State of Connecticut
Department of Economic and Community Development
Office of Brownfield Remediation and Development

Targeted Brownfield Development Loan Program Application

Program Description

The Connecticut Targeted Brownfield Development Loan Program will provide loan funds to municipalities, economic development agencies, for-profit and non-profit developers and other brownfield purchasers or innocent owners who are eligible to receive Brownfield Grants or Loans under Connecticut General Statute Chapter 588gg. The goal is to fund projects that will perform remediation, abatement, and demolition activities prior to redevelopment of the brownfield site(s). Additional goals include leveraging the maximum amount of non-State funds possible to increase the economic impact of the State's investment, reactivating long-stalled sites and encouraging job creation.

Note

This is a State of Connecticut funded program and this application will determine the eligibility of the applicant and/or project to apply for the program. *Please be sure to refer to the Rating and Ranking, and include all relevant attachments that support any information and statements being provided in this application.* This application may be reviewed by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) and other state or quasi-state agencies. Information for this application such as Rating and Ranking sheet may be found at www.ctbrownfields.gov.

Projects funded under this program may be subject to the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act ("CEPA"), as well as other environmental regulations, and DECD regulations related to procurement and bidding procedures. Please contact DECD at brownfields@ct.gov for further information on program requirements.

SECTION I APPLICANT INFORMATION

1. **Applicant:** City of Meriden

2. **Address:** 142 East Main Street, Meriden CT 06450

3. **Contact:** Juliet Burdelski, Director of Economic Development

Telephone: 203-630-4152 **Fax:** 203-630-4274 **Email:** jburdelski@meridenct.gov

4. **Type of Organization**

☒ **Municipality** ☐ **Economic Development Agency** ☐ **For-Profit Developer**

☐ **Non-Profit Developer** ☐ **Brownfield Owner** ☐ **Other**

5. **If applicable, please include copy of 501(c) 3 or corporate certificate. In addition, if applicant is a for-profit company, please include three years of financial statements.** Not applicable. Applicant is a municipality.

6. **Amount of Financial Assistance requested: $** 221,000

7. **Have you ever participated in any funding programs managed by DECD? Describe program, amount, contract date, and current status:** Yes. The City of Meriden has previously received several grants from DECD, including:

- **Municipal Brownfields Pilot funds** - $200,000 for demolition of Factory H, completed in 2012.
- **Remediation of the Meriden HUB site** - grants totaling up to $12,809,793 (DECD Urban ACT for $3,500,000 dated June 15, 2012, DECD Brownfield Grant for $500,000, DEEP grant Public Act PA 07-7 JSS, Sec 13(d) (32) for $5,659,793 and DEEP grant Public Act PA 07-7 JSS. 13(d)(32) for $3,150,000). Project is ongoing; to be completed within the next 12-18 months.
- **Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)** - $1.2 million to complete the rehab of seven foreclosed properties creating 12 units of affordable housing. Project completed 2013.
- **2014 OBRD Municipal Brownfields and Inventory Assessment & Cleanup grants** - $200,000 Funds committed on April 16, 2014 for the assessment of 161 State Street, 144 Mills Memorial, and 62 Cedar Street; $180,000 funds committed October 2014 for assessment of 1 King Place; and $597,000 committed October 2014 for cleanup of 177 State Street.
- **HUD Challenge Grant** -awarded to the State of Connecticut DECD for $2 million, of which Meriden was awarded $972,000 on February 28, 2011 for property Acquisition and Zoning/Planning. Project completed 2014.

8. **Have you ever participated in any funding programs managed by other Connecticut State agencies? Describe program, amount, contract date, and current status:** The City of Meriden receives various funding from the State of Connecticut. Funding specifically related to this project includes an $850,000

Department of Transportation TOD Pilot Grant dated April 17, 2012. The project is ongoing. $200,000 from the TOD Pilot grant has been used for assessment of brownfield sites in the TOD District.

9. Please provide the following demographic information related to the municipality in which the proposed project is located:

	Municipality	State	National
Unemployment:	8.5%	**7.0%**	**6.3%**
Median Household Income:	$53,722	**$69,243**	**$52,762**

Resources to Complete Table:
Unemployment - Department of Labor: http://www1.ctdol.state.ct.us/lmi/laus/lmi123.asp
Median Household Income (Median Nonfamily Household): See OBRD Website

SECTION II PROJECT INFORMATION – Attach supporting documents as needed for all responses.

1. **Project Address:** 1 King Place, Meriden, CT 06451 (Former Meriden Wallingford Hospital)

2. **Property Owner:** City of Meriden, acquired through tax foreclosure January 2014.

   If applicant is not the property owner, how and when will ownership be obtained? Applicant is also the property owner.

3. **Describe how this property is proposed to be developed in the future (mixed use, commercial, residential, industrial etc.)**
   The site contains a 245,000 square foot structure that spans two city blocks on 5.64 acres. It is located in the City's Transit Oriented Development zoning district and within approximately one-half mile from the Meriden Transit Center, a key station stop on the New Haven/Hartford rail line. The City acquired 1 King Place through tax foreclosure in January 2014 after numerous private attempts to redevelop the site failed. The City is committed to repurposing this facility; and through this process, assess the environmental hazards present and complete remediation and abatement strategies that can be incorporated into a redevelopment plan. The former hospital building has been in existence for over 100 years. Vacant since the 1990s, the building is debris filled, subject to repeated vandalism, and a burden on the surrounding neighborhood which includes a high concentration of low income and minority residents. The City's redevelopment goals for the site include a mixed use private development that includes housing and commercial development. The property is located in the TOD zoning district, which is designed to encourage mixed use and mixed income development that takes advantage of the proximity to the Meriden Transit Center, CT Transit bus service, and the future New Haven Hartford Springfield Rail service. Current zoning would allow for the construction of up to 282 mixed income housing units and at least one floor of non-residential uses. A project of this scale could have a value in excess of over $30 million.

Please provide a detailed overview of the proposed project. Include information regarding current interest for development, potential for job creation, housing creation, or improvement in health and safety.

The City, as the sole bidder on the property, acquired 1 King Place in January 2014 to proactively stem the further deterioration of the building, protect the public from immediate public health and safety hazards, and ultimately to transfer the site to a private party for redevelopment purposes. After acquiring the property, the City retained VHB, a Licensed Environmental Professional, to complete a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. VHB found that there are known recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the property, including lead based paint, UST, PCBs, and asbestos, and recommended that a Phase II environmental site assessment be conducted. It was VHB's opinion that prior to the start of Phase II Environmental Site Assessment activities, the City should undertake a Hazardous Building Materials Survey to evaluate the contents within the building, and that removal of the building contents will allow for thorough completion of a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, which under current conditions would be hindered by the significant amount of debris found throughout the building.

In September, 2014, Fuss & O'Neill completed a limited asbestos and hazardous building materials assessment at 1 King Place. The inspection included limited asbestos inspection (visible and accessible materials located on the floors, horizontal and vertical surfaces), fluorescent lamps and ballast (located in debris piles and on the floors throughout the building), paint chips (located on the floors in stairwells and mechanical spaces) and other materials observed throughout the building. The inspection was conducted for only suspect, visible hazards proposed for removal, cleanup and to "make safe" for individuals to enter the building. Fuss & O'Neill recommended that a comprehensive scope of work and technical specification be developed as part of the debris cleanup for the site. At the City's request, Fuss & O'Neill provided a hazardous building materials abatement cost estimate, which at minimum would allow for removal of visible and accessible asbestos containing materials. A probable cost estimate, including development of an AWP, work plan, project monitoring and construction administration is $221,000.

On March 9, 2015, the Meriden City Council authorized the City Manager to seek a loan in the amount of $221,000 to complete this interim cleanup action and make the building safe for further assessment. The City intends to use the loan funds to complete debris removal in the next 6-9 months and proceed with the full assessments in late 2015. The City has been awarded a DECD assessment grant in the amount of $180,000 for further Environmental Site Assessments (Phase II/III) and a Hazardous Building Materials survey. Once we have these assessments, we will have a true cleanup cost estimate, which we will be able to use in future development proformas, financial analyses, etc. and better position the City to seek out prospective developers.

In June 2014, the City initiated an RFQ/RFP process as a first step in seeking a private development partner to redevelop 1 King Place and eight other city-owned sites in the TOD zoning district. 1 King Place is a key TOD redevelopment parcel located within one-half mile from the HUB and Meriden Transit Center sites. During the RFQ process, one developer expressed interest in developing 1 King Place, however, did not submit a full development proposal as anticipated. We believe that private interest in the site is hindered by the unknown levels of environmental contamination present. Additional environmental assessment work is needed to help fully quantify the environmental cleanup strategies

and costs which will inform future development plans. The project will allow the City to make the site safe for additional assessments and completion of the proposed activities will improve the health and safety of Meriden residents by removing and disposing of known environmental hazards while eliminating a significant source of blight in the neighborhood.

Please describe the proposed development timeline (include attachments as needed):

- January 2014 – City acquires 1 King Place through tax foreclosure
- May 2014 – City conducts Phase I ESA, which recommends an evaluation of building contents and removal before conducting a recommended Phase II ESA
- June 2014 – City issues RFQ for 1 King Place and other priority sites in Meriden TOD District
- June 2014—City applies for DECD Assessment funds (awarded October 2014)
- August 2014 –Developer interviews
- August 2014 through October 2014 – Per recommendation of Phase I, City engages a hazardous material specialist to evaluate 1 King Place building contents and estimate cost of debris removal; conducts debris removal
- December 2014—TOD developer RFPs submitted and evaluated by City staff. No proposals received for 1 King Place
- March 9, 2015-City Council authorizes City Manager to apply for $221,000 in loan funds for interim cleanup
- Future activities following award of loan funds (1 month)-City selects LEP to oversee interim cleanup
- Future activities following award of loan funds (1 month)-City issues bid for hazardous materials abatement and selects cleanup contractor
- Future activities following award of loan funds (2 months) -Cleanup conducted and reports submitted to regulatory agencies as required.
- Future activities following interim cleanup-- City issues RFP for Phase II/III ESA, HBM report, and selects LEP (1 month)
- Future activities following interim cleanup—LEP completes Phase II/III ESAs completed, HBM report, probable cost estimate for cleanup (4-6 months)
- Future activities--Funds identified for cleanup and action plan for redevelopment

5. **What is the appraised value of the site(s) if remediated ("if clean"):** In September 2013, the property appraised for $2.25 million in vacant/poor condition. The appraisal did not take into consideration potential environmental contamination, which is likely to be significant. Therefore, the city assumes that the appraised value of the property, if clean, is $2.25 million.

6. **If applicable, please provide all relevant project financial information (i.e., development pro forma, development sources and uses; include attachments as needed): Not applicable**

Please describe how the State's financial investment is required to advance the remediation and/or redevelopment project (i.e., the "but for" rationale): The state's financial investment in the project is

required for several reasons. First, as an economically distressed municipality with little or no new growth in is tax base, city funding for environmental assessment and cleanup is limited. In 2014, the City was awarded $180,000 to complete environmental assessments at the site, however, the Phase I ESA concluded that "make safe" steps are necessary before further environmental assessments can be conducted. The funding requested will be used for interim cleanup activities prior to Phase II/III assessments.

Second, there are immediate public health and safety concerns posed by 1 King Place. The Phase I ESA identified numerous recognized environmental conditions in just a portion of the 245,000 square foot building. Several areas of the building were inaccessible during the Phase I due to large amounts of debris; therefore, many unknowns exist regarding the condition and potential contents of the building. After debris removal, the City will hire an LEP to complete Phase II/III ESA's and a Hazardous Building Material Survey to get a better understanding of the size and scope of potential remediation and abatement costs. The City has secured the building, which is extremely challenging given the size of the facility (spanning two city blocks on 5.64 acres) and the risks associated with abandoned buildings (e.g. fire, trespass, vandalism, recurring break-ins, exposure to potential hazardous). Having state funds available to undertake environmental assessments will help expedite the evaluation of the building hazards so that the City can put together an action plan for redevelopment.

Finally, this site, and numerous sites throughout the City Center have been vacant, underutilized or abandoned for many years. Historic downtown flooding, a decline in industrial activity, and unsuccessful urban renewal policies resulted in significant disinvestment in Meriden's City Center beginning in the 1960's. Recent efforts, including implementation of the Harbor Brook Flood Control Plan and city-led efforts to capitalize on state investments in rail infrastructure, have recently begun to breathe new life into downtown Meriden; however, there is much more to be done. 1 King Place is one of several distressed and/or underutilized properties in the TOD district that was recently acquired by the city for the purposes of redevelopment. Before the City acquired 1 King Place, numerous attempts by private parties to redevelop the site have failed and as a result the property has been vacant for more than 15 years. With the state's assistance, the city has an opportunity to fully understand current environmental conditions, estimate cleanup costs and bring this site back into productive use.

7. Please describe status of discussions with municipal elected officials, relevant municipal committees (i.e., Planning and Zoning), community groups and other key stakeholders :

The City of Meriden has identified 1 King Place as a top priority site for environmental assessment in the TOD district. As such, the City Manager and City Council supported acquisition of the property through tax foreclosure knowing that redevelopment may be challenging. Community groups have been engaged throughout the past year or more, through meetings of the surrounding Dutch Hill/Action 13 neighborhood meetings and through regular meetings of the Meriden Blight & Brownfield Committee. Formed in October 2002 to guide the city in redeveloping underutilized/vacant/brownfields properties and to support anti-blight efforts, the B&B Committee includes residents and members of key stakeholder groups in Meriden—non-profits, state and federal agencies (DEEP, EPA), local government,

and community-based organizations including the Meriden Council of Neighborhood Associations. The B&B Committee meets every quarter and welcomes the general public. The City has established good contacts and has extensive experience working in the Dutch Hill/Action 13 neighborhoods through previous B&B Committee planning and brownfields stakeholder involvement activities, such as the Factory H project. More info in the City's brownfield program is available at: http://www.meridenbiz.com/Content/Brownfields.asp

To address community concerns regarding vandalism and trespass, immediately after taking title, the City established a multi-department task force charged with securing the site for public safety purposes. Task force members include the Chief of Police, Fire Marshal, Director of Planning and Enforcement, City Building Inspector, City Housing Inspector, Director of Parks and Buildings, Director of Economic Development, City Attorney, Director of Public Works, and the City Manager. The task force developed and is executing a formal plan to secure the building and reduce the potential for trespass and exposure to hazardous materials. The task force meets regularly to review status and progress. In addition to the Phase I ESA, the City also hired attorneys Brown Rudnick to review federal and state environmental records filed under prior ownership (Veterans Memorial Medical Center, the Meriden Wallingford Hospital, and Bradley Research Center). The City has informed the public of its ongoing efforts to secure and assess the site and has worked to engage developers through an RFQ/RFP process.

On March 9, 2015, the Meriden City Council authorized the City Manager to apply for $221,000 in loan funds that will allow the city to "make safe" the building prior to further environmental site investigations. The City plans to undertake a Phase II/III Environmental Site Assessment and Hazardous Building Materials survey following the interim cleanup using a previously awarded DECD brownfields assessment grant ($180,000 awarded in 2014).

Does the project have site plan approval from the host municipality?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Details: No development plans are pending at this time.

8. **How will this redevelopment project address an unmet need within its surrounding neighborhood, municipality and/or region?** The most pressing unmet need that this redevelopment project will address is the immediate public health and safety threat that the property poses to Meriden residents. In addition, the redevelopment of 1 King Place is a key component of the city's efforts to transform the City Center into a walkable, vibrant neighborhood with access to jobs, housing and commercial/retail areas as well as medical services for the growing immigrant and senior population. An analysis of residential supply and demand indicates a potential demand for 600 to 1,000 housing units in the TOD district and up to 30,000 square feet of service and specialty retail to support new development. This new housing and retail will be attractive to young workers and empty nesters seeking high quality affordable and workforce housing.

Will the redevelopment project include affordable and/or mixed-income housing? While redevelopment plans for the site have not yet been conceptualized, the property is located within

Meriden's TOD district, which emphasizes and encourages mixed use development and affordable housing.

9. Please provide a range of permanent jobs associated with the redevelopment project: The proposed cleanup project would require up to 653 labor hours, including 240-320 contractor hours for cleanup activities (at prevailing wage rates) and an estimated 333 professional hours for a Licensed Environmental Professional and for Environmental Testing. Current zoning would allow for the construction of up to 282 mixed income housing units and at least one floor of non-residential use. A project of this scale has a value in excess of over $30 million. Using various jobs estimators (ARRA, Strategic Economic Research, IMPLAN, etc.) for the construction of multi-family housing projects, the project has the potential to create over 300 full time jobs (46% of jobs directly related to construction and 54% associated jobs).

10. Experience: Please list the project team members (municipal, developer, environmental professional, financing sources, etc.) and indicate the level of experience the team has with similar projects. Include project size, scope, and whether completed on time and within budget. The City of Meriden is experienced in managing public funding sources. Meriden partners with DCED, as well as DEEP for projects as needed throughout the city. The city is currently working with both entities under the HUB Flood Control & Park Project. Additionally, Meriden successfully managed several EPA Brownfields Grants and the CT DOT's TOD Pilot grant that are similar in size and scope to this proposal. The City complied with all relevant administrative requirements, including completing all projects on time and on budget. The City has a well-established process for selecting an environmental professional for environmental assessment projects. The City will solicit proposals from LEPs/Environmental Engineering firms through the city's established procurement procedures. State procurement requirements will be incorporated in the City's process.

Recently completed state and EPA grants that are similar in size and scope of this proposed project include: 1) FY09 EPA Assessment Grant (2B96110701) that provided $200,000 in federal funding for a city-wide inventory of brownfields. The city used funds to complete an inventory of recorded institutional/engineering controls; Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative community outreach and stakeholder meetings; Phase IIs for 116 Cook Ave. and 85 Cooper St.; Phase IIIs for 77 and 85 Cooper St., 104 Butler St., and 116 Cook Ave.; building hazards report for 116 Cook Ave.; and soil sampling at 104 Butler St., 2) FY07 EPA Assessment Grant (BF 97182101) that provided $200,000 in federal funds to identify and prioritize brownfields. The city used funds to complete a market and reuse analysis of Factory H neighborhood, a supplemental subsurface investigation of 77 Cooper and 104 Butler Street, Phase I's for 116 Cook Avenue, 85 Cooper Street, 62 Twiss Street, 60 State Street, 26-33 Colony Street, 62 Cedar Street, 144 Pratt Street, 161 State Street, and 33 and 51-53 South Colony Street, and Phase II for 161 State Street, and 3) CT Dept of Transportation TOD Pilot grant that provided $200,000 for environmental assessments. The City used funds to complete Phase I/II/III Environmental Site Assessments and Remedial Action Plans for 11 Crown Street and 177 State Street, two redevelopment parcels located within Meriden's TOD zoning district. The City also used TOD Pilot funds to conduct a Phase I environmental site assessment and environmental records search for 1 King Place.

11. For each property involved in this application please provide the following information:

Please describe the current use of the property:

(a) **Vacant x Abandoned ☐ Underused x Operating / In Use ☐**

Current/Prior Usage Details (including relevant time periods): The site is a 5.64-acre parcel located in the southwestern quadrant of the Meriden city limits and is improved with two primary structures: a 245,000-square-foot masonry building that was constructed in phases between the early 1900s and the late 1980s for use as a hospital and a two-story, 26,230-square-foot reinforced concrete parking garage building constructed circa 1980. Hospital operations ceased in the late 1990s and the site has since remained vacant. Prior to use as a hospital, the site had several uses including a bank, single-family homes, and a public school dating back to the late 1800s. Use as a hospital began on a portion of the site in the early 1900s and through the 1980s the hospital slowly overtook surrounding uses, ultimately resulting in the hospital spanning a majority of two city blocks.

If property is abandoned/vacant, how long has the property been abandoned/vacant? The property has been vacant since the late 1990s and was allowed to go into tax foreclosure. The city acquired the property in January 2014 for tax liens totaling $1.1 million. The city was the sole bidder on the property.

Property Location: 1 King Place, Meriden, CT 06451

If applicant is not the owner, does the applicant have site access? N/A

Tax Status: Exempt from taxes/city-owned

Acreage: 5.64

Description of why site may be considered a brownfield: The site is listed on the CT DEEP Brownfield Inventory. No RCRA enforcement or compliance actions for the site and no CT Property Transfer Act filings for the site have been recorded. A Phase I ESA completed by VHB in May 2014 reveals known or suspect recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs) at the site. The hazards present are indicative of releases or threatened releases of petroleum, hazardous substances, and/ or hazardous materials to soil, groundwater, and soil gas at the property including: USTs; asbestos; lead; PCBs; miscellaneous waste (e.g., universal, solid, hazardous); and radiation sources. Due to large amounts of debris present during the Phase I investigation, several areas of the building were inaccessible. As a result, unknowns exist as to the condition and contents of these areas of the building. The Phase I ESA recommends that the city undertake a HBM Survey to evaluate the contents within the building and remove debris to allow for a thorough completion of a Phase II ESA, which, under current conditions, would be hindered by the significant amount of debris throughout the building.

12. Please indicate pre-development activities to date, outlays and sources of funding: The City acquired the property for the amount of the back taxes owed on the property, $1.1 million, in January 2014. The City expended an additional $5,000 in legal costs for foreclosure proceedings. The City utilized Connecticut

Department of Transportation TOD Pilot grant funding to conduct the Phase I ESA ($2500) and for a legal review ($8,000). Since acquiring the site, the city has spent over $10,000 to secure the building. Other pre-development activities include issuing the TOD developer RFQ/RFP, which included 1 King Place.

Are there any DEEP or EPA enforcement actions related to the site?

Yes ☐ **No** ☒ **Details:**

Does this property fall under a State or Federal cleanup program?

Yes ☐ **No** ☒ **Details:**

Is the applicant working with the DEEP and/or a Licensed Environmental Professional (LEP)?

Yes ☒ **No** ☐ **Details:** The City engaged Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc., a Licensed Environmental Professional (LEP), to conduct the Phase I ESA. The city engaged Fuss & O'Neill, a Licensed Environmental Professional, to complete the Hazardous Materials Assessment and Abatement Cost Estimate. The City will seek bids from LEPs and from licensed hazardous removal contractors in accordance with City and State procurement requirements.

Who is the "Potential Responsible Party"? Not determined at this time.

When was the current environmental condition caused? Current conditions on this property likely occurred prior to the hospital's closure in the late 1990s.

Please describe the public health and environmental benefits of the proposed project: This brownfield property is of major concern to the City not only because of its blighting effect on the entire neighborhood but because of the fire and asbestos risk (e.g., potential to spread contaminants) in such close proximity to housing occupied by young children and seniors. The blight associated with this brownfield has had deleterious impacts on the Dutch Hill/Action 13 neighborhood's welfare. For example, the risks associated with trespass, homeless living in the building, and potential fire spreading contaminants has continued to have negative effects on the entire neighborhood. Hazardous materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs and other contaminants) have been identified on the property in addition to one or more USTs of which current condition is unknown. The outcomes from the assessment, cleanup and revitalization of 1 King Place will address the public health and environmental impacts noted above.

14. Please provide information on the following activities that have been completed for the site(s):.

	Consultant	Date Completed	Results/Estimates
Phase I ESA	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.	May 2014	$2500. Completed May 2014. Recommends Phase II after debris is removed from buildings
Phase II ESA			$20,000-$30,000 (funded by DECD)
Phase III ESA			$20,000-$30,000 (funded by DECD)
Remedial Action Plan:			$25,000-$30,000
Hazardous Building Materials/Asbestos Survey (Limited to Loose Debris):	Fuss & O'Neill	October 2014	$14,925. Completed. Recommends development of technical specifications for removal of asbestos to "make safe" structure for future environmental assessment
Demolition/Haz Building Materials/Asbestos Survey:			$62,000-$138,000 (For haz mat building survey, demo cost estimate, and bid documents only. Includes testing of Lead, PCB's, Universal Waste and Radiation. Total demolition cost may be upwards of $5 million due to size of facility. Funded by DECD.)
Remediation Activities:			TBD. Remediation may include removal of USTs, soil cleanup. Other remediation activities are unknown at this time

15. Mills/Historic Structures: Does the project include or assist in reuse or rehabilitation of any mills or historic structures (appearing on the national Register of Historic Places, State Register, or a designated Local Historic Property)? Yes ☐ No ☒ Details:

Will the project leverage federal and/or state historic tax credits?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Details: Portions of the building may be eligible for historic tax credits. Eligibility will be determined as a part of redevelopment planning.

If the project includes alteration or demolition of buildings more than 50 years in age, please indicate the dates of construction for the affected buildings: 1900.

16. Does project have required floodplain, SHPO, or wetland permits, or have they been applied for? *Note: Please include copies of any permits or communication regarding the same*: Not applicable for debris removal only.

17. Public Utility Service Area: Is the project within an existing public utility service area?

Yes ☒ **No** ☐

If no, would the project need new public utilities? Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **Details:**

18. Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), Public Transit and Pedestrian Environment:

Is the project site within walking distance (a half mile) of an existing or planned commuter train station or a bus stop? Yes ☒ **No** ☐ **Details:** Meriden Transit Center and CT Transit bus service are within walking distance from the site. Additionally, the site is located within Meriden's TOD district in downtown Meriden.

Does the property have any features nearby that would enhance walkability or bikeability? (Example: Complete Streets design features, sidewalks, street trees, bicycle lanes, bicycle storage facilities, etc.)

Yes ☒ **No** ☐ **Details:** The Meriden Transit Center and CT Transit bus service are within walking distance from the site. The Connecticut Department of Transportation is in the process of constructing a $20 million rail station to replace the aging Meriden Transit Center (Amtrak) station. The investment is part of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield (NHHS) rail program, a $467 million commuter/high speed rail service utilizing the existing AMTRAK rail corridor. Meriden has been designated a key station stop along the NHHS rail line. At full capacity, Meriden will have 56 bi-directional trains daily serving the Springfield to New Haven corridor and improved transit bus service. The Meriden Transit Center includes those features outlined above.

19. Mixed-Use Development:

Will future development of this site include a mixed-use development (residential, commercial, retail)?

Yes ☒ **No** ☐ **Details:** Identified as a key site in the TOD district, the city is seeking to partner with a developer to redevelop the property into mixed use with an affordable housing component.

If so, is the neighborhood currently zoned for mixed-use development?

Yes ☒ **No** ☐ **N/A** ☐ **Comments:** Meriden will utilize the TOD zoning district for this property, which was adopted in August 2013. The property is zoned TOD – Hanover.

If not, is the applicant pursuing the zoning changes to enable a mix of uses in the project site?

Yes ☐ **No** ☐ **N/A** ☒ **Comments:**

20. Summary of the subject property's tax contribution to the municipal tax base:

Subject Property Tax Impact

Most Recent Year	Projected Year 1 After Development
Exempt	unknown – based on future development

SECTION III PROJECT BUDGET INFORMATION

Note: If budget information is based on contractor bids or other formal estimates, please attach copies of the bid/estimate documents. (See Estimated Environmental Costs, attached.)

Project Activity (Use of Fund)	Source of Fund					
	DECD	Other State	Federal	Local	Private	Total
Land purchase (tax Foreclosure)				$1,100,000		$1,100,000
Environmental						
Assessment (Previously awarded)	$180,000	$17,500				$197,500
Remediation						
Abatement (interim cleanup)	$162,000					$162,000
Monitoring/LEP (interim cleanup)	$39,000					$39,000
Demolition						
Construction						
Administration soft costs						
Development fee						
Legal costs		$8,000		$5,000		$13,000
Other costs-security				$10,000		$10,000
Contingency (interim cleanup)	$20,000					$20,000
Other costs						
Total	$401,000	25500		1115000		$1,541,500

SECTION IV CERTIFICATION BY APPLICANT

It is hereby represented by the undersigned, that to the best of my knowledge and belief no information or data contained in the application and attachments are in any way false or incorrect and that no material information has been omitted. The undersigned agrees that the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), the federal Environmental Protection Agency are hereby

authorized now, or anytime in the future, to give the Department of Economic and Community Development any and all information in connection with matters referred to in this application. Your application and the contents of your application and our discussions with you are subject to public disclosure. We may communicate with the municipality, state agencies (including the CT Department of Energy & Environmental Protection, the CT Department of Housing, the CT Office of Policy and Management, the CT Department of Public Health), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the general public. You or the owner may be requested to enroll in the DEEP Voluntary Remediation Program, and to cooperate with DEEP and the EPA. Projects funded under this program may be subject to the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act ("CEPA"), as well as other environmental regulations, and DECD regulations related to procurement and bidding procedures. State funding may require placement of a lien on project property. In addition, if the applicant is a private corporation, a personal guaranty may be also required from each owner of 10% or more. In addition, the undersigned agrees that any funds provided pursuant to this application will be utilized exclusively for the purposes represented in this application, as may be amended and agreed to by the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD). DECD reserves the right to amend or cancel this NOFA, to modify or waive any requirement, condition or other term set forth in this NOFA or the Application, to request additional information at any time from one or more applicants, to select any number of applications submitted in response to this NOFA, or to reject any or all such applications, in each case at DECD's sole discretion. DECD may exercise the foregoing rights at any time without notice and without liability to any applicant or any other party. Applications to this NOFA shall be prepared at the sole expense of the applicant and shall not obligate DECD to procure any of the services described therein or herein from any applicant. DECD shall not be obligated to any applicant until a final written agreement has been executed by all necessary parties thereto and all applicable approvals have been obtained. As such, any funds expended by the applicant prior to these approvals will be done so entirely at the risk of the applicant.

Please be sure to include all attachments with your submission.

Signature:	Title: City Manager	Date: 3-10-2015

Via Email: Brownfields@CT.GOV

or Via Mail to:

DECD

Office of Brownfield Remediation and Development

505 Hudson Street

4th Floor

Hartford, CT 06106 , Attention: Donald Friday

Hazardous Materials Building Assessment

September 16-19 and 22, 2014
1 King Place
Meriden, CT

City of Meriden

Meriden, CT

November 4, 2014

FUSS & O'NEILL
EnviroScience, LLC

Fuss & O'Neill EnviroScience, LLC
146 Hartford Road
Manchester, CT 06040

Project No. 20120232.A7E

FUSS & O'NEILL
EnviroScience, LLC

November 4, 2014

Ms. Juliet Burdelski
Director of Economic Development
City of Meriden
142 East Main Street, Rm 217
Meriden, CT 06450

Re: Hazardous Materials Building Assessment-
Former Veteran's Memorial Hospital
1 King Place, Meriden, CT
Fuss & O'Neill EnviroScience Project No. 20120232.A7E

Dear Ms. Burdelski:

Enclosed is the report for the limited asbestos and hazardous materials building assessment conducted at the Former Veteran's Memorial Hospital located at 1 King Place in Meriden, CT (the "Site"). The work was conducted for the City of Meriden (the "Client").

The services were performed September 16-19 and September 22, 2014 by Fuss & O'Neill EnviroScience, LLC licensed inspectors and included a limited asbestos and hazardous material inspection in support of the clean-up project at the Site. The information summarized in this report is for the above-mentioned materials, only. The work was performed in accordance with our written proposal dated September 15, 2014.

If you should have any questions regarding the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to contact me at (860) 646-2469, extension 5570. Thank you for this opportunity to have served your environmental needs.

Sincerely,

Carlos Texidor
Project Manager

CT/seo

Enclosure

146 Hartford Road
Manchester, CT
06040
1 860.646.2469
800.286.2469
1 860.533.5143

www.fando.com

Connecticut
Massachusetts
Rhode Island
South Carolina

FUSS & O'NEILL
EnviroScience, LLC

Table of Contents

Hazardous Materials Building Assessment Report
1 King Place, Meriden Connecticut

Tables

Figures

Appendices

End of Report

FUSS & O'NEILL
EnviroScience, LLC

1 Introduction

Fuss & O'Neill EnviroScience, LLC (EnviroScience) representatives John Coletti, Anthony Malat, Bob Feingold, Chris McIntyre, and Kim Rinard performed a limited asbestos and hazardous materials assessment at the Former Veteran's Memorial Hospital located at 1 King Place in Meriden, CT (the "Site"). The inspection included the following:

- Limited asbestos inspection (visible and accessible materials located on the floors, horizontal and verticals surfaces.)
- Fluorescent lamps and ballasts (located in debris piles and on the floors throughout the building);
- Paint chips (located on the floors in stairwells and mechanical spaces); and
- Other hazardous materials observed throughout the building.

The work was conducted for the City of Meriden (the "Client") in accordance with our written scope of services dated September 3, 2014 and is subject to the limitations included in *Appendix A*.

2 Asbestos Inspection

A property Owner must ensure that a thorough asbestos-containing materials (ACM) inspection is performed prior to possible disturbance of suspect ACM during renovation or demolition activities. This is a requirement of the EPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulation located at Title 40 CFR, Part 61, Subpart M. At the time of the inspection there were no planned renovation or demolition activities. The inspection was conducted for only suspect ACM that was visible and accessible scheduled for removal as part of the proposed clean-up activities, and to "make safe" for individuals to enter the buildings.This inspection is not a NESHAP inspection, and should not be used to plan renovations or demolition projects.

On September 16-19 and September 22, Mr. Coletti, Mr. Malat, Mr. Feingold, Mr. McIntyre, and Ms. Rinard of EnviroScience conducted the inspection. Mr. Coletti and Mr. Malat are State of Connecticut Department of Public Health (CT DPH) licensed Asbestos Inspectors. Refer to *Appendix B* for EnviroScience licenses and accreditations.

2.1 Methodology

The inspection was conducted by visually inspecting debris observed on the floor which was suspect asbestos-containing material. Suspect asbestos-containing materials may include but are not limited to: asphalt floor tile, vinyl floor tile, vinyl sheet flooring, construction mastics, acoustical plaster, vinyl wall coverings, wallboards, spackling compounds, joint compounds, ceiling tiles, textured paints, spray-applied insulation, blown-in insulation, fireproofing materials, HVAC duct insulation, boiler insulation, pipe insulation, and fire doors. The EPA recommends collecting suspect ACM samples in a manner sufficient to determine asbestos content and to segregate each suspect type of homogenous (similar in color, texture, and date of application) materials.

The inspectors collected bulk samples of visible accessible suspect ACM materials from the debris piles on the floor and prepared proper chain of custody forms to submit the asbestos bulk samples to EMSL Analytical Inc. located in Cinnaminson, New Jersey (EMSL) for analysis. EMSL is a Connecticut-licensed and American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA)-accredited asbestos laboratory. The sample locations, material type, sample identification, and asbestos content as identified by PLM bulk sample analysis is provided in Table 1 attached hereto. Suspect ACM not listed in the table that may be identified at a later date at the Site, should be assumed to be ACM until sample collection and analysis indicate otherwise. Asbestos bulk sample analysis was conducted using the EPA Interim Method for the Determination of Asbestos in Bulk Building Materials (EPA/600/R-93/116) via Polarized Light Microscopy with Dispersion Staining (PLM/DS).

Select samples of plaster and mastic that were reported as < 1 % asbestos but above the laboratory method reporting limit were confirmed thru point counting by the PLM method mentioned above. Three of the samples verified thru point counting were reported with concentrations of asbestos above 1%. These materials are included in the list of ACM in section 2.2 below.

If samples of suspect materials could not be collected or were inaccessible but observed elsewhere, these materials were assumed to contain asbestos and the inspectors approximated quantities. The roof of the structure was not included in the scope of work for this inspection.

EnviroScience did not perform subsurface and/or destructive investigations for suspect ACM during our inspection of the subject property. Confined spaces were identified within the basement of the 1968 and Bradley buildings, portions of the building identified as confined spaces were not included in this inspection.

2.2 Results

Utilizing the EPA protocol and criteria, the following materials were determined to be **ACM**:

- White paper formerly on duct – Northwest Mechanical Room(1968 Building)
- White pipe insulation on ground – Northwest Mechanical Room (1968 Building)
- White mudded fitting insulation on ground – Northwest Mechanical Room (1968 Building)
- Off-white 9"x 9" floor tiles – Stairwell H (1968 Building)
- Black mastic on off-white 9" x 9" floor – Stairwell H(1968 Building)
- Off-white 9" x 9" floor tiles – Second Floor East Hall (1968 Building)
- Black mastic on off-white 9" x 9" floor – Second Floor East Hall (1968 Building)
- Beige 12" x 12" floor tiles – Second Floor Northeast Area (1968 Building)
- Black mastic on Beige 12" x 12" floor tiles – Fourth Floor Nurses Suite (1968 Building)
- Red 9" x 9" floor tile – Fifth Floor South Hall (1952 Section)
- Black mastic on red 9" x 9" floor tiles – Fifth Floor South Hall(1952 Section)
- Green 9" x 9" floor tile – Fifth Floor South Hall (1952 Section)
- Black mastic on green 9" x 9" floor tile – Fifth Floor South Hall (1952 Section)
- White air cell pipe insulation on floor – Fifth Floor Hallway (1952 Section)
- White magnesium insulation on ground – Third Floor Open Area Room (1952 Bradley)
- Air cell pipe insulation on ground – Third Floor Open Area Room (1952 Bradley)
- Off-white 12" x 12" floor tiles – Third Floor Open Area Room (1952 Bradley)

- Brown 9" x 9" checkerboard tile – First Floor Middle Room (1952 Bradley)
- Mastic on brown 9" x 9" checkerboard tile – First Floor Middle Room (1952 Bradley)
- Light brown 12" x 12" floor tiles – First Floor Hall (South Addition)
- White plaster(skim)* – Second Floor (Nursing school)
- White plaster (rough)* – Second Floor (Nursing school)
- White plaster (rough)* – First Floor (Far Southeast Area)

*Asbestos content determined thru TEM Gravimetric Reduction method.

In addition, the following materials were not within the limited scope of services for this phase however, they are assumed to be **ACM** based on visible inspection:

- Interior/Exterior Fire Doors
- Ceiling tiles located within the ceiling grid intact
- Sheetrock and plaster wall surfaces observed throughout the building
- Thermal system insulation observed on pipes and system components
- Surfacing materials observed on the underside of the concrete floor slabs, interior masonry partition walls and the interior surface of exterior building walls throughout the building

Refer to Table 1 for a complete list of ACM and non-ACM identified as part of this inspection. Refer to Figures 1-5 for asbestos bulk sample locations. The general condition of materials determined to be ACM is included in Table 1. Refer to *Appendix C* for the asbestos laboratory report and chain of custody forms. Refer to *Appendix D* for site photographs.

2.3 Discussion

The EPA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the CT DPH, define a material that contains greater than one percent (>1%) asbestos, utilizing PLM/DS, as being an ACM. Materials that are identified as "none detected" are specified as not containing asbestos.

2.4 Conclusion

The materials determined to contain asbestos that will be impacted by any proposed clean-up "make safe", work must be remediated by a licensed Asbestos Abatement Contractor prior to entry into the building(s).

If applicable, EnviroScience recommends that a comprehensive scope of work and technical specification be developed as part of the debris clean-up for the Site. We have developed an opinion of cost for the complete removal of all identified asbestos. Note the total cost is inclusive of removing all asbestos observed within the debris piles, and a more limited scope can be tailored to any specific clean-up, "make safe" work as necessary.

Suspect materials encountered during the clean-up, "make safe" activitiesthat are not identified in this report as being non-ACM should be presumed to be ACM until sample collection and laboratory analysis indicate otherwise.

3 Potential Lead-Based Paint

EnviroScience field staff observed potential lead-based paint chips on the floor from the deteriorated painted surfaces within the stairwells and mechanical spaces. No lead-based paint determination was performed at the time of the inspection. We recommended anayalizes of lead paint chips prior to disposal of building materials.

3.1 Discussion

Lead-based paint issues involving properties that are not residential are regulated to a limited degree for worker protection relating to paint-disturbing work activities and waste disposal. Worker protection is regulated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations, in addition to the CT DPH. These regulations involve air monitoring of workers exposure levels when disturbing lead-containing paint.

The EPA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection regulate the disposal of lead-containing waste. Potentially lead-containing materials that will be removed from the Site for disposal during the debris clean-up activities must either be analyzed using the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) analysis to determine if lead is present or be presumed as a hazardous waste. A TCLP sample is a representative sample of the intended waste stream. The results are compared to the threshold value of 5.0 milligrams per liter (mg/L): a result exceeding this value is considered a D008 hazardous waste in accordance with RCRA.

3.2 Conclusion

OSHA published a Lead in Construction Standard (OSHA Lead Standard) Title 29 CFR, Part 1926.62 in May 1993. The OSHA Lead Standards are task-based and derived from airborne exposure and blood lead levels.

Building components containing lead levels above industry standards that are disturbed during the debris clean-up activities may cause exposure to lead above the OSHA standards. No TCLP sample was collected at the time of the limited asbestos and hazardous material inspection to characterize the expected waste that may result from the debris clean-up.

4 PCB-Containing Fluorescent Light Ballasts and Mercury-Containing Lamps

4.1 PCB-Containing Fluorescent Ballasts

Fluorescent light ballasts manufactured prior to 1979 may contain capacitors that contain PCBs. Light ballasts installed as late as 1985 may also contain PCB capacitors. Fluorescent light ballasts that are not

labeled as "No-PCBs" must be assumed to contain PCBs, unless proven otherwise by quantitative analysis. Capacitors in fluorescent light ballasts labeled as non-PCB-containing may contain diethylhexl phthalate (DEHP). DEHP was the primary substitute to replace PCBs for small capacitors in fluorescent light ballasts in use until 1991. DEHP is a toxic substance, a suspected carcinogen, and is listed under EPA RCRA and the Superfund law as a hazardous waste. Therefore, EPA Superfund liability exists for landfilling both PCB and DEHP-containing light ballasts. These listed materials are considered hazardous waste under EPA RCRA, and require special handling and disposal considerations.

On September 16-19 and September 22, EnviroScience representative(s), Mr. Coletti, Mr. Malat, Ms. Rinard, and Mr. Feingold performed a visual inspection of representative fluorescent light fixtures to identify possible PCB-containing light ballasts. The inspection involved visually inspecting labels on representative light ballasts to identify dates of manufacture and labels indicating "No PCBs". Ballasts manufactured after 1991 were not listed as PCB or DEHP-containing ballasts, and were not quantified for disposal. 572 fluorescent lamp ballasts were observed during the inspection.

The light ballasts without a label indicating "No PCBs" are presumed to be PCB-containing waste and must be segregated for proper removal, packaging, transport, and disposal as PCB-containing waste. Those light ballasts labeled as "No PCBs" indicating manufacture dates prior to 1991 are presumed to contain DEHP. DEHP-containing light ballasts must be segregated for proper removal, packaging, transport, and disposal as non-PCB hazardous waste. Note that disposal requirements for DEHP-containing ballasts are slightly varied, and disposal costs are slightly less than PCB-containing light ballasts. Please refer to Table 2 for the type and estimated quantity on debris piles of PCB/DEHP-Containing Light Ballasts

4.2 Mercury-Containing Equipment

Fluorescent lamps/tubes are presumed to contain mercury vapor, which is a hazardous substance to both human health and the environment. Thermostatic controls and electrical switch gear may contain a vial or bulb of mercury associated with the control. Mercury-containing equipment is regulated for proper disposal by the EPA RCRA hazardous waste regulations. According to the EPA, mercury lamps are characterized as a Universal Waste. Therefore, fluorescent lamps must be either recycled, or disposed as hazardous waste.

On September 16-19 and September 22, EnviroScience representatives, Mr. Coletti, Mr. Malat, Ms. Rinard, and Mr. Feingold, performed an inventory of mercury lamps observed on ground and within the debris piles at the Site; please refer to Table 3. These fixtures were inventoried in-place.

5 Additional Hazardous Materials and Debris

EnviroScience field staff observed stockpiles of non-bulk containers of surplus chemicals, bulk containers of chemicals, debris piles containing household waste materials and car and truck tires throughout the building.

In addition to bulk containers and non-bulk containers of surplus chemicals, EnviroScience observed one cardboard box, with a heavy accumulation of crystalline material on the outer portion of the box with visible staining at the base of the box, with containers in various states of decay observed in the box. Enviroscience field staff could not determine the contents of the containers in the box at the time of the survey.

Based on Title 29 CFR 1926.120 "Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response" regulations, crystalline material shall be handled as a shock-sensitive waste until the contents are determined. Shock-sensitive materials may pose a flame or explosion hazard if improperly handled.

Bulk containers of unknown chemicals were observed in isolated areas within the hospital building located at the Site. The contents of these containers could not be determined as the labels were in various states of degradation.

- Four 5-gallon buckets of unknown fluid located in the Incinerator Room
- One 55-gallon drum observed in the Incinerator Room
- One 55-gallon drum observed in the Laundry/Storage Area
- One 55-gallon drum of cleaning solution observed in the South Addition Boiler Plant
- One 55-gallon drum observed in the South Addition Boiler Area
- One 55-gallon drum labeled "Mobil Racing Fuel" in the upper floors of the 1952 Building
- One oxygen/acetylene cylinder setup observed in the South Addition Boiler Plant

Non-bulk containers of unknown surplus chemicals in various states of decay were observed in maintenance, janitorial and mechanical spaces. The surplus chemicals observed included but are not limited to: spray paints, penetrating oils, cutting oils, adhesives, machine oil, cleaning solutions and pesticides.

5.1 Conclusion

The contents of the non-bulk and bulk containers must be characterized for disposal purposes or presumed hazardous and disposed of accordingly.

Report prepared by Environmental Technician Kim Rinard.

Reviewed by:

Carlos Texidor
Project Manager

Robert L. May, Jr.
President