



## **Regional Brownfields Partnership of West Central Connecticut**

c/o Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
49 Leavenworth Street, Third Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 | 203.757.0535 | [nvcogct.gov](http://nvcogct.gov)

### **RBP Executive Board Record of Meeting Virtual Video Conference 2 p.m., Wednesday, Nov. 10, 2021**

Mr. Dunne began the meeting by explaining that there is a vacancy on the Executive Board left by Roy Cavanaugh's resignation. However, he was uncertain if Mr. Nardozzi also intended to resign from the Board. Mr. Nardozzi clarified that he did not have an intention to do so – rather, since he has left the Waterbury Development Corporation, he wanted to give people from other institutions a chance to participate. He clarified that he is happy to stay.

#### **1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

All participants said the Pledge of Allegiance.

Board members present were: Sheila O'Malley (Acting Chair), Jim Nardozzi (Secretary/Treasurer), Ron Pugliese (member at-large), and Chris Edge (member at-large). Staff present were: Rick Dunne (NVCOG Executive Director), Michael Szpryngel (NVCOG Financial Director), Ricardo Rodriguez (Brownfields Project Manager), and Christine O'Neill (NVCOG Environmental Planner).

#### **2. Approval of the April 5th, 2021 RBP Executive Board Record of Meeting (Attachment A)**

*Mr. Nardozzi moved to approve the April 5th, 2021 RBP Executive Board Record of Meeting. Mr. Pugliese seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.*

#### **3. Finance Report: Michael Szpryngel (Attachment B)**

Mr. Szpryngel displayed the first table and explained that there are two active projects: O'Sullivan's Island and Derby Main Street South. The next table showed that all funds have been fully allocated from the 2016 EPA Assessment Grant. The final table showed the breakdown of the funds from the 2021 EPA Assessment Grant, including Hazardous, Petroleum, and Admin. No questions or comments.

#### **4. RBP Committee Business - Projects Updates: Reference Material: Memo RBP1110021 (Attachments C)**

Mr. Rodriguez began with a general overview of projects. In regard to the FY2016 grant, all money has been disbursed and all activities have been completed on the Minerva Street project. Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Szpryngel are in the process of closing out the grant.

For the FY21 grant, three applications were received. All are eligible, none are in Opportunity Zones. The first is for the Town of Berlin, at 1 Main Street, for \$40,500 for Supplemental Phase II/III. The proposed outcome is 14 residential condominiums. The next application was for the Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, at 526 North Main Street, for \$125,000 for Phase I/II & Hazardous Building Materials Assessment. The proposed outcome is mixed-use retail space and residential units. The final



## **Regional Brownfields Partnership of West Central Connecticut**

c/o Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
49 Leavenworth Street, Third Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 | 203.757.0535 | [nvcogct.gov](http://nvcogct.gov)

application is for the Town of Thomaston, at 1 Thomas Avenue, for \$15,000 for Phase I/II. The proposed outcome is to replace the current tennis court at a school with a modern green recreational area.

The total cost of all applications is for \$180,500, but there is only \$165,800 available.

Mr. Dunne stated the solution staff is proposing is to award \$40,500 for Berlin, \$100,000 for Waterbury, and \$15,000 for Thomaston. However, Mr. Dunne was confident that once NVCOG brought in its LEP, Waterbury would either be able to complete the 526 Main Street project for \$100,000 or be able to secure additional funds down the line. The approvals, he noted, should be done in three separate motions.

### **a) Consideration of Grant Request for 1 Main St, Berlin (Attachment D)**

*Mr. Pugliese moved to grant the Town of Berlin \$40,500 to conduct environmental assessment activities at 1 Main Street, Berlin. Mr. Nardozzi seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.*

### **b) Consideration of Grant Request for 526 North Main Street, Waterbury (Attachment E)**

*Mr. Edge moved to grant the Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury \$100,000 to conduct environmental assessment activities at 526 North Main Street, Waterbury. Mr. Pugliese seconded.*

Mr. Nardozzi asked who would be the administrator of this grant – NVCOG or Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury. Mr. Dunne replied that it would be overseen by NVCOG. Mr. Dunne pointed out that there is a letter of endorsement on file from Mayor O’Leary, which is necessary for non-governmental grants. Mr. Nardozzi appreciated the clarification, and the Board was ready to vote.

*All were in favor and the motion carried.*

### **c) Consideration of Grant Request for 1 Thomas Ave, Thomaston (Attachment F)**

*Mr. Nardozzi moved to grant the Town of Thomaston \$15,000 to conduct environmental assessment activities at 1 Thomas Avenue, Thomaston. Mr. Pugliese seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.*

Chris Edge asked if there was a matching component for these grants. Mr. Dunne said there is a 10% match requirement with no restrictions on who can pay that 10%. Ms. O’Malley asked if that was financial or in-kind. Mr. Dunne explained that the RBP Board is the body that originally set the policy, and that the purpose of the match was to give NVCOG money to pay its own staff for oversight. Mr. Szpryngel contributed that in-kind matches have been accepted in the past.

## **5. RBP Nominations (Attachment G)**

After some discussion regarding which positions were up for re-election, Mr. Dunne clarified that it would be Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary/Treasurer.

The following slate was proposed:

- Ms. O’Malley as Chair



## Regional Brownfields Partnership of West Central Connecticut

c/o Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
49 Leavenworth Street, Third Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 | 203.757.0535 | [nvcogct.gov](http://nvcogct.gov)

- Mr. Pugliese as Vice Chair
- Mr. Nardozzi as Secretary/Treasurer

Additionally, the movement of Mr. Pugliese from an at-large member to an officer created a vacancy. To fill the rest of Mr. Pugliese's vacated term, the new at-large member would only serve for one year. The Nominating Committee was asked to consider the Letter of Interest submitted by Rista Malanca to join the Board.

Therefore, an additional nomination was proposed to fill the vacancy:

- Rista Malanca to fill the At-Large vacancy (for a term of 1 year)

*Mr. Edge moved to present the above slate at the Annual RBP Meeting for consideration. Mr. Pugliese seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.*

### **6. Other Business - Annual RBP Update: Christine O'Neill**

Ms. O'Neill explained that the Annual RBP Meeting has been rescheduled to January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022. It will still take place at the Mattatuck Museum in Waterbury, from 1pm-3pm.

### **7. Adjournment**

*Mr. Pugliese moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Nardozzi seconded. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.*

### **Attachments**

Attachment A: April 5th, 2021 RBP Executive Board Record of Meeting

Attachment B: Finance Report

Attachment C: Memo RBP1110021

Attachment D: Application for 1 Main Street, Berlin

Attachment E: Application for 526 North Main Street, Waterbury

Attachment F: Application for 1 Thomas Avenue, Thomaston

Attachment G: Letter of Interest from Rista Malanca



## Regional Brownfields Partnership of West Central Connecticut

c/o Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
49 Leavenworth Street, Third Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 | 203.757.0535 | [nvcogct.gov](http://nvcogct.gov)

### Record of Minutes RBP Executive Board Virtual Video Conference 11 a.m., Monday, April 5, 2021

#### 1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 11:02 a.m.

**Attendance:** Sheila O'Malley (Co-Chair), Ron Pugliese, Jim Nardozzi, Chris Edge, Rick Dunne (NVCOG), Lesley Barewin (NVCOG), Michael Szpryngel (NVCOG), Aaron Budris (NVCOG), & Ricardo Rodriguez (NVCOG)

#### 2. Approval of the November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 RBP Executive Board Record of Meeting

On a motion by Chris Edge, seconded by Ron Pugliese, it was unanimously VOTED: To approve the November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2020 Record of Minutes.

#### 3. RBP Committee Business - Projects Updates: Reference Material: Memo RBP04052021

RBP grant request(s): Available Funds \$29,051.13

- a) Consideration of Grant Request for Legasse LLC. on 1000 Bank St, Waterbury. (application attached, motion)  
On a motion by Ron Pugliese, seconded by Chris Edge, it was unanimously  
VOTED: To approve sub-granting Legasse LLC. \$4,000 for environmental assessment work on 1000 Bank Street, Waterbury.
- b) Consideration of Grant Request for 222-226 Rubber Ave, Naugatuck. (application attached, motion)  
On a motion by Jim Nardozzi, seconded by Ron Pugliese, it was unanimously  
VOTED: To approve the RLF backstopping of the 226 Rubber Ave, Naugatuck project.
- c) Consideration of Grant Request for 67-71 Minerva St, Derby. (application attached, motion)  
On a motion by Ron Pugliese, seconded by Chris Edge, it was unanimously  
VOTED: To approved sub-granting the City of Derby \$14,133.66 for hazardous assessment activities and \$10,917.47 for petroleum assessment activities on the 67-71 Minerva Street project.

4. Other Business

5. Adjournment

Called by  
RBP Executive Committee

*A language or sign translator can be requested five days in advance of the meeting.  
Un traductor de idiomas puede ser solicitado al menos cinco días previos a una reunión.  
Tłumacza języka lub języka migowego można poprosić pięć dni przed spotkaniem.*



# Attachment B

November 10, 2021

**MEMORANDUM: 11102021-FIN-01**

To: RBP Executive Committee  
 From: Michael P. Szpryngel, Director of Finance  
 Subject: Brownfield Financial Status Report

DECD Municipal Brownfields					
Project	DECD Award	%	Distributed	Undistributed Balance	Status
WTBY-44 Chaple St	100,000	7.47%	60,424	39,576	Complete
STBY-Training School	200,000	14.95%	80,548	119,452	Complete
MAD River Development	500,000	37.37%	423,859	76,141	Complete
BEAC-100 Railroad Ave	78,000	5.83%	74,647	3,353	Complete
THOM-E Main River	60,000	4.48%	3,000	57,000	Ended
DERB-O'Sullivan's Island MBA	200,000	14.95%	131,669	68,331	Active
DERB-Main St South	200,000	14.95%	135,408	64,592	Active
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,338,000</b>		<b>909,555</b>	<b>428,445</b>	

**Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
EPA 2016 Assessment Grant**

2

Award Budget		EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
		200,000	200,000	-
Hazardous				
Projects	City / Town	Approved	Distributed	Balance
<i>0 French St</i>	Watertown	22,229	22,229	-
<i>420 Main St</i>	Ansonia	44,708	44,708	-
<i>1875 Thomaston Ave</i>	Waterbury	40,581	40,581	-
<i>Minerva St</i>	Derby	25,464	25,464	-
<i>6 Rubber Ave</i>	Naugatuck	7,385	7,385	-
<i>Minerva St 2</i>	Derby	18,134	18,134	-
<b>Total Contractual</b>		<b>158,500</b>	<b>158,500</b>	<b>-</b>
Oversite		Approved	Expended	Balance
Peronal		26,690	26,690	-
Fringe		10,635	10,635	-
Travel		2,500	2,500	-
Supplies		1,500	1,500	-
Legal		175	175	-
<b>Total Oversight</b>		<b>41,500</b>	<b>41,500</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total Hazardous</b>		<b>200,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>-</b>
Through Period Ending		September 30, 2021		

Award Budget		EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
		200,000	200,000	-
Petroleum				
Projects	City / Town	Approved	Distributed	Balance
<i>161 Massirio Drive</i>	Berlin	22,780	22,780	-
<i>Chamberlin Highway</i>	Berlin	36,093	36,093	-
<i>251 Rubber Ave</i>	Naugatuck	27,245	27,245	-
<i>909 Bank St</i>	Waterbury	25,381	25,381	-
<i>Minerva St</i>	Derby	36,083	36,083	-
<i>Minerva St 2</i>	Derby	10,986	10,986	-
<b>Total Contractual</b>		<b>158,568</b>	<b>158,568</b>	<b>-</b>
Oversite		Approved	Expended	Balance
Peronal		27,120	27,120	-
Fringe		10,482	10,481	-
Travel		2,435	2,435	-
Supplies		1,123	1,123	-
Legal		273	273	-
<b>Total Oversight</b>		<b>41,432</b>	<b>41,431</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total Petroleum</b>		<b>200,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>-</b>
Through Period Ending		September 30, 2021		

EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
400,000	400,000	-
Assessment Total		
Approved	Distributed	Balance
317,068	317,068	-
Approved	Expended	Balance
53,810	53,810	-
21,116	21,116	-
4,935	4,935	-
2,623	2,623	-
448	448	-
<b>82,932</b>	<b>82,932</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>400,000</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>-</b>
September 30, 2021		

**NVCOG**  
**EPA | Assessment 2021 Grant**

Award Budget		EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
		200,000.00	-	200,000.00
Hazardous				
Contractual Commitments	City / Town	Approved	Distributed	Balance
<i>Project 1</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 2</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 3</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 4</i>		-	-	-
<b>Total Contractual</b>		-	-	-
<b>Contractual   Obligated</b>		<b>165,800.00</b>	-	<b>165,800.00</b>
Oversite		Approved	Expended	Balance
Peronal		15,000.00	-	15,000.00
Fringe Benefits		4,900.00	-	4,900.00
Travel		2,700.00	-	2,700.00
Supplies		1,600.00	-	1,600.00
Indirect Charges		10,000.00	-	10,000.00
<b>Total Oversight</b>		<b>34,200.00</b>	-	<b>34,200.00</b>
<b>Total Hazardous</b>		<b>200,000.00</b>	-	<b>34,200.00</b>
Through Period Ending		October 31, 2021		

Award Budget		EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
		100,000.00	-	100,000.00
Petroleum				
Contractual Commitments	City / Town	Approved	Distributed	Balance
<i>Project 1</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 2</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 3</i>		-	-	-
<i>Project 4</i>		-	-	-
<b>Total Contractual</b>		-	-	-
<b>Contractual   Obligated</b>		<b>83,000.00</b>	-	<b>83,000.00</b>
Oversite		Approved	Expended	Balance
Peronal		7,500.00	-	7,500.00
Fringe Benefits		2,500.00	-	2,500.00
Travel		1,400.00	-	1,400.00
Supplies		600.00	-	600.00
Indirect Charges		5,000.00	-	5,000.00
<b>Total Oversight</b>		<b>17,000.00</b>	-	<b>17,000.00</b>
<b>Total Petroleum</b>		<b>100,000.00</b>	-	<b>17,000.00</b>
Through Period Ending		October 31, 2021		

EPA Funding	Distributed	Undistributed Balance
300,000	-	300,000
Grant Total		
Approved	Distributed	Balance
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
-	-	-
<b>248,800</b>	-	<b>248,800</b>
Approved	Distributed	Balance
22,500	-	22,500
7,400	-	7,400
4,100	-	4,100
2,200	-	2,200
15,000	-	15,000
<b>51,200</b>	-	<b>51,200</b>
<b>300,000</b>	-	<b>51,200</b>
Through Period Ending		October 31, 2021



November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021

**MEMORANDUM: BFRLF11102021**

1. Project Updates: NVCOG is in midst of closing out its FY16 Assessment Grant with EPA. The remaining funds were allocated to the Minerva Street, Derby project. All environmental work under this grant has been completed prior to September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021. NVCOG staff are currently working with EPA with the submission of the closing documents.

Note: Possible new EPA Assessment funding round February/March 2022.

2. New Solicitation: FY21 Assessment Grant: The EPA recently awarded NVCOG with a new Assessment Grant of which \$ 165,800 is to be used for hazardous assessment activities and \$83,000 is to be used for Petroleum assessment activities.

Priorities for evaluation:

Eligibility: All 3 sites are eligible to receive an EPA sub-grant.

Opportunity Zone: No sites are located within an opportunity zone.

*Suggested Motion: “To grant the Municipality or Non-Profit the proposed awarded funds to conduct environmental assessment activities on the proposed specific site.”*

**RBP Applications Ranked by Alphabetical Order: Grant Requests**

	Municipality - site	Request	Use	Outcome
1	Berlin – 1 Main Street	\$40,500	Supplemental Phase II/III  Hazardous	Additional testing will be used to conduct confirmatory sampling required to help move the property forward with the site’s masterplan. Once data has been acquired the needed remedial activities will be determined. The Town of Berlin is working with an interested developer for the site. Proposed outcome is for 14 residential condominiums
2	Waterbury – 526 North Main Street	\$125,000	Phase I/II & HBMA  Hazardous	The Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury has partnered with a Shekinah Church to redevelop a former manufacturing site in one of Waterbury’s communities in need of low-income/affordable housing. The proposed out will be for mixed-use with commercial and retail space on the first floor and residential units on the second and third.
3	Thomaston – 1 Thomas Avenue	\$15,000	Phase I/II  Hazardous	Environmental data will be needed at a school in Thomaston prior to redevelopment occurring. The town would like to remove the tennis court and update it with a modern green recreational activity. It is believed the site has a history of manufacturing.
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$180,500</b>		<b>Preliminary Grant Amount Requested</b>



**NAUGATUCK VALLEY  
COUNCIL of GOVERNMENTS**

49 Leavenworth Street, 3rd Floor, Waterbury, CT 06702 • 203-757-0535 • 203-735-8688 • [nvcogct.org](http://nvcogct.org)

Assessment Funds Available: \$165,800. An additional \$14,700 would be needed to completely fund all three sites.

**PRE-APPLICATION  
NAUGATUCK VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
BROWNFIELDS LOAN/GRANT PROGRAMS**

**Applicant Information**

Applicant: Town of Berlin  
Address: 240 Kensington Road, Berlin, CT 06037  
Phone: 860-250-0317 Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: jmahoney@berlinct.gov  
Contact Name/Title: Jim Mahoney, Economic Development Coordinator

**Project Information**

Site Address for Brownfields Assessment/Cleanup Loan:  
1 Main Street Kensington, CT

Purpose of Loan/Grant: Phase I  Phase II  Phase III  RAP  Remediation

Please describe the activities to be conducted with the proceeds from the loan. Must include status of conversations between the property owner, the municipality, and interested parties.

Extensive remediation and testing of the 1 Main Street site have been conducted the site is owned by CIL of Kensington, Inc., that has been dissolved. There was a Form III transfer act form and ECAF filed with Connecticut DEEP when CIL of Kensington, Inc. in 2008. The homeowners Association for phase 1 of the Lofts at Sherwood Falls project (86 residential condo units in the redeveloped former mill building at 10 Main Street) owns the development rights that they acquired by litigation with CIL of Kensington. The Town has contacted CIL, the parent of the dissolved LLC and we hope to gain their permission for

Please indicate the assessment information already developed on the site:

Phase I  Phase II  Phase III  RAP

LEP contact: Brent Hennebry Phone: 860-646-2468 ext. 1 Email: BHennebry@fr

Proposed reuse: Housing  Commercial  Retail  Industrial  Mixed

Please provide estimates of the outcomes of your project:

New taxes \$ 72,000/yr New or retained jobs 25, construction

New investment \$ 3,000,000

Please describe any other benefits to be derived from the project such as reduction of blight, clean up of a contaminated condition, new construction, etc. (use an additional page if required):

The former Sherwood Tool/Sherri-Cup complex on Main Street in Kensington is in the middle of a single-family residential area, across from Town owned Paper Goods pond and park. The Sherwood complex had two parts, the multi-story former mill building at 10 Main Street and two one story buildings across the street at 1 Main Street. When the complex became vacant it was a blighted property in an otherwise stable single family residential neighborhood. CIL of Kensington, Inc., a for profit subsidiary of the non-profit Corporation for Independent Living prepared a master plan for the brownfields site. The master

Amount requested \$ 40,500 Date required 11/2021

The following credit information/history shall be provided by non-municipal applicants only:

- Three (3) years of tax returns/bank statements/W-2's/property income statements/financial statements.

The Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments is a public agency. Any information provided may be subject to disclosure. The credit information will be provided directly by the Applicant to the underwriter and is not considered part of this document but may be subject to disclosure pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-200 et. seq. The Applicant hereby grants permission for NVCOG staff to contact the LEP to discuss the environmental information provided to the NVCOG and to obtain a credit review. The receipt of the pre-application and review of the information provided does not ensure that a loan will be made. All loans are subject to the review and approval of the NVCOG Board of Directors and/or the US Environmental Protection Agency and the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development.

The Applicant understands and acknowledges that this pre-application is for informational purposes only in order for the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments to have an opportunity to review the information to determine eligibility, qualifications, etc.

The Applicant acknowledges that the above is understood and accepted and hereby requests a review of this pre-application.

Town of Berlin

\_\_\_\_\_  
Applicant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## For EPA Internal Use ONLY

### ASSESSMENT PROGRAM INFORMATION NEEDED TO DETERMINE SITE ELIGIBILITY (updated 4/11)

(Use Tab, arrow keys or mouse to move through questions; use Spacebar or mouse to check boxes)

#### A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date: 6.28.2021

1. Grant number: BF-
2. Grant recipient: Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments
3. Person providing site information: Ricardo Rodriguez, NVCOG Environmental Planner
4. Property/site name: Chase Brass and Copper Co. (Rolling Mill Div.)
5. Property address: 526 North Main Street, Waterbury
6. Current property owner: Shekinah Christian Church
7. Work to be done:  Phase I  Phase II  Phase III  Other  
Explain Other: HBM, RAP

#### B. SITES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

1. Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfields (*a real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants*)?  Yes  No
2. Type of contamination present:  Hazardous Substances  Petroleum  Co-Mingled  
(*If the site has both hazardous substances and incidental petroleum contamination, check the box the "co-mingled" box. If the site has hazardous substances and distinguishable petroleum contamination, you must obtain approval from the State and EPA.*)
3. Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The Chase Rolling Mill, owned by the Waterbury Manufacturing Company, and located on 526 North Main Street was constructed in 1900 to supply brass to the Waterbury Manufacturing Company. In 1910, the Chase Rolling Mill and Chase Metal Works Inc. merged to form the Chase Companies, Incorporated. Their main products was brass, copper, and bronze sheets, rod, wire, tube, and fittings. The company later changed its name again to the Chase Brass and Copper Company to reflect one of their business' name in New York. During WWII, the Chase Brass and Copper Company was contracted by government to make brass speciality items for them (buttons, bullets, etc.). In 1958, the Chase

Rolling Mill seized operations and became a warehouse for the company. In 1962, the company decided to move their headquarters to Ohio. A slow departure of employees slowly followed until 1974 when it closed operations at the North Main site. Prior to the current owner, the site was owned by Plishner Revocable and Radio Research Instruments Reality LLC. Shekinah Church purchase the property in 2014 and is currently using it for storage.

4. Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you think it is contaminated? : The site became contaminated through historical use of the Chase Brass and Copper Company. A phase II and HBM will be needed to determine the extent of the contamination.
5. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury, who will be servicing the site as it's developer has proposed the redevelopment of the former industrial site into a 100 + apartment unit building with commercial space within the first two floors.

**C. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING**

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List?  Yes  No
2. Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA?  Yes  No
3. Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control the US government? (Land held in trust by the US government for an Indian tribe is eligible.)  Yes  No

*Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (C. 1-3) your property is **not** eligible.*

**D. SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION:**

Certain properties cannot be approved without a "Property Specific Determination". Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action?  Yes  No
2. Has your site/facility been issued a permit by the U.S. or an authorized state under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA)?  Yes  No

3. Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 3004(u) or 3008(h))?  Yes  No
4. Is your site/facility a land disposal unit that has submitted a RCRA closure notification under subtitle C of RCRA or is subject to closure requirements specified in a closure plan or permit?  Yes  No
5. Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA?  Yes  No
6. Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund?  Yes  No

*Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (D. 1-6), please call your Project Officer and she/he will explain how to prepare a property specific determination. Refer to Appendix 2, Section 2.5, of the Proposal Guidelines for additional information.*

**\*\* For petroleum sites, please proceed to Section F – Petroleum Only Sites**

#### **E. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY**

1. Are there any known ongoing or anticipated environmental enforcement actions (at the federal, state or local level) regarding the responsibility of any party for contamination or hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No If yes, please explain:

**Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient does NOT own the site:**

1. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site?  Yes  No
2. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No
3. Describe the assessment grant recipient's relationship with the current owner and the owner's role in the work to be completed: Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury (NHSW) and Shekihan Church have an agreement where NHSW will be redeveloping the site into residential and commercial space. This project will include low income housing for local residents.

**Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient owns the site or will own the site during the grant performance period:**

1. How was the property acquired (or how will it be acquired)?
  - a.  Negotiated purchase from a private individual
  - b.  Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
  - c.  Tax foreclosure
  - d.  Eminent domain
  - e.  Donation
  - f.  Other (explain):
  
2. What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)? 7/2/2014
  
3. What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired? Radio Research Instruments Reality LLC.
  
4. Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the assessment grant recipient has or has had with all prior owners or operators of the property: CTBLB and or NHSW does not have any affiliations with Shekihan Church nor the previous owners.
  
5. Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the assessment grant recipient acquired (or will acquire) the property?  Yes  No
  
6. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site?  Yes  No
  
7. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No
  
8. Did the assessment grant recipient perform any environmental inquiry prior to the purchase of the property?  Yes  No
  
9. If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and indicate whether the applicant performed the pre-purchase inquiry in accordance with EPA's All Appropriate Inquiry rule (or ASTM E1527-05, or its equivalent at the time of purchase): CTBLB and or NHSW has not completed the AAI process yet.

**F. PETROLEUM ONLY SITES - PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY**

*Petroleum-only sites are to be submitted to the state for eligibility determination. Please contact your state representative to obtain the information they require to determine site eligibility. As a courtesy, send a copy of the site eligibility information to your EPA Project Officer so he or she is aware of potential upcoming work. The assessment grant recipient must provide their EPA Project Officer with a copy of the state's determination letter. The following questions are typical of the*

*petroleum site information you may need to provide to the state:*

1. Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination on the site?  Yes  No

*Note: If the answers to question F.1 is no, the site may be eligible.*

2. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on site?  Yes  No Explain:
3. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site?  Yes  No Explain:

*Note: If question F.1 identified a responsible party who is liable for petroleum contamination at the site, and that party is financially viable to pay for assessment and cleanup costs, then the site is **not** eligible. If the identified responsible party took reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination at the site, and/or is not financially viable to pay for the assessment and cleanup costs, then the site may still be eligible.*

4. Is the site “relatively low risk” compared with other “petroleum-only” sites in the state:
- a. Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies?  Yes  No
- b. Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)?  Yes  No

*Note: If the answers to questions F.4a and F.4b are no, the site would be considered to be of relatively low risk for purposes of determining eligibility.*

5. Has any responsible party been identified for the site through, either:
- a. A judgment rendered in a court of law or an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site:  Yes  No
- b. An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site:  Yes  No
- c. A citizen suit, contribution action or other third party claim brought against the current or immediate past owner, that would, if successful, require the assessment, investigation, or cleanup of the site:  Yes  No
6. Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?  
 Yes  No

Note: If the answer to any of the questions in F.5 or F.6 is yes, the site is **not** eligible.

## G. ACCESS

Does the assessment grant recipient have access or an access agreement for this property?

Yes  No

## H. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) COMPLIANCE

Note: If you answer yes to any of the following questions you should contact your project officer to determine if any additional information is required.

1. Is your selected property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark?  Yes  No

2. Is your selected property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places?  Yes  No

In order to support your response, please provide any and all documentation from the federal Government and/or State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). (i.e., SHPO Determination Letter which you may obtain independent of the EPA process.

3. Is your selected property (site) part of a designated Historic District?  Yes  No

4. Will your project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures?  Yes  No

5. Does your project have the potential to impact archaeological resources?  Yes  No

## I. SITE ELIGIBILITY

(To be filled out by EPA Project Officer.)

The site, at the above-described property, is eligible for assessment work:  Yes  No

---

Project Officer

---

Date

Need for Attorney Consultation:  Yes  No Notes:

## For EPA Internal Use ONLY

### ASSESSMENT PROGRAM INFORMATION NEEDED TO DETERMINE SITE ELIGIBILITY (updated 4/11)

(Use Tab, arrow keys or mouse to move through questions; use Spacebar or mouse to check boxes)

#### A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Date: 11/3/2021

1. Grant number: BF-00A00995-0
2. Grant recipient: Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments
3. Person providing site information: Ricardo Rodriguez, NVCOG Environmental Planner
4. Property/site name: Center School, Thomaston, CT
5. Property address: 1 Thomas Ave, Thomaston, CT
6. Current property owner: Town of Thomaston
7. Work to be done:  Phase I  Phase II  Phase III  Other  
Explain Other:

#### B. SITES ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING

1. Does the site meet the definition of a Brownfields (*a real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which is complicated by the presence or potential presence of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants*)?  Yes  No
2. Type of contamination present:  Hazardous Substances  Petroleum  Co-Mingled  
(*If the site has both hazardous substances and incidental petroleum contamination, check the box the "co-mingled" box. If the site has hazardous substances and distinguishable petroleum contamination, you must obtain approval from the State and EPA.*)
3. Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The Town of Thomaston would like to get some environmental data on a portion of the Center school property, specifically the Tennis Court. The Town believes that the tennis court once was part of a manufacturing site.

Describe the environmental concerns at the site, including when and how the site became contaminated and, to the extent possible, the nature and extent of the contamination. If the environmental concerns are unknown, or if the land has been vacant for many years, why do you

think it is contaminated? : The site may have been contaminated through historical manufacturing that would have occurred on site prior to the school being developed.

4. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The Town would like to gather environmental data to make a better decision. However, they have stated that they would like to remove the tennis court and incorporate the site as a different form of green/recreational space.

### C. **SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING**

Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your facility listed (or proposed for listing) on the National Priorities List?  Yes  No
2. Is your facility subject to unilateral administrative orders, court orders, administrative orders on consent, or judicial consent decrees issued to or entered into by parties under CERCLA?  Yes  No
3. Is your facility subject to the jurisdiction, custody, or control the US government? (Land held in trust by the US government for an Indian tribe is eligible.)  Yes  No

*Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (C. 1-3) your property is **not** eligible.*

### D. **SITES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING WITHOUT A PROPERTY SPECIFIC DETERMINATION:**

Certain properties cannot be approved without a "Property Specific Determination". Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge:

1. Is your site/facility subject to a planned or ongoing CERCLA removal action?  Yes  No
2. Has your site/facility been issued a permit by the U.S. or an authorized state under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), or the Safe Drinking Water Act (SWDA)?  Yes  No
3. Is your site/facility subject to corrective action orders under RCRA (sections 3004(u) or 3008(h))?  Yes  No
4. Is your site/facility a land disposal unit that has submitted a RCRA closure notification under subtitle C of RCRA or is subject to closure requirements specified in a closure plan or permit?  Yes  No
5. Has your site/facility had a release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that is subject to remediation under TSCA?  Yes  No

6. Has your site/facility received funding for remediation from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund?  Yes  No

*Note: If you answered YES to any of the above (D. 1-6), please call your Project Officer and she/he will explain how to prepare a property specific determination. Refer to Appendix 2, Section 2.5, of the Proposal Guidelines for additional information.*

**\*\* For petroleum sites, please proceed to Section F – Petroleum Only Sites**

## **E. PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY**

1. Are there any known ongoing or anticipated environmental enforcement actions (at the federal, state or local level) regarding the responsibility of any party for contamination or hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No If yes, please explain:

### **Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient does NOT own the site:**

1. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site?  Yes  No
2. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No
3. Describe the assessment grant recipient's relationship with the current owner and the owner's role in the work to be completed: The Town of Thomaston is the Owner of the site.

### **Information on Liability and Defenses/Protections - Answer the following if the assessment grant recipient owns the site or will own the site during the grant performance period:**

1. How was the property acquired (or how will it be acquired)?
- a.  Negotiated purchase from a private individual
  - b.  Purchase or transfer from another governmental unit
  - c.  Tax foreclosure
  - d.  Eminent domain
  - e.  Donation
  - f.  Other (explain):
2. What was the date when the property was acquired (or the anticipated date when it will be acquired)? 1939

3. What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired?  
Town of Thomaston
4. Describe all familial, contractual, corporate or financial relationships or affiliations the assessment grant recipient has or has had with all prior owners or operators of the property:  
None
5. Did disposal of all hazardous substances at the site occur before the assessment grant recipient acquired (or will acquire) the property?  Yes  No
6. Did the assessment grant recipient ever arrange for the disposal of hazardous substances at the site, or transport hazardous substances to the site?  Yes  No
7. Did the assessment grant recipient ever cause or contribute to any releases of hazardous substances at the site?  Yes  No
8. Did the assessment grant recipient perform any environmental inquiry prior to the purchase of the property?  Yes  No
9. If a pre-purchase inquiry was performed, describe the types and dates of the assessments performed, indicate on whose behalf the assessments were performed, and indicate whether the applicant performed the pre-purchase inquiry in accordance with EPA's All Appropriate Inquiry rule (or ASTM E1527-05, or its equivalent at the time of purchase): Phase I will be prepared under the proposed assessment.

#### **F. PETROLEUM ONLY SITES - PROPERTY OWNERSHIP ELIGIBILITY**

*Petroleum-only sites are to be submitted to the state for eligibility determination. Please contact your state representative to obtain the information they require to determine site eligibility. As a courtesy, send a copy of the site eligibility information to your EPA Project Officer so he or she is aware of potential upcoming work. The assessment grant recipient must provide their EPA Project Officer with a copy of the state's determination letter. The following questions are typical of the petroleum site information you may need to provide to the state:*

1. Did the current and/or immediate past owner dispense or dispose of petroleum or petroleum products, or exacerbate existing petroleum contamination on the site?  Yes  No

*Note: If the answers to question F.1 is no, the site may be eligible.*

2. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, did the responsible party take reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination on site?  Yes  No Explain:
3. If the answer to either question F.1 is yes, is the responsible party financially capable to assess and clean up the site?  Yes  No Explain:

*Note: If question F.1 identified a responsible party who is liable for petroleum contamination at the site, and that party is financially viable to pay for assessment and cleanup costs, then the site is **not** eligible. If the identified responsible party took reasonable steps to address the petroleum contamination at the site, and/or is not financially viable to pay for the assessment and cleanup costs, then the site may still be eligible.*

4. Is the site “relatively low risk” compared with other “petroleum-only” sites in the state:

a. Is the site currently being cleaned up using LUST trust fund monies?  Yes  No

b. Is the site currently subject to a response under the Oil Pollution Act (OPA)?  Yes  No

*Note: If the answers to questions F.4a and F.4b are no, the site would be considered to be of relatively low risk for purposes of determining eligibility.*

5. Has any responsible party been identified for the site through, either:

a. A judgment rendered in a court of law or an administrative order that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site:  Yes  No

b. An enforcement action by federal or state authorities against any party that would require any person to assess, investigate, or cleanup the site:  Yes  No

c. A citizen suit, contribution action or other third party claim brought against the current or immediate past owner, that would, if successful, require the assessment, investigation, or cleanup of the site:  Yes  No

6. Is the site subject to any RCRA orders issued under 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act?  
 Yes  No

*Note: If the answer to any of the questions in F.5 or F.6 is yes, the site is **not** eligible.*

## **G. ACCESS**

Does the assessment grant recipient have access or an access agreement for this property?

Yes  No

## **H. NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT (NHPA) COMPLIANCE**

*Note: If you answer yes to any of the following questions you should contact your project officer to determine if any additional information is required.*

1. Is your selected property (site) currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places and/or is it a designated National Landmark?  Yes  No

2. Is your selected property (site) eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places?  Yes  No

In order to support your response, please provide any and all documentation from the federal Government and/or State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). (i.e., SHPO Determination Letter which you may obtain independent of the EPA process.

3. Is your selected property (site) part of a designated Historic District?  Yes  No

4. Will your project impact the viewshed of any adjacent or surrounding designated Historic Districts or registered historic structures?  Yes  No

5. Does your project have the potential to impact archaeological resources?  Yes  No

## I. SITE ELIGIBILITY

*(To be filled out by EPA Project Officer.)*

The site, at the above-described property, is eligible for assessment work:  Yes  No

\_\_\_\_\_  
Project Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Need for Attorney Consultation:  Yes  No Notes:

Additional Information:

# Attachment G

## City Of Torrington

RISTA MALANCA, AICP  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
140 Main Street • City Hall  
Torrington, CT 06790-5245



Phone: (860) 496-5920  
Fax: (860) 489-2541  
e-mail: [Rista\\_Malanca@torringtonct.org](mailto:Rista_Malanca@torringtonct.org)

Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments  
49 Leavenworth St  
Waterbury, CT 06702

RE: RBP Executive Board

Dear Ms. O'Neill,

I have worked for the City of Torrington for almost 8 years, the past 3 have been as the Director of Economic Development and previously, I was the Assistant Planner. I work very closely with our developers, especially when it comes to redeveloping a brownfield property.

I am interested in joining the RBP's Executive Committee, as I find the RBP to be an essential resource for brownfield redevelopment projects.

Please feel free to contact me if you would like any further information

Thank you for your consideration,

Rista Malanca, AICP  
City of Torrington