

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: October 8, 2014

Grant number: BF96166601

1. Grant recipient: City of Chicopee, MA
2. Person providing site information: Lee M. Pouliot
3. Property/site name: Former Facemate Property - Redevelopment Parcel #1
4. Property address: Assessors Parcel ID #0173-00001, West Main Street Chicopee, MA 01020
5. Current property owner: City of Chicopee
6. Work to be done: Phase I Phase II Phase III Other
Explain Other: Representative Hazardous Building Materials Study

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.*)

Describe the operational history and current use(s) of the site: The Former Facemate Corporation property consisted of two parcels totaling approximately 20.2 acres and was developed in the early 1800s for the manufacture of textiles. Between 1823 and 1915 the Site was owned by the Chicopee Manufacturing Company which manufactured and processed cotton cloth. The property was bought by Johnson & Johnson in 1915, who continued production activities. In 1977, the property was purchased by Facemate Corporation, which produced finished cotton and synthetic cloth. Facemate Corporation was forced to shut down in 2003 due to bankruptcy and foreclosure proceedings.

The City completed approximately \$6 million dollars in site-wide demolition and remediation work during summer and fall of 2013. Additionally, the City has completed an ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey and Subdivision Plans for the property to create three re-development parcels. The middle parcel has already been redeveloped as RiverMills Center - the City's new Senior Center.

Redevelopment Parcel #1 consists of approximately 4.6 acres and encompasses the southern portion of the former Facemate property. It includes former Facemate Building C (known as the Baskin Building), a rectangular brick warehouse building consisting of two (2) levels. Dimensions are approximately 146 feet by 38 feet with a finished space of approximately 11,000 square feet. The property is currently vacant as the City continues to prepare the parcel for redevelopment.

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? : An ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was completed in April 2010 for Redevelopment Parcel #1. Since that time, there has been significant cleanup of rail beds and surficial solid wastes. Over 3,000 cubic yards of rail bed soils were excavated and relocated to a consolidation area located on an adjacent parcel and layered with crushed asphalt, brick and concrete. Historic use of Redevelopment Parcel #1 included heavy manufacturing, with a canal, penstocks and tail races, making it very likely that buried demolition debris is located throughout much of the parcel. During on-going Phase II investigations, surface soil sampling conducted along abandoned rail lines identified the presence of heavy metals, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and residual pesticides/herbicides. In addition, twelve exploratory test pits were excavated and buried demolition debris was encountered in many of them. A total of eight soil borings were progressed at "suspect" locations on the Site and two of them were completed as groundwater monitoring wells. No groundwater contamination was encountered at those locations.

The proposed clean-up plan, per the City's FY 2014 US EPA Cleanup grant, includes the capping in place with on and off-site management of debris, wastes and contaminated soils. The City would like to complete the additional Phase II assessments to better quantify the known solid waste issues to be dealt with through a the planned cleanup project funded through the cleanup project. Additionally, the City would like to complete a Hazardous Building Materials Study on the Baskin Parcel to prepare for any required future abatement that may be needed to facilitate reuse of the structure.

Where the residual contaminant levels meet acceptable risk management objectives under the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP), capping with two feet of an engineered barrier (i.e. parking areas) and/or three feet of soil in landscaped areas is often a cost effective strategy that is protective of both human health and the environment. It is likely that this alternative would also include off-site management of: recyclable and reusable material (including contaminated soil); all hazardous and special wastes; and any other deleterious materials that are not suitable for capping on the Site. On-Site consolidation of certain debris and/or contaminated soil in designated areas (i.e. parking, under buildings, etc.) would also be implemented where appropriate and consistent with applicable regulations.

3. Describe the proposed expansion, redevelopment or reuse of the property: The Development Vision for Redevelopment Parcel #1 as defined in the RiverMills Vision Plan and Expanded Notification Form (EENF) with Phase I Waiver Request as submitted to the Office of Energy

and Environmental Affairs/Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office includes re-use of the 11,000 square foot Baskin Building as commercial/retail space and the development of eight (8) residential units. This proposal received a MEPA Phase I Waiver on September 12, 2012. The City anticipates development proposals by private development teams to vary from this original vision; however development teams are expected to capitalize on the catalytic components of RiverMills Center (the City's new Senior Center) which opened in September 2014. The City is currently exploring the possibility of developing a restaurant incubator at the property and is planning to advance grant proposals to other funding sources to complete a Market Study and Business Plan for the project.

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 City is the current owner of the property.

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)? The City acquired the former Facemate Corporation properties through tax foreclosure. The Facemate properties were acquired by parcel: Parcel 173-04 was acquired on June 16, 2003 as recorded in the Hampden County Registry of Deeds, Book 13344, page 589; Parcel 173-01 was acquired on July 26, 2005 as recorded in the Hampden County Registry of Deeds, Book 15274, page 379. The City has since sub-divided the property into three development parcels: this proposal addresses only Redevelopment Parcel #1.
3. What is the name and identity of the party from whom the property was (or will be) acquired?
The former Facemate Corporation
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: N/A
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

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): BETA Group, Inc., an environmental consultant, has been retained by the City to provide Licensed Site Professional (LSP) services, assess and develop remediation measures for environmental conditions at the property.

An ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was completed on April 2010 for Redevelopment Parcel #1. During on-going Phase II investigations, surface soil sampling conducted along abandoned rail lines identified the presence of heavy metals, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and residual pesticides/herbicides. In addition, twelve exploratory test pits were excavated and buried demolition debris was encountered in many of them. A total of eight soil borings were progressed at "suspect" locations on the Site and two of them were completed as groundwater monitoring wells. No groundwater contamination was encountered at those locations.

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

Christine Lombard
Project Officer

10/14/2014
Date

Need for Attorney Consultation: Yes No Notes:

Additional Information: