

Jaffrey Economic Development Council
Draft Minutes 10/19/17

9:00 am Town Office

Present: Peter Chamberlain, Chair
Larry Alvarez, Dominique Cassie, Cathy Furze, Sam Hackler, Stephanie Niemela, Mike Shea

Staff: Jo Anne Carr

In Attendance: Jon Frederick, Town Manager, Cush Moore, Selectman, Randy Heglin, DPW Director, David Chamberlain, Fire Chief, Rob Deschenes, Building/Code Enforcement, J.B. Mack, SWRPC, Larry Thibeault, property owner, Daisy Hawlk, Tory McCagg and Carl Querforth.

1. WW Cross Briefing by Steven Rickerich, Ransom Consulting

Steve Rickerich opened by describing the site and history. As part of the assessment the entire site had to be evaluated but the focus was on the westerly side – not subject to the current Groundwater Management Zone permit (GMP). See figure on slide three of the presentation (attached). The building is 100,000 sq. ft. on an 11 acre site, built in 1915. It was sold to the Community Development Finance Authority (CDFA) in 2004, then to private interests.

Overview: The loading docks are identified as potential spill sites, leaking roof and an above ground 20,000 gallon above ground storage tank. The sawtooth roof structure which was common in older mill buildings to let in light, is an asbestos source. The plating rooms has sumps and drains into which, prior to the Clean Water Act of the 1970s, is documented that 1000 gallons per year of contaminants such as zinc, brass, cadmium, cyanide, kerosene, etc. were dumped. At present some wastes are stored inside. Vandals have destroyed much of the building including the recently renovated portions.

The Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of 1924, 1941 and 1953 indicate the presence of a large underground storage tank for heating fuel. A 1952 aerial photo shows evidence of over the bank dumping (toward the settling ponds). Stanley Black and Decker has assumed liability per the Department of Environmental Services' requirement for the GMP.

The GMP Recognized Environmental Concerns (see slide 15) as documented by Loureiro Engineering include cadmium, cyanide and PCE downslope of the capped landfill. But these are also found at the top of the landfill – upgradient of where the contaminants were assumed to be contained. This leaves a question as to the source of the upslope contaminants.

Recognized Environmental Concerns on the easterly portion of the site (not subject to the existing GMP), subject to this Phase 1 Environmental Investigation and Hazardous Buildings Materials Inventory include:

- The known 20,000 gallon above ground storage tank (AST)
- The former underground storage tank (unknown size)
- Historical use of floor drains
- Impacts to monitoring wells upgradient of the landfill
- Possibility of an off-site plume migrating onto the site.

Other Concerns

- Vandalism,
- Potential releases within the building
- Historical loading/unloading areas
- Nearby high-risk properties
- Impacts to wells upgradient of landfill (source of contaminants?)
- Inventory and assessment of stored hazardous materials, removal and proper disposal

- Close the 20,000 gallon (AST)
- Review of historical property agreements. Stanley Black and Decker *may* be bound to clean-up the entire site as a result of old practices.

Recommended Phase II Environmental Assessment. Ransom Consulting recommends a follow-up assessment including installation of new monitoring wells and inventory of nearby property uses. At this time there is no funding approval through the Brownfields assessment program of the Southwest Region Planning Commission.

Hazardous Building Materials Assessment includes collected materials suspected of asbestos, lead paint, solvents, PCBs in paint and caulk. Three were positive detections of asbestos in the roofing materials. An order of magnitude cost estimate for asbestos mitigation is about \$216,760. An estimate of the cost of mitigating the remaining hazardous materials is \$21,429.

Summary:

- Found numerous Recognized Environmental Conditions
- Close the AST – manage and dispose of waste
- Evaluate indemnification for legacy issues
- Abatement of asbestos containing materials (ACM) cost not insignificant
- Universal Waste Management, recycling and disposal is needed

Questions:

Why was the original GMZ line drawn as shown on the third slide? Response is that there is no apparent rational explanation, there is no clean well on the outer perimeter which typically defines GMZ boundaries. Perhaps the thinking was drawing the line as such keeps the western portion of the parcel open for development?

Who can address the legacy issue and how do we access the contractual agreements? J.B. suggested that if the planning commission would need cause to pursue further investigations on site. That is SWRPC would need to hear from the Town that there was some kind of plan in place for redevelopment, with the owner's buy in. There would need to be a clear goal at the end of the clean-up process. There are funds available through the petroleum grant program which could address at least a portion of the cost.

A follow-up question asks how much of a commitment from the owner is needed? Mr. Thibeault replied that he has the building for sale.

Does this assessment assume a complete tear down? Much of the building is in poor condition, it would depend on the developer and what intended use is proposed.

Has there been an impact to the river? Sampling of the surface water to date has not reported any water quality exceedances. There is a use restricting on the landfill area which restricts any disturbance.

Do monitoring well limit access and redevelopment? That would depend on the results of monitoring. The wells themselves would not restrict development providing access was protected.

If cyanide was detected upgradient of the landfill why not investigate the cause? While cyanide was detected upgradient, the results have not exceeded ambient groundwater quality standards, thus an investigation is not required by DES at this time.

Clarification: The estimate for remediation is +200,000 added to the cost of building demolition and new construction. Also, there are differences in funding access and availability between a private developer and a non-profit or government organization. A private developer may be eligible for low interest loans, whereas a non-profit or government entity could benefit from grants. The site is also within an Economic Revitalization Zone which provides tax credits to a developer.

What is the estimated cost of the follow-up Phase II? EPA has specific requirements, Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), so the cost could be in the \$51,000 range.

The Phase I assessment will be valid for a period of 6 months. After that a new developer would have to update the report, which shouldn't be onerous.

There being no further questions, Peter Chamberlain thanked Mr. Rickerich for the presentation.

2. Other Business

Jo Anne reported that due to the schedule change Ed Merrell cannot attend EDC meetings. It was agreed to adopt a 2nd Thursday of the month schedule.

Budgets will be discussed next month.

3. Reports

- a. Route 202/124 Traffic Project – find project updates here -
http://town.jaffrey.nh.us/Pages/JaffreyNH_WebDocs/DowntownTrafficProject/
follow the link to the NH DOT site. It's important that the EDC generate citizen input – comments can be sent in to the town on the town website email us comments – here
http://town.jaffrey.nh.us/Pages/JaffreyNH_WebDocs/Comments
- b. The Town has updated its website to www.TownofJaffrey.com and has a facebook page
<https://www.facebook.com/Town-of-Jaffrey-849246111877553/>

4. Adjourn

Next meeting Date: November 9, 2017 @ 9:00 AM