

RECEIVED  
TOWN OF THOMPSON, CT.

2017 APR -7 A 11: 24

*Linda Paradisi*  
TOWN CLERK/ASSY

## SPECIAL MEETING

Mill Sites Redevelopment Advisory Committee (MSRAC)  
Friday, April 7, 2017 – 9:00AM  
Merrill Seney Community Room  
Thompson Town Hall

## MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Blanchette, Chairman  
R. Faucher  
S. Lewis  
N. O'Leary  
J. Hall  
B. Davis (arr. at 9:55AM)

ALSO PRESENT: M. A. Chinatti, Director of Planning & Development, K. Beausoleil, First Selectman (arr. at 9:04AM), W. Bugden, CME Engineers.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

J. Blanchette called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 10, 2017 Regular Meeting

**(M/S/C Lewis/O'Leary)** to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2017 meeting as presented. Carried unanimously.

### 3. CORRESPONDENCE

W. Bugden presented two (2) copies of the final plan for 630 Riverside Drive, and noted that the flood delineation line is removed so future developer could decide what to do as far as changing the floodplain/submitting a FEMA request.

### 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS - NONE

### 5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

a. 630 Riverside Drive

- i. Project Update – W. Bugden, CME Associates
  - a. UCONN Structural Analysis – Status/Discussion on Presentation

W. Bugden stated he will provide both digital and hard copies of the final RAP, and will also provide a digital copy of the final plan submitted at this meeting. He stated UCONN will not be able to make a presentation in Thompson of their structural engineering work, but that their final presentation is scheduled sometime between April 27 and the beginning of May at UCONN. He will advise M. A. Chinatti of the final date once he is notified, and she will notify this Committee should they wish to attend. He stated UCONN got involved because they were looking for experience in preparing a brownfield clean-up plan. He noted that the final plan, which, he believes, shows a greenhouse-type development, that will be presented has not been vetted by anyone; the students just needed plan design experience.

- b. 929 Riverside Dr.
  - i. Project Update – W. Bugden, CME Associates

W. Bugden stated work has stopped on the project because of the notice of intent to demolish,

K. Beausoleil stated the Town got notification there was an agreement with Southend Reclaimed for five (5) years that they have access to all of the buildings to remove them. He stated they have a five (5) year contract, and that the Town does not know what's going on at this point. He stated there is a new liability holder of the mortgage, which Wells Fargo sold to another source. He stated that the meeting that was supposed to have been held in March with Southend Reclaimed and its attorney but was cancelled due to the snow storm has not yet been rescheduled, but that April 24 is a possible date. He noted that final scheduling would depend on when the Southend representative will be able to make it up from North Carolina. He noted the Town has a substantial investment in the mill, with the Brownfield Grant, back taxes and the \$384K small cities loan. He stated the Town has no indication at this point as to what their intent is, and noted that Town Counsel will also be present at that meeting when it is rescheduled to ensure the Town's interests are protected/spoken to. He noted that there has been no attempt to pay the taxes owed

J. Blanchette stated her hope that the situation with the Belding Mill/how it got permitted to be demoed/left in its current state does not happen with 929 and asked if the Town has/needs to put something "on the books" to prevent 929 from being left in the same state as the

Belding site. K. Beausoleil stated that would need to be discussed with Town Counsel, as the Town has a vested interest in 929.

W. Bugden stated that existing State regulations preclude what occurred at the Belding site from happening at 929, noting that anything more than 10cy of material left on a site after demolition causes the site to be considered a solid waste disposal site if the material is left for over a certain period of time, which would cause the site to fall under the CT Solid Waste Regulations; the site would also then be considered an illegal landfill. He recommended requesting that a bond be posted prior to any demolition to ensure what happened at 630 doesn't happen at 929. He noted DEEP has mentioned they have interest here as well and they said they would step in and put a condition on any permit to demolish that the operator/owner have an approved remediation plan in place prior to commencement of demolition.

The Committee then discussed at length the transfer act/enforcement for non-compliance with required filings.

W. Bugden noted that 70% of the soil/groundwater investigation has been completed, and that CME has not done any work of the revitalization nature – no structural analysis, no hazardous building materials survey – CME has stopped doing everything re the grant's revitalization aspect.

K. Beausoleil stated the Town received confirmation from DECD back in November that it would not be required to repay any money received through that time to the State should demolition occur, and that DECD agreed work should now be halted until the owner's intent is clear.

W. Bugden stated that, though this work is funded by a program designed for revitalization of historic Brownfields, funding spent to date is money that would have been spent on any brownfield. He continued, stating that DECD interest in this project is to revitalize the property, and that the State could take remaining funds and re-purpose if, indeed, demolition occurs. He noted the State is flexible on how the money may get re-purposed, even in project-midstream. He stated it may be in the Towns interest to have conversations with the State to see what can be done with the remaining funds and "decide on the fly" if what is proposed meets the definition of brownfield revitalization. he noted there is still "a lot of stuff" the funds could be used for.

J. Blanchette stated a lot hinges on what happens at the to-be-rescheduled meeting, and that we currently have no indication of intentions.

K. Beausoleil stated he has not received any indication to date, and that no tax payment(s) have been made to date either.

W. Bugden suggested keeping all options open, and when the Town needs other resources (attorney specializing in environmental law, etc.) it should ask the State if it can use some of the grant funds for those purposes.

J. Blanchette asked if it is even an option that the Town could take the property for back taxes, to which M. A. Chinatti responded that it could. K. Beausoleil expounded on M. A. Chinatti's statement, stating that the possibility has been discussed and that there are risks and issues if the Town does, indeed, take the property. He stated once the Town knows the intent of the owner/easement holder, the Town will know where it needs to focus its efforts. He stated Southend, when its representative what here late last year, talked to the Town as far as getting away from the \$384K loan/what it (Southend) could do legally if the Town were not amenable to that, and that at that time Southend was working with Camden Properties who wants to redevelop the property, but Southend just wants "the easy-out" and demolish it.

W. Bugden stated, re the broken window, if they don't patch that very soon it will be a clear indication of what their intent is because if it is left in its current state deterioration will occur very rapidly and it will be lost. He stated a lot of towns have ordinances prohibiting demolition by neglect.

K. Beausoleil noted the Town does not have a blight ordinance, but that he would talk with Town Counsel to see if there is anything the Town can require of the owner due to the Town's substantial financial interest in the property.

Discussion re the broken window continued.

J. Blanchette stated an item for next month's agenda will be an update following the Town/Southend rescheduled meeting.

K. Beausoleil reminded members their input will be valuable re the Branding/Identity project, and that they should consider attending the next meeting, scheduled for April 17. M. A. Chinatti agreed to forward the meeting schedule to members.

M. A. Chinatti stated she has talked with Bill Warzecha, DEEP, who is looking into non-compliance with Transfer Act filings. W. Bugden

stated there are a lot of attorneys well-versed in environmental law and the Town may want to consider talking with one.

J. Blanchette pondered whether grant funds could be used for hiring an environmental attorney as a consultant to review this matter. W. Bugden stated he does know attorneys well versed in environmental law.

K. Beausoleil stated he is looking to the Town's attorney because the property owner/easement holder is looking at removing value when the Town has a lien on the property. He stated that, if the tax debt is paid off, the Town would be second in line for the \$384K. He reiterated the Town is on hold until the rescheduled meeting happens to know where their intent lies. He stated that, following the meeting, another public informational meeting will be scheduled to let everyone know what the owner/easement holder's intent is.

## 6. ADJOURNMENT

**(M/S/C Lewis/O'Leary)** to adjourn at 10:00 AM. Carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,  
M. A. Chinatti, Director of Planning & Development