Norwood	Former NORCO Property Redevelopment	\$ 730,600	Office, Light Industrial
2010-022	City of Toledo	Erie Street Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Office, Commercial
2010-023	City of Wellston	Former Frick-Gallagher Manufacturing Property	\$ 749,541	Industrial/Commercial Ready
2010-024	City of Youngstown	Former Demsey Steel Property Redevelopment	\$ 1,234,590	Industrial Ready
Project Total: 14			CORF Round 9 Grant Total \$	21,594,240
2011-002	City of Cincinnati	Oakley North (Millworks)	\$ 3,000,000	Commercial, Office, Residential
2011-004	City of Cleveland	John Hartness Brown Redevelopment	\$ 3,000,000	Hotel, Retail
2011-005	City of Cleveland	East 66th Midtown Redevelopment	\$ 1,012,524	Commercial/Residential Ready
2011-006	Columbus-Franklin County Finance Authority	Kinnear Road Redevelopment	\$ 2,342,190	Residential
2011-008	City of Hamilton	Former Estate Stove Property	\$ 774,095	Industrial, Manufacturing
2011-009	City of Ironton	Ironton Riverfront Development	\$ 1,581,330	Commercial/Residential Ready
2011-010	City of Lancaster	Former Lancaster Glass Facility	\$ 2,499,500	Residential, Commercial
2011-011	Lawrence County	Former Alpha Portland Cement	\$ 794,565	Industrial, Manufacturing
2011-012	City of Lorain	St. Joseph Community Center	\$ 1,617,901	Residential, Office, Commercial
2011-013	City of Piqua	Former Piqua Memorial Hospital	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Residential Ready
2011-014	City of Ravenna	Former White Rubber Facility	\$ 405,712	Office, Commercial
2011-016	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	Jeep Parkway Redevelopment	\$ 2,999,869	Industrial, Manufacturing
2011-017	Tuscarawas County Port Authority	Former ODOT District 11 Headquarters	\$ 826,180	Commercial/Retail Ready
2011-018	Village of Woodlawn	Former Hexion Specialty Chemicals	\$ 1,043,903	Commercial/Retail Ready
2011-019	City of Youngstown	Former Liberty-Paramount Theatre	\$ 803,490	Commercial/Retail Ready
2011-021	Columbus & Franklin County Metro Parks	Southern Tier of Whittier Peninsula	\$ 1,500,000	Office, Park
2011-022	Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority	Jeep Park Redevelopment	\$ 1,499,990	Park, Solar Field
Project Total: 17			CORF Round 10 Grant Total \$	27,701,249

All CORF Projects Funded To Date

Project ID	Grantee	Project Name	Grant Funded	Type of Development
2011-024	City of Akron	Former Goodyear Power House Property	\$ 2,953,196	Commercial/Office, Industrial
2011-025	City of Cincinnati	Calmege West Expansion Project	\$ 662,922	Industrial, Warehousing
2011-027	City of Cleveland	Miceli-Lograsso Development Company III Expansion	\$ 2,999,941	Industrial, Commercial
2011-028	City of Columbus	Former Timken Site	\$ 3,000,000	Industrial/Office, Commercial/Retail
2011-029	Cuyahoga County	Viking Hall Block Property	\$ 2,000,000	Commercial/Institutional Ready
2011-030	City of Dayton	Goodwill Easter Seals Project	\$ 2,198,345	Commercial/Office
2011-031	City of Kent	800 Mogadore Road	\$ 1,342,210	Commercial/Office Ready
2011-032	City of Norwood	Former American Laundry Property	\$ 2,489,574	Office/Research
2011-033	City of Sandusky	Former Apex Manufacturing Property	\$ 1,094,089	Commercial/Office/Industrial Ready
2011-034	City of Toledo	Plabell Rubber Company Property	\$ 865,700	Industrial, Residential
2011-035	City of Xenia	Former Hooven & Allison Cordage Company Property	\$ 1,982,787	Biodigester/Industrial
2011-036	City of Youngstown	Former Wean United Facility	\$ 1,775,418	Commercial/Industrial Ready
2011-037	Hamilton County	Lick Run - South Fairmount Neighborhood	\$ 1,246,740	Sustainable Infrastructure Park
2011-038	Miami County	Piqua Power Plant Waterfront Redevelopment	\$ 1,404,362	Urban Waterfront Park & Trail
2011-039	City of Toledo	UpTown Park	\$ 1,500,000	Signature Urban Park
Project Total: 15		CORF Round 11 Grant Total	\$ 27,515,284	
CORF Project Total: 150		CORF Total	\$ 308,450,005	