

REGULAR MEETING

RECEIVED
TOWN OF THOMPSON, CT.

Mill Sites Redevelopment Advisory Committee (MSRA)
Friday, April 13, 2018 – 9:00AM
Merrill Seney Community Room
Thompson Town Hall

2018 APR 16 A 9 19
Carol Wald
TOWN CLERK

MINUTES

PRESENT: J. Blanchette, Chairman
J. Hall
N. O’Leary
B. H. Davis

ABSENT: S. Lewis, Vice-Chairman

ALSO PRESENT: S. Donohoe, property owner representative, M. A. Chinatti, Director of Planning and Development, K. Beausoleil, First Selectman, W. Bugden, CME Associates, S. Kellerson, CME Associates

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. March 9, 2018 Regular Meeting

(M/S/C Hall/O’Leary) to approve the minutes as presented. Carried unanimously.

3. CORRESPONDENCE – M. A. Chinatti noted that a flash drive with reports will be supplied by CME Associates following this meeting.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS – None.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

a. 929 Riverside Dr. Updates

i. Brownfield Area-Wide Redevelopment (BAR) Grant – M. A. Chinatti noted that the application had been submitted timely and that W. Bugden/J. Guzkowski, CME Associates, were instrumental in helping to pull the application together on short notice; she noted for the record it could not have been accomplished were it not for their assistance. She stated that interviews of selected applicants will take place on April 30 in DECD’s Hartford office.

J. Blanchette cited the tasks requested in the application. She noted that a lot will get done if the Town is selected. M.A. Chinatti noted that at the last Brownfield Working Group meeting Binu Chandy, DECD Brownfield Coordinator, cited that as of that morning five (5) applications had been submitted but that she anticipated receipt of many more by the application closing which was later that afternoon.

W. Bugden noted that the BAR grant requires designation of a separate committee to oversee the work, and that the committee can't be an already-standing committee. M. A. Chinatti noted that the application did include that a subcommittee of this Committee has been established and will be responsible for overseeing the tasks.

W. Bugden also noted that the BAR grant asked for confirmation that the PREPARED Workbook would be used throughout the grant timeline, and that the Town already follows many of the steps outlined in the Workbook though hasn't actually been using it.

ii. Ongoing Brownfield Grant Work

Regarding 929 Riverside Drive, S. Kellerson noted that, since the last meeting there hasn't been a lot of field work done; the visual presented showed locations of former transformers which, he noted, CME hadn't had access to for quite some time because the enclosure was locked but Eversource did come and unlock it so shallow soil samples were collected. He stated that results do show that transformer oils were released, noting that there were still ETPHs and PCBs in soils at concentrations above acceptable regulatory standards. He stated that, based on what S. Donohoe had previously stated, Eversource (formerly CL&P) did do some remediation in the area, as evidenced by some absorbent booms left, and the process gravel in the area was used for backfill; however, not all of the contaminated soils have been removed.

W. Bugden noted a question that could not, at this time, be answered – who is the responsible entity for this clean-up. He noted it would be beneficial for whomever is involved to request of Eversource that it (Eversource) clean it up though they don't own the property and he did not believe they have any legal easement, so he is unsure what their legal obligation is. He stated that Eversource controlled that area, and it was Eversource's locks securing the perimeter that Eversource removed to allow CME access, that they are aware of it and did the previous clean-up. He stated a strong case could be made that the previous work was not completed and Eversource must return and finish it which, he stated, would be the best outcome – to have the utility take care of the clean-up so responsibility wouldn't fall to anyone

else and it wouldn't become an argument between anyone looking to redevelop the site and Rexnord (Sanitary Dash) who occupied the site presumably when these transformers were in operation. He stated the transformer location is in its own little area on the east side of the building right near the tailrace channel and that PCBs are very immobile in the environment and tend to just stick to the soils and not go anywhere. He stated that they (PCBs) also don't degrade, that they remain for decades/hundreds of years/whatever but they do have health issues and there are environmental clean-up standards that do apply, and clean-up is just a matter of digging the soils up/hauling it away and getting some clean samples around the perimeter.

J. Blanchette stated W. Bugden's suggestion re approaching Eversource to complete the clean-up of the area is an excellent one, and asked who would be willing to reach out. W. Bugden stated CME has a connection at Eversource, he would ask them to look into it on a quiet basis, with the hope that it would just get put into Eversource's "que" of projects and admit that clean-up is their responsibility. He noted that, if that were the case, the work would probably not get done promptly, but it would eventually get completed.

In response to a question by K. Beausoleil re what is the magnitude of the contamination, W. Bugden stated that the volume is unknown as detailed sampling was not done – only hand sampling, but he estimated 10s-of-yards/may-be 100 yards at the most. He stated his estimate may be a bit conservative as some of the material may have washed away/thus expanding the area before it sunk into the soil but that in-depth investigation was not part of CME's scope. He stated the work is very do-able, but that the only challenge might be on the side of the tailrace if the oils got to the edge of the tailrace channel, similar to the 630 issue where contamination was butted right up against the stone masonry.

Re whether Eversource would need to get permission from the property owner, W. Bugden stated his presumption that there would need to be an agreement with the owner to do the clean-up. He further stated he did not believe any party (owner/controlling entity/etc.) would oppose granting such permission, as that cost would not then be on it/them, and it would be Eversource's responsibility, following its clean-up, to verify that the area is, indeed, cleaned up.

The Committee agreed that it would be appropriate and appreciated if W. Bugden reached out to Eversource.

S. Kellarsen stated that Phase I ESAs have been completed for 948 and 915 Riverside Drive. He stated six (6) preliminary Areas of

Concern (AOC) were identified at 915, including: AOC 1 – upper loading dock on northeast side of building, AOC 2 – shipping/receiving doors on north side of building, AOC 3 – basically whole cleared area just north of building, AOC 4 – transformers located between main building and sheet metal building that's right up along Riverside Drive (three pad-mounted transformers) where staining is evident just north of the building/staining just west of building where concrete pads for former transformers are located, and the railroad corridor along the east boundary of the site. He noted no AOCs were identified inside 915's building and that it appeared there was very little use of liquids at the site.

W. Bugden then clarified that, as opposed to originally thought, 915 Riverside Drive is not subject to the Property Transfer Act in his opinion, based on his research, unlike 929 Riverside Drive. He noted that, overall, the news is good though there are six (6) areas being recommended for further investigation for thoroughness purposes only, noting that nothing really "stood out".

In response to a question from J. Blanchette re remaining grant funds, W. Bugden stated he would look into expenditures to date and get back to her on that.

Re 948, S. Kellerson stated the south side of the site, just beyond the water tower, when one reviewed historical aerial photographs beginning with 1934, and also 1951, 1963, 1965, it appears that filling had been done prior to 1951 and subsequently used as vehicle parking. He continued, stating that boulders/concrete debris/woody-and-other debris can be seen where the property drops off. He noted that, based on the timeframe and uses at the River Mill during that time, there is much uncertainty re what materials may have been used for fill to create the parking on the 948 site, and that the parking area is the one area of concern identified on the site.

- iii. Redevelopment News – M.A. Chinatti noted that the next public informational meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2018 at 6:00PM. It was pointed out that this will be discussed later in the agenda.

(M/S/C Hall/O'Leary) to modify the agenda to reverse the order of discussion – item b. to become item c., and item c. to become item b. Carried unanimously.

- b. Next Public Informational Meeting, May 23, 2018 – Discussion
M. A. Chinatti noted that the meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2018 at 6:00PM. The location at the Library/Community Center may need to be changed, depending on when needed HVAC work will be done. She stated J. Gumpert should have preliminary plans ready to present at that

meeting, and that in response to a request by his architect for additional photographs, she took/forwarded photos to him yesterday.

It was agreed that J. Blanchette and M. A. Chinatti would finalize an agenda for that meeting.

It was noted that J. Gumpert is looking for incentives from the Town, and M.A. Chinatti noted that the Economic Development Commission allocated funds from its budget and requested the Board of Selectmen bring the item to the Board of Finance for approval for specialized legal consultant to prepare a municipal/developer agreement to ensure the Town is protected re any incentives agreed upon. That request will be on the Board of Selectmen agenda for its next meeting and, should that Board agree, it will make the request at the next meeting of the Board of Finance.

c. "PREPARED" Workbook - Use for Brownfield Redevelopment

W. Bugden stated the thing to keep in mind is that the Workbook was put together by the USEPA and the states, and that they do expect it to be used and, when applying for funds, cite that it is being used. He noted the BAR grant requires a BAR Grant Committee be established, which cannot be a currently-standing committee. It was noted that the First Selectman, in preparation for submission of the BAR grant application, established that Committee, which is made up of members of the MSRAC, and that the BAR Committee is charged with implementing/using the Workbook. It was noted that the Town is already working on and/or completed a number of tasks outlined in the Workbook though not formally using it at that time. He noted only applicants who'd received a grant in the previous BAR round would be farther along than us at this point.

M. A. Chinatti noted that, though this Committee has been doing work outlined in the Workbook, it would need to be more conscious going forward to ensure that worksheets are completed/documentation included.

W. Bugden stated that documentation of tasks outlined in the Workbook would also benefit potential developers as they could submit that documentation when seeking funding/tax credits/etc.

6. MEMBER COMMENTS – None.

7. ADJOURNMENT – With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55AM.

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